

# TASK- BASED VOCABULARY LEARNING IN ADVANCED EFL LEARNERS OF PERSIAN

Fariba Rahimi Esfahani

Department of English, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran.

Rahimi\_Fariba@yahoo.com

**Abstract—** This paper investigated the effects of receptive and/or productive tasks on vocabulary gains. To achieve this end, a quick Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was administered to the senior students population studying English teaching at Khorasgan Azad university, and based on their OPT scores, four advanced classes were randomly grouped as receptive, productive, mixed task and control groups. Fifteen target words were explicitly taught and practiced with receptive, productive, or mixed tasks. The groups were tested on receptive and productive tests before, immediately after, and 4 weeks after the applications of words.

The results within groups revealed that all groups showed a statistically significant increase in their scores both in receptive and productive parts from pre tests to post tests. With regard to receptive tests, no significant decrease was observed in task groups from immediate to delayed post test. In the productive tests, on the other hand, although receptive task group was able to retain its

gains from immediate to delayed post test, there was a significant decrease in the other groups over time.

The present study also examined the receptive and productive vocabulary gains between groups to find out whether there was a significant difference in students' receptive and productive vocabulary gains among the groups. Both in the receptive and productive tests, all groups receiving tasks (receptive, productive or mixed) significantly outperformed the control group. However, on no account were there significant differences between the groups which received different tasks, which may show that none of the tasks (receptive, productive or mixed) was better than the other to increase receptive or productive vocabulary gains. The results of this study can benefit teachers and students to become aware of the merits and demerits of vocabulary learning tasks.

**Keywords—** receptive learning, productive learning, EFL (English as a Foreign Language)

## I. INTRODUCTION

### *L2 Vocabulary Knowledge*

Vocabulary knowledge is an essential part of literacy skills (Pulido & Hambrick, 2008). Understanding the vocabulary knowledge and its development process contributes to the understanding of how second language (L2) learners process and produce the language. The research into vocabulary development in size (Laufer, 1998; Laufer & Goldstein, 2004; Webb 2008), depth (Pigada & Schmitt, 2006; Waring, 2002) and receptive to productive use (Laufer &

Nation, 1995) has shown that the development on vocabulary knowledge is an incremental process. In fact, knowing a word involves understanding of numerous aspects of the vocabulary knowledge which is a multidimensional and complex construct (Henriksen, 1999; Nation 2001; Read 2000).

According to Henriksen (1999), the construct of lexical competence should consist of three dimensions: a "partial-precise knowledge" dimension in which levels of knowledge equal to different levels of word comprehension, a "depth of knowledge" dimension which also covers knowledge components identified in the vocabulary depth dimension discussed above (e.g., Qian, 1999; Qian & Schedl, 2004), and a "receptive-productive" dimension which concerns how well a learner can access and use a word. According to Henriksen (1999), when learners cannot use a word correctly or cannot access it freely for production it does not mean that they do not "know" the word; but they have not yet achieved adequate control over word access. The receptive and productive dimension of lexical knowledge is "a bridging dimension between lexical competence and performance" (Zareva et al., 2005:570).

Therefore, With regard to the acquisition of L2 vocabulary knowledge and its use, on the other hand, we also need to distinguish between receptive (passive) and productive (active) vocabulary knowledge, since these types of lexical knowledge – receptive vs. productive - require different amounts of learning time, different effects on vocabulary acquisition, and different learning methods (Laufer & Paribakht, 1998; Nation, 2001; Mondria & Wiersma, 2004; Webb, 2005).

### *Receptive vs. Productive Vocabulary Knowledge*

Up to now, many scholars have made definitions from different perspectives for receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. "Receptive knowledge" is defined as "being able to understand a word" (Schmitt; 2000); and it includes words which can be understood or recognized as individuals can assign their meanings while listening or reading (sometimes imperfectly) and which are also less well-known and less frequent in use and not used spontaneously (Hiebert & Kamil, 2005); it is the ability to perceive the form of the word and to retrieve its meaning(s) (Laufer & Goldstein, 2004); it entails

going from the form of a word to its meaning (Nation; 2001); it is the knowledge of the meaning of an L2 word; prototypically, being able to translate a word from L2 to L1 (Mondria & Wiersma, 2004); and it refers to the ability of the learners to understand a word's meaning (Read; 2000 cited in Uygun,2009).

