

## **Involvement Load of Vocabulary Tasks IELTS preparation Vocabulary Course Books**

<sup>1</sup> Maryam Sadeghi Garmaroudi,

English Language Teaching, Payame noor University, Tehran

<sup>2</sup> Mohammad Aghajanzadeh,

Ph.D. Assistant Professor, English Language Department, Payame Noor University,  
Rasht, Gilan, Iran

### **Abstract**

The importance of vocabulary is undeniable. EFL learners need sufficient lexicon in order to be a competitive speaker. Lots of strategies have been proposed. The concept of involvement load was first introduced by Hulstijn and Laufer (2001). They believed that deeper explanation of lexical information will result in better retention of them. The present study aimed at finding the involvement load indexes of vocabulary tasks used in two popular IELTS vocabulary books. It also intended to find the most applied vocabulary learning strategies by IELTS learners. Data were gathered from the intensive analysis of 20 selected task of “Oxford Word Skills” and “Advanced Vocabulary In Use”. Also 50 IELTS candidates were asked to fill a questionnaire. The results showed that books applied a variety of activities. The maximum index was 4 and the minimum was 1. The analysis showed that consolidating was used for the tasks with higher involvement load indexes. Tasks with lower involvement load indexes had other strategies like discovery. Data analysis revealed that learners implied different strategies in learning vocabularies. The most popular strategy was germane to determination strategies, which are clustered under discovery Strategy.

**Keywords:** involvement Load Hypothesis- Involvement Load Index- Vocabulary Learning Strategies

### **Literature**

It is beyond doubt that learning a language involves mastering a great deal of lexicon. In accordance with globalization progresses, English is becoming more important for communicative purposes, like cultural or international exchange. Not needed to mention that, learning English remains a difficulty for almost many learners (Jing & Jianbin, 2009). In order to become proficient learners, students are required to learn thousands of words, even those seldom used in everyday communication

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding address: English Language Teaching, Payame noor University, Tehran. Email Address: maryam.sadeghi.g@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Corresponding address: English Language Department, Payame Noor University, Rasht, Gilan, Iran. . Email Address: teachingutopia@yahoo.com.

(Adler,1991). As Ghorbani and Rahmandoost (2012) mentioned vocabulary is the main component of language proficiency and basis for reading, writing, listening, and speaking skill. Learning new words and using them can be a challenging process and EFL learners cannot achieve their potential without extensive knowledge of vocabulary. One of the main problems that learners encounter with vocabulary learning is that they forget them easily. There are many theories devoted to vocabulary learning.

The concept of involvement load hypothesis has been proposed by Laufer and Hulstijn (2001). In this model, it was tried to draw attention on cognitive (elaboration, attention as well as implicit, and explicit learning) and affective (motivation and need) aspects of L2 learning (Baleghizadeh & Abbasi, 2013). They proposed this notion in order to cover the lack of depth of processing theory operationability (Fatalaki, 2014). According to their theory, second language vocabulary learning, consists of three basic components: need, search, and evaluation. Those Tasks which induce a higher involvement load are more effective than those with lower involvement

Yaqubi, Rayati , and Allemzade (2010) studied the impacts of task types and involvement index on l2 vocabulary acquisition. Their study was built on Laufer and Hulstijn's (2001) motivational cognitive construct of task-induced involvement in learning vocabulary. They first re-examines the effect of processing load and then of task type on the initial learning and retention of words. 60 EFL learners were selected. The participants were assigned to three groups: The first group completed an input-oriented task with an involvement index of three; the second group also completed the same type of task but with an involvement index of two, and the third group completed an output-oriented task with the same involvement load as that of the first group. The comparison of the performance of the groups in the immediate and delayed posttests reveals that contrary to the prediction of the involvement load hypothesis, Task 2 with an involvement index of two was superior to Task 1, which had a higher index. Besides, the participants who had completed the output oriented task (Task 3) outperformed those that did the input-oriented task (Task 1), despite their index equivalency.

In order to remember and learn new data, they should be stored in one's memory. All the newly learned vocabularies and linguistic data stored in long term memory depends on how deeply information has been initially processed, and not on the amount of time those data have been stored in short-term memory ( Craik & Lockhart ,1972). Different ways exist to stick words in mind. The amount of efforts that learners has to spend for a better understanding depends on different things. Over the years, language learning strategies have been attracting the interest of language scholars and educators because of their potential to enhance learning. Lots of approaches had been proposed. The most popular and widely used approaches were the grammar–translation method, the audio–lingual method, and the communicative approach. Although these methods varied widely but they couldn't encourage learners to use many strategies to

promote their use of strategies (Kulikova, 2015). In the grammar–translation and audio–lingual methods, they both emphasized memorization strategies; though in the audio–lingual method learners are discouraged from using strategic learning because of the danger of making errors; in communicative approaches learners are encouraged to take more responsibility for their learning, but still more attention is paid to how teachers teach, than to how learners learn (Griffiths, 2003).

