**IRJABS**

# Effects of Recognition Task and Production Task on Incidental Vocabulary Learning of Iranian EFL Learners

## Hossein Vosoughi[1], Zahra Mehdipour[2]

1. Department of English, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
2. Department of English, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

*Corresponding Author email:* mehdipoordamiri@yahoo.com

**ABSTRACT:** The conviction that L1 and L2/FL learners can acquire unfamiliar vocabulary items in the course of reading, that is, that so-called incidental vocabulary acquisition is a by-product of the reading process, has been held by numerous researchers involved in the study of the relationship between reading and vocabulary (Paribakht & Wesche, 1997). This study investigated whether doing two types of tasks (production task and recognition task) are effective in incidental vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL learners. For this purpose 40 female Iranian EFL students at advanced level were selected based on their performance in Longman TOEFL Test (2007). They were then divided in two groups, one did recognition task and the other did production task through reading. This study investigated the effectiveness of each task on incidental vocabulary learning of the students. After ten sessions of treatments, the same vocabulary test was given to both groups as post-test to check the effectiveness of the treatments. Then paired sample statistics and independent sample tests were run. The results indicated that both treatments had significant effect on incidental vocabulary learning but this effect was greater in production group. It was concluded that those who did production task through reading outperformed those who did recognition group in vocabulary test. Both high-stake and low stakeholders can avail from the findings of this study.

*Key words:* Recognition task, Production task, Incidental vocabulary learning

## INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary learning is the most important part of learning a language which also makes the greatest difficulty for language learners especially foreign language learners. Foreign language learners repeatedly consult this problem with their language teachers and want to get rid of vocabulary lists. Although some of educated teacher insist on vocabulary learning through suitable context, many of teachers stick to repetition and vocabulary lists. Takac (2008) states that explicit vocabulary teaching would ensure that lexical development in the target language follows a systematic and logical path, and hence avoiding uncontrolled accumulation of sporadic lexical items. However, the contribution and effect of explicit vocabulary teaching on vocabulary acquisition is still under dispute. Learners do not learn everything that teachers teach. Lewis (2000) describes teaching as being linear and systematic, but it is wrong to conceive of learning as being the same. Recently, attention to intentional vocabulary learning has shifted toward incidental learning.

Incidental vocabulary learning occurs when learner tries to get the meaning. Researchers have shown that reading, as one of receptive skills, is much more helpful in vocabulary development of learners than generally realized. Nagy (1997) claims that an average learner can learn to recognize up to 1000 words a year from written materials. Ellis (1997) believes that through reading, learners can take a lot of advantages, consciously or unconsciously. The 'task' has become a fundamental concept in language teaching pedagogy. Skehan (1998) describes that different aspects of tasks, and different conditions under which they are carried out, can change the extent to which learners fit in importance to the accuracy of their language, expand the complexity of their expression or attend to the fluency of their performance. tasks ,well- chosen and developed which are centered

around relevant acquisition principles ,as well as sensitive to context have also the potential to lessen the need for test cramming and excessive reliance on a result/test based oriented syllabi.

Tasks can be also fun and highly student centered when borrowing on effective games and other such activities though task is not a substitute word for games. Where students are conscious of marks, including many Asian high school students, if tasks are not clearly supportive of good grades, they may find such exercises as either unrelated or even label them s bad teaching (Nunan, 2004). It can be reasoned that putting fun into learning represents positive motivation that can achieve even worthwhile outcomes in respect to the curriculum.

## Review of the related literature
### Theoretical background

Incidental learning is the process of learning something without the intention of doing so. It is also learning one thing while intending to learn another. In terms of language acquisition, incidental learning is said to be an effective way of learning vocabulary from context. Drawing on cognitive psychology, second language acquisition (SLA) researchers have discerned intentional and incidental language learning. Wode (1999) maintains that language learning as a by-product of language use by teacher or anybody else in the classroom without the linguistic structure itself being the focal point of attention or the target of teaching maneuvers.

He is in fact clear about this when he provides the following operational definition: "language learning as a by-product of language use by the teacher or anybody else in the classroom, without the linguistic structure itself being the focus of attention or the target of teaching maneuvers" (p. 245).

