

# Effect of Reading Input Vs. Listening Input on the Incidental Acquisition of Vocabulary



Omid Rezaei Dastgerdi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D. in TESOL, Isfahan University, Isfahan, Iran  
omidrezaei.rezaei99@gmail.com

## Citation

Rezaei, O. (2022). Effect of Reading Input Versus Listening Input on the Incidental Acquisition of Vocabulary. *International Journal of Language and Translation Research*, 3 (1), pp.1-17.

## Abstract

Available  
online

### Keywords:

Reading,  
Listening,  
Input,  
Vocabulary  
Acquisition,  
English  
Learners

The main objective of the research at hand was to investigate the possible effects of two various inputs; that is to say, listening input vs. reading comprehension input on the incidental acquisition of new vocabulary among Iranian students of English as a foreign language at an intermediate level in Jahad language institute. For this purpose, in advance, OPT test was used among 60 to see who were qualified to be chosen for the purpose of this research in each group thus 30 subjects were selected in a random mode 15 of whom were assigned to the reading group and the rest were assigned as a listening group. All participants took a vocabulary pretest which tested their knowledge of the target words before implementing the treatment. The two groups, then, received two different treatments; reading treatment for the reading comprehension group and listening treatment for the listening group. The duration for an absolute and good result of each treatment was 15 sessions and each session lasted for 90 minutes. They then received a posttest with the aim of investigating the impacts of treatments on incidental vocabulary acquisition. The results of an independent sample t-test showed that both groups had positive impacts on the incidental acquisition of vocabulary; however, the listening group outperformed the reading tasks. The results of this research can have some implications for language teachers, curriculum developers, and English learners.

## اثر ورودی خواندن در مقابل ورودی شنیداری در اکتساب اتفاقی واژگان

هدف اصلی تحقیق حاضر بررسی اثرات احتمالی دو ورودی مختلف بود. یعنی ورودی شنیداری در مقابل ورودی درک مطلب بر اکتساب اتفاقی واژگان جدید در بین دانشجویان ایرانی زبان انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجی در سطح متوسط در موسسه زبان جهاد. برای این منظور پیشاپیش از بین 60 نفر از آزمون OPT استفاده شد تا مشخص شود که در هر گروه چه کسانی واجد شرایط انتخاب برای این تحقیق بودند که 30 نفر به صورت تصادفی انتخاب شدند که 15 نفر از آنها در گروه خواندن و بقیه به عنوان گروه شنود اختصاص داده شدند. همه شرکت کنندگان یک پیش آزمون واژگانی گرفتند که دانش آن‌ها را در مورد کلمات هدف قبل از اجرای درمان آزمایش می‌کرد. سپس دو گروه دو درمان متفاوت دریافت کردند. درمان خواندن برای گروه درک مطلب و درمان شنیداری برای گروه شنوایی. مدت زمان نتیجه مطلق و خوب هر درمان 15 جلسه و هر جلسه 90 دقیقه بود. آنها سپس یک پس آزمون با هدف بررسی تأثیر درمان‌ها بر اکتساب واژگان اتفاقی دریافت کردند. نتایج یک آزمون t نمونه مستقل نشان داد که هر دو گروه تأثیر مثبتی بر اکتساب اتفاقی واژگان داشتند. با این حال، گروه گوش دادن از وظایف خواندن بهتر عمل کرد. نتایج این تحقیق می‌تواند پیامدهایی برای معلمان زبان، توسعه دهندگان برنامه درسی و زبان آموزان انگلیسی داشته باشد.

