Evaluating the Success of Iranian EFL Visual Learners in Vocabulary Learning Through Word List Versus Sentence Making Approaches

Ghasem Tayebi[*]
Department of English Language
Kazeroon Branch, Islamic Azad University
Kazeroon, Iran
Email: Ghasem_tayyebi@yahoo.com

Sara Marefat
M.A in TEFL
Department of English Language
Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University
Shiraz, Iran
Email: marefat113@gmail.com

Abstract. This study sought to evaluate Iranian EFL learners' achievements with the visual learning style when exposed to Iranian EFL sentence making and word list approaches. On that account, 45 basic level participants who studied at the Iran Language Institute (ILI), Bushehr, took part in this research study. At the outset, the learners were given Barsch learning style inventory (1991) to determine the learners' learning style. Accordingly, merely those test takers who had the visual learning style were chosen for the current study. Then, the researcher-made pre-test was run to know the unfamiliar vocabularies. Thereafter, they were randomly classified into two groups. In the course of 8 treatment sessions, one group was required to make sentences, and the other one was asked to acquire the new words by word list learning method. Not long afterwards, the post-test and the delayed posttest were carried out. In order to analyze the data, Independent Sample t-tests were run. The results cast light on the fact that word list learning seemed

123

to be effective in gaining knowledge of the new words in the short-term memory. By contrast, retaining words by sentence making approach regarded superior to word list learning in the long term memory.

Keywords: Sentence making, visual learning styles, word list learning (Rote learning)

1. Introduction

For many years, the importance of vocabulary was belittled, and vocabulary learning was only given incidental attention in course books and educational settings. After a long time of not paying great attention to vocabulary, language teachers, applied linguists, and researchers have focused their attention and efforts on teaching and acquiring vocabularies (Barcroft, 2004; Decaricco, 2001; Read, 2000). Therefore, in their views, lexical competence is viewed at the heart of communicative competence (Coady & Huckin, 1997; Richards & Renandya, 2002). In this line, one of the most demanding aspects of language learning that majority of learners encounter when studying any language is being mastered in vocabulary learning. As a result, they have to dedicate a considerable amount of time to memorizing long lists of words, and depend on bilingual dictionaries as a reliable source of communication.

It occurred to language teachers that most of learners' problems arise from their inadequate vocabulary repertoire, learning style, and strategies. Even in higher levels, they feel that there is always a need for learning vocabulary (Laufer, 1986; Nation, 1982). That is why it is said that "lexical competence is at the heart of communicative competence" (Meara, 1997, p.35), and can be a "prediction of school success" (Verhallen & Schoonen 1998, p. 452). For the purpose of surmounting these serious obstacles, two approaches to vocabulary learning, that is, the Word List Approach (Rote Learning) and Sentence Making Approach, were under investigation in the current study. The key purpose of the study was to suggest some vocabulary learning strategies so as to assist visual learners in dealing with vocabulary learning obstacles. Hence this research aimed to determine which type of vocabulary exercise was more useful in vocabulary learning and recall on the visual learners. Consequently, the research question guiding this study is as follows:

1- Is there any difference between the performances of the visual Iranian EFI learners when exposed to sentence making and word list learning?

Based on the research questions, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H0: There is not any difference between the performance of the visual Iranian EFI learners when exposed to the sentence making and word list approaches.

2. Literature Review

Throughout last three decades, the attitude towards vocabulary acquisition has dramatically modified and most of the researchers have taken an interest in this field of study. On that account, the movement towards efficacious methodologies for how to present new words has made researchers and teachers put forward different techniques (Cohen & Macaro, 2007; Mizumoto & Takeuchi, 2009).

Even though vocabulary plays an important role in learning language, having only knowledge of words is not sufficient. In fact, meaningful learning, how to retain the words in mind for the future use, and how to use them communicatively seem to be of great significance. For this reason, some studies on different approaches to learning vocabulary have been carried out (e.g. Goodfellow & Powell, 1994; Sanaoui, 1995; Shen, 2003). The succeeding part deals with theoretical and practical considerations in details through which this study was conducted.

2.1 Theoretical considerations
Vocabulary teaching is strengthened by some theories; however, just a few of them were inseparably related to this study. As a result, these theoretical frameworks laid the foundation for the literature review in this research work.

2.1.1 Theoretical considerations on word list learning
Theoretical considerations on word list learning commanded support for vocabulary teaching in this part. An important theory which is pertinent to word list learning is the Input Hypothesis suggested by Krashen.

