The Effect of Using De-contextualization and Semi-Contextualization Teaching Techniques on Turkish EFL Learners' Vocabulary Learning

Parisa Yeganehpour[1] and   Elham Zarfsaz[2]
yeganehpour.parisa@gmail.com
Agri Ibrahim Cecen University, Turkey

Abstract

Information from television, the internet, and digital media surrounds us. Multimedia links us to other languages and cultures. Multimedia provides several benefits for foreign language learning. The goal of this research was to see how semi-contextualized television programs and subtitled TV shows help vocabulary retention during language learning. This study was conducted in a Turkish state university. The instructor split the class into two experimental groups of 18-20 year olds. The study started with a pretest. Then the newly condensed words were taught utilizing decontextualized and semi-contextualized education strategies. The research lasted a semester with 14 sessions. An immediate post-test was given at the conclusion of semester after teaching all new words. Three sessions later, a post-test was given. Then the participants' scores were analyzed statistically. The research found no significant differences between semi-contextualized (TV show) and decontextualized vocabulary teaching methodologies (board monitoring). Focus should be given on the researchers' expertise as English teachers in predicting differences between two tactics (preference for semi-contextualized approach).

Keywords: Semi-contextualized Vocabulary Teaching, Decontextualized Vocabulary Teaching, Retention, Language Learning, Vocabulary Learning, Learning Strategy.

INTRODUCTION

Today, we know that human language is founded on vocabulary. The use of internet resources in educational contexts has increased, positively impacting vocabulary learning (Hanafiah, Aswad, Sahib, Yassi, & Mousavi, 2022). To be specific, vocabulary is a vital component of communication, which is made up of three fundamental language units: pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar (Susanto, 2017). Since two decades ago, language learning took a back seat to other priorities. However, the vocabulary area has been proven as one of the fertile research grounds for two prior decades. According to Wilkins (1972) and Alqahtani (2015) Nothing can be transmitted without vocabulary, despite the fact that very little can be articulated without grammar. To begin with, emphasis was placed on grammar and functional use. Language academics attacked previous grammar syllabuses and methodologies for their lack of attention for lexis. This is also true of more contemporary communication techniques. Theorists of communicative linguistics have been criticized for

---

[1] Assist.Dr, Agri Ibrahim Cecen University, Foreign Language Schools, Agri, Turkey. pyeganehpour@agri.edu.tr, Orcid ID: 0000-0003-2982-9085

[2] Assist.Dr, Tokat Gaziosmanpasa University, Education Faculty, Tokat, Country. elham.zarfsaz@gop.edu.tr, Orcid ID: 0000-0002-6172-6388

ignoring vocabulary and its education in favor of structures, functions, concepts, and communication tactics (O'Dell, 1997). By advancing the schools of psychology in second language teaching and learning, there was a shift away from the audio lingual approach, placed a premium on the structure and form of the language, toward a communicative approach, placed a premium on language use rather than language usage and whose overarching goal was to bring language learners closer to the target language by prioritizing fluency over accuracy. Another critical component of this technique is that all of the grammar and vocabulary that is learnt and used naturally emerges from the breadth of functional and situational settings included in the courses. Then there is an information processing hypothesis, which emerged from cognitive psychology and emphasizes the importance of memory in storing and remembering data. Cognitivists are a good illustration in this case, since Willams and Burden (1997) claim that the human brain is capable of thinking and even mental processes related to learning. Cognitivists and neurologists studied the information processing system and how the brain works when it comes to retaining, remembering, and storing knowledge in the mind (Chastain, 1998). For many years, the goal of instructors and students alike was to memorize and remember lexical elements.

To help EFL/ESL students build all-inclusive language competencies it seems as if having an acceptable vocabulary is required. Though the optimal method for acquiring and retaining new language has been a source of contention among researchers and linguists. Numerous investigations have been conducted and a plethora of ideas have been proposed so far. Nelson, Vadasy, and According to Sanders (2011), vocabulary is learned in two ways: via accidental encounters with words in dialogue and texts, and through formal training. Fast mapping, or the learning of word meanings through single accidental exposures to new words in conversations, is a significant method for early oral language development through incidental exposure. Celce Murcia (2001) agrees that, in addition to accidental encounters with vocabulary, formal instruction supported with contexts should be offered to ensure that the learning program is successful and forceful. Additionally, she states: "

New words should not be presented in isolation and should not be learned by simple rote memorization. It is important that new vocabulary items be presented in contexts rich enough to provide clues to meaning and that students be given multiple exposure to items they should learn. Exercises and activities include learning words in word association lists, focusing on highlighted words in texts, and playing vocabulary games (Hashemi, 2021). More recently, computer games and/or flipping the classroom that include the sounds of the words as well as illustrative pictures provide opportunity for practice with a variety of contexts, both written and spoken…. Incidental vocabulary learning is learning that occurs when the mind is focused elsewhere, such as understanding a text or using language for communicative purpose" (Celce-Murcia, 2001; Kneževic, Županec, & Radulovic, 2020).

