

The Effectiveness of Staged Translation in Young EFL Learners' Vocabulary Learning^{*,1)}

Ah Young Son & Chul Joo Uhm**

(Chonnam National University)

Son, Ah Young & Uhm, Chul Joo (2015). The Effectiveness of Staged Translation in Young EFL Learners' Vocabulary Learning. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal* 23(4), 149-168. This article examined the effects of staged translation on EFL vocabulary learning for young learners. To carry out the study, 112 sixth graders of Korean elementary school with equivalent English proficiency were randomly divided into two groups, a meaning-focused instruction (MFI) group and a staged translation (ST) group. During three teaching sessions, the ST group performed step by step translation tasks, whereas the MFI group received meaning-centered tasks. Two post examinations, a month apart, were administered to test active and passive vocabulary knowledge. The final analysis revealed the ST group performed significantly better on active and passive recall of vocabulary than the MFI group. Although more effort is required to learn lexical bundles, staged translation may attract young learners' attention to meaning and form of vocabulary and lead to learning.

Key Words: staged translation, vocabulary learning, young EFL learners, meaning-focused instruction

1. Introduction

For the last few decades, many theories and empirical studies (e.g., Coady, 1995) have hypothesized that a second language (L2) should be instructed in the target language, staying away from the learner's native language (L1).

* This work is based on the first author's doctoral dissertation (Son, 2016)

** The first author is Ah Young Son and the corresponding author, Chul Joo Uhm.

Particularly, with the emergence of the communicative approach translation using L1 has not received much attention and its role has been somewhat ignored in the EFL setting (Atkinson, 1987).

However, since young learners are able to retain new information more easily when relating the information to prior knowledge (Wood *et al.*, 1993), it can be assumed that concrete L1 knowledge in the process of translation works as a better medium for form and meaning mapping in second language vocabulary learning. In addition, research has proven that translation is a meaningful learning and teaching method in L2 classrooms (Benson, 2000; Chamot *et al.*, 1987).

To date, studies on translation have rarely investigated its effectiveness with respect to vocabulary learning. The studies employed individual techniques such as word-to-word translation or sentence translation alone without combining the techniques. In order to supplement the research, the present study applies step by step translation tasks and examines its effect in terms of vocabulary knowledge¹). During three sessions, translation tasks with different levels of difficulty were employed in stages. First, the students received teacher led translation as an input and then underwent individual translation tasks to produce an output. These tasks were done translating from L2-L1 to L1-L2 and from word level to sentence level translation. It is called 'staged translation' in this study, referring to translation both at the lexical level and the syntactic level.

The purpose of the study is to find a place for staged translation in facilitating language acquisition for young EFL learners compared to the meaning centered instruction which has been generously applied in Korea. The research questions to be addressed in the study are as follows:

1. Will staged translation tasks improve meaning and form recall of vocabulary more than meaning-focused tasks?
2. Will the vocabulary learning in staged translation tasks (if any improvement) be durable?

1) Word knowledge at three levels by Nation (2001) : form, meaning and use

2. Literature Review

Since the communicative language teaching (CLT) has emphasized communication in the actual discourse context, the focus of teaching English has shifted from language forms to linguistic functions and meanings for communication. However, the CLT has been criticized that it prevented L2 learners from developing linguistic knowledge and accuracy due to a lack of attention (Bax, 2003). The approach to second language acquisition has changed so that learners focus on the linguistic element (form) in the context of communication (Long, 1991). Some researches has supported the premise that translation is one of the influential form-focused techniques for teaching a new language (Laufer & Girsai, 2008). In the studies, translation has been mostly employed as an output task to draw learners' attention to linguistic elements. When students are supposed to produce language while translating, they would pay attention to a feature or grammar that they might otherwise ignore in light of the output hypothesis (Swain, 1995). Vaezi and Mirzaei (2007) suggests that translating L1 sentences into a target language can help learners focus on specific structures and use them.

