

# Promoting vocabulary learning through vocabulary notebooks: Teaching and learning strategies and gender

**Levent Uzun**

*English Language Teaching Department, Faculty of Education, Uludag University, Bursa, Turkey*

Email: [ulevent@uludag.edu.tr](mailto:ulevent@uludag.edu.tr)

(Received 17 November, 2012; Published online 29 April, 2013)

The present study investigated whether there were any differences between the vocabulary acquisition and retention level of female and male students with regard to two conditions: 1) formal instruction and feedback on vocabulary notebook keeping; and 2) the amount of information recorded in the vocabulary notebooks. Five groups of second year university students participated in the study (n = 147). Four of the groups kept vocabulary notebooks, two of which (Experimental Group 1 and Experimental Group 2) received formal instruction and feedback on the words recorded and how to keep vocabulary notebooks, while two other groups (Control Group 2 and Control Group 3) did not receive any instruction or feedback. The fifth group neither received any instruction or feedback nor kept vocabulary notebooks. The two data collection tools were: (i) a questionnaire of vocabulary knowledge and retention that was administered prior to the study; and (ii) a test of receptive and productive vocabulary which was administered as a post-test. Data analyses revealed that extra information recording related to the unknown words and regular feedback provided by the instructor improves vocabulary acquisition and the effect of vocabulary notebook keeping. However, no significant difference was observed between the impact of treatment on female and male students.

**Key words:** vocabulary notebook, feedback, acquisition, retention, gender differences.

## 1. Introduction

Vocabulary has always been a significant component in foreign language learning (FLL), and it is not surprising that it has attracted the interest of many researchers, especially in the last thirty years. One important aspect, among others, has been 'vocabulary learning strategies' (VLS). Ellis (2001, p.554) indicated that VLS is a promising field of investigation since the findings might help to define language learning targets and strategies. Likewise, Hatch and Brown (1995, p.372) remarked that understanding how learners acquire vocabulary and knowing about which methods work better could help teachers in assisting learners in adopting more profitable strategies. Similarly, Nation (1990, p.159) commented that if teachers want to help their learners to cope with unknown words, it would be better to spend more time on VLS rather than spending time on individual words.

Various and detailed taxonomies of VLS have been offered by many researchers that have tried to identify and categorise the strategies (see Schmitt, 1997; Nation, 2001; Gu & Johnson, 1996). In addition, there are more than fifty sub-strategies comprising the proposed taxonomies, such as 'analysing parts of speech', 'guessing meaning from context', 'asking classmates for meaning', 'interacting with native speakers', 'imaging word form', 'using keyword method',

'verbal repetition', 'keeping a vocabulary notebook', and 'expanding rehearsal'. Schmitt (1997, cited in Schmitt and McCarthy, 2001) reported that only 'guessing from context' and 'key word method' have been investigated in depth. Nevertheless, a survey of the recent literature shows that an important amount of research on VLS (e.g. Walters & Bozkurt, 2009; Kilickaya & Krajka, 2010; Zhang & Li, 2011; Ahmadi et al., 2012; Ma, 2012) has accumulated that should be considered more carefully and closely by those who might be interested. Moreover, besides the need for more research on VLS, there is also a need to study the ways of strategy training, and related pedagogical implications, which would be disseminated and introduced more effectively, particularly to the teachers and students.

### **1.1. Keeping Vocabulary Notebooks**

Schmitt (2000) claimed that the most often preferred VLS were the most 'shallow' ones, although they might be less effective than 'deeper' strategies. He also asserted that the commonly used VLS were 'memorization', 'repetition', and 'keeping vocabulary notebooks' (p.132). Keeping a vocabulary notebook is classified as a 'cognitive strategy' among the 58 vocabulary learning strategies included in Schmitt's list (Schmitt & McCarthy, 2001, pp. 207-8). Schmitt (op. cit.) described the cognitive strategies as follows:

They are similar to memory strategies, but are not focused so specifically on manipulative mental processing; they include repetition and using mechanical means to study vocabulary, including the keeping of vocabulary notebooks. (p.136)

Vocabulary notebooks are often considered as a useful way for learners to become more conscious about their vocabulary learning process (Lessard-Clouston, 1994; Schmitt & Schmitt, 1995; Tang, 1997; Leake & Shaw, 2000; Bailey & Onwuegbuzie, 2002; Fowle, 2002; Yongqi Gu, 2003; Horst, 2005; Ghazal, 2007). Keeping vocabulary notebooks requires learners to note down unknown words while also writing their meanings and related information, such as synonyms, antonyms, collocations, sample sentences, etc. Consequently, keeping a vocabulary notebook activates a complicated mental process that is carried out during the action of recording words. In support of this, Fowle (2002) maintained that while discovering the meaning and other aspects of an unknown word, learners might use strategies that involve using dictionaries, guessing from context, or consulting their teachers or classmates. Furthermore, researchers agree that keeping vocabulary notebooks necessitates learners to take more responsibility for their own learning process and become more autonomous. Although autonomy is not always favoured by all scholars (e.g. Laufer, 2005), it is generally regarded as a beneficial quality in FLL. Oxford (1990) indicated that independent learners have the advantage of becoming more confident and increasing their involvement and proficiency. Again, Nation (1990, p.174) remarked that strategies that learners can use autonomously are the most significant of all ways of acquiring vocabulary. Therefore, learners should be trained in the VLS they need most (Ghazal, 2007). McCrostie (2007) concluded that vocabulary notebooks are potentially beneficial means for vocabulary acquisition, but students need more guiding and training on this. So, since vocabulary notebooks provide learners with the opportunity to expand their repertoire of vocabulary, help them enhance vocabulary learning strategies, and encourage individual learning, the effectiveness of vocabulary notebooks should be investigated more closely.

The present study aims at investigating to what extent vocabulary notebooks assist learners in retaining the unknown words that they have come across during their classes at school and readings at home. Two aspects of keeping vocabulary notebooks are investigated: 1) the effect of instructing learners on vocabulary notebook keeping (VNK), and 2) the effect of VNK type, that is, keeping just the equivalents in the two languages versus noting down additional information about the words other than their meaning in L1, such as synonyms, antonyms, collocations, and examples in sentences. The present research seeks the answers of the following questions:

1. Is there any difference between the vocabulary retention level of the students who receive feedback on vocabulary notebook keeping and who do not receive any feedback?
2. Is there any difference between the vocabulary retention level of the students who record only the L1 equivalent(s) of the unknown L2 words and those who note down additional information related to the unknown words, such as synonyms, antonyms, collocations, and sentences that include the unknown word?
3. Are there any gender differences with regard to vocabulary notebook keeping types and L2 vocabulary retention level?

## Method

The present study was conducted at Uludag University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching (ELT) Department, Turkey. Students enrolled in the ELT Department receive formal education, usually for a period of eight semesters, during which they attend classes that are related to language and linguistics, education, history and general knowledge, and computing. About 60% of the courses are delivered in English, while the remaining courses are held in Turkish. Students are randomly placed in one of the ten classes of about 30 persons. The same books and materials are used in all classes and followed for the lessons conducted in English. The present study was carried out during the Linguistics classes of the fourth semester. Since classrooms and also life under natural conditions are not homogenous, participants were included as they were and in their natural environments, without any deliberate effort to create laboratory-like conditions. So, this is a quasi-experimental study, the design of which is naturalistic rather than positivistic. However, the study also included quantitative data collection and analyses.