Mizumoto and Takeuchi (2009) argues that since studying vocabulary seems to be tedious to students, instructors will have a difficult time teaching the language. Thus, instructors should use techniques and tactics in the classroom that have the potential to affect the learning process; In other words, teachers should be innovative in designing the most

effective approaches that meet students' expectations. Teachers should strive to use the most effective approach possible for teaching lexical elements to learners. Melisa and Ahmad Affendi (2021) compared different techniques, in which high and low proficient learners used to learn words. They conclude that language learners should be exposed to different techniques while they are young. Other techniques of teaching vocabularies include mnemonic approaches such as the key word approach, in which the new word is connected with a known or familiar term (Wei, 2014; Cioca, & Nerişanu, 2020).

The traditional technique of providing learners with a list of vocabulary and asking them to recall the meanings was frequently employed by language instructors and students (Sökmen, 2001; Webb, 2007). Nation (2002) and Korkmaz and Korkmaz, (2013) then distinguished between conventional or decontextualized ways of teaching and learning language and contextualized methods of teaching and learning vocabulary. Contextualized strategies teach students new terminology in the context in which it happens. Multimedia and visualization are two examples of contextualized teaching tools that might be beneficial. Mayer (2005, p.38) lists five cognitive processes that apply to multimedia learning and retention: Making acceptable word choices for verbal working memory processing, selecting acceptable images for visual working memory processing. Constructing a verbal model from selected phrases, a graphical model from selected photographs, and connecting verbal and graphical representations to prior knowledge

Television episodes, when accompanied by subtitles, is a useful way to teach vocabulary. Experiments demonstrate that teaching aids and strategies, such as decontextualized and semi-contextualized procedures, may help learners retain language effectively and forcibly.

The purpose of this research is to determine the effect of two teaching strategies on learners' vocabulary retention: decontextualized (board monitoring) and semi-contextualized (TV program).

Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study

By far, the most critical aspect of language learning is vocabulary acquisition. The common sense idea of how languages are learned, according to a non-language specialist, is that you replace the words in your first language with their counterparts in the second language. Words are seen as the building blocks for constructing second language knowledge (Alqahtani, 2015). In the past, vocabulary education and learning in second language programs got little attention, but there has recently been a renaissance of interest in the nature of vocabulary and its role in learning and teaching (Richards & Renandya, 2002). They said that there are three approaches to vocabulary teaching/learning in general: incidental or indirect learning, explicit or direct instruction, and independent strategy development (practice guessing the meaning of the words from context) (Richards & Renandya, 2002).

Researchers such as Martinez (2001), and Pinter (2006) claimed three common decontextualizing strategies are word lists, flashcards, and ordinary dictionary usage. Additionally, when using an indirect method, contextualizing strategies such as reading and

listening exercise, as well as speaking and writing practice, may be used (Oxford & Crookall, 1990). Concerning the first two ways of vocabulary teaching/learning, there is an unresolved issue. The issue is whether the direct approach (through the use of decontextualizing methods) is preferable than the indirect approach (through the use of contextualizing techniques).

Slatterly and Willis (2001) classified semi-contextualizing approaches for acquiring L2 vocabulary as: word grouping, word or idea association, visual imagery, auditory imagery, keyword, physical reaction, and physical feeling. While some context is derived via connections with other words or word-sounds (e.g., in word grouping, word or idea association, and to a degree in auditory imagery), some context is derived from extra-linguistic sources (e.g., in visual imagery, physical response, and physical sensation). Occasionally, context is presented by numerous methods, such as semantic mapping and keyword.