**کلید واژه ها:** خواندن، گوش دادن، ورودی، اکتساب واژگان، زبان آموزان انگلیسی

Corresponding Author's Email:  
<sup>1</sup>omidrezaei.rezaei99@gmail.com

P-ISSN: 2750-0594  
E-ISSN: 2750-0608

## Introduction

In second language acquisition (SLA), vocabulary is regarded as the basic integral part of language proficiency. This is due to the fact that vocabulary constitutes the basics for learners' performance in other language skills including speaking, reading, listening, and writing (Shahrokni, 2009). Vocabulary is not an optional component of foreign language learning because "words are the building blocks of language and without them, there is no language" (Milton, 2009, p.3). Instead, vocabulary has been identified as one of the five main features of the literacy process next to phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and text comprehension (Milton, 2009). In other words, any limitation in vocabulary knowledge can barricade the skills of any second language (L2) learners to effectively and accurately communicate in the target language as words contain the very basic information load of the meanings they wish to express (Read, 2004). However, much of the review literature on second language acquisition can reveal the fact that not much attention has been paid to the vocabulary learning process (Milton, 2009). In this regard, one hot topic of research which has attracted more attention from researchers is how much vocabulary acquisition happens (or can happen) in EFL settings as a result of such meaning-based communicative activities as reading and listening drills. Indeed, these various activities are regarded as the crucial source of incidental word learning in addition to the more direct methods of teaching vocabulary used by L2 teachers such as word lists (Gardner, 2004, 2004; Alqahtani, 2015).

Incidental learning is the process in which something is learned without the real intention of doing so. It is also a matter of learning one thing while intending to learn something else (Richards & Schmidt, 2002; Hunt and Beglar, 2005). Many studies have shown that much L2 vocabulary, except for the first few thousand words, is done incidentally while learners are engaged in extensive reading or listening practices (e.g. Paribakht & Wesche, 1997; Huckin & Coady, 1999; Tekmen, & Daloglu, 2006). In this regard, Ellis, for example, (1999) indicates that "oral and written input can constitute an effective source of data for incidental vocabulary learning even in the beginning stages of language acquisition" (p.38). Therefore, he calls for more research to examine how incidental vocabulary acquisition can be taken place from oral and written input; "given the primacy of input in many learning contexts together with its potential to facilitate vocabulary acquisition, it is surprising that so little attention has been paid to it in L2 vocabulary acquisition research" (p.38). In this regard, this study serves to investigate the extent to which EFL

learners can acquire words incidentally, in the sense of being a by-product of the main learning activity of listening and reading.

### **Research Questions Hypotheses**

The realm of vocabulary acquisition in general and incidental vocabulary acquisition have been widely investigated in the literature. Similarly, different modes of presenting vocabulary such as oral and written input have also been examined by different scholars. However, a few studies, especially in the Iranian context, have focused on comparing the effect of different channels of exposing learners to new words. Therefore, this study addresses a new dimension of incidental acquisition of vocabulary acquisition.

Although studies vary in incidental vocabulary learning, we have a very limited amount of knowledge on the rate at which vocabulary is grasped in these two different modes. This study had two main objectives in its focus. Firstly, it was an attempt to investigate the impact of exposing students to reading input on the incidental acquisition of vocabulary by Iranian intermediate learners. Secondly, it examined the effect of oral input in listening exercises on the incidental vocabulary acquisition by Iranian intermediate learners. Moreover, the effect of these two types of input on Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary acquisition was compared. Based on these issues, this study aimed to address the following research questions and hypotheses:

**Q1:** Does reading input have any significant effect on incidental vocabulary acquisition by Iranian EFL intermediate learners?

**Q2:** Does listening input have any significant effect on incidental vocabulary acquisition by Iranian EFL intermediate learners?

**Q3:** Does reading input versus listening input have any significant effect on incidental vocabulary acquisition by Iranian EFL intermediate learners?

**H01:** Reading input has no significant effect on incidental vocabulary acquisition by Iranian EFL intermediate learners.

**H02:** Listening input has no significant effect on incidental vocabulary acquisition by Iranian EFL intermediate learners.

**H03:** Reading input versus listening input has no significant effect on incidental vocabulary acquisition by Iranian EFL intermediate learners.

### Literature Review

Incidental vocabulary learning and extensive reading have a lot in common. This can be due to the definition of extensive reading. For example, as Bright and McGregor (1970), Day and Bamford (1998), Harmer (2003), Krashen (1993), Nation (2001), and Waring (1997) put it, extensive reading is seen as a reading situation in which the subjects read text with pleasure and at a level which is in line with their ability. For example, Krashen (as cited in Brown, Waring & Donkaewbua, 2008) in the comprehension hypothesis puts forward the idea that “comprehensible input is a necessary and sufficient condition for language development and extensive reading provides this condition” (p. 137). In this regard, the extensive reading programs and activities are set and designed in such a way that they can enhance such abilities of learners as reading fluency and reading comprehension skills and at the same time establish and deepen the already learned vocabulary and grammatical structures.

