

## The Effect of Triple Blank Filling and Summary Writing Exercises on Learning L2 Vocabulary Meaning, Form, and Use

**Marziyeh Rahbarian Dehkordi**

MA, Department of English, Shahreza Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahreza, Iran

**Sajad Shafiee \***

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

### Abstract

This study examined the effects of two vocabulary exercises on facilitating learning vocabulary meaning, form, and use. The participants of this study, who were selected through availability sampling, consisted of 50 EFL learners, and were classified into two groups of triple blank filling group (TBFG) and summary writing group (SWG). The intervention was composed of three phases: pretest, treatment, and posttest. At the outset of the experiment, the participants took the pretest, and subsequently they were subjected to instruction, in which the learners in each class were given their special exercises, which conformed to the treatment designed for that class. To be more specific, SWG was asked to summarize the reading passages and use the newly taught words in their written productions. On the other hand, for the TBFG, each sentence, which was an excerpt from the text, contained three blank spaces, and the learners were asked to fill in the blanks using correct words. Finally, the posttest was administered, and the results showed that the composition exercise overrode the blank filling exercises significantly in terms of being more conducive to the acquisition of meaning, form and use. The implications of the study may include, among other things, paying due attention to the value and usefulness of composition exercises and incorporating them into vocabulary teaching materials.

**Keywords:** vocabulary teaching techniques, form, meaning, use, summary writing, triple blank filling

### INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary is the knowledge of words and word meanings. As Stahl (2005, p. 1) puts it, "Vocabulary knowledge is the knowledge of a word, which not only implies a definition, but also implies how that word fits into the world". Vocabulary knowledge is not something that can ever be fully mastered; it is something that expands and deepens over the course of a lifetime. Instruction in vocabulary involves far more than looking up words in a dictionary and using the words in a sentence. Vocabulary is obviously a very important element within a language as the overwhelming majority of meaning is

carried lexically; therefore, it is something worthy of being taken into consideration both in second language (L2) and first language (L1) teaching.

Learning vocabulary is not only learning about the words or new vocabulary, but also learning how to use the vocabulary in correct, appropriate ways. What is meant by the meaning of a word is determined by the context where it is formed and also by its relation to other words. The word *book* sometimes means the kind of thing you read from, but it can also mean a number of other things. Many L2 learners have become tired of learning words in traditional ways. It has been found that due to inadequate class time, L2 learners are not much able to learn the indispensable words. They cannot memorize all the essential words appearing in their books. Considering their concerns, the present study, therefore, aims to experiment a complementary teaching aid to solve the learners' vocabulary learning problems. Therefore, it is hypothesized that using different types of vocabulary exercises has the potential to solve the problems faced by L2 learners. Using vocabulary tasks in English classes is a way of helping L2 learners become more active in practicing the newly learnt vocabularies through the means of different exercises. It encourages L2 learners to practice the words in a more meaningful way. The present study, hence, intended to examine the following research questions:

- Do the composition tasks better facilitate vocabulary learning than blank filling tasks?
- Do the two vocabulary exercises, triple blank filling and summary writing help students improve their knowledge of vocabulary meaning, form, and use significantly?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Many L2 researchers argue nowadays that learning vocabulary is perhaps the most challenging aspect of becoming proficient in an L2 because of the sheer enormity of the task (Meara, 1995; Nation, 2001). According to Zhi-Liang (2010), skills of language learning (including reading, writing, speaking, and listening) may not be successfully achieved without vocabulary. Moreover, (Segler, 2001, p. 1) contends that vocabulary "is central to language and crucially important for L2 learners." McKeown (2002) also argues that vocabulary knowledge is at the heart of a language comprehension and use. Moreover, Barra (1995) suggests that to comprehend a text successfully, L2 learners need to have sufficient word knowledge. That is to say that the comprehension of a language depends on the amount of words that are known in that language. Hence, L2 learners need to have sufficient word knowledge to understand what they read. L2 learners can understand a writer's message only if they know the meaning of most of the words used in a text. Likewise, Cardner (2010) states that vocabulary is used to determine the proficiency a student has in oral context. This is to say that vocabulary is an essential component to determine how much a student is able to communicate successfully. So, L2 learners have to overcome the lack of vocabulary knowledge in order to communicate effectively, and L2 teachers should focus on effective instruction communicate successfully.