Indeed, an impressive number of research have addressed the problem, although the majority of these investigations have produced inconsistent findings. Indeed, there is no unanimity on the superiority of one strategy over another. Nation (2002) advocates for a systematic rather than an ad hoc approach to vocabulary instruction, arguing that such an approach is an integral aspect of any language course. He emphasizes the constraints of incidental learning and the fact that L2 learners often miss out on the benefits of incidental vocabulary development via reading due to their limited vocabulary knowledge. Additionally, Read (2004), Abu Algilasi (2010), Hanoi (2010) argue that, although learners undoubtedly gain word knowledge incidentally when they participate in different language learning activities, a more systematic and direct study of vocabulary is necessary. According to testing scholars, examining vocabulary is crucial because words are the fundamental building blocks of language; they are the units of meaning from which bigger structures such as sentences, paragraphs, and whole texts are generated (Schmitt, Nation, & Kremmel, 2020). However, modern technologies promote language acquisition and retention. Vocabulary instruction, as defined by the National Reading Panel, is instruction in the meaning and recognition of words (National Institute of Child Health and Development [NICHD], 2000). Numerous research on the value of vocabulary training and visual vocabulary instruction demonstrate that all of the studies apply to instructors in all settings, including general education and inclusive environments. Haniff, Safinas, Haimi, Syafiq, and Suzieanna (2020) found that using visuals such as drawings while teaching vocabulary in a foreign language was both more successful and easier to recall than using words alone. Students who used a computer software with pictures were more attentive and learnt more vocabulary than students who were taught only by the teacher (Çakmak, Namaziandost, & Kumar, 2021).

Gánem-Gutiérrez, and Gilmore (2021) claimed, after delving into the basic argument for a mixed approach to vocabulary acquisition in ESL, that while basic or core vocabulary should be taught, less frequent vocabulary will be acquired 'naturally' through context, but even in that case, appropriate techniques should be taught. They concluded that a combination of approaches should be used, as there are advantages and disadvantages to using context-based inferential strategies and some other explicit vocabulary learning techniques, such as

key-word techniques, pair translation, and the use of a monolingual or bilingual dictionary (Gánem-Gutiérrez, & Gilmore, 2021). According to Chen and Hsu (2019), even if the majority of vocabulary is acquired via context, this does not mean that it is "the quickest or most effective method of acquiring specialized vocabulary." Numerous studies have shown evidence that the use of explicit vocabulary teaching in combination with considerable reading is beneficial (Tahir, 2017). Indeed, language instructors use a number of ways when teaching vocabulary, and proficient students employ a broader range of vocabulary-learning procedures.

The goal of this research is to assess the impact of Decontextualized (board monitoring) and Semi-contextualized (TV program) teaching strategies on learners aged 18-20 vocabulary retention in order to identify the degree to which these techniques might benefit learners. Following this line of inquiry, the literature is lacking a comparison of the impact of teaching vocabulary to young learners using board monitoring and a television program in EFL lessons. Thus, the purpose of this research is to provide learners and instructors with information on the effects of decontextualized and semi-contextualized vocabulary teaching strategies on foreign language vocabulary learning and retention. Thus, the purpose of this research is to determine the influence of decontextualized and semi-contextualized vocabulary teaching strategies on vocabulary retention.

Additionally, this research is unique in that it examines the effect of decontextualized (board monitoring) and semi-contextualized (TV program) vocabulary retention on teenaged learners, which has been investigated in a few previous studies. Additionally, concentrating on the long-term impacts of both techniques (delayed) on learners' vocabulary retention bolsters its novelty. Additionally, combining these two methodologies, decontextualized and semi-contextualized, provides another layer of uniqueness to this research.

Significance of the Study

For many instructors and scholars, the teaching of foreign language vocabulary would be a topic of debate (Al Farra,2014; Aidinlou, & Moradinejad, 2016). Korouglu, and Akbas, (2011) and Lin, Chen, and Dwyer (2006) investigated the impact of teaching new vocabulary using images, and their findings indicated that both instructors and students had a favorable attitude toward the use of pictures.

Teachers use a variety of instructional strategies. Thus, both English instructors and students would most likely feel that using decontextualized and semi-contextualized strategies enhances the learning process and makes the learning environment more enjoyable and memorable. In general, visual education would be useful for the acquisition and retention of vocabulary. Students would be trained and assessed in order to demonstrate this concept. As a consequence, instructors and students are encouraged to use visual treatments to enhance teaching and learning. Because all parties profit from this method, and the most significant point is that visual resources aid in the retention and reinforcement of vocabulary, and thankfully, both instructors and students agree on this point of teaching, learning, and retention.

The primary issue in this experiment is that Turkish EFL students have difficulties with vocabulary retention. Many students run into difficulties when they are required to learn new vocabulary, particularly in a single course. Some students abandon their careers due to the perceived inability to memorize the words. On the other hand, some students attempt to remember a list of words. Due to the difficulty of recalling the words and the prevalence of acquiring vocabulary in a meaningless manner, without any phonetic suggestions, among Turkish students, Turkish learners often claim that they forget the words and are unable to retain them in their mind. As a result, these teaching approaches resulting in a short term memory storage, frequent mispronunciations, and a lack of vocabulary use awareness.

