

An Investigation of Teacher-provided versus Student-made Vocabulary Notebooks

SASAN BALEGHIZADEH
Shahid Beheshti University
G.C., Tehran, Iran
sasanbaleghizadeh@yahoo.com

ELAHE MOLADOUST
Allameh Tabataba'i University
Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

Vocabulary notebooks are viewed as a self-study strategy, and they have been widely used in many EFL contexts (Nation, 2011). Given this, the challenge is that EFL learners may not be able to decide what sort of knowledge to acquire about a certain word. Anchored in this challenge, the present study compares teacher-provided vocabulary notebooks (TPVNs) with student-made vocabulary notebooks (SMVNs). The participants were 28 elementary teenage EFL learners divided into two experimental groups: TPVN and SMVN. The results indicated that the TPVN group outperformed the SMVN group, especially in their productive knowledge of orthography and productive knowledge of meaning and form. Three days after the post-test, a number of participants from both groups were interviewed randomly to explore their viewpoints about each kind of notebook. It was found out that the SMVN group did not look some of the words up for three reasons: (a) they thought they could guess the correct meaning from the context, (b) they were at times lazy, and (c) they did not have enough time. The results of this study have implications for EFL teachers and materials writers.

Keywords: vocabulary notebook; student-made vocabulary notebook (SMVN); teacher-provided vocabulary notebook (TPVN); self-study

INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary learning has always been of great importance to language learners. As a self-study strategy for vocabulary learning, a vocabulary notebook has attracted a lot of attention among different scholars (Decarrico 2001, Nation 2011, Walters & Bozkurt 2009). However, because creating a vocabulary notebook is time-consuming; many language learners are not keen on doing so. Another barrier to building vocabulary notebooks is that according to McCrostie (2007), language learners are not able to decide which words or what dimensions of each word to include inasmuch as they are incapable of identifying lexical input, which is commonly used for communicative purposes. One way to solve this problem is that teachers provide vocabulary notebooks for their students. In this study, teacher-provided vocabulary notebooks (TPVNs) are compared with student-made vocabulary notebooks (SMVNs).

Vocabulary notebooks can take the form of a loose-leaf binder or fixed-page notebook consisting of different pieces of information about a vocabulary item. Walters and Bozkurt (2009) have defined vocabulary notebooks as a form of a personal dictionary in which learners record the words they encounter along with their meanings and any other features of the word they consider important, such as word classes, collocations, synonyms, antonyms, and probably examples of sentences in context. Vocabulary notebooks are efficient tools for language learners to take charge of, organize, and manage their vocabulary learning (McCarthy 1990, Schmitt & Schmitt 1995). As McCrostie (2007) points out, the use of

vocabulary notebooks in language classes not only helps students acquire new vocabulary by practising and memorizing the items kept in them but also assists them in becoming autonomous learners. However, the main debate has often centred on which words should be included in a vocabulary notebook (Carroll & Mordaunt 1991, McCrostie 2007, Nation 2001).

The benefits of SMVNs have been discussed by different scholars including Bozkurt (2007), Fowle (2002), Ledbury (2006), Nation (2002), and Schmitt and Schmitt (1995). These scholars have identified four common merits of SMVNs. First, they help teachers make sure that their learners are making progress (Fowle 2002, Ledbury 2006, Nation 2002). Second, they encourage learners both to use dictionaries and to guess the meaning of unknown words from context (Nation 2002). Third, they foster learner autonomy (Fowle 2002), and finally they help students evaluate the usefulness of words, because as they write the words their teacher suggests, they may add other words they are eager to learn (Bozkurt 2007).

Among the demerits of SMVNs, the fact that whether learners themselves can choose which words to include in their notebooks is a controversial issue. Schmitt and Schmitt (1995) contend that letting learners choose the words they want to study is in line with the general recommendation that teachers should not be too prescriptive when teaching learning strategies. They insist that learners may have diverse learning styles or different preferred ways to study; therefore, the best teaching plan may be to introduce a variety of learning strategies to them and then let them decide for themselves which words they prefer to include in their notebooks. In contrast, McCrostie (2007) suggests that this advice unnecessarily blurs the distinction between learning styles and the content of what is to be learnt. He argues that EFL learners, particularly those at the beginning and intermediate levels, may not be capable of building up complete autonomy in selecting words to be learned. Likewise, Nation (2001) argues for a more prescriptive approach and maintains that learners should consult frequency lists in conjunction with their personal needs.

What to record about a word in a vocabulary notebook has also been addressed by different researchers (McCarthy 1990, Schmitt & Schmitt 1995, Walters & Bozkurt 2009). Leeke and Shaw (2000) analyzed the word lists kept by foreign language learners who had prepared their own vocabulary notebooks in different countries. The researchers stated that most of these notes were simply a list of the target words along with their translations and rarely did the learners include the context of use or an English synonym or any example sentences. Moreover, McCrostie (2007), whose study is a case of SMVN, believes that learners have difficulty in selecting what words to include in their notebooks and that they need more guidance as far as keeping vocabulary notebooks and organizing them is concerned.

