

The Effects of Explicit and Implicit Instruction of Vocabulary through Reading on EFL Learners' Vocabulary Development

Marzieh Khamesipour

Islamic Azad University of Bandar Abbas, Iran

Abstract—Vocabulary learning and teaching has been of central concern in the field of foreign language learning. This study was aimed at investigating the effects of two different methods of vocabulary instruction through reading on EFL learners' vocabulary development: explicit vocabulary instruction through presenting definition of vocabulary before reading and implicit vocabulary instruction through narrow reading. For this purpose, 30 intermediate students from Applied- Sciences University in Bandar Abbas were chosen. At first, the students took an explicit vocabulary pre-test, then received explicit vocabulary instruction and vocabulary definitions were taught before reading followed by explicit vocabulary post-test. After taking an implicit vocabulary pre-test, students received narrow reading and an implicit vocabulary post-test was conducted. The findings of this study revealed that both methods (explicit and implicit vocabulary instruction) were effective but the effect of implicit vocabulary instruction was more efficient and the instruction's difference was significant.

Index Terms—explicit vocabulary instruction, implicit vocabulary instruction, narrow reading, vocabulary development

I. INTRODUCTION

The past fifteen years have produced increasing research in the field of second language vocabulary acquisition. Knight (1994) believes that vocabulary is the single most important aspect of foreign language learning. Muscle (2006) states that vocabulary refers to the words we must know to communicate effectively by listening, speaking, reading and writing. Vocabulary is the knowledge of words and word meanings. Read (2000) believes that words which are units of meaning, larger structures such as sentences, paragraphs and texts are made from them.

Sedita (2005) believes that it is because of importance of vocabulary knowledge that we can access our background knowledge, express our ideas and communicate and learn new concepts. The research has dealt with lexical problems. It means the problems which language learners have in vocabulary learning. The research shows that lexical problems affect communication. In fact, communication breaks down when people do not use the right words (Allen, 1983). In addition, insufficient vocabulary means that there are too many words in the text that the learners do not know and will struggle to understand the writer's intended message.

It is also accepted that people with large vocabulary are more successful readers than those with limited vocabulary. People with large vocabulary are more successful readers than those with low vocabulary.

According to National Reading Panel (2000) there are five methods in teaching vocabulary: explicit vocabulary instruction, Implicit vocabulary instruction, Multimedia methods of vocabulary instruction (vocabulary is taught through a number of modalities such as semantic maps, graphic representations, hypertext, computer assisted instruction). Capacity methods of instruction (repeated exposure to words for automatic recognition and use such as flash cards, vocabulary drills). Association methods of vocabulary instruction (students make connections by association a new word with something they know such as key word method). This study includes the first two methods of teaching vocabulary: teaching explicit vocabulary through pre-reading and implicit vocabulary instruction through narrow reading. In other words, it intends to investigate which type of instruction (implicit or explicit) is more advantageous to another.

The National Reading Panel (2000) states that explicit vocabulary instruction occurs when students are given definitions or other attributes of words to be learned. According to Adult Basic Education Practitioner's Committee (2005) explicit instruction of vocabulary can be conducted through the definition of new words before reading. Teaching specific vocabulary before reading helps both learning words and reading comprehension. It is believed that explicit vocabulary instruction can increase students' knowledge of words and help them to understand what they are hearing or reading. In addition, it helps them use words correctly in speaking and writing.

In line with the consciousness issues in cognitive psychology, implicit learning, explained as "acquisition of knowledge which occur independently of conscious attempts to learn without explicit knowledge about what was acquired" (Deitcher, 2007, p.11). Implicit learning takes place when people are not conscious of it. Bensuythen (2005)

claims that implicit learning is the acquisition of knowledge that takes place naturally, simply and without conscious operation. Implicit vocabulary instruction does not include deliberately learning words.

