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Abstract
The current study aims to add to the debate on whether or not the use of L2 learners' mother tongue should be allowed in the classroom by evaluating the efficacy of specific instruction types. The current project was administered in two Iranian EFL classrooms to determine the differential effects of teachers' first language (L1) use and second language (L2)-only explanations on Persian-speaking adults' acquisition and learning of concrete and abstract English words. A sample of 30 Low Intermediate and Intermediate level EFL learners was chosen for L1-use group; 30 participants were allocated to an L2-only use condition, and another 30 participants to a comparison group. Pretests, immediate posttests, and delayed posttests (four weeks later) in the form of the revised vocabulary knowledge scale (RVKS) were applied to all participants. The study found that teacher's code-switching can result in higher vocabulary improvements in immediate and delayed retention, notably for concrete words in the process of teaching and learning.
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Background
The idea of code-switching has been extensively discussed in linguistics and a range of other related fields. This concept first came into view in Vogt's (1954) report on Weinreich Languages in Contact (1953). Weinreich used the term "switching codes," evidently borrowed from information theory (Fano, 1950). Jakobson (1953) and Haugen (1956) were among the first linguists to build up this notion.

The debate on code-switching between English as a Foreign/Second language (EFL/ESL) and the first language (L1) in English classrooms has been ongoing for over 20 years (Lee & Macaro, 2013). The omission of L1 from L2 classes was for a
long time an indisputable presumption in foreign language teaching. This approach, advocating the exclusive or near exclusive use of the target language (Lightbown, 2001; Turnbull, 2000; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002; Wong-Fillmore, 1985), is supported by the reason that L1 use in the classroom would be counterproductive and can limit input and output opportunities in L2 (Chaudron, 1988; Lightbown, 1991; Liu, 2008; Mattioli, 2004). Researchers on second language acquisition (SLA) support a situation of maximizing L2 and escaping or limiting the use of L1 in language classrooms (Chambers, 1991; Duff & Polio, 1990; Ellis 1984; Ellis, 1994; Franklin, 1990; Levine, 2011; Turnbull, 2001). They argue that if language teachers use L1 excessively in the classroom, learners' sufficient exposure to L2 input is denied with adverse effects on L2 learning and may also delay L2 acquisition (Kang, 2008, Polio & Duff, 1994; Turnbull & Arnett 2002). Moreover, they claim that the use of L2 through the "comprehensible input" outline (Krashen, 1985), and "interaction" opportunities in the language classroom (Long, 1983) tend to be more contributive to successful second language acquisition than relying upon L1 to teach L2.

Phillipson (1992) attributes to this approach as the 'monolingual fallacy', which claims that language is ideally taught monolingually. However, teaching practices are not necessarily matched with the language policy makers' views and research reports that teachers have continued to use L1 in foreign and second language classrooms consistently (Dailey O'Cain & Liebscher 2009; de la Campa & Nassaji 2009; Ferguson 2003; Kang 2008; Polio & Duff 1994). On the contrary, there are actually suggestions for the inclusion of L1 in L2 classrooms. Based on these recommendations, using L1 does not create an obstacle to L2 learning; rather, it's a useful cognitive, affective, and linguistic tool to scaffold the development of the L2 learner (Atkinson, 1987; Auerbach, 1993; Canagarajah, 1995; Cummins, 2007; Elridge, 1996; Ferguson, 2003; Levine, 2003; Macaro, 2001, 2009; Qian, Tian, & Wang, 2009; Rivera, 1990; Rivers, 2011; Shamash, 1990; Tian & Macaro, 2012; Tian, 2014). Nevertheless, this should not be viewed as a confirmation for reducing the target language (TL) input and maximizing the usage of L1 in the language classroom, because even those who have consistently opposed the exclusion of L1 from the L2 classroom address that the use of L2 needs to be maximized (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Cook, 2001; Macaro, 2001).

The functions of L1 use vary from explanations of morphology and syntax (Gearon, 2006) to managing students’ behavior (Franklin, 1990). However, the most common is to probably supply information on the meanings of lexical items in L2-dominated classrooms (Liu et al., 2004; Rolin-lanziti & Brownlie, 2002). Littlewood and Yu (2011) drew from their findings that the L1 is generally “an efficient way of clarifying the meanings of words” (p. 71).

The main reason we are centering on vocabulary acquisition is the fact that acquisition of vocabulary has a key role in learning a second language (Sökmen, 1997). Another claim is that second language learners need to have a considerable
vocabulary size (Nation, 2001). Cook (1991) claims that vocabulary learning is required for the four language skills. Schmitt and McCarthy (1997) claimed that “a learner's L1 is one of the most important factors in learning L2 vocabulary” (p.2). Macaro, (2001, 2009) conducted two studies on code-switching and vocabulary acquisition concluding that there is no evidence for any negative effects of code-switching. Nation (2001) and Auerbach (1993) declared that the using the learner's L1 in the L2 classroom have a positive influence on learners' second language learning, particularly in the area of vocabulary. In an experimental condition, using brief lexical code-switches, Tian and Macaro (2012) suggested an affirmative effect on vocabulary acquisition by university students.

Vocabulary teaching generally includes two kinds of medium of instruction (MoI) to deliver lexical information in L2 classrooms: the first is using L1 and the second is L2-only use. By definition, the previous relates to the process in which a target word's meaning is explained via its L1 equal. It must be mentioned that, this particular MoI can be employed only when all learners share a similar L1 with their non-native speaker teachers (NNSTs) and if an L2 word and its translation correspondent can be precisely and directly matched with the body meaning. Another technique for presenting lexical explanation is using the L2, a procedure during which target words are explained via intra-lingual teaching methods, including definition, paraphrase, circumlocution, exposition, contextualization, along with the providing semantic neighbors (e.g. synonyms, antonyms, hypernyms, and meronyms) (Tian & Macaro, 2012).

