

The Effectiveness of Explicit-Implicit Vocabulary Learning Using Subtitled-Video on Vocabulary Mastery of Students of MTs. Darul A'mal

Muhammad Iqbal Arramany, Cucu Sutarsyah, Ari Nurweni
FKIP Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No.1
E-mail: iqbal.aramany@gmail.com; Telp: 0811334443

Abstract: *The aim of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of explicit and implicit vocabulary learning using video with L1 or L2 subtitle to students' vocabulary mastery of 30 target words. The design is quasi-experimental with 2x2 factorial designs. Thirty (30) students in each classroom were assigned to one of these four conditions; explicit-L1 subtitle, explicit-L2 subtitle; implicit-L1 subtitle, and implicit-L2 subtitle. Two-way factorial ANOVA reveals that there is a statistically significant interaction between explicit-implicit learning and types of subtitled video on the students' immediate post-test results ($p = 0.004 < \alpha = 0.05$). Explicit learning was proved to be superior to implicit learning, and L1 subtitle is superior to L2 subtitle in four learning conditions. This result suggests that L1 (Indonesian) subtitled-authentic-video has proved to be a valuable resource to learn new vocabularies in the classroom, especially when presented using explicit instructions.*

Keywords: *vocabulary learning, explicit, implicit, video, subtitle*

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengamati efektifitas pembelajaran kosakata dengan pendekatan eksplisit-implisit menggunakan video yang diberikan *subtitle* L1 (Bahasa Indonesia) atau L2 (Bahasa Inggris) terhadap penguasaan 30 kosakata target. Desain penelitian ini adalah quasi-experimental dengan 2x2 desain faktorial. Tiga puluh (30) siswa di setiap kelas dimasukan kedalam salah satu dari empat perlakuan berikut; eksplisit-L1, eksplisit-L2, implisit-L1, dan implisit-L2. ANOVA dua jalur menunjukan adanya interaksi yang signifikan antara pembelajaran eksplisit-implisit dengan jenis *subtitle* yang digunakan dalam video terhadap hasil *immediate post-test* ($p = 0.004 < \alpha = 0.05$). Pembelajaran kosakata dengan pendekatan eksplisit terbukti lebih unggul dibandingkan dengan pembelajaran implisit; dan video dengan *subtitle* berbahasa Indonesia (L1) terbukti lebih unggul dibanding video dengan *subtitle* berbahasa Inggris (L2). Hasil ini menunjukan bahwa video yang diberikan *subtitle* berbahasa Indonesia (L1) dapat menjadi sarana pembelajaran kosakata yang baik terutama ketika dibarengi dengan penggunaan pendekatan eksplisit.

Kata kunci: pembelajaran kosakata, eksplisit, implicit, video, *subtitle*

INTRODUCTION

In his book *Linguistics in Language Teaching*, Wilkins, as cited in Folse (2011) stated that without grammar very little could be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing could be conveyed. Khoii (2013) stated that there are two approaches in relation to the processing of new vocabulary; implicit and explicit vocabulary learning. In implicit vocabulary learning, new vocabulary is acquired without the language learners being aware of it, especially when reading or during spoken interaction. In explicit vocabulary learning, the learner notices novel vocabulary, selectively attends to it, and uses a variety of strategies to try to infer its meaning from the context (Khoii, 2013). Some previous research has different conclusion whether explicit or implicit is best to promote vocabulary learning. Laufer (2005) specifically stated that intentional vocabulary learning (Focus on Forms) is more superior to incidental, meaning-focused word learning (Focus on Form).

The vast majority of incidental vocabulary research has been carried out in the area of reading (e.g. Hulstijn, 1992; Pitts et al., 1989; Eckerth and Tavakoli, 2012). Concerning those issues, some researchers have tried to compare the effect of combining reading and listening with reading or listening alone to students' vocabulary learning. Brown's et al., (2008) results showed that the participants learned the most words in the reading while listening mode, followed by reading only and then listening only.

Webb and Chang (2012) also found evidence supporting the value of audio-assisted reading similar to the results of Brown et al., (2008); the participants who received audio-assisted repeated reading gained greater vocabulary knowledge than those who were involved in unassisted repeated reading.

Apart from reading, listening and reading while listening, another well-known L2 vocabulary instruction method involves the use of pictures. Up to present several studies on memory have pointed out to the importance of pictures in enhancing memory performance e.g., Nelson, 1976 and Paivio, 1976. These two studies demonstrate that items presented in the form of pictures are recalled with more ease than those items presented in verbal form. Mayer, as cited in Washang (2014), stated that people learn more deeply from words and pictures than from words alone.

