Vocabulary Learning Strategies and ELT Materials

A Study of the Extent to Which VLS Research Informs Local Coursebooks in Iran

Ali Bastanfar (Corresponding author)

Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Islamic Azad university-Khoy Branch

Khoy, Province of West Azarbaijan, Iran

Tel: 98-461-225-3623   E-mail: alibastanfar@yahoo.com

Toktam Hashemi

Islamic Azad university-Khoy Branch

E-mail: hashemi5toktam@yahoo.com

Abstract

Lexical competence is now regarded to be at the heart of communicative competence. This is endorsed by psycholinguistic research and corpus linguistics which show more use of prefabricated chunks than rule-based constructions. The change has been embraced in ELT. But lexical needs are unique to the individuals, personally, professionally and academically. Research demonstrates that vocabulary learning strategies make learning more self-directed and transferrable to new situations but there is a need for training learners in the use of VLS. ELT coursebooks are agenda for classroom practices; hence a good place to incorporate learner training. This study analyzed local ELT materials to study to what extent insights from VLS research and learner training have informed the sampled coursebooks. The results show the new edition of Pre-University coursebook is a significant step in incorporating such insights however there is a long way before the treatment is adequate in the whole series.

Keywords: Vocabulary learning strategies (VLS), Learner training, ELT materials, Lexical needs

1. Introduction

A good knowledge of vocabulary is essential for communication. Although grammar and vocabulary are complementary, with a bit of negligence Wilkins (1972) asserts that "without grammar, very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary, nothing can be conveyed." In many instances, people deal with a particular situation by learning specific words related to that context while they have hardly any mastery of grammatical structures e.g. airport taxi drivers in EFL countries. These people have concluded that words have more communicative value considering the amount of time, attention and energy spent to learn. The common experience of teachers and learners also demonstrates that lack of a specific word cannot be compensated by circumlocution. In an example, a student remembers being caught in a situation where he had forgotten the word 'CHARGE'. The person was shopping from a hotel supermarket in an Asian country. He did not have cash on him so wanted to ask the cashier to 'charge' his room account. He fell back on different words and sentences to fill the gap but with no success. Finally, he decided to show his room card and make the context more relevant. This simple example testifies to the importance of the knowledge of vocabulary. Words are not merely slot-fillers which simply fill in the pre-assigned function slots determined by structures of language. Rather, they are building blocks of a successful communication.

All through the history of ELT, it has never been doubted that a typical language learner has to build up an efficient knowledge of vocabulary to construct sentences conveying his meanings. Nevertheless, in earlier periods of ELT, vocabulary teaching was overshadowed by a focus on grammar because it was thought that vocabulary could simply be left to take care of itself. The wave of change came along with the body of research which demonstrated the necessity of including vocabulary instruction in ELT programs. There is now general agreement that lexical competence is at the heart of communicative competence and learners must systematically build up an efficient knowledge of vocabulary (Coady and Huckin, 1997, as cited in Decarrico, 2001). Evidence from psycholinguistic research and corpus linguistics suggests that prefabricated chunks are the foundation of fluency and account for more of the choices speakers make than do novel constructions based on the application of grammatical rules (Decarrico, 2001; Ranalli, 2003).

Ranalli (2003) observes that a look at the practices in ELT suggests the field has resonated to this change and has tried to account for the new tendency by modifying its approaches and methodologies. The movement has gone so far as a controversial call for a lexical approach (Lewis, 1993; 1997). According to this view, words and their collocations, not the rules, will be the foundation for language learning (Willis, 1990). Lewis (1993) believed that language is composed of words connected by rules of language not of grammatical rules filled in by words. Thus, vocabulary was no longer a victim of discrimination in language teaching which, after decades of neglect, recognized lexis as central to any language learning process (Laufer, 1997). The change in the status of vocabulary in language learning has affected teaching and learning practices, as well as materials writing which has become more selective about what vocabulary to include (O'Dell, 1997). However it is truism that a typical instructional program for language learning is unable to provide all the lexis a learner will need (Lewis, 1993; Willis, 1990) since lexical needs are largely unique to the individuals, personally, professionally and academically (Rivers, 1983; Nation, 2001). The question is whether this is an insolvable dilemma in language teaching? A bulk of research on learning strategies continues to grow which can show us a way out. Thus, accompanied with the resurgence of interest in vocabulary, there has been recognition of the importance of equipping learners with how to acquire vocabulary on their own (Ranalli, 2003). This made the studies in the field of LLS relevant to vocabulary learning.