Many perspectives of a word require to be known in order to have the ability to utilize it properly and strategically, but what exactly requires to be known, and how that knowledge is identified remain evasive. The definition of what it means to "know" a word is different. According to Nagy and Herman (1987), an operational definition of knowing a word may be investigated on a continuum ranging from an obscure sense of recognition of its spelling or pronunciation to a correct knowledge of its semantics, syntax, or use (appropriate contextualized production).

Nation (2001) mentioned there are other perspectives of knowing a word. For the aims of the current research, knowing consists of different elements. At its most basic level, knowing a word contains comprehending form, meaning, and use. Knowledge of the spoken form of the word is procedural knowledge, the knowledge of how to create the structure of the word and contains how it seems and how it is pronounced. The written form contains what it looks like, how it is written, and how it is spelled. Knowledge of the parts of the word form include elements of the word that are recognizable (e.g., roots and affixes) and which parts are necessary for the expression of the intended meaning (Nation, 2001).

Learning the form of the word involves implicit learning that includes, for example, noticing. This may be achieved through repeated encounters with the word during reading in a variety of contexts as a means of developing vocabulary knowledge. Nation's (2001) vocabulary knowledge element of meaning is declarative (Levitt, 1989), which is the knowledge of what a word is, including its meaning, form, concept, referents, and associations. Knowledge of meaning includes the relationship between form and meaning and necessarily involves an understanding of the meaning that a word form denotes and what word form is used to express the intended meaning. To know a word, it is obligatory to comprehend what is included in the concept and what items the concept refers to. The relationships that the meaning of a word conjures are also significant. According to Stoller and Grabe (1993), development of vocabulary knowledge is highly necessary for both native and nonnative speakers. Hulstijn et al. (2005) believe that "If one does not know the meaning of the words occurring in a text, understanding is severely hampered" (p. 54). Hence, learners should pay attention to the words as a part of a message and individual words as well (Nation, 2001).

Nation (2001) noted that incidental vocabulary learning activities such as role play, ranking, and retelling are useful means of vocabulary learning. One important means to focus on vocabulary is exercises as they have a beneficial effect on vocabulary learning. Chastain (1988) believes that new information should be related to old information in order to be retrieved. Cevik (2007) stated that in order to connect new knowledge (new words in context) to existing knowledge, it should be supported with the exercises.

Amiryousefie and Kassaian (2010) asserted that exercises direct learners to specific vocabulary items and help them understand the meaning of words through different tasks. Moreover, Nation (1990, as cited in Cevik, 2007) states that "in order to remember a word, it needs to be encountered 5 to 16 times in activities or texts" (p. 2). Hence, if vocabulary items are repeated in different exercises and activities, learners'

vocabulary knowledge will be enhanced to a great degree. Paribakht and Wesche (1994) pointed out the importance of using exercises in vocabulary learning. They reported that text-based vocabulary exercises and activities are more effective and efficient than the reading only the text on vocabulary learning. Moreover, Llach (2009) emphasized the effect of vocabulary exercisers in promoting vocabulary knowledge.

