

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section covers the theoretical framework which will be applied to the analysis of this research. The second section explores previous studies relevant to this research.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Incidental Vocabulary Learning

The use of the term “incidental learning” has been used in experimental psychology and psychological literature for a long time (Hulstijn and Laufer 10). It is a form of learning in which the learner makes no deliberate decision to commit information to memory or in cases where learners are unaware of an upcoming retention test. As Marsick and Watkins described:

“It occurs as a natural offshoot of engaging in professional work when individuals learn to reflect on their experience, design personal learning experiments and engage in self-directed learning projects. ... Incidental learning is defined as a spontaneous action or transaction, the intention of which is task accomplishment, but which serendipitously increases particular knowledge, skill, or understanding. Incidental learning, then, includes such things as learning from mistakes, learning by doing, learning through networking, learning from a series of interpersonal experiments” (187).

According to Fodor, incidental learning is "a natural and individual response to the learning experience as a whole; learning not intended as part of a course"; learning that "included skills, attitudes, and information which the participants did not intend to acquire from the course, but nevertheless did learn" (4)

In second and foreign language studies, “incidental learning” has become known as the by-product of another activity, particularly, reading (Krashen 49). It is now widely agreed that most vocabulary, both in L1 and L2, is acquired incidentally, and that people learn most of their L1 and L2 vocabulary through incidental learning (Hulstijn 139). Coady (227) defines Incidental Vocabulary Learning as the learning of new words as a by-product of a meaning-focused communicative activity such as reading, listening, and interaction which occurs through multiple exposures to words in different contexts. In other words, Incidental Vocabulary Learning is learning without intentionally focusing on learning particular vocabulary. It occurs when the learner’s primary objective is to do something else, for example reading comprehension (Schmidt 1994). In the field of second and foreign language pedagogy, Incidental Vocabulary Learning is primarily the learning of vocabulary as the by-product of reading (Krashen 449).

In conclusion, Incidental Vocabulary Learning is a form in which learners are not aware that their vocabulary banks will increase through after completing a large number of reading exercises. According to Incidental Vocabulary Learning, vocabulary will stay in the long-term memory, even when words are not intentionally memorized. Words that are learned unintentionally tend to stay longer in the learners’ memories. Therefore, the reading materials that the researcher should design to be used in this study on Incidental Vocabulary Learning should focus on boosting a long-term memory in a manner in which words are not intentionally memorized; exposing the learners to various reading passages which contain a repetition of the targeted words. This form of practice takes learner-centered approach, rather than a teacher-centered one.

2.1.2 Depth of Processing

One form of Incidental Vocabulary Learning is depth of processing, suggested by Craik and Lockhart, who claim that the more deeply learners process information, the better it is retained (678). In other words, the chance that some piece of unfamiliar information will be stored in a long-term memory is not determined by the length of time that it is held in a short-term memory, but rather by the depth with which the information is processed. Depth implies a greater degree of

a semantic or cognitive analysis. It is believed that learners can analyze stimuli or information at different levels, and thus referring to it as the level of processing (LOP). Craik and Lockhart's theory observes that the meaning of a new lexical item takes place at a deeper level than processing a phonological form.

Craik and Tulving expanded the theory of Craik and Lockhart (288). Craik and Tulving suggested that “what is critical to retention is not only the presence or absence of semantic encoding, but the richness with which the material is encoded” (269). That means the more the vocabulary is exposed, the more it is likely to be remembered. In addition, a general agreement is that processing new lexical information more elaborately, for instance, by paying careful attention to a word's pronunciation, grammar, meaning, and relations to other words, will lead to higher retention. It is less successful to process new lexical information in a less elaborate environment, such as paying attention to only one or two words of the above dimensions (Hulstijn and Laufer 18).

To summarize, depth of processing theory maintains that how deep information is kept in a memory depends on certain types of processing. In depth of processing, the researcher is convinced that one of the most effective ways for the students to decode or memorize unknown L2 vocabulary is to create a lesson plan where the targeted words will be repeated and rounded by context clues instead of paying attention to just a few words at a time.

Following on from the Depth of Processing theory, the researcher believes that the Involvement Load Hypothesis model is suitable for this study because it does not require students to focus on vocabulary alone, but also on other surrounding elements.

