

**TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' LEXICAL COMPETENCE AND
PERFORMANCE:
A STUDY WITH PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS AT KÜTAHYA
DUMLUPINAR UNIVERSITY**

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Ceren TAŞATAN ÇAKMAK

Eskişehir 2020

**TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' LEXICAL COMPETENCE AND
PERFORMANCE:
A STUDY WITH PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS AT KÜTAHYA
DUMLUPINAR UNIVERSITY**

Ceren TAŞATAN ÇAKMAK

MA THESIS

Department of Foreign Language Education

MA in English Language Teaching Program

Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali MERÇ

Eskişehir

Anadolu University

Graduate School of Educational Sciences

July 2020

JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE'Yİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİN SÖZCÜKSEL YETERLİLİKLERİ VE PERFORMANSLARI: KÜTAHYA DÜMLUPINAR ÜNİVERSİTESİ HAZIRLIK SINIFI ÖĞRENCİLERİ İLE YAPILAN BİR ÇALIŞMA

Ceren TAŞATAN ÇAKMAK

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

İngilizce Öğretmenliği Programı

Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Temmuz 2020

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Ali MERÇ

Sözcük bilgisinin dil öğreniminin önemli bir yönü olduğu birçok çalışmada kanıtlanmıştır. Literatürdeki çalışmalar ışığında, bu çalışmanın amacı Kütahya Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin genel ve akademik sözcüksel yeterlilik ve performanslarını değerlendirmektir. Bu amaçla, bu çalışma öğrencilerin genel ve akademik algısal sözcük bilgisini ve üretimsel sözcük bilgisini ve aynı zamanda aralarındaki ilişkileri araştırmaktadır. Çalışmaya, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı bölümünde öğrenim görecektir olan 94 adet hazırlık sınıfı öğrencisi katılmıştır.

Çoklu test yaklaşımı benimsenerek iki farklı kelime testi uygulanmış, yazma uygulaması ve konuşma uygulaması gerçekleştirilmiştir. Sonuçlara göre öğrencilerin genel ve akademik sözcük boyutu ve derinliği yüksektir. Ancak, öğrenciler çoğunlukla sık kullanılan sözcükleri az kullanılan ve akademik sözcüklerden daha fazla tercih etmişlerdir. Öte yandan, üretimsel sözcük uygulamalarındaki sonuçlar algısal sözcük bilgilerinden daha düşük çıkmıştır. Bu nedenle, öğrencilerin sözcüksel yeterliliklerini sözcüksel performanslarına yansıtamadıkları gözlemlenmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Sözcüksel yeterlilik, sözcüksel performans, akademik sözcük bilgisi, yazma, konuşma

ABSTRACT

TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' LEXICAL COMPETENCE AND PERFORMANCE: A STUDY WITH PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS AT KÜTAHYA DUMLUPINAR UNIVERSITY

Ceren TAŞATAN ÇAKMAK

Department of Foreign Language Education

MA in English Language Teaching Program

Anadolu University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, July 2020

Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali MERÇ

Vocabulary has been accepted as an important aspect of language learning in many studies. In the light of these studies in literature, the purpose of the present study is to evaluate the general and academic lexical competence and performance of preparatory class students at Kütahya Dumlupınar University, School of Foreign Languages. Within this aim, the current study investigated the students' general and academic receptive productive vocabulary knowledge and their interrelationships among each other. The participants of the study included 94 preparatory class students who were going to major at Department of English Language and Literature.

Through multiple test approach, two different vocabulary tests, a writing task, and a speaking task were implemented. According to the results, the students had large general and academic vocabulary size and depth. However, they mostly preferred high frequent words more than low frequent and academic words. Moreover, their scores in productive vocabulary were lower than their receptive vocabulary knowledge scores. Therefore, it was observed that they could not reflect their lexical competence in their lexical performance.

Keywords: Lexical competence, lexical performance, academic vocabulary, writing, speaking

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would never have been able to finish my thesis without the people who have stood by my side and supported me throughout this process; therefore, my advisor, committee members, my colleagues, my friends, and my family all deserve to be appreciated.

First of all, I would like to express my deepest thanks and gratitude to my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali MERÇ for his continuous support, feedback and encouragement. Without his invaluable guidance and persistent help, this thesis would not have come to an end.

Secondly, I would like to express my thanks to the jury members; Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgür YILDIRIM and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa CANER for their valuable suggestions to the present study.

Next, I would like to thank to my colleagues and students at Kütahya Dumlupınar University for their contribution to the present study. I am also grateful to my dear friends Nurcan İLBAŞ and Fadime YILDIRIM, who have motivated me at the backstage. Especially, I owe special thanks to Asst. Prof. Dr. Dilşah KALAY for her support throughout the process. I also thank to administration of School of Foreign Languages.

Furthermore, my sincerest thanks from my deep heart go to my beloved parents, Hatice TAŞATAN and Mahir TAŞATAN, who always love and believe in me. I have relied on their constant affection, encouragement and support throughout my life. I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to my lovely sister, İrem TAŞATAN, who have always encouraged and motivated me to complete this process.

Last but not least, my husband Eren ÇAKMAK deserves the greatest thanks for always being with me whenever I need. Most importantly, I would like to thank my son, Alp ÇAKMAK, who is a blessing in my life and enlightens my way all the time. I am grateful to his innocent love that always makes me feel that I am the luckiest person in the world to have such a wonderful son.

Ceren TAŞATAN ÇAKMAK

Eskişehir 2020

27/07/2020

ETİK İLKE VE KURALLARA UYGUNLUK BEYANNAMESİ

Bu tezin bana ait, özgün bir çalışma olduğunu; çalışmamın hazırlık, veri toplama, analiz ve bilgilerin sunumu olmak üzere tüm aşamalarında bilimsel etik ilke ve kurallara uygun davrandığımı; bu çalışma kapsamında elde edilen tüm veri ve bilgiler için kaynak gösterdiğimi ve bu kaynaklara kaynakçada yer verdiğimi; bu çalışmanın Anadolu Üniversitesi tarafından kullanılan “bilimsel intihal tespit programı”yla tarandığını ve hiçbir şekilde “intihal içermediğini” beyan ederim. Herhangi bir zamanda, çalışmamla ilgili yaptığım bu beyana aykırı bir durumun saptanması durumunda, ortaya çıkacak tüm ahlaki ve hukuki sonuçları kabul ettiğimi bildiririm.

Ceren TAŞATAN ÇAKMAK

27/07/2020

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND RULES

I hereby truthfully declare that this thesis is an original work prepared by me; that I have behaved in accordance with the scientific ethical principles and rules throughout the stages of preparation, data collection, analysis and presentation of my work; that I have cited the sources of all the data and information that could be obtained within the scope of this study, and included these sources in the references section; and that this study has been scanned for plagiarism with “scientific plagiarism detection program” used by Anadolu University, and that “it does not have any plagiarism” whatsoever. I also declare that, if a case contrary to my declaration is detected in my work at any time, I hereby express my consent to all the ethical and legal consequences that are involved.

Ceren TAŞATAN ÇAKMAK

TABLE OF CONTENT

	<u>Page</u>
BAŞLIK SAYFASI	i
JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI	ii
ÖZET	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
ETİK İLKE VE KURALLARA UYGUNLUK BEYANNAMESİ	vi
STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND	
RULES	vii
TABLE OF CONTENT	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background to the Problem	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Significance of the Study	4
1.4. Aim and Research Questions	5
1.5. Definitions of Terms	6
1.5.1. Lexical knowledge	6
1.5.2. Academic vocabulary	6
1.5.3. General vocabulary	6
1.5.4. Lexical competence	6
1.5.5. Lexical performance	6
1.5.6. Receptive vocabulary knowledge	7
1.5.7. Productive vocabulary knowledge	7

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1. Aspects of Vocabulary Knowledge	8
2.2. Receptive and Productive Vocabulary Knowledge	9
2.2.1. Receptive vocabulary knowledge	10
2.2.1.1. Vocabulary size (breadth) and depth	10

2.2.1.2. Measurement of receptive vocabulary knowledge	17
2.2.2. Productive vocabulary knowledge	18
2.3. Empirical Studies on Receptive and Productive Aspects of Vocabulary Knowledge	22
2.4. Academic Lexical Competence and Performance	27
2.4.1. Empirical studies on academic lexical competence and performance	27
2.5. Significance of Related Literature on the Current Study	30

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY	31
3.1. Research Design	31
3.2. Research Setting	31
3.3. Participants	32
3.4. Instruments	33
3.4.1. Instruments to measure receptive vocabulary knowledge	33
3.4.1.1. Vocabulary level test	34
3.4.1.2. Word associates test	35
3.4.2. Instruments for measuring productive vocabulary knowledge	36
3.4.2.1. Writing and speaking tasks	36
3.4.2.2. Lexical frequency profile	38
3.5. Data Collection Procedure	41
3.6. Data Analysis	42

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS	44
4.1. Findings on Lexical Competence of the Participants	44
4.1.1. Size of general and academic vocabulary knowledge	44
4.1.2. Depth of general vocabulary knowledge	46
4.1.3. Overall lexical competence	47
4.2. Findings on the Lexical Performance of the Participants	49
4.2.1. Use of general and academic knowledge	49
4.2.1.1. Productive vocabulary knowledge on writing tasks	49
4.2.1.2. Productive vocabulary knowledge on speaking tasks	50
4.2.2. Overall lexical performance	51

4.3. Interconnection between the Participants' Lexical Competence and Performance	54
CHAPTER 5	
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	58
5.1. Discussion of the Findings	58
5.1.1. Insights on Lexical Competence	59
5.1.1.1. General receptive vocabulary knowledge	59
5.1.1.2. Academic receptive vocabulary knowledge	62
5.1.2. Insights on lexical performance	63
5.1.2.1. Insights on academic lexical performance	64
5.1.3. Insights on the interrelationship of all dimensions	65
5.2. Conclusion	69
5.3. Implications	70
5.4. Limitations	73
5.5. Suggestions for Further Studies	74
REFERENCES	76
APPENDICES	
CURRICULUM VITAE	

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Pages</u>
Table 2.1. Empirical studies on receptive vocabulary knowledge	14
Table 2.2. Empirical studies on productive vocabulary knowledge	21
Table 2.3. Empirical studies on receptive and productive aspects of vocabulary knowledge	25
Table 2.4. Empirical studies on academic vocabulary knowledge	29
Table 3.1. A sample output of LFP analysis	39
Table 3.2. The data collection tools implemented in the study	40
Table 3.3. Data analysis procedure according to research questions	43
Table 4.1. Descriptive statistics of Vocabulary Level Test	45
Table 4.2. Descriptive statistics of Word Associates Test	47
Table 4.3. Descriptive statistics of WAT and VLT	48
Table 4.4. Correlations between the vocabulary tests regarding receptive vocabulary knowledge	48
Table 4.5. Descriptive statistics for lexical performance on writing	50
Table 4.6. Descriptive statistics for lexical performance on speaking	50
Table 4.7. Descriptive statistics for lexical performance on speaking and writing	51
Table 4.8. The correlation analysis of speaking and writing scores of the participants	52
Table 4.9. The correlation analysis of receptive and productive vocabulary scores of the participants	55
Table 4.10. The correlation analysis of academic vocabulary knowledge scores of the participants	57

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>Pages</u>
Figure 1.1. Three different aspects of vocabulary knowledge	3

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AWL	: Academic Word List
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
ELT	: English Language Teaching
L1	: First Language
L2	: Second Language
LFP	: Lexical Frequency Profile
VLT	: Vocabulary Level Test
WAT	: Word Associates Test
M	: Mean

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Problem

Throughout the years, grammar learning was the main basis of language learning; yet, the outstanding status of vocabulary learning in language learning process was recognized later (Nation, 1990; Schmitt, 1997). The significance of learning vocabulary rather than grammar has showed up as people are able to understand the message very little without grammar but nothing can be understood without lexis (Wilkins, 1972). In addition, lexicon is regarded as the main aspect of language comprehension and use (Hunt & Beglar, 2005).

In consequence of the interest on the importance of vocabulary learning, many studies have been conducted related to both knowing vocabulary and producing vocabulary (Fan, 2000; Laufer & Goldstein, 2004; Laufer, Elder, Hill, & Congdon, 2004; Webb, 2005; Chen & Ge, 2007; Vongpumivitch, Huang, & Chang, 2009; Meara & Olmos, 2010; Rashidi & Khosravi, 2010; Schmitt, Ching, & Garras, 2010; Zhou, 2010; Aziez, 2011; Hellman, 2011; Ho & Lien, 2011; Mehrpour, Razmjoo, & Kian, 2011; Ehsanzadeh, 2012; Yüksel & Durmuşoglu, 2013; Karakoç, 2016; Tömen, 2016; Kalay, 2017). All of these mentioned studies elucidated the relationship between vocabulary and language acquisition; therefore, vocabulary knowledge, in other words, lexical competence, is suggested as one of the most essential determinants in language learning concerning the other skills such as listening comprehension, reading comprehension, quality of writing, fluency in speaking, and grammar patterns.

Vocabulary knowledge is described in different ways. Bogaard (2000) indicated the definition of knowing a word that Cronbach (1942) put forward five aspects in order to be able to comprehend a word. First of these aspects is generalization. In this procedure, learners can define a word. Second aspect is application in which learners are able to choose and recognize situations in order to utilize the target word appropriately. Thirdly, breadth is accepted as the next aspect and it means to have consciousness about other definitions of a word. After that, precision is concerned as being able to use the target word broadly. Lastly, availability represents the capability for students to utilize the target word in their speeches.

Besides, form, meaning, and use are regarded as the main bases to know a word (Nation, 2000). The notions of *receptive vocabulary* and *productive vocabulary* are also introduced by Nation (2000): Receptive vocabulary of learners comprises words that they can remember in reading or listening tasks while productive vocabulary of learners consists of the words used in speaking and writing tasks in an appropriate and accurate way.

To put it in a different way, vocabulary knowledge is examined in several aspects as receptive vocabulary and productive vocabulary (Webb, 2005). Receptive vocabulary dimension contains vocabulary size and depth. The size of vocabulary means the number of words that learners know and the depth of vocabulary shows learners' knowledge of various aspects regarding the target word (Yüksel & Durmuşoglu, 2013). The studies mostly have focused on receptive vocabulary achievement of learners. However, productive vocabulary shows that learners can take part actively in production process of their vocabulary knowledge so that they have a chance to prove themselves perceptibly as a result of their specializing and using the target words in a correct way.

In previous studies, it has been indicated that receptive skills of foreign language learners and vocabulary knowledge are correlated positively. Therefore, learners' comprehension on reading and listening tasks are contributed by their vocabulary knowledge, and it affects their performances in foreign language classes (Hu & Nation, 2000; Schmitt, 2000; Nation, 2006; Dang & Webb, 2013; Ling, 2015; Silverman et. al., 2015; Wang, 2015; Zhang et. al., 2014). As receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge are connected to one another, writing and speaking which are learners' productive language skills, are also subject to other studies in the field in order to define their impacts on learners' performances. Learners' lack of vocabulary knowledge results in facing difficulties in their writing tasks (Begriche, 2013; Rudy, 2013; Putra, 2014; Yang, 2015). Moreover, lack of vocabulary knowledge has a negative effect on learners' speaking performances as they hesitate to choose the right word and it causes long silences (Tahir, 2015).

Different hierarchies for the vocabulary knowledge structure have been proposed by different researchers (Henriksen, 1999; Read, 2004; Nation, 2000). According to Nation (2000), nine particular aspects of a word's form, meaning, and use have to be known by a language learner so that it is proven that they have the mastery regarding their receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. It is considered as the most

comprehensive framework among the others. Figure 1.1 shows the framework of vocabulary knowledge produced by Nation (2000).

Form	Spoken	Receptive	What does the word sound like?
		Productive	How is the word pronounced?
	Written	Receptive	What does the word look like?
		Productive	How is the word spelled?
	Word parts	Receptive	What parts can we recognize in this word?
		Productive	What word parts are needed to express meaning?
Meaning	Form and meaning	Receptive	What meaning does this form signal?
		Productive	What word form can be used to express this meaning?
	Concept and referents	Receptive	What is included in this concept?
		Productive	What items does the concept refer to?
	Associations	Receptive	What other words does this make us think of?
		Productive	What other words are possible to use instead of this one?
Use	Grammatical functions	Receptive	In what patterns does this word occur?
		Productive	In what patterns is this word required to use?
	Collocations	Receptive	What other words or types of words occur with this one?
		Productive	What words or types of words must we use with this one?
	Constraints on use (register, frequency, etc.)	Receptive	Where, when, and how often would we expect to encounter this word?
		Productive	Where, when, and how often can we use this word?

Figure 1.1. *Three different aspects of vocabulary knowledge (Nation, 2000, pp. 40-41)*

Figure 1.1 shows the aspects of form, meaning and use with the explanations for receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge.

Consequentially, all of these studies have proved that lexical competence and lexical performance are interconnected structures and they constitute receptive and productive notions of vocabulary acquisition together.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Vocabulary learning is commonly considered as the most prevalent language problem among the other language skills (Nation, 1999; Schmitt, 1997; Crossley & Salsbury, 2010; Mokhtar, 2010). Even if the learners have some vocabulary knowledge,

it is often challenging for them to use target words actively. Especially, academic vocabulary for higher education level learners has a critical importance as they need to both follow the literature regarding their discipline and write academic texts (Yüksel & Durmuşoğlu, 2013). In addition to writing tasks, learners can have some speaking performances and they also need productive vocabulary knowledge in order to produce an output. Writing and speaking skills can be considered as prerequisites for learners' academic competence since they are regarded as productive skills. In this way, language teachers have a chance to evaluate concrete things when students produce utterances by applying these skills.

In the previous studies, some dimensions of vocabulary knowledge have been studied. For example, studies related to size were carried out (Laufer, 1998; Laufer & Nation, 1995); however other dimensions including productive vocabulary knowledge have been neglected. Studies should include other vocabulary components such as vocabulary depth to define learners' vocabulary knowledge accurately (Read, 2000). Therefore, studies containing students' lexical competence and performance framework should be conducted so as to determine their vocabulary knowledge.

The quality of learners' writing and speaking performances is considered as an indicator of their lexical competence (Laufer & Nation, 1995; Jarvis, 2002, Zareva et. al., 2005). By this means, it is a more reliable way to evaluate learners' effectiveness on integrating vocabulary into production.

1.3. Significance of the Study

The scope of the current study aims to gain insight about vocabulary acquisition in several dimensions. The abovementioned studies generally emphasized on learners' receptive vocabulary; yet, writing and speaking aspects as productive notions of foreign language learning have been neglected to be studied. However, the productive vocabulary knowledge is also supposed to be contained along with the receptive vocabulary knowledge since these two features need to be considered as a whole.

Accordingly, there is a need for a research study to include the measurement of the students' both lexical breadth and depth as their lexical competence. Moreover, the lexical performance containing the students' writing and speaking performances as their productive vocabulary skills are also included.

English learners in Turkish context are more inclined to be exposed to receptive skills rather than productive skills in the classrooms. This situation also affects the exams. For example, foreign language exams implemented by Student Selection and Placement Centre do not include productive parts as speaking and writing; therefore, the students who take the exam are not evaluated in terms of the productive skills. On the other side, the proficiency exam at School of Foreign Languages, Kütahya Dumlupınar University has a writing section to measure the students' productive knowledge with regard to writing skills; however, it does not entail the speaking section. As a result of that, the students' productive skills seem to have been neglected compared to their receptive skills so far. Accordingly, receptive vocabulary knowledge has been given more importance more productive vocabulary knowledge.

In order to fill this gap in the literature, the current study aims to focus on the students' both receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge along with the interrelationship between these notions. Therefore, the results of the present study are supposed to be committed to the literature so as to determine necessary implications for vocabulary learning and teaching in language teaching courses.

1.4. Aim and Research Questions

The present study aims to investigate Turkish preparatory class students' general and academic aspects of lexical competence and performance at a state university. The size and depth dimensions of receptive vocabulary knowledge were examined in order to find out the relationship between them and the students' performances on writing and speaking in English as productive vocabulary knowledge.

The following research questions were formed in order to identify the participants' receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge and the interrelationship between these two dimensions:

1. What is the level of the students' general and academic lexical competence?
 - a. What is Turkish preparatory students' size of general vocabulary knowledge?
 - b. What is Turkish preparatory students' size of academic vocabulary knowledge?
 - c. What is Turkish preparatory students' depth of general vocabulary knowledge?
2. What is the level of Turkish preparatory students' general and academic lexical performance?

3. Does the level of the students' lexical competence and performance correlate with each other?

1.5. Definitions of Terms

In this section, the definitions of key concepts used in the present study will be explained.

1.5.1. Lexical knowledge

First of all, vocabulary is accepted as a list of words in English. "Lexical knowledge" and "vocabulary knowledge" is also used correspondently.

1.5.2. Academic vocabulary

"Academic vocabulary" means that the words take place in academic genres more than other types of texts (Coxhead & Nation, 2001). Coxhead (2000) constituted Academic Word List (AWL) and it was applied to determine the academic vocabulary in the study.

1.5.3. General vocabulary

"General vocabulary" contains all kinds of words from any fields and it is classified as 2000th, 3000th, 5000th, and 10000th frequency word levels (Nation, 2001). These frequency bands refer to the rates of presence of the words in the texts.

1.5.4. Lexical competence

"Lexical competence" indicates the students' abilities to recognize the words and the relations between the words. It is related to the number of the words the learners know and how well they know them. Due to the fact that lexicon involves huge number of words in a variety of frequency bands, it is generally accepted as a reference point of a fine lexical knowledge, and lexical competence is primarily defined as the count of words in general vocabulary (Henriksen, 1999).

1.5.5. Lexical performance

"Lexical performance" is accepted as the use of vocabulary in written and spoken context. The sharp distinction between lexical competence and lexical performance is presented as lexical competence is mostly related to knowing a word; however, lexical

performance is regarded as using that word appropriately. The difference between them could be explained as lexical competence includes the vocabulary use and size; in other words, receptive vocabulary knowledge; whereas lexical performance contains the cognitive process and the features of this productive facet; in other words, productive vocabulary knowledge (Yüksel & Durmuşoglu, 2013). It was also stated that lexical competence and lexical performance are regarded to form multifaceted characteristics of word knowledge (Webb, 2005; Zareva, 2005).