There are a number of studies done in the field of incidental vocabulary learning and teaching from an extensive reading point of view (see, for example, Pitts, White, & Krashen, 1989; Day et al., 1991; Dupuy & Krashen, 1993; Grabe & Stoller, 1997; Hayashi, 1999; Mason & Krashen, 1997; Waring & Takaki, 2003; Pigada & Schmitt, 2006; Ghanbari & Marzban, 2014). In addition, some of these studies of such extensive reading tasks have reported positive results in the overall language development of the students (see for example Cho & Krashen, 1994; Elley, 1991; Hafiz & Tudor, 1990). However, other studies have stressed benefits like enhanced motivation to learn better a new language in reading (see for example Brown, 2000; Hayashi, 1999; Mason & Krashen, 1997). Moreover, some studies have shown that such productive skills as writing and speaking have been both enhanced due to incidental vocabulary learning (Cho & Krashen, 1994; Janopoulos, 1986; Robb & Susser, 1989).

As Horst, Cobb, and Meara (1998) put it “through extensive reading learners can “enrich their knowledge of the words they already know, increase lexical access speeds, build network linkages between words, and...a few words will be acquired” (p. 221). In their research, a multiple choice, post-test measure could show that from among 23 new words provided for the learning book entitled “The Mayor of Casterbridge”, 5 words were learned by the students. In the same vein, Waring and Takaki (2003) run a multiple-choice, immediate post-test measure and could show that among the 25 new words for learning in the book entitled “A Little Princess”, only 11 words were learned by the students.

In another research by Horst (2005), an immediate post-test measure revealed that among 35 new words which were available for learning in reading materials, only 18 words were learned by the subjects which was equal to 51% of the total vocabulary. The results are similar to those achieved in the *A Clockwork Orange* study conducted by Saragi et al. (1978). In their research, subjects could detect the correct meanings of 75% of the target words.

The study by Waring and Takaki (2003) developed a unique methodology for measuring small gains by applying various test formats. Whereas other alike studies had used one measurement only, this study enjoyed three various measurements. The measurements they applied included a simple *yes* or *no* sight-recognition test, a standard multiple-choice test, and a translation test into the first language of the subjects. Their results could show that incidental vocabulary learning process from reading happened at several levels and that the gained scores depended mostly on the test type,

Brown, Waring, and Donkaewbua (2008) did research to investigate the impact of reading, reading-while-listening, and listening to stories on incidental vocabulary. For this purpose, they selected s sets of 28 words in four frequency bands. They then administrated two test types immediately after the reading and listening treatment. One treatment was after one week; whereas the other one was three months later. The results could show that subjects learned the new words incidentally in three weeks; however, the most frequent words were not learned. In addition, the items which were occurred more frequently were more likely to be learned by the subjects.

Studies to determine the benefits of extensive listening have been concerned, mostly, with native-speaker subjects. Reading stories told to children are recognized as good pedagogy, and when it is done with shared reading or recreational reading practices, it produces considerable positive results in reading and listening skills (Elley, 1989; Senechal & Cornell, 1993). A further benefit of listening to stories is the potential for acquiring new vocabulary incidentally.

In several different studies conducted by Elley (1989, 1991 & 1985), the results showed that generally such actives as oral story reading had positive effects on vocabulary acquisition for children because they had a considerable source of vocabulary and that this positive impact was not correlated to teachers' explanations on words and their meanings in reading comprehension. In one of the studies, subjects in one group showed gains of 15% from one story which was not accompanied teacher explanation; whereas, subjects in the second group, who received teacher explanations on vocabulary meaning, demonstrated gains of 40%. In addition, it was found that

the incidental vocabulary gained by the subjects were more permanent and that the main reason for the successful acquisition of the new words was the frequency of their recurrence of them in the story.

In another study, Ahmad (2012) did research on Intentional vs. incidental vocabulary learning to see which one has a more effect on vocabulary learning. For this reason, he gave two models of tests; that is to say, the Standard Confirmation Test and a Contrastive Extempore Test of intentional & incidental types to twenty students at the graduate level. The results could show that overall, the incidental type had more positive impacts on vocabulary learning as compared to intentional.

Whereas the number of studies on extensive listening activities in a foreign/ second language is, to a great extent, limited, there is, however, a great deal of didactic literature on the benefits and procedures of reading stories to students (e.g., Moody, 1974; Prowse, 2005). For example, West (1953) argued that reading aloud to the class was “valuable for practice in understanding correctly spoken English and the appreciation of literature” (p. 21). In addition, Nation (2001) claimed that “there is a growing body of evidence that shows...that learners can pick up new vocabulary as they are being read to” (p. 117).