### **Involvement Load Hypothesis**

Hulstijn and Laufer (2001) developed Involvement Load Hypothesis for L2 vocabulary learning. They believed that tasks with different involvement load will lead to different incidental learning. Remembering unfamiliar words is claimed to be depended upon the amount of involvement while processing these words. Shoari and Davatgari Asl (2015) asserted that “Involvement is working by tasks designed to vary in the degree of need, search, and evaluation. The need component is the motivational, and it is considered as a non-cognitive aspect of involvement. Two degrees are considered for need: moderate and strong” (p,5).

According to Hulstijn and Laufer (2001, p.5),” need is moderate when it is imposed by an external force. For example using a word in a sentence that the task has asked for. Need is strong when it is intrinsically motivated, that is, self-imposed by the learners, for instance, by the decision to look up a word in an L1-L2 dictionary when writing a composition”. Both Search and evaluation are cognitive dimensions of involvement, depending upon allocating attention to form-meaning relationships (Schmidt, 1994). Search is the attempt to find the meaning of an unknown L2 word or the attempt to find the L2 word form expressing a concept (e.g. trying to find the L2 translation of an L1 word) by looking up in a dictionary or other sources (e.g. a teacher). Evaluation consists of comparison of a given word with other words, a specific meaning of a word with its other meanings, or comparing the word with other words in order to decide whether a word will fit or not in its context. For example, when a word looked up in a dictionary is a homonym (e.g. bank of a “river”, or bank as a “financial institution”), a decision has to be made about its meaning by comparing all its meanings in specific context and deciding to choose the one that fits best. The kind of evaluation that needs learners to recognize differences between words (as in a fill-in task), or differences between several senses of a word in a given context, is considered as moderate. Evaluation that requires to make decisions about the combination additional words with the new word in an original (as opposed to given) sentence or text is referred to as strong evaluation (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001).

Each of the above mentioned factors can be present or absent in a task. The combination of the factors and their different degree will create involvement load. For example, consider two tasks with different loads. In one of them, the learners are required

to write original sentences with some words and these words are translated or explained by the teacher. The task induces a moderate need (imposed by the teacher), no search (as the words are glossed) and evaluation is strong because the new words are evaluated against suitable collocations in learner-generated context. If we want to describe the task in terms of an involvement index, where absence of a factor is marked as 0, a moderate presence of a factor as 1, and strong presence as 2, then the involvement index of the task is 3 (1+0+2). In task two, the students have to read a text and to answer comprehension questions. New words, which are relevant to the questions, are glossed with L1 equivalence. The task will induce a moderate need to look at the glosses (moderate because it is imposed by the task), but it will induce neither search nor evaluation. Its involvement index is 1. Therefore, task one induces a greater involvement load than task two (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001). It is supposed that task one will have better retention than task two.

Recently, different studies have been conducted and they showed how incidental learning of vocabulary can be enhanced by the use of text-based tasks. Words that their meanings are correctly inferred during a reading task are retained better than words explained by synonyms (Hulstijn, 1992), also words that are looked up in a dictionary during a reading task are remembered better than words that are not looked up (Cho & Krashen, 1994), or than words that are glossed in text margin (Hulstijn, Hollander, & Greidanus, 1996); words that are negotiated during communicative activities are remembered better than non-discussed words (Ellis, Tanaka, & Yazaki, 1994; Newton, 1995). Joe (1995) found that the task demands (specifically, attention, retrieval, and generation) can lead to a higher level of incidental vocabulary learning.

### **Vocabulary learning strategies and ILH**

Vocabulary can be considered to play an important role in learning, understanding, and communicating in a language. It is useful if language learners understand the importance of vocabulary in successful communication and comprehension. Learners should know the goals of learning a language. Learning goals help language teachers in planning lessons and adapting tasks for their students. Goals will result in learning achievement in the target language (Cameron 2001). Also, in vocabulary learning, the main purpose should focus on why language learners particularly learn vocabulary both in isolation and in context. For example, students need to hear a new word in isolation as well as in context, so that they can understand the sounds at the beginning and end, the stress pattern of the word, and the syllables that make up the word. They will need to hear the word spoken in isolation several times to catch all this information (Siriwan, 2007). However, possible objectives of vocabulary teaching and learning have been proposed by different scholars.

Aebersold and Field (1997) believed that three main goals of vocabulary teaching and learning are to help students 1) to know the vocabulary in the text, 2) to recognize vocabulary to make sense of the text, and 3) to consider vocabulary students need to know to function in the L2/FL in the future.

Krashen and Terrell (2000) assert that the goal of vocabulary learning is to provide enough vocabulary to allow language use outside the classroom, and to place the students in a position to continue second language acquisition”.

To sum up, vocabulary can be taught or learned effectively both in context and isolation. Some language teachers have focused on teaching their students to discriminate words. Some teachers tend to encourage their students to be advanced learners or independent learners. Others like to focus on teaching their students an extensive vocabulary stocked with a very large number of unfamiliar words. However, teaching vocabulary all share some common purposes, i.e. assist and guide students in how to learn, remember, and use words.

