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Abstract

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of employing both implicit and explicit strategies in EFL vocabulary instruction for primary school students, through the child-friendly context of storytelling. In so doing, a graded reader was used as the teaching material from which 40 target vocabulary items were selected: 20 were taught explicitly and 20 implicitly, proportionally distributed according to their level of difficulty and the part of speech they belonged to. Upon completion of the story, the children were required to recall the target vocabulary items orally. Their responses were carefully examined in relation to the way of instruction and the special features of the vocabulary items, in an effort to shed light to the factors that actually influence vocabulary learning. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS software. Interestingly, the results showed that despite a slightly higher vocabulary gain in the explicitly taught items, the explicit/implicit factor played an important role only in the recall of the words belonging to A1 level. The discussion of the findings draws on a variety of theoretical perspectives and suggests possible directions for effective vocabulary learning.
Chapter 1

Introduction

Albert Einstein, the quintessential modern genius, is credited as having said: “If you want your children to be smart, tell them stories. If you want them to be brilliant, tell them more stories” (as cited in Frayling, 2005, p.6). In line with this inspirational quote, teachers acknowledge the contribution of stories to children and believe in the adoption of storytelling as a medium of instruction with prolific potentials. Discussing this issue, Marsh (1986) comments that elementary school teachers have found that even students with low motivation and weak academic skills are more likely to listen, read, write and work hard in the context of storytelling. Nowadays, the importance of storytelling extends beyond the array of issues pertinent to L1: Research efforts, in foreign and second language contexts, explore the educational benefits of storytelling for children trying to learn another language and master its vocabulary.

On the other hand, mastering vocabulary in a second/foreign language has long been one of the controversial issues in language teaching (Dubravac, 2014). Although the significance of vocabulary in language teaching and learning has been established (Meara, 1980; Schmitt, 2000; Fadel, 2005), the question of ‘how it should be learnt’ still triggers contradictory discussions mainly revolving around one debate: The use of implicit or explicit instruction leads to more effective vocabulary acquisition? (Souleyman, 2009). Each way seems to have both benefits and weaknesses, while more and more researchers tend to suggest that “vocabulary is neither the exclusive domain of implicit nor that of explicit learning but it is rather associated with both and the two modalities interact with and influence each other” (Souleyman, 2009, p.48). Still, no definite conclusions can be drawn as to their interaction.

Apparently, both the implicit/explicit debate on vocabulary acquisition and the power of storytelling in classrooms generate educational interest. However, research on these domains remains scarce, especially when the learners are young and the learning tasks need to be more age-sensitive. Accordingly, Pilar Agustin Llach (2011) describes research studies on primary school learners’ development of lexicon as “almost non-existent” (p.xi), Spolsky and Hult (2007) consider the research on the role of implicit/explicit instruction in second/foreign language acquisition insufficient, while
Malkina (1995) indicates the inadequate research in the use of storytelling in the FL classroom with young children. The current study was driven by a desire to explore these obscure areas of Applied Linguistics, in the hope of contributing to narrow down this research gap at least a little. Therefore, this paper centered on both areas and actually examined how implicit/explicit vocabulary teaching worked in the motivating context of a story.
Chapter 2

Vocabulary in Foreign Language Classrooms

2.1 The nature of vocabulary

As this paper aims to engage the reader in reflection upon the English vocabulary and the teaching of it to young learners of English as a second/foreign language, a look through the intricate essence of vocabulary is deemed necessary. It is safe to argue that the nature of vocabulary is much more complex than one would initially assume (Schmitt, 2000), if we consider the fact that the questions which surround it lead to controversial topics: It is difficult to comprehend how experts can agree to some extent on what vocabulary is, but argue when it comes to its teaching/learning methods. Namely, when educators, linguists and researchers are invited to offer their own definition of what vocabulary actually is, the responses may vary but their core logic will not differ much; let us now imagine the answers which would emerge if the question called for the best vocabulary teaching/learning method, the experience which could contribute to growth in children’s vocabularies; the answers in this case would not only be varied but also contradictory (Dubravac, 2014). Although in no way are educators limited to teaching vocabulary using the same techniques and students to learn in the same ways, it seems that no teaching method can be justified without a thorough examination on what vocabulary entails. Shedding light on the different nuances of vocabulary might help in understanding its diverse nature. Therefore, it is crucial to establish first what vocabulary actually means to focus on teaching/learning it.

2.1.1 What is vocabulary?

The first thing that comes to our minds when we refer to vocabulary is probably the words of the language. As Read (2000) puts it, “we tend to think of it as an inventory of individual words, with their associated meanings” (p.16), and this is what most second language learners believe, considering the task of vocabulary learning as a “matter of memorizing long lists of L2 words” (p.16), and that “their immediate reaction when they encounter an unknown word is to reach for a bilingual dictionary” (p.16). Similarly, elaborating on vocabulary, Schmitt (2000), states that “the first idea
that probably springs to mind is *words*, a formulation that is admirably adequate for the layperson” (p.1), Ur (1996) defines it as “the words we teach in the foreign language” (p.60), while Neuman and Dwyer (2009) argue that vocabulary could be defined as “the words we must know to communicate effectively: words in speaking (expressive vocabulary) and words in listening (receptive vocabulary)” (p.385).

However, it is at least superficial to consider vocabulary only as lists of words. Neuman and Dwyer (2009) indicate that the term *word* is too general and does not sufficiently enclose the various nuances of vocabulary; it is about word meaning and the ideas that these words represent rather than simply labeling the words. Similarly, Souleyman (2009) observes that vocabulary should not be limited to individual words, as “it needs to include lexical items, grammatical features, whole phrases and discourse chunks, also known as bundles, as its units of identification” (p.18). Along similar lines Ur (1996) notes that “a new item of vocabulary may be more than a single word” (p.60), explaining that single ideas could be expressed through more than one-word units (e.g. mother-in-law), or that the meaning of a phrase many times cannot be readily understood by just recognizing the meaning of each word that composes it separately (e.g. call it a day). As Stahl (2005) insightfully puts it, "the knowledge of a word not only implies a definition, but also implies how that word fits into the world" (p.95). Words may be the building blocks of vocabulary, but they should not be treated as an end in themselves.

Despite the association of vocabulary with word recognition, it is indicated that nobody ever learns all the words in any language; we know and use the words that serve our particular purposes and keep learning new words as long as we live, due to vocabulary’s constant evolution (Abdulla, 2012). Mart (2012) also addresses the issue of vocabulary’s evolutionary nature, arguing that “vocabulary knowledge is not something that can ever be fully mastered; it is something that expands and deepens over the course of a lifetime (p.177). Therefore, despite how deeply the essence of vocabulary is linked to words and how extensive and impressive one’s FL vocabulary can grow, it is a well-known fact that vocabulary can never be considered as finite.
2.1.2. Vocabulary description: Lexicology - word knowledge

As was previously mentioned, vocabulary is related to words, but word knowledge is not a simple process: It demands a deeper level of analysis. Lexicology is that branch of Linguistics which studies and analyzes the vocabulary items of a language as well as their meanings and evolution (Hartman & Stork, 1972). A thorough study of vocabulary cannot be complete without this vocabulary description, as it deals with a) how words are classified (word classes), b) how they are formed – by affixation or compounding – (word formation), and c) how the different meanings of words are recognized (word meaning).

**Word classes:** All words belong to categories which are called word classes or parts of speech. Schmitt (2000) accordingly notes that “word class describes the category of grammatical behavior of a word” (p.59). There are four major word classes, depending on the part they play in a sentence: Nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. Interestingly, it has been proven that certain word classes are learnt easier than others. Namely, research has shown that nouns are the easiest word class, with adjectives and verbs following somewhere in the middle, and adverbs being proven to be the most difficult (Schmitt, 2000). Particularly investigating the use of nouns, Gentner (1982) explains that nouns are generally easier to learn than verbs, appear before verbs and dominate early lexicons, suggesting the ‘natural partitions’ hypothesis which basically assumes that noun dominance reflects the fact that nouns tend to label enduring entities while verbs label relational concepts. This relates to ‘imageability’ (Paivio, Yuille & Madigan, 1968), the ease with which a concept evokes a mental image and can influence learning and memory. However, further research into this area does not seem to validate the view that there is indeed a clear connection between word class and its effect on learning a word (Laufer, 1997), even if “there does not seem to be any doubt that word class is involved in the learning and storage of vocabulary” (Schmitt, 2000).

Apart from the four major word classes, it has been found that multiword units (MWUs) constitute a huge part of lexis, performing the role of lexical chunks which facilitate easier and more effective language use (Schmitt, 2000). Along similar lines, Linse (2005) observes that “vocabulary development is also…about learning formulaic phrases or chunks, finding words inside them and learning even more about those words” (p.3), while Swan (2008) notes that chunks constitute a large proportion of spoken and written text. Regarding their lexical access, Porto (1998) states that they are...
stored in the lexicon as wholes and, since they are readymade, they can be easily retrieved although research on this area is scarce; he basically attributes their easy acquisition to frequency of occurrence and context association. Swan (2008) also observes that there is an inconclusive debate about the storage of formulaic language and its lexical access, but encourages its teaching as he believes that chunks can save processing time and help learners approach a native-like command of the foreign language. Souleyman (2009) analyzes in detail the forms that chunks can take, separating them into multi-words, idioms, strong and weak collocations and lexical phrases. Chunks can act as individual units, falling thus into the item learning category because they are treated –at least at first- as frozen wholes; then, as the learners progress they realize that chunks can be creative and varied (Schmitt, 2000). To portray the issue in Mukoroli’s (2011) terms, “the main advantage of the use of lexical chunks is that they build on the fluency of the English language learner” (p.22).

**Word formation:** Regarding word formation, Fadel (2005) also refers to it as ‘word building’ which entails three forms: affixation, compounding and conversion. Mukoroli (2011) states that word roots, endings and affixes should attract the attention of students, so as to focus on cognates, while Fadel (2005) explains how prefixation and suffixation can modify meaning, changing a word from one class to another. Moving to the other two forms, compounding has to do with the combination of two or more separate words to form another one (it can be a part of MWUs), while conversion refers to the fact that one single item can be used in different word classes keeping the same form (e.g. present) (Fadel, 2005).

**Word meaning:** Finally, word meaning plays an important role in vocabulary semantization and it is usually acquired through the use of polysymy, synonymy, antonymy, or hyponymy (Fadel, 2005). Accordingly, for Mukoroli (2011) word meaning is a very complex process, which involves the use of *labeling* (giving a brief description of the item), *packaging* (grouping items under the same head topic) and *network building* (linking words together according to their meaning); nonetheless, it still remains difficult to determine the exact progress of the learners’ interlanguage semantic development (Hazenberg & Hulstijn, 1996).

Apparently, word knowledge is not simple and it gets even more intricate when its depth is measured in a foreign language. Taking into consideration lexicology, Linse (2005) suggests eleven aspects that are needed so as to know a word completely:
a. Receptive knowledge: Recognizing & Understanding its meaning when heard/read
b. Memory: Recall it when needed
c. Conceptual knowledge: Use it with correct meaning
d. Using it correctly in spoken form (in isolation and in discourse)
e. Grammatical knowledge: Accurate use
f. Collocation knowledge
g. Orthographic knowledge: spelling
h. Pragmatic knowledge: style and register
i. Connotational knowledge: positive and negative associations
j. Metalinguistic knowledge: grammatical properties
k. Cultural Content: what is the significance of use in the culture (deliver milk)

As can be expected, all of these aspects cannot be taught/learned automatically. They need time and favorable circumstances.

2.1.3 Receptive and productive dimension of vocabulary

Having in mind the intricate aspects of word knowledge, we will now explore one of its most important parts, through which we get to understand words’ meaning, form and use: The receptive and productive dimension of vocabulary. It mainly has to do with an important distinction concerning the words we have stored in our brains. Before outlining the key points of this distinction, the receptive/productive dimension could also be related to the difference between our linguistic competence (lexical knowledge) and our linguistic performance (language used in communication) respectively, initiating us thus into a more adequate understanding of how vocabulary actually functions. As Fromkin, Rodman and Hyams (2007) explain, linguistic competence is about “what we know” (p.11), while linguistic performance is “how we use this knowledge in actual speech production and comprehension” (p.11).

Broadly speaking, our receptive vocabulary refers to the lexical input which we decode when we hear or see it somewhere, while our productive vocabulary refers to the words we can actually produce when we speak or write: Our active vocabulary. Moreover, apart from receptive and productive, vocabulary has also been termed as
passive and active respectively (Harmer, 1991; Aebersold & Field, 1997). More specifically:

a) Receptive vocabulary: As Abdulla (2012) indicates, “it means that a learner can know and recognize the word when it is heard, and of what grammatical pattern the word will occur. In this type, they can distinguish the word from another word with a similar form” (p.28). Namely, it refers to words which can be adequately understood when heard or seen, but will not be easily produced in actual communication. Additionally, Haycraft (1978) has also used the term ‘passive’ vocabulary to refer to the words which learners can comprehend in the context of listening and reading, but as Fadel insightfully points out, “since comprehension is not a passive activity the term receptive is preferred to that of passive” (p.50). Discussing the significant role of word study, Benjamin and Crow (2012) draw our attention to our receptive control of words and indicate that our receptive vocabulary is considerably larger than our productive one. This is natural if we consider how easier it is to read or understand a word than speak or write it. The underlying argument in favor of the receptive vocabulary constituting a considerably larger proportion of words over productive, is that we are not required to know everything about a word in order to fully comprehend it: to know the gist of the word is most often enough to extract meaning, let alone have it in context (Benjamin & Crow, 2012). It is much easier to be in receptive control of a language than to be in productive control.

b) Productive vocabulary: The other side of the coin is the words which are actually used. Alqahtani (2015) defines it as “the words that the learners understand and can pronounce correctly and use constructively in speaking and writing. It involves what is needed for receptive vocabulary plus the ability to speak or write at the appropriate time” (p.25). Haycraft (1978) used the term ‘active’ vocabulary, to define those items that learners can understand, produce and use in a correct and constructive way. In addition to the correct and constructive use, Nation (1990) had also considered the grammatical knowledge needed in order to adequately use words productively. Accordingly, Benjamin and Crow (2012), talking about the productive control of the words that we use to express ourselves, point out that building on our receptive vocabulary we eventually become better acquainted with the words, we get to know more
information about them, their nuances, their connotations. This is probably why Schmitt (2000) believes that productive vocabulary stays in memory and holds that “memory has a key interface with language learning…most of forgetting occurred with words that were only known receptively; productive words were much less prone to forgetting” (p.129).

