*JOURNAL OF ENGLISH STUDIES*
Islamic Azad University, Science & Research Branch, 1(1), 65-79**,** Winter 2011

# Vocabulary Learning Strategies: Do They Help Iranian EFL Learners to Overcome Vocabulary Learning Difficulties?

**Mojgan Rashtchi**
Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch
**Fatemeh Rezvani**
Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch

ABSTRACT: The present study aimed at investigating whether vocabulary-learning strategies had any impact on the vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL learners. The participants of the study were 67 male and female undergraduate university students, majoring in English Translation and English Literature at Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch, who were taking "Reading Comprehension II" course. In order to ascertain that the participants were homogeneous in terms of their general language proficiency, a standardized proficiency test was administered. Subsequently, a standardized achievement test, which was prepared by the researchers based on the students' course book, consisting of 60 items, was administered to the participants to examine whether they were familiar with the target words to be taught during the treatment. Throughout the four-month semester and during 20 sessions, the participants were instructed to focus on three vocabulary-learning strategies. The subjects in the first group were trained to use bilingual and monolingual dictionaries; those in the second group were taught to guess the meaning of new lexical items from the context; and the subjects in the third group were trained to use different texts to understand the meaning of words appropriately. In order to create the opportunity for the researchers to trace the vocabulary learning, a posttest, the same as the test used in the pretest, was administered to the participants of the study. Paired samples t-tests proved that using vocabulary-learning strategies had a positive impact on vocabulary learning in each of the groups. Additionally, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated a significant difference among the three groups. Finally, the result of Scheffé's post hoc test showed that those participants who worked on text-specific activation strategy as a vocabulary learning strategy outperformed the subjects in the other two groups.

**Keywords:** cooperative dictionary use strategy, interactive guessing from context strategy, collaborative text-specific activation strategy, vocabulary learning

Vocabulary instruction has undergone many changes, along with other mutable aspects of Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESL/TEFL). In the past, vocabulary teaching and learning were often given little priority in second language (L2) or foreign language (FL) programs. Although teaching programs have witnessed a shift in their approach toward vocabulary learning and teaching recently, there is still an ongoing search to find ways, which can help learners to expand their vocabulary knowledge (Richards & Renandya, 2002).

Learning new lexical items is part of vocabulary instruction and learning, as well as the way they can be used more practically, is an important frontier to be occupied. Hulstijn (1993) has suggested that teaching vocabulary should not only consist of teaching specific words, but it should also aim at equipping learners with strategies necessary to expand their vocabulary knowledge. Rivers (1983), also, argues that the acquisition of an adequate amount of vocabulary is essential for successful L2 use because without knowledge of an extensive vocabulary, learners will be unable to use the structures and functions they have learned for comprehensive communication. The naive view that the vocabulary of a language should be viewed as a number of basic irregularities and its acquisition as a haphazard process of learning largely unrelated elements is long outdated. The appreciation of the importance of vocabulary teaching gives rise to a number of questions concerning the way in which it should be selected and presented for learning.

As Nunan (1999) maintains, "vocabulary is more than lists of target language words, thus, preparing an appropriate plan for teaching vocabulary in a curriculum is a necessity both for learners and teachers" (p. 82). Designing the vocabulary program of a course is similar to most examples of language course designs. In addition to considering the situation in which the course occurs, it is necessary to decide what vocabulary items will be selected for teaching, how many words are vital for learners to know, and how those will be sequenced and presented. The best means of achieving good vocabulary learning, as Schmitt (2008) puts forward, is imprecise, partly because it depends on a variety of factors, and it is perhaps not surprising that teachers and learners have often been unsure of the best way to follow it.

One of the most controversial issues in the area of vocabulary instruction is the role of memory and maintenance of the vast scale of lexicon flowing into the learners' memory (Stevick, 1976, cited in Nunan, 1991). The role of memory in the development of an L2 lexicon and the techniques for memorization receives relatively generous treatment compared with its use in other aspects of second language development, such as the acquisition of syntax and morphology (Nunan, 1991, p. 116).

