

The Effect of Task Type on Iranian Advanced EFL Learners' Vocabulary Learning

Touran Ahour

Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

Shokoufeh Abbasi Dogolsara

Department of English, Roudsar and Amlash Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudsar, Iran

Abstract—This study aimed to investigate the effect of teaching two types of tasks (multiple-choice item and sentence-writing) on Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary learning. For this purpose, sixty students were selected out of ninety through the administration of a Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT). They were junior translator trainees with the age range of 22-26. They were then divided into two comparison groups. A pretest of vocabulary was administered to both groups. Then both groups were given a five-session treatment. One group was taught vocabulary based on sentence-writing task, and the other group was taught vocabulary through multiple-choice task. After the treatment, the same version of vocabulary test was given to both groups as posttest to check the effectiveness of the treatments. The results of paired-samples and independent samples t-tests revealed that the effect of sentence-writing task on learners' vocabulary learning was more than that of the multiple-choice task. The implications and recommendations will also be presented.

Index Terms—CELT test, EFL learners, multiple-choice task, sentence-writing, task type

I. INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary is central to English language teaching and learning because without sufficient vocabulary students cannot understand others or express their own ideas. In most of the educational settings, it has been customized that language learners find it the easiest to learn new words by referring to their equivalent meaning in their own language, or resorting to antonyms or synonyms. Read (2004) states that these procedures are either time-consuming, or are considered as abstract ways of learning words, resulting in the non-durability of words. He notes that in EFL contexts, it would be effective for teachers to provide students with target vocabulary items through tasks and ask them to read only the texts that include the target words. Nation and Meara (2010) define English vocabulary as complex, possessing three main aspects which are concerned with meaning, form and use. It has also layers of meaning which are related to the stems or roots of individual words.

In a study on L2 vocabulary retention, Hulstijn (1992) concluded that using inferencing strategy to gain word meaning was much more effective than explaining it through synonyms. He noted that inferring the meaning of target vocabulary items had longer retention than when explained by their synonyms. Joe's (1995) viewpoint on the retention of unfamiliar words is notable, too. He claims that unfamiliar words are retained longer periods of time as learned through task-based activities, requiring higher level of generativity. On the importance of production-based task on vocabulary retention, Hulstijn and Laufer (2001) assert that production task promote target words retention longer and better than reading comprehension or fill-in-the-blank task which is a sample of recognition task. This finding reveals that the learners who are engaged in production tasks of vocabulary learning are able to remember target words better than those who are involved in vocabulary recognition

The main purpose and primary focus of the present study was to find out the effect of two tasks (i.e., multiple-choice-item as a recognition task versus sentence-writing as a production task) on learners' vocabulary knowledge as they encounter various contexts. These two variables and their potential interaction on each other have not been investigated thoroughly in the Iranian context yet. So the present study was going to fill this gap and shed more light on this by finding any possible effect of multiple-choice-item and sentence-writing tasks on the Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary knowledge development. Therefore, the following null hypotheses were formulated in this study:

H01: Sentence-Writing tasks do not affect Iranian advanced EFL Learners' vocabulary learning.

H02: Multiple-Choice-Item tasks do not affect Iranian advanced EFL Learners' vocabulary learning.

H03: There is no significant difference in the vocabulary learning of Sentence-Writing group and Multiple-Choice-Item group.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. The Importance of Vocabulary Knowledge

Vocabulary knowledge is one of the merits which facilitate reading comprehension. Among EFL students, reading comprehension can be predicted to a large extent by vocabulary, letter recognition and phonemic awareness (McQuirter Scott, 2010). In addition, vocabulary knowledge promotes reading fluency, improves academic achievement and enhances thinking and communication. (McQuirter Scott, 2010). Furthermore, McQuirter Scott (2010) holds that effective vocabulary instruction, beginning in the early years, can have a significant impact on individuals' future academic field. Vocabulary instruction which is targeted at students must go beyond the level of simple word definitions.

