

## Research Article

# THE IMPACT OF ORAL & WRITTEN STORY RECONSTRUCTION ON L2 VOCABULARY LEARNING & RETENTION: A CASE OF EFL YOUNG LEARNERS IN IRAN

*Houman Bijani<sup>#</sup>, Setareh Bayat<sup>\*\*</sup>, Ohood Alshammary<sup>\*\*\*</sup>, Salim Said Bani Orabah<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>,*

*<sup>#</sup>Assistant professor at Islamic Azad University, Zanjan Branch, Zanjan, Iran; <sup>\*\*</sup>Department of English Language, Islamic Azad University, Zanjan Branch, Zanjan, Iran; <sup>\*\*\*</sup>Assistant professor of Education at the Royal Commission for Yanbu Colleges and Institutes, Saudi Arabia; <sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>Head of English Language Center, University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Ibra, Oman*

## Abstract

Word acquisition was one of the important and essential parts for language learning. One of the learning difficulties that many L2 learners at all ages and proficiency levels face was meaningful vocabulary learning and retention as opposed to rote memorization of L2 words. Therefore, this study attempted to investigate the effectiveness of the story reconstruction, in the form of oral and written (storytelling and story writing), in improving young Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary learning and retention in comparison to the conventional methods of L2 teaching. Few studies investigated the effect of different modes of story reconstruction (i.e. spoken & written mode) on EFL learners' vocabulary learning. The participants were 60 language learners studying English in private language institute in Zanjan. They were young learners and their age range was 11-14. To meet the aim of the study, a 100-item Michigan grammar test and pre-test and post-test of vocabulary were administered to the participants in 3 groups (two experimental and 1 control groups) during conducting the study. The pre-test and post-test of vocabulary and the exam sheets on Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency (MTELP) of the experimental and control groups were scored by the researcher and then the collected data were analysed by using ANOVA analyses. Finally, the current research findings had benefits to everyone involved in English as foreign language teaching and learning process including, syllabus designers, foreign language teachers and administrators.

*ASEAN Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 24 S (Advancements in Psychology and Mental health), March-April 2023:01- 09.*

**Keywords:** Oral reconstruction, Retention, Vocabulary learning, Written reconstruction

## Introduction

Vocabulary learning was considered an important element in foreign language learning because the meanings of new words were emphasized more and more, whether in books or in the classrooms. It was also important and essential to language teaching and was really significant to a language learner. Recent research showed that teaching vocabulary could be problematic because many teachers were not confident about the best approaches in vocabulary teaching and sometimes did not know where to begin to form an instructional emphasis on word learning activity [1].

However, the opposite often happened. Vocabulary was not explicitly and directly taught in most language classes, and students were expected to "acquire" vocabulary on their own without any guidance. Courses on reading, writing, speaking, listening, grammar, and culture were usual in L2 programs for learning a foreign language, but very few vocabulary courses existed. Many instances of so-

called vocabulary instruction involved just giving students lists of words to memorize or providing limited practice opportunities and chances in learning, with no more guidance and help to the motivated and interested learner. Hague (1987) referred to the ignorance of vocabulary instruction in L2 classes, and they also suggested a different of possibilities for improving the situation [2].

Storytelling was one of the oldest forms of human communication, and it was said in the literature about its effectiveness in language teaching as a type of pedagogical tool in the development of language skills in first (L1) language, and also in a foreign or second language (L2), without consideration of learners' age or background. Furthermore, storytelling was even claimed to be more effective in language teaching compared to traditional teaching materials, such as textbooks. In fact, studies generally believed that effectiveness of storytelling depended on the fact that it was fun, and memorable, increasing learners' interest in listening to stories, as well

as in speaking, writing and reading about them [3].

Vocabulary learning was a necessary part in foreign language learning as the meanings of new words were often emphasized both in books and in classrooms. It was also effective to language teaching and was of significant importance to a language learner. Recent research showed that teaching vocabulary could be problematic because many teachers were not sure about best practice in vocabulary teaching and almost did not know where to begin to create an instructional emphasis on word learning [1].