To this purpose, the researchers wanted to use decontextualized (board monitoring) and semi-contextualized (TV program) vocabulary teaching strategies to determine if these techniques may help students retain their vocabulary. It is intended that examining such a topic would inform language instructors and students about the efficiency of various vocabulary techniques acquisition and enable them to choose the ones that are most beneficial for vocabulary retention.

Language students need novel approaches to teaching and acquiring vocabulary, as well as strategies that promote memory recall. Thus, language students are regarded to be those who might benefit from the current study results. Similarly, language instructors may benefit from the strategies described in this research. They may adapt the ways to teach language on their own. Additionally, learners need a vast array of motivation throughout the process of vocabulary acquisition and retention. Concerning this matter, instructors might use these strategies to escalate students' motivation. Additionally, the approaches described in this research may be included into teacher education programs, particularly for inexperienced instructors. Additionally, syllabus and material creators might make use of various vocabulary teaching methods based on the outcomes of this study.

The following issues emerged while examining the influence of semi-contextualized and de-contextualized vocabulary teaching strategies on learners' vocabulary acquisition and retention:

- To what extent using De-contextualized (board monitoring) and Semi-contextualized (TV show) teaching technique affect learners' vocabulary learning and retention?

In the mind, the following hypotheses arise:

- Ho: Using *De-contextualized* and *Semi-contextualize* techniques have no effect on learners' vocabulary learning and retention.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This is a quantitative research, referred to as a quasi-experimental comparison group design. The independent variable in this study was the teaching of vocabulary using a variety of techniques at two levels of de-contextualization (board monitoring) and semi-contextualization (TV show), while the dependent variable was vocabulary retention in the short and long term. The research included two groups (both of which were female for the aim of neutralizing the sex effect), and these groups was separated as (i.e., de-contextualized (board monitoring) and semi-contextualized) (TV show) groups. For the first group, chosen vocabulary were taught de-contextually, i.e., by board monitoring. The English term was shown on one side of the board, while the L1 (Turkish equivalent) was presented on the other. The second group (semi-contextualized method) received visuals or videos with the same phrases. The picture was shown on television without the Turkish translation of the phrases. A pre-test was used to ensure that the groups were homogenous in terms of vocabulary knowledge before treatment, and post-tests (at two intervals (delayed & immediate) were utilized to determine the short- and long-term effectiveness of the treatment.

Participants

The study's participants were divided into two categories. Two homogeneous pre-intermediate-level classes (N= 30 in each class) were chosen for data collection at a public university in Turkey. Following that, each group used one of two vocabulary instruction strategies (i.e. de-contextualized (board monitoring) or semi-contextualized (TV show)). The first experimental group, assigned to receive treatment using the keyword approach and board monitoring, they would get treatment using the Turkish version of the keyword method and board monitoring as a de-contextualizing teaching strategy. The second experimental group, received training based on utilizing a television program to demonstrate a picture and repeat the vocabulary, followed by subscribing underneath the image and saying the word again through television.

The participants were between the ages of 18 and 20 (mean=19) and were pre-intermediate level. Both groups, de-contextualized and semi-contextualized consisted of female learners and followed the same trend. Each class's learners were required to pass a standard placement exam. As a result, the researchers approved of the groups' homogeneity. The participants attended two 120-minute lessons each week.

Data Collection Tools

These instruments were used to gather data: placement test, Pre-test, mediate post-test, and delayed post-test.

Placement test

Placement test, which was utilized to determine the participants' proper level for the research at the outset. After administering the vocabulary unfamiliarity and placement tests, sixty participants remained and exam included fifty terms with which none of the students were acquainted. These words were then grouped into five or six-word groups for instruction during each session. The justification for exposing participants to 5-6 new words every session is based on O'Neill (2014) argument that a limited number of new words should be introduced at a time; otherwise, the learners would get overwhelmed. The treatment would consist of 14 sessions, two days a week, lasting 120 minutes each.

Pre-Test, Post-Test, Delayed Post-Test

It should be noted that the Cronbach's alpha study indicated that the test was reliable (r=0.75) and that the exam's content validity was verified by three experienced professional EFL teachers. The pretest was a vocabulary test developed by instructors, and the it was subsequently randomized and utilized as the immediate post-test and delayed post-test. Exam questions consisted of fifteen items in which each item required students to match the meaning of the target vocabulary items. Tangible and abstract terms were picked that were mutually exclusive and suitable for the learners' level, and the instant post-test was designed to assess learners' short-term memory for the taught lexical items at the last session. Finally, a delayed post-test administered to students to assess their lexical retention and recall. Additionally, Cronbach's alpha analysis demonstrated that the test was reliable (r=0.86), ensuring the content validity of both immediate and delayed post-tests.