In regard to productive vocabulary knowledge, it includes the production of a word of "one's own accord" (Schmitt; 2000:4); it refers to words that can be written or spoken frequently without hesitation as they are well-known and familiar (Hiebert & Kamil; 2005); it requires retrieving the appropriate spoken or written word form of the meaning to be expressed (Laufer & Goldstein; 2004); it includes being able to express a concept by means of an L2 word; prototypically, being able to translate a word from L1 to L2 (Mondria & Wiersma, 2004), and it also refers to eliciting the target word from one's memory with some stimulus (Read, 2000).

## II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Since vocabulary knowledge has been found to be related to many aspects of learning a foreign language, and both receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge are important for our context, what should be done to enhance vocabulary gains in language classes is a crucial question needed to be answered. Despite its importance, only few studies focus on the effects of receptive and productive tasks, and they reveal contradicting results. In addition, the researcher hasn't found any studies which compare receptive, productive, mixed (receptive+productive) tasks for the development of receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge.

## III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To investigate the impact of lexical learning tasks (productive vs. receptive, the following research questions were put forward. The groups were named as "receptive task group", "productive task group", "mixed task group" and "control group" according to the tasks they received.

1. Do groups receiving receptive, productive, and mixed tasks respectively and the control group differ within themselves in terms of receptive and productive vocabulary gains of the students?

2. Are there any significant differences in the students' receptive vocabulary gains among the groups from pre-test to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post test?

3. Are there any significant differences in the students' productive vocabulary gains among the groups from pre-test to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post test?

4. Do the groups differ in receptive and productive vocabulary gains when the delayed post test( retention test) is applied four weeks after dealing with the words?

## IV. METHODOLOGY

### A. Participants

The participants in this experiment were eighty Iranian EFL learners, 37 males and 43 females (approximately 20 to 25 years old) at Khorasgan Azad University. The participants were advanced level students as determined by the Quick Placement Test. Subjects whose scores ranged from 50 to 57 were regarded as advanced group. The subjects were in four intact groups which were assigned randomly to a control group and three experimental groups: receptive task group, productive task group, and mixed task group.

All the groups received explicit vocabulary teaching. After the teaching part, receptive task group received receptive tasks, productive task group received productive tasks, mixed task group receive both receptive and productive tasks, and control group did not receive any of them. The treatment in all groups was carried out by the researcher.

### B. Material

A quick OPT was used in this study to determine the level of proficiency of potential subjects. 15 target words (9 nouns and 6 verbs) were chosen from Nation's BNC list at 10<sup>th</sup> level of frequency. The number of target words was determined during pilot studies. The target words consisted of 8 nouns and 7 verbs because nouns and verbs are the most common parts of speech found in natural texts (Webb, 2005). Moreover, To measure the effects of different tasks on vocabulary gains, each group was given the same test as pre-test, immediate post-test, and four-week delayed post-test . All the tests were same except for the order of the items so as to prevent the test gain effects.

## V. DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

A quasi-experimental pre-post test design was carried out with randomly assigned treatment and control groups. The subjects were in four intact groups which were assigned randomly to a control group and three experimental groups: receptive task group, productive task group, and mixed task group. All the groups received explicit vocabulary teaching. After the teaching part, receptive task group received receptive tasks, productive task group received productive tasks, mixed task group receive both receptive and productive tasks, and control group did not receive any of them. Receptive tasks consisted of three different activities. The first one was a matching activity. The target words were matched with their definitions. The second receptive task was a multiple-choice task consisted of 17 sentences to be completed with the target words choosing one of the options below each sentence. The final part was designed as an odd one out task. Productive tasks, just like receptive ones, consisted of three various activities. The first task was a 'finding the word' task. The students were given the L2 definitions and were supposed to provide the correct target word for each definition. The second

productive task was a fill in the blank task. Students were required to fill in the blanks in 17 sentences with the target words from memory. The third part of the productive tasks included reconstruction of the target words. Receptive and productive tasks together were designed as mixed tasks for the third group of students. The matching task of the receptive task group and reconstructing the words task of the productive task group were taken as they are. Half of the multiple-choice part of the receptive tasks and half of the fill in the blanks part of the productive tasks were taken to form the last group. To measure the effects of different tasks on vocabulary gains, each group was given the same test as pre-test, immediate post-test, and four-week delayed post-test. All the tests were same except for the order of the items so as to prevent the test gain effects. The results of the groups were compared to determine how different learning tasks contributed to students' vocabulary retention.