Translation has been applied in various forms and proved to be beneficial in language learning: word level (e.g., Ellis & Beaton, 1993), sentence level translation (e.g., Vaezi & Mirzaei, 2007), one-way or two-way translation (e.g., Finkbeiner & Nicol, 2003; Ramachandran & Rahim, 2004). There are attempts needed to apply translation tasks combining a few techniques in stages considering relatively low linguistic ability of EFL young learners. When it comes to learnability, the translation tasks can be designed stage by stage on the model of the processability hierarchy hypothesized by Pienemann (1998). The processability theory (PT), a part of the cognitive approach to SLA, has claimed that learners can produce only those structures that their current language processor can handle. Pienemann (1998) has argued that learners must be able to process a simpler language structure before they acquire a more complicated structure in the next stage. A completion of the initial 'word to word translation', not requiring much procedure might lead to learners being able to grasp future phrase level and sentence level translation.

Class interaction during translation is another factor leading to language

acquisition and encouraging learners' attention to correct form. Research on interaction assumes that language learning is stimulated by communicative interaction (Gass, 2003). Long (1996) suggested that negative feedback received through negotiation can be facilitative of language acquisition and necessary for learning L1-L2 contrasts, at least for vocabulary. Newton (1995) examined the effectiveness of meaning-negotiation on a word in group interaction, proving negotiated words were more durable than ones not negotiated in learners' memory. Since translation tasks demand focus on form and accuracy from learners, they have an aptitude to be affected by negative feedback, compared to meaning centered tasks. When group works for translation are employed, interaction within a group and feedback from it, could work as negative feedback or meaning-negotiation to affect language acquisition.

Translation is a method mainly based on the use of L1, which differs from the currently used meaning focused instruction (MFI). A multitude of research has identified learners' L1 is considerably influential on L2 vocabulary learning. According to Schmitt (1997), learners can use their L1 in learning L2, and the use of bilingual dictionaries is of great importance. Psycholinguistic studies have demonstrated that L1 is influential on L2 lexical processing in both beginning and advanced levels of language acquisition (Hall, 2002). Laufer and Shmueli (1997) also suggest that translation is more effective than L2 based learning. Hall (2002) accounts for why the initial link between form and meaning can benefit from the use of L1. He stated that the link is a combination of a new L2 word form and the corresponding L1 item, which learners already have in their memory. The L1 translation can be a natural medium for achieving a L2 word. Furthermore, Schmitt (2008) suggests that explicit teaching can be more effective for the form-meaning link during the beginning of learning, thus making implicit exposure more beneficial for contextual knowledge. Translation can be an explicit method using learners' L1 to establish the initial form-meaning link of a word.

When it comes to the optimal stage in the use of translation particularly for vocabulary learning, Perkins(1985) has advocated for the use of the translation method for advanced learners with a solid foundation of L2. On the contrary, Husain (1995) has suggested that translation tasks can be remarkably effective in learning vocabulary and phrases with the low and intermediate level learners,

but cannot work as well with high level students. Prince (1996) found that newly learned vocabulary can be retrieved more easily when using L1 translation compared to L2 context. They found this to be especially true for low level.

In terms of type of vocabulary knowledge, Laufer (1998) distinguishes passive (receptive) and active (productive) vocabulary knowledge. Some researchers have investigated how effective translation is in each vocabulary knowledge or in both. Mondria (2003) finds that L2 based word learning was not more time-efficient than L1 meaning given method on meaning recall. Hummel (2010) also examines the effectiveness of translation on word meaning retention. Laufer and Girsai (2008) show that translation can positively affects both meaning and form of single words and collocations. Likewise, the effect of translation on passive and active vocabulary knowledge is investigated in this study.

To our knowledge, some studies on translation conducted in Korea, have exclusively targeted high school, university and adult students (e.g. Kim, 2012; Kim and Lee, 2008). It's rare to find the effectiveness of form-focused instruction including translation for young EFL learners. In their studies, translation has been used as an assessment method or they have focused on grammatical structures.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

In this study, six classes of 112 sixth graders from a Korean public elementary were randomly divided into two groups: a meaning focused instruction (MFI) group and a staged translation (ST) group. They were all Korean native speakers who have studied English in Korean public school for three years prior to the experiment. The two groups have equivalent English levels based on the results of their school issued English assessment test as Table 1 shows.