Mármol and Sánchez (2013) conducted a study on the effects of involvement load hypothesis on primary schools children vocabulary learning. They selected four groups of students in their fifth year of Primary Education worked with a list of English words by means of a different task: reading comprehension with marginal glosses; reading comprehension and gap-filling; writing with marginal glosses; writing and dictionary use. Each task was characterized by a different involvement load. After each group worked with the words in a different way, all students took a receptive and a productive vocabulary test in order to know the degree of acquisition of the target words. The group doing the task with the highest degree of involvement load obtained the best results in the vocabulary tests.

Also Bastanfar & Hashemi (2010) focused on vocabulary learning strategies that were applied in text books. They analyzed schools text books and they concluded that pre-university English book is the best one among all the books according to the use of VLSs.

Shoari and Davatgari Asl (2015) studied the effects of involvement load hypothesis: and also the effect of drawing relevant pictures on Iranian young EFL learners' L2 vocabulary performance. Sixty students participated in this study for one semester. The students were divided into two groups: one experimental group in which learners were taught new vocabulary items through drawing relevant pictures, and one control group whose students were taught the identical items through traditional instruction. A pretest was run on learners' L2 vocabulary knowledge. Then the intervention started. At the end of the sessions, one posttest was performed in order to measure effectiveness of the treatment. Afterwards, the researcher analyzed data. Because there were two groups in this study, the researcher utilized t-test for analysis, paired t-test for comparing the results within groups, and independent t-test for

comparing the results between groups. The results proved that drawing pictures were indeed contributing to L2 vocabulary learning by the learners.

Fatalak (2014) had his research on involvement load hypothesis and word meaning retention in both oral and written task types. To do so, they had 36 EFL learners from three branches of an English institute. Then, students were classified into two high and low proficient groups. Then participants were then randomly assigned to two groups: The first group receives reading input and the second group receives listening input. The comparison of the students' performance in the immediate posttests revealed that the students who received reading task were more successful in the retention of newly-learned vocabularies and there wasn't significance difference between groups after the delayed posttest.

Baleghizadeh and Abbasi (2013) studied the effect of four different types of involvement indices on vocabulary learning and retention of EFL learners. To fulfill the purpose of the study, four groups of 126 intermediate learners participated in this experiment. Then, the participants were pretested on the knowledge of the target items through the Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS). In 7 treatment sessions, the 4 groups were treated with different tasks (reading, fill-in-the blanks, sentence-writing, and composition-writing) with different involvement index according to the involvement load indexes. The vocabulary knowledge test was administered twice (immediate and delayed posttests) to measure the degree at receptive and productive levels. The results indicated the validity of the hypothesis in receptive and productive learning and receptive retention. It showed that learners had better performance in their productive retention tests.

According to involvement load hypothesis the rate of process of words that can involve long term memory can be scored by three criteria: need, search and evaluation. (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001) for choosing appropriate task to teach vocabulary teachers should be familiar with the words and Involvement load hypothesis. Current study aims to help teachers and also learners to know this important issue. Knowing how much a words can involve students' long term memory for proceeding can help teacher choose appropriate task for students. Then this study aims to compare tasks between two vocabulary books according to Involvement Load Hypothesis. Also the applied strategies by learners were compared, and then its relation with their scores on vocabulary tests was shown.

Language teachers and learners totally emphasized on the importance of vocabulary in by both first-language and second-language learning as an essential factor in language competence. Decarrico (2001) asserted that vocabulary learning is prominent to language acquisition no matter it is a second, or a foreign language. Even in a learner's first language, there is an increasing learning of new words and new meanings for old words (Thornbury 2002). So this study was designed to find out the involvement load of

vocabulary tasks used in two popular IELTS books and the most common vocabulary learning strategies that were used by Iranian EFL learners.

Having considered all said, the present paper aimed to explore and answer two research questions as follow: 1-To what extent lexical tasks in most frequently used vocabulary books for IELTS induce involvement load? 2- What are the common vocabulary learning strategies employed by learners for learning high involvement load tasks?

### **Methodology**

This study was designed to find out the degree of involvement load induced by vocabulary tasks used in IELTS books and the most common vocabulary learning strategies applied by Iranian EFL learners. The study followed a cross-sectional design in which the use of vocabulary was tested among EFL learners. Participants were upper intermediate and advanced and their age varied from 19-30. The study was conducted among EFL learners who took part in language schools in East of Tehran. They were studying in Shokkoh-e- Danesh and Poyesh language schools. As the researcher was an instructor, her own classes were selected as the participants of the study.

In order to make sure about the validity and reliability of questionnaire, it was given to 15 learners who were not prospective participants of the study. Then their responses were analyzed and by using alpha Cronbach. The reliability was calculated about 0.74 and the researcher could make sure about the reliability of the test. The validity of the test was proved by the instructor as well.

