

Journal of English Language
Teaching and Learning
No. 12, 2013

Task-Induced Involvement in L2 Vocabulary Learning: A Case for Listening Comprehension

Ali Jahangard

Assistant Professor, Sharif University of Technology

Abstract

The study aimed at investigating whether the retention of vocabulary acquired incidentally is dependent upon the amount of task-induced involvement. Immediate and delayed retention of twenty unfamiliar words was examined in three learning tasks (listening comprehension + group discussion, listening comprehension + dictionary checking + summary writing in L1, and listening comprehension + dictionary checking + sentence writing with the target words) inducing differential involvement loads - consisting of varying degrees of need, search and evaluation. Time-on-task was kept constant among all three tasks. The results partially supported the Involvement Load Hypothesis: The sentence writing task generated the highest retention rate, a finding which is quite in harmony with the Hypothesis's prediction. However, the other two tasks did not result in different retention rates despite equal involvement loads. These results are discussed with reference to the involvement load hypothesis and some suggestions are made as to how to improve and revise the original theory.

Keywords: task-induced involvement load hypothesis; depth of processing theory; vocabulary acquisition; English as a second language; incidental learning

تاریخ وصول: ۹۲/۱۰/۲ تأیید نهایی: ۹۳/۲/۶

E-mail: jahangard@sharif.edu

E-mail: jahangardali@gmail.com

Introduction

According to Hunt and Belgar (2005, p.24) "the heart of language comprehension and use is the lexicon", and that Widdowson's (1989, p.136) call "...to shift grammar from its preeminence and to allow the rightful claims of lexis" has yet to be on the researchers' working agendas. Though many language teachers are aware of the significance of vocabulary learning in developing the learners' linguistic ability, most often, they do not know the best way to implement it. Therefore, it is important to investigate what types of tasks provide the most efficient activities that culminate in more resilient and durable L2 lexical learning.

As a response to this necessity, some researchers have attempted to provide explanations as to why some tasks are more efficient than other tasks in boosting L2 vocabulary learning (Joe, 1995, 1998; Paribakht & Wesche, 1997; Rott, 2004). Craik and Lockhart (1972) held that retention of new information in long-term memory is not determined by the amount of time allotted in short-term memory; instead they considered the depth with which new information is processed as its major predictor and thus proposed depth of processing hypothesis. Craik and Tulving (1975) modified the hypothesis by stating that the crucial point regarding retention is not presence or absence of semantic encoding or depth of processing but richness of encoding or its elaboration that is a quantitative construct contrary to depth of processing. However, depth of processing hypothesis was criticized (Nelson, 1977; Baddeley, 1978) on the grounds that it did not account for a clear-cut definition of a level of processing; what exactly it is and how it can be measured. Similarly Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) argued that depth of processing lacks an operational definition since it is made up of abstract components of attention and elaboration and consequently proposed the Involvement Load Hypothesis for L2 vocabulary learning (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001) of which a brief description is in order.

Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) defined involvement as "a motivational-cognitive construct which can explain and predict learners' success in the retention of hitherto unfamiliar words" (p. 14) and proposed *need*, *search* and *evaluation* as its components that may

or may not exist in a vocabulary learning task. *Need* is the motivational non-cognitive element of involvement and is the drive to keep up with the task requirements. They also distinguished between moderate and strong need; the former refers to when it is imposed externally while the latter is self-imposed. An example for moderate need is when a teacher asks a learner to use a specific word in a sentence, and the example for the strong need is when the learner as a result of internally motivated drives decides to look up the meaning of a given unknown word in a bilingual dictionary when s/he is writing an essay or reading a short story. *Search* and *evaluation* are two cognitive components of involvement. Search is the learner's endeavor to discover the meaning of an unknown L2 word by looking it up in a dictionary, asking a teacher, or consulting other sources. Evaluation "implies some kind of selective decision based on a criterion of semantic and formal appropriateness (fit) of the word and its context" (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001, p. 15). Evaluation is considered moderate when differences between words or different senses of a word is recognized in a specified context and is considered strong when decision has to be made about additional words that combine with new word in an original text. For example, when encountering a homograph (e.g., project as verb or noun) the learner has to decide what sense is the most appropriate by comparing all the possible senses against the contextual specifications and choose the one that is most proper. Evaluation is considered moderate when choosing between different words (as in a fill-in-the-blank task where different words are provided) or recognizing the differences between the several meanings that a word may signify in a specific situation. The type of evaluation that entails making decisions as to what additional words will merge with the new word in producing (in contrast to receiving) a sentence or text is referred to as strong.