An investigation by Kaushanskaya and Rechtzigel (2012) on the learning of new words concerning concrete versus abstract words notified that the bilingual influence is more distinct for learning unfamiliar concrete referents in comparison to abstract words. This conclusion claims that bilingual advantages for word learning might be embedded, to some extent, in bilinguals' greater awareness of semantic information in the course of learning.

Theories of lexical processing in bilinguals mainly presuppose the semantic representations of translation equivalents in a bilingual's two languages overlap (Kroll & Stewart, 1994). Nevertheless, there have also been ideas about several kinds of words overlapping in the bilingual semantic system to contrasting degrees. Especially, the distributed feature model (De Groot, 1992) presupposes that concrete words seem to share semantic characteristics through bilinguals' two languages than abstract words, and several behavioral findings have implied that concrete translation equivalents over the bilingual's two languages may share a greater semantic overlap compared to abstract translation substitutes (Paivio & Desrochers, 1980; Van Hell & De Groot, 1998; De Groot, & Keijzer, 2000).

Even though concrete words can be recognized from abstract words to a certain level, it ought to be minded that the difference between them is not adequately definite, as they quite simply all sit along a continuum that spreads from most abstract
to most concrete. For instance, words like *animal, flora,* and *vehicle* indicate concrete entities, but additionally hold some extent of abstractness which raises difficulty when it comes to FL learning. As mentioned above, previous studies on learning concrete and abstract vocabularies are more based on theories and presuppositions other than experimental and classroom-practice-based investigations. Along this line of argument, we also examined the differential effect of L1 use and L2 only use on learning concrete and abstract words to obtain more realistic results concerning concrete and abstract vocabulary learning. In this study we solely examined the difference between immediate vocabulary retention and long-term retention of concrete and abstract words, and comparing the acquisition of concrete versus abstract words was not the subject of this research in line with Zhao and Macaro (2016).

The present study aims to look at code-switching from classroom perspective. Classroom code-switching is described as using multiple linguistic code or language in the classroom by teachers and students. Although code-switching has been largely investigated in the context of ESL and immersion classrooms since the 1980s (Turnbull & Arnett, 2002), studies on code-switching in FL classrooms are brand-new (Lin 2013). The majority of the research on classroom code-switching has long been widely descriptive and few studies have been experimental investigating L1’s role in TL acquisition (Macaro, 2009; Tian & Macaro, 2012; Zhao and Macaro 2016).

The majority of the studies on classroom code-switching between English and Persian used survey and/or interview data (Ghorbani, 2011; Hashemi & Sabet, 2013; Moghadam, Samad, & Shahraki, 2012; Momenian & Samar, 2011; Moradkhani, 2012; Nazary, 2008; Rahimi & Eftekhari, 2011; Rahimi & Jafari, 2011; Rezvani & Rasekh. 2011; Samani & Narafshan, 2016; Samar & Moradkhani, 2014; Simin, Teimouri, Kasmaee & Rezaei, 2005) and are not based on an analysis of the actual classroom language use. Therefore, it seems necessary to carry out more instruction-based and classroom-practice-based studies to cast more light on the exact practice of code-switching in the classroom, especially in the Iranian context which is still in its infancy.

Compared to the previous study by Zhao and Macaro (2016), the current research examines whether teachers’ L1 use and L2-only explanations have any differential effects on Iranian EFL learners’ acquisition of concrete and abstract English words. In the present study, a more realistic teaching procedure (retrieving target words after interventions) is carried out to lend more support and empirical observations about the L2 vocabulary teaching in instructional settings. The participants are low proficiency level EFL students; therefore, the material and assessments are consequently contrasting with Zhao and Macaro (2016). As reported by Ahmed & Jusoff (2009), code switching enhances the flow of classroom instruction since teachers don't need to spend a lot of time to describe or try to find easy and simple words to explain any misunderstanding that could happen. Many experts acknowledge that L1 plays a huge role in language teaching, mainly for the
low proficiency learners (LPL), providing a basis for learners to enhance L2 structures, particularly during collective activities in the classroom, arranging feeling of security and confirming the learners' real experiments, letting them to represent themselves (Atkinson, 1987; Nation, 2003; Schweers, 1999; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Tian & Macaro, 2012; Wells, 1999).

Although studies have centered on teacher L1 use concerning quantity and functions, few researches have studied its effect on language learning, due to the diverse variables that mediate in this kind of process–product study, especially when it occurs in intact classrooms. The higher need for English language learning for instrumental purposes and the failure of the EFL learners to accomplish a higher level of proficiency and the need for studies based on an analysis of the actual classroom language use and instruction-based and classroom-practice-based data to support the L1 use in EFL classrooms in Iran are crucial factors to conduct this research. Another issue could be that teachers who start their teaching as soon as they complete their studies are usually in a state of confusion about certain issues of English Language Teaching (ELT) in the first few experimenting years of their careers. The first and the foremost issue they encounter is whether or not they can use English-only policy or they can apply L1 (Shuchi & Shafiqul Islam, 2016).

Even though several studies have extensively centered on teacher L1 use concerning quantity and purposes, (Esfahani & Kiyoumarsi, 2010; Fatemi & Barani, 2014; Hadadi, Abbasi & Goodarzi, 2014; Mirhasani & Mamaghani, 2009; Noorbar & Mamaghani, 2016), there seems to be no study on its influence on vocabulary learning in the Iranian context. Almost all the studies so far have been based on survey, questionnaire and/or interview data and not an instruction-based and an experimental approach. Therefore, conducting an experimental investigation based on an analysis of the actual classroom language use regarding vocabulary learning is crucial to fathom whether or not to use L1 in the EFL classroom. Accordingly, the differential effect of using code-switching or L2 only on learning concrete and abstract words is investigated for the first time in the context of Iran.