2.1.1.1 Krashen's input hypothesis

It states that in order to gain the knowledge of material, the material should be challenging to pupils' current level, but it should not be too tough to learn. To comply with the Input Hypothesis, it can be claimed that word list learning is viewed as a sort of comprehensible input in which L2 vocabularies are linked to their equivalents in L1. Consequently, in the light of this theory, second language vocabulary acquisition is considered as comprehensible input. Considering the fact that the L2 vocabularies are unfamiliar to learners, one can digest what the new vocabularies mean with the help of translation.

2.1.2 Theoretical considerations on sentence making learning

There are some theories including the Generative model, the Depth of processing hypothesis, the Involvement load hypothesis, and the Output Hypothesis related to sentence writing approach.

2.1.2.1 The depth of processing hypothesis

Craik and Lockhart (1972) were on the same opinion that in the "Depth of Processing Hypothesis", the input undergoes processes in some different ways to forward several levels of memory. If the input goes through a deeper cognitive process, it will result in deeper memory trace. Put it differently, learners will certainly forget the knowledge that only reaches the short-term memory. By contrast, if the input reaches the long-term memory, they will retain it longer.

2.1.2.2 Involvement load hypothesis

It claims that the degree of involvement in processing new vocabularies exerts an influence on learning and retention (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001). To say it differently, if tasks involve a higher involvement load, they bring about more powerful recalling than those tasks with lower involvement.

2.1.2.3 The generative model

It claims that to further the long-term vocabulary recall, it is essential to bridge the old knowledge to the new one. As a matter of fact, the sentence making is viewed as a generative task in which the new knowledge

and the whole sentence is connected semantically (Wittrock, 1990).

2.1.2.4 Swain's output hypothesis

The Output Hypothesis claims that constructive learning takes place when a language is produced. As sentence writing is an output practice, it can assist learners in acquiring L2 vocabularies.

2.2 Practical considerations

Based on the objective and theoretical framework and rationale provided in the previous parts of the current study, some practical facts related to the aforementioned theories will be presented.

2.2.1 Practical considerations on word lists learning

Word list learning is regarded as a conventional word learning strategy whose chief stress is generally on repetition and memorization. It comprises the L2 vocabularies and their meanings. The common kind of word list is to present the target words on the left and their first language meanings on the right.

Decontextualized activities such as making notes, using word-lists, dictionaries, flashcards, games and the like can be beneficial ways to assist learners in storing new vocabularies, and are regarded as giving conscious attention to learning and the best way of consolidating the new words (Ellis, 1994; Hulstijn, Hollander & Greidanus, 1996; Laufer & Shmueli, 1997; Qian, 1996; Schmidt, 1990).

Conventionally when learners face new words, they highlight them and provide long lists of them. This technique is a kind of the decontextual method in which they focus their attention on the new words particularly in the initial stage of learning any language in a short space of time.

Word list learning referred to as rote learning is usually employed for recognition, retention, and memorization. It is used to enrich vocabulary size to fulfill a short-term purpose, for example for the examinations or quizzes (Nation, 1982). In the same vein, Mehrpour (2008) strongly believed that memorizing new words with the help of their first language definitions on the lists resulted in increasing retention.

Nonetheless, since word list learning is regarded to be too much

simple to learn words, acquiring words by bilingual word lists has gone out of fashion. In the light of this fact, Milton (2009) asserted that in spite of the fact that rote learning (intentional study) had been out of fashion, it is still used for two reasons. Firstly, it seems to be a requisite process of vocabulary learning, and secondly, it is viewed useful to absorb so many words in a short time.

However, Oxford and Scarcella (1994) declared that even though studying de-contextualized learning was a promising way to memorize words in the short time, learners will forget them soon after memorizing. Word list learning, in fact, forwards short term memory rather than long term memory. For this reason, McCarthy (1990) suggested that students could remember lots of words effectively when they learn them communicatively.

With regard to lots of the studies carried out on both the contextualized and decontextualized vocabulary learning, they unfortunately failed to come to the conclusion on the best way of vocabulary acquisition. Nevertheless, some educators share the same view that the superiority of context-based vocabulary learning has not been supported by conclusive evidence (Hulstjin, 1992; Tudor & Hafiz, 1989).