Vocabulary knowledge consists of not only the knowledge of form and meaning, which is the only knowledge most learners include in their notebooks, but also other dimensions such as the knowledge of orthography, syntagmatic association, paradigmatic association and grammatical function (Webb 2007), which most learners decide to exclude from their vocabulary notebooks (McCrostie 2007). Knowledge of orthography is the spelling of words, syntagmatic association is the knowledge of collocation, paradigmatic association is the knowledge of synonyms and antonyms, and grammatical knowledge is grammatical points useful in utilizing a word.

Walters and Bozkurt's (2009) study of SMVNs includes aspects of word knowledge for instance, the parts of speech, first-language translations, second-language synonyms, antonyms, derivations, and collocations in their vocabulary notebooks. They found that when vocabulary notebooks are used, about 40% of words are learned receptively and 33% productively.

Vocabulary notebooks would not be efficient unless teachers help learners choose the words to be included in their notebooks (McCrostie 2007). Learners are often not able to decide what sort of knowledge to learn about a certain word. McCrostie (2007) suggests that teachers help their learners decide which words and what aspects of words to learn. EFL learners, especially those at the beginning and intermediate levels, may not be capable of being completely autonomous in selecting words to be learned. Thus, McCrostie (2007) suggests that more research be done in this area.


Kinsella (2010) also suggests that EFL teachers provide vocabulary notebook pages to develop students' expressive (i.e. active words: words used actively in speaking and writing) command of a word. Figure 1 shows an example of Kinsella's (2010) TPNV.


FIGURE 1. A Sample of Vocabulary Notebook Adapted from Kinsella (2010, p. 21)


Academic Vocabulary Notebook ~ Sample Page


Reading Selection: *Soft Drinks Dry Up at Schools* Date: March 20, 2010

1.

Word	Meaning	Examples	Picture
portion portion <i>noun</i>	1. a small _____ or section of a larger thing	I put a small portion of my _____ into my savings account.	
SP: porción	2. a serving of _____	On Wednesdays the cafeteria serves only one portion of _____	

 **Verbal Practice:**
For dinner we usually eat one _____ of _____

 **Writing Practice:**
A large _____ of my binder is filled with _____

 **Academic Author:**

Kinsella (2010) presents the following steps for preparing the vocabulary notebook:

1. Write the word.
2. Write the syllabication; separate syllables with dots.
3. Write the part of speech in parentheses.
4. Copy the definition and omit one or two words. Choose the appropriate meaning for the context.
5. Copy the example sentence. Omit one word or phrase and leave a blank.
6. Design a practice task using a different familiar context. Write a simple response frame. Determine the grammar necessary to complete the frame. (p. 15)

To the best of the researchers' knowledge, to date no serious study has ever compared the effects of TPNVs and SMVNs. Thus, the present study aims to answer the following research question: Is there any difference between teacher-provided and student-made vocabulary notebooks in terms of the five aspects of vocabulary knowledge, namely knowledge of orthography, form and meaning, syntagmatic association, paradigmatic association and grammatical function?

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

The participants for this study were 28 Iranian elementary EFL learners whose L1 was Farsi. They were all teenage females attending a general English course twice a week at a private language institute in Rasht, Iran. They had all been learning English for more than 2 years in kids' classes for EFL learners. They had been interviewed and accepted at the elementary level in teenage courses. The 28 participants were randomly assigned to two experimental groups, each consisting of 14 participants. One group kept TPVNs, while the other group kept SMVNs.

INSTRUMENTS

PRETEST

A pre-test of Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) was administered to both groups to specify the unknown words prior to the study. The VKS test was designed by the researchers based on the modified version of VKS prepared by Min (2008). The participants were supposed to look at the list of words in the VKS test and choose the appropriate option for each word:

1. I don't remember having seen this word before.
2. I have seen this word before, but I don't know what it means.
3. I know this word. It means. (Give the meaning in definition or synonym.)
4. I can use this word in a sentence. (Write a sentence.) (If you do this section, please also complete 3.)

An extract of the VKS test administered is shown below:

details	1. ---	2. ---	3. -----	4. -----
respectful	1. ---	2. ---	3. -----	4. -----
interrupt	1. ---	2. ---	3. -----	4. -----

TWO THEMATICALLY-RELATED TEXTS AND THE TARGET WORDS

Two texts, thematically related to different subjects in the participants' course book, i.e. *Pacesetter: elementary level* (Strange & Hall 2005), were used in this study. The logic behind choosing the two texts, thematically related to the participants' course book, was to control for other types of learning regarded as extraneous variables. This is because if the words were selected from the participants' course book and the participants learned the words, it would not be clear whether the participants had learned them due to the course book or as a result of the treatment.