## VI. RESULTS

To determine whether there were any overall differences among the treatment groups and the control group, the following steps were done:

1. All groups, within themselves, were investigated to learn their gains from the tasks they received by using one way ANOVA for repeated measures. Students' test scores from pre-test to immediate post-test, from immediate post-test to delayed post-test, from pre-test to delayed post-test were compared.

2. Two way ANOVA for mixed measures were conducted to examine students' receptive and productive vocabulary gains between groups from pre-test to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post test.

### A. Within Group Differences in terms of Vocabulary Gains

In this part, receptive and productive vocabulary gains of the students in each group were scrutinized within themselves to see what differences came out in each group from pre-test to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post test. In order to find out whether there was a significant difference in general among the test intervals applied to each group, one way ANOVA for repeated measures was used. Following that, pairwise comparisons were administered to determine between which test intervals this difference stemmed from.

Tables 6.1 illustrates the results of one way ANOVA for repeated measures and pairwise comparisons on the differences of receptive and productive parts' scores on the tests applied to all groups at three different intervals. The results will be analyzed considering the research questions.

**Table 5.1 Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of the Groups, One way ANOVA Results and Pairwise Comparisons**

Groups	Part of Tests	Pre-test		Immediate Post-test		Delayed post-test		ANOVA for Repeated Measures		Pairwise Comparisons		
		mean	sd	mean	sd	mean	sd	f	p	Pretest-Immediate Post-test	Pretest-Delayed posttest	Immediate Posttest-Delayed posttest
										p	p	p
receptive	receptive	0.45	0.72	18.87	1.34	18.74	3.45	239.23	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*	0.885
(n=31)	productive	0.00	0.45	16.00	1.56	15.50	4.36	134.33	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*	0.885
productive	receptive	0.56	0.00	18.95	1.83	18.48	2.54	245.67	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*	0.937
(n=29)	productive	0.00	0.62	17.50	1.07	16.45	2.67	244.78	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*
mixed	receptive	0.43	0.00	19.55	0.9	19.35	2.56	554.89	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*	0.114
(n=32)	productive	0.03	0.17	17.00	2.28	16.12	3.68	235.66	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*	0.554
control	receptive	0.55	0.69	14.50	2.23	13.69	5.66	65.985	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*	0.003
(n=31)	productive	0.45	0.79	12.00	0.78	8.67	3.77	32.345	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*	0.036

### B. Vocabulary Gains within the Receptive Task Group

In order to answer whether there were any significant differences in the students' receptive and productive vocabulary gains within 'the receptive task group' from pre-test to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post-test, the group's scores in the tests were investigated.

As seen in Table 5.1, the group's mean scores in the receptive parts of pre test, immediate and delayed post tests were respectively 0.45, 18.87, 18.74. The results revealed that the group increased its scores after the treatments. Receptive test score differences of the receptive task group was found to be significant (Table 5.1) [(F(2-62)=239.23 p=0.000\*) which means the scores of the receptive task group changed significantly depending on the tests applied at different intervals. As seen in Table 5.1, when the receptive part scores of the receptive task group were compared, their post test scores (both immediate and delayed) were significantly different and better than their pre-test scores

(p=0.000\*). Although the group's mean scores decreased slightly in the delayed post-tests for both word groups, no significant differences between immediate and delayed post-tests were revealed (p=0.885).

The same analyses were performed on the productive parts of the tests to explore whether there were differences in

the scores of receptive task group's productive tests obtained at different intervals. As illustrated in Table 5.1, students' mean scores in the productive part in the same order

were 0.00, 16.00, 15.50 . The mean scores of the group revealed to have increased after the treatments.

