



The Effect of Collaborative Tasks via Incidental Attention on Vocabulary Enhancement, Reading Comprehension Skill and Vocabulary Learning Motivation

Milad Ahmadpour

M.A. in TEFL, Faculty of Literature and Foreign Languages, Kurdistan University, Sanandaj-Iran
Email: (etrans77@yahoo.com)

Mohammad Reza Khodabakhsh

Assistant Professor, Department of Literature and Foreign Languages, Kurdistan University, Sanandaj-Iran
Email: (rezak558@gmail.com)

Abstract

The current study attempted to examine the effect of collaborative tasks via incidental attention on vocabulary enhancement, reading comprehension skill and vocabulary learning motivation. To this purpose, 90 male and female intermediate level English learners at the English language institute of Atieh Gharb in Sanandaj with their age ranging from 15 to 19 were chosen for this study. The study was done by using experimental research design. This design was often used in classroom experiments when two experimental and one control groups were such naturally assembled groups as three classes, which were made homogenous. The results showed that there was a significant difference between experimental groups and control group such that the learners of the two experimental groups who had been taught through collaborative learning method performed better than those learners of the control group who had been taught vocabulary through traditional approach. Also, the learners of the experimental group I outperformed the learners of experimental group II. The findings of the immediate and delayed vocabulary post-tests indicated that the learners of experimental groups outperformed the control group both in immediate and delayed post-tests, it means that the motivation of vocabulary learning in experimental groups was higher than control group. Moreover, the motivation of vocabulary learning in experimental group II was lower than experimental group I. Besides, a further analysis known as the post hoc Tukey-HSD test was conducted to pinpoint exactly where the differences exist among the mean of three groups on immediate post-test.

Keywords Collaborative Tasks, Incidental Vocabulary Learning, Vocabulary Learning Motivation, Reading Comprehension.



1. Introduction

There is no doubt that all second language learners and their teachers are well aware of the fact that learning a language involves the learning of a large number of words (Avila & Sadoski, 1996; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001), but how to accomplish this task is often a great concern to them. Vocabulary is a core component of language proficiency providing much of the basis for how well learners speak, listen, read and write. "Vocabulary is at the heart of general language development and conceptual learning" (Pearson, Hiebert & Kamil, 2007).

The methods for learning English vocabulary are always different. Many students still use traditional methods to learn English vocabulary, such as learning new words through explicit instruction. Furthermore, many English teachers use traditional strategies to teach vocabulary, such as repeating the new words and reciting the new words. However, in other linguistic research, for instance Read (2000: 43), he found that "many native speakers acquire 70% of their native language incidentally as they meet with new words in the speech and writing of others". This means incidental learning is very useful for language acquisition.

Incidental vocabulary acquisition is not an uncontroversial topic, but it appears that foreign language vocabulary acquisition can benefit from activities in which learners take up words incidentally, similar to the acquisition of their first language (cf., e.g., Wode 1999: 245). Incidental vocabulary learning serves as an important method to help language learners to increase their vocabularies. Research on incidental vocabulary learning has focused predominantly on reading (cf., e.g., Hulstijn, 2003: 362–363), although some experts propose that much vocabulary is acquired from oral input. During the last years few studies have investigated aspects of incidental vocabulary learning from reading, each of them have been conducted in different aims and methods and have yielded effective results. This study adds to the body of research on incidental vocabulary acquisition by investigating a few of the collaborative tasks.

Vocabulary learning tasks are one effective way of improving, reinforcing, and adding to the learners' knowledge of new words. Working on these tasks is, in fact, considered a key component of learning vocabulary (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001). Although there are many tasks that can be used in the second language classroom (see Paribakht & Wesche, (1996) for an extensive list), it may be important to determine if there are differences among these tasks with regard to the degree of help in learning the new words they can provide the learners with. If differences do exist, the next step would be to find out about the characteristics that render some tasks more effective than others.

As vocabulary is an important phase of learning, and motivation is considered to be a key affective variable which promotes success and achievement in L2 learning, this study focuses on vocabulary enhancement test to examine incidental vocabulary learning through collaborative tasks. These tasks are seen as activities designed with a communicative purpose to reach a specific goal. Language will be a tool to accomplish the tasks with emphasis on meaning and communication. Since there have not been any studies on the collaborative tasks of English language learners in the intermediate level by using incidental attention on vocabulary enhancement, reading comprehension and vocabulary learning motivation, the aim of this study is to contribute to the field by examining the tasks experienced by intermediate students, at the English language institute of Atieh Gharb in Sanandaj.