A subcategory of general learning strategies is called language learning strategies which in turn include vocabulary learning strategies (Nation, 2001). Language learning strategies are certain skills, techniques and actions used by the learner to facilitate the learning and recall of one or several components of proficiency (Wenden and Rubin, 1987). A subset of these strategies, called vocabulary learning strategies, is strongly linked to successful vocabulary learning. The success implies making the process of learning more effective, more self-directed, and more transferrable to new situations. In fact, instead of or in addition to giving a few fish to a person we can teach him fishing. The LLS research, and VLS research by the same token, is linked to studies which show that more successful learners, in contrast to less successful learners, employ a group of specific strategies which are related to their success. Research tradition on learning strategies dates back to the 1970s studies which were involved with identifying the characteristics of good language learners. Thus, as LLS have been defined as "the special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn or retain new information" (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990), VLS have been characterized as any strategy which affects the process by which words are obtained, stored, retrieved and used (Schmitt, 1997).

Although research endorses the benefits of using these strategies, there is evidence to the effect that learners need training to use them efficiently with the ultimate result of improving their vocabulary learning. Left on their own, learners are mostly inclined to use basic vocabulary learning strategies but they "may be willing to try new strategies if they are introduced to them and instructed in them" (Schmitt, 1997). Nation (2001) also asserts that since "learners differ greatly in the skill with which they use strategies, it is important to make training in strategy use a planned part of a vocabulary development program". Thus, presenting vocabulary learning strategies should be the prime concern for coursebook writers, materials developers, syllabus designers, decision-makers and finally teachers. While it may be unimaginable to expect all teachers to unexceptionally include training learners to use VLS in their activities, it is more feasible to incorporate such training in ELT coursebooks as they are agenda for classroom practices for teachers and learners alike. Having this in mind, the necessity of attention to and incorporation of vocabulary learning strategies and training to use them in ELT coursebooks becomes clearer. This concern is even more important than developing a set of principles for selecting a collection of words to be included in a specific language program or coursebook. As a logical result of such discussions, the following questions arise: what measures have been taken in ELT coursebooks to present vocabulary learning strategies and training to use them? Are these attempts realized in the books as they are? These questions boil down to a basic question: have insights from VLS research "filtered down" (Schmitt, 1997) into the ELT materials? This study aims to delve into the research on vocabulary learning strategies and extract insights which can enrich ELT coursebooks. Then an attempt is made to gauge advances in treating VLS in ELT coursebooks. For this purpose, local ELT materials are analyzed to study to what extent insights from VLS research have informed the sampled coursebooks.

2. Taxonomies of Vocabulary Learning Strategies

Empirical research based mostly on learners' self-report of their strategy use is the cornerstone of VLS studies. Among the many studies that have been carried out to determine which strategies learners use and to figure out relationships between strategy use and success in language learning, there have been attempts to develop taxonomies of vocabulary learning strategies. On the whole, the taxonomies proposed by Gu and Johnson (1996), Lawson and Hogben (1996), Schmitt (1997) and Nation (2001) are always cited in the literature on vocabulary

