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Chapter 1 Introduction

Lexical competence is at the core of language learning, regardless of mother tongue (L1) or foreign language (L2). Decarrico (2001) emphasized its importance as "the core of communicative competence." Much research has emphasized the necessity of teaching vocabulary in the language classroom and made a great contribution to recognize the importance of teaching vocabulary. The studies not only draw teachers’ attention to the issues of implicit or explicit vocabulary teaching, but also provide helpful strategies for learners to memorize or recall vocabulary.

However, a general trend of vocabulary research has focused on the perception and memorization of target vocabulary (see Jiang, 2004, p.416). Those studies are worthy of great notice, but it is also necessary to draw attention to the process by which the semantic system of first language forms different concepts of target words in semantic memory. In other words, recognition of different semantic features of a word in a second language can improve the understanding or use of the word. It is very critical because how to perceive given words may have potential effects on second language acquisition and production (Jarvis, 2002).

For example, I learned ‘jar’ in the context of classroom English. The word was translated into Korean and saved with a translation equivalent in Korean in my memory. When one of my American friends asked me what the Korean word for a ‘jar’ in a picture was, however, I realized that I recognized it as ‘glass bottle’ instead of ‘jar’ in English. In other words, I knew the word ‘jar’ itself, but I did not have the right visual of ‘jar’ in my lexicon. More interesting is that a classmate from Japan called the jar a ‘bin’. Although my friend and I were incorrect, these misunderstandings are common according to research on semantic differences and semantic transfer.
Jiang (2004a) says that there were system-wide differences between English and Chinese in the patterns of naming objects. In the research, he discovered that English speakers usually identify objects by their shapes, whereas Chinese speakers usually identify objects by function. For example, both “binoculars” and “telescope” have the same name in Chinese. Also, Imai and Gentner (as cited in Munnich, Landau, & Dosher, 2001) claim that English speakers tend to categorize objects by shape, whereas Yukatec-Mayan and Japanese speakers tend to sort objects by material.

In addition, according to Jiang (2004a), when a new word in the L2 is adopted, learners’ previous semantic systems (formed by individual experiences or community cultures) have some effect on the process of vocabulary acquisition. Sometimes it is positive, but, on the other hand, it can also have a negative effect when learning a new language because some concepts are universal while others are local to each language. Yet second language learners unintentionally ignore the semantic differences between L1 and L2 translation equivalents.

In my case, ‘jar’ was translated into the Korean word Dahn-ji. When I translated it into Korean, jar had the same visual image of Dahn-ji. Dahn-ji is made of porcelain and ceramic pottery. So, the container made of glass in the picture I saw was ‘glass bottle’ to me naturally because ‘bottle’ is made of glass in my lexicon. For the same reason, my Japanese classmate called it ‘bin’ because the jar in the picture was not made of plastic.

Contrary to such theoretical points of view, language teachers usually focus on teaching translation equivalents and do not pay attention to what semantic maps are drawn in the learners’ mind. Of course, the translation equivalent technique is natural and helpful to understand concepts of target vocabulary. However, the technique could be more helpful if it
included raising learners’ awareness of semantic differences between the L1 and the L2. Recognition of different semantic features could help develop a new L2 semantic system and help with production of the words in communication.

The purpose of this project was to research the semantic differences of some domains across languages by reviewing previous literature, and adapt the findings into designing a vocabulary teaching portfolio to help Korean language teachers who teach Korean language to English speaking students. Thus, this teaching portfolio consists of a literature review, needs analysis, portfolio design, and sample activities.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

In this chapter, I review second language learning errors, semantic feature differences, semantic variation across languages in four domains (naming, motion verbs, spatial language and nominal number marking), and semantic transfer and development. This literature review will provide the ground to find salient semantic obligatory features across languages, especially between English and Korean, associated with the four domains and also to design vocabulary teaching strategies for English-speaking learners of Korean. In this study, learning a second language means learning another language besides the mother language and does not distinguish the context, such as ESL or EFL.

Theories on Second Language Learning Errors

The errors produced by second language learners provide significant information including the learners’ proficiency levels. Some errors are predictable before production and happen because of differences between a learner’s first language and second language. Brown (2001) gave an example spoken by a French learner of English: “I am here since January.” Brown pointed out that the tense error resulted from the negative influence of French, the mother tongue. On the other hand, some errors seem to be systematic regardless of L1 and L2, and are not predictable. These kinds of errors result not from the difference of L1 and L2 or L1 transfer but from the natural process of L2 rule making. An example is a Spanish learner of English who said in English, “She name is Maria,” showing that the error relates to neither languages (Yule, 2006, p. 167). Inter-language errors can be evidence of a system in which learners acquire the target language gradually and idiosyncratically (Lashmanan & Selinker, 2001).
Associated with language learning errors have been three representative approaches to interpret them. The first one was Contrastive Analysis (CA) which explains errors in terms of the similarity between L1 and L2 (Nunan, 2001; Murphy, 2003). CA supported the idea that “L1 syntax can be used to predict potential L2 errors, since transfer will more likely occur between typologically distant languages” (Murphy, 2003, p. 5). In other words, a learner may learn L2 with ease if L1 and L2 share common features (Lightbrown & Spada, 1999). CA was very popular for predicting the second language learners’ errors when it was first proposed. However, it was challenged because it was not valid to explain the developmental errors, and some predicted errors were not evident in real production (Schachter, 1974).

The second approach to explain the L2 learner’s errors was the Interlanguage Hypothesis, proposed by Selinker in 1972. According to Selinker (Lashmanan & Selinker, 2001), interlanguage is another linguistic system partially different from L1 and L2. Corder (in Celce-Murcia, 1996) visualized the notion as a continuum between L1 and L2, and the continuum is a different system run by other unique rules different from L1 and L2. This approach explained the learner errors as evidence of a “normal and healthy part of the learning process” (Nunan, 2001, p.88) just as children gradually develop rules in the course of their L1 acquisition. Research on morphological developmental order supported this idea that there are common stages in acquiring some morphological knowledge that second language learners and young children learning a native language share.

Error analysis was based on this assumption. Unlike the CA hypothesis, error analysis did not set up any prediction in advance (Lightbrown & Spada, 1999). Rather, error analysis tried to find out learners’ difficulties from the learners’ real language data. Error analysis
contributed to understanding what the difficulties of learning an L2 were and what occurred in the real classroom. According to Schachter (1974), error analysis proponents claimed that many language learning errors resulted from the strategies chosen by the language learners rather than first language interference.

The third approach combines prediction and error analysis to find the difficulties of L2 language learning. This approach adopted strengths of CA and error-analysis; for example, the approach regards prediction as important ground, and takes advantage of error analysis as a useful technique. Schachter (1974) analyzed writing samples of English relative clauses with five different language group students: Persian, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and English. Japanese and Chinese students were predicted to show more difficulties in writing English relative clauses because relative clauses habitually occur to the left of a head NP (Noun Phrase) in both languages. However, real data through error analysis showed the unexpected results that Chinese and Japanese students made a significantly small number of errors compared to Arabic and Persian students. The percentage of errors of Chinese and Japanese were 12% and 8% respectively, whereas that of Persian and Arab students was 25% and 20%. From the error analysis point of view, it should be interpreted that the former students had no serious difficulties in writing English relative clauses. In fact, however, the students did have problems in writing the relative clauses and actually avoided writing the clauses by subdividing one relative sentence into two independent sentences. Taking the example of avoidance as a weakness of Error Analysis, Schachter contends that a combination of CA’s prediction approach and the Error Analysis approach as a useful technique can provide more reasonable information about real difficulties in learning a second language.
Semantic Feature Differences across Languages

Lardiere (2008) said that the differences between languages are due to differences in phonological, formal and semantic features across languages. Among these three types of features, acquiring L2 semantic features seems the hardest one for language learners to acquire native-like competence in because 1) semantic differences are not clearly sensed like phonological or grammatical differences across languages, and 2) integrating semantic differences between the L1 and the L2 takes more time than integrating the others (Jiang, 2004).

Some semantic errors in the L2 result from the semantic feature differences between the native language and the target language (Suzuki, 1978). Two corresponding words identifying the same object or action in two languages may have a similar core meaning but many different peripheral meanings. Suzuki (1978) addressed some language learning errors originating from different semantic features of Japanese and English. One of the examples is “nomu” and “to drink” (p.18). “Nomu” can be translated as “to drink” in terms of its core meaning. Suzuki said, however, the semantic structure of “to drink” differs from that of “nomu”. For example, “to drink” is used only with liquid objects, whereas “nomu” is used for not only liquids but also solids. On top of that, Suzuki ascertains that different semantic features bring differences in collocation. For instance, “nomu” can be collocated with medicine in Japanese, but in English the correct form is “take medicine” instead of “drink medicine.” Also, he adds that the English verb “drink” is usually used for the case of edible things. “Drink” is rarely used for poisonous fluid. He said, for example, containers containing poisonous fluids are labeled as “Fatal if swallowed”, whereas “nomu” does not make such a distinction.
One reason for different semantic features across languages seems to originate from the different attentions to our world across languages (Slobin, 2003). Whorf (1956) said each language is not a mere instrument just to deliver thought. He said each language also plays a role as a “shaper of idea.” In other words, among enormous amounts of information and phenomena in the world, speakers of a particular language may differ in choosing, receiving, and evaluating some information because of obligatory features of the language they speak. For example, Jiang (2004) finds that Chinese and English speakers show some semantic difference in naming objects because, basically, Chinese speakers generally identify given objects by their functions, whereas English speakers generally identify given objects by shape. Taking an example of ‘binoculars’, he said that binoculars and telescopes are both translated as 眼 镜 (望 镜) in Chinese (p.121) because the function of telescopes and binoculars is the same. Likewise, he claims that many semantic errors produced by Chinese learners of English happened when they had to distinguish two different English words which are translated as the same word in Chinese. Similarly, Green (2000) claimed that different languages lead individuals to build different perceptions and representations. This idea is very controversial between language relativity and language universality, and it cannot be simply said as true or false. The related literature is discussed in the semantic variation section.