The intended audience for this study are researchers, materials designers, curriculum developers, teachers, and language learners. The findings of this study may encourage researchers to continue to look beyond the limited boundaries of second language research to fields such as educational and social psychology for theories and ideas to test in the field of second language learning. This study also tends to serve as an impetus to curriculum and materials developers to consider how people learn, and to design second language learning experiences and materials that more fully exploit those learning process. Motivation is known as a variable which has significant effect on language learning. The present study intended to investigate incidental vocabulary learning through collaborative tasks. Although many studies have been conducted on tasks, as far as the authors know there have not been any studies on the impact of collaborative tasks via incidental attention on three variables of vocabulary enhancement, reading comprehension and vocabulary learning motivation. Most of these studies have investigated the effect of



different communicative tasks on incidental vocabulary acquisition without considering motivation. Therefore, this study aimed to explore learning motivation and enhancement of the vocabulary incidentally in collaborative tasks.

2. Literature review

There has been several research studies related to the role of collaborative learning in incidental acquisition of new vocabulary in the field of language teaching and learning.

Storch (2005) in a study compared written texts produced by learners collaboratively and individually in terms of accuracy, fluency and complexity. It was found that collaborative writing resulted in more accurate and complex texts than individual writing, although the difference was not significant. In another study Storch (2007) investigated effect of collaboration on editing task. Learners were asked to correct a short written text which contained some errors such as verbs, articles, word forms one group in pairs another individually. It was observed that interaction and reflection on language forms in the paired group was higher than in individual group. However, the accuracy rate between two groups was not significant. It was argued that the reason for this was partly due to the nature of errors to be corrected.

Hou Shujing and Xie Hui (2007) examined the overall pattern of English incidental vocabulary learning strategies employed by non-English major graduates, the specific strategies used by high-proficiency learners, intermediate and low-proficiency learners, as well as correlation between learning strategies and learning proficiency. With the findings of different learning strategies employed by high and low proficiency subjects, as well as correlations between learning strategies and their incidental vocabulary learning proficiency, teachers need to make further comparison and help learners discover the most beneficial learning strategies for themselves.

Kim (2008) investigated the effect of collaborative and individual tasks on the acquisition of L2 vocabulary by comparing the performance of learners on a dictogloss task. The first group of participants was involved in individual work, but the other group was engaged in pair work. The results revealed significant effect of collaborative work on vocabulary acquisition.

Nassaji and Tian (2010) examined and compared the effectiveness of two types of output task (reconstruction cloze and reconstruction editing tasks) for learning English phrasal verbs in two intact low-intermediate adult EFL classes. They also investigated whether doing the tasks collaboratively led to greater success in learning the target verbs, and also whether task type made a difference. The results showed that performing the tasks collaboratively (in pairs) as opposed to individually led to greater accuracy in task completion. Nevertheless, collaborative tasks did not lead to significantly greater gains in vocabulary knowledge than individual tasks. Here, an effect was observed for task type, with editing tasks being more effective than cloze tasks, in promoting negotiation and learning.

Kim and McDonough (2011) implemented collaborative learning to different kinds of tasks. They studied the role of pre-task modeling on collaborative learning interaction. They divided students into two groups. One group received videotaped models of collaborative interaction before carrying out the task. The other group did not use pre-task modeling. The findings showed that the first group was more successful in completing the tasks and demonstrated more collaborative pair dynamics modeling.

Wang (2011) studied collaborative learning as a new method for improving college students' autonomy in China. He had two groups of students. The first group included 64 students who worked corporately, whereas the second group included 62 students who were taught in a traditional way. The findings showed that collaborative learning increased autonomy, and students learned better than the traditional way.

Thanh and Huan (2012) examined the effects of task-based language learning on motivating non-English majors to acquire vocabulary. They concluded that the participants were motivated to learn vocabulary and their vocabulary achievement improved after the experiment under task-based instruction.

Newton (2013) investigated the ways in which two groups of four adult EFL learners responded to unfamiliar words that they were exposed to in four communication tasks and the effects of different engagement levels with these words (including negotiation of form and meaning) on their later recall of



word meaning. Of the four tasks, two were information gap tasks and two were opinion gap tasks. The results revealed a significant task type effect on not only the amount but also the type of negotiation, with more negotiation of word form in the information gap tasks versus more negotiation of meaning in the opinion gap tasks. He concluded that, while the learners had also shown improved recall of several words that had not been negotiated, the ones which had been negotiated would be more likely to be acquired.

