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Abstract

The current study aimed at investigating how meaning-focused input and output activities affect active and passive vocabulary learning. The participants of the study were 38 intermediate level male students within the age range of 18 to 25 in a Language School in Tehran. Data were collected through administration of Oxford Placement Test (OPT), a vocabulary pre-test and immediate vocabulary post-test. The collected data were analyzed using the statistical test of MANOVA. The results showed that both meaning-focused output and meaning-focused input had positive and significant effect on the active and passive vocabulary learning. It was also found that there was no significant difference between the meaning-focused input and output in terms of their effects on active and passive vocabulary learning. The results of the study and its implications are discussed in the paper.
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Introduction

The world of SLA research has recently witnessed considerable expansion of interest in vocabulary studies, particularly in the context of linguistics applied to SLA (Carter, 1998; Read, 2004). “Such studies are principally concerned with descriptive accounts of the operations of lexis in use and with the development of appropriate strategies for teaching English vocabulary to speakers of other languages” (Nation, & Carter, 1989, p. 5). Vocabulary is said to be a key part of any Second Language Acquisition (SLA) program. In recent years there has been a revival of interests in teaching vocabulary. This may be partly due to computerized databases of words (e.g. corpora) or due to the developments of new approaches in language teaching, e.g. lexical approach and new theories like socio-cultural theory which emphasize vocabulary learning (Mitchell & Myles, 2004; Thornbury, 2002; VanPatten &Williams, 2007). No one can underestimate the important role of vocabulary in learning a language and a review of the current empirical literature (e.g., Nation, 1990, 1994, 2001, 2006, 2015; Webb, 2002, 2005, 2009;
Zimmerman, 1997, 2005) is a confirmation seal on the fact that vocabulary is the most important component of language learning. Vocabulary knowledge is one of the language skills crucial for fluent language use (Nation, 1994) and vocabulary size is an indicator of how well the second language (L2) learners can perform academic language skills such as, reading, listening, and writing (Bear, Helman, Templeton, Invernizzi, & Johnston, 2012; Treiman & Casar, 1996). According to Nation (1994), knowledge of around 3,000 word families is the threshold needed for tapping other language skills. Without this threshold, learners encounter problems understanding the language they are exposed to (Alderson & Banerjee, 2002).

Studies conducted on vocabulary (Davis, 1989; Gass, 1999; Stein, 1993; Wesche et al, 1999) have lent support to the essential role of vocabulary in SLA as restricted knowledge in vocabulary prevents L2 learners from engaging in effective communication in L2. Furthermore, many studies have investigated vocabulary as the main component of language learning, probing its contribution to L2 learning. For example, Laufer (1997) asserts that vocabulary learning is considered as the heart of L2 learning. The available literature on vocabulary learning in SLA has revealed the importance of knowing a sufficient number of words to be able to function well in an L2 situation (Nation, 2001; Read, 2004; Tschirner, 2004; Zimmerman, 2005). The development of adequate passive and active vocabulary is vitally important, and researchers have examined the use of learning strategies including meaning-focused output and meaning-focused input as valuable ways to scaffold the development of L2 vocabulary knowledge.

Despite the fact that vocabulary is central to language and crucially important for second language learners, lexis or word has traditionally been the Cinderella of the field of (SLA) research. This stands in sharp contrast to the fact that lexical errors are the most common ones among second language (L2) learners. As Gass (1989) observes, while grammatical errors may lead to understandable structures, vocabulary errors mostly result in total failure of communication. Acquisition of vocabulary is also of paramount importance in the educational domain, where studies such as Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) have demonstrated a connection between lexical development, reading comprehension, and academic success. Both passive and active words have been focused on in this regard. Nation (2001) believes that passive knowledge and use of a vocabulary item entails being able to recognize the word when it is heard, being familiar with its written form so that it is recognized when it is met in reading, recognizing that it is made up of different parts, knowing that it signals a particular meaning, and being able to relate these parts to its meaning (pp. 26-28).

Also, Nation (2007) presents that active words are produced with correct pronunciation including the accurate stress, are written with correct spelling, are used purposefully and accurately in different contexts, and are meaningfully focused on. Since 1980’s the discussion of meaning-focused output and meaning-focused input have been absorbing enough to attract various ELT researchers including Krashen (1985) with his seminal input hypothesis proposing that second language acquisition occurs when there is sufficient exposure to the comprehensible input and Swain (1985) with her output hypothesis that is mainly concerned with the active (productive) dimensions of vocabulary knowledge. As Swain (1985) proposed if speaking and writing as L2 language production forms are neglected, the information will remain passive.

Along these lines, Nation (2001) recommends the principle of the four strands and is certain that a well-balanced language course ought to include equivalent quantities of a) meaning-focused input (acquisition through comprehensible reading and listening input), b)
meaning-focused output (learning through pushed spoken and written output), c) language-focused learning (deliberate learning), and fluency development. “The strands draw on the input hypothesis and learning from extensive reading, the output hypothesis, studies on form-focused teaching, and the expansion of speaking and reading fluency respectively” (Nation, 2007, p. 1). The present study was an attempt to investigate differential effects of meaning-focused output and meaning-focused input on passive and active word acquisition among Iranian EFL learners.