Min and Hsu (1997) stated that reading plus vocabulary enhancement activities was more effective than narrow reading in vocabulary acquisition and retention. These vocabulary enhancement tasks and activities drew learners' attention to a particular word and enabled them to understand the meaning and function of the word and resulted in vocabulary learning (Min & Hsu, 2008). Folse (2006) compared the effect of written exercises on L2 vocabulary retention. To this end, 154 ESL learners of four U.S. universities practiced 18 unknown words in three following different types of conditions: one fill in the blank exercises (recognition exercises), three fill in the blank exercises (recognition exercises), and one original – sentence writing exercises (production exercises). An unexpected posttest was administered to see whether vocabulary retention differed by using three different conditions. The results showed that the mean scores of the three fill in the blank condition were the highest and the words under three fill in the blank condition were retained better than the other conditions.

Kargozari and Ghaemi (2011) did the most recent research to compare the effect of different exercises on L2 learners' vocabulary retention. They examined three tasks on L2 vocabulary retention: multiple choice exercise, fill in the blank exercise, and sentence writing. To this end, 54 Iranian EFL learners participated in this study. The learners were randomly assigned to three groups: fill in the blank group, multiple choice group, and the sentence writing group. While doing the exercises, a mini dictionary was distributed among the learners in order to help them understand the meaning of the words, and their usage. Five days after the treatment an unexpected posttest was administered to the learners in order to investigate which exercise type was the most effective in vocabulary retention. The results indicated that the mean of the multiple choice exercise was higher than the other two exercise types. The researchers concluded that the multiple choice exercise was more effective than the other two conditions on L2 vocabulary retention. They argued that in multiple choice exercises, retention of the words was longer than the other two types because in multiple choice exercises the learners had to just focus on the meaning of the words, but in doing fill in the blank exercise, and sentence writing the learners had to focus not only on the meaning of the words but also on the other aspects of language like grammar.

Folse (2006) concluded that three fill-in-the-blank conditions (recognition exercise) resulted in better vocabulary retention. The researcher pointed out that multiple target word retrievals in an exercise was an important factor. Kargozari and Ghaemi (2011) concluded that multiple choice exercises were conducive to vocabulary learning. Rassaei (2015) examined the effects of three forms of reading-based output activities on L2 vocabulary learning. To this end, three groups of learners of English as a foreign

language (EFL) were instructed to employ the following three output activities after reading two narrative texts: a) summarizing the texts and incorporating target vocabulary in the summary; b) generating several general comprehension questions out of reading texts and answering those questions while incorporating target vocabulary; and c) making predictions about what is to occur in the texts and including target vocabulary in the prediction. The results of a cued response production test and a multiple choice recognition test indicated that the three treatment conditions resulted in significant development of vocabulary knowledge. Moreover, the results revealed that making predictions and questioning/answering were more effective than summarizing for promoting L2 words knowledge.

## METHOD

### Participants

A number of 75 Iranian EFL learners studying English at Omid Language Institute in Shahrekord, Iran, participated in this study as part of their language learning course. Their ages ranged from 18 to 45 years. To ensure the homogeneity of the participants, Preliminary English Test (PET) was administered and 25 students were excluded from the study because they had extremely high, or extremely low scores on the test. The others were selected on the basis of obtaining a score one standard deviation above or below the mean. Finally, the participants of this study, who were selected through availability sampling, consisted of 50 EFL learners and they were classified into two groups of triple blank filling group (TBFG) and summary writing group (SWG).

### Materials

In this study, the following materials and instruments were chronologically employed for data collection: Preliminary English Test (PET), a pretest, a story book, and a posttest.

The first test which was utilized was the Preliminary English Test (PET), which is one of the Cambridge English tests. The test is used for intermediate level of English and measures the participants' language knowledge and has been extensively used as a homogeneity-checking test. It is composed of three papers of four skills: reading and writing, listening, and speaking. Reading and writing are included in paper 1, while listening and speaking are in papers 2 and 3, respectively.

### ***Paper 1: Reading and Writing (1 hour 30 minutes – 50% of total marks)***

There are five parts in reading section which are composed of 35 questions: Part One and Two are inferential questions, Part Three and Four are comprehension questions, and Part Five is a cloze test. Writing section has three parts and 8 questions: Part One is grammar, Part Two and Three are writing letters. This paper takes an hour and a half.

