

## Lexical Inferencing in a First and Second Language

## **SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**

**Series Editor: Professor David Singleton, *Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland***

This series brings together titles dealing with a variety of aspects of language acquisition and processing in situations where a language or languages other than the native language is involved. Second language is thus interpreted in its broadest possible sense. The volumes included in the series all offer in their different ways, on the one hand, exposition and discussion of empirical findings and, on the other, some degree of theoretical reflection. In this latter connection, no particular theoretical stance is privileged in the series; nor is any relevant perspective – sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, neurolinguistic, etc. – deemed out of place. The intended readership of the series includes final-year undergraduates working on second language acquisition projects, postgraduate students involved in second language acquisition research, and researchers and teachers in general whose interests include a second language acquisition component.

**Full details of all the books in this series and of all our other publications can be found on <http://www.multilingual-matters.com>, or by writing to Multilingual Matters, St Nicholas House, 31-34 High Street, Bristol BS1 2AW, UK.**

**SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**

*Series Editor: David Singleton, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland*

# **Lexical Inferencing in a First and Second Language**

## **Cross-linguistic Dimensions**

Marjorie Bingham Wesche and T. Sima Paribakht

**MULTILINGUAL MATTERS**

Bristol • Buffalo • Toronto

**Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data**

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Wesche, Marjorie Bingham

Lexical Inferencing in a First and Second Language: Cross-linguistic Dimensions/

Marjorie Bingham Wesche and T. Sima Paribakht.

Second Language Acquisition: 46

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Vocabulary--Study and teaching. 2. Second language acquisition. 3. Language and languages--Study and teaching. 4. Inference. I. Paribakht, Tahereh, – II. Title.

P53.9.W47 2009

418.0071--dc22 2009033461

**British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

A catalogue entry for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN-13: 978-1-84769-223-8 (hbk)

ISBN-13: 978-1-84769-222-1 (pbk)

**Multilingual Matters**

UK: St Nicholas House, 31-34 High Street, Bristol BS1 2AW, UK.

USA: UTP, 2250 Military Road, Tonawanda, NY 14150, USA.

Canada: UTP, 5201 Dufferin Street, North York, Ontario M3H 5T8, Canada.

Copyright © 2010 Marjorie Bingham Wesche, T. Sima Paribakht and the co-author of Chapters 1 and 2.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher.

The policy of Multilingual Matters/Channel View Publications is to use papers that are natural, renewable and recyclable products, made from wood grown in sustainable forests. In the manufacturing process of our books, and to further support our policy, preference is given to printers that have FSC and PEFC Chain of Custody certification. The FSC and/or PEFC logos will appear on those books where full certification has been granted to the printer concerned.

Typeset by Datapage International Ltd.

Printed and bound in Great Britain by Short Run Press Ltd.

# Contents

List of Figures and Tables. . . . .	vii
Acknowledgements . . . . .	ix
Preface . . . . .	xi
<b>Part 1: Lexical Inferencing: A Research Review . . . . .</b>	<b>1</b>
1 Research on the Lexical Inferencing Process and its Outcomes . . . . .	3
What is Lexical Inferencing and How Does it Relate to Reading Comprehension and Lexical Development? . . . . .	3
What Factors Influence Lexical Inferencing and its Outcomes? . . . . .	10
What Processes are Involved in Lexical Inferencing and How Have They Been Conceptualized and Explained? . . . . .	18
Conclusion . . . . .	29
2 Cross-linguistic Issues in Lexical Inferencing. . . . .	32
First Language Influences in Second Language Lexical Inferencing . . . . .	33
The Importance of Typological Distance Between Languages . . . . .	34
Conclusion . . . . .	42
<b>Part 2: Trilingual Study of Lexical Inferencing in a First and Second Language. . . . .</b>	<b>45</b>
3 Conceptualization and Methodology. . . . .	49
Conceptualization . . . . .	49
Research Design . . . . .	51
Research Questions . . . . .	52
Methodology. . . . .	54
Data Analyses . . . . .	63
4 First Language Influences on Knowledge Source Use in Second Language Lexical Inferencing . . . . .	67
Issues . . . . .	68
Methodology. . . . .	74
Findings . . . . .	76
Summary and Discussion . . . . .	107