### Vocabulary Learning

First of all, according to the orthographic definition, a 'word' is '. . . any sequence of letters (and a limited number of other characteristics such as hyphen and apostrophe) bounded on either side by a space or punctuation mark' (Carter, 1993).Its flaw is not only its limitation to the written language, but the fact that it is formalistic, inconsistent and incomplete because it neglects differences in meaning and the issues of polysemy, homonymy, grammar functions, etc.

Secondly, based on semantics, a word can be defined as the smallest meaningful unit of language (Carter, 1992). Knowledge of an L2 lexical item consists of several components. Generally, it is characterized by several dimensions of word knowledge (i.e. phonological and orthographic, morphological, syntactic and semantic) and by knowledge of conceptual foundations that determine the position of the lexical item in our conceptual system. Finally, it inevitably includes the ability of productive use, i.e. efficient retrieval of the lexical item for active use (Takac , 2008).

### Factors Affecting Vocabulary Learning and Acquisition

Some factors influence the learning of a lexical item and make the acquisition of vocabulary difficult. Based on Laufer (1997), the factors that affect the learnability of lexical items include pronounceability (phonological or supra-segmental features), orthography, length,

morphology, including both inflectional and derivational complexity that increase the vocabulary learning load, similarity of lexical forms (e.g. synforms,2 homonyms), grammar, i.e. part of speech, and semantic features (e.g. abstractness, specificity and register restriction, idiomaticity and multiple meaning).

### Incidental Vocabulary Learning through Reading

The conviction that L1 and L2/FL learners can acquire unfamiliar vocabulary items in the course of reading, that is, that so-called incidental vocabulary acquisition is a by-product of the reading process, has been held by numerous researchers involved in the study of the relationship between reading and vocabulary (Hulstijn et al., 1993; Ellis, 1994; Paribakht & Wesche, 1997).

Little is understood regarding how this incidental learning occurs particularly with respect the cognitive and meta cognitive processes learners engaged in when encountering unfamiliar words while reading and how differences in these processes affect vocabulary learning. The underlying assumption has been that incidental vocabulary learning primarily occurs through the process of inferring word meaning. But some research suggests that L2 learners who are left on their own generally neglect unfamiliar words, infer only when there is a definite need, and consult moderately and on a very selective basis (Bensoussan & Laufer, 1984; Paribakht & Wesche, 1997). Fraser (1999) accounts on a study of the lexical processing strategies that L2 learners use while reading for comprehension. Lexical processing strategies (LPSs) refer to the three strategic options an L2 reader has when confronting an unfamiliar word: ignore and continue reading, consult a dictionary or another individual, or infer word meaning on the basis of linguistic and contextual cues. Within the theoretical framework of classroom-based

research, the goal of this study was, first, to describe the LPSs that L2 learners use while reading and, second, to trace the impact of LPS-focused instruction on LPS use and other relevant variables including reading rate, reading comprehension, and vocabulary learning.

### Steps in Designing a Task-Based Program

Having specified target and pedagogical tasks, the syllabus designer analyzes these in order to identify the knowledge and skills that the learner will need to have in order to carry out the tasks. The next step is to sequence and integrate the tasks with enabling exercises designed to develop the requisite knowledge and skills. As I have already indicated, one key distinction between an exercise and a task is that exercises will have purely language related outcomes, while tasks will have non-language related outcomes, as well as language related ones. These are the steps that I follow in designing language programs.

1. Select and sequence real-world / target tasks
2. Create pedagogical tasks (rehearsal / activation(
3. Identify enabling skills: create communicative activities and language exercises
4. Sequence and integrate pedagogical tasks, communicative activities and language exercises.

### Focused versus Unfocused Tasks

Key issue for TBLT is whether the tasks themselves should be focused or unfocused. A focused task is one in which a particular structure is required in order for a task to be completed. An unfocused task is one in which the learners are able to use. Willis and Willis (2001) refuse the notion of 'focused' (or, as they call them, 'meta-communicative') tasks. The use of the word 'task' is sometimes reached include 'meta-communicative tasks', or exercises with a focus on linguistic form, in which learners manipulate language or formulate generalizations about form. But a definition of task which includes an explicit focus on form seems to be so all-embracing as to cover almost anything that might occur in a classroom. We consequently restrict our use of the term 'task' to communicative tasks and exclude meta-communicative tasks from our definition. One feature of TBL (task-based learning), therefore, is that learners carrying out a task are free to use any language they can to achieve the outcomes: language forms are not prescribed in advance.

