

# Exploring the Vocabulary Learning Strategy Use of Teachers in Their Vocabulary Instruction

Sindhu Vasu<sup>1</sup> and Senkamalam Periyasamy Dhanavel<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of English, Anna University*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Madras*

## Abstract

*The present study investigated the use of Vocabulary Learning Strategies (VLS) by Indian teachers in their classroom vocabulary instruction. It also examined the influence of gender and experience-related differences on their use of VLS in the classroom vocabulary instruction. The paper reports the results of data collected to identify the VLS used by them in their vocabulary instruction. T-test and one-way ANOVA were conducted to analyse and interpret the data. The results indicate that the teachers employ VLS, such as: guessing from the context to find the meanings of new words, group work to learn new words, and using new words in sentences to store them in memory. They also show that the teachers do not prefer VLS, such as: flashcards, L1 similarity used to find the meanings of new words, and the keyword method. Further, they reveal an experience-related difference in the teachers' vocabulary instruction.*

**Key words:** *classroom teaching; English in India; English language teaching; second language vocabulary learning; vocabulary instruction in India; vocabulary learning strategies.*

## Introduction

Vocabulary learning is important for second language learners pursuing higher education because their vocabulary size determines their effective use of language (e.g. Alderson, 2005; Schmitt, 2010). Their vocabulary size also affects their level of achievement in education and profession. Therefore, the continuous acquisition of vocabulary is imperative for second language learners. In fact, language learning gets momentum when there is a continuous vocabulary growth (Schmitt, 2008).

Hence, it is necessary to employ suitable Vocabulary Learning Strategies (VLS) to improve vocabulary to match different personal and professional needs. Another related challenge comes from the huge number of words in a language, which have to be judiciously chosen and presented in vocabulary teaching to meet the different needs of learners. In this context, O'Dell (1997) and Thornbury (2002) analysed the relevance of course books, which were based on a given syllabus, to vocabulary learning in a regular classroom. They believed that learners had failed to notice the VLS used to do vocabulary exercises in the textbook. To address this issue, Thornbury (2002) suggested that teachers could introduce VLS early, so as to enable the learners to understand the significance of VLS in enhancing their vocabulary. Therefore, this study aims at exploring teachers' use of VLS in their classroom instruction to improve the vocabulary of their students through a survey research.

### ***Need for the Study***

In India, the medium of instruction of about 80 percent of learners in school is their own regional language. As a result, when they attend university and later attempt to seek jobs, they find it extremely difficult to succeed in their educational and employment endeavours (Ramanathan, 2013). In fact, they have studied English for nearly 10 years as a school subject, although they study all the subjects in their own regional language. In contrast, the learners from English medium schools study all the subjects in English except the regional language course, because the medium of instruction for them is English. Whether students hail from regional or English medium schools, vocabulary is important for them to overcome the difficulty of understanding the subjects taught in English in their higher education (Venugopal & Aravind Kumar, 2013). It is also important for students to improve their vocabulary so that they can use the language effectively (Warrier, 2007). Therefore, students who enter higher education and then seek jobs require a good command of vocabulary at the tertiary level, which is possible through the effective use of VLS in vocabulary instruction.

Generally, vocabulary teaching focuses on the meanings of words, followed by their various forms, which is important for beginners (Thornbury, 2002). Thus, while teaching vocabulary, teachers may have a difficulty in concentrating on the instruction of other linguistic aspects and use of words. In addition, the complex issue of teaching an organised syllabus of both grammar and vocabulary at the same time is a challenge in second language vocabulary instruction (Coady & Huckin, 1997). However, it is possible for teachers to overcome their difficulty if they have some awareness of VLS, which can help them in the subsequent reinforcement of words taught, especially the nuances of lexical features and use of words, thereby contributing to continuous vocabulary learning. Hence, vocabulary instruction should include VLS to facilitate the independent and comprehensive learning of words by learners when they encounter unfamiliar words at any time in their life.

Several studies have been conducted to understand the key role of vocabulary instruction in different language teaching methods. Espinosa (2003) and Ketabi and Shahraki (2011) traced the status of vocabulary instruction from the Grammar-Translation Method to the Communicative Approach, and discussed the advantages and disadvantages of vocabulary teaching in each of them. They observed that no method of teaching words was successful without a focus on learners' own independent vocabulary learning. Schmitt (2008, p. 329) reviewed second language vocabulary instruction and emphasised "...an explicit, intentional learning component and a component based around maximizing exposure and incidental learning". He also recommended the development of a consistent vocabulary learning programme for achieving the mastery of lexical knowledge. Read (2004) investigated research into second language vocabulary teaching and learning, and vocabulary testing since 1999. He suggested designing a computer-based language learning programme to provide learners with opportunities to expand their vocabulary. Lai (2005) studied the VLS awareness, beliefs and practices of Taiwanese senior secondary school teachers. He examined the correlations between the teachers' beliefs and their teaching practices, and underlined the necessity to educate them of the state-of-the-art vocabulary pedagogy. His study attempted to create awareness among teachers about their vocabulary instruction. A recent study in Punjab University, India, focused on a framework for the instruction in VLS to learners of English for specific purposes (ESP) (Kavari, 2014). It analysed different VLS taxonomies and suggested appropriate means for strategy training. The present study investigated how teachers apply VLS in their vocabulary instruction in the ESL classrooms in India, and attempted to strengthen their awareness of VLS in vocabulary instruction.

The present study addressed two interrelated research questions: 1) What VLS do teachers employ in their classroom vocabulary instruction? 2) What differences exist in the use of VLS among teachers due to the independent variables of gender and experience?

### ***Objectives of the Study***

The objectives of the present study were:

- to investigate the different kinds of VLS teachers use in their classroom vocabulary instruction,
- to examine the influence of gender and experience-related differences on the teachers' use of VLS in vocabulary instruction.

## **Vocabulary Learning Strategies (VLS)**

### ***Definition***

Vocabulary learning strategies are the techniques which assist learners to direct their vocabulary learning. Catalan (2003, p. 56) defines VLS as "knowledge about the mechanisms (process, strategies) used in order to learn vocabulary as well as steps

or actions taken by students (a) to find out the meaning of unknown words, (b) to retain them in the long-term memory, (c) to recall them at will, and (d) to use them in oral or written mode". The present study used Catalan's definition of VLS for the preparation of the questionnaire.

### ***VLS Classification and Research***

Several studies have shown that learners use strategies to learn vocabulary though they may not be aware of them. They have also identified and classified VLS employed by ESL learners. Stoffer (as cited in Schmitt, 1997) listed 53 VLS of foreign language students at the University of Alabama and classified them into nine categories: i). authentic language use, ii). self-motivation, iii). organising words, iv). creating mental linkage, v). memory, vi). creative activities, vii). physical action, viii). visual/auditory aids, and ix). steps to overcome anxiety. Similarly, Gu & Johnson (1996) grouped the VLS used by Chinese learners under seven categories: i). beliefs about vocabulary learning, ii). metacognitive, iii). guessing, vi). dictionary, v). note-taking, vi). memory, and vii). activation strategies. Further, Schmitt's (1997) VLS taxonomy has two broad divisions: i). discovery strategies and ii). consolidation strategies. This taxonomy is based on both Oxford's classification of learning strategies (Oxford, 1990) and the Discovery and Consolidation Variation. Discovery strategies include determination strategies and social strategies. On the other hand, consolidation strategies include: social, memory, cognitive, and metacognitive strategies. These three VLS taxonomies are well-known in the VLS research.

In addition, a few other studies on VLS attempt to compare the proficiency level of learners with their VLS use (e.g., Gu, 1994), specifically to examine or compare a cognitive or a mnemonic VLS (e.g., Levin et al., 1982; Schmitt, 1997), to find the cultural impact on the learners' VLS (e.g., Schmitt, 1997), to investigate VLS and vocabulary knowledge (e.g., Komol & Sripetpun, 2011), to identify the beliefs, strategies and practices of teachers and learners (e.g., Aktekin & Guven, 2007; Celik & Toptas, 2010; Li, 2010), and to examine VLS and the English language teaching (ELT) materials (e.g., Bastanfar & Hashemi, 2010).

### ***VLS in the Vocabulary Teaching***

Students, teachers, material writers, and researchers recognise the crucial role of VLS in vocabulary teaching and learning (Nunan, 1991; Zimmerman, 1997; Read, 2000; Ehren, 2002; Graves, 2006 as mentioned in Pérez & Ruiz, 2007 and Schmitt, 2008; 2010) as a number of vocabulary teaching techniques are given in reference books and textbooks to teach vocabulary in the classroom.

First, Dhanavel (2012) suggested a novel approach, 5S approach, to teach and learn vocabulary in the Indian context. 5S stands for the five elements of each word, i.e., sight (shape), sound (pronunciation), source (origin), sense (meaning), and syntax (usage or sentential behaviour). The identification of word through its root, prefixes

and suffixes helps in the application of the 5S approach. The relationship between and among words is brought to the attention of learners with the help of this approach. It paves the way for co-operative learning in the classroom and suggests the possibility of moving from known to unknown words. It embeds many implicit strategies to vocabulary learning that promote self-learning: for example, guessing meaning from a root word and prefix or suffix, and dictionary use to find the other related words, etc.

Second, it is a common practice of teachers to teach vocabulary before reading a passage or a lesson, which is essential to comprehend and to read without distractions (Kaushik & Bajwa, 2009). Words can be taught in relation to the needs of students through illustrations or explanations, mimes or gestures, symbols, synonyms or antonyms (to explain the words), definitions, mother tongue and a context (spoken or written). Practice and reinforcement are stressed upon to enhance the long-term memory and to turn passive into active vocabulary.

Third, Thorat et al. (2000) recommended the use of dictionary to learn different word elements, their different forms, collocations, synonyms and antonyms, words of the same field as lexical sets, processes of word formation with prefixes and suffixes, compound words and words often confused. Each of these ways incorporates certain strategies either implicitly or explicitly. These contribute to vocabulary instruction encompassing VLS in the ESL classroom.

Apart from books, many research articles support views on VLS in vocabulary teaching. Notably, Hunt & Beglar (1998) proposed the seven principles of vocabulary learning in their study:

- provide opportunities for the incidental learning of vocabulary;
- diagnose which of the 3000 most common words learners need to study;
- provide opportunities for the intentional learning of vocabulary;
- provide opportunities for elaborating word knowledge;
- provide opportunities for developing fluency with known vocabulary;
- experiment with guessing from the context;
- examine the different types of dictionaries and teach students how to use them.

These principles are useful for incidental learning, explicit instruction and independent strategy development.

Schmitt (2008) discussed the concept of vocabulary instruction in his review of research on instructed second language vocabulary learning. He insisted on large vocabulary to productively use the second language, specific techniques in different stages of vocabulary learning to handle the complex and gradual vocabulary learning process, intentional learning for beginners to learn the meaning-form relationship, use of L1 to quickly link a word's meaning and form, multiple exposures to associate the meaning-form link of a word and to learn its usage, knowing the other aspects of a word implicitly as well as explicitly, and devoting maximum time to learn lexical items while learning a second language. Furthermore, a holistic vocabulary instruction involves independent strategic development.

Thus, these studies provide principles and techniques to improve vocabulary instruction with an implicit or explicit use of VLS in the English classroom. It is evident then that the VLS instruction is an integral component of vocabulary instruction.