learning strategies. It should be mentioned that other researchers' works should not be downgraded as they have been very influential in giving strategy researchers, including those who have developed the taxonomies, increasingly clearer views of the thoughts, behaviors and tendencies of learners. The studies carried out include but are not restricted to the following: Ahmed (1989), Sanaoui (1995), Stoffer (1995), Moir (1996), Gu and Johnson (1996), Lawson and Hogben (1996), Schmitt (1997), Porte (1988), Kudo (1999), Kojic-Sabo and Lightbown (1999), Lin (2001), Catalan (2003), Fan (2003). Thus, most of these studies resulted in the accumulation of an organized body of knowledge about VLS and allowed a few others to extract a taxonomy based on the existing research and their own empirical study. Nation's (2001) taxonomy is, however, an exception in that it does not derive from empirical research but is purely theoretical. The four taxonomies together with Sanaoui's (1995) general classification of the structured and unstructured approach to vocabulary learning and Nielsen's (2003) contextualized/decontextualized distinction will be dealt with in the following.

Sanaoui (1995) identified two distinctive approaches to vocabulary learning of adult learners: those who structured their vocabulary learning and those who did not. Structured learners engaged in independent study, did self-initiated learning activities and recorded the lexical items they were learning, reviewed such records, and practiced using vocabulary items outside the classroom. Structured Learners were shown to be more successful than those who followed an unstructured approach.

Gu and Johnson (1996) identified six types of strategy - guessing, dictionary, note-taking, rehearsal, encoding, and activation - together with two other factors: beliefs about vocabulary learning and metacognitive regulation. Metacognitive regulation consists of strategies for selective attention and self-initiation. The former allow learners to know which words are important for them to learn and are essential for adequate comprehension of a passage. The latter make the meaning of vocabulary items clear through the use of a variety of means. Guessing strategies, skillful use of dictionaries and note-taking strategies are labeled as cognitive strategies. Rehearsal and encoding categories are classified under memory strategies. Word lists and repetition are instances of rehearsal strategies. Encoding strategies include strategies such as association, imagery, visual, auditory, semantic, and contextual encoding as well as word-structure. Activation strategies include those strategies through which learners actually use new words in different contexts.

Lawson and Hogben (1996), in a classification which is more a reflection of the strategies actually exploited during one particular word-learning task than an overview of all vocabulary learning strategies at learners' disposal, distinguish four categories of strategies: repetition, word feature analysis, simple elaboration and complex elaboration. Repetition includes reading of related words, simple rehearsal, writing of word and meaning, cumulative rehearsal and testing. Word feature analysis contains spelling, word classification and suffix. Simple elaboration consists of sentence translation, simple use of context, appearance similarity, sound link and complex elaboration includes complex use of context, paraphrase and mnemonic. They found that learners who had used a greater range of learning strategies recalled more of the learned words later. However, all the learners alike tended to favor simple repetition strategies over more complex elaboration strategies, despite the fact that the latter yielded higher recall. Hence the researchers concluded that there is a need to present strategies more directly during language teaching since students are not aware of the advantages of these procedures.

Schmitt (1997) devised his taxonomy, self-reportedly, in response to the lack of a comprehensive list of vocabulary learning strategies. He organized 58 strategies under five types: determination, social, memory, cognitive and metacognitive. His categories were inspired by Oxford's (1990) inventory of general language learning strategies but included some modifications. Thus, social, memory, cognitive and metacognitive strategies have been adopted from Oxford (1990). The modification was that he made a distinction between discovery and consolidation strategies. The former helps learners to find out the meaning of new words when encountered for the first time, and the latter allows them to memorize, practice and retain the word after it has been introduced. The categories adopted from Oxford are included within consolidation strategies while discovery strategies contain determination and social strategies. Determination strategies are used when "learners are faced with discovering a new word's meaning without recourse to another person's experience" (Schmitt, 1997). For example, learners try to discover the meaning of a new word by guessing it with the help of context, structural knowledge of language, and reference materials. It is also possible to discover the meaning of a word through asking someone for help. Schmitt includes social strategies in both categories since they can be used for both purposes.