In any authentic or inauthentic task when processing the word each of these three factors can be present or absent. All these factors along with the extent of their prominence, yield involvement load. For example, consider two tasks with differential amounts of involvement loads as cited in Hulstijn and Laufer (2001). In task one, the learner is asked to generate original sentences with the new words whose meanings are clarified by the teacher. In this task, the induced need is

moderate since it is imposed by an external agent, i.e., the teacher. The task induces no search (the new words are explained or translated), and strong evaluation because the learner is obliged to assess the fitness of the new words against the collocational features of the neighboring words in the context which is created by the learner. To gain a quantitative value for the involvement index, we attribute the value of 0 to the factor when it is absent and 1 when the presence of factor is moderate and 2 when the presence of the factor is strong. Then, the involvement index which is the sum of the individual indexes amounts to 3 (1+0+2). In task 2, the learner is required to read a text and answer the related comprehension questions. Answering the reading comprehension questions necessitates that the learner know the meaning of the new words which are glossed. This task will induce moderate need (it is imposed by the task) to refer to the glossed words. The task will induce neither search nor evaluation. Consequently, the total induced involvement load amounts to 1 (1+0+0). Thus, the involvement load induced by task one is greater than task two.

Hulstijn and Laufer (2001) found empirical evidence for their hypothesis in a study conducted in an incidental learning environment. They intended to investigate whether vocabulary retention is dependent upon task-induced involvement load or not. To that end, they chose ten unknown words and investigated their short-term and long-term retention in three learning tasks: reading comprehension, comprehension plus filling in target words and, composition-writing with target words. They found that the amount of retention was related to amount of task-induced involvement load as they predicted and was highest in the composition-writing task that induces highest level of involvement.

According to Hulstijn (2003) the concepts of incidental and intentional learning mostly appear in the domain of vocabulary acquisition. Therefore, a number studies have been undertaken to discover retention of vocabulary in incidental learning environment. Ellis and He (1999) for instance studied the role of modified input and output in vocabulary acquisition in incidental environment and found that words used in productive tasks are far better recalled in comparison to words used in non-productive tasks. Also words

negotiated during communicative tasks showed higher retention than words which were not negotiated (Ellis, Tanaka and Yamazaki, 1994; de la Fuente, 2002). Joe (1995, 1998) also discovered that tasks that require a high level of generative process are more appropriate for incidental vocabulary acquisition than tasks requiring a low level of generative process. Paribakht and Wesche (1997) found that words are better retained if practiced in vocabulary-focused exercises after being met in a passage. They observed that learners who received this kind of treatment outscored learners who received mere reading treatment. In a more recent related study, Kim (2008) studied the role of task-induced involvement and level of proficiency in L2 vocabulary acquisition. The study consisted of two experiments investigating the involvement load hypothesis in vocabulary learning. In experiment 1, three tasks with different involvement loads were given to ESL learners who were divided into two levels of proficiency. Experiment 2 was aimed at discovering whether tasks with roughly the same amount of involvement load produce the same results. The findings of experiment 1 demonstrated that higher level of involvement load leads to more effective initial learning and better retention of words. The results of experiment 2 showed that tasks with similar involvement load produce the same amount of immediate and delayed learning.

All these empirical studies on the task-induced involvement load hypothesis are concerned with reading vocabulary and no studies have been conducted on listening vocabulary. The present research was designed and implemented to examine the effect of task-induced involvement load manipulation on vocabulary retention which, in turn, can be regarded as a touch stone to test the predictive power of the hypothesis.

Research Question

What is the effect of listening comprehension task-induced involvement load on the retention rate of words in immediate and delayed retention test conditions?

