Measuring the vocabulary size of Egyptian EFL learners and the effectiveness of some English lexical measures

Dr. Marghany Mahmoud Marghany
Higher Institute for Specific studies, Giza

Measuring the vocabulary size of Egyptian EFL learners and the effectiveness of some English lexical measures

Dr. Marghany Mahmoud Marghany

Higher Institute for Specific studies, Giza

Abstract

This study evaluates the effectiveness of some vocabulary testing measures, namely the Lex30, the Productive Level Test (PLT) and the Lexical Frequency Profile (LFP) in determining the vocabulary size of some Egyptian EFL learners. Data were collected by administered three versions of these three measures to ten Egyptian undergraduates majoring in English. Data were analyzed based on the percentages of the participants' scores in the three testing measures. The study concludes that the Lexical Frequency Profile is found to be the most effective measures in determining the vocabulary size of the tested sample of Egyptian EFL learners. The study introduces recommendations in lighted of the TEFL process within the parameters of the tested sampling population.

Introduction

The vocabulary size and lexical richness among EFL/ESL learners, who took vocabulary-assessment tests, haven been handled in several studies. Laufer and Nation (1999) developed the Vocabulary Levels Tests (VLT) in an attempt to challenge the learners who tried to find out an exact word in the sentence context.

This testing technique is based on providing the word's initial letters and the test-takers are required to complete such a word. The productive vocabulary sizes of test-takers can also be assessed by applying the Productive Levels Test (PLT). However, the VLTs are mainly designed for the purpose of diagnosing the EFL/ESL learners' frequency levels. Meara and Fitzpartick (2000) introduced the Lex30 test to measure the size of productive vocabulary where the participants are often asked to give as many associations as possible. In this regard Koizumi (2005:26) stated "There are nine main tests of productive vocabulary knowledge, and these assess different aspects of vocabulary. Firstly, in the Lexical Frequency Profile (LFP; Laufer & Nation, 1995), test takers write an essay of more than 200 words (p. 314). Then "the percentage of words a learner uses at different vocabulary frequency levels" (p. 311) is computed using computer software, and the ratio obtained is interpreted as "free productive ability" (Laufer & Nation, 1999, p. 37). Originally, the frequency levels used were "the first 1,000 most frequent words, the second 1,000, the University Word List, and the 'not-in-the-lists' word list" (p. 315), but Laufer (1995) suggested that a ratio of words "beyond 2000" is also a good measure of productive vocabulary (p. 267) content relevance and representativeness is an issue".

There are various lexical measures which aim to describe the productive lexis. Theses measures include lexical originality (LO), lexical density (LD), lexical sophistication (LS) and lexical variation (LV). These measures vary in their reliability when handling the lexical richness in general and when comparing the lexical richness of EFL/ESL learners to that of the native speakers in particular (Laufer and Nation 1995). Therefore, it is felt inevitable that a study should be conducted to investigate the liability of certain lexical measures, namely lex30 (Meara and Fitzpatrick 2000), productive level test (PLT) (Nation and Beglar 2007) and lexical frequency profile (LFP) (Laufer and Nation 1995).

Keywords: vocabulary size- Lex30- The Productive Level Test- the Lexical Frequency Profile- Egyptian EFL learners.

Statement of the problem

It is felt necessary, therefore, to apply some of these tests to some of the Egyptian EFL learners in order to evaluate the effectiveness of such tests in determining the vocabulary size of Egyptian EFL learners and include some of their vocabulary testing techniques into the EFL curricula in Egypt. The present study focuses mainly on the lex30, productive level test and the lexical frequency profile.

The study provides answers for the following questions:

1. Which of these three tests is the most effective for language teachers to assess their students with?

2. Which of these three tests is the most useful for language teachers, easiest for students, easiest for teachers to manage, and most informative?

3. To what extent can these three measures reflect the vocabulary size of non-native speakers of English, the case of Egyptian EFL learners?

4. Does frequency allow the assessment of the three-tested lexical measures?

Research aim

The paper aims mainly to compare these three lexical measures of lexical richness in relation to some Egyptian EFL learners. It determines the frequency percentage of these three measures and states the most effective among them in measuring the lexical richness of non-native speakers of English.

