

# **The Effect of Etymological Instruction on Receptive and Productive Vocabulary Learning of Adult EFL Learners in Turkey<sup>1</sup>**

*By Taher Mahmoudi\* & Meryem Mirioğlu<sup>‡</sup>*

*This mixed-method study assesses and evaluates the effect of etymological and morphological vocabulary instruction on the adult EFL learners' receptive/productive vocabulary knowledge. Indeed, the primary purpose of this study is to observe the impact of etymological and morphological instruction on adult B1 level (CEFR) EFL learners in Turkey. Forty-eight adult EFL learners were selected and randomly assigned to two groups (24 participants in each), one as the experimental and the other as the control group. Two tests were prepared by using Wesche and Paribakht's (1996) Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) to test receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. The tests were administered to both groups before and after the study. While the experimental group's participants received etymological and morphological instruction for two months, the participants in the control group were taught through conventional school instruction. Statistical results and the interviews revealed a significant and positive effect of etymological and morphological instruction on the experimental group members' receptive and productive vocabulary learning.*

**Keywords:** *Etymology, Morphology, Affixation, Receptive vocabulary, Productive vocabulary, Teaching English*

## **Introduction**

It is impossible to communicate in a language without vocabulary knowledge, and it is postulated that the first step in learning language is the learning and retention of thousands of words. For learning words quickly, teachers and learners use many strategies. One of the most critical and negotiable strategies for vocabulary building is etymological and morphological instruction. Etymology is the study of the origin, historical development of words and the history of a linguistic form (as a word) by tracing its development since its earliest occurrence in the language, transmission from one language to another, analysing words' components, its cognates in other languages or its cognates to a common ancestral form in an old language, and it is the study of the morphology or affixation analysis of a language to separate roots (The New Oxford Dictionary of English 1998). It is believed that etymological and morphological instruction facilitates vocabulary learning (Pierson 1989, Matthews 2001, Weber 2007, Chatzisavvas 2015). This study seeks to answer the effects of etymological and morphological instruction on Turkish EFL learners' receptive and productive vocabulary development.

---

\*Researcher, Cukurova University, Turkey.

<sup>‡</sup>Lecturer, Cukurova University, Turkey.

<sup>1</sup>This paper constitutes the main part of the PhD study supervised by Dr Meryem Mirioğlu.

## **Review of Literature**

As early as 1924, researchers note that the growth in reading power relies on continuous growth in word knowledge: Meaning/Oral Vocabulary, Receptive Vocabulary, and Literate Vocabulary (Pikulski and Templeton 2004: 1). Combining morphological elements including affixes, i.e. suffixes and prefixes along with word roots and base words, that are also known as derivational and lexical morphemes, has been one of the most common methods of creating new words in the English language. The way this process works could be regarded as one of the most useful understandings required to grow vocabulary. In case it is learned by students, they are equipped with a very powerful prerequisite in this regard (Anderson and Freebody 1981, Pikulski and Templeton 2004). Understanding these structures in language learning comprises knowledge about etymology and morphology of a language.

Some studies have been done by researchers like Pierson in 1989 about the importance of using etymology in teaching English through qualitative review research and Hutcheon et al. argued the importance of written spelling instruction through etymology in 2012 and Chatzisavvas argued the profits of etymology in vocabulary development of Greek ESL students in 2015. After learning phonics, phonology-orthography relationships and understanding onset/rhyme awareness and syllable, it is required that students realize the essence of morphological structure, which is a subset of etymology, and historical linguistics because it is this structure that secures the connection among vocabulary, spelling, words, sentences and reading comprehension (Rothstein and Rothstein 2008). It is also known to all that the students equipped with the proper morphological foundation are better readers and writers (Weber 2007).

In some studies, the importance of morphology is emphasized, and it is claimed that in case students lack morphological instruction, the learning process might be impeded when they face a text in which they may find permutations and word combinations with quite the same meaning. Regarding students who lack morphological foundation, it could be said that they might not be able to get hold of the history, which enables them to collect words in order to convey the same concepts or to realize what makes English, English (Matthews 2001).

Rothstein and Rothstein (2008) in their book include a chapter for clarifying and showing the interrelation among five significant aspects of language (phonology, morphology, etymology, semantics, and syntax) which is necessary to supply useful instructional models in order to improve language learner literacy.

Regarding native English speakers, if we have an overview on studies which are related to native students, being cognizant about, morphemic structure is of paramount importance in reading and understanding texts of academic nature especially over the years of high school as Nagy et al. (1989) concluded that almost sixty per cent of unknown words that native English students face in the middle school years and beyond are complex in terms of morphology and transparent enough in terms of meaning and structure; therefore, students might be incapable of reading and inferring the meaning of words in context. As it might be expected, "morphological awareness and reading derived words are significantly

related to reading comprehension by the upper elementary years" (Carlisle and Stone 2005: 433).

As this study was carried out with Turkish speakers of English as a foreign language, it is better to know that the Turkish language is categorized as an agglutinative language. So, any agglutinated morpheme maintains its positional, semantic, and phonological property in the word in which it is employed. The Turkish language originates from the Turkic family. All languages belonging to this family resemble each other concerning linguistic structure. Verb-final word-order, vowel harmony, and agglutinative morphology are among the typological resemblances (Carki et al. 2000). According to a study, Turkish children are capable of accurate decoding of complex pseudo-words very early (Oney and Durugunoğlu 1997) and learning to take notice of the ends of the words. They, therefore, become very cognizant of any word-end grapheme-phoneme manipulations (Durgunoglu et al. 2002). Mu (2019) emphasizes the mastery of analysing words focusing on their core meaning which helps to understand other forms combined with various affixations. Once the learners are explicitly trained about such word analysis, they can then easily apply it to other words making vocabulary learning more meaningful, enabling them to retain the newly learned words.

