

An Analysis of Iranian Language Learners' Vocabulary Learning

Ashraf Zalzadeh Borazjani

Payam e Noor University, Borazjan, Iran

February, 2017

The purpose of this study is to investigate how learner variables, including language proficiency, motivation, effort, and family background affect Iranian language learners' EFL vocabulary strategy use? Subjects in this study were 450 EFL students ($N=450$) at Payam e Noor University, Borazjan, Iran. After a placement test, they were grouped into different levels classes for teaching purposes and answered a vocabulary learning questionnaire during their regular English classes. After answering the questionnaire, collection was conducted by the author with the assistance of several English teachers and then underwent a series of statistical analyses by using the Statistical Packages for the Social Science (SPSS). Results of the study showed that the variable that had greatest effect on learners' vocabulary strategy use was motivation. Another important factor affecting vocabulary strategy use was family background, including family involvement, and years of study. Results of the study suggested that, teachers persuading of the students to adopt the most useful and effective vocabulary learning approaches will definitely have a positive effect on students' learning motivation and language performance.

Keywords: *vocabulary learning strategy, language proficiency, family background*

1. Introduction

With dawning of the electronic age, the importance of English proficiency has gained much more attention in recent years. Effective second language acquisition and learning strategies have been a major focus of researchers, while little emphasis has been given to the vocabulary learning strategies. Researchers indicated that the greatest obstacle for acquiring a second language is limited vocabulary size. According to Schmitt and Meara's (1984) study of L2 university students, lexical errors outnumbered grammatical errors by 3:1 or 4:1. A similar survey of L2 students taking university courses found that they identified vocabulary as a major factor that held them back in academic writing tasks (Leki & Carson, 1994). Although vocabulary has attracted increased interest since the 1980s, language researchers and teachers continue to give less attention to it than syntax and phonology (Clece-Murica, 1997). However, factors affecting vocabulary learning is very complicated, including individual and contextual factors.

Many researchers have worked on the factors that affect language learning. Al Shalabi and Salmani Nodoushan (2009) have argued that personality factors have a great effect on EFL learners language learning. Nemati, Salmani Nodoushan and Ashrafzadeh (2010) studies the effects of learning strategies in an ESP context. Salmani Nodoushan (2002, 2003, 2007a) should that text-familiarity and task type affect test performance and reading comprehension. Other studies have showed that Iranian EFL learners' field (in)dependence affected their performance on communicative tasks (Salmani Nodoushan, 2006) and their reading comprehension (Salmani Nodoushan, 2007b). EFL learners' cognitive orientation influences their writing performance (Salmani Nodoushan, 2007c,d), and text cohesion affects their reading success (Salmani Nodoushan, 2007e). Similarly, they are affected by metacognition

(Salmani Nodoushan, 2008), addiction to epistemic games (Salmani Nodoushan, 2009a), and their study major also affects their learning outcome (Salmani Nodoushan, 2009b); formal schemata affect their reading recall in L3 contexts (Salmani Nodoushan, 2010), and they are influenced by their temperament (Salmani Nodoushan, 2011), self-regulation (Salmani Nodoushan, 2012a), locus of control (Salmani Nodoushan, 2012b), and cognitive and learning styles (Salmani Nodoushan, 2014). Their writing performance is partly affected by their level of anxiety (Salmani Nodoushan, 2015) and their openness to cognitive structure modifiability (Salmani Nodoushan, 2016). In the non-Iranian context, Oxford (1990) proposed that many factors affect choice of learning strategies: degree of awareness, stage of learning, task requirements, teacher expectations, age, sex, nationality, ethnicity, general learning style, personality traits, motivation level, and purpose for learning the language.

In the light of the need for information about the factors which affect language learning in general, and vocabulary learning in specific, the major research question explored in this study is: how do learner variables, including motivation, language proficiency, years of study, effort, family tutors, and extracurricular learning activities affect students' EFL vocabulary strategies use? The results of this study will be beneficial for both participating teachers and students. The participating English teachers will learn more about their students, encourage their use of vocabulary learning strategies, and then adapt vocabulary teaching to students' needs more effectively. The study answers the following research questions:

1. How do learner variables, including language proficiency, motivation, effort, years of study, and cram school attendance affect EFL vocabulary strategy use?
2. Is there any relationship between extracurricular self-initiated learning activities and vocabulary strategy use?