One criterion for choosing the texts was the students' level of proficiency and another criterion was the students' interest (Renandya & Jacobs 2002), both of which were evaluated prior to the study by a group of students similar to the target group.

There were three after-reading comprehension questions in each text, too. The purpose of this was to make sure that the participants would be involved in the reading text (Renandya & Jacobs 2002).

The target words were chosen from these texts. The criterion for selecting the target words was that they were unknown by the participants prior to the study, which was made clear to the researchers through the VKS.

It is worth bearing in mind that the participants may have learned the words implicitly by seeing them in context. Hunt and Beglar (2002) believe that research has confirmed incidental vocabulary learning through reading.

VOCABULARY NOTEBOOKS

The teacher-provided vocabulary notebook (see Appendix A) was similar to a monolingual mini-dictionary, only having the information the participants of this level needed. For each word, the following were included in the TPVN: pronunciation and stress, part of speech, definition, at least two example sentences, knowledge of grammar, and paradigmatic (synonym and antonym) and syntagmatic (collocation) information, where possible. These are the types of knowledge found in most monolingual dictionaries. These sorts of knowledge are also the ones suggested by Webb (2007).

The student-made vocabulary notebook group was taught which words and what knowledge of words is necessary to be included in a vocabulary notebook. They were told to write the unknown words. Besides, they were told to include the following for each word in their notebooks: pronunciation, part of speech, definition, example sentence, synonym and antonym, collocation, and pictures if possible.

The SMVNs were checked by the teacher (second researcher) every other session. Following the treatment, the SMVNs were examined by both researchers.

INTERVIEW

Both groups were interviewed randomly to find out about their attitude toward their vocabulary learning. The interview was carried out three days after the post-test. The SMVN group was asked what knowledge they had included in their notebooks and why. They were also asked about the words they had not included in their vocabulary notebooks. The TPVN group was interviewed about their attitude toward the sort of vocabulary notebooks they kept. The typical questions raised for each group are as follows.

Typical questions for the SMVN group:

1. What words did you include in your vocabulary notebook? Why?
2. What kind of words didn't you include in your vocabulary notebook? Why?

Typical questions for the TPVN group:

1. Did you like the vocabulary notebook provided by the teacher? Why?
2. What aspect of the vocabulary notebook was interesting? What aspects were boring?

POSTTEST

The post-test was adopted from Webb's (2007) study. Ten separate tests were used to measure different aspects of vocabulary knowledge, namely orthography, paradigmatic association, syntagmatic association, grammatical functions, and meaning and form after the treatment. Each test was aimed at a specific aspect of vocabulary knowledge productively or receptively. The tests were carefully sequenced, following Webb's (2007) study, to avoid earlier tests affecting performance in subsequent tests. Since the present study was set up to

shed light on the effect of teacher-provided versus student-made vocabulary notebooks on different aspects of vocabulary knowledge, it seemed necessary to isolate the types of knowledge being measured. If a test were not pure by measuring more than one type of knowledge, then it would not be clear why the participants missed or gained the score. All productive tests were administered before the receptive ones to avoid a learning effect. Following Webb (2007), with some minor changes, the tests are described below:

a. Productive Knowledge of Orthography

This was the first test. The teacher (the second researcher) read each word twice, and the learners were given 10 seconds to write it down. If there were minor spelling mistakes, they were considered as correct, but if the meaning of the word would change with the form that the participants provided, it was considered as incorrect. The aim of this test was to see whether the participants knew how to write the words or not.

b. Receptive Knowledge of Orthography

In the second test, the participants circled the correct spellings in the given multiple-choice spelling test. There were four alternatives, three of which were distracters. The aim of this test was to check if the participants could recognize the words' correct spellings. The following is an example:

- | | | | | |
|----|---------|---------|--------|---------|
| 1. | teep | tip | tipe | typ |
| 2. | wilinng | weeling | weling | willing |

c. Productive Knowledge of Meaning and Form

The participants were supposed to write an English word for each definition. So the definitions of the words were given, and the participants were to provide the target words. An example is given below:

1. To affect the way someone or something develops, behaves, thinks, etc. without directly forcing or ordering them
2. To make someone or something part of a larger group or set

This test aimed to see whether the participants could establish links between the meaning and form of each word. Spelling was not considered as incorrect as long as a new word was not produced.

d. Productive Knowledge of Grammatical Function

This test was a sentence construction test. The list of vocabulary was provided, and the participants were supposed to write a sentence in which the target word was used. For instance, for the word 'smoothly', the participants could write a correct sentence such as: "Everything is ok", I told my mother smoothly. In this part, the participants had to know the exact part of speech of the word and use it in the right position in a sentence.