### 2.1. Participants

The participants of the present study were 147 university students (62 male and 85 female) from five randomly selected classes. The students' ages ranged between 20 and 25. One of the classes (Experimental Group 1) consisted of 24 students (12 male and 12 female) who received formal instruction and feedback on VNK and were asked to record the L1 equivalents of the unknown words that they encountered within the Linguistics course. Another class (Experimental Group 2) comprised 28 students (12 male and 16 female) who received instruction and feedback on VNK and were asked to note down, if available, also the synonyms, antonyms, and the collocations of the unknown words as well as the L1 equivalent(s) and a sentence in which each word existed. The third class (Control Group 1) consisted of 35 students (12 male and 23 female) and they neither received instruction on how to keep vocabulary notebooks nor were they asked to keep a record of the unknown words that they came across. The fourth class (Control Group 2) comprised 30 students (12 male and 18 female) who did not receive any instruction or feedback on VNK but were asked to note down the L1 equivalents of the unknown words that they encountered. Finally, the last class (Control Group 3) comprised 30 students (14 male and 16 female) who did not receive any instruction and feedback on VNK but were asked to note down the L1 equivalents of the unknown words that they came across, together with other possible detail such as synonym(s), antonym(s), the collocation(s) and an example sentence. Table 1 summarises the characteristics of all the groups along with the procedure appointed to each group and the number of students in each group.

**Table 1.** The student groups, numbers, and the procedure to follow.

Group	Number of students	Procedure to follow
Experimental 1	24 (12 male + 12 female)	Instruction and feedback on VNK + L1 equivalent recording
Experimental 2	28 (12 male + 16 female)	Instruction and feedback on VNK + L1 equivalent recording + extra info recording

Table 1 cont'd

Group	Number of students	Procedure to follow
Control 1	35 (12 male + 23 female)	No instruction and feedback on VNK + No deliberate vocabulary recording
Control 2	30 (12 male + 18 female)	No instruction and feedback on VNK + L1 equivalent recording
Control 3	30 (14 male + 16 female)	No instruction and feedback on VNK + L1 equivalent recording + extra info recording

## 2.2. Materials

Meara (1996) indicated that the need for reliable and valid tests of vocabulary knowledge is an important matter in vocabulary acquisition, and that the closest one to a standard vocabulary test is Nation's *Vocabulary Levels Test*, which was also revised and validated by Beglar and Hunt (1999). The materials that were used in the present study consisted of: 1) a vocabulary knowledge and retention questionnaire (VKRQ) which was used prior to the study (see Appendix 1), and contained 50 words from the academic words list (AWL) of Coxhead (2000); and 2) a test of receptive and productive vocabulary (TRPV) which included two parts: a receptive test that was based on the *Vocabulary Levels Test* of Nation (1983, 1990), and a productive test that was modeled on the controlled *Productive Vocabulary Levels Test* of Laufer and Nation (1999) (see Appendix 2). The VKRQ included 50 words that appeared in the units of the students' text materials covering a period of 8 weeks. From these words, 28 were unknown to all of the participants (the unknown category) and 22 were known either by most participants or by some (the known category). The TRPV was applied as a post-test, while the VKRQ was administered as a pre-test. The TRPV aimed at the target words (21 in the receptive part and 7 in the productive part) of the unknown category, which were detected to be unknown as a result of the VKRQ session.

In each item of the receptive part, the students were expected to match the provided definitions with the target words. There were three definitions and six words in each item (in the seventh item there were seven words), and there were seven items in total. Three of the six words in each item were from the unknown category and three from the known category (in the seventh item there were four words, so that all words from the known category were included). Also, in the controlled productive part, the students were required to complete the words, the initial letters of which were provided, so that they would complete the given sentences. In this part there were the remaining seven words from the unknown category. The complete test was composed of 14 items (7 items in the receptive part and 7 items in the productive part). The data collection tools were prepared and implemented by the researcher who also delivered the linguistics course. In order to validate the materials, two external professionals controlled the tools and applied these on a separate group of students who showed similar characteristics with the participants of the present study.