Another reason for different semantic features across languages is that semantic features reflect cultural values covertly. Suzuki (1978) argued that importing concepts with no regard to the value systems behind a language could cause misunderstandings. He compared a culture’s covert value system to an iceberg. He said that only one-seventh of an iceberg is above water. The visible one-seventh is overt, and the hidden six-sevenths is
covert. Like the iceberg, cultural values are located under the water and are rarely easily recognizable.

As an example, Suzuki (1978) compared different concepts about ‘cruelty to animals’ between Japanese and English speakers. He said that a British organization, Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, once accused Japanese people of being cruel because of abandoning their pets. The author refuted that it was crueler for Japanese to take mercy killing for their pets rather than to abandon them. The difference in cruelty came from different philosophies about life in two cultures. He explained that Europeans considered their dogs as their belongings and under their control. Therefore, it is very irresponsible for Europeans to abandon belongings which do not have free will. On the contrary, Japanese consider their dogs as an independent entity. It is considered very arrogant for Japanese to judge their pets’ lives. Suzuki interpreted that because the two cultures endowed different values on ‘pet,’ Europeans and Japanese had different interpretations of ‘cruelty to animals.’ According to his interpretation, for Europeans cruelty connotes ill-treatment and irresponsibility. On the other hand, when Japanese say ‘cruelty,’ it includes arrogant attitudes and terminating life. The different value systems result in different meanings of the same word.

*Semantic Variation and Obligatory Features in Four Domains*

Each language has some different “obligatory features” that must be expressed semantically, grammatically, or syntactically. In number, for example, singular and plural should be expressed and marked grammatically in English; however, the information is not obligatory but optional in Korean and Japanese (Wakabayashi, 2009). Similarly, marking of
hearsay is obligatory in Turkish, but optional in English (Gentner & Goldin-Meadow, 2003). Gentner and Goldin-Meadow say that when retelling an event, Turkish speakers are asked by their language to report whether they really witnessed the event or not. In contrast, English speakers can choose whether to leave out the information.

There are two conflicting and dominant views in psycholinguistics interpreting how the linguistic obligatory features in various domains relate to thought: 1) Different languages do not affect how people think (Munnich & Landau, 2001; Clark, 2003; Malt, Sloman, & Gennari, 2003) and 2) different languages shape different thoughts (Levinson, 2003; Lucy, 2003). The two views generally agree on the existence of semantic variances across languages, but they disagree as to the effect of the semantic variance on the manner of thought.

In her article, “Language and Representation,” Clark (2003) opposes the idea that linguistic variations encode different thoughts in different languages. While admitting the existence of different obligatory features in each language, she advocates that those features affect only the linguistic level. She argues that comprehension of an event and production of an utterance about the event are different dimensions. According to her, when people remember an event they experienced, they keep much information in their memory regardless of what language they speak. Yet, when they talk about the event, the information they express is restricted by the grammar of the language they speak.

Clark (2003) goes on to say that the lexical differences have no relation to the conceptual differences across languages. She claims that lexical differences across languages have largely resulted from the historical differences of language communities. Similarly, Malt, Sloman, and Gennari (2003) claim that the vocabulary of each language has been
adapted by a variety of forces, such as culture, sound changes, meaning changes—
broadening and narrowing—and contact with other languages through adding and deleting
words from the lexicon. Malt et al. (2003) suggest that cross-linguistic variation in naming
patterns for artifacts in particular does not influence similarity judgments across languages.

Unlike Clark and Malt et al., who believe language has little probable effect on thought,
Levinson (2003) strongly believes that 1) “languages vary in their semantics”, 2) “semantic
differences are bound to engender cognitive difference”, and 3) “these cognitive correlates of
semantic differences can be empirically found” (p.41-42). Levinson researched linguistic
differences in a spatial domain and non-linguistic correlates in the reference system in cross-
linguistic experiments with English speakers and Tzeltal speakers. Levinson found that the
two language groups employed different reference systems to denote space, and these coding
patterns in language were also applied to non-linguistic memory experiments.

Like Levinson, John Lucy (as cited in Levinson, 2003) demonstrated that English
speakers, whose language has obligatory number marking, were better able to remember
number in a non-linguistic experiment than Yucatec speakers, whose language has only
optional number marking. Further, Gaskins (as cited in Levinson, 2003) reports that “the lack
of number marking in Yucatec is associated with nominals whose semantics are unspecified
for quantificational unit”(p. 41). Gaskins said that banana in Yucatec can denote any entity of
banana stuff, such as, the tree, the leaf, or the fruit.

Different from the two extreme opinions on language and thought, Slobin (2003)
claims that it is highly likely that thought is reconstructed by a particular language at least
when people speak and understand utterances. For example, he said speakers of English have
third person pronouns informing the genders (he or she). In a discourse, English speakers
naturally disclose the information. Also, the listener anticipates it. However, gender pronouns do not exist in Turkish or Chinese, and Turkish and Chinese speakers or listeners do not tune in to the information naturally. Likewise, he argues that a specific language would “force its speakers and listeners to attend to certain semantic features that are encoded in the grammatical and lexical elements” (p. 160).

Given the findings from previous studies, in spite of the contrasting positions on language and thought, the answers always lie in the middle ground and cannot be stated in a simple way. In the next section, four domains – naming, motion verbs, spatial terms, and number marking - associated with semantic differences across languages are reviewed in more detail.

**Naming: Shape, Function, and Materials**

In the view of some experts, naming an object differs across languages. Malt, Sloman, and Gennari (2003) examined the different naming patterns but perception similarity for artifacts—a set of containers- by speakers of English, Chinese and Spanish. The subjects were asked to sort pictures among a set of sixty containers on the basis of overall similarity and then name the objects in their native languages. Next, the subjects were asked to sort a set of pictures of containers based on physical or functional features or both. According to Malt et al., when asked to sort sixty artifacts for overall similarity in the first experiment, the subjects usually tended to sort artifacts according to physical or functional characteristics regardless of their native languages.

Nevertheless, when asked to name the artifacts in their native language, the subjects showed language-specific differences. For example, the objects called “jar” in English were
named *ping* (瓶, *byeong* in Korean) in Chinese, but some objects called “bottle” or “container” in English were also named *ping*. Likewise, not only were the objects named “can” in English called *guan* (罐) in Chinese, but also some objects called “bottle” or “container” in English belonged to *guan*. Based on this finding, Malt et al. (2003) agree that there are significant differences in naming across the three languages. However, based on the result of the sorting experiments, they claim that no significant differences perceiving the similarity exist across the three languages. In other words, they claim that “the naming patterns do not necessarily or habitually impose differences in how speakers of the languages perceive relations among the objects” (p. 93).

While Malt et al. (2003) reported that there were significant differences for naming artifacts across the three languages, they did not research the strategies or patterns used by the language speakers. It would have been more beneficial for language teachers to understand the source of semantic errors produced by their students related to naming objects.

Unlike Malt et al., Jiang (2004a) suggests that there may be “system-wide differences” in the pattern of naming across languages. He said that Chinese speakers tend to name a concrete object by its function; however, English speakers name it by its shape. So, it is common for more than two different objects that serve the same function to share the same name in Chinese. For example, Chinese speakers use *bi* for all writing instruments which English speakers call “pencil”, “brush”, “crayon” and “marker.” On the contrary, two different objects that share a similar shape have the same name in English regardless of their function. According to Jiang, the word “rail” in English refers to both train track and the holding object along a staircase. Yet there are separate words corresponding to each one in
Chinese. Jiang suggests that such analysis on patterns can help language learners to understand how concepts are lexicalized across languages and thus to encourage them to further their semantic restructuring.

Even though it is not a direct study on the naming difference based on shape and materials, Lucy (as cited in Lucy & Gaskins, 2003) and Imai and Gentner (as cited in Imai & Gaskin, 2003) conducted non-linguistic experiments on the patterns of sorting objects by shape and material. According to their claims, English speakers tended to categorize an object by its shape, while Yucatec Mayan and Japanese speakers frequently tended to classify a simple object by materials. The same is true in the language task used by Lucy. Lucy used three categories of nouns: animal, implements (tools and containers), and substance (later materials), and found that English speakers and Yucatec speakers responded differently to the referent type of implements. In the following experiment with two language groups, Lucy and Gaskin found there was “relative classification bias toward the shape on the part of English and toward the material on the part of Yacatec speakers” based on the language analysis (Lucy and Gaskins, 2003, p. 469). Lucy et al. and Imai et al. experiments are discussed in the following number-marking section in more detail (Lucy & Gaskin, 2003; Iami & Mazuka, 2003).