***Paper 2: Listening (approximately 35 minutes – 25% of total marks)***

Listening has four parts and 25 questions. Part One contains dialogues with different subjects. Part Two is introduction of a music band, and Part Three of a restaurant. And Part Four is a dialogue with an educational subject. This paper takes half an hour.

***Paper 3, Speaking (10–12 minutes – 25% of total marks)***

This part involves four parts of speaking questions and a picture. There are some personal questions in Part One. Part Two, Three, and Four are conversations between two participants based on the provided picture. It takes 10-12 minutes.

The second instrument which was employed in this study was a 30-item pretest; the test included 10 questions gauging the knowledge of the learners regarding the meaning of the words taught during the course. It also contained 10 questions measuring the knowledge of the learners in relation to the form of those words. Finally, the remaining questions served to measure the learners' knowledge of vocabulary use. This test had been piloted with a group of similar learners; its validity had been approved by three TEFL professors, and the test-retest reliability of its different parts were established; more specifically, the reliability coefficients for the meaning, form, and use sections of the test were found to be .72, .85, and .76.

The instructional material exploited in this research was a story book. The targeted words and the excerpts by which exercises were constructed all emanated from this story book. Also, the vocabulary glossary and the worksheets included in the book served as a great source for the researchers to design different kinds of exercises.

The last instrument used in this research was the posttest. The posttest was similar to the pretest in terms of content, but different from it in terms of organization of the words and the test items. Since the reliability and validity of the pretest were assured, and owing to the fact that the posttest included a reshuffled version of the questions in the pretest, no need was felt as to reexamine the reliability and validity of the posttest.

**Procedures**

Data collection in the current study took place through a number of four phases. These phases are explicated below.

***Phase one***

Prior to the conducting of the study, EFL learners were tested for their homogeneity. To ensure the homogeneity of the participants, Preliminary English Test (PET) was administered. So, 50 participants who could obtain a score within one standard deviation below and above the mean took part in this study. Then they were classified into two groups of intact classes: TBFG and SWG.

### ***Phase two***

At the outset of a 90-min class, the participants completed the vocabulary pretest, which required them to choose the correct answer from among the provided alternatives. The class continued following the regular syllabus.

### ***Phase three***

The next phase started with the reading instruction on the following day when there were 90 minutes of class time. In a similar approach of teaching the readings in the learners' textbooks, the researchers led the students through the story with a focus on comprehension, pausing at each target word (TW) for its lexical information in the glossary. After the instruction, the learners in each class were given their special exercises, which conformed to the treatment designed for that given class. More specifically, the exercises for the condition of summary writing (SW) required its group to summarize the reading passage and use the TWs in their written productions. As for the TBFG, each sentence, which was an excerpt from the text, contained three blank spaces, and the learners were asked to fill the blanks using correct words. All of the sentences in these vocabulary exercises were written by the researchers, using the *Longman Dictionary* as a reference, and proofread by three near-native speakers who were teaching English in the institute.

### ***Phase four***

After the instructional period ended, the posttest was administered. The procedures for the administration and scoring of the posttest and the pretest were alike. One point was given to each correct response, while the incorrect responses were not given any point.

## **RESULTS**

To compare the pretest scores of the TBFG and SWG with respect to vocabulary meaning, form, and use, one-way MANOVA was utilized. This statistical test is used when there is one independent variable (in this case, type of vocabulary learning exercise, which surfaces as triple blank filling and summary writing exercises), and two or more related dependent variables (meaning, form, and use in this case). Prior to the administration of MANOVA, its assumptions (including normality, sample size, outliers, linearity, etc.) were checked. Tables 1 and 2 present descriptive and inferential statistics of the comparison of the TBFG and SWG on the pretest in terms of their vocabulary meaning, form, and use scores.