A closer look at the above distinction appears to suggest that receptive vocabulary gradually becomes productive and then we are able to use it properly. However, is receptive and productive knowledge placed on a continuum? There has been an inconclusive debate about whether this distinction implies a natural progression or not (Pignot-Shahov, 2012). On the one hand, researchers lend support to the belief that there is a gradual cline from receptive/passive to productive/active knowledge and, therefore, no dichotomy (Faerch, Haastrup & Phillipson, 1984; Tréville, 1988; Fadel, 2005). On the other hand, other experts in the field maintain that productive knowledge does not necessarily stem from receptive knowledge: Meara (1997) notes that the words we know receptively are not connected to our lexicon, while Schmitt (2000) states that “framing mastery of a word only in terms of receptive versus productive knowledge is far too crude” (p.5), exemplifying his view by setting his own experience of knowing productively a word in its oral form but not knowing it receptively in its written form. Therefore, the boundaries between the two types of vocabulary are still not clear and one needs to take them both into consideration when analyzing vocabulary mastery. As there is a crucial distinction between knowing a word and using it, different learning mechanisms are required for the knowledge aspect and different mechanisms for the skill aspect (Mukoroli, 2011).

### 2.1.4 Vocabulary and reading

A really important aspect of the nature of vocabulary, concerns its connection to reading. Krashen (1989) conducted some vocabulary tests which indicated that the mere reading of a text in the SL / FL causes vocabulary acquisition. Fadel (2005) supports this view and tries to explain it: He observes that teachers realize that their students have more opportunities to acquire the foreign vocabulary through abundant reading, rather than constant listening. He believes that a text can be a rich source of new vocabulary and if the reading context involves an adequate amount of familiar words (namely the high frequency sight words), the learners find it easier to learn new words building on the old ones. The more they read the more their word knowledge
increases. This is why he concludes that “learning vocabulary is in a direct relationship with success in reading and vice versa” (p.56). Apparently, since the goal of reading is meaning-making, research on vocabulary is often inextricably linked with reading comprehension. Stanovich (1986) states even more vividly that “general knowledge, vocabulary and syntactic knowledge are developed by reading itself” (p. 364).

In line with the view that the reading text can facilitate vocabulary growth, Ur (1996) emphasizes that although reading is a receptive skill, it does involve active participation on the part of the reader, and vocabulary echoes the reading text: She namely argues that when the learner reads a text s/he actively uses the context in order to guess the meaning of the unfamiliar vocabulary. Concerning the context and its role in the reading text, it has been found that young children with weak foreign vocabularies need to have some pre-teaching of the unfamiliar words, as the word families they know are not sufficient to facilitate word inference (Beck, McKeown & Kucan, 2005). Nonetheless, the exact relationship between vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension is still under the microscope.

2.2 Vocabulary in Language Teaching and Learning

2.2.1 Vocabulary in the Major Teaching Methods

Harmer (1991) once stated that “if language structures make up the skeleton of language, then it is vocabulary that provides the vital organs and the flesh” (p.153). However, the importance of vocabulary in language teaching and learning has not always been self-evident. Differing assumptions about the nature of language representations triggered different teachings methods. As Schmitt (2000) puts it “at times, vocabulary has been given pride in teaching methodologies, and at other times neglected” (p.10). The question of how to deal with vocabulary teaching/learning has followed the beliefs and principles of the intricate path of methodologies, all the way from Grammar Translation to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Fadel, 2005).

Although at the beginning of the 19th century Grammar translation began as reformist in nature trying to facilitate learning through the use of short sentences instead of whole texts (Howatt, 1984), it ended up putting too much emphasis on accuracy and explicit grammar rules (Schmitt, 2000). Ellis (2008) explains how “these explicit methods were motivated by the belief that perception and awareness of L2 rules
necessarily precedes their use” (p.120) and, therefore, led to a traditional teaching and learning of vocabulary. Lexis was not presented in context, but in bilingual lists to be memorized (Fadel, 2005), making bilingual dictionaries necessary (Schmitt, 2000) and proving that the basic criterion for vocabulary selection was its potential ability to exemplify a grammar rule (Zimmerman, 1997). What students were normally engaged in was memorizing hundreds of words of the target language, and the teacher was usually regarded as a ‘live’ dictionary (Wang, Han & Liu, 2007). Generally, Grammar Translation valued direct vocabulary learning, in which learners focused their attention on vocabulary through doing exercises and activities (Tong, 2001).

The Direct Method came as an answer to this pedantic teaching methodology, aiming at the ability to use language rather than analyze it. It focused on oral language and listening skills, where the acquisition of vocabulary would happen naturally through interaction, pictures and connection with the real world (Schmitt, 2000; Fadel, 2005). Audiolingualism and structural approaches which followed, were based on the behaviorist theory of learning and selected vocabulary that was easy and familiar, while the Situational Approach “treated vocabulary in a more principled way”, as lexis was grouped according to the situation in which it would be required (Schmitt, 2000).

Gradually, as the focus moved from language accuracy to language appropriateness, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) blossomed as a way to approach language for meaningful communication and fluency rather than explicit grammatical knowledge and accuracy; however, although it would be expected that by this method vocabulary would be brought into focus, CLT did not give adequate and clear guidance about effective ways to approach vocabulary, conveying the idea that vocabulary acquisition would just find its own way through students’ transaction of information using functional language (Coady, 1993). Through this short historical overview of basic methodologies and their impact on vocabulary teaching and learning we see how differing assumptions about the nature of language representation motivated different teaching traditions: Generally, there has been a shift from explicit methods to more ‘natural’ and ‘communicative’ approaches, affecting the role of vocabulary in L2 classrooms.

It seems, however, that most approaches did not really know how to handle vocabulary, with most relying on bilingual lists or hoping it would just be absorbed naturally” (Schmitt, 2000, p.15). Current lines of thought reject the idea that vocabulary
teaching and learning is of lesser importance, and actually try to draw attention to its central role. Accordingly, Souleyman (2009) indicates that “in the recent past research in vocabulary has mostly concentrated on whether vocabulary is worth teaching at all” (p.22), a situation which led Meara (1980) to call for its active teaching. Similarly, Fadel (2005) observes that while vocabulary has always been deemed as secondary (mostly to grammar), its role is now being reevaluated. Lewis (1997) points out that language consists of grammaticalized lexis and not lexicalized grammar, while Schmitt (2000) highlights the importance of vocabulary learning, arguing that students carry around dictionaries and not grammar books. In the same vein, Schmitt (2000) notes that “grammar and vocabulary are fundamentally linked” and that “one must conceptualize them as partners in synergy with no discrete boundary, sometimes referred to as lexicogrammar” (p.14). Dörnyei (2009) further explains how even the nature of CLT has changed with vocabulary gaining ground by not just taking care of itself, while Spada (2007) explains that “most second language educators agree that CLT is undergoing a transformation – one that includes increased recognition of and attention to language form within exclusively or primarily meaning-oriented CLT approaches to second language instruction” (p.271). Therefore, Semantics started to play a very important role in the teaching of vocabulary and as Fadel (2005) summarizes the situation “vocabulary, which was considered as a Cinderella in the teaching of foreign languages and suffered neglect for a long time, started to benefit from theoretical advances in the linguistic study of the lexicon (p.49).

2.2.2 Vocabulary Acquisition: The nature of the implicit-explicit distinction

Having outlined the intricate nature of vocabulary, its different types and position in foreign language teaching methods, it is now time to explore the intriguing question of how learners get to acquire such an impressive amount of vocabulary. The truth is that there is no global theory to explain vocabulary acquisition as in this domain whole areas still remain obscure or unknown (Schmitt, 2000; Nation, 1990; Al-Darayseh, 2014). Longhurst (2013) explains that there are so many variables which need to be considered such as “what mother tongue the student has, the age of the student, cultural background, level of motivation, and how much contact the student has with the target language” (p.14). Given this versatile nature of vocabulary acquisition, it is natural how the aforementioned history of trends in acquiring second language
vocabulary was so contradictory. However, it seems that eventually all views debate and revolve around one topic: the role of implicit and explicit linguistic knowledge and how their usage can lead to satisfactory results and vocabulary gains. (Dubravac, 2014). To portray the issue in Wang’s (2000) terms, “the pendulum has swung from direct teaching of vocabulary under the sway of the grammar translation method to implicit acquisition under the influence of top-down, naturalistic, and communicative approaches, and now, laudably, back to the middle: implicit and explicit learning” (p.17). On these grounds, Schmitt (2000) naturally observes that the thousands of word families which L2 students learn, are somehow acquired through these two approaches. Therefore, the nature of implicit and explicit teaching and learning will be the central focus of this discussion.

The terms implicit/explicit learning/teaching have raised many questions over the years, while research in the area of this dual distinction in relation to vocabulary acquisition still remains scarce. As Rieder (2003) observes, “it seems that the debate about implicit/explicit learning and vocabulary acquisition has frequently been blurred by a confusion of the issue under discussion” (p.24), an apparent situation if we consider the existing diverse terminology used, contrasting e.g. incidental vs. intentional learning, attended vs. unattended learning, direct vs. indirect learning. What follows is an effort to enlighten the key issues surrounding these two basic vocabulary approaches, as they are deemed fundamental for a thorough understanding of the present study which will focus on their implementation.

Implicit knowledge - implicit vocabulary acquisition: According to Ellis (2005) “implicit knowledge is procedural, is held unconsciously and can only be verbalized if it is made explicit. It is accessed rapidly and easily and thus is available for use in rapid, fluent communication” (p.214). Schmitt (2000) uses the term incidental learning explaining that it occurs when the learners are exposed to the target language and their attention is on language use and not on learning itself; it happens naturally, mostly while using language for communicative purposes. While this natural process inevitably refers to the learning of young learners, relatively recent research has shown that

---

1 This paper deliberately includes several perspectives about the same topic: Vocabulary learning will be encountered both as implicit/incidental and explicit/intentional. While these terms are still debatable, the current paper views explicit learning as a form of intentional and declarative process of knowledge, differing considerably from implicit learning which is a form of incidental, but not totally unconscious knowledge (Ellis, 1994; Hultstijn, 1998; Gass, 1999; Wang, 2000).
implicit learning is not strictly age related (Vinter & Perruchet, 2000). It seems that certain kinds of word knowledge are particularly responsive to implicit learning such as the orthographic/phonological regularities of a language, the acquisition of infrequent words and intuitions of collocation, which are said to be gained incidentally (Nation, 1990; Ellis, 1997; Schmitt, 2000).

The equation of implicit with incidental learning is also transferred to the particular area of vocabulary acquisition: Longhurst (2013) defines the implicit vocabulary acquisition process as learning and acquiring vocabulary without a specific focus on it, incidentally, during simple exposure to the language. The same view is also shared by Shakouri, Mahdavi, Mousavi and Pourteghali (2014) who look into implicit vocabulary learning and indicate that “the assumption is that new lexis will be grasped ‘incidentally’, through exposure to various contexts, reading passage and other material without deliberate memorization being involved” (p.523). Hulstijn (2001) also refers to implicit vocabulary acquisition as ‘incidental’ and notes that the learning of vocabulary can be described “as the by-product of any activity not explicitly geared to vocabulary learning” (p.271). In line with this view and particularly connecting incidental vocabulary learning with young learners, Khatib and Nourzadeh (2012) state that a large portion of L2 vocabulary knowledge is acquired incidentally in the sense that words are acquired as a natural by-product of children performing everyday linguistics activities and tasks. In the last years, research has provided ample support for the assertion that incidental vocabulary acquisition plays an important role in second language learning as it is acknowledged that apart from the first few thousand common words, L2 vocabulary is mainly acquired incidentally (Huckin & Coady, 1999; Rieder, 2003).

In order to further clarify how implicit knowledge works, Clark (2010) compares it to the knowledge most people have of their native language, a situation in which “an individual uses their ‘intuition’ to deduce the correctness of an utterance” (p.4). Similarly, Ellis (2008) gives another enlightening example from L1 context, this time referring to implicit knowledge and grammar: If we ask a young child how to form a plural she will most probably say that she does not know; but if we show her something and call it a ‘wug’ and then show another one and ask her what we have got, chances are that she will reply ‘two wugs’ (p.119). This example indicates that “the acquisition of L1 grammar is implicit and is extracted from experience of usage rather than from explicit rules—simple exposure to normal linguistic input suffices and no
explicit instruction is needed” (Ellis, 2008, p.119). The child has learnt how to use language implicitly, without any overt explicit instruction of its rules.

As it is readily understood, things are different when it comes to L2: What can be acquired implicitly from communicative contexts is typically quite limited in comparison to native speaker norms where the input is rich; it has been proven that adult attainment of L2 accuracy usually requires something more than implicit mechanisms: It calls for additional resources of explicit learning (Ellis, 2008). Schmitt (2000) also observes that although L2 vocabulary acquisition may undergo the same steps as in L1, the learning contexts differ a lot. Along similar lines, Gotseva (2015) states that the conditions in which L2 learning takes place in a foreign language classroom do not resemble, even remotely, the naturalistic learning in an immersion environment, as “the former presupposes mostly explicit learning and acquisition of explicit knowledge of the target language which might or might not turn into implicit knowledge” (p.87). In her extensive study, she finds out that implicit knowledge in L2 is significantly affected by the following variables: a) length of exposure to L2 where it is used as native, b) starting age of learning L2, c) length of learning L2 and d) Instruction type (Gotseva, 2015). It is generally agreed that pure incidental L2 learning from reading/listening on its own is not as effective as previously expected (Huckin & Coady, 1999).

Every approach has its own advantages and disadvantages and the same goes for implicit vocabulary instruction and acquisition. Zimmerman (1997), investigating the role of incidental vocabulary acquisition in second language learning, outlines three important advantages. First, incidental vocabulary learning is a type of contextualized learning, which provides learners with a richer sense of a word’s use and meaning, as they process new words in such a way that it makes sense to them in their own frames of reference; it goes far beyond drill-oriented methodologies. The second advantage is that incidental vocabulary learning has the potential to trigger and improve learners’ vocabulary and reading abilities simultaneously. Finally, the third advantage is that implicit vocabulary learning is more learner-centered and individualized because in many cases learners get to select the reading materials they prefer. Learners’ needs therefore are met to a great extent (Zhang, 2008; Huckin & Coady, 1999).