Nation's (2001) theoretically-oriented taxonomy makes a basic distinction between the aspects of vocabulary knowledge from the sources of vocabulary knowledge and from learning processes; hence, three general classes: planning, sources, and processes, each covering a subset of key strategies. 'Planning' involves choosing where

and how to focus attention on the vocabulary item and contains strategies for choosing words, choosing aspects of word knowledge and choosing strategies as well as planning repetition. 'Sources' involves finding information about the word from the word form itself, from the context, from a reference source like dictionaries or glossaries and from analogies and connections with other languages. Process means establishing word knowledge through noticing, retrieving and generating strategies.

In his review of research into vocabulary learning, Nielsen (2003) makes a distinction between contextualized and decontextualized vocabulary learning strategies which is inspired by the debate concerning learning words in context versus learning words out of context. Within the decontextualized vocabulary memorization strategies, he distinguishes between mnemonic and non-mnemonic elaboration techniques. Mnemonic techniques involve the use of both visual and verbal mental imagery to relate a word to be memorized with some previously learned knowledge; an example is the keyword method. Non-mnemonic elaboration techniques, such as semantic mapping and ordering, encourage learners to process target words in terms of their semantic properties. There are two versions of the keyword method, one based on the construction of visual images and the other based on the construction of sentences. 'Semantic mapping' involves brainstorming associations that a word has and diagrammatically displaying the results. 'Ordering' is a technique that asks learners to organize scrambled lists of words, forcing them to distinguish differences in meaning during the arrangement process. His contextualized VLS category includes learning words through reading and sentence writing method (Sentence Generate Method) which involves having learners construct a sentence containing the target word to be memorized.

3. Training in Vocabulary Learning Strategies

Learner training helps learners discover the learning strategies that suit them best (Ellis and Sinclair, 1989). It creates awareness of the choices available in language learning and facilitates learning and practice of strategies that encourage independence and enable self-directed learning (Oxford, 1990). Wenden (1991) considers learning strategies, metacognitive knowledge, and attitude as components of learner training. According to Chamot (1999) "learning strategies instruction can help students of English become better learners" since it assists them in becoming independent, confident learners. He continues to say that as learners begin to understand the relationship between their use of strategies and success in learning English they become more motivated. Lotfi (2007) reports Cohen and Aphek (1981) who taught students of Hebrew to remember vocabulary items by making paired mnemonic associations and found that those who made associations remembered vocabulary more effectively than those who did not. Stoffer (1995, as cited in Renalli, 2003) claims that strategy instruction is the single best predictor of use of VLS. Nation (2001) believes that since "learners differ greatly in the skill with which they use strategies, it is important to make training in strategy use a planned part of a vocabulary development program". He basically includes the element of training in the definition of a strategy when he says, to deserve attention from a teacher, a strategy must involve choice, be complex, require knowledge and benefit from training, and increase the efficiency of vocabulary learning and vocabulary use. Lawson and Hogben (1996) concluded that there is a need to present strategies more directly during language teaching since students are not aware of their advantages. However, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) make us aware of the fact that strategy training is a complex process which requires committed and informed teachers who spend an extended period of time working with learners.

Chamot (2004) asserts that strategy instruction should be explicit, that is, the teacher should inform students about the value and applications of the strategies either within regular language course or as a separate course. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) show that an explicit (vs. embedded or implicit) focus on metacognitive knowledge about learning processes is necessary to make them transferable to new learning tasks. Chamot (2004) believes that culture and context influence LLS by determining the demands of the task and the kind of learning strategies deemed effective. Thus, language teachers should help their students use the learning strategies that will best accomplish their instructional goals. This involves taking into account students' level of L2 (English) proficiency (which can affect their ability to understand metacognitive explanations for how and why to use strategies), learning context, learners' cultural backgrounds, previous educational experiences, learning styles, etc (Renalli, 2003). Training must also include opportunities for learners to monitor and evaluate their use of learning strategies (Sinclair and Ellis 1992). This necessitates pairing metacognitive and cognitive (direct) strategies to give students "direction or opportunity to plan their learning, monitor their progress, or review their accomplishments and future learning directions" (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990). On the basis of the findings of research the following results can be extracted:

▪   Vocabulary learning strategies have a wide variety and a typical learner is aware of and uses only a small fraction of them which may not be the most efficient ones.