One of the ever present problems of EFL learners is developing a good command of L2 vocabulary knowledge (Laufer & Nation, 1999). Having worked as an EFL teacher in a number of language schools in Tehran, the researcher has come to observe the problems that EFL learners at different levels face in developing their L2 vocabulary. According to Boers and Lindstromberg (2008), one needs to learn vocabulary as a key component should he/she achieve an advanced level of proficiency in L2. Zu (2009) asserts that today researchers and educators put emphasis on the acquisition of foreign language vocabulary as having a rich vocabulary is one indicators of the communicative competence and it is one of the significant dimension of L2 learning.

A multitude of studies on the different modes of teaching L2 has been carried out, some of which are note here: De la Fuente (2002) found that negotiation and oral acquisition of L2 vocabulary could improve learners’ general L2 learning. Blachowicz and Fisher’s (2004) study revealed that vocabulary knowledge of L2 learners could improve not only their self confidence in reading but also their learning processes. Webb (2005) explored the impacts of passive and active word acquisition on vocabulary knowledge and found that active vocabulary knowledge is more preferable for the EFL learners. Boers and Lindstromberg (2008) also found that EFL learners being exposed to cognitive linguistics and its principles in terms of active and passive words could improve their vocabulary and reading comprehension well. Gu’s (2010) study also revealed that learning strategies can highly improve vocabulary development of EFL learners.

Martinez and Schmitt (2015) found that L2 vocabulary development could significantly enhance the language proficiency of EFL learners. Likewise, Mican and Medina (2015) found that vocabulary learning could be “boosted through self-assessment in an English language teaching context” (p. 30). A sizeable number of studies on English vocabulary development has also been conducted by Iranian researchers. Naeimi and Foo (2013) studied effect of direct vocabulary learning strategies in reading comprehension. Hashemi Shahraki and Kassaian (2011) examined the impacts of three distinct tasks of receptive learning (RL), productive learning (PL), and negotiated interaction (NI) on the acquisition of new EFL words and found that NI group did significantly better than the other two groups in receptive and productive word acquisition and held up the knowledge over time. Nowbakht and Shahnazari (2015) inspected the relative impacts of comprehensible input, comprehensible output and corrective feedback on receptive (passive) L2 word acquisition and found that output production and corrective feedback were highly useful in enhancing the passive acquisition of L2 vocabulary items.

Reviewing the related literature, a small amount of research has been carried out regarding the comparison between receptive and productive vocabulary learning (Webb, 2005). Not so many studies have investigated the effect of meaning-focused input and meaning-focused output on passive and active words. Thus, the present research was an attempt to bridge this gap in the EFL context of Iran. In line with what has been discussed so far, this study was an attempt to investigate the effects of meaning-focused output and meaning-focused input on passive and
active word acquisition among Iranian EFL learners. To meet the objectives of the present study, the following research questions were formulated:

**RQ1:** Does meaning-focused output have any significant effect on short-term passive and active word acquisition of Iranian EFL learners as shown on immediate post-test?

**RQ2:** Does meaning-focused input have any significant effect on short-term passive and active word acquisition of Iranian EFL learners as shown on immediate post-test?

**RQ3:** Is there any statistically significant difference between the effects of meaning-focused output and meaning-focused input on short-term passive and active word acquisition of Iranian EFL learners as shown on immediate post-test?

**Method**

**Participants**

The participants of the study were 38 intermediate level male students within the age range of 18 to 25 in Khalaghiyat Sharif Language School in Tehran. These participants were chosen from the intermediate students according to their performance on a standard sample of Oxford Placement (OPT). The selection of participants was done as follows: At first, a sample of 38 intermediate male students were purposefully selected and the OPT test was administered to them. After the administration of OPT, it was revealed that all the students' scores fell between 24 and 47. Based on the scale presented at the closing section of OPT, the scores within 24 to 39 represent lower intermediate learners (B1, based on Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), while the scores within 31 to 47 represent upper intermediate learners (B2, based on CEFR). Due to the nature of the convenient non-random sampling, all the students were allowed to participate in the study. Based on the results of OPT, learners were assigned to two quasi-experimental groups, namely, Meaning-Focused Output Group (MFO) and Meaning-Focused Input Group (MFI). The selected participants were studying in the two quasi-experimental groups in two classes, consisting of 18 to 20 students in each class. Furthermore, the participants had been studying English in the same language school for at least 10 semesters (from elementary level to the intermediate one). All the participants had studied English courses in the public schooling system which is uniform all over the country. Therefore, the researcher’s expectation in terms of the learners’ language proficiency level was met to a great extent as they did not differ so much in this regard.

**Instrumentation**

The data for the present study were collected by means of three tests: An Oxford Placement Test (OPT) test, a pre-test of vocabulary recognition and production, an immediate post-test of vocabulary recognition and production in the form of 5 quizzes for each group at the end of the five sessions of instruction. To select the vocabulary items for treatment and the vocabulary tests, the researcher used Paribakht and Wesche’s (1993) vocabulary knowledge scale (VKS). Paribakht, and Wesche, (1993) propose five levels in the acquisition of individual words in their vocabulary knowledge scale (VKS). The VKS scale rating varies from total unfamiliarity through the recognition of the word and some idea of its meaning to the ability to use the word with grammatical and semantic accuracy in a sentence. These five levels include:
I. I do not remember having seen this word before.