Reading comprehension occurs after understanding the vocabulary in the context, and it is impossible to understand a text without vocabulary knowledge. There are many recommendations, strategies, and teaching methods proposed by teachers and researchers for vocabulary building which have their base in logician and cognitive approaches because it is related to brain, memory, and overall in cognition. In the process of learning, the most important factors are the memory and cognitive activities of the brain.

Knowledge sources employed in lexical inference have been categorized by Haastруп (1991). He categorized them into contextual, intra-lingual, and inter-lingual ones. The intra-lingual knowledge includes knowledge about the syntax of the target language and the target word orthography/ phonology, lexis, morphology, collocations, word class, and semantics. Inter-lingual knowledge includes knowledge about the first language and other languages. Contextual knowledge could be attributed to the knowledge about the content of the text, i.e. co-text, and knowledge of the world. Analytic processing and holistic inferencing have also been differentiated by Haastруп. While holistic inferencing includes foreseeing in accordance with the context, i.e. relying on the knowledge of the world in terms of conceptual or schematic knowledge (p.124), analytical processing is the investigation of the linguistic elements of the target word. All knowledge about language is clustered in the brain, and the most crucial case of the noticed theory is schemata theory. In 1932, schema theory was proposed by Frederic Bartlett during working on constructive memory (Psybox Ltd 2002). He regarded schema as a part of top-down processing and declared schemas to be structures of knowledge stored in the long-term memory (Psybox Ltd 2002).

Moreover, Rumelhart (1980) has illustrated schemata as "building blocks of cognition" that are used in the process of understanding sensory data, in repossessing information from memory, in managing goals and sub-goals, in

allocating resources, and in leading the flow of the processing system. Widdowson (1983) has redefined schema theory from an applied linguistics view. He proposed two levels for language, including a schematic and a systemic level. He explained that the first one relates to our background knowledge, while the latter includes morphological, phonological, and syntactic elements of language. Rumelhart claimed that if our schemata are unfinished and do not offer an understanding of the incoming information from the text, we will have trouble in processing and understanding the text (Psybox Ltd 2002).

It is believed that etymological and morphological instruction facilitates vocabulary learning (Pierson 1989, Matthews 2001, Weber 2007, Chatzisavvas 2015). Moreover, Pierson (1989) discussed the importance of using etymology in teaching English through qualitative review research and some researchers such as Chatzisavvas (2015) argued the profits of etymology in vocabulary development.

Ausubel et al. (1968) believe that being informed about the historical outlook and changes in the forms of words in the English language might result in better understanding of the true spirit of learning the English language, and it may make the vocabulary process more meaningful. Cognitivism looks at learning as mental and information processing, where the learner uses three different types of memory while learning, which are the sensory store, working memory (short-term memory) and permanent memory (long-term memory) respectively (Carroll 2000). Sensations are received via the senses into the sensory store before processing. "The information persists in the sensory store for less than one second. The duration in short-term memory is almost 20 seconds. If the information in short-term memory is not processed efficiently, it is not transferred to long-term memory for storage" (Ally 2013). The transferred data to long-term memory depends on the depth and quality of processing in short-term memory. The deeper the processing, the more associations happen and the acquired new information shapes in memory. The information which is transferred from short-term memory is assimilated and accommodated in long-term memory. During assimilation, the information is modified to fit into existing cognitive structures. Accommodation occurs when an existing cognitive structure is modified to unite the new information (Anderson 2008). It seems that etymological and morphological instruction deepens the processing of new words and helps them to transfer in the language learners' long-term memory. Moreover, Pierson (1989) claims that etymology and its instruction can provide students with purposeful linguistic principles and information for the learners.

Likewise, Zolfagharkhani and Moghadam (2011) studied The Effect of Etymology Instruction on Vocabulary Learning of Upper-Intermediate EFL Persian Learners and findings show that Persian learners received positive results from etymological instruction. These studies illustrate that etymological instruction does have a practical benefit in learning vocabulary in the English language. Moreover, Stockwell and Minkova (2001) declared that etymology could be helpful for students to enlarge their vocabulary size.

Bowers and Cooke (2012) believe that Morphological Instruction could be understood both through morphology and etymology since learners not only are required to realize word change, but also the word meaning. On the one hand,

etymology provides them with a meaning, and it establishes a link to word acquisition, cognates, and history and in a research, Eğecioglu (1996) carried out a study with junior students of English language of a public university in Turkey. The results revealed that teaching morphology to language learners is a useful tool for learning vocabulary. Integrating a semester-long morphological instruction into the specially designed reading writing a course for three hours a week, showed that, if the learners know the Greco-Latin word parts, they not only remember the words and terms better but also guess the word meanings more accurately. Besides, Bellomo (2005, 2009) in his study with a college preparatory reading class, students at a school in the United States revealed this fact that both native and foreign English speaking students lack vocabulary knowledge level necessary for higher education. His findings indicated that language learners recorded paramount progress by getting explicit instruction in Latinate word parts and vocabulary.

Similarly, Golaghaei and Kakolian (2015) studied the effect of visual and etymological treatments on learning idioms among intermediate English language learners. From among 116 learners they have selected seventy-nine students of an English school based on their performances on the Longman complete course for the TOEFL test. They then assigned the students into three experimental groups. At first, a pre-test of idiomatic expressions, including 48 idiomatic items, was administered to the participants in all groups. During the instructional period, the groups were taught a group of abnormally decomposable idioms through different treatments, namely, visual, etymological, and a combination of visual-etymological elaboration. At the end of the instructional period, a post-test, which was the same as a pre-test, was given to all students. The results of their data analysis revealed that the etymological treatment was more effective than visual aids on learning idioms and the visual-etymological treatment was the most effective one.

