Arif Sarıçoban, Hacettepe University, Turkey

Arif Sarıçoban, Hacettepe University, Turkey
Hamdiye Avcı, Karabuk University, Turkey
Handenur Coşkun, University of Turkish Aeronautical Association, Turkey
Leyla Karakurt, Hacettepe University, Turkey

The Asian Conference on the Social Sciences 2015
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract
This paper attempted to reveal to what extent using non-verbal semiotic elements (visuals, realias, maps, videos, body language, gestures etc.) influences the efficiency of vocabulary teaching. For this purpose, one experiment group (30 prep-class students from different engineering departments) and one control group (35 prep-class students from different engineering departments) were recruited from Karabük University. While in the control group just the meaning of the vocabulary items were told in students' mother tongue, in the experiment group different non-verbal semiotic elements were used in order to explain the words. After four weeks of teaching, a vocabulary post-test was applied and as a result a significant difference between the scores of control group and experiment group was obtained.

Keywords: Semiotics, Vocabulary Teaching, Foreign Language Teaching

1.0 Introduction

Vocabulary has a central role in English Language Teaching because students cannot understand others or express their own ideas without sufficient vocabulary. Wilkins (1972) says that "... while without grammar little can be conveyed, without vocabulary *nothing* can be conveyed" (pp.111-112). Even without grammar, with some key words and expressions, one may manage to communicate in different languages. Lewis (1993) also made contribution to this point, "lexis is the core or heart of language" (p.89). Since words have a significant role in reflecting our feelings, emotions, and ideas to others during communication, foreign language teachers should put a great emphasis on vocabulary teaching in their classes. The mastery of vocabulary can support the learners in speaking when they are communicating to people otherwise they will not be able to speak, write and translate anything in English. Given the circumstances that affect our teaching, it can be stated that it takes quite a long time to succeed in vocabulary teaching. The reason is the obstacles created unintentionally between cultures. Therefore, it is a well-known fact that vocabulary is very crucial with respect to the real communication to take place. Keeping that in mind, we yearn for searching the effects of using non-verbal semiotic elements in teaching vocabulary in EFL classes as students cannot make use of it without seeing the connection and the differences between their culture and the target one.

In respect to the semiotics, it is the science of signs, of symbolic behavior or of communication system (Lyons, 2004, p.17). Semiotics has been a field of interest for scholars with its applications in many fields of study since it has inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary nature and acts as a link between semiotics and foreign language teaching, educational semiotics has drawn growing attention of instructors and teachers all over the world. It was mainly studied by Levi-Strauss (1963) and Geertz (1973) who basically asserted that semiotics is a way of teaching language and culture using signs, symbols, icons, and several semiotic elements both verbal and non-verbal. According to Kim (1996:3), there are two main concerns of semiotics. The first one concerns the relationship between sign and its meaning. In the second, semiotics deals with the way by which signs are combined through following certain rules, or codes. What is more, the central theme of semiotics is the exchange of messages and of the system of signs that underlie them (Sebeok, 1991:60). According to Hişmanoğlu (2008), because of the fact that it contains "considerations of how messages are successively generated, encoded, transmitted, decoded and interpreted, and how this entire process is worked upon by the context, it is closely related with vocabulary teaching" (p.52).

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to see whether using non-verbal semiotic elements while teaching vocabulary has positive effect on acquisition of new vocabulary items at Karabük University, A2 Level Prep School classes.

1.2 Limitations

While conducting this study, some limitations were encountered. Firstly, due to the strict regulations of the school and limited time, one experimental group (41 students) and one control group (43 students) could be recruited. The day when the quiz was conducted 11 students from experimental group and 8 students from control group

were absent. Therefore, results would be more generalizable if more students participated. Secondly, vocabulary items could be chosen from different vocabulary categories such as colour names, proverbs, idioms, onomatopoeic words and compound words etc. and results could be interpreted accordingly. Yet, the level of the students (A2 Level) was not appropriate and the words which were in the curriculum had to be used.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Background Information about Vocabulary Teaching

In the scope of ELT, vocabulary teaching has the utmost importance because without knowing necessary vocabulary items, one cannot express what s/he intends to say and "vocabulary acquisition is the largest and most important task facing the language learner." (Swan & Walter, 1984). Due to this simple fact, almost each and every approach gives much importance to vocabulary teaching and has different ideas about how to teach vocabulary. Before stating these ideas, the definition of vocabulary and what knowing a vocabulary means should be mentioned. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary defined the vocabulary as "all the words that a person knows and uses" (2006: 1645) and knowing a vocabulary can be described at basic level as having knowledge about both form and meaning. In a deeper sense it means having the knowledge about its (Harmer 1993):

1) meaning, i.e. relating the word to an appropriate object or context
2) usage, i.e. knowledge of its collocations, metaphors and idioms, as well as style and register (the appropriate level of formality), to be aware of any connotations and associations the word might have
3) word formation, i.e. ability to spell and pronounce the word correctly, to know any derivations (acceptable prefixes and suffixes),
4) grammar, i.e. to use it in the appropriate grammatical form.