II. I have seen this word before, but I do not know what it means.

III. I have seen this word before, and I think it means ______ (synonym or antonym).

IV. I know this word. It means ______. (Synonym or antonym)

V. I can use this word in a sentence: _______________________. (Paribakht, Wesche, 1993, p. 4).

VKS was used as a criterion to select those vocabulary items that learners were not very familiar with. To this end, 30 vocabulary items presented in their course book were given to the learners and they were asked to assign numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 to the vocabulary items. The researcher monitored the learners while doing the activity to assure that learners were on the right track. Finally, based on the ratings of the students, 15 vocabulary items were chosen based on which treatment was carried out. The vocabulary items were those that the learners rated 1, 2 or 3 on the VKS.

**Oxford Placement Test (OPT)**

In order to check the homogeneity of the participants, the OPT was used. It is a flexible test of English language proficiency developed by Oxford University Press and Cambridge ESOL that gives teachers a reliable and time-saving method of finding a student’s level of English (Hill & Taylor, 2004) (www.oxfordenglishtesting.com). It is quick and easy to administer and is ideal for placement testing and examination screening. The test has two parallel versions, and takes approximately 30 minutes to administer. All the questions of the test are in multiple-choice format; answers are recorded directly on the answer sheet; and the answer sheets can be quickly marked using the overlays provided. The test assesses the knowledge of English structure, and also is considered as a global measures of ability in a language or other content areas. In order to have homogenous group of participants, those learners whose scores were within the range of 24 and 47 were selected to take part in the study. The test enjoys high reliability ($\alpha=.91$) based on Cronbach's alpha (Berthold, 2011, p. 674). The test has been also reported to enjoy high construct validity (Motallebzadeh & Nematizadeh, 2011; Wistner, Sakai, & Abe, 2009).

**Vocabulary Pre-test**

The second instrument used in the present study was a pre-test of vocabulary (See Appendix A) which included two separate sections (altogether, 30 items) aiming at checking the passive and active vocabulary knowledge of the learners. The test was developed, based on the level of the learners and the concepts presented in their course book. The first section of the test was composed of 15 short cloze passages in the production form and aimed at testing the active word knowledge of the participants. To do so, the test included the word items of which only the initial letters were given and the learners were guided this way to present the word item required. In fact, the learners were asked to fill out the gaps with the exact word items (Bachman & Palmer, 2010). The second section of test included 15 multiple-choice items testing vocabulary recognition, which in fact tested the passive word items. It should be noted that both the production and recognition vocabulary tests included exactly the same 15 vocabulary items. However, in order to minimize the familiarity and practice effect, the order of the items and also
the stems of the items were totally different on the two sections of the vocabulary test. To address the content validity of the test, the items developed by the researcher were reviewed by two PhD holders in TEFL with 15 years of teaching experience and due revisions were carried out on the items. To address the construct validity of the test, the researcher appealed to “differential experiment” procedure proposed by Brown (2007). According to this procedure, in order to show the construct validity of a measurement instrument, the instrument could be employed to assess the ability it claims on two different groups whose ability sounds obviously different in this regard. If the difference between the performances of the two groups proves to be statistically different, it could be concluded that the measurement instrument is assessing what it is supposed to measure and hence it is valid. Based on the aforesaid procedure, the test was administered to two different groups of learners who were upper-intermediate and advanced students, respectively. The scores obtained by the groups were analyzed using an independent samples t-test. The analysis indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the results with the advanced students outperforming the upper-intermediate ones, hence, the test proved to be valid.

Immediate Post-test Quizzes

The third instrument used in the study was an immediate post-test of vocabulary (See Appendix B) which was developed based on the content of the course book covered in the study treatment. It should be noted that the vocabulary items on the immediate post-test were exactly the same as the vocabulary items on the pre-test. Moreover, the same as the pre-test, the immediate post-test also had two versions i.e. recognition and production. The only difference was that each session after the treatment in the quasi-experimental groups, a quiz containing three of the vocabulary items in both the recognition and production format was given to the participants. The score of each of the quizzes for each individual were added up and the overall score was considered as the immediate post-test for each participant. In order to neutralize the practice effect, the order of the items and also the stems of the items were totally different on the two sections i.e. recognition and production versions of the vocabulary test.

Course Book

The course book which was used in the present study was the intermediate level book of the Touch Stone (McCarthy, McCarten, & Sandiford, 2013). Units 6-9 of Book 2 of the series was used in the present study. Touchstone is an innovative four-level series for adults and young adults, taking students from beginning to intermediate levels and based on the Common European Framework of Reference for languages, the series covers A1 to B1 (McCarthy, et al., 2013). The series presents natural language in authentic contexts, and explicitly develops conversation strategies so that learners could speak with fluency and confidence. “Based on extensive research into how people actually use English, Touchstone teaches students the grammar, vocabulary, and conversation strategies they need to communicate fluently and successfully in today’s modern world” (McCarthy, et al., 2013, p. 2). Its unique comprehensive syllabus also offers truly communicative pronunciation, listening, reading, and writing tasks. “With Touchstone in print, teachers and students are guaranteed lively lessons of personalized, learner-centered interaction exposure to natural English, and the development of learning strategies that students can take beyond the classroom” (McCarthy, et al., 2013, p. 2). Touchstone is also accompanied by online courses, a student book, an online and printed version of the workbook, CDs, DVDs, and teachers’ guide.
Procedure

Pretest

The first phase of this study was the piloting phase during which 30 intermediate students with similar features to the target sample took the Oxford Placement Test (OPT), and the researcher-made pre and post-tests to ensure the reliability of the tests for the context of the present study. The reliability of the vocabulary test was checked via piloting and Cronbach’s Alpha, while the content validity of the test was put to the scrutiny of two PhD holders of TEFL to get ensured of the test validity through an expert judgment method. In the second phase of this study the participants were selected. First, the piloted OPT was administered to 38 intermediate students to homogenize them regarding their general English proficiency. All the 38 learners’ scores fell between 24 and 47 and all of them were selected as the main participants of the study. In the third phase, the participants of the study in both groups took part in the researcher-made vocabulary pre-test (which included both passive and active word items through recognition and production tests) and to assure their homogeneity regarding their SL passive and active vocabulary knowledge.