## 2.3. Procedure

The present study was implemented through a period of 10 weeks and in three phases. In Phase 1, the participants and the words that would be included and afterwards tested were determined (in the first week of the study). In Phase 2, the instruction and feedback on and implementation of vocabulary notebooks as well as the preparation and application of the data collection tools were carried out (in the second to ninth weeks of the study). In Phase 3, the investigation of participants' vocabulary notebooks and evaluation of the results obtained from the pre-testing and post-testing sessions were accomplished (in the tenth week). In the following, these three phases are explained in detail.

### *2.3.1. Phase 1 – Determination of the participants and words*

Prior to the implementation of the procedures, it was determined which participants were to be included and which words were to be tested within the scope of the present study. From among the ten classes in the ELT department at Uludag University, five classes were randomly selected and again they were randomly appointed to one of the experimental or control groups specified in Table 1.

To determine which words were to be tested in the present study, it was decided to concentrate on Coxhead's (2000) academic words list (AWL), as it was anticipated that many of these words were rarely used and known but very frequently faced by the students during their readings. The researcher scanned the eight reading texts/chapters which had been forwarded to students at the beginning of the semester, and covered a period of eight weeks of the linguistics course. From these texts, the researcher selected 50 English words (see Appendix 1), which were all in the AWL and gave them as a questionnaire to all participants to check whether they know the words or not. In this questionnaire the researcher asked participants to mark the words that they knew and to provide any related information for each word either in L1 or in L2. The researcher discouraged students from giving positive answers for the words that they were not sure whether they knew or not. After this session, the researcher deduced that 28 words (see Appendix 3) were unknown by all participants. Consequently, the researcher decided to focus on the acquisition and retention of these words through the implementation of VNK as a strategy for vocabulary acquisition.

### *2.3.2. Phase 2 – Instruction and feedback on and implementation of vocabulary notebooks, and preparation and application of data collection tools*

This phase comprised two tasks. Task one was to inform participants about the use of VNK, to provide weekly feedback on their vocabulary notebooks, and to inspire them to systematically record unknown words while also deliberately focusing their attention on the 28 target words, and explaining to them how to keep their vocabulary notebooks. Therefore, all of the groups, except Control Group 1, were directed towards recording the unknown words that they faced during their readings of the course texts. As a result, the Experimental Groups 1 and 2, and the Control Groups 2 and 3 had vocabulary notebooks during the classes. However, only the Experimental Group 1 and the Experimental Group 2 were provided feedback on their vocabulary notebooks throughout the period of eight weeks. All groups, except Control Group 1, were deliberately instructed to follow one specific type of word recording (recording just the L1 equivalents versus recording the L1 equivalents and extra information). The researcher drew the attention of the participants to the target words during the classes by writing them on the board and also some extra words besides the other words that participants noted. The participants were also informed that the words that they would record in their notebooks would be useful during their exams and studies and throughout their entire academic lives as well. They were also reminded that the richer the repertoire of words is the better would be the comprehension and production of the L2. All four groups were enthusiastic and voluntarily participated in the study and its procedures. The words that were in the reading texts for the following week were written on the board two times, that is, before the classes were held and during the classes. The only difference for the Control Group 1 was that although they were also given the words, they were told that the given words were just some of the unknown words from the texts that they would have to read, but that they did not have to record them as they would already need to look them up while reading.

When the researcher checked the notes and text papers of the students in Control Group 1, the researcher could hardly see any of the target words or others noted, which suggested that the participants in Control Group 1 concentrated mostly on general meaning rather than individual words. The researcher has noticed that they still wrote the L1 equivalents of some of the words that they probably didn't know while reading the texts, but again, many of these were just like reminders and illegible. On the other hand, when the vocabulary notebooks of the participants in the other four groups were checked, it was seen that each participant had noted at least ten words for each week, and thus, the student who had recorded the least number of words had a

