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## InTRODU CTION

## Problem Statement

a lack of research data on the topic

## significance of the study

$\square$ contribute to general academic knowledge in the field
$\square$ Inform teachers about the use of podcasts for incidental vocabulary acquisition purposes,
$\square$ become a shareable data to future podcast creators for instructional purposes.

## Context: Armenia, private school

## Participants: high-school students, formal

Age: 16-18

## Proficiency Level: IIntermediate +

## Duration: 10 weeks

## Literature Review

Incidental vocabulary acquisition and its role in EFL
Riddler, 2003; Ma, 2009; Robinson, 2001; Schmitt, 2000; Nation \& Meara, 2010; Singleton, 1999).

# Receptive vocabulary, form-meaning relation ${ }_{(N a t i o n, ~ 2013, ~ 1995, ~ 2006 ; ~}^{\text {; }}$ Schmitt, 2000) 

## With the input of

graded readers (Lee, 2007; Horst, 2005; Mechraoui, Mechraoui, \& Raffeeq, 2015; Schmitt, 2000; Elley, 1991; Nation \&
Wang, 1999; Webb \& Chang, 2015)

## authentic novels <br> (Pellicer-Sanchez \& Schmitt, 2010)

lectures (Chang, 2009; Vidal, 2003)
graded readers with audios (Horst, 2005; Lee, 2007; Webb \& Chang, 2015)

# graded readers as input for incidental vocabuarydearning 

## 95-98\% vocabulary coverage (Nation \& Meara, 2010),

repetitive exposure to the target
Vocabulary (Nation \& Wang, 1999; Pellicer-Sanchez \&
Schmitt, 2010; Rott, 1999; Schmitt, 2008; Waring \& Takaki, 2003; Webb, 2007),
vocabulary as a cumulative process
(Nation \& Meara, 2010),
clues contributing to guessing (Elley, 1989;
Laufer, 2003; Nation \& Wang, 1999; Nation \& Meara, 2010; Schmitt, 2000),
retention (Nagy, 1997).
the amount of reading ${ }_{\text {Nation \& Meara, }}$ 2010; Nation \& Wang, 1999),
missing any clues or those clues being also unfamiliar (Laufer, 2003),
no guarantee for retention
2007; Pellicer-Sanchez \& Schmitt, 2010; Schmitt, 2008)
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Figure 2

## Monthly Podcast Listening

TOTAL U.S. POPULATION $12+$

\% LISTENED TO A PODCAST IN LAST MONTH

Estimated
104 Million


## Figure 3

## Monthly Podcast Listening

U.S. POPULATION
\% LISTENED TO A PODCAST IN LAST MONTH


## Podcasts and incidental vocabulary learning

Vidal $(2003,2011)$
14-15 lectures
4 weeks
30.41 out of 36
vocabulary items within four weeks

Mechraoui, Mechraoui, and Raffeeq (2015)
Gholami and
Mohammadi (2015)

# Research questions 

esearch question .Is there a relationship between listening to podcasts and incidental vocabulary acquisition?

Research question 2: What effect does the amount of time spent on listening to podcasts have on the incidental vocabulary acquisition?

Research question 3: What is the relationship between the frequency of occurrence of the target vocabulary in podcast episodes and incidental vocabulary learning?

Research question 4:" What is the relationship between the distribution of occurrence of the target vocabulary across the podcast episodes and incidental vocabulary learning?
Research question 5". What is learners' attitude to vocabulary acquisition via podcasts?

## Abbreviations

## Pre- and Post- UVLT -

 Ultimate Vocabulary Level pre- and post- TestsPre- and Post- PDT- Project designed pre- and post- tests

LCTs- Listening comprehension tests

## Methodol

 Oav
## Experimeptal/mixerdital

 listening journals +LCTs (Qual+QuanPostPDT
(Quan )

## Survey

(Quan)

RQ1: Is there a relationship between listening to podcasts and incidental vocabulary acquisition?

RQ2: What effect does the amount of time spent on listening to podcasts have on the incidental vocabulary acquisition?

RQ3: What is the relationship between the frequency of occurrence of the target vocabulary in podcast episodes and incidental vocabulary learning?