Considering all these information, effective teaching and learning should be accomplished. In order to do so, being knowledgeable about the process of 'learning a vocabulary' is crucial for language teachers. This process is described by Nation and Gu (2007) in five stages (Kersten 2010: 63): encountering new words; getting the word form; getting the word meaning; consolidating word form and meaning in memory; using the word. Keeping these in mind and taking the purpose of this paper into consideration, just some of the most effective approaches' points of view about vocabulary teaching will be dealt with in detail.

2.1.1 Grammar Translation Method:

The oldest methodology is Grammar Translation Method and as the name suggests it largely depends on the translation of a sentence or text from English into mother tongue or vice versa. Students are provided with long vocabulary lists and bilingual dictionaries and they are expected to learn them without any context. Students try to acquire them in L1 as in L2 and they can practice vocabulary items.

2.1.2 The Reading Approach:

This approach gave more priority to vocabulary than grammatical skills. The students are able to identify meaning rather than letters or words. The reading approach strictly controlled the vocabulary of the early readings. The two of teaching and learning activities are intensive and extensive readings in this approach and one of the most

significant roles of extensive reading in language learning is to increase the knowledge of vocabulary. Since the acquisition of vocabulary was regarded more prominent than the mastery of grammatical skills, expanding vocabulary as fast as possible was of great importance (Celce-Murcia and Prator 1979:3).

2.1.3 The Direct Method:

In the Direct Method, language is for oral use, knowing a language is being able to speak and there is a direct relation between form and meaning. Therefore, students study common, everyday speech in the target language. Vocabulary is emphasized over grammar, since there is no permission for translation; vocabulary teaching takes a lot of time.

2.1.4 The Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching:

In this approach, language teaching begins with spoken language. Material is taught orally before it is presented in written form. Reading and writing are introduced once a sufficient lexical and grammatical basis is established. There is a great focus on vocabulary and reading in the Oral-Situational approach. Actually, mastery of a set of high frequency vocabulary items is believed to result in good reading skills. Vocabulary selection procedures, which are directed according to the situations practiced that day, are followed to ensure that an essential general service vocabulary is covered.

2.1.5 The Audio-Lingual Method:

The Audio-Lingual Method, which is also called Army Method simply because of the armies that needed to become orally proficient in the languages of their allies and enemies during the World War II, is based on the behaviorist theory. It accepted that a human being can be trained using a system of reinforcement which means correct manner gets positive feedback, while errors receive negative feedback. In the Audiolingual the emphasis is on the acquisition of structures and patterns in common everyday dialogue. It is assumed that when grammatical fluency is present, exposure to the foreign language itself leads to vocabulary development (Coady 1993:4).

2.1.6 The Cognitive Approach:

In this approach, psychologists tried to create rules and explanations of human behavior and eventually generalized them to everyone's behavior. Therefore, they believed that language learning is a rule acquisition. Its theoretical base depends on the Transformational-Generative Grammar of Chomsky. In the Cognitive Approach, the acquisition of an adequate vocabulary is very important for a great use of second language use. After the students get the sufficient amount of vocabulary, they can use the structures and functions during the act of communication. In this classroom, the action should be from competence to performance or she should follow the presentation, practice and the application stages. Some of the techniques that can be used in a Cognitive class are teaching the meanings of the lexical items through contextualization, demonstrations, drawings, real objects, flashcards, OHP, etc and teachers teach synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, collocations, cognates and semantic fields in these classrooms.

2.1.7 Affective-Humanistic Approach:

In affective-humanistic approach to language teaching, learning a foreign language is a process of self-realization and of relating to other people, which means there is a respect for individual and his/her feelings. So in a humanistic classroom, the students develop problem solving strategies, reasoning skills, free will, self-development, and co-operation. Humanism and learning theory are combined, teacher is very humanistic and it is in practice integrated with teaching language items, teaching skills and flexibility. The most well-known applications of humanism in ELT are those of Curran's Counselling-Learning in which teaching of oral proficiency is very significant; particular pronunciation patterns and vocabulary are dealt with and Gattegno's Silent Way approach in which students are taught vocabulary items by using visual aids and word-charts. Functional vocabulary and core structure are the key to the spirit of the language. Thus, the syllabus is designed with the structural lessons planned around grammatical items and related vocabulary.