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Motivation

As Oxford (1990) and Salmani Nodoushan (2002, 2003, 2007a, etc.) indicated, factors affecting language learning are very complicated, and include motivation, attitudes, language anxiety, self-confidence, language aptitude, family size, and personality variables. Motivation is one of the most important factors which affect students' language learning achievement. According to Gardner and Smythe (1981), integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situations, and motivation are separate but correlated constructs, and motivation has direct effect on second language achievement. Gardner (2001) also proposed that the variable, integrativeness, reflects a genuine interest in learning the second language. A low level of integrativeness would indicate no interest in learning language in order to identify with the group, while a high level would indicate considerable interest. He also proposed that attitudes toward the learning situation, involves attitudes toward any aspect of the situation in which the language is learned, these attitudes could be directed toward the teachers, the course, the classmates, the course materials, extracurricular activities associated with the course.

In addition, integrative motivation is hypothesized to be a complex of attitudinal, goal directed and motivational attributes (Gardner, 2001). Dornyei (2001) mentions another variable for affecting language learning motivation is instrumental motivation. Instrumental motivation is an interest in learning the second language for pragmatic reasons. In conclusions, studies suggest that the retention of motivation to language achievement whether instrumental motivation or integrative motivation, persistence in language learning, activities

in the classroom which all have a significant impact on second successful language acquisition.

2.2. Family background, sibsize and achievement

As the literature suggested, family background is one of the important factors affecting foreign language proficiency. Number of siblings (i.e., sibsize or sibship size), father's social economic status, and birth order are all included in family background factors. Blake (1989) indicated that learning resources will be diluted in the large families, including parental interaction and attention. Nonetheless, the sibsize effects decline as the social status increases which accord with the dilution hypothesis. The advantaged parental socioeconomic status should mitigate the negative effects of increasing sibsize. According to Blake's research, men come from privileged families with large sibsize would suffer less educational loss than men from less privileged families with large sibsize.

Sewell and Shah (1967) mentioned that the educational aspirations among young people are positively related to socioeconomic background. Blake(1989) indicated that high socioeconomic status results not only in more intellectual ability and better performance in school, but that high status parents provide more encouragement and support for postsecondary education than do low status parents. According to the model proposed by Swell and Shah (1967), parents' background will affect grades positively because higher-educated parents will place more emphasis on academic achievement and create home situations that are conducive to study and concentration. In sum, parents' educational attainment, and socioeconomic status, and number of siblings have a significant effect on second language acquisition.

2.3. Vocabulary learning strategies

One of the most important things in learning vocabulary is to remember words, or more precisely to store words in memory. Memorizing vocabulary plays an important role in language learning. In this paragraph, some characteristics of the relationship between vocabulary and memory will be introduced. The discussed various strategies will aid learners to storage vocabulary. It includes pair association and mnemonic devices. Research suggests that words are stored and remembered in a network association. These associations can be of many types and be linked in a network association. This memory device called paired associate which links two words of similar sounds and meanings has proved effective (Stevick, 1976). Word family means many words built about a particular root are gathered so that the associations among them can be seen. Word family is similar to word formation, such as "part", "partition", "partly", "partner", "participant", etc. The key word method is that a reader learns a word in the target language by associating it with similar sound or meaning in the native language. Pair association will be a good way to memorize vocabulary effectively, for example the paired words of "fridge" and "bridge", "eight" and "night" (Hsueh, 1997).

2.4. Language Learning strategies

Learning strategies are the basic tools for active, self-directed involvement needed for developing L2 communicative ability (O'Malley & Chamot,1990; Nemati, Salmani Nodoushan & Ashrafzadeh, 2010). Research has shown that more effective language learners use more and better learning strategies than do poorer language learner (Rubin, 1975; Stern 1983). In addition, research also showed that more effective language learners in each of the four language skills (Tracke & Mendelsohn, 1986). Rubin suggested that the good language

learner is a willing and accurate guesser; has a strong persevering drive to communicate and willing to make mistakes in order to learn or communicate; focuses on form by looking for patterns; takes advantages of all practice opportunities; monitors his or her own speech and that of others; and pay attention to meaning.

Oxford (1990) indicated that language learning strategies can be classified, explained, and exemplified in six coherent groups. The six strategy groups are labeled memory, cognitive, comprehension, metacognitive, affective, and social. The first three groups are known as “direct” strategies, because they directly involve the subject matter, in this case the target language to be learned; the last three groups are called “indirect” strategies, because they don’t directly involve the subject matter itself, but are essential to language learning nonetheless. Chamot and Kupper (1989) mentioned that successful learners tend to select strategies that work together well in a highly orchestrated way, tailored to the requirement of the language task. These learners can easily explain the strategies they use and why they employ them (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990).