5	Inferencing Success and Initial Development of Word Knowledge . . . . .	114
	Issues . . . . .	115
	Methodology . . . . .	116
	Findings . . . . .	119
	Summary and Discussion . . . . .	134
6	Trilingual Study Summary, Discussion and Implications . . . . .	139
	Shared Cross-linguistic Aspects of Knowledge Source Use in First and Second Language Lexical Inferencing . . . . .	140
	Overall First and Second Language Differences in Lexical Inferencing . . . . .	144
	Persian and French First Language Influences on Second Language Lexical Inferencing Processes and Outcomes . . . . .	146
	Differential Receptive Second Language Vocabulary Knowledge and Lexical Inferencing Outcomes for Persian and French Speakers . . . . .	154
	What Have We Learned? . . . . .	157
	A Final Word . . . . .	161
	Research Issues . . . . .	161
	Implications for Second Language Reading and Vocabulary Instruction . . . . .	163
	Appendices . . . . .	168
	Appendix A . . . . .	168
	Appendix B . . . . .	170
	Appendix C . . . . .	172
	Appendix D . . . . .	173
	Appendix E . . . . .	174
	Appendix F . . . . .	175
	Appendix G . . . . .	178
	References . . . . .	180
	Index . . . . .	190

# ***List of Figures and Tables***

## **Figures**

3.1	VKS elicitation scale: Self-report categories . . . . .	57
3.2	VKS scoring categories: Meaning of scores . . . . .	58
4.1	Trilingual study taxonomy of KS use in L1 and L2 lexical inferencing . . . . .	77
4.2	Examples of KSs from transcripts of English, French and Persian speakers reading L1 and L2 texts . . . . .	78
5.1	Examples of fully and partially successful inferences . . . . .	118
5.2	Success of Persian speakers in inferring meanings for lexicalized versus non-lexicalized L2 words . . . . .	121
5.3	Success of French speakers in inferring meanings for lexicalized versus non-lexicalized L2 words . . . . .	123
5.4	Pre-task to post-task gains in average VKS scores for all L2 target words by Persian and French speakers . . .	124
5.5	Pre-task to post-task changes in knowledge of L2 target words: Persian speakers. . . . .	126
5.6	Pre-task to post-task changes in knowledge of L2 target words: French speakers . . . . .	127
5.7	Example of a Persian L2 reader's difficulties with a non-lexicalized word . . . . .	133

## **Tables**

3.1	Average English reading proficiency and receptive English vocabulary scores for the Persian and French speakers . . . . .	55
3.2	Topics of English texts used for eliciting lexical inferencing . . . . .	60

4.1	Readers' use of main KS types: Percentages of overall use in each condition . . . . .	85
4.2	L2 readers' use of main KS types in English with lexicalized and non-lexicalized target words . . . . .	89
4.3	L1 and L2 readers' use of <i>word</i> KSs in lexical inferencing . . . . .	90
4.4	L1 and L2 readers' use of <i>sentence</i> KSs in lexical inferencing . . . . .	92
4.5	L1 and L2 readers' use of <i>discourse</i> KSs in lexical inferencing . . . . .	93
4.6	Synthesis of L1 and L2 readers' use of KS sub-types: Rankings within relative frequency bands . . . . .	95
4.7	Number of different KSs used per inference in each condition . . . . .	100
4.8	Relative frequency of initial and post-initial KS use in lexical inferencing . . . . .	103
4.9	Average number of KSs per inference in each condition by word class . . . . .	105
4.10	Frequency rankings of KS sub-type use by word class: English L1 and Persian L2 readers . . . . .	106
5.1	L1 and L2 lexical inferencing success of English, Persian and French speakers . . . . .	120
5.2	Success in inferring meanings for lexicalized versus non-lexicalized words by Persian and French speakers . . .	122
5.3	Pre-task to post-task gains in average VKS scores for lexicalized L2 words by Persian and French speakers . . .	125
5.4	Pre-task to post-task gains in average VKS scores for non-lexicalized L2 words by Persian and French speakers . . . . .	125
5.5	Persian speakers' L2 receptive vocabulary knowledge, lexical inferencing success and gains in knowledge of target word meanings . . . . .	129
5.6	French speakers' L2 receptive vocabulary knowledge, inferencing success and gains in knowledge of target word meanings . . . . .	130