According to research on vocabulary teaching it can be understood that vocabulary can be though implicitly through indirect exposure to words. Vocabulary can be acquired implicitly by listening to books, reading aloud and reading widely. Reading volume is very important in terms of long term vocabulary development (Gunningham and Stanovich, 1998). They state that some kind of reading gives students repeated or multiple exposures to words. The research shows that words are best acquired implicitly from context in the course of reading.

Hunt and Beglar (2005) believe that implicit vocabulary instruction can occur as a result of reading activities such as narrow reading. Decarrico (2001) encourages learners to use "narrow reading" for multiple exposure purposes, that is, reading numerous texts about the same topic. She found these types of exposure important because meeting a word in different contexts expands what is known about it." Narrow reading means reading in only one genre, one subject matter, or the work of one" (Krshen,1981, p.1). It has the advantage of repeated exposure to the same vocabulary (Cho, Ahn & krashen, 2005).

Statement of the problem

A review of the current literature on vocabulary learning reveals a spectrum of studies about explicit and implicit vocabulary instruction. In these studies explicit vocabulary instruction directed at using dictionaries, inferring vocabulary meaning from context, memorizing word lists and some other procedures and implicit vocabulary instruction directed at activities such as wide reading, rereading, timed and paced readings and intensive reading as well as specially extensive reading. This study is conducted through reading with these approaches: first, explicit vocabulary instruction through presenting the definition of words before reading and second, implicit vocabulary instruction through narrow reading.

So, this study aims at determining if there is any difference between implicit and explicit instruction of vocabulary concerning EFL learners' vocabulary development.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. Vocabulary Teaching

Vocabulary plays a very crucial role in learning another language. By understanding the important role of vocabulary learning in second or foreign language learning, the importance of vocabulary teaching becomes clear. In the past, vocabulary teaching has often ignored in language programs, but today there is a new interest in teaching and learning it.

Broadly speaking, there are five methods to vocabulary teaching which are identified by National reading panel. In other words, the National Reading Panel (2000) in its review and analysis of thirty years of research described five methods of teaching vocabulary 1.Explicit instruction of vocabulary, 2.Implicit vocabulary instruction, 3.Multimedia methods, 4.Capacity methods, 5.Association methods. The description of explicit and implicit methods that were applied in this study will be presented.

Implicit vocabulary Instruction

Decarrico (2001) describes Implicit vocabulary instruction occurs when the mind is focused elsewhere, such as an understanding a text or using language for communicative purposes. Implicit vocabulary learning has its root in Krashen's Input hypothesis (1989), he states that as a result of multiple exposures in different contexts, meaning of new words are acquired subconsciously and conscious is on form not on something else. In Line with the consciousness issues advanced in cognitive psychology, implicit learning is generally viewed as in Reber's (1993) terminology that "implicit learning is, in fact, a default mode of learning, that happens unintentionally, unconsciously and most frequently as part of our daily experience" (Reber, 1993,p.5). Huckin and coady (1999) stated that implicit vocabulary learning occurs as a by-product of a meaning-focused communicative activity, such as reading, listening and interaction. It happens thorough multiple exposures to a word in different contexts.In addition, Decarrico (2001) recommends that in order that implicit vocabulary instruction occurs, it may be appropriate for students to read numerous texts, but all on the same topic (narrow reading) so that the texts will provide multiple exposures as topic-specific vocabulary is repeated throughout.

Narrow Reading

Krashen (1989) believes that while students are exposed to a rich Proportion of comprehensible input, language acquisition is easy. While some aspects of a language can be learned consciously, some other aspects can acquired incidentally or implicitly.

He recommends some kind of reading to increase vocabulary implicitly or incidentally such as free reading, sustained silent reading, self-selected reading, and narrow reading. Cho, Ahn & Krashen (2005) studied the effects of narrow reading for beginner EFL students. They used authentic books, although students weren't high proficient learners. They used the popular Clifford (The Big Red Dog) series. They realized that previous familiarity with the character and the repeated context would insure that the stories were comprehensible. Subjects' English proficiency and enthusiasm for English increased and it was because of the advantages of narrow reading.