## **Methodology**

### ***Instrument***

The present study used a questionnaire to conduct a paper survey among English teachers from various colleges in Tamilnadu. The participants filled in the hardcopy of the questionnaire given by the researcher in person. The questionnaire focused on the teachers' classroom vocabulary instruction. The survey collected primary data from the teachers on vocabulary teaching in the Indian ESL classroom. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 19, was used for the analysis of primary data. The structure and strategy description from the studies of Schmitt (1997), Lai (2005) and Kafipour and Naveh (2011) were adapted to suit the demography of the teachers who participated in the study. The questionnaire was framed with four categories. The reliability coefficient for the overall questionnaire was satisfactory. Further, the internal consistency of 37 statements in the questionnaire was evaluated by Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which was 0.879 for the present sample. Moreover, the reliability coefficients for the four subscales were also evaluated. The reliability coefficients for general vocabulary instruction, strategies to find the meanings of new words, strategies to learn new words, and strategies to remember new words were 0.546, 0.536, 0.688, and 0.834, respectively.

### ***Questionnaire***

The questionnaire had 40 questions along with the teachers' demographic details. Data related to their name, gender, designation, years of teaching experience, and college address were collected for the analysis. Out of 40 questions, 37 were the statements on a five-point Likert scale. The remaining three questions were open-ended. The 37 statements were presented in four sections to understand how the teachers instruct their learners to learn words. The statements 1 to 5 helped us to find the general vocabulary instruction in everyday English classes. The other three sections concentrated on: strategies to find the meanings of new words (statements 6 to 13), strategies to learn new words (statements 14 to 20), and strategies to remember words (statements 21 to 37). These statements helped us understand what VLS the teachers used to teach vocabulary. The questionnaire is presented in the descriptive analysis section.

### ***Sample***

The participants were the English language teachers from various arts, science, and engineering colleges in Tamilnadu, India, with experience ranging from a few months to 27 years. The questionnaire was administered to 125 teachers of whom 34 were male and 91 were female. Out of 125 participants, 118 were assistant professors, 3

were associate professors, and 4 were professors. Hence, the participation of assistant professors was higher in the study. There were 58 participants with less than 5 years of teaching experience; 37 participants had experience from 5 to 10 years, and 30 participants had more than 10 years of experience.

## Results

The results are reported in three sections. Section 1 includes the answers to the first research question through a descriptive analysis, section 2 considers the findings related to the second research question through a statistical analysis, while section 3 analyses the responses to the open-ended questions and relates them to the results covering the first research question.

### Section 1

This section deals with the VLS use by teachers in the classroom vocabulary instruction to develop students' vocabulary. Therefore, the following analysis provides the answers to the first research question.

#### VLS Use in the Common Vocabulary Instruction

The results given in Table 1 reveal that as many as 59.2% of the teachers always asked their students to learn words from newspapers, displays, fliers, advertisements, etc. They also reveal that 48% of the teachers always asked their students to learn words from English movies, songs, newscasts, TV shows, etc. Further, 42.4% of them frequently taught words in addition to those found in textbooks. Moreover, a maximum 35.2% of them frequently preferred wordlists while teaching a lesson or during reading comprehension. However, 28.8% of the teachers rarely used flashcards to teach words.

Table 1  
*Frequency distribution of the individual statements on vocabulary instruction*

No	Vocabulary instruction	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always	Total	Mean
1	I teach words separately apart from textbook exercises.	1 (0.8%)	5 (4%)	37 (29.6%)	53 (42.4%)	29 (23.2%)	125	3.83
2	I use word lists when teaching a lesson or reading comprehension.	6 (4.8%)	10 (8%)	38 (30.4%)	44 (35.2%)	27 (21.6%)	125	3.61
3	I use flashcards in the classroom to teach words.	35 (28%)	36 (28.8%)	33 (26.4%)	13 (10.4%)	8 (6.4%)	125	2.38
4	I ask learners to learn new words from English movies, songs, newscasts, TV shows, etc.	6 (4.8%)	7 (5.6%)	16 (12.8%)	36 (28.8%)	60 (48%)	125	4.10
5	I ask learners to learn new words from newspapers, displays, flyers, advertisements, etc.	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	13 (10.4%)	37 (29.6%)	74 (59.2%)	125	4.46

This data analysis showed that the significant practice of encouraging the students to learn new words from different sources was clearly evident from the teachers' responses. It explained the teachers' interest in creating awareness among the students to benefit from various available resources. Besides, the mean values for individual statements on vocabulary instruction ranged from 2.38 to 4.46. The lowest mean value of 2.38 indicated that flashcards were less used in the classroom vocabulary instruction. Perhaps the teachers did not have enough time to prepare flashcards for teaching vocabulary.

### Use of Strategies to Find the Meanings of New Words

The data given in Table 2 demonstrate that a maximum 50.4% of the teachers frequently instructed their students to guess the meaning from the context.

Table 2

*Frequency distribution of the individual strategies to find the meanings of new words*

No	Strategies to find new words' meaning	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always	Total	Mean
6	Analyse the part of speech of the word	7 (5.6%)	13 (10.4%)	33 (26.4%)	37 (29.6%)	35 (28%)	125	3.64
7	Find the meaning from prefixes and suffixes	7 (5.6%)	7 (5.6%)	39 (31.2%)	48 (38.4%)	24 (19.2%)	125	3.60
8	Check for L1 similarity in sound or origin	15 (12%)	31 (24.8%)	38 (30.4%)	26 (20.8%)	15 (12%)	125	2.96
9	Analyse any available pictures or gestures	7 (5.6%)	15 (12%)	43 (34.4%)	41 (32.8%)	19 (15.2%)	125	3.40
10	Guess from textual context	0 (0%)	8 (6.4%)	18 (14.4%)	63 (50.4%)	36 (28.8%)	125	4.02
11	Look up a bilingual dictionary	15 (12%)	24 (19.2%)	43 (34.4%)	25 (20%)	18 (14.4%)	125	3.06
12	Look up a monolingual dictionary	11 (8.8%)	16 (12.8%)	32 (25.6%)	39 (31.2%)	27 (21.6%)	125	3.44
13	Work in groups to discover the meaning	8 (6.4%)	11 (8.8%)	39 (31.2%)	35 (28%)	32 (25.6%)	125	3.58

They also reveal that 38.4% of the teachers reported frequent instruction in the use of affixes to find the meanings of new words. In addition, 34.4% of them reported a frequent use of analysis of pictures or gestures to discover the meaning of a new word. Further, 31.2% of them frequently encouraged their students to use a monolingual dictionary to find the meanings of new words. While 29% of them frequently preferred to teach the parts of speech analysis to find the meanings of new words, 34.4% of them sometimes instructed their students to use a bilingual dictionary. Moreover, 31.2% of the teachers sometimes motivated their students to work in groups to find the meanings of new words. Besides, 30.4% of the teachers revealed that they sometimes instructed their students to look for the similarity in sound or origin with L1 words to find the meanings of words.



The analysis reveals that guessing the meaning from the context was the most dominant VLS in the teachers' instruction to find the meaning of new words. On the other hand, the use of comparisons with L1 was the least preferred VLS in the teachers' instruction for the above-stated purpose. The mean values for individual VLS ranged from 2.96 to 4.02. The lowest mean of 2.96 demonstrated a very low use of L1 similarity in sound and origin of words to learn new words.

### Use of Strategies to Learn New Words

The results presented in Table 3 indicate that 40.8% of the teachers always asked their students to work in groups to learn new words.

Table 3

*Frequency distribution of the individual strategies to learn new words*

No	Strategies to learn new words	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always	Total	Mean
14	Study and practice in groups	4 (3.2%)	6 (4.8%)	24 (19.2%)	40 (32%)	51 (40.8%)	125	4.02
15	Orally repeat the word	4 (3.2%)	4 (3.2%)	25 (20%)	49 (39.2%)	43 (34.4%)	125	3.98
16	Write the word repeatedly	9 (7.2%)	14 (11.2%)	33 (26.4%)	37 (29.6%)	32 (25.6%)	125	3.55
17	Maintain a word list with word-related information	4 (3.2%)	14 (11.2%)	30 (24%)	50 (40%)	27 (21.6%)	125	3.66
18	Use flashcards to write the information related to the word	29 (23.2%)	31 (24.8%)	43 (34.4%)	19 (15.2%)	3 (2.4%)	125	2.49
19	Put English labels on physical objects	33 (26.4%)	25 (20%)	39 (31.2%)	22 (17.6%)	6 (4.8%)	125	2.54
20	Keep a vocabulary notebook	5 (4%)	6 (4.8%)	22 (17.6%)	43 (34.4%)	49 (39.2%)	125	4.00

They also show that 39.2% of the teachers always instructed their students to keep a vocabulary notebook to learn new words. Besides, 39.2% of them frequently insisted on oral repetition to learn new words, whereas 29.6% frequently instructed the use of repeated writing to learn new words. Further, 40% of the teachers frequently asked their students to maintain wordlists to learn new words and 34.4% of the teachers sometimes insisted on using flashcards to help their students learn new words. In contrast, 31.2% of them sometimes instructed their students to label on physical objects to learn new words.

In general, the majority of the teachers encouraged group work for the acquisition of new words in their instruction. However, many teachers did not use flashcards to teach new words. The mean values for individual VLS to teach new words ranged from 2.49 to 4.02. The lowest mean of 2.49 indicates that the teachers rarely used flashcards in vocabulary instruction.

### **Use of Strategies to Remember New Words**

The analysis given in Table 4 shows that the majority of the teachers always used VLS to help their students remember the newly-learned words. It indicates that a majority of 55.2% teachers always instructed their students to use new words in sentences to remember them. In addition, 51.2% of the teachers always encouraged their students to use the spelling of new words to remember them. While 44% of the teachers always preferred connecting words with personal experiences to keep them in memory, 37.6% of the teachers always motivated their students to study the sounds of words through oral repetition to keep them in memory. The analysis also reveals that a maximum of 47.2% teachers frequently instructed their students to imagine the meanings and forms of words to remember them. While 40.8% of the teachers frequently instructed their students to connect words with their synonyms and antonyms to enable them to remember those words, 34.4% of the teachers frequently asked their students to remember the meanings of words through the use of pictorial representations. Further, 32.8% of them frequently instructed their students to group words in a storyline as a mnemonic strategy. Moreover, 26.4% of the teachers frequently asked their students to continuously study and periodically practice new words to keep them in memory.

Further, 37.6% of the teachers sometimes paraphrased the meanings of words as a strategy to remember them. In addition, 35.2% of the teachers sometimes preferred to instruct their students in the use of physical action to keep them in memory. While 35.2% of the teachers sometimes instructed their students to remember the affixes and roots of new words in the classroom, 29.6% of the teachers sometimes encouraged their students to use semantic maps to remember new words. Moreover, 26.4% of the teachers sometimes preferred the use of adjective comparison to remember words and 24% of them sometimes encouraged their students to underline new words as a mnemonic strategy. The analysis also reveals that 28.8% of the teachers rarely taught the strategy of learning words in chunks to keep them in memory and 27.2% of the teachers never taught their students the keyword method in the classroom to keep words in memory. On the other hand, the mean values for individual strategies used to remember new words ranged from 2.62 to 4.44 with the highest mean value of 4.44 obtained for the strategy of using words in sentences, while the strategy of using spelling showed the mean value of 4.34. Thus, these two are found to be predominant in the teachers' instruction to remember words. In contrast, the keyword method indicated the lowest mean value of 2.62, while learning words in chunks pointed the mean value of 2.95. Hence, these two VLS are the least employed by the teachers to help their students remember new words.