Moreover, Saeidi and Mirzapour (2013) examined the relationship between morphological awareness and listening comprehension ability of Iranian EFL learners. Forty students (25 females and 15 males) majoring in ELT participated in their study and were randomly divided into control and experimental groups with 20 participants in each group. Four little listening passages were used as the pre-test, which included 30 tokens of words with morphemic structures. The results of the pre-test revealed no significant difference between the two groups. Then, four one-hour sessions were held for the experimental group as the treatment sessions. Finally, four short listening passages were used as the post-test. The results showed a significant difference between the two groups and revealed a significant relationship between morphological awareness and their listening comprehension ability.

Interestingly, Soleimani and Mohammadi (2015) studied the effect of the etymology of an additional language on EFL learners' vocabulary retention and found significant relationships and effects of an additional language (Arabic Literature) on vocabulary retention of 60 EFL learners.

Meaningful learning that is sought by educational psychologists could be offered by etymology, i.e. investigation of the origin of words. This is a kind of

learning associated with prior learning and could be more generalized and maintained that makes it superior compared to the uncomplicated rote learning of vocabulary.

### **Research Questions**

The present study aimed at exploring the effect of etymological and morphological instruction on receptive and productive vocabulary learning of adult EFL learners in Turkey. Specifically, the study set out to provide answers to the following research questions:

- RQ1. Is there any significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of receptive vocabulary of the control and experimental groups?
- RQ2. Is there any significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of productive vocabulary of the control and experimental groups?
- RQ4. What are the general opinions of experimental group members about etymological and morphological teaching?
- RQ5. What are the reasons that experimental group members support or do not support this strategy?

### **Methodology**

#### *Experimental Design*

This study utilized an experimental design. Two groups were randomly assigned to as an experimental group and a control group. Both groups took two pre-tests and two post-tests. However, only the experimental group received an etymological and morphological treatment and a semi-formal interview to gather their opinions about the vocabulary training.

#### *Participants*

48 English-preparatory year students studying at Adana Science and Technology University were selected randomly for the study.

In each group, 14 students were males and 10 students were females. Both groups were given two pre-tests in the beginning of the study and the same tests were administered at the end of the study, as well.

#### *Procedure*

First, to assess the type of vocabulary teaching strategies (VTSs) already employed in the English classes, five instructors and five participants from the control and experimental groups were interviewed via audio recording and the

recordings were then transcribed. From these interviews, we found out that etymological and morphological vocabulary instruction was not among the strategies used by the instructors. When the instructors were asked what kind of VTSs they generally use in vocabulary instruction, none of them mentioned etymological or morphological instruction as their applied strategy in their classes. Students from both groups also reported similar views concerning vocabulary teaching strategies to which they were exposed in their reading classes.

Also, to have a more definite overall picture about the way unknown vocabulary is taught, particularly among control group members, classroom observations were held for six sessions in the Reading Classes offered by two different instructors. Based on these observations, the classroom instructors tended not to really engage with etymological and morphological vocabulary instruction while teaching unfamiliar words. In most of the cases they limited the way they teach new words, to simply by providing synonyms, antonyms, or by using the new words in sentences. Moreover, in some cases it was observed that the instructors used gestures to try to explain the meanings of the unknown vocabulary or sometimes they gave the Turkish equivalents of these words especially when the learners had difficulty in understanding a vocabulary item.

Second, before the etymological and morphological intervention, participants in both groups were evaluated via Wesche and Paribakht's Vocabulary Knowledge Scale VKS (1996), which measures receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge, (see Appendix). The same VKS was administered to both control and experimental groups as a post-test following the completion of experimental groups' treatment of etymological and morphological vocabulary instruction which lasted for eight weeks. At the initial stage of the treatment, the participants in the experimental group were familiarized about etymology and its components, as well as the importance of the study, and the possible benefits they would gain were explained in order to increase their intrinsic motivation (Richard et al. 2000) for cooperation. The training on etymological and morphological vocabulary instruction of the experimental group was delivered in the Reading classes in the form of a three 45- minute sessions per week. The course book used in the reading classes was one of the National Geographic Life series books level B1 according to CEFR (by Helen Stephenson et al. 2013). At each instructional session, approximately 5-7 vocabulary items were covered from unit 3 to unit 12 in the course book. Additionally, handouts were prepared beforehand regarding the etymology and morphology of the words planned to be instructed at each of the training sessions.

## **Treatment**

For the purpose of etymological and morphological vocabulary intervention, a lesson plan was designed for each teaching session; the overall design remained the same except for the vocabulary items taught at each session. The first session of etymological and morphological vocabulary instruction of the experimental group included some explanation about the etymology and its subsets like

morphology and affixation. They were taught how to divide a word into its morphemes, which at this phase, meant to learn terms such as root, prefix, and suffix. Once they experimented with affixation processes, derivational and inflectional, and learned their functions in word formation, the participants have shown an increased interest in vocabulary learning. Furthermore, they developed an explicit awareness as to how many words they could learn easily. In short, having been exposed to more examples boosted their confidence to learn more about words.

Also, during the instruction period, it was often emphasised that etymology can reveal whether the meaning of a word or phrase has remained the same during centuries of usage or not. To get the learners more familiarized with the etymological vocabulary instruction, some more explanations and examples were provided as follows:

*Curfew: The Origins of "curfew" is French. The word translates to, "cover the fire." This refers to the practice in homes that used open fires for cooking to make sure the fire had extinguished for the night and would not spread around. The curfew was, "the signal or bell to cover or extinguish fires." This signal was conducted by the, "..town crier..".*

Then the etymology of "curfew" was checked from online etymological dictionary ([www.etymonline.com](http://www.etymonline.com)). The participants were observed to be fully involved as they were able to learn how words gained various meanings over time and hence a growing attention was easily noticeable. Thus, to maintain this interest they were encouraged to use online etymological and morphological dictionaries such as [www.etymonline.com](http://www.etymonline.com), [www.beta.merriam-webster.co](http://www.beta.merriam-webster.co) and morphological dictionaries (e.g. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English etymology), and its application for smartphones. In other words, we motivated the learners to use online etymology dictionaries and to install the 2005 Merriam Webster Etymology Dictionary on their smartphones, PCs, or laptops in order to look up the meaning of words whenever they needed, leading them into becoming more independent learners. Knowledge about the origin of words can help connect new words to the schema (Piaget 1920 as cited in Fleming 2004) of the learner and their learning would not be rote learning. From the second to the final session, the procedure was as follows:

Vocabularies were written on a white board and searched for on the internet using an interactive smart board for looking up their etymology, which was mostly about the first application of the word through history and the background story of the word. Words roots from other languages were discovered and learners followed the lesson using the visual screen and listening. As a subset of etymology, the morphology of the word was discussed and searched on the web pages, too. The words were divided into small parts and the parts' meanings were discussed and scrutinized, and prefixes and suffixes were clarified as well. Another step was studying other forms of vocabulary using affixation and how the meanings were affected by affixation was discussed. To sum up, the steps in etymological and morphological instruction were as follows;

1. Reviewing/recycling vocabularies taught previously;
2. Handing out worksheets with new vocabulary items to be used after instruction sessions. Participants had permission to write an additional explanation on the handout;
3. After writing vocabularies including their morphemes and affixations on the whiteboard by the instructor, their etymology was searched on the internet using online etymology and morphology dictionaries on the smart board and the learners were able to see and write down the necessary and additional explanations on their handouts;
4. Discussing briefly about similar words with the same roots (in the case of Greek or Latin roots) to haunt known words and their background;
5. Providing answers and explanations to learners' questions about words.

### Pre and Post Tests

Receptive and Productive Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) aimed at measuring the effectiveness of various vocabulary instructional techniques was utilized in this study. Wesche and Paribakht's VKS (1996) is a format that enables learners to mark the stage that indicates their knowledge of each vocabulary item through recognition, recall, and production of the word (cited in Kwon 2006). According to Wesche and Paribakht (1996) and Read (2000), VKS is a generic instrument that can be applied to measure any set of words. It includes five scales to capture certain levels in the core knowledge initial development of given words. The VKS merges self-report and performance items in order to elicit the self-perceived and demonstrated knowledge of particular words in a written form. This scale was used because it can assess both receptive and productive knowledge (Schmitt 2000). The validity and the reliability of the VKS have been established in some research studies by Wesche and Paribakht (1996 as cited in Kwon 2006) and Joe (1995, 1998). To examine its reliability, Wesche and Paribakht administered the VKS to groups of students. They found a strong relationship (with correlations of 0.92 to 0.97) between the students' self-ratings on the elicitation scale and their output scores suggesting that the students reported their level of knowledge of the target words accurately. For measuring Receptive Vocabulary Knowledge, the fourth section on the scale (*D-I can use this word in a sentence*) intended to measure the productive vocabulary knowledge was eliminated because this feature is measured by the Productive Vocabulary Knowledge Test.

In other words, VKS was designed to capture initial stages in word learning that are amenable to accurate self-report or demonstration through the use of a five-category Elicitation Scale that provides information for scoring using a five-scoring scale. Lack of "unidimensional representation" in terms of lexical knowledge could be, however, considered among VKS flaws (Schmitt 2010: 222, 224). However, Schmitt admits that "no current scale gives a full account of the incremental path of mastery of a lexical item, and perhaps acquisition is too complex to be so described." Scoring criteria of Receptive Vocabulary Knowledge

Test is 1 point for unknown words, 2 points for just simple answers and incorrect responses (translation or synonym) and 3 points for correctly answered items (as cited in Kwon 2006). The total score of an individual participant is obtained by adding up the given scores for each item on the Receptive Vocabulary Knowledge Test.

The control and experimental groups' receptive vocabulary knowledge, before and after the treatment (etymological and morphological vocabulary instruction) by using the Vocabulary Knowledge Scale of Wesche and Paribakht's (1996). It is confirmed by tests that when compared to active (productive) vocabulary, the passive (receptive) one is more substantial and that there exists a difficulty hierarchy between them: "if active knowledge is more difficult to achieve than passive knowledge, and if recall is more difficult than recognition, then the most advanced degree of knowledge is reflected in active recall, and the least advanced knowledge is passive recognition" (Laufer and Goldstein 2004: 408).

In vocabulary tests, Nation (2001) recommends a minimum of 30 items for a reliable vocabulary test. We prepared the Receptive Vocabulary Knowledge Test, which included 35 vocabulary items. The allocated time for answering the questions was 35 minutes. The vocabulary items of the test were selected from the participants' coursebook and workbook (Life, by Helen Stephenson et al. 2013). The books come in series including three books based on Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The vocabulary items taught through etymological and morphological instruction were selected from the final book, B1 level of Life series. The words, excluding most commonly used ones, were randomly selected from the reading texts in the coursebook and the accompanying workbook. Expert opinion was also sought in determining the vocabulary selection. We have tried not to prejudice over the selection of the words (just Latin or Greek) and their suitability for etymological or morphological properties because "Every word has its own history" (Bloomfield 1963: 328). The receptive vocabulary knowledge was assessed by asking learners to provide translations or synonyms of the word tested (as cited in Kwon 2006).

For comparing receptive vocabulary knowledge of the experimental and control group, their pre-test results were analysed through t-t est. Table 1 displays One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and the resulted output which indicates that all sigs are more significant than 0.05. which shows the normality of data and applicability of paired samples t-test.