Limitations of the Study

The paper is restricted to measuring the propriety of applying the early-mentioned three lexical measures to the Egyptian EFL learners and examining the lexical richness in the word, spontaneous and written outputs of the Egyptian EFL learners.

Significance of the study

This study is significant in the sense that it attempts to measure the vocabulary size of non-native speakers based on their proficiency level. Thus, it comes on contrary to other lexical richness measuring studies that relied on comparing the lexical richness of non-native speakers to that of the native speakers. The study can, therefore, provide a pedagogical insight to the process of EFL teaching within the parameters of the tested sampling population.

Literature review

Several studies have been carried out to verify the reliability of different measures of lexical richness. For example, Mendelsohn 1981; Arnoud 1984 and 1992; Cohen 1989; Laufer and Nation 1999; and Daller et al. 2003.

Laufer and Nation (1995) introduced the usage of the Lexical frequency profile (LFP) as a means of measuring the lexical richness of ESL intermediate learners in academic writing. In this regard, they studied the reliability and validity of the LFP in terms of the results stability. That is, the lexical measure can be judged as reliable and valid whenever its results of two different pieces of writings written by the same learners remain stable. In other words, the LFP provides same results of the same learners when their writing tasks differ in their topics.

In this concern, Laufer and Nation (1995) reported stable results of their learners who wrote two different English academic essays. They have reported certain advantages of using the LFP as it distinguishes the various proficiency levels of ESL learners; it also shows how ESL learners reflect their lexical richness while writing English essays; and it is considered as a reliable and valid measure of how ESL learners use their vocabulary size in writing academic English. Therefore, LFP helps identify the different factors that influence judging the writing quality and it can be successfully used in investigating into the relationship between the growth of ESL learners' vocabulary and their use of vocabulary. This relationship is significant as it helps ESL learners use their vocabulary size effectively; a matter that will have positive impact on their readers. As there are other factors besides lexical richness that affect the academic writings of ESL learners, there is a dire need for a reliable measure to judge the ESL learners' writing ability on different topics.

Laufer and Nation (1995) compared the use of LFP to other measures of lexical richness. They used two different types of LFP tests. The first one, which consists of the first and second most frequent words, was meant for the less proficient learners. On the other hand, the second LFP type, which includes other words, was

meant for the more advanced students. The researchers have found that the LFP measure is characterized by objectivity. That is, the LFP is highly regarded as an objective measure whenever compared with the Lexical Originality measure since it has nothing to do with the environment of learners. This characteristic of being independent leads to the stability of its results against the change of the learners groups. In contrast to the Lexical Density, the LFP is free to a great instance of the cohesiveness of both syntax and text. As such it mainly concentrates on the lexis proper use and is more appropriate for evaluating the lexical richness.

Mendelsohn (1981) clarified that although the Lexical Sophistication score is similar to the LFP in that they both can determine the learners' proficiency levels (beginners, intermediate, upper-intermediate or advanced) based on their vocabulary use, the latter outperforms the former in that it provides full details of the various used words whereas the former distinguishes only between words based on their frequency and sophistication. Another main advantage, that distinguishes the LFP from another lexical measure like the Lexical Variation, is that its ability to differentiate between learners using frequent or less frequent vocabulary. In addition, the LFP is more reliable as compared to other lexical measures because it is objective and it lacks what Laufer and Nation termed as

'subjective decisions'. Cohen (1989) indicated that whenever a word is used in an incorrect way, the LFP cannot count it as part of the learner's vocabulary. Laufer and Nation (1995) specified one disadvantage of using the LFP. That is, its inability to differentiate between homonyms. However, the inaccuracy of LFP in this regard is minimal as the manual analysis of the examined essays reveals that this disadvantage occurs between 2-3 homonyms.