Table 4

Frequency distribution of the individual strategies to remember new words

No	Strategies to remember new words	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always	Total	Mean
21	Study the word with a pictorial representation of its meaning	3 (2.4%)	7 (5.6%)	33 (26.4%)	43 (34.4%)	39 (31.2%)	125	3.86
22	Imagine the word's meaning and form	3 (2.4%)	6 (4.8%)	26 (20.8%)	59 (47.2%)	31 (24.8%)	125	3.87
23	Connect the word with personal experience	1 (0.8%)	4 (3.2%)	25 (20%)	40 (32%)	55 (44%)	125	4.15
24	Connect the word to its synonym and antonym	1 (0.8%)	2 (1.6%)	26 (20.8%)	51 (40.8%)	45 (36%)	125	4.10
25	Use semantic maps	13 (10.4%)	35 (28%)	37 (29.6%)	27 (21.6%)	13 (10.4%)	125	2.94
26	Use 'scales' for gradable adjectives <i>Scales for gradable adjectives:</i> Gradable adjectives with related meaning, e.g.: huge/big/medium-sized/small/tiny	27 (21.6%)	24 (19.2%)	33 (26.4%)	28 (22.4%)	13 (10.4%)	125	2.81
27	Group words to study them (together with their coordinate or in a storyline)	14 (11.2%)	11 (8.8%)	36 (28.8%)	41 (32.8%)	23 (18.4%)	125	3.38
28	Use words in sentences	1 (0.8%)	2 (1.6%)	7 (5.6%)	46 (36.8%)	69 (55.2%)	125	4.44
29	Study the spelling of a word	0 (0%)	4 (3.2%)	14 (11.2%)	43 (34.4%)	64 (51.2%)	125	4.34
30	Study the sound of a word and say it aloud	1 (0.8%)	8 (6.4%)	25 (20%)	44 (35.2%)	47 (37.6%)	125	4.02
31	Use physical action when learning a word	7 (5.6%)	16 (12.8%)	44 (35.2%)	31 (24.8%)	27 (21.6%)	125	3.44
32	Learn words in chunks	15 (12%)	36 (28.8%)	29 (23.2%)	30 (24%)	15 (12%)	125	2.95
33	Use Key word Method <i>Key word Method:</i> Find an L1 word which sounds like a target L2 word and combine the two words with an image, e.g.: the Tamil word 'kaadu' (forest) for the English word 'card' with the image of a card flying in the forest.	34 (27.2%)	25 (20%)	31 (24.8%)	25 (20%)	10 (8%)	125	2.62
34	Remember the affixes and roots	7 (5.6%)	14 (11.2%)	44 (35.2%)	33 (26.4%)	27 (21.6%)	125	3.47
35	Paraphrase the word's meaning	3 (2.4%)	6 (4.8%)	47 (37.6%)	42 (33.6%)	27 (21.6%)	125	3.67
36	Underline the initial letter of the word	19 (15.2%)	25 (20%)	30 (24%)	28 (22.4%)	23 (18.4%)	125	3.09
37	Use spaced word practice and continue to study over time	16 (12.8%)	27 (21.6%)	31 (24.8%)	33 (26.4%)	18 (14.4%)	125	3.08

## Section 2

In order to examine the second research question with reference to the impact of gender and experience on the teachers' vocabulary instruction, an independent *t*-test, one-way ANOVA and Duncan test were carried out, using SPSS - version 19. This section analyses the statistical data to find the results.

### Gender and Experience-Related Differences of the Teachers in Vocabulary Instruction

The *t*-test results from Table 5 show that the role of gender in vocabulary instruction was insignificant as the *P* value for overall dimensions was more than 0.05 ( $P > 0.05$ ). Hence, gender differences did not affect the teachers' instruction of VLS in their efforts to improve their students' vocabulary.

Table 5

*Gender-related difference with regard to the questionnaire categories*

Dimensions	Gender	Sample Size	Mean	SD	<i>t</i> -value	<i>P</i> value
Vocabulary instruction	M	34	18.26	2.937	0.268	0.789
	F	91	18.43	3.081		
Strategies to find new words' meaning	M	34	27.62	4.665	0.107	0.915
	F	91	27.71	4.405		
Strategies to learn new words	M	34	23.21	5.542	1.588	0.115
	F	91	24.64	4.026		
Strategies to remember words	M	34	59.41	11.228	0.578	0.564
	F	91	60.54	9.074		

Table 6

*Experience-related difference with regard to the questionnaire categories*

Dimensions	Experience in Years	Mean	SD	F value	<i>P</i> value
Vocabulary instruction	Below 5	18.72 <sup>a</sup>	3.15	0.826	0.440
	5-10	18.27 <sup>a</sup>	3.02		
	Above 10	17.87 <sup>a</sup>	2.83		
Strategies to find new words' meaning	Below 5	28.43 <sup>a</sup>	4.08	1.565	0.213
	5-10	26.89 <sup>a</sup>	4.21		
	Above 10	27.23 <sup>a</sup>	5.30		
Strategies to learn new words	Below 5	24.93 <sup>b</sup>	4.19	3.736	0.027
	5-10	24.73 <sup>b</sup>	3.86		
	Above 10	22.33 <sup>a</sup>	5.38		
Strategies to remember words	Below 5	60.78 <sup>a</sup>	8.99	0.847	0.431
	5-10	61.00 <sup>a</sup>	9.83		
	Above 10	58.23 <sup>a</sup>	10.75		

Note: Different letters <sup>(ab)</sup> for years of experience denote significance at 5% level in Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

Table 6 reveals that the teachers' experience played a significant role in the use of VLS in their instruction to learn new words as the P value of 0.027 was less than 0.05. In addition, the mean value obtained from one-way ANOVA and Duncan test clearly indicates that the experience of teachers affected their vocabulary instruction. The teachers with more than 10 years ( $M=22.33$ ) of experience differed from the teachers with 5 to 10 years of experience ( $M=24.73$ ) and below 5 years ( $M=24.93$ ) of experience in their use of VLS. But the teachers with less than 5 years of experience and 5 to 10 years of experience did not differ from each other. The fact that both of these groups did not differ in their use of VLS possibly indicates that the teachers took a long time to master VLS and their use in the classroom vocabulary instruction.

### **Section 3**

This section analyses the teachers' responses to three open-ended questions. These questions, given in the survey, were as follows:

1. Think about the strategies you use to learn vocabulary as a learner and teacher of English as a second language. Mention the strategies that you use.
2. Write down other actions or strategies used in the classroom but not given in the questionnaire.
3. Specify the vocabulary activity that you have administered in your classroom.

The first open-ended question in the questionnaire attempted to understand the teachers' VLS use with the aim to learn new words as the learners of English. The second and the third open-ended questions contributed to the identification of the VLS that the teachers used to instruct vocabulary through various activities. These questions helped us find out the VLS that the teachers employed to teach vocabulary apart from the ones mentioned in the questionnaire. The responses enabled us to further explore the teachers' use of VLS in the classroom vocabulary instruction.

### **Responses to the Open-ended Questions**

Out of 76 teachers who answered the first open-ended question, 26 teachers mentioned reading various materials extensively in English as the strategy they used to learn new words. On the other hand, 17 teachers suggested the use of a dictionary to learn words. Only 3 teachers mentioned the strategies related to listening. Learning and analysing etymology, mind mapping, memorising words, learning synonyms, translation method, deriving words from root words, and guessing from the context were also mentioned by the teachers. Further, the teachers mentioned the use of digital dictionary, TV shows, English news and movies as their strategies to learn new words. Out of 125 teachers, 49 teachers did not respond to the first open-ended question.

For the second open-ended question, in general, 24 teachers mentioned that they used word-building activities (e.g. spell bee, hangman, word wall, word games, quizzes, theme-oriented vocabulary and work sheets, etc.) for their vocabulary instruction in the classroom. In addition, 6 teachers claimed to use visual aids and physical actions as their classroom strategies to instruct vocabulary. The teachers also mentioned that,

for teaching vocabulary, they employed strategies, such as: naming objects, translation from L1 to L2 and vice-versa, using flashcards, use of language laboratory, group discussion, and narration of a situation from personal experiences. Besides, they noted that they used the strategies like learning the etymology on the internet, one word substitution, etc., as a part of their vocabulary instruction. Out of 125 teachers, remarkably, 70 teachers did not respond to this question.

For the third open-ended question, the teachers described certain interesting vocabulary activities they used in their classes. Out of 75 teachers who responded, 36 of them indicated the use of word games, crossword puzzles, comics in newspapers, quizzes, jumbled words and discussions on difficult words as interesting word games because they had a powerful learning impact on their students. Further, 6 teachers mentioned that the newspaper-related activities were of interest to their students. Apart from these activities, the teachers also reported on just a minute (e.g., write as many words as possible in one minute), pronunciation repetition, discussing movies, deriving words from root words, eliciting examples for a word or a phrase or an idiom, and vocabulary notebook, as they believed that these had a great impact on their students. Surprisingly, 50 teachers did not respond to the question, which means that they are not serious about knowing their students' interests.

## **Discussion**

Based on the data analysis presented above, the results for the first research question indicated that by and large the English teachers of arts, science and engineering colleges in India employed VLS in their classroom vocabulary instruction. In vocabulary instruction, the teachers encouraged students to use various sources, especially reading, as a VLS to learn new words. In fact, their responses to the first open-ended question also revealed their use of reading as a VLS to learn new words. Reading is the most preferred vocabulary learning and teaching strategy, so it is an intensive area of research. The language teaching methods which consider incidental vocabulary learning support reading as a strategy to learn vocabulary (Espinosa, 2003; Ketabi & Shahraki, 2011). Teachers, as once learners of ESL, may be inclined to teach vocabulary through the methods in which they were taught. However, these methods have some limitations for their own students (Coady & Huckin, 1997). Reading as a VLS provides students with opportunities to encounter new words. Thus, reading along with other VLS to learn, remember and use new words may motivate learners to develop their vocabulary independently. In addition, the teachers extensively used the strategy of guessing from the context to find the meanings of new words. The same idea is supported by the result from Sheorey's (2006) study on Indian College teachers' beliefs about the English language learning. The teachers also motivated students to work in groups to learn new words. Likewise, Newton (1995) stated that group activities with discussions on the meanings of L2 words enhanced students to build their vocabulary. Moreover, the teachers considered that the use of words in

sentences helped students to retain those words in memory. This result agrees with the outcome of the study of Hulstijn and Laufer (2001) which showed that students remembered L2 words better when involved in tasks to use them productively. Further, the teachers preferred wordlists to teach new words. This observation agrees with Lessard-Clouston (2012) and Hsu (2006), who advocated the use of wordlists to teach vocabulary. However, the teachers minimally used L1 similarity to find the meanings of new words. The least used strategies were flashcards and the keyword method, which is in agreement with the results of the study on teachers' beliefs, awareness and practices of VLS by Lai (2005). In contrast, the review of vocabulary research from various contexts by Blachowicz and Fisher (2000) revealed keyword method as a mnemonic strategy to be helpful in remembering words, which is contradictory to the result of the present study.