Students can be provided multiple opportunities to examine and explore new words and concepts across the curriculum, and be encouraged to attend to word structure, the multiple meanings of words and the connotations often attached to words. Students can be trained to become critical readers in all subject areas and be aware of the influence of word choice on readers. Their achievement of vocabulary and sensitivity to word choice play a role in more efficient language processing. As learners do not have to labor over decoding and recognizing new words, they can interact with text at a deeper level, which is assumed to free them to connect with the writer's message in creative and thought provoking ways (McQuirter Scott, 2008).

Given the empirical studies carried out on EFL learners' vocabulary learning, there are some factors influencing learners' capacity and quality of vocabulary gain. In a study carried out by Dela Rosa and Eskenazi (2006), they emphasized that word complexity, on both the phonetic and semantic levels, affects L2 vocabulary learning. As Oxford and Scarcella (1994) stressed, some factors such as maturational constraints, attention, previous language background, and order of acquisition affect L2 vocabulary acquisition. Perfetti (2010) placed primary focus on the incrementing role of reading, pointing out that reading is beneficial to vocabulary acquisition. Pavlik and Anderson (2005), based on a study on the vocabulary pairs, confirmed that the number and frequency of time that a learner receives an item during learning activities could affect the durability of the words they were exposed to. Still there are some other factors which appear to affect the learnability of lexical items. Laufer (1997) indicated a specific linguistic classification that contributes to vocabulary learning. He pointed out some features such as pronounceability (i.e., phonological or supra-segmental features), orthography, length, morphology, comprising inflectional and derivational complexity that add to the vocabulary learning load, resemblance or similarity of lexical forms (like synforms, homonyms), grammar (part of speech, and semantic features).

Incidental and intentional modes of vocabulary learning are two modes of learning, each of which possesses its own characteristics. Richards and Schmidt (2002) defined incidental learning as a process by which learning items or items of information takes place without the intention of doing so. Learning takes place as the individual intends to learn another item. Studies which have been conducted indicate the relationship between incidental learning and extensive reading in that incidental learning motivates language learners to have extensive reading. Coady (2001) asserted that this kind of learning is achieved mostly through extensive reading in input-rich environments, but at a rather slow rate. Some researchers such as Day, Omura and Hiramatsu (1991), Jenkins, Stein and Wysocki (1984), and Nagy and Herman (1985) maintained that incidental learning is viewed as effective way of learning vocabulary from context. According to these researchers, incidental mode of vocabulary learning involves deeper mental processing and leads to better retention. Learners find themselves in a process in which they make attempt to grasp the meaning of words using the clues provided in the text. This kind of activity requires their cognitive process because they ponder on the new and unknown words, helping them to retain the words they are exposed to for a long period of time. In incidental vocabulary learning, since learners are involved in extensive reading, they get involved in the process of deciphering the meaning of the new words using the clues available in the text. Hulstijn and Laufer, (2001) maintain that the words that learners are exposed to in incidental vocabulary learning are retained in their long-term memory and can be used more confidently in different situations as they are needed.

B. Vocabulary Learning Strategies

Stahl (1999) provided a notable suggestion, pointing out that the words that are new to students but represent familiar concepts can be addressed using a number of relatively quick instructional tactics. Many of these tactics are effective for pre-reading and oral reading. Stahl (1999) supplied a seven-component classification pertaining to strategies for vocabulary learning and development. This classification comprises word-based activities such as (a) working on synonyms, (b) working on antonyms, (c) examples provision, (d) non-examples provision (similar to using antonyms, providing non-examples requires students to evaluate a word's attributes. It gets students to explain why it is not an example), (e) constructing novel sentences (confirming their understanding of a new word, using more than one new word per sentence to show that connections can also be useful), (f) word sorting (providing a list of vocabulary words from a reading selection and have students sort them into various categories (e.g., parts of speech, branches of government), and (g) paraphrase definitions (requiring students to use their own words to define new words or state a word or an expression in more details).