Effective second language vocabulary acquisition was highly important for English since foreign language (EFL) learners who frequently got weak lexicons despite many years of formal study. This article completely reviewed and criticized second language (L2) reading vocabulary research and suggested that EFL teachers and administrators make use of a systematic structure in order to increase lexical development and improvement. This framework used two approaches:

- Improving explicit lexical instruction and learning strategies; and
- Encouraging the use of implicit lexical instruction and learning strategies.

The three most essential explicit lexical instruction and learning strategies had decontextualized lexis, using dictionaries and getting the idea and inferring from the context. Implicit lexical instruction and learning took many forms including the use of integrated tasks and narrow reading; however, this framework emphasized on extensive reading that was the primary and important way that EFL learners could build their reading vocabulary to an advanced and developed level. The main concept behind this framework was that the most effective and efficient lexical development happened in different curriculums that achieved to a deep balance between explicit and implicit activities for L2 learners at all levels of their development [4].

Traditionally, vocabulary was neglected in teaching programs and curriculums because of the grammar and other parts of language. Now researchers realized that vocabulary was a vital part of acquisition and teaching and ought to receive attention and research. Many studies done on vocabulary were taken as a symbol. Students were, however, reported to fail when they faced with new words, since they needed difficulty retaining them [5].

The purposes of this study were as follows: There were two extensive purposes for the current study. The first one was to investigate the effectiveness of the story reconstruction, in the form of oral and written (storytelling and story writing) in improving young Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary learning and retention in comparison to the conventional methods of L2 teaching. The second one was to generalize

the outcome of this study to foreign language learners using this technique to improve their vocabulary learning and it would bring remarkable and significant advantages to teachers to use retelling and rewriting as a useful pedagogical tool in their everyday teaching practice.

In this study the following research questions addressed:

- Does storytelling and story writing (compared to conventional method of vocabulary teaching) facilitate new vocabulary learning of Iranian young EFL learners?
- Does storytelling and story writing (compared to conventional method of vocabulary teaching) facilitate new vocabulary retention of Iranian young EFL learners?
- Does type of story reconstruction (oral vs. written) make any difference in new vocabulary learning and retention of Iranian young EFL learners (compared to conventional method of vocabulary teaching)?

## **Method**

### *Participants*

Convenience sampling was used to select one English language institute (in Zanjan, Iran) and then to choose three homogeneous classrooms (based on institute's placement test) of young English language learners: the conventional group (N=20 learners) and two experimental groups: the storytelling group (N=20 learners) and the story writing group (N=20 learners). Participants in this study were 60 language learners studying English in private language institute in Zanjan. They were young learners and their age range was between of 11-14. In this study, since intact classrooms were used, a quasi-experimental design was utilized to gather the required data. Storytelling and story writing were the independent variables and learners' vocabulary learning and retention were the dependent variables.

### *Design*

The current study was a quasi-experimental research. Storytelling and story writing was the independent variables and learners' vocabulary learning and retention were the dependent variables.

### *Instruments*

In the present study, the following instrument was utilized to collect data:

### *Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency (MTELP)*

A Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency (MTELP) was administered to the participants to specify their level of proficiency and to homogenize them. The MTELP used in the present study was a 100 item multiple choice

tests consisting of three parts. It included forty grammar items, forty vocabulary items requiring the completion of a sentence or the selection of synonyms or antonyms, and four reading passages each followed by five reading comprehension questions .

*Pre-test of vocabulary*

From the two stories, difficult and unfamiliar words were selected (40 words). As a pre-test and in order to identify target vocabulary items for the current study, the learners required answering the following two questions for each vocabulary item (about 40 words):

- Whether or not the word is familiar to them; and,
- If the word was familiar, what was its first language (L1) translation or English definition?