The emergence of video technology that's capable of combining the use of the picture and sounds allow students to listen and also take advantage of the pictorial information; this situation is what usually called bimodal-input situation. We can even put a text in the video to enrich the input for the students and make the situation become multimodal-input situation; audiovisual + textual input. The text in the video can be in the same language of the video (L2 subtitle) or in the learner native language (L1 subtitle). Previous research on the usage of subtitle suggests that subtitle was beneficial to students' language development (Vanderplank, 1988). In

a later study, Vanderplank (1990) suggests that the use of subtitles is not a distraction; the double modal input appears to enhance comprehension better than simple script or sound. Furthermore, Danan (2004) implies that subtitles can be a tool for teachers and an aid for students to visualize what they hear, especially if the input is not too far beyond their linguistic ability. Subtitling can also increase language comprehension and leads to additional cognitive benefits, such as greater depth of processing.

Based on theoretical explanation above, there is a gap on the theoretical basis that needs to be fulfilled. In this study, the researcher is trying to combine the use of listening activity and reading activity with the additional visual context using videos in learning new vocabularies explicit and implicit manner. The audiovisual material in this research will be given two different subtitle; English subtitle (L2) and Indonesian subtitle (L1). The present of direct vocabulary teaching in explicit vocabulary learning is one of several differential aspects of explicit-implicit learning in this research. In this manner, this current study is different from those previous studies. Accordingly, the aims of this research are: first, to know how many of the target words students in each group can retain after 2 weeks in delayed post-test; second, to know the interaction between explicit-implicit vocabulary learning using subtitled-video and types of subtitle (L1 and L2) to students' vocabulary mastery; third, to know the difference in students' vocabulary mastery between those who are treated with explicit and implicit

vocabulary learning using subtitled-video; and fourth, to know the difference in students' vocabulary mastery between those who are treated with L1 and L2 subtitled-video in explicit learning.

METHODS

The design of this research is quasi-experimental with 2x2 factorial designs. One hundred and twenty (120) female students of Islamic Junior High School of Darul A'mal participated in this research by watching three videos within three meetings with approximately three minutes long with either L1 or L2 subtitle. Thirty (30) students in each classroom were assigned to one of this four condition; explicit vocabulary learning with L1 subtitle, explicit vocabulary learning with L2 subtitle; implicit vocabulary learning with L1 subtitle, and implicit vocabulary learning with L2 subtitle. The students' vocabulary mastery of the target words was measured by two tests; immediate post-test, and delayed post-test. These two tests were basically an English-to-Indonesian translation test. The results of each test were analyzed and described separately. The statistical data were analyzed using two-way ANOVA. The data of students' retention were analyzed using simple descriptive statistics. A pre-test was carried out to determine the target words for this research. The result of this pre-test was analyzed and 30 target words were chosen out of 216 words in the pretest. The lists of target words obtained from pre-test for each meeting are in the table below:

Table 1 List of Target Words

No	Meeting 1	Meeting 2	Meeting 3
1	absolutely	beloved	consider
2	button	factory	hole
3	delighted	find	mind
4	elevator	heir	repair
5	enormous	joking	replace
6	happen	realize	roof
7	hold	reflect	same
8	piece	revelation	terrible
9	speed	semiannual	unexpected
10	taste	strange	weird

After conducting the pretest, the teacher started the treatment using subtitled-video based on which group they belong to. The video was played 5 times in the entire treatment. In explicit learning groups, the teacher informed the students that they were going to watch a movie and learn some vocabulary from the movie. The teacher explicitly asked the students to really pay attention and try to memorize the target words. To strengthen the effect of intentional learning, the teacher also informed that their knowledge of the target words was going to be tested at the end of the treatment; however, the students were not informed about the upcoming delayed post-test in the next 2 weeks. Before watching the video, the teacher taught the students the orthographic form and the proper pronunciation of the target words; then the teacher asked the students to repeat the pronunciation several times. Teacher, then, played the video with subtitle (L1 or L2, depended on which class was the teacher dealing with) and then explicitly asked the students to try to recognize the target words in the video. The teacher also suggested the students take notes if they wanted to do so, as they watched the video. After 5 minutes watching the video, the teacher and the students

discussed the target words in terms of the context of appearance in the videos (sentences on the video), the written form, the meaning, and the pronunciation. After that, the students watched the video again for the second time and repeat these processes up to the fifth time of watching the video. After that, students had an immediate-posttest to measure their vocabulary mastery of those target words; as they had been informed beforehand.

