

A Comparative Study on the Impact of Monolingual and Bilingual Dictionary Use on the Vocabulary Competence of Vietnamese Learners of Korean

Thieu Thi Hue Chi

First author, Students at the University of Foreign Language Studies, The University of Danang, Vietnam
thieuhuechi03@gmail.com

Nguyen Ngoc Tuyen

Corresponding author, Assistant Professor, University of Foreign Language Studies, The University of Danang, Vietnam
nntuyen@ufl.udn.vn

Abstract

Objectives This study investigates the impact of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries on vocabulary acquisition among Vietnamese students majoring in Korean language. The research aims to clarify how different dictionary types affect learners' ability to understand and apply vocabulary, recognizing vocabulary as a core element in language learning.

Methods The study compared the use of bilingual dictionaries, which provide immediate access to meanings, and monolingual dictionaries, which promote deeper semantic understanding and contextual usage. A small group of intermediate-level learners participated in the study, which was conducted over a short duration and focused on selected vocabulary dimensions.

Conclusions The study suggests that educators should encourage students to transition from bilingual to monolingual dictionaries and integrate monolingual dictionary-based tasks into instruction. While the study provides practical insights for optimizing vocabulary learning strategies in Korean language education, its limitations—such as small sample size and short research period—necessitate future studies with greater participant diversity and expanded linguistic skills.

Keywords monolingual dictionaries, bilingual dictionaries, vocabulary acquisition, intermediate Korean majors, Vietnamese students

<https://www.ijkculture.com>, DOI: doi.org/10.23159/IJKC.2025.10.312.006

Received: Sep. 20. 2025 ; Reviewed: Oct. 10. 2025 ; Accepted: Oct. 20. 2025

pISSN 2951-2808 eISSN 2951-2883

A Comparative Study on the Impact of Monolingual and Bilingual Dictionary Use on the Vocabulary Competence of Vietnamese Learners of Korean

Thieu Thi Hue Chi/Nguyen Ngoc Tuyen

Contents

1. Introduction
 2. A Survey on Dictionary Use Habits of Second-Year Students Majoring in Korean Language
 3. A Survey on the Vocabulary Proficiency of Korean Language Majors through the Use of Monolingual and Bilingual Dictionaries
-
-

1. Introduction

When beginning to learn a new language, learners are required to encounter a large amount of vocabulary. Kim (2012) emphasized that in order to communicate effectively, mastering the vocabulary of the language is the most crucial factor. The ability to acquire and accurately use vocabulary not only enables language learners to communicate effectively but also provides a solid foundation for understanding and applying grammar, reading comprehension, and developing writing skills. This demonstrates that vocabulary is an essential component in language learning and is no exception in the case of foreign language acquisition (Schmitt, 2008).

Vocabulary learning is not merely the process of acquiring and understanding the meaning of words but also includes the ability to use them accurately and appropriately

www.kci.go.kr

in different communicative situations. In the process of language learning, one of the important reference tools widely used by students is the dictionary. A dictionary is defined as a “cultural product that collects, organizes, and presents the words of a language (or sometimes multiple languages), along with information on spelling, pronunciation, meaning, and usage” (Kim, 1993). Similarly, Carstens (1995) considered the dictionary one of the important tools that help improve language competence. In the current context of foreign language learning, language learners or students majoring in linguistics commonly use two types of dictionaries: monolingual and bilingual dictionaries.

Research on dictionaries for Korean language learners has developed significantly since the late 1990s. However, studies on Korean lexicography during this period mainly focused on practical issues such as building Korean language corpora, dictionary naming, and usage examples, rather than the impact of dictionary use on vocabulary competence. Since the 2000s, however, experimental studies on the effectiveness of vocabulary learning through dictionaries have been increasing. Although many international studies have discussed the influence of these types of dictionaries on foreign language learning in general, up to now, no research has been found that clearly compares the impact of using these two types of dictionaries on the vocabulary competence of Vietnamese students majoring in Korean language. Therefore, this study is conducted to provide a new approach by analyzing in depth the impact of each type of dictionary on the vocabulary learning process of Vietnamese students majoring in Korean language.