Intervention

The overall duration of the study was 8 sessions. The first session was for administering the OPT to select the participants. The second session was for administering the pre-test. The third session was devoted to explaining the tasks for the groups and five sessions were allotted to the treatment and the post-tests. The whole semester included 8 weeks (16 sessions) and the learners attended the class two days a week each session lasting for 90 minutes in both groups. Considering the fact that the syllabus of the language had to be covered during this semester too, 5 sessions of 20 minutes were allocated to the experiment in the quasi-experimental groups. The allocated time was devoted to presenting the learners with the initial training in terms of applying meaning-focused input and output. It is worth mentioning that the classes of both quasi-experimental groups received the same hours of instruction and practice. Also the researcher himself taught both groups.

In quasi-experimental group I, the Meaning-Focused Output Group (MFO), the learners were trained based on Swain’s (1985) output hypothesis which emphasizes the active (productive) dimensions of vocabulary knowledge. She believes that if production (speaking and writing) is neglected, the information will remain passive. In fact, each session 3 vocabulary items were worked out using MFO activities. Thus, the participants in this group received a reading text each session and were required to present a summary or paraphrase of the text based on the note taking they had already done. Hence, the MFO group received the new words through writing. More specifically, the teacher asked the students to read a piece of reading for 5 to 6 minutes and take notes. Then, the learners were asked to put aside the reading texts and start writing their summary-paraphrasing.
In quasi-experimental group II, the Meaning-Focused Input Group (MFI), the learners were asked to cover the same materials the other group received thorough a receptive mode, which was reading comprehension. In fact, the MFI received a reading comprehension text followed by some true/false items as well as some comprehension questions. More specifically, the learners received texts and asked to underline the words they found difficult and then tried to guess the meaning from the context clues.

**Immediate Posttest**

After the treatment in each session, the participants in both quasi-experimental groups received their immediate post-tests which were developed based on the content of the course book covered in the study treatment. In fact, the test was run to measure the learners' ability and development in both passive and active word items following the treatment. The data gathered were put into SPSS version 24 and the results were reported. Each research question was checked against the findings and each hypothesis was evaluated to be rejected or accepted.

**Results**

**Homogeneity Check**

As described in the previous chapter, the students in the two groups were homogenized by administering the OPT test. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics and means of the two groups in terms of the OPT scores. In order to see whether the two groups were homogenous as regards the proficiency level, they were compared employing independent samples t test. One of the assumptions of t test is normality, which was checked by computing the skewness and kurtosis ratios of the data. Since these ratios were smaller than +1.96, the data were considered normal enough to allow for running parametric independent samples t test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>35.6000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>36.5556</td>
<td>.510158</td>
<td>-.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 presents the independent samples t test results. As the results of Levene’s test show, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met for t test, and the t test result shows no significant difference between the two groups, t = -.503, df = 36, p > .05. Therefore, the two groups are considered homogeneous in terms of proficiency at the outset of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Answering the First Research Question

The first research question of the present study was:

Question 1: Does meaning-focused output have any significant effect on short-term passive and active word acquisition of Iranian EFL learners as shown on immediate post-test?

In this question, we were required to compare the pre-test and immediate post-test means of the meaning-focused output group (i.e. repeated-measures design) in terms of passive and active word acquisition mean as well as their total scores together (i.e. three dependent variables). To do this, repeated-measures multivariate analysis of variance (RM MANOVA) was run. To begin the analysis, first the descriptives in terms of passive and active word acquisition scores as well as their total scores on pre-test and immediate post-test were computed (Table 3).

One of the assumptions of RM MANOVA is normality, which was checked by computing the skewness and kurtosis ratios (by dividing the skewness/kurtosis value by standard error) of the data from Table 3. Since these ratios were within ±1.96, the data were considered normal enough to allow for running parametric RM MANOVA.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>.75840</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Passive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>.85749</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6.6111</td>
<td>1.37793</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.358</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>8.8889</td>
<td>1.32349</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Passive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9.3889</td>
<td>1.50054</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.580</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>18.2778</td>
<td>2.73981</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first RM MANOVA table is the multivariate test results (Table 4) which compares all the three dependent variables at the same time. As the results indicate, all the multivariate test results are significant (p < .05) showing that the pre-tests and immediate post-tests of the dependent variables are significantly different from each other, but it is not clear which one.
Table 4

Multivariate<sup>a,b</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Within Subjects Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Test</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>176.463&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>176.463&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>22.058</td>
<td>176.463&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>22.058</td>
<td>176.463&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Design: Intercept
Within Subjects Design: Test
<sup>b</sup> Tests are based on averaged variables.
<sup>c</sup> Exact statistic

In order to see which post-test differs from its relevant pre-test, the univariate test results for each dependent variable was checked as presented in Table 5. Since the results in Table 5 are significant (p < .05), with regard to the descriptives in Table 3 it is concluded that significant increases have happened from pre-test to post-test in the meaning-focused output group in terms of the short-term passive, active and total word acquisition. In other words, the null hypothesis to the first research question is rejected. That is to say, meaning-focused output has a significant effect on short-term passive and active word acquisition of Iranian EFL learners as shown on immediate post-test.