2.2.2 Practical considerations on sentence making

The majority of the views on the way of teaching new vocabularies seem to be that sentence making forward longer retention of words (Ehri & Wilce, 1980; Fitzpatrick, Al-Qarni, & Meara, 2008; Randall, 2007). Chastain (1988) asserted that in learning vocabulary, new knowledge of words should be linked to the old one. In this line, Thornburg (as cited in Cevik, 2007) held a deep conviction that exercises are of great significance in connecting the latest knowledge to existing knowledge. On this account, a common exercise, as Muncie (2002) put forward, is sentence making with a new word in a context as a general way to improve L2.

In one study a close relationship between written assignment and vocabulary learning among Iranian beginners was investigated (Dehghani, 2007). In the study, the test takers were classified randomly in to two groups: the experimental and the control groups; in the experimental

group, the learners were required to write lines for each vocabulary, whereas in the control group they were introduced the words orally. The finding shed light on the fact that the learners in the experimental group outperformed the learners in the control group. The influence of the three rehearsal methods, namely definition, examples, and sentence writing were investigated by Coomber, Ramstad, & Sheets (1986). In the light of their findings, they reached the conclusion that writing sentences as the most semantic processing produced the better results compared to the other two methods.

As several studies showed that sentence making has not resulted in production nor retention of unfamiliar words (Barcroft, 1998, 2004; Folse, 2000; Nielsen, 2001, 2003; McDaniel & Kearney, 1984; Pressley, Levin, & Delaney, 1982), other findings proved that writing with the target words has had effective results in recalling of the words (Coomber, et al., 1986; Laufer, 1997). As a consequence, the intense interest of this current study was investigating the roles of the sentence making, and the word list strategies on the lo1ng-term recall of the words among the visual learners.

3. Method

3.1 Participants

In order to do the present study, the researcher homogenized the available sampling through the Oxford Placement Test (2007). Accordingly, 45 basic-level female learners in the 18-23 age group were singled out. They studied at the Iran Language Institute, Bushehr for about one year, and were of the same background knowledge, and proficiency.

3.2 Instrument

In this study, the Oxford Placement test (2007), Barsch learning style inventory (1991), as well as teacher-made tests were used.

The Oxford Placement test (2007) included 50 multiple choice questions on grammar and vocabulary, 10 questions on reading comprehension and an optional writing task to assess learners' ability to yield the language. However, concerning the purpose of the study, merely 24 questions related to the vocabulary part were selected. The participants had to sit the test in 20 minutes.

Some scholars (Noraizan, Bahry, Saiful, Zulkefli, Mohd, & Szarina, 2011) estimated the reliability of the test in the piloting test and reported it 0.75. Oxford University Press has asserted that it is supported by a dedicated research program to guarantee that it is just, accurate, reliable and valid (n.d.).

Barsch Learning Style Inventory (1991) was made up of 24 items, and had three choices including "often", "sometimes", and "seldom". It consisted entirely of three learning styles, namely visual, auditory and tactual. But based on the purpose of this study, only the visual and auditory learning styles were taken into consideration. On that account, the learners replied to the sixteen items within 15 minutes. Noraizan, Bahry, Saiful, Zulkefli, Mohd, and Szarina (2011) estimated its reliability in the piloting test and reported 0.73. Its validity was assessed by four subject matter experts who held a deep conviction that Barsch Learning Style Inventory (1991) seems to have the simple language and format so that a great number of learners can digest it without any help. Eventually, they concluded from its face validity and content validity that it was valid.

Four types of the researcher-made tests taken from the Basic ILI course book were served as the piloting test, pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest. The pretest had forty-three questions, whereas the piloting test, posttest, and delayed posttest had forty questions were made of forty questions. The piloting test indicated three items were poor and vague which were modified. The reliability of the piloting test was estimated by Cronbach's Alpha which was reported 0.78. To examine the validity, the researcher held a consultation with four subject matter experts. They examined their content validity and face validity by looking at the items and agreed that the test was valid.

