



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Vocabulary and Good Language Teachers*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/160516/>

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:

Dang, TNY orcid.org/0000-0002-3189-7776 and Webb, S (2020) *Vocabulary and Good Language Teachers*. In: Griffiths, C and Tajeddin, Z, (eds.) *Lessons from good language teachers*. Cambridge University Press , pp. 203-218. ISBN 9781108774390

<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108774390.019>

© Cambridge University Press 2020. This material has been published in *Lessons from Good Language Teachers* edited by Carol Griffiths <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108774390>. This version is free to view and download for private research and study only. Not for re-distribution or re-use.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Pre-print version

Source: Dang, T. N. Y., & Webb, S. (2020). Vocabulary instruction and the good language teachers. In C. Griffiths, Z. Tajeddin, & A. Brown (Eds.), *Lessons from good language teachers* (pp. 203–218). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .

CHAPTER 16.

Vocabulary and good language teachers

Introduction

Research on vocabulary instruction has generated a great deal of interest in the field of language teaching in recent years because of its close connection with other aspects of language learning. This chapter presents key research-based suggestions for vocabulary instruction. First, it discusses significant findings in vocabulary research that language teachers should know to achieve positive teaching outcomes. Second, it describes

- a corpus-based study which examined the occurrences of different kinds of words in various spoken and written texts to highlight the importance of word selection in vocabulary instruction; and
- a follow-up study which examined the extent to which teachers apply research-based principles in their instruction.

Third, it discusses the four main roles of good vocabulary teachers. Finally, the chapter concludes by describing the need to further investigate the extent to which teachers from various contexts apply research-based principles in their vocabulary instruction.

Theoretical underpinnings and existing research

This section describes what teachers should do to achieve effective vocabulary instruction. It begins with the words that teachers should introduce to their students. Then, it discusses how teachers can help their students learn these words and assess their knowledge of this vocabulary. Instead of summarizing large amounts of vocabulary research, this section presents key principles that have been widely accepted by prominent vocabulary researchers. Such principles can guide teachers in their vocabulary instruction. This section, as well as the whole chapter, should be seen as a starting point to draw teachers' attention to key principles in vocabulary instruction. Those who are interested to learn more about the principles can find information in other vocabulary volumes written by Gairns and Redman (1986), Thornbury (2002), Schmitt, Schmitt, and Mann (2011), Nation (2013), and Webb and Nation (2017).

Which words should teachers introduce to their students?

Vocabulary research suggests that good teachers consider their students' learning purpose when selecting the words for vocabulary instruction (Nation, 2013). If the purpose is to engage in general conversation, teachers should draw students' attention to high and mid-

frequency words. Vocabulary can be divided into different 1,000-word levels based on their frequency and range in English (Nation, 2013). Items at the 1st 1,000-word level are the most frequent and wide ranging words. The further the 1,000-word levels are from the 1st 1,000-word level, the less frequent and useful the words become. Words at the 1st and 2nd 1,000-word levels (e.g., *good, match*) are considered to be high-frequency words; those at the 3rd-9th 1,000-word levels (e.g., *significant, skip*) are considered to be mid-frequency words; items that are beyond the 9th 1,000-word levels (e.g., *gloat, petunia*) are considered to be low-frequency words. Good vocabulary teachers should deal with each kind of word differently (Nation, 2013). They should give priority to high and mid-frequency words. Compared to low-frequency words, high and mid-frequency words are much smaller in number but cover a much larger proportion of vocabulary in spoken and written texts. Therefore, learning high and mid-frequency words offers learners a good return for their learning effort. Knowledge of these words should enable learners to understand a large proportion of spoken and written texts. In contrast, low-frequency words do not deserve classroom attention. Instead, teachers should train their students to use learning strategies so that they can deal with low-frequency words themselves. Research has shown that guessing from context, deliberate learning using word cards, mnemonic techniques, and using dictionaries are effective strategies to learn low-frequency words (Nation, 2013).