1.5.6. Receptive vocabulary knowledge

Receptive dimension of vocabulary knowledge refers to size and depth; size means the number of words learners know and depth means how well they comprehend the words. It can be assumed that receptive dimensions are dominated by lexical competence.

1.5.7. Productive vocabulary knowledge

The use of words in context is accepted as productive dimension of vocabulary knowledge. The notions of productive vocabulary knowledge are overarched with lexical performance.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the studies that contribute to the current study will be included. Firstly, vocabulary knowledge aspects will be introduced. Moreover, receptive and productive dimensions of vocabulary knowledge will be mentioned in detail in the light of studies in the literature. In addition, academic lexical competence and performance will take place. Besides, empirical studies on receptive and productive dimensions of vocabulary knowledge and on academic lexical competence and performance will be contained. Lastly, significance of related literature on the present study will be discussed.

2.1. Aspects of Vocabulary Knowledge

The confined and recalled information related to the definitions of specific vocabulary items constitutes vocabulary knowledge (Nagy, 2005). Nonetheless, this assumption cannot be accepted alone because it is more than isolated and memorized information since it was stated that learning is a burden as it is the quantity of exertion which is necessary to understand a word consisting of its patterns and knowledge (Nation, 2001). The aspects to know a word also affect the learning a new word process (Nation, 1990) and these aspects are accepted as the main constituents in this proceeding.

Commonly, knowing a word can be described as being able to recognize the form of vocabulary and understand its meaning. Boogard (2000) mentioned five different aspects to know a word which was presented as generalization, application, breadth, precision and availability (Cronbach, 1942 as cited in Bogaard, 2000). Moreover, Nation (2001) signified that form, meaning, and use are necessary notions to know a word.

The description of vocabulary knowledge was explained in eight items (Richards, 1976).

1. Vocabulary is going on enlarging even in adulthood which is dissimilar from syntax because it demonstrates slight improvement in the lives of adults.

2. To know a word equals to how possible to face with that word in writing and speaking discourse is. For several words that we are also aware of the type of them mostly can be determined as relevant to the word.

3. To know a word means that learners should know the drawbacks of its use regarding diverseness of function and situation.

4. To know a word is noticing the syntactic behaviour linked with the word.

5. To know a word brings about knowledge of the elemental form of a vocabulary item and the formations.

6. To know a word calls for knowledge of lexical network of the words and also other vocabulary items in the language.

7. To know a word requires understanding the semantic worth of a word.

8. To know a word signifies perceiving several distinct meanings related to the word (pp. 83).

The assumptions mentioned here about knowing a word demonstrate that Richard (1976) combined the features of morphology and syntax belonged to a word as well as its frequency and register into the meaning of vocabulary knowledge.

Dimensions of the vocabulary knowledge, receptive and productive, should also be mentioned in the nature of knowing a word (Nation, 1990). Receptive vocabulary knowledge includes realizing and noticing a word during reading and listening processes. Differently, productive vocabulary knowledge is regarded as expressing and transmitting a message with the help of writing and speaking processes (Nation, 2000). This distinction is similar to the difference between listening and reading, which are receptive language skills, and writing and speaking, which are productive language skills (Crow, 1986).

2.2. Receptive and Productive Vocabulary Knowledge

It is commonly agreed that learners perceive the words receptively; therefore, learners' productive vocabulary knowledge is less than their receptive vocabulary knowledge (Webb, 2005). In addition, it is claimed that learners' receptive vocabulary knowledge may predict their productive vocabulary knowledge to some extent (Waring, 2002).

Notwithstanding, there are some objections indicating that there is not a clear border between these two dimensions since it is claimed that learners' productive vocabulary knowledge is needed while using receptive vocabulary knowledge and vice versa (Milton, 2007).

Nation (2001) presented the features of receptive and productive vocabulary to demonstrate the differences of both. Firstly, the characteristics of receptive vocabulary knowledge are stated:

1. Learners should notice the words meanwhile they hear them.

2. They should be acclimated to the written form of the words in reading texts.
3. They should know the affixes and their relation to their meanings.
4. They must realize that the word signalizes a specific meaning.
5. The meaning of the word in a specific context should be known.
6. They should be aware of the other related words existed.
7. They could understand the word utilized appropriately in a sentence.
8. They should be aware of the collocations of the word.
9. They should decide if the word is common or not (pp .26).

The characteristics of productive vocabulary knowledge, on the contrary, are:

1. The learners have an ability to pronounce the words correctly with the appropriate stress.
2. They should spell the words in a correct way.
3. They could apply right parts of the word in suitable forms.
4. They must produce the words in several contexts.
5. The synonyms and antonyms for the words should be known by them.
6. The words are supposed to be used appropriately in the authentic context.
7. They could supply collocations for the word.
8. They must perceive usage of the words regarding when, where and how to use them (pp. 41, 42).

The distinctions between students' receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge are made through these mentioned items to shed light to the literature. To sum up, it could be reached that receptive vocabulary knowledge is related to knowing the target word whereas productive vocabulary knowledge requires using the target word correctly.

2.2.1. Receptive vocabulary knowledge

2.2.1.1. Vocabulary size (*breadth*) and *depth*

Vocabulary size (*breadth*) is described as the quantity of words that a learner perceives; nonetheless, vocabulary depth includes different aspects of a target word that a learner should know (Yüksel & Durmuşoğlu, 2013).

There are several studies investigating the learners' vocabulary size. To start with, Aziez (2011) carried out a study evaluating the corpus of texts in junior and senior high schools. These texts were preferred to be implemented in Indonesia as English National

Examination texts. The study was corpus based applying Web VocabProfiles program which was improved by Cobb (2008) and the duration of the study was four years. The primary purpose of the study was to examine the number of words that a reader requires to know. In the frame of frequency bands given in the study, a reader is supposed to know nearly 95% apprehension of the target text. According to the outcomes of the study, there was not any systematicity in test construction since different exams were evaluated. Therefore, it could be suggested that these exams should be revised in order to provide consistent exams.

Laufer and Goldstein (2004) also conducted a study investigating vocabulary knowledge of learners in the line with progress in vocabulary size. Two researchers studied the validity of the models which are concerning four strength categorization. The categorization involved passive recognition, active recognition, passive recall and active recall. Passive recognition includes selecting the L1 word while passive recall means supplying the L1 word. Besides, active recognition refers to selecting the L2 word whereas active recall requires to supply the L2 word. As an instrument of the research, bilingual computerized test was implemented. After their investigation, academic success and the link between the modes were analysed. The findings of the study demonstrated that there were differences in growth of vocabulary size.

Connately, Laufer et. al. (2004) implemented a research study having the same aim; however, it was carried out with different participants and setting. Vocabulary size dimension was supposed to be evaluated via items taken from Vocabulary Level Test (VLT) developed by Schmitt et. al. (2001) and vocabulary strength was assessed through four-way categorization model. Results of the study presented that a learner's gains in vocabulary size had a possibility to change according to the applied strength mode.

Apart from vocabulary size, vocabulary depth is also regarded as another crucial aspect of lexical competence. Ho and Lien (2011) examined depth of vocabulary knowledge of students. The subjects' scores were investigated through the analysis of their vocabulary depth and a reading comprehension test; thus, the interconnection between vocabulary depth and comprehension of reading in addition to participants' speed and comprehension of reading were aimed to be assessed. Moreover, the performances of low and high achievers could be determined. According to the gathered data, it was predicted that the learners' depth of vocabulary knowledge was supposed to be accepted as an important indicator of reading comprehension test scores. The

relationship between low and high achievers also demonstrated that the subjects' proficiency scores of depth of vocabulary mostly had an effect on their speed and performances in reading as well.

Diversely, Ehsanzadeh conducted a research study regarding the effects of vocabulary breadth and depth on vocabulary knowledge. The aim was to find the above-named aspects' lexical range in second language lexical inference performance and incidental vocabulary acquisition regarding reading tasks. First of all, VLT and Word Associate Tests (Read, 2000) were implemented to the subjects of the study. At the second step which was conducted two weeks later, Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) (Paribakht & Wesche, 1997) was applied in three sessions. The researcher determined a correlation between the depth of vocabulary knowledge and incidental learning of words more than the others, and this result showed that it strengthened the ideas about lexical learning behaviour claiming that learners' conceptual system was efficient. In addition, a correlation analysis between breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge and second language (L2) lexical inference performance pointed out that correlation of depth of vocabulary knowledge and second language lexical inference scores were higher than the correlation of vocabulary size knowledge and L2 lexical inference scores. Moreover, depth of vocabulary knowledge was found to be a better indicator of second language inferential success when it was compared to breadth of vocabulary knowledge in terms of their significance in the study.

Furthermore, Hellman (2011) conducted a study analysing the relationship between the breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge and native-like L2 lexical attainment. In this study, adult English learners' limits of final second language vocabulary success were investigated. In other words, the main objective of the study was to detect the features having impacts on second language lexical acquirement. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), Self-rated Vocabulary Test (SRVT), WAT and interviews were implemented as instruments. As a result of the data analysis, the last lexical achievement was detected among adult-onset second language trainees, regardless of the start age of immersion in the target language, which suggested that the majority of second language participants of adult onset could have approved native level of L2 vocabulary.

Accordingly, Mehrpour et. al. (2011) carried out a research aiming to reveal whether there is a relationship between the breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge and Iranian students' reading comprehension. In the study, the participants were learning

English as a foreign language. The instruments included the VLT, the WAT, and a reading comprehension test obtained from a TOEFL exam, which are similar to the former studies. The correlation analysis indicated that a broader vocabulary caused a better comprehension of a reading text. Likely, a student's knowledge of the vocabulary of the target language was essential since it also increased reading comprehension. With respect to the correlation between the breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge, it was obvious that they were correlated with each other, suggesting that the more the number of words that learners know increased, the more their word knowledge became grounded deeply.

Similarly, Rashidi and Khosravi (2010) ran a research study including 71 Persian subjects in Iran to find out the interconnection between size and depth of vocabulary knowledge and their reading performance scores. The measurements involved WAT, VLT, and Reading Comprehension Test (RC). The findings fulfilled the outcomes of the study by Mehrpour et. al. (2011) in which the current study showed significant correlations between these two dimensions and the reading comprehension. In the same vein, deep knowledge of the vocabulary confirmed to be a potential predictor of a better understanding of reading than size, which is similar to previous study.

Li and Kirby (2014) explored the relationship between depth and breadth of vocabulary and their possible effects on various aspects of reading in English. The study was conducted in Chinese context, in which participants were Chinese high school ESL students. The outcomes demonstrated that depth and breadth of vocabulary were moderately related to each other, and these two dimensions had an effect on word reading; however, the effect of breadth of vocabulary was higher than the effect of the depth of vocabulary. In addition, breadth of vocabulary significantly had a prediction on multiple-choice reading comprehension assessment tool, requiring general comprehension of the text. On the other hand, depth of vocabulary had a contribution to summary writing, which was a deeper text measure treatment. Therefore, it could be reached that depth of vocabulary tended to help productive skills while breadth of vocabulary tended to help receptive skills.

The studies related to receptive vocabulary knowledge are demonstrated in Table 2.1 including the information about researchers, the scope of the studies, aims, instruments and the findings.

Table 2.1. *Empirical studies on receptive vocabulary knowledge*

Researcher(s)	Study	Aim(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Aziez (2011)	Evaluating the corpus of junior and senior high school English National Examination texts to be used in Indonesia	To examine how many vocabulary items that a reader requires to know	• Web VocabProfiles program by Cobb (2009)	• There was not any systematicity in test construction since different exams were evaluated. • Therefore, it could be suggested that these exams should be revised in order to provide consistent exams.
Laufer & Goldstein (2004)	Investigating vocabulary knowledge of learners in the line with progress in vocabulary size	To investigate whether four strength model was valid and which one correlated best with classroom language performance	• Bilingual computerized test	• There were differences in growth of vocabulary size.
Laufer et. al. (2004)	Investigating vocabulary knowledge of learners in the line with progress in vocabulary size	To evaluate vocabulary size dimension and vocabulary strength	• VLT • Four-way categorization model	• A learner's gains in vocabulary size have a possibility to change according to the applied strength mode.
Ho & Lien (2011)	Examining the depth of vocabulary knowledge	To assess the interconnection between the subjects' depth of vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension scores, between students' reading speed and their reading comprehension scores, and the performances of low and high achiever students.	• Depth of vocabulary measure • Reading comprehension test	• Depth of vocabulary knowledge was accepted as a good indicator of reading comprehension test performance.

Table 2.1. *Empirical studies on receptive vocabulary knowledge (Continues)*

Researcher(s)	Study	Aim(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Ehsanzadeh (2012)	Finding out the effects of vocabulary breadth and depth aspects on vocabulary knowledge	To find the size and depth aspects lexical range in second language lexical inference performance and incidental vocabulary acquisition regarding reading tasks	• VLT • WAT • VKS	• Depth of vocabulary knowledge was found to be a better indicator of second language inferential success when it was compared to breadth of vocabulary knowledge in terms of their significance in the study.
Hellman (2011)	Analysing the relationship between the breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge and native-like L2 lexical attainment	To determine the features having effects on second language lexical acquirement	• The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test • Self-Rated Vocabulary Test (SRVT) • WAT • Interviews	• The final lexical achievement was detected among adult-onset second language trainees, regardless of the age of onset of immersion in the target language.
Mehrpour et. al. (2011)	Revealing the relationship between the breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge and the reading comprehension of Iranian students of English as a foreign language	To focus on the relationship between the size and depth of vocabulary knowledge and the reading comprehension scores	• VLT • WAT • A reading comprehension test taken from a TOEFL exam	• A broader vocabulary caused a better understanding of a reading text.

Table 2.1. *Empirical studies on receptive vocabulary knowledge (Continues)*

Researcher(s)	Study	Aim(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Rashidi & Khosravi (2010)	Learning the relationship between depth and breadth, and reading performance including 71 Persian subjects in Iran	To investigate the relationship between depth and breadth of vocabulary knowledge and reading performance scores	• WAT • VLT • Reading Comprehension Test (RC)	• Deep knowledge of the vocabulary proved to be a possible predictor of a better understanding of reading compared to size.
Li & Kirby (2014)	Putting forward the relationship between receptive vocabulary knowledge and reading in English in Chinese context	To examine the relationship between depth and breadth of vocabulary and their possible impacts on various dimensions of reading in English.	• Vocabulary tests • Reading comprehension tests	• Depth and breadth of vocabulary were moderately related to each other, and these two dimensions had an effect on word reading; however, the effect of breadth of vocabulary was higher than the depth of vocabulary.

2.2.1.2. Measurement of receptive vocabulary knowledge

It is claimed that receptive dimensions of vocabulary knowledge are difficult to evaluate because of the limited valid and reliable instruments in the literature. Vocabulary Level Test (VLT) can be considered as the most popular instrument to determine how many words a learner knows (Yüksel & Durmuşoğlu, 2013). VLT was firstly improved by Nation (1990) but it was revised later by Schmitt et. al. (2001) four times. VLT includes 5 word-frequency bands evaluating vocabulary knowledge, which are 2000th level, 3000th level, 5000th level, academic word level, and 10,000th level.

The 2000th level test represents 1,986 word families coming from the General Service List (GSL) that was developed by West (1953) (West, 1953; as cited in Karakoç, 2016). GSL is accepted as enlightening list of the most commonly used words as part of English today (Nation & Waring, 1997). When it comes to the other levels; 3000th, 5000th, and 10,000th levels exemplify a sample of vocabulary items from the third, fifth and tenth 1000-word frequency bands which are based on the word list developed by Thorndike and Lorge (1944). Lastly, the academic word level includes the words selected from Academic Word List (AWL) developed by Coxhead (2000), and this list comprises 570 word families as Li and MacGregor suggested (2010).

Each of these bands contains six groups, and they include six words and three definitions. The students who are required to take the test need matching the words with the meanings. In each cluster, the parts of speech of the vocabulary items are the same and they are demonstrated as separate words instead of being in the context in order to avoid the possibility of the clues. The students do not need to remark other aspects of the words like collocation or grammatical pattern when they are answering the questions. VLT was designed to assess the students' size of vocabulary as a trait, not including any specific context of application so it is specifically launched out and intentional instrument (Read & Chapelle, 2001).

The leading cause why VLT is generally wanted to be utilized to evaluate receptive vocabulary knowledge is to present a prediction of the test-takers' size of vocabulary regarding each of frequency bands. Moreover, the information taken from this test may be used in pedagogical context by teachers or administrators (Karakoç, 2016). For example, they can make up their minds on suitable lexical resources related to language tasks according to the level of the students (Schmitt, Schmitt, & Clapham, 2001).

Although VLT is accepted as a famous instrument to evaluate vocabulary size, vocabulary depth has not been examined as the former one (Yüksel & Durmuşoğlu, 2013). Read (2000) introduced Word Associates Test (WAT) to investigate “paradigmatic and syntagmatic knowledge”. In WAT, target words consist of adjectives that are used frequently. The test contains two boxes with four words in each one. The words which are on the left box help test-takers to understand the definitions of the target word while the words which are on the right box show the collocations of the target word. Test-takers need to choose four words in left and right boxes totally; however, it does not have to be consistent number of true answers on left and right boxes.

2.2.2. Productive vocabulary knowledge

As it has been discussed before, most of the studies related to vocabulary have been conducted on receptive dimensions of vocabulary knowledge since receptive vocabulary knowledge gets ahead productive vocabulary knowledge in literature (Zhou, 2010). As a result of the researchers’ opinions, investigation of the students’ receptive vocabulary knowledge is not as complicated as the investigation of their productive vocabulary knowledge. However, productive vocabulary knowledge has more important aspects than receptive vocabulary knowledge. The reason for that is, a learner has a chance to prove his/her word knowledge through being actively participated in the production process (Yüksel & Durmuşoğlu, 2013).

Productive vocabulary knowledge needs to be measured by different types of tools since it is also fluctuant as a nature of itself, composing response words to stimuli and composing words in a composition are considered as various types of production; as a result of that, they are supposed to have different types of assessment tools. The productive version of VLT was introduced by Laufer and Nation (1995), and it was considered as an effective way to measure productive dimension including composing response words to stimuli. The test consists of the same word levels and the number of items; and these items include a sentence with a missing word but the initial letters of the words are given. The reason for the presented letters is to prevent participants from writing an alternative word fitting in the context and force them to find the target word (Waring, 1997). The test is accepted as a valid assessment tool of vocabulary size, and it makes differences among the participants of different proficiency levels of language (Laufer, 1998; Laufer & Nation, 1995).

Fan (2000) also implemented a research to reveal the gap between “active” and “passive” vocabulary utilizing the productive version of Vocabulary Levels Test. Active vocabulary means the usage of a word in a context which is created by learner while passive vocabulary infers understanding the definitions of common words in the target language (Laufer & Paribakht, 1998). To be able to implement his study, active and passive vocabulary of 103 first year students was evaluated. The aim of the study was to determine strategies of vocabulary learning to fill the gap between active and passive vocabulary. As instruments, two tests and a questionnaire were utilized, containing Word Level Test (Nation, 1990) with some alterations for passive vocabulary and the productive version of Vocabulary Levels Test in which participants required to present a word to complete a sentence for the active vocabulary. The findings of the study did not find out steady results concerning the relationship between language proficiency and active and passive vocabulary knowledge. To give an example, some of the students with higher language proficiency scores had less active vocabulary or vice versa. For the passive vocabulary knowledge, the situation is the same, as well. Nevertheless, seven vocabulary learning strategies were determined in order to have more active vocabulary knowledge. Some of them were stated as finding the meanings of the words in dictionaries, guessing the definitions from context, grouping words so as to learn by heart, repeating the words, subconsciously learning vocabulary with the help of playing games.

In the generating part of productive dimension, free productive assessment, in which the students utilize the words at their free will such as writing tasks was included. Lexical Frequency Profile (LFP) is used to measure that production parts (Laufer & Nation, 1995). In LFP, the proportion of high frequency general service and academic words in writing tasks are intended to be measured. LFP has been applied in many vocabulary knowledge studies as a tool of assessment. One of these studies was conducted by Lee and Muncie (2006) to examine secondary school students’ productive vocabulary. LFP was implemented as a tool of post reading composition task. The results presented that the identification of vocabulary and using them were promoted through discussion, negotiation, teachers’ explicit explanation and elicitation.

Free productive vocabulary knowledge can be evaluated through four of the most popular tools which are “lexical originality” (the number of tokens taken from a student’s writing task in a group are divided by the tokens of the total number), “lexical density” (the percentage of lexical words taken place in a text are split up by the tokens of the total

number), “lexical sophistication” (comparing the number of advanced words used in a composition and the number of total words) (Karakoç, 2016). LFP is consistent on essays with more than two hundred words (Laufer & Nation, 1995).

Assessing vocabulary in use provides a balanced framework about learners’ vocabulary knowledge; therefore, it must be accepted as a very important aspect in language learning and evaluating process (Read, 2000). To give an example, students’ lexical richness in writing skills can be measured by LFP and it enables the lexical wealth of a written text concerning the frequency bands. To put it differently, the total number of the vocabulary in the text is divided into frequency levels considering predetermined lists. According to the results, when the number of the words in a text increases their lexical richness rating also rises (Nation, 2007).

Laufer and Nation (1995) produced both Productive Vocabulary Level Test (PVLТ) and Lexical Frequency Profile (LFP) so as to evaluate students’ lexical performance; in other words, productive vocabulary knowledge is measured. Although both of the tests have been used as instruments of vocabulary knowledge in aforementioned studies, PVLТ is considered to have some limitations since it is regarded as a remembering word format test. As a consequence of this, it cannot be accepted as a productive test but receptive one because the initial letters of the target words are provided and the participants remembers the words and complete them (Webb, 2008). Moreover, Meara and Fritzpatrick (2000) also criticized PVLТ stating that it is suitable only for low-level students.

Because of these drawbacks of other instruments aimed to evaluate productive knowledge of vocabulary, this study applies VocabProfile BNC 20 since it provides a more detailed lexical profile so as to analyse learners’ productive vocabulary knowledge in their writing tasks such as paragraphs and essays. In this program, the text is supposed to be matched against twenty frequency lists based on British National Corpus (BNC). The outcomes of the analysis demonstrate the percentage and number of the words at each 1,000 of the twenty lists of 20,000 vocabulary items (Laufer, 2013).