*Post-test of vocabulary (immediate and delayed)*

Folse’s (2006) modified version of Paribakht and Wesche’s (1997) vocabulary knowledge scale employed as it could measure learners’ receptive knowledge of word meanings and productive knowledge of meanings and use [6,7]. These aspects, on which most previous studies concentrated, were those that were most likely to be learnt (Schmitt, 2000).

*Reading passage*

Two short stories selected by the researcher to serve the purpose of the study for the treatment (output activity) sessions. The stories were selected from the participants’ course books. These stories were taken from the end of the book to ensure that students were unfamiliar with them. In the output activity session, the learners were exposed to both passages. The passage included 12 target vocabulary items. The target words that were underlined were followed by their L1 definition embraced in parentheses. The passages were the same for the three groups of participants.

*Procedure*

Convenience sampling was used to select one English language institute (in Zanjan, Iran) and then to choose three homogeneous classrooms (based on institute’s placement test) of young English language learners: the conventional group (N=20 learners) and two experimental groups: the storytelling group (N=20 learners) and the story writing group (N=20 learners). One teacher taught these three classes and the treatment was implemented during the term.

**Table 1**

Descriptive statistics of storytelling, story writing, and conventional methods in vocabulary learning of Iranian young EFL learners.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
<b>Conventional</b>	20	68.9	17.5	3.91	60.7	77.09	39	95
<b>Storytelling</b>	20	80.8	7.5	1.67	77.28	84.31	69	96
<b>Story Writing</b>	20	79.5	10.3	2.3	74.67	84.32	56	98
<b>Total</b>	60	76.4	13.41	1.73	72.93	79.86	39	98

First, a pre-test, teacher-made vocabulary test, was given to the participants prior to any kind of instruction to ensure that none of the participants were familiar with the target words. Then, the conventional group were taught the given vocabulary items in the conventional way, i.e. listening to the story on the tape read by a native speaker, looking up for meanings in dictionaries or asking the teacher, then reading and doing a reading comprehension task individually, followed by teacher feedback. In contrast, the storytelling and story writing groups instructed the vocabulary items through storytelling and story writing techniques, requiring them to reconstruct the story orally or in a written mode. At the end of the each instruction (after performing each story which contains target words) the immediate post-test of vocabulary was given to the learners. In addition, the delayed post-test two weeks after the first one was administered to check students’ retention of the learned words.

*Data analysis*

The collected data analyzed by using SPSS software. First, descriptive statistics reported. Also, Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was used for checking the normality assumption of the data, to decide whether to use parametric or non-parametric tests.

Then, mixed ANOVA was used to compare two experimental and one control groups’ performances on immediate and delayed post-tests.

**Results**

*Investigation of the first research question*

The first research question was “Does storytelling and story writing (compared to conventional method of vocabulary teaching) facilitate new vocabulary learning of Iranian young EFL learners?”

The first research question was analysed using Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for checking the normality assumption of the data. Then, mixed ANOVA was used to compare two experimental and one control groups’ performances on immediate and delayed post-test. Table 1 displays the mean and SD of both two experimental and one control group.

Based on the table 1, the mean for the conventional group was 68.90 and the mean for storytelling and story writing was 80.80 and 79.50 respectively that showed there was no significant difference between these two experimental

groups. Also the Test of Homogeneity of Variances showed that the variances in the compared groups are different (Table 2). Generally the significant rate in the tables showed that both oral and story reconstruction had better performance and effect compared to conventional method of teaching vocabulary both in learning and retention (Table 3).

An ANOVA was conducted to find if there was a significant difference between storytelling, story writing and conventional method in EFL learners learning of vocabulary. The ANOVA result indicated no significant difference between storytelling, and story writing ( $p=2.85168$ ) compared to conventional method of learning at the level .05 ( $P>0.05$ ) (Table 4).

*Investigation of the second research question*

The second research question was “Does storytelling and story writing (compared to conventional method of vocabulary teaching) facilitate new vocabulary retention of Iranian young EFL learners?”