3.3 Procedure

Initially, the Oxford Placement Test (2007) was used to decide on the learners' proficiency level. As a result, among 85 participants participating only 60 learners were chosen. Then Barsch learning styles inventory (1991) was employed to identify the test takers' styles of learning in acquiring the vocabularies. Based on the objective of the study, only

45 participants who preferred visual learning style were chosen. After that, the piloting test was conducted. Its validity was examined by subject matter experts and Cronbach's Alpha was used in order to estimate its reliability which was .80. Subsequently, in order to determine which words were not familiar for the learners, the pretest was administered. Afterwards, they were randomly assigned into the sentence making group and the word list group. In the eight treatment sessions, the visual learners were taught a bit differently in the both groups. To put it in another way, the researcher, who was the teacher, initially asked the participants to close their books and just listen carefully. Then she read out each word 2 or 3 times as she went through the entire list each session. Next, she read out each word and invited them to repeat each of them chorally and individually. As the next step, she wanted them to open their books and look at the words while reading out. Up to here, all the steps in both groups were the same expect that in the sentence making group, the researcher provided the learners with some examples orally as well as in the written forms. Subsequently, the test takers were invited to give the researcher one sentence for each word. But in the word list group, the researcher only gave them the translation of each word.

Finally, Independent sample t-tests were administered to ensure whether statistically important differences between the performance of the two groups exist.

4. Result

4.1 Result of the barsch learning styles inventory (1991)
Table 4.1 indicates the result of the questionnaire replied by the participants. Table 4.2 also represents the descriptive statistics of the visual learners.

Table 4.1: Visual learning style in the both groups

Group	Visual learning style
	N0
Sentence making group	21
Word list learning group	24
Total	45

The total number of the visual learners was 45 including 21 and 24 learners in the sentence making and word list learning groups respectively.

Table 4.2: Descriptive statistics of the learners

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Visual	45	22.00	36.00	29.95	3.55

Table 4.2 showed descriptive statistics of the visual learners in this study.

Research Question: Is there any difference between the performance of the visual learners when exposed to sentence making and word list learning?

Table 4.3: Group descriptive statistics

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest Sentence making Word list	21 24	4.71 5.54	.956 1.14	.208 .232
Pretest Sentence making Word list	21 24	28.61 31.20	2.97 2.50	.649 .510
Delayed posttest Sentence making Word list	21 24	31.47 27.29	2.31 3.73	.505 .762

Table 4.3 gives the descriptive statistics of the visual learners' performance in the two groups. In the pretest, there were 21 learners with mean score of 4.71 and Std. deviation of .956 in the sentence making group. In the same vein, there were 24 participants with the mean scores of 5.54 and Std. deviation of 1.14 in the word list group. Taking the significance level into consideration, which was reported .01, the difference was statistically significant [t (43)=-2.61, P=.01].

In the posttest, there was an increase in the mean scores of the visual learners from the pretest to the posttest in the both groups. To put it another way, the mean scores of the participants in the sentence making increased from 4.71 in the pretest to 28.61 in the posttest. Likewise,

there was an increase in the mean scores of the learners in the word list group from 5.54 to 31.20. Furthermore, in the posttest, the mean scores of the learners in the word list group was higher than the mean scores of the learners in the sentence making group. Regarding the significance level which was .003, the difference was statistically significant [t (43)=-3.17, P=.003]. Consequently, the researcher reached the conclusion that the word list was the promising approach among the learners.

Table 4.4: Independent sample t-test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance		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
Pretest	1.52	.224	-2.61	43	.012	-.827	.316	-1.46	-1.89
			-2.64	42.93	.011	-.827	.312	-1.45	-.196
Posttest	.492	.487	-3.17	43	.003	-2.58	.816	-4.23	-.943
			-3.13	39.32	.003	-2.58	.825	-4.25	-.919
Delayed posttest	4.69	.036	4.38	43	.000	4.18	.942	2.28	6.08
			4.57	38.98	.000	4.18	.914	2.33	6.03

Moreover, two weeks after the instruction, the delayed posttest was administered to determine whether or not there were statistically important differences in the total average score between immediate and delayed-post tests. In the delayed posttest, the mean scores of the sentence making group increased from the posttest to the delayed posttest. By contrast, the mean scores of the word list group decreased from the posttest to the delayed posttest. Moreover, owing to the fact that mean scores of the sentence making group was higher than the word list group and the significance level was .00 in the delayed posttest [t (43)=4.38, P=.00], it can be concluded that sentence making group outperformed the word list group in recalling the newly taught words. On that account, this increase in the mean scores of the sentence making group underscored the rejection of the null hypothesis that holds that there is not any difference between the performance of the visual learners when exposed to sentence making and word list learning.