Table 1. The Initial Equivalency of the ST group and the MFI group

Tests	MFI (N=56)		ST (N=56)		t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
School issued English assessment test	85.09	85.18	9.977	10.487	-.046	.963

* $p < .05$

Additionally, eighty four percent of study participants received extra English education outside of school based on their answers on a survey before the experiment. The amount of private education and its curriculum focusing on their school textbook were assumed to be almost identical in both groups. Even if we left the extra education out of the discussion, we can't completely rule out the possibility that the extra education might lead to vocabulary learning. The lower level students with reading impairments were excluded from the experiment.

3.2 Target Items

The target English words and lexical bundles²⁾ were selected after testing the participants a week before the experiment. The pre-test asked the participants to write the meaning of the 70 English words in Korean. It was done on the assumption that young learner's receptive vocabulary knowledge develops faster than productive knowledge (Laufer, 1998). Based on the results of the pre-test, the book "LOOK WHAT I'VE GOT!" by Anthony Browne was selected and the target vocabulary was embedded in the book. Ten single words³⁾ and ten lexical bundles⁴⁾, which the sixth graders didn't know were selected.

3.3 Procedure

Each session was taught in English and in Korean, once a week for 40 minutes like in their regular class. The experiment lasted three weeks and was

2) Lexical bundles are defined by frequently occurring sequences of words, differing from idiomatic expressions (Biber and Barbieri, 2007).

3) bet, crossly, enormous, glare, pirate, pleased, pull, suddenly, terrified, towards

4) all right, come by, come out, go for a walk, be full of, leap out at, out of, park-keeper, pounce on, take someone to

intended to mirror the three week curriculum of the school. The learners in each condition were taught by the same researcher and participated in both, individual and group activities that had a time limit set for each task. During all the sessions, they could ask the teacher for help about unknown words or grammar without using dictionaries.

Both groups received identical warm-up activities in the beginning of each session: listening to the story with an audio file recorded by a native English teacher, then reading the book by themselves and answering true or false text-based statements.

Afterward, different tasks were given to each group. The MFI group received tasks which were grounded in the whole contents and the context of the story: answering comprehension questions, assuming the meaning of vocabulary from the context, retelling or reorganizing the story and doing role-play. The ST group received staged translation tasks based on difficulty level over time: translating a whole story into L1 guided by a teacher, matching L1 and L2, doing two way translation from word-level to sentence-level. (see APPENDIX for more details)

A week after the last treatment, all the learners were tested on the target items without notice. Active recall and passive recall were tested separately at different times. A month later another test was administered in the same manner to check long-term memory.

The answers were graded 0 to 1. A correct answer was rated 1 point and an incorrect answer or a blank received zero points. In the test on active recall, the answers with minor spelling errors were not taken into account. Any Korean words or phrases on passive recall that made sense in the context of the English sentences were considered correct.

4. Results and Discussion

A quantitative analysis of the test results was carried out through SPSS 21.0 version. Independent T-test for comparison between two different conditions and paired T-test for comparison between two post-tests were administered based on the students' scores on the two sets of the post-tests. This study used

the analysis test at the .05 significance levels. Table 2 and Table 3 present descriptive statistics for the results of the two post-tests. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations of the immediate post-tests on meaning and form recall of the target words and lexical bundles respectively. The results of the test administered one month later are presented on Table 3. The figures of the tables indicate that the ST group received the higher scores in both the immediate tests and the delayed tests.

Table 2. Immediate post-test scores

Condition		Passive recall		Active recall	
		Single words	Lexical bundles	Single words	Lexical bundles
MFI (N=56)	M	4.07	3.11	2.34	1.09
	SD	2.053	1.580	1.919	1.014
ST (N=56)	M	7.02	6.27	5.25	2.75
	SD	2.707	3.024	3.271	2.391

Table 3. Delayed post-test scores

Condition		Passive recall		Active recall	
		Single words	Lexical bundles	Single words	Lexical bundles
MFI (N=56)	M	3.89	2.96	2.16	.95
	SD	1.979	1.595	1.924	.961
ST (N=56)	M	6.96	6.29	5.25	2.54
	SD	2.565	2.903	3.187	2.264

Although the scores of both groups went down slightly on the delayed tests, the ST group still achieved a higher score than the MFI group. The delayed test verifies that both groups retained a significant amount of the learned vocabulary in long-term memory. On both immediate and delayed tests, the two groups scored higher on the passive tests compared to the active test. This once again confirms that vocabulary learning is incremental and students tend to acquire passive vocabulary knowledge before mastering active knowledge (Laufer, 1998).