e. Productive Knowledge of Syntagmatic Association

In this test, the learners were supposed to write an English syntagmatic associate for each word. Syntagmatic association refers to the words that go together, like collocation. The example provided in Webb (2007) was for the word 'locomotive'. Syntagmatic associations for this word could be 'station', 'tracks', 'left', and 'arrived'. So in this test, the list of vocabulary was presented and the participants were supposed to write a correct syntagmatic

association for each word. For instance, for ‘smoothly’ they could mention: ‘say’, ‘talk’, or ‘confidently’.

f. Productive Knowledge of Paradigmatic Association

In this test, the participants were given the list of vocabulary and were to write paradigmatic associations, i.e. a synonym, antonym, coordinate, or subordinate for each word. For the word ‘smoothly’, they could provide ‘calmly’ as a synonym, and for the word ‘include’ they could provide ‘exclude’ as an antonym.

g. Receptive Knowledge of Grammatical Function

For this test, the participants had to know the part of speech of each word and know where in the sentence it should appear and which words it describes. For instance, when the learners knew ‘willing’ was an adjective, they could choose option *c* as the correct response in the following multiple-choice item:

- 1) He willing to go there.
- 2) His willing is appreciated.
- 3) He found a willing friend to go biking with her.

So the participants were to circle the correct response out of the three given alternatives.

h. Receptive Knowledge of Syntagmatic Association

In this test, the participants circled the word that was mostly related to the target word and was most likely to appear with the target word in a context. An example could be the word ‘smoothly’ which appears in the same context as ‘say’, but not with ‘invite’ or ‘exercise’. The following are some examples:

- | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1. Smoothly | a. say | b. invite | c. exercise |
| 2. Emotion | a. clever | b. sad | c. difficult |

The distracters were the words the meanings of which the participants were familiar with. All the other three alternatives were also of the same part of speech.

i. Receptive Knowledge of Paradigmatic Association

For this test, paradigmatic associations were checked. The participants were to circle the correct response among the alternatives and decide which word could be the target word’s subordinate, coordinate, synonym, or antonym. For example, for the word ‘include’, a proper antonym could be ‘exclude’. The following are some examples:

- | | | | |
|-------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1. Smoothly | a. slowly | b. calmly | c. carefully |
| 2. Emotion | a. feeling | b. kindness | c. speed |

j. Receptive Knowledge of Meaning and Form

The participants were given a list of the target words for which they were to provide the definition in English. Of course, the participants were told that they could provide the meaning in any way they could in their own words, not just the exact dictionary definition. The aim of this test was to see whether the participants knew the meaning of the words. An example is shown below:

1. Smoothly -----

2. Emotion -----

PROCEDURE

Through the pre-test administered to both groups, the words unknown to the participants were identified. Among the 30 words tested in the pre-test, 15 were unknown by all the participants. Those 15 words were selected as the target words. Two weeks after the pre-test, the treatment began. The whole treatment lasted for five sessions over a period of three weeks.

The TPVN group went through the following procedure. During the first session, the first text, along with three reading comprehension questions, was given to the participants. Moreover, the participants were provided with the TPVN prepared for that text. During the next session, the three reading comprehension questions were checked, first in pairs and then with the whole class. Later, a follow-up discussion about the content of the passage was made by the participants first in pairs and then in the whole class. During the third session, the second text, which included 3 reading comprehension questions, was presented. Besides, the TPVN prepared for this part was given to the participants. The next session, the reading comprehension questions were checked first in pairs and then in the whole class. Then, a discussion activity which followed the reading comprehension questions was done by the participants to explore the content of the passage.

The SMVN group had the same procedure as the TPVN group, except that the kind of notebooks they had was different. During the first session, the text, including the 3 reading comprehension questions, was given to the students. They were taught how to prepare SMVNs. They were required to look the new words up at home. During the second session, their notebooks were examined by their teacher after the three reading comprehension questions were checked, first in pairs and then in the whole class. Later, a follow-up discussion about the content of the passage was made by the participants first in pairs and then in the whole class. The same procedure went on for the second text in the third and fourth sessions.

In each session, about 30 to 35 minutes were devoted to the reading comprehension questions, plus the discussion and checking the notebooks. After the treatment period, both groups were given the posttest in the fifth session.

DATA ANALYSIS

To determine whether there was any significant difference among the treatment groups, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was run using the scores on the 10 dependent measures (productive orthography, receptive orthography, productive meaning and form, receptive meaning and form, productive paradigmatic association, receptive paradigmatic association, productive syntagmatic association, receptive syntagmatic association, productive grammar and receptive grammar). The independent variable was the type of vocabulary notebooks (SMVN vs. TPVN) and the dependent variable was vocabulary learning.

The SMVNs were closely examined by the researchers. Moreover, a few students from each group were randomly interviewed.