Review of Related Literature

Theoretical Arguments for the Use of L2-Only Explanations

One controversy that is recurrently raised by those who approve using L2-only explanations is in accordance with the L1 = L2 acquisition hypothesis (Dulay & Burt, 1974), which implies that the mechanisms underlying L2 learning resemble those underlying L1 learning. This means that, L2 learning can to some extent be similar to infant L1 learning. It ought to be reminded however that such a monolingual setting might work for the acquisition of some linguistic aspects and structures, but it wouldn't cover every feature of a language system. This may include vocabulary, for that, the concepts that L2 words interpret are already shaped via the L1.
Therefore, the effectiveness of L2-only use needs to be revised. This exception is extremely correct for L2 adults, a population whose ‘brain plasticity' is low and whose L1 is deeply developed in the brain (Seidenberg & Zevin, 2006). The next claim in support of teachers' L2-only use concerns to the Krashen's input hypothesis, which supposes that input can be comprehensible by casting a 'net' in the L2 to assure that learners with various competence levels are all capable of successfully understanding the teaching content (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). It should be taken into consideration that L2 input is unquestionably necessary, yet it is not an adequate condition for intake to appear because in some cases changing input into intake generally demands other mediating factors. For instance, an item's perceptual saliency, learners' attention, and learners' prior encyclopedic and linguistic knowledge (Gass, 1997; Schmidt, 1990). As Gass (1988, p. 204) marked, for L2 learners, the most important thing is not comprehensible input but comprehended input. The first one is 'managed by the person supplying the input ', and the second one is 'learner-controlled '.

When the subject of MoI is addressed from another aspect, a developing frame of literature has confirmed teachers' L1 use, particularly for L2 vocabulary learning and teaching.

**Literature Supporting the Effectiveness of Teachers’ L1 Use in Teaching Vocabulary**
The L2 lexical access and processing procedure provides understanding of the role learners' L1 plays in L2 vocabulary learning and teaching. As outlined by Kroll and Stewart's (1994) revised hierarchical model (RHM, see Figure1 below), an L2 word is believed to be matched onto its translation equivalent at the first stage of learning (i.e. the word association stage) (the dotted lexical link between L1 and L2). With learners' improving L2 fluency, the link between an L2 word and its L1 translation develops (the solid lexical link between L1 and L2) and the link between an L2 word and its conception is built up to the conceptual system shared by the two languages of a bilingual learner (i.e. the conceptual mediation stage) (dotted conceptual link becomes solid). Based on this point of view, the L1 is associated with accessing and processing lately encountered L2 words, in particular when vocabulary learning is considered as a procedure instead of an end phase. In this manner it looks incorrect to note teachers' L1 use as a resource of negative conflict that restricts the rate and procedure of L2 vocabulary acquisition (Zhao, & Macaro, 2016).
Figure 1: The Revised Hierarchical Model (adapted from Kroll and Stewart 1994)

Jiang (2000, 2004) suggested another model that presupposes a probable developmental procedure for L2 vocabulary learning in instructional framework, a procedure which might be put into three main stages: the L2-L1 word association stage, the L1 lemma (i.e. semantic and syntactic) mediation stage, and the complete integration stage. This three-stage model is along with the RHM, in the manner that both affirm the role that the L1 probably plays in L2 lexical processing, even though its effect can vary greatly based on L2 learner's language knowledge and how words are learnt.

Macaro (2009) demonstrated the findings of two researches regarding the effectiveness of code-switching on students' vocabulary learning. Macaro concluded that when given the L1 equals of new L2 words, “the amount of processing that a learner has to do is in fact increased rather than decreased”, it conveys that more cognitive processing takes place, and students seemed to manage “deeper processing opportunities” compared to L2 definitions provided (Macaro, 2009, p. 47).

All words have their particular physical forms, phonological elements, syntactic functions, semantic properties, and pragmatic implications. Among these characteristics is word concreteness or abstractness. These qualities define words as individual items in the lexical repertoire with different word processing patterns and consequently distinct vocabulary learning process for FL learners.

Previous Studies on Learning Concrete and Abstract Words

Applying a modal view of languages (Barsalou, 1999), the procedures of concrete and abstract words' processing are regarded as different. Learners are considered to carry both physical and psychological features. In this way processing concrete words is more expected to be interceded by the learners' sensory-motor system (e.g. visual, auditory, and/or olfactory). In comparison, such a mechanism or dual coding approach, in the words of Paivio (1986), is less probable to be engaged in processing abstract words.

Additionally, based on the distributed feature model (De Groot, 1992a, b; 1993; see Figure 2), the degree to which two languages share conceptual representations widely depends upon the activation degree of common features that both languages possess. The concepts that concrete words represent are considered to
be more similar across languages (more links between different concrete words in L1 and L2) in comparison with those of abstract words (only one common abstract word between different concrete words in L1 and L2). Studies in bilingualism have indicated that concrete words are more simply learned than compared to abstract words (Altarriba & Bauer, 2004; de Groot, 1992; Duthie et al., 2008; Schwanenflugel et al., 1992). The explanation for this has been related to the visual imagery of concrete words. The ‘dual-coding theory’ (Paivio & Desrochers, 1980) hypothesizes a concreteness effect namely, that is to say the productive imagery of concrete words kept in the brain assists in retrieval of lexical information.