In implicit group, the students were simply asked to watch the videos without any direct vocabulary teaching before and afterward. They also did not being directed to pay attention to particular target words, since they did not know there were any target words to learn from the video. Their only job in this treatment was to comprehend the general storyline or the message of the video. The teacher helped the students to comprehend the content and context of the videos by giving contextual clues of the situation, but only in a very general and limited manner; teacher did not specifically address target words or the meaning of a particular target word. Then, the students were asked to write a summary of the video in Bahasa

Indonesia and submit it to the teacher. The videos were played 5 times as well, with 5 minutes pause break for each turn. Students in implicit vocabulary learning were not informed about the upcoming immediate and delayed post-test. At the end of video-watching activity in each meeting, students in implicit learning also had an unannounced immediate-posttest to measure their vocabulary learning of those target words.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results of the immediate post-test showed that the mean score for the Explicit-L1 Subtitle condition is 23.50 with the lowest score is 21, and the highest score is 26. In the Explicit-L2 subtitle condition, the mean score is 21.00 with the lowest score is 19.00 and the highest score is 23.00. However, in the implicit group, with L1 subtitle, the mean score of students' immediate post-test is only 5.00 with the lowest score

3.00 and the highest score is 7.00; where the L2 subtitle group mean score is only 4.00 with the lowest score is 2.00 and the highest score is 6.00.

The results of the delayed post-test showed that the mean score for the Explicit-L1 Subtitle condition is 14.17 with the lowest score is 11, and the highest score is 17. In the Explicit-L2 subtitle condition, the mean score is 12.17.00 with the lowest score is 9.00 and the highest score is 15.00. However, in the implicit group, with L1 subtitle, the mean score of students' immediate post-test is only 1.13 with the lowest score 0.00 and the highest score is 3.00; where the L2 subtitle group mean score is only 0.83 with the lowest score is 0.00 and the highest score is 2.00. In order to understand the differences in mean score in immediate post-test and delayed post-test, means score from the two tests are compared in the table below:

Table 2 Ratio of Decrease and Retention Rate in Delayed Post-Test

Types of Vocabulary Learning	Type of Subtitles	Mean 1 (Immediate)	Mean 2 (Delayed)	Differences	Ratio of Decrease	Retention Rates
Explicit	L1 (Indonesian)	23.50	14.17	9.33	39.72 %	60.28 %
	L2 (English)	21.00	12.17	8.83	42.06 %	57.93 %
	Total	22.25	13.17	9.08	40.82 %	59.18 %
Implicit	L1 (Indonesian)	5.00	1.13	3.87	77.33 %	22.60 %
	L2 (English)	4.00	.83	3.17	79.17 %	20.83 %
	Total	4.50	.98	3.51	78.15 %	21.85 %
Total	L1 (Indonesian)	14.25	7.65	6.60	46.32 %	53.68 %
	L2 (English)	12.50	6.50	6.00	48.00 %	52.00 %
	Total	13.37	7.07	6.30	47.10 %	52.91 %

In Table 2 above, it can be seen that students' scores in every

learning condition are decreasing. However, students in explicit learning

tend to have the lowest ratio of decrease (40.82% decreases); especially those in L1 subtitle condition (39.72% decreases). It means that students in explicit learning tend to retain the target words more than those in implicit learning; with students with L1 subtitle having the highest retention rate (60.28%). In this manner, the research question number 1 has been answered by Table 4.19 above. The target words that students can retain after 2 weeks delay in Explicit-L1 subtitle group is 14.17 (60.28%); in Explicit L2 subtitle group is 12.17 (57.93%); in the Implicit-L1 subtitle is 1.13 (22.60%) and in the Implicit-L2 subtitle is 0.83 (20.83%).

There might be several reasons for this finding. First of all, this study was conducted in MTs Darul A'mal, an Islamic Boarding School based junior high school, where the dominant educational system is more or less memorization oriented. This fact may also support the superiority of explicit learning over implicit learning in this research even after 2 weeks delay. Some researchers also suggest that the memorization technique is not entirely useless. Laufer (2010) stated that "when facing a memorization task for an upcoming test, learners may try their best and employ a variety of mnemonic techniques to reinforce word in memory".