Krashen and Brown (2007) believe narrow reading can be applied to reading as one type of strategy. Reading texts by one author or about one topic of intrest is narrow reading strategy, it helps comprehension and repetition of same vocabulary and grammar.

The theory behind narrow reading is that by reading about the same topic, the main ideas and the vocabulary can be more easily understood. A great help in understanding and remembering words is to see repeated words and ideas (Nie 2007). Narrow reading gives several exposures to the same or similar topic(s) written by the same writer. Krashen (1989) has long argued for the power of incidental learning from exposure, with reading as a particularly good source.

Thus as Nation (1990) puts forward, due to the incremental nature of vocabulary acquisition, for consolidating a new word in learner's mind multiple exposures are essential. Put succinctly, Krashen (2004) believes that narrow reading has two more advantages: first, since each writer has his/ her favorite expressions and distinctive style and each topic has its own vocabulary and discourse, narrow reading provides a built-in review.

And second, background knowledge is a tremendous facilitator of comprehension.

Decarrico (2001) encourages intermediate foreign language learners to use narrow reading for multiple exposures. Decarrico believes that reading numerous topic-specific texts in which a word is met in different contexts expands what is known about it, and thus the quality of knowledge is improved. This is in line with what Horst (2000) proposes: the frequency effects in the input enhance the strength of long-term store of linguistic and lexical data.

Explicit Vocabulary Instruction

According to National Reading Panel (2000), explicit instruction of vocabulary is highly effective. In explicit vocabulary instruction, students are involved in activities where they learn directly vocabulary words. Hunt and Beglar (2005) stated that the goal of explicit vocabulary instruction is to direct learner's attention. To develop vocabulary intentionally, students should be explicitly taught both specific words and word learning strategies. In accordance with consciousness issue in cognitive psychology, explicit learning is generally viewed facilitative, it guarantees the chance for the acquisition of information by direct attention to it.

A way to help students develop vocabulary is by increasing word consciousness; it means an awareness and interest in words. Word consciousness is not an isolated component of vocabulary instruction; it needs to be taken in to account each and every day. (Diamond and Gultlohn, 2006). One way in which teachers can encourage acquisition of new vocabulary is by the use of pre-reading activities that shows vocabulary in the text. Previewing can increase the salience of target vocabulary; ensure more repetition in terms of input and output (Zimmerman, 1997). Adult Basic Education Practitioner's committee (2005) has stated the explicit vocabulary instruction as follows:

"Explicit instruction occurs when students are given definition of words to be learned before reading. For example, the teacher may assign a reading passage and ready the student for that reading by explicit instruction of new words. However the teacher may ask the students a text or every text that is important to them, to work on new words that need defining. Because the students have a need to know, explicit instruction of identified words is useful (Adult Basic Education practitioner's Committee, 2005, p.1).

B. Teaching Vocabulary before Reading

For reading instruction it is important to teach vocabulary and it occupies a major part of the lesson. It is justified that pre-reading instruction makes the passage easier to understand. In fact, some research suggests that pre-teaching of vocabulary facilitates vocabulary acquisition. Medo and Ryder (1993) found that vocabulary instruction prior to reading texts helped 8th grade students to learn vocabulary better. Brett, Rothelien and Hurley (1996) realized that 4th grade students who received pre-instruction of key words in the text, had better vocabulary than those students who were not given pre-instruction in control group.

Christen and Murphy (1991) emphasized that for learning to occur, there should be integration between new and previous information. Kueker (1990) also argues that pre-reading help greatly in reading comprehension and vocabulary development.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

The participants of this study consisted of 30 EFL students attending in ESP courses in Applied-Sciences University in Bandar Abass in Iran. The students ranged from 20 to 27.