The studies related to productive vocabulary knowledge are demonstrated in Table 2.2 including the information about researchers, the scope of the studies, aims, instruments and the findings.

Table 2.2. *Empirical studies on productive vocabulary knowledge*

Researcher(s)	Study	Aim(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Fan (2000)	Evaluating active and passive vocabulary knowledge of 103 first year students	To examine the gap between “active” and “passive” vocabulary	• Word Level Test(WLT) • Productive version of Vocabulary Levels Test	• The findings of the study did not find out steady results concerning the relationship between language proficiency and active and passive vocabulary knowledge.
Lee & Muncie (2006)	Examining secondary school students’ productive vocabulary.	To reveal the students’ productive vocabulary knowledge at a secondary school	• LFP • Reading composition task	• The results demonstrated that the identification of vocabulary and using them were promoted through discussion, negotiation, teachers’ explicit explanation and elicitation.

2.3. Empirical Studies on Receptive and Productive Aspects of Vocabulary Knowledge

Receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge of the learners was the main subject of many studies in the field (Webb, 2005; Zareva, 2005; Zhou, 2010).

To begin with, Zareva (2005) implemented a study to present the aim of recognizing the minimum set of lexical knowledge indicators that are considered to be as practical as the full model at estimating the detailed case of native speakers and second language learners' lexicon. Receptive and productive dimensions were analysed by participants' skills to identify a word and give definitions of it through presenting clarification, appropriate synonym and translation of the target word. As a result of the study, the model of Zareva (2005) can be used for contrasting L2 learners' lexical competence and native speakers' knowledge of word because this model enabled to produce unpredictable results through three groups.

Webb (2005) also conducted a study comparing receptive and productive vocabulary so as to learn the effects on vocabulary knowledge corresponding with reading and writing activities. Two experiments were implemented and they were different from others in which he assessed five aspects of vocabulary knowledge; meaning and grammatical patterns, orthography, syntax, association and form of the vocabulary via tests. The tests on receptive and productive vocabulary demonstrated significant outcomes on association, syntax, meaning, grammar and orthography. Nevertheless, productive tasks had more effects than receptive tasks in vocabulary learning.

In many studies, lexical diversity is predicted to obtain effects on learners' writing scores and the task quality. With respect to that, Lemmouh (2008) carried out a study with 37 participants consisting of advanced English students. Three tests were implemented in order to compare their lexical richness scores in their essays and their grades in addition to lesson grades and their word knowledge. Apart from the tests, a questionnaire with 14 item was utilized to the teachers grading the essays to reveal the significance of lexical richness in grading procedure for them. The results of the study found out that overall lesson grades and advanced vocabulary use in essays were correlated to each other. Moreover, teachers graded the essays giving importance to grammar and content rather than lexical features.

Douglas (2010) also studied lexical richness and its effects on students' academic success at university level. A writing test was included to assess the participants' academic achievement since he believed that writing skills must be accepted as a sample

of academic success. Lexical profiling instrument was implemented to calculate lexical richness in the study and the outcomes showed that lexical richness was effective in writing evaluation processing and academic success.

Furthermore, Yüksel and Durmuşoğlu (2013) conducted a study with freshman and senior students at university level in order to reveal learners' receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. The instruments that guided the study included VLT, WAT, LFP, and WordSmith Tools in addition to a paragraph writing task. The results showed that the participants' lexical competence was larger than their lexical performance and these two dimensions had impacts on one another.

Moreover, Zhong (2014) examined the internal form of vocabulary knowledge under the terms of receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge as a multi-aspect framework. The aim of the study was to look at the receptive knowledge of some aspects as meaning, form, morphology, collocation and association. The relationship between these aspects and productive vocabulary knowledge were also included to be dealt with as an aim of the research. The participants of the study comprised of 523 EFL high school students in China. Five different vocabulary tests were implemented adopting multi-task approach. The results pointed out that the more students' vocabulary knowledge improved the more their receptive knowledge including all the aspects showed a consistent quantity of alteration in productive vocabulary knowledge. Furthermore, participants' productive vocabulary knowledge affected the collocation and association more than other dimensions in their receptive knowledge. All in all, the study provided a different point of view regarding the progressional pattern from receptive vocabulary to productive vocabulary. It also displayed a correlation between receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge overtly.

The impact of vocabulary knowledge on writing, reading and proficiency scores was examined by Karakoç (2016) in a Turkish context with preparatory school students. This research study examined the connection between receptive and productive knowledge. The relationships between reading performance and receptive vocabulary knowledge and writing performance and productive vocabulary knowledge were aimed to be discussed. As instruments of the study, vocabulary level tests, a reading exam and a writing exam were utilized and their scores were evaluated. LFP also was implemented to find out lexical level of the participants' essays. According to the analysis, the effects of vocabulary knowledge to the participants' performances on reading, writing and

proficiency exams were significant. Moreover, it was found out that the students' productive vocabulary knowledge and the lexical level of their essays were related with each other.

Tömen (2016) also applied a study to be able to evaluate participants' vocabulary size, lexical density and lexical diversity in Turkish context. The participants of the study included 309 freshmen and senior students from English Language Teaching department. Argumentative essays and writing scores of the students were used as the instruments of the study. In data analysis part, LFP was utilized. Considering the outcomes, it could be reached that lexical features did not directly affect the students' writing scores.

Similarly, another study was implemented at higher education level in Turkish context by Kalay (2017). 371 preparatory school students attended the study and they were given three different instruments as VLT, WAT and a writing task. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the participants' receptive vocabulary knowledge including size and depth and productive vocabulary knowledge containing writing skill. The results implied that the learners' lexical competence and performance are interconnected.

Table 2.3. *Empirical studies on receptive and productive aspects of vocabulary knowledge*

Researcher(s)	Study	Aim(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Zareva (2005)	Recognizing the minimum set of lexical knowledge indicators that could be as practical as the full model at estimating the detailed case of native speakers and second language learners' lexicon.	To analyse receptive and productive aspects to identify a word and give definitions of them	• Clarification, appropriate synonym and translation of the target word in the given task	• The model of Zareva (2005) could be used for contrasting L2 learners' lexical competence and native speakers' knowledge of word because this model enabled to produce unpredictable results among the participants.
Webb (2005)	Comparing receptive and productive vocabulary	In order to learn their effects on word knowledge corresponding with reading and writing activities	• Receptive and productive vocabulary tests	• Productive tasks had more effects than receptive tasks in vocabulary learning.
Lemmouh (2008)	Evaluating lexical diversity and the learners' writing scores and quality of the task	To reveal whether lexical diversity is predicted to have effects on learners' writing scores and quality of the task	• Vocabulary tests • Questionnaire • The students' essays and their grades	• Overall lesson grades and advanced vocabulary use in essays were correlated to each other.
Yüksel and Durmuşoğlu (2013)	Revealing the learners' receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge at the university level.	To discover the students' lexical competence and performance	• VLT • WAT • LFP • WordSmith Tools • Writing a paragraph task	• The participants' lexical competence and performance had impacts on each other. High and low frequent words showed the effect of vocabulary frequency levels.

Table 2.3. *Empirical studies on receptive and productive aspects of vocabulary knowledge (Continues)*

Researcher(s)	Study	Aim(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Douglas (2010)	Assessing lexical richness and its effects on students' academic success at university level.	To determine the lexical richness and its effects on the learners regarding their academic success	• A writing test • Lexical profiling instrument	• Lexical richness was effective in writing evaluation processing and academic success.
Zhong (2014)	Recognizing the internal form of vocabulary knowledge under the terms of receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge as a multi-aspect framework	To look at the receptive knowledge of some aspects as meaning, form, morphology, collocation and association.	• Five different vocabulary tests	• The more students' vocabulary knowledge improved the more their receptive knowledge including all the aspects showed a consistent amount of alteration in productive vocabulary knowledge.
Karakoç (2016)	Examining the impact of vocabulary knowledge on writing, reading and proficiency scores in a Turkish context with preparatory school students	To focus on the relationship between the receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge, and their effects on reading performances	• Vocabulary knowledge tests • A reading exam • A writing exam	• The contribution of vocabulary knowledge to the foreign language performances of reading, writing and proficiency was significant. • Lexical level of the essays and the students' productive vocabulary knowledge were related to each other.
Tömen (2016)	Evaluating the participants' vocabulary size, lexical density and lexical diversity in Turkish context.	To shed light to the relationships among vocabulary knowledge aspects involving size of vocabulary, lexical density and diversity	• Argumentative essays • Writing scores of the students • LFP • Vocd-D • Lexical density formula	• Lexical features are not accepted as the only factors having impact on writing scores.
Kalay (2017)	Evaluating the students' receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge	To find out the relationship between the participants' receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge	• VLT • WAT • A writing task	• Receptive and productive dimensions of vocabulary knowledge have effects on each other.

2.4. Academic Lexical Competence and Performance

Academic vocabulary consists of words that are common in academic genres but not in the other types of texts. They are considered as the words taking place in academic speeches like lectures, academic reading texts and academic writing (Coxhead & Nation, 2001). Academic words present to define, describe, enhance, and evaluate abstract aspects like theories and hypotheses (Cobb & Horst, 2004). Because of the abstract definitions, language learners may have some difficulties while mastering academic words. Therefore, these words have a crucial role in vocabulary knowledge, especially for the advanced learners of the language. Academic vocabulary helps students to understand academic discourse in general because they need them at university level regardless of their discipline.

Academic vocabulary lists are combined from several selections of academic texts so as to determine the most important words in academic contexts. Among these lists, Academic Word List (AWL) which was developed by Coxhead (2000) is accepted as the most popular, useful and referred compilation in literature. AWL involves 570 word families, in which each one including headword. The headwords were chosen based on occurring a hundred times at minimum in an academic corpus of 3.600,000 words of several genres (Yüksel & Durmuşoğlu, 2013). It also consists of between 15 and 28 disciplines under the four subjects grouping of corpus, which are named as law, arts, commerce and science (Coxhead, 2000). As a result of that, AWL is regarded to cover nearly 90% of the running words in academic text.

2.4.1. Empirical studies on academic lexical competence and performance

The researchers in the field conducted several studies related to the students' academic lexical competence and performance. To begin with, the students' depth of second language academic vocabulary knowledge at a university level was examined by Santos (2010). The impacts of academic vocabulary knowledge on size of second language vocabulary knowledge and their mother tongue skills were aimed to be analysed. As a result of the study, academic vocabulary was found as problematic and a direct relationship was determined between the students' breadth and depth of academic vocabulary and their mother tongue skills. In other words, the students have weak academic vocabulary knowledge when their L1 and L2 academic skills are low.

To illustrate another empirical study on this topic, Zhou (2010) implemented a research study to investigate and make comparison between Chinese students receptive and productive academic vocabulary knowledge in EFL classes. It was also aimed to revise the implications for academic vocabulary teaching in classes. As instruments, VLT (Schmitt et. al., 2001) and another test developed by the researcher were applied to evaluate productive vocabulary. The findings revealed that high level of receptive academic vocabulary size caused larger productive academic knowledge among the students. Academic vocabulary knowledge in receptive dimension rises at a higher amount when it was compared to productive knowledge, as well.

There are several studies claiming that academic vocabulary has a key role on vocabulary learning process, especially the words from AWL in order to provide learners academic achievement at university level (Morris & Cobb, 2004; Coxhead & Nation, 2001; Cobb & Horst, 2000; Laufer & Paribakht, 1998; Laufer & Nation, 1995;). These studies had a common result, which demonstrated that students had better academic performances on the condition that they could utilize academic vocabulary in an effective way.

The applicability of AWL to different kinds of disciplines was studied by several researchers in different fields such as engineering, anatomy, applied linguistics, business and finance. The findings of these researches showed that AWL basically includes common vocabulary across all these areas. It can be accepted that it reaches to a large extent (Mudraya, 2006; Chung & Nation, 2003).

In addition to written discourse, AWL has been implemented in spoken discourse as well. Hincks (2003) conducted a study regarding learners' second language presentations about technical issues and analysed them through AWL. In different field, Thomson (2006) investigated lectures in economics at university levels. The results of the studies revealed that students' spoken discourse were covered in AWL to large extent.

Table 2.4. *Empirical studies on academic vocabulary knowledge*

Researcher(s)	Study	Aim(s)	Instrument(s)	Related Findings
Santos (2010)	Examining students' depth of second language academic vocabulary knowledge at a university level	To learn the effects of academic vocabulary knowledge on size of second language vocabulary knowledge and their mother tongue skills	• VLT	• The students have weak academic vocabulary knowledge when their L1 and L2 academic skills are low.
Zhou (2010)	Investigating and making comparison of receptive and productive academic vocabulary knowledge of Chinese students in English as a foreign language classes	To revise the implications for academic vocabulary teaching in classes	• VLT • Another test developed by the researcher	• High level of receptive academic vocabulary size caused larger productive academic knowledge among the students.
Hincks (2003)	Regarding learners' second language presentations about technical issues	To analyse the students' academic word use in their presentations	• AWL analysis	• The students' spoken discourse were covered in AWL to large extent.
Thomson (2006)	Examining lectures in economics at university levels	To find out the students' academic word use in lectures	• AWL analysis	• The students' spoken discourse were covered in AWL to large extent.

2.5. Significance of Related Literature on the Current Study

The importance of vocabulary knowledge in language learning process has gained awareness; therefore, many studies related to learning and teaching vocabulary have been carried out.

According to the studies regarding learners' receptive vocabulary knowledge, it could be concluded that the size and depth of vocabulary knowledge of students are related to each other. Moreover, depth of vocabulary could be considered as a better indicator on students' vocabulary knowledge than size of vocabulary as a result of the outcomes of the research studies.

Moreover, productive vocabulary knowledge of learners could be considered as an effective aspect of language learning. The results of the studies proved that students' receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge had impacts on each other.

Apart from them, students' academic vocabulary knowledge could be also divided as receptive and productive; and they affected each other in the vocabulary learning process.

The high and low frequent words and academic words were the focus of the several studies. It has been concluded that the word frequency level is a significant factor in the process of vocabulary learning. Among the word frequency levels, academic vocabulary knowledge has been also given importance since it is necessary for the academic achievement in language learning.

All of the studies mentioned in literature containing theoretical and empirical ones have constituted the basis of the present study. Thus, the current study intended to investigate the receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge involving general and academic vocabulary at the university level.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will present research design, research setting, the participants of the study and the instruments implemented in the study.

3.1. Research Design

The current study aims to investigate Turkish preparatory school students' lexical competence and performance including both general and academic aspects. In the present study, a quantitative research design was used. In quantitative research design, the conductor of the research chooses the topic to be studied, demands questions which are specific and narrow, gathers numeric data from the participants of the study and analyses them applying the statistics, and lastly administrates the inquiry in an objective manner (Creswell, 2005).

The study was designed as a descriptive and correlation study. The objective was to identify and find out the participants' general and academic lexical competence and performance in overall state within the scope proposed in the study. Another point emphasized in the study was the correlation among the variables.

3.2. Research Setting

The study was carried out at Kütahya Dumlupınar University (KDPU), School of Foreign Languages (SFL). The medium of instruction at KDPU is Turkish. At SFL, English preparatory class is compulsory only for the students of English Language and Literature, Elementary Maths Teaching, and Electrical and Electronic Engineering programs. Apart from that, the students from other programs can also attend to preparatory class if they wish. When these students register for preparation school program, they are also required to fulfil all the necessities for that program as the obligatory students.

Students take English lessons for two terms in an academic year intensively at SFL. The students who are obliged to study at SFL are supposed to take a proficiency exam at the start of the fall term. On the condition that they take at least 65 points out of 100, they are considered as successful and pass the exam. Thus, they are able to start their own departments directly. The students who fail and the ones who attend to preparatory class voluntarily are required to take a placement exam in order to be placed at appropriate

levels from elementary to pre-intermediate. At the end of the academic year, all the students are required to be at intermediate level. Elementary level students' classes are called as EPI, which means that they cover elementary, pre-intermediate and intermediate books. Pre-intermediate level students' classes are called as PI, which means that they cover pre-intermediate and intermediate books. In addition to the two levels, students of the English Language and Literature department are placed in a different class, which is called as LIT. Their levels are intermediate. LIT students are supposed to cover intermediate and upper-intermediate books, and the exams they take during the year are different from the other levels. At the end of the year, proficiency exam for these students is also different from the other students' proficiency exam because they cover different levels of books and they are being prepared to get ready for their departments following year; therefore, they are exposed to more academic English at preparation school than the other students from different departments.

SFL gives four main courses to the students: *Main Course*, *Reading and Writing*, *Listening and Speaking*, and *Exam Skills* (only for elementary level students). Additionally, they take a 3-hour lesson for a foreign language apart from English, such as *German*, *Russian*, *Italian*, *French*, or *Japanese*. These lessons are not obligatory as well. The coursebook followed (*New English File by Oxford*) is a communicative one, and specifically places emphasis on listening and speaking skills as well as reading and writing skills and grammar. Skills books also supplement the course book (*Q skills for Success by Oxford*) for *Reading and Writing*, and *Listening and Speaking* courses separately.

3.3. Participants

In the current study, convenience sampling method was implemented; therefore, the participants of the study were chosen regarding their availability, convenience, and representing the features of target group (Cresswell, 2005). Accordingly, among three level of students at preparatory class, LIT level students were determined to be studied. LIT level included all English Language and Literature students; therefore, they were considered as the most advanced students in English among the all levels.

At the outset of the study, there were initially 100 students to participate in the study; yet, 6 students dropped out of the school. Therefore, the population of the study decreased and was determined as 94 students.

All participants in the study were Turkish students learning English as a foreign language. The students attended the proficiency exam; yet, they were not able to pass it. Their proficiency levels were determined as intermediate, which were defined at the beginning of the academic year through the placement exam at KDPU SFL.

Taking into account that English Language and Literature department would be compelling, an exclusive schedule focusing on advanced grammar and academic skills was designed for these students. As regards this program, LIT students take 24-hour English courses in a week during the academic year. The lessons they take are *Main Course*, *Reading and Writing*, and *Listening and Speaking* courses. In *Main Course* lessons, the focus is on grammar topics. In *Reading and Writing* lessons, the learners study reading texts and they also learn to write different kinds of paragraphs as descriptive, opinion, response, explanatory and argumentative ones. Accordingly, they are required to write a paragraph suitable to the genre that they study in each unit. All of the students have to keep a writing portfolio including the paragraphs that they write. They also get points from these writing tasks and the instructors of the lesson give them feedback on their tasks. On the other hand, the students are supposed to deal with listening exercises and perform speaking tasks in *Listening and Speaking* lessons, which aim to develop the students' communicative abilities and listening skills. The students are supposed to perform speaking tasks related to covered units in the book and they get points from them. This procedure is also carried out by the instructor of *Listening and Speaking* lesson.

3.4. Instruments

The focus of the present study is to evaluate the students' general and academic lexical competence and performance. Therefore, different instruments were implemented to answer the research questions posed.

3.4.1. Instruments to measure receptive vocabulary knowledge

Vocabulary knowledge has complicated nature itself (Laufer & Nation, 1999), so using diverse instruments in studies has become popular. It is commonly accepted that using different measures of vocabulary knowledge is considered as essential in order to have better comprehension of allied dimensions of lexical knowledge (Laufer, 1998). Thus, Laufer (1998) introduced the "Multiple Test Approach" because vocabulary

knowledge cannot be measured by a single test which doesn't include both vocabulary size and depth evaluation. The results of the tests can show a comprehensive framework of students' vocabulary consisting of various levels of language development. Therefore, the "Multiple Test Approach" was adopted in order to have better visions to assess the interconnected dimensions of lexical knowledge so that different tools of vocabulary knowledge essentialness can be met regarding the students' vocabulary profile at different levels of language development.

Accordingly, different kinds of data collection tools provide validity and reliability of the study; thus, two particular instruments were applied to assess the lexical competence including size and depth of vocabulary knowledge constructs.

3.4.1.1. Vocabulary level test

The lattermost version of Vocabulary Level Test (VLT) improved by Schmitt et. al. (2001) was administrated in order to evaluate the size of vocabulary; in other words, receptive aspect of lexical competence (Appendix A). This test composes of all five-word frequency bands: 2000th level, 3000th level, 5000th level, 10000th level as well as academic vocabulary level. This was the reason why this test was chosen regarding its coverage which was broader than the other alternatives.

The test wanted to learn about the participants' initial knowledge concerning the meaning sense of words in the test. Moreover, the test contains academic vocabulary chosen from AWL, which makes the test different from others in the area.

In scoring process of the VLT, each true answer was evaluated with one point. 2000th level, 3000th level, and 5000th level parts comprise of 30; 10000th level part includes 24; and academic vocabulary level part contains 36 items. It signifies that 150 can be counted as the maximum score for the whole test.

In the test, the students are supposed to match the target vocabulary with three definitions as in the following example;

1. *copy*
2. *even* _____ *end of highest point*
3. *motor* _____ *this moves a car*
4. *pity* _____ *thing made to be like another*
5. *profit*
6. *tip*

The correct answers for this example would be;

1. *copy*
2. *even* ____ **6** ____ *end of highest point*
3. *motor* ____ **3** ____ *this moves a car*
4. *pity* ____ **1** ____ *thing made to be like another*
5. *profit*
6. *tip*

As it can be seen above, the items in the test are designed in clusters and each one includes six words with three choices of definitions. In the format of this test, Schmitt et. al. (2001) explained three basic applications. Firstly, target vocabulary items should be given in their base forms. Secondly, vocabulary items in the definitions are more common than target ones along with being short and simple to read. Lastly, target vocabulary items are placed randomly and in alphabetical and length order so as to prevent wild guessing of meanings of the words.

VLT was validated by expert opinions in the context of the present study. On the other hand, the reliability of VLT was determined as .88 with Cronbach alpha in this current study.

3.4.1.2. Word associates test

Word Associates Test (WAT) advanced by Read (2000) was applied so as to determine the depth aspect of lexical competence (Appendix B). Lexical quality is evaluated regarding the correct associational links which are determined by the participants. Three kinds of associations are determined consisting of paradigmatic, syntagmatic, and analytic associations. Paradigmatic association means that two words have similar or the same meanings; syntagmatic association means that two words are collocated; and lastly analytic association means that the word is regarded as a part of the definition which occurs in dictionary.