2.1.8 The Communicative Approach:

This approach is based on the view that language is learned when the students are involved in real communication. There is a shift from a focus on accuracy and the forms of language, to a focus on communication and fluency. It sees the language learning as a process of creating construction involving trial and error. In the CLT classrooms, the primary units of language are not merely its grammatical and structural features, but categories of functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse. New words are not presented in isolation, but in the context of a complete sentence, and in a meaningful situation (Şenel, 2002). Moreover, Thornbury (2002:14) stated that course books begin to incorporate communicative activities specifically targeting vocabulary since the meaning-giving role of lexis is recognized in this approach.

2.1.9 Lexical Approach:

This approach concentrates on developing learners' proficiency with lexis, or words and word combinations. So, lexis is the basis of language. It is believed that if learners do not recognize the meaning of keywords, they cannot take part in conversations. Lewis (1997:7) claims that "language contains not traditional grammar and vocabulary, but often multi-word prefabricated chunks". In the classrooms that focus on the Lexical approach; collocations, phrasal verbs, idioms catchphrases, sayings, sentence frames, social formulae and discourse markers are used as the most important chunks for the foreign language learner.

2.2 Techniques in Teaching New Vocabulary

Murcia 1991:301-302 lists different techniques used in presenting new vocabulary as follows:

- visual aids (pictures, objects)
- word relations (synonyms, antonyms)
- pictorial schemata (Venn diagrams, grids, tree diagrams, or stepped scales)
- definition, explanation, examples, and anecdotes
- context
- word roots and affixes

Ur 1996:63 also suggests different techniques:

- concise definition
- detailed description (of appearance, qualities...)
- examples
- illustration (picture, object)
- demonstration (acting, mime)
- context (story or sentence in which the item occurs)
- synonym, hyponyms, hypernyms
- opposite(s) (antonyms)
- translation
- associated ideas, collocations

2.3 Semiotic Approach's View about Vocabulary Teaching

2.3.1 What is Semiotics?

The Semiotic Approach (SA) dates back to the time of the philosophers such as Aristotle, Plato, Socrat, Sextus, and Heraclitus, who generally thought 'the language is the sign system of our minds'. However, the field of semiotics, with its current meaning, was mainly studied in the 1950's (Şenel, 2007). Tobin (1990) states that semiotics includes visual and verbal as well as tactile and olfactory *signs* as they form code systems, which systematically communicate information or messages. Here we should think about what the sign, which is the basic unit of semiotics, is. Sign is actually the combination of signified and signifier. Sert (2006) states that the relationship between the signifier and the signified is mutual and reciprocal which means that one cannot speak of a sign freed from its signifier or signified. They interact with each other and directly affect one another. Basically, the signifier is the form that the sign takes and the signified is the concept that the form represents. For example, when we think about "car", the car as an object is the signified and the sound pattern (or in written form) is the signifier, which represents the car as coded culturally to our minds. The relationship between signifier and signified is totally arbitrary and culture dependent; signifier can be "araba" in Turkish and "auto" in Germany and there is no explanation behind this; it should be learnt by the speaker. We call this type of signs as s*ymbol*, which is one of the three types of sign; the others are icon and index. Sert (2006) indicates that symbol is a mode in which the signifier does not resemble the signified but which is fundamentally arbitrary or purely conventional-so that the relationship must be learned (numbers, national flags, particular languages, Morse code etc.). Icon is a mode in which the signifier is perceived as resembling or imitating the signified (cartoon, portrait, imitative gestures, etc.). On the other hand, as Chandler (2002) argues, index is a mode in which the signifier is not arbitrarily, but directly connected to the signified (as in the relation between fire and smoke. We can classify these signs as *non-verbal communication* elements which are wordless messages that can be sent through gestures, body language, facial expressions, eye contact etc. (Abushibab, 2012). Together with non-verbal communication, verbal communication, which is a conversation between two or more individuals by using the speech organs to convey a message (Abushibab, 2012), create the whole communication.

2.3.2 The Relation between Semiotics and ELT

When we consider all of these things in the scope of ELT, it is clearly seen that SA has significant contributions to language teaching. In order to fully understand these contributions; principles of SA should be taken into account first; Şenel (2007) listed the principles as;

- signs and languages are interrelated with each other
- language learning is a sign learning in all aspects
- language learning is a concentrated sign learning, signs are the building blocks of conveying messages
- language learning is reinforced by iconic signs and signs
- in every culture, a sign represents a code of its own
- signs represent something meaningful
- culture is a sign system and communicates itself through signs

As for contributions of SA in ELT, the first thing is that foreign language teachers should be knowledgeable about the concepts that are mentioned above which are verbal, non-verbal and visual communication tools and use them to activate students' knowledge in order to make the language learning more meaningful and understandable. In this perspective language is a whole of signs and learning a language means learning the sign system of that language and since these signs are unique to each culture, learning a language means learning the target culture. Because of this significant fact, teachers had better show the difference across cultures and they should apply communicative activities. Secondly, they can use these elements in order to teach four skills (listening, speaking, writing, reading), grammar and vocabulary. Besides these, teacher can make use of semiotic elements so as to achieve effective classroom management; they can use facial expressions, mimics and gestures and they can make eye contact. Finally, teachers can make use of signs while giving written feedback; using some signs instead of long explanations makes the students understand better.