The next reason is that students in the explicit group received explicit teaching of target words which eventually help them to perform better in delayed post-test. When giving explicit teaching of the target words, the teacher along with the students discusses the target

words in terms of its meaning (L1 translation or equivalent), the context of appearance in the videos (sentences on the video), its written form, and how those words pronounced. These activities, I suspect, also support the successfulness of students in explicit learning in their retention test. This result is supported by Hummel (2010) who stated that exposure to translation equivalents and active translation may be considered as allowing deeper and more elaborated processing and therefore may facilitate retention. This statement supports the findings in delayed post-test that suggest the best condition that leads to the best word retention is L1 subtitle in explicit learning, and then followed by L2 subtitled in explicit learning, then L1 subtitle in implicit learning and the last in L2 subtitle in implicit learning.

The second purpose of this research was to find out if there is an interaction between explicit-implicit vocabulary learning using subtitled-video and types of the subtitle (L1 and L2) to students' vocabulary mastery of the target words. To find out the interaction, students' immediate post-test score from 3 meetings (the final scores) are analyzed using two-way (or factorial) ANOVA. The output from factorial ANOVA was interpreted to see the interaction. The main effect was also interpreted accordingly by considering the significant value of the interaction to answer research question number 3 and 4.

The descriptive statistics of two-way ANOVA showed that the mean score of the explicit group, which is 22.25, is higher than the mean score of the implicit group

which is 4.50. The mean score of students in L1 condition, both in the explicit and implicit group, is also higher than those in L2 condition. But do these differences statistically significant? Before answering that question, we need to first take a look

at the interaction effect because it may change the interpretation of the separate main effects of each independent variable (Leech et. al, 2005). Table 6 below is the output of between-subjects two-way ANOVA.

Table 3 Tests of Between-Subjects two-way ANOVA

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	9560.625 ^a	3	3186.875	1610.795	.000
Intercept	21466.875	1	21466.875	10850.359	.000
VocabLearning	9451.875	1	9451.875	4777.418	.000
TypeOfSubs	91.875	1	91.875	46.438	.000
VocabLearning * TypeOfSubs	16.875	1	16.875	8.529	.004
Error	229.500	116	1.978		
Total	31257.000	120			
Corrected Total	9790.125	119			

Table 3 shows that there is a significant interaction between types of Vocabulary Learning and Types of Subtitled Video on students' translation test final score because the significance value is much lower than the alpha ($p = 0.004 < 0.05$). This interaction means that the effect of *explicit-implicit vocabulary learning on students' score of Translation Test* depends on *which type of subtitle* is being considered (L1 or L2); and also can mean that the effect of type of subtitle (L1 and L2) depends on the type of vocabulary learning (Explicit and Implicit). This means that null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. To answer the third research question, we can see that in Table 6 at the main effect of *Types of Vocabulary Learning*; it is significant with $p = 0.000 < 0.05$. However, because the interaction is also significant, simple effect analysis was conducted to break down an interaction term in factorial ANOVA (Field, 2009).

One-way ANOVA on the effect of the effect of explicit and

implicit vocabulary learning revealed that the overall F (1610.795) is significant ($p < 0.001$), which indicates that there are significant differences somewhere. By this, we can actually confirm that the *third research question* has been answered; that there is a significant difference in students' vocabulary mastery between those who are treated with explicit and implicit vocabulary learning using subtitled-video. It also means that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. A contrast test, in Table 4, revealed that there was a significant difference ($p = .000$) in *translation test scores* between students in *explicit and implicit vocabulary learning* when the video was in *L1 Subtitle*. It means that students in Explicit vocabulary learning scored significantly much better (18.5 points) on the Translation test than those in Implicit Vocabulary learning ($p = .000$). The same can be said *when the subtitle of the video is in L2 (English)*, students in *Explicit vocabulary learning* do also much better (17 points) on the Translation

Test than those in *Implicit vocabulary learning* ($p = .000$). In this manner, it can be concluded that explicit vocabulary learning is better than

implicit vocabulary learning in facilitating students to learn the target words both in L1 and L2 subtitled video.

Table 4 Contrast Tests of the First Simple Effect Analysis

		Contrast	Value of Contrast	Std. Error	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
FinalScore	Assume equal variances	1	18.5000	.36318	50.940	116	.000
		2	17.0000	.36318	46.809	116	.000
	Does not assume equal variances	1	18.5000	.36119	51.219	55.991	.000
		2	17.0000	.36515	46.556	58.000	.000

This result actually goes along with Barcroft (2009) and Sonbul and Schmitt (2010) that confirm explicit teaching lexical word items claimed to be superior to word learning that occurs as a by-product of second language (L2) use during listening or reading. Sonbul (2010), moreover, said that direct instruction is especially effective in facilitating the deepest level of knowledge, i.e. form recall.