### **Participants**

This study was conducted among EFL in two language schools in Tehran. The participants had passed their intermediate levels in language schools and they were upper intermediate and advanced learners. Most of them were preparing themselves for IELTS exam. They could be considered as intact group as they were instructed by the researcher herself. About 40 questionnaires were distributed among learners and they were required to choose their best responses for each question. They were assured that the results of this test had not any impact on their course results. The questionnaire consisted of 25 questions in Likert- type scale. In order to find out vocabulary books, the researcher asked ten EFL instructors. Among the introduced books, two available and most popular books were selected.

### **Instruments**

In order to determine the involvement loads of the vocabulary books, two books were selected according to EFL teachers' most popular books. The first one was

Oxford Word Skills by Ruth Gairns and Redman (2009) and the other one was Advanced Vocabulary in Use by B.J. Thomas (1999). Ten tasks were selected from these two books randomly. To find out the most used VLS (vocabulary learning strategies) a questionnaire was used. The questionnaires was in English language. They consisted of 25 items classified by six types of strategies, which were adapted from the vocabulary learning strategy classification based on Schmitt's Taxonomy (1997): Determination, Social (Discovery), Social (Consolidation), Memory, and Cognitive in order to make them suitable for the subjects of the study. The questionnaires were approved and improved by the advisor and were tested with some students. Also the questionnaires were given to all respondents within one class period. The respondents were also told that they had to answer in terms of how well the explanations of each item describe them. The answered questionnaires were collected right after the respondents finished them. From all of collected respondents' answers, 40 questionnaires had been distributed and 40 questionnaires were returned that is, 100% of the respondents' responses. All of the questionnaires were analyzed. They were retrieved and were ready for coding.

### **Procedure**

This study aimed at finding the most used strategies among Iranian EFL learners also it intended to find out the involvement load of tasks in vocabulary books. To reach these goals, two books were chosen according to EFL teachers' suggestions. Then ten tasks were selected randomly and the involvement load index of each were shown in tables. To estimate the Involvement Load of each task, Hulstijn and Laufer's (2001) concept of involvement load index was used. Need, search and evaluation of each task were estimated separately. Need was considered as moderate when it was imposed by an external force, it was strong when it was intrinsically motivated, (self-imposed by the learners). Search was estimated when learner were required to discover the meaning of intended items, or their forms, when they were exposed to in context. Evaluation was measured through the comparison of a given word with other words, a specific meaning of a word with its other meanings, or comparing the word with other words in order to decide whether a word will fit or not in its context. The kind of evaluation that needed learners to recognize differences between words (as in a fill-in task), or differences between several senses of a word in a given context, was considered as moderate. Evaluation that requires making decisions about the combination additional words with the new word in an original (as opposed to given) sentence or text is referred to as strong evaluation. In order to make sure about the evaluation of the books' involvement indexes, two EFL instructors reviewed the tasks. The tasks were from different types, it was tried to cover the tasks which were devoted to the same units of the book. Then to find out the most common VLS by Iranian IELTS learners in high involvement load tasks, four tasks with higher involvement load indexes were selected and forty upper intermediate and advanced IELTS learners were asked to define their strategies for these tasks. A Likert-type questionnaire by Schmitt (1997) was given to them. The questionnaire consisted of



25 questions and they were devoted to different categories that were proposed by Schmit (1997). It was intended to find out the strategies that they were used most for high involvement load tasks. Learners were given enough time to complete the test. Then the paper were collected and they were analyzed by the conductor. The SPSS software package data was used to analyze the results of the collected data.

### Results

#### The Reliability Analyses of the Questionnaire

The main instrument applied in this study was a Likert scale questionnaire test. The reliability of 25 items of the questionnaire was estimated through running Cronbach's Alpha to the data collected in a pilot study on (n=10) EFL learners. Moreover, the index of reliability was interpreted according to the reliability standards suggested by Barker, Pistrang, and Elliott (1994).

Table 4.1

*Suggested Standards (Adopted From Barker, Pistrang, and Elliott, 1994)*

Interpretation of the findings	Reliability indices
Good	.80
Acceptable	.70
Marginal	.60
Poor	.50

The results of the reliability analysis are presented in the following section:

Table 4.2

*Reliability Statistics*

	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Questionnaire	.70	20

The determined value of Cronbach's Alpha equaled (.70) for the questionnaire. This index was acceptable based on the above mentioned criterion.

#### The Results of Involvement load Index Analysis and Applied Strategies

In order to find out the involvement load of task in vocabulary books, 20 tasks were chosen from two vocabulary books randomly. Table 4.3 presents the involvement load of each tasks of the first book and also the strategy that was used in it.