The other studies also have investigated the effect of collaborative learning on incidental vocabulary acquisition as follows:

A study by Nadarajan (2009) showed that direct vocabulary instruction alone is not effective for all learners as learning words may require contextual explanation. She experiments the effects of instructional options and classroom context on second language learners' vocabulary growth. In her study, the samples were 129 learners from six academic writing classrooms who were divided into three groups (L1 only, L1 and L2, and L2 only). Learners from the three classes were taught a specific set of words implicitly in context while the three other classes were taught a specific set of words explicitly. The findings revealed that: (a) both implicit and explicit instructional groups showed no difference in vocabulary gains, (b) the combined group of L2 learners in the L1 and L2 learnt differently from the other subgroups; and c) direct teaching of vocabulary does not necessarily increase all L2 learners' vocabulary growth. She claims that not all words can be presented explicitly as in some situations contextual explanation is necessary and serves its purpose.

Javanbakht and Yasuji (2011) explored the evidence of incidental vocabulary learning through three kinds of tasks (reading comprehension, reading comprehension with fill-in gaps, and sentence writing) on male elementary EFL learners. The results indicated evidence of the significant impact of task involvement on the incidental learning of vocabulary by male elementary EFL learners.

Ghapanchi, Eskandari and Tabasi (2012) in their study examined the effect of direct instruction on vocabulary gain through reading texts. Thirty-eight intermediate adult learners of English were administered with two kinds of experimental conditions: reading comprehension and reading comprehension followed by direct instruction of vocabulary. The Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) developed by Paribakht and Wesche (1997) was used to measure the participants' quantitative and qualitative knowledge of target words before and after each treatment. The results of the study revealed that the treatment resulted in greater gains in learners' vocabulary knowledge. The results showed that if reading for meaning is complemented with some instructions and vocabulary exercises, it may produce better gains for the targeted words.

Ajideh et al. (2013) conducted a study in order to achieve activation of L2 incidental vocabulary acquisition as a result of engagement with a reading-while listening task. The results of their study confirm the effectiveness of task-specific motivation in improving linguistic achievements. The findings also showed that motivational involvement had an enhancing effect on both retention and ease of activation of L2 vocabulary in short-term assessment.

Vosoughi and Mehdipour (2013) considered the effect of recognition task and production task on incidental vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL learners. The results indicated that both treatments had a significant effect on incidental vocabulary learning but this effect was greater in production group.

Based on these studies using collaborative learning method, especially in tasks, can be effective for the students. Therefore, this research was conducted to see the effects of collaborative tasks via incidental attention on vocabulary enhancement, reading comprehension skill, and vocabulary learning motivation.

3. Methodology

Mackey and Gass (2005) claimed that the number of participants needed for L2 research ultimately depends on the type of the study conducted. In a similar vein, Fraenkel and Wallen (2006) proposed a sample size guideline, which suggested minimum numbers for three types of research in education. They claimed that an approximate number of 15 to 30 participants can be appropriate in experimental research which required maintaining control of the effect of several variables. In contrast, a larger number of about 100 participants or more may be necessary for descriptive research and 50 participants for carrying out correlational



research. Based on this categorization, this study fits into the first category, as it adopts an experimental research strategy. The implementation of this study involved very complex design and procedures, which made it unfeasible to involve a very large number of subjects.

The participants in this study were intermediate learners of English teaching at the language institute of Atieh Gharb in Sanandaj. All of them were native speakers of Kurdish language, while the Persian language was regarded as their L2. The language of instruction in class was English combined with Persian when the students did not understand some passages in English.

In order to achieve the aims of the preset study and to collect the required data, five instruments were used: 1) Oxford Placement Test, 2) vocabulary pre-test, 3) immediate vocabulary post-test, 4) delayed vocabulary post-test, and 5) questionnaires.

Above all, as the part of method aforementioned, the tests were divided into four parts. Furthermore, according to the different kinds of methods of vocabulary acquisition, the data of the test was divided and analyzed separately. Four tests were made up of Oxford Placement Test, teacher-made technical vocabulary pre-test, teacher-made technical vocabulary post-tests including immediate and delayed post-tests respectively. Finally, this research focused on the comparison of the data of the immediate post-test among one control group and two experimental groups, and also compared the distinction among the data of the delayed post-test of these groups.

Scoring and validating the above-mentioned tests was one of the most important and sensitive parts of the study. Since both immediate and delayed post-tests were designed by the researcher, their validity and reliability had to be established. The evaluation of reliability and validity are essential criteria in research. Patton (2002) stated that validity and reliability are two factors which should be taken into account when designing a study, analyzing the results and judging the quality of the study.