In this test, there are eight words apart from the target words; four of them are semantically related to target words; and the other four words are not related. The aim of the participants who take this test is to find related words. In grading process of WAT, subjects' answers are typed on "<http://www.lex tutor.ca/tests/associates/>" website one by

one. The grading procedure indicates that 160 is accepted as the maximum score of this test, as each correct answer equals to 1 point.

Here is a sample item in this test;

1. *sudden*

☐ beautiful ☐ quick ☐ surprising ☐ thirsty	☐ change ☐ doctor ☐ noise ☐ school
--	--

The correct answers for this example would be;

1. *sudden*

☐ beautiful ☒ quick ☒ surprising ☐ thirsty	☒ change ☐ doctor ☒ noise ☐ school
--	--

The words on the left side describes the definition of “sudden” and the words on the right side can be collocations of “sudden”. Therefore, sudden may mean “quick” or “surprising” on the left side. On the other hand, “change” and “noise” can come after sudden so they are the correct answers. However, there is not consistent number of correct answers on the left or right side; participants should choose four related words with the target word randomly.

The reliability of WAT was determined as .92 with Cronbach alpha and the validity of the study was confirmed as valid as a result of expert opinions in the context of the present study.

3.4.2. Instruments for measuring productive vocabulary knowledge

Productive vocabulary knowledge could be assessed through writing and speaking tasks. After the participants fulfilled these tasks, LFP was implemented to determine the frequency bands of the used words. They will be discussed under the separate headings in the study.

3.4.2.1. Writing and speaking tasks

Participants’ lexical performances were examined with the help of an assigned writing task and a speaking task through lexical frequency profile analysis. Writing tasks were preferred to be used in several studies since it is an efficient way to evaluate the productive dimension of vocabulary knowledge (Muncie, 2002). In this study, writing an opinion paragraph was chosen as the writing task to determine the participants’ academic lexical performance (Appendix C). The topic of writing task was “How to make a good

first impression” and the students were to write an opinion paragraph about this topic including a topic sentence, supporting sentences, details, and a concluding sentence. The word limit for this task was determined as approximately 150 words.

The students learned how to write an opinion paragraph in their *Reading and Writing* courses and they were supposed to write paragraphs with using 120-150 words in their portfolios. That’s why, the writing task was designed as an opinion paragraph with nearly 150 words as the students were accustomed to that procedure. The researcher chose this task because the students were familiar with the topic as they studied it in their *Reading and Writing* lessons. Being familiar with the topic affects students’ tendency to negotiate meaning (Ellis, 2003); by this way, they can use their knowledge of vocabulary in the production part.

Vocabulary knowledge has an important role in producing an utterance with suitable meanings (Koizumi & In’nami, 2013). Levelt (1989) and Karmos (2006) also defined three parts of speech productions which are named as conceptualization, formulation, and articulation. In the conceptualization stage, speakers constitute preverbal messages. In the formulation stage, they try to find essential words from the mental lexicon. Finally, in the last stage, they can utter the speech as a result of formulation including syntactic and phonological information. Hence, necessity of size and depth of vocabulary in speaking in addition to lexical performance are the key factors to be examined.

Putting an emphasis on the importance of speaking skill as a part of productive vocabulary knowledge, a speaking task was also given to the subjects to evaluate their speaking performance with regards to their productive vocabulary skills. The speaking task was designed as face to face oral interviews composed of some questions for interviewees to answer (Appendix E). The participants were supposed to talk about “Change” by answering sub-questions such as;

- Is change good or bad? How?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of change? Can you give examples?
- What is the biggest change in your life? Can you describe it?

The topic was chosen from the book they have covered in *Listening and Speaking* lesson; therefore, they were already familiar with the subject. They were expected to talk almost 2 minutes covering all these questions including details and examples about the topic. In *Listening and Speaking* courses, the students had already performed speaking

tasks including face-to-face interviews. The reason why face-to-face oral interviews were chosen was the participants' familiarity with the task. The participants already knew what they were supposed to do so that they could produce the vocabulary to perform the speaking task without any preparation.

3.4.2.2. *Lexical frequency profile*

The evaluation procedure of productive vocabulary in writing tasks causes controversies because researchers can't agree on which aspects of vocabulary should be measured (Muncie, 2002). Lexical originality, lexical diversity and lexical variations are among the evaluated aspects; however, there are several drawbacks of them regarding their validity and reliability (Laufer & Nation, 1995). Therefore, Lexical Frequency Profile (LFP) was introduced by Laufer and Nation (1995) as their own measurement to be able to evaluate productive vocabulary knowledge.

Therefore, LFP was implemented in order to assess the participants' both writing and speaking tasks. To find out the participants' lexical use, Vocabprofile which is accessible on "www.lextutor.ca/" was carried out. To operate Vocabprofile, a LFP test, a text is entered on it. After that, text analysis consisted of the rates of type/token ratio and word families are enabled regarding four different frequency levels including 1k (1 to 1000), 2k (1001 to 2000), off-list and academic word level (AWL) words in English. In operating procedure of LFP, the texts should include at least 200 tokens in order to be typed into the program. Then, word forms should be recognized as members of word families, containing base forms, inflections and affixes (Laufer & Nation, 1995). After that, the word families in the texts and word frequency lists are compared with each other to form the productive vocabulary profile. LFP analysis sample output is shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1. *A sample output of LFP analysis*

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000)	64	75	160	87.91%
Function	...	...	(93)	(51.10%)
Content	...	...	(67)	(36.81%)
K2 Words (1001-2000)	6	6	7	3.85%
1k+2k			...	(91.76%)
AWL Words	4	4	5	2.75%
Off-list Words	?	6	10	5.49%
	74+?	91	182	100%

As Table 3.1 shows, the participants' vocabulary knowledge is evaluated by examining percentages of their K1 words, K2 words, 1k + 2k words, AWL words and off-list words. The percentages are demonstrated separately in the right box under the current profile part as well. The original format of a sample output of LFP analysis was given in appendices (Appendix G).

Laufer (2005) carried out a study to assure the reliability of LFP and it was clear that LFP enabled similar outcomes for different proficiency levels. Furthermore, the validity of LFP was detected by the coverage of words in the word lists. It was argued that applying 3000 *head words* which are grouped into *word families* will increase the coverage and this situation causes a rise in its validity (Coniam, 2007).

The measurements used in the present study are summarized in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2. *The data collection tools implemented in the study*

	Data collection tool	Aspects to be measures	What is assessed?	Anticipations from subjects
LEXICAL COMPETENCE	Vocabulary Level Test (VLT) (Schmitt et. al., 2001)	Receptive vocabulary knowledge (size)	The amount of words a student knows	To link with the words, chosen from 2000th, 3000th, 5000th, AWL and 10000th frequency levels, with three meanings of them
	Word Associates Test (Read, 2000)	Receptive vocabulary knowledge (depth)	How well a student notice the vocabulary	To detect the words that are semantically linked with the target vocabulary
LEXICAL PERFORMANCE	Opinion essays, Speaking tasks	Lexical use	The amount of productive vocabulary used in writing	To write opinion essays including at least 150 words according to the assigned topic; to perform given speaking task
FURTHER ANALYSIS ON ACADEMIC VOCABULARY	Vocabulary Level Test (Academic Vocabulary Level Part) (Schmitt et. al., 2001)	Receptive vocabulary knowledge (academic vocabulary knowledge – size)	The amount of academic vocabulary that a student knows	To link the vocabulary, chosen from AWL with three definitions
	Opinion essays, Speaking tasks	Lexical use	The number of productive words used in writing	To write opinion essays including at least 150 words according to the assigned topic; to perform given speaking task

As Table 3.2 demonstrates, the students' size and depth of general and academic vocabulary knowledge were measured through VLT, in which the vocabulary and the meanings were supposed to be matched in different frequency bands consisting of 2000th, 3000th, 5000th, AWL, and 10000th levels. By this way, how many words the learners know came to light. The depth of vocabulary knowledge of the participants was evaluated through WAT, in which the students were required to find semantically related words with the target words. With the help of this test, how well the learners know the target

words was concluded. On the other hand, as productive skills of the students, opinion essays for writing skills and speaking tasks for speaking skills were implemented to reveal the number of productive vocabulary use of the students. Hereby, the students' productive vocabulary knowledge containing general and academic aspects aimed to be determined.

3.5. Data Collection Procedure

The data were collected from the participants in the spring term in 2019. The researcher obtained the necessary permission from Anadolu University ethical committee (Appendix I) and management of School of Foreign Languages at Kütahya Dumlupınar University (Appendix J) for the purpose of gathering data to carry out the current study. Moreover, the researcher received permission from the teachers of the participants to use their lesson time so as to implement the instruments.

The Vocabulary Level Test and Word Associates Test were distributed to the subjects during the regular class hour. Before distributing the test, the researcher explained the aim of the study to the participants. After that, the students completed the consent forms (Appendix H) to indicate that they were volunteer to take these tests in the study. The students weren't allowed to use any kind of dictionaries and ask someone the meaning of words in the class while answering the questions. It was conducted like an exam procedure. Firstly, they were supposed to do VLT in one class hour (50 minutes) and after 10 minutes-break, they were assumed to do WAT in another class hour.

After the implementation of VLT and WAT, the participants were to write an opinion paragraph about "How to make a good first impression" in the following day. The students weren't allowed to use dictionaries or any other materials to help them so they did this task in an exam procedure as well. The time given to the participants was one class hour again.

Later, the participants were asked to perform the speaking tasks another day in the same week. In the speaking task, the students were allowed to speak individually about the given task. The topic of the speaking task was determined as "Change" and the participants were supposed to talk about it. They were also familiar with this topic concerning their *Listening and Speaking* lessons. The speaking tasks were implemented in a class one by one and each task lasted nearly 2 minutes. In the procedure of speaking performance, the participants were asked to introduce themselves as a preparation part and then they were supposed to talk about the given task. While they were speaking, their

voices were tape recorded by the researcher. In the classroom, there was only the student who was performing the task and the researcher as the interviewer. After the student finished the task, she or he left the classroom and the next student came in the classroom. The researcher did not interrupt the students' speeches; however, she asked some sub-questions related to topic in order to make the students speak more. The advantages and disadvantages of change, the biggest change in their life are the sub-topics mentioned in the task. After all these steps finished, the audio records were transcribed by the researcher.

3.6. Data Analysis

Instruments were collected from the participants and they were evaluated according to their grading procedure of the tools. VLT was graded regarding the five frequency bands as well as the whole score. On the other hand, WAT was evaluated by typing the responses on "<http://www.lex tutor.ca/tests/associates/>" website one by one. Moreover, opinion paragraphs were typed into the computer (Appendix D), and then entered on VocabProfile separately. In addition to them, speaking performances of the students as a result of implementing speaking tasks were transcribed (Appendix F) and then entered on VocabProfile individually like opinion paragraphs. After that, they were analysed through the program as the same procedure as opinion paragraphs.

As a result of these steps, students' VLT scores with five different levels and a total score, their WAT scores, their writing and speaking tasks' outcomes through VocabProfile as four different levels were determined. All these data gathered from the instruments were analysed with the help of Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS).

An overall sight of subjects' vocabulary size (VLT), depth (WAT), and lexical use (speaking and writing) were determined through descriptive statistics. In addition, a Pearson's correlation test was implemented in order to analyse the correlation among all the instruments.

The data analysis concerning the research questions are shown in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3. *Data analysis procedure according to research questions*

Research Question	Instrument	Analysis
<i>Participants' size of general vocabulary knowledge</i>	Vocabulary Level Test (VLT)	Descriptive Statics for total score and for each frequency band
<i>Participants' depth of general vocabulary knowledge</i>	Word Associates Test (WAT)	Descriptive Statistics for total score
<i>Participants' size of academic vocabulary knowledge</i>	Academic vocabulary section of VLT	Descriptive Statistics for total score
<i>Participants' general lexical performance</i>	Opinion essays, Speaking tasks, Lexical Frequency Profile (Vocabprofile)	Descriptive Statistics about general vocabulary use at the output of Vocabprofile
<i>Participants' academic lexical performance</i>	Opinion essays, Speaking tasks, Lexical Frequency Profile (Vocabprofile)	Descriptive Statistics about general vocabulary use at theoutput of Vocabprofile
<i>Correlation of participants' lexical competence and performance</i>	All instruments	Pearson's correlation test

As Table 3.3 indicates, the subjects' lexical competences including general and academic aspects were aimed to be learned by the first research question of the current study. Vocabulary size and depth of the learners were also purposed to be discovered. Therefore, VLT was utilized for size of vocabulary knowledge, and WAT was used for depth of vocabulary knowledge of the students. Size of academic vocabulary knowledge of the participants was also measured by academic vocabulary level section of VLT. To analyse the results, descriptive statistics were implemented. To answer the second research question, the students' general and academic lexical performance were evaluated by opinion essays, speaking tasks, and LFP. Firstly, the data taken from the opinion essays and speaking tasks were assessed with the help of LFP. Later, the output taken from LFP was measured through descriptive statistics. The third research question of the study is to find out the relationship between lexical competence and performance of the participants. Thus, a Pearson's correlation test was run to check the possible relationship.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In this chapter, the findings that were obtained by the analyses of the data will be presented. Firstly, the results on lexical competence of the participants will be included. Under the title of lexical competence of the participants, their size and depth of general and academic vocabulary knowledge will be mentioned separately. Later, overall lexical competence will be added.

Next, the results on the lexical performance of the participants will be presented. Under the title of lexical performance of the participants, their use of general and academic word knowledge will be discussed. As sub-headings of the use of vocabulary, the students' productive vocabulary knowledge on speaking tasks and writing tasks will be presented separately. After that, results pertaining to overall lexical performance will be given.

Lastly, the findings related to the interconnection between the learners' lexical competence and performance will be presented to shed light on the outcomes in detail.

4.1. Findings on Lexical Competence of the Participants

“What is the level of students' general and academic lexical competence?” is the first research question in this study. It involves students' size and depth of receptive vocabulary knowledge. Initially, this question was answered through the analysis of lexical competence.

4.1.1. Size of general and academic vocabulary knowledge

The sub-questions of the first research question are “What is Turkish preparatory students' size of general vocabulary knowledge?” and “What is Turkish preparatory students' size of academic vocabulary knowledge?” They mean how many words the students know regarding general and academic vocabulary in English. In order to reveal that, VLT was given to the participants. According to the outcomes, the subjects' scores for general vocabulary knowledge from VLT included four different levels as 2000th, 3000th, 5000th, 10000th and their scores for academic vocabulary knowledge were evaluated with the academic vocabulary level part. In addition to these levels, total scores were also measured. The 2000th, 3000th, and 5000th level tests were graded out of 30

points; academic word level test was graded out of 36 and 10000th level test was graded out of 24 points. The total grade was determined as 150.

Table 4.1 demonstrates the outcomes of VLT.

Table 4.1. *Descriptive statistics of Vocabulary Level Test*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
VLT_2000	94	13	30	25,84	3,112
VLT_3000	94	7	30	23,37	4,300
VLT_ACADEMIC	94	9	36	28,01	5,155
VLT_5000	94	0	30	18,33	6,339
VLT_10000	94	0	22	6,77	5,200
VLT_TOTAL	94	54	137	102,44	18,568

Considering the scores shown in Table 4.1, the subjects' vocabulary knowledge was the highest point at 2000th level (M = 25,84) and the lowest point at 10000th level (M = 6,77). According to the table, when the levels rise, the scores of the students fall because 2000th level contains the highest frequent level of words whereas 10000th level includes the lowest frequent level of words. Therefore, it could be stated that the students knew low level of vocabulary knowledge more than high levels. Apart from that, academic vocabulary level (M = 28,01) showed that the participants were also familiar with academic words. 5000th level (M = 18,33) and the 10000th level (M = 6,77) were the bands that the participants had difficulties to choose the correct words and got lower scores comparing to other bands.

Moreover, the total score of VLT implied that the students' size of vocabulary knowledge was more than half of the words (M = 102,44).

According to the results, it could be seen that apart from 10000th level, there were students who got the highest point in the test. There were also students who got zero point from 5000th and 10000th level sections, which displayed that they did not know any of the words in these sections. In 5000th level, only one student got zero point out of 30; and five students took zero point out of 24 in 10000th level section as well.

The number of the students who got highest scores in 2000th level was four; in 3000th level was five; in academic level was two; in 5000th level was two; however, there were no students who got the highest score in 10000th level section. In total scores, none

of the participants reached the highest score as well. There were 11 students among 94 participants who took at least 125 points out of 150.

All in all, the analyses on VLT scores regarding frequency levels indicated that the students who took the test noticed more than half of the words in high frequent level and academic word level; nonetheless, they could not show the same success in lower frequency vocabulary items such as 5000th and 10000th levels. The participants were thought to know most of the vocabulary items that they came across continually; however, their recognition of the words became less when the words became less frequent.

In the first part of the analysis on lexical competence, the learners' size of vocabulary knowledge including both general and academic was investigated through frequency bands and overall knowledge of the words. The findings present that frequency of vocabulary was found as an effective factor in finding out the learners' vocabulary size. To conduct more research about the subjects' receptive vocabulary knowledge, the depth of vocabulary was also investigated as the second part of the analysis.

4.1.2. Depth of general vocabulary knowledge

The other sub-question of the first research question is "What is Turkish preparatory students' depth of general vocabulary knowledge?" In order to answer this question, the Word Associates Test (WAT) developed by Read (2000) was utilized. The value of participants' vocabulary knowledge was evaluated as presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2. *Descriptive Statistics of Word Associates Test*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
WAT	94	9	124	76,74	26,791
Valid N (listwise)	94				

*The mean values were determined out of 160, the maximum score of WAT

Table 4.2 demonstrates the students' scores. The mean score was nearly half out of the total score from WAT (M = 76,74). The minimum score was 9 and the maximum score was 124. It can be reached that the subjects' depth of vocabulary knowledge was nearly half out of the total score.

In this context, it could be referred that although the participants showed higher level of performances regarding their size of vocabulary knowledge, they had limited quality of vocabulary knowledge as a result of the evaluation of WAT.

The results of WAT and VLT illuminate the students' lexical competence; in other words, their receptive vocabulary knowledge could be asserted through the dimensions as vocabulary size and depth. These two sub-dimensions may enable deeper view into the students' vocabulary competence as a whole. Therefore, overall lexical competences of the participants were explained using VLT total scores and WAT total scores in the next section.

4.1.3. Overall lexical competence

The outcomes of vocabulary knowledge as size and depth were aimed to be investigated as the overall lexical competence of the participants; thus, the overall scores of vocabulary tests, VLT and WAT, were added up. These vocabulary tests showed the receptive vocabulary knowledge of the subjects in this study as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3. *Descriptive Statistics of WAT and VLT*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean*	Std. Deviation
WAT	94	9	124	76,74	26,791
VLT_TOTAL	94	54	137	102,44	18,568
WAT+VLT_TOTAL	94	63	261	179,18	45,359

*Mean values were determined out of 310, the maximum score of VLT is calculated as 150 and WAT is calculated as 160.

Table 4.3 shows that subjects' receptive vocabulary knowledge was above half of the total score ($M = 179,18$) as the maximum score is considered as 310. The minimum score was 63 and the maximum score was 261 as a result of the lexical competence tests. Comparing these two tests, the students' performances on VLT were higher than WAT. It demonstrates that the students knew more vocabulary in terms of the number of words; however, they were not successful at the depth of the words. It could be concluded that the subjects of the current study had receptive vocabulary knowledge quite well as the total scores displayed.

To be able to evaluate the relationship between total scores of VLT and WAT, a Pearson's correlation analysis was run between these two vocabulary tests and obtained results are indicated in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4. *Correlations between two vocabulary tests regarding receptive vocabulary knowledge*

		VLT_TOTAL	WAT
VLT_TOTAL	Pearson Correlation	1	,314**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,002
	N	94	94
WAT	Pearson Correlation	,314**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,002	
	N	94	94

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 4.4 shows, there was a positive correlation between the vocabulary tests, which measured the participants' receptive vocabulary knowledge. The correlation value of VLT and WAT is seen as ,01 (2-tailed) significance level. The significant positive correlation suggests that the subjects' scores from one vocabulary test may estimate the scores in another test. It was suggested that correlations are interpreted as weak, moderate, and strong by values between -1.00 and 1.00. The values between 0.10 and 0.30 are determined as weak; 0.30-0.50 are determined as moderate; and 0.50-1.00 are determined

as strong (Cohen, 1988). Regarding this guideline, the results were clarified. Particularly, there was a moderate positive correlation between VLT and WAT [$r = 0.311$, $p < .01$], which means that the larger number of words the participants know, the more accurate they can utilize the words appropriately while using the second language.

After figuring out receptive dimensions as size and depth under the title of lexical competence, the learners' productive vocabulary knowledge was evaluated through assessing their performances in academic writing and speaking tasks. The gathered results of this analysis are enabled in the following section.

4.2. Findings on the Lexical Performance of the Participants

In order to answer the second research question "What is the level of Turkish preparatory students' general and academic lexical performance?", the participants' productive vocabulary knowledge was identified. A writing task was implemented to learn the students' use of vocabulary knowledge in writing, and a speaking task was utilized to find out the students' use of oral vocabulary knowledge in speaking.

4.2.1. Use of general and academic knowledge

4.2.1.1. Productive vocabulary knowledge on writing tasks

The participants were to write opinion paragraphs and these tasks were typed on the computer and submitted one by one to VocabProfile program from <http://www.lex tutor.ca/vp/eng/> to find out vocabulary of 1000th level frequency, 2000th level frequency, 1000th + 2000th level frequency, their academic vocabulary level, and the off-list words use. The lexical competence of the students was evaluated by VLT and WAT, and there were some frequency levels in VLT. These levels started with 2000th level frequency band; therefore, total of 1000th and 2000th level frequency bands were taken into account -instead of evaluating them separately- while analysing LFP of writing tasks. Therefore, the participants' vocabulary of first 2000th high frequency, academic vocabulary and off-list words were calculated.