In terms of the research questions, T-tests were used to check whether there was a measurable difference in the learners' performance in the post tests using two conditions. The administered t-tests scores show a significant difference in

all cases in Table 4 and Table 5. The study aimed to verify whether staged translation tasks will improve meaning and form recall of vocabulary more than the generally used meaning-focused tasks.

Table 4. Differences between the two groups (Immediate post-tests)

Tests	MFI (N=56)		ST (N=56)		t	p	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Passive Recall	Single words	4.07	2.053	7.02	2.707	-6.491	.000*
	Lexical bundles	3.11	1.580	6.27	3.024	-6.932	.000*
Active Recall	Single words	2.34	1.919	5.25	3.271	-5.743	.000*
	Lexical bundles	1.09	1.014	2.75	2.391	-4.785	.000*

* $p < .05$

Table 5. Differences between the two groups (Delayed post-tests)

Tests	MFI (N=56)		ST (N=56)		t	p	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Passive Recall	Single words	3.89	1.979	6.96	2.565	-7.094	.000*
	Lexical bundles	2.96	1.595	6.29	2.903	-7.504	.000*
Active Recall	Single words	2.16	1.924	5.25	3.187	-6.211	.000*
	Lexical bundles	.95	.961	2.54	2.264	-4.835	.000*

* $p < .05$

The test results indicate that the ST group demonstrated significantly higher scores than the other group on all immediate tests and delayed tests. The MFI group, that only received meaning-centered instruction, learned a small percentage of lexical bundles. In the aggregate, the ST group acquired almost 67 percent of passive vocabulary and 40 percent of active vocabulary on the immediate tests, while the MFI group learned approximately 36 percent of new passive vocabulary and 17 percent of active vocabulary on the immediate tests.

Paired t-tests were carried out to compare the difference of means between the immediate and delayed tests within the group. The delayed test results of the two groups declined slightly on both, passive and active tests, as seen in Table 6 and Table 7.

Table 6. Differences between the two post-tests for MFI group

Tests	Immediate test (N=56)		Delayed test (N=56)		t	p	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
	Passive Recall	Single words	4.07	2.05			3.89
	Lexical bundles	3.11	1.58	2.96	1.60	2.21	.031*
Active Recall	Single words	2.34	1.92	2.16	1.92	2.20	.032*
	Lexical bundles	1.09	1.01	.95	.96	1.74	.088

* $p < .05$

Table 7. Differences between the two post-tests for ST group

Tests	Immediate test (N=56)		Delayed test (N=56)		t	p	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
	Passive Recall	Single words	7.02	2.71			6.96
	Lexical bundles	6.27	3.02	6.29	2.90	-.23	.821
Active Recall	Single words	5.25	3.27	5.25	3.19	.00	1.00
	Lexical bundles	2.75	2.39	2.54	2.26	2.12	.038*

* $p < .05$

The learning of new word knowledge in the MFI group doesn't last completely for one month with the exception of active recall of lexical bundles. The results on the lexical bundles can be explained by their immediate test, which shows that the MFI group learned a small quantity of lexical bundles, or none at all.

On the other hand, the ST group's results present the complete opposite. The differences between the immediate tests and delayed tests in the ST group are not statistically significant excluding the tests on active recall of lexical bundles. Thus, revealing the acquisition of new word knowledge being retained for at least one month. However, the active recall of the lexical bundles and its proper usage resulted in the most significant drop on the delayed tests of the ST groups. This can be explained by the 'processability theory' (see 'literature review' section). According to the processability hierarchy (Pienemann, 1998), the target lexical bundles were a few kinds of phrases which hold higher difficulty levels and need more procedure than a simple word without procedure. Therefore, the lexical bundles acquisition of a verb and an adverb or a

preposition can be harder than a single word.