Table 4.3

*Book One Tasks Analysis (Advanced Vocabulary in Use)*

Task	Sort of activity	Involvement load	strategy
1	Fill in gaps	3	Consolidation(memory)
2	Answer by given word	4	Consolidation(memory)
3	Say and write	2	Consolidation(memory)
4	match	1	Consolidation(memory)
5	Explain difference	2	Consolidation( memory)
6	match	2	Consolidation(memory)
7	Find words	4	Consolidation(memory)
8	Word form	3	Discovery (part of speech)
9	Word meaning	3	Consolidation( memory)
10	Plural forms	2	Discovery( form of word)

As the above table indicated, the first task was a fill in the gap, no glossary was presented the involvement load of it was (1+1+1=3); need=1, search=1 and evaluation 1. The applied strategy was memory (consolidation). Second task asked learners to answer questions by given words, again no glossary was given, learners were required to search between some words and the index is as follow, N=1, S=2, E=1 and the involvement load of the task was 3; again the used strategy was consolidation. Task three was a say or write the words, (N=1, S=1, E=0) as there was no evaluation in the task the index was 2 also the strategy was consolidation. Task four was match the given words and the index was 1 (N=0, S= 1, E=0) and the used strategy was memory, consolidation. For the other tasks the same procedures were taken and the involvement load of each task and also their applied strategies were shown. As the table indicated, just one task used discovery strategy. The following tables 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 shows the descriptive statistics of the first book tasks analysis.

Table 4.4

*Descriptive Statistics for Involvement Load and Applied Strategies of Book One*

		Statistics	
		Involvement load	strategy
N	Valid	10	9
	Missing	0	1
Mean		2.60	1.11
Median		2.50	1.00
Sum		26	10

The mean of involvement load was 2.6 for first books tasks.

Table 4.5

*Statistics for Involvement Load Indexes*

		Involvement load			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	10.0	10.0	10.0
	2	4	40.0	40.0	50.0
	3	3	30.0	30.0	80.0
	4	2	20.0	20.0	100.0
Total		10	100.0	100.0	

As table 4.5 showed, 40% of the tasks had the index of 2 and 10% had load index of 1. Table 4.6 presents the statistics for applied strategies in the book.

Table 4.6

*Applied Strategies of Book One*

		strategy			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	consolidation	8	80.0	88.9	88.9
	discovery	1	10.0	11.1	100.0
	Total	9	90.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	10.0		
Total		10	100.0		

The above table indicated that 80% of the applied strategies was consolidation.

The following table (4.7) presents the tasks of the second book.

Table 4.7

*Book Two Task Analysis (Oxford word skill)*

task	Sort of activity	Involvement load	Strategy
1	Translate	1	discovery
2	replace	2	consolidation
3	synonyms	2	consolidation
4	Complete	2	consolidation
5	Cross out	3	consolidation
6	Look up in dictionary	3	discovery
7	Word form	1	discovery
8	Cross word	2	consolidation
9	Sentence making	1	consolidation
10	Write correct form	1	discovery

As table 4.7 presented the involvement loads of the tasks and the used strategies in them, it can be inferred that this book applied discovery strategy more than the former one. The following tables presents the descriptive statistics of the second book.

Table 4.8

*Descriptive Statistics*

Statistics			
		Involvement load	strategy
N	Valid	10	9
	Missing	0	1
Mean		1.80	1.33
Median		2.00	1.00
Sum		18	12

Table (4.8) showed that the mean of involvement load for second book tasks. The mean was 1.8 which is lower than the previous book.

Table 4.9

*Statistics for Involvement Load Indexes*

Involvement load					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	4	40.0	40.0	40.0
	2	4	40.0	40.0	80.0
	3	2	20.0	20.0	100.0
Total		10	100.0	100.0	

Table (4.9) showed that index 1 and 2 included 40% of the loads. No index was calculated to be 4 or above. Table 4.10 shows the applied strategies in second book.

Table 4.10

*Applied Strategies of Book Two*

Strategy					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	consolidation	6	60.0	66.7	66.7
	discovery	3	30.0	33.3	100.0
	Total	9	90.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	10.0		
Total		10	100.0		

About 30% of the used strategies were discovery and 66% were devoted to consolidation strategies, the other strategies had no portion though.

### Results of VLS Questionnaire Analysis

Four tasks with higher involvement load indexes were selected these tasks had indexes above 4, forty IELTS learners were asked to define their strategies for these tasks. In the following table 4.3 each question and the mean, median and percentages have been shown.