If the learners' purpose for studying English is to comprehend academic spoken and written texts, teachers should direct students' attention to specialized vocabulary (i.e. the vocabulary that appears frequently in a wide range of specialized texts such as engineering textbooks, applied linguistics articles, or business lectures). Specialized vocabulary cuts through different layers of general vocabulary (high, mid, and low). That said, some specialized words (e.g., *fact, issue*) also appear often in general conversation but have specialized meanings while others are infrequent in general conversation but occur very frequently in specialized texts (e.g., *paradigm, domain*). One way for teachers to support students' learning of specialized words is to help them master high-frequency words first and then move on to specialized vocabulary. Another way is to focus directly on the specialized words that are beyond learners' current knowledge of general vocabulary (see Dang, 2018 for more details).

A question that then arises is how teachers can identify high-frequency, mid-frequency, and specialized vocabulary. Although this may be done intuitively, research suggests that even the most knowledgeable teachers are unlikely to accurately differentiate between the frequencies of words (Alderson, 2007). This suggests that good vocabulary teachers should make use of lists derived from corpus data. Corpora (the plural form of corpus) are principled collections of texts in electronic format. Because corpora represent naturally occurring language, corpus-based wordlists provide teachers with valid information about the words that learners are likely to encounter in their language use. There are several useful, recent, and freely available high-frequency, mid-frequency, and specialized wordlists. General English teachers can make use of:

- The Essential Word List, which is available at Stuart Webb's website (<http://www.edu.uwo.ca/faculty-profiles/docs/other/webb/essential-word-list.pdf>). This list is useful for English as a foreign language (EFL) beginners because it may allow them to recognize about 75% of the words in spoken and written English.
- The BNC/COCA lists, which can be downloaded from Paul Nation's website (<https://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/paul-nation>). These lists were developed from the two largest corpora of spoken and written texts to date, and are relevant to more advanced learners.

English for Academic Purposes teachers can use:

- Coxhead's (2000) Academic Word List, which can be found at Averil Coxhead's website (<https://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/averil-coxhead>). The list represents 10% of words in academic written English and has been widely used to develop EAP teaching materials, tests, and dictionaries.
- Gardner and Davies's (2014) Academic Vocabulary List, which is available from: www.academicvocabulary.info. It was derived from the largest academic written corpus and represent 14% of words in academic written English.
- Dang, Coxhead, and Webb's (2017) Academic Spoken Word List, which is available from: <https://osf.io/gwk45/>. This list was developed from the largest academic spoken corpus even been created and represents more than 90% of words in academic spoken English. It has levels that match learners' proficiency levels.

Good vocabulary teachers should be aware that knowing a word involves knowing its form (spoken form, written form, and word parts), meaning (form and meaning, concepts and referent, association) and use (grammatical functions, collocations, constraints of use) (Nation, 2013). Of these aspects, teachers should help their learners to acquire knowledge of the relationship between form and meaning first and then gradually develop knowledge of other aspects of the word both receptively and productively. Receptive knowledge typically refers to the knowledge required to understand words when they are encountered, while productive knowledge is the knowledge necessary to use words.

Effective vocabulary instruction should follow Nation's (2007) four-strands principle:

- meaning-focused input
- meaning-focused output
- fluency development
- language-focused learning

Following this principle, teachers can provide learners with a great deal of opportunities to acquire, consolidate, and expand on their knowledge of words in a meaningful way. Each of the four strands contributes to the development of vocabulary knowledge in a different way and should be given about one quarter of the course time.

Teaching with meaning-focused input involves helping students to gain vocabulary knowledge by creating opportunities for them to encounter words repeatedly through listening and reading. Some useful activities designed to promote meaning-focused input are listening to stories, watching L2 television, and reading extensively. Teaching with meaning-focused output involves creating opportunities for students to use words productively through speaking and writing. Activities that promote meaning-focused output include participating in role play, writing emails, and telling stories. To organize effective meaning-focused input and output activities, teachers should create plenty of opportunities for learners to read, listen, write, and speak about the topics related to their interests. A large amount of input increases the potential to learn words through encountering them repeatedly in different contexts. Increasing the opportunities for output raises the likelihood that students will be able to gain the knowledge required to use words effectively.