2.3.3 Using Non-verbal Semiotic Elements in Vocabulary Teaching

Vocabulary teaching has the utmost importance in language teaching because of the fact that without having necessary vocabulary knowledge, one cannot express his/her ideas effectively even if s/he is proficient in the grammar of the target language. However, teaching new vocabulary items that reflect the cultural characteristics of the English language necessitates great attention. "Since color names, proverbs, idioms, compound words, and the use of lexical items in literary texts exhibit culture specific properties, language teachers may encounter some problems in teaching these items to their students" (Hişmanoğlu 2000, p.55). At that point, integrating non-verbal semiotic elements (pictures, relias, iconic images, body language, gestures, facial expressions etc.) into vocabulary teaching plays a vital role in order to contribute to facilitating the learning of meanings of the new words in the target language and making vocabulary learning permanent (Hişmanoğlu 2000, p.66). This situation stems from the fact that by using non-verbal semiotics elements, students' prior knowledge and their schemata will be activated and giving students schemata with which they associate the new information provides a way for them to access the new ideas and to incorporate the new ideas with knowledge they have already stored.

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Research Questions

- ✓ Is there a link between using non-verbal semiotic elements and vocabulary teaching?
- ✓ To what extent does using non-verbal semiotic elements affect teaching vocabulary?
- ✓ Does using non-verbal semiotic elements in vocabulary teaching create differences among students who are from various departments?

3.2 Participants

Given the circumstances of educational environments at universities, assessment and penetration of the effect of teaching vocabulary by means of semiotic elements is best done if carried out on prep students since most of them are new in learning English as a foreign language. With this thought in mind, two groups were chosen, one of which is the control group and they got no teaching based on semiotic elements. The other group, on the other hand, is the core of that study. It can be guaranteed that special attention was paid in order to be able to specify groups which have similar features to make the assessment truly credible. The control group, B39 Class, has 43 elementary (A2) students and their departments are electrical and electronic engineering, mechanical engineering, computer engineering, automotive engineering, rail systems engineering and medicine engineering. The experimental group, B13 Class, has 41 elementary (A2) students and their departments are the same as the control group.

3.3 Data Collection Tools

A posttest (vocabulary quiz) which has 6 different sections was conducted to the experimental and control group in order to see to what extent using non-verbal semiotics elements affect the acquisition of new vocabulary items. Different vocabulary testing tools were applied to increase the reliability of the quiz. In the first section, students were asked to match the 8 words with their definitions, in the second one they were supposed to find the correct words that describe the 9 given pictures. This second part is important in terms of the interpretation of the results because it is the only part that has semiotic element and it is designed in order to see whether it creates a difference in the students' scores. In the third part, students were given 8 sentences that have missing parts and they were asked to complete these sentences by using the vocabulary items in the box above. Then, in the fourth section students were supposed to complete 5 multiple choice questions which include missing sentences and five options. After that, in the fifth part, there were 5 mixed words and students were asked to unscramble them. Finally, students were given 5 sentences in which they were supposed to circle the correct words. As for data analysis, this posttest was evaluated and the results were interpreted regarding the difference between control group and experiment group.

3.4 Design and Procedure

After experimental and control groups were decided, target words were selected from Richmond Publishing's The Big Picture Elementary Book, which is selected from the university and used in the prep school curriculum. 63 words were selected from 8 different units (2-9) with regarding their difficulty and familiarity of the students. The period in which these units would be covered was decided as 4 weeks. Target vocabulary items were taught in vocabulary teaching parts and integrated with the

other skills. Experimental and control group weren't informed about the study but they were told that there could be a vocabulary quiz. However, the time when the quiz was conducted had not been announced beforehand. Through 4 weeks, in the control group's class, translation was used as the technique for vocabulary teaching; just the meanings of the target vocabulary items were told in students' mother tongue (Turkish). In experiment group's class, following non-verbal semiotics elements were used to teach the words. Finally, the posttest which was described in data collection tools part was conducted on each of the groups at the end of the 4 weeks period.