To give a tentative answer to the above question the following null hypothesis was formulated: The amount of task-induced involvement load has no significant effect on the retention rate of words in both immediate and delayed retention test conditions.

Methodology

Participants

Ninety four college students (aged 18-25) were taking English as a foreign language as a compulsory three-unit course participated in the study. They were Persian native speakers and were majoring in different fields of engineering sciences. They had studied English as a foreign language at least for six years prior to the experiment. Some of them had also studied English in other private language schools before the study. Their English language proficiency was estimated by the researcher and other experienced teachers who were thoroughly familiar with the learners to match the Intermediate-High level according to ACTFL proficiency guidelines. The participants were randomly assigned to each task group: the listening comprehension task group (LC) which consisted of 31 learners, the dictionary checking plus L1 summary task group (DS), which comprised 32 learners, and the writing task group (DW), which consisted of 31 learners.

Target Items

The target items which were instructed and tested included ten single words (*ostracism, ephemerality, castigate, vindicate, reify, teleological, conundrum, insinuate, bulwark*) and ten collocations (*keep under surveillance, grasp the nettles, baffle them into reverence, hold sway on, well-entrenched belief, in perverse defiance of, ride roughshod over, imbued with, held in abeyance, police cordon*). Collocations here were those phrases which are habitually used together. The target words were selected through pre-testing all the participants. The target items were embedded in a text titled *Scam* which was transformed into an audio text later by the researcher of the study. To minimize the complications caused by complex grammatical structure, an attempt was made to produce a text which was grammatically facile. Contextual clues were inserted into the text so that the meaning of the target words could easily be inferred by the learners. To find the manuscript of the listening passage, see Appendix 1.

Procedure

The study was conducted in an incidental learning condition, i.e., the learners were not aware that they were going to be tested on the vocabulary items included in the listening passage. The time-on-task was kept constant in each one of the groups representing each one of the tasks.

In the (LC) group, the learners were asked to listen to the audio passage presented through the earphones. The learners knew that they had to answer the comprehension questions after the audio was presented three times. The meaning of the items was clarified through a glossary which was given to the learners when completing the listening task. After listening to the audio passage, they talked about the text in their L1s, in group and paired discussions. In this group, the listening task induced moderate need, (it is imposed by the task rather than by the learners), no search and no evaluation. Therefore the total involvement load index ($[1] + [0] + [0]$) is 1 (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001).

In the (DS) group, the first step was similar to the (LC) group. In the second step, they were asked to find the meaning of the target words in the electronic dictionaries which were at their disposal on their computers in the class. At the end, they were required to write a summary of the audio text in their L1s (Persian). According to Hulstijn and Laufer (2001), the dictionary checking and summary writing task induced moderate need, + search (the learners had to find the meaning of the target words from the dictionary) and no evaluation. Therefore, the total involvement load index ($[1] + [1] + [0]$) equals 2.

The third group in the experiment, the (DW), in the first step, listened to the listening passage and answered the related comprehension questions. In the second step, they looked up the meaning of the target items in the audio text from the dictionaries on their computers. Finally, they were asked to put them to use in summarizing the original audio text in English. The dictionary checking and writing task induced moderate need and + search. Furthermore, the task induced strong evaluation because the learners had to make decisions about additional words that combined with the

new words in the original text they had produced. Hence, the total involvement load index ($[1] + [1] + [2]$) is equal to 4.

All the learners were tested on the target items once immediately after the instruction and the second time three weeks after the class. A copy of the test is available in Appendix 2.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the mean, number of the subjects, and the standard deviations of the tests measuring the retention of the lexical items immediately after the instruction. Table 2 presents the results of the delayed test.