RESULTS

THE RESULTS OF MANOVA

The MANOVA (Tables 1 and 2) indicated an overall statistically significant difference between the groups, $F(10, 17) = 3.60, p = .00$. This means that the type of vocabulary notebook had a significant difference on vocabulary knowledge. The statistically significant F value shows that there were significant differences between the overall mean scores of the TPVN and SMVN. The descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations and number of participants) of vocabulary knowledge scores for the 10 dependent measures are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 1. MANOVA of Ten Tests by Types of Vocabulary Notebook

		Multivariate Tests				
	Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.98	89.22	10.00	17.00	.00
	Wilks' Lambda	.01	89.22	10.00	17.00	.00
	Hotelling's Trace	52.48	89.22	10.00	17.00	.00
	Roy's Largest Root	52.48	89.22	10.00	17.00	.00
GROUP	Pillai's Trace	.68	3.60	10.00	17.00	.01
	Wilks' Lambda	.32	3.60	10.00	17.00	.01
	Hotelling's Trace	2.12	3.60	10.00	17.00	.01
	Roy's Largest Root	2.12	3.60	10.00	17.00	.01

TABLE 2. Tests of Between Subject Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
GROUP	PO	46.28	1	46.28	7.35	.01
	RO	1.75	1	1.75	.32	.57
	RM	9.14	1	9.14	3.46	.07
	PG	1.28	1	1.28	.34	.56
	PS	1.75	1	1.75	.22	.63
	PA	17.28	1	17.28	3.02	.09
	RG	6.03	1	6.03	.78	.38
	RS	4.32	1	4.32	.76	.38
	RP	1.75	1	1.75	.25	.61
	PM	38.89	1	38.89	8.56	.00

Note: PO: productive knowledge of orthography; RO: receptive knowledge of orthography; PM: productive knowledge of meaning and form; RM: receptive knowledge of meaning and form; PA: productive knowledge of paradigmatic association; RA: receptive knowledge of paradigmatic association; PS: productive knowledge of syntagmatic association; RS: receptive knowledge of syntagmatic association; PG: productive knowledge of grammar; RG: receptive knowledge of grammar.

Based on these results, it can be concluded that there were only two instances of significant differences (see Table 2, where the significant differences are shown in bold) between the mean scores of TPVN and SMVN groups' scores on the ten tests. Table 3 displays the descriptive statistics for the ten tests. On test of productive knowledge of orthography and test of productive knowledge of meaning and form, the TPVN group performed better with mean scores of 11.35 and 4.14, respectively.

THE EFFECT OF THE NOTEBOOKS ON EACH TYPE OF WORD KNOWLEDGE

According to Table 3, although both types of notebooks contributed to gains in receptive and productive knowledge of each aspect of vocabulary learning by both groups, almost in all tests the TPVN group outperformed the other group except in the receptive knowledge of syntagmatic association. However, in some tests particularly in tests of productive knowledge of orthography and productive knowledge of meaning and form, the TPVN group performed much better.

TABLE 3. Means and Standard Deviations of Learning Conditions on Dependent Measures

Learning condition	N	PO	RO	PM	RM	PA	RA	PS	RS	PG	RG
SMVN	14	8.78 (2.25)	11.21 (2.42)	1.78 (2.35)	.71 (1.13)	1.92 (2.36)	6.07 (2.67)	3.00 (2.82)	8.85 (2.24)	1.07 (1.94)	4.28 (2.81)
TPVN	14	11.35 (2.73)	11.71 (2.19)	4.14 (1.87)	1.58 (1.99)	3.50 (2.40)	6.57 (2.53)	3.50 (2.71)	8.07 (2.49)	1.50 (1.91)	5.21 (2.75)

Note: Maximum score: 15; standard deviations are in parentheses in the Table. Key: PO: productive knowledge of orthography; RO: receptive knowledge of orthography; PM: productive knowledge of meaning and form; RM: receptive knowledge of meaning and form; PA: productive knowledge of paradigmatic association; RA: receptive knowledge of paradigmatic association; PS: productive knowledge of syntagmatic association; RS: receptive knowledge of syntagmatic association; PG: productive knowledge of grammar; RG: receptive knowledge of grammar.

TABLE 4. Percentage of Gains in Tests in Two Learning Conditions

Learning condition	N	PO	RO	PM	RM	PA	RA	PS	RS	PG	RG
SMVN	14	58	74	11	4	12	40	20	59	7	28
TPVN	14	75	78	27	10	23	43	23	53	10	34

The greater gains on the receptive tests specify that the receptive tests were more sensitive to gains in partial knowledge, as was expected. Both groups did better on all the receptive tests than the productive tests, except in knowledge of meaning and form (Table 4). In knowledge of meaning and form, both groups did better on the productive tests than on their receptive counterparts. The percentage of the scores in productive knowledge of meaning and form for TPVN was 27%, and the percentage of the receptive knowledge of meaning and form was 10%. The percentage of the productive knowledge of meaning and form for SMVN was 11%, and for receptive knowledge of meaning and form was 4%.

The smallest mean percentage gains for the groups varied (see Table 4). For the SMVN group, it was receptive knowledge of meaning and form (4%), and for the TPVN group, it was receptive knowledge of meaning and form and productive knowledge of grammar (both 10%).