Table 5

Univariate Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Test</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Sphericity Assumed</td>
<td>300.444</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300.444</td>
<td>350.901</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser</td>
<td>300.444</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>300.444</td>
<td>350.901</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huynh-Feldt</td>
<td>300.444</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>300.444</td>
<td>350.901</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>300.444</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>300.444</td>
<td>350.901</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Sphericity Assumed</td>
<td>312.111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>312.111</td>
<td>280.900</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse-</td>
<td>312.111</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>312.111</td>
<td>280.900</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Answering the Second Research Question

The second research question of the present study was:

Question 2: Does meaning-focused input have any significant effect on short-term passive and active word acquisition of Iranian EFL learners as shown on immediate post-test?

In this question, we were required to compare the pre-test and immediate post-test means of the meaning-focused input group (i.e. repeated-measures design) in terms of passive and active word acquisition mean as well as their total scores together (i.e. three dependent variables). To do this, repeated-measures multivariate analysis of variance (RM MANOVA) was run. To begin the analysis, first the descriptives in terms of passive and active word acquisition scores as well as their total scores on pre-test and immediate post-test were computed (Table 6).

One of the assumptions of RM MANOVA is normality, which was checked by computing the skewness and kurtosis ratios (by dividing the skewness/kurtosis value by standard error) of the data from Table 6. Since these ratios were within ±1.96, the data were considered normal enough to allow for running parametric RM MANOVA.

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Active</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.8000</td>
<td>.76777</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>-.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Passive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1500</td>
<td>1.22582</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>7.9500</td>
<td>1.82021</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Active</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>8.5500</td>
<td>1.57196</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>-.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Passive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9.3500</td>
<td>1.53125</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>-.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>17.9000</td>
<td>2.97180</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first RM MANOVA table is the multivariate test results (Table 7) which compares all the three dependent variables at the same time. As the results indicate, all the multivariate test results are significant (p < .05) showing that the pre-tests and immediate post-tests of the dependent variables are significantly different from each other, but it is not clear which one.
Table 7
Multivariate\textsuperscript{a,b}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Within Subjects Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input Test</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>88.919\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>88.919\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>9.880</td>
<td>88.919\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>9.880</td>
<td>88.919\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Design: Intercept
Within Subjects Design: Test
\textsuperscript{b} Tests are based on averaged variables.
\textsuperscript{c} Exact statistic

In order to see which post-test differs from its relevant pre-test, the univariate test results for each dependent variable was checked as presented in Table 8. Since the results in Table 8 are significant ($p < .05$), with regard to the descriptives in Table 6 it is concluded that significant increases have happened from pre-test to post-test in the meaning-focused input group in terms of the short-term passive, active and total word acquisition. In other words, the null hypothesis to the second research question is rejected. That is to say, meaning-focused input has a significant effect on short-term passive and active word acquisition of Iranian EFL learners as shown on immediate post-test.

Table 8
Univariate Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input Test</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Assumed Sphericity</td>
<td>330.625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330.625</td>
<td>185.443</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser</td>
<td>330.625</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>330.625</td>
<td>185.443</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Huynh-Feldt</td>
<td>330.625</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>330.625</td>
<td>185.443</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>330.625</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>330.625</td>
<td>185.443</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Sphericity Assumed</td>
<td>176.400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176.400</td>
<td>82.552</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser</td>
<td>176.400</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>176.400</td>
<td>82.552</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huynh-Feldt</td>
<td>176.400</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>176.400</td>
<td>82.552</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>176.400</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>176.400</td>
<td>82.552</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Sphericity Assumed</td>
<td>990.025</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>990.025</td>
<td>145.283</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser</td>
<td>990.025</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>990.025</td>
<td>145.283</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huynh-Feldt</td>
<td>990.025</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>990.025</td>
<td>145.283</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>990.025</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>990.025</td>
<td>145.283</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Answering the Third Research Question

The third research question of the present study was:

Question 3: Is there any statistically significant difference between the effects of meaning-focused output and meaning-focused input on short-term passive and active word acquisition of Iranian EFL learners as shown on immediate post-test?

As the data analysis of the questions above indicated, both meaning-focused input and meaning-focused input groups showed significant increases from pre-tests to immediate post-tests indicating short-term passive and active word acquisition by Iranian EFL learners. In order to see which group showed more significant gain in word acquisition, the mean passive and active word acquisition scores and total scores of the groups were compared. It should be noted since these three variables were the components of the same construct (i.e. word acquisition), multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was run considering all these three variables in one analysis. Moreover, since Tables 3 and 6 as well as 9 show that the three groups did not have equal pre-test means in their mean passive and active word acquisition scores and total scores, the pre-test initial differences were all considered as covariate, and instead of MANOVA, multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was run to take into account the initial differences or covariate effect.

