Impact of Vocabulary Learning Tasks on Communicative Knowledge of Iranian EFL Learners with Different Proficiency Levels

Fariba Rahimi Esfahani

Islamic Azad University-Shahrekord Branch

ABSTRACT

This paper investigated the effects of receptive and productive learning from word pairs on comprehension, and the use of taught words in writing in Persian EFL learners with different proficiency levels. To this end, a quick Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was administered to the junior students population studying English teaching in Khorasgan Azad university, and based on their OPT scores, two samples of 40 male and female students were selected and assigned to low intermediate and high intermediate group. The students in each group were randomly divided into two equal groups of 20 each. One group in each proficiency level was taught 15 target words receptively while another group learned the same target words productively. After the treatments, two tests measuring comprehension and writing were administered to each group. The scores of the groups in each level were analyzed via a one-way MANOVA. The results indicated that both proficiency groups who had learned their target words productively outperformed the receptive participants on the writing test significantly. Similarly, the receptive groups in both proficiency samples did significantly better on the comprehension tests than the productive groups. The findings of this study revealed that receptive vocabulary learning may be more beneficial to understanding a text and productive learning is more effective in improving the use of students’ taught words in writing. Moreover, it was found that proficiency would be of little significance in the interaction between vocabulary learning task and communicative gains of learners. The results of this study can benefit teachers and students to become aware of the merits and demerits of vocabulary learning tasks, and help them to select the tasks that best suit their needs.
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Introduction

L2 Vocabulary Knowledge:

Although vocabulary is regarded as an essential element in L2 learning, less attention has been paid to the theoretical establishment of vocabulary learning than that of L2 grammar learning [19]. However, there has recently been a noticeable increase in L2 research into vocabulary learning. The L2 vocabulary research has mainly dealt with the issues like ‘what it means to know a word’ and ‘how words are learned and how they are used’. That is, L2 vocabulary research has been devoted to the identification of lexical knowledge and the memorization, storage, and retrieval of lexical knowledge [1].

Some researchers [19,14,21] propose models of word knowledge which consists of separate traits (known as separate trait models). These models divide lexical knowledge into a set of descriptive criteria. For example, Nation [14] listed the aspects of the lexical knowledge in four categories: form (spoken and written form), position (grammatical behavior and collocation patterns), function (word frequency and appropriateness), and meaning (conceptual content and word associations).

Other existing models which promote several dimensions for description of the lexicon as a whole are referred to as global trait models. These models propose smaller numbers of measurable dimensions which reflect the overall state of learners' vocabulary [2]. In this model, the L2 vocabulary knowledge is examined in two or three dimensions. For example, some researchers suggest two aspects of breadth and depth [17,18]. Vocabulary breadth is associated with vocabulary size, and vocabulary depth is connected with quality of knowledge [17]. In other words, vocabulary breadth is defined as the number of the words the meaning of which a learner has at least some superficial knowledge, and depth of vocabulary knowledge is described as how well a learner knows a word [18]. The depth dimension should cover such components as pronunciation,
spelling, meaning, register, frequency, and morphological, syntactic, and collocational properties [17].

Apart from those, Henriksen suggests that the construct of lexical competence should consist of three dimensions: a “partial-precise knowledge” dimension in which levels of knowledge equal to different levels of word comprehension, a “depth of knowledge” dimension which also covers knowledge components identified in the vocabulary depth dimension discussed above [17,18], and a “receptive-productive” dimension which concerns how well a learner can access and use a word. According to Henriksen, when learners cannot use a word correctly or cannot access it freely for production it does not mean that they do not “know” the word; but they have not yet achieved adequate control over word access. The receptive and productive dimension of lexical knowledge is “a bridging dimension between lexical competence and performance” [25].