With reference to the second research question, gender difference had no impact on the teachers' VLS use in their vocabulary instruction. On the other hand, experience-related differences had an instructional variation in the use of VLS by the teachers. This effect of experience-related difference on the teachers' classroom vocabulary instruction is consistent with the findings of the study on the grade-level teachers' beliefs and practices of vocabulary instruction with social science textbooks by Hedrick, Harmon and Linerode (2004). In addition, their study revealed the impact of teachers' experience on some of their beliefs. In the present study, the teachers with more than ten years of experience showed a difference in their instructional choice of VLS. The reasons for the impact of experience on instruction may lie in the difference in their understanding of students' needs as well as their own understanding of vocabulary nuances.

On the whole, the results showed that the teachers understood how they used VLS in their instruction. Hence, it is essential for them to understand the specific vocabulary learning needs of their students for shifting the focus from what to teach to how to teach vocabulary in the classroom. Aktekin and Guven (2007) indicate that the majority of teachers agree upon the limited opportunities provided in the textbooks for VLS. Moreover, 80% of the teachers stated in the present study that they understood their students through informal classroom observations. This response also reinforces the importance of understanding the vocabulary learning needs of students before designing their vocabulary instruction. Clearly, if vocabulary instruction matches the learners' vocabulary learning needs, vocabulary instruction with the awareness of VLS will certainly become successful.

All these strategies may not always help all students equally to learn, retain and use new words. Perhaps, time-tested strategies like finding synonyms and antonyms, sharing of new words and their meanings, composing sentences by using picture clues are the exceptions. According to Nation (2001), knowing a word involves learning its form, grammar and use. Therefore, teachers should conduct various activities to introduce all the aspects of a word, so that students will know and use them correctly.

The teachers articulated that vocabulary learning games created an impact on the learners during the classroom vocabulary instruction in their response to the second and the third open-ended questions. Hence, the use of vocabulary learning games for the classroom vocabulary instruction may provide teachers with opportunities to introduce different VLS creatively and learners to use VLS enthusiastically. Many teachers did not respond to the open-ended questions. Their reluctance to respond to these questions and their limited preferences for VLS use in vocabulary instruction emphasise the need for further investigations of the teachers' VLS awareness. As Sheorey (2006) observes, teachers' beliefs and choice of strategies affect their approach to vocabulary and VLS teaching.

Although this study gave a few insights into the Indian English teachers' use of VLS in their classroom, it had a few limitations. For instance, it did not corroborate the responses of teachers with those of their own students. Further, there was no interview with individual teachers to verify their responses to the questionnaire. Importantly, this study cannot represent all English teachers throughout India, as there are wide variations in their practice of teaching English in India. It did not include the VLS use of students to examine the similarities and differences between the students' use of VLS and teachers' instructional use of VLS in classrooms. Further, there was no interview with the teachers who participated in the study. In addition, the study could be generalised only with its replications in various Indian places and also in other contexts.

## **Conclusion**

This survey research among the English teachers of arts, science and engineering colleges in Tamilnadu, India, clearly shows that the teachers use a number of VLS in their classroom. In general, they instruct the use of reading as a strategy to learn new words through various resources. Predominantly, they also use the following strategies: guessing to find the meanings of new words, group activities for learning new words, and using a word in a sentence to remember new words. It appears that they have the least preference for flashcard and the keyword method. Perhaps, they do not have enough time and resources to prepare their own flashcards. It is also possible that many of them are not familiar with the keyword method. A significant finding of this study is that teachers take over ten years to master a variety of VLS to use them in their vocabulary instruction. This fact suggests that an early intervention is needed to help teachers understand the importance and use of VLS in a successful vocabulary instruction. Overall, the investigation indicates that similar studies have to be conducted, including a larger number of teachers, to create awareness of VLS among them as it will go a long way in an effective vocabulary instruction.



## References

- Alderson, J. C. (2005). *Diagnosing foreign language proficiency: the interface between learning and assessment*. London: Continuum.
- Aktekin, C., & Guven, S. (2007). Raising learners' and teachers' awareness of vocabulary strategy learning. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 13, 72 /online/. Retrieved on 28<sup>th</sup> December 2014 from [http://sl.sabanciuniv.edu/sites/sl.sabanciuniv.edu/files/raisinglearnersandteachersawarenessofvocabularystrategylearning-nafiyecigdem\\_s.pdf](http://sl.sabanciuniv.edu/sites/sl.sabanciuniv.edu/files/raisinglearnersandteachersawarenessofvocabularystrategylearning-nafiyecigdem_s.pdf)
- Baker, S. K., Simmons, D. C., & Kameenui, E. J. (1995). *Vocabulary acquisition: Synthesis of the research*. National Center to Improve the Tools of Educators, College of Education, University of Oregon /online/. Retrieved on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2014 from [http://www.doe.virginia.gov/instruction/virginia\\_tiered\\_system\\_supports/training/higher\\_ed/vocab\\_acquisition\\_synthesis\\_of\\_research.pdf](http://www.doe.virginia.gov/instruction/virginia_tiered_system_supports/training/higher_ed/vocab_acquisition_synthesis_of_research.pdf)
- Bastanfar, A., & Hashemi, T. (2010). Vocabulary learning strategies and ELT materials: A study of the extent to which VLS research informs local coursebooks in Iran. *International Education Studies* Vol. 3, 3 /online/. Retrieved on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2014 from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ies/article/view/5493/5299>. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v3n3p158>
- Blachowicz, C. L. Z., & Fisher, P. (2000). Vocabulary Instruction. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, volume III*, p. 503. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Çelik, S., & Toptaş, V. (2010). Telling ELT tales out of school vocabulary learning strategy use of Turkish EFL learners. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 62-71 /online/. Retrieved on 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2014 from [http://ac.els-cdn.com/S187704281001387X/1-s2.0-S187704281001387X-main.pdf?\\_tid=6222cd14-3696-11e4-b260-00000aab0f6c&acdnat=1410098204\\_ca78f173f85f6eba5cff36131a81bd57](http://ac.els-cdn.com/S187704281001387X/1-s2.0-S187704281001387X-main.pdf?_tid=6222cd14-3696-11e4-b260-00000aab0f6c&acdnat=1410098204_ca78f173f85f6eba5cff36131a81bd57). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.013>
- Catalan, R. M. J. (2003). Sex differences in L2 vocabulary learning strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 54-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00037>
- Coady, J., & Huckin, T. (Eds.). (1997). *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, A. D. (2011). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Harlow: Longman/Pearson Education.
- Dhanavel, S. P. (2012). *English Language Teaching in India: The Shifting Paradigms*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Ltd.
- Espinosa, S. M. (2003). Vocabulary: Reviewing Trends in EFL/ESL Instruction and Testing. *Odisea* 4, 97-112 /online/. Retrieved on 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2014 from [http://www.ual.es/odisea/Odisea04\\_MorenoEspinosa.pdf](http://www.ual.es/odisea/Odisea04_MorenoEspinosa.pdf)
- Gu, Y. (1994). *Vocabulary learning strategies of good and poor Chinese EFL learners*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (p. 27) /online/. Retrieved on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2013 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED370411.pdf>
- Gu, Y., & Johnson, R. K. (1996). Vocabulary learning strategies and language learning outcomes. *Language learning*, 46(4), 643-679. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01355.x>

- Hedrick, W. B., Harmon, J. M., & Linerode, P. M. (2004). Teachers' beliefs and practices of vocabulary instruction with Social studies textbooks in grades 4-8. *Reading Horizons*, 45(2), Article 2 /online/. Retrieved on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2015 from [http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading\\_horizons/vol45/iss2/2](http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons/vol45/iss2/2)
- Hsu, J. T. (2006). Teaching English lexically: The University word list is a good start. *Online Submission, Paper presented at the Taiwan TESOL Conference*, Taiwan. Retrieved on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2015 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED492898.pdf>
- Hulstijn, J. H., & Laufer, B. (2001). Some empirical evidence for the involvement load hypothesis in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*, 51, 539-558. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00164>
- Hunt, A., & Beglar, D. (1998). Current research and practice in teaching vocabulary. *The Language Teacher Online*. Retrieved on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2014 from <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/1998/01/hunt>.
- Kafipour, R., & Naveh, M. H. (2011). Vocabulary learning strategies and their contribution to reading comprehension of EFL undergraduate students in Kerman province. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(4), 626-647 /online/. Retrieved on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2013 from <http://staff.neu.edu.tr/~cise.cavusoglu/Documents/Advaced%20Research%20Methods/Quantitative/Kafipour%20Descriptive%20Correlational.pdf>
- Kaushik, S., & Bajwa, B. (Eds.). (2009). *A Handbook of Teaching English*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Kavari, K. E. (2014). Teaching English in ESP Contexts through Vocabulary Learning Strategies Instruction. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(2), 247-256.
- Ketabi, S., & Shahraki, S. H. (2011). Vocabulary in the Approaches to Language Teaching: From the Twentieth Century to the Twenty-first. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 2(3), 726-731 /online/. Retrieved on 24<sup>th</sup> December 2012 from <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/jltr/article/view/0203726731/3071>. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.3.726-731>
- Komol, T., & Sripetpun, W. (2011). *Vocabulary learning strategies employed by undergraduate students and its relationship to their vocabulary knowledge*. Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> International Conference on Humanities and Social Sciences, Prince of Songkla University /online/. Retrieved on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2014 from <http://fs.libarts.psu.ac.th/research/conference/Proceedings3/article/2pdf/008.pdf>
- Lai, Y. L. (2005). *Teaching vocabulary learning strategies: Awareness, Beliefs, and practices. A survey of Taiwanese EFL senior high school teachers*. (Master's thesis). Essex: Department of Language & Linguistics University of Essex /online/. Retrieved on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2014 from [http://english.tyhs.edu.tw/epaper/epaper9/thesis\\_eng.pdf](http://english.tyhs.edu.tw/epaper/epaper9/thesis_eng.pdf)
- Lessard-Clouston, M. (2012). Word lists for vocabulary learning and teaching. *The CATESOL Journal*, 24, 287-304 /online/. Retrieved on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2015 from [http://www.catesoljournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/cj24\\_lessard\\_clouston.pdf](http://www.catesoljournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/cj24_lessard_clouston.pdf)
- Levin, J. R., McCormick, C. B., Miller, G. E., Berry, J. K., & Pressley, M. (1982). Mnemonic versus nonmnemonic vocabulary learning strategies for children. *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 19, 1, 121-136 /online/. Retrieved on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2013 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1162372>.