In data analysis, the mean values for LFP of each student were evaluated and the overall mean values were calculated. The results are demonstrated in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5. *Descriptive statistics for lexical performance on writing*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean*	Std. Deviation
WRITING_K1+K2	94	81	97	90,75	3,309
WRITING_AWL	94	0	8	2,91	1,553
WRITING_OFFLIST	94	1	14	6,09	2,466

* Mean scores were calculated out of 100.

As it could be concluded from the table, the participants' first 2000th level of frequency bands were really high (M = 90,75). On the other hand, their academic word use was very low (M = 2,91). Therefore, it could be claimed that the students may produce high frequent level of words much more than academic words in their writing tasks. Off-list words were the words that were except from these categories, which may be accounted as low frequent vocabulary (M = 6,09).

4.2.1.2. *Productive vocabulary knowledge on speaking tasks*

The subjects were to speak about the given topic with the sub-questions to help them utter related words and sentences. Thereafter, these speaking tasks were audio-recorded and transcribed. The transcriptions were typed on the computer and submitted separately to VocabProfile program. The evaluation of speaking tasks was done regarding the same frequency bands as first 2000th level, academic word level, and off-list words.

After the variables were analysed, the mean values for LFP of each student were investigated and the mean values of overall scores were calculated. The obtained outcomes are demonstrated in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6. *Descriptive statistics for lexical performance on speaking*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean*	Std. Deviation
SPEAKING_K1+K2	94	87	97	93,29	2,248
SPEAKING_AWL	94	0	4	1,63	,899
SPEAKING_OFF_LIST	94	1	12	5,01	2,139

* Mean scores were calculated out of 100.

As Table 4.6 shows, the students' use of the first 2000th level words were quite high (M = 93,29). However, they did not include academic words in their speech much (M = 1,63). Finally, the off-list category words were larger than academic words (M = 5,01).

The results of writing and speaking tasks clarified the students' lexical performance; in other words, their productive vocabulary knowledge could be defended through their use of language in production areas of the language. The outcomes of productive vocabulary knowledge as writing and speaking could be explained together in order to understand the participants' lexical performance as a whole. Accordingly, the overall lexical performance of the participants was investigated including the scores of writing and speaking tasks on VocabProfile, and the results are introduced in the next section.

4.2.2. Overall lexical performance

The outcomes of productive vocabulary knowledge regarding the students' writing and speaking tasks were intended to be examined as overall lexical performance of the participants. Therefore, descriptive statistics for the results of speaking and writing tasks were implemented. These tasks demonstrate productive vocabulary knowledge of the participants. The presentation of the students' lexical performance on speaking and writing is shown in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7. *Descriptive statistics for lexical performance on speaking and writing*

	Writing		Speaking	
	Mean*	SD	Mean*	SD
K1+K2	90,75	3,309	93,29	2,248
AWL	2,91	1,553	1,63	,889
OFF_LIST	6,09	2,466	5,01	2,139

*Mean scores were calculated out of 100.

Table 4.7 demonstrates that the participants used the first 2000th level of frequent words (K1+K2) in speaking (M = 93,29) slightly more than writing (M = 90,75). Both of the productive vocabulary use in writing and speaking could be accepted as a high level because their scores were more than 90 out of 100. When it came to academic word level, the participants' academic word use in writing (M = 2,91) was slightly more than in speaking (M = 1,63).

Lastly, the scores of off-list words in writing (M = 6,09) were higher than in speaking (M = 5,01).

To be able to investigate the connection between the students' speaking and writing scores, a Pearson's correlation analysis was run between these two productive vocabulary use tasks and the outcomes are shown in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8. *The correlation analysis on speaking and writing scores of the participants*

	WRITING_K1+K2	WRITING_AWL	WRT_OFF-LIST	SP_K1+K2	SP_AWL	SP_OFF-LIST
WRITING_K1+K2						
Pearson	---	-,549**	-,789**	,532**	-,065	-,070
Correlation		,000	,000	,000	,535	,502
Sig. (2-tailed)		94	94	94	94	94
N						
WRITING_AWL						
Pearson	---	---	,158	-,012	,386**	,038
Correlation			,127	,908	,000	,718
Sig. (2-tailed)			94	94	94	94
N						
WRT_OFF-LIST						
Pearson	---	---	---	-,081	,115	,328**
Correlation				,440	,271	,000
Sig. (2-tailed)				94	94	94
N						
SP_K1+K2						
Pearson	---	---	---	---	-,368**	-,910**
Correlation					,000	,000
Sig. (2-tailed)					94	94
N						
SP_AWL						
Pearson	---	---	---	---	---	-,013
Correlation						,904
Sig. (2-tailed)						94
N						
SP_OFF-LIST	---	---	---	---	---	---

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

WRITING_K1+K2: 1000th and 2000th level of words in writing tasks

WRITING_AWL: The words in Academic Word Level in writing tasks

WRT_OFF-LIST: Off-list words in writing tasks

SP_K1+K2: First 2000 words that in speaking tasks

SP_AWL: The words in Academic Word Level in speaking tasks

SP_OFF-LIST: Off-list words in speaking tasks

According to the results of the correlation analysis, there was a positive correlation between the students' first 2000 level of words in writing and speaking tasks; their academic word level in writing and speaking tasks; their off-list words in writing and speaking tasks. Nevertheless, negative correlation was determined between the

participants' first 2000 level of words and academic word level of vocabulary in writing tasks; their first 2000 level of words and off-list words in writing tasks; their first 2000 level of words and academic word level of vocabulary in speaking tasks; and lastly, their first 2000 level of words and off-list words in speaking tasks. To clarify this view, the significant positive correlations show that the higher score the students have in one test, the higher scores they have in another test.

Conversely, the significant negative correlations demonstrate that while the students' scores in one test are high, their scores in another test can be low or vice versa. It could be concluded that, in positive correlations, the participants' scores in one test may predict the other tests' results; nevertheless, in negative correlations, the subjects' higher scores in one test may cause lower scores in another test.

To make the results clear, there was a strong positive relationship between the students' first 2000 level of words in writing and speaking tasks [$r=0.532$, $p<.01$] which puts forward that when the students used the first two level bands of vocabulary in writing, they utilized the same frequent-band words in their speaking as well. This situation was also the same for the relationship between academic word level of vocabulary in writing and speaking tasks [$r=0.386$, $p<.01$] which showed a moderate positive correlation. The students' use of academic words in their writing and speaking tasks was similar.

Moreover, off-list words in writing and speaking tasks were positively correlated with each other at a moderate degree [$r=0.328$, $p<.01$]. It could be deduced that the students' production of off-list words was similar in their writing and speaking tasks.

On the other hand, first 2000 level of words was negatively correlated with academic word level of vocabulary [$r=-0.549$, $p<.01$] and off-list words in writing tasks [$r=-0.789$, $p<.01$]. The relationship between first 2000 level of words and academic word level of vocabulary in writing tasks and off-list words in writing could be regarded as a strong one. The outcomes in speaking part were also similar to writing part, which showed first 2000 level of words was negatively correlated with academic word level of vocabulary [$r=-0.368$, $p<.01$] and off-list words in speaking tasks [$r=-0.910$, $p<.01$]. The correlation between first 2000 level of words and academic word level of vocabulary in writing tasks could be determined as moderate; the relationship between first 2000 level of words and off-list words in writing tasks could be concerned as a strong one. These

relationships demonstrate that when the students' use of high frequency words expands, their use of academic and off-list words decreases or vice versa. Because of the fact that off-list words contained low frequent words, these results were in accordance with the students' first 2000 level of words and off-list words both in writing and speaking.

Thereupon, the analyses of general and academic receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge proposed that the participants had specific realization and production of both general and academic vocabulary for sentence, paragraph or speech level. Moreover, the receptive vocabulary including size and depth, and productive vocabulary containing writing and speaking were related within themselves. However, the researcher wanted to figure out whether receptive vocabulary and productive vocabulary were interrelated comprising of all instruments. For this aim, a correlation analysis among all the data collection tools was conducted, and the findings of this part are available in the following section.

4.3. Interconnection between the Participants' Lexical Competence and Performance

On the purpose of investigating the relationship among all the aspects of lexical competence and performance of the students in the study, the third research question "Does the level of the students' lexical competence and performance correlate with each other?" was scrutinized through a Pearson's correlation analysis on the outcomes of all instruments.

The receptive dimension of vocabulary knowledge, VLT and WAT were found to be correlated to each other. This correlation was regarded as moderate positive correlation. When the productive dimension of vocabulary knowledge was taken into consideration, first 2000 level of words in writing and speaking tasks; academic word level of vocabulary in writing and speaking tasks; off-list words in writing and speaking tasks were correlated positively. In addition, first 2000 level of words and academic word level of vocabulary in writing tasks; first 2000 level of words and off-list words in writing tasks; first 2000 level of words and academic word level of vocabulary in speaking tasks; and first 2000 level of words and off-list words in speaking tasks were correlated negatively.

Within this perspective, the relationship between receptive and productive vocabulary regarding the scores of VLT/WAT and WRITING/SPEAKING among the participants were examined. The gathered findings are demonstrated in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9. *The correlation analysis of receptive and productive vocabulary scores of the participants*

	VLT_TOTAL	WAT	WRITING_K1+K2	WRITING_AWL	SP_K1+K2	SP_AWL
VLT_TOTAL						
Pearson						
Correlation	---	,314**	,364**	,105	,318**	,106
Sig. (2-tailed)		,002	,000	,315	,000	,307
N		94	94	94	94	94
WAT						
Pearson						
Correlation	---	---	,328**	-,164	,306**	-,060
Sig. (2-tailed)			,000	,115	,000	,567
N			94	94	94	94
WRITING_K1+K2						
Pearson	---	---	---	-,549**	,532**	,065
Correlation				,000	,000	,535
Sig. (2-tailed)				94	94	94
N						
WRITING_AWL						
Pearson	---	---	---	---	-,012	,386**
Correlation					,908	,000
Sig. (2-tailed)					94	94
N						
SP_K1+K2						
Pearson						
Correlation	---	---	---	---	---	-,368**
Sig. (2-tailed)						,000
N						94
SP_AWL						
	---	---	---	---	---	---

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.9 presents that total score of VLT had a positive relationship with first 2000 level of words in scores of writing tasks [$r=0.364$, $p<.01$] and speaking tasks [$r=0.318$, $p<.01$] at a moderate degree. To put it in a different way, the learners' receptive vocabulary knowledge with regards to size of vocabulary had an effect on their productive vocabulary knowledge including writing and speaking. However, the influence of vocabulary size on writing had slightly more than speaking but the difference is small. What is more, WAT had a positive relationship with first 2000 level of words in scores of writing tasks [$r=0.328$, $p<.01$] and speaking tasks [$r=0.306$, $p<.01$] at a moderate degree as well. These findings proved that the participants' receptive vocabulary

knowledge concerning depth of vocabulary had an effect on their writing and speaking skills, which could be counted as productive vocabulary. The outcomes imply that the depth of vocabulary knowledge had slightly more effect on writing than speaking. What's more, the size of vocabulary had also slightly more impact on writing than speaking.

All in all, it could be deduced that the students' receptive vocabulary and productive vocabulary were related to each other regarding the instruments of VLT, WAT; first 2000 level of words in writing and speaking tasks.

There was not a meaningful relationship between VLT & WAT and academic word level of vocabulary in writing and speaking tasks. In order to investigate the participants' academic word knowledge deeper, the effect of academic word level of the VLT on academic word level of vocabulary in writing and speaking tasks was taken into consideration. In addition to academic word level, off-list words were also examined in detail. The findings are displayed in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10. *The correlation analysis of academic vocabulary knowledge scores of the participants*

	VLT_ACADEMIC	SP_AWL	WRITING_AWL	WRT_OFF-LIST	SP_OFF-LIST
VLT_ACADEMIC					
<i>Pearson</i>	---	,272**	,284**	-,041	-,061
<i>Correlation</i>		,000	,000	,692	,560
<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>		94	94	94	94
<i>N</i>					
SP_AWL					
<i>Pearson</i>	---	---	,386**	,115	,306**
<i>Correlation</i>			,000	,271	,000
<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>			94	94	94
<i>N</i>					
WRITING_AWL					
<i>Pearson</i>	---	---	---	,158	,038
<i>Correlation</i>				,127	,718
<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>				94	94
<i>N</i>					
WRT_OFF-LIST					
<i>Pearson</i>	---	---	---	---	,328**
<i>Correlation</i>					,000
<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>					94
<i>N</i>					
SP_OFF-LIST	---	---	---	---	---

Table 4.10 shows that academic word level scores of VLT were correlated with academic word level of vocabulary in writing [$r=0.284$, $p<.01$] and speaking [$r=0.272$, $p<.01$] through weak positive correlation. Therefore, it could be stated that the students' academic knowledge had an effect on their use of academic knowledge in their speaking and writing tasks. However, the results of academic word level scores of VLT were found as not correlated with off-list words in speaking and writing at ,001 significance level; therefore, it could be said that the students' academic word knowledge receptively does not affect their use of off-list words productively.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1. Discussion of the Findings

In this chapter, the results obtained from the instruments will be dealt referring to the related literature mentioned previously. The discussion part will be indicated by following the same route with the layout of the present study. Accordingly, first of all, the outcomes of lexical competence of the participants will be handled with regard to previous studies. Later, lexical performance of the subjects regarding the vocabulary use will be negotiated. Lastly, the interconnection between the students' lexical competence and performance; in other words, their receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge concerning general and academic words will be discussed through focusing on the factors behind the current results.

To mention the overall evaluation of findings about the learners' lexical competence and performance, it could be stated that their lexical competence including vocabulary size and depth, and lexical performance comprising their writing and speaking skills were measured through the following instruments: the Vocabulary Level Test (VLT), the Word Associates Test (WAT); a writing task (opinion paragraph) and a speaking task (speech about the given task).

According to the results of lexical competence, the receptive vocabulary level of (in terms of size of vocabulary) the students was thought as a quite high level ($M = 102,44$ out of 150) regarding their proficiency level determined as intermediate as a consequence of proficiency exam conducted at the beginning of the year at Kütahya Dumlupınar University. In addition to VLT, WAT outcomes also showed that the depth of vocabulary level of the students was determined lower than their size of vocabulary knowledge ($M = 76,74$ out of 160). Comparing these two instruments through a Pearson's correlation analysis, the findings proved that there was a moderate positive correlation which means that when the students' size of vocabulary increases, their depth of vocabulary knowledge rises, too.

In the second place, lexical performance of the students was evaluated and the findings demonstrate that their use of high frequent words both in writing and speaking was more than their use of academic and low frequent words, which was determined in Language Frequency Profile. However, there was a slight difference between the

students' speaking levels and writing levels ($M = 93,29$ and $M = 90,75$ out of 100 respectively). Comparing these two instruments via a Pearson's correlation analysis, the findings indicate that use of high frequent words in writing and speaking were related to each other at a strong level. The same situation was available for academic use of words in writing and speaking, which was correlated moderately. Moreover, the subjects' use of low frequent words was also related to each other moderately. These relationships among the instruments signified that the students' use of words in one productive skill could affect the other productive skill. Thus, the used vocabulary items in writing could predict the used words in speaking or vice versa.

On the other side, the negative correlation was determined between the students' high frequent words and their use of academic and low frequent words both in writing and speaking. This implied that when the students' use of high frequent words increases, academic and low frequent word use decreases or vice versa.

Thirdly, the interrelationship between the participants' receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge was identified, and a Pearson's correlation analysis was implemented among all the instruments. According to the results, the students' size and depth of vocabulary knowledge were related to high frequent word use in writing and speaking. Furthermore, the students' size of academic word knowledge had an effect on their use of academic words in writing and speaking weakly. Nevertheless, the students' receptive academic words were not related to their use of low frequent words.

5.1.1. Insights on Lexical Competence

5.1.1.1. *General receptive vocabulary knowledge*

To determine the participants' lexical competence, the size of vocabulary knowledge was measured by the instrument of VLT while the depth of vocabulary knowledge was evaluated through WAT. The results of these tests demonstrated that the subjects' size of vocabulary knowledge was higher than their depth of vocabulary knowledge. Besides, the students' depth of vocabulary knowledge was determined as nearly half of the total score ($M = 76,7$) which was lower than their size of vocabulary knowledge. In addition, there was a positive correlation between the size and depth of vocabulary knowledge; in other words, the students' size of receptive vocabulary knowledge was accepted as a determinant on their depth of receptive vocabulary

knowledge or their depth of vocabulary knowledge could be concerned as a significant factor on the size of vocabulary knowledge.

The students' size of vocabulary knowledge was found out as high ($M = 102,44$ out of 150) and the reason why they got high scores could be comprehensible input that they were exposed to during the lessons because they did not have any vocabulary course separately at the preparatory class. The participants acquired the vocabulary through exposure to skills lessons as *Reading and Writing* and *Listening and Speaking*, which are language-focused courses. These outcomes suggested the value of comprehensible input given in foreign language lessons through the materials (Yüksel & Durmuşoğlu). Thus, it was believed that the students' size of vocabulary knowledge could be raised without an explicit way of teaching vocabulary.

The scores of the participants from each frequency levels in VLT were distinct regarding their competences on word frequency levels. In detail, the students' results were lower at 5000th and 10000th levels than the 2000th, 3000th, and AWL. These outcomes are in compliance with the findings of Yüksel and Durmuşoğlu's (2012) study. They also put forward that EFL students are successful at noticing the high frequency level of words rather than low frequency level of words. Moreover, the present study corresponds to the results of Vermeer (2001) since the researcher implied that less proficient students had an inclination to be acquainted with more frequent words; on the other hand, the students' better insight into the language causes them to be adjusted to less frequent words. To put differently, the more language learners acquire, the better the networks and the deeper the vocabulary knowledge they will have.

Cohen (1986) also explained that some words enter the vocabulary of students very easily without much attention, while others need conscious effort that involves the repetition of memory or techniques of organization. In particular, low frequent and academic words require such a special effort. The analysis of the students' vocabulary size regarding the frequency bands promoted this assumption as well.

Moreover, according to the study of Zahar et. al. (2001), the effects of the frequency were taken into consideration. Therefore, it could be concluded that there is a threshold after 2000th word level, which means that students who obtained 50% at the 2000th word level comprehended less than 90% of the vocabulary in the texts. Akbarian (2010) also stated that with 2000th frequency word level, the students might be acquainted with only 86% of running words in the texts they face with. This claim is in accordance with Zahar

et. al.'s (2001) suggestion as well. His study revealed a positive correlation between the students' size and depth of vocabulary knowledge; therefore, the researcher suggested that they could be taught in combination instead of being taught separately in English lessons.

Gredanus and Nienhuis's (2001) research also supported the correlation of breadth and depth of vocabulary. They affirmed that vocabulary knowledge grows both in size and in depth. They also highlighted the relationship between the frequency of words and their quality. The higher frequent words mean the more quality they have. To put it another way, the earlier and frequent comprehended words are better in terms of their quality than the less frequent and more recently comprehended ones. Given the large and growing vocabulary size of the 2000th, 3000th, and academic words of the students compared to less frequent 5000th and 10000th words in the present study, it could be said that the assumption of Gredanus and Nienhuis (2001) is accurate for Turkish preparatory students in this context.

Considering the relationship between the students' breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge, Zareva (2010) put forward that when the number of words that the students know increases, they get more familiar with a well-established and interconnected lexicon. Furthermore, the researcher also suggested that expanding levels of lexical competence enable the students to form an important network within the lexicon. All these relational bonds enrich the process of awareness, which helps the students to be able to notice and utilize more vocabulary items in a useful way. It was assumed that smaller size of vocabulary is characterized through fewer links among the words whereas larger size of vocabulary demonstrates more connectivity allowing the learners to associate more words.

In accordance with these findings, the results of the studies conducted by Zhou (2010); Rashidi and Khosravi (2010); and Mehrpour et. al. (2011) demonstrated that the students' knowledge about the number of words affects them to get deeply rooted both in general and academic vocabulary knowledge in different contexts. Furthermore, Meara (1996) set forth that when the learners' size of vocabulary expands, the importance of a well-constructed and related lexicon enlarges considerably.

In addition to these studies, Schmitt and Meara (1997) reported a high and significant vocabulary association and size of vocabulary as a result of their study. Taking into consideration the interaction between size and depth, Qian (1999) concluded that

language learners would not have an in-depth vocabulary knowledge in which their general size of vocabulary was limited.

On the whole, the investigation on Turkish preparatory school students uncovers that different dimensions such as size and depth compose lexical competence and this situation approves the competence of word knowledge as Zareva (2005) and Henriksen (1999) suggested.

The studies by Yüksel and Durmuşoğlu (2013) and Kalay (2017) established a likewise point of view through the analysis of the relationship between breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge. The ideas of the researchers prove that size and depth of vocabulary could be dominated by the construction of lexical competence.

5.1.1.2. Academic receptive vocabulary knowledge

The academic dimension of receptive vocabulary knowledge was evaluated with the help of the instrument AWL frequency band in VLT. The findings showed that the students recognized academic words in the list ($M = 28,01$ out of 36); yet, these outcomes fell behind the students' 2000th and 3000th word levels in VLT. This situation can be explained with the characteristics of academic vocabulary as abstraction, polysemy, which can be defined as one form can have several meanings at the same time, and homonymy, which means that one definition can be exemplified by several forms (Nation, 2001). It can give rise to difficulties for the students to learn and utilize academic vocabulary because of the fact that the definitions of new academic vocabulary do not link with the words of mother tongue, for which semantic descriptions are already improved (Yüksel & Durmuşoğlu, 2013). In order to cope with this problem, researchers stated that exposure to learn academic vocabulary is an effective way (Laufer, 1998). If the students encounter fewer academic words as a result of reading less, they will learn restricted meanings of any polysemic academic words. As a consequence of that, it would prevent the students' academic vocabulary development. Therefore, it can be proved that the more the learners are exposed to language, the more academic vocabulary they acquire.

Milton (2009) also agreed the idea of exposure to language in order to learn more academic words. The assumption of how language learners could acquire vocabulary that is considered in academic level or less frequency level of vocabulary takes place during the time experiencing knowledge gaps in high frequent vocabulary through foreign

language exposure in EFL classes. He claimed that in EFL lessons, words may not be learned regarding the rate of availability but acquired thematically from reading texts as well as course books used in classes and lectures.