As summarized in Table 5.1, the results of the receptive task group in productive tests applied at different intervals (as pre-test, immediate and delayed post tests) indicate a significant difference [(F(2- 62)=134.33 p=0,000\*). In other words, the scores of the receptive task group differed significantly according to the tests applied at different intervals. Similar to the results gained in the receptive parts of the tests, the immediate and delayed post-test scores of the receptive task group were significantly different and better than their pre-test scores for (p=0,000). There is also a slight decline from the immediate post-tests to the delayed post-test, but the differences were not statistically significant (p=0,885).

#### *C. Vocabulary Gains within the Productive Task Group*

To see whether there were any significant differences in the students' receptive and productive vocabulary gains within 'the productive task group' from pre-test to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post-test, the group's scores were investigated.

As seen in Table 5.1, the productive task group's mean scores in the receptive parts of the pre test, immediate and delayed post tests were 0.56, 18.95, 18.48. It can be said that the scores of the productive task group increased after the treatments. The results for the productive task group in the receptive parts of the tests with both word sets revealed a significant difference in the tests conducted at three different intervals [(F(2-64)=245,67 p=0,000\*) That is, the scores of the productive task group varied with regard to the intervals of the tests. As illustrated in Table 5.1, the comparison of the receptive test scores for the productive task group revealed that their immediate and delayed post-test scores were significantly different and better than their pre-test scores (p=0.000). Despite the slight decrease in the group's mean scores in the delayed post-tests, the difference between immediate and delayed post-tests was not significant (p=0.937)

The same analyses were conducted on the productive parts of the tests to explore whether productive test scores of the productive task group were statistically different or not. As seen in Table 5.1, the group's mean scores on the productive tests were respectively 0.00, 17.50, 16.45.

The results revealed the tests conducted at different intervals created a difference in the

scores of the productive parts of the tests [(F(2-64)=244,78 p=0,000\*) .

As summarized in Table 5.1, the comparison of the scores for the productive task group in the productive parts of the tests disclosed that their immediate and delayed post-test scores were significantly different and better than their pre-test scores (p=0.000\*). However, a significant decrease in the

productive task group's scores from immediate to delayed post tests was observed, and this revealed a significant amount of forgetting for the productive task group over time [(p=0,000\*)

#### *D. Vocabulary Gains within the Mixed Task Group*

To be able to understand whether there were any significant differences in the students' receptive and productive vocabulary gains within 'the mixed task group' from pre-test to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post-test, the group's scores were investigated.

As seen in Table 5.1, the groups' receptive part scores were 0.43, 19.55, 19.35. Just looking at the scores the mixed task group received in all tests, one can infer that the group increased its scores after the treatments. When investigated to find out whether these differences in the scores of the mixed task group's receptive tests applied at different intervals were statistically significant or not, the results for the mixed task group in the receptive parts of the tests revealed a significant difference in the tests conducted at three different intervals (F(2-62)=554,89 p=0,000\*). In other words, the scores of the mixed task group diverged according to the intervals of the tests. As seen in Table 5.1, when the scores of the mixed task group were inquired, their immediate and delayed post-test scores were identified to be significantly different and better than their pre-test scores (p=0,000\*). Even though the group's mean scores in the delayed post-tests decreased slightly, the difference between immediate and delayed post-tests was not significant (p=0,114)

To question whether the scores of the mixed task group's productive tests applied at different intervals were statistically different or not, the same analyses were conducted on the productive parts of the tests . The group's productive part scores were 0.03, 17.00, 16.12 . The scores of the group highlighted an increase in the mean scores after the treatments. When the results of the group were investigated, the scores of the mixed task group changed significantly depending on the tests applied at different intervals [(F(2-64)=235, 66p=0,000\*). As presented in Table 5.1, a closer analysis of the results emphasized that the mixed task group's immediate and delayed post-test scores were significantly different and better than their pre-test scores (p=0.000). Though there was a decrease in the grades between the immediate and delayed post test scores the difference was not statistically significant (p=0,554).