**Motion Verbs**

According to analyses of verb lexicalization patterns across languages, there exist linguistic variations in the domain of motion verbs (Malt et al, 2003). Slobin (2003) also claims that the motion verb is one of the most important semantic domains, and motion verbs show distinctive lexicalization patterns across languages. The meaning of motion verbs
consist of three parts: path, agent, and manner of movement (Malt et al., 2003). Also, each language differs in the lexicalization of these verbs. So, English, as well as other Germanic languages, encodes manner of movement within the motion verb. Path is encoded with particles (such as in, on) outside of the verb, for example, climb up, and climb down. In contrast to those languages, Turkish, Spanish, and Romance languages encode path within the motion verbs and express manner with an adverbial phrase outside of the verb. For example, while English speakers would say “agent runs out,” Spanish speakers would say “agent exits/enters” with adverbial manner phrase (Malt et al., 2003, p. 98).

In Talmy’s (as cited in Slobin, 2003) terminology, languages like English are S-languages (satellite-framed verb) and languages like Turkish, Spanish, and French are V-languages (verb-framed verb). S-languages are required to express both path and manner; in contrast the V-languages express the manner optionally (Malt et al., 2003). However, it does not mean that all motion verbs in V-languages are path verbs. For example, there are common manner verbs, such as walk and run in V-languages (Malt et al, 2003). The distinction between S-language and V-language is based on the general lexicon of motion verbs in each language.

Malt et al. (2003) discussed an experiment conducted by Gennari in 2002 on motion verbs with 47 native Spanish speakers and 47 American English native speakers. The experiment tested 1) language-specific patterns of the attention to path and manner and 2) the influence of the linguistic variance in the domain of recognition memory and perception similarity. The subjects of the two languages were divided into three groups each. The stimuli of the experiment were 108 digitized video films. Each group watched the 36 films, carrying out different tasks. The first groups of each language were asked to describe the events while
they were watching them. The second groups were asked to simply watch the video, and the third groups were asked to repeat meaningless syllables while they were watching the films to restrain the linguistic process. Next, each group carried out an unrelated task for 10 to 20 minutes to make recall more difficult. Then, all participants were engaged in a recognition task and a similarity task. The recognition task judged 108 films for whether a film on screen was one of the 36 films that they had watched 10 to 20 minutes ago. For the similarity task, 36 sets of triad films were given to all groups to choose which alternative (manner or path) was similar to target stimuli.

According to Malt et al (2003), as they predicted, there is linguistic motion-verb variance between English and Spanish. 89% of English verbs were manner verbs and 89% of Spanish verbs were path verbs in the description carried out by the two first groups. Malt et al. went on to say that Spanish speakers expressed manner less than English speakers. In the recognition test, the mean number of false alarms did not significantly differ between the two languages. Also, they said only the Spanish speakers in the first group consistently preferred to choose the same path alternatives in the similarity test while the other group did not show significant differences.

However, the mean data of the false alarm of the recognition test showed that the first groups of each language, who encoded the film in their native languages, have a significantly low rate of false alarms (4.79, English speakers with manner items), compared to the free encode second groups (7.73, English speakers with manner items) and the shadow groups (13.38, English speakers with manner items), who repeated meaningless syllables while they were watching the films. This result could be interpreted to indicate that language can help improve accuracy of the memory.
Slobin (2003) also studied manner in the motion verb. He concentrated on the motion verbs used in discourse. His experiment showed that S-language speakers (speakers of English, Mandarin Chinese, and Russian) produced manner verbs more often than V-language speakers (speakers of Spanish, Turkish, and Hebrew) in conversation, oral narratives, and written narratives. Besides, he found S-languages have more manner verbs in their lexicon and the degree of manner verbs is more fine-grained. In addition, he argues a large portion of manner verbs are learned in the pre-school period in English speaking countries.

Also, Slobin’s experiment on mental image differences showed that S-language and V-language speakers attended to different elements after listening to the same story. He reports S-language speakers describe how the character moves, whereas V-language speakers attend to the physical surroundings or emotional condition. Slobin (2003) explains these differences across languages in the frame of “thinking for speaking” (p. 158). He argues that thought and speaking are connected to produce or to understand utterances. Because the subjects are requested to describe the images after listening to the story, their thoughts fit into each language. As a result, S-language speakers attend to the motion of manner of the main character when they hear the story because their languages require it as obligatory, but V-language speakers attend to the change in physical settings along the path.

Spatial Terms

Semantics in the domain of space across languages is also both universal and language-specific. One of the most distinct spatial differences is the reference system. Levinson (2003) found that English speakers and Tzeltal speakers have differences in their
reference systems. He said English speakers employ a relative frame of reference along with the intrinsic, whereas Tzeltal speakers use an absolute frame of reference supplemented by the intrinsic. A relative frame of reference uses terms such as left, right, front, and back, and denotes objects from the point of the viewer. Intrinsic reference involves the reference object, such as, the left of the tree. An absolute frame of reference uses a cardinal-direction system, such as north and south. So Tzeltal speakers would express “He’s hiding east of the tree,” whereas English speakers would say “He’s hiding behind the tree” (Levinson, 2003).

Levinson (2003) also demonstrated that this linguistic difference correlated with non-linguistic representation. Through a non-linguistic experiment, his prediction was demonstrated that in novel places, speakers of languages with an absolute frame of reference had a more accurate sense of direction than speakers of languages with a relative frame of reference. Similarly, in a non-linguistic memory experiment using a rotation paradigm carried out with four relative and six absolute language communities, he found that subjects are consistent with their coding patterns in language even in the non-linguistic experiments.

On the other hand, Munnich, Landau and Dosher (2001) claim that linguistic differences in the domain of space across languages are not parallel to non-linguistic foundations. Munnich et al. conducted an experiment on the spatial relation terms for figure-reference objects between English speakers and Japanese speakers. Their experiment employed Hayward and Tarr’s method which consisted of naming and memory tasks. In the naming task, two language groups were asked to fill out the location of the figure based on the reference object. In the memory task, the subjects were asked to compare two scenes separated by a mask, and judge whether the two scenes were the same. According to Munnich et al., the result showed that both English and Japanese speakers, regardless of their
languages, used universal axial structure of the reference object and described the location of figures using axial spatial terms, such as top, bottom, left and right. Also in the memory test, the participants had the best spatial memory when the figure was along one of the axes.

Munnich et al. (2001) conducted further experiments to generalize their findings with twenty English speakers and twenty Korean speakers. The second experiment focused on the semantic differences related to “contact” between English and Korean. In English, “on” and “above” are obligatory to denote the distance between the figure object and the reference object. However, the contact information is not obligatory and it is encoded optionally in a number of verbs in the Korean language. The method was the same as the first experiment except the figure object was changed to a cup or a ball, and the reference object was changed to a table to give a three-dimensional effect to the participants. The language task showed that the Korean speakers also used the axial terms, like English speakers and Japanese speakers. Munnich et al. maintained that although there are cross-linguistic differences in encoding “contact” and “non-contact” between English and Korean, the differences did not lead to better memory for spatial relationships for English speakers. Thus, they conclude that although spatial language may differ across languages, the spatial concepts are generally universal.

Like Munnich et al., Bowerman and Choi (2003) also conducted experiments on the spatial categorization with Korean language speakers. However, their claims are contrary to Munnich et al. Bowermann and Choi found that English speakers distinguish support (on) from containment (in) and attend to the categories when two objects are given, whereas Korean speakers distinguish fitness from looseness and attend to those features, cutting across the range of on and in. According to Bowermann and Choi (2003), for example,
English speakers would say,

1) put the book *in* the case  
2) put the book *in* the bag

whereas Korean speakers would say,

1) chakul case-e kkida (chak: book, case: case, kkida: fit tightly)  
2) chakul gabang-e nehta (gabang: bag, nehta: put loosely in or around)

Most importantly, Bowermann and Choi claim that this attention begins from a very young age and the attention is introduced by language input.

Bowerman and Choi (2003) also researched the vertical spatial domain “up” and “down.” They claim that those vertical particles are combined with verbs and give a general path to vertical movement in English, and English speaking children grasp the meaning as early as 12 to 14 months and typically by 16 to 17 months. In contrast, they claim that Korean children do not show all-purpose ‘up’ and ‘down’ in their language. Instead, Korean children learn a lot of positioning verbs involving vertical motion, such as *anta* (hold in arms), *nupta* (lie down), *olla kata* (ascend go, go up), or *naylye kata* (descend go). Bowerman and Choi say that the same is true of Tzeltal and Tzotzil speaking children (see Bowerman and Choi, 2003, p. 400). Unlike previous work, which suggested that spatial concepts with children are universal, Bowerman and Choi suggest that based on the findings, basic notions such as support, contact, and vertical movement are not universal.

