Lang. Teach. (2009), **42:3**, 341–354 © Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S0261444809005771

Research Timeline

Second language vocabulary acquisition from language input and from form-focused activities

Batia Laufer University of Haifa, Israel
batialau@research.haifa.ac.il

Interest in L2 vocabulary learning and teaching started long before the nineteen-eighties (for references to earlier studies, see Rob Waring's database http://www1.harenet.ne.jp/~waring/vocab/vocrefs/vocref.html) but it declined with the advent of generative linguistics to the point of discrimination and neglect (Meara 1980). In 1986, I argued that vocabulary was about to acquire a legitimate and prominent place within applied linguistics (Laufer 1986), but I did not envisage the vast quantities of lexical research that would have been produced in the following two decades. One of the central concerns of vocabulary researchers is the source of L2 vocabulary learning. Is it L2 input, enhanced input, interaction, communicative tasks, non-communicative 'artificial' exercises, list learning, or repetition? A similar question is addressed by SLA researchers in general. This similarity of interests, which demonstrates the integration of vocabulary into mainstream SLA, prompted me to define the topic of this timeline as I did. And since the field of SLA developed in the 1980s, this timeline starts in the nineteen-eighties. I focus here on the external sources of learning, i.e. language input and instructional techniques, and not on learner-related variables, like motivation, L1, age, or strategies of learning. Nor do I focus on any other areas of lexical research, important as they may be, such as the construct of vocabulary knowledge, lexical development, testing, bilingual mental lexicon, or corpora analyses.

The precursors of input-based learning and form-focused instruction were indirect and direct learning and teaching of vocabulary (Nation 1982). The indirect approaches found theoretical support in the Input Hypothesis (Krashen 1985). However, the hypotheses of Noticing (Schmidt 1990), limited processing ability (VanPatten 1990), and 'pushed' output (Swain 1985) provided the theoretical underpinning of 'Focus on Form' (Long 1991; Ellis 2001), which in turn became the pedagogical framework for direct approaches to vocabulary learning through communicative activities. Decontextualized vocabulary learning that is associated with Focus on Forms had been strongly discouraged since the heyday of communicative language teaching, but its association with the skill acquisition theory (DeKeyser 1998) contributed to the view that this type of learning is legitimate for studying the basic vocabulary quickly. Most recent approaches to vocabulary learning attach less importance to the source of learning, and more to the quality of elaboration of word information, task involvement, and frequent rehearsals. It is also believed that different aspects of word knowledge may be affected differently by different conditions of learning. Finally, a growing number of empirical studies suggest that input together

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with engaging word-focused activities and frequent rehearsals are likely to yield the best results.

My selection of notable publications aims to represent the above developments. I constructed this timeline by consulting the LLBA[1] database, Paul Nation's data base (http://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/staff/paul-nation/vocrefs/index.aspx) and the latest issues of the most prominent journals in applied linguistics. The selection represents seven recurring themes, each of which is marked by a capital letter A – G in my annotations to each publication:

A Effects of text input, without lexical support (**A1**) and with lexical support (**A2**)
B Learning words in authentic and/or communicative tasks with Focus on Form
C Learning decontextualized vocabulary, or in minimal contexts with Focus on Forms
D Multiple exposures/rehearsals
E Acquiring partial knowledge of words
F Theoretical positions related to vocabulary learning
G Technology in vocabulary research and learning

References

DeKeyser, R. M. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspective on learning and practical second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 42–63.

Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning* 51.1 (supplement 1), 1–46.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.

Laufer, B. (1986). Possible changes in attitude towards vocabulary acquisition research. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 24.1, 69–75.

Long, M. (1991). Focus on Form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg & C. Kramsch (eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 39–52.

Meara, P. M. (1980). Vocabulary acquisition: A neglected aspect of language learning. *Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts* 13.4, 221–246.

Nation, I. S. P. (1982). Beginning to learn foreign vocabulary: A review of the research. *RELC Journal* 13.1, 14–36.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11.2, 17–45.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 235–253.

VanPatten B. (1990). Attending to content and form in the input: An experiment in consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12.3, 287–301.

BATIA LAUFER is Professor of Applied Linguistics in the department of English Language and Literature, at the University of Haifa, Israel. Her research is on lexicography, cross linguistic influence, reading, and testing, but mainly on Vocabulary Acquisition in Additional Languages. She has published numerous journal articles and book chapters, and lectured extensively in and outside of Israel. Her most known and cited work is on vocabulary threshold for reading comprehension, vocabulary development, task effect on learning, quantitative assessment of vocabulary, and factors of word difficulty.