#### *E. Vocabulary Gains within the Control Group*

To investigate whether there were any significant differences in the students' receptive and productive vocabulary gains within 'the control group from pre-test to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post-test, the group's scores were studied.



As given in Table 5.1, the control group's mean scores in receptive part of the tests were respectively 0.55, 14.50, 13.69. An increase in the receptive scores in the control group's mean scores after the treatments was obvious just like the task groups' even though the group did not deal with any tasks. Moreover, the results identified a significant difference for the control group in the receptive parts of the tests administered at three different intervals [ $F(2-56)=65.985$ ,  $p=0.000^*$ ]. Also, the immediate and delayed post-test scores for the control group were identified to be significantly different and better than their pre-test scores ( $p=0.000^*$ ). On the other hand, there was a statistically significant decrease in the delayed post-test scores of the group when compared to their immediate post-test scores, which refers to a significant amount of forgetting in the receptive parts of the tests ( $p=0.003^*$ ).

In order to research whether the scores of the control group's productive tests applied at different intervals were statistically different or not, the same analyses were conducted on the productive parts of the tests. As given in Table 5.1, the group's mean scores were 0.45, 12.00, 8.67. Depending on the scores, it can be said that the control group increased its productive scores as other groups despite receiving no tasks. As seen in Table 5.1, the results indicated that the tests administered at different intervals brought a difference in the scores of the productive parts of the tests ( $F(2-56)=32.345$ ,  $p=0.000^*$ ).

This means the productive scores of the control group differed according to the intervals of the tests. When the productive parts of the tests were analyzed further, the group's immediate and delayed post-test scores were found to be significantly different and better than their pre-test scores ( $p=0.000^*$ ). However, a significant decrease was observed from immediate post-test to delayed post-test in the control group both ( $p=0.036^*$ ) which refers to a significant amount of forgetting over time in the productive parts of the test for the control group.

## VII. BETWEEN GROUP DIFFERENCES IN TERMS OF VOCABULARY GAINS

### A. Between-Group Differences in the Receptive Parts of the Tests

In this part, receptive vocabulary gains of the students in each group from pre-test to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post-test were examined between groups. Two way ANOVA for mixed measures was conducted to find out whether there were significant differences in the scores of the groups from pre-test to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post test. Then, to investigate among which groups these differences stemmed from, a Tukey HSD

test was conducted. Table 6.1 presents between-group comparisons in the receptive parts of the tests.

Table 6.1. Between-Group Comparisons in the Receptive Parts of the Tests

Groups	Tukey HSD Test			
	Receptive	Productive	Mixed	Control
Receptive		0.258 ( $p=0.99$ )	0.107 ( $p=0.051$ )	5.734* ( $p=0.00$ )
Productive			-1.835 ( $p=0.233$ )	4.676* ( $p=0.00$ )
Mixed				5.987* ( $p=0.00$ )
Control				

$P^* < 0.05$

The investigation of the groups revealed that the receptive, productive and mixed task groups were significantly different from control group ( $p=0.000^*$ ). Although the mixed task group received better scores than the receptive and productive task groups, these differences were not statistically significant [ $(p=0.051)$ for rec. ( $p=0.331$ )for pro.]. When the receptive task group was compared to productive task group, the difference was extremely slight; in other words, these two groups were almost equal in the receptive part of the delayed post test (retention test) ( $p=0.99$ ). It means that different tasks had different roles on the receptive part scores of the students.

### B. Between-Group Differences in Productive Parts of the Tests

Productive vocabulary gains of the students in each group from pre-test to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post-test were examined between groups and explained in this part. Similarly, two way ANOVA for mixed measures was conducted to find out whether there were significant differences in the scores of the groups from pretest to immediate post-test, immediate post-test to delayed post-test and pre test to delayed post test. Then, to investigate among which groups these differences stemmed from, a Tukey HSD test was conducted. Table 6.2 presents between-group comparisons in the productive parts of the tests.