To answer the second research question, we used Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for checking the normality assumption of the data. Then, mixed ANOVA was used to compare two experimental and one control groups’ performances on immediate and delayed post-test. Table 3 displays the mean and SD of both two experimental and one control group to answer the second research question.

**Table 2**  
Test of homogeneity of variance.

Score			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
12.457	2	57	0

**Table 3**  
ANOVA test evaluating significant difference among storytelling, story writing, and conventional methods in vocabulary learning of Iranian young EFL learners.

	Score				
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1704.4	2	852.2	5.452	0.007
Within Groups	8910	57	156.316		
Total	10614.4	59			

**Table 4**  
Test results of storytelling, story writing, and conventional method in vocabulary learning of Iranian young EFL learners.

Dependent Variable: Score						
Games-Howell						
(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Conventional	Storytelling	-11.900*	4.258	0.025	-22.48	-1.31
	Story Writing	-10.6	4.541	0.066	-21.78	0.58
Storytelling	Conventional	11.900*	4.258	0.025	1.31	22.48
	Story Writing	1.3	2.851	0.892	-5.68	8.28
Story Writing	Conventional	10.6	4.541	0.066	-0.58	21.78
	Storytelling	-1.3	2.851	0.892	-8.28	5.68

\* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Based on the Table 5, the mean for the conventional group was 63.9500 and the mean for storytelling and story writing was 75.9500 and 81.2500 respectively that showed there was no significant difference between these two experimental groups. Also the Test of Homogeneity of Variances showed that the variances in the compared groups are different.

An ANOVA was conducted to find if there was a significant difference between storytelling, story writing and conventional method in EFL learner’s retention of vocabulary. The ANOVA result indicated no significant difference between storytelling, and story writing ( $p=3.48255$ ) compared to conventional method of retention at the level .05 ( $P>0.05$ ). The Significant rate based on the table for the oral and written construction was higher than conventional method which showed it was significant and these types of reconstruction were better than conventional method (Tables 6-8).

*Investigation of the third research question*

The third research question was “Does type of story reconstruction (oral vs. written) make any difference in new vocabulary learning and retention of Iranian young EFL learners (compared to conventional method of vocabulary teaching)?

To answer the third research question, we used Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for checking the normality assumption of the data. Then, mixed ANOVA was used to compare two experimental and one control groups’ performances on immediate and delayed post-test. Table 5 displays the mean and SD of both two experimental and one control group to answer the second research question.

Based on the above Table 9, it was seen that the mean of

**Table 5**

Descriptive statistics of storytelling, story writing, and conventional method in vocabulary retention of Iranian young EFL learners.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Score		Minimum	Maximum
					95% Confidence Interval			
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Story Telling	20	75.95	9.976	2.23	71.28	80.61	58	97
Story Writing	20	81.25	11.959	2.674	75.65	86.84	60	98
Conventional	20	63.95	15.662	3.502	56.61	71.28	29	90
Total	60	73.71	14.504	1.872	69.96	77.46	29	98

**Table 6**

Test of homogeneity of variance.

Levene Statistic	Score		
	df1	Df2	Sig.
3.225	62	57	0.047

**Table 7**

ANOVA test evaluating significant difference among storytelling, story writing, and conventional methods in vocabulary learning of Iranian young EFL learners.

	Score				
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3142.533	2	1571.27	9.66	0
Within Groups	9269.65	57	162.625		
Total	12412.18	59			

**Table 8**

Test results of storytelling, story writing, and conventional method in vocabulary retention of Iranian young EFL learners.