As far as the disadvantages are concerned, implicit instruction has been criticized for a number of potential problems. First of all, guessing the meaning of unknown words from context does not necessarily happen quickly and efficiently. On
this matter, Zhang (2008) notes that “heavy reliance on L2 vocabulary acquisition through inferring words from context seems to be a slow process. In natural contexts, incidental L2 vocabulary learning does not seem to contribute a lot to vocabulary retention” (p.30). Moreover, inferring word meanings from context may lead to inaccurate guesses (especially from lower proficiency students) (Huckin & Coady, 1999; Mukoroli, 2011), while learners may even choose to simple ignore the vocabulary items they do not understand (Fraser, 1999). However, even if the learners are able to accurately guess the meaning of a word from context and satisfy their immediate communicative needs, this does not necessarily lead to its long-term retention and later productive use, since no deep mental processing of the word has occurred (Zhang, 2008; Hulstijn, 2001). The overall picture is that with the implicit method, there is no control over what learners learn (Mukoroli, 2011).

-Explicit knowledge- Explicit vocabulary acquisition: Other types of word knowledge are particularly responsive to explicit learning, during which Schmitt (2000) notes that, the learners pay special attention on the specific information to be learnt, establishing thus better chances for its ultimate acquisition. Explicit knowledge is “the declarative and often anomalous knowledge of the phonological, lexical, grammatical, pragmatic and socio-critical features of an L2 together with the metalanguage for labelling this knowledge” (Ellis, 2005, p.214). Along similar lines, Clark (2010) refers to this relationship between explicit knowledge and declarative knowledge, as the student’s ability to describe the factual information of the language in terms of rules or, in other words, using metalurgical knowledge. Therefore, the available views seem to suggest that explicit learning occurs consciously, is learnable and verbalizable and learners typically turn to it through controlled processing when they face some kind of linguistic difficulty in the use of the L2 (Ellis, 2005). Explicit learning has also been associated with intentional learning, which in turn has been defined as “the learning mode in which participants are informed, prior to their engagement in a learning task, that they will be tested afterward on their retention of a particular type of information” (Hulstijn, 2006); therefore, explicit learning is the result of deliberate effort and study in a clearly defined way (Longhurst, 2013). Souleyman (2009) successfully summarizes the operations of explicit learning, explaining that it is the situation in which “the learners are consciously aware of the target features under investigation and are overtly instructed on what is expected of them within the activity” (p.28).
Discussing particularly the relation between explicit learning and vocabulary acquisition and indicating the foregoing close bond between explicit and declarative knowledge, Wang (2000) comments that the declarative knowledge aspect of vocabulary learning (namely the mappings between lexical, conceptual and semantic aspects of vocabulary), is “more dependent on explicit learning processes” (p.18) because in this way learners can use cognitive and metacognitive strategies which can facilitate their effort. In a similar vein, Oxford and Scarcella (1994) take the position that explicit vocabulary instruction is necessary so as to guide learners’ attention to specific strategies for acquiring words, and help them learn vocabulary even in contexts outside of L2 classrooms. For example, one vocabulary area that can be favored through such attention and explicit focus, is spelling and pronunciation (Schmitt, 2000). The significance of this guided attention is equally highlighted by Brabham and Villaume (2002) who support that explicit, intentional, systematic instruction plays an important role in the development of rich vocabularies; incidental learning is of equal significance to the core mechanisms of vocabulary growth, but it should not overshadow the facilitating effects of explicit methods.

Furthermore, Schmitt (2000) maintains that “certain important words make excellent targets for explicit attention, for example, the most frequent words in a language and technical vocabulary” (p.121), recognizing at the same time that “some explicit learning is probably necessary to reach a vocabulary size ‘threshold’” (p.120), although he refers to the whole process as potentially being “time-consuming and… too laborious” (p.120). Nagy (1997), pointing out the remarkably huge number of the words of a language, also describes the direct teaching of vocabulary as a time wasting procedure; he recognizes, though, that the acquisition of a small proportion of these words could be facilitated by explicit instruction. Nation (1995), on the other hand, propounds the view that these words need to be learnt explicitly, and considers the time spending on them well worth it. Similarly, Shakouri et al. (2014) indicate that “learners should be given explicit instruction and practice in the first two to three thousand high frequency words, while beyond this level, most low frequency words will be learned incidentally while listening or reading (p.523). These views draw on research conducted by Cohen and Aphek (1980) and Laufer (1997) which corroborate the notion that lower level proficiency learners benefit from learning words out of context rather than learning them in context, as in order for a learner to comprehend a text coverage s/he needs to know at least 3,000 word families or else the context will be very distracting.
On these grounds, Wang (2000) states that “the basic vocabulary should be taught to learners as quick as possible” (p.16). Apart from the aforementioned benefits of the explicit approach - which mainly have to do with an explicit tuning towards pronunciation, spelling and the most frequent vocabulary- Sökmen (1997) lists additional pedagogical advantages for vocabulary acquisition. Namely, she holds the view that explicit vocabulary has the potential to “build a large sight vocabulary, integrate new words with the old, provide a number of encounters with words, promote a deep level of processing, facilitate imaging and concreteness, use a variety of techniques, and encourage independent learner strategies” (p.153). Accordingly, Zhang (2008) observes that over-reliance on implicit vocabulary instruction has proved to be inadequate and ineffective, indicating that it is worthwhile to add explicit vocabulary to the usual contextual activities of L2 classroom. As far as the disadvantages are concerned, Longhurst (2013) warns about the risk of too much explicit teaching which can be time consuming, can overshadow the importance of incidental learning, or make learners become less autonomous (Shakouri et al., 2014).

2.2.3 The concept of ‘consciousness’ in implicit/explicit foreign language learning

In line with the above specifications, there is an important issue that needs to be addressed: While the absence of conscious operations seems to be the crucial factor distinguishing implicit/incidental from explicit/intentional learning, there has been an inconclusive debate about whether the role of consciousness and attention in implicit learning should be downgraded as such. Rieder (2003) observes that this problematic area in L2 pedagogy is related to the aforementioned distinction of incidental vs. intentional vocabulary acquisition which appears to have only a superficial correspondence to the implicit-explicit debate; accordingly, she notes that “a general problem with the operational definition of incidental vocabulary acquisition is that it seems to suggest that incidental learning occurs unconsciously” (p.25). The trouble in this depiction of incidental vocabulary acquisition, as a by-product of another activity which does not involve any conscious processes and learning intentions, is that it neglects the active role of the learner (Gass, 1999). Ellis (1994) also criticizes the seeming equation of incidental with unconscious learning of vocabulary, advocating the view that incidental is implicit in the sense that it does not require explicit attention on the part of the learner. On the other hand, Hultstijn (1998) suggests that attention does play an important role in the implicit vocabulary acquisition process (as the learner is
actually required to take notice of the meaning of the word and its form), while at the same time he maintains that it happens “without any conscious inductions” (p.48). The element of attention is also highlighted by Marzban and Kamalian (2013) who note that “implicit learning is not entirely implicit, as learners must pay at least some attention to individual words” (p.93). The role of consciousness and attention in implicit learning is also deemed crucial by Wang (2000) who states that “though many authors take implicit learning as something that is learnt without the object of that learning being the specific focus of attention in a classroom context, the pedagogically induced attention may or may not fit in with learner attention” (p.17); the fact that we have not been taught vocabulary does not mean that we have not taught ourselves (Ellis, 1994).

It is clear that a terminological confusion arises, blending the sense of consciousness and attention, with that of implicitness. In an effort to disambiguate these terms, Rieder (2003) lists five definitions of consciousness:

- consciousness as *intentionality* (incidental vs. intentional learning),
- consciousness as a product of *attention* (attended vs. unattended learning),
- consciousness as *awareness* (learning with/without online awareness),
- consciousness as *instruction* (implicit acquisition vs. explicit instruction),
- consciousness as *control* (implicit vs. explicit memory) (p.27).

This distinction helped her conclude that the terms *implicit* and *non-conscious* are connected in the sense of *unaware*, while the term *incidental* can be realized in the sense of *unintentional*: Therefore she suggests that *implicit* and *incidental* are related if we consider “incidental vocabulary acquisition as being composed of implicit learning processes (which happen without the learner’s awareness) and/or of explicit learning processes (which take place without learning intention but nevertheless involve online awareness and hypothesis formation)” (p.28). She proposes, thus, a possible answer to the challenging question of how far incidental vocabulary acquisition can be said to correspond to implicit or explicit learning.

### 2.2.4. Relation between implicit and explicit knowledge: Brain networks and Interface Hypothesis

Before going through studies which investigated the impact of explicit and/or implicit learning/teaching on vocabulary, it is very important to address an issue which has brought up various conflicting theories: Despite the differences between implicit and explicit language knowledge mentioned above, do they interact? Much research has
focused on the separability of implicit and explicit learning, but less has focused on how they might interact (Willingham & Goedert-Eschmann, 1999). What follows is a cross-disciplinary discussion concerning the neural mechanisms underlying explicit versus implicit learning (Yang & Li, 2012), along with a brief overview of the psychological research investigating whether or not there is an interface between implicit and explicit learning (Sanz & Leow, 2011).

Dissociations between implicit and explicit learning have figured prominently in memory research (Yang & Li, 2012) and have indicated that the parallel brain systems, supporting learning and memory, differ in their capacity for affording awareness of what is learned (Reber & Squire, 1994) and are mediated by different processes (Isingrini, Vazou & Leroy, 1995). It could be argued that cognitive neuroscience has treated implicit and explicit learning as distinctive processes. Abundant research has supported this view: Gotseva (2015) notes that people “possess separate implicit and explicit memory systems which store knowledge of and about language in different areas of the brain” (p.88). Accordingly, Ellis (2008) observes that brain science has proved that different areas of the brain are specialized and involved in implicit memory and different in explicit memory. Important foundations concerning this dissociation between implicit and explicit memory, and implicit and explicit learning have been proved in patients with anterograde amnesia, who, after suffering brain damage, cannot consolidate new explicit memories, connected with new places or faces, but maintain implicit memories and are able to learn new perceptual and motor skills (Schacter, 1987; Ellis, 2008; Sanz & Leow, 2011).

However, Willingham and Goedert-Eschmann (1999) note that despite their neuropsychological distinction, implicit and explicit learning are not mutually exclusive, arguing that when explicit knowledge is acquired, implicit learning can still occur in parallel. Yang and Li (2012) also point to a growing number of studies which indicate that the two types of learning might interact even if the precise neurocognitive mechanisms of explicit and implicit knowledge remain to be determined. More specifically, they advocate the view that the interaction between the two mechanisms may be represented by brain networks of differential connectivity and concluded that only when explicit learning and implicit learning occur together can the learner apply the explicit knowledge to explicit structures. Despite the neuropsychological dissociations and distinct neural patterns, the possible interaction between the two learning mechanisms is even more interestingly shown if one observes how previous
cognitive studies (such as Yang & Li, 2012) found no significant performance differences between the explicit and implicit learning groups. In other words, despite the fact that explicit and implicit learning conditions rely on different brain regions, an interaction between the two is not overruled as both mechanisms yielded similar behavioral performance.

As it is understood, the complex and multi-faceted interaction between the implicit and explicit knowledge has not been universally recognized: Many researchers have questioned the degree of autonomy and independence between the two learning systems, and this debate eventually resulted in an effort to evaluate whether knowledge acquired explicitly can become implicit. Three positions arose from their discussions: The Non-Interface Hypothesis, the Strong Interface Hypothesis and the Weak Interface Hypothesis.

**The Non-Interface Hypothesis:** Emergentist theories build the non-interface position which actually completely dissociates implicit from explicit knowledge. Krashen’s (1981) Input Hypothesis is an extreme of non-interface position, viewing L2 acquisition coming naturally through implicit processes exclusively. According to Krashen (1981), explicit and implicit knowledge do not have any interaction and there is no communication between them.

**The Strong Interface Hypothesis:** Skill-building theories promote the strong interface position, which holds that learners move from one stage of knowledge (declarative and explicit) to the other (procedural and implicit) through practice (DeKeyser, 1988). To put it in Sciliar-Cabral’s (2010) terms, “the advocates of a strong interface between explicit and implicit knowledge…believe that explicit knowledge becomes implicit knowledge through its proceduralization” (p.244).

**The Weak Interface Hypothesis:** Somewhere in the continuum between strong interface and non-interface, lies the weak interface position (Ellis, 1994) which claims that there is an indirect role for explicit knowledge in developing an implicit knowledge system. Referring to this hypothesis Sciliar-Cabral (2010) points out that “explicit learning might promote the development of implicit knowledge, since it plays the role of a facilitator of intake by providing the ability to notice the details in the input” (p. 244). Among proponents of the existence of a weak interface between explicit and implicit knowledge are Schmidt (1990) -through his Noticing Hypothesis (input does not become intake unless it is noticed) - and Ellis (1994) who propounds the view that
explicit knowledge acquired through formal instruction can become implicit knowledge only if the learner has reached a level of development that allows him/her to receive the new linguistic material.

Apparently, these three positions support very different approaches to vocabulary teaching. However, as the extreme cases of the Interface Hypothesis develop extreme implications for teaching (i.e. strong interface favors Grammar-Translation and non-interface favors the Natural Approach) it seems that a form of weak interface position- where instruction needs to be directed at developing both implicit and explicit knowledge, giving priority to the former- is more accurate (Ellis, 2005). On these grounds, Sanz and Leow (2011) conclude that Applied Linguistics was left with some kind of weak interface position, which renewed interest in explicit teaching not in the old form of decontextualized meaningless drills, but through communicative meaningful tasks. In this vein, they state that a weak interface position is supported whereby explicit knowledge plays various roles:

a) in the perception of, and selective attending to, L2 form by facilitating the processes of ‘noticing’ (i.e., paying attention to specific linguistic features of the input); b) by ‘noticing the gap’ (i.e., comparing the noticed features with those the learner typically produces in output); and c) in output with explicit knowledge coaching practice, particularly in initial stages, with this controlled use of declarative knowledge guiding the proceduralization and eventual automatization of language processing, as it does in the acquisition of other cognitive skills (p.37). Nevertheless, teachers should keep in mind that the extent to which explicit knowledge can be converted into implicit knowledge remains controversial.

2.2.5 Vocabulary growth: Research employing Explicit and Implicit methods

Despite differing theories on the exact terminology and (co)operation of explicit and implicit approaches, it is safe to argue that they both affect the outcomes of second/foreign language vocabulary acquisition/learning. In fact, there is a rapidly growing literature in which researchers have tried to incorporate these methods so as to reach their own conclusions on which of the two works better towards vocabulary attainment.