## Instruments

Pre- UVLT-> pre- PDT -> Post- UVLT-> post- PDT-> Teacher interview

Digital listening journals Survey

Pre- PDT -> post- PDT

Participant/ Source of data

Experimental group Control group

Experimental group
22 students

Experimental group
22 students

Pindiigg andprottritg
Pre-UVLT->Selecting the sample (32) ->
Dividing into experimental and control groups $->$ Pre- PDT $->$
Weekly meeting + Digital listening journals + LCTs->
Post-UVLT-> Post-PDT -> Listening journal analysis ->Survey
->Teacher interview
one episode at home per week
Weekly meetings
Digital listening journals

School curriculum and course-book
Classroom projects (watching TED talks, movies, Vimeo videos, etc.) No episodes the experimental group listened to
No digital listening journals

## Ethical consider ations

$\times$ Confidentiality
$\times$ A parent and teacher permission

Voluntary participation


## RQ1: The relationship between listening to podcasts and incidental vocabulary acquisition

Table 1
Independent Samples T-Test in the Experimental and Control Groups for the PDT

|  | t | df | p | Mean <br> Difference | SE <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-PDT | -0.408 | 30 | 0.686 | -0.445 | 1.091 |
| Post-PDT | -10.285 | 30 | $<.001$ | -19.986 | 1.943 |

Note. The test scales from 0 to 54

## Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Vocabulary Learning Gains from Pre- and Post-PDTs for the Experimental and Control Groups

|  | Group | Mean | SD | Minimum | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pretest | Experimental Control | $\begin{gathered} 11.05 \\ 10.6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.57 \\ & 3.44 \end{aligned}$ | 8 $6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| Post-test | Experimental Control | $\begin{gathered} 28.89 \\ 8.9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.97 \\ & 1.85 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| Absolute gain (pre to post) | Experimental Control | $\begin{gathered} 33.02 \\ -2.203 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.65 \\ & 7.84 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.2 \\ -16.65 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46.2 \\ & 9.26 \end{aligned}$ |
| Relative gain (pre to post) | Experimental Control | $\begin{aligned} & 41.97 \\ & -4.07 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.25 \\ & 11.56 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ -23.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62.5 \\ & 14.4 \end{aligned}$ |

[^0]
## Table 3

## Paired Samples T-Test of the Post- PDT for the Experimental and Control Groups

| Groups | T | Df | P | Wilcoxon |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Experimental | 20.22 | 21 | $<.001$ | $<.001$ |
| Control | 1.316 | 9 | . 221 | . 258 |

Note. The test scales from 0 to 54

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for the LCTs Per Week

|  | Week1 | Week2 | Week3 | Week4 | Week5 | Week6 | Week7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | 38.6 | 39.09 | 40.46 | 38.18 | 40 | 38.63 | 41.82 |
| Std. Deviation | 7.10 | 6.83 | 7.85 | 7.33 | 6.90 | 7.10 | 7.33 |

Note. The test scales from 0 to 50
$\square$ Cronbach's alpha was 0.78
$\square$ approximately 79 \% of the answers were correct
$\square 95.5 \%$ affirmed that the texts were easy to understand and contained a decent amount of unfamiliar vocabulary.

Table 5
Paired Samples $T$-Test results for the UVLT Test in the Experimental and Control Groups

| UVLT pretest | UVLT post-test | Groups | t | df | P | Wilcoxon | Cohen's d |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UVLT <br> pretest <br> 1000 | UVLT post-test $1000$ | Experimental Control | $\begin{aligned} & 2.45 \\ & 2.01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.023 \\ & 0.075 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.048 \\ & 0.100 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.523 \\ & 0.636 \end{aligned}$ |
| UVLT <br> pretest <br> 2000 | UVLT post-test $2000$ | Experimental Control | $\begin{aligned} & 2.82 \\ & 0.95 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.010 \\ & 0.366 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.018 \\ & 0.586 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.602 \\ & 0.301 \end{aligned}$ |
| UNLT <br> pretest $3000$ | UNLT post-test $3000$ | Experimental Control | $\begin{aligned} & -5.16 \\ & 1.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <.001 \\ & 0.187 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <.001 \\ & 0.036 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1.101 \\ & 0.451 \end{aligned}$ |


| UVLT | UVLT | Experimental | -2.68 | 21 | 0.014 | 0.022 | -0.571 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| pretest | post-test | Control | 2.77 | 9 | 0.022 | 0.036 | 0.876 |
| 4000 | 4000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UVLT | UVLT | Experimental | -3.21 | 21 | 0.004 | 0.004 | -0.685 |
| pre-test | post-test | Control | 2.94 | 9 | 0.016 | 0.036 | 0.931 |
| 5000 | 5000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

RQ2: The amount of time spent on listening to podcasts have on the incidental vocabulary acquisition