vocabulary data bank of 80 words, while others had up to 160 words. The mean number of recorded words was 136 for the Experimental Group 1, 96 for Experimental Group 2, 112 for the Control Group 2, and 87 for the Control Group 3. Throughout the period of eight weeks, the researcher checked the vocabulary notebooks of the participants weekly, and provided feedback so that each student kept on the track that was predetermined for each group. The researcher also made sure that all of the 28 target words were recorded by each participant. Wrongly recorded words (spelling or meaning or inappropriate usage) were corrected. The students who were in the Experimental Group 2 and recorded just the L1 equivalent were encouraged and required to add more relevant information for each recorded word, such as synonyms, antonyms, or collocation if available, and an example sentence. For the Experimental Group 1 there was no need for much extra interference by the researcher, except reminding about the target words if they were not on the vocabulary notebooks of the students. The Control Group 2 and the Control Group 3, on the other hand, were instructed to record the words, as specified in Table 1, at the beginning of the study. They were informed that their vocabulary notebooks would be collected and checked at the end of the ninth week. So, unlike the Experimental Group 1 and the Experimental Group 2, they did not receive weekly instruction or feedback on their recordings. Even so, it was observed that all participants in the Control Group 2 and 3 had recorded all of the 28 target words that were provided before and during the classes by the researcher along with other words. It was also observed that most of the students in the Control Group 3 preferred to record the words together with their L1 equivalents and just an example sentence, or just a synonym or an antonym. Few students recorded synonyms, antonyms, collocations, and an example sentence together with the L1 equivalent.

Task two was to prepare and apply the data collection tools. The researcher had specified 28 unknown words in the administration session of VKRQ, and deliberately focused on these during the VNK procedures. So, the researcher randomly selected 21 of these words for the receptive part, and again randomly appointed the remaining 7 of these to the productive part of the TRPV. The items in the receptive part were designed in such a way that besides the three target words, there were three other words in each item which were taken from among the remaining 22 words that were in the VKRQ. Definitions of the three target words in each item were given in mixed order while the definitions of the remaining words were not included. Three words in each item (and four words in the seventh item) were added to increase the difficulty of the items. In this part students were asked to match the given words with their definitions.

In contrast, the productive part included gap-fill sentences, which necessitated students to complete the words the initials of which were provided, so students could complete the given sentences with the correct words. The definitions of the words in the receptive part, and the example sentences in the productive part were adopted or adapted from Longman Exams Dictionary (2006). In order to decide how many letters of the words in the productive part should be provided as initials, the same two external professionals who controlled the tools and applied these on a group of students were consulted. One letter was provided each time until the consultants were able to identify and complete the words.

### *2.3.3. Phase 3 – Investigation of participants' vocabulary notebooks and evaluation of the results obtained from the pre-testing and post-testing sessions*

As a primary step in this phase, the researcher implemented the TRPV at the end of the semester that was the tenth week. Students were handed the test during their usual class hour and were allocated as much time as they needed to complete the test. Although there was no time limitation, all participants finished the test within thirty minutes. In addition, all participants sat in an isolated way so that they did not have any opportunity to talk amongst each other or to look at one another's papers. The scoring was done by giving 1 point to each correctly answered word in the items of both receptive and productive parts.

In this phase the researcher also collected the vocabulary notebooks of all the participants that were in the four groups (Experimental Groups 1 and 2, and Control Groups 2 and 3) and investigated them thoroughly. The results of this investigation are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Overview of genders and their vocabulary notebooks.

Group	Gender	Mean number of recorded words	Total mean	Number of students who recorded extra information
Experimental 1	female	140	136	0
	male	132		
Experimental 2	female	105	96	28
	male	87		
Control 2	female	113	112	0
	male	111		
Control 3	female	93	87	30
	male	81		

### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1. Overall findings

The VKRQ that was applied at the beginning of the study revealed that all groups were almost at the same level regarding their knowledge of the presented words from the AWL, with group average scores ranging from 32–38% (see Table 3). In contrast, the results of the TRPV shown in Table 3 reveal that while both the Experimental Groups averaged above 80%, Control Group 1 only averaged 35.5%, while the other two Control Groups averaged an intermediate 64.5% and 75% respectively. These findings suggest that although the vocabulary knowledge (regarding the presented words from the AWL) of all participants was almost equal at the beginning of the study, significant differences appeared after the treatment, especially between Control Group 1 and the other four groups.