Therefore, With regard to the acquisition of L2 vocabulary knowledge and its use, on the other hand, we also need to distinguish between receptive (passive) and productive (active) vocabulary knowledge, since these types of lexical knowledge – receptive vs. productive - require different amounts of learning time, different effects on vocabulary acquisition, and different learning methods [22,14,13,24,10].

Receptive vs. Productive Vocabulary Knowledge:

Up to now, many scholars have made definitions from different perspectives for receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. “Receptive knowledge” is defined as “being able to understand a word” [20]; and it includes words which can be understood or recognized as individuals can assign their meanings while listening or reading (sometimes imperfectly) and which are also less well-known and less frequent in use and not used spontaneously; it is the ability to perceive the form of the word and to retrieve its meaning(s) [11]; it entails going from the form of a word to its meaning [14]; it is the knowledge of the meaning of an L2 word; prototypically, being able to translate a word from L2 to L1 [13]; and it refers to the ability of the learners to understand a word’s meaning [21].

In regard to productive vocabulary knowledge, it includes the production of a word of “one’s own accord” (Schmitt; 2000:4); it refers to words that can be written or spoken frequently without hesitation as they are well-known and familiar; it requires retrieving the appropriate spoken or written word form of the meaning to be expressed [11]; it includes being able to express a concept by means of an L2 word; prototypically, being able to translate a word from L1 to L2 [13], and it also refers to eliciting the target word from one’s memory with some stimulus.

In general, productive vocabulary use is considered to be more difficult than receptive vocabulary use, even though the specific reasons for this relative difficulty of productive use have not yet been discovered [14]. With respect to the learning process for receptive and productive vocabulary use, Mondria & Wiersma [13] claimed that receptive learning is less difficult than productive learning, since receptive learning requires less time than productive learning, and receptive retention tests result in a better performance than productive retention tests. Laufer & Paribakht [10] also mentioned that receptive vocabulary knowledge is learned faster than productive vocabulary, and thus receptive vocabulary is usually larger than productive vocabulary.

How does vocabulary knowledge affect comprehension?

Success in reading comprehension is usually seen as fundamental to the academic success of foreign language learners. Second language proficiency often assumes vocabulary and grammar as knowledge and reading as the ability to understand the text [8]. Research consistently reveals that vocabulary knowledge heavily relates to reading comprehension moreso than other factors such as grammar knowledge [8]. Laufer [9] has written, “No text comprehension is possible, either in one’s native language or in a foreign language, without understanding the text’s vocabulary” (p. 20). Hence, without understanding the meaning of words, second language readers may have a hard time developing comprehension. Consequently, vocabulary seems to be an important factor in reading comprehension [19].

L1 research investigating the effects of vocabulary instruction on comprehension has been inconsistent. Some studies have found that vocabulary instruction has a significant effect on vocabulary knowledge but may not affect comprehension [5,15] while others have shown that it may improve both vocabulary knowledge and comprehension [12]. However, these findings are also inconsistent and there is some evidence indicating that decontextualized learning tasks such as the keyword technique and learning from wordpairs may also increase comprehension [12].

While there have been many L1 studies investigating the effects of vocabulary instruction on comprehension, there have been very few L2 studies. Johnson [6] found that studying the definitions of target words prior to reading a passage had no significant effects on two comprehension tests. However, very little detail was given about the instruction including how much time was spent on the task.
How does vocabulary knowledge affect writing?

At present, there is very little research that has investigated the effects of vocabulary knowledge on writing. L1 research tends to show that learners may be able to successfully use recently taught words in their writing, and that their performance might depend on the type of instruction [3, 12, 16].

With regard to L2 research, Webb [24] investigated the effects of pre-learning vocabulary on reading comprehension and writing. Japanese students studying English as a foreign language (EFL) learned word pairs receptively and productively; four tests were used to measure reading comprehension, writing, and receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. The findings suggest that pre-learning EFL vocabulary may be an effective method of improving reading comprehension and writing, with the direction of learning having a significant effect on a learner's ability to use or understand a word. Participants who completed the productive learning task had higher scores on the writing test and on the test of productive vocabulary knowledge, while participants who completed the receptive learning task had higher scores on the comprehension test.