2.1.3 Involvement Load Hypothesis

Another form of Incidental Vocabulary Learning is Involvement Load Hypothesis developed by Hulstijn and Laufer who were influenced by the Craik and Lockhart's notions of depth of processing and Craik and Tulving's elaboration (271). Hulstijn and Laufer propose a motivational-cognitive construct of involvement consisting of three elements: “*need*”, “*search*”, and “*evaluation*” which they believe can explain and predict learners' success and the degree of task effectiveness

in regard to the retention of unfamiliar words. Involvement is conducted by various tasks designed to differ in degrees of *need*, *search*, and *evaluation* (20-24).

Need is the motivational component of the Involvement Load Hypothesis. It is interpreted as a drive to comply with the task requirements which can be either externally imposed or self-imposed. The two degrees that are suggested for *need* are moderate and strong. *Need* is moderate when it is imposed by an external agent, for example when a teacher asks students to use a word in a sentence which they have asked the students to produce. *Need* is strong when it is self-imposed by the students, for example when they decide to look up a word in an L1-L2 dictionary.

Search is one of the two cognitive dimensions of involvement. *Search* is an attempt to find the meaning of targeted words or to find the translation of an unknown L2 word by negotiating the meaning with peers, consulting an authority like a teacher and using a dictionary.

Evaluation is another cognitive component of involvement; concerning a selective decision in which a word's context is taken into account, by comparing a given word with other words to access whether the word fits its context or not. There are two suggested degrees of *evaluation*. *Evaluation* is moderate on two occasions. First is when students have to recognize differences between words in a fill-in task where different words are provided, and secondly, to decide a meaning of a homonym in a particular text context. *Evaluation* is strong when students are required to decide how additional words will combine with a new word in an original sentence.

The combination of factors, with their degree of prominence in a task, constitutes task-induced involvement load. An involvement index is used to describe the absence of a factor as 0, a moderate presence of factor as 1, and a strong presence of factor as 2 (Hulstijn and Laufer 2001). In the following example of involvement index, students are asked to write an original sentence with some words translated or explained by the teacher. In this case, the task induces a moderate *need* (1 or +N) as it is imposed by the teacher, *no search* (0 or -S) as the meaning of the words are given, and strong *evaluation* (2 or ++E) because the new words are evaluated against suitable collocation in the learner-generated context. Therefore, the involvement index of the task is 3 (+N, -S, ++E).

To simplify, the three components – *need*, *search*, and *evaluation* – can be induced in different degrees depending on real-life communication, or a teacher-designed learning task. In other words, retention of unfamiliar words is claimed to be conditional upon the amount of involvement in the task, whether it is set by the teacher or student's own will, whether the new word has to be searched and whether it has to be compared, or combined with other words

Hulstijn and Laufer conducted two parallel experiments of Involvement Load Hypothesis in two countries; The Netherlands and Israel. The subjects that took part in these experiments were three intact classes of advanced university learners of English in both countries. The participants were randomly assigned to one of the three learning conditions or the involvement load. In a gloss condition, participants read a text with L1 marginal glosses for ten targeted words and answered ten multiple-choice comprehension questions; this condition provided 1-involvement index (+N, -S, -E). In the fill-in condition, participants read the same text and answered the same questions but the targeted words were deleted from the text, leaving ten blanks that they had to fill in by choosing the words from a list that contained fifteen words with their L1 translation and L2 explanations. This condition provided 2-involvement index (+N, -S, +E). In the writing condition, participants wrote a composition using the targeted words for which grammatical category, L2 explanation, examples, and L1 translation were provided. This condition provided 3-involvement index (+N, -S, ++E). Participants were instructed to provide an L1 translation or an L2 explanation for the targeted words. They had to complete a comprehension test, but were not instructed to learn targeted words. Post-tests were used to measure vocabulary retention. The results indicated that the writing condition yielded significantly higher retention than the fill-in and gloss conditions in both experiments, and that the fill-in condition showed significantly higher retention than the gloss conditions in one experiments but not in the other. In their study of the Involvement Load Hypothesis, it is concluded that higher involvement in a word induced by the task either naturally or artificially will result in better retention. However, Hulstijn and Laufer have undergone further studies and discussions on the subject. One of them is whether the quality of exposure to new vocabulary during

tasks can compensate for the limited amount of exposure, which is characteristic of learning a second language in a native language speaking environment (9).