Through their study, Paribakht and Wesche (1994) introduced a five-component classification of various types of L2 vocabulary exercises, comprising (a) selective attention, (b) recognition type of exercise, (c) manipulation, (d) interpretation, and (e) production exercises. They noted that the selective attention type of exercises is referred to the category of exercises designed to draw learners' attention to a particular vocabulary item. It includes presenting a list of words before a text, and asking the learners to read the words and pay attention where these words appear in the text. As

they showed, the recognition drills are designed to have learners to associate the word form and its meaning. To do this, the learners are just supplied partial knowledge of the words. The most common drills of this classification are matching a vocabulary item with synonym or definition of the word, and choosing the correct meaning of a word in a multiple choice test. Paribakht and Wesche (1994) explained that in manipulation type of exercise, learners are supposed to rearrange the elements of phrases by referring to their morphological and grammatical knowledge. One frequently-used sample of the exercise is using stems and affixes to make a complete and meaningful word. Interpretation involves making and establishing a sort of relationship between vocabulary items with other words or expressions represented in the text; the common examples of this assignment are synonyms and antonyms given in the text. As they state, Production exercises, like open cloze exercises, which are different from the previous ones, draw learners' attention to retain and reconstruct the vocabulary items, and then retrieve and make a suitable word in the text given. The extent to which, these different exercises culminate in productive gains of vocabulary knowledge and further vocabulary learning is not equal.

To infer and accomplish the meaning of unknown words, learners make use of two different types of tools which are termed word-guessing strategies and knowledge sources. Scholars such as Chern (1993), Morrison (1996), and Nassaji (2003, 2004) have identified the so-called tools that learners use in order to learn target words incidentally. Nassaji (2004) recognized and introduced three types of word-guessing strategies including Identifying, Evaluating, and Monitoring. He also establishes some certain knowledge sources which are viewed as effective in learners' process of incidental vocabulary learning and acquisition. These knowledge sources include grammatical, morphological, world, L1, and discourse knowledge.

Ahmed (2011), Khatib and Nourzadeh (2012) distinguished the concept of intentionally vocabulary learning and incidental mode of vocabulary learning. They viewed that intentional vocabulary learning can be justified based on some exercises, including word substitution, multiple choice, scrambled words and crossword puzzles, synonyms, and antonyms regardless of context. This mode of learning encourages learners to rote learning, enabling them grasp the meaning of the new words and expressions without resorting to cognitive process. They showed that intentional vocabulary acquisition involves straightforwardly memorizing terms and expressions along with their respective translations from a list. They were of the view that this sort of learning is quick and therefore usually preferred by learners, but it is also superficial. Learners encounter vocabulary in an isolated, often infinitive form and remain incapable of using it correctly in context.

C. Empirical Studies

On the importance of exercise types and their determining effect on L2 vocabulary learning, a variety of empirical studies have been carried out. The orientation of these studies has been into the context where the new or unknown words are represented. Some early researchers such as Dunmore (1989), Min and Hsu (1997), and Paribakht and Wesche (1994) emphasized the importance of applying exercises in L2 vocabulary learning. They pointed out that text-based vocabulary exercises and activities could be much more effective and efficient than the reading only the text on vocabulary learning. The findings of Amiryousefie and Kassaian's (2010) study on vocabulary retention supported the idea that vocabulary must be given in text-based exercises in that they would facilitate vocabulary learning. In addition, Llach (2009) supported the effect of vocabulary exercisers in promoting vocabulary knowledge. The ultimate goal of the findings was that using different exercises is essential and beneficial for vocabulary learning and retention.