Procedure

Prior to treatment, the researchers chose two intact pre-intermediate-level classes (i.e., two female classes) with thirty learners in each class using the placement exam at the beginning of the term. The sixty female participants were divided into two groups for the duration of the study: de-contextualized (board monitoring) and semi-contextualized (TV program) vocabulary teaching strategies. The researchers next conducted a vocabulary exam acted as a pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test. The targeted words were chosen from the texts they were expected to study in the subsequent terms.

For the first set of learners, the researchers utilized the De-contextualized approach (i.e., board monitoring). To do this, the researchers posted the English terms on the board alongside their Turkish translations, and the learners repeated the English words and learned the Turkish meaning (the repetition was done chorally and individually). They were then instructed to construct a phrase utilizing the newly presented vocabulary. Following that, teachers instructed the participants to write the terms in their notebooks, with the English word on one side and the Turkish translation on the other.

The researchers chose the same 50 concrete and abstract terms taught in the first group for the learners in the second group, namely, semi-contextualized. However, using a different means, namely a television program. The researchers used a television program that included

the targeted phrase. The photographs were shown on television with bolded captions underneath the images. The video repeated the English pronunciation three times, as did the instructor and subjects chorally and individually. Finally, after the participants repeated the printed word, they were asked to spell the word and use it in a sentence.

This method lasted 14 sessions. The last twenty minutes of class were devoted to teaching the vocabulary in the two styles stated before. Each session, the subjects were taught 5-6 new terms. At the end of session fourteen, immediately after the instruction of the whole words, an instant post-test was administered to all learners. All learners received a delayed post-test three weeks later. The examinations consisted of 15 words chosen from taught vocabularies, and a score of 15 was awarded for accurately responding to all questions (1 points for each question). Following that, the data were examined for vocabulary retention.

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Due to the non-normal distribution of scores, the researchers used non-parametric statistics. We did so by doing the U Mann Whitney test, which is a subset of the T-test. The findings indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between these two techniques.

Table.1 *Case Processing Summary*

	Group	Cases					
		Valid		Missing		Total	
		N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Pretest	TV	30	100%	0	0%	30	100%
	Board	30	100%	0	0%	30	100%
Immediate	TV	30	100%	0	0%	30	100%
Posttest	Board	30	100%	0	0%	30	100%
Delayed	TV	30	100%	0	0%	30	100%
Posttest	Board	30	100%	0	0%	30	100%

All subjects were present at the pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest, as shown in the preceding table.

Table .2 *Descriptive Statistics for TV Group at Pretest*

	Groups			Statistic	Std. Error
Pretest	TV	Mean		3.90	1.30
		95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	.951	
			Upper	6.84	

Bound		
5% Trimmed Mean	3.44	
Median	2.50	
Variance	16.98	
Std. Deviation	4.12	
Minimum	1.00	
Maximum	15.00	
Range	14.00	

At pretest, Table.2 displays descriptive data for the TV group. As the table indicates, the mean and standard deviation for the TV group were M = 3.44 SD = 4.1.

Table .3 *Descriptive Statistics for Board Group at Pretest*

Groups				**Statistic**	**Std. Error**
Pretest	**Board**	**Mean**		1.9000	.458
		95% Confidence Interval for Mean	**Lower Bound**	.863	
			Upper Bound	2.93	
		5% Trimmed Mean		1.88	
		Median		2.00	
		Variance		2.100	
		Std. Deviation		1.44	
		Minimum		.00	
		Maximum		4.00	
		Range		4.00	

Table.3 summarizes descriptive data for the pretest board group. As indicated in the table, the mean and standard deviation for the board group were M = 1.88 and SD = 1.44, respectively.

Table .4 *Descriptive Statistics for TV Group at Immediate Posttest*

Groups				**Statistic**	**Std. Error**
Immediate Posttest	**TV**	**Mean**		13.20	.359
		95% Confidence Interval	**Lower Bound**	12.38	

				Statistic	
for Mean					
		Upper Bound		14.01	
		5% Trimmed Mean		13.22	
		Median		13.00	
		Variance		1.28	
		Std. Deviation		1.13	
		Minimum		11.00	
		Maximum		15.00	
		Range		4.00	

The descriptive data for the TV group at the immediate posttest are shown in Table.4. The mean score and standard deviation for the TV group were M = 13.00 SD = 1.13, as indicated in the table. The findings indicated that there was a difference in the mean scores of the groups.