**Table1.** Descriptive Statistics Results Comparing S TBFG and SWG

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Meaning	TBFG	26	4.11	1.79
	SWG	24	4.16	1.34
Form	TBFG	26	4.46	1.30
	SWG	24	4.04	1.26
Use	TBFG	26	3.69	1.46
	SWG	24	3.70	.944

The mean score of the TBFG and SWG for vocabulary meaning, form, and use on the pretest are shown in Table 1. There were apparently slight differences between the mean scores of the four groups, but to see whether the differences were of statistical significance or not, one has to refer to the MANOVA table below.

**Table 2.** MANOVA Results Comparing TBFG and SWG on Vocabulary Meaning, Form, and Use on the Pretest

	Value	<i>F</i>	Hypothesis <i>df</i>	Error <i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.10	1.57	9.00	291.00	.32	.03
Wilk's Lambda	.89	1.61	9.00	231.00	.32	.03
Hotelling's Trace	.11	1.62	9.00	281.00	.31	.03
Roy's Largest Root	.09	2.95	3.00	9700	.03	.08

Since the most commonly reported statistics is Wilk's Lambda, here the value for this statistics is reported as well. The Wilk's Lambda's associated *Sig.* value was found to be .32, which is larger than the significance level (i.e.  $.32 > .05$ ). This shows that the both groups of TBFG and SWG were not significantly different on their vocabulary pretest in terms of the three variables under investigation, i.e. meaning, form, and use. It is thus redundant to proceed with the other tables in MANOVA analysis.

The following tables in this section present the results of a second MANOVA conducted to compare the TBFG and SWG on the vocabulary posttest. Any possible changes on the posttest could be attributed to the treatment provided for the two groups.

**Table 3.** Descriptive Statistics Results Comparing TBFG and SWG on Vocabulary Meaning, Form, and Use on the Posttest

	Groups	<i>N</i>	Mean	Std. Deviation
Use	TBFG	26	6.19	1.12
	SWG	24	7.29	1.42
Form	TBFG	26	6.76	1.93
	SWG	24	7.62	1.02
Use	TBFG	26	5.65	2.18
	SWG	24	6.66	1.56

The mean score of the TBFG and SWG for vocabulary meaning, form, and use on the posttest, as shown in Table 3, were different from one another. Yet, to find out whether these differences were statistically significant or not, one needs to consult the MANOVA table.

**Table 4.** MANOVA Results Comparing TBFG and SWG on Vocabulary Meaning, Form, and Use on the Posttest

	Value	<i>F</i>	Hypothesis <i>df</i>	Error <i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.46	5.92	9.00	291.00	.000	.15
Wilk's Lambda	.56	6.74	9.00	231.35	.000	.17
Hotelling's Trace	.70	7.37	9.00	281.00	.000	.19
Roy's Largest Root	.62	20.19	3.00	97.00	.000	.38



The Wilk's Lambda's associated *Sig.* value was .000, which is less than the significance level (i.e. .05 = .05). A *p* value less than or equal to the significance level shows that there was a significant difference between the groups. Thus, the two groups of TBFG and SWG were significantly different on their vocabulary posttest in terms of the three dependent variables (vocabulary meaning, form, and use) taken as a composite dependent variable. Now to see which of the three variables caused the difference between the groups, Table 5 should be looked at.

**Table 5.** Test of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variables	Type III Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	Partial Eta Squared
Meaning	43.80	3	14.60	9.46	.000	.22
Form	52.80	3	17.60	15.46	.000	.32
Use	49.61	3	16.53	13.65	.000	.29

Because we are looking at a number of separate analyses here, it is suggested that we use a more stringent significance level to avoid Type I error. The most common way of this is to apply Bonferroni adjustment, which entails dividing the significance level (i.e. .05) by the number of analyses. In this case, since there were three dependent variables, significance level ought to be divided by three (giving a new significance level of .017). The results now are significant if the probability value (*Sig.*) is less than .017. In Table 3.5, under the *Sig.* column, all the three values were less than .017. This means that vocabulary meaning significantly differed in the TBFG and SWG, and this was also true for vocabulary form, and vocabulary use. Since the mean scores of SWG regarding meaning, form, and use were greater than the mean scores of TBFG, it could be concluded that summary writing exercises were significantly more effective than blank filling exercises for the purpose of vocabulary learning.