Moreover, the way new vocabularies are stored is another question to be considered. As De Bot, Lowie, and Verspoor (2005) note, discussions about the mental lexicon are based on models and metaphors. Early models were commonly based on the *spatial* metaphor, in which lexicons or parts of lexicons are assumed to be located in separate places. Recent models are mostly based on connectionist models consisting of networks, in which each entry may be connected into one or many other entries, similar to what we know about neural networks. Today, almost all models are based on connectionist models, combined with a reference to the *activation metaphor***.** This metaphor entails that entries in the lexicon may vary in their degree of activation. Activation may increase as the result of some event (for instance, after coming across a certain word) and will decrease in the course of time (Schank & Abelson 1977, cited in Abdullah, 1993).

There are several approaches to elevate the vocabulary learning process: (a) incidental learning in which vocabulary learning is a product of doing other activities as reading or listening; (b) explicit instruction (Richards & Renandya, 2002 ) in which learners should identify specific vocabulary acquisition; and (c) independent strategy development in which learners are taught strategies for inferring words from context, as well as those strategies which help learners retain the meanings of words they have learned. Hence, it is recommended that a combination of the three approaches, namely indirect, direct, and strategy training be employed (Richards & Renandya, 2002).

On the other hand, applying these approaches depends on the learners' language proficiency level, their styles of learning, and the learning context. For example, Deccarico (2001) believes in a systematic approach to learning vocabulary and argues that incidental learning has its own limitations and thus maintains that there is a need to focus on learning vocabularies as L2 learners are often unable to use reading for learning vocabulary because of the limitations in their vocabulary knowledge. Laufer (2005) asserts that there are several reasons to claim that explicit vocabulary learning is necessary. Learners who understand the message of the text do not pay attention to the precise meanings of individual words; guessing from the context is often unreliable; words which are easily understood, for example by guessing, may not be remembered by the learners; and finally, those words which are met in the context should be met again quickly to avoid their being forgotten.

The enduring debate has promoted an innovative line of research aimed at describing and understanding the different types of strategies and knowledge sources and their efficiency, which learners use whenever they face unknown words in the context. Vocabulary learning strategies refer to a series of actions learners use to facilitate the completion of a learning task. A strategy starts when a learner starts to analyze the task, the

situation, and what is available in their repertoire. Then, the learner goes on to select, deploy, monitor, and evaluate the effectiveness of this action and decides if they need to revise or change the action (Gu, 2003). Oxford (1990) believes that learning strategies refer to certain facilitative actions, which learners employ to adjust themselves to new situations. Furthermore, Cohen's (2007) classification includes language learning strategies and language use strategies; the former refer to those strategies used to learn a task, such as remembering, and the latter suggest the strategies used for language use, such as communicating in L2.

Johnson (2001) questions the teachability of learning strategies and their usefulness for learners. Ellis and Sinclair (1989, cited in Johnson, 2001) offer a self-training manual that can be used by learners and can help them learn the strategies. The manual divides learning of the strategies into two stages: (a) Stage one, called *preparation for language learning*, deals with a series of questions on the type of language learners' different styles, their needs in language learning, and the way they organize their learning; and (b) Stage two, which is entitled *skills training,* and the four language skills and sub skill areas it looks at; yet, as Johnson argues, there is not much evidence whether strategies can be taught.