Dependent Variable: Score						
Games-Howell						
(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Story Telling	Story Writing	-5.3	3.482	0.293	-13.8	3.2
	Conventional	12.000*	4.152	0.018	1.79	22.2
Story Writing	Story Telling	5.3	3.482	0.293	-3.2	13.8
	Conventional	17.300*	4.406	0.001	6.52	28.07
Conventional	Story Telling	-12.000*	4.152	0.018	-22.2	-1.79
	Story Writing	-17.300*	4.406	0.001	-28.07	-6.52

**Table 9.** Descriptive statistics of oral construction, written construction, and conventional method in vocabulary learning and retention of Iranian young EFL learners.

Dependent Variable: Score				
Group	Method	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Conventional	Vocab Learning	68.9	17.501	20
	Vocab Retention	63.95	15.662	20
	Total	66.42	16.583	40
Oral	Vocab Learning	79.5	10.308	20
	Vocab Retention	75.95	9.976	20
	Total	77.72	10.172	40
Written	Vocab Learning	79.5	10.308	20
	Vocab Retention	81.25	11.959	20
	Total	80.37	11.056	40
Total	Vocab Learning	75.96	13.873	60
	Vocab Retention	73.71	14.504	60
	Total	74.84	14.177	120

conventional group in terms of vocabulary learning and vocabulary retention was 68.9000 and 63.9000 respectively.

In addition, that the reported means in both oral and written methods both in terms of learning and retention aspects

**Table 10**

Test of homogeneity of variance.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances <sup>a</sup>			
Dependent Variable: Score			
F	df1	df2	Sig.
4.38	5	114	0

<sup>a</sup>Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Design: Intercept + Group + Method + Group \* Method

**Table 11**

ANOVA test investigating the difference among the three methods.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects								
Dependent Variable: Score								
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power <sup>b</sup>
Corrected Model	4792.542 <sup>a</sup>	5	958.5	5.71	0	0.2	28.56	0.99
Intercept	672153.008	1	672153	4006.04	0	0.972	4006.04	1
Group	4390.867	2	2195.43	13.08	0	0.187	26.17	0.99
Method	151.875	1	151.87	0.9	0.343	0.008	0.905	0.15
Group * Method	249.8	2	124.9	0.74	0.477	0.013	1.48	0.17
Error	19127.45	114	167.78					
Total	696073	120						
Corrected Total	23919.992	119						

<sup>a</sup>R Squared = .200 (Adjusted R Squared = .165)

<sup>b</sup>Computed using alpha = .05

**Table 12**

Test results of oral construction, written construction, and conventional method in vocabulary learning and retention of Iranian Young EFL learners.

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Score						
Tukey HSD	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval
						Lower Bound      Upper Bound
	Conventional	Oral	-11.30 <sup>*</sup>	2.896	0	-18.17      -4.42
		Written	-13.95 <sup>*</sup>	2.896	0	-20.82      -7.07
	Oral	Conventional	11.30 <sup>*</sup>	2.896	0	4.42      18.17
		Written	-2.65	2.896	0.63	-9.52      4.22
	Written	Conventional	13.95 <sup>*</sup>	2.896	0	7.07      20.82
		Oral	2.65	2.896	0.63	-4.22      9.52

Based on observed means.

<sup>\*</sup>The error term is Mean Square (Error) = 167.785.

<sup>\*</sup>The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

were near to each other. Also the Test of Homogeneity of Variances showed that the variances in the compared groups are different. The Significant rate based on the table for the oral and written construction was higher than conventional method which showed it was significant and these types of reconstruction were superior to conventional method.

An ANOVA was conducted to find if there was a significant difference between written storytelling, oral storytelling and conventional method in EFL learner's retention and learning of vocabulary. The ANOVA result indicated that Std. Error between oral storytelling, and written storytelling ( $p=2.89642$ ) compared to conventional method in terms of retention and learning at the level .05 ( $P>0.05$ ).The Significant rate based on the table for the oral and written construction was higher than conventional method which showed it was significant and these types of reconstruction

were superior to conventional method (Tables 10-12).

## Discussion

*To address the first research hypothesis*

The first research hypothesis, "Storytelling and story writing (compared to conventional method of vocabulary teaching) does not facilitate new vocabulary learning of Iranian young EFL learners." was also confirmed.