- Learners need instruction to widen their range of strategies and use them. This training has the role of changing knowledge into skill. It is the independent use of these strategies which is the ultimate goal of strategy instruction.

- In earlier stages of language learning, decontextualized strategies are necessary and a greater proportion of them is recommended. With progress, the proportion is balanced.

- Since students in earlier stages lack metalinguistic information for explicit VLS training, it is better to rely more on presenting VLS implicitly, that is, embedded within other activities and introduce explicit VLS gradually.

- Metacognitive strategies should be included in instruction along with the direct strategies.

- Learners may show indifference or resistance to strategy training because of their previous learning experience, educational or cultural background, learning style or other factors. So the goals of strategy instruction should be explained and their motivation in terms of positive affective factors should be stimulated and involved.

- Explicit instruction is more effective. So, use of L1, that is, the learner's mother tongue or the language which the learner uses for his general academic needs, is better unless learners are advanced.

4. The Role of Materials

Tomlinson (2001) reports that coursebook is the most convenient form of presenting materials; it produces consistency and continuation, gives learners a sense of system, cohesion and progress, and helps teachers prepare and learners revise. Littlejohn (1992) believes that coursebooks today are more influential than ever before in terms of the extent to which they structure what happens in language classrooms. Most of the times, changes in policy are implemented through coursebook revision or change since coursebooks are agenda for classroom teaching and learning practices. While it is possible alternatively to fall back on teacher training and professional development programs to implement a procedure in language teaching, it is more practicable to count on coursebooks. This is the case with presenting VLS and training learners to use them in their activities and is the rationale behind the present study as will be explained presently.

5. The Study

This study attempts to apply criteria extracted from VLS research on local ELT materials to evaluate their treatment of VLS. The purpose is to analyze the specified coursebooks based on the insights gained from VLS research to gauge the extent to which the sampled coursebooks have incorporated VLS and training in using them. Thus, this study can be considered as a micro-evaluation in that a particular teaching task is selected and is subjected to a detailed empirical evaluation (Ellis, 1997). In a similar undertaking, Schmitt (1997) concluded that insights from research and scholarly discussion have been "filtering down" into recently published vocabulary-learning materials. However, a focused and comparative work can be more insightful.

The method of analysis and evaluation was that a set of criteria were derived from the research history on both vocabulary learning strategies and learner training in VLS. Lake's (1997) evaluative framework of learner training was adopted with major modifications according to the goals of the study. The criteria are presented in Table 1. The degree of correspondence of each coursebook with the criteria were recorded in terms of a subjective rating scheme with four points (0-3) to provide the reader with a mental framework and to facilitate comparisons among the coursebooks in this study. The zero (0) in this scheme means that the book in question has not dealt with the specified strategies or it has dealt with them in a disorganized manner and sporadically; it also represents a lack of correspondence with the criteria. One (1) means dealing with strategies in small scale and weak correspondence. Two (2) means moderate dealing with strategies and correspondence. And three (3) means almost perfect treatment. The rating was repeated independently by the researcher's colleague on two coursebooks chosen randomly from among the coursebooks under analysis in order to ensure inter-reliability.

The coursebooks analyzed and evaluated in this study were coursebook series used to teach English in local General Education in Iran. The series include seven coursebooks. Three books belong to Guidance School level of General Education which has three levels and begins after primary school. This is where English is introduced for the first time in local General Education. All students have to study Guidance School to be qualified to enter High School. Thus, they take three English courses during the three-year period of the Guidance School. High School has three levels and takes three years. Here again students have to take one English course each year. After students finish High School, they have to continue studying for another one year to be qualified to take University Entrance Exam to enter university. This one-year period is called Pre-University. So every Iranian student takes seven English courses before he enters university. The English coursebooks used in these levels have been arranged as a series and they claim to have one ultimate goal which is the improvement of students'