Al- Darayseh (2014) focused on the effectiveness of both implicit and explicit vocabulary teaching strategies on developing adult EFL learners’ vocabulary size and improving their reading comprehension skills. His study was very interesting as very few studies have dealt with the impact of combining both vocabulary teaching
techniques. The findings of his study indicated that there were significant differences between the mean scores of the control group which was taught vocabulary in the traditional way (with memorization, translation and dictionaries) and the experimental group which was taught vocabulary through a combination of implicit and explicit strategies. The data appears to suggest that the combination of explicit and implicit strategies proved to be more effective both for vocabulary retention and reading comprehension. Therefore, he concludes that the utilization of explicit vocabulary teaching strategies should not be neglected even if the attention centers around implicit learning.

Yali (2010) tried to investigate the role of reading in L2 vocabulary acquisition, and the effect of different vocabulary instructional techniques on the vocabulary learning of college ESL students in China. The data gathered in the study suggested that the combination of the incidental and intentional learning instruction leads to greater vocabulary gains and better retention, and that students’ prior vocabulary size was an important variable for success in the productive aspect of the vocabulary knowledge.

In his effort to find out which of the two vocabulary approaches (implicit or explicit) is more effective, Mirzaii (2012) conducted a study which compared the effectiveness of implicit vocabulary learning (IVL) through extensive reading with that of explicit vocabulary learning (EVL) through activities requiring deep processing on the long-term vocabulary recall of 62 Iranian intermediate EFL learners. The data yielded in this study indicated that while the EVL group outperformed the IVL group in meaning and preposition, the IVL group did slightly better in the area of collocation.

In his study, Souleyman (2009) employed both implicit and explicit teaching in his effort to investigate immediate and delayed vocabulary retention. The data yielded by this study indicated that the explicit group scored higher on the immediate retention test. What probably happened with the implicit group is that the learners focused mostly on the words they considered necessary in order to understand the text. However, although the quantity of the learnt words was much smaller than that of the explicit group, the tests showed that these words were eventually learnt more efficiently and for a longer period compared to the selected items learnt by the explicit group. It could be argued that the quality of the learning was better than the quantity. Therefore, he concluded that “leaving the choice of the focus of the learning task entirely to the learner is detrimental to learning a wide range of vocabulary items” (p.248). As far as the delayed retention test is concerned, the findings indicated that the scores of the
implicit group remained close to the immediate retention ones proving that “they did not lose more of their initial gains over the period of three and a half weeks” (p.251). Perhaps the fact that they did not have explicit guidance required further effort and deeper processing of the selected words. This finding provides confirmatory evidence for Salomon’s (1983) theory of mental effort-dependent success which basically correlates the amount of effort to learn something with its eventual retention. It is also in line with the finding of Shakouri et al. (2014) who investigated the effects of explicit and implicit teaching and concluded that the participants of the implicit group had retained the new vocabulary longer as a result of deeper processing and involvement in learning the new words.

Looking into university teachers’ knowledge of vocabulary instruction, Zhang (2008) investigated their beliefs about vocabulary learning and teaching. Findings showed that the participants tended to employ an integrated approach to vocabulary teaching: Teachers namely reported that an integration of implicit and explicit vocabulary teaching and a combination of traditional and communicative language teaching is the best way to teach vocabulary. Explicit methods seemed to acquire a large part of their teaching, a situation motivated by their belief that over-reliance on implicit instruction may prove inadequate. Talking about implicit vocabulary teaching the teachers suggested the learning of vocabulary through extensive reading. Zhang (2008) concluded that the participants’ view regarding the most effective approach to L2 vocabulary learning coincides with what earlier studies had proved (e.g. Sökmen’s, 1997): The optimal situation seems to be integrating implicit L2 vocabulary instruction into explicit L2 vocabulary learning.

It seems that current research findings and teachers’ beliefs lend support to the claim that a combination of explicit and implicit teaching methods seems the most appropriate for vocabulary acquisition. Wang (2000) points out that “the tunings of the implicit learning can be guided and governed by explicit learning and explicit learning can be consolidated and reinforced by implicit learning” (p.18). Thus, implicit learning and explicit learning should be considered as the two sides of a coin in vocabulary acquisition, complementary rather than mutually exclusive. For example, he notes that “while explicit teaching can be a very good first introduction to a word, the context encountered in the subsequent reading can lead to new knowledge of its collocation, additional meanings and other higher level knowledge” (Wang, 2000, p.18), and repeated exposure to reading texts can help to consolidate the meaning of the previously
learned words. Thus, his basic conclusion is that it is “worthwhile to add explicit vocabulary instruction to implicit vocabulary learning. Explicit vocabulary instruction may not only enhance the efficiency of implicit learning, but may also have an effect on students' learning strategies, and overall interest and motivation in learning words” (Wang, 2000, p.17). Nevertheless, contextual learning should not be neglected.

Similarly, Ellis (2008) states that recent research converged on the conclusion that despite the fact that explicit and implicit knowledge are distinct and dissociated, operate in different ways and occupy different parts of the brain, their influence in processing is mutual. Concerning the separable contributions of implicit and explicit foreign vocabulary language learning, the best approach is a balanced learning curriculum incorporating both methods. Also drawing on recent studies, Longhurst (2013) observed how findings suggested that “a mixture of tasks incorporating explicit and implicit methods is the most effective route towards FL vocabulary acquisition” (p.25), although further research is needed. His study showed that explicit vocabulary is a valuable addition in communicative contexts; the teachers, however, need to be aware of the risk of using too much explicit teaching which could have unfortunate results: What is recommended is a combination of implicit and explicit modalities as this could prove to be more beneficial for the learners than using only one modality. Shakouri et al. (2014) seem to validate this view, stating that “a well-structured vocabulary program needs a balanced approach that includes explicit teaching together with activities providing appropriate contexts for incidental learning” (p.523).

2.2.6 Vocabulary growth: Teaching techniques and learning strategies

It has already been mentioned that there is no such thing as the perfect vocabulary method in foreign language teaching, but researchers and educators are constantly trying to report the techniques they find helpful. Also, no vocabulary learning strategy has been proved to be the most effective but, still, every effort is being made to help learners find their own way to vocabulary enhancement. The following are some of the various teaching techniques and learning strategies that have been proposed over the recent years.

Alemi and Tayebi (2011) investigated the influence of incidental as opposed to intentional vocabulary teaching methods, in addition to the learning strategies that the students followed. The vocabulary test conducted showed no significant difference- as far as the learners’ performance is concerned-between incidental and intentional
learning, but the intentional mode proved more predictive of this performance. Concerning the learning strategies, they mentioned that mostly higher-level learners can use them effectively, and argued that it is very difficult to precisely spot them due to the interference of certain variables such as personality, effort and autonomy. Nonetheless, what was crucial for them was to raise teachers’ awareness on the importance of helping learners develop learning strategies and not just promote ‘spoonfeeding’ by easily giving for example the meaning of an unknown word. For them, creating autonomous learners seems to be the most important vocabulary teaching method.

Jeng-yih (2012) talking about debates on whether vocabulary should be taught explicitly/directly or implicitly/indirectly concludes that current research revolves around one vocabulary teaching model: Direct, explicit vocabulary instruction is needed for beginners before reaching a threshold level. As they develop their proficiency, indirect, implicit vocabulary teaching along with extensive reading will gradually gain more ground over direct emphasis of vocabulary. Beyond the threshold level, students’ learning of new words will occur out of L2 direct reading, such as reading for pleasure. As far as effective vocabulary teaching techniques are concerned, he suggests that it would be helpful if teachers conducted first a needs analysis and then prepare class activities that meet the following criteria:

(1) exposures to words in meaningful contexts and in 4-skill (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, and writing) activities;
(2) connection between new and old words;
(3) rich and elaborative rehearsal about each word (e.g., describing word meanings, ordering words, and collocational matching games);
(4) use of various techniques (e.g., word unit analysis, mnemonic devices, semantic mapping, dictionary skills)
(5) multiple exposures to words;
(6) active participation by students in the learning process

(Jeng-yih, 2012, p.5).

Focusing only on explicit vocabulary teaching methods, Zhang (2008) mentions exemplification, word formation, semantic relationship, and definition as effective techniques. Similarly, Shakouri et al. (2014) list further explicit teaching techniques such as word definitions, synonym pairs, word lists, word associations, the keyword method, semantic mapping, semantic feature analysis, the use of realia, pictures, mimicry, contrast, enumeration, explanation and translation. Concerning implicit vocabulary teaching methods, they simply urge the teachers to let their students infer the meaning of the unknown words, just by using context clues (Shakouri et al., 2014). Alqahtani (2015) refer both to implicit and explicit vocabulary teaching, offering a list
of techniques that can be implemented: Use of objects (such as realia and visual aids),
drawing (on the board or on flashcards), use of illustrations and pictures, contrasting
(present the new word in relation to its opposite/synonym), enumeration (list words of
the same kind under one category), mime facial expressions and gestures, encourage
guessing from context (which implies extensive reading), translation (which does not
promote motivation but can check students’ comprehension) and scales.

Recognizing the learner-centered aspect in L2 vocabulary learning, Lai (2005)
explains how a student should try to work towards vocabulary acquisition, noting that
an aspirant vocabulary learner:

1. is a willing and accurate guesser;
2. has a strong drive to communicate;
3. is uninhibited and willing to make mistakes;
4. focuses on form by looking at patterns and using analysis;
5. takes advantage of all practice opportunities;
6. monitors his or her own speech and that of others;
7. pays attention to meaning (p.12).

As far as the vocabulary learning strategies are concerned (VLS), they can be classified
in four strategy groups: Social, memory, cognitive, and metacognitive (Lai, 2005).
Schmitt (1997) further categorizes them into a) discovery strategies (which include
determination and social strategies) for the actual discovery of a word’s meaning and b)
consolidation strategies (which include the aforementioned social, memory, cognitive,
and metacognitive strategies) for consolidating a vocabulary item after it has been
encountered. Lai (2005) mentions examples of the discovery strategies, such as
“guessing from context, guessing from an L1 cognate, using reference materials (mainly
a dictionary), or asking someone else (e.g. their teacher or classmates)” (p.23).
Regarding consolidation, memory strategies include a) study a word accompanied by a
pictorial representation of its meaning, b) make associations of the word with its
coordinates, c) use semantic maps, d) group words of the same kind together, e) study
the pronunciation and spelling of a word, f) use Keyword Method, g) use physical
movement accompanying the word etc; cognitive strategies involve verbal and written
repetition of the new vocabulary; metacognitive strategies refer to the learners’ ability to
mentions the use of vocabulary cards and vocabulary notebooks.

It is readily understood that the abundance of learning and teaching strategies,
offered through the years, provide both the educators and the students with great
chances to find what suits them and achieve the best results possible.
2.3 Summary

This chapter is concerned with the intricate nature of vocabulary and outlines its importance to foreign language learning and teaching. Initially, it deals with the question of what vocabulary actually entails and outlines its various dimensions. It further discusses the position of vocabulary in the long journey of foreign language learning/teaching, which is followed by the most controversial debate concerning vocabulary acquisition: The nature of the implicit/explicit distinction. Given the centrality of this issue to the current paper, effort has been made to disentangle and relate these terms, so as to shed more light on the obscure area of vocabulary acquisition. The consensus view seems to be that an efficient vocabulary program should include both implicit and explicit methods. However, no research seems to have tested separate lists of vocabulary items taught implicitly and separate lists taught implicitly, all coming from the same source. In the end, particular vocabulary teaching and learning strategies are presented, indicative of recent research findings.
Chapter 3

Storytelling

The importance of storytelling as a tool in teaching a language in a context familiar to the child is highlighted by Ellis and Brewster (2012). A story can take many forms: The form of a fairytale, a myth, a parable, a fable and more. Due to the multitude of its nuances, the word ‘story’ will be used as an umbrella term for all its types, as the term ‘storytelling’ will be the tree that will encompass all its offshoots. Generally, we tend to associate story time with young children’s favorite pastimes and this is natural if we consider how many parents devote a significant amount of time to storytelling. Storytelling, however, goes beyond a merely entertaining habit. Most parents know about the benefits of reading stories with their young children; it is not an accidental choice. The importance of poring over a book while creating a safe atmosphere for their child is currently being highlighted by pediatricians, psychologists and educators, as “reading books with children on a daily basis advances their language skills, extends their learning about the world, and helps their own reading later in school” (Reese, 2013). This extension of storytelling advantages beyond home and inside FL school experience will be the focus of this chapter. Additionally, it will be indicated that stories may not have to address only very young learners, surpassing -thus- conservative age boundaries.

3.1 The concept of storytelling

In order to fully comprehend the important role a story could play in classrooms, one needs first to appreciate their remarkable nature. Fadel (2005) maintains that storytelling should no longer be considered as an old-fashioned way of growing children’s minds and remarks that “a fairytale, a fable, or a mere narrative story has the advantage of creating a magical, but also a meaningful context” (p.4) through which young children thrive and improve themselves, developing their identities in an entertaining way. Underlining such context that serves as a path transferring the mind into different worlds, Mcdrury and Alterio (2002) define storytelling as “a uniquely human experience that enables us to convey, through the language of words, aspects of ourselves and others, and the world real or imagined, that we inhabit” (p.31). Similarly, Abdulla (2012) identifies storytelling as “the sharing of ideas and experiences through
words and actions to communicate and make meaning about our lives and the lives of others” (p.24). In addition, Delette (1997) defines storytelling as “the oral interpretation of a story, during which the storyteller invites the listeners to create meaning through conversation and imagination” (p. 10). Apparently, the consensus view seems to be that storytelling is an interactive process, a combinatorial tool that builds on seemingly simple structures, but nonetheless creates a deeper level of understanding.

Drawing on previous studies (Kavanagh, 2000; Mason, 2004; Fadel, 2005), it should be noted that this paper considers reading as an inseparable component of storytelling and will not treat it merely as the activity in which the teacher is the narrator and the students are the audience. As Fadel (2005) puts it, “we cannot disassociate storytelling from pleasure reading. Reading a story is essential to create a relaxed and secure atmosphere in order to involve the pupils in the reading activity by keeping their interest in the topic” (p.65). Along similar lines Mason (2004) propounds the view that students should not be confined to listening to a story but also read a written version of it, while Kita, Eshel, Mazor and Maron (1995) found that the use of a series of readers, often familiar to the pupils in their first language kept them interested through the storytelling process. On these grounds, the concept of ‘storytelling’ in the current study will also include pleasure reading.

3.2 The universal values

Another aspect of storytelling that needs to be considered is its universality. A universality associated with the multifarious nature of stories, the themes they convey, the age they address and the form they take.