B. Instruments

Nelson Proficiency Test

In order to realize the general English proficiency level of the subjects of the study, a proficiency test was needed. Before the participants took the proficiency test, the test was piloted to increase the reliability of the test. To fulfill this requirement, Nelson English Language Tests by WS Fowler and Norman Coe, (1976) was used. For this purpose a second group with the same knowledge level (i.e., a group of fourth term students in the Applied-Sciences University in Bandar Abass) took a 100-item Nelson Proficiency Tests (selected from the Intermediate section of the tests). After administering the test, the item analysis was done on the items and 40 items were deleted. The reliability of this test (applying KR formula) was estimated as 0.72.

The Textbook for Instruction

The textbook for instruction was *reading skillfully (2)* by Mirhassani and Rahmani. Three texts were selected randomly for explicit vocabulary instruction and three texts were selected randomly for implicit vocabulary instruction

from this book, too. In order to do an implicit vocabulary instruction (narrow reading), there was a need to select three other texts with the same title and the same vocabulary. Then three texts with these properties were selected from the internet. These nine texts which were selected from the book and the internet have the same readability level. The *fog* formula was applied to determine the readability of these texts. The readability of texts in reading skillfully book and the internet was 6. The Fog formula measures the grade level of a text by manipulating two factors: the average sentence length and the percentage of hard words.

Vocabulary Tests

Two vocabulary tests were taken from *Reading Skillfully (2)* by *Mirhassani and Rahmani*. They were used as explicit and implicit pre- and post-tests. Each one consisted of 25 items.

C. Procedure

The students took part in a language-learning course that lasted for 18 hours or 9 sessions, in 63 days. This study was conducted in three phases:

In the first phase, before any instruction, to determine the level of the participants' proficiency, they took a proficiency test.

In the second phase, the participants took a pre-test. This was necessary since in this study, there was just one group of students and there was not any control group. The Time Series Method was used. In order to see the effects of instruction, the treatment was introduced between the pre-test and the post-test. In other words, after the pre-test, treatment was introduced followed by a post-test.

So, after taking a pretest, the vocabulary was taught explicitly and students received definitions of new vocabularies before reading the texts. After this treatment, the post-test was given to the participants.

The third phase of this study, implicit vocabulary instruction through narrow reading was conducted. After taking a pre-test, participants read three texts. In order to do a narrow reading, 3 texts which were taken from the internet was read Implicit vocabulary instruction lasted for 6 sessions. This instruction followed implicit vocabulary post-test.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section is intended to present the results of the quantitative analyses of the obtained data and to further examine the given null hypothesis. In so doing, the beginning section of this section provides a discussion of the pre-tests in the study and the remaining sections focus on the discussion of the null hypothesis in focus

A. The Pre-test of the Study

For the scores to be comparable and for an experiment like this to be meaningful, a pre-test before each instruction (explicit and implicit) was administered to see the effects of two kinds of instruction. In other words, the researcher was going to see whether different kinds of treatment yielded different results. In order to meet the above-mentioned requirement, a pre-test was given to participants to gauge their knowledge of vocabulary. Table1. Shows the descriptive statistics of the participants' mean scores on the explicit and implicit pre-test

TABLE 1
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON THE PRE-TESTS

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
Explicit pre-test	30	3	9	6.5000	1.8147
Implicit pre-test	30	4	9	6.4667	1.7564

It can be seen in the above table that the minimum score on explicit pre-test is 3 and maximum score is 9. The implicit pre-test minimum score is 4 and the maximum score is 9. The mean score of the explicit and implicit scores are statistically very close (6.50~ 6.4667). Therefore, it can be concluded that the learners' knowledge of vocabulary before any instruction was statistically almost equal.