English proficiency. The three Guidance School books have mostly a structural basis sporadically interspersed with some dialogues and functions which are always misused through treating them as Grammar-Translation activities. The three High School books are reading-oriented but the structural basis of the books is in evidence. However, they are a relative improvement compared to the three former ones. This being said, it is very interesting that the new edition of English coursebook of Pre-University level proves to be a quite different attempt in developing local English coursebooks. However, the efficiency of learning English in local General Education is notoriously low. One reason for this among many other reasons is the structural basis of the coursebooks. Even the overemphasis on reading skill in these coursebooks has been overshadowed by being structurally-oriented (Jahangard 2007). This being known, no study has ever tried to realize the status of vocabulary learning strategies in these books, specifically the new edition of Pre-University coursebook. This study is an attempt to gain an understanding in this regard.

6. Results and Discussion

The final scores in table 2 show the degree to which each coursebook within this series has incorporated the criteria. While the six coursebooks all through the Guidance School and High School levels show a weak attention to research base, there is a considerable gain in the case of Pre-University coursebook. This is because the new edition of the book has moved a long way in incorporating vocabulary learning strategies and the elements of learner training. Not only has the book changed the long established direction of the earlier books in the series, but also it has introduced elements which were sort of taboo in General Education coursebooks. An important difference is that earlier books did not address learners all through the book; rather they addressed the teacher by including regular recommendation notes on how to teach various parts of the book. This is quite against the aims and methods of learner training. Catering for self-directed learning and independence entails trusting in the learner as a person who can take the responsibility of his learning and providing a system of necessary notes for him/her which make for increasingly independent learning. This is embodied in the inclusion of an informative nine-page preface as well as regular notes through the new edition of the book which draw students' attention to strategies and give them practice in using the strategies. It should, however, be pointed out that even in Pre-University book the treatment of vocabulary learning strategies is not adequate when a comparison is made to the treatment of other kinds of strategies, e.g. reading strategies. This shows a general tendency in General Education English coursebooks to place more emphasis on specific components and skills of language, that is, grammar and reading. Nevertheless, inadequate treatment of VLS is a general deficiency which most coursebooks suffer from. What is noticeable in all books of this series is a widespread lack of attention to metacognitive strategies including strategies providing both for self-direction and self-assessment and monitoring. This is not a minor problem as strategies and learner training can be realized only when cognitive strategies are complemented with metacognitive ones as organizing factor. Even in the case of direct (cognitive) strategies, as the rating for 'Breadth' shows, not a wide range of vocabulary learning strategies have been presented all through the series. On the whole, the analysis shows that although the Pre-University coursebook is a significant step in absorbing the insights from research on VLS, the entire series suffer from a widespread lack of attention to VLS presentation and learner training. There is no explicit teaching of cognitive and metacognitive strategies, a problem which undermines a systematic approach to vocabulary. The range of VLS which are presented, of course implicitly, is so limited that important strategies such as resource use and note-taking are not dealt with. There is no extended and long-term plan for generalizable and personalized vocabulary construction and strategy instruction, instead single and isolated activities are used. Metacognitive strategies are neglected and there is scarce attention to learner attitude. On the whole, the Pre-University book has taken good steps in incorporating VLS but there is a long way before we can evaluate the treatment of VLS in the entire series as efficient and adequate.

7. Conclusion

The new edition of Pre-University book proved to obtain higher scores with regard to vocabulary learning strategies and learner training. This is rewarding since by improving General Education coursebooks it is possible to exert a positive influence on students' proficiency. Because of their wide range of audience, General Education coursebooks can be a suitable point of departure to launch innovations and implement improvements in ELT. One more advantage that local coursebooks have is the possibility of using L1 to present VLS explicitly and metacognitive knowledge about them. The research recommends use of L1 when students' level of proficiency is not high enough to understand metalanguage. It can also summon the element of attitude which is a very important factor in VLS training.