Malkina (1995) addresses the issue of the universality of stories touching on cultural literacy, stating that “the experience that storytelling offers is not only personal experience, it is a universal experience encompassing world cultures” (p.2). Advocating the same belief as Malkina (1995), Abdulla (2012) has supported a story’s potential to help children to become culturally literate, holding that “storytelling is an ideal learning tool for expressing cultural realities” (p.25). This view is in line with Fadel (2005), who also believes that all realities, virtues and themes that the stories convey, are not culture specific but “universally found in all cultures and communities” (p.61).
Recognizing the multi-faceted, exceptional nature of storytelling, Abdulla (2012) discusses the aforementioned universal themes in more detail, indicating that stories and tales “embrace light and darkness, touch universal fears, hopes and aspirations. People enjoy the tradition and romance of fairy tales; they (especially children) enjoy hearing kings and queens, dragons and witches” (p.30). Ellis and Brewster (2014) scrutinized the possibilities of using storytelling, and argued that touching on numerous topics, “storybooks address universal themes that go beyond the utilitarian level of basic dialogues and mundane daily activities. They allow children to play with ideas and feelings and to think about issues that are important and relevant to them” (p.7). Along similar lines, Fadel (2005) highlights the universality of tales arguing that “‘once upon a time’ formula is the sesame which opens the marvelous world of tales” and that the universal values are apparent considering that children all over the world receive the moralities found in them (p.58). Namely, he propounds the view that tales entail values such as honesty, justice, mutual help, fidelity and many others, which are respected everywhere (Fadel, 2005).

Children are more easily touched by such universal values as their hearts are more pure and their imagination vivid. They are in the process of shaping their identities and as Kimmel (1970) had early indicated, stories may play a significant part in shaping children’s thinking even though the depth and duration of this impact remains to be determined. If the storytelling themes can influence a child so beautifully, does this mean that their influence is automatically related only to that age? If a story has so much to offer, why should its audience be restricted to very young listeners? Research into this area supports the view that although children are more easily intrigued by a story, older listeners can benefit, too. Fadel (2005) mentions that “reading, listening to a tale, a legend, a myth or a fable is an activity which appeals to all ages” (p.58).

Investigating whether age matters in relation to storytelling in schools, McArthur and Carr (1975) were two of the first avid supporters of the tales’ benefits for older learners, especially with the facilitation of listening comprehension, exclaiming: “Fairy tales in secondary-school language classes? Yes. Enthusiastically, yes” (p.1005). Similarly, drawing on the nature of stories and their resounding universal echoes, Ellis and Brewster (2014) explain that “while the telling of stories in class is often associated with primary-age children, the attraction of the story remains throughout life” (p.2). No
matter how deeply the universal themes and values become entrenched and how long they last, a story offers the opportunity for everyone to meet them.

Finally, apart from their values, themes and appeal to all ages, the universality of stories is apparent in other factors, too. Ali-Benali (1993) states that even in matters of organization and structure, different stories from different origins follow the same pattern: If we reflect upon our readings—especially when we were young—there is always a beginning where we encounter a danger, an ordeal, a misdeed, or a departure, and an end where the danger is over and there is atonement, catharsis, recovery or coming back. Indeed, Fadel (2005) considers it an advantage that stories are structured and follow a course of events that is predictable. As Bauer and Arazi (2011) note, EFL learners “already possess some background knowledge about the characters, the plot, and the major events in the story…which will transfer to their comprehension of the text in English” (p. 383). Thus, stories are similar not only in connection with the themes, values and topics they offer; their universality goes beyond to reach the characters and even the organization and structure.

3.3 Storytelling in EFL classrooms

Is there room for storytelling in a classroom and more specifically a classroom where foreign languages are learned? Can a story, a fairy tale, a fable transform a FL classroom into something more creative, enjoyable and most importantly effective? If yes, which stories should we teach? And if storytelling really does open up numerous educational possibilities, which techniques can teachers and learners follow?

Previous research has provided ample support for the use of storytelling in classrooms. Ellis and Brewster (2014) claim that good teachers have always known what a powerful and appealing tool stories are for a classroom, as they hold a magical quality that can engage learners in a way that few other materials and methods can. Furthermore, a strong argument that few could challenge is that storytelling is both life experience and linguistic experience, a powerful way “to reach deep within the learners into those areas that regular teaching may not visit” (Fadel, 2005, p.63).

Much research has dealt with the use of stories in FL classrooms exclusively. Particularly working towards an understanding of the connection between storytelling and FL learning context, Fadel (2005) actually finds out that learners’ contact with
stories, “facilitates comprehension and creates a favorable environment for the acquisition of new components of a FL” (p.4), proving that storytelling is a powerful force in language teaching. Also recognizing the benefits of storytelling in language classrooms, Lomba (2011) emphasizes the ability of storytelling to be both an enjoyable and an effective technique for the teaching of foreign languages to young children. A storytelling approach has also been deemed as a powerful strategy in language development where learners can receive a lot of interesting, enriching, comprehensible input (Kalantari & Hashemian, 2016). In the same manner, Dolzhykova (2014) portrays storytelling as an efficient didactic tool, although she found out that teachers sometimes encounter difficulties when implementing it to their lessons due to limited time and resources.

It is readily understood, that the educational value of storytelling has gained a lot of support, even though some obstacles may be encountered; this, however, is the case with every educational approach.

3.3.1 Selection of stories: Authenticity, adaptation and criteria to consider

Selecting an appropriate story or a tale is perhaps the basic yardstick by which the success of storytelling in FL classrooms will be measured, as it constitutes the initial step, the decision which will later shape the related educational experience (Malkina, 1995; Drucker, 2003; Fadel, 2005; Ellis & Brewster, 2014). This means that if, for example, the selection of the story is unfortunate, it will possibly determine its course in the classroom, generating unsuccessful results.

The first question that arises is whether the selected material should be an authentic text or a text adjusted to the learners’ needs. However, there has been an inconclusive debate on this issue. Fadel (2005) argues that the authenticity of the text is something that needs to be conserved and that the selected story should be as close to the original as possible. Despite supporting the authentic material, Fadel’s (2005) viewpoint insinuates a necessary alteration of the story before its access in the classroom; an insinuation which he later supports as he proposes the replacement of archaic words, such as ‘thou’, and structures, such as inversion, with more naturalistic ones. Similarly, Malkina (1995) also argues that authentic stories and mainly fairy tales, although enticing, might prove to be inadequate because of their complicated or even archaic language. Therefore, in her own study she used original stories but adapted them
to the learners’ level, simplifying its vocabulary and grammar (replacing for example the past with present tenses). Modified input has also been favored by Lee and Van Patten (2003) who support the view that it yields high results, whereas authentic raw material can prove rather difficult due to its structure.

As a rebuttal to the aforementioned views, Ellis and Brewster (2014) believe that such ‘difficult’ structures are not to be avoided, arguing for example that “the past tense is a natural feature of narrative and many stories would sound unnatural and distorted if this was changed. Furthermore, children will be concentrating on the meaning of the story, not on why and how the simple past is used” (p.16). Ellis and Brewster (2014) understand how in the recent past ELT teachers preferred to use only “adapted and simplified versions of popular fairy tales and fables, or specifically written stories, often referred to as ‘readers’” (p. 14), but notice that a shift has occurred after the 1990s with teachers gradually introducing more and more authentic, ‘real’ stories. For them this happened due to the reevaluation of the authentic texts’ nature, which namely defines them as a clever choice, a rich source of authentic input which can prove to be challenging and motivating for learners who understand that they have dealt with the ‘real thing’; Nonetheless, they do not suggest that authentic material is the only choice; the idea is that teachers may use whatever they find effective – graded readers or original stories- without fearing, though, the introduction of authenticity in their classrooms any more. (Ellis & Brewster, 2014). Mukoroli (2011) also stands against the simplification of input, advising the teachers to insist on the major concepts the learner should acquire and not on everything.

While the issue of authenticity leads others to believe that graded readers are the best choice when selecting educational reading and others to prefer authentic texts, Schmitt (2007) insightfully accepts the use of both and maintains that there is a gradual jump from the one to the other. He namely concludes that graded readers (i.e. “books with a controlled vocabulary and limited range of grammatical structures” (p.150)) are a very nice start for beginning learners, even though they have been criticized for containing stilted language, as modern series are well written and provide learners with rich input while instilling a long-term reading habit in L2. He explains, however, that as their level increases, learners will want to proceed with authentic texts and unmodified language; this transition from graded readers to authentic material could happen with ‘narrow reading’, a process which entails reading plenty texts on the same topic.
(Schmitt, 2007). Therefore, authenticity could be the gradual aim of a carefully designed reading curriculum.

Apart from the factor of authenticity, there are also other criteria to consider. Malkina (1995) suggests that a suitable story might include “chain structures, rhyming words, repetition, action words, sound words etc” (p.5). She mostly explains the importance of action words in a story because they require the learners’ both mental and physical response, eventually facilitating comprehension. Sénéchal and Cornell (1993) highlight the importance of repetition, indicating that book reading is very effective because it is “highly repetitive and narrows down possible meanings of words by showing specific illustrations” (p.361). Fadel (2005) also believes that the story needs to include repetitive vocabulary and notes that the selected text should be compatible with the students’ age, level of proficiency and prior knowledge, while its layout (letter size, spacing, illustrations etc) is also important. As for the plot, it would be ill-advised to choose a complicated story with too many characters because it could prove troublesome for the learner (Fadel, 2005).

Drucker (2003) highlights the value of cultural difference and holds that, whenever possible, teachers should “choose texts that will match the cultural schemata and background knowledge” of their foreign language learners (p.26). Previous research on the issue of culture has led her to suggest that teachers need to find stories that do not reinforce stereotypes, are appealing to students and perhaps include characters of different ethnicities (Drucker, 2003). Finally, really analytic and deep research was conducted by Ellis and Brewster (2014) who separated the selection criteria in nine categories: Level, literacy devices, content/ subject matter, illustrations/ layout, educational potential, motivation, values, global issues and language/ content.

Clearly, the selection of an appropriate story is not an easy issue, but needs to be done with caution in order to produce the best results possible.

3.3.2 Benefits for learners and teachers

Acknowledging the educational value of storytelling in classrooms, the view that stories can have positive effects both for the teacher and for the learner, has found fertile ground among many researchers. Huang (2006) argues that storytelling is a powerful tool for language learners, helping them progress from oracy to literacy, and that teachers should definitely try to utilize the benefits of storytelling in their classrooms,
while Davies (2007) describes it as an inspirational and creative approach to learning, urging teachers to develop storytelling and use it in their elementary classes, offering practical advice and techniques. Along similar lines, Abdulla (2012) observes that storytelling constitutes an impressive technique in language teaching, presenting arguments to emphasize its advantages both for the teacher and for the student; namely, he advocates the view that:

- For a teacher, storytelling is important because of its effectiveness in fostering a relaxed and intimate atmosphere in the classroom. So, teachers can hold the attention of their classroom and teach not only the art of storytelling, but also the information of core subjects using stories. This teaching method brings fun into learning for today's video generation.
- For students, they can increase their skills in both speaking and listening, as well as writing, and they can more easily retain the information found in the contents of a story, especially vocabulary (p.22).

Additionally, concentrating on students, Fadel (2005) has insightfully proposed a distinction of the storytelling effects on the learners, into emotional and educational. As anticipated, if stories offer possible gains in these two categories, they constitute a coveted tool for teachers, too. The main theoretical premise behind the emotional effects is that stories can have an impact on the learners’ construction of knowledge and self through the listeners’ active mental participation which allows them to enter the story, participate in the course of events, feel for the characters or even identify with them. A story can recount events which may move the students and offer them a chance to see things from a different perspective. This has to do with what Deacon and Murphy (2001) call ‘deep impact’ of storytelling, extending its value into areas beyond language teaching and giving a course depth. As they note, “this deep impact makes language learning an enriching experience that students find intrinsically valuable” (Deacon & Murphy, 2001, p.1). A student’s own words in her action log cover sufficiently the topic of emotional effects that stories can cause: “Even today I can still remember your stories! Maybe you will not teach me again. But a teacher’s saying can influence a person a long time, maybe one life” (Deacon & Murphy, 2001, p.1).

As far as the educational effects are concerned, they have to do with a quality of stories other than their ability to make us travel to other worlds: Stories are used as comprehensible input in which learners make connections with the language in context rather than in bits and pieces. As mentioned earlier (see section 3.1), we cannot disassociate storytelling from pleasure reading. Learners have the chance to enjoy
reading in the target language, an activity considered by Rivers (1968) the most important activity but, unfortunately, many students do not find it very interesting. Apart from reading, listening skills are also enhanced (Penno, Wilkinson & Moore, 2002). The fact that children ask to hear a story over and over leading to its frequent repetition, along with the aforementioned natural repetition of structures and key words in the stories, make it easier for the learner to listen and eventually acquire new language items (Ellis & Brewster, 2014). Among the other language learning skills that can be developed through stories and according to the learners’ level, Ellis and Brewster (2014) recognize benefits in vocabulary, grammar, speaking, pronunciation, writing and learning about culture. This is natural if we consider that a story is actually “a complete and very efficient teaching material. It contains different grammatical structures, a wide variety of vocabulary and different types of discourse. Thus, it can be used as a vehicle for teaching grammar, reading comprehension, listening comprehension and vocabulary development” (Fadel, 2005, p.66). The current study will focus on stories’ educational impact on vocabulary.

3.3.3 Storytelling and vocabulary acquisition

Among all the benefits that storytelling can generate in FL classrooms, vocabulary gains engross the attention of the present paper; it seemed really interesting to examine how the implementation of stories in classroom can facilitate vocabulary acquisition in particular, because it is a challenging area in education considering how many EFL learners face difficulties in retrieving vocabulary items (Abdulla, 2012).