[1] Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (electronic resource). The Hague: Mouton.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEME
1982	Nation, I. S. P. (1982). Beginning to learn foreign vocabulary: A review of the research. *RELC Journal* 13.1, 14–36.	**Nation** raised several key questions to be addressed in future L2 vocabulary research: the relationship between indirect learning (incidental while reading or listening) and direct learning (with conscious effort), learning words in context and in lists, and effectiveness of vocabulary teaching techniques.	**A** **B** **C** **D** **F**
1985	Nagy, W. E., P. A. Herman & R. C. Anderson (1985). Learning words from context. *Reading Research Quarterly* 20.2, 233–253.	**Nagy et al.** estimated the probabilities of learning an L1 word from reading after one exposure to be between .10 and .15. They claimed that since learners were exposed to large amounts of vocabulary, they would learn a substantial number of words from input.	**A1**
1987	Cohen, A. D. (1987). The use of verbal imagery mnemonics in second-language vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 9.1, 43–61.	**Cohen** suggested that mnemonics, particularly learner-generated, could facilitate word retrieval, and could therefore supplement other methods of intentional learning. He implied that learners could be trained in using verbal and imagery mnemonics.	**C**
1989	Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *The Modern Language Journal* 73.4, 440–464.	In the framework of the Input Hypothesis, **Krashen** suggested that, similarly to L1 acquisition (NAGY ET AL. 1985), vocabulary in L2 was acquired subconsciously through comprehensible input, particularly through reading, when learners focused on messages, and not on individual words.	**F** **A1**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEME
1989	Pitts, M., H. White & S. Krashen (1989). Acquiring second language vocabulary through reading: A replication of the Clockwork Orange study using second language acquirers. *Reading in a Foreign Language* 5.2, 271–275.	Adult L2 learners read two chapters of a novel containing Russian slang words. Subsequent testing revealed some acquisition of these words, providing empirical evidence for KRASHEN'S (1989) hypothesis that learners, like native speakers, could acquire vocabulary from reading. However, the number of words was around 2 out of 29.	**A1**
1989	Elley, W. B. (1989). Vocabulary acquisition from listening to stories. *Reading Research Quarterly* 24.2, 174–187.	**Elley** investigated children's L2 vocabulary learning from listening to a single story (as opposed to most studies, which focused on vocabulary and reading). After listening three times, learners acquired the meanings of 20% of target words. Adding explanation of words raised learning to 38%. These data seem to support the acquisition from input position. However, only six target words were tested.	**A1** **A2**
1989	Laufer, B. (1989). What percentage of text lexis is essential for comprehension? In C. Lauren & M. Nordman (eds.), *Special language: From humans thinking to thinking machines*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 316–323.	**Laufer** delineated the lexical characteristics of a text that made comprehension and, subsequently, learning words from context possible. She defined the lexical threshold for basic text comprehension as 95% of text words familiar to the learner.	**A1** **F**
1992	Hulstijn, J. H. (1992). Retention of inferred and given word meanings: Experiments in incidental vocabulary learning. In P. J. L Arnaud & H. Béjoint (eds.), *Vocabulary and applied linguistics*. London: MacMillan, 113–125.	To study the effect of glossing unfamiliar words in a text on their learning, **Hulstijn** compared the retention of words inferred from context with words provided with glosses, or sample sentences. Inferred words were better retained than given words, but only when cues for inferring were available. However, retention of words from mere exposure and guessing was very low and guesses were sometimes incorrect.	**A1** **A2** **B**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1994	Mondria, J-A. & S. Mondria-DeVries (1994). Efficiently memorizing words with the help of word cards and 'hand computer': Theory and applications. *System* 22.1, 47–57.	**Mondria & Mondria-DeVries** introduced a system of memorizing decontextualized words using word cards and a repetition system of distributed retrievals (repetitions through ever longer intervals). The authors claimed that this method was flexible regarding type of words and type of learners and, therefore, superior to learning from lists.	**C** **D**
1995	Joe, A. (1995). Text based tasks and incidental vocabulary learning. *Second Language Research* 11.2, 149–158.	**Joe** found that attention to new words, retrieval and particularly use in novel contexts ('generation') contributed to word retention. This study highlighted the importance of language output in incidental learning.	**B**