Clenton (2008) examined the construct of four measures to assess productive vocabulary, namely Lex30, PLT, LFP and Brainstorm Frequency Profile (BFP). For the purpose of data collection, eighty Japanese learners of English answered the four tests. The LFP is the first in its percentage (90%) of words production as compare to 60% for the BFP, while the Lex30 comes third in its percentage (49%) and the PLT comes fourth in its percentage (47%). That is, whereas the percentage of LFP is the highest among the four tested tests followed by that of the BFP, the percentages of both Lex30 and PLT are slightly different in favour of the Lex30. In this concern, Fitzpatrick and Clenton (2010: 539) criticized the LFP and stated "Free productive tasks are problematic too, with a lot of language being produced which is superfluous to the measure being used. Laufer and Nation's (1995) Lexical Frequency Profile, for example, analyzes a discursive essay. This sort of text contains a high proportion of very frequent function

words, which do not give us useful information about the range of vocabulary available to that learner. The vocabulary produced in these tasks is also context-limited; the texts are produced in response to an essay question, and do not therefore encourage learners to display their full range of lexical knowledge". They also explained that the Lex30 measure is mainly designed to fill the gap of vocabulary tests. Its main aim is to introduce valuable estimates of the lexical ability of EFL/ESL learners. This aim can be directly achieved in the case of receptive vocabulary tests. However in the case of productive vocabulary tests, full words should be elicited efficiently. Therefore, the problem is it might be difficult to test the EFL/ESL learners' vocabulary size as they grow. In addition, elicitation necessitates the measure of the receptive vocabulary as well.

Fitzpatrick and Clenton (2010) handled the question of Lex30 construct. They divided it into vocabulary-related components, i.e. how vocabulary can be elicited and measured. Furthermore, they refuted claims against the lack of effectiveness of Lex30. Fitzpatrick and Clenton (2010: 538) stated "This, we feel, is a situation not constrained to Lex30. The process by which a test is validated – now generally recognized as a non-finite, evolutionary process (Chapelle, 1998; Fulcher & Davidson, 2007) – often seems to lag

behind its widespread application (Fitzpatrick, 2007a, pp. 116–117). This is especially true of tests which are perceived as resting on familiar constructs and which appear simple to administer, complete and score. Read (2000, p. 120) makes similar observations about Nation's Vocabulary Levels Test (1983; see also Schmitt, Schmitt & Clapham, 2001), which, like Lex30, is based on the relatively familiar construct of word frequency and produces quick, quantitative score data. Ironically, it seems that the more attractive a test is to teachers and learners – the greater its 'face validity' – the more likely it is to be adopted for practical use with minimal attention to its actual usefulness. Face validity is consistently maligned in testing research for attracting disproportionate attention from test designers (see, for example, Cronbach, 1984, pp. 182–183), but it has persistently influenced the choice of tests used in the teaching world (Hughes, 1989, p. 27)". They refuted what Baba (2002: 70) describes as a disadvantage of the Lex30 test "it assesses learner's written performance but does not assess their spoken vocabulary knowledge". Baba's claim lessens the significance of Lex30 in measuring a learner's spoken ability in which he/she can perform better than his/her written performance.

Fitzpatrick and Clenton (2010) refuted that claim by conducting an empirical study on the spoken and writing ability of forty Chinese, Korean and Japanese learners of English whose

proficiency level ranges from elementary to low intermediate by using different forms of lex30. The results show slight difference between the respondents' written and spoken types of performance. However, the correlation between the respondents' written and spoken scores is weak to a certain extent although it is significant. Fitzpatrick and Clenton (2010) cautiously interpreted the results and attributed them to the difference between the respondents' ability of writing and speaking English.

Fitzpatrick and Clenton (2010) clarified the advantages of Lex30 as its instructions show no prejudice against those sit for the test. The structure of Lex30 test, including its breadth and organization, helps measure the learner's mental awareness of vocabulary. Fitzpatrick and Clenton (2010:541) discussed the reliability of Lex30 issue and stated "These findings support those of Fitzpatrick and Meara, and indicate that the test does produce comparable results at two test times and in that sense, we can estimate that it has a high degree of reliability. Following Fitzpatrick and Meara (2004), we examined our data to see whether the strong correlation between scores at the two test times is due to participants tending to produce the same response items at both times. On average, only 41% of items produced by participants at test time one were repeated in the test time two data. The fact that we find a strong correlation between the two test time scores, then, is not due

to the same items being produced. Rather, it indicates that the frequency profiles of the two sets of response data are similar. This, as Fitzpatrick and Meara (2004) suggest, supports the idea that the Lex30 task elicits a data set which is broadly representative of the individual's lexicon".