The ST condition demonstrated that a high acquisition of vocabulary knowledge occurred. Significantly higher scores showed even in their active recall of lexical bundles which can be the most difficult aspect of vocabulary knowledge compared to the MFI group. As Coady and Huckin argue (1997) that vocabulary knowledge is considered to be the core of communicative skills, it can be assumed with certainty that elementary school learners exposed to ST not only benefit in vocabulary knowledge but also from enhanced communicative competence. As for what stage (age) the use of translation could be applied to, the results of this study suggest that translation tasks can have positive effects on even young learners supporting the levels used by Husain (1995) and Prince (1996).

In order to examine the learners' attention to word form deeply, we scored the immediate post-tests on active recall with a syllable unit. As Table 8 shows, the ST group outperformed the MFI group significantly.

Table 8. The Amount of Syllables the Sixth Graders Acquire

	Mean		Std. Deviation		t	p
	MFI (N=56)	ST (N=56)	MFI	ST		
Single Words (Max=20)	3.23	11.52	2.573	6.030	-9.458	.000*
Lexical Bundles (Max=26)	3.34	11.59	2.369	6.269	-9.212	.000*
Total (%)	6.57 (14%)	23.11 (50%)				

* $p < .05$

The ST group shows almost 50% of form knowledge learning, while the MFI group learns 14% of the syllables. The differences between the two groups in the syllable-unit scores are bigger than in the word-unit scores, 40% vs. 17%. Therefore, we can assume that the ST group's incorrect answers were not totally wrong, but incomplete ones which is valued when learning perfect forms. Particularly the MFI group's score drops down from 17% to 14% on single words and slightly go up from 9% to 11% on lexical bundles. This little variation reflects that the students of the MFI group tend to acquire the

vocabulary with fewer syllables relatively. Moreover, their incorrect answers on active recall would be wrong without forming partially right answers.

When looking at the results of lexical bundles in both groups, the same scores on single words attract our attention. The amount of syllables the learners remembered are the same in single words and lexical bundles. This verifies that English learners do not find it difficult learning words in lexical bundles, but struggle connecting two or three words to make the right expression.

The table 9 also reveals that the lowest level students with scores of zero on the tests on active recall show significantly different results in this respect.

Table 9. The Amount of Syllables the Lowest Level students Acquire

	Mean		Std. Deviation		t	p
	MFI (N=56)	ST (N=56)	MFI	ST		
Single Words (Max=20)	.67	4.00	.888	.	-3.608	.004*
Lexical Bundles (Max=26)	1.00	4.56	1.106	.882	-8.434	.000*
Total (%)	1.67 (4%)	8.56 (19%)				

* $p < .05$

The ST group students with scores of zero retain almost 20% of syllables, while the MFI group remembers less than 4%. Although their learning on active knowledge of the vocabulary seems to be close to nothing on the post tests, it is assumed that the students in the ST group were on the way to acquisition of the vocabulary.

The two conditions' effectiveness can be compared using the 'output hypothesis'. Translation tasks in this experiment were writing activities, which differ from speaking activities. The students of the ST group were able to check and correct their tasks by the answers provided at the end of tasks, compare the gaps with their peers and see the correct answers. The learners could take notice of even small gaps in their intra-lingual and inter-lingual knowledge and stretch their linguistic knowledge to complete the *pushed output* correctly. When they faced unknown words or problematic structures, they could pay more attention to the words or the grammar of the language to produce the right answer. On