Altogether, the involvement of learners’ sensory-motor system and a superior level of conceptual overlap between languages assist the acquisition of concrete words, a procedure in which the distinctive impacts of MoIs (medium of instructions) might probably be expounded.

Figure 2: The distributed feature model (adapted from De Groot 1992b)
According to the distributed feature model as the framework, it may be probable to develop supposition with respect to the strengths of the concreteness effects in bilingual versus monolingual learning. In monolinguals, production of a concrete word generates a broader lexical–semantic network than it does the presentation of an abstract word (De Groot, 1989; Grondin et al., 2009; Schwanenflugel & Shoben, 1983), and then the same is probably true for bilingual speakers.

Even though some studies have centered on teacher L1 use concerning quantity and purposes, (Esfahani & Kiyoumarsi, 2010; Fatemi & Barani, 2014; Hadadi, Abbasi & Goodarzi, 2014; Mirhasani & Mamaghani, 2009; Noorbar & Mamaghani, 2016), one or two studies investigated its influence on language learning in Iranian context especially on vocabulary learning, perhaps due to the range of variables that mediate in such a process–product study, especially when it occurs in intact classrooms. Those studies are based on survey, questionnaire and/or interview data and they are not an instruction-based experimental research. Therefore, it is crucial to conduct a study based on an analysis of the actual classroom language use regarding vocabulary learning in the context of Iran.

Research Questions
In the context of the present study, there seems to be an empirical gap in relation to the use of L1 in EFL classrooms. The present study attempts to fill this gap and addresses the following research questions:
1. Is there any significant difference between immediate vocabulary retention and long-term retention of concrete words?

2. Is there any significant difference between L2 only group and L2+L1 explanation group in immediate vocabulary retention and long-term retention of concrete words?

3. Is there any significant difference between immediate vocabulary retention and long-term retention of abstract words?

4. Is there any significant difference between L2 only group and L2+L1 explanation group in immediate vocabulary retention and long-term retention of abstract words?

**Methods**

This study was directed in Iran between May and July 2017. The research design is represented by two phases: the pilot study phase and the main study phase. To check and ensure the suitability of the level of the texts, to examine how much time the teaching and testing process would take, to test the intervention strategy and materials, and to identify the components that are most important to the facilitation of the intervention, a pilot study was carried out with 15 students who did not take part in the main research phase.

A quasi-experimental design was conducted in the main study, including two intervention groups. In the intervention groups, the target words were taught either through teachers’ L1 use or via L2-only explanations after a reading practice task, while in fact the comparison group did not receive any treatment related to vocabulary learning. Pre-tests, immediate post-tests (third week of the study after teaching the target words completely), and delayed post-tests (in the fifth week of the study) in the form of the revised vocabulary knowledge scale (RVKS) (Zhao & Macaro, 2016) were given to all participants.

**Participants**

Participants were 90 male learners (30 in the L1-use group, 30 in the L2-only group and 30 in the comparison group) aged between 20 to 37-year old who were learning EFL at two language institutes in Ahvaz, Iran. They were recruited from seven intact classes with a range of 15 to 18 students. This population had been learning EFL for approximately 2 years, amounting to an estimated 312 hours of classroom exposure to English (on average, approximately 3 hours per week). Their native language was Persian and their education level was Undergraduate. Their proficiency level was assumed to be B1 (Low Intermediate and Intermediate), but to test their homogeneity, their average proficiency levels were estimated through the Cambridge PET exam (Preliminary English Test), indicating that they had an average vocabulary size of approximately 4,000 words, according to the British National Corpus (2007).

The randomization of participants was impossible due to practical educational considerations. Therefore, short demographic questionnaires which consisted of six
questions regarding age, levels of education, length of studying English, previous English score, ethnicity and native language, the Cambridge PET exam (Preliminary English Test), a vocabulary size test (VST) (Nation & Beglar, 2007) and a Word Associates Test (WAT) (Read, 1998) were given to the participants before the intervention to iron out any initial differences and to guarantee that any possible differences in vocabulary learning outcomes could be associated to the intervention instead of to sample differences. In this study, participants’ gender is not the focus of the researcher.

**Teacher and teaching procedure**

The teacher who took part in this research had five years of EFL teaching experience. The researcher and participating teacher outlined the teaching process. Each EFL reading session in the intervention groups included four phases: a lead-in phase, a task-type introduction phase, a reading—scanning-or-skimming phase, and a word explanation phase.

1) Each session began with a two-minute warm-up to introduce the particular reading topic and to make participants interested.

2) Next, the question type tasks in each reading exercise were covered as an introduction to the topic. For example, in one task type, the students completed sentences by filling in the blanks with appropriate words or phrases provided from the reading passage which did not include any of the target words.

3) After the teacher had given precise instructions, ten minutes were given to the participants to work on their reading skills by doing the tasks related to the texts. The tasks were specifically designed to prevent the target words.

4) The target words were then presented using PowerPoint slides, and their meanings were explained through teachers’ L1 use or L2-only descriptions (see Appendix 1 for examples).

The target words were presented at the last stage of teaching instead of an earlier stage when the learners were asked to do reading or the exercises, and it was important that students comprehend the reading first to ease inferring the meaning of the target words. Then the target words were taught and practiced once after one week since the purpose of the study was to examine the difference between L2 only group and L2+L1 explanation group in immediate vocabulary retention and long-term retention of concrete and abstract words. If the target words had been taught during the reading and practiced in reading exercises, it would have affected the learning process of the target words.