**Table 3.** The VKRQ and TRPV results of the groups and genders.

Group	Gender	VKRQ Mean % (/50)	TRPV Mean % (/28)	Group total mean TRPV %
Experimental 1	female	34%	82%	82%
	male	32%	82%	
Experimental 2	female	36%	86%	84%
	male	38%	82%	
Control 1	female	36%	39%	35.5%
	male	36%	32%	
Control 2	female	32%	68%	64.5%
	male	38%	61%	
Control 3	female	38%	75%	75%
	male	34%	75%	

In relation to Research question 1, it was observed that the Experimental Group 1 (82%) and the Experimental Group 2 (84%) who received feedback on their vocabulary notebooks and word recording, provided a total mean of 83%, which was 13% higher than the total mean of 70% of the Control Group 2 (65%) and the Control Group 3 (75%). This difference of 13% indicates that the feedback provided by the instructor added about 4 words to the vocabulary knowledge of the students. Since the two Experimental Groups and the two Control Groups showed similar characteristics related to age, gender, and linguistic background, as well as similar vocabulary knowledge levels from the VKRQ prior to the treatment, it might be concluded that the only different factor that should be considered here was the availability of weekly feedback or lack of it. The observed difference suggests that students become more motivated and willing to keep their work at the best that they can do when regular feedback is provided by their instructor, and this was also informally and clearly observed by the researcher during the study. A comparison of the total mean percentage of the Experimental Group 1 and 2 and the Control Group 1 revealed stunning results. The difference here was about 47 %, which means that approximately 13 more words out of 28 were acquired by the Experimental Groups. However, this difference should not be attributed only to the existence or lack of feedback, but also by the whole treatment procedure which also involved the recording of the unknown words and extra information related to these words.

Regarding Research question 2, it seems that recording extra information related to the unknown words relates positively to the knowledge and retention of the students. It was observed that the Experimental Group 2 scored 2% higher compared to the Experimental Group 1. Likewise, the Control Group 3 scored 10% higher than the Control Group 2. Thus, it was clearly evident that the lack of control and feedback increased the difference between the two Control Groups. Therefore, recording extra information related to the unknown words, apparently, created a 10% difference between the group of students who recorded just the L1 equivalent of the words and the group of students who noted down more and varied information about the unknown words, in favour of the latter. However, this difference seemed to decrease by 8% when weekly and regular feedback and control was provided to the students. On the other hand, when comparing Experimental Group 1 and Control Group 3, which recorded extra information related to the unknown words, with the Control Group 1, this revealed differences of approximately 48% and 39% respectively. These findings suggest that keeping vocabulary notebooks makes a considerable contribution to the acquisition and knowledge of the students.

With regard to Research question 3, no significant difference was observed between the female and male participants. As Table 3 shows, in all groups the males and females started with very similar levels of knowledge and progressed very similar amounts when compared with each other within a group.

### **3.2. Pedagogical Implications**

The present study suggests that vocabulary notebook keeping contributes positively to the vocabulary acquisition and retention of students. It also reveals that there is need for systematic and regular control and feedback by the teachers, which seems to improve the motivation and diligence of the students. What is more, apparently, recording the unknown words together with as much related information as possible cultivates better results rather than recording the L1 equivalents. Thus, it would be beneficial if teachers encourage students to work on the unknown words and to search for synonyms, antonyms, collocations, etc., and to use the words in sentences. It might also be useful if teachers make students regularly exchange their vocabulary notebooks to check and study the words that their peers record. Furthermore, the teachers might check the vocabulary notebooks of the students and prepare or organize some specific exercises and games besides other usual language learning activities.