5.1.2. Insights on lexical performance

To determine the students' lexical performance; in other words, their productive vocabulary knowledge, the learners were given to write opinion paragraphs and perform speaking tasks. The outcomes of the instruments were evaluated through Vocabprofile and the percentages were commented as a whole. One of the causes to carry out lexical performance apart from lexical competence is that it seems to be challenging for the students to form links between receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge (Nation, 2001; Morris & Cobb, 2004; Yüksel & Durmuşoğlu, 2013). Thus, the lexical use of the students in the current study was aimed to be investigated in preparatory school context in Turkey.

The findings of the current study proved that the students mostly relied on high frequency words, including the first 2000th level of frequent words (K1+K2) in speaking (M = 93,29 out of 100) and in writing (M = 90,75 out of 100). In order to understand them deeper, it would be useful to compare them with the LFP implemented for the students in other studies. One of them is Muncie's (2002) study showing that the participants produced 12% high frequent words (K1+K2) as a result of evaluating their writing tasks. Moreover, Morris and Cobb (2004) found a similar result indicating 11,6 % high frequent words among the participants of Canadian University. Likewise, Tschirner (2004) revealed 22% of high frequent words of German students produced in the study. Yüksel and Durmuşoğlu's (2012) study showed that all the students got more than 90% high frequent words. Karakoç (2016) also found a similar result with the percentage of 89,79% use of high frequent words of the learners. Therefore, the outcomes of these studies in terms of the students' use of high frequent words are parallel with the present study. It could be expressed that the participants in this study highly used high frequent vocabulary items in their writing and speaking tasks.

The results of the present study demonstrated that the learners preferred to use vocabulary belonging to high frequency level more than low frequency level or academic level of words as a productive part of the language.

It has been claimed that the 2000th high frequent words of English may be adequate for the students (Nation, 2001). These frequency level of words may not be suitable to utilize the target language to transmit their ideas in an effective way in the academic area (Kaur & Hegelheimer, 2005). Crossley, Salsbury, and McNamara (2010) also clarified the dependence of high frequency level of words on writing through attributing to the discrepancy between the knowledge of vocabulary of mother tongue and target language. Due to the limited knowledge of vocabulary in target language compared to L1, the learners apt to utilize more vocabulary of general meaning compared to specific meaning.

Several studies have demonstrated that language learners apt to understand, process and produce higher frequency vocabulary items well (Crossley & Salsbury, 2010; Ellis, 2002; Laufer & Goldstein, 2004). Moreover, Laufer (1991) brought out that EFL learners of higher education did not accordingly rise their productive vocabulary knowledge on the condition that there was not any systematic instruction aimed at learning vocabulary. It was underlined that the students want to implement basic, frequent, and general vocabulary in the production process. The reason why the students feel reluctant to apply low frequent words may be because of their uncertainty about the words' usage and limited vocabulary knowledge in target language (Laufer & Nation, 1999).

5.1.2.1. *Insights on academic lexical performance*

The findings related to academic lexical competence were discussed in the previous chapter and the results demonstrated that the learners' academic word knowledge was higher than their low frequent word knowledge; yet, it was lower than their high frequent word knowledge. Similarly, considering the students' lexical performance, the use of academic words in their writing and speaking tasks pointed out that they utilized very limited academic words both in writing ($M = 2,91$) and speaking ($M = 1,63$) productively. These results were in concert with the other findings regarding lexical performance revealing that the students relied highly on high frequent words rather than low frequent words and academic words even producing them.

The studies related to production of academic words claimed that the language learners preferred to choose high frequent words depending on more casual manners in spite of academic manner. This preference can be explained by the hypothesis of avoidance (Laufer & Nation, 1995; Read, 2000). It means that the students do not want to use academic words. It may be derived from their desire to feel safer when they use

high frequent words as they are afraid of making mistakes. Even if they have enough knowledge of academic words, they may not be sure about the usage of these words; therefore, they do not want to take risk while producing words both in writing or speaking (Laufer & Nation, 1995). Another reason may stem from the learners' limited knowledge of academic words. These clarifications could make sense when the outcomes of academic vocabulary size in terms of productive knowledge are taken into account.

Malmstrom, Pecorari, and Shaw (2018) also stated that many studies have been conducted to examine the relationship between receptive and productive vocabulary related to general words rather than academic words; however, the implementation of academic words are also important to be evaluated in order to see the students' productive vocabulary knowledge. Nizonkiza (2016) found out that the participants of her study did better regarding their receptive academic vocabulary knowledge rather than their productive academic knowledge concerning the tests including words from University Word List and AWL. These results are also similar to the findings of present study in terms of the use of the academic words both in receptively and productively.

Crossley et. al. (2010) and Laufer and Goldstein (2004) also presented that the subjects of their studies preferred mostly high frequent words. This situation may result from the fact that these students often face with high frequency words in their courses since their curriculum were designed as language focused in the language learning contexts. Moreover, they also claimed that the participants of their studies relied on some academic words, and it may stem from the academic reading and writing course they had.

When it was compared to current study, the participants' use of academic words was determined as low level. Therefore, it could be said that although they had *Listening and Speaking* and *Reading and Writing* lessons, they had no academic courses focusing on production of academic words. As a consequence of this situation, the students did not rely on academic words both in writing and in speaking. Crossley et. al (2010) promoted these interpretations claiming that language learners have a possibility to utilize the words in an effective and productive way in given tasks on the condition that they are exposed to frequent words.

5.1.3. Insights on the interrelationship of all dimensions

The present study revealed that there were correlations between the instruments as a result of the tests applied to the participants. Firstly, the students' size of receptive

vocabulary knowledge had an effect on their depth of receptive vocabulary knowledge. Secondly, the participants' productive vocabulary knowledge with regard to both speaking and writing were found to be related to each other as well. Lastly, the relationship between the students' receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge demonstrated that the instruments affected each other to some extent. To explain in detail, the participants' receptive vocabulary knowledge was correlated with the high frequent words in speaking and writing. When academic words were taken into account, the subjects' size of academic word knowledge affected their productive academic words in writing and speaking. The other instruments were not found to be correlated with each other at a significant level. All in all, it could be reached that the students' scores in the tests of receptive vocabulary knowledge were higher than their scores in the tasks of productive vocabulary knowledge.

The previous studies had also similar findings regarding the results of the present study. Laufer and Paribakht (1998) revealed a moderate significant correlation between the participants' receptive and productive vocabulary sizes.

Nation (1990) stated that the subjects' lexical competence and lexical performance complement each other. That is to say, the students' productive vocabulary knowledge includes their receptive vocabulary knowledge and expands it further. Namely, the students' receptive vocabulary size represents their productive vocabulary size.

Crossley and Salsbury (2010) and Zareva (2007) claimed that the associations of the participants' receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge provide learners to improve their lexical production. Because of the fact that lexical performance includes how to write a word, the meaning of it and how to utilize it in grammatical patterns and collocations (Nation, 1990), the correlation revealed in this study could be concerned as expected.

Due to the fact that receptive vocabulary knowledge requires less effort to perform compared to productive vocabulary knowledge, L2 learners' receptive vocabulary knowledge was larger than their productive vocabulary knowledge (Laufer, 1998; Fan, 2000; Webb, 2008; Zhou, 2010).

Aitchison (1994), Channell (1988), and Crow (1986) also have similar perceptions towards L2 learners' vocabulary size, considering that their size of vocabulary knowledge is larger than their productive vocabulary knowledge.

Similarly, Griffin's study (1992) also pointed out that receptive learning causes larger outcomes in receptive vocabulary knowledge rather than productive vocabulary knowledge. However, productive learning seems to be more efficient in expanding productive knowledge. Therefore, the students may be exposed to both receptive and productive learning to increase their word levels.

Likewise, Webb (2005) carried out a study evaluating the students' lexical competence and performance. The results were similar to the present research study, showing that learners' productive vocabulary knowledge was lower than their receptive vocabulary knowledge. It could be concluded that the subjects of the study had partial productive knowledge of second language forms for the vocabulary items known receptively; yet, they did not have full knowledge of meaning and form for the words productively as much as they had receptively. He indicated that vocabulary learning in the lessons is in tendency to be receptive since the students are more familiar with receptive vocabulary activities in the classroom. He pointed out that the other researchers stated that L1 words are acquired receptively with the help of reading and listening (Jenkins, Stein, & Wysocki, 1984; Nagy, Anderson, & Herman, 1987; Nagy & Herman, 1987) and this situation causes greater insights in receptive vocabulary than productive vocabulary knowledge (Griffin & Harley, 1996; Mondria & Wiersma, 2004). It was also explained that one of the reasons for the difference between receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge could be derived from the participants in the study were exposed to rote learning strategies to learn new words and due to this reason they were not able to produce target words (Schmitt, 1997). This situation could be the same for the participants of the present study as well.

Connately, considering the present study, another reason why the participants got higher scores in receptive vocabulary test than productive tasks may be their exposure to such kind of receptive activities in the language lessons more than producing the target words in writing and speaking as it was mentioned above. Therefore, the students should be encouraged to implement productive skills as well as the receptive skills in the lessons so that they can have a chance to produce target words both in their writing and speaking courses.

When it comes to investigate the learners' receptive and productive skills in terms of speaking side, Clenton's (2008) study suggested that although there was no significant correlation between the students' vocabulary knowledge and oral ability, it was marked

that sophistication increased with word knowledge, mostly with AWL. On the other hand, articulation rate was attached to the students' 2000th word level knowledge. The outcomes of the current study are not similar to that research since the present study found out the relationship between the students' vocabulary knowledge and their speaking skills. However, the present study examined the participants' use of words in speaking rather than sophistication and articulation.

Pignot and Shahov (2012) also defined that receptive knowledge means to be able to comprehend a word in its written and spoken forms whereas productive knowledge seems to be able to utilize a word accurately in a written work or speech. Therefore, it was claimed that it is useful to teach the word productively in order to learn it productively. By this way, the students' lexical performance may increase as much as their lexical competence. It is commonly agreed that productive vocabulary learning is substantially more challenging than receptive vocabulary learning (Schmitt, 2008).

Regarding the students' speaking proficiency levels, which could be asserted as their productive vocabulary knowledge, Kouzimi and In'nami (2013) revealed that the participants' speaking proficiencies can be estimated through their vocabulary knowledge to a substantial degree. The predictors of speaking proficiency can be counted as the size, depth and speed of speaking. The results of the study proved that the learners with more size and depth of vocabulary knowledge did better while producing oral performance, and this situation can be explained like that size and depth of receptive vocabulary knowledge may predict their lexical performance to some degree. These results are also similar to the present findings concerning the relationship between the subjects' lexical competence and performance in terms of speaking side. The reasons why the participants' receptive knowledge precedes their productive knowledge were indicated in this study as followings. Students firstly learn how to pronounce and write the word and its meaning when they come across target words (Melka, 1997). After that, they become ready to apply it; therefore, receptive mastery and productive mastery is accepted as a continuum. It could also be added that lexical items need activating to be accessible; in other words, they need connections in the mental lexicon (Schmitt, 2010). Moreover, the increase of the number of connections enables students to connect to the active words in the mental lexicon more. As a result of that, the more students know about the words, the more they become master towards productive level from receptive level.

Ultimately, the present study aimed to evaluate the School of Foreign Languages students' general and academic lexical competence and performance at a state university in Turkey and it was obvious that vocabulary knowledge is a consistent and complicated process that needs broad examination. As a result, the current study has led the way to implement several measurements and offer a general framework on this topic.

5.2. Conclusion

The objective of the present study was to evaluate the students' lexical competence and performance within a tentative dimensional framework of vocabulary knowledge. For this reason, the learners' size and depth of vocabulary including general and academic words and the students' productive skills containing writing and speaking abilities were taken into account. The participants of the study consisted of English Language and Literature students enrolled at preparation school at Kütahya Dumlupınar University. The instruments guided the study included the Vocabulary Level Test, the Word Associates Test, a writing task (opinion paragraph), a speaking task (speech about the given task), and Lexical Frequency Profile.

The first research question of the present study was to examine the participants' lexical competence as size, depth and academic vocabulary knowledge. The results of the vocabulary tests demonstrate that the students' size of vocabulary was determined as a quite high level ($M = 102,44$ out of 150). On the other hand, their depth of vocabulary was concerned lower than the size of vocabulary knowledge ($M = 76,44$ out of 160). The outcomes of the size of academic vocabulary knowledge show that the students were also familiar with academic words ($M = 28,01$ out of 36). Moreover, there was a positive correlation between the students' receptive vocabulary knowledge as size and depth of vocabulary.

The second research question was to investigate the participants' lexical performance as writing and speaking skills. The results of the instruments reveal that the students' use of high frequent words was more than their use of academic and low frequent words according to the results of LFP. Nevertheless, their speaking levels were slightly more than their writing levels.

The third research question was to find out the interrelationship between the participants' lexical competence and performance. The findings indicate that the students' size and depth of vocabulary were interrelated to each other. Furthermore, their receptive

vocabulary knowledge was related to high frequent word use in writing and speaking. In addition, the students' size of academic word knowledge had an effect on their use of academic words in writing and speaking. However, the students' receptive academic words were not related to their use of low frequent words.

All in all, the results indicated that the subjects of the study had large general and academic size and depth of vocabulary knowledge regarding the high scores on the vocabulary tests. Nevertheless, the productive vocabulary knowledge of the students appeared to be considerably less than their receptive vocabulary knowledge. Therefore, they could not reflect their vocabulary knowledge in their free production tasks, paragraph writing and speaking tasks.

The studies carried out in the literature also pointed out that the learners' receptive vocabulary knowledge was larger than their productive vocabulary knowledge since producing target words needed more effort than just knowing them. Apart from the difficulty of producing words, the students may not feel comfortable while speaking and writing so they can prefer high frequent words instead of low frequent and academic words to feel safe.

Furthermore, the students' lexical competence and performance were interrelated and interdependent with each other as a result of the correlation analyses among all of the measures. Therefore, it could be stated that the more the students know the target words the more they are able to use them appropriately in their writing and speaking tasks.

Eventually, it could be estimated that both general and academic vocabulary knowledge have a multi-dimensional structure and they affect each other. As a result, the students' exposure to learning vocabulary including both receptive and productive ones may enable their vocabulary levels to increase in language learning process.

5.3. Implications

To provide a broader picture of the research, multiple-test approach was used in the present study. As theoretical implications, it could be reached that multiple-test approach provided the results to come to light. The different dimensions of lexical competence and performance including the general and academic vocabulary improved at different rates. In addition, their improvements are interrelated and interdependent with each other. At this point, the present study confirmed the multi-dimensional accumulative nature of vocabulary knowledge. Thus, it could be concluded that the proposed framework for

general and academic lexical competence and performance in the current study have theoretical ground basing on the process of vocabulary acquisition. Moreover, triangulated data analyses enabled empirical support to the study. Therefore, the present study and framework of it could be counted as a guideline for foreign language vocabulary knowledge research.

As methodological implications, it could be stated that there were several studies with different methodologies that have taken place in the literature concerning the importance of vocabulary knowledge in language learning process. It could be implied that a single measurement to evaluate the learners' vocabulary knowledge could be misleading because of the multi-dimensional nature of vocabulary knowledge (Schmitt, 2010; Read, 2000). Hence, the variety of instruments in a study could provide more comprehensive and reliable description of vocabulary knowledge.

In line with these inferences, the current study implemented two different vocabulary tests, a speaking task and a writing task to evaluate vocabulary knowledge of the participants. By this way, receptive and productive dimensions were covered separately with the help of multiple test approach since these dimensions developed at different rates and paces. Consequently, it could be proposed that multiple instruments for lexical competence and performance should be applied to provide reliable explanations and generalizations.

Besides, the scope of the present study has differences from other similar vocabulary research studies as this study explored the academic words affecting lexical competence and performance. Moreover, speaking skill and writing skill as productive vocabulary knowledge were also examined. AWL was included in the VLT as receptive academic vocabulary knowledge, and it also took place in LFP to determine the learners' productive academic vocabulary knowledge scores. Apart from AWL, the speaking task was also added as well as the writing task in order to learn the students' productive vocabulary knowledge in terms of their communication skills. Speaking skill should be considered as a significant part of the language learning; therefore, it should be evaluated like writing skill. For other language contexts and participant profiles, AWL and speaking tasks could be implemented in addition to general receptive vocabulary knowledge and productive vocabulary knowledge that only includes writing skill.

For the pedagogical implications, first of all, it could be suggested that teachers and learners of English should be informed about the multi-dimensional nature of vocabulary.

In addition to learners and teachers, material developers and syllabus designers should also be aware of this situation. As a result of raising awareness, more focus on vocabulary could be provided through materials, activities and syllabuses.

Academic vocabulary should be paid attention as well. Specially, academic vocabulary has a crucial role at higher education level for academic achievement. Accordingly, activities and materials in addition to course books should provide academic vocabulary to the learners and promote the use of academic words in the course contents.

Considering the multi-dimensional structure of vocabulary learning, it could be put forward that a balanced vocabulary teaching method should be implemented instead of favouring one approach to another. Nation (2001) also supported the balanced approach focusing on the four strands; meaning-focused input, language-focused learning, meaning-focused output and fluency development. Meaning-focused input enables the learners to learn new vocabulary items through listening and reading activities. Secondly, language-focused learning refers to explicit or direct teaching. Explicit teaching has an important role on up to the most frequent 3,000 word families in English (Nation, 2001). Thirdly, meaning-focused output provides the learners to develop their knowledge of language with the help of speaking and writing activities. Speaking and writing are counted as invaluable means of vocabulary development since they lead the learners focus on the vocabulary items they need for communication. These productive activities may help the learners to reinforce their productive vocabulary knowledge. Lastly, fluency development has an effect on the other three strands to make the words readily available.

To be able to carry through all of them, suggestions for EFL learners, teachers, curriculum developers and material designers could be presented. Firstly, students and teachers should focus on vocabulary teaching and learning as well as the other skills of language such as grammar. To provide this focus, curriculum developers and material designers could include vocabulary activities more in the syllabus. Because of the fact that both receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge are crucial in language learning process, both of them should be included in the curriculum. Especially, learners' productive vocabulary knowledge should be improved as it was observed that their productive vocabulary knowledge was lower than their receptive vocabulary knowledge. Therefore, the content of courses and materials are required to be revised and rearranged to support both general and academic lexical competence and performance.

All in all, it could be suggested that general and academic vocabulary learning and teaching for Turkish preparation classes could be revised in line with the outcomes of the current study. This revision should include conceptualizing lexical competence and performance, and integrating vocabulary dimensions, with a particular focus on academic vocabulary. By this way, the learners' both receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge could improve to be proficient at the target language. However, not only learning opportunities but also learners' motivation is also crucial to explore the necessary opportunities and implement them to mediate their receptive and productive knowledge (Zhang, 2012). Therefore, creating the awareness of the importance of vocabulary in language learning setting is considered as a very effective way.

5.4. Limitations

The present study consequently implied the importance of lexical competence and performance. It implemented the multi-test approach with a population of 94 students to gain new perspectives on the general and academic vocabulary knowledge. Despite having significant results, the present study included also some limitations like most of the empirical studies.

Firstly, the population of the participants was limited to only English Language and Literature majors studying at preparation school and the number of them was 94. Actually, at the beginning of the term, they were 100 students; yet, 6 students dropped out the school. In addition to these subjects, other departments' students could also be included in the study and the different proficiency levels might be compared. Therefore, these results could not be generalized to other proficiency levels, other departments at this university and at other universities in Turkey.

Next, the study included receptive and productive dimensions of the vocabulary; namely, the size and depth for the conceptualization of the lexical competence and performance. Nevertheless, some other dimensions such as syntactic, pragmatic, strategic, contextual, and lexical uses and diversity were not examined in the current study. Thus, the dimensions in the study stand only for certain traits of lexical competence and performance.

Lastly, the instruments used in the study consisted of VLT, WAT, a writing task and a speaking task. The writing task included an opinion paragraph; thus, the participants' productive vocabulary knowledge in terms of writing skills was examined

only in this genre and with a particular writing task. On the other hand, the speaking task involved a face-to-face oral interview about the given topic. The subjects' lexical performance in terms of speaking skills was evaluated only in this format and with a specific speaking prompt. As a consequence of them, the lexical performance of the students was restricted to one paragraph and one speaking topic so it may not be representative enough to make generalization about their lexical performance.

As a result, the results should be interpreted taking these limitations into account in the current study.

5.5. Suggestions for Further Studies

Future researches are suggested to overcome the limitations of the present study to enable more detailed analysis of lexical competence and performance. Through further studies, the learners' receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge could be revealed at different research settings and with different participants. By this way, more effective vocabulary teaching approaches could be explored.

To begin with, considering the participants of the study, the number of them could be increased. In addition, other majors could also be included in order to discuss the impacts of different disciplines on learning vocabulary.

Moreover, the scope of the further studies could involve more vocabulary components such as lexical use and density, syntactic and pragmatic discourse. These different dimensions would present larger perspectives on the learners' general and academic vocabulary knowledge.

Besides, the longitudinal case studies could be carried out in order to get insights about the nature of lexical competence and performance as well as the developmental process of the vocabulary knowledge in a detailed way.

In addition, the further studies may contain different data collection instruments while evaluating writing and speaking skills of the learners as productive knowledge. For instance, different types of writing tasks such as argumentative or response paragraphs and speaking tasks such as description of a picture or discussion about a topic could be implemented. In that way, the subjects' tendencies to utilize the certain words could be accounted.

Overall, any research study that could give a new or detailed perspective on vocabulary knowledge could be regarded as worthwhile in the literature.