For Ellis and Brewster (2014), the issue of vocabulary and storytelling lies at the heart of their discussion and, as advocated, “vocabulary in stories is presented in a vivid and clear context and the illustrations help to convey meaning” (p.31). The context of the story along with all its frequently amusing situations and pictures, make vocabulary retention easier (Ellis & Brewster, 2014). Similarly, Griffith and Ruan (2007) believe that “story innovation can be a powerful instructional strategy that supports children’s vocabulary and fluency development in primary classrooms” (p.334). In line with this view, Sénéchal and Cornell (1993) advocate the view that “a primary activity associated with vocabulary development is joint picture-book reading by an adult and a child” (p.361).
Related experiments provide confirmatory evidence that storytelling facilitates vocabulary comprehension. Fadel’s (2005) work looked into the relationship between storytelling and vocabulary acquisition in the teaching of EFL at the elementary level and validated the view that storytelling can indeed be a useful means as input for the acquisition of new foreign vocabulary items, improving vocabulary learning and retention skills. He develops the claim that “literature which includes different genres is of great benefit in learning a foreign language, especially lexis” (Fadel, 2005, p.154). This was partly explained due to the fact that new vocabulary items were often remembered within the context of the particular story, aroused by the plot and not as a result of vocabulary presentation in bits and pieces (Fadel, 2005). Contextualized storytelling was also proposed as an instructional tool to help learners with vocabulary acquisition, while emphasis was given on the crucial role of multi-sensory teaching (Cary, 1998; Elley, 1989). Huang’s (2006) study, however, yielded different results as it indicated that “no positive effect of storytelling was found on word recall” (p.65). In their recent research on the effects of storytelling on improving the vocabulary of young EFL learners, Kalantari and Hashemian (2015) proved that this approach, accompanied by the use of visual cues and gestures, was very effective and led to increase in children’s vocabulary knowledge and motivation. Additionally, Verdugo and Belmonte (2007) indicate the importance of internet-based technology and show that digital stories could result in even greater improvement in young learners’ progressive understanding of vocabulary.

Judging by the aforementioned available evidence, it is apparent that the vast majority of research found a strong connection between vocabulary acquisition and a storytelling approach.

### 3.3.4 Storytelling techniques

Storytelling techniques have been proposed both for the teacher and for the learner. Planned lessons and strategies when following a storytelling approach can greatly assist in teaching and learning, working towards successful outcomes.

Before the implementation of any strategy the storyteller needs to know the audience he addresses, their interests, likes and dislikes, level of literacy, attention span, previous experience with stories, and act correspondingly (Abdulla, 2012). Nations’
(1990) suggested techniques for learning and retrieving vocabulary seem to mirror the actions that teachers usually take when use stories in class: The most important ones are performing actions and gestures in order to facilitate the words’ understanding, showing at the same time pictures of books or drawing relevant images on board. A related interesting finding was that a change in behavior during reading could have substantial positive effects on children’s language development (Sénéchal and Cornell, 1993). McArthur and Carr (1975) also value the ability of the teacher to employ dramatic emphasis, overpronounce words or repeat certain structures, because they believe that “the dramatic aspects of the teacher’s oral interpretation can assist and can delight students in the ‘lightening’ translation of the tale” (p.1006). Although becoming a confident performer with great theatrical skills is deemed the ideal situation during storytelling, optimal teaching through stories does not necessarily imply that a teacher without this theatrical quality is doomed to failure (Abdulla, 2012). Instead, if teachers know their audience, believe in the story and practice, trying step by step to narrate events building on emotions, descriptions, gestures and pictures, they gradually become better storytellers and create visual thinking (Abdulla, 2012).

The above mentioned theatrical qualities that could boost the performance of the listeners, reinforce the idea that a story is better told than read (Wright, 1995; Abdulla, 2012). According to Abdulla (2012), telling a story builds a stronger relationship and better interaction between the teacher and the listener, as the teacher has the opportunity to respond and use body language; thus, the dynamic role of the teacher is highly encouraged (Fadel, 2005). The best way to start the storytelling procedure is to set the scene by asking relevant questions to introduce the learners to the topic. Marsh (1986) suggests that children get more out of a reading assignment when the lesson is preceded with background information and followed with discussion. Getting the students actively involved in the reading episode, will create better teaching conditions and promote motivation (Zhang, 2008; Mukoroli, 2011). Through such interactions, teachers should encourage students to talk about the events of the story as they experience them, using storytelling as a narrative approach to curriculum development, depending on a set of four guiding principles: a) context, b) construction, c) collaboration and d) conversation (McDrury & Alterio, 2002). It should be mentioned, however, that one study concluded that active participation and interaction did not boost students’ learning and that reading the story verbatim was as effective (Sénéchal and Cornell, 1993). Apart
from the last study, the majority of researchers seem to suggest that educators should try and foster a trusting environment, welcoming the students to participate in the story because the construction of knowledge will eventually be the result of an active teacher-learner interaction, cooperation and discussion.

The following are some more specific recommended storytelling techniques adapted from Brewster, Ellis and Girard (2004) for FL teachers:

- If students are unfamiliar with storytelling, begin with short sessions which do not demand too much from them and over time extend their concentration span;
- Read slowly and clearly. Give the students time to relate what they hear to what they see in the pictures, to think, ask questions, make comments. However, do vary the pace when the story speeds up;
- Make comments about the illustrations and point to them to focus the students’ attention;
- Encourage students to take part in the storytelling by repeating key vocabulary items and phrases. Teachers can invite students to do this by pausing and looking at them with a questioning expression and by putting the hand to the ear to indicate that they are waiting for them to join in, then repeat what they have said to confirm that they have predicted correctly, and if appropriate, expand by putting the word into a full phrase or sentence;
- Use gestures, mime, and facial gestures to help convey the meaning;
- Vary the pace, volume and your voice;
- Pause where appropriate to add dramatic effect or to give children time to relate what they hear to what they see, and to assimilate details in the illustration;
- Disguise your voice for the different characters as much as you can to signal when different characters are speaking and help convey meaning;
- Ask questions to involve the children;
- Do not be afraid to repeat, expand and formulate. This increases the opportunities for exposure to the language and gives the children a second chance to work out the meaning and have it confirmed. (p. 21).

Similarly, Ellis and Brewster (2014) focusing on storytelling in primary EFL situations, determine the teachers’ techniques in relation to the role of the teacher which can be classified into affective, procedural, behavioral and interactive. a) The affective role implies that the teacher needs to recognize the diversity and unique value of each child, respecting their learning styles and creating a motivating, collaborative environment, while the procedural role entails the efficient preparation of the lesson, with clear aims, pre and post-activities and provision of opportunities for learners’ self-direction. The importance of the affective factor was also highlighted by Sénéchal and
Cornell (1993) who were against asking children to define the target words of a story, considering it an insensitive act. b) The behavioral role leads teachers to help students develop their own strategies while experiencing the story, and the interactive role promotes the aforementioned active participation of the learner (Ellis & Brewster, 2014). Moreover, teachers should help learners to discover the story themselves, by guiding their attention to the illustrations of the storybook, encouraging them to make questions and predictions about the story, focus on specific details or make associations with other stories they know. In addition, the storytelling organization and the inclusive learning environment will be reinforced if the teacher uses audio-visual aids (such as real objects, puppets, flashcards, masks, songs, digital videos, rhymes and video recordings) (Ellis & Brewster, 2014).

As far as the learners are concerned, they can develop their own techniques, thanks to the deep impact of a story and the assistance of the teller of the story, the teacher. Deacon and Murphey (2001) have suggested four techniques, which they deem very effective: shadowing, summarizing, newslettering, student retelling and action logging. Shadowing has to do with “repeating language after someone either silently or out loud… hearing the story twice: once from the speaker and once in their internal voice” (Deacon & Murphey, 2001, p. 3). Summarizing and student retelling refers to the chance for the students to retell the story to their partners in their own words, after hearing it first from their teacher, or retell it as homework to people outside the class. This works best when the story is separated in chapters. The technique of action logging is of mutual interest both for the learner and the teacher: The learners write their evaluation of the story activities and homework along with what proves helpful or what they have learned, and by newslettering they are encouraged to turn in their logs and permit their anonymous post on a handout or a closed Internet group, enabling the entire class to share their experiences, see how each fellow student thinks and works and suggest future customizations (Deacon & Murphey, 2001). These techniques offer the learners many possibilities to enhance a better understanding of the story, more easily.
3.4 Summary

In this chapter, the concept of storytelling was explored in terms of its application in foreign language education. It was pointed out that this method has the ability to engage our narrative minds in the service of language learning (Deacon & Murphey, 2001), as it deals with universal values and constitutes motivational context. If the story is carefully selected, regardless if the material is authentic or modified, it can lead to massive target language gains. Focusing on the aspect of vocabulary in particular, the available research seems to suggest that storytelling helps students enhance their vocabulary knowledge. All related benefits of the storytelling method, can be further reinforced by certain storytelling techniques.
Chapter 4

The study

4.1 Aim, Hypotheses and Research Questions

In light of the review of literature and building on previous research, two factors encouraged the implementation of this study: a) the importance of storytelling as an ideal context for young learners’ vocabulary learning (Fadel, 2005) and b) the controversial role of implicit and explicit instructional options on vocabulary growth. Taking both strands into consideration, the aim of the present study is to investigate how the implementation of explicit and implicit teaching may eventually affect vocabulary learning in a storytelling context. Vocabulary learning will further be explored in terms of the influential interaction between the difficulty level of the target vocabulary items and the way it has been taught, while particular attention will be given to the word class that was eventually learnt more easily. The hypotheses are as follows:

1. Learners will exhibit higher vocabulary gains for the words that have been taught through explicit teaching methods, as incidental learning solely from exposure to reading and listening is not enough for young learners (Huckin & Coady, 1999).

2. The difficulty level of words will prove to be a determining factor in relation to implicit explicit teaching, probably at the beginning levels.

3. Irrespective of the teaching method, nouns will be the part of speech most easily retrieved.

The research questions addressed in the present study are as follows:

1. Explicit or implicit vocabulary teaching will lead to more correct responses?

2. (a) Did the level of difficulty of the words affect significantly the performance of the learners?
   (b) Did the implicit/explicit variable affect significantly the performance of the learners?

3. Which part of speech produced more recalls?
4.2 Participants – Selection criteria

The participants selected for the current study were 8 third-grade students (9 years old) enrolled in a private Language School in Thessaloniki, and recruited from one EFL class of A1 level. The study took place during the spring semester in the academic year 2015-2016. The class had two 75-minute class periods a week for English Language instruction and the study was carried out during these lessons. The selection of the specific students was made after meticulous consideration which was to a large extent affected by one factor: The age profile of the participants in relation to a) their cognitive characteristics and b) the scarce vocabulary acquisition research available.

As for their cognitive characteristics, Lee (2016) particularly talks about 9-year old children and their cognitive development and notes that children at this age have longer attention spans, they can develop interests –such as reading suspenseful books-and cultivate them with passion, and they are full of questions as they begin to be logical and analytical. Thus, it seemed interesting to experiment on this age group by teaching with an alternative method and observe its outcomes. Furthermore, critical period studies seemed to suggest that a child’s brain is more plastic compared with that of an adult, and up to the age of 9, a child is a specialist in language learning; during the age span of 9-12 the brain progressively becomes stiff and rigid in the language learning process (Penfield & Roberts, 1959). However, there have been dissenters to the view that there is an actual age limit which seems beneficial for language learning. For example, Ervin-Tripp (1974) was one of the first to find out that 7- to-9-year-olds performed better than 4- to 6-year-olds did in foreign language learning, which led to the conclusion that, initially, older children acquire faster than younger children (Collier, 1987 p.2). Such differing theories made it even more intriguing to explore how my students would perform their vocabulary tasks at this young age.

Regarding research on second/foreign vocabulary acquisition, it has been observed that, in this sensitive age, research has not been sufficiently explored. Pilar Agustín Llach (2011) points out that research on foreign/second language acquisition is relatively scarce, especially in connection with primary school graders, Malkina (1995) observes the scarcity of research in vocabulary acquisition through storytelling to young learners, while Spolsky & Hult (2007) state that there is not enough research on the role of implicit or explicit instruction to young learners in first and second language
acquisition. Therefore, the selection of young participants seems more appropriate, as studies with primary graders enrolled in EFL vocabulary instruction through explicit/implicit processes and storytelling belong to an extremely obscure area of language teaching.

4.3 Research material: Storybook and target words

For the purpose of this study, one commercially available picture book was selected, combining both visual and verbal narrative: *The Wild Swans*, written by Hans Christian Andersen (1838) and retold by Dooley and Evans (2002). It is a literary fairytale about a princess who saves her eleven brothers from a spell cast by an evil queen. Andersen's fairy tales, which have been translated into more than 125 languages (Wenande, 2012) have become culturally embedded in the West's collective consciousness, readily accessible to children, presenting lessons of virtue and resilience in the face of adversity for mature readers as well (Wullschläger, 2002). McArthur and Carr (1975) had early acknowledged the value of his fairy tales in EFL classrooms and specifically mentioned that “because, the stories of the brothers Grimm, Hans Christian Andersen, and other folk tales are part of the common heritage of most students, hearing their foreign language version… allows students to rely on easy recall of the familiar and to engage in productive anticipation of plot details” (p.1006). The main theoretical assumption behind this view is that in this way the children can participate in the pleasure of recognizing in another language words, phrases and sentences, as they hear what they expect to hear.

It needs to be mentioned, however, that the particular story has been selected mostly due to its captivating nature which characterizes all Andersen’s fairytales, and not so much because it is instantly recognizable by children. In fact, out of the 8 participants, only one seemed to be familiar with the story’s plot. The reason for this choice is that regardless of whether the plot is already known or not, the learners can benefit from storytelling as it conveys language and story plot structure which enhances reading comprehension (Marsh, 1986). The assumption is that the context of a not so well-known story world will captivate their interest and keep them in suspense, while at the same time help them acquire new knowledge building on story structures, which are universal (Fadel, 2005; Abdulla, 2012; Ellis & Brewster, 2014) and familiar. In this
way, the nature of the story itself will facilitate their understanding but since the continuation of the story gradually unfolds it will also require more effort on the part of the learners because it will narrow down their lucky guessing.

The particular version of *The Wild Swans* belongs to *storytime* graded readers and addresses beginning EFL learners aged 6 to 9. *Storytime* is a series of graded readers which helps young learners to develop their knowledge of the English language through enjoyable stories that have been carefully selected from all over the world. Using a graded reader for the current study was not an accidental choice; it is based on the authenticity criteria involved in the selection of the story (see chapter 3), which share one important premise: When teachers have to decide upon the selection of an appropriate story and deal with beginning FL learners, adapting original stories to the children’s level leads to higher results (Malkina, 1995); transition to authentic material will happen gradually with narrow-reading (Schmitt, 2007).

Further features of the storybook contributed to its selection. First of all, it is important that the story is written in rhyme, because in this way it keeps one of the most natural features of a fairy tale alive. Rhyme has also educational benefits: According to the authors, the learners “find it much easier and more enjoyable to read and learn language in rhyme” (Dooley & Lloyd, 2002, p. i). Furthermore, the storybook uses colorful illustrations and it is accompanied by a fully-dramatized recording audio CD and a fully-animated DVD. The audio CD portion reads the full text of the story, while the DVD portion contains a movie version of the story, too: The form of digital expression aimed to facilitate the young learners’ understanding of vocabulary (Vendugo & Belmonte, 2007). The story itself is presented in double-page spreads and is accompanied by a picture dictionary for each spread, which presents the core vocabulary used. Activities, for further practice of the language learnt throughout the story, are offered in the book through child-friendly signposting. At the end of the book, children can find a song related to the topic of the story, and a glossary of all the vocabulary items presented in the picture dictionary.