Table 1
Number of participants, mean retention scores, and standard deviations in immediate post-test (maximum = 20)

	N	Mean	S.D
Listening(LC)	31	5.65	1.836
Listening + dictionary checking+ L1 summary(DS)	32	6.09	1.907
LC+ Dictionary checking+ Writing(DW)	31	10.71	3.298
Total	94	7.47	3.327
Model			
Fixed Effects			2.436
Random Effects			

پروہ شگاہ علوم انسانی و مطالعات عربی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی

Table2

Number of participants, mean retention scores, and standard deviations in delayed post-test (maximum = 20)

	N	Mean	S.D
Listening(LC)	31	2.97	1.197
Listening + dictionary checking+ L1 summary(DS)	31	3.61	1.542
LC+ Dictionary checking+ Writing (DW)	31	6.16	2.647
Total	93	4.25	2.334
Model			
Fixed Effects			1.899
Random Effects			

The figures in both tables indicate that performance in writing group (DW) was higher than that in the dictionary checking plus L1 summary group (DS), which, in turn was higher than that in the listening group (LC).

Inferential Statistics

The retention scores were processed through repeated measures 3×1 analysis of variance (ANOVA), with task as the between-subject factor(listening, listening plus dictionary checking plus L1 summary, dictionary checking plus writing) and time (immediate, delayed post-tests) as within-subjects factor. The results as is evident from Table 3, indicated a significant task effect, [$F(2,86) = 35.54$; $p < .05$; effect size (partial eta squared)= .45], also a significant time effect, [$F(1,86) = 520.6$; $p < .05$; effect size(partial eta squared) = .85]. In addition, a significant time × task interaction [$F(2, 86) = 20.69$; $p < .05$; effect size (partial eta squared) = .32] was obtained. The first two tasks culminated in small retention rates; however, the writing task produced better results.

The Student-Newman-Keuls post hoc multiple-range test revealed that there was a significant difference between the mean of the writing group and the means of the listening group and the dictionary checking plus L1 summary group, but that the means of the latter two groups were not significantly different from each other. The results of

the pair wise comparisons of the means from the different tasks as shown in table 3 corroborate the same findings as well.

Table 3

Pair wise comparisons of the means obtained from the tasks

(I) Task	(J) Task	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig. ^a	95% Confidence Interval for Difference ^s	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
LC	DS	-.600	.540	.809	-1.918	.718
	DW	-4.253*	.545	.000	-5.583	-2.923
DS	LC	.600	.540	.809	-.718	1.918
	DW	-3.653*	.545	.000	-4.983	-2.323
DW	LC	4.253*	.545	.000	2.923	5.583
	DS	3.653*	.545	.000	2.323	4.983

a. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Discussion

The results of the experiment partially reject the null hypothesis that, the amount of task-induced involvement load has no significant effect on retention rate of words in both immediate and delayed retention test conditions. The results indicated that the task-induced involvement load hypothesis is partially supported in that task 3, (DW), with highest value of involvement load resulted in better retention rates than task 1, (LC), and 2, (DS), but task 2, (DS) did not produce retention rates significantly higher than task 1, (LC). The findings of the present study are consistent with the results of the study by Hulstijn and Laufer (2001) in the Dutch-English Experiment. The possible interpretation might be that the extent to which each one of the components, i.e., need, search, evaluation, contributes to retention rate is not equal for every one of the components. It is likely that the involvement load induced by the evaluation component has stronger effects on retention rates than the other two counterparts. In the original hypothesis as proposed by Laufer and Hulstijn (2001), the

effect of the values of each one of the components are assumed to be the same on retention rates. It is suggested that more weight should be assigned to the *valuation* component in calculating the involvement load induced by a given task. This suggestion becomes more plausible taking the results of three other related studies into consideration (see Kim, 2008; Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001; Jahangard, 2011).

A further possible suggestion is that the operational definition of the components of *search* and *need* be modified. In operationalizing the construct of *need* in the original article, Laufer and Hulstijn (2001, p.14) wrote, Need is moderate when it is imposed by an external agent, e.g. the need to use a word in a sentence which the teacher has asked the learner to produce. Need is strong when imposed on the learner by him- or herself. In some cases, however, the former assumption might not be true in that the drive that is generated by the external agent can be equal or sometimes greater than the drive that is produced by internal agents. For example, my own personal experience as a teacher shows that if the teacher allocates some credit points for the completion of a task in a given class activity, the learners will invest more time and energy and get more deeply involved with the assignment than when the learners are asked to carry out a task for reasons of curiosity to know about the content of a text or the desire to complete a task only for the sense of accomplishment that the learner might feel, or some other internally motivated drives.