5. Discussion

The research question posed in the current study explored whether or not there was a difference in the performance of the visual learners when exposed to the sentence making and word list approaches. To address this question, the visual learners' performance in the pretest, posttest and delayed posttest was compared in the both groups. Based on findings, there was a meaningful difference between the mean scores of the participants in the both groups in the pretest. In other words, the learners in the word list performed better than the sentence making group.

After the treatment sessions were over, the posttest was carried out in order to see which group was more successful in recalling the taught words in the short term memory. The result showed that the test takers performed a lot better in the word list group than those in the sentence making group. It implied that word list approach was an efficacious approach in gaining knowledge of the words.

However, the results yielded in the posttest were to some degree surprising; through reviewing the literature, ample evidence (e.g. Carpenter & Olson, 2012; Hashemi & Pourgharib, 2013; Kim & Gilman, 2008; Moore & Calvert, 2000) cast light on the fact that the visual learners hinge upon seeing whether by reading or watching. In the sentence making group, the researcher read out each word 2 or 3 times and then she asked the participants to restate it chorally and individually. Next, they were provided with some sentence examples both orally and in the written forms. Subsequently, the learners were invited to provide some examples as well. On that account, the stimuli provided by the teacher were quite sufficient for the visual learners in order to retain the taught words. Yet, they were not successful in recalling the words. On the other hand, in the word list group, the visual learners were provided with correct pronunciation of words several times by the researcher. Subsequently, they were required to repeat the words in chorus with individual spot checks. Eventually, the translation of each word was given to the learners. In this way, although, they saw the words for the short time, it does not mean that the visual stimuli were enough. Against all expectation, they could remember the words far better than those learners in

the sentence making group.

The result of the study was consistent with a study done by Oanh (2006) on the word list learning approach. In fact, he investigated the role of memorization on the students at university in Vietnam. Analysis of the obtained data revealed that 96% of the participants and 85% of the teachers strongly stated that word list learning is a right way to gain knowledge of words.

To Randall (2007), word list learning is not a matter of repeating aimlessly. In actual fact, it is regarded a way in which it helps the learners to think over the new words, their depth of processing and practice. Therefore, they tend to employ word list approach in order to obtain knowledge. Moreover, by linking the form to meaning, and with the help of their L1 equivalent translation, they can learn the new vocabularies effectively (Nation, 2001). The finding is also in tune with the arguments which stated that rote learning can assist learners in memorizing the words remarkably (Fitzpatrick et al., 2008; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990).

Gairns and Redman (1993, p. 93) claimed that acquiring words through word list approach opened up "the opportunity to manipulate the oral and written forms of language items, and many learners derived a strong sense of progress and achievement from this type of studying". In the delayed posttest of this study, nonetheless, the visual learners in the word list group did not perform successfully. The result threw light on the fact that the participants seemed to be more successful in the sentence making group compared to the learners in the word list group. Accordingly, the null hypothesis that states that there is not any difference between the performance of the visual learners when exposed to the sentence making and word list approaches was strongly rejected. New words goes through five meaningful stages in order to be stored in memory including facing the new words, gaining their forms, gaining their meanings, consolidating them in memory, and using them (Gu, 2003; Nation, 2006). Throwing a quick glance at tables 4.3 and 4.4, it can reach the conclusion that the visual learners could consolidate the words through sentence making approach much better than word list approach.

In the light of the finding of the current study in the delayed posttest and according to the results gained by Chastain (1988), knowledge of the words should be transferred from the short term memory to the long term memory for the future use, and that is possible only through repetition in different exercises. To Chastain (1988), Nation (2001), and Wesche and Paribakht (2000), "there is so much to know about each word that one meeting with it is not sufficient" (P. 74). One effective exercise in learning words is sentence making.

One reason for the weak recall of the visual learners in word list group is that the words were stored in the declarative memory. In other words, the learners did not employ the words in a communicative way and they did not link the new words to the old ones. In actual fact, contrary views concerning the word lists emerged, and most researchers claimed that employing word lists, or trying to find the words in dictionaries does not give rise to a long term vocabulary learning. Carrell (1984) asserted "merely presenting a list of new or unfamiliar vocabulary items to be encountered in a text, even with definitions appropriate to their use in that text, does not guarantee the induction of new schemata" (p. 335). She believed that the effectiveness of vocabulary teaching should "be integrated with both the student's pre-existing knowledge and other pre-reading activities designed to build background knowledge" (p. 336). Oxford and Crookall (1990) proceeded further to mention that word lists with their translations were deemed not to be so promising since language learners may not be capable to utilize the new words in their real-life situations independently. At the same time, through word lists researchers do not really know how the pupils use the lists of words in their minds for learning. What is important is that such lists will be studied as lists and this is referred as rote learning (Davis, 1989; Jacobs, Dufon, & Hong, 1994; Hulstijn, Hollander, & Greidanus, 1996).