1996	Chun, D. M. & J. L. Plass (1996). Effects of multimedia annotations on vocabulary acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal* 80.2, 183–198.	Students of L2 German read a text on the computer screen. 82 words were glossed by definition and example; some words also had a still picture, others – a video. The text + pictures condition proved most effective. The paper demonstrates the value of multimedia for vocabulary learning.	**A2** **B** **G**
1996	Hulstijn, J. H., M. Hollander & T. Greidanus (1996). Incidental vocabulary learning by advanced foreign language students: The influence of marginal glosses, dictionary use, and reoccurrence of unknown words. *The Modern Language Journal* 80.3, 327–339.	**Hulstijn et al.** compared retention of new words in three conditions: gloss, availability of electronic dictionary and control. They introduced a new factor: two frequencies of word occurrence in each condition. Frequency contributed to learning when reading was supported by gloss or dictionary. Without such support, words may be ignored or inferred incorrectly (cf. HULSTIJN 1992).	**A2** **A1** **D** **G**
1996	Qian, D. D. (1996). ESL vocabulary acquisition: Contextualization and decontextualization. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 53.1, 120–142.	**Qian** compared teaching contextualized vocabulary with decontextualized word lists. The decontexualized condition resulted in superior retention. These results challenge the assumptions by KRASHEN (1989) and LONG (1991) stated in the introduction.	**A1** **C**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEME
1997	Laufer, B. (1997). The lexical plight in second language reading: Words you don't know, words you think you know and words you can't guess. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 20–34.	**Laufer** presented three main problems in L2 reading: inadequate vocabulary size for comprehension, misinterpretations of seemingly familiar words, and guessing difficulties, due to text, word and learner factors. The implication is that the relationship between vocabulary learning and reading is neither simple nor problem-free.	**A1** **F**
1997	Coady, J. (1997). L2 vocabulary acquisition through extensive reading. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 225–237.	**Coady** presented the 'beginner's paradox'. How could learners learn words through extensive reading if their vocabulary was insufficient to read extensively? He suggested that learners should first receive explicit instruction in 3000 most common word families (following LAUFER 1997). Only then should they engage in enjoyable reading tasks.	**F** **A1**
1997	Hulstijn, J. H. (1997). Mnemonic methods in foreign language vocabulary learning: Theoretical considerations and pedagogical applications. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 203–224.	Drawing on experimental and psycholinguistic literature and on personal teaching and language learning experience, **Hulstijn** argued that mnemonic techniques, including the keyword method, were a useful supplement to other approaches to vocabulary learning (cf. COHEN 1987). He also provided practical guidelines for using mnemonics and rehearsals in learning words.	**C** **F**
1997	Paribakht, T. S. & M. Wesche (1997). Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 174–200.	**Paribakht & Wesche** compared word learning in 'Reading only' (8 texts) and 'Reading plus' (4 texts with various vocabulary exercises) conditions. 'Reading only' produced small word gains, but 'Reading plus' yielded significantly better results. The results support the importance of explicit instruction.	**A1, E** **C**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1997	Watanabe, Y. (1997). Input, intake and retention. Effects of increased processing on incidental learning of foreign language vocabulary. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19.3, 287–307.	Using a more complex research design than HULSTIJN (1992), **Watanabe** compared the effect of type of word explanation (appositives, marginal glosses and multiple choice marginal glosses) on the acquisition of 16 words. He found that both types of glosses significantly improved word learning and retention on the delayed test.	**A2** **B**
1998	Schmitt, N. (1998). Tracking the incremental acquisition of second language vocabulary: A longitudinal study. *Language Learning* 48.2, 281–317.	**Schmitt** studied the acquisition of 11 individual words over a year with three advanced L2 adult learners. He tracked four types of word knowledge: spelling, associations, grammatical information, and meaning. The study did not show evidence of a developmental hierarchy for word knowledge types.	**E**
1998	Horst, M., T. Cobb & P. Meara (1998). Beyond a Clockwork Orange: Acquiring second language vocabulary through reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language* 11.2, 207–223.	Learners read and listened to a simplified version of a novel (21,000 running words during six class sessions) and were subsequently tested on two aspects of knowledge of 45 words. On average, they acquired about five words. The authors admitted to small gains, but wondered whether testing more items would have revealed more acquisition.	**A1** **E**