In order to assure reliability of intervention procedure, the teacher used a checklist to direct their teaching process. Furthermore, the researcher monitored the teaching sessions and then provided particular feedback, if needed, after classroom observations. The same routine was applied with the comparison group, except that
the target words were not taught. Instead, these students were guided to analyze two or three syntactically complicated sentences from the reading materials, and those sentences did not include any target words from the study.

**Instruments and Materials**

**Reading Materials**

The reading materials were chosen and adapted from the articles in British Council Magazine Article (see Appendix 2 for an example) based on students' proficiency level B1 (Low Intermediate and Intermediate). Eight articles were extracted. Informal individual interviews were carried out to show that the students had little or no access to these contents, indicating that they had little or no prior knowledge of the reading materials. Three baseline tests were also administered to the participants to guarantee that no learner had knowledge of the target words, including the vocabulary size test (VST) (Nation & Beglar, 2007), the word associates test (WAT) (Read 1998) and the Cambridge PET exam (Preliminary English Test). The suitability of the reading materials and the target words was tested and verified by examining via the vocabulary profiler. 5% of the vocabulary in each text was at or above the 5,000-word level among which the target words were chosen.

All the words in the input contents, excluding pronouns, were therefore profiled and analyzed using the vocabulary profiler on the Complete Lexical Tutor website (Cobb 2000). Pronouns were omitted from the analysis, since they are not included in the British National Corpus. It has been proposed that L2 readers ought to know 95% of the running words (i.e. tokens) in a text to acquire sufficient comprehension (Laufer, 1989). Attempts were made to assure that at least 95% of the input texts’ tokens were below the 5,000-word level, according to the vocabulary profiler results. Although, if a text was observed to have more than 5% of the tokens at or above the 5,000-word level, L1 translations of non-target words were given in brackets to lessen learners’ comprehension struggles.

**Selecting Concrete and Abstract Words**

First, eighty potential experimental words were chosen from the input texts: forty concrete words, and forty abstract words. Most concrete words (e.g. herb, rock pool and wizard) were related to objects or entities that can be apprehended via our sensory system and most abstract words (e.g. achievement, harm and spell) interpreted feelings or emotions. No target words were cognates with their L1 translations. Most of them were at or beyond the 5,000-word level according to the vocabulary profiler results although, some words at or below the 4,000-word level, might still have been unfamiliar to the students according to the researcher’s and participating teachers’ understanding of their vocabulary knowledge.
Only those words that met the following criteria were applied as the target words in this study: their meanings could not be simply deduced from the input texts (helpfulness of the contextual clues), they were remarkably concrete or abstract (the degree of concreteness or abstractness), and they were regarded to be notably practical to the participants.

Finally, 72 words were selected as target words based on the normalizing procedure (see Appendix 3 for 36 concrete and 36 abstract items). Notice that some words and phrases chosen from learners’ course books were also covered in each RVKS test to alleviate the Hawthorne effect.

Assessments

The participants of the comparison group and intervention groups received three baseline tests preceding the intervention, including the VST (Nation & Beglar, 2007), the WAT (Read 1993), and the Cambridge PET exam (Preliminary English Test) reading, writing, speaking and listening comprehension test. A brief description of each test is introduced below:

The VST measures learners’ L2 vocabulary size by counting how many words can be justly paired by meaning to their L1 equivalents. In consideration of the participants’ English proficiency levels, sections of the VST will be administered to them (varying between the 3,000-word and the 5,000-word level) (Nation, 2006). A learner’s total score on the 140-item test needs to be multiplied by 100 to find the learner's total vocabulary size. It typically takes around 40 minutes to sit the 140-item test.

The WAT has been viewed as a reliable way to measure the depth of learners’ L2 vocabulary knowledge (Read, 1998). The test contains 40 items. Each item consists of one stimulus word, which is an adjective and two boxes each containing four words. Among the four words in the left box, one to three of them can be synonymous to one aspect of, or the whole, meaning of the stimulus word, while among the four words in the right box, there can be one to three that collocates with the stimulus word. Each item always has four correct choices. However, these choices are not evenly spread. In scoring, each word correctly chosen was awarded one point. The maximum possible score, therefore, was 160 for the 40 items.

Cambridge English Preliminary (PET) is made up of four parts, namely reading and writing, listening and speaking. The reading comprehension component consists of five parts, 35 questions. Writing includes three parts, 7 questions. Participants’ listening proficiency was assessed using the PET as well, in which they listen to four parts, 25 questions. For each part, they have to listen to a recorded text or texts and answer some questions. They hear each recording twice. Speaking test has four parts and the students take it together with another candidate.
The revised vocabulary knowledge scale (RVKS) was administered as a pretest, post-test, and delayed post-test to evaluate and observe participants’ learning outcomes in the present study (Zhao & Macaro, 2016) (see Appendix 4).

The RVKS test was scored as follows: 0 was attributed to level I. For level II, 1 point was awarded to the correct choice but 0 to the wrong one. Two points were assigned when test takers defined the meaning of a target word properly either in the L1 or in the L2. On the contrary, if an erroneous explanation was given, 0 (unrelated to the correct category) or 1 (related to the correct category) was given.

Data Collection Procedures
All groups studied the eight articles in 4 weeks. Each three texts were given weekly to give the learners an equal chance in performing the tasks related to each reading containing new words including the target words. As vocabulary gains for unknown words can be augmented more effectively when a reading text is accompanied by text-based vocabulary exercises than without them (Paribakht & Wesche, 1993, 2000), and since an effective vocabulary learning program should include repeated exposures to the same words over reasonably short time spans (Waring & Nation, 2004, p. 18), the target words were retrieved weekly in activities to reinforce the students’ memory after they acquired new vocabularies.