- visual aids (Pictures, Objects)
- word relations (Synonyms, Antonyms)
- pictorial schemata (Venn diagrams, grids, tree diagrams, or concept mapping)
- anecdotes
- presenting in meaningful context (story or sentence in which the item occurs)
- detailed description (of appearance, qualities...)
- acting, facial expressions, body language, gestures
- synonym, hyponyms, antonyms
- associated ideas, collocations
- cultural elements

4.0 Data Analysis and Discussion

Table 1. Averages of the classrooms' scores from post test

	Averages of the classrooms' scores from post test
Experiment group	78.1
Control group	71.6

The first concern of this study is to find out whether there is a link between using non-verbal semiotic elements and vocabulary teaching. As seen on table 1, there is a significant difference between the scores of experimental group and the control group; these findings suggest that making use of non-verbal semiotic elements influences the efficiency of vocabulary teaching in a positive way. While the average of experiment group's scores is 78.1, the average of the control group's scores is 71.6. When it is thought that the classrooms which have very similar students profile were chosen as study groups, it is clearly seen that the thing that creates the difference is whether using non-verbal semiotic elements or not.

The second point is that whether there is a difference among the scores of different departments. Before interpreting the results, we should take two things into consideration first of which is the extra department in the experimental group. In the control group we have 6 departments to evaluate whereas in the experimental group we have 7; the extra one as the metallurgical and materials department. That makes it necessary to add the results of that department to the total results, but on the other hand, not to compare the students' results in this department with the control group so as to ensure validity and reliability of the research since the control group lacks that department. Secondly, the participants taking the quiz in some departments are very few, which unable the correct evaluation of the results, making it hard to compare two identical departments properly in two groups.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the control group

Department	Mean	Minimum Value	Maximum Value
Electrical and Electronic Engineering (II)	72.7	59	87
Mechanical Engineering (II)	72.2	61	80
Computer Engineering (II)	74	42	97
Automotive Engineering (II)	68.3	49	88
Railway Systems Engineering (II)	78	78	78
Medical Engineering (II)	*71*	68	76

The figures in the Table 2 below show the statistical results of the students in different departments in general. As it can be clearly seen, automotive engineering departments has the lowest mean whereas railway systems engineering department has the highest. Yet, it should be noted that only one participant from the railway systems engineering department took the quiz, which makes the mean, minimum and maximum values be the same. That causes a problem in the reliability of the test as it is not right to generalize the results based on only one participant's quiz score. Given the results of the mean, minimum and maximum values, it is computer engineering having the highest score that is 74. On the other hand, that department has the lowest minimum value. There is only one participant in that department having a score under 60. The reason is the lack of background English knowledge of that participant. When checked, the A part in the quiz seems like the most difficult and distinctive part for the students in this group. Especially the students in automotive engineering department had difficulty in answering the questions in that part right. What made it difficult for them is that they were supposed to match the vocabulary words with their definitions. In the other parts, they made use of the semiotic elements intentionally provided whereas in A part there were only words and their definitions, which shows the importance of semiotic elements for students in understanding the activities and carrying them out right.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of the experimental group

Department	Mean	Minimum Value	Maximum Value
Electrical and Electronic Engineering (II)	78	66	94
Mechanical Engineering (II)	77	59	100
Computer Engineering (II)	76.6	61	94
Automotive Engineering (II)	75.5	55	96
Railway Systems Engineering (II)	81	72	90
Medical Engineering (II)	*76.5*	72	81
Metallurgical and Materials Engineering (II)	*79*	58	89

Responses given to the questions in the quiz show that the most successful department in the experimental group is the railway systems engineering department, having 81 as the mean score. However, we have the same situation in the experimental group as in the control group. There were two participants taking the quiz from the railway systems engineering department, the lowest score of which is 72 while the highest is 90. Just like railway systems engineering department, there are other two departments only two students of which took the quiz. These departments are medical engineering and automotive engineering. In this regard, with the mean of 79, participants from the metallurgical and materials engineering departments have the highest score in the quiz. The students belonging to that department did pretty well in the A part which was a problematic one for the others since the students in that department graduated from Anatolian high schools where English learning is given great importance compared to other school types in Turkey. As it can also be depicted in the Table 3, the scores that each and every department got are very close. That can be considered as one of the most indicative results of the research portraying the importance of semiotic elements while teaching vocabulary. They basically help everyone learn the target vocabulary, thus having similar results, good ones.

Upon discussing the results obtained from the quiz for each group, we should draw a parallel between two groups and compare them. First and foremost, the difference between the same departments in each group needs to be discussed. It should be noted that there is not such a big difference between two groups in terms of their English level and background knowledge. That is why; it is obvious that the result we have in that chart is the indication of the success students got in vocabulary learning by means of semiotic elements. The results in the control group vary while similar results have been obtained in the experimental group, thus, showing the positive effect of semiotic elements on vocabulary learning.