The second reason would be related to the general assumption about the "Depth of Processing Hypothesis" that holds that if input takes part in cognitive processes (Folse, 2004; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001; Lefrancois, 2006; Sokmen, 1997), the deeper memory trace will happen, and accordingly deeper encoding will occur, all of which lead to better retention

(Craik & Tulving, 1975). On this account, word list learning merely furthers the short-term memory which provides poor retention (Lefrancois, 2006).

Furthermore, through rote learning, learners only take words, their forms, and how to read and write into consideration. This phenomenon strengthens the common assumption which claims that "knowing" words is a lot easier than remembering it. To put it another way, the participants had sufficient knowledge of words by word list learning, though they were unable to recall the words successfully in their real-life situations (Gu, 2003).

Another reason for the weak retention of the learners in the word list group would be related to the nature of visual stimuli. Generally, visual learners receive knowledge by means of watching and writing so as to forward their abilities to recall everything. Taking the way these kinds of the learners were instructed, it can be concluded that they were not provided with the adequate visual stimuli; therefore, the less stimuli were provided, the less satisfactory encoding took place, and the shorter memory recall happened. As a consequence, word list learning was not presumably an efficacious approach for the visual learners to achieve the unfamiliar words.

On the other hand, with regard to the successful performance of the visual learners in retaining the words in the sentence making group, as a possible reason, it can be concluded that making sentences with the new words was a kind of output practice which led to producing the second language, thus an increase in learning vocabulary (Swain, 1985). Based on the "Depth of Processing Hypothesis" in the sentence making group, the input went through different deeper cognitive processes which forwarded the levels of memory which caused deeper memory trace (Craik & Lockhart, 1972).

The results of the study underpinned the previous research studies on sentence making sentences (Amiryousefie & Kassaian, 2010; Ellis & He, 1999; Jalilifar & Amin, 2008; Kwon, 2006; Sarani, Mousapour, & Ghaviniat, 2013). They were compatible with De la Fuente (2002) who showed that output was indispensable for vocabulary acquisition in the course of sentence making processes.

In addition, the finding of the current study defended the significance of the Involvement Load Hypothesis which argues that those tasks that make the learners more engaged will certainly be more effective in vocabulary learning (Craik & Lockhart, 1972). Besides, the finding complied with the Generative Model which maintained that in order to make the long-term vocabulary recall more effectual, there should be a semantic link between the old and new knowledge of words (Wittrock, 1990).

6. Conclusion

To put it in nut shell, the influence of sentence making and word list approaches on retention of newly taught words among the visual learners were under study in this article. Some theories were employed in order to support the findings: Krashen's Input Hypothesis, Generative Model, the Involvement Load, Depth of Processing Hypothesis and the Output Hypothesis. Regarding the results yielded in this study, it can be concluded that deeper processing was required to remember the new vocabularies through sentence writing. The prime conclusions of this study were as follows: in the short-term memory, retention of the words by the word list learning method had a superior result, compared to sentence making method. By contrast, in the long-term memory, retention of the unfamiliar words through sentence making was regarded superior.

7. Pedagogical Implications

Due to the importance of vocabulary, suitable strategies should be pre-eminent parts of vocabulary teaching and learning schedules so that the students learn how to find the definitions of the vocabularies, store them, and use them and enlarge them. Among vastly different strategies, sentence making and word list strategies were chosen and their values were evaluated.

The aforementioned results and discussion bring about some pedagogical and theoretical implications for educators in the field of language learning. It can be claimed that teachers can take full advantage of the sentence making with EFL learners in an educational settings. Moreover the results recommend that the learners trained through sentence making recalled more words than the word list method. On this account, inte-

grating this method into the learners' regular language learning schedule is highly advocated.

However, it does not imply that all new foreign language words should be taught using the sentence making procedures since it is demanding to employ this method to all words. But it is pretty advisable to spice up other strategies like word list learning in the educational atmosphere.

In the end, it is hoped that the findings would be used as helpful guides for educators, curriculum planners, and course book writers to prepare their classroom materials and activities more effectively and communicatively.