**Table 1.** One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of pre-test scores of experimental and control groups (Receptive Vocabulary Knowledge)

<b>One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test</b>		
	<i>Pre-test Experimental group</i>	<i>Pre-test Control group</i>
N	24	24
MEAN	42.5000	42.6250
Std. Deviation	6.27625	9.17375
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	.758	.939
Sig.	.613	.341

Independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the receptive vocabulary knowledge of the experimental and control group, as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2.** *Productive Vocabulary Knowledge, Pre-Tests Results of the Experimental and Control Group, Analysed via Independent-Samples T-Test*

Group	N	MEAN	St.d	t	df	p
Experiment	24	42.500	6.276	-.055	46	.956
Control	24	42.625	9.173			

The results show that while the mean and standard deviation of the experimental group is (M=42.500, SD=6.27625) and the mean and standard deviation of the control group is (M=42.625, SD=9.17375). Conditions;  $t(46) = -.055$ ,  $p = .956$ . So, Sig. (2-Tailed) Value in the outcome is 0.956. This value is bigger than .05. So, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the pre-test means of the experimental and control groups in terms of their receptive vocabulary knowledge.

The vocabulary selection procedure for the Productive Vocabulary Knowledge Test was precisely the same as the Receptive Vocabulary Knowledge Test regarding number of items which was 32. As mentioned earlier, in vocabulary tests, Nation (2001) recommends a minimum of 30 items for a reliable vocabulary test. In this phase of the study, productive vocabulary knowledge of the experimental and control groups was measured quantitatively.

Language learners' vocabulary knowledge includes receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. Receptive vocabulary knowledge refers to the ability to understand a word after it is heard or seen while productive vocabulary knowledge is the knowledge to produce a word when one tries to write or speak. It is believed that words are known receptively at first and only after intentional or incidental learning become productive and it is generally believed that learners' receptive vocabulary size is much larger than their productive vocabulary size. Then, in our study, we wanted to assess the possible effect of etymology on productive vocabulary knowledge of experimental group's participants in comparison with the control group's participants. As productive vocabulary knowledge is the knowledge to produce a word when one tries to write or speak (Zhou 2010: 2).

Participants had 32 minutes for filling in the blanks. Wesche and Paribakht's (1996) VKS enables learners to mark the stage that indicates their knowledge of each vocabulary item through recognition, recall, and production of the word on the test (as cited in Kwon 2006). VKS can assess both receptive and productive knowledge (Schmitt 2000). The validity and the reliability of the VKS have been established in some research studies by Wesche & Paribakht (1996, cited in Kwon 2006). As can be seen, the only difference between the receptive and productive VKS is in the final part (Forming sentence) where the participants are required to produce a sentence with the given vocabulary item.

As for the scoring criteria of the Productive Vocabulary Test, for unknown words, the score given is 1. For just simple answers and incorrect response (translations or synonyms), the given score is 2. For Correct response, the given score is 3. If the word is used in a semantically inappropriate manner with

grammatical inaccuracy in a sentence, the given score is 3. If the word is used either in a semantically inappropriate manner or with grammatical inaccuracy in a sentence, the given score is 4. If the word is used in a semantically appropriate manner and with grammatical accuracy, the given score is 5 (as cited in Mukarto 2005: 154). The total score of an individual participant is obtained by adding the given scores for each item on the Productive Vocabulary Knowledge Test.

To compare productive vocabulary knowledge of the experimental and control groups, their pre-test results were analysed through independent t-test. It can be observed in Table 4 that all sigs are more significant than 0.05 which shows the normality of data and applicability of paired samples t-test.

**Table 3.** *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Pre-test Scores of Experimental and Control Groups (productive vocabulary knowledge test)*

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
	<i>Pre-test exp</i>	<i>Pre-test cont</i>
N	24	24
MEAN	40.4167	41.7500
Std. Deviation	6.28951	10.83172
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	.476	.902
Sig.	.977	.391

The Productive Vocabulary Knowledge pre-tests results of both groups were compared through independent t-test to see if there is any significant difference between the pre-tests scores of both groups and the results are displayed in Table 5 below.

**Table 4.** *Productive Vocabulary Knowledge, Pre-Tests Results of the Experimental and Control Group, Analyzed via Independent-Samples T-Test*

Group	N	MEAN	St.d	t	df	p
Experiment	24	40.416	6.289	-.522	46	.605
Control	24	41.750	10.831			

The results show that the mean and standard deviation of the experimental group is (M=40.416, SD=6.289) and the mean and standard deviation of the control group is (M=41.750, SD=10.831). Conditions;  $t(46) = -.522$ ,  $p = .605$ . So, Sig. (2-Tailed) Value in the outcome is 0.605. This value is bigger than .05. So, we can conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between the pre-test means of the experimental and control groups in terms of their productive vocabulary knowledge level.

## Results and Findings

To begin with, any difference between receptive vocabulary learning pre/post-test scores of the experimental and control groups were scrutinised. T-test results showed, as discussed earlier in the methodology section that there was no

significant difference between the pre-test results of the experimental and control groups.

While the pre-test mean of the receptive vocabulary knowledge test of the participants in the experimental group was 42.50, it increased to 79.79 in the post-test results. Moreover, the pre-test mean of the control group was 42.5, which increased to 46.65 in the post-test results.

To find out if there were any significant differences between the scores of the post-test results of the experimental and control groups' receptive vocabulary knowledge, a mixed ANOVA test was applied and the results are shown in Table 6 below.

**Table 5.** Results of Pre-Test and Post-Test of Receptive Vocabulary Knowledge of the Experimental and Control Groups

		N	Pre-test		Post-test		Group X Factor	
			Mean	St.d	Mean	St.d	F	p
Groups	Experimental	24	42.50	6.27	79.79	9.06	378.83	.000
	Control	24	42.62	9.17	46.625	11.06		

According to the results depicted in above, the pre-test mean of the experimental group was 42.50 which increased up to 79.79 after post-test. However, the control group's pre-test means the score was 42.62, which had a slight increase in the mean of the post-test score up to 46.625.

Since the post-test Mean of the experimental group (M=79.79, SD= 9.06) is bigger than the post-test mean of the control group (M=46.62, SD= 11.06) and (F= 378.83,  $p < 0.05$ ), there is a significant difference between the post-test scores of the experimental and control groups. In other words, the experimental group outperformed the control group in receptive vocabulary knowledge, and this outperformance shows significant growth of etymological and morphological instruction on the experimental group's participants.