## **4. Conclusions and suggestions for further research**

The present study has demonstrated that the use of vocabulary notebooks is effective and beneficial in vocabulary acquisition. However, it seems that students also need formal instruction and encouragement and regular feedback as well in order to keep their motivation



fresh and to improve their work. In addition, it should be stated that the implementation of vocabulary notebooks requires that sufficient extra time and effort be allocated and put in by the teachers. The present study has provided empirical support for the claim that vocabulary notebooks are potentially quite beneficial in terms of vocabulary acquisition. It was observed anecdotally that students showed positive attitudes to keeping and working with vocabulary notebooks. It was observed that vocabulary learning is significantly enhanced by keeping vocabulary notebooks, with the greatest gains made when instructor input and feedback are provided.

Further studies might contribute significantly to the field of FLL if they provide evidence for the most effective vocabulary learning strategies, and to what percentage each strategy adds to vocabulary knowledge or acquisition. It would also be interesting to research whether there is any difference between the strategy preferences of male and female learners, as well as the efficiency of the strategies at certain linguistic proficiency levels. There is also a need to practice VLS more often in language learning environments to derive concrete pedagogical conclusions in order to catch the attention of teachers and learners and help them learn more efficiently.

### **Appendix 1. Vocabulary Knowledge and Retention Questionnaire (VKRQ)**

Please tick the words that you know and provide any related information for each word either in L1 or in L2.

Adjacent	Considerably	Exclusively	Qualitative
Alteration	Controversial	Fundamental	Quote
Ambiguity	Debate	Implement	Reinforce
Approximate	Denote	Initially	Reliability
Arbitrariness	Derive	Interval	Require
Assess	Dimensional	Invoke	Reveal
Assume	Discriminate	Notion	Scope
Attain	Distinction	Objective	Ultimate
Briefly	Emergent	Occur	Unify
Coherently	Encounter	Overlap	Unique
Coincide	Equivalent	Perceptions	Utilise
Compile	Establish	Preceding	
Comprise	Evaluation	Priority	

### **Appendix 2. The Test of Receptive and Productive Vocabulary (TRPV)**

#### **PART 1 – Receptive Part**

Please match the words with the definitions.

- 1.a) utilise
- b) adjacent ----- next to something
- c) occur----- an idea, belief, or opinion
- d) require----- to use something for a particular purpose
- e) fundamental
- f) notion

**2.a) ambiguity**

- b) initially----- to get something from something
- c) emergent----- in the early stages of existence or development
- d) priority----- the most important
- e) derive
- f) implement

**3.a) reliability**

- b) interval----- without a reason or a plan
- c) unique----- causing disagreement
- d) arbitrariness----- the period between two events
- e) controversial
- f) debate

**4.a) considerably**

- b) coherently----- much or a lot
- c) compile----- part of one thing covers part of another thing
- d) preceding----- coming before the time, place, or part mentioned
- e) unify
- f) overlap

**5.a) reveal**

- b) denote----- to think that something is true
- c) assume----- to mean something
- d) establish----- to repeat exactly what someone has said or written
- e) quote
- f) discriminate

**6.a) scope**

- b) objective----- to be close to something
- c) evaluation----- difference or separation between two things
- d) reinforce----- to support and strengthen an idea, or feeling
- e) distinction-----
- f) approximate-----

**7.a) briefly**

- b) qualitative----- for a short time
- c) invoke----- to experience something

- d) comprise----- to use a principle or theory to support your views
- e) encounter-----
- f) attain-----
- g) assess-----

## **PART 2 – Productive Part**

Please complete the words and fill in the gaps.

1. Have you noticed any al \_\_\_\_\_ in the patient's behaviour?
2. His entry to the team did not coi \_\_\_\_\_ with his marriage.
3. There is a social dim \_\_\_\_\_ to education.
4. Candidates should have a high-school diploma or its eq \_\_\_\_\_.
5. The report does not concentrate ex \_\_\_\_\_ on language education.
6. We need to challenge many popular per \_\_\_\_\_ of old age.
7. The ul \_\_\_\_\_ outcome of the experiment cannot be predicted.