Explicit pre-test and post-test scores

In order to investigate the effect of explicit instruction of vocabulary on the learners' knowledge of vocabulary, a paired-samples t-test was run. This t-test was intended to compare the obtained mean scores of the participants on the explicit pre- and post-test to indicate the effectiveness of the treatment. The descriptive statistics, along with the results of the t-test for explicit scores, are presented in Tables 4.2 and 4.3., respectively

Inferential statistics for explicit scores

TABLE 2
PAIRED SAMPLES STATISTICS FOR EXPLICIT SCORES

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Explicit pre-test	30	6.5000	1.8147	.3313
Explicit post-test	30	18.8667	4.6218	.8438

TABLE 3
 PAIRED SAMPLES T-TEST RESULTS FOR EXPLICIT SCORES

Domain	N	Mean Difference	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	T	Sig.
Explicit pre-test	30	12.3667	4.3508	7944.	15.568	.000
Explicit post-test	30					

Given the information in Table 2., one can clearly see that the mean score obtained on the post-test (18.8667) is higher than the one obtained on the pre-test (6.50). However, a paired-samples t-test was run to ensure that the observed difference was significant. In the table 3. the final column labeled as sig. (2- tailed) represents the probability value. If this value is less than 0.05 (the critical value), then it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in scores obtained from the pre- and post-test because the probability value is substantially smaller than the specified critical value ($0.000 < 0.05$).

Accordingly, explicit instruction was shown to exert a positive effect on the vocabulary learning by EFL learners. In fact the subjects performed better on explicit vocabulary post-test after receiving the treatment.

Implicit pre- and post-test scores

In order to compare the implicit pre and post-test scores or show the effects of implicit treatment, a paired-samples t-test was conducted. Tables 4 and 5 provide the descriptive statistics, along with the results of the given paired-samples t-test.

Inferential statistics for implicit scores

TABLE 4
 PAIRED-SAMPLES DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR IMPLICIT SCORES

	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Standard Error Mean
Implicit pre-test	30	6.4667	1.7564	.3207
Implicit post-test	30	21.6333	3.2851	.5998

TABLE 5
 PAIRED-SAMPLES T-TEST RESULTS FOR IMPLICIT SCORES

Domain	N	Mean Difference	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	T	Sig.
Implicit pre-test	30	15.1667	2.6008	.4748	31.940	.000
Implicit post-test	30					

On a closer inspection of the mean scores given in Table 4 one can clearly see that the subjects on implicit test (narrow reading) gained a higher mean score on the post-test after receiving the treatment (post-test=21.6333 pre-test=6.4667). However, the researcher had to go further to find out whether or not the observed difference was significant. Therefore, the results of the t-test were taken in to account. It can be concluded from the information presented in Table 5 that there is a significant difference in the performance of the participants on the implicit pre- and post-test. This conclusion can be drawn because the probability value in Table 5 is observed to be 0.00 which is less than the (0.05).

B. The Null Hypothesis

The null hypothesis states that "there is no difference between explicit and implicit (narrow reading) instruction of vocabulary through reading on EFL learners' knowledge of vocabulary.

In order to investigate the impact of explicit and implicit (narrow reading) instruction of vocabulary through reading on EFL learners' knowledge of vocabulary, a paired samples t-test was run. (since there was one group of participants, the paired t-test was used in the following way). This t-test was intended to compare the obtained mean scores of the participants on explicit test(taught via presenting definition of new words before reading) and the mean ones on implicit test(the participants received narrow reading), to indicate the effectiveness of this instruction. The descriptive statistics, along with the results of the T-test for these scores, are presented in the following Tables.

Descriptive statistics on post-tests scores

Table 6 presents the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation of explicit and implicit post tests scores.

TABLE 6
 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT POST-TESTS

	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Explicit post-test	30	4	23	18.8667	4.62179
Implicit post-test	30	12	25	21.6333	3.28511

As the table suggests the implicit post-test lowest score was 12 and the explicit lowest score was 4.(it should be mentioned that the explicit and implicit tests had a total score of 25)

The implicit highest post-test score was 25 and the explicit highest post-test score was 23.