The results of previous research comparing receptive and productive learning from word pairs [4, 22] indicate that the productive task is more effective than the receptive task in increasing productive knowledge. Since writing is essentially a productive task, the findings suggest that productive learning from word pairs may be more effective. Since there have been so few studies, further investigation of the effect of vocabulary instruction on writing are needed. This is particularly apparent with L2 research for which there do not appear to be many studies that have specifically addressed this issue.

The relatively few empirical studies that have addressed receptive and productive learning have produced contradictory findings and, therefore, offered conflicting implications for foreign language teaching. Moreover, these studies are limited to a certain proficiency level and therefore their results are not generalizable to all levels of proficiency. Informed by the previously cited research, the present study investigated the effects of receptive and productive learning from word pairs on comprehension, and the use of taught words in writing in students with different levels of proficiency. Specifically it examined the following questions:

Research Questions:

To investigate the impact of lexical learning tasks (productive vs. receptive) on communicative knowledge of Iranian EFL learners with different proficiency levels, the following questions were put forward:

1. Does receptive learning of vocabulary from word pairs lead to more successful comprehension of the vocabulary in reading than productive learning in both low intermediate and high intermediate EFL learners?
2. Does productive learning of vocabulary from word pairs lead to more successful use of the vocabulary in writing than receptive learning in both low intermediate and high intermediate EFL learners?
3. Do results differ among individuals with different proficiency levels?

Hypotheses:

Based on the above questions, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Receptive learning of vocabulary from word pairs leads to more successful comprehension of the vocabulary in reading than productive learning in both low intermediate and high intermediate EFL learners.
2. Productive learning of vocabulary from word pairs leads to more successful use of the vocabulary in writing than receptive learning in both low intermediate and high intermediate EFL learners.
3. Results do not differ among individuals with different proficiency levels.

Methodology:

Participants:

The participants in this experiment were two groups of 40 Iranian EFL learners (both male and female) in Azad University of Khorasgan, Iran. They were chosen through a quick OPT (Oxford Placement Test) and divided into two groups, low intermediate and high intermediate, based on their OPT scores. Subjects whose scores ranged from 30 to 39 were considered as low intermediate and those who scored between 40 to 47 were regarded as high intermediate group. The subjects in each proficiency level were randomly assigned to the experimental groups.

Material:

A quick OPT was used in this study to determine the level of proficiency of potential subjects. 15 target words (9 nouns and 6 verbs) were chosen from Nation’s BNC list at 10th level of frequency. Nine nouns and six verbs were selected as target words because nouns and verbs are the most common parts of speech found in natural text, and the 9:6 ratios approximates their proportional frequency of occurrence in language use. The number of target words was determined during pilot
studies. These target words were replaced with disguised forms to ensure that the subjects had no prior knowledge of the target words. All of the disguised forms were two syllables, and resembled English words phonetically and orthographically. The disguised forms and their English meanings were as follows: napid (bubble), zotel (hairdryer), tamel (bookshelf), folid (yarn), todest (sunflower), labit (subway), heper (bangle), raggle (dormitory), jartner (aquarium), melect (glisten), tansel (hunch), nasin (brandish), toncop (dabble), cader (chuckle), hodet (clasp).

Moreover, 2 tests were used to measure the effects of receptive and productive learning tasks on writing and comprehension. The first test that was administered after the treatments was a picture description test (see Appendix 1). It was used to measure the subjects' use of the target words in writing. The comprehension test followed the picture description test. The comprehension test used a true/false format (see Appendix 2).