In this regard, Parvareshbar & Ghoorchaei (2016) did research to investigate the impacts of using short stories on vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL learners. For this purpose, 50 students were randomly selected and assigned to two groups. One group received treatments that were short stories; whereas the other group (control group) received a placebo. The results of the post-test could show that there was a positive relationship between telling short stories and enhancing the vocabulary learning process of the Iranian EFLs.

## **Methodology**

### **Design**

The design of this research was quasi-experimental in nature as the researchers couldn't assign random sampling to the subjects. In addition, this research enjoyed a comparative group design as the groups received two different treatments in line with their nature; that is to say, one group received listening treatment and the other group received reading comprehension treatment.

### **Data collection regime, Subjects, and Procedures**

The data collection procedure commences with administering Oxford Quick Placement Test to students studying at an intermediate level at Jahad language institute. According to the result of the placement test, 60 participants in the intermediate level participated among whom, 30 intermediate learners were selected and considered qualified as prospective participants of the study. Then, they randomly were assigned to two groups each containing 15 participants. The group which was provided with reading as input was referred to as the reading group, and the group that received oral input was called the listening group.

Before the beginning of the semester, all participants took a vocabulary pretest which tested their knowledge of the target words before implementing the treatment. After that, the participants were provided with the treatment in different groups in form of reading and listening. In the reading group, students were supposed to read small texts from the Top notch series, Touch stone series, and inside reading series which were well-organized and its content was in accordance with the knowledge of intermediate students as well as including the target words and they were supposed to guess the meaning of the words from the context and teacher provided scaffolding, if they face any difficulty. Likewise, in the listening group, learners listened to short conversations had been provided by Top Notch series, Touchstone series and Tactics for listening series as it was played and read by the native speakers which were quite understandable and meaningful to them, and the content as well as words in that book were sufficient and well-understandable as well as not being too sophisticated. In the next stage, words were to be guessed from the context of the conversation. Teachers provided hints and support to learners while they were inferring the meaning of the new words. The treatments lasted for 15 sessions and each session was 90 minutes. In the end, participants in both groups took the post-test and the results of the post-test were analyzed by running statistical procedures on the scores.

### **Instruments**

This study enjoyed various instrumentations for the matter of practicality and feasibility. The instrumentations used in this research were as the followings:

### **Vocabulary Pretest and Posttest**

Learners' knowledge of the target words of the study was tested by a test. The test was made of 30 fills in blank items. Each item corresponded to one of the target words in the study. The



reliability of the test was calculated by piloting the test with a group of participants similar to the main participants of the study and the scores were put into Cronbach's alpha formula which was equal to 0.75%.

### **Reading Input**

The reading input of the study consisted of five short texts each including six new words. The texts were selected from different English textbooks at the intermediate level like the Top Notch series, Touchstone series, and Inside reading series. The length of the tests was equal (each text was not more than 250 words) and they all had the same readability. The readability of the text was compatible with the participants' level of proficiency. The texts were written by native speakers of English. Each reading comprehension contained 10-15 new vocabularies. Regarding the time, all the text materials from which the texts were selected were written after 2010. This gave the learners up-to-date reading texts.

### **Listening Input**

The listening materials were the same as the reading materials. The listening input of this also consisted of five short conversations at an intermediate level. Like reading input, each conversation included 10 to 15 new words. The conversations were selected from different English textbooks at the intermediate level like the Top Notch series, Touchstone series, and Tactics for listening series. These books were written after 2010. The speakers of the conversations were all native speakers of English (British and American accents).

### **Participants**

The populations from which the sample of this study was drawn were Iranian intermediate EFL learners. To this end, EFL learners who were about 60 studying at Jahad institute in Isfahan Iran were asked to take part in Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) and based on the results of the test, 30 intermediate learners (male and female) were selected to serve as the participants of the study. They aged between 20 and 25 years and were randomly assigned to two groups each including 15 participants. The sampling procedure for this study was non-random convenience sampling. The mother tongue of the subjects was Persian.



## Data Analysis

To analyze the data both descriptive and inferential statistics were used. These statistics were drawn by SPSS (version 20). To compare the performance of groups independent sample t-test was run on the scores. For assigning the subjects into groups and determining the general level of the subjects, a one-sample test was conducted. Table 1 shows the results of the test.