This study can help students better understand the effectiveness of each type of dictionary in vocabulary learning, thereby providing a basis for developing optimal vocabulary learning methods for Korean language students. Furthermore, the findings may serve as a reference for lecturers and educators in choosing appropriate teaching methods, as well as provide students with more effective vocabulary learning strategies in the process of learning Korean.

1.1. Research question

This study aims to compare the effects of using monolingual and bilingual dictionaries on the Korean vocabulary competence of students majoring in Korean Studies in Vietnam. To achieve this objective, the following research questions are addressed:

- What are the habits of second-year students of Korean Studies at the University of Foreign Languages, University of Da Nang, in using dictionaries for vocabulary learning?
- After using the two types of dictionaries (monolingual and bilingual), which proves to be more effective for learners in recognizing word forms?
- After using the two types of dictionaries, which proves to be more effective for learners in understanding word meanings?
- After using the two types of dictionaries, which proves to be more effective for learners in applying vocabulary in specific contexts?

2. A Survey on Dictionary Use Habits of Second-Year Students Majoring in Korean Language

2.1. Method

2.1.1. Participants

In the survey on dictionary use habits, the sample size was determined based on the total number of second-year students majoring in Korean Language.

Accordingly, the total population of the survey was 107 students. To ensure the reliability of the results, the sample size determination formula proposed by Yamane (1967) was applied. According to Yamane's formula, the minimum sample size required to conduct the survey on dictionary use habits with a 10% margin of error is approximately 52 students. However, in practice, the data from a total of 67 students,

which exceeds the minimum requirement was collected. This enhances the reliability of the data collected for the study.

2.1.2. Material

To address the first research question, a survey to gain an overview of the dictionary usage habits of second-year Korean language majors at the University of Foreign Language Studies, University of Da Nang was designed. The survey was developed with the purpose of collecting information on the types of dictionaries they most commonly use in their learning and vocabulary lookup processes, as well as the frequency with which they consult dictionaries for specific information. In addition, The perceived effectiveness of each type of dictionary in providing access to the information contained within them was also examined.

The survey questionnaire was constructed in detail as follows:

Personal information section included:

- Personal email;
- Grade point average (on a 10-point scale) of the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) in the most recent semester of the respondent.

Survey question section included:

- Questions on dictionary usage habits;
- Questions on the current use of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries.

In the section on dictionary usage habits, The second-year students' practices in using dictionaries, including the formats they employ and information related to their preferred types of dictionaries, were explored. According to Kato (2022), the history of dictionary development demonstrates the existence of various types of dictionaries, including less common forms such as CD-ROM dictionaries, picture dictionaries, or character dictionaries. However, with technological advancement, some of these types have gradually become less familiar and rarely used. Therefore, in the question regarding the formats of dictionaries most frequently used by learners, instead of

covering all possible types, only the four formats most commonly used by learners, based on Lee's (2015) study, were focused on. To investigate the actual use of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, the survey examined students' lookup habits, perceived effectiveness, and frequency of use when encountering unfamiliar Korean vocabulary. Specific items targeted key aspects such as meaning, pronunciation, usage examples, spelling, grammar, and synonyms, measured on a five-point Likert scale. The questionnaire also assessed whether students had received formal instruction in dictionary use, thereby clarifying their preparedness to utilize dictionaries effectively in language learning.