According to Richards (1976), knowing a word involves knowing a great deal about general frequency, syntactic, and situational limitations of its use; its underlying form and the forms that can be derived from it; the network of its semantic features; and the various meanings associated with the item. In order to have a good command of L2 vocabulary knowledge, learners should utilize different vocabulary strategies. The common problem regarding the issue of vocabulary learning which most of the learners encounter is when, how, and which type of these strategies they might use. For instance, while some previous studies of inferencing have shown that it can significantly aid in learning new vocabulary (Bengeleil & Paribakht, 2004), others have indicated that inferencing is not always an efficient or an easy strategy for L2 students to use. Dictionary use, as another vocabulary learning strategy, positively affects incidental vocabulary learning (Hulstijn, Hollander, & Greidanus, 1996), but if it is overused, it can break down the comprehension. In addition, to a large degree, improving our insight into L2/FL acquisition depends on improving our understanding of how learners acquire individual words and word parts. This very fact indicates the potential need for research on vocabulary learning strategies and their use among different age groups. Having sufficient knowledge of this process can aid instructors and learners to create various ways to explore newer techniques and strategies.

Therefore, this study was carried out to find answers to the following research questions:

1. Does teaching vocabulary-learning strategies have any significant impact on Iranian EFL learners' learning of new vocabulary items?

2. Which of the three, cooperative dictionary use, interactive guessing from context, or collaborative text-specific activation strategies, leads to significant changes in Iranian EFL learners' learning of new vocabulary items?

## Method

### *Participants*

Initially, a total number of 90 undergraduate male and female intermediate-level students of English Translation and English Literature programs at Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch, in three intact classes, took an English proficiency test (PET). The results of the standardized English proficiency test led to the deletion of 23 of the participants whose test scores surpassed one standard deviation above and below the mean. Therefore, 67 students in the three intact groups, aged between 19 and 25, who were about to take a Reading Comprehension (II) course, participated in the study. Afterwards, the subjects in the three groups were randomly assigned to three experimental ones, with 23 students in the first group, 22 students in the second group, and 22 students in the third one.

### *Instrumentation*

The first instrument used in this study was an English general language proficiency test adopted from a Cambridge Preliminary English Test (PET) to measure general language proficiency level of the participants and to ensure that they all belonged to the same population. The test available at http://cambridgeesol.org/exams/general-english/pet.html is mostly used for intermediate-level learners and is compatible with language proficiency level of most Iranian undergraduate learners majoring in English (Rahimi, 2009).

Originally, the test comprised four sections including speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Each of the writing and reading sections had three parts (sign interpretation, two reading texts, and a vocabulary cloze for the reading part; and paraphrasing, letter writing, and story writing for the writing part). The first two sections, i.e., speaking and listening sections, were removed from the test because those parts were beyond the main concern of the study; however, the reading and writing sections were used to homogenize the participants. To verify that the test was a well-constructed one, the reading and writing sections were piloted with 30 intermediate-level students studying at the same college, prior to the test

administration. The reliability estimate of the test (r=0.78), calculated through Kuder-Richardson formula (KR-21), indicated that the test had a relatively high reliability index and showed that there was an acceptable internal consistency among the items of the test.

Furthermore, an achievement test of vocabulary, based on the students' course book (Reading for Ideas II), consisting of 60 items, was prepared by the researchers and was used both as the pretest and post test and administered to the participants before the treatment. The test was used to ensure that the participants were not familiar with the vocabulary items prior to the study and after the treatment, and to measure the effect of the treatment. The first 31 items of the test were multiple-choice type items of vocabulary, the next section (items 32-44) involved two reading comprehension passages for which the students were required to read and guess the meaning of some unknown words from the context provided. The last part of the test (items 44-60), incorporated a cloze test which the participants were asked to complete, choosing the appropriate words from the table of words presented to them. To guarantee the content validity of the test, the researchers consulted and checked the items of the test with two university instructors. The cut point set for the test was 40 out of 60.

The main goal of the test was to separate those who passed the test from those who failed it. Therefore, in the process of two administrations, the B-index of the test was calculated by comparing the answers of the learners in the pretest and posttest. The results showed that the test met the B-index in the range of 0.7 and 0.11. The agreement of the test was computed by estimating the threshold loss agreement through Subkoviak approach (Brown, 2005). The agreement coefficient of the test was 0.75, which signified sound evidence for the test having been used justifiably. Thus, with about 75% agreement, the test could separate those who passed from those who failed it, and was proven consistent as a criterion-referenced test. After the treatment, once more, the agreement of the test used as the posttest, was computed and proved to be identical (r =0.75) to the pretest.