- Li, S. (2010). *Vocabulary learning beliefs, strategies and language learning outcomes: A study of Chinese learners of English in higher vocational education*. (Master's thesis). Auckland: School of Languages and Social Sciences Auckland University of Technology /online/. Retrieved on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2014 from <http://aut.researchgateway.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10292/1064/LiS.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y>
- Mukoroli, J. (2011). Effective vocabulary teaching strategies for the English for academic purposes ESL Classroom. *MA TESOL Collection*. Paper 501 /online/. Retrieved on 8<sup>th</sup> January 2014 from [http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/ipp\\_collection/501](http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/ipp_collection/501)
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524759>
- Newton, J. (1995). Task-based interaction and incidental vocabulary learning: A case study. *Second Language Research*, 11, 159-177. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/026765839501100207>
- O'Dell, F. (1997). Incorporating vocabulary into the syllabus. In N. Schmitt, & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: description, acquisition, and pedagogy* (pp. 258-278). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, Inc.
- Ozturk, M. (2005). Vocabulary teaching. *Ankara Universitesi Dil Dergisi*, 133, 20-28. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1501/Dilder\\_0000000060](http://dx.doi.org/10.1501/Dilder_0000000060)
- Pérez, A. S., & Ruiz, R. M. M. (2007). Research on Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition and Learning: An Introduction. *International Journal of English Studies*, 7(2) /online/. Retrieved on 27<sup>th</sup> August 2013 from <http://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/2595023.pdf>
- Ramanathan, H. (2013, January 14). Teaching English. *The Hindu* /online/. Retrieved on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2014 from <http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-features/tp-educationplus/teaching-english/article4305627.ece>
- Read, J. (2004). 7. Research in teaching vocabulary. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 146-161 /online/. Retrieved on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2014 from <http://nowparast.persianguig.com/7v09xI8X2P/document/Teaching%20Skills/Research%20in%20teaching%20Vocabulary.pdf>. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000078>
- Renganathan, R., Balachandran, S., & Govindarajan, K. (2012). Customer perception towards banking sector: Structural equation modeling approach. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(46), 11426-11436.
- Sheorey, R. (2006). *Learning and teaching English in India*. New Delhi: Sage Publications India.
- Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary Learning Strategies. In N. Schmitt, & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: description, acquisition, and pedagogy* (pp. 199-227). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2008). Review article: Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language teaching research*, 12(3), 329-363 /online/. Retrieved on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2013 from [https://www.norbertschmitt.co.uk/uploads/schmitt-n-\(2008\)-instructed-second-language-vocabulary-learning-language-teaching-research-12-3-329-363.pdf](https://www.norbertschmitt.co.uk/uploads/schmitt-n-(2008)-instructed-second-language-vocabulary-learning-language-teaching-research-12-3-329-363.pdf). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230293977>
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Thorat, A. R., Valke, B. S., & Gokhale, S. B. (2000). *Enriching your competence in English*. Mumbai: Orient Longman.
- Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to teach vocabulary*. New Delhi: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Venugopal, V., & Aravind Kumar, B. (2013, June 6). Language barrier puts students from Tamil medium in a fix. *The Hindu* /online/. Retrieved on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2014 from [http://www.thehindu.com/features/education/issues/language-barrier-puts-students-from-tamil-medium-in-a-fix/article\\_3336855.ece](http://www.thehindu.com/features/education/issues/language-barrier-puts-students-from-tamil-medium-in-a-fix/article_3336855.ece)
- Warrier, B. S. (2007, December 17). Build a rich vocabulary. *The Hindu* /online/. Retrieved on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2014 from <http://www.hindu.com/edu/2007/12/17/stories/2007121750140600.html>

---

**Sindhu Vasu**

Department of English, College of Engineering Guindy,  
Anna University, Guindy  
Chennai-600025, Tamilnadu, India  
[sindhuvasu86@gmail.com](mailto:sindhuvasu86@gmail.com)

**Senkamalam Periyasamy Dhanavel**

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences,  
Indian Institute of Technology Madras  
Chennai-600036, Tamilnadu, India  
[dhanavelsp@gmail.com](mailto:dhanavelsp@gmail.com)  
[dhanavelsp@iitm.ac.in](mailto:dhanavelsp@iitm.ac.in)

# Kako se nastavnici koriste strategijama za usvajanje vokabulara kada poučavaju vokabular

---

## Sažetak

*U ovom se radu istražuje uporaba strategija za usvajanje vokabulara (SUV) među nastavnicima koji u Indiji poučavaju vokabular. Odnosi se također na to kako spolne i iskustvene razlike među nastavnicima utječu na njihovu uporabu SUV u učioničkom kontekstu. U radu su prikazani rezultati koji proizlaze iz identifikacije SUV koje rabe sami nastavnici kada poučavaju vokabular. Provedeni su T-test i jednosmjerna ANOVA da bi se dobiveni podaci analizirali i tumačili. Rezultati pokazuju da se nastavnici koriste SUV kao što su: pogađanje iz konteksta pri određivanju značenja novih riječi, grupni rad s ciljem usvajanja novih riječi i uporaba novih riječi u rečenicama radi njihova pamćenja. Istraživanje također pokazuje da nastavnici ne preferiraju sljedeće SUV: uporaba kartica, sličnost s J1 i metoda ključne riječi. Osim toga, otkriva iskustvene razlike među nastavnicima kada je riječ o poučavanju vokabulara.*

**Ključne riječi:** *engleski jezik u Indiji; poučavanje engleskog jezika; poučavanje vokabulara u Indiji; strategije usvajanja vokabulara; učionička nastava; usvajanje vokabulara stranog jezika.*

## Uvod

Leksičko znanje stranog jezika studentima je važno jer im bogatstvo rječnika određuje učinkovitu uporabu jezika (npr. Alderson, 2005; Schmitt, 2010). Razina do koje su usvojili vokabular također im utječe na obrazovanje i struku. Njegovo je kontinuirano usavršavanje stoga imperativ onome tko uči strani jezik jer proces ovladavanja jezikom u biti ulazi u fazu kada se broj riječi stalno povećava (Schmitt, 2008). Potrebno je stoga primjenjivati odgovarajuće strategije za usvajanje vokabulara (SUV) kako bi usvojeni leksik odgovarao osobnim i profesionalnim potrebama pojedinaca. Drugi s tim povezan izazov proizlazi iz vrlo velikog broja leksičkih jedinica u jeziku, koje treba promišljeno birati i prezentirati u nastavi kako bi odgovarale različitim potrebama učenika. U tom su kontekstu O'Dell (1997) i Thornbury (2002)

analizirali koliko su udžbenici, utemeljeni na određenom silabu, relevantni za usvajanje vokabulara u redovitoj učioničkoj nastavi. Bili su uvjereni da učenici ne uspijevaju uočiti strategije (SUV) korištene za rješavanje vježbi u udžbenicima. Stoga je Thornbury (2002) predložio nastavnicima uvođenje strategija za usvajanje vokabulara (SUV) prije njihova rješavanja da bi učenici mogli spoznati koliko su one važne u proširenju vokabulara. Prema tome, cilj je ovog rada istražiti nastavnikovu uporabu strategija za usvajanje vokabulara u praksi da bi usavršili vokabular svojih učenika.

### **Potreba za istraživanjem**

U Indiji se oko 80 % učenika školske dobi poučava na njihovu regionalnom jeziku tako da kada se uključe u sustav visokog obrazovanja, a potom nastoje pronaći posao, nailaze na iznimne poteškoće pri postizanju obrazovnog i poslovnog uspjeha (Ramanathan, 2013). Točnije, oni uče engleski jezik kao školski predmet gotovo 10 godina premda se nastava svih predmeta održava na njihovu regionalnom jeziku. Nasuprot njima, učenici iz škola kojima je dostupna poduka na engleskom jeziku imaju nastavu svih predmeta upravo na tome jeziku, osim tečaja regionalnog jezika, jer njima je engleski jezik onaj na kojem ih poučavaju. Bez obzira na to dolaze li iz škola u kojima ih poučavaju na nekom regionalnom ili engleskom jeziku vokabular im je svima važan da bi prevladali probleme razumijevanja onih kolegija za koje se nastava održava na engleskom jeziku (Venugopal i Aravind Kumar, 2013). Osim toga, oni trebaju usavršiti svoje leksičko znanje tako da se mogu učinkovito koristiti jezikom (Warrier, 2007). Prema tome, učenici koji ulaze u sustav visokog obrazovanja, a zatim traže zaposlenje, zahtijevaju dobro leksičko znanje na toj tercijarnoj razini obrazovanja, što je moguće ostvariti s pomoću učinkovite primjene strategija (SUV) u nastavi.

Općenito govoreći, težište se u takvoj nastavi stavlja na značenje riječi, nakon čega slijede njihovi razni oblici, što je osobito važno za početnike (Thornbury, 2002). Dok poučavaju vokabular, nastavnici se teže koncentriraju na poučavanje drugih jezičnih aspekata i uporabu leksika. Osim toga, složeno pitanje nastave, utemeljene na nekom strukturiranom silabu koji istodobno podrazumijeva gramatiku i vokabular, predstavlja izazov u nastavi stranog jezika orijentiranoj na usvajanje leksičkog znanja (Coady i Huckin, 1997). Nastavnici ipak mogu prevladati tu poteškoću ako su donekle svjesni strategija za usvajanje vokabulara, pa im je poslije možda lakše utvrđivati usvojeno leksičko znanje, osobito male razlike između riječi u smislu njihovih karakteristika i uporabe, čime pridonose kontinuiranom usvajanju vokabulara. Taj dio nastave treba, dakle, obuhvatiti spomenute strategije da bi učenici lakše samostalno i sveobuhvatno usvajali leksik kada u životu naiđu na nepoznate riječi.

Da bi se shvatila ključna uloga leksičkog poučavanja s pomoću različitih metoda u nastavi jezika, provedeno je nekoliko istraživanja. Espinosa (2003) i Ketabi i Shahraki (2011) pronašli su tragove takvog poučavanja od gramatičko-prijevodne metode do komunikacijskog pristupa, a dodatno su razmatrali prednosti i nedostatke načina na koji se vokabular poučavao u svakom od tih razdoblja. Primijetili su da nijedna

metoda poučavanja nije uspješna ako nije fokusirana na samostalno usvajanje vokabulara. Schmitt (2008) daje pregled leksičkog poučavanja u nastavi stranog jezika te ističe „eksplicitnu, svjesnu komponentu usvajanja i komponentu temeljenu na maksimalnom izlaganju i spontanom učenju”. Također predlaže razradu jednog konzistentnog programa za usvajanja vokabulara s ciljem učenikova ovladavanja leksičkim znanjem. Read (2004) je razmatrao istraživanja o leksičkom poučavanju u nastavi stranog jezika i testiranju leksičkog znanja od 1999. godine. Predložio je računalni program za učenje jezika koji bi učenicima omogućio bogatiji vokabular. Lai (2005) je proučavao svjesnost o strategijama za usvajanje vokabulara, uvjerenja i praksu tajvanskih srednjoškolskih nastavnika engleskog kao stranog jezika. Istražio je korelacije između nastavnikovih uvjerenja i njihove prakse te istaknuo nužnost educiranja nastavnika o najnovijim pristupima poučavanju vokabulara. Nastojao je svojim istraživanjem osvijestiti nastavnike o tome kako poučavaju vokabular. Jedno nedavno istraživanje na indijskom Sveučilištu u Punjabu bilo je fokusirano na poučavanje studenata o strategijama za usvajanje vokabulara engleskog jezika struke (Kavari, 2014). Pritom su se analizirale različite taksonomije spomenutih strategija te su predložene odgovarajuće mjere za poduku o strategijama. Istraživanje u ovom radu nastoji odgovoriti na pitanje kako indijski nastavnici primjenjuju strategije za usvajanje vokabulara u svojoj nastavi na engleskom kao stranom jeziku, nastojeći ih više osvijestiti o onim strategijama koje su za to važne.

U njemu su postavljena dva međusobno povezana pitanja: 1) Kojim se strategijama za usvajanje vokabulara (SUV) nastavnici koriste u svojoj učioničkoj praksi kada poučavaju studente kako usvajati leksik? 2) Koje razlike u uporabi strategija za usvajanje vokabulara postoje između nastavnika s obzirom na neovisne varijable spol i iskustvo?

### ***Ciljevi istraživanja***

Ciljevi istraživanja bili su sljedeći:

- istražiti različite vrste SUV kojima se nastavnici koriste kada poučavaju leksik u učionici;
- istražiti utjecaj spola i iskustva na razlike u uporabi strategija (SUV) kada poučavaju studente usvajanju leksika.