Receptive knowledge, measured through recognition items, tends to be less demanding than productive knowledge, i.e. recall measures, because the format of multiple-choice tests allows the participants to score correctly through guessing (Nation, 2001). The largest gains for both groups, according to Table 4, were the receptive knowledge of orthography (TPVN: 78%, SMVN: 74%).

The researchers also scrutinized some of the participants' vocabulary notebooks in the SMVN group to see which vocabulary and which aspects of vocabulary knowledge they had included in their notebooks. Inasmuch as the participants had been given guidance on which words to include and what kind of knowledge about each word to learn, the researchers expected the participants to include most of this knowledge in their vocabulary notebooks with respect to the fact that their notebooks were checked every session, but not very strictly.

It should be mentioned that almost all the participants in the SMVN group had written the meaning and definition of words in their vocabulary notebooks. However, some of them did not include all the aspects of vocabulary knowledge mentioned above in their vocabulary notebooks, despite the fact that they had been reminded to do so.

The researchers interviewed some of the participants to explore the reasons for ignoring some words. Also, the participants were asked why they did not include all aspects of vocabulary knowledge in their SMVN. Some of them thought it was unnecessary to write all the words, and some others stated they could guess the words and thought it would be unnecessary. However, some other participants confessed that they liked to write more information about each word, but they did not have enough time. They all complained about their school projects and other assignments they were forced to do. They said they wanted to learn English more effectively, yet they were too busy.

A few participants did not include all the unknown words in their notebooks. They had written only about 60 to 70 percent of the unknown words. When asked why, they said that they understood the words in the reading text. They stated that they did not check the exact meaning of a word in the dictionary when they understood a word's meaning in its context.

A few participants in the TPVN group were also interviewed randomly. They were asked about their evaluation of the whole procedure. They were very glad to have the meaning and other information provided for the words. They mostly enjoyed having the synonyms ready. They wished they had it for all unknown words. They said they did not have to look up all the words. It should be noted, however, that it might have been due to the novelty of the treatment that the participants paid so much attention to it. A longitudinal study, therefore, might better indicate the potential difference(s) between TPVNs and SMVNs over an extended period of time.

Both groups were asked how much time they spent on learning the words. The maximum time the TPVN group spent was 1 hour and 30 minutes, and the minimum time was 1 hour for text one. For the second text, the maximum time was 1 hour and the minimum time, 15 minutes. For the SMVN group, it took longer to learn the words. For text one, the maximum time was 3 hours, and the minimum time was 30 minutes. And for the second text, the maximum time was 1 hour and 30 minutes, and the minimum time, 1 hour. It can be seen that the SMVN group had to spend almost twice as much time as the TPVN group on learning the words in addition to the time it took them to look up the words in a dictionary.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study was an attempt to explore whether there was a difference in the type of vocabulary notebooks used for learning 5 different aspects of vocabulary knowledge in productive and receptive modes. The types of vocabulary notebooks were teacher-provided vocabulary notebook (TPVN) and student-made vocabulary notebook (SMVN). The 5 aspects of vocabulary knowledge studied were the knowledge of words' meaning and form, orthography, grammatical functions, paradigmatic association, and syntagmatic association.

The results of the MANOVA indicated that both types of notebooks contributed to gains in receptive and productive knowledge of all aspects of vocabulary learning by both groups. However, almost in all tests the TPVN group performed better except in receptive knowledge of syntagmatic association.

The SMVN group performed better in the receptive knowledge of syntagmatic association. The reason is perhaps because when the SMVN group wanted to look a word up in the dictionary, they had to pay more attention to the context of words so they knew which

meaning was intended by the author. The TPVN group did not have to pay attention to the context of words as much as the SMVN group did, because they had the words' definitions available to them. This is a piece of evidence for Hunt and Beglar's (2002) suggestion that context contributes to vocabulary learning. Surprisingly however, the SMVN group did not outperform the TPVN group in the productive knowledge of syntagmatic association. It may be claimed that context assists learners in receptive but not in the productive knowledge. In line with this claim, some learning occurred for the SMVN group in the receptive knowledge of meaning and form (the knowledge mostly needed for listening and reading skills). Webb (2007) in the study of the effects of a single context on vocabulary knowledge suggests that a single glossed sentence context may have little effect on vocabulary knowledge. This argument is in contrast with Hunt and Beglar's suggestion that context plays a role in vocabulary learning. More research should be conducted to investigate what sort of knowledge is more affected by context. In contrast, in productive modes of knowledge such as productive knowledge of meaning and form (the knowledge most needed for writing and speaking skills) and productive knowledge of orthography (the knowledge mostly needed for writing skill), the TPVN group performed much better.