Table 9
Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Active</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.8000</td>
<td>.76777</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Passive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.1500</td>
<td>1.22582</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>-.740</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>7.9500</td>
<td>1.82021</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Active</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>8.5500</td>
<td>1.57196</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Passive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9.3500</td>
<td>1.53125</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>-.921</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>17.9000</td>
<td>2.97180</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>-.481</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.1111</td>
<td>.75840</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Passive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>.85749</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test. Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6.6111</td>
<td>1.37793</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.358</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>8.8889</td>
<td>1.32349</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Passive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9.3889</td>
<td>1.50054</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.580</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>18.2778</td>
<td>2.73981</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 presents the multivariate tests results taking all the dependent variables together. Obviously, the results are not significant ($p > .05$), meaning that when all the dependent variables are taken into account together, there is no significant difference between the groups in terms of their mean passive and active word acquisition scores and total scores.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Design: Intercept + Pre-test. Passive + Pre-test. Active + Pre-test. Total + Group
b. Exact statistic

In order to check each dependent variable separately, a univariate test (i.e. a separate ANCOVA) was run for each dependent variable. Table 11 also presents the Levene’s test on the quality of groups’ variances in terms of each dependent variable. Clearly, all these results are not significant ($p > .05$), hence the meeting of the assumption of homogeneity of variances.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Im. Post-test. Passive</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Active</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im. Post-test. Total</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

Table 12 presents the main separate ANCOVA results which demonstrate that the groups are not significantly different on the post-test in terms of all mean passive and active word acquisition scores and total scores ($p > .05$), hence supporting the MANCOVA results above. All in all, it could be concluded that there is no statistically significant difference between the effects of meaning-focused output and meaning-focused input on short-term passive and active word acquisition of Iranian EFL learners as shown on immediate post-test.

Table 12

<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>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Im. Post-test. Passive</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The aim of the present study was investigating the effect of meaning-focused output and meaning-focused input on passive and active word acquisition of Iranian EFL learners. The results of data analysis indicated that both meaning-focused output and meaning-focused input had positive and significant effect on active and passive vocabulary learning. The results of comparisons showed that there was no significant difference between the meaning-focused input and output in terms of their effects on active and passive vocabulary learning.

The fact that meaning-focused input and output had significant effect on active and passive vocabulary learning in short term lies in the great role of input and output in vocabulary learning. Both input and output have been assigned great roles in literature in language learning and acquisition. In addition, it does not seem logical to assume language learning without receiving input and having the chance to produce language. For instance, with regard to input, Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1985) says that second language acquisition occurs when we have sufficient exposure to comprehensible input. This speculation is closely connected to passive (receptive) word acquisition, since in this regard learners should learn words through listening and reading (Daller, Milton, & Treffers-Daller, 2007; Kamil & Hiebert, 2005). With regard to role of output, Swain (1985) proposed the Output Hypothesis that is concerned with the active (productive) dimensions of vocabulary knowledge. She believes that if production (speaking and writing) is neglected, the information will remain passive.

In addition to the role of input and output discussed above, another component of treatment was the meaning-focused nature of input and output. The meaning-focused nature of input and output adds an essential learning property to the treatment. This meaning-focused nature of language learning activities has been referred to focus on form in language acquisition literature. Laufer (2005) considered various research studies within ‘focus on form’ versus ‘focus on formS’. She states that ‘focus on form’ is a condition in which vocabulary forms are instructed in a communicative context in which those forms are necessary to complete the task. The general impression is that focus on form is more learning-centered and more valuable in language acquisition. That could be another reason for the significant effect of meaning-focused input and output on passive and active vocabulary learning. In other words, it was the combined effect of focus on input and output and also the meaning-focused nature of the input and output that greatly impacted the learning of the vocabulary.

Another finding of the current study was that there was not any significant difference between meaning-focused input and output on learning passive and active vocabulary. This lack of difference can be justified based on the features of input and output based activities. The input based activities focus mainly on the receptive knowledge which is conveyed through receptive skills like reading and listening. These activities seem to be more associated with passive vocabulary learning. On other hand, output oriented techniques are more connected with productive learning. In output methods, the focus is on production like conversations and writing. This way of learning is therefore more associated with active vocabulary learning. The
true explanation for such findings require extensive review of learning psychology and linguistics which is out of the scope of the study. However, one explanation that seems to lie in the distinction between input and output. In fact, it may not be possible to draw a true distinguishing line between input and output. In other words, it is difficult to imagine that in output based practice of language, there is not input and vice versa. It is highly possible that a learner learns new words while reading or listening and at the same time practices them productively in his mind by using them in new sentences in a productive manner.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the study and the related explanations several conclusions can be drawn. First of all, it can be concluded that both input and output related language activities have the potential to enhance the vocabulary learning of foreign language learners. Secondly, it seems that the way input and output activities are delivered in classroom has important role in success of the input and output activities. In the present study the explanation that was put forward for positive effect of both input and output activities was meaning based nature of input and output activities. In other words, the study did not intent to solely focus on input and it rather attempted to deliver the input and output activities in communicative and meaningful manner. All these conclusions are backed by the language learning theories like input and output hypotheses (Krashen, 1989; Swain, 1995), Ausubel meaningful learning (Ausubel, 2000) and Focus on Form (Nation, 2007).