the other hand, the MFI group also received output based tasks in speaking activities. The students of the MFI group tried to comprehend the whole context rather than the specific mechanics of the new vocabulary. Moreover, they could try to avoid the difficult vocabulary or patterns of L2 and select the easier ones instead. As a result, higher vocabulary acquisition can be attributed to ST, particularly in active recall. The processability theory (Pienemann, 1998) suggests that learners can produce only those structures that their language ability can handle. The staged translation tasks designed for the experiment based on this theory, started from whole class translation, which did not ask the learners to produce output directly. Next, step by step translation tasks from word-based translations to sentence-based translations were sequentially provided to a class of learners with different processing levels. According to the processability hierarchy provided by Pienemann (1998), the stages are listed, from a single word with no procedure to subordinate clause procedure. The higher the level of lexical bundles, the harder it was to actively recall. By producing staged output, learners can accumulate linguistic knowledge and grammatical rules that help in the higher levels of language acquisition according to Pienemann. In comparison, the spoken output tasks that the MFI group produced were not designed sequentially, nor did the learner receive predetermined structures or vocabulary during production. Therefore, the students were likely to use familiar expressions which didn't include the target items. Regardless of their processing ability, some learners probably produced a no procedure output stunting their development, thus leading the learners to a relatively lower acquisition of target vocabulary. That could lead the learners to the relatively lower acquisition of vocabulary.

In a public school classroom, learners stay at school for six hours a day with the same routines, peers and teachers. The young learners were exposed to lots of interaction while doing English translation activities in groups, which can be influential for them. As interaction hypothesis assumes that language learning is motivated by communicative pressure (Gass, 2003), the conversation between the students, or between the teacher and the learners during the translation tasks could stimulate the vocabulary acquisition. After the learners read the books and partook in the reading tasks (input), they were able to get involved in the conversation with the group members (interaction) and produce a meaningful

output. Carroll (1999) claims that learners can increase production through interaction by noticing their deficiencies and realizing their strengths. Through the implicit or explicit feedback from their interaction, the learners could find their linguistic problems and try to modify them. The MFI group also participated in group works and had interactions in their group. Since the MFI group focused on the fluency and the flow of the whole story, the MFI learners were not likely to exchange corrective feedback from each other.

5. Conclusion

Contrary to the current guideline of public English education in Korea, this experiment tried out translation on vocabulary acquisition for young learners. The test results indicated that the ST group showed significantly higher vocabulary acquisition than the other group on all the post-tests. The delayed tests also revealed that the considerable amount of newly learned vocabulary was retained at least for one month in the ST group except the active recall of the lexical bundles. Although the active recall of the lexical bundles resulted in the lowest scores with a significant drop on the delayed tests, the results of lexical bundles in the syllable unit scores, turn up as the same scores of single words. This verifies that the difficulty learners have, resides in linking words, not in lexical bundles themselves. This indicates that the learners of the ST group are on the way to acquire active knowledge even when they have some wrong answers. Moreover, English teachers for young learners may need to spend more time and effort with instructing L2 multi-words, phrases, since learners have difficulties when connecting L2 words for correct phrases which are not identical with their L1.

It is an undeniable truth that communication is the goal of language learning or teaching. However, that doesn't mean the approach to achieving this goal should be fixed only on one method. The results suggest that staged translation may attract young learners' attention to meaning and form of an individual word and lead to vocabulary learning.

In Korea, students learn English as a foreign language and there is little chance to be in contact with authentic English learning experiences. They are

commonly exposed to their mother tongue rather than English regardless of extra education. This makes it hard to expect young learners to naturally acquire a new language over long periods of time in an EFL setting. As Schmitt (1997) states, with all the exposure to their first language, the L1 can be one of the most important facilitator's in L2 vocabulary learning. Unambiguously acquired linguistic knowledge (including vocabulary) through L1 added to comprehension of whole story and its context, may help lead to the next phase of learning. The vocabulary knowledge can hardly be mastered without learners' attention to individual items and comprehension of these items in a short period of time. Through this study, it may be concluded that translation using L1 explicitly in the learning of L2 can be a complementary or an alternative method to communicative techniques that exclude L1 use and lack attention to small details.

Other aspects of second language learning which were not targeted in this study, such as grammar and writing skills, may also prove to be positively impacted by translation tasks through further research. In this short-term empirical study, the learners lacked the time to develop their procedures and accumulate their linguistic knowledge that can help them deal with all the tasks perfectly, which can be further reference for long-term research.