Design and Procedure:

Four experimental groups (two low intermediate and two high intermediate groups) were used in this study to examine the effects of receptive and productive learning on writing and reading in both low intermediate and high intermediate levels of proficiency. One experimental group in each proficiency level studied 15 L2 target words receptively, and the other group studied the same target words productively. In the receptive treatment, the target words were presented in a column on the left side of a paper, and their translations were presented on their right. The subjects were instructed to cover the translations and then look at the target words and try to recall their translations. If they could not recall a meaning, the subjects were told to uncover the translation and check the meaning. In the productive treatment, the translations were on the left and the target words were on the right. The subjects completed the same task except they covered the target words, and then tried to recall them. Each group was given six minutes to complete their task. Two tests measuring writing and comprehension were administered after the treatments. The writing test was given first followed by the comprehension test.

The results of the groups in each proficiency level were compared to determine how receptive and productive learning from word pairs contributed to writing and comprehension in learners with different proficiency levels.

Results:

The descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and number of subjects) of picture description test and reading comprehension test in low intermediate group are reported in Table 1. To determine whether there were any overall differences among the treatment groups, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed using the scores on the two dependent measures (picture description test and reading comprehension test). The independent variable was the type of learning task (receptive and productive learning of vocabulary). The MANOVA revealed an overall significant multivariate main effect for the task, Wilks' lambda is .765, F (2,37) = 5.686, P < .05. Thus, we conclude that task had a significant effect on the dependent variables (The results are shown in Table 2).

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics (LOW-INTERMEDIATE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pic_description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEPTIVE</td>
<td>7.2500</td>
<td>2.12442</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTIVE</td>
<td>8.6000</td>
<td>1.87504</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.9250</td>
<td>2.09257</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEPTIVE</td>
<td>10.5500</td>
<td>1.27630</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTIVE</td>
<td>9.5000</td>
<td>1.19208</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.0250</td>
<td>1.32988</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Multivariate Tests (c) (low intermediate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Noncent. Parameter</th>
<th>Observed Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>5.686(b)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>37.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>11.371</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>5.686(b)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>37.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>11.371</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>5.686(b)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>37.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>11.371</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>5.686(b)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>37.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>11.371</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the significance of the overall test, the univariate main effects were examined. Table 1 shows that the subjects that learned the target words in the productive task outperformed those that completed the receptive task on the picture description test. Table 3 shows that the productive group significantly outperformed the receptive group on the picture description test (F(1,37) = 4.540, p < .05). Moreover, the receptive group demonstrated larger gains on the reading comprehension test (F(1,37) =
A summary of the statistical analysis is shown in table 3. In the high intermediate group, like the low intermediate group, subjects in the productive tasks outperformed the receptive group on the picture description test. A summary of the statistical analysis is shown in table 4.

Table 3: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (low intermediate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Noncent. Parameter</th>
<th>Observed Power(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>pic description</td>
<td>18.225</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.225</td>
<td>4.540</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>4.540</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comprehension</td>
<td>11.025</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.025</td>
<td>7.230</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>7.230</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics (High intermediate GROUP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>pic description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RECEPTIVE</td>
<td>8.850</td>
<td>1.08942</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTIVE</td>
<td>10.250</td>
<td>1.61815</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.550</td>
<td>1.53506</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEPETIVE</td>
<td>12.800</td>
<td>1.79473</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTIVE</td>
<td>8.600</td>
<td>1.35336</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.700</td>
<td>2.64284</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Multivariate Tests(c) (High intermediate Group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Pillai's Trace</th>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>Hotelling's Trace</th>
<th>Roy's Largest Root</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.2067</td>
<td>.2067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>38.231(b)</td>
<td>38.231(b)</td>
<td>38.231(b)</td>
<td>38.231(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error df</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncent. Parameter</td>
<td>76.462</td>
<td>76.462</td>
<td>76.462</td>
<td>76.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed Power(a)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the significance of the overall test in the high intermediate group, the univariate main effects were examined (table 6). Significant differences were found on the picture description test (F(1,37) = 10.302, p<.05). On the reading comprehension test, receptive group significantly outperformed the productive group (F(1,37) = 69.825, p<.05).