References

Ahmed, M. O. (1989). Vocabulary learning strategies. In P. Meara (Ed.), *Beyond Words* (pp. 3-14). London: CILT.

Carter, R. (2002). Vocabulary. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 42-47). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Catalan, R. M. (2003). Sex differences in L2 vocabulary learning strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 13(1), 54-77.

Chamot, Anna Uhl, (1999), Learning strategy instruction in the English classroom. *The Language Teacher Online*, 23(6). [Online] Available: http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/1999/06/chamot (January 7, 2009)

Chamot, Anna Uhl, (2004), Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, Vol. 1, No. 1. [Online] Available: http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg (October 21, 2008)

Coady, J. & Huckin, T. (Eds.). (1997). *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A.D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.

Cohen, A.D. & Aphek, E. (1981). Easifying second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 3(2), 221-36.

Decarrico, J. S. (2001). Vocabulary learning and teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (3rd ed.). London: Thomson Learning.

Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 36 - 42. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, G. & Sinclair, B. (1989). *Learning to learn English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fan, Y. (2003). Frequency of use, perceived usefulness, and actual usefulness of second language vocabulary strategies: A study of Hong Kong learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(2), 222-241.

Gu, Y. (2002). Gender, academic major, and vocabulary learning strategies of Chinese EFL learners. *RELC Journal* 33(1), 35-54.

Gu, Y. & Johnson, R. K. (1996). Vocabulary learning strategies and language learning outcomes. *Language Learning,* 46(4), 643-679.

Harris, Vee. (2003). Adapting classroom-based strategy instruction to a distance learning context. *TESL-EJ, 7*(2). [Online] Available: http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/past-issues/volume7/ej26/ej26a1/ (October 21, 2008)

Hunt, A. & Beglar, D. (2002). Current research and practice in teaching vocabulary. In J. C. Richards & W. Renandya. (Eds.). *Methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Jahangard, Ali. (2007). Evaluation of EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(2) [Online] Available: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com (March 21, 2009)

Kojic-Sabo, I. & Lightbown, P. M. (1999). Students' approaches to vocabulary learning and their relationship to success*. Modern Language Journal,* 83(2), 176-192.

Kudo, Yongqi. (1999). L2 vocabulary learning strategies. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Hawai'i. [Online] Available: http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW14.pdf (March 21, 2009)

Lake, N. (1997). Survey review: learner training in EFL coursebooks. *ELT Journal* 51(2), 169-182.

Laufer, B. (1997). What's in a word that makes it hard or easy: some intralexical factors that affect the learning of words. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 140-155). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lawson, J. M. & Hogben, D. (1996). The vocabulary learning strategies of foreign language students. *Language Learning*, 46(1), 101-135.

Lessard-Clouston, M. (1997). Language learning strategies: An overview for L2 teachers. *The Internet TESL Journal*. [Online] Available: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Lessard-Clouston-Strategy.html (October 21, 2008)

Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: the state of ELT and a way forward*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (1997). *Implementing the lexical approach*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Lin, L. (2001). Taiwanese children's EFL vocabulary learning strategies. Unpublished MA Thesis, Chin-Hwa University, Taipei, Taiwan.

Littlejohn, A. P. (1992). Why are English language teaching materials the way they are? Lancaster: Lancaster University.

Lotfi, Ghazal. (2007). Learning vocabulary in EFL contexts through vocabulary learning strategies. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 1(2). [Online] Available: http://www.novitasroyal.org/Ghazal.html (October 21, 2008)

Moir, J. (1996). Task awareness and learning effectiveness: a case study of ten learners' perceptions of a vocabulary learning task. *LALS*, Victoria University of Wellington.

Nation, P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Nielsen, B. (2003). A review of research into vocabulary learning and acquisition. [Online] Available: http://www.kushiro-ct.ac.jp/library/kiyo/kiyo36/Brian.pdf (October 21, 2008)

O'Dell, F. (1997). Incorporating vocabulary into the Syllabus. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: description, acquisition and pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.