Teachers should use the fluency development strand to help students to learn through all four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. This strand does not aim to teach students new words, but rather it should help them to become more fluent in using the items they already know. Some fluency development activities are speed reading, 10-minute writing,

and listening to easy stories. To achieve positive outcomes when organizing fluency development activities, teachers should ensure that learners

- know all the words in the task and the topics
- perform the task at a faster speed than normal
- focus on receiving and conveying meaning
- have a large amount of input and output in the activities.

In the language-focused learning strand, teachers should draw their students' attention to the words themselves. This strand is what most people would consider to be the main job of vocabulary teachers. However, good vocabulary teachers should understand that it is only one of the many things that is included in vocabulary instruction. Language-focused learning is necessary because it enables learners to gain a large amount of knowledge in a limited period of time. It may involve directly teaching high or mid-frequency words, or it may involve directing attention to lexical features such as collocation and word parts which are not likely to be acquired from normal acquisition due to a lack of repetition. For the success of language-focused learning activities, teachers should

- ensure that learners deliberately pay attention to the language features, and process them in a thoughtful way
- create repeated opportunities for learners to pay attention to the same language features throughout the course. Examples of language-focused activities are learning vocabulary from word cards, reading intensively, memorizing dialogues, or giving feedback about writing.

In terms of assessing knowledge of the most useful words, good vocabulary teachers should make use of research-based tests to measure their students' vocabulary knowledge. The most useful test for this is the Vocabulary Levels Test (VLT). Advancing on previous versions, the most recent version of the VLT (Webb, Sasao, & Ballance, 2017) was based on the updated corpus-based word lists and allows teachers to diagnose their students' receptive knowledge of the most frequent 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, and 5,000 words. It is freely available in both PDF and online format at Stuart Webb's website. Teachers can use the test to determine where students need help with their vocabulary learning.

A corpus-based study

The previous section suggests that good vocabulary teachers should be aware of research-based principles and apply them in their vocabulary instruction. These principles may be new to many language teachers. Therefore, we conducted a corpus-based study and a study with teachers to confirm the validity of these principles.

The corpus-based study examined the occurrences of high, mid, and low-frequency words represented by Nation's (2012) 1st-25th 1,000-BNC/COCA wordlists in eight spoken and eight written corpora. The 1st BNC/COCA wordlist represents the 1,000 most frequent words while the 25th BNC/COCA wordlist represents the 24,001-25,000 most frequent words. The 16 corpora represent different kinds of spoken and written discourse and 10 different varieties of English (e.g., American English, British English, Canadian English, Hong Kong English, New Zealand English). Their size ranged from 512,801 to 87,602,389 words. To our knowledge, this is the first study that has examined the issue by analyzing a large number of

corpora with a great degree of variety. Its results should provide clear evidence for a key principle in vocabulary research; that is, words should be learned according to frequency.

Heatley, Nation, and Coxhead's (2002) RANGE program was used to count the number of times words were encountered in each 1,000 BNC/COCA wordlist in the different corpora. The percentage of words covered by each wordlist in a corpus is called lexical coverage. Research has found that lexical coverage is closely related to comprehension (Laufer & Ravenhorst-Kalovski, 2010; Schmitt, Jiang, & Grabe, 2011; van Zeeland & Schmitt, 2013). That is, the higher coverage the better comprehension. In this study, lexical coverage was calculated by dividing the total frequency of the words at a certain level by the total number of words in the corpus and multiplying by 100. The coverage of high-frequency words in one corpus was the sum of the coverage of the 1st and 2nd 1,000-BNC/COCA words in that corpus. The coverage of mid-frequency words was the sum of the coverage of the 3rd-9th 1,000-BNC/COCA words while the coverage of low-frequency words was the sum of the coverage of the 10th-25th 1,000-BNC/COCA words. Table 1 presents the results of the analysis.