Vosoughi and Mehdipour (2013) carried out and presented a study on the Effects of Recognition Task and Production Task on Incidental Vocabulary Learning of Iranian EFL Learners. Through this study, they investigated the effectiveness of two types of tasks (production and recognition) on Iranian EFL learners' incidental vocabulary learning. In other words, the study investigated the effectiveness of each task on incidental vocabulary learning of the students. The findings of the study indicated that both treatments (production and recognition tasks) had significant effect on incidental vocabulary learning but this effect was greater in production group. Hashemzadeh (2012) conducted a study on the effect of exercise type on EFL learners' vocabulary retention targeting at elementary EFL learners' vocabulary retention. She examined the effect of recognition exercises versus production exercises in immediate and delayed vocabulary tests on English institute-level learners. The results showed that recognition exercises were more effective than production exercises in EFL vocabulary retention. Chen and Chen's (2009) study, which was concerned with investigating the effect of constructed responses and multiple-choice item types with cueing in students' vocabulary learning in a self-guided web-based language learning environment, suggested that constructed responses items had greater effect than the multiple-choice items on students' posttests (recall and recognition). Touti's (2013) research was an attempt to investigate the effectiveness of two types of tasks (fill-in-the-blank and writing) on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' vocabulary learning. To this end, this study employed 64 Iranian intermediate EFL learners divided into two 32 experimental groups named as fill-in-the-blank and writing. The findings were in favor of the writing group, due to the laudably magnificent cognitive demand induced by such a task.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

The participants in this study were sixty Iranian EFL students who were majoring in English Translation at advanced level at the Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon branch, Iran. They were junior translator trainees with the age range of 22-26. To ensure the homogeneity of the participants, a model of CELT test was administered. The CELT test was given to ninety students out of whom sixty were selected based on the results of the test. That is, the students whose scores fell between one standard deviation below and above the mean were considered as participants of the study. Then, they were randomly assigned into the sentence-writing and multiple-choice-item groups.

B. Instruments and Materials

The instruments and materials used in the current study were as follows:

a) The CELT test: The CELT test for advanced level, which was administered to determine the participants' proficiency and homogeneity, consisted of two sections including vocabulary and reading comprehension. The test was in multiple-choice-item form.

b) Vocabulary pretest and posttest: The pretest included a vocabulary test consisting of 20 multiple-choice items (recognition type). The vocabulary test was determined and constructed based on the original vocabulary book entitled "Vocabulary for the High School Students" (Levine, 2011). It was a course-book on morphology that the students in the university had already passed during their course of study. The same version of vocabulary multiple-choice-item test, with rearrangement of some items, was administered as posttest to the both groups.

c) The material for the treatment: The material used in the treatment for both groups included eighty words extracted from the same native vocabulary book (Vocabulary for the High School Students) based on which the pretest and posttest were constructed. The selected lexical items were divided into five sections, each of which included 16 words.

C. Procedure

After the administration of the CELT and pretest in both groups, they underwent their treatments (sentence writing in one group and multiple-choice in the other group) for the same period of time through the same material and based on the same methodology. The material selected for this purpose included eighty words selected from a native vocabulary book entitled "Vocabulary for the High School Students" (Levine, 2011). The words selected for the purpose of the treatment were classified into five sections, each of which comprised exactly 16 words. Totally, five sessions of treatment was offered to the both groups, and each section of the words was taught in one session. The participants of the two groups were supposed to work on the material through the instructions provided to them.

The sentence-writing group was taught based on **sentence-writing exercises** as one of the independent variables. The students of this group were taught in five sessions within two subsequent weeks, including three sessions in one week and two sessions in the other week. Each session was completed by introducing exactly sixteen words which were taught to the participants of the group through a variety of sentence-writing exercises. The participants were asked to write one or more than one sentence using any of the single words given to them as the key word. They read their own sentences aloud in the treatment sessions, receiving their classmates' views and feedback. They were greatly encouraged to extract and find the meaning of the newly introduced words by referring to their definition in L2 or by resorting to their synonyms in Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary. The application of the participants' native language equivalents for the meaning of the words was strongly avoided.