## *Procedure*

***pretest.*** As stated above, three intact classes were randomly chosen and an English language general proficiency test (PET) was administered to assure the homogeneity of the groups. The results of the test enabled the researchers to select 67 students whose scores were one standard deviation above and below the sample mean. The comparison of the means of the three groups on the general proficiency test through ANOVA signified that the three groups were homogeneous with respect to their language proficiency. Moreover, to ascertain that the learners were not familiar with the vocabulary items, as well as to trace the development of the students in

learning of the words to be taught during the treatment, the participants were asked to take the vocabulary achievement test as the pretest.

***treatment.*** The reading classes met two times a week, with each session lasting 90 minutes for a period of 10 weeks. During this period, the participants were trained to use bilingual and monolingual dictionaries, to guess the meaning of new lexical items, and to use different texts to understand the meaning of the words appropriately. The three experimental groups received three different vocabulary-learning strategies during the course. All treatment sessions were conducted by three university instructors who had been briefed on the type of the treatment to give to their students, already. Furthermore, one of the researchers was present in every session as an observer to check the instructional procedure using a teaching checklist to make sure that the treatment advanced in the appropriate manner in each of the three groups.

The teaching techniques and procedures were almost the same in the three groups except for the strategy employed in each of the classes. Different vocabulary-learning strategies were employed in each of the classes. The first group was trained to employ cooperative dictionary use (CDU) as a vocabulary learning strategy. The participants in this group worked in pairs, and, after reading the texts, they looked up the new words of the text in dictionaries (monolingual and/or bilingual). While they were reading the passages, they underlined the unknown words and then found them in their dictionaries, and talked about the meaning of the words with their peers while the instructor helped and monitored the learners. At the end of each session, learners were provided with different reading passages that included the newly learned vocabulary items, and the learners were asked to read the passages, identify the new lexical items, and write down their meanings.

The second experimental group received interactive guessing of vocabulary (IGV), as another vocabulary learning strategy. The participants were divided into groups, and they were given time before every reading comprehension passage. Then, everyone in the group guessed the meaning of the unknown words using contextual clues, structural knowledge of language, and reference materials, and then they wrote down the meaning. At the end of the practice time, the participants guessed vocabulary meanings cooperatively. The instructor asked the meaning of new lexical items, and students read their guessed meanings. The instructor and other groups of the students checked the meanings and interacted with each other in order to find the most appropriate meaning for the target words. The instructor helped and monitored learners during all the stages.

Finally, the third experimental group received collaborative text-specific activation (CTA) as a vocabulary learning strategy for which the participants were exposed to different contexts that contained the recently

learned lexical items. The instructor asked the students to search for different texts relevant to the topic they had studied and to bring them to class. In this group, the learners shared their texts with each other through sending e-mails; therefore, they were able to have other members' texts to talk about and transfer their ideas on the text more easily and readily. Moreover, they found the new lexical items in several contexts so that they had the opportunity to learn them more meaningfully. During the class time, they collaborated and negotiated on the different texts they had read.

In and out of the class, all of the students were engaged in several activities and assignments. They worked on the exercises from the textbook, exchanged their information on different texts through sending e-mails to each other, prepared themselves after each unit, and took quizzes after the instruction of three units.

***posttest.*** After the treatment, the same achievement test used in the pretest stage was administered as the posttest to determine any improvement in the scores of the participants.

## Results

As stated above, the first step through the research procedure was to pilot the general English proficiency test. Thus, the test was administered to a sample group, and its results were analyzed for the purpose of standardization. The test was used to clarify that all groups belonged to the same population. Table 1 below shows the descriptive statistics and the reliability estimate obtained through Kuder-Richardson (KR-21) formula.