To estimate the reliability of both post-tests, the Cronbach Alpha Formula was applied, but to assess the validity of them, the content validity was used to measure. All the items in the vocabulary post-tests were reviewed by the researcher as self-validation. The content validity of these tests items were evaluated by two competent teachers in the institute who had considerable experience in test planning. They were asked to rate each item in two tests as to whether it was congruent with the objectives and the level of comprehension stated using the evaluation from constructed by the researcher. These two raters examined both immediate and delayed post-tests and validated the appropriateness of them.

The present study was done by using experimental research design. This design was often used in classroom experiments when two experimental and one control groups were such naturally assembled groups as three classes, which were made homogenous. Three classes of intermediate learners at English Language Institute of Atieh Gharb were chosen. Ten passages of "family and Friends, from book 5 and two ones of the website named www.esl-lounge.com were selected for the treatment. The selected subjects were put into three groups to receive different treatments. The researcher applied three different approaches to teach incidental vocabulary learning to the subjects in this study. Each group involved the participants reading the texts and responding to them. Sentence writing which was one of the strongest learning conditions in many reported experiments and a basis for a number of generalizations regarding productive language use and semantic elaboration, wasn't used for the control group. The participants were provided with the target words in each session separately in order not to have pre-exposure to the other treatment items. The overall time devoted to the related tasks in three groups was about 90 minutes each session.

The present study was an empirical research quantitative in nature. Data were collected through four tests, two survey questionnaires, and ten passages with unfamiliar words. Before data collection, the students were assured that the results of the tests would not affect their course grades in institute and that they would be used only for academic purposes.

The analysis in the empirical studies combined theory- and data-driven coding orientation, meaning that the content of the data was analyzed according to categorizations that emerged from both theoretical and empirical content (Mayring, 2000). In order to answer the research questions and test the hypotheses, and also to assess whether the participants acquired vocabulary knowledge from the pre-test to the post-

tests, a One-Way ANCOVA was conducted. In this study, the collected data was analyzed by Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Firstly, the descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations and number of participants) of ANCOVA was run to compute the mean differences of the Oxford Placement Test. Secondly, it was also conducted to calculate the scores of the pre-test. Next, descriptive statistics was used to examine whether there was significant difference in vocabulary knowledge of learners in one control group and two experimental groups. It was also to see how the control and the two experimental groups performed on both immediate and delayed post-tests and whether the differences among their means in vocabulary learning between male and female in the groups was significant or not. To locate the differences among means, a post hoc Tukey HSD' test procedure was used. Finally, two questionnaires were used to investigate the participants' attitude towards the performed reading activities. The descriptive statistics of the students' scores to the questionnaires were calculated. At the end, all three groups' answers were checked and graded by the teacher and the means of their grades were measured to see the upshot of the given treatment. Analysis of the data was used to identify similarities and differences in the cooperative learning strategies selected, implementation of the techniques, and overall student achievement.

4. Results and discussion

There are four main instruments to be discussed in the section: the result of Oxford Placement Test, the result of pre-test, the result of post-tests, the result of questionnaires, and the hypothesis testing. Table 1 below displays the descriptive statistics of the participants' scores on Oxford Placement Test. Table 2 shows gender distribution.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of OPT

N	Min.	Max.	Mode	Median	Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	Kurtosis	
								Statistic	Std. Error
90	6	21.50	20	16	15.52	15.24	3.91	.827	.503

Table 2: Gender distribution

		Group					
		Control		Experimental I		Experimental II	
		N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Participants	Male	12	60 %	12	60 %	12	60 %
	Female	8	40 %	8	40 %	8	40 %
	Total	20	100 %	20	100 %	20	100 %

4.1 The Results of Pre-test

The descriptive statistics of the participants' scores on the pre-test are presented in table 3. The inferential statistics of the participants' scores of pre-test is shown in Table 4.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of pre-test

Group	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SEM	Min.	Max.
Experimental I	Male	12	10.37	2.44	0.70	5	13.5
	Female	8	10.94	0.98	0.35	10	13
	Total	20	10.60	1.97	0.44	5.00	13.50
Experimental II	Male	12	9.75	2.43	0.70	5	14.5
	Female	8	11.56	2.29	0.81	8	15