1999	Nation, P. & M. K. Wang (1999). Graded readers and vocabulary. *Reading in a Foreign Language* 12.2, 355–380.	**Nation & Wang** showed the potential for vocabulary learning from graded readers, and also recommended specific quantities of reading – a graded reader every week – to meet new words soon enough to reinforce previous encounters. This requirement highlights the practical limitations of extensive reading in an FL context.	**A1** **D**
1999	Ellis, R. & X. He (1999). The roles of modified input and output in the incidental acquisition of word meanings. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 21. 2, 285–301.	**Ellis & He** found that learners who interacted in a task acquired more new words from it than learners who received two types of input with the same content. Similarly to JOE (1995), the paper highlights the importance of language use. Additionally, the authors emphasize the qualitatively superior dialogic interaction of the output group.	**B**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEME
2000	Hu, M. & I. S. P. Nation (2000). Unknown vocabulary density and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language* 13.1, 403–430.	**Hu & Nation** delineated the optimal lexical coverage (percentage of familiar words in a text) for comprehension, and subsequently, word learning from reading. While LAUFER (1989) suggested 95% minimum threshold for basic comprehension, Hu & Nation suggested 98% coverage for reading for pleasure.	**A1** **F**
2000	Boers, F. (2000). Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics* 21.4, 553–571.	**Boers** argued that enhancing learners' awareness of the metaphor's literal origin could facilitate retention of unfamiliar figurative expressions. Three EFL experiments supported his position. The results corroborate COHEN (1986) and HULSTIJN (1997) regarding the value of verbal imagery.	**C**
2000	Laufer, B. & M. M. Hill (2000). What lexical information do L2 learners select in a CALL dictionary and how does it affect word retention? *Language Learning and Technology* 3.2, 58–76. (http://llt.msu.edu/vol3num2/laufer-hill/index.html)	**Laufer & Hill** used a computer programme which comprised a text, highlighted target words, and multiple dictionary information: word explanation in English, L1 translation, sound, root, and 'extra' information (HULSTIJN ET AL. 1996 provided only translations of words). Different learners revealed different lookup preferences. The use of multiple dictionary information reinforced incidental acquisition.	**A2** **B** **G**
2000	Groot, P. J. M. (2000). Computer assisted second language vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning and Technology* 4.1, 60–81. (http://llt.msu.edu/vol4num1/groot/default.html)	**Groot** used a unique computer-assisted word acquisition programme (CAVOCA), which presented each word in four modes: deduction of meaning, illustration of usage, examples, and lexical retrieval. Retention, however, was not better than in a list-learning condition. This raises the issue of the effectiveness of sophisticated technology in learning.	**C** **D** **G**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2001	Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Intentional and incidental second language vocabulary learning: A reappraisal of elaboration, rehearsal and automaticity. In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 258–286.	**Hulstijn** conceptualized the notions of incidental and intentional learning. He argued that the distinction between them could be operationalized in research, but it had no significance for word retention. Retention depends on the quality of processing, i.e. elaboration on aspects of a word's meaning and form, and on amount of rehearsal.	**F**
2001	Laufer, B. & J. [H.] Hulstijn (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics* 22.1, 1–26.	In an attempt to operationalise 'attention' and 'elaboration' into concrete task-specific constructs, **Laufer & Hulstijn** introduced a construct of 'Task Induced Involvement' with motivational and cognitive dimensions: Need, Search and Evaluation. The hypothesis predicts that retention of unfamiliar words is conditional upon the amount of involvement during task performance.	**F**
2001	Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.	In the most comprehensive book to date on L2 vocabulary learning, **Nation** introduced and developed the notion of four strands in balanced vocabulary learning (and language learning in general): comprehensible meaning-focused input, form-focused instruction, meaning-focused output, and fluency development.	**A, B C, D E, F**
2001	Zahar, R., T. Cobb & N. Spada (2001). Acquiring vocabulary through reading: Effects of frequency and contextual richness. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 57.4, 541–572.	**Zahar et al.** investigated the effect of frequency of word occurrence and contextual support on word acquisition from reading a story. Learners learnt, on average, 2.6 words out of 30, regardless of contextual support. The authors calculated that learning 2000 new words from input would take 29 years, thus challenging KRASHEN (1989) and supporting NATION & WANG'S (1999) practical limitations of extensive reading.	**A1 D**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEME
2002	Swanborn, M. S. L. & K. de Glopper (2002). Impact of reading purpose on incidental word learning from context. *Language Learning* 52.1, 95–117.	**Swanborn & de Glopper** measured the effect of learners' reading purpose on vocabulary learning. The probability of learning a word incidentally was .10 when students read for knowledge of the topic, .08 when reading for text comprehension and .06 when they read for fun.	**A1**
2002	De la Fuente, M. J. (2002). Negotiation and oral acquisition of L2 vocabulary: The roles of input and output in the receptive and productive acquisition of words. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24.1, 81−112.	**De la Fuente** compared the effects of input, negotiation, and negotiation with 'pushed output' on receptive and productive word acquisition. Negotiation with and without output was equally effective for receptive acquisition, but negotiation with output was more effective for productive acquisition and retention. The paper develops the idea of output importance (SWAIN 1985, JOE 1995, ELLIS & HE, 1999 – see introduction).	**B** **E**
2002	Snellings, P., A. van Gelderen & K. de Glopper (2002). Lexical retrieval: An aspect of fluent second language production that can be enhanced. *Language Learning* 52.4, 723−754.	**Snellings et al.** demonstrated the feasibility of computerized training for fluent lexical retrieval of L2 words in classroom, as evidenced by improved lexical decision and written retrieval tasks. The paper shows how the fluency strand in vocabulary teaching (NATION 2001) can be implemented in classroom.	**D** **C** **G**
2003	Laufer, B. (2003). Vocabulary acquisition in a second language: Do learners really acquire most vocabulary by reading? *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 59.4, 565–585.	**Laufer** challenged some basic assumptions underlying the claim that reading was the major source of vocabulary acquisition, and reported three experiments in which word-focused tasks yielded higher learning scores than reading.	**F** **A1** **C**
2003	Mondria, J-A. (2003). The effects of inferring, verifying, and memorizing on the retention of L2 word meanings. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 25.4, 473−499.	**Mondria** found that retention of new words was the same, irrespective of whether their meaning was provided by, or inferred from, context. The meaning inferred method took longer. The results seem to contradict HULSTIJN (1992). However, Mondria's study involved a memorization stage after verification of meaning, i.e. intentional learning.	**C**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2003	Waring, R & M. Takaki (2003). At what rate do learners learn and retain new vocabulary from reading a graded reader? *Reading in a Foreign Language* 15.2, 130–163.	**Waring & Takaki** studied the retention of 25 non-words that appeared 1–18 times in a text. After three months, learners remembered an average of one meaning of words that appeared eight times or more. The authors concluded that massive quantities of graded reading were needed to build new vocabulary (cf. ZAHAR ET AL. 2001), but the benefits of graded readers were in enriching the vocabulary known already.	**A1** **D** **E**
2004	Mondria, J-M. & B. Wiersma (2004). Receptive, productive, and receptive + productive L2 vocabulary learning: What difference does it make? In P. Bogaards & B. Laufer (eds.), *Vocabulary in a second language.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 80–100.	**Mondria & Wiersma** hypothesized that, in intentional learning, word retention type, receptive or productive, is related to the mode of learning: receptive, productive, or receptive + productive. They found that receptive learning proved best for receptive knowledge, and productive learning for productive knowledge. Additional receptive learning did not lead to improved productive knowledge.	**E** **C**
2004	Pulido, D. (2004). The relationship between text comprehension and second language incidental vocabulary acquisition: A matter of topic familiarity? *Language Learning* 54.3, 469–523.	**Pulido** found that text comprehension, irrespective of topic familiarity, had a favorable effect on short- and long-term retention of the meaning of 32 nonsense words in the text. Topic familiarity was related to recognition of word forms only. If comprehension is achieved with 95%–98% of vocabulary coverage (LAUFER 1989, HU & NATION 2000), it seems that good vocabulary knowledge can compensate for lack of background knowledge.	**A1** **E**
2005	Webb, S. (2005). Receptive and productive vocabulary learning: The effects of reading and writing on word knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 27.1, 33–52.	**Webb** introduced a time-on-task factor and examined five aspects of word learning after encountering words in three glossed sentences, or using them in original sentences. With identical time on task, reading was more effective. With unlimited time, writing took longer, but proved more effective. Since the latter case represented authentic learning, a strong argument could be made for productive tasks.	**C** **E**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEME
2005	Horst, M. (2005). Learning L2 vocabulary through extensive reading: A measurement study. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 61.3, 355–382.	Unlike previous studies, **Horst** investigated a large amount of reading (four books, on average) and tested many words (100). She used electronic scanning of books, lexical frequency profiling, and individualized word checklists. Learners demonstrated some knowledge of about 17 words, more than in earlier studies, probably due to the innovative methodology.	**A2** **E** **G**
2005	Laufer, B. (2005). Focus on form in second language vocabulary acquisition. In S. H. Foster-Cohen, M. P. Garcia-Mayo & J. Cenoz (eds.), *EUROSLA Yearbook* 5. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 223–250.	Responding to the discouraging learning results from input, **Laufer** conceptualized 'Focus on Form' and 'Focus on Forms' within a vocabulary acquisition framework, and provided theoretical and empirical justification for both pedagogical approaches.	**F**
2005	Horst, M., T. Cobb & I. Nicolae (2005). Expanding academic vocabulary with a collaborative on-line database. *Language Learning and Technology* 9.2, 90–110. (http://llt.msu.edu/vol9num2/horst/default.html)	**Horst et al.** found that many words were learnt receptively and productively when practiced in a computer-assisted environment: word banks, online dictionaries, concordances, cloze exercises, hypertexts, and self-quizzes. The results show the benefits of word-focused non-communicative activities (QIAN 1996, LAUFER 2003) and the potential of technology for vocabulary learning (GROOT 2000, LAUFER & HILL 2000).	**E** **C** **A2** **G**
2006	Pigada, M & N. Schmitt (2006). Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading: A case study. *Reading in a Foreign Language* 18.1, 1–28.	**Pigada & Schmitt** found that one month of extensive reading (four readers) enhanced some aspects of knowledge in 65% of 133 target words, particularly spelling. Knowledge of meaning and grammatical characteristics improved less. In spite of the encouraging results, the authors recommended supplementing incidental learning with intentional learning.	**A1** **E**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2006	Folse, K. S. (2006). The effect of type of written exercise on L2 vocabulary retention. *TESOL Quarterly* 40.2, 273–293.	Following LAUFER & HULSTIJN's (2001) Involvement Hypothesis, **Folse** compared word learning in conditions differing in involvement, but also in the number of word retrievals. The latter was more influential than involvement. The findings suggest that repeated exposure is a stronger factor than involvement load in retention.	**C** **D**
2007	Webb, S. (2007). The effects of repetition on vocabulary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics* 28.1, 46–65.	Like ZAHAR ET AL. (2001) & WARING & TAKAKI (2003), **Webb** studied the effects of repeated encounters (1, 3, 7, and 10 times) on word learning, but examined five aspects of word knowledge. After ten repetitions in context, some learning could occur, but full knowledge of a word would require more than ten repetitions.	**C** **E** **D**
2008	Kim, Y. J. (2008). The role of task-induced involvement and learner proficiency in L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning* 58.2, 285–325.	**Kim** provided empirical evidence for the involvement load hypothesis (LAUFER & HULSTIJN 2001). A higher task involvement load promoted more effective initial and delayed vocabulary learning. Identical involvement load in two tasks yielded similar results. Results were the same for two L2 proficiencies.	**A2** **C**
2008	Lindstromberg, S. & F. Boers (2008). The mnemonic effect of noticing alliteration in lexical chunks. *Applied Linguistics* 29.2, 200–222.	Studying data from three experiments, **Lindstromberg & Boers** suggested that alliteration had considerable mnemonic potential for facilitating the learning of lexical chunks. However, since learners were not very likely to notice alliteration, teachers should encourage them to exploit it.	**C**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809005771 Published online by Cambridge University Press

YEAR	REFERENCES	ANNOTATIONS	THEME
2008	Laufer, B. & N. Girsai (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: A case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics* 29.4, 694–716.	**Laufer & Girsai** demonstrated the effect of a specific type of form-focused instruction – contrastive analysis and translation, which yielded better results than other form-focused tasks and meaning-oriented tasks, for short and long-term retention of single words and collocations.	**B** **C** **D**
2008	Brown, R., R. Waring & S. Donkaewbua (2008). Incidental vocabulary acquisition from reading, reading-while-listening, and listening. *Reading in a Foreign Language* 20.2, 136–163.	Integrating ELLEY'S (1989) and WARING & TAKAKI'S (2003) research questions, **Brown et al.** compared L2 vocabulary acquisition across three input modes: reading, reading while listening, and listening to stories. After three months, learners could supply, on average, the meaning of 0–1 word, but they could recognize about ten words on a multiple choice test. The lowest uptake was in the listening mode. The authors recommend at least ten word recurrences for learning to take place.	**A1** **E** **D**