Furthermore, the construct of *search* might be needed to be modified in terms of operational definition. The construct of *search* has been defined by Laufer and Hulstijn (2001, p.14) as, *the attempt to find the meaning of an unknown L2 word or trying to find the L2 word form expressing a concept (e.g. trying to find the L2 translation of an L1 word) by consulting a dictionary or another authority (e.g. a teacher) . It is assigned +1 value whenever present in a given task notwithstanding the type (monolingual or bilingual) of the dictionary in which the unknown word is searched for. However, the magnitude of involvement load might vary with the type of the dictionary employed by the learner. The involvement load generated as a function of working with a monolingual dictionary might be relatively higher in magnitude than the one which is produced from a*

bilingual dictionary. For instance, when consulting a monolingual dictionary for an unknown word, the learner normally encounters definition(s) or, and example sentence(s) and sometimes synonym(s) / antonyms (s) concerning the sense or senses that a word form might represent. Here, the learner has to make inferences which might culminate in several possible candidate concepts as to the signified meaning(s) of the unknown word based on the information provided by the dictionary.

Compare this search process with the one a learner undertakes when finding the meaning of an unknown word from a bilingual dictionary in which a straightforward L1 equivalent is provided. Unlike the monolingual dictionary search, the learner does not need to infer the intended meaning(s) from the definitions and example sentences or synonyms /antonyms whose meaning(s) in turn, might be unknown requiring an extra additional search, thereby adding to the involvement load induced by the search component. Therefore, a likely suggestion would be to make a distinction between search types according to whether the learner looks for a word in a monolingual or bilingual dictionary, whereby a strong involvement load can be assigned to the former and a moderate one to the latter.

A possible counter argument against this contention might be that the load induced as such by different search types can be added to the valuation component. However, I think this might not be the case because the inference process entailed by search component is somehow independent of the processes involved in comprehending the text in which the unknown word is embedded or the text where it will be used in cases of sentence production.

Conclusion

The results of the present study indicated that the value of task-induced involvement load partially affected the retention rates of vocabulary in the experiments. The task-induced involvement hypothesis as proposed by Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) was partially supported by the findings of the current research, although, it was suggested that the operational definitions of component constructs, i.e., *read* , *search* , and *valuation* need to be modified.

Moreover, considering the results of other related researches (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001; Kim, 2008) and the findings of this study, it seems that the magnitude of the involvement load induced by the evaluation component has a more influential role in determining the retention of words than other counterpart components. The dictionary search plus writing (DW) task generated the highest retention rate in both conditions of immediate and delayed measurement despite keeping the time-on-task constant in all the experiments in the study. A possible pedagogical implication might be that more time and energy should be allocated to more production-oriented tasks whose involvement load which is generated by the evaluation construct is relatively larger.

One of the limitations of the present research was that the measurement of vocabulary learning was limited to only two lexical features, i.e., semantic and collocational, from among other important ones such as phonological, orthographic, and syntactic. Further research with more rigorous testing of lexical learning where other additional features are taken into account is needed to examine the effect of task-induced involvement load on the retention of each one of these distinct features.

Also, almost all the research studies conducted on the task-induced involvement hypothesis have focused on the investigation of the hypothesis in an incidental learning condition; further studies are required to assess the adequacy of the hypothesis in intentional learning condition. Moreover, additional studies focusing on the measurement of word retention with longer time intervals are necessary, taking note of the fact that in pedagogy the ultimate goal of teaching/learning activities is, rightly in fact, long-lasting and resilient learning rather than short-lived transitory one.