Control	Total	20	10.47	2.49	0.56	5.00	15.00
	Male	12	9.83	2.16	0.62	6	12.5
	Female	8	10.81	1.62	0.57	7	12
Total	Total	20	10.22	1.98	0.44	6.00	12.50
	Male	36	9.99	2.30	0.38	5	14.5
	Female	24	11.10	1.67	0.34	7	15
	Total	60	10.43	2.13	0.27	5.00	15.00

Table 4: Inferential statistics of pre-test (using ANCOVA)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (2-tailed)
Between Groups	1.46	2	.729	.156	.856
Within Groups	265.77	57	4.66		
Total	267.23	59			

4.2 The Results of post-tests

After finishing the treatment period, two post-tests were given to the participants of both experimental and control groups. These tests were administrated so that I would know whether or not there were significant differences between the means of post-tests scores of the groups. The post-tests mean of experimental I, II, and control groups were calculated, respectively. To find out any difference between the means, it is important to compare the mean of post-tests scores of three groups. To test the hypothesis of these tests, the post-tests means of three groups was compared by using One-Way ANCOVA employing SPSS 20.

4.2.1. The Results of immediate post-test

The descriptive and inferential statistics of the participants' scores on immediate post-test and results of post hoc Tukey-HSD test on immediate post-test are presented in tables 5, 6, and 7 respectively.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics of immediate post-test

Group	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SEM	Min.	Max.
Experimental I	Male	12	16.08	2.18	0.63	13	19
	Female	8	16.81	2.27	0.80	12	19
	Total	20	16.38	2.19	0.49	12.00	19.00
Experimental II	Male	12	15.21	3.15	0.91	11	20
	Female	8	15.38	2.94	1.04	11	19.5
	Total	20	15.28	2.99	0.67	11.00	20.00
Control	Male	12	14.83	2.14	0.62	10	17
	Female	8	14.44	2.61	0.92	10	17
	Total	20	14.68	2.28	0.51	10.00	17.00
Total	Male	36	15.38	2.52	0.42	10	20
	Female	24	15.54	2.69	0.55	10	19.5
	Total	60	15.44	2.57	0.33	10.00	20.00

Table 6: Inferential statistics of immediate post-test (using ANCOVA)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (2-tailed)	Partial Eta Squared
Pre-test	40.55	1	40.55	165.627	.000	.747
Between Groups	2.99	2	1.496	6.111	.004	.179
Within Groups	13.71	56	.245			

Total 59.00 60

Table 7: Results of post hoc Tukey-HSD test on immediate post-test

Groups			Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)
Control	Experimental	I	-1.7	0.001
	Experimental	II	-0.6	0.327
Experimental I	Control		1.7	0.001
	Experimental	II	1.1	0.019
Experimental II	Control		-1.1	0.327
	Experimental	I	0.6	0.019

4.2.2 The Results of delayed post-test

Tables 8 and 9 below display the descriptive and inferential statistics of the participants' scores on delayed post-test, respectively.

8

Table 8: Descriptive statistics of delayed post-test

Group	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SEM	Min.	Max.
Experimental I	Male	12	13.96	2.65	0.76	7	17
	Female	8	12.50	3.86	1.36	6	17
	Total	20	13.37	3.18	0.71	6	17
Experimental II	Male	12	12.21	3.66	1.06	5	16
	Female	8	12.88	3.79	1.34	7	17.5
	Total	20	12.47	3.62	0.81	5	17.5
Control	Male	12	14.83	2.14	0.62	10	17
	Female	8	14.44	2.61	0.92	10	17
	Total	20	11.92	2.72	0.61	6	15
Total	Male	36	12.63	3.23	0.54	5	17
	Female	24	12.57	3.22	0.66	6	17.5
	Total	60	12.59	3.20	0.41	5	17.5

Table 9: Inferential statistics of delayed post-test (using ANCOVA)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (2-tailed)	Partial Eta Squared
Pre-test	39.36	1	39.36	130.288	.000	.699
Between Groups	1.45	2	.724	2.395	.100	.079
Within Groups	16.92	56	.302			
Total	59.00	60				

4.2.3 The Results of questionnaires

After doing the immediate post-test, two questionnaires of Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) and Task Evaluation Questionnaire (TEQ) with closed-ended questions were administrated

respectively to the participants of three groups. The reliability of both questionnaires was calculated using Cronbach's Alpha. To validate the questionnaires, the content of both of them were assessed based on the content validity and it was clear that they were valid.

4.2.3.1. The Results of Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire

This questionnaire consisted of five subscales which are presented in table 11. The descriptive statistics of the participant's scores to the questionnaire in three groups is given below in table 10. The inferential statistics of this questionnaire is also presented in table 12.