As for its disadvantages, they cautiously come to the conclusion that Lex30 provides consistent scores of the same learners over short periods of time; Lex30 does not distinguish between native and non-native speakers of English as some non-native speakers who have advanced proficiency levels may outperform their native counterparts. The scores resulted from the Lex30 test have significant correlation with those resulted from other tests. In addition, there is low correlation between written and spoken responses of non-native speakers. They have recommended that the Lex30 test should be applied for the purpose of having crucial decision on the learners' levels of proficiency or in the placement tests.

Mochizuki (2012) reviewed the previous studies on vocabulary testing in terms of the three components of vocabulary knowledge, i.e. size of vocabulary, depth of vocabulary and accessibility of vocabulary. As for the first component of vocabulary size, Mochizuki (2012:46) attributed the emergence of the depth of

vocabulary to Harold Palmer "father of British applied linguistics .... Who first draw attention to one aspect of vocabulary depth, collocation.... He not only selected 3000 headwords .... but also made a tentative list of English collocations for technicians so that they could apply it to textbook compilation". This asserts the wide understanding of how vocabulary depth knowledge is important. For the component of lexical accessibility of vocabulary knowledge, Mochizuki (2012) has reviewed a number of studies self-designed computer programme in order to measure the lexical access time such as Coulson (2005) who makes use of the Q_Lex programme, Aizawa and Iso (2010) who rely on the LEXATT.

Research method

Ten participants were randomly selected for the purpose of this study. They are all non-native speakers of English affiliated to the same language and culture and are classified as intermediate-level learners as they are enrolled as undergraduates at the Department of languages and Translation. They were asked to answer a Lex30 test adopted from Meara and Fitzpatrick (2000) http://www.lognostics.co.uk/tools/Lex30/index.htm. They were asked to answer a productive vocabulary test adopted from http://www.lextutor.ca/tests/levels/recognition/1_14k/ (Nation and Beglar 2007). As for the Lex30 test construct, the researcher printed

out 30 items as shown in the electronic version (Appendix A). The productive level test (PLT) is constructed as the researcher selected the first five sentences of the first thousand words, followed by the sentences from six through ten of the fifth thousand words, then sentences from one through five of the seventh thousand words, followed by the sentences from six through ten of the eleventh thousand words and finally sentences from six through ten from the thirteenth thousand words (Appendix B). They were asked to write an essay of maximum 250 words on "The roles of parents and schools in teaching children" to analyze lexical frequency profile (LFP) (Laufer and Nation 1995) http://www.lextutor.ca/vp/eng/.

Procedures

The Lex30 test was printed out and distributed to the participants who answered it manually. Then, the researcher himself inserted the participants' answers into the Lex30 electronic version. As for the Lex30 test construct, the research printed out 30 items as shown in the electronic version. The researcher asked the participants to answer it manually during the first day of data collection. During the second day, the participants answered the PLT test in less than two hours. During the third day, the participants were asked to answer the LFP test. The LFP answers of all participants- except two of them- were reprinted and inserted into the LFP electronic version in order to get the analysis results. The score of every participant for each test is computed separately. Then, the total score obtained by the ten participants of each test is computed. Finally, the total scores of the lexical tests are stated to determine the most reliable lexical

measure among the examined tests. This is done by computing the percentages of the three measures total scores which are divided by 1000 (the final mark of each test 100 multiplied by the ten participants) and multiplied by 100 according to the following equation.

$$P = \frac{TS}{1000 \times 100}$$

Where,

P is the percentage

TS means the total scores

Data Analysis and Results:

This section is devoted to report on the ten participants' scores in the examined lexical measures, namely Lex30, PLT and LFP. The effectiveness of each measure is indicated through the participants' scores where the percentages of the ten participants' scores in the three measures are indicated in table no. 1. Towards the end of every participant analysis, there researcher sums up his or her result.

Participant 1:

The scores obtained by participant 1 in the three measures as 13 (Lex30), 56.66 (PLT) and 92.91 (LFP). The result shows LFP as more effective than the other two measure in assessing the participants.

Participant 2:

Participant 2 scores are 56, 46.66, and 91.56 for Lex30, PLT and LFP respectively. The result indicates LFP exceeds in its effectiveness to assess the participants the other two measures lex30 and PLT.

Participant 3:

He scored 42 for the Lex30, 43.33 for the PLT and 93.51 for the LFP. These scores suggest higher effectiveness for the LFP over Lex30 and PLT.