References

- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241-247.
- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: a context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 278-287.
- Benson, M. J. (2000). The secret life of grammar-translation. In H. Trappes-Lomax (Ed.), *Change and continuity in applied linguistics* (pp. 35-51). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Biber, D., & Barbieri, F. (2007). Lexical bundles in university spoken and written registers. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 263-286.
- Carroll, S. (1999). Putting "input" in its proper place. *Second Language Research*, 15, 337-388.

- Chamot, A. U., O'Malley, J. M., Kupper, L., & Impink-Hernandez, M. V. (1987). *A study of learning strategies in foreign language instruction: First year report*. Rosslyn, VA: Interstate Research Associates.
- Coady, J. (1995). Research on ESL/EFL Vocabulary Acquisition: Putting It In Context. *Second Language Reading and Vocabulary Learning*. Ed. T. Huckin, et al. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation. 3-19.
- Coady, J., & Huckin, T. (Eds.), (1997). *Second language vocabulary acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, N. C., & Beaton, A. (1993). Psychological determinants of foreign language vocabulary learning. *Language Learning*, 43, 559-617.
- Finkbeiner, M., & Nicol, J. (2003). Semantic category effects in second language learning. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 24, 161-178.
- Gass, S. M. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224-255). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hall, C. J. (2002). The automatic cognate form assumption: Evidence for the parasitic model of vocabulary acquisition. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 40, 69-87.
- Husain, K. (1995). Assessing the role of translation as a learning strategy in ESL. *International Journal of Translation*, 1(2), 59-84.
- Kim, B. J. (2012). Translation as a Pedagogical Tool for Improving Linguistic Accuracy in Written English. *Joongang English Language and Literature*, 54(3), 73-101.
- Kim, H. S. & Lee, B. M. (2008). The validity of Translation Tasks as an EFL Reading Comprehension Assessment Method in Korean High School Classrooms. *The SNU Journal of Education Research*, 17, 31-70.
- Laufer, B. (1998). The development of passive and active vocabulary in a second language: Same or different? *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 255-271.
- Laufer, B., & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused in second language vocabulary learning: A case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied linguistics*, 29(4), 694-716.
- Laufer, B., & Shmueli, K. (1997). Memorizing new words: Does teaching have anything to do with it? *RELC Journal*, 28(1), 89-108.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsh (Eds.), *Foreign*

- language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia, (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition: Vol. 2. Second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Nation, P. (2001), *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Newton, J. (1995). Task-based interaction and incidental vocabulary learning: A case study. *Second Language Research*, 11, 159-177.
- Perkins, C. (1985). Sensitizing Advanced Learners to Problems of L1-L2 Translation. In C. Titford & A. E. Hiehe, (Eds.), *Translation in foreign language teaching and testing* (pp. 51-72). Tübingen: Narr.
- Pienemann, M. (1998). *Language processing and second language development: Processability theory*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Prince, P. (1996). Second language vocabulary learning: the role of context versus translations as a function of proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80(4), 478-93.
- Ramachandran, S. D., & Rahim, H. A. (2004). Meaning recall and retention: The impact of the translation method on elementary level learners' vocabulary learning. *RELC Journal*, 35(2), 161-178.
- Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary learning strategy. In N. Schmitt and M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 199-227). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2008). Review article: Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 329 – 363.
- Spada, N. (1987). Relationships between instructional differences and learning outcomes: A process-product study of communicative language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 131-161.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidhofer, (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vaezi, S., & Mirzaei, M. (2007). The-effect of using translation from L1 to L2 as a teaching technique on the improvement of EFL learners' linguistic

accuracy-Focus on form. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 9(5). Retrieved February 20, 2008, from [http:// www.hlomag.co.uk/ Sep07/mart03.htm](http://www.hlomag.co.uk/Sep07/mart03.htm).

Wood, E., Miller, G., Symons, S., Canough, T., & Yedlicka, J. (1993). Effects of elaborative interrogation on young learners' recall of facts. *The Elementary School Journal*, 94, 245-254.