Table 1: Coverage of high, mid, and low-frequency vocabulary, proper nouns, and marginal words in 16 corpora (%)

Corpora	Words	Words					MW	High+
		High	Mid	Low	PN	PN+		
<i>Spoken</i>								
British Nation Corpus (spoken)	10,484,320	91.0	3.87	0.33	1.35	2.98	99.20	
International Corpus of English (spoken)	5,641,642	86.54	5.28	0.43	2.31	2.58	96.71	
Open American National Corpus (spoken)	3,243,449	91.60	2.38	0.18	0.85	3.51	98.34	
Movie corpus	2,841,573	90.79	3.79	0.57	2.95	1.18	98.71	
Wellington Corpus of Spoken New Zealand English	1,112,905	89.78	3.19	0.36	1.81	3.90	98.68	
Hong Kong Corpus of Spoken English	977,923	82.87	4.99	0.21	3.47	7.67	99.00	
TV program corpora	943,110	90.84	4.05	0.56	2.39	1.02	98.30	

London-Lund corpus	512,801	90.70	4.26	0.45	2.09	1.34	98.39
<i>Written</i>							
British National Corpus (written)	87,602,389	83.28	10.35	0.86	3.56	0.34	97.53
Open American National Corpus (written)	12,839,527	75.14	13.75	1.57	3.70	0.65	93.24
International Corpus of English (written)	3,467,451	80.70	11.0	0.93	2.77	0.49	94.96
Freiburg-Brown corpus of American English	1,024,320	82.01	11.27	0.98	3.40	0.47	97.15
Freiburg-LOB Corpus of British English	1,021,357	83.19	10.37	0.99	3.55	0.33	97.44
Wellington Corpus of Written New Zealand English	1,019,642	84.28	9.80	0.88	2.96	0.3	97.34
Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen corpus	1,018,455	84.99	9.30	0.87	3.08	0.48	97.85
Brown corpus	1,017,502	83.77	10.47	0.98	2.93	0.40	97.57

High= high-frequency words, *Mid*= Mid-frequency words, *Low* = low-frequency words, *PN*= proper nouns, *MW* = Marginal words

What is clearly evident here is the value of introducing words according to frequency levels. Teachers may introduce all 25,000 words (high, mid, and low) to learners so that learners can recognize nearly 100% of the words they encounter. However, it may be too daunting a task given that the classroom time is limited and learners may acquire an average of only 400 words per year (Webb & Chang, 2012). High-frequency words are small in number (2,000 items) but may allow learners to recognize a large proportion of words that are encountered. Their coverage in different corpora ranged from 75.14% to 91.60%. Words at lower frequency levels are larger in number but accounted for a much smaller amount of coverage. The 7,000 mid-frequency words provided coverage of 2.38%-13.75%, and the 16,000 low-frequency words covered only 0.18%-1.57% of the words in the different corpora. These findings support the suggestion of vocabulary researchers (e.g., Webb & Nation, 2017) that high-frequency words should be the crucial starting point for vocabulary learning. Learners only have to learn a relatively small number of words, but then may be able to understand a great proportion of the words in different discourse types.

The findings also suggest that it is still important for teachers to help their students learn mid-frequency words once they have mastered high-frequency words. Knowing 2%-14% more of

the vocabulary that is encountered will have a positive impact on comprehension. Given that proper nouns (e.g., *James, Kate*) and marginal words (e.g., *oh, ah*) may not have as much learning burden as other words (Nation & Webb, 2011), if learners know high-frequency words, mid-frequency words, proper nouns, and marginal words, they should recognize 93.24%-99.20% of the words that they encounter. Because vocabulary knowledge is closely related to comprehension, this huge amount of coverage highlights the importance of high and mid-frequency words to L2 learners. Knowledge of these words may allow language learners to achieve adequate comprehension of different kinds of discourse despite their limited class time and slow vocabulary growth rate. In brief, the research supports the principle that good vocabulary teachers should help students learn words according to frequency so that they can get the best return for their learning efforts.