Participant 4:

His scores are 50, 30 and 90.56 for lex30, PLT and LFP respectively. This result suggests further effectiveness for the third measure LFP at the expense of Lex30 and PLT. The scores suggest that the lowest level of effectiveness for the PLT measure among all participants occurs in the case of participant 4 (30).

Participant 5:

Similarly based on participant 5 scores, the LFP measure (89.59) comes first in its effectiveness vis-à-vis Lex30 (41) - which comes second- and PLT (40) that comes third in terms of effectiveness. However for participant 5, the effectiveness of both Lex30 and PLT is slightly different as similar to the case of participant 3 but in contrast to the cases of participants 1, 2, and 4.

Participant 6:

The scores indicated in table no. 1 prove extremely higher effectiveness for LFP (93.75) over Lex30 (55) and PLT (50).

Participant 7:

The scored obtained by participant 7 are 33 for Lex30, 87.93 for LFP and 50 for PLT. The scores similarly highlight the effectiveness of LFP as compared to the other two measures Lex30 and PLT. However, the scores indicate the lowest level of effectiveness (87.93) for LFP among the ten participants' scores.

Participant 8:

The scores of participant 8 are 74, 100 and 94.49 for Lex30, PLT and LFP respectively. The scores surprisingly indicate higher level of effectiveness for PLT (100) at the expense of LFP (94.49)- which comes second in rank- and Lex30 (74). In this regard, PLT achieves the highest level of effectiveness among all cases of the participants' scores, i.e. 100. In such a case, the PLT higher effectiveness than that of LFP can be attributed to the distinguished performance of participant 8 who achieved the highest scores among all participants in Lex30 (74) and PLT (100). As for the LFP measure scores, participant 8 (94.49) comes second to participant 9 who obtained the highest LFP scores (96.99) among all participants.

Participant 9:

The scores of participant 9 are 66 for Lex30, 96.99 for LFP and 36.66 for PLT. These scores indicate that the LFP restores its highest effectiveness as compared to the other two measures Lex30 and PLT. They also indicate that the second lowest level of effectiveness for the PLT measure occurs in the case of participant 9 (36.66).

Participant 10:

Participant 10 obtained 66 for Lex30, 91.37 for LFP and 66.66 for PLT. The scores of participant 10 emphasize the highest effectiveness of the LFP measures (91.37) among the three tested measures, namely Lex30 and PLT which respectively have the scores of 66 and 66, 66. The result indicates that the PLT measure (66.66) comes second to the LFP measure in the case of participant 10, whereas the Lex30 measure comes in the third place (66). However, the effectiveness levels of both Lex30 and PLT are slightly different by 0.66.

Table no. 1: Percentages of the participants' scores in the three measures

Participants	Lex30	PLT	LFP
P1	13	56.66	92.91
P2	56	46.66	91.56
P3	42	43.33	93.51
P4	50	30	90.56
P5	41	40	89.59
P6	55	50	93.75
P7	33	50	87.93
P8	74	100	94.49
P9	66	36.66	96.99
P10	66	66.66	91.37
Total score for each test	496/1000X100	519.97/1000X100	922.66/1000X100
Percentage	49.6	51.99	92.26

The results of the data analysis can be summarized as follows:

- The effectiveness level of Lex30 ranges from 13 to 74, where 13 the score of participant 1 shows the lowest effective level of Lex30 while its highest effectiveness level occurs in the case of participant 8 score (74). The mean score of the Lex30 effectiveness level exists in the score of participant 7 (33).

- As for PLT measure, its effectiveness level exists between the scores of 30 (the case of participant 4) and 100 (the case of participant 8). The score of 30 reflects its lowest level of effectiveness whereas the score of 100 indicates its highest level of effectiveness. The scores of participants 6 and 7 (50) represent the mean score of the PLT measure.

- The LFP effectiveness level ranges from the scores of 87.93 (the score of participant 7) which reflects the lowest effectiveness level of the measure and 96.99 (the score of participant 9) which indicates the highest effectiveness level of the measure. The score of participant 1 (92.91) can be considered as the mean score of the LFP measure.