Table 10: Descriptive statistics of MSLQ

Group	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SEM	Min.	Max.
Experimental I	Male	12	218.50	32.09	9.26	170	276
	Female	8	223.50	20.04	7.08	189	247
	Total	20	220.50	27.39	6.13	170	276
Experimental II	Male	12	224.83	22.83	6.59	192	271
	Female	8	202.50	33.30	11.77	134	235
	Total	20	215.90	28.92	6.47	134	271
Control	Male	12	211.33	32.78	9.46	138	246
	Female	8	215.88	33.99	12.02	142	248
	Total	20	213.15	32.45	7.25	138	248
Total	Male	36	218.22	29.26	4.88	138	276
	Female	24	213.96	29.83	6.09	134	248
	Total	60	216.52	29.31	3.78	134	276

Table 11: The Subscales of MSLQ

Scales	Number of Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach Alpha
Cognitive strategy use	13	63.23	8.83	0.71
Self-regulation	9	41.3	6.67	0.64
Self-efficacy	9	46.05	8.93	0.89
Intrinsic value	9	48.3	7.87	0.81
Test anxiety	4	17.63	3.84	0.58
Total	44	216.52	29.31	0.92

Table 12: Inferential statistics of MSLQ (using ANCOVA)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (2-tailed)
Between Groups	551.63	2	275.82	.313	.73
Within Groups	50153.35	57	879.88		
Total	50704.98	59			

4.2.3.2. The Results of Task Evaluation Questionnaire

The descriptive and inferential statistics of the participant's scores to the questionnaire in three groups are given below in tables 13, and 15, respectively which accompanying the figure 4. Task Evaluation Questionnaire had four subscales which are presented in table 14.

Table 13: Descriptive statistics of TEQ

Group	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	SEM	Min.	Max.
Experimental I	Male	12	72.42	12.42	3.59	50	94
	Female	8	75.88	9.14	2.23	65	89
	Total	20	73.80	11.09	2.48	50	94



Experimental II	Male	12	75.67	11.52	3.33	59	98
	Female	8	72.50	8.12	2.87	60	84
	Total	20	74.40	10.18	2.28	59	98
Control	Male	12	70.67	9.73	2.81	49	85
	Female	8	73.13	7.86	2.78	60	82
	Total	20	71.65	8.89	1.99	49	85
Total	Male	36	72.92	11.15	1.86	49	98
	Female	24	73.83	8.16	1.67	60	89
	Total	60	73.28	10.00	1.29	49	98

Table 14: The Subscales of TEQ

Scales	Number of Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach Alpha
Interest/enjoyment	7	23.20	4.69	0.70
Perceived choice	5	16.5	2.82	0.38
Perceived competence	5	18.25	3.26	0.74
Pressure/tension	5	15.33	2.53	0.14
Total	22	73.28	10	0.79

Table 15: Inferential statistics of TEQ (using ANCOVA)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (2-tailed)
Between Groups	83.63	2	41.817	.410	.666
Within Groups	5812.55	57	101.975		
Total	5896.18	59			

10

4.3. Discussion

The findings of the current study are discussed in line with the research questions. The first research question was: Do collaborative tasks have any effect on incidental vocabulary enhancement and vocabulary learning motivation? To answer the first question, the aim was to examine the effect of collaborative teaching on incidental vocabulary learning on the learners of three groups. To find out the treatment effects, i.e., the efficiency of the different types of tasks, a One-Way ANCOVA was carried out to compare learners' results for the vocabulary knowledge meant to measure learners' performance of the studied vocabulary. While the learners of experimental groups I and II enjoyed vocabulary learning by collaborative teaching, the learners of control group felt a lack of motivation and vocabulary enhancement as well as they were less enthusiastic in vocabulary learning compared to the collaborative groups. This reveals the decisive role of collaborative tasks in motivating and enhancing learners to learn vocabulary.

The findings of this study demonstrated that the two experimental groups had significantly improved their vocabulary knowledge comparing to the control group. The reason for the relative success of experimental groups in the process of incidental vocabulary acquisition might lie in their collaborative nature. Ample evidence suggests that collaborative tasks create more language learning and, particularly, more vocabulary learning opportunities than individual tasks (Fernández Dobao, 2014, p. 500). The collaborative nature of the experimental groups and the support of participants from each other in their efforts to complete the tasks while discussing them might have led to effective performance in this experiment. The findings of this study are also in agreement with the findings of studies by Kim (2008) and Huang (2004), Kim investigated the effect of collaborative and individual tasks on the acquisition of L2 vocabulary by comparing the performance of learners on a dictogloss task. The first group of participants was involved in individual work, but the other group was engaged in pair work. The results revealed significant effect of collaborative work on vocabulary acquisition. The study conducted by Huang compared three different reading tasks: multiple-choice, filling the gaps with the target words and making sentences with the target words. It turned out that the task of making sentences with target words resulted in better retention of the words than the task of filling gaps with target words and task of multiple-choice.