As far as the target words tested are concerned, 40 vocabulary items were chosen from the fairytale. As vocabulary should not be limited to individual words (Souleyman, 2009; Stahl, 2005; Ur, 1996), the chosen collection includes multi-word units (lexical chunks), too. For the purposes of the study, the items were separated into
two groups (i.e. 20 items for the implicit group (IG) and 20 items for the explicit group (EG), depending on the way they have been taught. The target words for the IP were: *same, follow, deep, go away, send, far away, land, want, share, leave, country, as well, anymore, it's true, of course, almost, still, what does this mean, at last and glad*. The target words for the EG were: *daughter, collect, prison cell, turn into, set free, wicked, shore, finished, throw, sons, a dark forest, wife, lie down to sleep, be wrong, handsome young men, woods, stand, lost, a bunch of flowers and afraid*.

Moreover, two further classifications were made, categorizing these vocabulary units according to a) their level of difficulty and b) the part of speech they belong to. *The level of difficulty:* The levels of difficulty were distinguished by the Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR) in 2001 to indicate the various levels of language proficiency of users of a language. The CEFR levels range from A1 (breakthrough) to C2 (mastery). According to this level distinction, the two groups (EG and IG) were meticulously analyzed as follows: Each group contained an equal number of items belonging to the same level of difficulty, which has been set according to the standards of English Vocabulary Profile (EVP) which classifies words by level according to their meaning: Namely, in each group 10 items were assigned level A1 (5 for IG and 5 for EG), 18 items were assigned level A2 (9 for IG and 9 for EG), 6 items were assigned level B1 (3 for IG and 3 for EG), 4 items were assigned level B2 (2 for IG and 2 for EG) and finally 2 items were assigned level C2 (1 for IG and 1 for EG). No instances of words belonging to C1 level were met.

*The part of speech:* As regards the target words’ part of speech, it was deemed preferable to include every word class. The sample of vocabulary units was non-normally distributed into nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs and chunks.

### 4.4 Research design and methodology

The experiment took seven lessons to complete. Firstly, before their introduction to the story, the children were asked one by one to look at the target words (each one was separately written on plain cards) to ensure that these vocabulary items were probably not known to them. This process lasted about an hour and was presented as a playful activity, reassuring the children that this was not a test but a quiz which included many words which they may have encountered in movies, cartoons, video games or
other situations of their lives. Through this procedure, it was made clear that the children were not familiar with the vast majority of these words, at least outside context.

Five lessons followed, which were entirely dedicated to vocabulary acquisition through storytelling, incorporating ‘The Wild Swans’ as the sole medium of instruction; the coursebooks used throughout the school year were not used during the conduct of the study. Instead, each pupil had a copy of the reader which they could use for pleasure reading. As mentioned in chapter 3, an important element of this paper is its approach to storytelling as a process inextricably linked to pleasure reading. The teaching procedures and classroom activities were influenced by previous research in explicit/implicit learning and storytelling in connection with vocabulary acquisition (refer to chapters 2 and 3), while the storytelling techniques presented in subchapter 3.3.4 were followed. More specifically, in line with the recommendations, offered by Brewster, Ellis and Girard (2004), which promote the elicitation of comments about the storybook’s illustrations, each lesson begins with the children asked to look at the pictures and describe what they see, answering at times questions of the teacher. In this way the learners will be actively and effectively introduced to the reading episode (Fadel, 2005; Zhang, 2008; Mukoroli, 2011; Marsh, 1986). After that, comes perhaps the most important teaching technique, the dramatic aspects of the teacher’s oral interpretation (McArthur and Carr, 1975): The teacher reads the story excerpt aloud, slowly and quite dramatically (change voices, mime, help them understand unknown words through body language); This dynamic role of a teacher-performer has been proved to facilitate vocabulary acquisition (Abdulla, 2012; Fadel, 2005; Sénéchal and Cornell, 1993; McArthur and Carr, 1975). Then, the children read the story aloud themselves, engaging thus in a form of ‘shadowing’ (Deacon and Murphey, 2001). After the intended story parts are read, the children are actively involved saying what they liked most and expand on it, even using their L1. Having discussed everything they wanted about the story, the students watch the video of these excerpts and the accompanying vocabulary games (offered by the available CD-ROM), as audio-visual aids contribute to a motivating, inclusive learning environment (Ellis & Brewster, 2014). In the end, they are also invited to summarize in their own words and with the teacher’s help the plot of the reading episode (Deacon and Murphey, 2001) or predict what is going to happen next. Creative activities were also assigned in order to associate
the new vocabulary with fun pastimes such as drawing (refer to Appendix III for samples).

As far as the teaching of the target vocabulary items is concerned, it was mentioned before that they were classified into two groups: The explicit group (EG) and the implicit group (IP). This classification was determined according to the intended way by which these vocabulary items would be taught: explicitly or implicitly.

- The EG contained 20 words that were intended to be taught explicitly and learnt intentionally. Accordingly, the picture dictionaries which accompanied each page and to which learners’ attention was guided by the teacher, formed the source from which these vocabulary items were selected. These items were taught explicitly as they were deemed important for an effective understanding of the story. This method agrees with Laufer’s (1997) view which assumes that learning words out of context would favor lower level proficiency learners, rather than learning them in context. If the children did not thoroughly understand the meaning of the vocabulary unit from the picture, then synonyms were provided in the target language, or relevant drawings on the board. L1 was used only as a last resort. Also, in the end of the lesson, the words of the picture dictionary were assigned as dictation for the next time. The dictation was never in the traditional form of translation, but in the playful form of crosswords.

- The IG consisted of 20 words that were intended to be taught implicitly and learnt incidentally. These words were obviously not considered among the core vocabulary of the fairytale, as the authors did not include them in the picture dictionary and out of context. The learners’ attention was not explicitly guided to these vocabulary units. The teacher did not offer any explanations of their meanings, and the learners did not have to study them for dictation. However, the aforementioned role of the teacher as a performer using gestures and other techniques to facilitate comprehension was used equally both for implicit and for explicit teaching. Therefore, the idea was that the learners would learn the items of the IG by eliciting their meaning from context (Alqahtani, 2015; Jeng-yih, 2012) and interpreting the teacher’s performance. The vocabulary items of the implicit group were also repeated many times through the lessons, during the interactions between the teacher and the students, so as to ensure that the learners would encounter the items multiple times. As Stahl (2005) points out, the
learners need to see a word more than once to place it firmly in their long-term memories.

In the end, the target words were examined not only by the way through which they were taught but also according to their level of difficulty. Additionally, particular attention was also given to the target words’ part of speech (irrespective of the way of instruction and the level of difficulty) in an effort to see which part of speech would eventually be recalled more easily.

Upon completion of the story, the aim of the last lesson was to find out to what extent the 40 target vocabulary items were recalled. This was a time-consuming procedure where the learners once more were recorded one by one both on the EG and the IG. Although they were again reassured that this was not a test, this time the children were a little bit nervous because they knew that the required words had already been taught. The procedure was simple. The target words from both groups were tested in the same way. The teacher showed the student big cards (Alqahtani, 2015) with parts from the story and the target vocabulary units missing (refer to Appendix I & II). Therefore, the target items were to be found in context. The cards for the IG included assisting photos outside the storybook, while the card for the EG included the particular pictures of the storybook’s picture dictionary. The learners were invited to recall orally the missing word through the help of context and pictures. Therefore, both their receptive vocabulary was activated as they were reading the story excerpt and their productive vocabulary when they had to recall the missing word and say it. Their responses were recorded on an especially designed chart (refer to Appendix IV & V), and then analyzed through the use of the SPSS software. The results of the collected data are presented in the following chapter.

---

2 Initially, more than 20 words were tested for the EG. The final selection was guided by an effort to proportionally distribute the words according to the level and part of speech of the IG.
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Results

5.1 Explicit or implicit vocabulary teaching will lead to more correct responses?

Regarding the first research question which the present research paper set out to answer, namely which target vocabulary group -the IG or the EG- would generate more correct responses, the data show that the students produced more correct responses when asked to recall the items taught explicitly ($M = 12.25; SD = 4.09$) than when they had to do the same with the vocabulary items taught implicitly ($M = 9.62; SD = 4.92$). A paired Samples t-test revealed significant difference between these two categorical variables i.e. explicit-implicit vocabulary ($t = 2.539; p = .039$). Thus, the first hypothesis that learners would exhibit higher vocabulary gains for the words that have been taught through explicit teaching methods, as solely incidental practicing may not be enough, is confirmed. On the other hand, looking at the students’ individual recalls, an interesting finding comes up: The available evidence seems to suggest that explicitly taught vocabulary appears to favor the weak student, as the minimum number of the correct responses was bigger there (5), than the minimum number reported for the implicitly taught vocabulary (2). However, the same result does not occur for the stronger student, who seems slightly favored by the vocabulary taught implicitly, as in this case the maximum number of the correct responses is bigger (17) than that of the explicitly learned vocabulary (16). This means that although the total sum of the correct responses was significantly bigger for the words taught explicitly, it was the implicitly learned vocabulary that helped the strongest student retain more items.

5.2 Did the level of difficulty of the words affect significantly the performance of the learners?

Addressing the first part of the second research question, attention was given to the CEFR word levels and whether any difference would occur at the recall of the words of the same level depending on their explicit or implicit instruction. Therefore, a paired samples t-test was used to compare the A1, A2, B1, B2 and C2 level vocabulary items taught explicitly, with the vocabulary items of the corresponding level taught implicitly.
The difference was held significant for A1 level, revealing more correct responses for the A1 level vocabulary items which were taught explicitly \((t=+6.148; p<.001)\). It seems that the second hypothesis is confirmed and explicit teaching did play an important role, favoring the acquisition of the A1 level words. However, as the level of the words increased, there were not any significant differences between the correct responses of the children and the way these items were acquired. It seems fair to suggest that the factor of implicit/explicit teaching and learning did not play an important role in this case. In fact, as far as the A2 vocabulary items are concerned, the t-test yielded more correct responses for the vocabulary items taught implicitly \((t=-1.210; p=.265)\). Also, planned comparisons for implicitly taught vocabulary between A1 and A2 levels yielded significant improvement in the latter case \((t=-5.584; p=.001)\); still, no such difference was evidenced in the comparison of explicitly taught vocabulary for these same difficulty levels \((t=-1.183; p=.275)\). B1 to C2 level items did not show significant differences, but they were not taken into important consideration due to the small sample of the size.

### 5.2.1 Did the implicit/explicit variable affect significantly the performance of the learners?

Proceeding to the other component of the second research question, an issue deemed important was whether the independent variable of explicit/implicit learning (alone and in relation to the level of difficulty of words) would have a significant effect on the dependent variable of the scores of the students. The actual results of the ANOVA and the Tests of Between Subjects Effects conducted, revealed a significant effect of the level of difficulty of the vocabulary items, \((F=7.969; p=.035; \eta^2=.889)\), and of its interaction with the explicit/implicit factor \((F=3.179; p=.019, \eta^2=.154)\), albeit in the absence of a significant main effect of the explicit/implicit factor \((F=1.048; p=.364, \eta^2=.208)\). The available evidence corroborate the notion that the overall performance scores of the children were not greatly affected by the explicit/implicit factor, while a large effect size was observed due to the factor of the level of the items along with the interaction of level and explicit/implicit factor. Nonetheless, when further analysis was conducted with the Tests of Between Subjects Effects for each level, the explicit/implicit factor was significant for the A1 level \((F=11.455; p=.004, \eta^2=.450)\), a result which validates the previous finding of the paired samples t-test
conducted before. The implicit/explicit factor showed significant difference and effect only in relation to the lowest level of the vocabulary items.

Although the implicit/explicit variable did not affect the overall performance of the learners (but for the A1 level), a question arose as to whether there is an indirect link between the implicit and explicit learning and the corresponding performance of the learners: If a student achieves high scores on implicitly learned vocabulary, does this mean that s/he will perform equally well with the vocabulary learned explicitly? Accordingly, if a student cannot recall much implicit vocabulary, does this entail a possible underachievement on explicit vocabulary as well? The graph below shows a clear correlation between the scores on implicit vocabulary and explicit vocabulary ($\chi^2$=.817, $p$=.013). The students, who performed well on the recall of explicit vocabulary items, did very well at the recall of implicit vocabulary items, too. Similarly, students who did not score high on vocabulary items learned explicitly, had also poor performance in vocabulary items learned implicitly. Although data yielded by this study cannot provide convincing evidence for the kind of interface that exists between the two learning mechanisms (as different lists of words are examined: one for incidental learning and another for intentional learning), it appears to suggest one thing: There seem to be reciprocal relationships and causal connection between the scores on implicit and explicit vocabulary, a bidirectional cognitive process.
5.3. Which part of speech produced more recalls?

As regards the third research question, an effort was made to analyze the responses of the students after having categorized the vocabulary items they had to recall in the parts of speech they belong to. The Kruskal-Wallis H Test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the recalling score between the different parts of speech ($\chi^2 (4)= 22,694; p< .001$), with a mean rank recalling score of 20.63 for nouns, 22.63 for adjectives, 19.38 for verbs, 6.38 for adverbs and 33.50 for chunks. The subsequent table contains the students’ individual results. Their responses are, then, examined so as to determine which vocabulary items received easy or difficult recall according to the part of speech that characterizes them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nouns (n=7)</th>
<th>Adjectives (n=7)</th>
<th>Verbs (n=8)</th>
<th>Adverbs (n=2)</th>
<th>Chunks (n=16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We ran a Wilcoxon two-sample paired signed-rank test as our sample was non-normally distributed and a non-parametric test was deemed more effective. Analyzing each part of speech in comparison with the others, it revealed the following:

- **Nouns**: Regarding nouns, it was found that nouns were learned more easily than adverbs ($Z= -2.530; p=.011$), while chunks were learned more easily than nouns ($Z= -2.371; p=.018$). Difference of the median ranks from the scores of the two pairs adjective-noun and verb-noun, showed no significant results.
- **Adjectives**: As far as the adjectives were concerned, it was found that the recall of adjectives was easier than that of adverbs ($Z= -2.539; p=.011$), while it was more difficult than that of chunks ($Z= -2.375; p=.018$). When the adjectives
were analyzed in comparison with verbs and nouns, the median ranks yielded no statistically significant results. Furthermore, a very interesting finding came to light when the learners were required to recall two adjectives - one from the IG and one from the EG - which referred to the same noun. More specifically, the students had to recall the adjectives ‘deep’ (IG) and ‘dark’ (EG) which both described the word ‘forest’ in two separate excerpts of the fairytale; while almost all students found and said the adjective ‘dark’, no one managed to recall the word ‘deep’ and actually everyone replaced it with the apparently “easier” adjective ‘dark’. Three possible reasons may account for this incident. Either the adjective ‘deep’ was more difficult because it belongs to a higher level (B2) than ‘dark’ (A2) (although no significant differences were found between the IG and the EG as the level increases), or because the word ‘deep’ was not given much attention through the implicit teaching. The third and very important reason is that ‘dark forest’ was presented and learnt explicitly as a lexical chunk, while the adjective ‘deep’ was to be recalled on its own in a context which already provided the word ‘forest’ which was described. Perhaps the imageability of the concept ‘deep forest’ was not strong enough to be conceptualized and entrenched in students’ memory.