Table. 5 *Descriptive Statistics for Board Group at Immediate Posttest*

Groups				**Statistic**	**Std. Error**
Immediate Posttest	**Board**	**Mean**		13.10	.566
		95% Confidence Interval for Mean	**Lower Bound**	11.81	
			Upper Bound	14.38	
		5% Trimmed Mean		13.16	
		Median		13.50	
		Variance		3.21	
		Std. Deviation		1.79	
		Minimum		10.00	
		Maximum		15.00	
		Range		5.00	

The following table summarizes the descriptive data for the board group at the immediate posttest. The mean score and standard deviation for the board group were M = 13.16 SD = 1.79, as indicated in the table. The findings indicated that there was a difference in the mean scores of the group from pre to post-test.

Table.6 *Descriptive Statistics for Board Group at Delayed Posttest*

	Groups				Statistic	Std.Error
Delayed Posttest	**Board**	**Mean**			14.70	.213
		95% Confidence Interval for Mean	**Lower Bound**		14.21	
			Upper Bound		15.18	
		5% Trimmed Mean			14.77	
		Median			15.00	
		Variance			.456	
		Std. Deviation			.674	
		Minimum			13.00	
		Maximum			15.00	
		Range			2.00	

The following table summarizes the descriptive data for the board group at the delayed posttest. The mean score and standard deviation for the board group were M = 14.77 SD = 0.67, as indicated in the table. The findings indicated that there was a difference in the mean scores of the group from pre to post-test.

Table .7 *Test of Normality*

	Groups	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
		Statistic	**df**	**Sig.**
Pretest	**TV**	.386	30	.000
	Board	.228	30	.152
Immediate posttest	**TV**	.370	30	.000
	Board	.192	30	.200[*]
Delayed posttest	**Board**	.472	30	.000

The distribution of scores for various groups was not normal (sig>0.05), as shown in Table.7. As a result, the researchers were forced to use non-parametric testing. In doing so, they used the U Mann Whitny-test, a kind of T-test.

Table .8 *Ranks for the Groups at Pre, Immediate and Delayed Posttests*

	Groups	N	Mean rank	Sum of Ranks
Pretest	TV	30	11.85	118.50
	Board	30	9.15	91.50
	Total	60		
Immediate posttest	TV	30	10.50	105.00
	Board	30	10.50	105.00
	Total	60		
Delayed posttest	TV	30	11.50	115.00
	Board	30	9.50	95.00
	Total	60		

Table.8 demonstrates that there is minimal variation in Mean Ranks between the TV and Board groups. However, in order to determine whether or not this difference is substantial, we must consult table 9.

Table .9 *Mann-Whitney U Test*

	Pretest	Immediate posttest	Delayed posttest
Mann-Whitney U	36.50	50.00	40.00
Wilcoxon W	91.50	105.00	95.00
Z	-1.059	.000	-1.45
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.290	1.00	.147
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.315[a]	1.00[a]	.481[a]

The difference between the TV and Board groups at pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest is not statistically significant (sig>0.05), as shown in Table.9. As a result, the study's null hypothesis is validated.

RH0: Decontextualized and semi contextualized techniques do not have any effect on vocabulary learning and retention.

Answer to the Research Question

Concerning the study topic, it should be concluded that decontextualized and semi-contextualized strategies have no influence on vocabulary acquisition and retention. As a consequence, it is possible to assert that the null hypothesis is not rejected. It may be stated that there was no significant difference in short run research for female groups between two methodologies.

DISCUSSION

The primary objective of this research was to demonstrate the efficiency of the TV program strategy for teaching and retaining vocabulary in EFL learners. The results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups: those taught using a decontextualized approach (board monitoring) and those taught using a semi-contextualized technique (TV show). Principally, both strategies have some beneficial impacts on learners' vocabulary acquisition and retention, however the effect of the semi-contextualized strategy is somewhat greater than the effect of the decontextualized methodology.

Numerous studies having been compared visual aids to different strategies for teaching new vocabulary items concluded that visuals are more effective and increase creativity compared with traditional methods. The purpose of this research was to determine the efficacy of two vocabulary teaching strategies. Semi-contextualize technique is a subcategory of contextualize method. According to Sökmen (2001), the ability to guess/infer from context is a beneficial method for vocabulary acquisition and should be addressed in a language education (Korkmaz & Korkmaz, 2013). According to Korkmaz and Korkmaz (2013), learners employ contextualization to create meaning that is context-dependent. Additionally, Gánem-Gutiérrez, and Gilmore (2021) found that learners taught language via context and mixed methods retained more meaning than those taught decontextually. The researcher anticipated that the results would be consistent with the current study in terms of the superiority of Semi-contextualized technique, a subcategory of Contextualized method, over Decontextualized technique; however, the findings did not meet her expectations. According to Webb's (2007) research, determined that context had little impact on language acquisition. Webb (2007) focused on repletion of new words and the findings of his study revealed that as the number of repeats increased, larger improvements in knowledge were discovered for at least one facet of knowledge. There may be significant learning benefits if learners encounter new words 10 times in context. However, it is possible that more than 10 repetitions are required to fully understand a word. These conclusions are consistent with the findings of this investigation.