- Comparing the mean scores of 33, 50, 92.91 for lex30, PLT and LFP respectively and the effectiveness levels of 13-74 (for Lex30), 30-100 (for PLT), and 87.93-96.99 (the case of LFP) indicate that the LFP measure is the most effective among the examined measures.

- The LFP measure is proven as the most effective measure compared to Lex30 and PLT for teachers to assess their learners.

- Based on the total percentage scores, the PLT measure comes second (51.99%) to the LFP measure (92.26%) and the Lex30 (49.6) which come third among the tested measures.

- There is a slight difference between the percentage scores of both PLT and ex30. It is in favour of the PLT measure in contrary to the reported results of Clenton 2008 which is in favour of the Lex30 at the expense of the PLT measure.

- The three tested measures Lex30, PLT and LFP can be assessed according to the lexical frequency.

Discussion

The discussion is based on the findings of the different measures tests. The researcher concludes that the lexical frequency profile to be the most

reliable lexical measure among the examined three lexical measures. The findings are discussed in terms of answering the early-mentioned four research questions. As for the first question, the results indicate that the LFP measure is the most effective for language teachers to assess their students. This result is similar to those concluded by Arnoud 1984 and Laufer and Nation 1995 and Clenton 2008. This finding is based on the advantages of the LFP as it provides stable results. That is, the LFP has the highest percentage scores among nine participants out of ten participants. Its total percentage score is 92.26% as compared to 49.6% for Lex30 and 51.99% for PLT.

As for the second question therefore, the LFP is most useful for language teachers, easiest for students, easiest for teachers to manage, and most informative because it indicates the variation of the participants' lexical richness. As such it is informative in the sense that it provides information for teachers on levels of their students and determines their vocabulary trouble spots. Thus, it helps teachers to their ESL/EFL classes. This result is similar to those reported Arnoud 1984, Laufer and Nation 1995 and Clenton 2008.

As for the third question, the LFP measure is found to be the most effective measure to reflect the vocabulary size of non-native speakers of English. This is similar to what is reported by Arnoud 1984, Laufer and Nation 1995 and Clenton 2008. As for the fourth question, the research concludes that frequency does allow the assessment of the three-tested lexical measures as based on the percentage score of them as shown in table no. 1. This finding is similar to those found by Arnoud 1984, Laufer and Nation 1995 and Clenton 2008.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study has examined the liability of certain lexical measures, namely lex30 (Meara and Fitzpatrick 2000), productive level test (PLT) (Nation and Beglar 2007) and lexical frequency profile (LFP) (Laufer and Nation 1995). It has attempted to answer four questions. First, which of these tests is most effective for language teachers to assess their students with? Second, which of these tests is most useful for language teachers, easiest for students, easiest for teachers to manage, and most informative? Third, to what extent can these three measures reflect the vocabulary size of non-native speakers of English? And fourth does frequency allow the assessment of the three-tested lexical measures?

The study has come to the conclusion that the LFP measure is proven as the most effective measure compared to Lex30 and PLT for teachers to assess their learners. Based on the total percentage scores, the PLT measure comes second (51.99%) to the LFP measure (92.26%) and the Lex30 (49.6) which come third among the tested measures. There is a slight difference between the percentage scores of both PLT and ex30. It is in favour of the PLT measure in contrary to the reported results of Clenton 2008 which is in favour of the Lex30 at the expense of the PLT measure. The three-tested measures Lex30, PLT and LFP can be assessed according to the lexical frequency.

The study confirms as well the importance of both measures Lex30 and PLT in measuring the productive vocabulary of EFL/ESL learners as both come second and third to the LFP measure. This finding resembles those results reported by Clenton 2008, Fitzpatrick and Clenton (2010) who assert the significant validity and usefulness of the Lex30 test. It provides consistent and similar scores of EFL/ESL learners; it shows improvement on the part of EFL/ESL vocabulary knowledge.

Therefore, the study recommends that an integrated language course should be designed based on the components included in the three tested measures in order to enrich the vocabulary size of EFL undergraduates at the Language and Translation Department and train them to accurately use several words contained in the three tests. The suggested language course can be taught to the department freshmen in order to lay the foundation for their vocabulary size.

The study recommends conducting further research on topics like investigating the reliability of other lexical measures such as the Brainstorm Frequency Profile (BFP) and Vocabulary Levels Test (VLT). It also suggests examining the lexical richness of different EFL/ESL groups to determine their lexical richness.