2.2. Procedure

After determining an appropriate sample, the survey was administered via a questionnaire designed on Google Forms from April 26, 2025 to May 1, 2025. During this period, the questionnaire was distributed to second-year students majoring in Korean Language at the University of Foreign Language Studies, University of Danang, and a total of 67 valid responses were collected, meeting the research objectives. Following data collection, all responses were compiled and processed using Microsoft Excel. For questions designed on a Likert scale, the (=AVERAGE) function in Excel to calculate the mean values was applied, thereby reflecting the general level of agreement among the participants. At the same time, the (=STDEV.S) function was used to calculate the standard deviation, which assessed the degree of variability in the responses, thereby clarifying whether students' perspectives on dictionary use were divergent or consistent. Through these data processing and analysis steps, a sound basis was established for making objective observations about the actual state of dictionary use among second-year Korean Language majors.

2.3. Result

The survey results indicate that second-year Korean Language majors predominantly

use modern dictionary formats, with mobile applications (95.5%) and web-based dictionaries (74.6%) being the most common. Among them, Naver Dictionary was overwhelmingly favored, while alternatives such as Lingodeer, Daum, and Papago were rarely used. Students primarily consulted dictionaries for word meanings, spelling, and usage examples, with grammatical information receiving less attention.

A clear distinction emerged between dictionary types: bilingual dictionaries were valued for convenience and quick access to meanings in the mother tongue, whereas monolingual dictionaries were regarded as more effective for deeper knowledge and academic language development. These findings suggest that dictionary use is both essential and habitual, but optimal learning requires a balanced use of both dictionary types, along with systematic training in dictionary skills.

3. A Survey on the Vocabulary Proficiency of Korean Language Majors through the Use of Monolingual and Bilingual Dictionaries

3.1. Method

3.1.2. Participants

According to Wingate (2002), foreign language learners must attain a minimum language proficiency to comprehend definitions in monolingual dictionaries. This requirement is typically met by learners at the intermediate level, who have accumulated sufficient vocabulary to understand explanations in the target language without constant reliance on their mother tongue. Similarly, Lee (2012) notes that learners at the beginner level often lack the lexical resources to fully utilize monolingual dictionaries, which can result in difficulties and a stronger dependence on bilingual dictionaries. Conversely, advanced learners may already possess the skills to infer word meanings from context, rendering the distinction between dictionary types less significant.

For these reasons, the present study selected intermediate-level learners as the most

appropriate participants. This group has enough linguistic foundation to engage with monolingual dictionaries but still benefits from dictionary support, making the comparative impact of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries more measurable.

From the total of 67 second-year Korean language majors at the University of Foreign Languages, University of Danang, 20 students were randomly selected. These students, all classified at the intermediate level based on their cumulative scores in the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing), were divided into two groups: 10 using a monolingual Korean-Korean dictionary and 10 using a bilingual Korean-Vietnamese dictionary.

To further examine the influence of individual proficiency, participants were categorized into three achievement groups:

- Group I: Three or more skills scored 8.0-9.0, with no skill below 7.0.
- Group II: Up to two skills scored 8.0-9.0, with most remaining skills between 7.0-8.0.
- Group III: At least one skill scored below 7.0.

This classification provided a more nuanced understanding of how academic performance interacts with the effectiveness of dictionary use in vocabulary acquisition.

3.1.3. Material

3.1.3.1. Selection of dictionary

The dictionaries employed in this study include both monolingual and bilingual resources.

a) Standard Korean Language Dictionary (표준국어대사전)

Compiled and published by the National Institute of the Korean Language in 1999, this dictionary follows standardized rules of orthography and grammar. It was digitalized in 2001 and contains approximately 510,000 entries and 590,000 senses,

www.kci.go.kr

covering a broad spectrum of modern Korean vocabulary. Each entry provides detailed definitions, examples, and lexical relations, making it a highly scholarly reference. Owing to its comprehensive coverage and linguistic accuracy, this dictionary was selected as the monolingual reference for the study.

b) Naver Dictionary (네이버 국어사전)

Developed by Naver Corporation, this digital bilingual dictionary offers more than 220,000 lexical items ranging from everyday words to specialized terminology. According to Lee (2015), Naver is the most widely used dictionary among Korean language learners in 29 countries, and prior studies (Won & Zhu, 2016) confirm its frequent use among Chinese learners of Korean. For this study, the Naver Korean-Vietnamese Dictionary was chosen as the bilingual resource, given its accessibility and relevance to the Vietnamese participants.