TABLE 7
SHOWS THE FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PROFICIENCY SCORES

groups	frequency	percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
1.00	9	30.0	30.0	30.0
2.00	19	63.3	63.3	93.0
3.00	2	6.7	6.7	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0	

As the table 7 Shows, in the first column by considering proficiency scores, the students were divided to three levels: pre-intermediate (1), intermediate (2) and upper-intermediate (3). In order to divide the participants into three groups of pre-intermediate, intermediate and upper-intermediate the mean and standard deviation of proficiency scores were calculated. It was decided to consider the scores which were 1 standard deviation above the mean as the upper intermediate and the scores which were 1 standard deviation below the mean as pre-intermediate and the scores that were in between as the intermediate. 9 participants were pre-intermediate, 19 and 2 participants were intermediate and upper-intermediate, respectively. The third column shows the percent level of students. It means that 30 percent of participants are pre-intermediate. 63.3 percent of them are intermediate and 6.7 are upper- intermediate.

TABLE 8
SHOWS THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT POST-TEST SCORES OF THREE LEVELS OF PRE-INTERMEDIATE, INTERMEDIATE AND UPPER-INTERMEDIATE.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Explicit post-test	9	14.7778	6.41829
	19	20.4737	1.98238
	2	22.0000	.00000
	30	18.8667	4.62179
Implicit post-test	9	18.1111	3.65529
	19	22.9474	1.47097
	2	25.0000	.00000
	30	21.6333	3.28511

*The table 8 shows that the mean of implicit scores of nine pre- intermediate students was 18.11 and the mean of explicit scores was 14.77

*The mean of implicit scores of nineteen intermediate students was 22.94 and the mean of explicit ones was 20.47

*The mean of implicit scores of two upper-intermediate students was 25 and the mean of their explicit ones was 18.86

In general, by considering the information in Table 8, one can clearly realize that the implicit mean scores of pre-intermediate, intermediate and upper-intermediate students of implicit scores are higher than their mean in explicit ones. Inferential statistics for Explicit and Implicit post-tests

TABLE 9
PAIRED SAMPLES T-TEST RESULTS DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT POST-TESTS

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Explicit post-test	30	18.8667	4.6218	.8438
Implicit post-test	30	21.6333	3.2851	.5998

TABLE 10
PAIRED-SAMPLES T-TEST RESULTS FOR EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT POST-TESTS

Domain	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	T	Sig.
Explicit post-test	30	2.7667	2.5418	.4641	5.962	.000
Implicit post-test	30					

A cursory look at the table 9, might lead one to see that the obtained implicit post-test mean scores is 21.6333 which is higher than the one obtained on the explicit scores 18.8667.

However, a paired-samples t-test was run to ensure that the observed difference was significant. If one looks at the final column labeled sig.(2-tailed) at the table 10, he can see that this value is less than .05, then we can conclude that there is a significant difference between these two sets of scores.

Accordingly, the null hypothesis was rejected because implicit instruction of vocabulary was shown to exert a positive effect on the learning of vocabulary by EFL students. In fact, the subjects received implicit vocabulary instruction through narrow reading got better scores than when they receive explicit vocabulary instruction through presenting definition of vocabulary before reading.

Discussion

As mentioned in the previous chapters, this study has incorporated two approaches: first, explicit vocabulary instruction and second, implicit vocabulary instruction. Rieder (2003) explains explicit learning as involving the learners' online awareness, and Decarrico (2001) believes that explicit vocabulary learning occurs when learners engage in activities that focus attention on vocabulary. Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) have stated that implicit learning is learning without learners' deliberate decision to commit information to memory. In other words, explicit and implicit vocabulary instructions can be distinguished simply by pre-learning instructions that either do, or do not, forewarn subjects about