Involvement Load Hypothesis consists of three elements: *need*, *search*, and *evaluation*. To apply the three elements in this study, it is acknowledged that students already have a strong need as they aim to learn vocabulary in order to score high on the TOEFL®. Therefore, their need has already existed as a strong learning motivation to achieve the learning goal. However, *search* is a constructed learning process where the researcher could arrange the teaching materials and the learning environment so that they could guess the meaning on their own, discuss with their peers, use a dictionary, and/or consult with the teacher. *Evaluation* can be arranged through extensive exercises that are designed to increase their vocabulary bank. Based on the Involvement Load Hypothesis, evaluation is strongest when students are asked to create new sentences from the targeted words. However, the type of questions that the students will be encountered in the TOEFL® test is a multiple-choice one. Therefore, the TOEFL-based evaluation should be combined with the evaluation type of the Involvement Load Hypothesis.

2.1.4 Text Exposure to Targeted L2 and Vocabulary Acquisition

Exposure to target L2 vocabulary results in better retention and multiple exposures are required to foster meaning and access to targeted words. The connection between the number of occurrences of new words and readers' vocabulary pickup rate is compelling in vocabulary learning. As mentioned previously, it is widely agreed that the more frequently a new word occurs in text and in learners' surrounding, the more likely it is to be acquired. Thus, repeated exposure as a technique is important if meaningful cognitive processing or attention is involved (Coady 231; Horst 208). Nagy et al. added that even a single exposure to an unknown word during reading contributes to a small but significant gain in vocabulary acquisition. Vocabulary knowledge can be expanded by incidental learning via reading activities (234).

The frequency of exposure is another point to consider for students' own different learning paces. Rott proposed that exposure of at least two times is sufficient to affect vocabulary growth, and that six exposures yield the greatest



retention to vocabulary learning (17). Similarly, Crothers and Suppes added that six to seven repetitions are sufficient (9). However, Saragi et al. argued that the minimum number of repetitions for new words to be learned is around ten (72). Beck and McKeown suggested that a minimum of twelve exposures is needed to develop fluent and precise word knowledge (152). However, Nation estimated five to sixteen exposures for better retention in a long term memory (21). Although the precise number of exposure is still debatable, it is estimated that six to twelve exposures in a variety of contexts are critical to vocabulary learning (Brown 268; Coady 236).

Along with text exposure in proper frequency, active learning activities should be accompanied to strengthen vocabulary knowledge. Students could use pre-reading activities like highlighting unknown vocabulary in the text. During-reading activities, they should find the meaning from a dictionary and negotiate meanings among classmates. They could use post-reading activities such as matching definitions, in-class discussions for interactive modifications through negotiated input, forming new phrases and sentences in writing exercises, and undergoing frequent reviews. These activities are encouraged to be included with students' reading assignments to increase the salience of target vocabulary which ensures more repetition of input and output to recycle previously met vocabulary and consolidate it in long-term memory (Zimmerman qtd. in Hunt and Beglar 24). Strengthening academic vocabulary is achievable when the target vocabulary is repeated and appears consistently in the learning material. As it is widely accepted that there is a relationship between text exposures and vocabulary acquisition, it is also found that cooperative learning activities support exposure which encourages students to read more, thus leading to a higher level of vocabulary knowledge and reading proficiency (Steven and Slavin 325).

To summarize, the more that students are exposed to unknown vocabulary incidentally the more likely it is for students to retain the information and the longer the words will be memorized. Therefore, the lesson plans designed for this study should contain an intensive reading with repetition of targeted words as well as reading exercises that focus on exposing the targeted words. Students will review



and use the words in a variety of in-and-outside classroom exercises in order to strengthen vocabulary knowledge; resulting in better retention, overall.

2.1.5 Cooperative Learning

Prior to World War II, cooperative learning theory was established after social theorists had found that group work was more effective in quantity, quality, and overall productivity than individual work (Gilles and Ashman 11). In contemporary context, cooperative learning is a pedagogical approach that is claimed to promote students' interaction by working in small group in order to enhance their learning and reaching their shared goal. The definition of cooperative learning has been defined by many educators. According to Kessler cooperative learning is a "within-class grouping of students usually of different levels of second language proficiency, who learn together on specific tasks or projects" (22). Brown said that "cooperative learning involves students working together in pairs or groups, and they share information" (277). According to Slavin, cooperative learning is "an instructional program in which students works in small group to help one another master academic content" (217). Cooperative learning can be constructed in many different models. Madinabeitia confirms that all models of cooperative learning share the same idea in that students work together in order to learn and are responsible for their teammates' learning as well as their own (80).