c) Korea University Korean Dictionary (고려대 한국어대사전)

Published in 2009 by the Institute for the Study of Korean Culture at Korea University, this dictionary contains around 250,000 entries. It is regarded as one of the most authoritative Korean monolingual dictionaries, alongside the Standard Korean Language Dictionary. Prior analyses (Lee, 2008; Cho, 2012) emphasize its extensive semantic explanations and rich examples, making it particularly suitable for academic research. In this study, it was used as an auxiliary reference to cross-check and analyze the meanings of target vocabularies. By employing these complementary dictionaries—monolingual, bilingual, and a secondary reference—the study ensures reliability, objectivity, and depth in analyzing vocabulary use and learning outcomes.

3.1.3.2. Selection of target vocabularies

This study investigates the effects of using monolingual and bilingual dictionaries on the lexical competence of intermediate-level Korean majors, focusing on three

dimensions:

- (1) Ability to recognize word forms
- (2) Ability to understand word meaning
- (3) Ability to use vocabulary in specific contexts

To ensure validity, target words were selected from the Standard Korean Language Education Curriculum (National Institute of the Korean Language, 2017), a scientifically validated framework developed from large-scale corpus research and aligned with international standards such as CEFR, ACTFL, and WIDA (Kim et al., 2017; Lee In-hye & Lee Joon-ho, 2021). The curriculum defines six proficiency levels, encompassing a total of 10,635 words, systematically distributed from beginner (Levels 1-2) to advanced (Levels 5-6). Each level specifies goals for recognition, semantic understanding, and contextual use, reflecting established theories of vocabulary acquisition (Nation, 2001; Henriksen, 1999) and communicative competence (Bachman & Palmer, 1996). Given that the participants were second-year Korean majors at the intermediate level, selecting beginner-level vocabulary would compromise the reliability of results, as learners were likely already familiar with those words. Accordingly, the study drew upon the Level 5 word list (2,365 items), which is considered advanced, to ensure that the target words were unfamiliar yet pedagogically relevant. Practical constraints, such as limited time and participant workload, necessitated the exclusion of Level 6 items, which is acknowledged as a limitation of the study.

Further, the target vocabulary was refined according to specific criteria: complex morphological forms, potential for learner confusion, absence of excessive polysemy, and clear definitions in both the monolingual and bilingual dictionaries used as research tools. Through this process, 50 Level 5 words were selected as the experimental vocabulary set.

After the first round of vocabulary selection, a second round was conducted through a survey administered to 20 second-year Korean majors. The survey was designed using a 5-point Likert scale adapted from Paribakht & Wesche's (1993) Vocabulary Knowledge

Scale, with the following interpretation:

- 1.00-1.80: I do not remember seeing this word before.
- 1.81-2.60: I have seen this word before, but I do not know its meaning.
- 2.61-3.40: I have seen this word and can guess its meaning.
- 3.41-4.20: I know this word.
- 4.21-5.00: I can use this word in a sentence.

A Google Form was created with 50 multiple-choice items corresponding to the 50 target words from the first selection. For responses indicating partial or full knowledge (Levels 3-5), students were required to provide short-answer explanations or example sentences, allowing for a more accurate assessment of their vocabulary knowledge. Following data collection, the Excel AVERAGE function was used to calculate mean scores for each word. Short-answer responses were also evaluated manually to determine correctness. If a student selected Level 3, 4, or 5 but gave an incorrect meaning or failed to produce a valid sentence, the item was excluded from the final list.

Based on this procedure, the 15 words with the lowest mean scores—indicating the least recognition among participants—were selected as the final set of target vocabulary. This final list consisted of 9 nouns, 4 verbs, and 2 adjectives, as presented in the table below.