**Table 1.***Descriptive Statistics for the Piloted Proficiency Test*

| No. of participants | No. of items | Mean | SD | KR-21 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | 35 | 18.8 | 6.12 | 0.78 |

Afterwards, the test was administered to the participants of the study. Those students whose scores fell between one standard deviation above and below the mean were included in the investigation and were randomly assigned to three experimental groups (CDU, IGV, and CTA) where each group consisted of 23, 22, and 22 students, respectively. Table 2 shows the results of the proficiency test administered to the pool.

**Table 2.** *Descriptive Statistics for the Proficiency Test*

| Groups | No. | Mean | SD | SEM | Skewness | Std. error of skewness |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CDU | 23 | 20.52 | 7.14 | 1.48 | 0.441 | 0.481 |
| IGV | 22 | 17.09 | 4.75 | 1.01 | -0.222 | 0.491 |
| CTA | 22 | 18.45 | 6.10 | 1.30 | 0.529 | 0.491 |

The results of the skewness analysis, as it is signified in Table 2, obtained by dividing the statistic of skewness by the standard error of each of the three groups, revealed that the assumption of normality was observed in the distribution of the scores of the three groups (0.91 for the CDU group, -0.45 for the IGV group, and 1.07 for the CTA group, all three of the indices falling within the range of -1.96 and +1.96 of SD). Subsequently, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to ensure that there was no statistically significant difference among the means of the three groups prior to the treatment. As the results of the ANOVA revealed, the three groups were homogeneous in terms of their language proficiency [F (2, 64) =1.81, P= 0.17]. Table 3 shows the results of the ANOVA.

**Table 3.** *ANOVA Results for the Proficiency Test*

| Pretest | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 134.60 | 2 | 67.30 | 1.81 | .17 |
| Within Groups | 2379.01 | 64 | 37.17 | | |
| Total | 2513.61 | 66 | | | |

Followed by the proficiency test, the vocabulary achievement test was administered prior to the treatment to make sure that the participants were not familiar with the vocabulary items to be taught during the treatment. Since Leven's test was greater than 0.5, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated. Thus, a one-way ANOVA was run to see whether there was a significant difference among the means of the three groups before learning vocabulary through different strategies. Table 4 below shows the descriptive statistics for the vocabulary pretest. The results of skewness analysis showed that the assumption of normality was observed in the distribution of the scores of the three groups, as well (-

1.96<0.13, 1.01, 0.67< +1.96). The results of the ANOVA [F (2, 64) =2.54, p= 0.08] yielded no significant difference among the groups.

**Table 4.** *Descriptive Statistics for the Vocabulary Pretest*

| Groups | No. | Mean | SD | Std. Error | Skewness | Std. Error of Skewness |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CDU | 23 | 29.47 | 9.21 | 1.92 | .32 | .48 |
| IGV | 22 | 33.63 | 9.40 | 2.00 | -.49 | .49 |
| CTA | 22 | 27.86 | 7.51 | 1.60 | .06 | .49 |

**Table 5.** *Test of Homogeneity of Variances*

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| .675 | 2 | 64 | .513 |

**Table 6.** *ANOVA Resutls for Vocabulary Pretest*

| Pretest | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 390.99 | 2 | 195.49 | 2.54 | .08 |
| Within Groups | 4909.42 | 64 | 76.71 | | |
| Total | 5300.41 | 66 | | | |

To create the opportunity for the researchers to trace the vocabulary learning, a posttest identical to the pretest was administered to the participants in the three groups after the treatment. Table 6 demonstrates the descriptive statistics for the vocabulary test administered after the treatment.