## **Appendix 3. The Words in the Known and Unknown Categories**

### **The Unknown Category**

Adjacent  
Alteration  
Approximate  
Arbitrariness  
Assume  
Briefly  
Coincide  
Considerably  
Controversial  
Denote  
Derive  
Dimensional  
Distinction  
Emergent  
Encounter  
Equivalent  
Exclusively  
Interval  
Invoke  
Notion  
Overlap  
Perceptions  
Preceding  
Priority  
Quote  
Reinforce  
Ultimate  
Utilise

### **The Known Category**

Ambiguity  
Assess  
Attain  
Coherently  
Compile  
Comprise  
Debate  
Discriminate  
Establish  
Evaluation  
Fundamental  
Implement  
Initially  
Objective  
Occur  
Qualitative  
Reliability  
Require  
Reveal  
Scope  
Unify  
Unique

## References

- Ahmadi, M.R., Ismail, H.N., & Abdullah, M.K.K. (2012). Improving vocabulary learning in foreign language learning through reciprocal teaching strategy. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 2(6), 186-201.
- Bailey, P.D. & Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2002). The role of study habits in foreign language courses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(5), 463-473.
- Beglar, D., & Hunt, A. (1999). Revising and validating the 2000 Word Level and University Word Level Vocabulary Tests. *Language Testing*, 16(2), 131-162.
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213-238.
- Ellis, R. (2001). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Fowle, C. (2002). Vocabulary notebooks: implementation and outcomes. *ELT Journal*, 56(4), 380-388.
- Ghazal, L. (2007). Learning vocabulary in EFL context through vocabulary learning strategies. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 1(2), 84-91.
- Hatch, E., & Brown, C. (1995). *Vocabulary, Semantics, and Language Education*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Horst, M. (2005). Learning L2 vocabulary through extensive reading: A measurement study. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61(3), 355-382.
- Kilickaya, F., & Krajka, J. (2010). Comparative usefulness of online and traditional vocabulary learning. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(2), 55-63.
- Laufer, B., P. Meara, & P. Nation 2005. Ten best ideas for teaching vocabulary. *The Language Teacher*, 29(7), 3-6.
- Laufer, B., & Nation, P. (1999). A vocabulary-size test of controlled productive ability. *Language Testing*, 16(1), 33-51.
- Leeke, P., & Shaw, P. (2000). Learners' independent records of vocabulary. *System*, 28, 271-289.
- Lessard-Clouston, M. (1994). Challenging student approaches to ESL vocabulary development. *TESL Canada Journal*, 12(1), 69-80.
- Longman Exams Dictionary* (2006). England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ma, Q. (2012). Matching vocabulary learning process with learning outcome in L2 academic writing: An exploratory case study. *Linguistics and Education* (in press).
- McCrostie, J. (2007). Examining learner vocabulary notebooks. *ELT Journal*, 61(3), 246-255.
- Meara, P. (1996). The dimensions of lexical competence. In Brown, G., Malmakjaer, K., & Williams, J. (Eds.). *Performance and Competence in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 35-53). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I.S.P. (1990). *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary*. Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary Learning Strategies. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.). *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy* (pp. 199-227). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N., & McCarthy, M. (2001). *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (1995). Vocabulary notebooks: theoretical underpinnings and practical suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 49(2), 133-143.

- Tang, G.M. (1997). Pocket electronic dictionaries for second language learning: Help or hindrance? *TESL Canada Journal*, 15(1), 39-57.
- Walters, J.D., & Bozkurt, N. (2009). The effect of keeping vocabulary notebooks on vocabulary acquisition. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(4), 403-423.
- Yongqi Gu, P. (2003). Vocabulary learning in a second language: Person, task, context and strategies. *TESL-EJ*, 7(2), retrieved from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej26/a4.html>.
- Zhang, B., & Li, C. (2011). Classification of L2 vocabulary learning strategies: Evidence from exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. *RELC Journal*, 42(2), 141-154.