Table 1. The second target vocabulary list

STT	Vocabulary	Meaning	POS	Average
1	진수성찬	A big feast	Subject	1,2
2	가느다랗다	Slim, slender	Adjective	1,25
3	빈둥거리다	Loaf around, idle	Verb	1,25
4	시끌벅적하다	Bustling, noisy, crowded, boisterous	Adjective	1,3
5	투덜거리다	Grumble, mutter	Verb	1,3
6	희로애락	Joys and sorrows, emotions	Noun	1,4
7	헛걸음	A wasted trip	Noun	1,4

8	헛수고	Fruitless effort, wasted effort	Noun	1,5
9	들락거리다	Go in and out, come and go repeatedly	Verb	1,55
10	회갑연	60th birthday party	Noun	1,6
11	적령기	Right age (marriageable age)	Noun	1,65
12	피로연	Party / Reception	Noun	1,65
13	엄지손가락	Thumb	Noun	1,65
14	완곡하다	Be tactful / Euphemize	Noun	1,7
15	일광욕	Sunbathing	Noun	1,75

3.1.3.3. Test item

After completing the dictionary consultation activity a vocabulary knowledge test to the two research groups was administered. The test was divided into three types of questions to evaluate Korean majors' vocabulary knowledge (VLK) across three main aspects, as follows:

a) Ability to recognize word forms

In the first type, to assess recognition of word forms, a matching test was constructed based on Kato's (2022) receptive vocabulary test model. This test was designed to measure learners' ability to associate word forms with their meanings. Participants were provided with definitions of target words and had to select the correct word from six given options. To ensure systematicity and avoid cognitive overload, the test items were grouped. In each group, six words were listed on the left and three corresponding definitions on the right; learners had to match the word to its correct definition by writing the number of the word next to the definition. This section included five questions.

Table 2. Illustration of the question format for identifying the correct definition of a vocabulary item by matching the corresponding number

* Select the vocabulary item in the left column that matches each definition in the right column by writing the corresponding number of the word (1-5)	
1. 우유부단하다	
2. 월망스럽다	_____ 앞으로 닥칠 일이 걱정되어 마음이 초조하고 불안하다
3. 조마조마하다	_____ 망설이기만 하고 결정을 짓지 못하는 점이 있다.
4. 나지막하다	_____ 물건이나 얼굴 등이 빼놓여지거나 주름이 많이 지게 쭈그러지다.
5. 자수성가하다	
6. 일그러지다	

b) Ability to understand word meaning

Nation (1983, 1990) and Schmitt et al. (2001) proposed the Vocabulary Level Test (VLT) to assess receptive vocabulary knowledge, requiring learners to match target words with appropriate meanings from a list of six choices. While this method is widely used, Schmitt (2010) pointed out that it mainly measures recognition of word forms rather than deeper understanding of meanings, as learners simply choose the correct option without explaining the word. To address this limitation, the researcher adapted Webb's (2005) model, which requires learners to explain the meaning of target words in their first language when the words are presented in the second language. This approach provides a more accurate measure of learners' understanding. In this section, 15 questions were developed, corresponding to the 15 target words.

Table 3. Illustration of the question format for describing the meaning of vocabulary items in the native language

* Please provide the corresponding Vietnamese meaning for each of the following Korean vocabulary items (1-15).
1. 우유부단하다: _____

c) Ability to use vocabulary in specific contexts

Laufer and Nation (1999) proposed a test of productive vocabulary knowledge,

requiring learners to retrieve target words from given contexts. To reduce confusion with semantically similar words, their test included the initial letter of the target word.

Table 4. Example of the research model by Laufer & Nation (1999)

The picture looks nice; the colours br_____ really well. The garden was full of fra flowers.
--

Building on this model, the present study designed test items to evaluate students' ability to use vocabulary appropriately in specific contexts. However, unlike Laufer and Nation (1999), the initial letters were not provided, thereby increasing the difficulty and allowing for a more accurate assessment of learners' independent word production. Test sentences were selected from both the Standard Korean Language Dictionary and the Naver Korean-Vietnamese Dictionary. A total of 10 questions were included in this section to minimize the possibility of random guessing.