Appendix A

The lesson plans of the two treatments

	Min.	MFI	Min.	ST
1st	5'	Introduction Listen to a part of the story without the book		
	15'	Read the book and answer 12 true or false text-based statements Go over the answers with the class		
	20'	Find the meaning of their unknown words from the context as pairs Go over the answers with the class	10'	Read it again with the class translating it to L1
			10'	Read it again Match L2 sentences to L1 as groups Go over the answers with the class
	Min.	MFI	Min.	ST
2nd	5'	Talk about the last time Read the story with the book		
	20'	Answer 10 open-ended reading comprehension questions Go over the answers with the class	10'	Translate L2 words/phrase to L1 reading the book Go over the answers with the class
	15'	Match picture cards to the sentences and tell the story Go over the answers with the class	5'	Check some grammar for translation with the class
			20'	Translate L1 sentences to L2 using the expressions above Go over the answers with the class
	Min.	MFI	Min.	ST
3rd	5'	Listen to the whole story without the book		
	10'	Complete the story putting the sentences in order Go over the answers with the class	15'	Translate the sentences from L2 to L1 Go over the answers with the class
	15'	Talk about the characters and scenes of the story with 4 questions as pairs Share them with the class	20'	Translate the sentences from L1 to L2 Go over the answers with the class
	10'	Pick one scene and practice a role-play Present the role-play with the class		

Appendix B

※ The post-test on active recall

번호	한글	영어 단어/표현
1	엄마는 기분 <u>좋아</u> 보였다.	
2	그는 <u>갑자기</u> 주저앉았다.	
3	친구가 <u>통명스럽게</u> 말했다.	
4	네가 밀면 내가 <u>당길게</u> .	
5	그가 <u>나를 서울에 데려가실 거야</u> .	
6	그는 숲을 <u>향해</u> 계속 걸었다.	
7	우리는 그 마을 <u>밖으로</u> 벗어났다.	
8	그 남자가 나의 <u>눈길을 끌었다</u> .	
9	그 어린이는 <u>집을 먹었다</u> .	
10	<u>서둘러라</u> . 그러면 늦지 않을 거야.	
11	너는 숙제를 안 한 게 <u>분명해</u> .	
12	그 <u>공원관리인</u> 은 앉아 있었다.	
13	문구점에 <u>잠깐</u> 들렀다.	
14	서울에는 <u>거대한</u> 건물들이 많다.	
15	우리는 <u>산책을</u> 갔다.	
16	화가 난 동생이 <u>노려보았다</u> .	
17	호랑이가 토끼를 <u>덮쳤다</u> .	
18	너 <u>괜찮니?</u>	
19	그 집은 <u>사람들로 가득했다</u> .	
20	<u>해적</u> 들이 말했다.	

※ The post-test on passive recall

번호	영어	한글 뜻
1	He sat down <u>suddenly</u> .	
2	The <u>park-keeper</u> works hard.	
3	He said <u>crossly</u> .	
4	My brother was angry and <u>glared</u> .	
5	I am <u>all right</u> .	
6	He walked on <u>towards</u> the woods.	
7	We came <u>out of</u> the shop.	
8	She <u>pulled</u> me out of the water.	
9	We are late. <u>Hurry up!</u>	
10	My dad will <u>take me to the zoo</u> .	
11	My school <u>was full of</u> people.	
12	He has an <u>enormous</u> house.	
13	The boy was <u>terrified</u> .	
14	<u>I came by</u> there.	
15	Sam <u>went for a walk</u> .	

16	The news leaped out at me.	
17	The gorilla pounced on him.	
18	I bet you wish you had one.	
19	I am pleased you like it.	
20	The pirates said to him.	

Ah Young Son

Department of English Education
Chonnam National University
77 Yongbong-ro Buk-gu
Gwangju 61186
Phone: (062)524-9600
Email: kr991111@hanmail.net

Chul Joo Uhm

Department of English Education
Chonnam National University
77 Yongbong-ro Buk-gu
Gwangju 61186
Phone: (062)530-2440
Email: cjuhm@jnu.ac.kr

Received on October 7, 2015

Revised version received on December 27, 2015

Accepted on December 31, 2015