# **Acknowledgements**

This book has come to fruition with the contributions and support of a number of institutions and individuals, for which we are grateful. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada funded the study reported here. The University of Ottawa's Faculty of Arts and our home department, the Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute (former Second Language Institute), provided financial and administrative support at different stages of our research and preparation of this publication. A Distinguished Scholar-in-Residence Grant awarded by the Journal, *Language Learning*, made possible an intensive work period with Kirsten Haastrup in Ottawa.

Our special appreciation goes to Kirsten Haastrup for her insightful and steady collaboration as co-author of the research review presented in Part 1 of the book, and for her pertinent comments on Part 2 at different stages of manuscript preparation.

We are grateful to our colleague, Marie-Claude Tréville, for her vital role in all aspects of the French sub-study, most critically in data collection and qualitative analysis.

We are particularly indebted to the Persian-, French- and English-speaking students from post-secondary institutions in Tehran and the Ottawa region, including the University of Ottawa, who participated in the study and shared their insights. Without these participants there would have been no study.

We thank all our research assistants, especially Shiva Sadeghi, who conducted interviews in Tehran and Ottawa, trained the French interviewers and worked on data analysis, and Nazmia Bengelil, Danielle Higgins, Hélène Lamarche, Golda Tulung, Julita Kajzer, Karen Jesney, Shahla Shoebyi, Ali Abasi and Roozbeh Paribakht for their valuable assistance with different aspects of the project.

We thank Dr Akbar Mirhassani, who coordinated the recruitment of Persian-speaking participants for the study and facilitated data collection in Iran, and Geraldine Arbach, who carried out similar functions in Quebec.

Doreen Bayliss and her assistant Frederic Nolet, and Philip Nagy earned our gratitude for their patient work on statistical analyses.

Our thanks to Birgit Harley, who provided thoughtful and timely comments on an early version of Part 1, and to Rolf Wesche and Margaret Des Brisay who gave useful editorial feedback on different chapters of Part 2.

We benefited from the expertise and efficiency of Manon Labelle in the word processing and formatting of the manuscript and of Béatrice Magyar, who prepared the final tables and figures.

We also appreciate the collegial support of James Cummins and Alister Cumming. Sonia Wesche was an ongoing source of encouragement.

Finally, we express our deep gratitude to our spouses, Rolf Wesche and Alireza Shoamanesh, for their ongoing support, humor and steadfast faith in us and our lengthy project.

## ***Preface***

This volume includes two closely related parts: the first, a comprehensive review of research on the topic of lexical inferencing, and the second, presentation of a trilingual study of first language (L1) influences in second language (L2) lexical inferencing and other cross-linguistic dimensions of L1 and L2 lexical inferencing by Persian, French and English speakers. The trilingual study evolved from our previous studies of L2 lexical acquisition starting in the early 1990s and carried out within the larger context of an increasing research focus by applied linguists and language educators on lexical issues. Our mutual professional context at the University of Ottawa's Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute (formerly the Second Language Institute) and Education Graduate Studies involved participation in academic English L2 instruction and test development alongside graduate teaching and research.

The research journey we undertook together began with issues of lexical development through L2 reading and reading-related vocabulary instruction, leading over time to a primary focus on lexical inferencing. It built on our respective life experiences as language learners in varied contexts and as applied linguists and language educators; thus, in addition to theoretical considerations, language learners' perspectives and considerations of appropriate contexts and methodologies for language teaching were important in the conceptualization and interpretation of our studies of L2 vocabulary learning through reading. Paribakht brought to this work a research background in L2 communication strategies and comprehension-based language learning and instruction, while Wesche's previous research had centered on the nature of the language addressed to learners, L2 learning through content-based instruction in school immersion and post-secondary programs, and language testing.