## **Strategije za usvajanje vokabulara (SUV)**

### ***Definicija***

SUV su tehnike koje učenicima daju smjernice o tome kako usvajati riječi. Catalan (2003) definira SUV kao „znanje o mehanizmima (proces, strategije) koji se koriste za usvajanje vokabulara, te kao korake ili aktivnosti učenika s ciljem (a) pronalaženja značenja nepoznatih riječi, (b) njihova zadržavanja u dugoročnom pamćenju, (c) voljnog dosjećanja i (d) uporabe u govornom ili pisanom obliku”. U ovom se istraživanju koristimo Catalanovom definicijom spomenutih strategija pri izradi upitnika.

## **Klasifikacija i istraživanje SUV**

Nekoliko je istraživanja pokazalo da se učenici koriste strategijama za usvajanje vokabulara iako toga možda nisu svjesni. U njima su također identificirane i klasificirane SUV kojima se koriste oni koji usvajaju engleski kao strani jezik. Stoffer navodi 53 takve strategije što ih rabe studenti stranog jezika na Sveučilištu u Alabami, a klasificira ih u devet kategorija: i) autentična uporaba jezika, ii) samomotivacija, iii) organiziranje riječi, iv) stvaranje mentalnih veza, v) pamćenje, vi) kreativne aktivnosti, vii) fizička djelatnost, viii) vizualna/auditivna pomagala i ix) koraci za prevladavanje anksioznosti (Schmitt, 1997). Gu i Johnson (1996) slično grupiraju SUV kineskih studenata u sedam kategorija: i) uvjerenja o usvajanju vokabulara, ii) metakognitivne kategorije, iii) pogađanje, iv) uporaba rječnika, v) vođenje bilješki, vi) pamćenje i vii) aktivacijske strategije. Nadalje, Schmittova (1997) taksonomija SUV obuhvaća dvije velike skupine: i) strategije otkrivanja, i ii) konsolidacijske strategije. Ta se taksonomija temelji na oxfordskoj klasifikaciji strategija učenja (Oxford, 1990) i na varijaciji otkrivanja i konsolidacije. Strategije otkrivanja sadrže strategije determinacije i društvene strategije. S druge strane, konsolidacijske strategije obuhvaćaju društvene, mnemoničke, kognitivne i metakognitivne strategije. Sve su tri taksonomije dobro poznate u istraživanju strategija za usvajanje vokabulara.

Osim toga, u nekolicini drugih istraživanja SUV autori nastoje uspoređivati razinu znanja učenika s uporabom SUV (npr. Gu, 1994), osobito istražiti ili usporediti kognitivne ili mnemoničke SUV (npr., Schmitt, 1997; Levin i sur., 1982), utvrditi utjecaj učenikove kulture na SUV (npr., Schmitt, 1997), istražiti SUV i leksičko znanje (npr., Komol i Sripetpun, 2011), među nastavnicima i učenicima odrediti prednosti, strategije i prakse (npr., Li, 2010; Celik i Toptas, 2010; Aktekin i Guven, 2007), te istražiti SUV i materijale koji se koriste u nastavi engleskog jezika (npr., Bastanfar i Hashemi, 2010).

## **SUV u poučavanju vokabulara**

Učenici, nastavnici, autori nastavnog materijala i istraživači prepoznaju ključnu ulogu SUV u leksičkom poučavanju (Read, 2000; Zimmerman, 1997; Nunan, 1991; Graves, 2006; Ehren, 2002 prema Pérez i Ruiz, 2007 te Schmitt, 2008; 2010) s obzirom na to da se određeni broj tehnika navodi u referentnim izvorima za poučavanje u učionici.

Prvo, Dhanavel (2012) predlaže novi pristup, pristup 5S, za poučavanje i usvajanje vokabulara u indijskom kontekstu. 5S označava pet elemenata svake riječi, tj. izgled (oblik), zvuk (izgovor), izvor (podrijetlo), osjećaj (značenje) i sintaksu (rečenična uporaba). Prepoznavanje riječi s pomoću njezina korijena, prefiksa i sufiksa olakšava primjenu 5S pristupa, a s pomoću njega učenicima postaje zanimljiv odnos između dviju ili više riječi. On otvara put suradničkom učenju u učionici i predlaže moguće pomicanje težišta s poznatih na nepoznate riječi. U ovladavanje leksikom uvodi brojne implicitne strategije koje promiču samostalno učenje: primjerice, pogađanje značenja riječi s pomoću njezina korijena, prefiksa i sufiksa, zatim uporaba rječnika za pronalaženje srodnih riječi itd.



Drugo, uobičajena je praksa među nastavnicima da prije čitanja nekog ulomka ili lekcije poučavaju vokabular koji je ključan za njihovo razumijevanje i neometano čitanje (Kaushik i Bajwa, 2009). Riječi se mogu poučavati / objašnjavati prema potrebama učenika pomoću ilustracija ili objašnjenja, mimike ili gesta ili simbola, sinonima ili antonima (za objašnjenje riječi), definicija, materinskog jezika i konteksta (govornog ili pisanog). Naglasak je na uvježbavanju i utvrđivanju radi postizanja boljeg dugoročnog pamćenja i pretvaranja pasivnog vokabulara u onaj aktivni.

Treće, Thorat i sur. (2000) preporučuju uporabu rječnika za stjecanje znanja o različitim leksičkim elementima, njihovim oblicima, kolokacijama, sinonimima i antonimima, riječima iz istog semantičkog polja, derivacijskim procesima pomoću prefiksa i sufiksa, složenicama i riječima koje se često zamjenjuju jedna s drugom. Svaki od spomenutih načina sadrži određene strategije bilo implicitno ili eksplicitno. Oni pridonose usvajanju vokabulara tako što objedinjuju SUV u nastavi engleskog kao stranog jezika.

Osim u udžbenicima, u mnogim se znanstvenim radovima podržava stajalište o SUV pri poučavanju vokabulara. Naime, Hunt i Beglar (1998) u svojem istraživanju predlažu sedam načela usvajanja vokabulara:

- omogućiti spontano usvajanje vokabulara;
- dijagnosticirati koje od 3000 najčešćih riječi učenici trebaju usvojiti;
- omogućiti namjerno/plansko usvajanje vokabulara;
- omogućiti proširenje leksičkog znanja;
- omogućiti razvijanje tečne uporabe usvojenog vokabulara;
- eksperimentirati s pogađanjem iz konteksta;
- proučiti različite vrste rječnika i poučiti učenike kako se njima koristiti.

Navedena su načela korisna za spontano usvajanje leksičkog znanja, eksplicitnu poduku i samostalni strategijski razvoj. Pogađanje iz konteksta i poučavanje o uporabi različitih vrsta rječnika dvije su glavne strategije unutar spomenutih načela za usvajanje vokabulara.

Schmitt (2008) raspravlja o konceptu poduke u svom preglednom članku o usvajanju vokabulara na stranom jeziku u nastavnim uvjetima. Ustrajava na bogatom rječniku kao uvjetu za produktivnu uporabu stranog jezika, specifičnim tehnikama u različitim fazama kao uvjetu za upravljanje složenim i postupnim procesom leksičkog usvajanja, planiranom učenju za početnike kao uvjetu za spoznavanje odnosa između značenja i forme, uporabi materinskog jezika kao uvjetu za brzo povezivanje značenja i oblika riječi, višestrukom izlaganju riječima kao uvjetu za njihovo povezivanje (značenja i forme) i učenje o tome kako se koriste, spoznavanju ostalih leksičkih aspekata na implicitan i eksplicitan način, određivanju maksimalne količine vremena za usvajanje leksika u procesu ovladavanja stranim jezikom. Štoviše, holistički pristup usvajanju vokabulara obuhvaća samostalan razvoj strategijskog ponašanja.

Dakle, spomenuta istraživanja pružaju načela i tehnike za poboljšanje nastave usmjerene na usvajanje vokabulara s implicitnom ili eksplicitnom uporabom SUV

na satu engleskog jezika. Jasno je onda da poduka o SUV čini sastavni dio nastave fokusirane na leksičko usvajanje.

## **Metodologija**

### **Instrument**

U ovom istraživanju korišten je upitnik na uzorku nastavnika engleskog jezika iz raznih visokoškolskih institucija u Tamilnadu. Svaki od njih dobio je papirnatu inačicu od autora istraživanja osobno. Fokus pitanja bio je na njihovu poučavanju vokabulara u nastavi. Anketom su prikupljeni primarni podaci o poučavanju vokabulara u nastavi engleskog kao stranog jezika u Indiji, koji su zatim analizirani s pomoću statističkog paketa za društvene znanosti SPSS 19. Upitnik je prilagođen demografiji nastavnika koji su sudjelovali u istraživanju, a predstavlja prilagođeni opis strukture i strategija preuzet iz istraživanja Lai (2005), Kafipour i Naveh (2011), Schmitt (1997). Podijeljen je u četiri kategorije. Koeficijent pouzdanosti za kompletan upitnik pokazao se zadovoljavajućim. Osim toga, interna konzistencija za njegovih 37 tvrdnji izračunata je s pomoću koeficijenta Cronbach alpha, odnosno 0,879 u ovom istraživanju. Koeficijenti pouzdanosti za četiri podljestvice također su određeni na sljedeći način: poučavanje vokabulara općenito (0,546), strategije za određivanje značenja novih riječi (0,536), strategije za učenje novih riječi (0,688) i strategije za pamćenje novih riječi (0,834).

### **Upitnik**

Upitnik je sadržavao 40 pitanja, kao i demografske podatke o nastavnicima. Za potrebe analize prikupljeni su sljedeći podaci: ime, spol, zvanje, godine nastavnog iskustva, adresa institucije. Od 40 pitanja, njih 37 bilo je u obliku tvrdnji (Likertova skala od 5 stupnjeva), a preostala su 3 bila otvorenog tipa. Tih je 37 pitanja bilo podijeljeno u 4 cjeline da bi se spoznalo kako nastavnici poučavaju studente o leksičkom znanju. Tvrdnje rangirane od 1 do 5 omogućile su lakšu spoznaju o tome kako se spomenuta poduka općenito svakodnevno provodi na satu engleskog jezika. Tri su dijela bila usmjerena na strategije za utvrđivanje značenja novih riječi (tvrdnje od 6 do 13), strategije za usvajanje novih riječi (tvrdnje od 14 do 20) i strategije za pamćenje riječi (tvrdnje od 21 do 37). S pomoću njih su autori mogli uočiti koje SUV nastavnici upotrebljavaju kada poučavaju vokabular. Upitnik je prikazan u dijelu koji sadrži deskriptivnu analizu.

### **Uzorak**

U istraživanju su sudjelovali nastavnici engleskog jezika s raznih humanističkih, prirodoslovnih i tehničkih fakulteta u Tamilnadu, u Indiji, čije se nastavno iskustvo kreće u rasponu od nekoliko mjeseci do 27 godina. 125 nastavnika dobilo je upitnik, od njih su 34 nastavnika bili pripadnici muškog spola, a 91 je bilo pripadnica ženskog spola. Od ukupno 125 sudionika njih 118 bili su u zvanju docenta, 3 u zvanju

izvanrednog profesora i 4 u zvanju redovitog profesora. 58 sudionika imalo je manje od 5 godina nastavnog iskustva, 37 sudionika imalo je nastavno iskustvo od 5 do 10 godina, a 30 ih je poučavalo engleski jezik više od 10 godina.