the vocabulary learning. This means that, if we present to students the definition of vocabulary before reading, the outcome will be explicit vocabulary learning and if they do not know that the focus of instruction here is on vocabulary, and receive vocabulary in the text, the learning will be implicit. But in addition the term implicit learning, when is referred to the learning without conscious to lean or for example, learning vocabulary, as learners' primary goal is on reading, has more general, educational meaning. Based on the data obtained in this study, it is found that the participants' scores on implicit vocabulary post-test, which received implicit vocabulary instruction through narrow reading, is better than participants' scores on explicit vocabulary post-test, who received definitions of vocabulary before reading. Referring back to the table 10 and considering $P < .05$ value, it is revealed that the mean difference between the post-tests of vocabulary in two tests is significant at .05. Considering the results of the descriptive statistics of the post-tests on the table 6 also support this assumption .so the result of this study shows the positive effect of implicit vocabulary instruction. It means that participants, who received narrow reading, enjoyed the advantages of repeated exposure to the same vocabulary, had better scores in comparison with scores in explicit instruction in which participants received definition of vocabulary before reading. Thus this study shows that repeating the same vocabulary has effective advantages than presenting definition of vocabulary before reading.

V. CONCLUSION

The investigation of the results obtained from the study yielded the following conclusions:

1. The results of the descriptive statistics of the participants' mean scores on the explicit and implicit pre-tests revealed that the learners' knowledge of vocabulary before instruction was almost equal. On the other hand, this finding shows that the participants possessed almost the same level of knowledge in vocabulary, too. After the participants received treatment, i.e., explicit vocabulary instruction and implicit vocabulary instruction, the results of the t-test showed that both instructions was effective but the effects of implicit instruction was more effective and the instruction's difference was significant.

2. The mean of implicit post-test scores of 9 pre-intermediate, 19 intermediate, 2 upper-intermediate students were higher than their mean in the explicit ones.

3. The result of t-test of explicit and implicit post-test scores produced significant difference between them. In the light of this finding, it can be concluded that the implicit vocabulary instruction has more positive effects than the explicit one. In other words, the results of the t-test between the mean scores of participants' post-tests showed a significant difference at the .05 level of significance, which is indicative of the implicit treatment or narrow reading. Results and findings of this study regarding the effectiveness of implicit vocabulary teaching and learning is in line with the studies and findings of Krashen (2004); Lamme (1976); Cho, et al., (2005); Krashen and Brown (2007) and many other studies conducted in this regard. According to Krashen and Brown's assertion (2007) narrow reading is to read texts about single topic of interest, which helps ensure comprehension and natural repetition of vocabulary. This procedure which was approved by Krashen and other practitioners (e.g. Brown & Krashen, 2007, Cho & Krashen 1994, 1995) is similar to the second instruction (implicit vocabulary instruction) which was applied in this study and as the investigation of the results in the previous chapter showed, the amount of vocabulary acquisition in the explicit vocabulary instruction through presenting the definition of vocabulary before reading was lower than that of the implicit vocabulary instruction which students received repeated exposure to the same vocabulary.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adult Basic Education Practitioner's Committee. (2005). Back to Basics: vocabulary. [http:// Abe Florida. Org/PDF/ brochers/ Back to Basics- June 2005.pdf](http://AbeFlorida.Org/PDF/broachers/Back%20to%20Basics-%20June%202005.pdf).
- [2] Allen, V.F. (1983). *Techniques in Teaching Vocabulary*. Oxford: oxford University Press.
- [3] Benthuisen, R. V. (2002). Explicit vocabulary instruction: using a word list to focus attention. [http://Cicero. U- bunkyo. Ac. Jp/kiyo/ f sell 2002/ index. Html- 6k. 2012](http://Cicero.U-bunkyo.Ac.Jp/kiyo/fsell2002/index.html-6k.2012).
- [4] Brett, A., Rothlein, L., & Hurley, M. (1996). Vocabulary acquisition from listening to stories and explanations. *Elementary school journal*, 96(4), 415-422.
- [5] Cho, Ahn & Krashen. (2005). The effects of narrow reading of authentic texts on interest and reading ability in English as a foreign language. *Reading Improvement*, vol.42, 58-64.
- [6] Christen, W., L. & Murphy, T., J. (1991) Increasing comprehension by activating prior knowledge. ERIC Digest. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearing house on Reading, English, and Communication. ED328885.
- [7] Decarrico, J.s. (2001). Reading for academic purposes: Guidelines for the ESL/EFL teacher. In M. Celce- Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (p.285). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- [8] Deitcher, R. (2007). The implicit learning of action research. [http://jean mcneiff.com/ critical debates\ radhel. html. 2014](http://jean.mcneiff.com/critical%20debates/radhel.html).
- [9] Diamond, L. & Gultlohn, L. (2006). Teaching vocabulary. [Http: www. Reading rockets.org/ article/9943/2013](http://www.ReadingRockets.org/article/9943/2013).
- [10] Cunningham, A.E. & Stanovich, K. E. (1997). Early reading acquisition and its relation to reading experience and ability 10 years later. *Developmental Psychology*, 33,934,945.
- [11] Horst, M. (2000). *Text Encounters of the Frequent Kind: learning vocabulary through reading*. Swan Sea: university of Wales
- [12] Huckin, T. & Coady, J. (1999). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: A review. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 21, 181-193.