Results
Regarding learning concrete and abstract words, the outcomes of the L1 use group (i.e. the class in which the target words were explained through L1 equivalents), the L2-only use group (i.e. the class in which the target words were explained through L2-only explanations), and the comparison group (i.e. the class in which the target words were not explicitly explained) were analyzed over three time points using a 3 × 3 mixed ANOVA, with instructional type (L1-use, L2-only explanations, and no explicit explanation provided) as a between-subjects factor and time of test (pre-test, post-test, and delayed post-test) as a within-subjects factor. Huynh-Feldt corrected values were reported in cases where the assumption of sphericity was violated. In this study we examined the difference between immediate vocabulary retention and long-term retention of concrete and abstract words and comparing the acquisition of concrete vs. abstract words was not the subject research (Zhao & Macaro, 2016).

Concrete Words
As for learning concrete words, the analysis of 3 × 3 mixed ANOVA for learners’ performances on RVKS tests are illustrated in Table 1 – 3.
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Concrete Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructional Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>L1 use</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>L2 only</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>L1 use</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>1.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>L2 only</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>2.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Post-Test</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Post-Test</td>
<td>L1 use</td>
<td>34.03</td>
<td>1.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Post-Test</td>
<td>L2 only</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>1.819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Multivariate Tests for Concrete Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect × time</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>5895.161</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>5895.161</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>5895.161</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>5895.161</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Type × time</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>72.340</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Type</td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>418.232</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Type</td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>84.410</td>
<td>1793.702</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Type</td>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>84.057</td>
<td>3656.473</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Concrete Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>40260.033</td>
<td>21469.459</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Type</td>
<td>10847.244</td>
<td>5784.508</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results confirm that there was a significant main effect for time of test, F = 5895.161, p < 0.001, with a large effect size (Partial Eta Squared = .993), and for instructional type, F = 5784.508, p < 0.001, with a large effect size (Partial Eta Squared = .993). Additionally, there was a meaningful time of test × instructional type interaction, F = 418.232, p < 0.001, with a large effect size (Partial Eta Squared = .907).
The ANOVA analysis was supplemented with Bonferroni-corrected post hoc pairwise comparisons. The results show that the L1 use group remarkably outperformed the L2-only use group in learning concrete words in both post-test and delayed post-test, all p values < 0.001.

In addition, both intervention groups improved significantly in post-tests relative to pre-tests, both p values < 0.001. There was a significant decline at delayed post-test compared with post-test, In the L2-only use group, p values < 0.001. However, there was still a significant improvement in delayed post-tests relative to their pre-tests, p values < 0.001. Furthermore, in the L1 use group, there was a drop at the delayed post-test in respect to the post-test, p values < 0.001, but there was no significant change according to the group’s delayed post-test and post-test Mean Scores. Additionally, there was a significant improvement in delayed post-tests relative to their pre-tests, p values < 0.001. As for the comparison group, learners’ performance demonstrated no significant differences between pre-tests, post-tests, and delayed post-tests. These effects are displayed in Figure 3.

![Estimated Marginal Means of RVKT For Concrete Words](image)

**Figure 3:** Mean Scores of Correct RVKS Test Responses for Concrete Words in Three Groups (the maximum score for each test was 72)

**Abstract Words**

As for learning abstract words, the analysis of 3 × 3 mixed ANOVA for learners’ performances on RVKS tests are reported in Table 4–6.
### Table 4

**Descriptive Statistics for Abstract Words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructional Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Test Comparison</strong></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Test L1use</strong></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Test L2only</strong></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Test Total</strong></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Test Comparison</strong></td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Test L1use</strong></td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>1.535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Test L2only</strong></td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Test Total</strong></td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>13.232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delayed Post-Test Comparison</strong></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delayed Post-Test L1use</strong></td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>1.535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delayed Post-Test L2only</strong></td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delayed Post-Test Total</strong></td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>12.565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

**Multivariate Tests for Abstract Words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Pillai's Trace</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Hotelling's Trace</th>
<th>Roy's Largest Root</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>88.821</td>
<td>88.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3819.30</td>
<td>3819.30</td>
<td>3819.30</td>
<td>3819.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6

**Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Abstract Words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>30020.033</td>
<td>13057.989</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Type</td>
<td>9645.811</td>
<td>4195.695</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2.299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results depict that there was a significant main effect for time of test, $F = 3819.30$, $p < 0.001$, with a large effect size (Partial Eta Squared = .989), and for instructional type, $F = 4195.69$, $p < 0.001$, with a large effect size (Partial Eta Squared = .990).
Moreover, there was a significant time × instructional type interaction, $F = .957$, $p < 0.001$, with a large effect size (Partial Eta Squared = .957). The ANOVA analysis was supplemented with Bonferroni-corrected post hoc pairwise comparisons. The L1 use group significantly improved more than the L2-only use group in the post-test and the delayed post-test, all $p$ values < 0.01; the intervention groups declared meaningful progress in the post-tests relative to their pre-tests, both $p$ values < 0.001, and drops in the delayed post-test relative to the post-tests, both $p$ values < 0.001. However, there were still significant improvements in the delayed post-tests compared with their pre-tests, both $p$ values < 0.001. These effects are illustrated in Figure 4.

![Estimated Marginal Means of RVKS Test Responses for Abstract Words](image)

**Figure 4:** Mean Scores of Correct RVKS Test Responses for Abstract Words in Three Groups (the maximum score for each test was 72)

To sum, in both immediate and delayed recall of the target words’ definitions, the two intervention groups noticeably outperformed the comparison group, and the L1 use group considerably performed better than the L2-only use group in terms of learning concrete and abstract words. The intervention groups had considerable advancements in post-tests compared with delayed post-tests and in delayed post-tests in comparison with pre-tests, in the L2 only use group, there were not notable decreases in delayed post-tests compared with post-tests, particularly for concrete words.