It should be noted that the researchers are also English teachers with more than 20 year teaching experience, have perceived the superiority of visuals over other methods and the significant difference between contextualized and decontextualized teaching techniques, but not in this study. Numerous studies, such as Cioca and Nerișanu (2020); Haniff, Safinas, Haimi, Syafiq, Suzieanna, (2020); and Wei (2014), demonstrate that animated pictures are effective at fostering young learners' imagination and fantasy development because they feature colorful characters and engaging visual presentations accompanied by enjoyable sounds and music.

CONCLUSION

Vocabulary is a fundamental component of language instruction; it is thus important in the process of teaching and learning any language. Effective communication requires a working grasp of an appropriate language. Scholars and linguists have proposed a variety of

ways for educating learners about vocabularies. Among the different vocabulary teaching strategies, visual teaching techniques are among the most successful.

The goal of this research was to determine the influence on learners' vocabulary retention of utilizing decontextualized (board monitoring) and semi-contextualized (TV program) vocabulary teaching strategies.

The study's overall conclusion was that television shows and board monitoring are comparable. If learners are exposed to films with subtitles, this results in a high level of retention of vocabulary. Additionally, studying from the board benefits learners and promotes long-term memory of language.

It should be noted that, contrary to the researchers' expectations, the data did not reveal a substantial difference between two groups. The researchers reasoned that since the findings were obtained using a small sample of pre-intermediate students and in a short-term inquiry without gender comparison, the results may be different in the long-term period, gender-across, and with a considerable research sampling.

Regardless of the level of study, learners experience anxiety while remembering new vocabulary and recalling previously remembered topics. As a result, they are seldom driven to acquire new vocabulary items. Thus, there is a need to close this gap, and language learners may be deemed to gain the most from the study's results, as they need good methods of teaching and learning vocabularies that aid in recall. Teachers should push students to learn and retain new vocabulary items. As a consequence, instructors should be aware of the most effective methods of instruction for motivating students. Teachers might also benefit from incorporating these ideas into their own ways for teaching vocabulary. Additionally, this research might aid language instructors by incorporating the approaches into their own vocabulary teaching procedures. Activities that draw on learners' prior knowledge to concisely explain the meaning of new words in various contexts should be considered.

REFERENCES
Abu Algilasi, M. (2010). The effects of using animation on students' performance in English four skills among students of the fifth grade in Southern Hebron. Un published Master, Hebron University.

Aidinlou, N. A., & Moradinejad, A. (2016). Short-Term and Long-Term Retention of Vocabulary through Authentic Subtitled Videos. Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 7(5), 14-22, https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.7n.5p.14.

Al Farra, R. (2014). The Effectiveness of Using Smart Boards in Developing Tenth Graders' Vocabulary Achievement, Retention, and Attitudes towards English in Gaza. The Islamic University-Gaza, Gaza., http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12358/18773.

Alqahtani, M. (2015). The Importance of Vocabulary in Language Learning and How to be Taught. International Journal of Teaching and Education, 3(3),21-34, DOI: 10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002.

Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature, and Culture. Vol.7 No.2 2022

https://jurnal.unai.edu/index.php/acuity

Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.) (2001). Teaching English as a second or foreign language (3rd ed.).

Chastin, K. (1998). Developing second-language skills theory and practice. (3rd edit). USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Chen, H., & Hsu, H.L. (2019). The impact of a serious game on vocabulary and content learning, Computer Assisted Language Learning 33(1),1-22, DOI: 10.1080/09588221.2019.1593197.

Cioca, L., & R. A. Nerișanu. (2020) Enhancing Creativity: Using Visual Mnemonic Devices in the Teaching Process in Order to Develop Creativity in Students, Sustainability 12(5), https://doi.org/10.3390/su12051985.

Çakmak, F., Namaziandost, E., Kumar, T. (2021). CALL-Enhanced L2 Vocabulary Learning: Using Spaced Exposure through CALL to Enhance L2 Vocabulary Retention, Education Research I nternational, 2021, https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/5848525.

Gánem-Gutiérrez, G.A., & Gilmore, A. (2021). A mixed methods case study on the use and impact of web-based lexicographic tools on L2 writing, Computer Assisted Language Learning, DOI: 10.1080/09588221.2021.1987273.