According to the obtained results some pedagogical implications can be suggested for Iranian context of foreign language learning including the pedagogical implications for language teaching and also for materials development. The very first one is that meaning based input and output activities should be further emphasized in the instruction of vocabulary. To do so, teacher educators may refer to the findings of the current study highlighting the effectiveness of input-based and out-based activities for teaching vocabulary. Material developers and syllabus designers may incorporate the output and input based activities in their materials and syllabus if the intention is that output and input based activities be further emphasized in foreign language classrooms.

The present study had some limitations which can be addressed in future studies. In this study, due to time constraints and practicality reasons, it was not possible to have a delayed posttest to check whether the vocabulary learnt has been retain or not. Moreover, the participants of the study were male students within the age range of 18 to 25 at the intermediate level of language proficiency. Similar investigations can be carried out with female participants and from other proficiency levels and age ranges.
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Appendix (A)

Pre-test Test Items (Production)

Section 1: Complete the following sentences with one word. The initial letter of each word has been given.
• Each of these drops is located by the time and place records in the book and the time records on the diagram as belonging to a particular service pipe; so that out of possibly 300 premises the bulk of the leakage has been located or just outside fifteen.

• The star of silver bears the black eagle on an orange ground surrounded by a silver fillet on which is the motto of the order Suum Cuique.

• We thus learn that the bronzes referred to above, although chemically uniform when solid, are not so when they begin to solidify, but that the liquid deposits crystals richer in copper than itself, and therefore that the residual liquid becomes richer in tin.

• D.... to find some peace and quiet, Wynn ignored the men racing in different directions through the hallways and went to one of the back stairwells.

• In the last stage of Greek philosophy, the spirit produced remarkable results outside the philosophies of those properly called eclectics.

• The mirror C D is set at such an angle as to rays from the star S in the direction of the polar axis to the mirror R and thence to the horizontal telescope T.

• Those huge hands had started to explore her body in a way that left her feeling f..., delicate, and willing to let him take control in a way she never permitted him before.

• Because of those reasons, the amounts of "Elders Living Alone" families are growing, and the risk in their senectitude is increasing. So, we need a s.... old people's long-term care system.

• I hide my storm-like love in my heart just not to give you any pressure. The more precious my love is, the more I c.... the love from others.

• He goes on to a.... the world's science and civilization to pagan inventors; but it is not clear whether in this he is alluding specially to the culture of his own city.

• Does the bedrock constitutional principle of equal protection for all require affirmative action, merely allow it, or even p..... it?

• At least 35 manufacturers have flouted a law requiring p..... reporting of such malfunctions.

• Early research suggests creatine supplements might be able to help slow the progression of Parkinson's, an incurable brain disorder that can slowly but steadily p..... patients.

• The trader is then guaranteed to know the exact minimum profit that his or her position will g....

• The Roman arms were not very s...., and King Aretas retained his whole possessions, including Damascus, as a Roman' See Edom, and (for the view that Mal.

Vocabulary Pre-test Items (Recognition)

Section 2: Select the option which best completes the following sentences.
• During the winter these animals retire to their burrows, sleeping the greater part of the time, but awakening about February or March, when they feed on the …………….. grain.
  • Guaranteed
  • Garnered
  • Give way
  • Ghastly
  • We …………….. Edison's success to intelligence and hard work.
    • Attended
    • Attributed
    • Accentuated
    • Accelerated
  • All things considered, I think we could say that the meeting was …………….. and met its objectives.
    • Successful
    • Suggestive
    • Suffocated
    • Sustainable
  • I want to hear the woman who lives by the …………….. of no apologies, no regrets, who told me once that her own soul searching taught her to live, doesn't want my help turning that three months into eternity.
    • Mandate
    • Muse
    • Mission
    • Motto
  • Until relatively lately the cast iron for the Bessemer and open-hearth processes was nearly always allowed to …………….. in pigs, which were next broken up by hand and remelted at great cost.
    • Solidify
    • Sustain
    • Surrogate
    • Submerge
  • …………….. to enjoy her first relaxing experience in a few weeks, she watched to make sure the door closed behind him and went to the locker room.
    • Decisive
    • Derivative
    • Determined
• Disgusted
• In philosophy there has been a remarkable increase of activity, partly assimilative or .................. and partly original.
• Elated
• Evasive
• Eclectic
• Enunciated
• It comforted her to .................. that she was not better as she had formerly imagined, but worse, much worse, than anybody else in the world.
• Refrain
• Resume
• Resign
• Reflect
• The room was utterly .................., from the pale colors to the silk and lace accents and carved furniture.
• Feminine
• Fugitive
• Fictional
• Far-fetched
• Supper was picked-at leftovers, and neither felt like .................. with Bird Song's guests, who came and went on their own, without their usual afternoon goodies and conversation.
• Submerging
• Sustaining
• Socializing
• Succeeding
• When the World War broke out Enver began to .................. strategical ambitions.
• Cherish
• Charter
• Challenge
• Cheer for
• Let life go on in it unhindered and let it defend itself, it will do more than if you .................. it by encumbering it with remedies.
• Packed
• Pampered
• Postulated
• Paralyzed

• Great Britain, instead of agreeing to ……………… the importation of bounty-fed sugar, was allowed to permit it under certain limits.
• Prevent
• Postpone
• Prohibit
• Ponder

• Dean was surprised by the FBI's ……………… response to what he'd described to Winston as an unimportant matter.
• Pugnacious
• Prompt
• Preposterous
• Pecky

• The active army and its reserve are not ………………, but drawn from and distributed over the whole of France.
• Lucrative
• Localized
• Lost
• Liberated

Appendix (B)

Immediate Post-test Items: Session One

Section 1: Select the option which best completes the following sentences.