## Rezultati

Ovdje su rezultati predstavljeni u tri dijela. Dio 1 daje odgovor na prvo istraživačko pitanje s pomoću deskriptivne analize, dio 2 prikazuje nalaze povezane s drugim istraživačkim pitanjem s pomoću statističke analize, a dio 3 analizira odgovore nastavnika na pitanja otvorenog tipa i odnosi se na rezultate prvog istraživačkog pitanja.

### Dio 1

U ovom je dijelu riječ o SUV kojima se nastavnici koriste u učioničkoj nastavi kada poučavaju da bi obogatili rječnik svojih studenata. Dakle, sljedeća analiza daje odgovore na prvo istraživačko pitanje.

#### Uporaba SUV u uobičajenoj nastavi

Rezultati u Tablici 1 pokazuju da je čak 59,2 % nastavnika tražilo od studenata da uče riječi iz novina, javnih obavijesti, letaka, reklama itd. i da je 48 % nastavnika od studenata tražilo da uče riječi iz filmova, pjesama, vijesti, TV programa na engleskom jeziku itd. Nadalje, 42,4 % nastavnika često je poučavalo dodatne riječi, osim onih u udžbenicima. Štoviše, 35,2 % njih preferiralo je popise riječi dok su držali predavanje ili poučavali razumijevanje čitanjem. No, 28,8 % nastavnika rijetko je rabilo kartice za leksičko poučavanje.

Ta analiza podataka pokazuje da je značajna praksa poticanja studenata na usvajanje novih riječi iz različitih izvora jasno vidljiva u odgovorima nastavnika, što objašnjava njihovo zanimanje za osvješčivanje studenata o prednostima uporabe raznih dostupnih izvora. Osim toga, srednja vrijednost za individualne tvrdnje o nastavi na kojoj studenti usvajaju riječi kreće se od 2,38 do 4,46. Najniža srednja vrijednost od 2,38 ukazuje na slabiju uporabu kartica u učionici. Nastavnici možda nemaju dovoljno vremena da bi pripremali kartice za poučavanje riječi.

#### Tablica 1

#### Uporaba strategija za pronalaženje značenja novih riječi

#### Tablica 2

Podaci u Tablici 2 ukazuju na to da je maksimalno 50,4 % nastavnika često poučavalo studente kako pogađati značenje iz konteksta. Otkrili su također da je 38,4 % njih spomenulo čestu uputu o korištenju afiksa pri traženju značenja novih riječi, a 34,4 % nastavnika izvjestilo je o često analizi slika ili gestama pri otkrivanju značenja nove riječi. Nadalje, 31,2 % nastavnika često je poticalo studente na uporabu jednojezičnih rječnika za otkrivanje značenja novih riječi, 29 % često je preferiralo poučavanje o

jezičnoj analizi s tim istim ciljem. 34,4 % nastavnika ponekad je poučavalo studente kako rabiti dvojezične rječnike. Štoviše, 31,2 % nastavnika ponekad je motiviralo studente na grupni rad da bi otkrili značenje novih riječi. Osim toga, 30,4 % njih je otkrilo da ponekad uče studente da traže sličnosti između zvuka i podrijetla riječi u materinskom jeziku kako bi otkrili značenje novih riječi na stranom jeziku.

Analiza je pokazala da u njihovoj nastavi najviše prevladava strategija pogađanja iz konteksta kada određuju značenje novih riječi. Međutim, usporedba s materinskim jezikom najmanje je preferirana među nastavnicima. Srednja vrijednost za individualne SUV za određenje značenja novih riječi u rasponu je od 2,96 do 4,02. Najniža vrijednost od 2,96 ukazuje na vrlo slabu primjenu strategije uspoređivanja s materinskim jezikom (sličnost između zvučne slike riječi i njezina podrijetla) pri usvajanju novih riječi.

### **Uporaba strategija za usvajanje novih riječi**

#### Tablica 3

Rezultati u Tablici 3 pokazuju da je 40,8 % nastavnika uvijek tražilo od studenata da rade u grupama kako bi naučili nove riječi te da je njih 39,2 % uvijek poticalo učenike da zapisuju nove riječi u bilježnicu kako bi ih naučili. Također, 39,2 % nastavnika često je ustrajavalo na usmenom ponavljanju s ciljem usvajanja novih riječi, a njih 29,6 % je često poučavalo studente primjeni ponovljenog pisanja. Nadalje, 40 % nastavnika često je tražilo od studenata popisivanje riječi. Štoviše, 34,4 % nastavnika ponekad su ustrajavali na tome da njihovi studenti rabe kartice. Nasuprot tome, 31,2 % nastavnika ponekad je poučavalo studente obilježavanju fizičkih predmeta kako bi usvojili nove riječi.

Općenito, većina nastavnika poticala je grupni rad u nastavi s ciljem usvajanja novih riječi. Ipak, mnogi nastavnici nisu za to rabili kartice. Srednja vrijednost za individualne SUV u sklopu poučavanja novih riječi iznosila je od 2,49 do 4,02. Najniža vrijednost od 2,49 ukazuje na to da nastavnici rijetko rabe kartice kada poučavaju vokabular.

### **Uporaba strategija za pamćenje novih riječi**

Analiza u Tablici 4 pokazuje da je većina nastavnika uvijek primjenjivala SUV kako bi pomogli studentima da zapamte tek naučene riječi. Ona ukazuje na to da je većina od 55,2 % nastavnika poučavala studente uporabi novih riječi u rečenicama da bi ih zapamtili. Također, 51,2 % njih uvijek je poticalo studente na sricanje novih riječi radi pamćenja, a 44 % ih je uvijek preferiralo povezivati riječi s osobnim iskustvom da bi ih zadržali u pamćenju. 37,6 % nastavnika motiviralo je studente na proučavanje zvučne slike usmenim ponavljanjem radi pamćenja riječi. Analiza je također otkrila da je maksimalno 47,2 % nastavnika često instruiralo studente da zamisle značenje i oblik riječi kako bi ih zapamtili, a njih 40,8 % često je poticalo studente na povezivanje riječi s njihovim sinonimima i antonimima kako bi im omogućili da ih zapamte, 34,4 %

nastavnika često je tražilo od studenata da zapamte značenje riječi s pomoću slikovnih reprezentacija. Nadalje, 32,8 % nastavnika često je upućivalo studente na grupiranje riječi u priču kao na strategiju njihova pamćenja. Štoviše, 26,4 % njih često je tražilo od studenata kontinuirano usvajanje i povremeno uvježbavanje novih riječi da bi ih mogli pohraniti u pamćenju.

#### Tablica 4

Nadalje, 37,6 % nastavnika ponekad se koristilo parafraziranjem značenja kao strategijom pamćenja riječi, a njih je 35,2 % ponekad preferiralo na upućivanje studenata na primjenu fizičke aktivnosti pri usvajanju riječi da bi je zapamtili. Dok je 35,2 % nastavnika ponekad poučavalo studente da pamte afikse i korijene novih riječi, njih je 29,6 % ponekad poticalo studente na korištenje semantičkih mapa s ciljem pamćenja novih riječi. Štoviše, 26,4 % nastavnika ponekad su preferirali usporedbu pridjeva, a njih je 24 % ponekad poticalo studente na podvlačenje novih riječi kao strategiju pamćenja. Analiza također pokazuje da je 28,8 % nastavnika rijetko poučavalo strategijom povezivanja riječi u blokove, a njih 27,2 % nikad nije poučavao strategiju pamćenja utemeljenu na određenju ključnih riječi. No, srednja vrijednost za individualne strategije pamćenja novih riječi u rasponu je od 2,62 do 4,44. Očito je da je strategija korištenja riječi u rečenicama ukazala na najvišu srednju vrijednost od 4,44, a strategija sricanja onu od 4,34 kada je riječ o pamćenju. To pak znači da te dvije strategije za usvajanje vokabulara prevladavaju kod nastavnika kada poučavaju studente kako pamtit nove riječi. Nasuprot tome, metoda ključne riječi ukazala je na najnižu vrijednost od 2,62, a vezano usvajanje riječi istaknulo je srednju vrijednost 2,95. Dakle, nastavnici se najmanje koriste tim dvjema strategijama kako bi pomogli studentima da pohrane nove riječi u pamćenje.

### **Dio 2**

Da bi se istražilo drugo pitanje o utjecaju spola i iskustva na leksičko poučavanje, primijenjeni su neovisni t-test, jednosmjerna ANOVA i Duncan test (SPSS 19). U ovom se dijelu analiziraju rezultati statističke analize.

#### **Spolne i iskustvene razlike među nastavnicima u odnosu na poučavanje vokabulara**

Rezultati t-testa u Tablici 5 pokazuju da spol nema značajnu ulogu u poučavanju vokabulara jer je P vrijednost za sve dimenzije veća od 5 ( $P > 0,05$ ). Prema tome, spolne razlike ne utječu na to kako nastavnici, nastojeći poboljšati vokabular svojih studenata, poučavaju o SUV.

#### Tablica 5

Tablica 6 otkriva da iskustvo nastavnika ima značajnu ulogu u njihovu poučavanju o strategijama za usvajanje vokabulara jer je P vrijednost od 0,027 manja od 0,05. Nadalje, kada je u pitanju jednosmjerna ANOVA i Duncan test, srednja vrijednost

jasno pokazuje da iskustvo nastavnika utječe na njihovo leksičko poučavanje. Nastavnici s više od 10 godina ( $M=22,33$ ) iskustva razlikuju se po svojoj uporabi strategija za usvajanje vokabulara od nastavnika s 5 – 10 godina iskustva ( $M=24,73$ ) i manje od 5 godina ( $M=24,93$ ) iskustva. Međutim, nastavnici s manje od 5 godina iskustva i nastavnici s iskustvom od 5 do 10 godina ne razlikuju se jedni od drugih. Činjenica da se obje grupe nastavnika (manje od 5 godina iskustva i 5 – 10 godina iskustva) ne razlikuju po svojoj uporabi SUV možda ukazuje na to da je nastavnicima potrebno više vremena da bi usvojili SUV te ih primijenili u nastavi.

Tablica 6

### **Dio 3**

Ovaj dio sadrži analizu nastavnikovih odgovora na tri sljedeća pitanja otvorenog tipa:

1. Razmislite o strategijama kojima se koristite da biste usvojili vokabular kao učenik i nastavnik engleskog kao stranog jezika. Navedite kojim se strategijama koristite.
2. Navedite ostale aktivnosti ili strategije koje ste upotrebljavali u učionici, a nisu navedene u upitniku.
3. Specificirajte aktivnost koju ste primijenili u nastavi.

Prvim se otvorenim pitanjem nastojalo doći do podataka o SUV kojima se kao učenici engleskog jezika koriste nastavnici pri usvajanju novih riječi. Drugo i treće pitanje omogućuju jednostavniju identifikaciju SUV kojima se nastavnici koriste da bi posredstvom raznih aktivnosti poučavali vokabular. Ta su pitanja pomogla pri utvrđivanju SUV koje nastavnici upotrebljavaju da bi poučavali vokabular, osim onih koje su navedene u upitniku. Odgovori su autorima istraživanja omogućili da saznaju nešto više o uporabi SUV pri poučavanju vokabulara u učioničkim uvjetima.