*Number-Marking Semantics: Object and Substances*

Number marking is likely to be associated with the domain of grammar, but actually research on nominal number markings shows that there is a correlation between number
marking and the notion of the noun (Lucy & Gaskins, 2003; Imai & Muzuka, 2003). Some languages have obligatory nominal number markings, but some do not. Nominal number markings are not required in Korean or Japanese language (Wakabayasi, 2009) although they may be done if the speakers wish. Similarly, Yucatec Maya speakers are reported to have optional number marking with numeral classifiers (Lucy & Gaskins, 2003). The numeral classifiers provide not only the role of the unit but also crucial information about shape or material properties of the referent of the noun. For example, Yucatec speakers say un-tz’iit kib (one long thin candle) and ka’a-tz’iit kib (two long thin candle) to express the optional number marking (Lucy & Gaskins, 2003). Lucy and Gaskins go on to say that numeral classifiers of this kind are distributed widely, including in Asian languages, such as Chinese, Japanese and Thai. Unlike those languages, typically English speakers must signal number marking for countable nouns (Lucy & Gaskins, 2003).

Lucy has researched the number marking differences between American English and Yucatec Maya associated with the cognition of adult and child speakers of both languages since 1992 (Lucy & Gaskins, 2003). Lucy reports that English-speakers show a ‘split’ pattern of number marking between a discrete object and an amorphous object, such as ‘car’ versus sugar. So, English has to signal obligatory number marking when referring to the discrete object, but not for the amorphous object. However, Yucatec shows a ‘continuous’ pattern whereby no signal plural marking is needed for a discrete or an amorphous object.

For these phenomena, Lucy and Gaskins (2003) believe that this difference results from the fact that all nouns in Yucatec are not specified for a quantificational unit. For instance, Gaskins said that kib, the translation equivalent of candle in Yucatec, is more like wax and does not denote the shape of a candle like English, so kib in Yucatec is not specified
as a unit. Based on this finding, Lucy and Gaskins believe that English speakers frequently consider a unit based on the shape and English words ordinarily attend to the shape of the object rather than materials of the object. In contrast, they believe that Yucatec speakers, lacking specification of quantificational units, do not attend to the shape, but attend to the material composing the noun. Like Levinson, Lucy (as cited in Levinson, 2003) demonstrated that English speakers, who have obligatory number marking, were better able to remember number in non-linguistic experiments than Yucatec speakers who have only optional number marking.

Similarly, Imai and Mazuka (2003) researched object and substance. They find that language-specific distinction of objects and substances are relevant to the interpretation of individuation. They went on to say that the distinction of entity between object and substances is grammatically marked in many languages. For example, they said native English speakers mark it in their grammar by distinguishing objects as counted nouns and substances as massed nouns. However, Japanese individuate an object less explicitly than English. They say that as a classifier language, Japanese uses numeral classifiers to mark individuation like English mass nouns.

In their experiment on how English speakers and Japanese speakers classify objects, Imai and Mazuka (2003) said that in classifying simple discrete objects Japanese adults project the word meaning on the material, whereas English speakers selected the match on the basis of shape. However, in classifying complex objects, both group showed a bias toward shape.

So far, this literature review has mainly reviewed the studies on different semantic features and cross-linguistic semantic differences in the domains of naming, motion verbs,
spatial terms, and number markings across languages. In the following section, this study will review semantic transfer to understand how the cross-linguistic semantic differences may affect learning an L2.

Semantic Transfer and Development

Recently, there has been a trend of research on semantic (or conceptual) transfer and development related to bilingual semantic memory and foreign language vocabulary learning (Ervin-Tripp, 2000; Pavlenko, 2000; Jarvis, 2000; Jiang, 2004). In contrast to the previous assumption that language learners learn new concepts through learning new words in the L2 (see Jing, 2004), some researchers have proposed that new L2 words are linked to the L1 semantic structure until semantic restructuring happens as they increase L2 proficiency (Jiang, 2004). Jiang says evidence in support of semantic transfer is found in the L2 learner’s lexical errors.

Jarvis (2000) argued that while conceptual transfer seems to be related to the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis to some degree, conceptual transfer differs from CA in that the focus of it is not on the external language (syntax) but on individual internal concepts. He goes on to say, generally, that the concept of semantic transfer is related to how language learners acquire the meaning of L2, and also to the role of the semantic concepts of L1 in second language vocabulary acquisition. Jarvis (2000) also suggests that the underlying conceptions of language learners may have a potential effect on second language acquisition and production. His findings give additional framework for understanding learners’ difficulties of second language acquisition.

Based on a 2002 experiment, Jiang (2004) divided acquisition of L2 vocabulary into
two stages: 1) comprehension stage and 2) developmental stage. At the comprehension stage, Jiang insists that semantic transfer of L1 plays a main role to enter a new L2 word into the lexicon because a translation equivalents strategy is used. The new L2 word is considered as having the same semantic features as the correspondent L1 word. He claims that this dependency on the first language semantic system is a helpful and natural way to acquire new L2 words in the comprehension stage, but it may bring fossilization of meaning and failure to enter the developmental stage of the L2 semantic system.

The developmental stage assumed by Jiang (2004) is the level at which it is possible to elaborate the contents of an L2 word from core to peripheral meaning, to distinguish semantic differences or relatedness among similar L2 words, and to understand figurative and connotative meaning. In an experiment testing Chinese ESL students’ semantic developmental stage (Jiang, 2004), most participant students answered that the task of identifying the difference between words with similar meanings was highly difficult. Jiang insists that the progress from the comprehension stage to the developmental stage is not automatically guaranteed, and the progress takes a long time and needs exposure to a context where the target language is used.

Later, Jiang (2004b) divided two stages into three and put them into the form of a diagram. In his article, Jiang claims that the semantic system of the first language of a language learner performs salient roles to form the concept of translation equivalents of the target language. His hypothesis is that there are three stages in the process of adult vocabulary acquisition: 1) word association stage, 2) L1 lemma mediation stage, and 3) full integration stage (see pp.417-418). In the first stage, according to his hypothesis, a new L2 word enters into the L2 lexicon, but the concept of the word is transferred from the L1
translation equivalent, and the L1 word and the L1 concept are co-activated whenever the L2 word is activated. In the second stage, a learner starts to mediate the difference of meaning between the L2 word and its L1 equivalent through continued exposure to some contextualized input. An L2 specific concept starts to activate in the second stage. In the last stage, the L2 word is directly connected with the L2-specific concept and the link between the L2 word and its L1 equivalent becomes weakened. He adds that the process is very slow and usually incomplete in adult learners. Through the semantic relatedness judgment experiment with Korean ESL learners, Jiang (2004b) demonstrated that the Korean subjects judged the relatedness based on Korean translation.

To the question of what makes semantic development difficult, Jiang (2004a) gave an answer by asking what is needed for semantic development. First, he said, explicit intervention of instructors or teachers is needed to correct any mismatch of L1 and L2 words. Second, information should be provided to students how the L2 word is semantically different from the L1 word through contextualized input.

To conclude, as discussed by previous studies, each language has different semantic features and these differences are often unintentionally disregarded by translating an L2 word into an L1 word because learners assume the two words have the same semantic features. This leads to obstacles preventing advancement to the level of native-like vocabulary use.
Chapter 3 Needs Analysis

For this needs analysis, I gathered various data types in order to find evidence of semantic errors supporting semantic transfer based on the literature reviews. The purpose was to gain some information on learners' errors caused by the semantic differences between English and Korean and to understand effective vocabulary strategies of KFL (Korean as a Foreign Language) teachers related to teaching the semantic differences.

For this reason, email interviews with KFL teachers, interviews with English-speaking learners of Korean, class observations of KFL classes, and a semantic error analysis on five writing samples were administered. The data collection took place from May, 2009 to November, 2009. The chronological order was interviews with English-speaking learners of Korean, email interviews with KFL teachers, class observations, and gathering writing samples.

Email Interviews with KFL Teachers

Participants

The participants for the email interview were three Korean language teachers in Eugene, Oregon, USA. The teachers were all native speakers of Korean. Two KFL teachers had been teaching university students at the University of Oregon and another KFL teacher taught in a public elementary school in Eugene, Oregon. The teaching experiences as KFL teachers varied from one year to a little more than three years.

Instrument

The interview schedule for the KFL teachers consisted of five open-ended questions. It was designed to find out preferred vocabulary teaching strategies and to gather examples of
students' semantic errors related to naming pattern, motion verbs, spatial terms, and number marking. (See Appendix A.) The first three questions were for gathering background information, such as years of teaching experience, average student numbers in a class, and the level of classes they taught.

Procedure

I contacted the three KFL teachers for email interviews. A set of interview questions was sent to each by email in the first week in November, 2009 and received two weeks later to give them enough time to recall examples. The questionnaires were written in English, but a short description of the purpose of this interview was written in Korean. Teachers replied in Korean or English or mixed.

Interviews with English-speaking Learners of Korean

Participants

Two high advanced native English learners of Korean language, who had experienced teaching English in Korea, were interviewed. One had taught English to university students for a little more than 15 years. She did not receive formal education about the Korean language, but she had studied Korean language for almost 20 years. The other had taught English to Korean elementary school students in a private English institution for two years. He had learned Korean for three years in formal education and the whole period of learning Korean was nine years.