Table 6 below illustrates the analysis of the pre/post-test results of the productive vocabulary knowledge of experimental and control groups.

**Table 6.** Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of Productive Vocabulary Knowledge of the Experimental and Control Groups

		N	Pre-test		Post-test		Group X Factor	
			Mean	St.d	Mean	St.d	F	p
Groups	Experimental	24	40.41	6.28	86.41	8.35	659.4	.000
	Control	24	41.75	10.83	44.83	11.18		

The pre-test means the score of the experimental group (40.41) shows an increase (86.41 ) in the post-test, and the control group's pre-test mean score (41.75 ) increased in the post-test results (44.83 ) as well.

Since the post-test mean of the experimental group (M=86.41, SD=8.35 ) is bigger than the post-test mean of the control group (M=44.83, SD= 11.18 ) and (F= 659.4,  $p < 0.05$ ), there is a significant difference between the post-test scores

of the experimental and control group. In other words, the experimental group outperformed the control group in productive vocabulary knowledge, and this outperformance shows the positive effect of etymological and morphological instruction on the experimental group after receiving etymological and morphological instruction.

Fourteen members of the experimental group participated voluntarily in the semi-formal interview after the treatment. The interview included two questions; one asked the participants' opinions about the etymological and morphological vocabulary learning strategy used in their classes, and the other one asked the participants to exemplify words learned through this vocabulary strategy instruction. The answers gathered were categorized, content analysed, and explained.

According to the responses to the first question in the semi-formal interview, regarding the popularity of etymological and morphological instruction, ten interviewees "liked this strategy" while the remaining four "liked it to some extent." Other categorized data is related to the features of the etymological and morphological instruction. The interviewees reflected in their comments as "interesting," "it requires teachers' effort", "It was efficient" and "enjoyable" for them. The other categorized part was about the benefits of etymological and morphological instruction in general. Three participants commented that this strategy was "helpful for memorizing new words," two other participants claimed that etymologically learned words helped them retain the words more "permanently" in their mental lexicon. Five participants stated that "roots and suffixation" were helpful in their vocabulary learning. Moreover, one comment was about the benefit of this strategy in his plan for vocabulary learning. All participants' responses after being considered together, the utility of etymological and morphological vocabulary instruction could be regarded as a commonly accepted beneficial strategy of vocabulary learning.

Moreover, to the second question in the interview, ten interviewees gave some examples about the learned words through etymological and morphological instruction. However, four interviewees were not able to provide examples, "I do not remember", "I cannot remember." It seems that they had no presence of mind at that moment. Moreover, from among these four participants with no presence of mind two students stated that "If I see the word, I can remember the meaning of it." Active factors in learning words through etymological and morphological instruction were clarified by some participants. Eleven interviewees clarified the reasons why they would prefer using etymology as a strategy for learning. They discussed the "origin of words" and "the effectiveness of knowing the root of the words." One participant claims that "knowing other forms of the word helped him to learn the new words he encountered. Three times the importance of knowledge of "word root" in learning new words were emphasized by the participants. The importance of "roots and affixation" was indicated by the learners for four times to boost their vocabulary learning. Moreover, for four times "familiarity with one part of the word" as an active factor in learning new vocabulary was emphasized by the participants. One participant reported that this strategy is good, but he prefers other strategies, as well. As a whole, the responses show that the

interviewees believe that etymological and morphological vocabulary instruction is a reasonable and logical strategy for learning words and expanding the vocabulary.

## Discussion

By studying the etymology of words, it is believed that learners would be more successful in learning words. For example, some studies have been done by researchers like Pierson (1989) about the importance of using etymology in teaching in the classroom through qualitative review research, and Hutcheon et al. (2012) also discuss the importance of instruction through etymology. Similarly, Chatzisavvas (2015) argues the benefits of etymology in vocabulary development of Greek ESL students.

The results of the study show that there are significant differences between pre-test and post-test results (scores) of the experimental and control groups in three of the domains tested. The findings indicate the outperformance of the experimental group members and the positive effects of etymological and morphological approaches in vocabulary learning of adult EFL learners. During the two-month etymological and morphological instruction, the experimental group members learned new vocabulary through the etymology of words. The control group members followed the school conventional method, and students probably had their own strategies for learning words. Moreover, it was observed that the etymological and morphological instruction strategy was quite helpful in the experimental group participants' vocabulary learning. According to the results, it is revealed that the control group members had slight progress, as the mean of the receptive vocabulary pre-test score of the control group members increased from 42.65 to 46.65 in their post-test. The same pre-test mean of the experimental group was 42.5, which increased to 79.79 in their post-test results. The superficial improvement of the control group might be attributed to their conventional school instruction or their own effort for vocabulary learning. Moreover, the more substantial increase in the mean of the post-test result of the experimental group could be the effect of etymological and morphological instruction.

Although there was no significant difference between pre-test scores of the experimental and control group through t-test in regards to their productive vocabulary knowledge, a significant morphological awareness between the post-test scores of the experimental and control group through mixed ANOVA test, the productive vocabulary of the control group showed a slight increase and this increase might be attributed to their conventional school instruction. However, the results of the experimental group showed dramatic improvement as the mean of their productive vocabulary score increased from 42.500 to 79.79, which indicates that the experimental group outperformed the control group. The outcome results from this part of the study prove that a more extensive receptive vocabulary shows more productive vocabulary size (Webb 2008).

According to the results gathered from the semi-formal interview with 14 volunteering participants, it was revealed that they were in favour of the

etymological and morphological approach and that they liked "it to some extent" (28.5 %) and "liked it" (71.5%) by claiming that it was "interesting," a "great strategy" and "very good." The popularity of this strategy is evident in the given answer to this semi-formal interview question. The participants, who liked the etymological and morphological instruction as a good strategy, have supported this strategy in general and believed that "roots and suffixation," "meaning of word parts" and "other forms of the same word" have helped them in learning new words.