Table 6.2. Between-Group Comparisons in the Productive Parts of the Tests

Groups	Tukey HSD Test			
	Receptive	Productive	Mixed	Control
Receptive		-1.205 (p=0.523)	-0.875 (p=0.563)	8.657* (p=0.000)
Productive			0.317 (p=0.873)	9.879* (p=0.00)
Mixed				9.356* (p=0.000)
Control				

p\* < 0.05

What Table 6.2 provides is that there was no significant difference between the task groups. Even though productive task group performed better than receptive task group, this difference was not significant (p=0,523). Similarly, the difference between mixed and receptive task groups was not significant (p=0,563). The groups which received productive tasks (productive task group and mixed task group) were almost same in the productive test scores of the students (p=0,873).

## VIII. DISCUSSION

This study investigated whether receptive and/or productive tasks contribute to receptive and productive gains differently or not. In doing this, the groups receiving receptive, productive mixed and no tasks were investigated among themselves. The results revealed a significant difference between the task groups and control group both in receptive and productive tests. The results indicated no significant difference among the tasks groups, which means receiving only receptive, only productive and both receptive and productive tasks made no significant difference in the receptive and productive vocabulary gains of the students.

Similarly, Waring's (1997) study revealed no significant difference in receptive and productive tests between the groups which received receptive or productive tasks from immediate to delayed post tests.

On the contrary, the results of some studies support one or the other type of tasks. For example, in their study, Hulstijn and Laufer (2001) gave receptive task group a text and a set of ten multiple choice comprehension questions. Target words were glossed in L1 in the margins of the text. The second group receiving reading plus fill-in task received the same text and same questions, but the target words were deleted from the text. They were asked to fill in the blanks with 15 words 5 of which were distractors with their L1 translations. The third group, composition writing task group, was given target words with explanations and examples of usages and was asked to write a composition with the target words. The results showed that productive tasks were better for receptive vocabulary gains.

Mondria & Wiersma (2004) argued that receptive tasks were good for receptive vocabulary gains, and productive tasks were good for productive vocabulary gains. They found it by

giving learners L2 to L1 translations as receptive, L1 to L2 translations as productive tasks. Then,

students were tested again on translation tests.

Similarly, Choi (2007) revealed that receptive tasks were better both in receptive and productive gains than productive tasks. To do so, Choi gave reading in glossed sentences as receptive tasks, and sentence writing as productive tasks. At the end, students were tested on translation tests. Barcroft (2004; 2006) indicated receptive tasks were better for receptive gains. Barcroft gave words with pictures as receptive (2004; 2006), and sentence writing (2004), word writing (2006) as productive tasks, and tested students on a receptive test, recall from pictures.

What is common in these studies investigated is the fact that none of them included explicit teaching of the target words. They gave tasks to students and let them study the target words on their own, and then they tested the students. Apart from the differences in the teaching part, the difference between the current study and the others lies in the differences in the tasks. While most of the studies mentioned above used L2 and L1 equivalents of the words for receptive and L1 to L2 equivalents of the words as productive tasks, translation methods were not preferred in this study because these types of tasks requiring shallower processing were found to yield less retrieval (Sagarrá & Alba, 2006). Instead, the target words were presented in sentences following the steps of vocabulary teaching (Harmer, 1991, 2003) due to the positive effects of explicit instruction on learners' vocabulary development (Morimoto & Loewen, 2007).

The scores the control group received in this study proved that tasks contribute to receptive and productive gains significantly. No matter which task type was preferred after explicit vocabulary instruction, it contributed to receptive and productive gains significantly. However, when the task groups were investigated within themselves for their productive gains, the receptive task group was the only group which was able to retain its productive vocabulary knowledge in four weeks. While the gains of the other task groups receiving productive and mixed tasks faded significantly in time, receptive task group was able to yield significantly superior retention. The reason behind that could be the group might have been able to focus on the features related to the target word's form to a greater extent because their attention was not divided into conceptualizing, producing, and monitoring production (Choi, 2007) as it would have been for the productive and mixed task groups. In other words, while only processing and evaluating input could be enough to complete the receptive tasks, greater amount of different types of processing, which included both semantic and structural elaboration as well as meta-cognitive strategies such as planning and monitoring could be necessary for the completion of the productive tasks (Choi, 2007). In this way, the receptive task group might have consumed less attentional resources than the groups receiving productive tasks, and they may have invested more mental effort to the formal prosperities of the target words.