The results of this research were in correspondence to some extent with the conducted study by Arvizu (2020) which indicated that using stories and pre-teaching vocabulary were effective, especially over time [8]. The effect of teaching English through stories in EFL contexts helped elementary school students to develop vocabulary in this language. Furthermore, the effects of using instructional

strategies such as pre-teaching vocabulary, using visuals, and telling a story in the students' native language, were all effective in the vocabulary acquisition process. These effects were observed across time, after the test was conducted. Furthermore, the participants' perspective was mainly positive. The young learners of EFL expressed their interests in the approaches in general as they were exposed to a new method of instruction that allowed them to practice the English language and learn vocabulary. Teaching English to young learners in foreign language contexts increased in the last decades. It was highly important that English language programs, particularly in public education, had the best possible use of the limited resources they had to advance the language learning process and achieve communicative competence. It was clear that this could be done through the implementation of teaching strategies that are effective as research evidence supported to develop the language in meaningful lessons that promote vocabulary acquisition, as well as all the skills.

Asyiah (2017) conducted some studies in this regard that the results of the study were in correspondence with this study to some extent about learning of vocabulary [9]. The findings of the study could be noted as follows. First, concerning perception on vocabulary teaching and vocabulary learning, both teacher and students gave positive perception towards vocabulary teaching and vocabulary learning. It was showed that vocabulary teaching and vocabulary learning needed to be conducted since it was viewed as an influential way to develop students' language skills that cover cognitive, affective, and behaviour. Further, vocabulary teaching and vocabulary learning was seen most effective to improve students' cognitive skills relating to how students remember, understand, and to apply the vocabulary in daily communication. Vocabulary teaching and vocabulary learning was also considered influential to improve students' affective and followed by behaviour. Regarding strategies, teacher mostly taught the vocabulary in the continuum began with fully-contextual way of teaching and followed by de-contextual and semi-contextual teaching strategy. Fully contextual type of teaching was found as the most frequent strategy employed by the teachers through which the teacher taught the vocabulary by integrating the four English skills. It was then followed by de-contextual strategy which was represented by employing monolingual dictionary and wordlists. The least frequent teaching strategy was found to be semi-contextual strategy. This finding implied that the combination of explicit or intentional and implicit or incidental vocabulary learning considered more effective to help students enhancing their vocabulary mastery. Moreover, it was also noted that explicit or de-contextual teaching was still important to be applied in vocabulary instruction as knowledge aspect needed more conscious and explicit learning mechanisms, referring to the fact that National Exam only tests reading which highly needs students' vocabulary knowledge. The finding implied that students' choice of vocabulary learning strategies had some

influences on their vocabulary mastery. Based on these findings, this study presented several recommendations. First, it was suggested for English teachers to put more attention to vocabulary in teaching English. Vocabulary instruction should be implemented and integrated into other English teaching. It was also highly recommended for teacher to teach vocabulary in continuum, began with fully-contextual teaching, and followed by semi-contextual and de-contextual teaching by previously considering students' ability. Besides, EFL teachers were also advised to teach students various strategies to improve their vocabulary mastery so that they could decide the most effective strategy which would help to their vocabulary learning. Second, EFL students were recommended to be familiar with various kinds of vocabulary learning strategies, both in finding the meaning or in storing the vocabulary into their long term memory. Hence, it was concluded that the findings of the present study supported the results of the other studies that storytelling, and story writing compared to the conventional method do not seem to have any significant role in learning vocabulary.

#### *To address the second research hypothesis*

The second research hypothesis, "Storytelling and story writing (compared to conventional method of vocabulary teaching) does not facilitate new vocabulary retention of Iranian young EFL learners." was confirmed.