The multiple-choice-item group was taught the same material but through **multiple-choice-item exercises** in exactly the same period of time like the sentence-writing group. To meet the requirements of this group, the meaning of the new words and expressions, like the other group, were clarified by definition provision or synonym replacement. The new words were offered and practiced through a variety of multiple-choice-item exercises. After the completion of treatment period for the both groups within five sessions, they were given the post-test, which was the same version of test on vocabulary administered as pretest, with a rearrangement of some items in the posttest.

D. Design

The study employed pretest-posttest comparison group design as one of the quasi-experimental designs. The independent variable of the study was task type including multiple choice and sentence-writing tasks and the dependent variable was vocabulary learning.

E. Data Analysis

The collected data were entered into the SPSS 16.0 for further analysis. An Independent-Samples t-test was used to test the null hypothesis of the study and the alpha level for significance testing was set at .05.

F. Results

This section is devoted to the description of the statistical analyses which were performed to test and answer the null hypotheses formulated for the purpose of this research.

TABLE 1:
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS' SCORES ON THE PROFICIENCY TEST (CELT)

N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Variance	Std. Error of Mean
60	98.68	23.00	166.00	143.00	2778.14	5.55

The proficiency test (CELT) was administered as a homogeneity test to 90 participants at advanced level, out of whom sixty were selected based on the results of the test. The mean score of the participants was 98.68 and those students whose score fell within one standard deviation above and below the mean were selected as the participants of the study.

TABLE 2.
RESULT OF THE NORMALITY 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
Vocab. Equal Variances	Assumed .07	.78	2.94	58	.005	1.73	.58
Equal Variances not assumed			2.94	57.22	.005	1.73	.58

As given in the table above, according to the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, it can be inferred that the variance of participants has been normal ($F = 0.07$), $\text{Sig.} = .78 > .05$).

1. First Null Hypothesis

The first null hypothesis of the study suggested that sentence-writing tasks do not affect Iranian advanced EFL Learners' vocabulary learning. For this purpose, a Paired-Samples t-test was conducted. The descriptive statistics are represented in Table 3.

TABLE 3.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE PAIRED-SAMPLES T-TEST FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (SENTENCE-WRITING)

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PosttestSW	15.80	30	2.13	.39
	PretestSW	13.53	30	2.54	.46

Table 3 shows that the posttest mean score (15.80) of the sentence-writing group was more than their pretest mean score (13.53). The standard deviation for the posttest was less than the pretest. This may give an image of less variability among experimental group's posttest scores compared to their pretest scores. In order to find out whether there was a significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of the sentence-writing group, the results of Paired-Samples t-test are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF PAIRED DIFFERENCES (SENTENCE-WRITING GROUP)

Paired Differences		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	PosttestSW - PretestSW	2.26	.69	.12	17.95	29	.000

As shown in Table 4, there is a significant difference, $t(29) = 17.95$, $p = .000$, between the pretest-posttest mean scores of the sentence-writing group. Therefore, the first null hypothesis of the study is rejected.

2. Second Null Hypothesis

The second hypothesis of the study was constructed on the supposition that multiple-choice-item task does not affect Iranian advanced EFL learners' vocabulary learning. To investigate this hypothesis, a Paired-Samples t-test was run for the multiple-choice group.

TABLE 5.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF PAIRED-SAMPLES T-TEST FOR THE COMPARISON GROUP (MULTIPLE-CHOICE-ITEM GROUP)

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PosttestMC	14.06	30	2.40	.43
	PretestMC	13.16	30	2.62	.47

As the results clearly show, the mean score of multiple-choice group in pretest was 13.16 but in the posttest was 14.06. So the participants' vocabulary gain after treatment was really something to be taken into account. This clue is

considered an indicator of the rejection of the second null hypothesis. Furthermore, standard deviation (Std. Deviation) for the posttest in this group was less than that of the pretest. This may be indicative of less variability among multiple-choice group's posttest scores than that of the pretest. Likewise, the next table (Table 6) provides further clue concerning the rejection of the second null hypothesis.