## DISCUSSION

Vocabulary knowledge has an important role in almost all areas of language learning; learning a language depends on learning its vocabulary. According to Stoller and Grabe (1993), development of vocabulary knowledge is highly necessary for both native and nonnative speakers. Hulstijn et al. (2005) believe that "If one does not know the meaning of the words occurring in a text, understanding is severely hampered" (p. 54). Hence, learners should pay attention to the words as a part of a message and individual words as well (Nation, 2001).mNation (2001) noted that incidental vocabulary learning activities such as role play, ranking, and retelling are useful means of vocabulary learning. One important means to focus on vocabulary is exercises as they have a beneficial effect on vocabulary learning. Amiryousefie and Kassaian (2010) asserted that exercises direct learners to specific vocabulary items and help them understand the meaning of words through different tasks. Moreover, Nation (1990, as cited in Cevik, 2007) states that "in order to remember a word, it needs to be encountered 5 to 16 times in activities or texts" (p. 2). Hence, if vocabulary items are repeated in different exercises and activities, learners' vocabulary knowledge will be enhanced to a great degree.

Some researchers believe that teaching vocabulary by reading texts plus exercises and activities will be more effective (Paribakht & Wesche, 1994; Zimmerman, 1997). Vocabulary learning is one of the major focuses in language studies. Providing different tasks and activities can be effective and beneficial in this regard. As such, the present study put in efforts to see the effects of two vocabulary exercises, triple blank filling and summary writing, on knowledge of vocabulary meaning, form, and use. The results of this study showed that although the mean scores of vocabulary meaning, form, and use improved for the two groups of SWG and TBFG, summary writing exercises proved to be more useful for vocabulary meaning, form, and use than blank filling exercises.

The findings of this study are in agreement with Dunmore (1989) who highlighted the need for exercise types in vocabulary learning and emphasized the importance of context in understanding the meaning of unknown words. In another study, Paribakht and Wesche (1994) pointed out the importance of using exercises in vocabulary learning. They reported that text-based vocabulary exercises and activities are more effective and efficient than the reading only the text on vocabulary learning. Moreover, Llach (2009) emphasized the effect of vocabulary exercisers in promoting vocabulary knowledge, which is in line with the results of the present study. Min and Hsu (2008) stated that reading plus vocabulary enhancement activities were more effective than narrow reading in vocabulary acquisition and retention. These vocabulary enhancement tasks and activities drew learners' attention to a particular word and enabled them to understand the meaning and function of the word and resulted in vocabulary learning (Min & Hsu, 2008). Hence, using different exercises was essential and beneficial for vocabulary learning and retention. The similarity between these studies and the current study is that in all of these studies, vocabulary exercises promote vocabulary knowledge.

In another study, Folse (2006) compared the effect of written exercises on L2 vocabulary retention. To this end, 154 ESL learners of four U.S universities practiced 18 unknown words in three following different types of conditions: one fill in the blank exercise (recognition exercise), three fill in the blank exercises (recognition exercises), and one original sentence writing exercise (production exercise). An unexpected posttest was administered to see whether vocabulary retention differed by using three different conditions. The results showed that the mean scores of the three fill in the blank conditions were the highest, and the words under three fill in the blank condition were retained better than the other conditions. This study showed that doing multiple target word retrievals in an exercise was important in L2 vocabulary learning.