References

- ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) (1998). *Proficiency Guidelines*. SIL International. Retrieved June 6, 2011, from <http://www.actfl.org/files/public/Guidelinespeak.pdf>
- Baddeley, A. D. (1978). The trouble with levels: A reexamination of Craik and Lockhart's framework for memory research. *Psychological Review*, 85, 139-152.
- Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 11, 671-684.
- Craik, F. I. M., & Tulving, E. (1975). Depth of processing and the retention of words in episodic memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology; General*, 104, 268-294.
- de la Fuente, M. J. (2002). Negotiation and oral acquisition of L2 vocabulary: The roles of input and output in the receptive and productive acquisition of words. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 81-112.
- Ellis, R., & He, X. (1999). The role of modified input and output in the incidental acquisition of word meaning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 285-301.
- Ellis, R., Tanaka, Y., & Yamazaki, A. (1994). Classroom interaction, comprehension, and L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*, 44, 449-491.
- Hulstijn, J. (2003). Incidental and intentional learning. In Doughty, C; & Long, M. (Eds). *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 349-381). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hulstijn, J. H., & Laufer, B. (2001). Some empirical evidence for the involvement load hypothesis in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*, 51, pp.539-558.
- Hunt, A. & Belgar, D. (2005). A framework for developing EFL reading vocabulary. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, (17)1, 23-59.
- Jahangard, A. (2011). An Empirical investigation of the task-induced involvement load hypothesis: A case for intentional learning environment. *Biannual Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, (11)2, 7-22.

- Joe, A. (1995). Text-based tasks and incidental vocabulary. *Second Language Research*, 11, 149-158.
- Joe, A. (1998). What effects do text-based tasks promoting generation have on incidental vocabulary acquisition? *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 357-377.
- Kim, Y.J. (2008). The role of task-induced involvement and learner proficiency in L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*, (58)2, 285-325.
- Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement, *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 1° 26.
- Nelson, T. O. (1977). Repetition and depth of processing. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 16, 151-171.
- Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. (1997). Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary acquisition. In Coady, J. & Huckin, T. (Eds.). *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy* (pp.174-200). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rott, S. (2004). A comparison of output interventions and un-enhanced reading conditions on vocabulary acquisition and text comprehension. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61(2), 169-202.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1989). Knowledge of language and ability for use. *Applied Linguistics*, (10)2, 128-137.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching* (pp. 148-164). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix 1

Scream

I don't know whether it is hot or cold. There is no purpose for me, no purpose no **credo**. I am completely in the state of disbelief. There is no destiny. My destiny is like a monster that does not frighten me anymore and I can **reify** it in front of me. My **teleological** views had all disappeared and I doubt the reason of my existence and whatever I think and do. I can feel how **ephemeral** the time is. Everything happened in a blink of an eye. However, I do not want to **vindicate** that I was innocent; it was me who committed it, it was me who killed him and now find myself facing this **conundrum**. My life has always been **imbued with** different kinds of problems and tight spots, but not as complicated as this.

Is there anyone who can claim that he is not afraid of his father? An old father who has spent his youth away from his son doing whatever he has wished stealthily and now is full of complex and wants to take revenge on me. He always **rode roughshod over** me by hitting ,and ridiculing me, and laughing at me and making me feel this **ostracism** from the family, society, and the world since I had always been a reject.

Someone draws the curtain. Is it my father? I don't know. There is a shadow behind the window. In think it is the **bulwark** of my unconsciousness that wants to protect me and encourage me to **grasp the nettle**; to withstand my fear and fight the problems firmly. A gentle breeze is blowing in the room and strikes my face saying something into my ears. It wants me to threaten my father, to kill him. I look at him and read the words in his eyes. The eyes that have always terrified me and **insinuated** that I am nothing. They are like daggers that have **kept me under constant surveillance** from my birth and **hold sway over** me at any moment. I was influenced and controlled by them not because he was my father, but because of my **well-entrenched** beliefs about the power of his eyes.

He had always belittled me and it was the ripe time to **baffle him into reverence**, to make him respect my existence, my personality and my emotion. I could not think logically since my brain was **in abeyance** for a little while and I was not sure as to do it or not. I decided to do it but my hands were **in perverse defiance of** what I had in my brain. They disobeyed the decision my mind made. I was cold and sweating to every pore, my heart beat fast and I was facing a real dilemma. Finally they agreed to do it. They did it. I don't **castigate** myself for the thing I did, but for the way I did it. His blood was warm and fresh on my hand. The knife was still in his heart waiting for me to pull it out. I opened my eyes and found the **police cordon**

above my head and all over the room, and my neighbor talking to them about the scream she heard.