Table 5. Illustration of the cloze test format with appropriate vocabulary in specific sentences

Fill in the blanks with the appropriate vocabulary (1-10)
1. 잘 가꾼 정원의 꽃들이 이번 폭우로 다_____고 말았다.

3.1.3.4. Participant Interview Questionnaire

In order to clarify the factors influencing the effectiveness of dictionary use and to provide a deeper explanation of the results obtained from the vocabulary knowledge test, after completing the survey, the in-depth interviews with several students from both research groups were conducted. The purpose of these interviews was to explore students' actual experiences when using monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, the advantages and challenges they encountered during the process of looking up words, as well as their evaluation of the role of dictionaries in vocabulary retention and application.

Face-to-face interviews were chosen so that a fuller understanding of learners' perceptions and attitudes could be obtained. A total of 10 students participated, with 5 students from each group. Moreover, students with different proficiency levels were

deliberately selected to gain more comprehensive insights into the perceptions of various learners when using each type of dictionary. The entire interview process was recorded and excerpts were incorporated into the analysis section of the study. The interview content was structured into three main parts as follows:

Part 1: Advantages of using monolingual and bilingual dictionaries for vocabulary lookup;

Part 2: Difficulties encountered when using monolingual and bilingual dictionaries;

Part 3: The extent to which each type of dictionary is appropriate for students' current proficiency level.

3.2. Procedures

In this study, to evaluate learners' vocabulary competence after using different types of dictionaries, 20 second-year Korean language majors were randomly divided into two groups: one using a monolingual dictionary and the other a bilingual dictionary. The research procedure consisted of two main stages:

- (1) A vocabulary recognition survey to identify the target word list
- (2) a vocabulary competence test to measure participants' performance while using monolingual and bilingual dictionaries.

Both stages were conducted in person to ensure accuracy and reliability. Specifically, the vocabulary recognition survey was administered through a Google Form, where participants assessed their knowledge of each target word on a five-point Likert scale under the researcher's supervision, without the use of dictionaries. The vocabulary competence test was carried out individually and face-to-face. Prior to dictionary consultation, participants were introduced to the structure of the dictionary and guided on how to locate target words.

To ensure that the results reflected only the effects of dictionary consultation, learners were not allowed to take notes or use any other vocabulary learning strategies.

Participants were instructed to look up all target words as they normally would when using a dictionary, with no time restrictions. Immediately after this activity, they completed a vocabulary test.

To examine differences in task completion time between the two groups, participants were asked to record the duration of each task using the stopwatch function on their mobile phones. Following the test, in-depth interviews were conducted with each student to explore perceived advantages and challenges in using both types of dictionaries. Through these interviews, the deeper insights into the strengths and limitations of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries were gained, thereby providing practical implications and pedagogical recommendations for Korean vocabulary instruction.

3.3. Results

3.3.1. The ability of recognizing word forms

In the post-test stage, a total of 600 responses were collected from 20 second-year Korean language majors, with 150 responses for each group in the lexical form recognition task. Results indicate that both groups demonstrated generally strong recognition abilities. The bilingual dictionary group achieved a correct response rate of 96.7% (145/150), slightly higher than the monolingual dictionary group at 94.0% (141/150). Although the absolute difference is small, it suggests that bilingual dictionaries, by providing immediate access to meanings in learners' native language, facilitate faster recognition of word forms. Conversely, monolingual dictionaries require processing in Korean, which may slow recognition or cause occasional confusion. Nonetheless, the high accuracy of the monolingual group (94.0%) indicates its effectiveness for learners with stronger target-language proficiency.