The result of this research also provides confirmatory evidence to Schmitt's (2008) claim that when the specific goal is to learn vocabulary, usually with an explicit focus, intentional vocabulary learning almost always leads to greater and faster gains, with a better chance of retention and of reaching productive levels of mastery. Paribakht and Wesche in 1997, as cited in Barcroft (2009), also come to the same conclusion by stating that vocabulary learning is typically greater in more

intentionally oriented vocabulary-learning contexts. The results support the importance of explicit instruction.

The same procedure was done in answering the fourth research question. One-way ANOVA on the effect of types of subtitle (L1 and L2) showed that the overall F (1610.795) is significant ($p < .001$), which also indicates that there are significant differences somewhere. By this, we can actually confirm that the third research questions have been answered; that there is a statistically significant difference in students' vocabulary mastery between those who are treated with L1 and L2 subtitle in learning using subtitled-video. It also means that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. However, to identify which one that is actually better (L1 or L2 subtitle) in facilitating students to master the target words, contrast test is carried out; the output is as follows:

Table 5 Contrast Tests for the Second Simple Effect Analysis

		Contrast	Value of Contrast	Std. Error	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
FinalScore	Assume equal variances	1	2.5000	.36318	6.884	116	.000
		2	1.0000	.36318	2.753	116	.007
	Does not assume equal variances	1	2.5000	.37981	6.582	57.670	.000
		2	1.0000	.34575	2.892	57.238	.005

Table 5 revealed that there was a significant difference ($p = 0.000$) in *vocabulary mastery of the target words (translation test score)* between students with *L1 and L2 subtitle* in Explicit Learning. It means that, in Explicit Learning, students with L1 subtitle do significantly better (2.5 points) on the Translation test than those with L2 subtitle ($p = .000$). Moreover, in Implicit Learning (as it can be seen in Contrast 2), there is also a significant difference with $p = .007$; it implies that L1 subtitle is also better (1 point) than L2 subtitle for students in Implicit Learning. Thus, it can be concluded that L1 subtitle is better than L2 subtitle in facilitating students to learn the target words both in Explicit and Implicit Learning. This result is similar to Markham and Peter (2003) and Bianchi and Ciabattoni (2008) who also find out the superiority of L1 over L2 subtitle in listening comprehension test.

Markham and Peter (2003) in their studies compared Spanish captions, English subtitles and no captions with a Spanish-speaking soundtrack on the comprehension of intermediate-level students of Spanish. The statistically significant results revealed that the English captions group (L1 subtitle; note that the participants in Markham's research are English native speaker, so L1 here means English subtitle) performed at a considerably higher level than the Spanish captions group (L2 subtitle) which in turn performed at a substantially higher level than the no captions group on the listening test.

Bianchi and Ciabattoni (2008) also demonstrated the effectiveness of L1 over L2 subtitle on content comprehension task. The findings

showed that in the content comprehension tasks students with L1 subtitles (Italian subtitle in this case) obtained the best results, regardless of their proficiency level, and of the type of film. This result, they add, is expected given that subtitling (L1 subtitle) is processed automatically and content comprehension can logically be facilitated by text in the mother tongue.

So far, we can conclude that L1 subtitle, is found to be useful for those who have not yet established good reading or listening skills in regards to the target language, regardless their proficiency level (Bianchi and Ciabattoni, 2008). In terms of L2 subtitles, it is found that they are helpful for advanced learners with high-level proficiency, have good listening skills, and an ability to read rapidly (Danan 2004, Markham and Peter, 2003 and Vanderplank, 2010). More importantly, L2 subtitle can help learners link the aural form of the word with the written form. In short, it can be said that L1 subtitle is more helpful for low proficient learners while learners with high proficiency level can get more advantage from L2 subtitles.

CONCLUSION

The students in explicit learning tend to learn and retain the target words more than those in implicit learning; with students in L1 subtitled condition having the highest retention rate (60.28%). The students in explicit vocabulary learning scored significantly much better (18.5 points in L1 subtitle, 17 points in L2 subtitle) in immediate translation test than those in Implicit Vocabulary learning. In this manner, it can be

concluded that explicit vocabulary learning is better than implicit vocabulary learning in facilitating students to learn the meaning of the target words both in L1 and L2 subtitled video. In explicit and implicit learning, students with L1 subtitle do significantly better (2.5 points in Explicit, 1 point in Implicit) on the Translation test than those with L2 subtitle ($p = 0.000 < \alpha = 0.05$). Thus, it can be concluded that L1 subtitle is better than L2 subtitle in facilitating students to learn the meaning of the target words both in Explicit and Implicit Learning.