3. Method

3.1. Participants & Context

The subjects involved in this study compromised 450 students enrolled at Payam e Noor University, Borazjan, Iran. The respondents consisted largely of females with an average age of 19-22 and their first language is Persian. They place at a low-medium level in language ability. At the time of this research project, they were taking one required English course- two hours per week. This project was implemented in the general required English course which aims to enable students and teachers to teach and learn vocabulary more effectively. It was stressed that the results would not affect their English course grades.

3.2. Instruments

3.2.1. The placement test

The Test of English for International Communication (TOEFIC BRIDGE) was used as an English language proficiency test. Placement of students into levels was based on the test scores. The test is composed of 100 multiple-choice questions divided into two sections. The first part of the test is listening comprehension, including fifty questions. The second section covers reading and grammar and makes up the other fifty questions.

3.2.2. The questionnaire

A questionnaire that was designed by the researcher was used to discover factors affecting students’ vocabulary learning strategies. The questionnaire was divided into three parts (1) students’ background information, (2) students’ vocabulary learning strategies and student’s self-initiated outside classroom vocabulary learning activities.

3.3. Procedure

The placement test was administered to all of the students who were taking the general English courses as a requirement. Then the students were assigned to different ability groups based on the scores of the English Ability Test, and then received different instructions in the new coming semester. The survey of students’ vocabulary learning strategies was conducted at the end of the fall semester. Six middle-level classes, two lower level classes and two high-level classes were randomly selected to serve as the subjects.

3.4. Data Analysis

Data collection was conducted by the author, with the assistance of several English teachers in Payam e Noor University, Borazjan, Iran. A vocabulary learning strategy questionnaire was distributed to the participating students during their regular English classes at the beginning of the fall semester. The researcher then conducted a series of statistical analyses on the collected data by using the Statistical Packages for the Social Science (SPSS). One way ANOVA was performed to examine the significance of differences among the three ability groups. Results were considered statistically significant at .05 level.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Students' Vocabulary Strategy Use

One of the purposes of this study is to investigate how the students learn and memorizes vocabulary. The results of the study reveals that the most popular vocabulary learning strategy is looking up words in a dictionary, followed by vocabulary application in daily life, mental lexicon, contextual clues, key words methods, and associations.

4.2. Extracurricular vocabulary learning activities & Vocabulary strategies use

Table 1 indicates that proficient learners were much more devoted to extracurricular self-initiated vocabulary learning activities than the less proficient learners. The most popular self-initiated vocabulary learning activities were watching English TV programs, whereas listening to English radio programs, reading English newspaper or books and playing computer games in English were also popular activities. Proficient learners participated in a wide range of learning activities than did less proficient learners. Nevertheless, it is surprising to find that respondents rarely participated in Internet vocabulary learning activities.

Table 1. Extracurricular vocabulary learning activities

| Rank of order | Self-initiated vocabulary learning activities | Average Frequency of participation | P ^a |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1 | Watch TV programs, movies in English | Medium to High (M=3.95) | .009* |
| 2 | Listen to English programs on the radio | Low to Medium (M=2.94) | .001* |
| 3 | Read English newspaper and magazines regularly | Low to Medium (M=2.96) | .009* |
| 4 | Play computer games in English | Low to Medium (M=2.83) | ---- |
| 5 | Internet vocabulary learning activities | Low(M=2.37) | ---- |

a: when p-value < 0.005, that means there is a significant difference among these three levels students.

4.3. Factors Affecting Vocabulary Strategy Use

4.3.1. Motivation & Language Proficiency

Nearly ninety percent of the respondents express that the most important reason for learning English is to pass the examination in the classes. Generally speaking, these subjects participating in this study didn't have stronger motivation for learning English. Results of the study show that students with stronger motivation participated in self-initiated learning

activities than did the less motivated. Table 2 presents the information that learning motivation is found to be the paramount factor for affecting the use of vocabulary learning strategies, followed by family involvement, language proficiency, years of study, and effort.