TABLE 6.
PAIRED-SAMPLES T-TEST (MULTIPLE-CHOICE GROUP)

Paired Differences		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean		
Pair 1 PosttestMC - PretestMC	.90	1.91	.35	2.57 29 .01

As shown in Table 6, there is a significant difference, $t(29) = 2.57$, $p = .01$, between the pretest-posttest mean scores of the multiple-choice group. Therefore, the second null hypothesis of the study, which suggested that multiple-choice-item tasks do not affect Iranian Advanced EFL learners' vocabulary learning, is rejected.

Therefore, the second hypothesis is rejected.

3. Third Null Hypothesis

To examine the third null hypothesis, the researchers ran an Independent-Samples t-test. The descriptive statistics of the results are schematically represented in Table 7.

TABLE 7.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE SENTENCE-WRITING AND MULTIPLE-CHOICE GROUPS IN THE POSTTEST

TaskType	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Vocab SW	30	15.80	2.13	.39
MC	30	14.06	2.40	.43

Based on Table 7, the mean of the sentence-writing (production) group in the posttest was 15.8, and that of the multiple-choice-item (recognition) group was 14.06. The results showed that the sentence-writing group outperformed the multiple-choice-item group. So, it is concluded that the sentence-writing task was more effective than the multiple-choice-item task. Furthermore, the standard deviation value for the sentence-writing group, according to the table, is less than the other group, meaning that there was less variability in the scores of the sentence-writing participants compared with those of the multiple-choice group. However, in order to find out whether there was a significant difference between the two groups' mean scores in the posttest, the results of the Independent-Samples t-test are presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8.
INDEPENDENT-SAMPLES T-TEST FOR THE SENTENCE-WRITING AND MULTIPLE-CHOICE-ITEM GROUPS IN THE POSTTEST

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	
Vocab. Equal Variances	Assumed	.076	.78	2.95	58	.005	1.73	.58
Equal Variances not assumed				2.95	57.22	.005	1.73	.58

As Table 8 demonstrates, there is a significant difference, $t(58) = 2.95$, $p = .005$, between the sentence writing and multiple-choice-item groups. Therefore, the third null hypothesis of the study was rejected.

IV. DISCUSSION

The results of the study revealed that the sentence-writing task (as production task) had a significant effect on Iranian advanced EFL learners' vocabulary learning compared to the multiple-choice-item task (as recognition task). These findings seem to be in line with the research study carried out by Vosoughi and Mehdipour (2013) who investigated the effects of Recognition Task and Production Task on Incidental Vocabulary Learning of Iranian EFL Learners. Their findings indicated that production exercises had significant effect on vocabulary learning compared to recognition types of exercises. These findings are also in agreement with Chen and Chen's (2009) research whose area of study was investigating the degree of effectiveness of two modes of tasks (constructed responses versus multiple-choice item) as vocabulary learning tasks. The findings of their study confirmed that constructed responses items were more effective than the multiple-choice items on learners' vocabulary learning. In addition, the findings of this study are consistent with what Touti (2013) concluded in her study. Touti (2013) investigated the effect of fill-in-the-blank versus writing tasks on Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary learning targeted at intermediate level. The findings of her study were in favor of the writing task; in other words, the writing task was found to have a significant effect on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' vocabulary learning.

Therefore, the findings of this study, being in line with those of some other studies mentioned above, can be a good justification for putting more emphasis on teaching vocabulary through sentence-writing in EFL classes. As it can be inferred from the findings of this study, a production type of task like sentence-writing can be more effective than a recognition type of task such as multiple-choice in learning vocabulary in EFL classes.

V. CONCLUSION

The findings demonstrated that sentence-writing was more facilitating in the learning of vocabulary than just having learners read and learn vocabulary through recognition drills, namely, multiple-choice-item. The facilitating role of sentence writing in learning vocabulary may be somehow due to the fact that the meaning of words are not consolidated in the learners' mind unless they produce the new words in their own sentences. Requiring learners to write sentences of their own on the new words promotes learning vocabulary, as the findings of the present study show. The nature of some recognition exercises, especially, that of the multiple-choice-item drills is such that requires comprehension only, without any requirement to produce them, orally or in written form. Providing learners with production tasks (sentence writing) associated with other exercises, instead of the mere use of the exercises which rely on recognition, help learners with vocabulary learning in an effective way.