The negative role of forced output at the initial stage of learning can be a reason why the task groups receiving productive tasks (productive and mixed task groups) decreased their productive gains significantly in delayed post tests. As Barcroft (2004; 2006) suggests, forcing output during the initial stages of learning could exhaust learners' processing resources, resulting in decreased rates of learning.

According to Barcroft (2004), when new L2 words are presented to learners, they must allocate processing resources to complete dual tasks: encoding new L2 word forms as well as encoding form-meaning mapping. The mental effort required for the simultaneous completion of these two processing operations during forced output tasks can exhaust learners' processing resources, resulting in decreased rates of learning. In the current study, receptive task group was spending time and effort only for recognition while productive and mixed task groups were trying to produce target words in mind to complete the tasks, which might cause the groups receiving productive tasks learn in decreased rates compared to the receptive task group.

#### REFERENCES

- Barcoft, J. (2004). Effects of sentence writing in second language lexical acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 20(4), 303-334.
- Barcoft, J. (2006). Can writing a new word detract from learning it? More negative effects of forced output during vocabulary learning. *Second Language Research*, 22(4), 487-497.
- Choi, J. (2007). *The effect of receptive and productive tasks on lexical knowledge development*. Unpublished MA dissertation, Michigan State University.
- Henriksen, B. (1999). Three dimensions of vocabulary development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 303-317.
- Hulstijn, J. & Laufer, B. (2001). Some empirical evidence for the involvement load hypothesis in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*, 51( 3), 539-558.
- Kamil, M., & Hiebert, E. H. (2005). Teaching and Learning Vocabulary: Perspectives and Persistent Issues. In P. Kamil, M. & Hiebert, E. H. (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary Bringing Research to Practice* (1-23). New Jersey, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Laufer, B. & Nation, P., (1995). Vocabulary Size and Use: Lexical richness in L2 written production. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(3), 307-322.
- Laufer, B. & Paribakht, T.S. (1998). The relationship between passive and active vocabularies: effects of language learning context. *Language Learning*, 48 ( 3), 365-39t.
- Mondria, J. & Wiersma, B. (2004). Receptive, productive, and receptive + productive L2 vocabulary learning: What difference does it make?, In P. Bogaard & B. Laufer ( Eds.) *Vocabulary in a second language*, (pp. 79 – 100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Morimoto, S., Loewen, S. (2007). A Comparison of the effects of image-schemabased instruction and translation-based instruction on the acquisition of L2 polysemous words. *Language Teaching Research*, 11,3, 347-372.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Pigada, M., & Schmitt, N. (2006). Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading: A case study. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 18(1), 1-28.
- Pulido, D. & Hambrick, D.Z. ( 2008). The virtuous circle: Modeling individual differences in L2 reading and vocabulary development. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 20(2), 164-190.
- Qian, D. D. & Schedl, M. (2004). Evaluation of an in-depth vocabulary knowledge measure for assessing reading performance. *Language Testing*, 21, 28-52.
- Read, J. (2000). *Assessing vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. UK.
- Sagara, N., & Alba, M. (2006). The Key is in the Keyword: L2 Vocabulary Learning Methods with Beginning Learners of Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90:2, 228-243.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching* . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Waring, R. (1997). A comparison of the receptive and productive vocabulary sizes of some second language learners. *Immaculata (Notre Dame Seishin University, Okayama)*, 1, 53-68.
- Waring, R.( 2002). Scales of vocabulary knowledge in second language vocabulary assessment. *The occasional papers of Notre Dame Seishin, Kiyo*. Retrieved May 29, 2011 from <http://www1.harenet.ne.jp/~waring/papers/scales>.
- Webb, S. (2005). Receptive and productive vocabulary learning: The effects of reading and writing on word knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 33-52.
- Webb, S. (2008). The effects of context on incidental vocabulary learning. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 20, 232-245.
- Zareva, A., Schwanenflugel, P., Nikolova, Y. (2005). Relationship Between lexical competence and language proficiency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 567-595.