**Table 7.** *Descriptive Statistics for the vocabulary posttest*

| Groups | No. | Mean | SD | Std. Error | Skewness | Std. Error of Skewness |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CDU | 23 | 30.52 | 9.50 | 1.98 | .64 | .48 |
| IGV | 22 | 32.45 | 10.68 | 2.27 | -.25 | .49 |
| CTA | 22 | 39.18 | 10.36 | 2.21 | .35 | .49 |

To answer the first research question, three different paired samples *t*-tests were conducted to compare the pretest and posttest scores of each group on the vocabulary test. Although the means of the three groups indicated an increase after the treatment (Tables 7 and 8), this difference was not statistically significant in two of the groups: [CDU (M= -1.04, SD= 4.58); t (22) = -1.09, p=0.28]; [IGV (M= 1.18, SD= 5.30); t (21) = 1.04, p=0.30]. However, the results in the third group, [CTA (M= 1.13, SD=5.24); t (21) = 10.13, p< 0.001] suggested that cooperative dictionary use strategy had a significant impact on the vocabulary knowledge of the participants.

**Table 8.** *Paired Samples t-test Results for Pretest/Posttest Vocabulary*

| Groups | Mean | SD | Standard Error | *t* | df | Sig.(2 tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CDU | -1.04 | 4.58 | 0.95 | -1.09 | 22 | .287 |
| IGV | 1.18 | 5.30 | 1.13 | 1.04 | 21 | .30 |
| CTA | 1.13 | 5.24 | 1.11 | 10.13 | 21 | .000 |

Subsequently, the Leven's test (Table 9) was computed. The results illustrated that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated. Hence, a one-way, between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of the three different vocabulary strategy uses on the knowledge of vocabulary of the learners. The analysis signified that there was a significant difference in the application of the three different strategies [F (2, 64) = 4.43, p=.01, $\eta^2$ = .12]. The effect size, using eta squared, was 0.12, which indicated a relatively large effect size. It means that collaborative test-specific activation by itself accounted for 12% of the overall

**Table 9.** *Test of Homogeneity of Variances*

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| .278 | 2 | 64 | .759 |

variance. A Post hoc comparison using the Scheffé's test (Table11) indicated that the mean score for the group utilizing collaborative text-specific activation strategy (M= 1.13, SD = 5.24) was significantly different from the cooperative dictionary use strategy (M= -1.04, SD = 4.58), and Interactive guessing from context strategy (M = 1.18, SD= 5.30).

**Table 10.** *One-way ANOVA for Vocabulary Posttest*

| Posttest | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Eta Squared ($\eta^{2)}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 921.53 | 2 | 460.76 | 4.43 | .01 | .12 |
| Within Groups | 6642.46 | 64 | 103.78 | | | |
| Total | 7564.00 | 66 | | | | |

**Table 11.** *Post Hoc Sheffé Test for Vocabulary Posttest*

| | | | | | 95%Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Groups | Groups | Mean Difference | Std. Error | Sig. | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| CDU | IGC | -1.93 | 3.03 | 0.89 | -9.38 | 5.51 |
| | CTA | -8.66 | 3.03 | *0.01 | -16.10 | -1.21 |
| IGC | CDU | 1.93 | 3.03 | 0.89 | -5.51 | 9.38 |
| | CTA | -6.72 | 3.07 | 0.09 | -14.25 | 0.80 |
| CTA | CDU | 8.66 | 3.03 | *0.01 | 1.21 | 16.10 |
| | IGC | 6.72 | 3.07 | 0.09 | -0.80 | 14.25 |

## Discussion

The first research question of the study aimed at exploring whether teaching vocabulary learning strategies could improve vocabulary knowledge of a group of Iranian EFL learners. Although the means of the groups prior and subsequent to the treatment displayed an increase in the vocabulary knowledge of the learners, only the difference between the pretest/posttest means of one of the groups, i.e., CTA group showed a

significant difference. This signifies that not all types of strategies are equally beneficial because the learners and teachers should be vigilant in deciding upon the type of strategies utilized in the classroom. Using effective strategies can contribute to the improvement of the learners' learning habits and can facilitate the cumbersome process of vocabulary learning. Furthermore, the results of the study can be indicative of the responsibility of the teachers and practitioners who should resourcefully look for the facilitative strategies to be employed in the classroom. Moreover, strategy training should be viewed as a teaching technique and be integrated into classrooms as an inseparable part of the in-class routines.