Teacher survey

This study surveyed the opinions of 16 Vietnamese EFL teachers about sources for vocabulary selection, resources for vocabulary instruction, and roles of vocabulary teachers (see the Appendix for the survey questions). These teachers' years of experience teaching EFL learners ranged from 2 to 24 years. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study that has investigated these issues.

Table 2: Sources for vocabulary selection

Source	Number of teachers	Degree of influence
		Median
Textbooks	14	5.5
Experience using English	13	5.0
Supplementary materials	11	4.0
Relevance to the topics in textbooks	10	4.0
Tests	10	5.0
Vocabulary research	4	2.5
Dictionaries	1	2.0

Table 2 shows that textbooks, experience using English, supplementary materials, relevance to the topics in textbooks, and tests were the main sources of word selection. These sources were used by more than 60% of the participants. Of these sources, textbooks had the strongest influence on the teachers' vocabulary selection. Next came experience using English and tests. Supplementary materials and relevance to the topics in textbooks ranked third in terms of degree of influence. In contrast, vocabulary research and dictionaries were the least popular and influential sources of vocabulary selection. These results suggest that teachers were unfamiliar with principles suggested by vocabulary research and were heavily

oriented by classroom materials and tests. Perhaps this is because many language programs are test-oriented and use prescribed textbooks and teaching materials.

Table 3: Resources for vocabulary instruction

Resources	Number of teachers	Degree of usefulness
		Median
Textbooks	14	5
Dictionaries	10	6
Flashcard/word card programs	10	4
Movies in English	8	4
TV programs in English	6	4.5
Graded readers	5	4
Corpus-based word lists	5	5
Research-based vocabulary tests	5	5
Lexical profilers	2	4

This finding is supported by the resources used by teachers for vocabulary instruction. As shown in Table 3, textbooks were the most popular resource (selected by 87.5% of the participants). Next came dictionaries, flashcard/word card programs, and L2 movies (selected by at least 50% of the participants). Other resources highlighted in vocabulary research were used by fewer than 40% of the participants. The median scores of degree of usefulness rated by those using the different resources ranged from 4 to 6 out of 6. Dictionaries received the highest rating (6). It was then followed by textbooks (5), and two resources highlighted by research: corpus-based word lists (5) and research-based vocabulary tests (5).

Regarding the principled tasks of vocabulary teachers, Table 4 shows that overall the participants did these tasks fairly frequently (median scores of degree of frequency ranging from 4 to 5 out of 6). However, they still focused greatly on direct teaching of words. It was the most frequent task indicated by the teachers, together with planning vocabulary learning activities. Other tasks (selecting words, testing and training vocabulary learning strategies) were less frequent.

Taken together, the first study illustrates the validity of principles suggested by vocabulary research, while the second study indicates that language teachers may not be fully aware of these principles and resources highlighted by vocabulary research.

Table 4: Tasks of vocabulary teachers

Tasks	Degree of frequency
	Median
Planning vocabulary learning activities	5
Direct teaching of words to students	5
Selecting words for students to learn	4
Testing students' vocabulary knowledge	4
Teaching vocabulary learning strategies	4

Practical implications

What emerges from the corpus and teacher studies is that vocabulary research provides teachers with principled ways to support learners' vocabulary development, and teachers who applied these principles found them useful. However, not many teachers were familiar with these principles. This indicates the need to raise teachers' awareness of the research-based principles outlined in this chapter. In particular, because many students may fail to learn the most frequent words (Webb & Nation, 2017), it is essential for teachers to be aware of what they can do to help students make good progress in their vocabulary learning. The corpus study indicates that there are so many words in English that teaching all of them is an impossible task. Yet the second study reveals that teachers tend to focus on the direct teaching of words. Therefore, it is crucial for teachers to be aware that good vocabulary teachers should not restrict their job to teaching vocabulary. Planning, training, testing, and teaching all deserve a great deal of attention.