Table 4.3

#### *Statistics for VLS*

<i>Questions</i>	Mean	S.D	variance
1. I use a bilingual dictionary	3.81	0.4	0.16
2. I use pictures illustrated in the textbook to find meaning	3.43	0.56	0.32
3. I learn meaning of words by identifying its part of speech.	3.43	0.72	0.53
4. I ask the teacher to translate the words into Persian	3.466	0.57	0.326
5. I ask the teacher to put an unknown word into a sentence	2.7	0.702	0.493
6. I ask my classmate for meaning.	1.86	0.819	.671
7. I know some new words when working in group works	1.50	.937	.879
8. I practice English in group work activities	1.20	.805	.648
9. I ask native speakers for help.	1.16	.74664	.557
10. 10. I learn words about the culture of English speaking countries	0.86	.681	.464
11. I write a new word in a sentence so I can remember it.	1.23	.77385	.599
12. I study a spelling of new words.	2.0	1.174	1.379
13. I use physical actions when learning words	2.30	1.317	1.734
14. I speak words out loud when studying.	2.0333	1.21721	1.482
15. I repeatedly practice new words.	2.3667	.96431	.930
16. I write a new word on a flash card so I can remember it	1.3667	.66	.447
17. I learn words by listening to vocabulary CDs.	0.7667	.56832	.323
18. I record vocabulary from English soundtrack movies in my notebook.	1.50	.937	.879
19. When I try to remember a word, I write or say it repeatedly.	3.2333	.85836	.737
20. I make vocabulary cards and take them with me wherever I go.	1.200	.71438	.510
21. I listen to English songs and news.	2.833	1.176	1.385

22. I memorize word from English magazines	0.7333	.69149	.478
23. I review my own English vocabulary cards for reviewing before the next lesson starts.	2.0000	1.23176	1.517
24. I am not worried very much about the difficult words found when reading or listening, I pass them	2.50	1.27982	1.638
25. I use on-line exercise to test my vocabulary knowledge.	1.0000	.74278	.552

In order find out the frequency of each applied strategy, SPSS software package was used. The above table presented them separately. As the table indicated the first question had the highest mean among them all (3.8). This was categorized under social strategies (Determination Strategy, Discovery). The next one with the mean of 3.6 also belonged to this category. The next ones with the mean of 3.44 were in the third place of most used strategies. Both questions belonged to consolidating strategy which were considered as memory strategies. The mean of item 19 was 3.2 this referred to cognitive strategy. Metacognitive strategies were among the next most used strategies (use media, study over time, skip the words). It is worth mentioning that using magazines was the least used strategy with is still among metacognitive strategy. Cognitive strategies were also popular among EFL learners. They were vocabulary notebook, writing, verbal repetition and word lists. The participants of this study also used memory strategies a lot, to mention some we can refer to spelling, say aloud, word image and physical action. The least used strategies belonged to metacognitive and also social strategies (asking natives and studying culture).

### **Answering the Questions of the Study**

Q.1.To what extent lexical tasks in most frequently used vocabulary books for IELTS induce involvement load?

In order to answer the first question of the study, 20 tasks were chosen from two popular vocabulary textbooks. The results showed that books applied variety of activities. The maximum index was 4 and the minimum was 1. Also different strategies were applied by the textbooks. The analysis showed that consolidating was used for the tasks with higher involvement load indexes. Tasks with lower involvement load indexes had other strategies like discovery. By comparing two books, it can be inferred that the involvement load of vocabulary activities used in the first book (Advanced Vocabularies in Use) tasks were higher than the second book (Oxford Word Skills). Also the results indicated that the first book applied more consolidation strategies than the second one.

Q.2. what are the common vocabulary learning strategies employed by learners for learning high involvement load tasks?

Data analysis revealed that learners applied different strategies in learning high involvement load tasks. For the four selected tasks, the most used strategy was determination strategy, which is clustered under Discovery Strategy. Next ones were among consolidating strategies. All kinds of strategies were used by learners and some of them were more popular than others. Metacognitive strategies were in the least used strategies and learners did not seem to use them as much. Repetition strategy which is a cognitive strategy was also used by learners. Results of data analysis showed that for tasks with high involvement load indexes, IELTS candidates used discovery strategies more.

### **Discussion**

Asgari et al. (2011) had a study on the vocabulary learning strategies that were used by university students in Malaysia. They concluded strategies such as the learning a word through reading, the use of monolingual dictionary, the use of various English language media, and applying new English word in their daily conversation were related to memory, determination, metacognitive strategies respectively were popular strategies and the learners used them more. The findings of the present study was the same. Using dictionary and media (Determination) was used more frequent than other strategies.

Also Bastanfar and Hashemi (2010) focused on vocabulary learning strategies that were applied in text books. They concluded that text books applied different strategies. The findings were also in line with the present study's findings, in which the analysis showed that textbooks tend to use different strategies that would induce different involvement loads.

Shoari and Davatgari Asl (2015) studied the effects of involvement load hypothesis on learners' retention of vocabulary. Although the aims of their study was different from the present study, but both studies concluded that textbooks applied different tasks with different involvement loads.

Jing et al. (2009) who studied involvement load hypothesis in incidental vocabulary acquisition in EFL listening. They concluded that tasks with different loads had different effect on learners' retention of vocabularies. The present study had different aim, but it can be inferred that tasks with different loads encountered different strategies as well.

Yaqubi et al. (2010) had their study on the effect of task types and involvement index on 12 vocabulary acquisition. The findings indicated that tasks with higher involvement loads induced more vocabulary acquisition, also they found that tasks with higher loads applied variety of strategies. The first conclusion of their study was far apart from the purpose of the present study, but their conclusion on the use of variety strategies was in line with the findings of the present study.