**Discussion**

The present study has specified a different prospect on classroom code-switching and has probably featured that L1 use considerably develops vocabulary acquisition and
retention and should not necessarily be ignored as something negative in a lower-secondary EFL classroom.

In this research, the intervention groups' better achievements compared to that of the comparison groups' implies that explicitly defining new words in L2 classrooms can be beneficial, a finding agreeing with the one reported by Zhao and Macaro (2016). Additionally, teachers' L1 use was far more remarkable than their L2-only explanations with regards to the acquisition of concrete and abstract words. This conclusion is in line with previous research that found the positive effect of teachers' L1 use in L2 vocabulary learning (Hennebry, Rogers, Macaro, & Murphy, 2013; Lee & Macaro, 2013; Sonbul & Schmitt, 2010; Tian & Macaro, 2012; Zhao & Macaro, 2016). There are two potential interpretations to clarify L1 use's advantage over L2-only explanations. First, the lexical information presented through teachers' L1 use and L2-only interpretations may be restored and processed variously. To demonstrate, when a translation equivalent is given, an immediate link will relate an L2 word and its translation.

Accordingly, L2 learners will depend greatly on the lexical route designated in the RHM to retrieve the L2 word. Learning L2 vocabulary through L1 translations forms in a relatively simple routine, and such directness would possibly assist the progress of learners' recovery of concrete and abstract word meanings easier and successfully. In comparison, processing an L2-only explanation is more complicated, since learners have to try to comprehend and integrate the lexical information, to conform to their ingrained conceptual knowledge, and to derive the target word's meaning. Such a process is graphically illustrated in Figure 5.

![Figure 5: A Flowchart of Processing L2-only Explanations by Learners](image)

Therefore, it can be discussed that learners might meet different challenges in learning L2 vocabulary via teachers' L2-only explanations. For example, some teachers' explanations, relatively deduced from personal experience, could possibly be idiosyncratic. Accordingly, when a piece of lexical information goes out of learners' perceptions' circle or the present level of their conceptual information about a target word's referent, their possibilities of successful deriving the meaning will be considerably decreased. Preferably, learners have no choice but to pick a candidate meaning that they consider most adequate, but that candidate may in fact be quite...
different from the target meaning. When this kind of candidate choosing appears, learners almost possibly perceive the ‘best candidate’ as the target word's real meaning unless they recognize that they have misconceived it (Zhao & Macaro, 2016).

The next possible reason has to do with the indefinite semantic frameworks relating to the target word and its semantically correlated words. This ambiguity comes from a substantial alikeness between members of the same family or ‘family resemblance’ (Wittgenstein, 2009). As a result of insufficient definite semantic boundaries absence, it is probable that learners misunderstand its neighboring meanings for the target one, specifically with subordinate-level words. Evidence can be detected in the incorrect study participants’ RVKS test answers (see Table 7 for examples). For instance, the target word wagon has many characteristics in common with its neighboring word truck or trailer, as both associate with a vehicle used for transporting goods. Consequently, some participants mixed up the meaning of truck for that of wagon.

Table 7
Examples of Inaccurate RVKS Test Answers from the L2-only Use Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target words</th>
<th>L2 definition</th>
<th>Inaccurate RVKS test answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>The power to give order and enforce actions</td>
<td>سلطه (domination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>A group of people living in the same place or having a characteristic in common</td>
<td>خانواده (family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>A thing given in exchange for good work or achievement</td>
<td>سود (Benefit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopy</td>
<td>An ornamental cloth held up over something</td>
<td>پرده (curtain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wagon</td>
<td>A vehicle used for transporting goods</td>
<td>کامیون (truck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sprinkler</td>
<td>A device that sprays water</td>
<td>اب پاش (spray)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Answers are presented in Persian characters first, accompanied by their English translations.

Another significant finding was that vocabulary retention was noticeable in the long-term, that could be related to the levels-of-processing theory; that is, information processed at a deep level are generally recalled better than information developed at a shallow level (Craik & Lockhart, 1972). In this survey, lexical information was developed with sufficient depth and precise elaborations. The target words were recovered after intervention; therefore, the target words’ meanings were well retained in long-term memory. In spite of the fact that all the target words including concrete and abstract words were practiced equally in both L1-use and L2-only groups once before immediate post-test, the results still indicated a significant difference between L1 use and L2 only groups and between concrete and abstract words. Since there was no practice regarding the target words between immediate and delayed post-test the
results of delayed post-test define the effectiveness of L1 use method in comparison with L2 only method. This holds true recognizably about L1 use MoI, and concrete words. Therefore, long-term retention can be attributed to the L1 vs. L2 use.

Finally, L1 use was discovered to be better than L2-only explanations disregarding word type. As discussed previously, concrete words' imagery system and a major level of conceptual overlap across languages aid the progress of their recall; nevertheless, such a benefit does not make the inadequate MoI efficacy insignificant. However, both intervention groups, particularly L1 use group, exceeded in acquiring and recalling the concrete words compared to the abstract words.

Conclusion
The techniques non-native speaking teachers (NNSTs) describe L2 words affect learners' acquisition of concrete and abstract words. The current study investigates the preference of teachers' L1 use over L2-only definitions. How well learners remember L2 words is influenced by the mechanisms through which learners perceive, integrate, develop, and recall pieces of lexical information. Teachers' L1 use is found to be more effective than L2-only descriptions for both classes of words, even though there are processing dissimilarities between concrete and abstract words.