References

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.

Barcroft, J. (1998). *L2 vocabulary learning: Do sentence writing and oral repetition help?* Poster presentation at the Second Language Research Forum, Honolulu, HI.

Barcroft, J. (2004). Effects of sentence writing in second language lexical acquisition. *Second Language Research, 20,* 303-334.

Barsch, J. (1991). *Barsch Learning Style Inventory.* Novato, CA: Academic Therapy.

Carpenter, S., & Olson, K. (2012). Are pictures good for learning new vocabulary in a foreign language? Only if you think they are not. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 38*(1), 92-101.

Carrell, P. L. (1984). Schema theory and ESL reading: Classroom implications and applications. *The Modern Language Journal, 68*(4), 332-343.

Cevik, O. A. (2007). *The effect of exercises in English elementary reading books, on the success of vocabulary teaching problems and their solution proposals.* Unpublished master's thesis, Trakya University, Turkey.

Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills: Theory and Practice.* Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Coady, J., & Huckin, T. (1997). *Second language vocabulary acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A. D., & Macaro, E. (2007). *Language learning strategies: Thirty years of research and practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coomber, J. E., Ramstad, D. A., & Sheets, D. R. (1986). Elaboration in vocabulary learning: A comparison of three rehearsal methods. *Research in the Teaching of English, 20*(3), 281-93.

Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 11,* 671-684.

Craik, F. I. M., & Tulving, E. (1975). Depth of processing and the retention of words in episodic memory research. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 104,* 268-294.

Davis, J. N. (1989). Facilitating effects of marginal glosses on foreign language reading. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(1), 41-48.

De la Fuente, M. (2002). Negotiation and oral acquisition of L2 vocabulary. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24,* 81-112.

Decaricco, J. (2001). Vocabulary learning and teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language (pp. 285-299).* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Ehri, L. C., & Wilce, L. S. (1980). Do beginners learn to read function words better in sentences or in lists? *Reading Research Quarterly, 15,* 451-476.

Ellis, N. C. (1994). Consciousness in second language learning: Psychological perspectives on the role of conscious processes in vocabulary acquisition. *AILA Review, 11,* 37-56.

Ellis, R., & He, X. (1999). The role of modified input and output in the incidental acquisition of word meanings. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21,* 285-301.

Fitzpatrick, T., Al-Qarni, I., & Meara, P. (2008). Intensive vocabulary learning: A case study. *Language Learning Journal, 36*(2), 239-248.

Folse, K. S. (2000). *The effect of type of written practice activity on second language vocabulary retention.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida, Tampa.

Folse, K. S. (2004). Myths about teaching and learning second language vocabulary: What recent research says? *TESL Reporter, 37*(2), 1-13.

Gairns, R., & Redman, S. (1993). *Working with words: A guide to teaching and learning vocabulary.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodfellow, R., & Powell, C. (1994). Approaches to vocabulary learning: Data from a CALL interaction. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 6*(1), 27-33.

Gu, P. Y. (2003). Vocabulary learning in a second language: Person, task, context and strategies. *TESL-ET, 7*(2), 10-25.

Hashemi, M., & Pourgharib, B. (2013). The effect of visual instruction on new vocabularies learning. *International Journal of Basic Sciences & Applied Research, 2*(6), 623-627.

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.

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

Jacobs, G. M., Dufon, P., & Hong, F. C. (1994). L1 and L2 vocabulary glosses in L2 reading passages: Their effectiveness for increasing comprehension and vocabulary knowledge. *Journal of Research in Reading, 17*(1), 19-28.

Jalilifar, A. R., & Amin, F. (2008). Classroom vocabulary learning: Investigating the role of task types on Iranian high school learners of English as a foreign language. *Teaching English Language and Literature Society of Iran, 2*(8), 111-141.

Kim, D. & Gilman, D. A. (2008). Effects of text, audio, and graphic aids in multimedia instruction for vocabulary learning. *Educational Technology & Society, 11*(3), 114-126.

Kwon, S. (2006). *Roles of output and task design on second language vocabulary acquisition.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Florida.

Laufer, B. (1986). Possible changes in attitude towards vocabulary acquisition research. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*(1), 69-75.

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: Cambridge.

Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics, 22,* 1-26.

Laufer, B., & Shmueli, K. (1997). Memorizing new words: Does teaching have anything to do with it? *SAGE Journals, 28*(1), 89-108.