Siriwan (2007) had his PHD thesis on vocabulary learning strategies applied by university student. The findings reveal that three main vocabulary categories discovery of the meaning of new vocabulary items, the retention of the knowledge of newly learned vocabulary



items, and the expansion of the knowledge of vocabulary were used more by learners. The same conclusion was found in this study. Learners used determination and consolidation strategies more.

Riankamol (2008) conducted another study on the use of vocabulary learning strategies by EFL learners. The mean score indicated that the use of Metacognitive strategies are most frequently used by English students. This was not consistent with the findings of this study, in which metacognitive study was not used as much as other strategies.

Kulikova (2015) concluded that active use of a dictionary, guessing, and note-taking strategies, use of rehearsal strategies, especially repetition were used most by EFL learners. The findings were somehow in line with the present study. In this study, use of dictionary was the most common strategy by EFL learners.

As the above mentioned studies showed, there were some similarities between the findings of the present study and previous ones. The literature lack a rich comparison between the applied strategies by English vocabulary textbooks and their involvement load indexes.

### **Conclusion**

This study was designed to find out the involvement load indexes in two popular IELTS vocabulary books. Also, it aimed at spotting the most common vocabulary strategies for tasks with high involvement load. The selected books were two popular IELTS vocabulary books and the involvement load index of them were calculated, it was shown that these two books had different loads. The applied strategies by them were also shown. Also, the analysis of tasks in vocabulary textbooks showed that tasks with higher indexes used more consolidating strategies. The results of questionnaire analysis showed that learners applied different kinds of strategies to learn vocabularies. It was shown that using bilingual dictionary was the most common strategies among them all which is classified as discovery strategy. This study can pave the way for new experience in the IELTS preparation courses and it can help teachers as well. Using tasks with higher involvement loads would be beneficial for learners' vocabulary acquisition. In this was both teachers and learners can be assured that the process of learning new vocabularies would be facilitated. Knowing the most popular strategies can help teacher to focus on other strategies as well to enhance their students' vocabulary learning acquisition. Also IELTS text books developers can adopt different strategies to improve tasks involvement loads. Involvement load can improve the retention of the vocabularies. Using variety of strategies in tasks can make the tasks more enjoyable and less boring.

### **References**

- Aebersold, J. A. Field, M. (1997). *From reader to reading teacher: issues and strategies for second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Adler, N.(1991). Communicating across Cultural Barriers. International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior. Retrieved from <https://global.duke.edu/sites/default/files/images/NancyAdlerCrossCultComm..pdf>
- Asgari, A & Bin Mustapha, G. (2011). The Type of Vocabulary Learning Strategies Used by ESL Students in University Putra Malaysia. *English Language Teaching*, 4, 2, 84-90
- Baleghizadeh, S., & Abbasi, M. (2013). The Effect of Four Different Types of Involvement Indices on Vocabulary Learning and Retention of EFL Learners. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 5, 2, 1-26.
- Bastanfar, A., & Hashemi, T. (2010). Vocabulary learning strategies and ELT materials: A study of the extent to which VLS research informs local course books in Iran. *International Education Studies Vol. 3, 3* / Retrieved on 14th January 2014 from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ies/article/view/5493/5299>.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cho, K.S., & Krashen, S (1994). 'Acquisition of vocabulary from the Sweet Valley Kids Series: adult ESL acquisition'. *Journal of Reading*, 37: 662-7
- Craik, F., & Lockhart, R. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour*, 11(3): 671-684.
- Decarrico, J. S. (2001). Vocabulary learning and teaching. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 3, 285-299.
- Ellis, R., Y., Tanaka . A., & Yamazaki. (1994). "Classroom interaction, comprehension, and the acquisition of L2 word meanings". *Language Learning*, 44, 449-491.
- Fatalaki, J. (2014). Involvement Load Hypothesis: Word Meaning Retention across Oral and Written Task Types. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 37, 29-45.
- Ghorbani, M., & Rahmandoost, M. (2012). Higher Task-induced Involvement Load Enhances Students' EFL Vocabulary Learning. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3, 6, 1203-1210.
- Griffiths, C. (2004). Language Learning Strategies: *Theory and Research. Occasional Paper*, 1, 1-26.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (1992). Retention of inferred and given word meanings: Experiments in incidental learning. In P. J. Arnaud & H. B'joint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*. London: Macmillan, 113-125.
- Hulstijn, J., Hollander, M., & Greidanus. T. (1996). Incidental vocabulary learning by advanced foreign. language students: the influence of marginal glosses, dictionary use, and reoccurrence of unknown words. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80, 327-