In brief, cooperative learning is a learning environment without students competing against each other. The ideal cooperative learning classroom should consist of friendly peers and teachers which make students feel comfortable to learn, work with others, and consult with their teachers. A cooperative learning environment is beneficial in this study to support the learning activities which are arranged for *search* and *evaluation* so that the students are encouraged to work in pairs and/or small groups. In the cooperative learning environment, the students could share ideas and learn from each other; a learning condition which will boost their Incidental Vocabulary Learning and thus increase their vocabulary and reading ability effectively.

2.1.6 Cognitive Learning Theory and Reading

Cognition or cognitive processes is the process of the mind regarding how humans perceive, remember, learn and think about information. It is the processing of information and applying knowledge which can be conscious or unconscious (National Research Council Committee on Learning Research and Education 14). Cognitivists explore mental processes such as thinking, memory, knowing, and problem-solving to understand how people learn. They view knowledge as schema or symbolic mental constructions. Learning, therefore, is a change in a learner's schema. Cognitive theories explain brain-based learning using two key assumptions: the memory system is an active, organized processor of information and prior knowledge is important in learning (Schunk 39).

According to Eggen and Kauchak (152), cognitive learning theory emphasizes a change in the thinking process. Learning is a change in the brain structure which enables an individual to exhibit characteristics. This brain structure includes knowledge, belief, goal and expectation. Cognitive theory focuses on the function of the brain which facilitates critical thinking and rationality. Cognitive theories also believe that a learner needs to interact with outside stimuli; in this case it can be referred to reading. Reading is believed to require a number of brain activities in order to interact with and understand the text.

Cognitive psychologists have long been interested in how it is that a reader is able to create meaning from the printed page. Reading is a complex cognitive process of decoding symbols to construct meaning and comprehension. While reading, complex interaction between the text and the reader takes place and meaning is constructed by the reader's prior knowledge, experiences, and attitude. The reader integrate the words they have read into their existing framework of knowledge or schema. The reading process requires continuous practices, development, and refinement (Sawyer 112).

Cognitive theory, in other words, believes that the brain is the key factor that creates a relationship between what an individual already knows (background knowledge) and what is needed to be learned (new information). In reading, cognitive theory can be implied as a reader's attempt to make out new information by using their background knowledge. Reading is, thus, linked with cognitive

process. And since the process in reading involves ongoing practices, it can be concluded that the more students are exposed to reading materials, the more the process in reading is stimulated, and the more practice students can engage themselves in. In reading academic English, readers may encounter topics that they are not familiar with. In order to understand the text, cognitive process plays a role in helping the readers make assumptions and understand the text.

2.1.7 Reading for Academic Purpose

According to Saengsin (59) effective strategies in teaching academic reading consist of three phases. (1) Pre-reading instruction provokes students' interest and also to access students' background knowledge that can facilitate the reading task. Some commonly used pre-reading activities include skimming the text, exploring key vocabulary, and brainstorming. (2) During-reading, instruction will guide students through the text and checks their understanding of the text by having them answer a series of questions. Three types of questions that effectively check students' comprehension are as follows; questions of which answers can be found in the text, questions which can be answered by critical thinking and questions that require readers' background knowledge. (3) Post-reading instruction determines whether key ideas and vocabulary in the text are captured, and also extends further classroom discussion based on the information learnt. Some commonly used post-reading activities include completing a table, chart, or grid, and answering some comprehensive questions. The pre-, during-, and post- instructions can be adapted to different classrooms or used for different lessons (Grabe and Stoller 202).

In academic reading, especially for TOEFL[®], the passages cover various topics which the readers may have limited background knowledge on. Therefore, the pre-reading activities can prepare the students with some background information. The during-reading activities guide students through the text and also assist students when they encounter any unknown words. The post-reading activities, finally, can check the students' understanding of the texts as well as help them organized newly acquired information. By having the students engage in different types of activities and exercises, it is likely that students get more involved which will, in turn, promote more Incidental Vocabulary Learning

2.1.8 Attitudes in Language Learning and Reading

An attitude is a “readiness of the psychē to act or react in a certain way” (Jung 87). Attitude, in other words, is an individual’s positive or negative view of a person, place, thing, or event. On the other hand, the degree of like and dislike for something can be simultaneously posed. Both direct experience and observational learning from the environment can affect an individual’s attitude.