The most important job of good vocabulary teachers is planning. This involves ensuring that learners focus on the most relevant vocabulary and receive a proper balance of vocabulary learning opportunities across the four strands of the course (meaning-focused input, meaning-focused output, fluency development, and language-focused learning). Planning is important because it ensures that learning effort is well-returned. To create an effective vocabulary learning plan, teachers should understand the relative value of different words for language learners and the degree to which their materials are suitable to their students. This can be done through checking wordlists or using lexical profilers such as RANGE, VocabProfiler, and AntWordProfiler, which are freely available at Paul Nation's website, Tom Cobb's website (<http://www.lextutor.ca>), and Laurence Anthony's website (http://www.laurenceanthony.net/antwordprofiler_index.html), respectively. These apps mark up the words in materials according to different 1,000-word frequency levels and provide lists of these words. Lexical profilers reveal to teachers the lexical demands of materials allowing them to select, adapt, or reject materials according to their students' vocabulary level (Webb & Nation, 2008, 2017).

The second most important job of good vocabulary teachers is training. No matter what the teachers do, and the course presents, it is the learners who do the learning and determine the learning outcomes (Nation, 2013). Therefore, helping students manage their own learning effectively is essential. Autonomy only happens if learners really want to take responsibility

for their learning. Given the fact that some learners are reluctant to make a change because of immediate pressure or past experience (Nation & Moir, 2008), teachers should spend time discussing with learners the approach that they are taking to raise learners' awareness of useful techniques and improve their attitude toward being responsible for their vocabulary learning. For instance, teachers can present learners with a lexical profiler output like Table 1 to make them more aware of the importance of learning words according to frequency. Then, they can direct learners to lists of useful words and train them to use lexical profiler programs to choose suitable input for self-study. They can also teach different learning strategies (e.g., using word cards, dictionaries) to expand their vocabulary learning repertoire. Importantly, teachers should help students to keep track of their progress over the short term (e.g., how many words they have learned in a week, how successful they are at using words in their writing and speaking). This may give learners a feeling of achievement and motivate further vocabulary learning.

The third most important job is testing. This involves assessing learners' progress and the effectiveness of vocabulary learning within and between courses. To do this, teachers should know what vocabulary tests are available and what procedure they should follow to administer and interpret the results of these tests. For example, at the beginning of an English course, teachers should use Webb et al.'s (2017) VLT to determine which words their students know and which words teachers should focus on for learning. Based on students' test results and their specific teaching context, teachers can help students to determine their vocabulary learning goals. For example, if the learning purpose is to engage in general conversation, and the students score fewer than 29 out of 30 at the most frequent 1,000-word level in the VLT, the vocabulary learning goal should be to learn items from Dang and Webb's (2016) Essential Word List. Selecting words for learning according to students' test scores helps avoid repeatedly learning and teaching known items and draw students' attention to important words that are beyond their current vocabulary levels. Apart from the VLT, regular short-term achievement tests can help teachers to become aware of their students' progress and encourage them to focus on the vocabulary goal of each individual course (Webb & Chang, 2012). To determine if their students have mastered basic knowledge of taught words, teachers can let them do quick tests in the format of Yes/No tests with the words as the test items. If teachers would like to have further understanding about their students' knowledge of the words, they can ask the students to indicate the degree of difficulty they have with the words when reading, listening, writing, and speaking. Teachers can also ask their students to use the words in speaking and writing tasks. After the completion of a course, teachers should evaluate the extent to which the target words have been learned and vocabulary knowledge has been developed. This will enable teachers to monitor the efficacy of the vocabulary learning program and to help students master the target words.

The fourth most important job is teaching. Vocabulary learning is a gradual process in which learners build up their knowledge of a particular word through multiple meetings of the word in different contexts. Therefore, teaching that word is only one step in this process, and teachers should not spend too much time on teaching. Instead, they should spend more time planning learning opportunities and training learners to become independent in their vocabulary learning. When teaching is needed, teachers should ensure that:

- the activities focus on the words that are useful to learners
- the knowledge gained through the activities deserves the amount of time taken
- the activities include features that contribute to learning.