Table 2: Significant F-Tests of Background variables on Vocabulary Strategy Variables

| Dependent variables | Independent Variables | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | Motivation | Effort | Year | LP | FI |
| Strategy 1 | F=6.40 | F=3.85 | F=6.435 | ----- | F=5.37 |
| Strategy 2 | ----- | ---- | ----- | ----- | ---- |
| Strategy 3 | F=22.8 | ----- | | F=4.927 | F=13.24 |
| Strategy 4 | F=15.36 | ----- | | F=5.747 | F=6.42 |
| Strategy 5 | F=12.57 | ----- | ----- | F=4.872----- | F=7.31 |
| Strategy 6 | F=14.40 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ---- |

- Strategy 1 represents instantly review ; strategy 2 represents mental lexicon;
- strategy 3 represents daily Application; strategy 4 represents contextual clues; strategy 5 represents key words method; strategy 6 represents association.
- Only significant F-values are shown in this table. $P < .005$
- Effort = Time spent in learning English, Year =years of English study, LP=Language proficiency
FI= Family involvement

4.3.2. Effort

Table 2 indicates that the degree to which students spent their time and effort in learning English just didn't make a significant effect on the vocabulary strategy use. The results also reveal that the students who reported spending much time in learning English didn't use vocabulary learning strategy more frequently than those spending less effort.

4.3.3. Family background

According to the results of the study, motivation had a paramount effect on vocabulary learning strategy use, followed by family tutors, language proficiency, years of study and effort. Generally speaking, proficient learners had family members tutoring them than did less proficient learners. Moreover, they made better use of vocabulary learning strategy than the less proficient learners. Another finding is that the relationship between years of study and vocabulary strategy use for language learners didn't have a significant difference. In addition, proficient learners participated in a wider range of self-initiated learning activities than do the less proficient.

5. Conclusion

To conclude the discussion of the findings, some implications that revealed from this study will be outlined. The analyses of the data show that motivation, self-initiated learning activities and several other factors definitely have an important impact on vocabulary learning strategies. It will be discussed in the followings.

As suggested in literature, motivation plays an important role while learning a second language. Motivation is the most significant factor for learning the second language because it determines the extent of the learners' active involvement and attitude toward leaning. The respondents with high motivation used vocabulary learning strategies more often than did the less motivated. Moreover, proficient learners devoted much time to participate in

extracurricular learning activities. The data from this case study showed that most of the subjects participating in this study didn't have high learning motivation as we expected. The low learning motivation definitely has a negative effect on students' language proficiency. Instructional strategies to enhance student motivation will be an important task for English teachers. They should design learning activities focusing on the accuracy and appropriateness of application in various contexts of use, and learners must be given opportunities to participate as languages users. Then, motivation for learning vocabulary will be enhanced.

Another important factor affecting students' use of vocabulary learning strategies is family background. Family involvement plays an important role in foreign language learning. Proficient learners had more family members tutoring them in English than did less proficient learners. The results of the study indicated that those who have family members tutoring them in English made use of vocabulary learning strategies than did the less proficient learners. In addition, proficient learners were good at using vocabulary learning strategies with high motivation than the less proficient learners. They often participated in self-initiated learning activities for the vocabulary acquisition. Moreover, the years of learning English didn't show a significant impact on vocabulary strategy use. The training for the vocabulary learning can motivate both the proficient learners and less proficient learners. Careful analysis of students' need, personalized instruction, providing practice in using vocabulary strategies, and a variety of vocabulary strategies should be woven into the regular classroom activities. In conclusion, motivation and family background are the main factors for affecting not only academic achievement, foreign language proficiency, but also vocabulary learning strategy. Though learners' family background can't be changed by English teachers or educational practitioners, they can provide authentic materials, and set up good language learning policy to enhance students' learning motivation.

References

- Al Shalabi, M. F., & Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2009). Personality theory and TESOL. *Journal on Educational Psychology*, 3(1), 14-22.
- Blake, J. (1989). *Family size and achievement*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Carroll, J. B. (1990). *Cognitive abilities in foreign language aptitude: Then and now*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regent.
- Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annuals*, 22, 13-14.
- Checchi, D. (2006). *The economics of education: Human capital, family background and inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clece-Murica, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course*. Cambridge: New Bury House.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Longman.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13(4), 266-272.
- Gardner, R. C., & Symthe, P. C. (1982). On the development of the attitudes/motivation test battery. *Canadian Modern Journal of Behavioral Science*, 22, 254-270.