### Consciousness-Raising Tasks

Ellis (2001) reasons for a particular variant of focused tasks that he calls consciousness-raising (CR) tasks. Consciousness-raising tasks are designed to draw learners' attention to a particular linguistic feature through a range of inductive and deductive procedures. The assumption here is not that a feature once raised to consciousness will be immediately incorporated into the learner's inter-language, but that it is a first step in that direction. Ellis (2001) posits that consciousness-raising tasks differ from other focused tasks in two essential ways.

First of all, while structure-based production tasks, enriched input tasks and interpretation tasks are intended to cater primarily to implicit learning, CR-tasks are designed to cater primarily to explicit learning – that is, they are intended to develop awareness at the level of 'understanding' rather than awareness at the level of 'noticing' (Ellis, 2001). Thus, the desired outcome of a CR task is awareness of how some linguistic feature works. Second, whereas the previous types of task were built around content of a general nature (e.g. stories, pictures of objects, opinions about the kind of person you like), CR-tasks make language itself the content. In this respect, it can be asked whether CR-tasks are indeed tasks. They are in the sense that learners are required to talk meaningfully about a language point using their own linguistic resources. That is, although there is some linguistic feature that is the focus of the task learners are not required to use this feature, only think about it and discuss it. The 'taskness' of a CR-task lies not in the linguistic point that is the focus of the task but rather in the talk learners must engage in order to achieve an outcome to the task (Ellis 2001).

### Previous studies

Fallah(2009) tried to find out the effects of incidental and intentional  vocabulary learning on the rate of the retention . The findings suggest that both incidental and intentional vocabulary strategies are effective, but the better retention of vocabulary is gained through intentional vocabulary learning. Shirinzarii (2008) examined the effects of two types of text modification (i.e. simplification and elaboration) on incidental vocabulary acquisition. She concluded that although text modification contributes considerably to reading comprehension, it fails to enhance incidental EFL vocabulary acquisition of the learners. Ghanbarpour (2006) considered the effect of learning style (global and analytic learning styles) on incidental and intentional vocabulary learning of upper intermediate students. In her study, she found the difference between intentional and accidental vocabulary achievement of

global and analytic learners is not significant. However, the researcher of this study aims at exploring the effects of recognition task and production task on incidental vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL learners.

### Statement of the Problem

Despite the abundance of research on vocabulary acquisition that has been conducted by linguists, psychologists and theorists of L2 acquisition, there is still no generally accepted theory of vocabulary acquisition. However, this study is going to scrutinize the effect of two types of tasks of reading on incidental vocabulary learning. These two types are recognition task and production task ( or summary task). Accordingly, due to the paucity of research in this area, the present study was developed in an attempt to answer the following questions.

### Research Questions

1. Is incidental vocabulary gain significant by doing recognition task in reading?
2. Is incidental vocabulary gain significant by doing production task?
3. Is there a significant difference between incidental vocabulary gain through recognition task and production task?

### Research Null Hypotheses

1. Incidental vocabulary gain is not significant by doing recognition task in reading.
2. Incidental vocabulary gain is not significant by doing production task in reading.
3. There is not any significant difference between incidental vocabulary learning through production task and recognition task.

### Methodology
### Participants

For the purpose of the study, 48 advanced EFL learners from Simin language institute were randomly chosen. To homogenize the subjects, a Longman TOEFL Test (2007) was given to them. The students took the test in 90 minutes. Out of 48 students, 4o students who scored one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below the mean were finally participated in this study. These 40 students were randomly divided into two groups. Each group consisted of 20 students. Both groups had the same material. The researcher herself taught the material to two groups. All the participants are female and are at the same level of proficiency. Their age ranged from 16 to 24. These students are studying at lower advanced level. They are studying passages book 1in Simin institute.