Table 5: Technique Feature Analysis (Nation & Webb, 2011)

Criteria	Score	
Motivation	0	1
Is there a clear vocabulary learning goal?	0	1
Does the activity motivate learning?	0	1
Do the learners select the words?	0	1
Noticing	0	1
Does the activity focus attention on the target words?	0	1
Does the activity raise awareness of new vocabulary learning?	0	1
Does the activity involve negotiation?	0	1
Retrieval	0	1
Does the activity involve retrieval ¹ of the word?	0	1
Is it productive retrieval?	0	1
Is it recall?	0	1
Are there multiple retrievals of each word?	0	1
Is there spacing between retrievals?	0	1
Creative use	0	1
Does the activity involve creative use?	0	1
Is it productive?	0	1
Is there a marked change that involves the use of other words?	0	1
Retention	0	1
Does the activity ensure successful linking of form and meaning?	0	1
Does the activity involve instantiation ² ?	0	1
Does the activity involve imaging?	0	1
Does the activity avoid interference?	0	1
Maximum score	18	

NB

Retrieval is the process of successfully accessing memory for information such as when you remember the meaning of a word.

Instantiation is when you remember something better because of the circumstances in which you learned it. For example, you might be able to remember the word *toboggan* because it was learned when riding down a snowy hill on a toboggan for the first time.

They can make use of Nation and Webb's (2011) Technique Feature Analysis to evaluate different activities and select the one that will provide the greatest learning potential (see Table 5). This checklist consists of 18 questions categorized according to psychological conditions that contribute to vocabulary learning. A Yes answer is scored as 1 while a No answer is scored as 0. The total score indicates the relative value of that activity. The higher the total score, the more effective the activity is.

Directions for future research

Teacher cognition of vocabulary instruction is clearly an underexplored area in both vocabulary and cognition research (Borg, 2006, 2015). The second study described in this chapter is among the very few recent attempts to address this gap. Yet, some questions deserve attention from further research:

- The second study examined opinions of a limited number of Vietnamese EFL teachers. Will the results be the same if we replicate the study with a large sample of teachers from various contexts?
- Surveys were used as a means to explore the participants' experience in the second study. Does what they reported concur with their actual teaching practice? Using questionnaires together with classroom observation may shed better light into the extent to which teachers applied research-based principles in their teaching.
- Most of the teachers in the second study relied heavily on textbooks in their vocabulary instruction while not many of them were aware of research-based principles. What are the reasons for this? Do the textbooks used by the teachers follow principles suggested by vocabulary research?

Conclusion

It is indisputable that vocabulary is of primary importance when learning a new language. By implication, therefore, an important role of good language teachers is the effective teaching of vocabulary. This chapter shows that vocabulary research provides language teachers with useful guidance to help students learn and deepen their knowledge of the most useful words at different proficiency stages. However, teachers may not be familiar with these principles. This chapter, therefore, highlights the need to raise awareness of key vocabulary research findings, especially the roles of teachers in vocabulary instruction. It also provides useful online resources and calls for further research investigating the degree to which teachers have applied these principles in the language learning classroom.

References

- Alderson, J. C. (2007). Judging the frequency of English words. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(3), 383-409.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education*. London: Continuum.
- Borg, S. (2015). Language teacher cognition bibliography. Retrieved from <http://www.education.leeds.ac.uk/people/academic/borg>
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213-238.
- Dang, T. N. Y. (2018). The hard science spoken word list. *ITL – International Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
- Dang, T. N. Y., Coxhead, A., & Webb, S. (2017). The academic spoken word list. *Language Learning*, 67(4).