References:

–   Arnoud, P.J.L. 1984. "The lexical richness of L2 written productions and validity of vocabulary test" in T.Culhane, et al. Practice and problems in language testing. *University of Essex occasional papers* no. 29, 14-28.

–   Arnoud, P.J. L. 1992. Objective lexical and grammatical characteristics of L2 written compositions and the validity of separate component tests in P.J.L Arnoud and Bejoint (eds.,) 1992. *Vocabulary and Applied linguistics London: Macmillan.*

–   Baba, (2002). "Test review: Lex30". *Language Testing Update, 32,* 68–71.

–   Bell, H. (2012). Language Acquisition and Learning Unit, Ethics
And Consent Forms . Manchester Metropolitan University.

–   Clenton, J. (2008). "investigating the construct of productive
vocabulary: comparing different measures". Proceedings of BAAL annual
conference.

–   Cohen, Attrition in the productive lexicon in two Portuguese
third language speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 135-49.

–   Daller, et al. (2003). Lexical richness in spontaneous speech of
bilinguals. *Applied Linguistics*: 197-222.

–   Fitzpatrick, T. and J. Clenton (2010). "the challenge of
validation: assessing the performance of a test productive vocabulary".
Language Testing, 27 (4), 537-554.

–   Koizumi, R. (2005) Relationships between Productive
Vocabulary Knowledge and Speaking Performance of Japanese Learners of
English at the Novice Level. A Dissertation Submitted to the University of
Tsukuba In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in Linguistics.

–   Laufer, B. & P. Nation (1995). Vocabulary size and use: lexical
richness in L2 written production. *Applied Linguistics*. 16 (3), 307- 322.

–   Laufer, B. & P. Nation. (1999). A vocabulary-size of controlled
productive ability. *Language Testing*, 16, 33-51.

–   Meara, P. and H. Bell. 2001. P_Lex: a simple and effective way
of describing the lexical characteristics of short L2 texts. *Prospect* 16/3, 5-19.

–   Meara, P. and T. Fitzpatrick. 2000. Lex30: an improved method
of assessing productive vocabulary in an L2. *System* 28, 19-30.

–   Mendelsohn, 1981. We should access lexical richness, not only
in lexical errors. Paper delivered to TESOL' 81.

–   Mochizuki, M. (2012). "Empirical vocabulary test studies". *Vocabulary learning and instruction*, 1(1), 44-52.

–   Online tests:

o   Lex30 and P_Lex http://www.lognostics.co.uk/tools/

o   http://www.lextutor.ca/tests/levels/productive/

o   http://www.lextutor.ca/tests/levels/recognition/1_14k/

قياس حجم الكلمات الإنجليزية لدى الطلاب المصريين الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية و قياس

فعالية بعض المقاييس لأختبار الكلمات الإنجليزية

د/ مرغنى محمود مرغنى

المعهد العالى للدراسات النوعية- جيزة- هرم

ملخص الدراسة:

تقيم الدراسة فعالية بعض المقاييس لإختبار المعرفة بكلمات اللغة الإنجليزية و تحديدا إختبار الكلمات

٣٠، و إختبار المستوى الإنتاجى ، و إختبار تكرار الكلمات ، و ذلك فى تحديد حجم كلمات اللغة

الإنجليزية لدى بعضا من الطلاب المصريين الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية ، و قد تم جمع

البيانات البحثية من خلال تقديم ثلاث نسخ لهذه الإختبارات لعشرة من الطلاب المصريين المتخصصين

فى دراسة اللغة الإنجليزية، كما تم تحليل البيانات البحثية إستنادا على النسب المئوية لدرجات المشاركين

فى الدراسة فى تلك الإختبارات الثلاثة ، و قد خلصت الدراسة إلى أن إختبار تكرار الكلمات يعد أكثر

هذه الإختبارات الثلاثة فعالية فى تحديد حجم معرفة العينة التى تم إختبارها بكلمات اللغة الإنجليزية، و

قدمت الدراسة بعضا من التوصيات فى ضوء عملية تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية فى نطاق محيط المنشأة

التعليمية التى تم إنتقاء عينة الدراسة منها ، و إقتراح بعضا أخر من الدراسات المستقبلية