- Gardner, R. C. (2001). Language learning motivation: The student, the teacher, and the researcher. *ERIC Digest* (464495).
- Hsieh, L. T. (1997). Teaching English vocabulary and reading in an EFL reading classroom. *Bulletin of Institute of National Pingtung Commerce*, 5, 221-240.
- Laufer, B., & Nation, P. (1995). Vocabulary size and use: Lexical richness in L2 written production. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 307-322.
- Leki, I., & Carson, J. G. (1994). Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 81-101.
- Leleoup, J. W. (2000). Enhancing authentic language learning experiences through Internet. *ERIC Digest*.
- Lessard-Clouston, M. (1996). Vocabulary and the ESL/EFL curriculum. *TESL Reporter*, 29, 2.
- Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Nemati, M., Salmani Nodoushan, M. A., & Ashrafzadeh, A. (2010). Learning strategies in proficient and less proficient readers in medicine. *Journal on Educational Psychology*, 4(2), 19-32.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisitions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R., & Crookall, D. (1990). Vocabulary learning: A critical analysis of techniques. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7, 9-30.
- Oxford, R. (1989). *The role of styles and strategies in second language learning*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. Washington: DC.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies. What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Publishers.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 41-51.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2002). *Text-familiarity, reading tasks and ESP test performance: A study on Iranian LEP and Non-LEP university students*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2003). *Text-familiarity, reading tasks and ESP test performance: A study on Iranian LEP and Non-LEP university students*. *The Reading Matrix*, 3(1), online.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2006). Does field independence relate to performance on communicative language tests? *Journal of Educational Technology*, 3(3), 79-85.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2007a). Are task type and text familiarity predictors of performance on tests of English for specific purposes? *Asian ESP Journal*, 3(1), 67-96.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2007b). Is Field Dependence or Independence a Predictor of EFL Reading Performance? *TESL Canada Journal*, 24(2), 82-108.

- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2007c). Thinking on the write path. *Training Journal*, May 2007, 37-40.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2007d). On adopting a cognitive orientation in EFL writing classroom. *Journal on Educational Psychology*, 1(1), 15-18.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2007e). Is text cohesion a precursor to reading success? *Journal of Educational Technology*, 3(4), 87-91.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2008c). The role of metacognition in the language teaching profession. *Journal on Educational Psychology*, 2(1), 1-9.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2009a). The Shaffer-Gee perspective: Can epistemic games serve education? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(6), 897-901.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2009b). Is EFL study major a predictor of language achievement. *The Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(3), 182-193.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2010c). The impact of formal schemata on L3 reading recall. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 4(4), 357-372.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2011). Temperament as an indicator of language achievement. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 5(4), 33-52.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2012a). Self-regulated learning (SRL): Emergence of the RSRLM model. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 6(3), 1-16.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2012b). The impact of locus of control on language achievement. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 6(2), 123-136.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2014). Cognitive versus learning styles: Emergence of the Ideal Education Model (IEM). *Journal on Educational Psychology*, 8(2), 31-39.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2015). Anxiety as it pertains to EFL writing ability and performance. *Journal on Educational Psychology*, 8(4), 1-12.
- Salmani Nodoushan, M. A. (2016). Working on the 'write' path: Improving EFL students' argumentative-writing performance through L1-mediated structural cognitive modification. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 10(4), 131-152.
- Schmitt, N., & Meara, P. (1997). Researching vocabulary through a word knowledge framework: Word association and verbal suffixes. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 17-36.
- Stern, H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31 (4), 304-318.
- Stevick, E. (1976). *Memory, meaning and method*. Newbury House,
- Rowley, S. J., Sewell, W. H., & Shah, V. P. (1967). Socioeconomic status, intelligence and the attainment of higher education. *Sociology of Education*, 34, 82-92.
- Tyacke, M., & Mendelsohn, D. (1986). Student needs: Cognitive as well as communicative. *TESL Canada Journal, Special Issue 1*, 171-183.

Appendix A

Vocabulary Learning Questionnaire

A: Background Information

1. Birth Year _____
2. Department _____
3. Years for learning English _____
4. Who can teach you English at home? (You can choose more than one answer)
 1. grandfather 2. grandmother 3. Mother 4. father 5. Brother 6. sister 7. Brother
 9. Nobody 10. Others (please name): _____

B: Please answer the following questions with a Likert scale.

(5 Strongly agree 4 Agree 3 Moderate 2 Disagree 1 Strongly disagree)

1. I often watch TV programs in English.
2. I often listen to English programs on the radio.
3. I often read English newspaper and magazine regularly
4. I often play computers games in English.
5. I often participate in online vocabulary learning activities.
6. I often spend a lot of time studying English. (more than one hour per day)
7. I often review English vocabulary instantly right after classes
8. I often memorize vocabulary by key word methods.
9. I often memorize vocabulary by mental lexicon.
10. I often memorize vocabulary by associations.
11. I often recognize vocabulary by context clues.
12. I often apply English vocabulary into daily lives.