The Vocabulary was an important sub-skill of language that was often considered to be challenging to teach by language teachers. Based on intentional vocabulary learning through instruction, this study aimed to provide insight into the understanding of teaching and learning vocabulary and investigated if the vocabulary instruction through in-class vocabulary strategies developed by the researcher were helpful for Turkish 8<sup>th</sup> grade EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students' English vocabulary retention in comparison to traditional vocabulary instruction. The data collected through the post-test and retention-test design were analysed via SPSS 16.0. It was concluded that both in the short and medium term, there was a significant difference between the vocabulary retention scores of the students who were instructed with in class vocabulary strategies (Experimental Group) and those who were given traditional instruction (Control Group) in favour of the Experimental Group. Built on intentional vocabulary learning through two different instruction types, this study basically intended to compare the efficacy of implementing several in-class vocabulary teaching strategies to the traditional vocabulary instruction. The major conclusion made from this study is that involving students in inventive and interesting in-class strategies supported by hands-on activities is an effective way of teaching vocabulary. It was observed in the comparisons made one day after the instruction (post-test) between control and experimental groups that EG students retained more vocabulary as a result of being instructed with in-class vocabulary strategies

which the results were in correspondence to our study in some respects [10].

This paper was an attempt to investigate whether the Elementary EFL learners' vocabulary retention of the newly learned words significantly differed by using recognition exercises (fill-in-the-blank, and matching) and production exercises (paraphrasing, and glossing) in immediate and delayed vocabulary tests. 46 Iranian Elementary learners who were studying English in a language Institute participated. Four texts were selected from Elementary Total English book. Each text contained ten unknown words followed by one exercise type. Each session the learners read a text, and then did the following exercises. The meaning of the words was provided in a mini dictionary. After doing each exercise, the learners were instructed to provide an English synonym, or an English definition, or translation of the word in L1 for each word. Before the test, mini dictionaries were collected. After a two week interval, the participants' vocabulary learning was tested through the final vocabulary test containing all the words presented in four exercise types. The results of comparing four exercise types revealed that learners recalled more words in fill-in-the-blank exercise than other exercise types both in immediate and delayed tests. Moreover, the results indicated that recognition exercises were more effective than production exercises in EFL vocabulary retention. In addition, learners' scores in immediate tests were better than their scores in delayed tests in four different exercise types. Thus, unknown words should be repeated in different exercises, in order to be stored in long term memory and to be retained easily Hashemzadeh (2012). It was not in correspondence with our conducted study that showed storytelling and story writing (compared to conventional method of vocabulary teaching) does not facilitate new vocabulary retention of Iranian young EFL learners." was confirmed.

This study intended to investigate the comparative effectiveness of keyword and context method on immediate and delayed vocabulary retention of EFL learners. It also compared the rate of forgetting in the keyword and context groups. With a quasi-experimental design, 40 learners from two intact classes in a language teaching institute in Khorramabad, Iran, were randomly assigned to the keyword and context group. The keyword group had the keyword strategy training, but the context group focused on learning vocabulary in their real context. The result indicated that learners in the keyword group recalled more vocabulary immediately after training and one week later. The results also indicated the rate of forgetting is more in the context group than in the keyword group [11].

Hence, it can be concluded that the findings of the present study supported the results of the other studies that storytelling, and story writing compared to the conventional method did not seem to have any significant role in retention of vocabulary.

*To address the third research hypothesis*

The third research hypothesis, "Type of story reconstruction (oral vs. written) does not make any difference in new vocabulary learning and retention of Iranian young EFL learners (compared to conventional method of vocabulary teaching)" was confirmed.

The purpose of this study was to examine which ways of presentation (i.e., L2 definition, aural, and video animation) were effective for learners' vocabulary learning and delayed word recollection. One control group and three experimental groups were formed by 132 intermediate language learners. Pre- and post-tests of productive recall and multiple-choice productive recognition were administered, and learners' perceptions toward glossing were examined through a questionnaire and interviews. Quantitative data were analysed using ANCOVA, and themes that emerged from the qualitative data were identified. The quantitative findings revealed that dual glossing modes were more effective than single glossing modes for many test sessions. However, single glossing was also effective for a few test sessions. The questionnaire and interview data showed that learners preferred both modes of L2 definition and video animation. The findings provided insights for vocabulary learning and teaching which was in contrast with our study results that type of story reconstruction (oral vs. written) did not make any difference in new vocabulary learning and retention of Iranian young EFL learners (compared to conventional method of vocabulary teaching) [12].

