

The Effects of Plot Familiarity on EFL Lexical Inferencing and Retention

Mohsen Darvand ^{1*}, Saied Ketabi ²

1. English Department, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

2. Associate professor, English Department, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

* Corresponding Author's Email: Mohsendarvand@gmail.com

Abstract – Being an integral part of language learning, vocabulary learning is a burdensome task exerting a great deal of time and energy resulting in learners frustration. Of the confirmed strategies having a facilitative effect on vocabulary learning, Context method has been investigated from different angles, but few, if any, have assessed the effects familiar plot stories, serving as a context, may have on lexical gain. This paper analyzes the effects of familiar plot stories vs. unfamiliar plot stories on lexical knowledge. Thirty eight adult learners, male and female, of English majoring in English language and literature at University of Malayer in Iran are participants of the study. Using empirical statistics, the impact of plot familiarity on lexical knowledge was analyzed_ using an alpha level of .05 as its pre-set level of significance for its statistical tests. Findings are suggestive of facilitative impact being familiar with story plots has on lexical inferencing, lexical inferencing ease, and lexical retention. Results shed new light on our understanding regarding lexical knowledge, and also suggest applying familiar plot stories for teaching vocabulary in ESL curriculum.

Keywords: plot familiarity, context, inferencing, inferencing ease, retention

I. INTRODUCTION

The importance of vocabulary knowledge in foreign language learning seems self-evident. However, it has been widely acknowledged by theorists (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Research suggests that lexical inadequacy frequently interferes with communication; communication appears effortful and breaks down when interlocutors don't use the right words (Allen, 1983). A number of methods and strategies have recently been developed. However, there is no general agreement regarding the optimal method or strategy to develop foreign language vocabulary.

Of the main methods and strategies used for foreign language vocabulary teaching which are widely known, context method has proved conducive to lexical gain and more beneficial for long term retention (Wang & Thomas, 1995). Context method makes learners infer meaning from context clues. What is dealt with in context method is merely context clues which can help learners to surmise the targeted word in the context. Few, if any, research has examined the context with which learners are familiar in terms of its plot. Based on Dual Coding Theory which maintains that two separate systems are responsible for cognitive phenomena: the verbal system which deals with language and the non-verbal system that deals with non-verbal objects and

events. These two systems are assumed to be interrelated so that activation of one can activate the other. It is hypothesized that activation of both systems has an additive effect on retention. This study tries to investigate the efficacy of contexts with plot of which EFL learners are familiar on learner's lexical retention and lexical inferencing through reading. Findings of the study would prove beneficial to our understanding of theories regarding lexical knowledge as well as the strategies to teach and learn vocabulary.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The importance of vocabulary knowledge in foreign language learning seems self-evident; however, it has been put by scholars in the L2 realm (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Laufer (1997) believes that vocabulary learning is at the center of any language learning activity and language use. With its salient significance, vocabulary as an inseparable part of language has been probed in different angles to be well understood so as to have insights regarding optimal methods and approaches to tackle its cumbersome task of learning it.

There have been indications of the significance of contexts in vocabulary learning (Nash & Snowling, 2006). Concerning deriving meaning from context research suggests learners with richer vocabulary knowledge perform better than those with poor lexical knowledge (Cain, Oakhill, & Lemmon 2004). Research also indicates better memory performance with greater background knowledge (Ellis, 2001). A few studies investigated background knowledge, or assessed inferencing in different contexts in terms of degree of semantic richness. Adams (1982) reported that script activators (i.e. describing statements) enhanced lexical inferencing for beginning learners of French when reading paragraphs about everyday activities. Li (1988) reported more success and greater ease in guessing when Chinese advanced learners of English processed semantically rich compared to semantically poor sentences. Similarly, Mondria and Wit-de Boer (1991) reported better inferencing in semantically rich sentences with Dutch learners of French.