When evaluating in depth, we come up with the following statements. In Electrical and Electronic Engineering department, the mean of the students' success in control group is 72.7 whereas it is 78 in the experimental group. In written exams they had similar scores. Yet, in that quiz they differ in their scores. The one and only reason for it is the difference in their learning style. The first group was just informed about the meanings of the target words while the second group had visual aids, PPTs, mind maps…etc., which assisted them a lot not only in an educational way, but also in a fun way. The biggest difference is between the Automotive Engineering departments. The control group has 68.3, and the experimental group has 75.5 as the mean. What causes that gap between two groups is just the way they have been taught vocabulary items.

Hence, it is fair to say that teaching vocabulary through semiotic elements makes a huge difference, easing the process not just for teachers but for students, as well.

Table 4. Difference among the various parts of the quiz

	Total Score	Experiment Group (n=30)	Control Group (n=35)
Part A (Matching the words with the meaning)	16	11.8	10.9
Part B (Matching the words with the pictures)	18	18	17
Part C (Completing the sentences)	16	10.3	9.94
Part D (Multiple Choice)	20	13.6	11.6
Part E (Scrambled words)	15	12.8	12.12
Part F (Circling the correct answer)	15	13	10.4

The last point that is worth to discuss is the assessment phase. As it is explained in the *design and procedure* section; the quiz has a part (Part B) in which students were asked to match the words with the correct pictures. Since this is a part that includes a semiotic element (pictures), it was investigated that whether students will become more successful in that part or not. Thus, the results in table 4 show us that the students made much better in that part than the other parts. This finding reveals the importance of making use of semiotic elements; it is clearly understood that they help the learners grasp and then remember the meanings of the words.

5.0 Conclusion

This study has been set out to investigate the effects of semiotics elements in teaching vocabulary items. The following discussion will focus on the application, appropriateness and usefulness of semiotic elements in teaching vocabulary from both the students' as well as the teacher/researcher's perspective.

It is a crystal-clear fact that while teaching vocabulary, it is of great importance to activate the schema of students with the purpose of ensuring permanent learning, which has been one of the biggest concerns in the field of teaching. With this thought in mind, a four-week-study has been carried out among two prep students groups one of which as the control and the other one as experimental group at Karabuk University. During 4 weeks, the experimental group was taught 8 units in the book, The Big Picture Elementary by Richmond Publishing. As for the control group, the students in that group were just given the L1 translation of the target vocabulary items. The experimental group was provided with different techniques and activities. As Ur (1996:63) and Murcia (1991:301-302) stated, there are many different ways and techniques of presenting new vocabulary and most of them, which has been explained in detail below, are paid great attention to be used while performing that study.

The first teaching stage of the study focused on identifying the schematic stages of the students and how cohesion is achieved. The experimental group consists of students learning better with visual aids. Focusing on only the meaning (translated into L1) has had a temporary effect on learning target vocabulary items whereas the meaning

enriched with visual aids has provided just the opposite. To that end, the techniques below have been used;

- ✓ visual aids (pictures, objects) to teach items like household, furniture, jobs
- ✓ word relations (synonyms, antonyms) to teach adjectives
- ✓ definition, explanation, examples, and anecdotes to teach target vocabulary for quantifiers
- ✓ detailed description (of appearance, qualities...) to teach body parts, adjectives and adverbs
- ✓ demonstration (acting, mime) to teach target vocabulary for Future Tense structures
- ✓ opposite(s) (antonyms) to teach weather types

The techniques mentioned above have helped carry the point of the study. The experimental group got the average of 78.1 in the assessment quiz at the end of the study while the control group, which has only been taught the L1 meaning of the target vocabulary, got 71.6. To sum up this discussion of the data in response to the research question that was posed "Are semiotic elements effective in teaching vocabulary items?" there are two main points to be made:

I. the students' ability to examine a number of vocabulary items on their own, use the target items while speaking improved. The systemic functional semiotic teaching was an important and fruitful way to get the desired result.

II. using semiotic elements gave the opportunity to have a friendly atmosphere while learning, which also helped get students to be enthusiastic about learning as they had the chance of learning cultural elements by means of visual aids.

At the end of the study carried out, there are points need to be taken into account, one of which is the difference between average points of the two groups. The control group members had hard times recalling the words while having the quiz. The experimental group, on the other hand, did not experience something like this. The second thing to be considered and catered as the proof for the reliability of the study is that two groups almost have similar features like their English level, departments, ages and English background. What result has been gained at the end of it is absolutely connected with the semiotic teaching. So, it can be said that the measurements are consistent with the preliminary calculations.