In this regard, the findings of this study can be helpful for teachers of English, syllabus designers and test designers. Teachers are supposed to provide their learners with more opportunities to practice and learn vocabulary by using sentence writing exercises rather than mere practice of multiple-choice-item drills in their classes. It will be useful that teachers provide opportunities by using different exercises in different contexts and by engaging learners in different activities and tasks to improve their vocabulary knowledge.

The importance of this idea is that learners naturally think about and practice some other contextually appropriate vocabulary while writing new and novel sentences of their own on the words. Likewise, learners are encouraged to build their vocabulary by being involved in production skills and benefiting from their already-learned vocabulary. Syllabus designers may find it as useful to provide EFL learners with curricula which rely upon production types of task in addition to recognition ones as a facilitating factor in learning vocabulary. The widely used approach for constructing and testing vocabulary in EFL contexts is multiple-choice-item type of exercise. The present study suggests that test constructors include sentence writing types of exercises associated with other exercises, rather than those with solely recognition exercises. It will be useful for test constructors to find out how well learners are able to seek for other contextually appropriate vocabulary.

This study was concerned with and conducted at Iranian advanced EFL learners. The future studies of similar nature can address other proficiency levels of the EFL learners such as intermediate or upper-intermediate learners. In this study, only sentence writing task (as production task) and multiple-choice task (as recognition task) were tested on EFL learners' vocabulary learning. The future experiments can investigate the effectiveness of other types of tasks.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ahmed, M. O. (2011). Intentional vs. Incidental Vocabulary Learning. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Cotemporary Research in Business*, 3(5), 67-75.
- [2] Amiryousefie, M. & Kassaian, Z. (2010). The effect of reading only vs. reading plus enhancement activities on vocabulary learning and production of Iranian Pre- University students. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 94-98.
- [3] Chern, C. (1993). Chinese students' word-solving strategies in reading in English. In T. Huckin, M. Haynes, & J. Coady (Eds.), *Second language reading and vocabulary learning* (pp. 67- 85). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- [4] Chen, C. H. & Chen, Y. W. (2009). Effectiveness of constructed responses and multiple-choice questions on recall and recognition in a web-based language learning environment. *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Computers in Education*. Hong Kong: Asia-Pacific Society for Computers in Education.
- [5] Coady, J. (2001). Research on ESL/EFL vocabulary acquisition: Putting it in context. In T..Huckin & M. Haynes & J. Coady (Eds). *Second language reading and vocabulary learning* (pp.3-23).
- [6] Day, R., Omura, C., & Hiramatsu, M. (1991). Incidental EFL vocabulary learning and reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 7, 541-551.
- [7] Dunmore, D. (1989).Using contextual clues to infer word meaning: An evaluation of current exercise types. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 6(1), 337-347.
- [8] Hashemzadeh, M. (2012). The Effect of Exercise Types on EFL Learners' Vocabulary Retention. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(8), 1716-1727.
- [9] Hulstijn, J.H. (1992). Retention of inferred and given word meanings: Experiments in incidental vocabulary learning. In P.J. Arnaud & H. Bejoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and applied linguistics*(pp. 113-125). London: Macmillan.
- [10] Hulstijn, J.H., & Laufer, B. (2001). Some empirical evidence for the involvement load hypothesis in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*, 51, 539-558.
- [11] Jenkins, J. R., Stein, M. L., & Wysocki, K. (1984). Learning vocabulary through reading. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21, 767-787.
- [12] Joe, A. (1995). Text-based tasks and incidental vocabulary learning. *Second Language Research*, 11, 149-158.
- [13] Kargozari, H. & Ghaemi, H. (2011). A Reappraisal Perspective on Written Tasks Types and Vocabulary Acquisition and Retention of EFL Learners. *World Applied Sciences*, 12 (10), 1653-1661.