Lefrancois, L. (2006). Development, trafficking, and function of memory T-cell subsets. *Immunol, 211,* 93-103.

McCarthy, M. (1990). *Vocabulary.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McDaniel, M. A., & Kearney, E. M. (1984). Optimal learning strategies and their spontaneous use: The importance of task-appropriate processing. *Memory and Cognition, 12,* 361-73.

Meara, P. M. (1997). Towards a new approach to modeling vocabulary acquisition. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy (pp.109-121).* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mehrpour, S. (2008). A comparison of the effects of two vocabulary teaching techniques. *Asian EFL Journal, 10*(2), 192-209.

Milton, J. (2009). *Measuring second language vocabulary acquisition.* North York: Multilingual Matters.

Mizumoto, A., & Takeuchi, O. (2009). Examining the effectiveness of explicit instruction of vocabulary learning strategies with Japanese EFL university students. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(4), 425- 449.

Muncie, J. (2002). Process writing and vocabulary development: Comparing lexical frequency profiles across drafts. *System, 30,* 225-235.

Nation, I. S. P. (1982). Beginning to learn a foreign language: A review of the research. *RELC Journal, 13*(I), 14-36.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nation, I. S. P. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 63*(1), 59-81.

Nielsen, B. M. (2001). *The effectiveness of sentence generation on the acquisition of receptive and productive knowledge of explicitly presented lexical items.* Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Wollongong, NSW Australia.

Nielsen, B. M. (2003). *A review of research into vocabulary learning and acquisition.* Retrieved October 21, 2008, from http://www.kushiro-ct.ac.jp/library/kiyo/kiyo36/Brian.pdf

Noraizan, A., Bahry, F., Saiful, D., Zulkefli Mohd, Y., & Szarina, A. (2011). *Learning styles of non-science and non-technology students on technical courses in an information management program.* Paper presented at the Asia-Pacific Conference on Library and Information Education and Practice (A-LIEP), University Technology MARA, Malaysia.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oanh, D. T. H. (2006). Memorization and EFL students' strategies at University Level in Vietnam. *TESL- EJ, 10*(2), 1-21.

Oxford University Press, (2007). *Solutions placement test: Elementary to intermediate.* Retrieved January 7, 2015, from http://www.ubd.ua/upload/other-resourses/solutions/solutions-placement-test.pdf

Oxford, R. L., & Crookall, D. (1990). Vocabulary learning: A critical analysis of techniques. *TESL Canada Journal, 7*(2), 9-30.

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.

Panah Dehghani, A. (2007). *The effect of homework assignment on learning vocabulary among Iranian EFL beginners.* Unpublished master's thesis, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran.

Pressley, M., Levin, J. R., & Delaney, J. D. (1982). The mnemonic keyword method. *Review of Educational Research, 52,* 61-91.

Qian, D. D. (1996). ESL vocabulary acquisition: Contextualization and decotextualization. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 53*(1), 120-142.

Randall, M. (2007). *Memory, psychology, and second language learning.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Read, J. (2000). *Assessing vocabulary.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Sanaoui, R. (1995). Adult learners' approaches to learning vocabulary in second languages. *The Modern Language Journal, 79*(1), 15-28.

Sarani, A., Mousapour, G., & Ghaviniat, M. (2013). The role of task type in L2 vocabulary acquisition: A case of involvement load hypothesis. *Language and Culture, 35*(4), 377-386.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 129-158.

Shen, w. w. (2003). Current trends of vocabulary teaching and learning strategies for EFL settings. *Feng Chia Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 7,* 187-224.

Sokmen, A. J. (1997). Current trends in teaching second language vocabulary. In N. Schmitt & M. MacCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy (pp. 237-257).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.),*Input in second language acquisition (pp. 235-253).* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Tudor, I., & Hafiz, F. (1989). Extensive reading as a means of input to L2 learning. *Journal of Research in Reading, 12*(2), 78-164.

Verhallen, M., & Schoonen, R. (1998). Lexical knowledge in L1 and L2 of third and fifth graders. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(4), 452-470.

Wesche, M., & Paribakht, T. (2000). Reading-based exercises in second language vocabulary learning: An introspective study. *The Modern Language, 84*(2), 196-213.

Wittrock, M. C. (1990). Generative processes of comprehension. *Educ. Psychol., 24,* 345-376.