Instrument

The interview rubric for high-advanced English speaking learners of Korean consisted of six background information questions, a task, and an after-task question. In the
first person interview, a children’s book, “Frog, where are you?” written by Mercer Mayer, was used to gather examples of semantic errors. The book is a picture book with no written text. The first interviewee was asked to tell the story in Korean, while looking at the pictures in the book. In the second person’s interview, a picture that was designed for gathering semantic differences on spatial terms was used. Short post-interview questions were also conducted. (See Appendix B) The reason for using two different instruments is to gather various semantic errors.

Procedure

Both interviews with the high advanced Korean learners were face-to-face, and the whole interviews were recorded. Instructions were given in English and Korean, and the answers were given in Korean. The questions for background information were given and answered in English, but the specific task to tell the story or describe objects and their location was answered in Korean.

The interview dates were in May, 2009 and July, 2009. They took place in quiet places which enabled clear recordings. The recording time for each was about 15 minutes to 20 minutes.

Class Observations

Participants

A KFL teacher and her students were observed two times for the class observations. The teacher was one of three KFL teachers who had been interviewed by email. She had a little more than three years of teaching experience in a KFL setting. The students were university students at the 200 level of the Korean language program at Yamada Center,
University of Oregon. Most of the students had learned Korean the last year from the same teacher, and this was their second year of learning Korean. The class size was around 16. The class met five days a week. The ethnicities of students were various, including Korean-American, Chinese, Japanese, Taiwanese, and American.

**Instrument**

The purpose of the class observations was to investigate time for teaching vocabulary in class and gather some helpful activities for teaching semantic differences across English and Korean. For the purposes, the class observations were recorded on an integrated observation tool, which consists of sections of time, descriptions of activities and comments/questions. Short post-observation questions with the class teacher were also conducted. (See Appendix C)

**Procedure**

Korean classes were observed in the middle of November, 2009. During the observations, times and short descriptions of activities performed in the classes were recorded on the observation tool. Also, simple comments were written for post-observation questions.

**Writing Sample Analysis**

**Participants**

Five writing samples were randomly gathered from the 300 level Korean class at Yamada Center, University of Oregon. Five samples were taken from five different students. The writing samples were their homework. They were essays, and they were each half to one-page long. The topics were all different.
Instrument

The purpose of gathering writing samples was to analyze semantic errors related to translation equivalents. A table was used for recording semantic error samples. One column of the table was for word level errors, and the other column of the table was for collocation level errors. (See Appendix D)

Procedure

Writing samples were collected from students in a 300 level class during two weeks in November, 2009. The original samples were copied. The originals were already edited by one of the Korean instructors. The writing samples were mostly a page long. All the semantic errors were selected first, and then sorted into two categorizations: word level and collocation level. Semantic errors at the word level were selected if a word was wrong. On the other hand, semantic errors in the collocation level were collected if two words were not matched even if the two words were respectively right. To decide the collocation of two words, I used a Korean dictionary and found the collocation on the web site. To do this, I looked up both words in the dictionary to find out sentence examples. Or I typed in the words into a Korean portal web-site and searched for sentences in which the two words were collocated.

Results

Email Interviews with KFL Teachers

For the question “How long have you taught Korean language in a KFL setting?,” teachers had one year, two years, and a little more than three years of experience respectively. Two teachers had taught 5 days a week and covered different levels every day. The grades of students varied from elementary school students to university students. The average number
of students in a class was from 3 to 20.

For the question of favorite techniques or strategies for teaching vocabulary, the teachers said that a vocabulary list (2: number of teachers), games (2), visual aid such as pictures or realia (2), making stories (1), info-gap (1), and the key word method (1) were preferred. A teacher who taught in a public elementary school said that visual images were effective for delivering the meaning of a new word. Also, she said that games engaged her students in classroom activities and contributed to better memory retention of words. Another teacher said that she sequenced or mixed several activities for teaching a set of target vocabulary because various activities give more opportunities for learners to use the target vocabulary. For example, games from Mime to Taboo would be used for a set of target vocabulary.

For the question “What kind of semantic errors have you experienced in your class due to translation equivalents?” a teacher gave two examples of semantic errors related to the verb “open”. Yeolda is a typical translation equivalent of “open”. For example, “open the box” or “open the window” can be translated to yeolda in Korean. Yet, yeolda and “open” are not completely correspondent. According to the teacher, students often made some errors when they over-generalized the translation equivalent of “open.” For example, can (a metal container) eul (object marker) yeolda (translation equivalent of verb open) should be can eul ddada. Also, nun (eye, eyes) eul (object marker) yeolda should be nun-eul dduda. In English, saying “open a can” or “open the eyes” is correct, but it is awkward to use yeolda with eyes and can(s) for native Koreans. These are good examples of semantic transfer of L1 to L2.

Also, for the same question, another teacher answered that students in her class had difficulties making correct choices between two different Korean numbering systems. Unlike
English, there are two cardinal numbering systems in Korean: one is a pure Korean cardinal numbering system, and the other is a Sino-Korean cardinal numbering system. The two numbering systems are used in different contexts. For example, age is usually counted in pure Korean cardinal numbers, while time and birthday is counted in Sino-Korean cardinal numbers. In addition, Korean numbers are often used in conjunction with different classifiers (unit counters or quantifiers), for instance, sal and se. Sal and se are both classifiers for counting age. Sal is used in conjunction with pure Korean numbers in oral communication. On the other hand, se is used with Sino-Korean numbers in an official written document. Generally, Sino-Korean numbers are used with words that originate from the Chinese language. A cross-match between numbering systems and their counters makes errors. The teacher said that students in her class were confused about the contexts of the two numbering systems and often made errors by combining unmatched cardinal numbers and classifiers.

Interviews with English Speaking Advanced Learners of Korean

Two English native speakers were Americans. They had studied Korean for 9 years and 20 years respectively. Their proficiency levels were both high advanced. One started to learn Korean for missionary work. The other had had interest in learning one of the Asian languages and she had an opportunity to teach English in Korea. Both had teaching experience in Korea. Both of them said that vocabulary is one of the most difficult things for even advanced learners of Korean. One of them said even though she was strong at reading, writing and listening in every day topics, she had difficulties in finding differences between similar words.

In a specific task to describe a picture, a participant made a semantic error related to
numbering. Describing a rectangle, he used the “centi-meter” system, which is a formal unit for Koreans. At first, he correctly said 2~3 centi in the Sino-Korean way. But when he described another rectangle, he said 4~5 centi in the pure Korean numbering system. “Centi” is usually used in combination with Sino-Korean numbers. Besides these numbering errors, in the post-interview questions, the participant said he had difficulty in finding the right words for two different shaped squares. He said he wanted to distinguish those objects in terms of a rectangle and a square as in English. Of course, the Korean language has corresponding words to ‘rectangle’ (jik-sa-gak-hyung) and ‘square’ (jung-sa-gak-hyung), but those are mathematical terminology. Nemo which refers to a generic shape of a square and rectangle, is usually used in real communication. The participant used nemo first when he described the objects. Then, he wanted to change it into more accurate words corresponding to English ‘rectangle’ and ‘square,’ and it was difficult for him. It was natural that he could not recall the words because nemo does not distinguish a rectangle from a square.

In another specific task to describe a storybook, another participant made three or four semantic errors related to the verb “be”. The English ‘to be’ verb is translated two ways in Korean. When the ‘be’ verb means a condition, it is translated to i-da; however, when it means existence or possession, it is translated to it-da. The participant confused i-da and it-da as she said “there was night” in Korean instead of “it was (a) night.” In the post-interview, she answered that she recognized the differences, but it was sometimes confusing because i-da and it-da were so similar. She added that like Koreans sometimes confuse “he” and “she” even though they fully recognize the differences, she made errors between i-da and it-da.

Class Observations
Class observations were focused on how to teach the semantic differences between English and Korean as well as how much time was allowed for vocabulary teaching and what kinds of activities were done. Two observations of one class showed that the Korean language teacher spent more than 20 minutes out of 50 minutes to teach and practice new vocabulary, and various activities for vocabulary instruction and practice were used, including games, info-gaps, dicto-comps, pair work or group work. For teaching semantic differences, the teacher tried to deliver the meaning by saying the closest translation equivalents in English. Also, she sometimes mentioned cultural backgrounds of some words or the context in which the new words would be used in.

Specifically, a song was used to teach the different order of a noun, its number, and its classifier (also quantifier). Unlike English countable nouns, Korean nouns do not obligatorily show number markings: instead, the number of a noun could be optionally indicated by using a specific classifier. In such a case, the order of Korean number marking is very different from that of English. To make it easy to memorize the order, she selected a song whose title and rhyme helped students recall the order easily.

Overall, two approaches to vocabulary teaching were observed. First, students were given five new words on the blackboard every day. The everyday vocabulary list was already decided at the beginning of the term. The list was categorized by topics, such as family, hobby, and shopping. After a small talk, the teacher started the class with the list, explaining the meanings and how to use the words for two or three minutes. In the post-observation interviews, the teacher said that students were asked to memorize around 250 words during a term, and dictation quizzes are performed periodically.