### **Odgovori na otvorena pitanja**

Od 76 nastavnika koji su odgovorili na prvo otvoreno pitanje, njih je 26 spomenulo ekstenzivno čitanje raznog materijala na engleskom jeziku kao strategiju kojom se koriste za usvajanje novog leksika. No, 17 nastavnika predložilo je korištenje rječnika za usvajanje riječi. Samo su 3 nastavnika navela strategije povezane sa slušanjem. Ostale strategije koje su spomenuli nastavnici obuhvaćaju: etimološko znanje i analizu, mentalno mapiranje, memoriranje riječi, usvajanje sinonima, prevođenje, derivaciju s pomoću korijena riječi i pogađanje iz konteksta. Nastavnici su kao strategije za usvajanje novih riječi još spomenuli: korištenje digitalnih rječnika, TV zabavne programe, vijesti i filmove na engleskom jeziku. Od 125 nastavnika njih 49 nije odgovorilo na prvo pitanje otvorenog tipa.

Na drugo otvoreno pitanje 24 nastavnika spomenula su da u učionici primjenjuju aktivnosti za usvajanje vokabulara kao što su: krvnik, zid od riječi, igre s riječima, kvizovi, tematski rječnik i radni listići itd. Osim toga, 6 je nastavnika spomenulo da u tome smislu u učionici upotrebljavaju vizualna sredstva i pomagala, kao i tjelesne

aktivnosti. Dodavali su još strategije za usvajanje vokabulara kao što su: imenovanje predmeta, prevođenje s J1 na J2 i obrnuto, uporabu kartica, korištenje jezičnog laboratorija, grupne rasprave i opisivanje neke situacije iz vlastitog iskustva. Primijetili su također da se pri usvajanju novog leksika koriste primjerice strategijama učenja o etimologiji putem interneta, zamjene jedne riječi i ostalim. Od 125 nastavnika čak njih 70 nije odgovorilo na to pitanje.

U pogledu trećeg otvorenog pitanja nastavnici su opisivali neke zanimljive aktivnosti u vezi s vokabularom kojim su se koristili u nastavi. Od 75 nastavnika koji su odgovorili, njih 36 spomenulo je sljedeće: igre riječima, križaljke, čitanje stripova u novinama, kvizovi, premetanje slova u riječima, razgovor o teškim riječima. Za njih su to zanimljive igre jer snažno utječu na njihove studente u procesu učenja. Nadalje, 6 nastavnika navelo je da su aktivnosti povezane s novinskim materijalom zanimljive njihovim studentima. Osim njih spomenuli su kako od studenata traže da u jednoj minuti napišu što je moguće više riječi, ponavljaju pravilan izgovor, razgovaraju o filmovima, tvore riječi s pomoću njihova korijena, navode primjere neke riječi ili sintagme ili idioma, zapisuju leksičke jedinice u bilježnicu – za sve te aktivnosti misle da snažno utječu na njihove studente. Zanimljivo je da 50 nastavnika nije odgovorilo na to pitanje, što znači da ne misle ozbiljno na ono što zanima njihove studente.

## **Rasprava**

Rezultati analize podataka za prvo istraživačko pitanje pokazuju kako nastavnici koji poučavaju engleski jezik u umjetničkim, prirodoslovnim i tehničkim visokoškolskim institucijama u Indiji najviše primjenjuju SUV kada poučavaju studente o usvajanju novog leksika. Pritom ih potiču na uporabu raznih izvora, osobito na čitanje. Odgovori nastavnika na prvo otvoreno pitanje zapravo su također ukazali na čitanje kao strategiju s pomoću koje se usvaja novi vokabular. Čitanje je strategija koju najviše vole u nastavi kada poučavaju vokabular, stoga je riječ o intenzivnom istraživačkom području. Metode poučavanja u nastavi jezika koje se odnose na spontano usvajanje vokabulara idu u prilog čitanju kao strategiji s pomoću koje se usvaja leksičko znanje (Espinosa, 2003; Ketabi i Shahraki, 2011). Nastavnici, oni koji su nekad sami učili engleski jezik, možda su skloni poučavati svoje studente na isti način na koji su njih poučavali. Međutim, ti načini njihovim studentima pružaju ograničavajuće mogućnosti (Coady i Huckin (1997). Čitanje kao SUV omogućuje im kako bi našli nove riječi tako da čitanje, zajedno s drugim SUV za usvajanje, pamćenje i uporabu novog leksika, može poticati studente na samostalno razvijanje vokabulara. Nadalje, nastavnici ekstenzivno primjenjuju strategiju pogađanja iz konteksta za pronalaženje značenja novih riječi, što također potvrđuje rezultat istraživanja Sheoreya (2006) na Indian Collegeu o uvjerenjima nastavnika u vezi s učenjem engleskog jezika. Nastavnici također potiču studente na grupni rad pri usvajanju novih riječi. Newton (1995) slično tvrdi da grupne rasprave o značenju riječi na stranom jeziku pomažu studentima u razvijanju vokabulara. Nastavnici, štoviše, smatraju da uporaba riječi u

rečenicama studentima pomaže da ih zapamte. Taj je rezultat potvrda onog do čega su došli Hulstjin i Laufer (2001). Istraživanje Hulstjina i Laufera (2001) pokazalo je da studenti bolje pamte strane riječi kada su angažirani na nekom zadatku i da produktivno upotrebljavaju riječi. Osim toga, nastavnici preferiraju popise riječi pri usvajanju novog leksika, što je u skladu s Lessard-Clouston (2012) i Hsu (2006), koji su se zalagali za njih u procesu poučavanja. Međutim, nastavnici se minimalno koriste sličnošću s materinskim jezikom kao pomoći pri određivanju značenja novih riječi. Najmanje korištene strategije su kartice i metoda ključne riječi, što odgovara rezultatima istraživanja koje je Lai (2005) proveo o uvjerenjima, svjesnosti i praksi nastavnika u pogledu SUV. Suprotno tome, pregled raznih istraživanja na temu vokabulara, čiji su autori Blachowicz i Fisher (2000), otkrio je metodu ključne riječi kao mnemoničku strategiju, korisnu za pamćenje riječi, što je pak u suprotnosti s rezultatom ovog istraživanja.

U odnosu na drugo istraživačko pitanje spolne razlike među nastavnicima uopće ne utječu na njihovu uporabu SUV u poučavanju vokabulara. No, to se ne može reći za njihove iskustvene razlike. Taj je nalaz konzistentan s istraživanjem o uvjerenjima i praksi nastavnika u pogledu poučavanja vokabulara s pomoću udžbenika društvenih znanosti, koje su proveli Hedrick, Harmon i Linerode (2004). Nadalje, njihovo je istraživanje istaknulo utjecaj nastavnikova iskustva na neka od uvjerenja. U ovom se istraživanju nastavnici s više od 10 godina iskustva razlikuju po svom odabiru SUV u nastavi. Razlog zbog kojeg iskustvo utječe na nastavu može biti u različitim shvaćanjima nastavnika o potrebama studenata i njihovu osobnom shvaćanju leksičkih nijansi.

Rezultati u cjelini pokazuju da su nastavnici svjesni kako upotrebljavaju SUV u nastavi. Ključno je pritom da su svjesni specifičnih potreba studenata za usvajanjem vokabulara kako bi težiste pomaknuli s predmeta poučavanja na način poučavanja vokabulara u učioničkoj nastavi. Aktekin i Guven (2007) ukazuju na to da se većina nastavnika slaže u tome kako udžbenici imaju neka ograničenja kada je riječ o SUV. Štoviše, 80 % nastavnika u ovom je istraživanju izjavilo kako spoznaje o studentima dobivaju zahvaljujući neformalnom promatranju u učionici. Takav odgovor dodatno potvrđuje važnost uvida u studentske potrebe za usvajanjem vokabulara prije izrade programa odgovarajuće poduke usmjerene na vokabular. Jasno, ako takva poduka odgovara potrebama studenata, onda će svjesnost o SUV kao njezin sastavni dio svakako imati uspjeha.

Sve te strategije ne mogu uvijek podjednako pomoći svim studentima da usvoje, zapamte i upotrebljavaju nove riječi. Možda su iznimka prokušane strategije kao što su: pronalaženje sinonima i antonima, zamjena novih riječi i njihovih značenja, sastavljanje rečenica s pomoću slikovnih prikaza. Prema Nation (2001), znanje o nekoj riječi podrazumijeva njezin oblik, gramatiku i uporabu. Nastavnici prema tome trebaju provoditi različite aktivnosti da bi približili studentima svaki aspekt neke riječi tako da je prepoznaju i točno upotrijebe. Nastavnici su jasno tvrdili u odgovorima



na drugo i treće otvoreno pitanje kako igre s ciljem usvajanja vokabulara imaju učinak na studente u nastavi, stoga njihova primjena nastavnicima može omogućiti kreativno uvođenje različitih SUV, a studentima uporabu SUV s entuzijazmom. Mnogi nastavnici nisu odgovorili na otvorena pitanja. Njihova nevoljkost da na njih odgovore i ograničeno preferiranje uporabe SUV u poučavanju vokabulara naglašava potrebu za daljnjim istraživanjima na temu svjesnosti nastavnika o SUV. Kao što Sheorey (2006) zapaža, uvjerenja nastavnika i njihov odabir strategija utječu na njihova stajališta o poučavanju vokabulara i strategijama za njihovo usvajanje.

Iako je ovo istraživanje dalo određeni uvid u to kako nastavnici engleskog jezika u Indiji primjenjuju SUV u nastavi, ima i neka ograničenja. Primjerice, studenti nisu potkrijepili odgovore nastavnika. Nije također proveden nijedan individualni intervju s nastavnicima da bi se verificirali odgovori dobiveni na temelju upitnika. Važno je napomenuti da ovo istraživanje ne može predstavljati sve indijske nastavnike engleskog jezika jer u Indiji postoje velike razlike u njihovoj nastavnoj praksi. Njime se ne istražuje studentska uporaba SUV da bi se pokazale sličnosti i razlike s onom njihovih nastavnika. Osim toga, nije proveden intervju s nastavnicima koji su sudjelovali u istraživanju. O njemu se mogu donositi opći zaključci samo ako se ponovi u raznim dijelovima Indije kao i u drugim kontekstima.

## **Zaključak**

Ovo istraživanje, provedeno među nastavnicima engleskog jezika u umjetničkim, prirodoslovnim i tehničkim visokoškolskim ustanovama u Tamilnadu u Indiji, jasno pokazuje da nastavnici primjenjuju određeni broj SUV u učionici. Općenito govoreći, poučavaju uporabu strategije čitanja materijala iz raznih izvora za usvajanje novih riječi. Da bi naučili nove riječi, još se koriste, prije svega, strategijom pogađanja značenja i grupnih aktivnosti i upotrebom riječi u rečenici da bi zapamtili nove riječi. Čini se da najmanje preferiraju kartice i metodu ključne riječi. Moguće je da nemaju dovoljno vremena i resursa da bi sami pripremili kartice. Moguće je također da mnogi od njih ne poznaju metodu ključne riječi. Značajan je nalaz ovog istraživanja kako je nastavnicima potrebno više od deset godina da bi ovladali raznim SUV da bi ih primjenjivali kada poučavaju vokabular. Ta činjenica upućuje na potrebu za ranom reakcijom da bi nastavnici lakše shvatili važnost SUV i rabili ih u uspješnom poučavanju vokabulara. Na kraju, ovo istraživanje ukazuje na to da se slična istraživanja moraju provesti na širem uzorku nastavnika kako bi postali svjesni SUV jer ih očekuje dug put do učinkovitog poučavanja vokabulara.