- [14] Khatib, M. & Nourzadeh, S. (2012). Incidental L2 Vocabulary Acquisition through Reading. Comprehension: Issues, Agreements and Controversies. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies*, 2(2), 1-11.
- [15] Laufer, B. (1997). The lexical plight in second language reading: Words you don't know, words you think you know, and words you can't guess. In J. Coady, & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 20-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [16] Laufer B. (1997). What's in a word that makes it hard or easy: Some intra-lexical factors that affect the learning of words. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Llach, M. P. A. (2009). The effect of reading only, reading and comprehension, and sentence writing in lexical learning in a foreign language: Some preliminary results. *RESLA*, 22, 9-33.
- [18] McQuirter Scott, R. (2008). *Knowing words: Creating word-rich classrooms*. Toronto, ON: Nelson Education.
- [19] McQuirter Scott, R. (2010). *Word Study Instruction. Enhancing Reading Comprehension*. Ontario: The Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat.
- [20] Morrison, L. (1996). Talking about words: A study of French as a second language learners' lexical inferencing procedures. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53, 41-75.
- [21] Min, H. T. & Hsu, W. S. (2008). The impact of supplemental reading on vocabulary acquisition and retention with EFL learners in Taiwan. *Journal of National Taiwan Normal University*, 53(1), 83-115.
- [22] Nagy, W. E. and Herman, P. A. (1985). Incidental vs. instructional approaches to increasing reading vocabulary. *Educational perspectives*, 23(1), 16-21.
- [23] Nagy, W., Herman, R. & Anderson, R. (1985). Learning words from context. *Reading research quarterly*, 20, 233-253.
- [24] Nassaji, H. (2004). The Relationship between Depth of Vocabulary Knowledge and L2 Learners' Lexical Inferencing Strategy Use and Success. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61, 107-134.
- [25] Nassaji, H. (2003). L2 vocabulary learning from context: Strategies, knowledge sources and their relationship with success in L2 lexical inferencing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 645-670.
- [26] Nation, P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [27] Nation, I.S.P. & Meara, P. (2010). *Vocabulary*. In N. Schmitt (ed.) *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. Edward Arnold. Second edition. pp. 34-52.
- [28] Oxford, R. L. & Scarcella, R. C. (1994). Second language vocabulary learning among adults: State of the art in vocabulary instruction. *System*, 22(2), 231-243.
- [29] Paribakht, T. S. & Wesche, M. (1994). Enhancing vocabulary acquisition through reading: A hierarchy of text-related exercise types. Paper presented at the AAAL for Applied Linguistics, Baltimore.
- [30] Perfetti, C. A. (2010). *Decoding, vocabulary, and comprehension: The golden triangle of reading skill*. NY: Guilford Press.
- [31] Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). London, England: Longman.
- [32] Stahl, S. A. (1999). *Vocabulary Development*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- [33] Touti, E. (2013). Task-Type Based Vocabulary Instruction: An Impact on Incidental Word Retention. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 22 (12), 1739-1744.
- [34] Vosoughi1, H. & Mehdipour, Z. (2013). Effects of Recognition Task and Production Task on Incidental Vocabulary Learning of Iranian EFL Learners. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4 (2), 356-363.

Touran Ahour is an assistant professor in TEFL. She is currently a faculty member at the Islamic Azad University of Tabriz - Iran, where she teaches TEFL courses. Her areas of interest in research include writing assessment, reading-writing connection, syllabus design, material evaluation, and ELT issues.

Shokoufeh Abbasi Dogolsara is a Ph. D. student at the Islamic Azad University of Tabriz - Iran. She is a faculty member at the Islamic Azad University of Roudsar and Amlash, Iran. She teaches in English institute. Her areas of interest in research are reading, vocabulary and ELT issues.