Besides five new words everyday, new words related to the content of the lessons
were taught in the class, too. These new words were practiced through various activities, such as games, songs, watching related videos, and tests. In the post-observation interview, the teacher said she tried to use various activities because she wanted to enlarge the opportunities to use the target vocabulary.

Writing Samples

Overall, semantic errors written by language learners in the 300 level were generally comprehensible but sounded awkward to native speakers. Semantic errors from five writing samples were categorized into two levels: word and collocation level. First, in the word level, ja-yeon ja-won (natural resource) was confused with ja-yeon (nature). A student wrote, “Ja-yeon (nature) will be used up in the future.” Also, bu-dae (military troops) was confused with gun-dae (armed force). A student wrote, “Korean bu-dae would be second biggest in the world.” Bu-dae is one of the subordinates of gun-dae. So-dae, jung-dae, dae-dae are included in the group.

In addition, Je-il (the most or the first) was excessively used to translate a kind of English superlative, such as “the second biggest.” In this case, Koreans do not use je-il because je-il refers to only the first one. The student seemed to deliver the superlative “biggest,” but Koreans express it as “second big” instead of “second je-il big.”

At the collocation level, it was found that kyung-je (economy) was collocated with seda (strong). Seda (strong) is not a usual modifier of kyung je (economy) in Korean; instead, bou you ha da (wealthy) or joh da (fine) could be collocated with kyung je. Another example was “kitchen room-floor” in Korean. A student wrote “I would like to have a marble room-floor for my kitchen in the future” in Korean. There are various types of rooms in English,
such as restroom, classroom, and bedroom. *Bahng* is a typical translation equivalent of English “room.” However, the concept of room in Korea is only restricted to a bedroom in English. So, basically, *bahng-badak (room floor)* is not usually collocated with “kitchen” or “restroom.”

**Conclusions**

Given the findings from these various data, it can be concluded that first, translation equivalent is one of the preferred methods to make students understand the concept of target vocabulary. Vocabulary lists that consisted of L2 words and their L1 translation equivalents were common to two KFL teachers. Second, according to the data, some semantic errors result from semantic differences between the L1 and L2. Three KFL teachers have experienced semantic errors made by students because of semantic difference between English and Korean and semantic transfer of English into Korean. For example, native English learners of Korean make errors when they say “open eyes” or “open arms” in Korean. Korean does not collocate *yeol-da* (translation equivalent of “open”) with eyes or arms. Third, although translation equivalents are very useful to help students understand the concept of target vocabulary, they also cause some semantic errors because translation equivalents do not fully consider the semantic differences between two languages. In addition, these kinds of errors are not always distinct; however, these errors happen to even advanced level language learners when they have to distinguish words of similar meanings.

To conclude, as discussed in the literature review and considered by the collected data, Korean and English have their own different semantic features, and translation equivalents
between them can cause unintentional semantic errors because learners assume that translation equivalents have the same semantic features.
Chapter 4 Portfolio Design

Through the process of the literature review and needs analysis, I set up guidelines for designing my portfolio for teaching Korean vocabulary to English speaking learners. Also, my experiences as a Korean teacher for two and half years in the U.S supported me in devising the guidelines.

Organizing Principle

Previous studies showed very well that semantic features differ in the four domains across languages. In addition, the results of the needs analysis for this project showed related semantic errors. Therefore, I have designed applicable activities for overcoming the weakness of the translation equivalent technique related to naming patterns, motion verbs, spatial terms and nominal number markings.

Teaching Approach

First, considering semantic transfer of translation equivalents, translation equivalents are not enough in acquisition of target vocabulary. To make up for translation equivalent techniques, visualization or internalization of meaning should be added. For example, using pictures or realia could be helpful when target vocabulary words are nouns, especially concrete objects. Visual images, such as pictures or realia, could help learners to become aware of the differences in naming patterns. Jiang (2004a) claimed language learners’ awareness of naming patterns could encourage further semantic restructuring.

In addition, translation equivalents with semantic differences between Korean and English should be provided with contextualized input. Semantic errors related to translation
equivalents are found easily when learners use the words in oral or written communication. In the assessment like dictation quiz, those errors are not easily found. To give contextualized input, storybooks are one of the better ways.

Besides, various classroom activities should closely involve the learner’s interests or needs. The purpose of vocabulary teaching is to use the words in real communication. Interests or needs can be a good motivation to keep learning and to use the target vocabulary.

Last, explicit intervention of instructors or teachers is needed to correct any mismatch of L1 and L2 word for learners’ semantic development. Learners are not good at distinguishing meaning differences between translation equivalents. Also, it takes too much time to develop a semantic system of a target language in the context of the foreign language. So, in this condition, explicit intervention of instructors seems desirable to help students extend their target language semantic system.

Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives have been organized in four parts.

Naming Patterns Goal

Goal 1: Students will comprehend the difference of naming patterns between Korean and English.

Objectives:

1. Students will be able to comprehend that there may be material preference or function preference for naming objects in Korean.

2. Students will be able to identify two similarly shaped objects with different names.
Goal 2: Students will memorize words by visualizing target words without translation into the mother tongue.

Objectives:
1. Students will be able to match objects and letters.

**Motion Verbs Goal**

Goal 1: Students will use nonverbal cues to increase communicative competence.

Objectives:
1. Students will be able to produce nonverbal cues, such as gestures and facial expressions, subject to Korean culture.

Goal 2: Students will internalize that motion verbs in Korean include path.

Objectives:
1. Students will be able to produce related motions or Korean sign language with target motion verbs.

**Spatial Terms**

Goal 1: Students will understand that vertical movements should be expressed with various positioning words.

Objectives:
1. Students will be able to produce various positioning words in Korean correctly.

**Number Markings**

Goal 1: Students will increase familiarity with the two number systems in Korean.
Objectives:

1. Students will be able to distinguish when to use the pure Korean number system.
2. Students will be able to distinguish when to use the Sino-Korean number system.

Goal 2: Students will understand how to use nominal number marking in Korean.

Objectives:

1. Students will be able to choose the right quantifiers (counting unit) relevant to nouns.
2. Students will be able to produce number markings in order of noun, number and quantifier.
Chapter 5 Activities and Sample Lessons

In this chapter, sample activities and lesson plans are presented for four domains: naming patterns, motion verbs, spatial terms, and number marking. The four domains were selected not only because of the previous studies that claimed the domains showed distinct semantic differences across languages, but also because of the results of the needs analysis, as well as my experiences as a foreign language learner and teacher, which gave evidence of some semantic errors. So to produce this teaching portfolio, activities created by me and activities adapted from other resources are compiled.

Activities

Naming Patterns

1. Identification Activity: Bahng(room) or Sil(room)?

   1) Time: 15 minutes
   2) Proficiency level: intermediate
   3) Age level: Adult
   4) Number of students: 10 or less.
   5) Goal: Students will comprehend the difference of naming patterns between Korean and English.
   6) Objectives:
      a. Students will be able to comprehend that there is material preference or function preference for naming objects in Korean.
      b. Students will be able to identify the difference between bahng and sil/.
      c. Students will be able to understand that room is not always translated into bahng.
7) Procedure:

a. Teacher provides target vocabulary with visual aids, such as pictures. Five to ten words are a desirable number for presentation (2 min).

b. Students are asked to produce or label the names of objects working individually (1 min).

c. Form a group of three or four and have a group discussion for deciding the name of each object and the reason (3 min).

d. Each group selects a spokesperson and presents names and reasons (4 min).

e. Teacher provides some answers and encourages students to report the difference in naming patterns between English and Korean. Teacher adds some explanation on cultural background if possible (3 min).

f. Students are asked to rename remaining objects (2 min).

방 (room) or 실(room) ?
What's the difference between bang and sil? Let's try naming.
1. Name the following place.
2. Share the names of given pictures in your group.
3. Each group reports the names and reasons.
4. Rename the places.
2. Show & Tell Activity: Tell me what it is for?

1) Time: 5 minutes

2) Proficiency level: advanced

3) Age level: Adults

4) Number of students: 10 or less.

5) Goal: Students will develop rich vocabulary of target culture.

6) Objectives:
   a. Students will be able to comprehend and produce necessary vocabulary for given objects.

7) Procedures:
   a. Teachers shows a cultural object to the class
   b. The object is sent around to share among students and returned to the teacher (1 min).
   c. Teacher shows the object and asks students the name of the object in Korean.

   Ex) T: 이건 뭐예요? (What is this?)

   S: 사탕 (Satang, candy)........?

   T: 잘 해어요. (Good try) 이건 뭐예요? (This is a Yut)

   d. Teacher asks the characteristics of the object, such as shape, color, touch, materials, and function.

   T: 사탕과 달라요. (It’s not Satang).

   (Showing candies) 어떻게 다르죠? (What’s the difference?)

   S: 모양이 달라요. (The shape is different)
e. Teacher and students keep asking and answer. Teacher draws a word map.
f. Review some difficult words.
3. Memory Game: This activity is taken from Sogang Korean 1 A.

1) Time: 10 minutes

2) Proficiency level: beginning

3) Age level: young or adult learners

4) Number of students: 10 or less.