With respect to time, the bilingual dictionary group completed the task more quickly, averaging 5 minutes 15 seconds (range: 2:00-9:17), compared to 6 minutes 35 seconds in the monolingual group (range: 4:07-16:05). This difference reflects the relative efficiency of bilingual dictionaries in supporting rapid lexical access. However, the

findings also suggest that for basic recognition tasks, dictionary type is not the sole determinant of performance, as learner vocabulary size, inference ability, and prior experience with Korean definitions also play important roles.

3.3.2. The ability of understanding word meaning

In the vocabulary meaning recognition test, students using the bilingual dictionary outperformed those using the monolingual dictionary, with correct response rates of 88.66% (133/150) and 78.66% (118/150), respectively. Although the 10% gap may not be statistically large, it indicates that bilingual dictionaries help learners access and understand meanings more quickly and accurately. Completion time also differed markedly: the bilingual group averaged 3 minutes 5 seconds (range: 1:02 -7:05), while the monolingual group required 8 minutes 32 seconds (range: 2:02 - 20:27). These results suggest that monolingual dictionaries pose greater cognitive demands, making comprehension slower and more challenging for intermediate learners.

3.3.3. The ability of using vocabulary in specific contexts

To examine the effect of dictionary type on learners' ability to apply vocabulary in context, a fill-in-the-blank test was administered. Results from 20 sophomores showed that both groups faced difficulties, with correct response rates at a moderate level: 59% (59/100) for the monolingual dictionary group and 50% (50/100) for the bilingual group. Although the bilingual dictionary enabled faster comprehension, the monolingual dictionary group demonstrated higher accuracy in sentence use, likely due to its richer semantic explanations.

In terms of task completion time, the monolingual group averaged 12 minutes 37 seconds (range: 6:33 -15:45), while the bilingual group averaged 9 minutes 13 seconds (range: 6:02 -13:03). These findings suggest that while bilingual dictionaries facilitate speed, monolingual dictionaries better support accurate contextual usage of vocabulary.

4. Conclusion

Based on the findings, this study recommends that learners take an active role in selecting the type of dictionary that aligns with their proficiency level and learning objectives. For intermediate-level learners and above, it is advisable to gradually increase their use of monolingual dictionaries in order to develop a deeper understanding of semantics and to enhance the application of vocabulary in authentic contexts. Bilingual dictionaries, however, may still be employed flexibly as a supportive resource to provide quick access to essential information when necessary.

Furthermore, Korean language instructors should provide explicit guidance to students regarding the distinct roles and functions of each type of dictionary, while also training them in effective lookup strategies. Integrating tasks that require the use of monolingual dictionaries into classroom activities can foster learners' habit of actively engaging with vocabulary, thereby promoting more accurate and flexible usage. In parallel, dictionary developers are encouraged to continue improving dictionary content, user interface, and search functions, as well as to incorporate richer contextual examples that facilitate both comprehension and practical application. The appropriate selection and use of dictionaries not only supports learners in expanding their vocabulary but also contributes to sustainable language development. Importantly, the present findings provide practical implications for both learners and instructors in designing more effective approaches to vocabulary learning and teaching in Korean language education.

Nevertheless, this study is subject to certain limitations. First, the experimental scale was relatively small, with only 20 second-year students participating, thereby limiting the representativeness of the findings for the broader population of Korean language majors across different proficiency levels. As the sample primarily included intermediate-level learners, the results may not fully capture the effects of monolingual and bilingual dictionary use among beginners or advanced learners. In addition, the experimental duration was relatively short, and the assessment focused primarily on three dimensions of vocabulary knowledge: (1) recognition of word forms, (2)

comprehension of word meanings, and (3) application of vocabulary in specific sentences. Consequently, the study did not fully address other key language skills, such as speaking and writing, within authentic communicative settings. Although the study combined surveys of learning habits with in-depth interviews, variables such as learning motivation, individual learning styles, and external environmental factors were not sufficiently examined, which may have influenced the results.

Future research is therefore encouraged to adopt larger and more diverse samples, extend the experimental timeframe, and include a broader range of influencing factors in order to enhance the validity, applicability, and generalizability of the findings.