Table 6: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (High intermediate Group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Noncent. Parameter</th>
<th>Observed Power(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>pic description</td>
<td>19.600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.600</td>
<td>10.302</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>10.302</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comprehension</td>
<td>176.400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176.400</td>
<td>69.825</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>69.825</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the results, task did have a significant effect on the dependent variables in both low intermediate and high intermediate groups. As table 1 and 4 show, the receptive group significantly outperformed the productive group on the reading comprehension test. Thus, Hypothesis 1 is supported. That is, receptive learning of vocabulary from word pairs led to more successful comprehension of the vocabulary in reading than productive learning in both low intermediate and high intermediate EFL learners.

Moreover, the productive group outperformed the receptive group on the picture description test and their scores were significantly higher. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 is also confirmed. That is, productive learning of vocabulary from word pairs led to more successful use of the vocabulary in writing than receptive learning in both low intermediate and high intermediate EFL learners.

Although there were some differences in the univariate main effects between low intermediate and high intermediate group, the results of MANOVA revealed an overall significant multivariate main effect for the task in both groups. The same results were obtained for students with different proficiency levels, that is, task had a significant effect on reading comprehension and picture description tests in both levels of proficiency. Based on the results, hypothesis 3 is confirmed, too. Results did not differ among individuals with different proficiency levels.
Discussion:

This research investigated the relative effectiveness of receptive and productive learning from word pairs on comprehension and writing. A comparison of the two tasks in both low and high intermediate groups indicated that receptive learning contributed to significantly higher scores on the comprehension test than productive learning. Moreover, the productive groups in both levels of proficiency did significantly better on the picture description test.

The results of this study also revealed that proficiency was of little significance in the interaction between vocabulary learning tasks and communicative knowledge of learners since productive learning of vocabulary led to both high and low intermediate learners’ higher gains on writing and receptive learning led to their higher scores on comprehension test. Therefore, learning tasks affected communicative gains of learners in both groups in the same way, regardless of their level of proficiency.

The results of the picture description and comprehension tests suggest that receptive vocabulary learning may be more beneficial to understanding a text and productive tasks may have greater effect on writing. This is supported by earlier findings that have shown that receptive learning from word pairs is better suited to developing receptive vocabulary knowledge [4,13,22,23]. Therefore, if the primary aim of instruction is to improve comprehension, receptive tasks may be more effective.

Since previous research has indicated that productive tasks may be more effective [3], and that productive learning might be better suited to developing productive vocabulary knowledge than receptive learning [4,22,23], it should not be surprising that productive learning from wordpairs was superior on the picture description test. Writing is essentially a productivetask that involves several different types of productive vocabulary knowledge. To write a sentence, learners must produce the forms of the words, and then use them withsyntactic, semantic, and grammatical accuracy. Since receptive learning tends to focus learners on understanding language rather than producing it, it would be puzzling if receptive tasks were more effective than productive tasks in improving writing.

Taken as a whole, the results of the picture description and comprehension tests suggest that productive vocabulary learning may improve comprehension and writing with performance dependent on the method of instruction. Receptive learning from word pairs was found to be a more effective method of increasing comprehension than productive learning from word pairs. In turn, this suggests that receptive learning may be better suited to improving comprehension than productive learning. Productive learning from word pairs was found to be better suited to improving writing than receptive learning from word pairs. This suggests that productive tasks may be more effective if the aim is to use taught words.