### Instruments

To achieve the purpose of this study the following instruments were used. A Longman TOEFL test (2007) as a homogeneity test, a vocabulary test of CELT (Comprehensive English Language Test) consisting of 75 items as pretest and posttest, 10 reading passages from TOEFL reading flash book.

### A Longman TOEFL Test (2007) as a Homogeneity Test

A Longman TOEFL test was used to determine the participants' level of general English language proficiency as a whole and its listening comprehension section was used to specify the participants' listening comprehension ability in order to see if the participants of both groups were homogeneous. The Longman TOEFL test included three parts: listening comprehension, structure and written expression, reading comprehension and vocabulary. Characteristics of each section were as follows:
• Listening comprehension contained 50 questions with a time limit of 40 minutes.
• Structure and written expression contained 40 questions with a time limit of 25 minutes.
• Reading comprehension and vocabulary included 50 questions with a time limit of 25 minutes.

### Vocabulary Test of CELT as Pretest and Post test

As the name of this test speaks for itself, the test measures the general vocabulary knowledge. This test included 75 vocabularies, multiple choice items. The test was given to the students to ensure that they don't know the words at the beginning of the study. After doing some statistics and calculating of mean scores of two groups in pre- test, it was justified the participants in both groups were able to answer very few items of the test (it verified their homogeneity too). By conducting those mentioned treatments we hoped to compensate it and improve students' vocabulary knowledge. This was obtained by providing a post test. After ten sessions of treatments, the test was given to students as a post test to measure the vocabulary gain of the both groups. The analysis is

elaborated in chapter four. To ensure the internal validity of the research, teacher didn't provide students with new words except for those few words provided by the student's book.

### Ten Reading Texts as Material from TOEFL Reading Flash Book

The researcher chose ten reading texts from the book "TOEFL Reading Flash" that the participants weren't taught before. Each reading text was taught in one session. For recognition group, each text was accompanied with some multiple choice questions that participants were asked to recognize the right answer. For comprehension group, each text was given to students without any questions and they were asked to read the text and write a summary of that. At the end of each session, teacher asked two or three students to read their summaries.

### Procedure

To achieve the purpose of the present study, the following steps were taken during the research process. The purpose of this study is to measure the amount of incidental vocabulary gain through two types of tasks (recognition task and production task) by students who are learning English as a foreign language at Simin institute. First of all, the researcher requested students who were studying at advanced level to participate in the study. The researcher (who is a teacher in the institute) gave the students Longman TOEFL test as a homogeneity test. After calculating the mean score and doing some statistics, 40 students who scored one standard deviation above and below the mean score   participated in this study. Then students were randomly divided into two groups. One group who attended the class at 5-6:30 on Saturdays and Wednesdays did the recognition task through reading. Another group who attended the class at 7-8:30 p.m. on Saturdays and Wednesdays did the production task through reading. According to the schedule for each course, students attended the class 2o sessions but 10 sessions of them, the researcher did the treatment. Ten reading passages were chosen from the TOEFL reading flash book. Both groups of students read the same material in ten sessions. Each session, they read a reading passage .They covered these materials in ten sessions.  One of the groups of learners   read the materials and answered the multiple choice questions (recognition task). Another group of learners read the materials and wrote summaries of them (production task). Learners were in two different classes and they read only one reading each session. Participants didn't know that there was a post test of vocabulary because the purpose was to measure their incidental vocabulary gain.

About30 minutes of the class time were devoted to this study. Teacher made the warm up by asking some questions about the topic and other pre-task activities. Students in recognition groups were asked to read the passage and answer the questions related to general idea or details of the passage. The questions were written at the below of the passage and some of them were asked by teacher orally. Teacher helped the students with new word by inviting them to guess, inference the meaning, using monolingual dictionary while reading. Sometimes teacher provided the meaning by telling the synonyms and antonyms of new words. With the production group, teacher did the same job. But these students were asked to write a summary of the reading passage in the classroom. The reading passages were all chosen from TOEFL *reading flash* which they weren't taught before.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter is devoted to the description of the statistical analyses which were performed to answer the question formulated for the purpose of this research. All the data were processed using version 17.0 SPSS software.