Porte, G. (1988). 'Poor language learners and their strategies for dealing with new vocabulary'. *ELT Journal*, 42(3), 167-172.

Ranalli, James M. (2003). The treatment of key vocabulary learning strategies in current ELT coursebooks: repetition, resource use, recording. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Birmingham. [Online] Available: www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/RanalliDiss.pdf (October 21, 2008).

Rivers, W. (1983). *Communicating naturally in a second language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Ruutmets, Kristel. (2005). Vocabulary learning strategies in studying English as a foreign language. Unpublished MA Thesis, Tartu University. [Online] Available: http://www.utlib.ee/ekollekt/diss/mag/2005/b17557100/ruutmets.pdf (October 21, 2008).

Sanaoui, R. (1995). Adult learners' approaches to learning vocabulary in second languages. *The Modern Language Journal, 79* (1), 15-28.

Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary learning strategies. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: description, acquisition and pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Segler, T. M. (2001). Second language vocabulary acquisition and learning strategies in ICALL environments. PhD Research Proposal. [Online] Available: http://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/s9808690/newprop.pdf (October 21, 2008)

Sinclair, B. & Ellis, G. (1992). Survey: learner training in EFL coursebooks. *ELT Journal*, 46(2), 209-244.

Stoffer, I. (1995). University foreign language students' choice of vocabulary learning strategies as related to individual difference variables. Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, University of Alabama.

Tomlinson, B. (2001). Materials development. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. Hemel Hepstead: Prentice Hall.

Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics and language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.

Willis, D. (1990). *The lexical syllabus*. London: Collins.

Table 1. Criteria derived from VLS and learner training research adopted and adapted from Lake (1997)

Criteria	Definition
Scope of Learner Training	Presenting learning strategies, metacognitive knowledge and attitude altogether
Type of VLS Training	Awareness-raising activities, one-off activities, or long-term training; the latter is preferred
Language of VLS Presentation	L1 (the learner's mother tongue or the language which the learner uses for his general academic needs), L2 (English) or a combination of the two is used for presenting strategies and learner training; the latter is preferred
Presentation of Metacognitive Strategies	Self-direction: opportunities for individual choice of activities, the method of completing the activity, and the mode in which it is done
	Self-assessment and Monitoring: to enable students to assess and evaluate their performance and progress
Method of Presentation of Metacognitive Strategies	Explicit (using explanation, teacher modeling and separate work for strategy instruction) or implicit (integrating the instruction into regular work); the former is preferred
Presentation of Direct (Cognitive) Strategies	Explicit
	Implicit
	Contextualized
	Decontextualized
Balancing	The extent to which Metacognitive and Direct (cognitive) Strategies are balanced
Breadth	Range and Combination of different strategies
Suitability	The extent to which activities are suitable to the Academic Level of the students
Motivation	Variety and Flexibility: range of approaches and activity types to suit different interests and learning styles
	Balance of Psychological and Technical Preparation
Feedback	Providing explanations for tests

Table 2. The results of applying criteria on local general education coursebook series

Criteria/Values		GS1	GS2	GS3	HS1	HS2	HS3	PU
Scope of Learner Training		1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Type of VLS Training		1	1	1	2	2	2	3
Language of VLS Presentation		0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Presentation of Metacognitive Strategies	Self-direction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Self-assessment and Monitoring	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
Method of Presentation of Metacognitive Strategies		1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Presentation of Direct Strategies	Explicit	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	Implicit	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
	Contextualized	0	1	2	2	2	2	3
	Decontextualized	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Balancing Metacognitive and Direct Strategies		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Breadth		1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Suitability of Activities to Level		2	1	1	2	1	1	3
Motivation	Variety and Flexibility	0	1	1	1	1	1	2
	Balance of Psychological and Technical Preparation	0	0	0	1	1	1	2
Feedback		1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Total		11	13	14	18	17	17	31

GS= Guidance School   HS= High School   PU=Pre-University