Comprehension questions:

Answer the following questions based on what you read in the story.

1. How does the man imagine his destiny?
2. Why did the man feel a reject?
3. How does the story describe the old father's eyes?
4. Why was the man influenced and controlled by his father's eyes?
5. What was the man feeling at the moment of killing his father?
6. Does the man blame himself for killing his father?

Appendix 2: The Vocabulary Test

Section One.

Fill in the blanks in the sentences below with the appropriate expressions from the list. Just write the corresponding number of the expression in your answer sheet.

1. kept ° under surveillance
2. held ° under surveillance
3. grasp the nettles
4. drink the poison
5. confuse them to respect
6. baffle them into reverence
7. hold sway on
8. put sway over
9. well-entrenched belief
10. rooted belief
11. in odd disobedience from
12. in perverse defiance of
13. went with boots over
14. rode roughshod over
15. imbued with
16. imbued of
17. held in abeyance

18. kept in the form of abeyance
19. police belt
20. police cordon

1. The party could ----- some crucial votes.
2. The police have the nightclub because of suspected drug activity.
3. His poetry was + +. deep, religious feeling.
4. There was a +++ ++ .. around the building where the President was going to make his annual speech.
5. Some of the parliament members in western countries do not have ++++ ++ in democracy.
6. The project is being ++ +++ until agreement is reached on funding it.
7. Eventually, they +++ + +. and admit their failure.
8. He is the manager who + ++++ ++.. all opposition.
9. The time will certainly come when that union will manifest itself as earthly and fallible; and the two disunited spirits, finding each other again, will become united here for the world beyond this--united, I tell you, ++ +++ + a ll human laws and of all human notions of right and wrong.
10. This is not to say that teachers need to stun people into wonderment by words of learned length, and ++ +++ ++

Section Two

Choose the best answers and mark (a, b, c, or d) in your answer sheet.

11. AIDS victims often experience social + +++ +.. an d discrimination.
 - a. ostracism
 - b. chauvinism
 - c. feminism
 - d. racism
12. The ++ ++.. o f fame in the world of rock and pop is self-evident to many.
 - a. popularity
 - b. ephemerality

- c. legality
d. brutality
13. Health inspectors ~~4~~ ~~44~~ ~~4~~ t he kitchen staff for low standards of cleanliness.
a. backbit
b. castrated
c. prognosticated
d. castigated
14. The decision to include Morris in the team was completely ~~4444~~ ~~44~~ when he scored three goals.
a. convinced
b. demonstrated
c. satisfied
d. vindicated
15. To think of or treat something abstract as if it existed as a real and tangible object is referred to as to ~~44~~ ~~444~~
a. retain
b. reify
c. reconceptualize
d. reconstruct
16. The challenge for any mechanistic theory, then, is to explain the origin of the human world in non-~~444444~~ terms.
a. biological
b. telepathical
c. teleological
d. televisual
17. In the 20th century, Marxism has been the subject of conflicting interpretations. It served as the official ideology of a number of totalitarian states, and it was also the inspirational ~~4444~~ ~~4~~ of many revolutionary and nationalist movements throughout the world.
a. dogma
b. credo
c. deed
d. creativity

18. Particles of such high energy pose a..... . On the one hand, they are likely to come from outside our galaxy because no known acceleration mechanism could produce them and because they approach from all directions even though a galactic magnetic field is insufficient to bend their path. On the other hand, their source cannot be more than about 30 million light-years away, because the particles would otherwise lose energy by interaction with the universal microwave background radiation left over from the birth of the cosmos in the big bang.
- convergence
 - convection
 - conundrum
 - convulsion
19. When I treat of the peculiar duties of women, as I should treat of the peculiar duties of a citizen or father, it will be found that I do not mean to ~~that~~ that they should be taken out of their families.
- insult
 - indulge
 - inculcate
 - insinuate
20. Under the rule of the Habsburg Dynasty, Austria had fulfilled the important function of uniting politically, economically, and culturally, the countries of the Danubian basin, and of serving as a ~~barrier~~ first against Turkey, later, against Russian and German expansion.
- precaution
 - bulwark
 - warden
 - preservation