In summary, task-based instruction had a marked effect on vocabulary acquisition. As Li-na (2012) argued, task-based instruction is an effective way in English vocabulary learning in which it can afford



interest and authenticity, improve language by negotiation of meanings, and create a climate of intimacy and deep cooperativeness basic to learners' emotional and cognitive growth. To sum up, the findings of the current study indicated that collaborative tasks enhanced incidental vocabulary acquisition and gave motivation to the learners to learn the words better.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

The results of the study showed that collaborative tasks had statistically significant effect on the performance of language learners on acquiring incidental vocabulary. Findings from the study show that after the treatment period, the two experimental groups and one control group have improved in their results on post-tests.

The results also indicated that the motivational involvement had an enhancing effect on initial L2 vocabulary in short-term assessment. Unlike short-term acquisition, the long-term acquisition of vocabulary was not significantly affected by motivational involvement as there was a considerable decay of retention on the delayed post-test. Therefore, the enhancing effect of motivational involvement was restricted to immediate post-test, and the effect disappeared very soon. Consequently, as the results of the One-Way ANCOVA showed there was a significant difference among the three groups' performance on vocabulary immediate and delayed post-tests.

By and large, based on the obtained results of One-Way ANCOVA, the learners of the two experimental groups who had been taught through task-based language teaching (collaborative learning) performed better than those learners of the control group who had been taught vocabulary through traditional approach (individual learning). Also, the learners of the experimental group I outperformed the learners of experimental group II. It can be concluded that collaborative learning in tasks affected the L2 learners' performance on the incidental vocabulary learning. Such findings can be justified by considering some outstanding features about the nature of task-based language teaching and learning and its effectiveness in EFL (English as a foreign language) contexts.

First, TBLT (task-based language teaching) is a meaning-centered methodology, i.e. it develops learners' communicative competence by focusing on the meaning. Thus, TBLT encourages the learner to understand the written text with an unconscious and peripheral focus on the form of the language. According to Ellis (2003), such meaningfulness in TBLT provides an authentic, purposeful and intentional background for comprehending and using language and it is encouraging for the EFL learners.

Second, in TBLT there is a very helpful pre-task phase in which the teacher tries to activate the learners' background knowledge and the related schemata by engaging the learners in completing tasks similar to those which should be worked out during the task phase itself. In comparison with other methods for teaching reading comprehension including CBLT (content-based language teaching), TBLT has a more effective, authentic, meaningful and purposeful pre reading phase. In addition, the pre-reading phase in TBLT is more elaborate and complete. Furthermore, a peculiar feature of pre-task phase in TBLT which embodies the pre-reading phase in reading comprehension skill is a kind of a task which should be completed by the students. In fact, we have a minimized TBLT approach even in the first phase. In contrast, in other methodologies adopted for teaching reading comprehension there is a very simple list of questions or maybe some figures or photos for pre-reading activators.

Third, In CBLT the focus is on the content and the students are only concerned with mere information or the subject matter which has been put on the paper. Here, students are not concerned about the language. And what is important for the teacher is the secondary function of the language, which is the transactional function. Nevertheless, in TBLT, both the learning and the manipulation of the language are considered. And the tasks are at the service of the communication of meaning through language. Here, students are encouraged by other peers to use the subject matter and to manipulate it in order to complete a task.

Next, the superiority of TBLT is the planning and report stages which are done by the students during the task phase. The cooperative nature of planning and report stages help students get feedback from the members of a Task-Based group. Of course, the students in TBLT groups receive feedback from the



teacher. However, in the CBLT group the students work individually on the exercises and do not receive any feedback from their peers and the only authority for judging the accuracy of exercises is the teacher. Therefore, existence of such a feedback can be claimed to provide a more relaxing and less threatening condition for learning a foreign language.

Finally, in TBLT methodology, there is a post-task phase or a language focus phase during which the teacher deductively teaches complicated formal aspects of language such as difficult structures, vocabulary and other problematic points in reading texts. Accordingly, the formal instruction of language is also considered by TBLT methodology. The existence, the place and the time of such a language-focused phase belongs only to TBLT and such a stage cannot be seen as long as CBLT is concerned.