The correlation is statistically significant $p=.021$
$r=-.487$

## RQ3: The frequency of occurrence of the target vocabulary and incidental vocabulary learning

ANOVA: $F(4,54)=3.167, p=.032$
Correlation analysis: $r=.346, p=.01$
Table 6
Frequency of Occurrence and Relative Gain

| Frequency of occurrence | Number of words | Mean of relative gain from pre to post-test | Mean of absolute gain from pre to post-test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-4 (Category 1) | 21 | 32.7 | 27.8 |
| 5-8 (Category 2) | 12 | 33.1 | 27.9 |
| 10-17 (Category 3) | 14 | 65.3 | 33.7 |
| 28 and more (Category 4) | 7 | 78.6 | 37.4 |

## Figure 4

Mean Relative Gains for the Frequency of Occurrence (from Pre- to P


## RQ 4: The distribution of occurrence of the target vocabulary and incidental vocabulary learning

ANOVA: $F(5,54)=3.167, p=.032$.
Correlation analysis: $r=.387, p=.004$

## Table 7

Mean of Relative Gains on the Pre-to Post Test According to the Distribution of Analysis

| Distribution across episodes | Number of words | Mean of relative gain from pre to post-test | Mean of absolute gain from pre to post-test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 (Category 1) | 18 | 30.5 | 26.11 |
| 2 (Category 2) | 13 | 35.2 | 28.4 |
| 3 (Category 3) | 4 | 8.1 | 6.25 |
| 4 (Category 4) | 14 | 51.26 | 43.57 |
| 5, 6 and 7 (Category 5) | 5 | 60.87 | 28 |

## Figure 5

Mean Relative Gains for the Distribution of Occurrence (from pre-to post-PDT)


RQ5: Learners' attitude to vocabulary acquisition via podcasts
Figure 6
Sinviey respornses



## Discussio n and conclusio

 nRQ1: The relationship between listening to podcasts and incidental vocabulary acquisition
$\square$ Identified/recognized- 11.05 lexical units*
$\square$ Acquired- 17.84 lexical units (33\%)*
$\square$ Not acquired- 25.11 lexical units*
*out of 54 lexical units
30.41 lexical units (84.5\%) out of 36 vocabulary items for four weeks (Vidal, 2003)
19.68 lexical units (19.68\%) out of 100 vocabulary items within thirteen weeks (Webb \& Chang, 2015)

RQ2: The amount of time spent on listening to podcasts and incidental vocabulary acquisition
$\square$ Spearman's rho = -. 487
$\square \quad p=.021$

Not strong because of
Easily comprehensible input
100\% (survey) on average 79\% (LCTs)
Decent number of unfamiliar words $\square>86 \%$ (survey) The length of the episodes 45.5\% (survey) The same vocabulary level

RQ3: The relationship between the frequency of occurrence and incidental vocabulary learning
the correlation was statistically significant ( $p=.01$ ) but

e.g. "Sheets and Giggles" and "ethical"
at all levels but more at 10+ (Pelicer:5ancherez s scmmitit 2010; Waing and Tiakidi, 2003) no fixed number of repetition guarantees learning ${ }_{\text {Nation }}$ wang, ${ }_{1999}$ became disputable

RQ4: The distribution of occurrence of the target vocabulary and incidental vocabulary learning
$\square$ The correlation was statistically significant
$r=.387$
$\mathrm{p}=.004$
No correlation (Nobonand Chang 2005) because of
$\square$ the imbalanced vocabulary distribution,
$\square$ the difference of the genres for the selected books, etc.

## examples

"transparency" -300 \% relative gain. low frequency in each episode - 1 in each episode high distribution- in 5 episodes from episode 1 to episode 7.
"takeaway" - 50\% relative gain low frequency- once in each high distribution- episodes 1, 3, 6 and 7

RQ5: Learners' attitude to vocabulary acquisition via podcasts
$\square$ 95\% - improved their listening skills and vocabulary

- 100\% - easy to comprehend
$\square$ 86\% - a decent amount of unfamiliar vocabulary integrated into them.
- 45.5\% - length of episodes
- 100\% - motivated


## Pedagogical implications

Share the practice with EFL teachers and students Not demanding in terms of hardware

Create podcasts for instructional purposes similar to graded readers

Suitable input for auditory learners

## Limitations:

Personal data protection Pre-test vocabulary recognition

* Duration of the project


## Delimitations:

Private school students aged 16-18
Instruments
Design
Sample size

## New research

## Retention

Audio input with authentically written representation Phrases
Treatment of strategies and their impact incidental vocabulary acquisition
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