- **Verbs**: With respect to the verbs, the analysis appeared to suggest significant difference when verbs were compared with the adverbs and the chunks. The verbs were recalled more efficiently than the adverbs ($Z = -2.388; p = .017$) and with more difficulty than the chunks ($Z = -2.375; p = .018$). The results of the median ranks were not statistically significant when the recall of verbs was analyzed in connection with nouns and adjectives.

- **Chunks**: Concerning the recall of chunks, the analysis revealed significant differences indicating that they were learned more easily that all the other parts of speech. More specifically, the recall was easier compared to that of nouns ($Z = -2.371; p = .018$), adjectives ($Z = -2.375; p = .018$), verbs ($Z = -2.375; p = .018$) and adverbs ($Z = -2.521; p = .012$).

- **Adverbs**: Finally, as regards the analysis of adverbs in relation to the other parts of speech, the analysis conducted gave significant differences with all the other parts of speech, exhibiting the recall of adverbs as less efficient than that of all the other parts of speech. In particular, significant difference was found in the
scores of nouns ($Z = -2.530; p = .011$), adjectives ($Z = -2.539; p = .011$), verbs ($Z = -2.388; p = .017$) and chunks ($Z = -2.521; p = .012$). However, it should be noted that the range of the variable of adverbs in the present study was substantively restricted as opposed to that of the other parts of speech, and this limitation should be taken into account for a more cautious interpretation of the results.

As the chunks generated more correct responses, the third hypothesis (which anticipated a larger recall for nouns) was not confirmed.
Chapter 6

Discussion

6.1 Discussion of results

The present study set out to explore the effects of employing both implicit and explicit teaching methods in EFL vocabulary instruction for 9 year old students. A group of vocabulary items was taught implicitly and another group was taught explicitly, while all of the words were chosen from the same teaching material: A graded reader. The data, generated by the children’s responses, indicated illuminating results which led to the formation of particular conclusions.

To begin with, the first finding of the study which indicated more correct responses for the vocabulary items taught explicitly appears to suggest that young learners did benefit from explicit teaching. The combination of pictorial and textual glosses, along with the guidance of the learners’ attention to particular vocabulary items proved to produce slightly higher vocabulary gains when immediate word recall was tested. This finding lends support to Schmitt’s (2000) claim that when learners pay special attention on the specific information to be learnt, they get better chances for its ultimate acquisition. Even if a storybook is considered the ideal material for young learners (Ellis & Brewster, 2014) which can provide powerful context for vocabulary development (Marsh, 1986) building on universal values (Abdulla, 2012; Fadel, 2005; Malkina, 1995) and patterns (Ali-Benali, 1993), it still seems that solely reading and telling a story will not lead to the same vocabulary growth as when some explicit teaching is implemented (Huckin & Coady, 1999). The fact that the children were informed (prior to their engagement with each reading passage) that certain vocabulary items would later be encountered in child-oriented dictations, as well as the fact that the reader itself provided these items in picture dictionaries attracting thus attention, led to deliberate effort and intentional studying of these items (Hulstijn, 2006; Longhurst, 2013).

On the other hand, despite the fact that the explicit vocabulary group produced more recalls, incidental learning also produced many correct responses. New lexis was grasped incidentally just through exposure to the fairytale context and its vivid presentation by the teacher. The productive vocabulary recalled in this way, occurred
without any deliberate memorization of the words (Shakouri et al., 2014); it was just a by-product of storytelling: success in such vocabulary gains occurred through a child-oriented activity which wasn’t explicitly geared to vocabulary learning (Hulstijn, 2001). Regardless of the fact that incidental vocabulary acquisition was weaker than intentional, it still was important. The student, who managed to perform better throughout the whole procedure, appeared to be favored by implicit learning, as that was the area in which he achieved more correct recalls. This implies that the extent to which explicit/implicit variable affected the performance of each kid perhaps has to do with their learning styles (Ellis, 1994). For example, this child may enjoy reading generally and perhaps read the fairy tale many times alone at home. In contrast, the child who scored the lowest total of recalls and appeared to be favored by explicit learning, may not enjoy reading but prefer a combination of visual and auditory learning: As the vocabulary items taught implicitly were not depicted in the picture dictionary of the storybook, the imageability of their concepts was lower and the child might have to rely only on the theatrical performance of the teacher triggered by the textual material. Therefore, it is suggested that the learning styles of the students can benefit both from implicit and explicit teaching strategies.

As regards vocabulary acquisition as a result of the interaction between explicit/implicit teaching and the word level of proficiency, the results showed significant differences only for the A1 level. This result provides confirmatory evidence and reinforces previous research which claims that at the beginning level the learners need to be explicitly taught the basic vocabulary, even out of context (Shakouri et al., 2014; Wang, 2000; Laufer, 1997; Nation, 1995; Cohen & Aphek, 1980). Words that belong to the lower level of proficiency (and usually are among the most frequent), need to be conveyed through explicit instruction because beginners need to know at least 3,000 word families so as to efficiently comprehend a text without considering it distracting (Cohen & Aphek, 1980; Jeng-yih, 2012). Beyond that level, the study showed that the explicit/implicit factor was not determining for the effective acquisition of the vocabulary items. In fact, planned comparisons for implicitly taught vocabulary between A1 and A2 levels indicated that the vocabulary gains of the A2 level were significantly more. As the level of the words increased no significant differences were observed, suggesting that implicit/explicit teaching could produce similar recalls.
Furthermore, the clear correlation that was found between the scores of implicit and explicit vocabulary suggests a reciprocal and bidirectional relationship between explicit and implicit learning, which actually is against theories which completely dissociate them. Students who did well on the recall of implicit vocabulary items did well on the recall of explicit items, while the same happened in the reverse case. This result is in line with the findings generated by previous studies, which yielded no significant performance differences between the explicit and implicit learning groups (Yang & Li, 2012). Despite their neuropsychological dissociations, the two learning mechanisms yielded similar behavioral performance. If a child performs in the same way both for vocabulary items taught explicitly and for those taught implicitly, then perhaps a combination of the two modes could prove even more effective. This indirect link between incidental and intentional learning points to vocabulary acquisition as a by-product of both methods, supporting previous research which attempted this process (Al-Darayseh, 2014, Yali, 2010). Naturally, taking into consideration the nature of implicit and explicit teaching, no method should be approached to its extreme as merely ‘natural’ acquisition through exposure to input or too much explicit instruction out of communicative tasks and decontextualized will not lead to satisfactory results (Sanz and Leow, 2011). It seems that the co-occurrence of explicit and implicit learning away from decontextualized meaningless drills worked well, suggesting that vocabulary is neither the exclusive domain of implicit nor that of explicit learning: the combination of both strategies can prove to be very effective (Souleyman, 2009; Yali, 2010; Sanz & Leow, 2011; Yang & Li, 2012; Al-Darayseh, 2014).

Finally, regarding the ease by which each part of speech was learnt, the findings indicated that the vocabulary items which were learnt together as wholes (either incidentally or intentionally) were eventually the easiest to be instantly recalled. This result supports the teaching of multi-word units as it values the importance of learning vocabulary in context. Although research on the ways by which lexical chunks are retrieved is not sufficient, linguists promote their teaching because chunks are stored as wholes and save processing time (Port, 1998; Swan, 2008). In the study, the young participants learnt the chunks as frozen wholes of the fairytale; however, it has been proved that such formulaic language builds on the proficiency of the learners (Mukoroli, 2011). This means that as the children progress, they will be able to understand the potentials of the chunks and use them creatively. For example, the young learner who was taught the lexical chunk ‘a bunch of flowers’ will later understand the use of ‘a
A bunch of”, isolate it and use it with other nouns. Moreover, it should be noted that a fairytale is an abundant source of formulaic language (Papadopoulou, 2016) and choosing it as the teaching material in this study favored the learning of chunks.

6.2 Teaching implications

In light of the aforementioned discussion of results, the following implications are suggested:

- A story appears to be a great context for vocabulary acquisition, especially a graded reader which takes into account the level of the learners and provides rich input to which young learners can relate.
- Core vocabulary items of A1 level may be best taught explicitly. Incidental acquisition only from exposure to input is not enough.
- A bidirectional relationship between the implicit and explicit factor (indicated by the performance of the learners) suggests a combination of explicit and implicit teaching methods as the level of proficiency increases. Neither method should be downgraded at the expense of the other.
- Vocabulary acquisition may be facilitated by accompanying picture notebooks (such as the ones offered in graded readers) which enhance imageability.
- New vocabulary can be presented in the form of lexical chunks, which appeared to be easy to recall.

6.3 Suggestions for further research

This study did not distinguish between the learning styles of participants, although an effort was made to account for everyone. The vocabulary items taught implicitly were naturally not accompanied by a picture dictionary and, therefore the learning of a visualizer might not have thrived from the teaching process. Moreover, the present study investigated the immediate vocabulary gains of participants. There is a need to further assess the delayed retention of target words after a one/two-week period; other studies (e.g. Souleyman, 2009) have found that explicit teaching led to higher immediate vocabulary gains than implicit teaching but when the participants were tested again after some weeks, they presented a bigger loss from their immediate gains than the learners in the implicit condition. Finally, this study included few target vocabulary items belonging to B1 to C2 level. A similar study could investigate a larger sample size in order to lower the variance.
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Conclusion

The present study attempted to understand the complex effects of direct and indirect teaching of vocabulary through storytelling among Greek EFL young learners, contributing to the relatively scarce research on the subject. Storytelling proved to be fertile ground for this study implementation, as the use of pictures and fairytale language motivated the young learners to engage in such vocabulary exploration more willingly. The participants were encouraged to recall the target vocabulary items from the story and their responses have given important data in connection with the implicit/explicit variable. The results have shown that teaching vocabulary implicitly through reading and storytelling without detailed instructions, and teaching vocabulary explicitly by occasionally giving detailed and precise instructions produce slightly different outcomes. The target words which were learnt intentionally through explicit teaching appeared to be more easily recalled, but the explicit factor seemed to favor only the A1 level words suggesting that as the level increases implicit learning can generate equal or even more productive outcomes. Nonetheless, it is indicated that despite the fact that incidental learning is much closer to the child’s nature, explicit teaching has benefits too. Finally, the ease by which the lexical chunks were recalled compared to the other parts of speech suggests that teachers might consider their more active implementation for effective vocabulary learning. Additional research – longitudinal and quantitative- in the field of incidental/intentional vocabulary acquisition by young learners through storytelling will allow future efforts in this area to more fully meet its intended goals and objectives.
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Appendices

Appendix I - Vocabulary cards for implicit vocabulary

in a ______ near the water.

There is a king
He is alone.

The King is alone.

He a new wife
to his throne.
Because they are swans.

They all
The king tells Eliza

"____! You smell!"
is very sad.

But the wicked Queen Eliza is sad...
Stay with a poor family.

The Queen to Eliza.
In the forest so tired
"Just this stream."

"They are over there."
They're not swans.

They turn into her brothers.
"Can I come in?"

They have lots to tell of the they live in.
But her brothers are swans.

What can she do?

She's happy, ___.
He loves her—

When he sees Eliza,
One night, ______ finished,

She goes out to find a last

bunch of nettles.
ten shirts
She finishes the nettles,
Cell.
Eliza sews in her prison.
But it hasn't got the other.

It has only one sleeve.

The eleventh brother?

for
And tell you you're wrong!

I can speak!
on that day.

They want to burn her.
Appendix II - Vocabulary cards for explicit vocabulary

The _______ her _______.

"If you are a _______ in her _______. That is very bad."

How can’t he? It has only one _______.

Eleven swans fly down when she’s at the _______. Eliza _______.

Eleven princes _______. there, _______. and strong.

At last, I can speak and tell you you’re _______.

I only make shirts to _______. my brothers _______.

One night, almost _______. she goes out _______.

to find a last _______. of nettles _______.

He wants to _______. her. He gives her a _______.

She _______. some nettles and works all day _______.
Eleven swans come flying and __________
in the __________.
They __________ her brothers.
Eliza runs to __________ them.
'We can all make a __________
They're __________ men.
Just follow this __________
The old woman says in Eliza's __________
She __________ on some __________
in the forest so.
Eliza is __________ sad and alone in the forest so
But the __________
She makes Eliza __________
Eliza is __________
She sends her to stay in the __________
She uses a __________ to change them.
Appendix III - Activities

THE WILD SWANS

Draw your favourite character of the story. Describe what he/she looks like, what he/she is wearing, how he/she feels, where he/she is etc. You can use the words of the box.

- tall, short, thin, fat, dress, wicked, kind, scared, angry, sad, happy, glad, sew,
- fly, beautiful, ugly, sleep, dance, lake, palace, friendly, poor,
- white/brown/blond hair etc

My favourite heroine from history is Lizta. She is slim, tall, and beautiful. She lives in the big palace and is happy why going to the brothers again.
He has got one wing, black hair very big crown and it is the smaller in the family.
THE 11th BROTHER

He has got a gron, one wing, and one head.
He is tall and thin.
Appendix IV - Chart testing implicit vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>student 1</th>
<th>student 2</th>
<th>student 3</th>
<th>student 4</th>
<th>student 5</th>
<th>student 6</th>
<th>student 7</th>
<th>student 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anymore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it’s true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what does this mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at last</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix V - Chart testing Explicit Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>student 1</th>
<th>student 2</th>
<th>student 3</th>
<th>student 4</th>
<th>student 5</th>
<th>student 6</th>
<th>student 7</th>
<th>student 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>king</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lock up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>witch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prison cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleeve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>set free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turn into</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handsome young men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lie down to sleep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wicked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>