Correspondingly, the further studies that complement or improve the current study would make contributions to the literature in terms of vocabulary knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Aitchison, J. (2003). *Words in the Mind*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Akbarian, I. (2010). The relationship between vocabulary size and depth for ESP/EAP learners. *System*, 38(3), 391-401.
- Aziez, F. (2011). Examining the Vocabulary Levels of Indonesia's English National Examination Texts. *Asian EFL Journal*, 51(4), 1-14.
- Begrache, F. (2014). *The role of teaching vocabulary to enhance foreign language learners' writing skill*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Retrieved from <http://dspace.univbiskra.dz:8080/jspui/handle/123456789/4741>.
- Bogaard (2000). Testing L2 vocabulary knowledge at a high level: The case of the Euralex French tests. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(4), 490-516.
- Channell, J. (1988). Psycholinguistic considerations in the study of L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*, 83-96, London: Longman.
- Chen, Q., & Ge, G. (2007). A corpus-based lexical study on frequency and distribution of Coxhead's AWL word families in medical research articles (RAs). *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(4), 502-514.
- Chung, T. M., & Nation, P. (2003). Technical vocabulary in specialised texts. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 15(2), 103-116.
- Clenton, J. (2008). Investigating the Construct of Productive Vocabulary: Comparing different measures. *Taking the Measures of Applied Linguistics*, 27-28.
- Cobb, T., & Horst. M. (2004). Is there a room for an academic word list in French? *Vocabulary in a Second Language*, 23, 15-38.
- Cobb, T. & Horst, M. (2000). Vocabulary sizes of some City University students. *City University (HK) Journal of Language Studies*, 1, 59-68.
- Cobb, T. (2008). Web Vocabprofiler (Version 2.6) [Computer software].
- Cohen, A. (1986). Forgetting foreign language vocabulary. In B. Weltens, K. de Bot, & T. Van Els (Eds.), *Language Attrition in Progress*. (pp. 143-158). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Foris.
- Cohen, J.W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd edn). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Coniam, D. (1999). An investigation into the use of word frequency lists in computing vocabulary profiles. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 103-23.
- Coxhead, A., & Nation, P. (2001). The specialized vocabulary of English for Academic purposes. In J. Flowerdew, & M. Peadocks (Eds), *Research Perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 252-267), Cambridge: CUP.
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly* 34(2), 213-238.
- Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1942). An analysis of techniques for diagnostic vocabulary testing. *Journal of Educational Research*, 36(3), 206-217.
- Crossley, S. A., & Salsbury, T. (2010). Using lexical indices to predict produced and not produced words in second language learners. *The Mental Lexicon*, 5(1), 115-147.
- Crossley, S. A., Salsbury, T., & McNamara, D. (2010). The development of polysemy and frequency use in English second language speakers. *Language Learning*, 60(3), 573-605.
- Crow, J. T. (1986). Receptive vocabulary acquisition for reading comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(3), 242-250.
- Dang, T. N. Y., & Webb, S. (2013). The lexical profile of academic spoken English. *English for Specific Purposes*, 33, 66-76.
- Douglas, S. R. (2010). *Non-native English speaking students at university: Lexical richness and academic success*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Alberta: University of Calgary.
- Ehsanzadeh, I. S. (2012). Depth versus Breadth of Lexical Repertoire: Assessing Their Roles in EFL Students' Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL Du Canada*, 29(2), 24-24.
- Ellis, N. (2002). Frequency effects in language processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(2), 143-188.
- Fan, M. (2000). How big is the gap and how to narrow it? An investigation into active and passive vocabulary knowledge of learners. *RELJ Journal*, 31(2), 105-119.
- Greidanus, T., & Nienhus, L. (2001). Testing the Quality of Word Knowledge in a Second Language by means of Word Associations: Types of Distractor and Types of Association. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 567-577.

- Griffin, G. F. (1992). *Aspects of the psychology of second language vocabulary list learning*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Coventry: University of Warwick, UK.
- Griffin, G., & Harley, T. (1996). List learning of second language vocabulary. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 17(4), 443-460.
- Hellman, A. B. (2011). Vocabulary Size and Depth of Word Knowledge in Adult-Onset Second Language Acquisition. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21(2), 162-182.
- Henriksen, B. (1999) Three dimensions of vocabulary development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 303-317.
- Hincks, R. (2003). Pronouncing the Academic Word List: Features of L2 student oral presentations. *Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Phonetics Sciences* (pp. 1545-1548). Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain.
- Ho, M. A., & Lien, H. (2011). The correlation between vocabulary knowledge depth and reading comprehension. *Journal of Vocabulary Learning*, 6, 9-34.
- Hu, M., & Nation, I. S. P. (2000). Unknown vocabulary density and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 13(1), 403-430.
- Hunt, A., & Beglar, D. (2005). A framework for developing EFL reading vocabulary. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 17, 23-59.
- Jarvis, S. (2002). Short texts, best fitting curves and new measures of lexical diversity. *Language Testing*, 19(1), 57-84.
- Jenkins, J. R., Stein, M. L., & Wysocki, K. (1984). Learning Vocabulary through Reading. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21(4), 767-787.
- Kalay, D. (2017). Foreign Language Learners' Evaluation of Lexical Competence and Performance. *Journal of Educational and Practice*, 8, 78-88.
- Karakoç, D. (2016). *The Impact of Vocabulary Knowledge On Reading, Writing and Proficiency Scores of B2.2 Level Turkish Students: A study with Anadolu University English Prep-School Students*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.
- Kaur, J., & Hegelheimer, V. (2005). ESL students' use of concordance in the transfer of academic word knowledge: An exploratory study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 18(4), 287-310.

- Kouzimi, R., & In'nami, Y. (2013). Vocabulary Knowledge and Speaking Proficiency among Second Language Learners from Novice to Intermediate Levels. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(5), 900-913.
- Laufer, B. (2013). Lexical Frequency Profiles. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Laufer, B. (2005). Lexical Frequency Profiles: From Monte Carlo to the Real World. A response to Meara. *Applied Linguistics*, 26, 581-587.
- Laufer, B. (1998). The development of passive and active vocabulary in a second language: Same or different? *Applied Linguistics*, 12, 255-271.
- Laufer, B. (1992) Reading in a foreign language: How does L2 lexical knowledge interact with the reader's general academic ability? *Journal of Research in Reading*, 15, 95-103.
- Laufer, B. (1991). How much lexis is necessary for reading comprehension? In P.J.L. Arnaud & H. Bejoint (Eds). *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics* (pp.126-132). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Laufer, B., & Goldstein, Z. (2004). Testing vocabulary knowledge: Size, strength, and computer adaptiveness. *Language Learning*, 54(3), 399-436.
- Laufer, B., & Nation, P. (1995). Vocabulary size and use: Lexical richness in L2 written production. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 307-322.
- Laufer, B., & Paribakht, T.S. (1998). The relationship between passive and active vocabularies: Effects of language learning context. *Language Learning*, 48(3), 365-391.
- Laufer, B., Elder, C., Hill, K., & Congdon, P. (2004). Size and Strength: Do we need both to measure vocabulary knowledge? *Language Testing*, 21(2), 201-226.
- Lee, S. H., & Muncie, J. (2006). From Receptive to Productive: Improving ESL Learner' Use of Vocabulary in a Post-Reading Composition Task, *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(2), 205-320.
- Lemmouh, Z. (2008). The relationship between grades and the lexical richness of student essays. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 7(3), 163-180.
- Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking*. MA: MIT Press.
- Li L., & MacGregor, L.J. (2010). Investigating the receptive vocabulary size of university-level Chinese learners of English: How suitable is the Vocabulary Levels Test? *Language and Education*, 24, 239-249.

- Li, M., & Kirby, J. R. (2014). The effects of vocabulary breadth and depth on English reading. *Applied Linguistics*, 1-25.
- Ling, G. U. I. (2015). Predictability of vocabulary size on learners' EFL proficiency: Taking VST, CET4 and CET6 as instruments. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 10(3), 18-23.
- Malmström, H., Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2018). Words for what? Contrasting university students' receptive and productive academic vocabulary needs. *English for Specific Purposes*, 50, 28-39.
- Meara, P., & Fitzpatrick, T. (2007). Vocabulary size estimator. Swansea: Lognostics.
- Meara, P. (1996). The dimensions of lexical competence. In G. Brown, K. Malmkjaer, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Performance and competence in second language acquisition* (pp:35-53). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meara, P. M., & Alcoy, J. C. (2010). Words as Species: An Alternative Approach to Estimating Productive Vocabulary Size. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22(1), 222-236.
- Mehrpour, S., Razmjoo, S. A., & Kian, P. (2011). The Relationship between Depth and Breadth of Vocabulary Knowledge and Reading Comprehension among Iranian EFL Learners. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 53(222), 98-127.
- Melka, F. (1997). Receptive vs. productive aspects of vocabulary. In Schmitt, N., & McCarthy, M. (Eds.). *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition, and Pedagogy* (pp. 84-102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milton, J. (2009). *Measuring Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Mokhtar, A. A. (2010). Achieving Native-like English Lexical Knowledge: The Nonnative Story. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(4), 343-352.
- Mondria, J. A., & Wiersma, B. (2004). Receptive, productive, and receptive + productive L2 vocabulary learning: What difference does it make? *Vocabulary in a second language: Selection, acquisition and testing*, 79-100.
- Morris, L., & Cobb, T. (2004). Vocabulary profiles as predictors of TESL student performance. *System* 32(1), 75-87.
- Mudraya, O. (2006). Engineering English: A lexical frequency instructional model. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 235-256.

- Muncie, J. (2002). Process Writing and Vocabulary Development: Comparing Lexical Frequency Profile across Drafts, *System*, 30, 225-235.
- Nagy, W. (1997). On the role of context in first- and second- language vocabulary learning. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy, (Eds.), *Vocabulary: description, acquisition and pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagy W. E., & Herman, P. A. (1987). Breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge: Implications for acquisition and instruction. In M. G. McKeown, & M. E. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition*, (pp. 19-36). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Nagy, W. E., Anderson, R. C., & Herman, P. A. (1987). Learning Word Meanings from Context during Normal Reading. *American Educational Research Journal*, 24(2), 237-270.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2007). The four strands. *Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001) *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Waring, R. (1997). Vocabulary size, text coverage and word lists. In N. Schmitt, & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary, description, acquisition and pedagogy*, (pp. 6-19). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, P. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *Canadian Modern Language Review/ La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes*, 63(1), 59-82.
- Nation, P. (1990). *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Nizonkiza, D. (2016). First-year university students' receptive and productive use of academic vocabulary. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics*, 45, 169-187.
- Paribakht, T.S., & Wesche, M. (1997). Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary acquisition. In J. Coady, & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy* (pp. 174-199). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pignot-Shahov, V. (2012). Measuring L2 receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. *Language Studies Working Papers*, 4(1), 37-45.
- Putra, A. R. (2014). *Using picture series to improve the writing skill on recount of 8th graders SMP Muhammadiyah 3 Depok in the 2013–2014 Academic Year*. A PhD Dissertation. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri.

- Qian, D. D. (1999). Assessing the roles of depth and breadth of vocabulary knowledge. *Canadian Modern Language Reviews*, 56, 282-307.
- Rashidi, N., & Khosravi, N. (2010). Assessing the Role of Depth and Breadth of Vocabulary Knowledge in Reading Comprehension of Iranian EFL Learners. *Journal of Pan Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 81-108.
- Read, J. (2004). Research in Teaching Vocabulary. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 146-161.
- Read, J. (2000). *Word Associates Test*. Retrieved from www.lex tutor.ca. In January, 2019.
- Read, J., & Chapelle, C. A. (2001). A Framework for Second Language Vocabulary Assessment. *Language Testing*, 18 (1), 2-33.
- Richards, J. C. (1976). The role of vocabulary teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10, 77-89.
- Rudy, M. (2013). EFL Writing strategies of the second year students of SMPIT Daarul ‘Ilmi Kemiling Bandar Lampung. *Paper presented at International Conference on Education and Language (ICEL)*, Bandar Lampung University.
- Santos, M. G. (2010). Depth of academic vocabulary knowledge: Investigating depth of academic vocabulary knowledge among language-minority community college students. *Reflections on English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 19-42.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching Vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary learning strategies. *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy*, (pp.199-227). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Schmitt, N., & Meara, P. (1997). Researching vocabulary through a word knowledge framework. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 17-36.
- Schmitt, N., Ching, Ng, J. W., & Garras, J., (2010). The Word Association Format: Validation Evidence. *Language Testing Online*, 1-22.
- Schmitt, N., Schmitt, D., & Clapham, C. (2001). Developing and Exploring the Behaviour of Two New Versions of the Vocabulary Levels Test. *Language Testing*, 18(1), 55-88.
- Silverman, R. D., Proctor, C. P., Haring, J. R., Hartranft, A. M., Doyle, B., & Zelinke, S. B. (2015). Language skills and reading comprehension in English monolingual

- and Spanish-English bilingual children in grades 2-5. *Reading and Writing*, 28(9), 1381-1405.
- Tahir, S. Z. (2015). Improving students' speaking skill through voice chat at University of Iqra Buru. *Journal of Modern Education Review*, 5(3), 296-306.
- Thorndike, E. L., & Lorge, I. (1944). *The teacher's word book of 30,000 words*. New York: Bureau of Publications.
- Tinkham, T. (1989). Rote learning, attitudes and abilities: A comparison of Japanese and American students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 695-698.
- Tömen, M. (2016). *The relationship between vocabulary size, lexical diversity, lexical density and EFL writing scores: A cross-sectional study*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey.
- Tschirner, E. (2004). Breadth of vocabulary and advanced English study: An empirical investigation. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1(1), 27-39.
- Vermeer, A. (2001). Breadth and depth of vocabulary in relation to L1/L2 acquisition and frequency of input. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 22(2), 217-234.
- Vongpumivitch, V., Huang, J., & Chang, Y. (2009). Frequency Analysis of the Words in The Academic Word List (AWL) and Non-AWL Content Words in Applied Linguistics Research Papers. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28, 33-41.
- Wang, S. (2015). An empirical study on the role of vocabulary knowledge in EFL listening comprehension. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(5), 989-995.
- Waring, R. (2002). Basic principles and practice in vocabulary instruction. *The Language Teacher-Kyoto-Jalt*, 26(7), 11-12.
- Webb, S. (2005). Receptive and productive vocabulary learning: The effects of reading and writing on word knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 33-52.
- Webb, S. (2008). Receptive and productive vocabulary size. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 30, 79-95.
- Wilkins, D. (1972). *Linguistics and Language Teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Yang, Y. I. (2015). An investigation of Chinese junior high school teachers' and students' attitudes towards EFL writing. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 5(2), 59-75.

- Yüksel, İ., & Durmuşoğlu Köse, G. (2013). ELT Majors' Cross Sectional Evaluation of Academic Lexical Competence and Performance. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(2), 244-252.
- Zahar, R., Cobb, T., & Spada, N. (2001). Acquiring vocabulary through reading: Effects of frequency and contextual richness. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 541-572.
- Zareva, A. (2010). Multicompetence and L2 users' associative links: Being unlike native like. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 2-22.
- Zareva, A. (2007). Structure of the second language mental lexicon: How does it compare to native speakers' lexical organization? *Second Language Research*, 23(2), 123-153.
- Zareva, A. (2005). Models of Lexical Knowledge Assessment of Second Language Learners of English of Higher Levels of Language Proficiency. *System*, 33(4), 547-562.
- Zareva, A., Schwanenflugel, P., & Nikolova, Y. (2005). Relationship between lexical competence and language proficiency: Variable sensitivity. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(4), 567-595.
- Zhang, D. (2012). Vocabulary and grammar knowledge in second language reading comprehension: A structural equation modelling study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96(4), 558-575.
- Zhang, J., McBride-Chang, C., Wong, A. M. Y., Tardif, T., Shu, H., & Zhang, Y. (2014). Longitudinal correlates of reading comprehension difficulties in Chinese children. *Reading and Writing*, 27(3), 481-501.
- Zhong, H. (2014). *The interface between receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge: Vocabulary knowledge as a multi-aspect construct*. A PhD Thesis. Sdney: University of Sydney, Australia.
- Zhou, S. (2010). Comparing Receptive and Productive Academic Vocabulary Knowledge of Chinese EFL Learners. *Asian Social Science*, 6(10), 14-19.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. Vocabulary Level Test

Class _____ Name _____ Number _____

Please choose the right word to go with each meaning. Write the number of that word next to its meaning. Here is an example:

- | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. business | |
| 2. clock | _____ part of a house |
| 3. horse | _____ animal with four legs |
| 4. pencil | _____ something used for writing |
| 5. shoe | |
| 6. wall | |

You answer it in the following way;

- | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. business | |
| 2. clock | <u>6</u> part of a house |
| 3. horse | <u>3</u> animal with four legs |
| 4. pencil | <u>4</u> something used for writing |
| 5. shoe | |
| 6. wall | |

THE 2,000 WORD LEVEL

- (1)
- | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. copy | |
| 2. even | _____ end of highest point |
| 3. motor | _____ this moves a car |
| 4. pity | _____ thing made to be like another |
| 5. profit | |
| 6. tip | |

- (2)
- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 1. accident | |
| 2. debt | _____ loud deep sound |
| 3. fortune | _____ something you must pay |
| 4. pride | _____ having a high opinion of yourself |
| 5. roar | |
| 6. thread | |

APPENDIX A. Vocabulary Level Test (Continues)

(3)

- | | |
|--------------|------------------|
| 1. birth | |
| 2. dust | _____ game |
| 3. operation | _____ winning |
| 4. row | _____ being born |
| 5. sport | |
| 6. victory | |

(4)

- | | |
|------------|----------------------|
| 1. clerk | |
| 2. frame | _____ a drink |
| 3. noise | _____ office worker |
| 4. respect | _____ unwanted sound |
| 5. theatre | |
| 6. wine | |

(5)

- | | |
|----------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. dozen | |
| 2. empire | _____ chance |
| 3. gift | _____ twelve |
| 4. opportunity | _____ money paid to the government |
| 5. relief | |
| 6. tax | |

(6)

- | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. admire | |
| 2. complain | _____ make wider and longer |
| 3. fix | _____ bring in for the first time |
| 4. hire | _____ have a high opinion of someone |
| 5. introduce | |
| 6. stretch | |

(7)

- | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. arrange | |
| 2. develop | _____ grow |
| 3. lean | _____ put in order |
| 4. owe | _____ like more than something else |
| 5. prefer | |
| 6. seize | |

(8)

- | | |
|----------|------------------------|
| 1. blame | |
| 2. elect | _____ make |
| 3. jump | _____ choose by voting |

APPENDIX A. Vocabulary Level Test (Continues)

4. manufacture _____ become like water
5. melt
6. threaten

(9)

1. brave
2. electric _____ commonly done
3. firm _____ wanting food
4. hungry _____ having no fear
5. local
6. usual

(10)

1. bitter
2. independent _____ beautiful
3. lovely _____ small
4. merry _____ liked by many people
5. popular
6. slight

THE 3,000 WORD LEVEL

(1)

1. bull
2. champion _____ formal and serious manner
3. dignity _____ winner of a sporting event
4. hell _____ building where valuable objects are shown
5. museum
6. solution

(2)

1. blanket
2. contest _____ holiday
3. generation _____ good quality
4. merit _____ wool covering used on beds
5. plot
6. vacation

APPENDIX A. Vocabulary Level Test (Continues)

(3)

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 1. apartment | |
| 2. candle | _____ a place to live |
| 3. draft | _____ chance of something happening |
| 4. horror | _____ first rough form of something written |
| 5. prospect | |
| 6. timber | |

(4)

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. administration | |
| 2. angel | _____ group of animals |
| 3. frost | _____ spirit who serves God |
| 4. herd | _____ managing business and affairs |
| 5. fort | |
| 6. pond | |

(5)

- | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. atmosphere | |
| 2. counsel | _____ advice |
| 3. factor | _____ a place to cover with grass |
| 4. hen | _____ female chicken |
| 5. lawn | |
| 6. muscle | |

(6)

- | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. abandon | |
| 2. dwell | _____ live in a place |
| 3. oblige | _____ follow in order to catch |
| 4. pursue | _____ leave something permanently |
| 5. quote | |
| 6. resolve | |

(7)

- | | |
|-------------|------------------------------|
| 1. assemble | |
| 2. attach | _____ look closely |
| 3. peer | _____ stop doing something |
| 4. quit | _____ cry out loudly in fear |
| 5. scream | |
| 6. toss | |

(8)

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. drift | |
| 2. endure | _____ suffer patiently |
| 3. grasp | _____ join wool threads together |
| 4. knit | _____ hold firmly with your hands |

- 5. register
- 6. tumble

(9)

- | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|
| 1. brilliant | |
| 2. distinct | _____ thin |
| 3. magic | _____ steady |
| 4. naked | _____ without clothes |
| 5. slender | |
| 6. stable | |

(10)

- | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. aware | |
| 2. blank | _____ usual |
| 3. desperate | _____ best or most important |
| 4. normal | _____ knowing what is happening |
| 5. striking | |
| 6. supreme | |

ACADEMIC VOCABULARY

(1)

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 1. area | |
| 2. contract | _____ written agreement |
| 3. definition | _____ way of doing something |
| 4. evidence | _____ reason for believing something is or is not true |
| 5. method | |
| 6. role | |

(2)

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| 1. construction | |
| 2. feature | _____ safety |
| 3. impact | _____ noticeable part of something |
| 4. institute | _____ organization which has a special purpose |
| 5. region | |
| 6. security | |

(3)

- | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. debate | |
| 2. exposure | _____ plan |
| 3. integration | _____ choice |
| 4. option | _____ joining something into a whole |
| 5. scheme | |
| 6. stability | |

APPENDIX A. Vocabulary Level Test (Continues)

(4)

- | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. access | |
| 2. gender | _____ male or female |
| 3. implementation | _____ study of the mind |
| 4. license | _____ entrance or way in |
| 5. orientation | |
| 6. psychology | |

(5)

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| 1. accumulation | |
| 2. edition | _____ collecting things over time |
| 3. guarantee | _____ promise to repair a broken product |
| 4. media | _____ feeling a strong reason or need to do |
| something | |
| 5. motivation | |
| 6. phenomenon | |

(6)

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| 1. adult | |
| 2. exploitation | _____ end |
| 3. infrastructure | _____ machine used to move people or goods |
| 4. schedule | _____ list of things to do at certain times |
| 5. termination | |
| 6. vehicle | |

(7)

- | | |
|-------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. alter | |
| 2. coincide | _____ change |
| 3. deny | _____ say something is not true |
| 4. devote | _____ describe clearly and exactly |
| 5. release | |
| 6. specify | |

(8)

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 1. convert | |
| 2. design | _____ keep out |
| 3. exclude | _____ stay alive |
| 4. facilitate | _____ change from one thing into another |
| 5. indicate | |
| 6. survive | |

(9)

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 1. bond | |
| 2. channel | _____ make smaller |
| 3. estimate | _____ guess the number or size of something |

4. identify _____ recognizing and naming a person or thing
5. mediate
6. minimize

(10)