The results of this study are in contrast with the current study because the current study showed that SW exercise was more effective than TBF exercise in vocabulary meaning, form, and use. On the whole, the results of both studies showed that vocabulary exercises had significant effect on vocabulary learning. Kargozari and Ghaemi (2011) did a more recent research study to compare the effects of different exercises on L2 learners' vocabulary retention. They examined three tasks on L2

vocabulary retention: multiple choice exercise, fill in the blank exercise, and sentence writing. To this end, 54 Iranian EFL learners participated in this study. The learners were randomly assigned to three groups: fill in the blank group, multiple choice groups, and the sentence writing group. While doing the exercises, a mini dictionary was distributed among the learners in order to help them understand the meaning of the words, and their usage. Five days after the treatment an unexpected posttest was administered to the learners in order to investigate which exercise type was the most effective in vocabulary retention. The results indicated that the mean of the multiple choice exercise was higher than the other two exercise types. The researchers concluded that the multiple choice exercise was more effective than the other two conditions in L2 vocabulary retention. They argued that in multiple choice exercises, retention of the words was longer than the other two types because in multiple choice exercises the learners had to just focus on the meaning of the words, but in doing fill in the blank exercise, and sentence writing the learners had to focus not only on the meaning of the words but also on the other aspects of language like grammar. The similarity of this study with the current study was the significant effect of vocabulary exercises on vocabulary learning. However, this study showed in multiple choice exercises, the retention of words was longer than other exercises and in the current study, SW exercise was better than TBF exercises.

Rassaei (2015) examined the effects of three forms of reading-based output activities on L2 vocabulary learning. To this end, three groups of learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) were instructed to employ the following three output activities after reading two narrative texts: a) summarizing the texts and incorporating target vocabulary in the summary; b) generating several general comprehension questions out of reading texts and answering those questions while incorporating target vocabulary; and c) making predictions about what is to occur in the texts and including target vocabulary in the prediction. The results of a cued response production test and a multiple choice recognition test indicated that the three treatment conditions resulted in significant development of vocabulary knowledge. Moreover, the results revealed that making predictions and questioning/answering were more effective than summarizing for promoting L2 words knowledge.

All in all, the results of these studies are in consonance with the result of the current study and all of them showed that vocabulary exercises facilitate vocabulary knowledge.

## CONCLUSION

The present study was an attempt to examine the effects of two types of vocabulary exercises (TBF and SW) on vocabulary meaning, form, and use. The first research question investigated which exercise type is conducive to vocabulary learning. It was founded that EFL learners' vocabulary improved by using different exercise types. Indeed, different exercises had different results in improving learners' vocabulary learning. The results showed that SW exercise was more effective than TBF for all the three aspects of vocabulary knowledge (meaning, form, and use).

The teachers are advised to provide more opportunities for L2 learners to practice vocabulary by using SW exercises rather than TBF exercises in their classes. These types of exercises are valuable in helping L2 learners become more proficient L2 users. L2 teachers should include different types of exercises such as TBF and SW exercises in their vocabulary teaching. In this way, the words would stick to learners' minds, and the learners can remember the words easily after a long time. The inclusion of these exercises in the classroom for L2 teaching, especially for word teaching, would increase L2 learners' motivation in studying of complex L2 structures, improve their communicative skills, and lead to better understanding.

L2 learners are often conscious of the extent to which limitations in their vocabulary knowledge hamper their ability to communicate successfully in an L2 (Read, 2004). From this perspective, it is clear that without an extensive vocabulary and strategies for learning new words, learners typically achieve less than their potential and may be discouraged from making use of L2 learning opportunities around them such as listening to the radio, listening to native speakers, using the language in different contexts, reading, or watching television (Richards & Renandya, 2002). One of the implications of the current study is that L2 learners can use the both types of vocabulary exercises (TBF and SW) for improving their four language skills. The most important implication of this study is that L2 syllabus designers and curriculum developers can include these types of vocabulary exercises in L2 textbooks and in different language skills as an applicable and suitable method in teaching words. This study suggests L2 teachers to apply summary writing exercise for teaching vocabulary meaning, form, and use in the classroom.