[References]

- Carstens, A(1995). Language teaching and dictionary use: An overview. *Lexikos*, 5, 105-116.
- Kim, G. H(1993). *An Introduction to Korean Vocabulary Theory*. Seoul: Jipmundang.
- Kim, H. N(2012). *A Study on Vocabulary Teaching Using Meaning-Centered Morphological Methods*. Master's thesis, Graduate School of Education, Sogang University.
- Kato, M(2022). *A Study on the Effect of Vocabulary Learning through Dictionary Use: Focusing on Japanese Learners of Korean*. Master's thesis, Interdisciplinary Program of Korean Studies, Graduate School, Yonsei University.
- Laufer, B., & Nation, P(1999). A vocabulary-size test of controlled productive ability. *Language Testing*, 16, 33-51.
- Lee, E. K(2015). The Actual Condition of Dictionary Use among Korean Language Learners. *Korean Language and Literature Association*, 145-178.
- Nation, I. S. P(1990). *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary*. New York: Newbury House.
- Nation, I. S. P(2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N(2008). Review article: Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 329-363.
- Won, M. J., & Zhu, W. D(2016). The Effects of Dictionary Use on Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary Learning. *Korean Lexicography*, Korean Society of Lexicography, 201-220.

베트남 한국어 학습자의 어휘 능력에 미치는 단일어 사전과 이중어 사전 사용의 영향에 관한 비교적 연구

티에우 티 후에 치(Thieu Thi Hue Chi)

베트남 다낭대학교 대학원생(제1저자)

응우옌 응옥 투옌(Nguyen Ngoc Tuyen)

베트남 다낭대학교 조교수(교신저자)

한국어 요약

연구 목적 이 연구는 한국어를 전공하는 베트남 학생들을 대상으로, 단어 습득 과정에서 단일어 사전과 이중어 사전이 학습자에게 미치는 영향을 조사하는 것을 목적으로 한다. 어휘가 언어 학습의 기초 요소라는 점에 주목하여, 다양한 사전 유형이 학습자의 어휘 이해와 실제 활용 능력에 어떠한 차별적 효과를 가지는지를 탐구한다.

연구 방법 이 연구에서는 단일어 사전과 이중어 사전의 특성을 비교하였다. 이중어 사전은 의미에 빠르게 접근할 수 있는 장점을 가지며, 단일어 사전은 단어의 의미에 대한 깊은 이해와 문맥적 활용 능력을 촉진한다. 본 연구는 중급 수준 이상의 학습자를 대상으로 하여, 제한된 표본 규모와 짧은 연구 기간이라는 조건 속에서 어휘 습득의 특정 측면을 중심으로 분석을 수행하였다.

결론 연구 결과, 중급 이상의 학습자는 언어 능력 향상을 위해 점차 단일어 사전 사용을 늘려야 하며, 이중어 사전은 보조적 도구로 활용될 때 효과적임이 확인되었다. 따라서 교육자들은 학생들에게 사전 활용법을 지도하고, 단일어 사전을 기반으로 한 과제를 수업 과정에 통합할 필요가 있다. 다만, 본 연구는 제한된 표본과 기간, 그리고 특정 어휘 차원에만 집중했다는 한계를 가진다. 향후 연구에서는 학습자 집단을 확대하고, 언어 능력 전반에 걸친 탐색을 통해 결과의 일반화 가능성을 높여야 한다. 전반적으로 이 연구는 한국어 교육 현장에서 어휘 학습 전략을 최적화하는데 유용한 실질적 통찰을 제공한다.

핵심어 단일어 사전, 이중어 사전, 어휘 습득, 중급 한국어 전공자, 베트남 학생

이 논문은 2025년 9월 20일에 투고 완료되어,
2025년 9월 25일부터 2025년 10월 10일까지 심사위원이 심사하고,
2025년 10월 20일에 심사위원 및 편집위원 회의에서 게재 결정된 논문임.