**Table 1**

*Results of One-Sample Statistics*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Placement Test	29	54.79	5.634	1.046

As can be seen, the mean of the one sample statistic was 54.79. In this regard, the level of the subject participating in the study was upper intermediate.

For comparing the level of the two groups, reading and listening, a group statistical test was applied. The results are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2**

*Group Statistics Results*

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest	Reading Group	15	12.20	1.897	.490
	Listening Group	15	12.47	1.642	.424

As can be seen in table 2 can show, the man in the reading and listening groups were not significantly different from each other (12.20 vs. 20).

**Table 3**

*Results of Independent Sample T-test (pre-test)*

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances					t-test for Equality of Means				
Equal variances assumed	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2- tailed)</i>	Mean Differen ce	Std. Error Difference	95% CI	
								Low	upper
	.692	.412	-.412	28	.684	-.267	.648	1.594	1.060

As can be seen in table 3. The Sig. (2-tailed) was .684 which is bigger than .5. In this regard, it is said that there was not statically any significant difference between the reading vs. listening group in the pre-test and before the implementation of the treatment.

For comparing the results of the treatment, a group statistic was conducted for both reading and listening groups. The results are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4**

*Results of Group Statistics*

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Posttest	Reading Group	15	17.53	1.995	.515
	Listening Group	15	20.47	4.764	1.230

As the results of table 4 can demonstrate, the mean of the reading group was 17.53; whereas the mean of the listening, the group was 20.47. In this regard, it is seen that both the listening group and the reading group had statically significant impacts on the incidental acquisition of vocabulary. However, from the statistics, it is seen that the listening group had more impact than the reading group.

**Table 5**

*Results of Independent Sample T-test (post-test)*

Equal variances assumed	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2- tailed)</i>	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% CI	
	10.102	.004	-2.200	28	.036	-2.933	1.334	Low	upper
								-5.665	-.202

Table 5 shows that the Sig. (2-tailed) was .36. which is smaller than .5. In this regard, it can be said that there was a statically significant difference between pre-test and post-test in reading and listening groups.

## Reading Group

For assessing the results of treatment in a reading group, a paired t-test was conducted. The results are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

**Table 6**

*Reading Group Paired Samples Statistics*

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Protest	12.20	15	1.897	.490
	PosttestR	17.53	15	1.995	.515

As the data in table 6 can show, the mean of the pre-test reading group was 12.20; whereas the mean of the post-test was 17.53. In this regard, there was a significant difference after the treatment in the reading pot-test group.

**Table 7**

*Paired Samples Test Results*

		Paired Differences						
		95% Confidence Interval of the						
		Std. Mean	Std. Error	Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Deviation	Mean	Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre-test R – Post-test R	-5.333	3.395	.877	-7.213 -3.453	-6.085	14	.000

As can be seen in the table, the 2-tailed result was .000 which is lower than .5. In this way, it can be said that there was a significant difference between reading groups after the treatment.

## Listening Group

As with the reading group, the same process was taken for the listening group. The results of paired sample- test is sown below.

**Table 8**

*Paired Samples Statistics*

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
--	--	------	---	----------------	-----------------

Pair 1	Pretest	12.47	15	1.642	.424
	Post-test L	20.47	15	4.764	1.230

As can be seen from the results in table 8 the mean of the pre-test in the listening group was 12.47; while the mean of the post-test was 20.47. In this regard, it is said that there was a significant difference between the listening pre-test and post-test.

**Table 9**

*Results of the Paired Samples Test*

		Paired Differences							
		95% Confidence							
		Interval of the							
		Difference							Sig. (2-
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower	Upper	t	df	tailed)
Pair 1	Pretest L – Posttest L	-8.000	6.000	1.549	-11.323	-4.677	-5.164	14	.000

Table 9 shows the results of the paired sample t-test between pre-test listening and post-test. As can be seen, the 2-tailed was .000 which is lower than .5. In this way, it is said that there was a significant difference between pre-test and post-test listening groups.

## Discussions

### Response to the First Research Question

The first research question of this research was to investigate if reading input has any significant effect on incidental vocabulary acquisition by Iranian EFL intermediate learners. For this purpose, the experimental group received reading instructions for incidental vocabulary learning. The results of the t-test (tables 3 and 6) showed that the mean of the post-test in the reading group was 17.53 and the level of significance was 0.000. In this regard, it can be said that the teaching and instructions of reading groups positively impacted the incidental learning of vocabularies among the subjects. As a result, it can be said that the null hypothesis is rejected.