In language learning, the learner's attitude to the learning process is significantly important. Additionally, social and cultural attitude, such as community views toward English language learning, is critical in influencing the individual’s attitude toward learning the language. Social and cultural attitudes influence the needs and the behavior of the learner. A student whose social and cultural attitudes are positive toward the second language tends to create a positive learning situation which results in better language acquisition (Gardner and Lambert 269). Social and cultural attitudes also affect learners’ motivation which is one of the most important factors of success in learning the language. A person’s genuine interest and preference of the culture that the target language is part of, is of great influence in language learning (Yamashita 3).

Attitude also plays a key role in a student’s reading achievement. Reading attitude is a “system of feelings related to reading which causes the learner to approach or avoid a reading situation” (Alexander and Filler 9) or “a state of mind, accompanied by feelings and emotions, that makes reading more or less probable” (Smith pars.2). Reading attitude is defined by three components; cognitive (personal belief), effective (emotions and feelings), and connotative (behavioral intentions). It is believed that L2 learners’ attitudes towards reading will influence their performance or engagement in extensive reading (Yamashita 4).

To summarize, attitude is significantly important for language learning as it can drive language learners to success or failure. Learners who are successful usually have positive social and cultural attitudes. It is very important for the readers’ achievement to establish a positive attitude surrounding the reading process. This is an important guideline for the researcher in designing the reading part of the lesson plans and promotes students’ reading achievement.

words In task B, students answered to listening comprehension questions with marginal glosses relevant to the questions. After listening to the listening passage for the first time, the students were instructed to finish multiple choices which could only be correctly answered with understanding. The correct choice linked to the explanation of unknown words. The teacher explained the targeted words to help students understand the text clearer and make sure that the students could get the correct answer. The involvement index in Task B was 1 (+N, -S, -E). The task C was the same as task B where students were instructed to complete multiple choices. After finishing the listening comprehension questions, the students wrote a short article with the given words. In this task, *need* was moderate (+N) as the need to learn the targeted words was imposed by the task and *evaluation* was strong (++E) because students were asked to make a decision as to how additional words could be combined with the targeted words in a sentence or text. However, there was *no search* in the task (-S) as all the targeted words were glossed (6). This research shows that the task which incorporated targeted words and uses the highest involvement index, yields the best retention results. The task that requires reading comprehension and filling in targeted words produces better results than the task with reading comprehension with marginal explanations of targeted words. Lu and Jianbin's study proved the validity of the Involvement Load Hypothesis of Hulstijn and Laufer (19), and also provided evidence that incidental vocabulary learning can occur during listening activities. Even though Lu and Huang's findings are in accordance with the Involvement Load Hypothesis, the vocabulary skills of the participants prior to the experiment were not mentioned, which is a critical factor that could influence the results.

Xu examined the three tasks on vocabulary acquisition to test the Involvement Load Hypothesis. 152 freshmen who have been learning English as a second language participated in the study. The subjects were from three intact English classes at a university in China. Two of the classes were of high level English, and the other class was of a lower level. Three reading tasks were designed with different involvement loads consisting of, multiple-choice comprehension questions or Task M, blank-filling task or Task B, and a sentence-making task or

Task S. Then, an immediate posttest and delayed posttest were carried out; the two tests were composed of supply-spelling, matching, and definition-selecting. The subjects were asked to write a composition using the targeted words whose meaning had been explained in the reading passages. Task B and Task S which induced higher involvement load than Task M supported the Involvement Load Hypothesis; they were more effective for vocabulary retention. However, Task B yielded slightly higher retention than Task B. The findings contradicted to the Involvement Load Hypothesis which found remarkable differences between the tasks with moderate (Task B) and strong evaluation (Task S) (89). This might be due to the fact that the time controls in Xu's study were different from that in Hulstijn and Laufer's study.