Table1. Descriptive Statistics of Longman TOEFL Test

| Test | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Longman TOEFL | 48 | 68.52 | 4.33 |

The Longman TOEFL test was given as a homogeneity test to 48 students at advanced level. The mean score of the students was 68.52 and standard deviation was 4.33. The descriptive statistics of this test is presented below.

Table 2. Independent samples test Independent t- test vocabulary test of CELT as pretest

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Scores | Equal variances assumed | 2.249 | .142 | 1.256 | 38 | .217 | 1.350 | 1.075 | -.825 | 3.525 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.256 | 35.611 | .217 | 1.350 | 1.075 | -.830 | 3.530 |

It should be noted that the two groups are also homogenous in terms of their variance. The F= 2.49 has a probability of .142 which is much higher than the significance level proposed by the researcher, i.e. .05. Hence the results of the t-test are reliable enough to be presented.

Table3. Group statistics descriptive  Statistics vocabulary test of CELT as pre-test

| | Groups | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scores | production | 20 | 8.70 | 3.813 | .853 |
| | recognition | 20 | 7.35 | 2.925 | .654 |

Based on these results, it can be concluded that there is not any significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups on the pre-test. In other words the two groups are homogenous in terms of their general vocabulary knowledge prior to the administration of the treatments. The following analysis was done to answer the first research question
Q1: Is incidental vocabulary gain significant by doing recognition task in reading?

Table 4. Paired Samples StatisticsPaired t-test  recognition group

| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pair 1 | posttest | 34.30 | 20 | 10.214 | 2.284 |
| | pretest | 7.35 | 20 | 2.925 | .654 |

As you see in the table above, the mean scores on pretest and posttest of recognition  were compared. The mean score in pretest was 7.35 and in post test was 34.30. This shows that the treatment had significant effect on students vocabulary gain.

Table 5.  Paired Samples Test

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | | Lower | Upper | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Pair 1 | posttest - pretest | 26.950 | 9.801 | 2.191 | 22.363 | 31.537 | 12.298 | 19 | .000 |

As you see the p< .05 so,  results reveal the students in this group had a significant gain after the treatment. So, first null hypothesis is rejected. To answer the second research question the following analysis was run.
**Q2**: Is incidental vocabulary gain significant by doing production task?

Table 6. Paired Samples StatisticsPaired t-test production group

| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pair 1 | posttest | 48.50 | 20 | 8.338 | 1.864 |
| | pretest | 8.70 | 20 | 3.813 | .853 |

As the results clearly show, the mean score of production group was  in pretest was 8.70 but in posttest was 48.50. So,  the vocabulary gain after treatment was really significant and noticeable.

Table 7. Paired Samples TestPaired t-test production group

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| | | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | posttest - pretest | 39.800 | 7.613 | 1.702 | 36.237 | 43.363 | 23.380 | 19 | .000 |

The results of the paired t-test reveal a significant gain for the production group. The p<.05 so the participants in this group improved their vocabulary knowledge noticeably. To answer the third research question, following analysis were done.

Q3: Is there a significant difference between incidental vocabulary gain through recognition task and production task?

Table 8. Group Statistics Descriptive  Statistics vocabulary test of CELT as post-test

| | Groups | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scores | production | 20 | 48.50 | 8.338 | 1.864 |
| | recognition | 20 | 34.30 | 10.214 | 2.284 |

This table compares the two mean scores of participants in post-tests. You can see that mean score of production group in post-test was 48.50 and that of recognition group is 34.30.

Table9. Independent Samples Test Independent t-test vocabulary test of CELT as post-test

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Scores | Equal variances assumed | .563 | .458 | 4.816 | 38 | .000 | 14.200 | 2.948 | 8.231 | 20.169 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 4.816 | 36.536 | .000 | 14.200 | 2.948 | 8.224 | 20.176 |

The results show a significant difference between incidental vocabulary learning of two groups. The production group outperformed the recognition group, i.e. t(38)=4.816, p<0.05. So the third and fourth hypothesis is rejected and the fifth hypothesis was accepted.

## CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Although there are some studies aimed at exploring the possible effect of doing task-based teaching on incidental vocabulary learning worldwide in general and in Iranian EFL situations in particular, and also its implication on foreign language learning and teaching, the author of the research aimed at confirming whether her research on Iranian advanced EFL learners at English language institutes would show any result of importance. The results showed that doing recognition task and production task, in this particular research, had some effects on the improvement of vocabulary learning. Therefore, by presenting the gained results (discussed in data analysis part), the possible effects on language studying and in this particular case vocabulary learning have been discussed and focused on. The result of this study can be summarized as follow:

1. After administering and scoring pre-test, the independent t-test showed that the student didn't in both groups couldn't answer the vocabulary items (it showed, they were homogenous, as well)

2. Being exposed to treatment in recognition group production groups, the participants were given the post-test. After scoring the post-test and paying attention to the sig. (i.e. P-value, or tail probability) for each F ratio, the researcher discovered that there was significant main effect for doing tasks in both groups.

3. By doing independent t-test on post test, it was proved that production group outperformed the recognition group.

The result of this study has some hints for English instructors to pay attention to while teaching reading texts. Because reading texts are important input to enhance vocabulary knowledge of the foreign language learners, teachers can help students build their vocabulary by teaching them strategies to guess the meaning of

unfamiliar words. They can benefit from doing different types of tasks to improve their students' incidental vocabulary learning.

This study was concerned with advanced EFL learners. It can be replicable for other proficiency levels of the EFL learners, i.e. intermediate or upper-intermediate learners can be participants for other similar experiments. In this study, only recognition task and production were used, however it is possible to investigate the effectiveness of other types of tasks. The present study was only concerned with the reading skill in English language. Other skills and sub-skills including writing, speaking, and vocabulary retention could be studied for further research. For example, participants can be asked to write about the theme of the interview, speak about what they have understood or even act out the interview about the same subject. They can also use the vocabulary they have learned from the interviews to make complete sentences in order to test their vocabulary retention at the end of the study.

## REFERENCES

Bensoussan M, Laufer B. 1984. Lexical guessing in context in EFL readingcomprehension. Journal of Reading Research, 7, 15–32.
Carter K. 1993. The place of story in research on teaching and teacher education.
Educational Researcher, 22 (1), 5--12, 18.
Ellis NC. 1997. Vocabulary acquisition: Word structure, collocation, word-class, and meaning. In: N. Schmitt and M. Mccarthy, eds. Vocabulary: description, acquisition and pedagogy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ellis R. 2001: Introduction: investigating form-focused instruction. Language Learning 51(1): 1–46.
Fallah A. 2009. The effect of both intentional and incidental vocabulary learning on the rate of retention .Unpublished master's thesis, Center branch, Azad university, Tehran, Iran.
Fraser CA. 1999. Lexical processing strategy use and vocabulary learning through reading. SSLA, 21, 225-241.
Ghambarpour TA. 2006. The imact of learning style (global and analytic learning styls) on intentional and incedental vocabulary learning of upperAzad university, Tehran, Iran. ntermediate students. Unpublished master's thesis , Center branch
Huckin T, Haynes M, Coady J. 1993. Second language reading and vocabulary learning.    Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
Laufer B. 1997. What's in a word that makes it hard or easy: some intra-lexical factors that affectthe learning of words. In N. Schmitt and M. McCarthy, eds, Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy, 140-155, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lewis M. 2000.Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach. Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.
Nagy W.1997. On the role of context in first- and second-language vocabulary learning. In N.Schmitt and M. McCarthy, eds. Vocabulary: description, acquisition and pedagogy     Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Nunan D. 2004. Task-based language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Paribakht TS, Wesche M. 1999. Reading and incidental L2 vocabulary acquisition. An introspective study of lexical inferencing. SSLA,  21, 195-224.
Shirinzarii M. 2008. The effects of two types of text modification (i.e. simplification and elaboration ) on incidental vocabulary acquisition. Unpublished master's thesis, Science      and Research branch, Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
Skehan P. 1998.  A cognitive approach to language learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Takac VP. 2008. Vocabulary learning strategies and foreign language acquisition. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Willis D, Willis J. 2001. Task-based language learning. In R. Carter and D. Nunan (eds.). The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Wode H. 1999. Incidental vocabulary acquisition in foreign language classroom. SSLA, 21, 243-258.