### Response to the Second Research Question

The second research question was to explore the impact of listening input has any significant effect on incidental vocabulary acquisition by Iranian EFL intermediate learners. For this objective, the like reading group, and the listening group received listening input as the treatment. According to the results of the t-test (in tables 8 and 9), the mean of the post- listening was 20.47 and the level of significance was .000. In this way, it can be argued that the listening input had a positive impact on incidental vocabulary learning of the Iranian upper-intermediate subjects. In other words, the null hypothesis is rejected.

### **Response to the Third Research Question**

The third research question of this study was to see if reading input versus listening input has any significant effect on incidental vocabulary acquisition by Iranian EFL intermediate learners. For this goal, both the listening group and the reading group received their instructions and after the treatment, they were given a post-test on vocabulary acquisition. As table 4 can show, the mean of the reading group was 17.53; whereas the mean of the listening group was 20.47. In this regard, it can be said that the input of both groups had statically significant impacts on vocabulary acquisition; however, from the data, it can be said that the listening group had more impact as compared to the reading group in vocabulary acquisition (17.53 vs. 20.47). As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected.

The results of this study are in line with some other studies like Laufer (2001), Perez & Desmet (2012) Tajedin & Daraee (2013), Marefat & Hassanzadeh (2014), Teng (2015), Nation (2015); Hatami (2017). All these studies reported the positive impacts of listening and reading input on the incidental acquisition of second language learners. However, this study had contradictory results with that of Vidal (2003), and Brown et al., (2008), which found that reading had more impacts on incidental vocabulary learning as compared to listening input.

### **Concluding Mark**

The main purpose of this quasi-experimental research was to investigate the possible effect of reading input versus listening input on the incidental acquisition of vocabulary. For this purpose, 30 subjects were selected in a random method 15 of whom were assigned to a reading group and the rest were assigned to a listening group. The results of this research showed that both reading and listening tasks are acceptable sources for incidental vocabulary learning in a second language; however, listening input may have a greater impact on the incidental vocabulary process.

This study can have some implications for various groups. First and most, teachers in the realm of second language teaching can use the findings of this research useful as they will know how to provoke the vocabulary process among learners with such tasks as listening and reading. In addition, material developers can exploit the finding of this study to include vocabulary in listening and reading tasks and in designing new materials. More, English learners can use the findings of this research. They will understand which techniques and inputs are better for them while trying to learn new vocabulary.

This study had, however, some limitations. The first limitation was that the number of subjects was limited (30 subjects). It would be better if this study was conducted by employing more subjects. In this regard, the results could be more generalizable. The second limitation was that the number of treatment sessions for each group was limited. The number of instructions for each group was 5. This limitation was due to the class timing the instructors faced. It might be better if the instructions were more for a better impact on subjects' learning.

This research can, however, spark new studies in the future. As an example, the matter of gender is interesting in that it can be researched to learn males or females to gain better results in incidental language learning and teaching. In addition, this research was conducted for upper-intermediate learners. Another study can be done for intermediate and advanced learners of English as a foreign language as they are in the different stages of learning English. In addition, comparative research is worth doing in which subjects with different backgrounds in English are studied to see which technique is suitable for them. Needless to say, the impact of speaking on incidental vocabulary learning can be also researched as another suggestion for further research.

## References

- Ahmad, J. (2012). Intentional vs. incidental vocabulary learning. *International Association of Research in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics ELT Research Journal*, 1(1), 71-79.
- Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, III (3), 21-34. doi:10.20472/te.2015.3.3.002.
- Bright, J., & McGregor, G. (1970). *Teaching English as a second language*. London: Longman.