## **Conclusion**

This study was an attempt to investigate The Impact of Oral & Written Story Reconstruction on L2 Vocabulary Learning & Retention in EFL Young Learners in Iran. With respect to the first research question, the findings revealed that The ANOVA result indicated no significant difference between storytelling, and story writing ( $p=2.851$ ) compared to conventional method of learning at the level .05 ( $p>0.05$ ).

As to the second research question, an ANOVA was conducted to find if there was a significant difference between storytelling, story writing and conventional method in EFL learner's retention of vocabulary. The ANOVA result indicated no significant difference between storytelling, and story writing ( $p=3.482$ ) compared to conventional method of retention at the level .05 ( $p>0.05$ ).

About the third research question like the first and the second one, an ANOVA was conducted to find if there was a significant difference between written storytelling, oral storytelling and conventional method in EFL learner's retention and learning of vocabulary. The ANOVA result indicated no significant difference between oral storytelling, and written storytelling ( $p= 2.89642$ ) compared to conventional method in terms of retention and learning at the level .05 ( $p>0.05$ ).



## References

1. Berne JI, Blachowicz CL. What reading teachers say about vocabulary instruction: Voices from the classroom. *The reading teacher*. 2008 Dec 1;62(4):314-23.
2. Hague SA. Vocabulary instruction: What L2 can learn from L1. *Foreign Language Annals*. 1987 May;20(3):217-25.
3. Atta-Alla MN. Integrating language skills through storytelling. *English Language Teaching*. 2012 Dec 1;5(12):1.
4. Hunt A, Beglar D. A framework for developing EFL reading vocabulary. *Reading in a foreign language*. 2005 Apr;17(1):23-59.
5. Amiryousefi M, Ketabi S. Mnemonic instruction: A way to boost vocabulary learning and recall. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 2011;2(1):178.
6. Paribakht TS, Wesche M. Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary acquisition. *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*. 1997;55(4):174-200.
7. Folse KS. The effect of type of written exercise on L2 vocabulary retention. *TESOL quarterly*. 2006 Jun;40(2):273-93.
8. Arvizu MN. L2 Vocabulary Acquisition through Narratives in an EFL Public Elementary School. *IAFOR Journal of Education*. 2020;8(1):115-28.
9. Asyiah DN. The vocabulary teaching and vocabulary learning: perception, strategies, and influences on students' vocabulary mastery. *Jurnal bahasa lingua scientia*. 2017 sep 19;9(2):293-318.
10. Demir Y. The Role of In-class Vocabulary Strategies in Vocabulary Retention of Turkish EFL Learners. *Ilkogretim Online*. 2013 Oct 1;12(4).
11. Soleimani H, Saeedi M, Mohajernia R. The effect of keyword and context methods on vocabulary retention of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*. 2012 Jul 1;1(2):49-55.
12. Ramezanali N, Faez F. Vocabulary learning and retention through multimedia glossing.

**Corresponding author: Houman Bijani, Assistant professor at Islamic Azad University, Zanjan Branch, Zanjan, Iran**

**Email:** houman.bijani@gmail.com

**Received:** 27 March 2023, Manuscript No. AJOPY-23-93380; **Editor assigned:** 29 March 2023, Pre-QC No. AJOPY-23-93380 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 07 April 2023, QC No AJOPY-23-93380 (Q); **Revised:** 10 April 2023, Manuscript No. AJOPY-23-93380 (R); **Published:** 20 April 2023, DOI: 10.54615/2231-7805.4770.