Hanafiah, W., Aswad, M., Sahib, H., Yassi, A.H., & Mousavi, M.S. (2022). The Impact of CALL on Vocabulary Learning, Speaking Skill, and Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety: The Case Study of Indonesian EFL Learners, Education Research International, Special Issue,1-13, https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/5500077.

Haniff, M.T.M., Safinas, M.A.A.I., Haimi, M.A.A., Syafiq, Y.S.M., Suzieanna, M.S.D. (2020). The Application of Visual Vocabulary for ESL Students' Vocabulary Learning. Arab World Engl. J, 11 (2), 323–338. Doi: 10.24093/awej/vol11no2.23.

Hanoi, Đ. (2010). Using Movies and Videos to teach English Vocabulary to the 10th form students. MA. Vietnam National University.

Hashemi, A. (2021). The Effects of Using Games on Teaching Vocabulary in Reading Comprehension: A Case of Gifted Students. Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 9(2), 151-160. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17478/jegys.846480.

Kneževic,L., Županec, V., & Radulovic, B. (2020), Flipping the Classroom to Enhance Academic Vocabulary Learning in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) Course, SAGE Open, 10 (3), *https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020957052*.

Korkmaz, S., & Korkmaz, Ş. Ç. (2013). Contextualization or De-contextualization: Student Teachers' Perceptions about Teaching a Language in Context.   Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93, 895-899, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.09.299.

Koroglu, M. & Akbas, R. (2011). A Small Scale Experimental Study: Using Animations to Learn Vocabulary. The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 10(2), 15-30, https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ932222.pdf.

Lin, H. Chen, T.& Dwyer, M. (2006). Effect of Static Visuals and Computer Generated Animations in Facilitating Immediate and Delayed Achievement in EFL classroom. Foreign Languages Annals, 39 (2),.203-207, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2006.tb02262.x.

Martinez, M. E. (2001). The Process of Knowing: A Biocognitive Epistemology. The Journal of Mind and Behavior, 22(4), 407–426. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43854156

Mayer, R. E. (2005). Cognitive Theory of Multimedia Learning. In R. E. Mayer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning, 31-48 Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511816819.004.

Melisa, C.B. & Ahmad Affendi, S. (2021). A comparison of the vocabulary learning strategies employed by high and low proficient pre-university students in Malaysia. LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 14(2), 222-246, https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1310802.pdf.

Mizumoto, A. & Takeuchi, O. (2009). Examining the effectiveness of explicit instruction of vocabulary learning strategies with Japanese EFL university students. Language Teaching Research, 13 (4), 425 – 449, https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168809341511

Nation, P. (2002). Best practice in vocabulary teaching and learning. In.J.C.

Nelson, J. R., Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2011). Efficacy of a tier 2 supplemental root word vocabulary and decoding intervention with kindergarten Spanish-speaking English learners. Journal of Literacy Research, 43(2), 184–211. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X11403088.

O'Dell, F. (1997). Incorporating vocabulary into the syllabus. Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy (p. 258-278). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Neill, J.G. (2014). Teaching and learning in everyday settings, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305576519_Teaching_and_learning_in_everyday_settings#fullTextFileContent.

Oxford, R.L. and Crookall, D. (1990). "Vocabulary Learning: A Critical Analysis of Techniques". TESL Canada Journal, 7, 9-30.

Pinter, A. (2006). Teaching young language learners. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Read, J. (2004). Assessing vocabulary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (2002). Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice, (pp.254-266), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmitt, M., Nation, P., and Kremmel, B. (2020). Moving the field of vocabulary assessment forward: The need for more rigorous test development and validation, Language Teaching, 53, 109–120, doi:10.1017/S0261444819000326.

Slatterly, M., & Willis, J. (2001). English for primary teachers. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Sökmen, A. J. (2001). Current trends in teaching second language vocabulary. In N.

Susanto, A. (2017). The Teaching of Vocabulary: A Perspective. Journal KATA: Penelitian tentang Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra, http://doi.org/10.22216/jk.v1i2.2136.

Tahir, M.H.M. (2017). Research and Trends in the Studies of Explicit Vocabulary Instructions and Vocabulary Acquisition. Journal of Educational Studies, 3(2).

Webb, S. (2007). The Effects of Repetition on Vocabulary Knowledge. Applied Linguistics, 28, 46- 65.http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml048.

Wei, Z. (2014). Does teaching mnemonics for vocabulary learning make a difference? Putting the keyword method and the word part technique to the test, Language Teaching Research, 19(1), 43-69, https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541734.

Wilkins, D. A. (1972). Linguistics and language teaching. London: Edward Arnold.

Williams, M. and Burden, R. (1997) Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.