## Conclusion

We can conclude that according to the theoretical framework, meaningful learning has helped the learners in the learning of words and according to the schema theory, every new word is stabilized and learned through connecting data with previously stored data in the brain practically. According to the results, it seems that the learners who were exposed to the etymological and morphological instruction spent less effort to learn and memorize the words.

Moreover, the responses of the semi-formal interview revealed that the majority of the interviewees were in favour of learning vocabulary through etymological and morphological instruction. Most of them developed an awareness of the morphological analysis of words for learning or remembering vocabularies.

As one participant claimed that when they encountered a new unknown word, "suspicion" for example, his background knowledge about the word "suspect" helped him in learning the new vocabulary as "suspicion" as it shares the same root as "suspect." We may, therefore, conclude that the learners' schema helps them in learning new vocabularies. Overall obtained qualitative and quantitative data supported that etymological and morphological instruction of vocabulary was beneficial. It seems that meaningful learning is useful and interesting for learners.

To sum up, the experimental group participants highly benefited from the explicitly taught etymological as well as morphological vocabulary instruction, and it seems that they were able to rematch the new data in Turkish EFL learners. Although the mother tongue of the majority of the participants was Turkish, there were 2 participants with Arabic, 1 participant with Kurdish and 1 participant with Azerbaijani-Turkish language as their mother tongue. However, all these participants with various language backgrounds had already received formal Turkish language instruction. Therefore, the linguistic knowledge of participants about the Turkish language, which is an agglutinated language and whose speakers are naturally familiar with the suffixation and roots of words, may have positively affected the participants' receptive and productive vocabulary development.

Non-native adult English language learners whose mother tongues are not English confront a great difficulty in learning and memorizing the vast number of English words. The English language has borrowed thousands of words from other languages and linguistically has many words which can be traced etymologically and can be morphologically scrutinized and analysed. The difficulty of learning

vocabulary, to some extent, emerges from negligence or lack of familiarity with the etymological or morphological units as well. Therefore, vocabulary instruction through etymology and morphology should have continuity, and greater emphasis should be put on it.

## References

- Ally M (2013) *Foundations of Educational Theory for Online Learning*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3djLsW3>. Amsterdam. Philadelphia
- Anderson TA (2008) *The Theory and Practice of Online Learning*. AU Press, Athabasca University.
- Anderson RC, Freebody P (1981) Vocabulary knowledge. In J Guthrie (ed), *Comprehension and teaching: Research Reviews*, 77-117. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Ausubel DP, Novak JD, Hanesian H (1968) *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Print book : English : 2nd edition.
- Bellomo TS (2005) *Latin word parts and vocabulary: Contrasts among three groups comprising the community college preparatory reading class*. Doctoral dissertation, the College of Education, the University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL. Retrieved November 30, 20016, from <https://bit.ly/3ceqSWY>.
- Bellomo TS (2009) Morphological analysis and vocabulary development: Critical criteria. *The Reading Matrix* 1(9): 44-55. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2SEv8qQ>.
- Bloomfield L (1963) *Language*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Limited.
- Bowers PN, Cooke G (2012) *Morphology and the Common Core Building Students' Understanding of the Written Word*. The International Dyslexia Association Perspectives on Language and Literacy.
- Carlisle JF, Stone CA (2005) Exploring the role of morphemes in word reading. *Reading Research Quarterly* 40(4): 428-449.
- Carki K, Geutner P, Schultz T (2000) Turkish LVCSR: towards better speech recognition for agglutinative languages. In *2000 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing. Proceedings (Cat. No. 00CH37100)*, vol. 3, 1563-1566. IEEE.
- Carroll DW (2000) *Psychology of Language*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Chatzisavvas K (2015) *The Benefits of Etymology in the Vocabulary Development of Greek ESL Students, study*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cg99yA>.
- Dictionary, O. E., & Pearsall, J. (1998). *The new Oxford dictionary of English*.
- Durgunoğlu AY, Öney B, Kuscul H, Dağidir FZ, Aslan F, Cantürk M, et al. (2002) *Functional Adult Literacy Program, level I (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)*. Istanbul, Turkey: Mother Child Education Foundation.
- Eğecioğlu A (1996) *İngilizce'deki Grekçe-Latince kaynaklı sözcükleri öğretmede kökenlere dayalı 'çağrışımsal ilmekleme' yordamı [Root-based 'associative linking' technique in teaching words of Graeco-Latin descent in English]*. Doctoral dissertation: Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences, English Language Teaching Department, Istanbul, Turkey. Retrieved from Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu, Ulusal Tez Merkezi (Higher Education Board, National Thesis Center), <http://www.yok.gov.tr>.