To explore the reasons for the better performance of the TPVN group, the SMVNs were examined by the researchers. Furthermore, both groups were randomly interviewed to investigate their views about the different kinds of notebooks and they were asked how much time they spent on learning the words. Based on the researchers' evaluation of the SMVNs, the participants did not include all the unknown words in their vocabulary notebooks for three reasons. First, in many cases they thought were able to guess the meaning of the words from the context. This is in line with Brown's (2001) and Hunt and Beglar's (2002) arguments. Second, they were at times lazy to care about this (Ho 2003). Thirdly, they did not have enough time to include all the words (Hayati 2010).

Interviewing the SMVN group, the researchers found out that the participants did not look up the words if they assumed they would understand them in context. Guessing the meaning from the context is a strategy that many learners employ and this might be the reason why most learners do not look up every new word they encounter. However, as Hunt and Beglar (2002) argue, for EFL learners to learn the newly taught vocabulary, teachers need to provide opportunities for elaborating word knowledge. Guessing from context is a complicated strategy to carry out efficiently (Hunt & Beglar 2002). As Kelly (1990 cited in Hunt and Beglar 2002) explains, on many occasions there is little chance of guessing the meaning from the context correctly and also because guessing from context fails to direct attention to word form and meaning, relatively little learning occurs. Hence, Hunt and Beglar (2002) advise that teachers and learners combine the two strategies of guessing from context and dictionary training. They also emphasize that after guessing the meaning from context, learners should also look up the word in a dictionary to check whether their guess is correct or not. Besides, learners should learn other aspects of word knowledge.

The second reason why the participants did not include some of the words in their dictionary was because of laziness. This is similar to Ho's (2003) study in which she explored the reasons why some of her participants did not take part in gathering audio journals. She found that one of the reasons was a lifestyle that encouraged a pattern of simple laziness.

The third reason why some participants did not write some of the words in their vocabulary notebooks was that they did not have enough time. Busy learners tend to find the easiest and shortest way to learn things. Evidently, searching the words and writing them in vocabulary notebooks takes a lot of time. However, the time spent by students looking the words up and writing them in vocabulary notebooks is wisely invested as far as involvement load hypothesis (Hulstijn & Laufer 2001) is concerned. Involvement load hypothesis holds that the more involved learners are in vocabulary learning, the more learning occurs.

However, one might argue whether copying words from a dictionary to a vocabulary notebook can involve learners at all. But surely, looking the words up in a dictionary and finding which meaning suits a certain context involves them to a large extent (Hunt & Beglar 2002).

In the course of the interviews, the TPVN group indicated that first and foremost they had a positive attitude toward the notebooks. This is similar to Walters and Bozkurt's (2009) study of SMVNs in which they (p. 418) stated that "The interviews with the students revealed very positive attitudes about the usefulness of the vocabulary notebooks, even though they found the discipline required to maintain the notebooks quite difficult". Secondly, they did not feel the material provided for them (i.e. TPVN) was prescriptive. This is in line with Schmitt and Schmitt's (1995) recommendation that teachers should not be too prescriptive in vocabulary notebooks formats. Thirdly, the TPVN group thought they were supported by the teacher because they were given the meaning and other related knowledge of the words they needed.

The results of the study also support McCrostie's (2007) belief that students need help with what words they should include in their notebooks and that they need more support on how to organize their notebooks and what sort of knowledge to include in them. While acknowledging the fact that this argument needs more investigation, he believes that learners, especially those at the beginning and intermediate levels, are not capable of choosing the words to be included in their notebooks. Likewise, Nation (2001) contends for a more prescriptive approach and maintains that learners ought to consult frequency lists in combination with their personal needs. McCrostie (2007) further adds that if learners themselves choose the words to be learned, vocabulary notebooks would not be effective tools for vocabulary learning. The present study therefore supports McCrostie's (2007) statement that beginning and intermediate learners might be incapable of choosing the words to be learned.

McCrostie (2007) contends that educators may have to do more work with learners at the most basic word levels. That may be another reason why provision of notebooks in the TPVN group helped learners outperform in almost all tests of vocabulary knowledge, especially in the two tests of productive knowledge of meaning and form and productive knowledge of orthography.

The present study is also in line with Nation's (2001) suggestion for a more prescriptive approach in teaching vocabulary despite the fact that the TPVN group's evaluation indicated that they did not feel that the notebooks were prescriptive.

The findings are also in contrast with Schmitt and Schmitt's (1995) contention that learners should be allowed to choose the words they want to study. They recommend that teachers should not be too prescriptive when teaching learning strategies. They emphasize that different learning styles may be the reason why the best teaching plan is to introduce a variety of learning strategies and techniques to learners and let them decide which words they are inclined to include in their notebooks. However, the present study indicates that even if teachers are prescriptive, learners learn their vocabulary. They may even learn vocabulary better when the teacher decides what they should learn.

In sum, the findings of the present study suggest that both types of vocabulary notebooks promote gains in knowledge of orthography, paradigmatic association, meaning and form, syntagmatic association, and grammar in a short time. However, learning vocabulary through TPVNs is more effective, particularly when productive knowledge of orthography and productive knowledge of meaning and form are concerned. Thus, teachers and materials writers are recommended to introduce TPVNs to language learners.