• The rapid growth of the firm was ……………… to its unique strategy.
  • Attended
  • Accentuated
  • Accelerated
  • Attributed

• Women do not necessarily have to imitate men to be ……………… in business.
  • Suggestive
  • Suffocated
• Successful
• Sustainable

The experience gained in the great famines of 1898 and 1901 has been .......... by these commissions, and stored up in the "famine codes" of each separate province, where rules are provided for the treatment of famine directly a crop failure is seen to be probable.

• Guaranteed
• Give way
• Garnered
• Ghastly

Section 2: Complete the following sentences with one word. The initial letter of each word has been given.

• Alternatively, delay gives the leader more time to size up the situation and to do some persuading, cajoling and arm-twisting behind the scenes to g........ more support.

• The conclusions of such a work are of wider significance than the assumptions we a............. to the author would warrant.

• Other problems connected with his family interests served to complicate the situation and eventually to prevent the s............... consummation of many of his plans.

Immediate Post-test Items: Session Two

Section 1: Select the option which best completes the following sentences.

• No one had a suggestion for the next step, but Fred was ................. to continue to research the ownership of the severed digit.

• Decisive
• Determined
• Derivative
• Disgusted
• The mass of glass is rolled on a polished slab of iron, the " marvor," to ................. it, and it is then slightly hollowed by blowing.

• Sustain
• Surrogate
• Submerge
• Solidify
• In England the Agricultural Society was founded in 1838, with the ................. " Practice with Science," and shortly afterwards incorporated by royal charter.

• Mandate
• Muse
• Mission
Section 2: Complete the following sentences with one word. The initial letter of each word has been given.

- This seems to have been interpreted by its author and by the Sophists in general in a subjective sense, with the result that it became the m………. of a skeptical and individualistic movement in contemporary philosophy and ethics.
- The matrix is the lime or cement, whose chemical action with the added water causes the concrete to s………….; and the aggregate is the broken stone or hard material which is embedded in the matrix.
- Young people, who would be expected to do the dying if another war came, are generally more d………. to keep the peace than their elders.

Immediate Post-test Items: Session Three

Section 1: Select the option which best completes the following sentences.

- She bought a couple sundresses and some …………… T-shirts for herself.
- Fugitive
- Fictional
- Feminine
- Far-fetched
- But in every case these artistic efforts were followed at short intervals by gross relapses into barbarism which ……………… the anarchy of the political conditions.
- Refrain
- Resume
- Reflect
- Resign
- And yet Neoplatonism cannot be described as an …………….. system, in the ordinary sense of the word.
- Evasive
- Elated
- Eclectic
- Enunciated

Section 2: Complete the following sentences with one word. The initial letter of each word has been given.

- In the 19th century the term "e………………" came to be applied specially to a number of French philosophers who differed considerably from one another.
- This, however, did not lead him to doubt the truth of those reported by others - a fact that is somewhat surprising when we r……………. that the phenomenon caused him much disquiet and perplexity.
• The other side of her face displayed facial features that were heavy rather than f………………, resembling her father's.

Immediate Post-test Items: Session Four

Section 1: Select the option which best completes the following sentences.

• Her mouth opened in a frozen scream as the burning pain …………….. her.
  Packed
  Pampered
  Paralyzed
  Postulated

• Though in favour of national reform he continued to …………….. a strong feeling of loyalty to the royal family, and on the trial of Marie Antoinette in 1793 bore testimony in her favour.
  Charter
  Challenge
  Cheer for
  Cherish

• So Mrs. Martin is up there …………….. with Mr. Martin in her heaven, unaware that Mr. Martin is balling his brains out with Annie across the hall—cloud—while Annie, in her heaven, is the happy homemaker up on Oak Street.
  Submerging
  Socializing
  Sustaining
  Succeeding

Section 2: Complete the following sentences with one word. The initial letter of each word has been given.

• With the establishing of market economy, the processing has s………………, the civil society is more and more becoming a completely new analyzable category during the current state.
  The days without you, I will be more to c……………….; no money of the day, you have to take care of yourself; no love life, you and I together!
  Smoking would immediately trigger abnormal contractions that would p………………. muscles, like those involved in breathing.

Immediate Post-test Items: Session Five
Section 1: Select the option which best completes the following sentences.

- Manufacturing is largely ………………… in the northwestern part of the state along the Ohio river.
- Lucrative
- Localized
- Lost
- Liberated
- After the ………………… suppression of this rebellion, the Committee became sovereign in the direction of Ottoman affairs.
- Pugnacious
- Prompt
- Preposterous
- Pecky
- Much as she liked Sarah, the idea of Giddon's displeasure would ………………… any such intent.
- Prevent
- Prohibit
- Postpone
- Ponder

Section 2: Complete the following sentences with one word. The initial letter of each word has been given.

- The act turned public opinion against such executions and led King Charles to p……………… hangings for her sort of crime.
- He would appreciate the p……………… return of books to the library.
- For the very reason that his presence is common and universal he is not l……………… to the same extent as his fellow-deities, and, while always enumerated in a list of the great gods, his place in the systematized pantheon is more or less vague.
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