The quest to find an answer to the second research question led the researchers to conclude that the learners had an inclination toward CTA, as compared to the other two types of strategies, namely CDU and IGC. This finding implies the inclination of the learners towards incidental vocabulary learning; that is, the multiple exposures to a word, provided by using the strategy, gave the learners the opportunity to experience incidental vocabulary learning while reading. This strategy, as the study suggests, can particularly be effective in EFL settings where learners have insufficient exposure to spoken language as a way of picking up vocabulary items unintentionally. The students' search for texts, which were related to the reading passage they had studied in the class, exposed them to extensive reading and provided them with various contexts as sources of input. Furthermore, the strategy enhanced the contact of the learners with vocabulary items and thus boosted vocabulary learning (Schmitt, 2008).

Additionally, this study suggests that interaction and negotiation of meaning with peers, as it was part of the strategy employed, could foster vocabulary learning in the classroom and amplify the exposure of the learners, which comprises a necessary component in vocabulary learning.

## Conclusion

Learning vocabulary is a systematic task that should be employed by learners for learning new words. As Fraser (1999) argues, learners use a number of strategies when they encounter unfamiliar words while reading. Hence, teaching different types of strategies to learners would enable them to depict the most appropriate strategy compatible with their age, learning style, and background knowledge. In addition, utilizing vocabulary-learning strategies in reading various texts will facilitate incidental learning. Hence, it is the responsibility of the teachers to seek for strategies that best suit their learners.

## References

Abdullah, K. I. (1993). Teaching reading vocabulary: From theory to practice. *Forum*, *31*(3), 10-19.

Bengeleil, N. F., & Paribakht, S. (2004). L2 reading proficiency and lexical inferencing by university EFL learners. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *61*(2), 14-34.

Brown, J. D. (2005). *Testing in language programs.* NY: Mc. Graw-Hill.

Cohen, A. (2007). *Language learning strategies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2005). *Second language acquisition: An advanced resource book*. Oxon: Routledge.

Fraser, C. A. (1999). Lexical processing strategy use and vocabulary learning through reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21,* 225-241.

Gu, P.Y. (2003). Vocabulary learning in a second language: Person, task, context, and strategies. *TESL-EJ*, *7*(2), 1-25.

Hulstijn, J. H. (1993). When do foreign-language readers look up the meaning of unfamiliar words? The influence of task and learner variables. *Modern Language Journal, 77*(2), 139-47.

Hulstijn, J., Hollander, M., & Greidanus, T. (1996). Incidental vocabulary learning by advanced foreign language students: The influence of marginal glosses, dictionary use and reoccurrence of unknown words. *Modern Language Journal, 80*(3), 327-339.

Johnson, K. (2001). *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching.* Essex: Person Education.

Laufer, B. (2005). Focus on form in second language vocabulary learning. *EUROSLA Yearbook, 5,* 223-250.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers.* Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Rahimi, M. (2009). The role of teachers' corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy over time: Is learners' mother tongue relevant? *Reading and Writing, 22*(2), 219-243.

Richards. J. C. (1976). The role of vocabulary teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 10*(1), 77-89.

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

Rivers, W. M. (1983). *Communicating naturally in a second language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmitt, N. (2008). Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(3), 329-363.

## AUTHORS

**Mojgan Rashtchi** is Head of the Graduate TEFL department at the Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch. She has published several articles and books on teaching English to children and adults and has participated in different national and international conferences. Her main areas of interest include issues of first language acquisition and second language teaching to children and adults.
Email: mojgan.rashtchi@gmail.com

**Fatemeh Rezvani** is currently working on her master's thesis in TEFL at the Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch. She has been teaching English in different language schools in Tehran. She has published books on general English and study skills sample tests.
Email: frezvani85@yahoo.com