REFERENCES

- Barcroft, J. 2009. Effects of Synonym Generation on Incidental and Intentional L2 Vocabulary Learning During Reading. *Tesol Quarterly*. 43, 79-103
- Bianchi, F. and T. Ciabattini. 2008. Captions and Subtitles in EFL Learning: An Investigative Study in a Comprehensive Computer Environment. In A. Baldry, M. Pavesi and C. Taylor Torsello (eds.), *From Didactas to Ecolingua*. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste. 69-80.
- Brown, R., Waring, R., and Donkaewbua, S. 2008. Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition from Reading, Reading-While-Listening, and Listening to Stories. *Reading in a Foreign Language*. 20, 136-163.
- Danan, M. 2004. Captioning and Subtitling: Undervalued Language Learning Strategies. *Meta: Translators' Journal*. 49(1), 67-77.
- Eckerth, J., and Tavakoli, P. 2012. The Effects of Word Exposure Frequency and Elaboration of Word Processing on Incidental L2 Vocabulary Acquisition through Reading. *Language Teaching Research*. 16(2) 227-252.
- Field, A. 2009. *Discovering Statistics using SPSS: Third Edition*. SAGE Publications: London.
- Folse, K. 2011. Applying L2 Lexical Research Findings in ESL Teaching. *Tesol Quarterly*. 45(2), 392-369.
- Hulstijn, J. H. 1992. Retention of Inferred and Given Word Meanings: Experiments in Incidental Vocabulary Learning. In: Arnaud, P., Bejoint, H. (Eds.). *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*. (pp. 113-125). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hummel, K. M. 2010. Translation and short-term L2 vocabulary retention: Hindrance or help? *Language Teaching Research*. 14(1) 61-74
- Khoii, R and Sharififar, S. 2013. Memorization versus Semantic Mapping in L2 Vocabulary Acquisition. *ELT Journal*. 67(2), 199-209.
- Laufer, B. 2005. Focus on Form in Second Language Vocabulary Learning. *EUROSLA Yearbook*. 5, 223-50.
- Laufer, B. 2010. Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning in R.

- Chacón-Beltrán, C. Abello-Contesse, and M. M. Torreblanca-López (eds.). *Insights into Non-native Vocabulary Teaching and Learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Markham, P., and Peter, L. 2003. The Influence of English Language and Spanish Language Captions on Foreign Language Listening/Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*. 31(3), 331-341
- Nelson, D. L., Reed, V. S., and Walling, J. R. 1976. Pictorial Superiority Effect. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Human Learning and Memory*. 2(5), 523-528.
- Paivio, A., and Csapo, K. 1973. Picture Superiority in Free Recall: Imagery or Dual Coding? *Cognitive Psychology*, 5, 176-206.
- Pitts, M., White, H., Krashen, S., 1989. Acquiring Second Language Vocabulary through Reading: a Replication of the Clockwork Orange Study Using Second Language Acquirers. *Reading a Foreign Language*. 5, 271-275.
- Schmitt, N. 2008. Instructed Second Language Vocabulary Learning. *Language Teaching Research*. 12(3), 329-363.
- Sonbul, S and Schmitt, N. 2010. Direct Teaching of Vocabulary after Reading: is it Worth the Effort? *ELT Journal*. Volume 64(3), 253-260.
- Vanderplank, R. 1988. The Value of Teletext Sub-titles in Language Learning. *ELT Journal*. 42(4), 272-281.
- Vanderplank, R. 1990. Paying Attention to the Words: Practical and Theoretical Problems in Watching Television Programmes with Uni-lingual (CEEFAQ) sub-titles. *System*. 18(2), 221-234.
- Vanderplank, R. 2010. *Déjà vu? A Decade of Research on Language Laboratories, Television and Video in Language Learning*. *Language Teaching*. 43, 1-37 doi:10.1017/S0261444809990267
- Washang, S. 2014. Boosting Vocabulary Retention through Adding a Video Component to the Vocabulary Building Classes in English for Specific Purpose Situations. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 136, 89-93.
- Webb, S., and Chang, C.-S. 2012. Vocabulary Learning Through Assisted and Unassisted Repeated Reading. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*. 68, 276-290.