Martinez-Fernandez conducted an experiment in Spanish with 45 native English-speaking college students. Three different tasks were designed with different degrees of the involvement load. The first task was the single gloss task (+N, -S, -E) which participants read the text with translation single glosses of the targeted words. The second task was the fill-in task (+N, -S, +E). In this task the targeted words were deleted from the text and the participants were asked to fill in the blanks as they read. They did not search for the meaning of the words because it was provided, but they compared different possible options that would fit best in each given context. In the multiple-gloss task (+N, +S, +E), the participants read the text with translation and multiple-choice glosses. Each multiple-choice gloss consisted of three options and a *don't-know* option. The participants searched for the meaning of the targeted words as it was not provided and compared different possible options that would fit best in the given context. The targeted words were neither bolded nor glossed (211-218). Surprisingly, Martinez-Fernandez's experiment did not find support for the Involvement Load Hypothesis. It yielded a contrary result; the task with a higher involvement load did not lead to higher vocabulary learning. Martinez-Fernandez claimed that this could be partially due to the type of word – concrete vs. abstract nouns (226). Simply put, Martinez-Fernandez shows that one factor affecting the outcome is the type of vocabulary – concrete and abstract – used in the research.

Wu investigated the effects of task-induced involvement load on listening tasks, vocabulary learning and on retention. The subjects were 167 non-English major freshman students in Taiwan. The participants were divided into three groups each completing different listening tasks. In Task 1, the participants had to record the main ideas of the six dialogues while they listen. They also had to write down words or phrases that they didn't understand and to guess the meaning of the words in order to complete the table. The involvement index in this Task was 2 (+ (1) need, - (0) search, + (1) evaluation). In Task 2, the participants were also instructed to record the main ideas of the six dialogues and complete the table. Later, they had to solve the situational problem by using the information from the listening text. Then, they were asked to write down opinions about the dialogue in Chinese. In this phase, they were allowed to use a dictionary. Task 2 induced moderate need (+), search (+), since a dictionary was used, and evaluation (+) since participants needed to infer and judge the meanings in the context. Thus, the involvement index in this Task was 3. In Task 3, which was similar to Task 2, the participants had to record the main ideas of the six dialogues, take notes, and then write their opinions about the dialogues, using a dictionary. Unlike Task 2, in this Task the participants had to write in English (137). Therefore, the involvement index was 4 (+ (1) need, + (1) search, ++ (2) evaluation). Surprisingly, the results show that the participants doing the Task with higher involvement index did not reveal significant outperformance. This could possibly be explained by the participants' different level of proficiency.

Obermeier compared the retention effects of two vocabulary learning tasks: a monolingual English task and a bilingual task, translating English to Japanese. Fifty-five third year English major students were participants and most of them aimed to get English teaching licenses. They scored 48 on the TOEFL iBT. The two tasks, the monolingual and bilingual tasks carried out in this study had a similar involvement load. The participants had to evaluate whether a word matched its definition. One difference between these two tasks, however, is that in one task the definition was a Japanese translation and in the other the definition was simplified English. Both tasks induced moderate *need* (+N) as the participants had to match the words to the definition to complete the exercise. *Search* was absent (-S) in both tasks.

Evaluation in the bilingual model was strong (++S), while the one using a monolingual model, was moderate (+S). The results were contrary to the Involvement Load Hypothesis in that there was no significant vocabulary gain from either task (3). This is possibly because some of the targeted words were easier to remember than the others due to distinctive features of the words themselves e.g. spelling, pronunciation. It is concluded that even though the participants in this study had fairly good proficiency, the results were not as predicted.

Overall, Martinez-Fernandez's research tested whether the Involvement Load Hypothesis was effective in teaching Spanish to native-English speakers, while Lu and Jianbin, Wu, and Xu conducted their studies with Chinese students who studied English as a second language. Obermeier's and Yaqubi's tested Japanese and Iranian ESL learners respectively. It is also notable that while four studies were conducted to measure the Involvement Load in reading tasks, the remaining two – studies by Lu and Jianbin, and Wu – were done in the ESL listening classrooms. Surprisingly, of all six studies mentioned above, only one study conducted by Lu and Jianbin yields the result in accordance with the Involvement Load Hypothesis. The possible factors that contribute to the variation of results are (1) the participants' level of language proficiency, (2) time control, (3) types of vocabulary used as targeted words, and (4) the participants' L1 that affect their translation in L2. The findings from these studies will shed light on some possible problems this study may encounter. The researcher will try to avoid them in designing and conducting the study.