339. Retrieved from: [onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1996.tb01614.x/full](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1996.tb01614.x/full).
- Intaraprasert, C. (2004). EST students and vocabulary learning strategies: A preliminary investigation. Unpublished research, Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand. Retrieved from : [www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042813026426](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042813026426)
- Jing, L.,& Jianbin, H. (2009). An Empirical Study of the Involvement Load Hypothesis in Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition in EFL Listening. *Polyglossia* , 16,1,11.
- Krashen, S. D.,& Terrell, T. D. (2000). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. New York: Longman.
- Kulikova, O. (2015) .Vocabulary learning strategies and beliefs about vocabulary learning: a study of beginning university students of Russian in the United States. *Iowa Research Online* . Retrieved from : <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/1868>.
- Laufer, B.,& Hulstijn, J. (2001) Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics*, 22 (1): 1-26.
- Mármol, G.,& Sánchez, A. (2013). The Involvement Load Hypothesis: It's Effect on Vocabulary Learning in Primary Education. *RESLA*, 26, 11-24.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shoari,E. Davatgari Asl, M. (2015). The Effect of Drawing Relevant Pictures on Iranian Young EFL Learners' L2 Vocabulary Performance. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(7), 196-210.
- Siriwan ,M.(2007). english vocabulary learning strategies employed by rajabhat university students. Unpublished thesis. Retrieved from [http://sutir.sut.ac.th:8080/sutir/bitstream/123456789/284/1/mayuree\\_fulltext.pdf](http://sutir.sut.ac.th:8080/sutir/bitstream/123456789/284/1/mayuree_fulltext.pdf)
- Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to Teach Vocabulary*. Harlow: Longman.
- Yaqubi, B., Rayati, R.,& Allemzade Gorg, N. (2010). The Involvement Load Hypothesis and Vocabulary Learning: The Effect of Task Types and Involvement Index on L2 Vocabulary Acquisition. *JTLS*, 2(1), 1-19.

## Appendix One

### Questionnaire in English Language

#### Questionnaire of Vocabulary Learning Strategies

##### Directions

- This vocabulary learning strategies is designed for students who learn English as a foreign language. You will find about vocabulary learning strategies. Please read each statement.

• Put ( ) in the box (4, 3, 2, 1, or 0) that tells the degree of opinion on the strategies you use to learn English vocabulary. Please mark the statement that most describe you.

**4 = always use it**

**3 = often use it**

**2 = sometimes use it**

**1 = seldom use it**

**0 = never use it**

**Part I: General Information**

1. Gender	Female	Male	
2. Age	15-16 years		more than 16 years

The Statement of Vocabulary Learning Strategies

1. I use a bilingual dictionary to help me translate English words into Persian.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
2. I use pictures illustrated in the textbook to find the word meanings.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
3. I learn meaning of words by identifying its part of speech.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
4. I ask the teacher to translate the words into Persian.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
5. I ask the teacher to put an unknown word into a sentence to help me understand the word meaning.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
6. I ask my classmate for meaning.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
7. I know some new words when working in group works.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
8. I practice English in group work activities.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
9. I ask native speakers for help.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
10. I learn words about the culture of English speaking countries.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
11. I write a new word in a sentence so I can remember it.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
12. I study a spelling of new words.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it
13. I use physical actions when learning words.  
4 .always use it    3. Often use it    2.        Sometimes use it    1.seldom use it    0. Never use it

14. I speak words out loud when studying.  
4 .always use it 3. Often use it 2. Sometimes use it 1.seldom use it 0. Never use it
15. I repeatedly practice new words.  
4 .always use it 3. Often use it 2. Sometimes use it 1.seldom use it 0. Never use it
16. I write a new word on a flash card so I can remember it.  
4 .always use it 3. Often use it 2. Sometimes use it 1.seldom use it 0. Never use it
17. I learn words by listening to vocabulary CDs.  
4 .always use it 3. Often use it 2. Sometimes use it 1.seldom use it 0. Never use it
18. I record vocabulary from English soundtrack movies in my notebook.  
4 .always use it 3. Often use it 2. Sometimes use it 1.seldom use it 0. Never use it
19. When I try to remember a word, I write or say it repeatedly.  
4 .always use it 3. Often use it 2. Sometimes use it 1.seldom use it 0. Never use it
20. I make vocabulary cards and take them with me wherever I go.  
4 .always use it 3. Often use it 2. Sometimes use it 1.seldom use it 0. Never use it
21. I listen to English songs and news.  
4 .always use it 3. Often use it 2. Sometimes use it 1.seldom use it 0. Never use it
22. I memorize word from English magazines.  
4 .always use it 3. Often use it 2. Sometimes use it 1.seldom use it 0. Never use it
23. I review my own English vocabulary cards for reviewing before the next lesson starts.  
4 .always use it 3. Often use it 2. Sometimes use it 1.seldom use it 0. Never use it
24. I am not worry very much about the difficult words found when reading or listening, I  
pass them
25. I use on-line exercise to test my vocabulary knowledge.  
4 .always use it 3. Often use it 2. Sometimes use it 1.seldom use it 0. Never use it