This study was conducted over a short period of time and the materials which the participants worked on were only two texts. A longitudinal study, therefore, is needed to further explore the advantages of TPVNs over SMVNs.

REFERENCES

- Bozkurt, N. (2007). The effect of vocabulary notebooks on vocabulary acquisition. Unpublished MA thesis. Retrieved July 5, 2012 from: <http://www.belgeler.com/blg/15g0/the-effect-of-vocabulary-notebooks-on-vocabulary-acquisition-kelime-defterlerinin-kelime-edinimi-zerindeki-etkisi>
- Carroll, M., & Mordaunt, O. (1991). The frontier method of vocabulary practice. *TESOL Journal*, 1, 23-26.
- Decarrico, J. S. (2001). Vocabulary learning and teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 285-299). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Fowle, C. (2002). Vocabulary notebooks: Implementation and outcomes. *ELT Journal*, 56, 380-388.
- Hayati, M. (2010). Notes on teaching English pronunciation to EFL learners: A case of Iranian high school students. *English Language Teaching* 3, 121-126.
- Ho, Y. (2003). Audiotaped dialogue journals: An alternative form of speaking practice. *ELT Journal*, 57, 269-277.
- Hulstijn, J. H., & Laufer, B. (2001). Some empirical evidence for the involvement load hypothesis in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*, 51, 539-558.
- Hunt, A., & Beglar, D. (2002). Current research and practice in teaching vocabulary. In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya. *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. (pp. 258-266). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kinsella, K. (2010). Bolstering confident and competent vocabulary use through explicit instruction. Retrieved June 4, 2012, from <http://www.sbcseport.org/published/two/twowaycabe/collection/1/3/upload.c-twowaycabe-1n3.pdf>
- Ledbury, R. (2006). *Vocabulary notebooks: Ways to make them work*. Retrieved June 4, 2012, from http://www.developingteachers.com/articles_tchtraining/vbookspf_robert.htm
- Leeke, P., & Shaw, P. (2000). Learners' independent records of vocabulary. *System*, 28, 271-289.
- McCrostie, J. (2007). Examining learner vocabulary notebooks. *ELT Journal*, 61, 246-255.
- McCarthy, M. (1990). *Vocabulary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Min, H-T. (2008). EFL vocabulary acquisition and retention: Reading plus vocabulary enhancement activities and narrow reading. *Language Learning*, 58, 73-115.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2002). Best practice in vocabulary teaching and learning. In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya. (Eds.). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. (pp. 267-272). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2011). Research into practice: Vocabulary. *Language Teaching*, 44, 529-539.
- Renandya, W. A., & Jacobs, G. M. (2002). Extensive reading: Why aren't we all doing it? In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya. *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. (pp. 295-302). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (1995). Vocabulary notebooks: Theoretical underpinnings and practical suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 49, 133-143.
- Strange, D., & Hall, A. (2005). *Pacesetter: Elementary level*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walters, J., & Bozkurt, N. (2009). The effect of keeping vocabulary notebooks on vocabulary acquisition. *Language Teaching Research*, 13, 403-423.
- Webb, S. (2007). Learning word pairs and glossed sentences: The effects of single context on vocabulary knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 11, 63-81.

Appendix A
A sample of Teacher-Provided Vocabulary Notebook

- **Stuff** / stʌf / *noun* [uncountable]:

THINGS informal used when you are talking about things such as substances, materials, or groups of objects when you do not know what they are called, or it is not important to say exactly what they are :

I've got some sticky stuff on my shoe.

How do you think you're going to fit all that stuff into the car?

- **GRAMMAR**

Stuff is an uncountable noun and has no plural form. Use a singular verb after it :

Most of my stuff is still in packing cases.

- **mention** / 'menʃ ə n / *verb* [transitive]: to talk or write about something or someone, usually quickly and without saying very much or giving details :

*Was my name **mentioned** at all?*

*Some of the problems were **mentioned** in his report.*

- **mention (that):** *He **mentioned** that he was having problems, but he didn't explain.*
- **It's worth mentioning** (= it is important enough to mention) *that they only studied a very small number of cases.*
- **As I mentioned earlier**, *there have been a lot of changes recently.*
- **She mentioned in passing** (= mentioned in a quick unimportant way) *that you had just been to Rome.*

▶ Do not say 'mention about' something. **Mention** is followed by a direct object: *She didn't mention her mother.*

- **As I mentioned earlier**, *it will cost a lot of money.*
 - **It is worth mentioning that** (= it is important enough to mention). *It is worth mentioning again that most accidents happen in the home.*
- **smoothly** / 'smu:ðli / *adverb*

if you say something smoothly, you say it in a calm and confident way:

'All taken care of,' he said smoothly.

SYN calmly and confidently