In regard to instructional practice, the results of this study help teachers and students know that which tasks are more useful for acquiring which aspect of communication. It will also show what each task contribute to vocabulary knowledge as well as which tasks may complement each other to improve learning. Those involved in vocabulary learning should be aware that the tasks that are used might have a powerful effect on what learners can and cannot do with a word. Since the majority of tasks used in vocabulary learning are receptive, they are well suited for improving receptive knowledge or comprehension but less appropriate for improving the use of taught words productively. Common teaching methods such as providing a definition or translation, and looking up words in the dictionary may be more conducive to increasing receptive knowledge. However, if the aim of a learner or an instructional program is to improve speaking and writing, teachers and learners need to be aware that they may be more successful if they use productive tasks. If their goal is to improve overall language skills, the results indicate that a combination of receptive and productive tasks may prove to be most effective.
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APPENDIX A
Receptive word pairs.

Napid ﻣﺤﺒﺎﺏ
Zotel ﻟﻤﺸﻮﺍﺭ
Tamel ﺗﻠﻤﺪ
Folid ﻣﺤﻔﻮﻡ
Todest ﺗﻐﻠﺒﻖ ﻣﺸﺎﺭ
Labit ﻣﺸﺎﺭ ﻳﻀﺎﺭ
Heper ﻋﺒﺪ ﻣﺸﺎﺭ
Raggle ﺗﻠﻤﺪ ﻳﻀﺎﺭ
Jartner ﺗﻐﻠﺒﻖ ﻋﺒﺪ
Melect ﻋﺒﺪ ﻳﻀﺎﺭ
Tansel ﺗﻐﻠﺒﻖ ﻋﺒﺪ
Nasin ﻋﺒﺪ ﻳﻀﺎﺭ
Toncop ﻋﺒﺪ ﻳﻀﺎﺭ
Cader ﺗﻐﻠﺒﻖ ﻋﺒﺪ
Hodet ﺗﻐﻠﺒﻖ ﻋﺒﺪ
Appendix B

*Productive word pairs.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>حبب</td>
<td>Napid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سوار</td>
<td>Zotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قفصة كتاب</td>
<td>Tamel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نخ</td>
<td>Folid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أقفاص غردن</td>
<td>Todes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مترو</td>
<td>Labit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الگو</td>
<td>Heper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خوابگاه</td>
<td>Raggle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اکاریم</td>
<td>Jartner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>درخشیدن</td>
<td>Melect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قوز کردن</td>
<td>Tansel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در هوا تکان دادن</td>
<td>Nasin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>با آب پاژ کردن</td>
<td>Toncop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هر هر خدیدن</td>
<td>Cader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>محکم گرفتن</td>
<td>Hodet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C

*Picture Description Test.*

Write one sentence about each picture using a word that you learned today.

1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  
5.  
6.
Appendix D
True/False Comprehension Test.
Circle true or false for each sentence.

1. There were a lot of napids in the air. True/ False
2. Students sometimes bring napids to school. True/ False
3. Children usually use a zotel when they want to eat lunch. True/ False
4. People usually use a zotel at home. True/ False
5. Tamels are very soft. True/ False
6. People usually have tamel at home. True/ False
7. Most houses in Iran are made of solid. True/ False
8. Folid is usually used for making clothes. True/ False
9. Todests are made of wood. True/ False
10. A todest is beautiful. True/ False
11. Teachers like to wear a labit at school. True/ False
12. They took a labit since it was faster. True/ False
13. Hepers are made of gas. True/ False
14. Hepers are expensive. True/ False
15. A raggle is as large as a car. True/ False
16. A raggle is a good place to rest. True/ False
17. A jartner can be dangerous. True/ False
18. It is interesting to watch a jartner. True/ False
19. People often melect when they are happy. True/ False
20. His eyes were melecting. True/ False
21. People are shorter when they tansel. True/ False
22. Women look more attractive when they tansel. True/ False
23. You can easily nasin water. True/ False
24. They nasined their sword. True/ False
25. People usually toncop when they are hungry. True/ False
26. Children like to toncop in summer. True/ False
27. Men sometimes cader when they talk to each other. True/ False
28. People move slower when they cader. True/ False
29. Parents sometimes hodet their children. True/ False
30. People sometimes hodet on trains or buses. True/ False