- Brown, R., Waring, R., & Donkaewbua, S. (2008). Incidental vocabulary acquisition from reading, reading-while-listening, and listening to stories. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 20(2), 136-163.
- Day, R. R., Omura, C., & Hiramatsu, M. (1991). Incidental EFL vocabulary learning and reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 7, 541-551.
- Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Dupuy, B., & Krashen S. (1993). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in French as a foreign language. *Applied Language Learning*, 4, 55-63.
- Ellis, R. (1999). *Learning a second language through interaction*. Amsterdam: Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Eller, R., Pappas, C., & Brown, E. (1988). The lexical development of kindergartners: Learning from written context. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 20, 5-24.
- Elley, W. (1985). *What do children learn from being read to?* Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council of Educational Research & Institute of Education.
- Elley, W. (1989). Vocabulary acquisition from listening to stories. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 24, 174-187.
- Gardner, D. (2004). Vocabulary input through extensive reading: a comparison of words found in children's narrative and expository material. *Applied Linguistics*, 25, 1-37.
- Ghanbari, M., & Marzban, A. (2014). Effect of extensive reading on incidental vocabulary retention. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 3854-3858. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.854
- Harmer, J. (2003). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2003). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex: Longman.
- Horst, M., Cobb, T., & Meara, P. (1998). Beyond *A Clockwork Orange*: Acquiring second language vocabulary through reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 11, 207-223.
- Huckin, T. & J. Coady, J. (1999). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: A review. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21: 181-193.
- Hunt, A., & Belgar, D. (2005). A framework for developing EFL reading vocabulary. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 17, 23-59.



- Krashen, S. (1989) We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal* 73, 440-464.
- Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading*. Colorado: Eaglewood Libraries Unlimited.
- Krashen, S. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Laufer, B. (2001). Reading, word-focused activities, and incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language. *Language Teaching*, 16(3), 44-54. doi:10.1017/s0261444809005771.
- Marefat, F., & Hassanzadeh, M. (2014). Vodcast: A Breakthrough in Developing Incidental Vocabulary Learning? *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)*, 17(2), 27-58.
- Mason, B., & Krashen, S. (1997). Extensive reading in English as a foreign language. *The system*, 25, 91–102.
- Milton, J. (2009). *Measuring Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Moody, H. (1974). Technique and art in reading aloud. *ELT Journal*, 28, 315–324.
- Nagy, W., Herman, P., & Anderson, R. (1985). Learning words from context. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20, 233–253.
- Nation, P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Paribakht, T. S. & Wesche, M. (1997). Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary acquisition. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy* (pp. 174-199). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Parvareshbar, F., & Ghoorchaie, B. (2016). The effect of using short stories on vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(7), 1476. doi:10.17507/tpls.0607.20v.
- Perez, M. M., & Desmet, P. (2012). The effect of input enhancement in L2 listening on incidental vocabulary learning: A review. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 34, 153-157. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.02.031
- Richards, J., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Malaysia: Pearson Education.
- Saragi, T., Nation, P., & Meister, G. F. (1978). Vocabulary learning and reading. *The system*, 6, 72– 78.

- Shahrokni, S. A. (2009). Second language incidental vocabulary learning: The effect of online textual, pictorial, and textual pictorial glosses. *TESLEJ*, 13(3). Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume13/ej51/ej51a3>.
- Tajeedin, Z., & Dareea, D. (2013). Vocabulary acquisition through reading input: Effects of form-focused, message-oriented, and a comprehension task. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 16(4), 1-19.
- Tekmen, E.A., & Daloglu, A. (2006). An investigation of incidental vocabulary acquisition about learner proficiency level and word frequency. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(2), 220-243.
- Teng, F. (2015). EFL vocabulary learning through reading BBC news: An analysis based on the involvement load hypothesis. *English as a Global Language Education (EaGLE) Journal*, 1(2), 63-90.
- Vidal, K. (2001). Academic Learning: A Source of Vocabulary Acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 56-89.
- Waring, R. (1997). Graded and extensive reading: Questions and answers. *The Language Teacher*, 21, 7-13.
- Waring, R., & Takaki, M. (2003). At what rate do learners learn and retain new vocabulary from reading a graded reader? *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 15, 130-163.
- West, M. (1953). The technique of reading aloud to a class. *ELT Journal*, 8, 21-24.

### Biodata

Omid Rezaei (Corresponding Author) holds a Ph.D. degree in TESOL from Isfahan University; Iran. He has published several papers in internationally well-known and indexed journals. He teaches general and specialized English. He also teaches IELTS and TOEFL in different language institutions as well as universities in Iran. His main areas of research include, but are not limited to, fields like language testing and assessment, first and second language acquisition, material deployment, and research methodology.

Email: [omidrezaei.rezaei99@gmail.com](mailto:omidrezaei.rezaei99@gmail.com)

