Book of Abstracts

Lexical Studies Research Network Conference
February 2015

Kazumi Aizawa (Tokyo Denki University)
Mind the gaps: Modals and quasi-modals

The purpose of this study is (1) to analyze the way of introducing modals and quasi-modals in grammar-based reference books published in Japan, and (2) to investigate how accurately university students can use them in different contexts. The modals (must, can, will) and their counterpart quasi-modals (have to, be able to, be going to) were focused upon in this study. The results showed that reference books tend to overgeneralize the different usage of modals and quasi-modals. This finding may help to explain why learners cannot distinguish them precisely. There appears to be a trade-off between retention of (quasi-)modals and understanding them accurately and precisely.

Christopher J Hall (York St John University)
The lemma as lexical hub: Parasitic connections in the multilingual lexicon

In this presentation I review evidence for the Parasitic Model of lexical development, a conceptual framework for understanding the cognitive processes and representations involved in the earliest stages of word learning in a second or subsequent language (cf. Hall, 2002; Sills & Hall, 2005; Hall *et al*. 2009; Hall & Reyes, 2009; Ecke, 2014). In the model, the grammatical frame (or "lemma") level of lexical knowledge plays a key role, as the default 'hub' around which learning (and loss) typically pivot. I present evidence from the analysis of written L2 production, patterns of inter-generational loss, and grammaticality judgement tests in L2 and L3 learning. I consider also the role of cognate forms, typological proximity, and proficiency level. I conclude with some remarks about teaching implications and ontological challenges.

Ecke, P. (2014). Parasitic vocabulary acquisition, cross-linguistic influence, and lexical retrieval in multilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, first view. doi:10.1017/S1366728913000722.

Hall, C. J. (2002). The automatic cognate form assumption: Evidence for the Parasitic Model of vocabulary development. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 40, 69-87.

Hall, C. J., Newbrand, D., Ecke, P., Sperr. U., Marchand, V. & Hayes, L. (2009). Learners' implicit assumptions about syntactic frames in new L3 words: The role of cognates, typological proximity and L2 status. *Language Learning*, 59, 1, 153-202.

Hall, C. J. & Reyes, A. (2009). Cross-linguistic influence in L2 verb frames: the effects of word familiarity and language proficiency. In Benati, A. & Roehr, K. (Ed.), *Issues in second language proficiency* (pp. 24-44). London: Continuum.

Sills, R. & Hall, C. J. (2005). Cambios léxicos en el véneto: una perspectiva psicolingüística. *Lingüística Mexicana*, II, 2, 277-293.

Tadamitsu Kamimoto (Kumamoto Gakuen University)
Title: EFL vocabulary development: What would happen to words once learned?

There has been growing research on L2 vocabulary acquisition but there is scant research on lexical attrition. Researchers have accumulated knowledge on acquisition, but how much do we know about forgetting? Vocabulary development consists of processes of gain and loss. There is a two-month summer holiday between two terms in Japanese university academic calendar. During the period, students of English have no contact with English. What is going to happen to words they have learned when students come back on campus? To learn about forgetting should help students learn better. Research questions are: (1) How much vocabulary do students retain after 2-month no contact with English? (2) What is relationship between vocabulary gain and loss in an EFL situation? Does it support the regression hypothesis – the process of language loss is a mirror-image of the process of language acquisition (cf. de Bot and Weltens, 1991)?

During the first term of 15 weeks, students were instructed to learn 1,000 words of level 5 of a total of 12 levels with a CALL programme (it may seem extremely demanding, but as shown below, an average of 60% of them were known already in April). The CALL task is made up of five drills such as multiple-choice questions and a matching exercise. A vocabulary test of 60 items was constructed and given three times to measure vocabulary development as a pre-test in April, as an immediate post-test in July, and as a delayed post-test in September. Some students failed to take all the three tests. Their data were removed from the following analyses. In the end, the data of 25 students were analysed.

Results showed that means of participants' vocabulary increased from 59.18% in April to 74.80% in July and decreased to 72.28% in September. A difference between July and September was not statistically significant. A within-subject analysis showed a correlation of -.698 between gain and loss, implying that students had a marked inclination to lose what they gained. A within-item analysis showed a correlation of -.351 between gain and loss, implying that items that have been gained are not necessarily forgotten. Further analyses of 8 higher- and 8 lower-proficient students showed that the higher group successfully retained what it had gained in July, but the lower group lost some of gain.

Overall high retention after 2-month summer was rather surprising but it should be noted that there was variation among students. A partial written production exercise in the CALL programme may be a large part of the reason, helping students process words deeply and perform better on a written receptive test. The study also presented evidence supporting the regression hypothesis for the subjects, but not for the items, indicating that there is a clear need for much further work on EFL lexical attrition. Vocabulary acquisition and attrition research should benefit each other.

Kimberly Klassen (Cardiff University PGR)
Do proper nouns affect L2 reading comprehension?

This presentation centers on a 'puzzle' that I hope can be unraveled during the discussion. The puzzle concerns difficulties that L2 readers sometimes have with proper names. I will briefly recap two completed experiments, along with three mini investigations done this year. I will then present several possible ways to move forward for discussion.

Paul Meara (Cardiff University)
Lexical Choices: an Exploration of Aizawa's Problem
This paper describes some of my recent work on minimal vocabulary tests. Specifically it describes a test of Lexical Originality – the unique lexical choices that people make when they use words.
The paper decribes some of the thinking that went into developing a simple test for Originality and some of the issues that this test format raises.
The wider context of this paper is a set of questions posed by Aizawa:
Where do good ideas for research come from?
How do you avoid doing things that are obvious?
How do you develop innovative ideas and methods for research?

The paper is designed to stimulate a discussion around these wider questions.

John P. Racine (Cardiff University PGR)
Procedural Priming in Second Language Word Association

To determine the effects of priming on word association (WA) responses two studies were performed. These were designed to examine the influence of cue order and prior tasks on WA responses in English as both a first and second language. The purpose of these studies was to determine whether, and to what extent, participants continue to respond in accordance with their individual response profiles despite priming manipulations. Broadly, the results of both studies showed that tasks undertaken by respondents immediately

preceding WA trials, and the order in which cues are presented, do have significant effects on response patterns. Results are discussed in terms of second language proficiency and response profile strength. Methodological issues are examined and future research is proposed.

Peter Thwaites (Cardiff University, PGR)
What's behind "collocational" responses in Word Association Tests?

Researchers using a word association test (WAT) paradigm have long used a "syntagmatic", or position-based, category to group WAT responses, and support for this category is both intuitively logical and supported by various sources of data. However, recent studies suggest that there is little correlation between this type of WAT response and corpus-based collocation data. So what type of word knowledge are respondents drawing on when they produce this type of response? In this seminar, I will review evidence both for and against the hypothesis (cf. Mollin, 2009) that respondents use *only* semantic knowledge when producing WAT responses, before suggesting some possible ways forward.