5) Goal: Students will memorize words by matching objects without translation of mother tongue

6) Objectives:
   a. Students will be able to match objects and letters.

7) Procedures:
   a. Teacher presents the name of the objects on the picture cards and students repeat the words (2 min).
   b. Make groups of four.
   c. Students review the words (working in group, 2 min)
   d. Students play a memory game using pairs of cards; match the pictures with the word cards (5 min).
   e. Teacher writes down words that students have difficulty memorizing and reviews them (1 min).
   f. This activity could be applicable to learning concrete object words such as fruits, vegetables, vehicles, and so on.
Memory Game

Let's play a memory game.

1. Read aloud words on the picture cards.
2. Make groups of four.
3. Play a memory game; match the pictures with the words.
4. Review the words.

Preparation:
Say the names of the objects on the picture cards.

Activity:
Play a memory game using pairs of cards; match the pictures with the word cards.

Follow-up:
Write down any difficult vocabulary words and review them.

Picture from Sogang Korean 1 A
**Motion Verbs**

1. Guess the words through mime activity.

   1) Time: 15 minutes

   2) Proficiency level: beginning

   3) Age level: young or adult learners

   4) Number of students: 10 or less.

   5) Goal: a. Students will internalize manner or direction of action verbs by performing some actions.

      b. Students will be able to use nonverbal cues to increase communicative competence.

   6) Objectives:

      a. Students will be able to visualize the meaning of words with gestures, facial features, and movement.

   7) Procedures:

      a. Teacher prepares ten verb cards.

      b. Teacher presents the meanings of the verbs (2 min).

      c. A student chooses a card, and mimes the action written on it (1 min).

      d. Other students guess what the word is.

      e. Next student chooses a card, and mimes the action (1 min each).

      f. After the last student is done, Teacher reviews difficult words (3 min).
**Pantomime**

*Mime an action.*

1. *Choose a card.*
2. *Mime the action written on it.*
3. *Your classmates guess the words.*
4. *Review the words.*

**Word List:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>올라가다</td>
<td>Climb up, go up, get on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>내려가다</td>
<td>Move down, descend, go down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>올리다</td>
<td>Raise, lift up, upload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>내리다</td>
<td>Take down, lower down,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>주다</td>
<td>Give, present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>받다</td>
<td>Get, take, receive, accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>보다</td>
<td>See, look at, watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>듣다</td>
<td>Listen to, hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>세수하다</td>
<td>Wash one’s face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>닦다</td>
<td>Brush, wipe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Vocabulary teaching with KSL (Korean Sign Language).

   1) Time: 15 minutes

   2) Proficiency level: beginning

   3) Age level: young or adult learners

   4) Number of students: 10 or less.

   5) Goal: Students will internalize meaning of motion verbs.

   6) Objectives: Students will be able to memorize words with relevant sign language.

   7) Procedures:

      a. Teacher prepares ten verb cards.

      b. Present each word with Korean sign language (3 min).

      c. Students practice 10 words with sign language (working individually, 5 min).

      d. Divide students into two teams. Each team makes a line facing the front.

         Students at the back of each line read a card that teacher shows.

         The students deliver the word with Korean sign language. The next students
         repeat the process. The students at the front of the line write the words on the
         blackboard. The team that writes the most words correctly, wins (5 min).

      e. Review different words (2 min)
Deliver words with sign language

Let's working on new vocabulary with Korean sign languages.
1. Present each verb with Korean sign language.
2. Memorize verbs with their sign language.
3. Make two teams and line up facing the front.
4. Teacher shows a card and the students at the end of line read the card.
5. Deliver the words with sign language to next student.
6. Students in the front of line write the words on the blackboard.
7. Review the words.

Word list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Sign languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>먹다 (Eat)</td>
<td>오른쪽 손바닥을 구부러 먹는 동작을 한다. (Gently curl your right hand and pretend to eat something.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>마시다 (Drink)</td>
<td>오른 손에 컵을 전 모습에서 마시는 동작을 한다. (Make pretend to hold a glass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>삼키다 (Swallow)</td>
<td>오른 손을 약간 구부러 턱 맞에서목 앞으로 모아 쥘며 내린다. (Gently close your right hand and lower your hand from front chin to neck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>배우다 (Learn)</td>
<td>오른 손 검지 손가락을 구부러 코코코를 한다. (Make a right angle with your second right finger and point your nose three times.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>보다 (See, Look at)</td>
<td>양손 엄지와 검지를 등그랗게 하여 눈 앞에 앞으로 믿다. (Form a circle with your index finger and thumb with both hands, put them on eyes and move them straight out)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource from
Spatial Terms

1. Raise/lower your blue/white flag Activity (up & down)

   1) Time: 5 minutes
   2) Proficiency level: beginning
   3) Age level: young or adult learners
   4) Number of students: 10 or less.
   5) Goal: Students will understand that Korean verbs include path.
   6) Objectives:
      a. Students will be able to say olida (lift up) and nerida (lower).
      b. Students will be able to say imperative mood of olida and nerida.
      c. Students will be able to listen to and respond to do/don’t correctly.
   7) Procedures:
      a. Two students make one team.
      b. One student takes two flags in each hand, and follows the command that the other
         says. For example, if B says 정기 올리 (chung gi olyu, raise your blue flag), then
         A raises only the blue flag. If B says 백기 내려 (bak gi naryu, lower your white
         flag), then A lowers only the white flag.
      c. Students take turns.
      d. After students are used to listening to and responding to do “do-imperative”,
         “don’t-imperative” of olida and nerida is added to play.
청기 올려 (Raise your Blue flag!)

Let's play a game!

1. Do rock, scissors, and paper with your partner.
2. One commands, and the other takes two flags (blue, white) in each hand.
3. According to commands, the flagman carries out the commands.
4. Take turns.

Imperative Sentences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>청기 올려</td>
<td>Raise up your blue flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>청기 내려</td>
<td>Lower your blue flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>백기 올려</td>
<td>Raise your white flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>백기 내려</td>
<td>Lower your white flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>청기 올리지마</td>
<td>Don’t raise your blue flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>청기 내리지마</td>
<td>Don’t lower your blue flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>백기 올리지마</td>
<td>Don’t raise your white flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>백기 내리지마</td>
<td>Don’t lower your white flag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Numbers and Number Marking

1. Problem Solving Activity: Let’s play a baseball game.
   1) Time: 10 minutes
   2) Proficiency level: beginning
   3) Age level: adults
   4) Number of students: 10 or less.
   5) Goal: Students will increase their familiarity with numbers and classifiers in Korean.
   6) Objectives:
      a. Students will be able to comprehend numbers that they hear in Korean.
      b. Students will be able to produce numbers with classifiers in Korean.
   7) Procedure:
      a. Divide the class into two groups (team A, team B), and select team leaders (1 min).
      b. The team leaders decide a three digit number, but do not show the number to the opposite team.
      c. Members in team B guess the number of team A by turns.
      d. For each number, the leader of Team A should say how many strikes and balls there are in Korean, for example, “one strike and two balls.” After students master how to say, change the answer to “strike han(number 1) gae (classifier), ball du (number 2) gae (classifier)”. A strike means that a number and its digits are correct. A ball means that the number is in different digits (3 min).
      e. Team B can try 5 times to find the correct 3 digit number through discussion (3 min).
      f. If team B guesses the correct answer within 5 times, then team B has one point.
Let's Play a Baseball game!

Guess the three digit number while asking and answering.

How to play:
1. Select your group leader.
2. The team leader thinks a three digit number (example 345)
3. Team A starts first. Team B guesses the number and says three numbers.
4. Team leader compares each digit of two numbers, and tells the results. For example, if the original number is 345, and a guessed number is 357, then team leader should say "one strike and one ball".
5. Members of team B take turns to find the correct numbers.
6. Each team has five times chance to guess.
7. Speaking in Korean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team A has:</th>
<th>2 4 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team B says:</td>
<td>2 7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strike Du gae (two strikes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team A</th>
<th>Team B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Counting Number Game: Play 3, 6, 9 game!

This activity is taken from a book, Sogang Korean 1A (2009).

1) Time: 5 minutes
2) Proficiency level: beginning
3) Age level: young or adult learners
4) Number of students: 10 or less.
5) Goal: Students will be able to count numbers from 0 to 100 in Korean

6) Objectives:
   a. Students will be able to say numbers in Korean.
   b. Students will be able to listen to numbers in Korean

7) Procedures:
   a. The first student starts by saying the number 0.
   b. Next student says '1', and the next says '2', and so on.
   c. If your number contains '3', '6', or '9', clap your hands instead of saying the number.
   d. If anyone misses clapping or says the wrong number, start with '0' from the person.
   e. Repeat the game faster.
   f. Review counting numbers (2 min).

---

**Let's Play 3, 6, 9 game!**

Clap your hands if your number contains 3, 6, or 9

0 1 2 🌞 4 🌞 5 🌞 7, 8, 🌞 10, 11, 12, 🌞 ....

---


   The idea of this activity was from the instructor, Bomi Oh, whose class I observed.

   1) Time: 17 minutes
   2) Proficiency level: beginning
3) Age level: young or adult learners

4) Number of students: 10 or less.