5.1. Recommendations

For future researchers, it is recommended that they use collaborative tasks to notice their effects on enhancing incidental vocabulary learning. It is also suggested that researchers as teachers use collaborative tasks in teaching other components and skills such as grammar learning, pronunciation, writing, speaking and so on. Since, as far as the researcher perceived, using these tasks made learners participate in group discussions and in fact made them speak more and also helped them be aware of their weakness in English speaking. Accordingly, it is recommended that teachers and learners consider the findings of this study toward a better practice in vocabulary learning.

References

- Abbasnasab Sardareh, S. (2016). **Formative feedback in a Malaysian primary school**. Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 3(1), pp. 9-20.
- Avila, E., & M. Sadoski. (1996). **Exploring new applications of the keyword method to acquire English vocabulary**. Language Learning, 46, pp. 379-395.
- Ellis, R. (2003). **Task-based language learning and teaching**. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Fernández Dobao, A. (2014). **Vocabulary learning in collaborative tasks: A comparison of pair and small group work**. Language Teaching Research, 18(4), pp. 497-520.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). **How to design and evaluate research in education**. (6th, Ed.) Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2003). **"Incidental and Intentional Learning"**. In Catherine Doughty & Michael H. Long (eds.). The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition. Malden: Blackwell, pp. 348-381.
- Hulstijn, J. H., & Laufer, B. (2001). **Some empirical evidence for the involvement load hypothesis in vocabulary acquisition**. Language Learning, 51(3), pp. 539-558.
- Kim, K. (2008). **The contribution of collaborative and individual tasks to the acquisition of L2 vocabulary**. The Modern Language Journal, 92 (1), pp. 114-130.
- Kim, Y. (2008). **The role of task-induced involvement and learner proficiency in L2 vocabulary acquisition**. Language Learning, 58(2), 285-325.
- Kim, Y., & McDonough, K. (2011). **Using pretask modeling to encourage collaborative learning opportunities**. Language Teaching Research, 15 (2), pp. 183-199.
- Li-na, Z. H. O. U. (2012). **Pedagogical Strategies for Task-Based Vocabulary Acquisition**. Sino-US English Teaching, 9(4), pp. 1056-1060.
- Mackey, A., Gass, S. M. (2005). **Second language research: Methodology and design**. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mayring P (2000). **Qualitative content analysis**. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research 1(2). Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index._Php/fqs/article/view/1089.
- Nadarajan, S. (2009). **The effect of instruction and context on L2 learners' vocabulary development**. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 6 (2), pp. 177-189.
- Nassaji, H., & Tian, J. (2010). **Collaborative and individual output tasks and their effects on learning English phrasal verbs**. Language Teaching Research, 14 (4), pp. 397-419.
- Newton, J. (2013). **Incidental vocabulary learning in classroom communication tasks**. Language Teaching Research, 17(2), pp. 164-187.
- Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. (1996). **Enhancing vocabulary acquisition through reading: A hierarchy of text-related exercise types**. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 52(2), pp. 155-178.



- Paribakht, T.S., & Wesche, M. (1996a). **Enhancing vocabulary acquisition through reading: A hierarchy of text-related exercise types**. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52 (1), pp. 155-178.
- Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. (1997). “**Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary development**”, in J. Coady and T. Huckin (eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 174-200.
- Pearson, P. D., Hiebert, E.H. & Kamil, M. L. (2007). **Vocabulary assessment: What we know and what we need to learn**. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42, pp. 282-296.
- Read, J. (2000) **Assessing Vocabulary**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Storch, N. (2005). **Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students’ reflections**. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), pp. 153-173.
- Storch, N. (2007). **Investigating the merits of pair work on a text editing task in ESL classes**. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(2), pp. 143–159.
- Thanh, K. N., & Huan, N.B. (2012). **Task-Based Language Learning and Student Motivation in Vocabulary Acquisition**. *Language Education in Asia*, 3(1), pp. 106-120.
- http://dx.doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/12/V3/I1/A10/Thanh_Huan.
- Vosoughi, H., & Mehdipour, Z. (2013). **Effects of Recognition Task and Production Task on Incidental Vocabulary Learning of Iranian EFL Learners**. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4(2), pp. 356-363.
- Wode, Henning. (1999). “**Incidental vocabulary acquisition in the foreign language classroom**”. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 21, pp. 243–258.