Findings prove that Iranian EFL learners have a greater capability to learn words which are defined in L1+L2 MoI than L2-only MoI. It is obvious from the results that words having a L2-only definition are problematic to learn, remember and recall even when they are practiced and exercised in a given amount of time.

This study's results provide a number of pedagogical implications with regard to present conceptualizations associated with L2 vocabulary teaching and learning in training settings. Learners take advantage of explicit instruction of L2 vocabulary after a reading exercise, and teachers 'L1 use functions superior to L2-only explanations for the acquisition of concrete and abstract words.

When instructors employ L2-only explanations, distinctions between a target word's meanings plus those of semantically linked words have to be explained. Furthermore, teachers need to be motivated to consider a learner-centered strategy in giving L2-only explanations. Preferably, every description would be within each learner's experiential scope and at or close to their world knowledge levels. This appears to be crucial to present learners a couple of seconds to perceive, integrate, process, and then infer the lexical information given in the L2-only.

It will be recommended for policymakers as well as syllabus designers to take into account the MoI's function in L2 vocabulary teaching and learning and to supply evidence-based instructions for teachers to carry out in practice. Textbook writers and material developers would be well suggested to obviously point out the favored MoI for defining concrete and abstract words in L2 classrooms. On the plus side, this has been noticed in several course books, for example ‘English Result' series for adults and ‘Project' series for teenage L2 learners. This kind of direction can be applied to
newer text books to increase learners' better understanding of the materials taught in the classroom by using their first language. The matter regarding L1 use ought to be completely reviewed in teacher training courses, by that inform beginners of the respective pros and cons of being a non-native speaking teacher (NNST) and a native speaking teacher (NST).

Second language organizations may well utilize the present research by means of its policy-making implications. It could be advised to provide a more adjustable perspective towards the L1 using in their L2 classes and permit their teachers to practice a moderate code-switching method regarding the situations, particularly in lower level classes and to think about code-switching as a facilitator in the classroom. Nevertheless, they are recommended to use their students' mother tongue cautiously. Extreme use of L1 in L2 classes could be adverse and deprives the students of adequate L2 exposure.
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Appendix 1

Examples of Lexical Information Provided Through Teachers’ L1 use and L2-only Explanations

Coast (n)
L1 use: ساحل
L2-only: the land next to or close to the sea.

Luxury (n)
L1 use: تجميل
L2-only: great comfort, especially as provided by expensive and beautiful things

Precaution (n)
L1 use: احتياط
L2-only: an action which is done to prevent something unpleasant or dangerous happening.

Hybrid (n)
L1 use: پیوندی
L2-only: a plant or animal that has been produced from two different types of plant or animal, especially to get better characteristics, or anything that is a mixture of two very different things.

Appendix 2

Example of a Reading Text with the Target Words Underlined

Imagine a beach; a quiet place, with only the noise of the sea and the gulls in the background. There are boats floating near the shore and a few people swimming in the water next to them. It’s a hot day, and there are some people lying on the sand enjoying the sunshine and slowly going brown. There are no shops, no people making noises, no loud music, everything is peaceful. There is just the sea, the sun, and the beach; a little paradise.

For a child a beach is a wonderful place. Here I found lots of space to run and play on the sand or to swim in the water. Being a campsite there were always lots of other families with children to play with. Another of my favorite activities was climbing on the rocks and cliffs around the beach. Rock pools were very educational places where I used to study the little fish and sea animals.

Although the sea can be beautiful, this beach is sometimes a dangerous place to be. When the weather is bad there are often storms with strong winds. When this happens, the waves can get up to 2-3 meters high – definitely not weather for swimming. Every year some of the boats anchored on the beach are lost because the sea is so rough. I remember holding down our tent to stop the wind blowing it away on many occasions! However, if the waves weren’t too high all the children (and some adults) used to go swimming in life jackets, as it was very exciting.
Appendix 3

Target Words Used in the Present Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anchor</td>
<td>achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explosives</td>
<td>environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life Jacket</td>
<td>luxury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rock pool</td>
<td>rib-tickler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanctuary</td>
<td>Spell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority</td>
<td>excitement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinkler</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gulls</td>
<td>Black joke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magician</td>
<td>exhilarating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slalom</td>
<td>Paradox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black joke</td>
<td>spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canopy</td>
<td>ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herb</td>
<td>fascination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnet</td>
<td>Patronage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steam</td>
<td>survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engine</td>
<td>taboo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common</td>
<td>sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heroine</td>
<td>fertility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passageway</td>
<td>persecution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wagons</td>
<td>taboo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play</td>
<td>precaution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warlock</td>
<td>taste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coral reef</td>
<td>competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humidity</td>
<td>honor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potion</td>
<td>recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water sports</td>
<td>temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crucible</td>
<td>controversy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hybrid</td>
<td>invention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rainforest</td>
<td>revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wetsuit</td>
<td>treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enchantress</td>
<td>illusionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refuge</td>
<td>wizard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entertainment</td>
<td>light year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reward</td>
<td>theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 4

Format of Simplified RVKS Test

Instruction: If you know what a word means, please use Persian or English to fill in the blank. If you do not know its exact meaning, please choose the category that relates to the word from A, B, C, and D. If you do not know what a word means, please fill in the blank with E.

1. Wersuit ______ A. Money B. Clothes C. Food D. Goods
2. Gull ______ A. Animal B. Appearance C. Money D. Sound
3. Cliff ______ A. Location B. Weather C. Sports D. Technology
4. Magician ___ A. People B. Food C. Language D. Feeling
5. Fertility ______ A. Time B. Location C. Feeling D. Quality
8. Black joke ______A. Concept B. Transport C. Feeling D. Art
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