This study was limited to learners at intermediate proficiency level. There can be more investigations for elementary and advanced levels of proficiency to see if generalizations to those learners could be done or not. Second, in this study, two specific exercises (e.g. TBF & SW) were used. There are some other exercises and techniques that can be considered in such investigations. Third, the participants were Iranian, so the results cannot be generalized to learners of other nationalities. Although this study was performed on L2 learners in a language school; further research needs to be carried out at different universities as well as other language schools.

## REFERENCES

- Amiryousefie, M., & Kassaian, Z. (2010). The effect of reading only vs. reading plus enhancement activities on vocabulary learning and production of Iranian pre-university students. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 94-98.
- Cevik, O. A. (2007). *The effect of exercises in English elementary reading books, on the Success of vocabulary teaching problems and their solution proposals*. Unpublished master's thesis, Trakya University, Turkey.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second-language skills: Theory and Practice*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.
- Dunmore, D. (1989). Using contextual clues to infer word meaning: An evaluation of current exercise types. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 6(1), 337-347.

- Folse, K. S. (2006). The effect of type of written exercise on L2 vocabulary retention. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 273-293.
- Hulstijn, J. H., Fukkink, R. G., & Simis, A. (2005). Does training in second language word recognition skills affect reading comprehension? An experimental study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, 54-75.
- Karkozari, H. R., & Ghaemi, H. G. (2011). A reappraisal perspective on written tasks types and vocabulary acquisition and retention of EFL learners. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 12(10), 1653-1661.
- Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). Skill theory and language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 1, 53-70.
- Llach, M. P. A. (2009). The effect of reading only, reading and comprehension, and sentence writing in lexical learning in a foreign language: Some preliminary results. *RESLA*, 22, 9-33.
- McKeown, M. G., L. (2002). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Meara, P. (1995). Vocabulary acquisition: A neglected aspect of language learning. *Language Teaching and Linguistics Abstracts*, 13, 221-246.
- Min, H. T. & Hsu, W. S. (2008). The impact of supplemental reading on vocabulary acquisition and retention with EFL learners in Taiwan. *Journal of National Taiwan Normal University*, 53(1), 83-115.
- Nagy, W. E., & Herman, P. A. (1987). Breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge: Implication for acquisition and instruction. In M. G. McKeown & M. E. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 19-35). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. B. (1994). *Enhancing vocabulary acquisition through reading: A hierarchy of text-related exercise types*. Paper presented at the AAAL for Applied Linguistics, Baltimore.
- Rassaei, E. (2015). The effects of three forms of reading-based output activity on L2 vocabulary learning. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 16(3), 1-26.
- Read, J. (2004). Research in teaching vocabulary. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 146-161.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). Current research and practice in teaching vocabulary. In J. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching* (pp. 254-266). Edinburgh, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. & McCarthy, M. (1997). *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Segler, T. (2001). *Second language vocabulary acquisition and learning strategies in ICALL environments*. Unpublished master's thesis. Trakya University, Turkey.
- Stahl, S. A. (2005). Four problems with teaching word meanings and what to do to make vocabulary an integral part of instruction. In E. H. Hiebert & M.L. Kamil (Eds.),

*Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice* (pp. 95-116). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Stoller, F. L., & Grabe, W. (1993). Implications for L2 vocabulary acquisition and instruction from L1 vocabulary research. In T. Huckin, M. Haymes, & J. Coady (Eds.), *Second language reading and vocabulary learning* (pp. 24-45). Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Zhi-Liang, L. (2010). A study on English vocabulary learning strategies for non-English majors in independent college. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 6(4), 152-164.

Zimmerman, C. (1997). Do reading and interactive vocabulary instruction make a difference? An empirical study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 121-140.