5) Goal: Students will be able to understand how to mark numbers of nouns and how to order noun, its number and its unit in Korean.

6) Objectives:
   a. Students can count nouns with number and quantifier in Korean
   b. Students will be able to connect noun with counting unit in Korean.

7) Procedures:
   a. Teacher reviews nouns with counting units (2 min).
   b. Teacher hands out the song, and translates the lyrics of the song (1 min).
   c. Play the song using multimedia video clip and repeat the song until students master the rhythm and melody (5 min).
   d. Make groups of three or four.
   e. Students change the lyrics by replacing nouns and counting units (5 min).
   f. Each team presents the rewritten song (3 min).
   g. Teacher writes the nouns and counters.
   h. Review nouns and counter (1 min).
나도 작사가! (I'm a songwriter.)

Write a lyric.
1. Sing a song "Three Bears".
2. Change the lyric of the song with your partners. Replace three bears into other noun with number and its counting unit.
3. Present your group song!
4. Review the words.

곰 세 마리

곰 세 마리가 한 집에 있어
아빠곰, 엄마곰, 애기곰
아빠곰은 동동해
엄마곰은 날쌔해
애기곰은 너무 귀여워

책 (book) → 권 (counting unit: Kwon)
연필 (pencil) → 자루 (counting unit: Jaru)
동물 (animal) → 마리 (mari)
Lesson Plans

Sample 1: 어디에 가세요? (Where are you going?)

1) Students:

My target students are ten beginning level adult students in the US. Their native language is English, and they are learning Korean to communicate with Korean communities in Eugene. Their ages differ from twenty to fifty.

2) Time: 50 minutes

3) Objectives:

➢ Students will get familiarized with two Korean cardinal number systems.

   o Students will be able to say the hour in pure-Korean number with 시 (Si).

   o Students will be able to say minutes in Sino-Korean number with 분 (bun).

   o Students will be able to ask and answer time.

➢ Students will internalize meaning of action verbs.

   o Students will be able to visualize action verbs using gestures.

➢ Students will collaboratively work with other classmates to practice classroom activities.

4) Materials: Vocabulary packet, Text book, flash cards, a clock, time-zone map

5) Procedures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>- Small talk (1 min): T asks 2~3 students what time they get up every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>- Counting 1 to 12 in pure-Korean numbers.</td>
<td>A toy clock, Time</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Counting hour with \( \text{\textbullet} \) (hour) in pure-Korean numbers.
- Counting 1 to 60 in Sino-Korean numbers.
- Counting minutes with 분 (minutes) by 10 minute-rate in Sino-Korean numbers.
- T asks and SS answer, "What time is it now?" in Korean (controlled Activity)
- Work in pairs with a time zone map
  Ex) What time is it now in Korea?

- T presents 10 action verbs: study, wash one's face, shop, do homework, exercise, talk, work, make a phone call, take a meal, and go, with flash cards.
- T shows a word written on a card and explains the meaning with Korean sign language.
- Students practice action verbs by imitating T's gestures.
- Delivering Game:
  Divide students into two teams. Each team makes a line facing the front. Students at the back of each line read a card that teacher shows. The students deliver the word with motions. The next students repeat the process. The students at the front of the line write the words on the blackboard.
- Ss practice making questions using time and action.
- Ss write daily schedule.
- Ss share daily schedule in pairs

| difference map worksheet. | Flash cards | 20 min |
| Work sheet. Textbook | 10 min |
Sample 2: 오늘이 몇 월 며칠이에요? What’s the date today?

1) Students:

My students are ten beginning level adult students in the US. Their native language is English, and they are learning Korean to communicate with Korean communities in Eugene. Their ages differ from twenty to fifty.

2) Time: 50 minutes

3) Objectives:

➢ Students will get familiarized with the words related to date.

   o Students will be able to say months in Korean, such as Sino-Korean number + counting unit for month.

   o Students will be able to correctly pronounce 유월(June), 시월(October) in Korean.

   o Students will be able to say the seven days of the week in Korean.

   o Students will be able to write the date in Korean style (year, month, and day).

➢ Students will distinguish the different usage between interrogative pronouns ‘몇’(which/what) and ‘무슨’(what).
Students will be able to ask today’s date using interrogative ‘몇’ (what/which).

Students will be able to ask the day using interrogative pronoun ‘무슨’ (what/which)

Students will collaboratively work with other classmates to practice classroom activities.

4) **Materials**: Vocabulary packet, textbook, flash cards

5) **Procedures**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>- Small talk (1 min): Teacher asks students today’s day, date, and years and writes them on the BB in American style and Korean style. Teacher asks students the differences between them. Students read the date in Korean style using counters 년, 월, and 일 (counter for year, month, and day)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>- Review how to read numbers more than 100.</td>
<td>Vocabulary Packet</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Practice reading the years in the packet in pairs with the counter ‘년’ (nyun).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review how to count 1 to 12 in Sino-Korean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Practice saying the twelve months with the counter ‘월’ (Wol) in pairs. In particular, be careful to pronounce June and October in Korean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Change the date to Korean style and write the date in pairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review how to read and write date in Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style.</td>
<td>Flash cards</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- T presents 7 days: 월요일, 화요일, 수요일, 목요일, 금요일, 토요일, 일요일 with flash cards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Make a group of four and play memory game.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One set of cards has English words on it and the other set of cards has Korean words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ss sing a ‘day song’ with cues that T provides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review how to say today’s date in the Korean way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ss ask and answer while looking at a calendar in pairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ss share the most meaningful day of their lives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review &amp; Home work Assignment</th>
<th>Review time.</th>
<th>2 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T assigns this week’s hw.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6 Conclusion

This project is a vocabulary teaching portfolio in which various activities have been developed to help Korean language teachers in the Korean as a foreign language context. Through reviewing the literature on semantic differences and semantic transfer and conducting a needs analysis involving Korean language teachers and Korean language learners, I found that translation equivalents used by learners of Korean are not clear enough and can cause semantic errors.

On top of that, I found that recognizing semantic differences between English and Korean translation equivalents will develop higher accuracy with Korean vocabulary. For example, if learners know that English words having ‘room’ are translated into bahng or sil depending on their function, they would use the words more correctly. In addition, recognition of semantic differences can lead to better understanding of Korean culture. For example, bahng is generally used for traditional housing styles and sil is used for a modern Western housing styles. Also, the internalization of the knowledge of semantic differences can increase the possibility of communicative competence because lexical competence is the core of communicative competence (Decarrico, 2004)

Through this, I expect to help Korean teachers to gain more understanding of semantic transfer and weakness of translation equivalents techniques so as to help them adapt new activities and materials for vocabulary teaching in their classrooms. Also, it is hoped that these ideas may be applicable to English teachers in Korea.
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Appendices

Appendix A. Interview Rubric for KFL Teachers

By filling out this interview question, you are taking part in research being conducted by Yunkyung Lee, yunkyung@uoregon.edu, who is working on an MA in Linguistics, Language Teaching Specialization, at the University of Oregon. The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information for cross-linguistic semantic differences between English and Korean and semantic errors of translation equivalents. Your participation is voluntary. Any information you provide will confidential and your name will not be used in the project. If you are willing to complete this questionnaire, please let me know by return email.

1. How long have you taught/ been teaching Korean language in KFL setting?
2. What grade do/did you teach?
3. How many students on average do you teach in a class?
4. What are your favorite techniques to effectively teach vocabulary in your class and the reasons?
   Examples:
   • Using pictures
   • Making stories
   • games
   • Making vocabulary list
   • Other
5. What kind of semantic errors have you experienced in your class due to translation equivalents?
   Examples:
   • Number - singular/plural
   • Motion Verb- climb up, climb down,
   • Spatial - on/ over, in/on
   • Container - shape / material
   • Object / Substance
   • Other
Appendix B. Interview Rubric for Korean Language Learners

Consent Form

Yunkyung Lee, yunkyung@uoregon.edu, a graduate student from the Language Teaching Specialization program, Linguistics Department, University of Oregon, is conducting this interview to collect information for the semantic error analysis of a Korean language program for KFL and EFL teachers in a KFL setting. Your participation is voluntary. Any information you provide will confidential and your name will not be used in the project without your permission. Your signature will indicate that you give permission for Yunkyung Lee to use information from the interview in her terminal project.

Please print

Date ______________

Participant’s Name ______________________

Participant’s signature ___________________
Interview Rubric

<General information>

1. Why did you learn Korean?

2. How many years have you studied Korean?

3. Which level do you think you are?

4. Have you ever been in Korean?

5. Have you ever taught English in Korean or to Koreans?

6. What's the most difficult part to learn Korean?

7. <Specific individual task>

   7-1. Describe a picture copied from a storybook (see Appendix E).

   7-2. Describe a picture (see Appendix F).

<After Description>

8. What was the most difficult thing when you describe the picture or the story.
Appendix C. Integrated Observation Tool

Class ___________________________ Level ____________ Date ____________

Time Period ______________________ Site ____________________________

Classroom Diagram

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
<th>Comments/Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Semantic Error Analysis Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word-level</th>
<th>Collocation-Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. A Picture Copied from "Frog, where are you?" written by Mercer Meyer
Appendix F. A Picture with Various Shapes