### **A shared research journey**

Our early joint studies evolved from issues facing the University in terms of its L2 instructional programs for Canadian and international student populations, and all of them have been at least partially grounded

in the French/English context of the bilingual national capital region of Ottawa, Canada. Important to all our work has been frequent contact with North American and international colleagues involved in related issues, in person and through correspondence, particularly in the early years when both applied linguists and language educators were beginning to deal more comprehensively with L2 lexical issues after a long period in which vocabulary acquisition research had tended to be separate from lexical research in language education. Annual AAAL conferences and triennial World Congresses of Applied Linguistics (AILA) provided stimulating venues for the critical exchange of ideas and information in this area.

In 1996, at the 11th AILA Congress in Jyväskylä, Finland, we reported on our work in two symposia that – together with other Congress activities – recognized the increasing importance of lexical issues in second language acquisition (SLA) after a long period of relative neglect and the need to share research perspectives on vocabulary research across the fields of SLA and language education. One symposium, co-organized by Kirsten Haastrup and Åke Viberg (Haastrup & Viberg, 1998), offered multiple perspectives on lexical acquisition, including that of lexical input processing (Wesche & Paribakht, 1998). This led to our ongoing exchange of ideas with Kirsten on topics of common interest that culminated in her collaboration with us on the comprehensive review of lexical inferencing research that comprises Part 1 of this book. We, ourselves, co-organized the other symposium, on ‘incidental’ vocabulary acquisition (i.e. gains in vocabulary knowledge that occur as a ‘by-product’ when L2 readers are focused on comprehending text meaning rather than on the goal of learning new words). Several of its participants underscored the importance of lexical inferencing in reading comprehension and its frequent role as an initial stage in lexical acquisition. Papers from this symposium were published, with others, in a special issue of *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* on the same topic (Paribakht & Wesche, 1999; Wesche & Paribakht, 1999a, 1999b). This Congress and the resulting interactions with other researchers provided a vital stimulus to our work on L2 lexical issues.

The following brief account of the consecutive studies that led to the trilingual study of Persian, French and English speakers presented in Part 2 of this volume serves to contextualize this research, and may be of particular interest to readers not familiar with our previous work. The individual studies are outlined below.

## **Study I: Vocabulary learning in a comprehension-based L2 course**

The first study (Paribakht & Wesche, 1993) responded to changes in a long-standing L2 graduation requirement at the University of Ottawa, an institution with a mandate to promote students' knowledge of both official languages of Canada. Undergraduate students enrolled in the faculties of Arts and Social Sciences were required to attain functional listening and reading proficiency in their second 'official' language, adequate for them to read textbooks or comprehend lectures in their respective fields. In reality, this L2 requirement in English or French represented a third (or later) language for many international students, whose study language was itself an L2. Due to difficulties in equitably enforcing this high-level, functional L2 proficiency requisite for graduation through formal testing, particularly with the University's increasing enrolment of international students, the requirement was modified to allow students the alternative of completing a series of four one-semester L2 courses that emphasized receptive skills (listening and reading comprehension). The Institute was mandated to develop and deliver these 'comprehension-based' courses in both English and French. The resulting teaching approach emphasized development of students' ability to comprehend challenging thematic content presented through authentic oral and written texts, with only a minimal focus on grammar and language production.

As faculty members involved in the design and delivery of these comprehension-based courses, we undertook evaluation of the reading-related learning outcomes of the advanced English as a second language (ESL) comprehension courses and an exploration of the role of comprehension in L2 development. In the 1993 study, we examined students' proficiency gains in receptive vocabulary and grammar over a period of one semester in the fourth-level ESL comprehension course, as compared with gains by students in a four-skills course at the same level, involving explicit grammatical instruction and both oral and written production. The vocabulary study evaluated and compared gains in target word knowledge by the two groups in terms of the word types (nouns or verbs versus discourse connectors) that were more readily acquired by each group, and explored whether different stages of word learning could be identified and measured. The comprehension-based group showed superior gains in vocabulary knowledge for all the word types studied, whereas the comparison group made greater gains in grammatical knowledge.