- Golaghaei N, Kakolian S (2015) The effect of visual and etymological treatments on learning decomposable idioms among EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 4(5): 72-81.
- Haastrup K (1991) *Lexical inferencing procedures or talking about words: Receptive procedures in foreign language learning with special reference to English*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Hutcheon G, Campbell M, Stewart J (2012) Spelling Instruction through Etymology – A Method of Developing Spelling Lists for Older Students. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, 60-70.
- Joe A (1995) *Text-based tasks and incidental vocabulary learning*. *Second Language Research*. Victoria University of Wellington.
- Joe A (1998) What effect do text-based tasks promoting generation have on incidental vocabulary acquisition? *Applied Linguistics*. *Oxford University Press*, 19(3): 357-377.
- Kwon SH (2006) *Roles of output and task design on second language vocabulary acquisition*. Ph D dissertation. University of Florida. Retrieved from Cukurova University Library.
- Laufer B, Goldstein Z (2004) Testing vocabulary knowledge: Size, strength, and computer adaptiveness. *Language Learning* 54(3): 399.
- Matthews PH (2001) *A short history of structural linguistics*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mukarto FX (2005) Assessing the Depth of Second Language Vocabulary Knowledge. RELC International Seminar, SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, Singapore 8(3): 151-169.
- Mu H (2019) The Application of Iconicity in Teaching Vocabulary in College English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 9(11), 1449-1453.
- Nagy WE, Anderson R, Schommer M, Scott JA, Stallman AC (1989) Morphological families and word recognition. *Reading Research Quarterly* 24: 262-282.
- Nation ISP (2001) *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Öney B, Durgunoğlu AY (1997) Beginning to read in Turkish: A phonologically transparent orthography. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 18: 1–15.
- Pierson H (1989) Using etymology in the classroom. *ELT Journal* 43(1): 57-63.
- Pikulski JJ, Tempeton S (2004) *Teaching and developing vocabulary: Key to long-term reading success*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Psybox Ltd (2002) Schema [Electronic version] Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3fndVfn>.
- Read J (2000). *Assessing Vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard MR, Deci EL (2000) Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 25: 54–67.
- Rumelhart DE (1980) Schemata: the building blocks of cognition. In RJ Spiro et al. (eds) *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rothstein E, Rothstein AS (2008) *English grammar instruction that works!: developing language skills for all learners*. Corwin Press.
- Saeidi M, Mirzapour F (2013) The Impact of Morphological Awareness on Iranian University Students' Listening Comprehension Ability. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature* 2(3).
- Schmitt N (2000) *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt N (2010) *Researching Vocabulary. A Vocabulary Research Manual*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Soleimani F, Azizmohammadi F (2015) The effect of an additional language on Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary retention. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences, Online International Journal* 5(S2): 1449-1458 Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2WAAIAr>.
- Stockwell RP, Minkova D (2001) *English words: history and structure*: Cambridge University.
- Stephenson H, Dummett P, Hughes J (2013) *Life intermediate*. National Geographic Learning.
- Webb S (2008) The effects of context on incidental vocabulary learning. *Reading in a foreign language* 20(2): 232-245.
- Weber R (2007) The attack on hiss and groan: structural linguistics and reading instruction in mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. *History of Reading News* 30(2): 1-8.
- Wesche M, Paribakht T (1996) Assessing vocabulary knowledge: depth vs. breadth. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 53(1): 13-40.
- Widdowson HG (1983) *Learning purpose and language use*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Zhou S (2010) Comparing Receptive and Productive Academic Vocabulary Knowledge of Chinese EFL Learners. *Asian Social Science*, 14-19.
- Zolfagharkhani M, Ghorbani MR (2011) The Effect of Etymology Instruction on Vocabulary Learning of Upper- Intermediate EFL Iranian Learners. *Canadian Social Science* 7(6): 1-9.

## Appendix Wesche and Paribakht's Vocabulary Knowledge Scale VKS

### Part I Receptive Vocabulary Test

Your name and surname:

Please answer these questions sincerely.

1	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“augmented”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

2	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“sophisticated”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

3	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“ventilation”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

4	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“entrepreneur”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

5	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“sculpture”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

6	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“complemented”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

7	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“readjust”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

8	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“intersection”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

9	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“mutinous”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

10	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“prospectors”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

11	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“elegant”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
12	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“deforestation”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
13	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“conservationist”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
14	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“relic”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
15	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“hardship”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
16	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“confrontation”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
17	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“hieroglyph”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
18	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“infuriate”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
19	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“advocate”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
20	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“revolt”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
21	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“indigenous”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

22	Q	What do you know about this word? " <b>deliberately</b> ".
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
23	Q	What do you know about this word? " <b>infrastructure</b> ".
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
24	Q	What do you know about this word? " <b>squander</b> ".
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
25	Q	What do you know about this word? " <b>dwindle</b> ".
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
26	Q	What do you know about this word? " <b>reputation</b> ".
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
27	Q	What do you know about this word? " <b>suburbia</b> ".
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
28	Q	What do you know about this word? " <b>consultancy</b> ".
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
29	Q	What do you know about this word? " <b>desalination</b> ".
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
30	Q	What do you know about this word? " <b>deplore</b> ".
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
31	Q	What do you know about this word? " <b>orator</b> ".
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
32	Q	What do you know about this word? " <b>predictability</b> ".
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

33	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“attribute”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

34	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“articulate”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)

## Part II Productive Vocabulary Test

1	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“illustration”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

2	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“interface”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

3	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“ventilation”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

4	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“entrepreneur”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

5	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“injustice”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

6	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“scratch”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

7	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“exhausted”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

8	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“downstream”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

9	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“inconvenient”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

10	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“compensation”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

11	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“rejoiced”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

12	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“cyclones”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

13	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“contaminant”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

14	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“incompetent”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

15	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“accommodate”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

16	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“descendant”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

17	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“distort”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

18	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“outstretch”</b> .
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

19	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“distract”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

20	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“fascination”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

21	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“troublesome”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

22	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“thrive”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

23	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“promptness”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

24	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“sculpture”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

25	Q	What do you know about this word? <b>“regulation”</b>
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

26	Q	What do you know about this word? “ <b>prescriptive</b> ”
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

27	Q	What do you know about this word? “ <b>plummet</b> ”
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

28	Q	What do you know about this word “ <b>impartial</b> ”
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

29	Q	What do you know about this word? “ <b>determination</b> ”
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

30	Q	What do you know about this word? “ <b>daunting</b> ”
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

31	Q	What do you know about this word? “ <b>commodities</b> ”
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....

32	Q	What do you know about this word? “ <b>traumatic</b> ”
	A	I don't know <input type="checkbox"/>
	B	I am not sure, but I think it means ..... (write Synonym or Translation)
	C	Surely; it means ..... (Synonym or Translation)
	D	I can use this word in a sentence.....