- [13] Hunt, A. & Beglar, D. (2005). A framework for developing EFL reading vocabulary. *Reading in a foreign language*. Vol.17, No. 1. Pp.23-59. <http://werku.baidu.com/view/70c2c52ea551810a687da.html>. Retrieval time:2013.
- [14] Knight, S. (1994). Dictionary use while reading. The effects on comprehension and vocabulary acquisition for students of different verbal abilities. *Modern language journal*, 78(3), 285-299.
- [15] Krashen, S. (1981) the case for narrow reading. *TESOL Newsletter*, 15(6), 12-23.
- [16] Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 440-464.
- [17] Krashen, S. (2004). Free Voluntary reading: New research, applications; and controversies. [Www. sdkrashen. Com./ articles/pac5/ all.html](http://www.sdkrashen.com/articles/pac5/all.html).2014.
- [18] Krashen, S. & Brown, C. L. (2007) what is academic language proficiency? [www.Sdkrashen.Com.\articles/krashen-brown-Alp.Pdf](http://www.Sdkrashen.Com/articles/krashen-brown-Alp.Pdf).2014.
- [19] Lamme, L. (1976). Are reading habits and abilities related? *Reading Teacher* 30:21-27.
- [20] Luppescue,S. &Day, R. (1993). Reading, dictionaries, and vocabulary learning. *Language Learning*, 43,263-87.
- [21] Medo, M. A. & Ryder, R. J. (1993). The effects of vocabulary instruction on readers' ability to make casual connections. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 33(2), 119-134.
- [22] Muscle, D. (2006). Expanding your child's vocabulary promotes skilled reading. <http://ezinearticles.com/Expanding-your-childs-vocabulary-promotes-skilled-reading8id=153660>.June2014.
- [23] Nation, I. S.P. (1990). *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary*. Boston, Mass: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- [24] National reading Panel. (2000) *Teaching Children to Read*. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- [25] Nie (2001).Narrow reading –a powerful way to improve your English. [http://www.bangkok post. Net/education/ site 2000/ptaul1701.htm](http://www.bangkokpost.net/education/site2000/ptaul1701.htm). june 2014.
- [26] Read, J., (2000). *Assessing vocabulary*. Cambridge, UK.
- [27] Reber, A.S. (1993). Implicit learning and tacit knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*. 79: 162-170.
- [28] Sedita, j. (2005). Effective vocabulary instruction. *Insights on learning Disabilities* 2(1) 33-45.
- [29] Zimmerman, C.B. (1997). Does reading and interactive vocabulary instruction make a difference? An empirical study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 121-140.
- [30] Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2002). L2 vocabulary learning: How do we meet learners' need for effective learning and sustained motivation? [http://dana. Ucc. Edu\ ksw8/vocab.htm](http://dana.ucc.edu/ksw8/vocab.htm). 2014.

Marzieh Khamesipour, Isfahan, Iran, 1980. Master's degree in English Language Teaching (TESOL), Bandarabbas (2009). She has worked as an ESOL teacher in different language institutes and universities in Esfahan.