The results suggest that teachers and students can benefit from semiotic elements to have a better understanding of the target language and culture. However, the teaching part needs to be done in a way, which is smooth and comprehensible to students. That is, the students and teacher must share a clear classroom atmosphere to talk about target language, and this should be done with a shared sincerity, which can be developed when studying on the target language through semiotic elements. Student development of vocabulary knowledge also needs to be seen as an ongoing process supported with practice.

References

Abushihab, I. M. (2012). A Semiotic-based Approach as an Effective Tool for Teaching Verbal and Non-verbal Aspects of Language. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *3(6),* 1150-1156.

Celce-Murcia, M. (ed.) (1991). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed.). Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Celce-Murcia, M. and C.H. Prator (1979). An Outline of Language Teaching Approaches in Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Celce-Murcia, M. and L. McIntosh (Eds.). Los Angeles: Newbury House Publishers, Inc, p.p: 3-5.

Coady, J. (1993). Research on ESL/EFL Vocabulary Acquisition: Putting it in Context in Second Language Reading and Vocabulary Learning. Haynes, M. and J. Coady (Eds.). Norwood: Ablex, p.p: 3-23.

Geertz, C.J. (1973). The Interpretation of Cultures. Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Harmer, J. (1993). *The practise of English language teaching*. New York: Longman.

Hişmanoğlu, M. (2000). Semiotic Elements and Difficulties in Teaching Vocabulary Items. Language Journal, 128, 51-68. http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/27/752/ 9598.pdf

Kersten, S. (2010). *The mental lexicon and vocabulary learning*. Tübingen: VerlagNarr.

Kim, F. 1996. A Book About Semiotics. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Company.

Lewis, M. (1993). The Lexical Approach. London: Language Teaching Publications.

Lévi-Strauss, C. , Jacobson, C. & Schoepf, B.G. (1963). Structural Anthropology. Basic Books: New York

Lyons, John. (2004).Language and Linguistics. An Introduction, London: Cambridge University Press.

Murcia, Marianne Celce (1991). Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Sebeok, T. (1991). A Sign is Just a Sign. Bloomington: Indiana UP.

Sert, Olcay. (2006). Semiotic approach and its contribution to English language learning and teaching, *Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty of Education [Hacettepe Üniverisitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi], 31,* 106-114.

Swan, M.& Walter, C. (1984). *The Cambridge English course 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Şenel, M. (2007). The Semiotic Approach and Language Teaching and Learning. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 3(1),* 117-131.

Goldstein, B. & Jones, C. (2011). The Big Picture Elementary Student's Book. Richmond Publishing.

Wilkins, D.A. (1972). Linguistics in Language Teaching. Edward Arnold: Australia.

Extended Abstract

Considering the efficiency of semiotic signs in the field of teaching and learning, what has been searched and found for years on that field is obviously the core element that we need to know, and semiotics has a few branches one of which is the one concerning us, the teachers, the most: educational semiotics. And vocabulary teaching is of utmost importance in educational semiotics. What has been aimed at semiotic studies concerning vocabulary teaching is our number one priority as it sets ground for our research, which on the other hand is the one that we feel the need of taking a fresh look at by means of our study.

Given the circumstances that affect our teaching, it can be stated that it takes quite a long time to succeed in vocabulary teaching. The reason is the obstacles created unintentionally between cultures. Keeping that in mind, we yearn for searching the effects of using non-verbal semiotic elements in teaching vocabulary in EFL classes as students cannot make use of it without seeing the connection and the differences between their culture and the target one. In our research, we basically deal with the importance of vocabulary teaching and teaching vocabulary with the help of semiotic elements. Then; verbal communication, non-verbal communication, background of vocabulary teaching, techniques in presenting new vocabulary and non-verbal semiotic elements in vocabulary teaching is taken into account. Right after this, the role of teachers in teaching vocabulary by means of semiotics is outlined with a clear-cut line.

Given the circumstances of educational environments at universities, assessment and penetration of the effect of teaching vocabulary by means of semiotic elements is best done if carried out on prep students since most of them are new at learning English. With this thought in mind, we have chosen two groups, one of which is the control group and they will get no teaching based on semiotic elements. The other group, on the other hand, will be the core of that study. As for the specific features of these two groups, we can surely state that they have been paid attention to have similar features to make assessment truly credible. The control group, B39 Class, has 43 students and their departments are electrical and electronic engineering, mechanical engineering, computer engineering, automotive engineering, rail systems engineering and medicine engineering. The experimental group, B13 Class, has 42 students and their departments are the same as the control group. The book that is being taught is Richmond Publishing's The Big Picture Elementary Book. For four weeks, the units from 2 to 9 will be carried out, and at the end of that period, a quiz will be used as the means of assessment.