1. explicit
2. final _____ last
3. negative _____ stiff
4. professional _____ meaning „no“ or „not“
5. rigid
6. sole

(11)

1. analogous
2. objective _____ happening after
3. potential _____ most important
4. predominant _____ influenced by personal opinions
5. reluctant
6. sole

(12)

1. abstract
2. adjacent _____ next to
3. controversial _____ added to
4. global _____ concerning the whole world
5. neutral
6. supplementary

THE 5000 WORD LEVEL

(1)

1. analysis
2. curb _____ eagerness
3. gravel _____ loan to buy a house
4. mortgage _____ small stones mixed with sand
5. scar
6. zeal

(2)

1. concrete
2. era _____ circular shape
3. fiber _____ top of a mountain
4. loop _____ a long period of time
5. plank
6. summit

APPENDIX A. Vocabulary Level Test (Continues)

(3)

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 1. circus | |
| 2. jungle | _____ musical instrument |
| 3. nomination | _____ seat without a back or arms |
| 4. sermon | _____ speech given by a priest in a church |
| 5. stool | |
| 6. trumpet | |

(4)

- | | |
|--------------|---------------------------|
| 1. artillery | |
| 2. creed | _____ a kind of tree |
| 3. hydrogen | _____ a system of belief |
| 4. maple | _____ large gun on wheels |
| 5. pork | |
| 6. streak | |

(5)

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 1. chart | |
| 2. forge | _____ map |
| 3. mansion | _____ large beautiful house |
| 4. outfit | _____ place where metals are made and shaped |
| 5. sample | |
| 6. volunteer | |

(6)

- | | |
|----------------|----------------------------|
| 1. contemplate | |
| 2. extract | _____ think about deeply |
| 3. gamble | _____ bring back to health |
| 4. launch | _____ make someone angry |
| 5. provoke | |
| 6. revive | |

(7)

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| 1. demonstrate | |
| 2. embarrass | _____ have a rest |
| 3. heave | _____ break suddenly into pieces |
| 4. obscure | _____ make someone feel shy or nervous |
| 5. relax | |
| 6. shatter | |

APPENDIX A. Vocabulary Level Test (Continues)

(8)

- | | |
|---------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. correspond | |
| 2. embroider | _____ exchange letters |
| 3. lurk | _____ hide and wait for someone |
| 4. penetrate | _____ feel angry about something |
| 5. prescribe | |
| 6. resent | |

(9)

- | | |
|---------------|----------------------------|
| 1. decent | |
| 2. frail | _____ weak |
| 3. harsh | _____ concerning a city |
| 4. incredible | _____ difficult to believe |
| 5. municipal | |
| 6. specific | |

(10)

- | | |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. adequate | |
| 2. internal | _____ enough |
| 3. mature | _____ full grown |
| 4. profound | _____ alone away from other thing |
| 5. solitary | |
| 6. tragic | |

THE 10,000 WORD LEVEL

(1)

- | | |
|---------------|---------------------------|
| 1. apparition | |
| 2. botany | _____ ghost |
| 3. expulsion | _____ study of plants |
| 4. insolence | _____ small pool of water |
| 5. leash | |
| 6. puddle | |

(2)

- | | |
|------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. alcove | |
| 2. impetus | _____ priest |
| 3. maggot | _____ release from prison early |
| 4. parole | _____ medicine to put on wounds |
| 5. salve | |
| 6. vicar | |

(3)

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 1. dissipate | |
|--------------|--|

APPENDIX A. Vocabulary Level Test (Continues)

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 2. flaunt | _____ steal |
| 3. impede | _____ scatter or vanish |
| 4. loot | _____ twist the body about uncomfortably |
| 5. squirm | |
| 6 vie | |

(4)

- | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. contaminate | |
| 2. cringe | _____ write carelessly |
| 3. immerse | _____ move back because of fear |
| 4. peek | _____ put something under water |
| 5. relay | |
| 6. scrawl | |

(5)

- | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|
| 1. indolent | |
| 2. nocturnal | _____ lazy |
| 3. obsolete | _____ no longer used |
| 4. torrid | _____ clever and tricky |
| 5. translucent | |
| 6. wily | |

(6)

- | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. alabaster | |
| 2. chandelier | _____ small barrel |
| 3. dogma | _____ soft white stone |
| 4. keg | _____ tool for shaping wood |
| 5. rasp | |
| 6. tentacle | |

(7)

- | | |
|----------------|----------------------------|
| 1. arsenal | |
| 2. barracks | _____ happiness |
| 3. deacon | _____ difficult situation |
| 4. felicity | _____ minister in a church |
| 5. predicament | |
| 6. spore | |

(8)

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 1. alkali | |
| 2. banter | _____ light joking talk |
| 3. coop | _____ a rank of British nobility |
| 4. mosaic | _____ picture of small piece of glass or stone |
| 5. stealth | |
| 6. viscount | |

APPENDIX B. Word Associates Test

Instruction for taking Word Associates Test:

This is a test of how well you know the meaning of adjectives that are commonly used in English. Each item looks like this:

Example: sudden

☐ beautiful ☒ quick ☒ surprising ☐ thirsty	☒ change ☐ doctor ☒ noise ☐ school
--	--

There are eight words in the two boxes (left & right boxes).

The words here on the left side may help to explain the meaning of "sudden".	The words here on the right side are nouns that may come after "sudden" in a phrase or a sentence.
"Sudden" means "happening quickly and unexpectedly", so the correct answers on the left side are " quick " and " surprising ".	We do not normally say "a sudden doctor" or "a sudden school", but we often say " a sudden change " and " a sudden noise ", so "change" and "noise" are the correct answers on this side.

From the two boxes, select **FOUR WORDS** that you think are relevant to the stimulus word, then, according to the criteria mentioned above, put (✓) in the boxes.

NOTE: In the example above, there are two correct answers on the left and two on the right, but this is just an example. **Do NOT assume there is a consistent number of correct answers on the left or on the right.** Just remember: try to find **four related words for each item.**

APPENDIX B. Word Associates Test (Continues)

1. beautiful

☐ enjoyable ☐ expensive ☐ free ☐ loud	☐ education ☐ face ☐ music ☐ weather
---	--

2. bright

☐ clever ☐ famous ☐ happy ☐ shining	☐ color ☐ hand ☐ poem ☐ taste
---	---

3. calm

☐ open ☐ quiet ☐ smooth ☐ tired	☐ cloth ☐ day ☐ light ☐ person
---	--

4. natural

☐ expected ☐ helpful ☐ real ☐ short	☐ foods ☐ neighbors ☐ parents ☐ songs
---	---

5. fresh

☐ another ☐ cool ☐ easy ☐ raw	☐ cotton ☐ heat ☐ language ☐ water
---	--

6. general

☐ closed ☐ different ☐ usual ☐ whole	☐ country ☐ idea ☐ reader ☐ street
--	--

7. bare

☐ empty ☐ heavy ☐ uncovered ☐ useful	☐ cupboard ☐ feet ☐ school ☐ tool
--	---

8. acute

☐ hidden ☐ often ☐ rich ☐ sharp	☐ angle ☐ hearing ☐ illness ☐ stones
---	--

9. common

☐ complete ☐ light ☐ ordinary ☐ shared	☐ boundary ☐ circle ☐ name ☐ party
--	--

10. complex

☐ angry ☐ difficult ☐ necessary ☐ sudden	☐ argument ☐ passengers ☐ patterns ☐ problem
--	--

11. broad

☐ full ☐ moving ☐ quiet ☐ wide	☐ night ☐ river ☐ shoulders ☐ smile
--	---

12. conscious

☐ awake ☐ healthy ☐ knowing ☐ laughing	☐ face ☐ decision ☐ effort ☐ student
--	--

13. convenient

☐ easy ☐ fresh ☐ near ☐ suitable	☐ experience ☐ sound ☐ time ☐ vegetable
--	---

14. dense

☐ crowded ☐ hot ☐ noisy ☐ thick	☐ forest ☐ handle ☐ smoke ☐ weather
---	---

APPENDIX B. Word Associates Test (Continues)

15. **curious**

☐ helpful ☐ interested ☐ missing ☐ strange	☐ accident ☐ child ☐ computer ☐ steel
--	---

16. **distinct**

☐ clear ☐ famous ☐ separate ☐ true	☐ advantage ☐ meanings ☐ news ☐ parents
--	---

17. **dull**

☐ cloudy ☐ loud ☐ nice ☐ secret	☐ color ☐ knife ☐ place ☐ rock
---	--

18. **direct**

☐ honest ☐ main ☐ straight ☐ wide	☐ fence ☐ flight ☐ heat ☐ river
---	---

19. **favorable**

☐ helpful ☐ legal ☐ possible ☐ positive	☐ habit ☐ response ☐ teacher ☐ weather
---	--

20. **secure**

☐ confident ☐ enjoyable ☐ fixed ☐ safe	☐ game ☐ job ☐ meal ☐ visitor
--	---

21. **tight**

☐ close ☐ rough ☐ uncomfortable ☐ wet	☐ bend ☐ pants ☐ surface ☐ wood
---	---

22. **violent**

☐ expected ☐ smelly ☐ strong ☐ unlucky	☐ anger ☐ death ☐ rubbish ☐ storm
--	---

23. **chronic**

☐ continuing ☐ local ☐ serious ☐ unplanned	☐ accident ☐ examination ☐ illness ☐ shortage
--	---

24. **compact**

☐ effective ☐ small ☐ solid ☐ useful	☐ group ☐ kitchen ☐ medicine ☐ string
--	---

25. **crude**

☐ clever ☐ fair ☐ rough ☐ valuable	☐ behavior ☐ drawing ☐ oil ☐ trade
--	--

26. **domestic**

☐ home ☐ national ☐ regular ☐ smooth	☐ animal ☐ movement ☐ policy ☐ speed
--	--

27. **profound**

☐ bright ☐ deep ☐ exact ☐ great	☐ effect ☐ machine ☐ taste ☐ thought
---	--

28. **fertile**

☐ dark ☐ growing ☐ private ☐ special	☐ business ☐ egg ☐ mind ☐ soil
--	--

APPENDIX B. Word Associates Test (Continues)

29. formal

☐ fast ☐ loud ☐ organized ☐ serious	☐ bomb ☐ education ☐ growth ☐ statement
---	---

30. independent

☐ changed ☐ equal ☐ important ☐ separate	☐ child ☐ country ☐ ideas ☐ prices
--	--

31. original

☐ careful ☐ closed ☐ first ☐ proud	☐ condition ☐ mind ☐ plan ☐ sister
--	--

32. sensitive

☐ feeling ☐ interesting ☐ sharp ☐ thick	☐ clothes ☐ instrument ☐ skin ☐ topic
---	---

33. professional

☐ paid ☐ public ☐ regular ☐ religious	☐ advice ☐ manner ☐ musician ☐ transport
---	--

34. critical

☐ clear ☐ dangerous ☐ important ☐ rough	☐ festival ☐ illness ☐ time ☐ water
---	---

35. synthetic

☐ artificial ☐ electronic ☐ expensive ☐ simple	☐ drug ☐ meal ☐ radio ☐ sound
--	---

36. liberal

☐ free ☐ moderate ☐ plenty ☐ valuable	☐ crops ☐ furniture ☐ parents ☐ transport
---	---

37. dramatic

☐ exciting ☐ official ☐ surprising ☐ worried	☐ adventure ☐ change ☐ patient ☐ salary
--	---

38. conservative

☐ cautious ☐ hopeful ☐ traditional ☐ warm	☐ clothes ☐ estimate ☐ meeting ☐ signal
---	---

39. coherent

☐ clear ☐ normal ☐ recent ☐ together	☐ crime ☐ health ☐ speech ☐ theory
--	--

40. ample

☐ heavy ☐ large ☐ plentiful ☐ windy	☐ amount ☐ climate ☐ feelings ☐ time
---	--

APPENDIX C. The Writing Task

Please write a well-developed opinion paragraph of about 100-150 words, using specific reasons and examples to support your position.

“Are first impressions accurate? Why/Why not?”

Make sure you write;

- a topic sentence
- supporting sentences
- a concluding sentence

[illegible]

APPENDIX D. A Sample Answer to the Writing Task

From childhood to being adult, when we meet someone, most of us judge people according to their behaviors and how they look. That's why make a good first impression is important. When I meet someone, I prefer to learn about him or her as much as I can, but also I want to make a good first impression. Firstly, I keep my distance against the person. I don't want to look like a disturbing person, but also I don't want to be a cold person. I balance my distance. Secondly, I wear little bit more formal clothes. I want to show that I care him or her. When I meet the person, I want to learn a lot about him/her and someday I become an old book. In this way, we trust each other. Finally, the most important way for me is eye contact. I listen him/her carefully and look in the eyes. It is another way to say that I care you and your words. If you are a good listener, rest of it is not important so much.

To sum up, to make a good first impression, care about the other person, show him/her your interest and attention, it will make a good first impression.

APPENDIX E. The Speaking Task

You are supposed to do talk about “Is change good or bad?”

- Why/Why not?
- What is the biggest change in your life? Can you give some details and examples?
- What are the advantages/ disadvantages of a change?
- What is your conclusion about this topic?

APPENDIX F: A Sample Transcript for the Speaking Task

STUDENT (S): Hello, I am Ahmet, Ahmet Sevim. I have been studying English Language Literature in Kütahya. This my second university; maybe I can start with this. This is really important changing for me. Because it's actually difficult, but it's really important for me because after my graduation from my first university and realized that I work as I English teacher. And then I realized that I should be English teacher and I decided to study. But of course, I know I'm late. But I strongly think that people should do whatever they want, no matter it's late or not. And feeling is really important. When I'm back. When I go my back of course I was very happy at my first university. But now actually I feel better then. So this change is good for me. Good change. Advantages and disadvantages. Actually it depends on the situation. For me, there are some advantages and disadvantages. As I said before, I'm 26 so this is disadvantages because I have a friend from my first university, they got married and they have a baby and their baby started to walk. And now I'm single maybe I will marry after five years. I don't know, I'm not sure. Advantages... I feel better now. I can say that. I love this department. For example, in the past, after lessons we always played games, we always spent time with my friends. I didn't want to study lesson but now I really want to study. Every day I can read a book, I can study English. I love my department. So this is actually advantages for me because if I didn't come here, doing my life, rest of my life I've always, I will probably thought that "I wish, I wish I study this department" And conclusion, with my story I always say that to people they should follow their... their...hayal?

Teacher (T): Dream...

S: Dream. This is really important. And... it doesn't matter it's late or not. It's dangerous or not. Actually if you really want you can do whatever you want. I strongly think that.

APPENDIX G: A Sample LFP Output

WEB VP OUTPUT FOR FILE: Untitled (1.89 kb)

Words recategorized by user as 1k items (proper nouns etc): NONE (total 0 tokens)

	<u>Families</u>	<u>Types</u>	<u>Tokens</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
K1 Words (1-1000):	106	127	350	96.15%	
Function:	...	...	(214)	(58.79%)	
Content:	...	...	(136)	(37.36%)	
> Anglo-Sax	...	...	(66)	(18.13%)	
K2 Words (1001-2000):	4	5	6	1.65%	
> Anglo-Sax	...	...	()	(0.00%)	
1k+2k			...	(97.80%)	
AWL Words:	1	1	1	0.27%	
> Anglo-Sax	...	...	()	(0.00%)	
Off-List Words:	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1.92%</u>	
	111+?	139	364	100%	

Current profile		Words in text (tokens):	364
		Different words (types):	139
		Type-token ratio:	0.38
		Tokens per type:	2.62
		Lex density (content words/total)	0.41
%	Cumul.	<i>Pertaining to onlist only</i>	
96.15	96.15	Tokens:	357
1.65	97.80	Types:	133
0.27	98.07	Families:	111
1.92	100.00	Tokens per family:	3.22
		Types per family:	1.20
		Anglo-Sax Index:	%
		(A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	
		Greco-Lat/Fr-Cognate Index: (Inverse of above)	%

APPENDIX H: Consent Form

ARAŞTIRMA GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU

Bu çalışma, “**Üniversite Hazırlık Sınıfı Öğrencilerinin Sözcüksel Anlama ve Performanslarının Değerlendirilmesi: Kütahya Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Örneği**” başlıklı bir araştırma çalışması olup Kütahya Dumlupınar Üniversitesi’ndeki hazırlık sınıfında öğrenim gören öğrencilerin genel ve akademik sözcüksel algılarını ve performanslarını incelemek ve değerlendirmek amacını taşımaktadır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda öğrencilerin sözcüksel anlama ve performanslarının birbirleriyle ilişkisi ve öğrencilerin edindikleri sözcükler derinlik ve boyutluk kapsamında değerlendirilerek, algısal ve üretimsel aşamalara etkileri incelenecektir.

Çalışma, Öğr. Gör. Ceren TAŞATAN ÇAKMAK tarafından yürütülmekte ve sonuçları ile öğrencilerin sözcük bilgisinin algısal ve üretimsel boyutunun birbirleriyle olan ilişkisine ve bu ilişkinin öğrencilerin dil öğrenme sürecindeki etkisine bakılacaktır.

- Bu çalışmaya katılımınız gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır.
- Çalışmanın amacı doğrultusunda, sözcük testleri uygulanacak, sözlü görüşmeler yapılacak ve görüş paragrafları yazdırılacaktır. Bunlar sonucunda veriler toplanacaktır.
- İsminizi yazmak yada kimliğinizi açığa çıkaracak bir bilgi vermek zorunda değilsiniz. Araştırmada katılımcıların isimleri gizli tutulacaktır.
- Araştırma kapsamında toplanan veriler, sadece bilimsel amaçlar doğrultusunda kullanılacak, araştırmanın amacı dışında ya da başka araştırmada kullanılmayacak ve gerekmesi halinde, sizin (yazılı) izniniz olmadan başkalarıyla paylaşılmayacaktır.
- İstemeniz halinde sizden toplanan verileri inceleme hakkınız bulunmaktadır.
- Sizden toplanan veriler bilgisayar depolama ve klasik depolama yöntemleri ile korunacak ve araştırma bitiminde arşivlenecek veya imha edilecektir.

APPENDIX H: Consent Form (Continues)

- Veri toplama sürecinde/süreçlerinde size rahatsızlık verebilecek herhangi bir soru/talep olmayacaktır. Yine de katılımınız sırasında herhangi bir sebepten rahatsızlık hissederseniz çalışmadan istediğiniz zamanda ayrılabilirsiniz. Çalışmadan ayrılmanız durumunda sizden toplanan veriler çalışmadan çıkarılacak ve imha edilecektir.

Gönüllü katılım formunu okumak ve değerlendirmek üzere ayırdığınız zaman için teşekkür ederim. Çalışma hakkındaki sorularınızı Anadolu Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümünden Doç Dr. Ali Merç'e yöneltebilirsiniz.

Araştırmacı Adı : Ceren TAŞATAN
ÇAKMAK
Adres : Kütahya Dumlupınar Üniversitesi YDYO
B Blok Oda:109

Cep Tel : 05346922715

Bu çalışmaya tamamen kendi rızamla, istediğim takdirde çalışmadan ayrılabileceğimi bilerek verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlarla kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.

(Lütfen bu formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra veri toplayan kişiye veriniz.)

Katılımcı Ad ve Soyadı:

İmza:

Tarih:

APPENDIX I: Anadolu Üniversitesi Etik Kurul Belgesi

Evrak Kayıt Tarihi: 13.03.2019

Protokol No: 21576

Tarih: 28.03.2019



ANADOLU ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER BİLİMSEL ARAŞTIRMA VE YAYIN ETİĞİ KURULU
KARAR BELGESİ

ÇALIŞMANIN TÜRÜ:	Yüksek Lisans Tez Çalışması
KONU:	Eğitim Bilimleri
BAŞLIK:	Üniversite Hazırlık Sınıfı Öğrencilerinin Sözcüksel Anlama ve Performanslarının Değerlendirilmesi: Kütahya Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Örneği
PROJE/TEZ YÜRÜTÜCÜSÜ:	Doç. Dr. Ali MERÇ
TEZ YAZARI:	Ceren TAŞATAN ÇAKMAK
ALT KOMİSYON GÖRÜŞÜ:	-
KARAR:	Olumlu
Prof.Dr. Coşkun BAYRAK (Başkan Eğitim Fak.)	
Prof.Dr. T. Volkan YÜZER (Başkan Yardımcısı-Açıköğretim Fak.)	Prof.Dr. Esra CEYHAN (Eğitim Fak.)
Prof.Dr. Münevver ÇAKI (Güzel Sanatlar Fak.)	Prof.Dr. M. Erkan ÜYÜMEZ (İkt. ve İdari Bil. Fak.)
Prof.Dr. Hândan DEVECİ (Eğitim Fak.)	Prof.Dr. Emel ŞIKLAR (İkt. ve İdari Bil. Fak.)

**APPENDIX J: Kütahya Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Veri
Toplama İzni**

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 20/05/2019-8388



T.C.
ANADOLU ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Genel Sekreterlik
Yazı İşleri Müdürlüğü



Sayı : 63784619-605.01
Konu : Ceren TAŞATAN ÇAKMAK'ın
Yüksek Lisans Tezi Uygulama İzin
Talebi

KÜTAHYA DUMLUPINAR ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE

Üniversitemiz Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngilizce Öğretmenliği Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Ceren TAŞATAN ÇAKMAK, Doç. Dr. Ali MERCİ'in danışmanlığında "Üniversite Hazırlık Sınıfı Öğrencilerinin Sözcüksel Anlama ve Performanslarının Değerlendirilmesi: Kütahya Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Örneği" başlıklı Yüksek Lisans tezini hazırlamaktadır. Tez çalışması kapsamında 2018-2019 öğretim yılı Bahar döneminde Üniversitemiz Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Hazırlık sınıfı orta üst seviye sınıflarında bulunan öğrencilerle sözcük testleri, konuşma görevleri ve görüş paragraflarından oluşan çalışmasının uygulanması planlanmaktadır. Araştırmanın uygulanmasında Üniversitemiz Etik Kurulunca sakınca bulunmamaktadır.

Bilgilerinizi ve araştırmanın uygulanabilmesi için gerekli iznin verilmesini arz ederim.

e-imzalıdır
Prof. Dr. Güler GÜNŞOY
Rektör a.
Rektör Yardımcısı

Ek: Yüksek Lisans Tez Önerisi