- Dang, T. N. Y., & Webb, S. (2016). Making an essential word list. In I. S. P. Nation (Ed.), *Making and using word lists for language learning and testing* (pp. 153-167). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gairns, R., & Redman, S. (1986). *Working with words: A guide to teaching and learning vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner, D., & Davies, M. (2014). A new academic vocabulary list. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 305-327.
- Heatley, A., Nation, I. S. P., & Coxhead, A. (2002). *Range: A program for the analysis of vocabulary in texts*. Retrieved from <http://www.vuw.ac.nz/lals/staff/paul-nation/nation.aspx>
- Laufer, B., & Ravenhorst-Kalovski, G. C. (2010). Lexical threshold revisited: Lexical text coverage, learners' vocabulary size and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22(1), 15-30.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2007). The four strands. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2012). *The BNC/COCA word family lists*. Retrieved from <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/paul-nation>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Moir, J. (2008). Vocabulary learning and the good language learner. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Webb, S. (2011). *Researching and analyzing vocabulary*. Boston: Heinle, Cengage Learning.
- Schmitt, N., Jiang, X., & Grabe, W. (2011). The percentage of words known in a text and reading comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(1), 26-43.
- Schmitt, D., Schmitt, N., & Mann, D. (2011). *Focus on Vocabulary* (2nd ed.). London: Pearson Education
- Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to teach vocabulary*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- van Zeeland, H., & Schmitt, N. (2013). Lexical coverage in L1 and L2 listening comprehension: The same or different from reading comprehension? *Applied Linguistics*, 34(4), 457-479.
- Webb, S. A., & Chang, A. C.-S. (2012). Second language vocabulary growth. *RELC Journal*, 43(1), 113-126.
- Webb, S. & Nation, I. S. P. (2008). Evaluating the vocabulary load of written text. *TESOLANZ Journal*, 16, 1-10.
- Webb, S., & Nation, I. S. P. (2017). *How vocabulary is learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Webb, S., Sasao, Y., & Ballance, O. (2017). The updated Vocabulary Levels Test. *ITL – International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 168(1), 34-70.

APPENDIX. Questions in the survey

1. You select a certain word for your students to learn because it is ... (You can choose **MORE THAN ONE** option).
- a. in textbooks
 - b. in supplementary materials
 - c. in neither (a) nor (b) but relevant to the topics in textbooks
 - d. important for tests
 - e. suggested by vocabulary research
 - f. in dictionaries
 - g. useful based on your experience using English
 - h. Others. Please specify.....

2. Indicate the **degree of influence** of each source on your vocabulary selection.

	Extremely weak	←—————→				Extremely strong
	1	2	3	4	5	6
a. Textbooks	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Supplementary materials	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Relevance to the topics in textbooks although the word is in neither (a) nor (b)	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. Tests	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. Vocabulary research	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. Dictionaries	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. Your experience using English	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. Other. Please specify.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

3. What resources do you use in your vocabulary instruction? (You can choose **MORE THAN ONE** option)

- a. Dictionaries
- b. Graded readers
- c. Textbooks
- d. Movies in English
- e. TV programs in English
- f. Research-based word lists (e.g., BNC/COCA lists, Academic Word List)
- g. Flashcard/word card programs (e.g. Quizlet)
- h. Vocabulary analyzing programs (e.g., RANGE, Lextutor, AntWordProfiler)
- i. Research-based vocabulary tests (e.g. Vocabulary Levels Test, Vocabulary Size Test)
- j. Others. Please specify.....

4. Of the **resources** that you have used, indicate the **degree of usefulness** of each resource for your vocabulary instruction.

	Not useful at all	←—————→				Absolutely useful
	1	2	3	4	5	6
a. Dictionaries	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Graded readers	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Textbooks	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. Movies in English	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. TV programs in English	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. Research-based word lists (e.g., BNC/COCA lists, Academic Word List)	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. Flashcard/word card programs (e.g. Quizzlet)	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. Vocabulary analyzing programs (e.g., RANGE, Lextutor, AntWordProfiler)	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. Research-based vocabulary tests (e.g. Vocabulary Levels Test, Vocabulary Size Test)	1	2	3	4	5	6
j. Others. Please specify.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

5. Indicate the **degree of frequency** you do these tasks in your vocabulary instruction.

	Never	←—————→				Always
	1	2	3	4	5	6
a. Direct teaching words to students	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Planning vocabulary learning activities	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Selecting words for students to learn	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. Testing students' vocabulary knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. Training vocabulary learning strategies (e.g., using dictionaries, word cards)	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. Others. Please specify.....	1	2	3	4	5	6