APPENDIX A

Average: 2506\35=71.6

Table 1. Control Group's Scores from Vocabulary Quiz					
Participant no	Department	Score	Participant no	Department	Score
1	Electrical and Electronic Engineering (II)	73	23	Electrical and Electronic Engineering (II)	72
2	Electrical and Electronic Engineering (Eng.)(II)	73	24	Computer Engineering (Eng.) (II)	84
3	Mechanical Engineering (II)		25	Computer Engineering (Eng.) (II)	
4	Mechanical Engineering (II)		26	Computer Engineering (Eng.) (II)	73
5	Mechanical Engineering (II)	79	27	Computer Engineering (Eng.) (II)	70
6	Mechanical Engineering (II)	64	28	Computer Engineering (Eng.) (II)	86
7	Computer Engineering (II)	97	29	Mechanical Engineering (Eng.) (II)	77
8	Computer Engineering (II)	67	30	Mechanical Engineering (Eng.) (II)	80
9	Computer Engineering (II)	42	31	Mechanical Engineering (Eng.) (II)	
10	Computer Engineering (II)	75	32	Mechanical Engineering (Eng.) (II)	
11	Computer Engineering (II)		33	Mechanical Engineering (Eng.) (II)	61
12	Computer Engineering (II)	72	34	Electrical and Electronic Engineering (Eng.)(II)	67
13	Automotive Engineering (II)	49	35	Electrical and Electronic Engineering (Eng.)(II)	68
14	Automotive Engineering (II)	81	36	Electrical and Electronic Engineering (Eng.)(II)	80
15	Automotive Engineering (II)		37	Electrical and Electronic Engineering (Eng.)(II)	87
16	Automotive Engineering (II)	73	38	Railway Systems Engineering (Eng.) (II)	78
17	Automotive Engineering (II)	54	39	Railway Systems Engineering (Eng.)(II)	
18	Automotive Engineering (II)	65	40	Medical Engineering (II)	68
19	Automotive Engineering (II)	88	41	Medical Engineering (II)	69
20	Electrical and Electronic Engineering (II)	86	42	Medical Engineering (II)	76
21	Electrical and Electronic Engineering (II)	59	43	Mechanical Engineering (Eng.) (II)	51
22	Electrical and Electronic Engineering (II)	62			

APPENDIX B

Table 2. Experimental Group's Scores from Vocabulary Quiz

Participant no	Department	Score	Participant no	Department	Score
1	Mechanical Engineering		22	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	69
2	Computer Engineering		23	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	81
3	Automotive Engineering		24	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	82
4	Mechanical Engineering	72	25	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	83
5	Computer Engineering	69	26	Metallurgical and Materials Engineering	85
6	Computer Engineering	61	27	Metallurgical and Materials Engineering	86
7	Automotive Engineering	55	28	Metallurgical and Materials Engineering	72
8	Automotive Engineering	96	29	Metallurgical and Materials Engineering	58
9	Automotive Engineering		30	Metallurgical and Materials Engineering	
10	Mechanical Engineering (English)		31	Metallurgical and Materials Engineering	89
11	Mechanical Engineering (English)	59	32	Metallurgical and Materials Engineering	81
12	Mechanical Engineering (English)	100	33	Metallurgical and Materials Engineering	82
13	Mechanical Engineering (English)		34	Biomedical Engineering	
14	Computer Engineering (English)	94	35	Railway Systems Engineering (English)	
15	Computer Engineering (English)	79	36	Railway Systems Engineering(English)	72
16	Computer Engineering (English)		37	Railway Systems Engineering (English)	90
17	Computer Engineering (English)	81	38	Medical Engineering (English)	81
18	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	82	39	Medical Engineering (English)	
19	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	94	40	Medical Engineering (English)	72
20	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	76	41	Computer Engineering	76
21	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	66		Electrical and Electronic Engineering	69

Average: 2343\30=78.1

APPENDIX C

The Big Picture A2 Elementary Vocab Corpus used in Application

Unit 2: My Life
nephew
niece

Unit 3: Days to Remember	
take a break	wash the dishes
go dancing	share a flat
go shopping	finish work
get dressed	have a shower

Unit 4: Home Life	
sofa	local shop
cupboard	shopping centre
sink	news-stand
cooker	wardrobe

Unit 5: A Real Achievement	
jogging	sing
skateboarding	stretch
sudoku	climbing, judo

Unit 6: Shopping Around	
computer store	spotty
convenience	hair: curly, ponytail
outfit	tattoos
denim	stall
sandals	

Unit 7: Going Places	
cloudy	warm
humid	foggy
wet	icy
cosy	explore
sunny	souks
windy	handmade

Unit 8: In the News	
podcasts	get the flu
local news	go to a concert
bands	go to a show
	pandemic

Unit 9: Hungry Planet	
fruit juice	lettuce
delicious	pasta
bowl	slices
carrots	throw away
beans	spicy
sweets	disgusting
	creamy