A major by-product of this research was an instrument that could capture certain initial stages in learning previously unknown L2 words. This instrument, the *Vocabulary Knowledge Scale* (VKS), has been useful in our subsequent studies of word learning through reading, including the present research (see Chapter 4; Paribakht & Wesche, 1996, 1997; Wesche & Paribakht, 1996), as well as to other researchers, including in an adapted form for oral language (e.g. Joe, 1995).

We developed the VKS for the purpose of documenting evidence of learners' knowledge of selected L2 words, to allow tracking and comparison of their knowledge gains in different contexts involving written texts. It uses both a self-report Elicitation Scale and confirmation tasks evaluated on a separate Scoring Scale to identify five kinds of target word knowledge that are widely considered to represent progressive stages in learning a given word. These range from recognition of the word form to the ability to use the word with both semantic and syntactic accuracy in a sentence. VKS scores offer a relatively efficient means of broadly characterizing a reader's knowledge of selected target words at a given point in time; they do not, however, provide detailed information on the process of learning individual words or a particular dimension of that process. Parallel and subsequent work for other purposes on the multiple dimensions of lexical development, 'depth' of vocabulary knowledge and the issues involved in determining developmental progressions has advanced understanding of what is needed for more precise theoretical characterizations of the word-learning process, but the development of measurement instruments for quantifying this remains a challenge (see, e.g. Haastrup & Henriksen, 1998; Henriksen, 1999, 2008).

## **Study II: Incidental versus instructed vocabulary learning**

The findings of the first study incited us to further explore the nature of incidental vocabulary acquisition through reading in post-secondary educational contexts, given the relevance of this issue not only for theory, but also as a practical concern for learners studying through their L2. A follow-up comparative study (Paribakht & Wesche, 1997) investigated the vocabulary gains of a similar population of ESL students at the University of Ottawa under two experimental conditions: 'incidental' versus 'instructed' vocabulary acquisition. In the 'Reading Only' (incidental) condition, students read thematically related core and supplementary texts that together provided repeated exposure to unfamiliar target words, followed by a series of text-based comprehension questions. In

the 'Reading Plus' (instructed) condition, reading of core texts was combined with systematic exposure to the target words through a series of text-based vocabulary exercises. An equal amount of time was spent on the two treatments.

Learners gained vocabulary knowledge under both conditions, but the gains were superior in the Reading Plus condition, both quantitatively (i.e. the number of words learned) and qualitatively (i.e. how well they were learned, as operationalized by the VKS). This research demonstrated the slow and unpredictable, even if measurable, nature of incidental L2 vocabulary learning through reading, and that it often leads only to a recognition level knowledge of target word forms. It also showed that instructional intervention involving manipulation and practice of words first encountered through reading enhances vocabulary-learning outcomes. In the course of this research, we developed a 'taxonomy of text-based vocabulary exercises/task types' for designing different word-learning exercises for selected words in texts (Paribakht & Wesche, 1996). These types roughly correspond to Gass' (1988) SLA stages (here applied to lexical acquisition), which are each, in turn, seen as requiring a higher level of cognitive activity, i.e. apperceived input (noticing), comprehended input, intake, integration and output.

The next, closely related, research phase involved two introspective studies with similar groups of intermediate ESL readers to further explore the processes underlying the differential vocabulary learning outcomes of the Reading Only and Reading Plus experimental conditions.

### **Study III: Reading Only**

In the Reading Only introspective study (Paribakht & Wesche, 1999), the goal was to better understand how learners deal with unfamiliar words when reading and the strategies they use. Participants were required to read brief authentic texts and carry out two comprehension tasks. The first task required them to answer a series of text-related comprehension questions, while the second required them to orally summarize the main points in the text. Following each of the comprehension tasks, readers were asked to indicate any unfamiliar words they had encountered while reading the texts and doing the tasks, and how they had dealt with each of them.

Participants reported ignoring about half of the words they did not know, while for the other words, they used three strategies to find word meanings. Lexical inferencing was their main strategy, used 80% of the time, while in the other cases they either attempted word retrieval