The studies above demonstrate that background knowledge and rich semantic contexts affect lexical inferencing in discrete sentence contexts. Few of the studies above assessed retention after the inferring phase. Li (1988) reported superior retention of the words in the semantically rich sentences based on a cued recall. Rott (2000) also reported occasional successful recall of target word (TW) meanings when learners had used background knowledge to surmise the meanings. However, Mondria and Wit-de Boer (1991), who evaluated retention after a verification task to confirm or correct the guesses, revealed weak retention on a translation task, and found weak and negative correlations between retention and inferencing. Similarly, Mondria (2003) also found low retention of correctly inferred words after a verification task, and high correct retention of incorrectly inferred words in a study with learners of Dutch. These latter two studies gave this explanation that due to the strong association of context and meaning, and supposed ease in guessing, learners likely did not pay enough attention

to the word form and its meaning during the learning activities. Pulido (2003) by presenting two stories with more familiar scenarios (grocery shopping and doctor visit) and two stories with more unfamiliar scenarios (publishing and home buying) for Spanish adult learners found that background knowledge had facilitative effects on the short term retention of learners. In a similar study, Pulido (2004) obtained facilitative effects of culturally familiar scenarios on the immediate retention of L2 learners.

Few of the studies have investigated delayed retention of learners' retention, and few have investigated the effects that stories with familiar plots might have on EFL learners' retention of vocabulary. To fill this gap, the present study aims at exploring the possible effects plot familiarity might have on EFL learners' lexical inferencing and lexical retention. To achieve the intended aim, the following questions guided this study:

1. Which one of the following factors has a greater impact on EFL lexical inferencing: a) familiar-plot context, b) unfamiliar-plot context?
2. Which one of the following factors has a greater impact on difficulty in lexical inferencing of EFL learners: a) familiar-plot context, b) unfamiliar-plot context?
3. Which one of the following factors has a greater impact on EFL lexical retention: a) familiar-plot context, b) unfamiliar-plot context?

Given research regarding topic familiarity, and its similarity with plot familiarity in terms of schemata, It was hypothesized plot familiarity, by providing richer context and paving the way for using background knowledge, would have a significant effect on Lexical inferencing, inferencing difficulty, and contribute to lexical retention.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

The participants for this study were 39 adult learners of English as a foreign language, majoring in English language and literature at Malayer University (i.e., 28 females and 11 males). Their level of English proficiency were determined high intermediate by Oxford placement test (OPT).

B. Passages

The texts were four short stories taken from the website bygosh.com, two stories out of the four were supposed to be familiar to subjects due to existing in their elementary school curriculum, and two of them unfamiliar (see Appendix A). That the stories were actually familiar

to participants was later confirmed by their responses to plot familiarity questionnaire, delineated in the following sections. Based on theories suggesting if scenario is familiar to learners, a scrip is stored in long term memory (Graesser et al. 1994), the familiar plot stories were considered having a script in long term memory. The stories were of approximately the same length and readability difficulty (see Table 1). The Flesch-Kincaid Reading Ease score for two stories, one with familiar plot and one with unfamiliar plot, was 74.5 and 73.2 respectively. And also, two relatively easier stories, one with familiar plot and one with unfamiliar plot were calculated having scores of 92.3 and 91.7 respectively as their ease indexes.

Table 1: Comparison of stories

	Familiar stories		Unfamiliar stories	
	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Character Count	779	597	406	393
Syllable Count	238	188	125	119
Word Count	193	166	97	100
Sentence Count	7	9	4	7
Characters Per Word	4.0	3.6	4.2	3.9
Syllables per word	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.2
Words per Sentence	27.6	18.4	24.3	14.3

C. Target Words

In each story two verbs and two nouns were chosen evenly, that is, 8 verbs and 8 nouns collectively. Then, sixteen nonsense words were contrived to be substituted for the chosen words so as to be sure that subjects had no prior knowledge of the target words (Appendix B). The nonsense words were contrived words constructed according to the orthographic and morphological rules of English language. All inflectional and derivational morphemes were maintained. Between one TW and the next were from two to four intervening sentences. Each TW appeared only once in each story, thus the frequency of each contrived word was equal to the others.

D. Independent Variables

Plot familiarity was determined by a self- reported questionnaire tapping the familiarity of subjects to the stories (see Appendix C). Subjects were expected to be familiar with stories 1 and 2, being a part of their elementary school curriculum. Two other stories corresponding with story 1 and 2 in terms of readability difficulty and length supposed to be unfamiliar to subjects were selected as well.

This task provided information about participants' background knowledge. Except for one participant, all participants were familiar with stories 1 and 2 and unfamiliar to stories 3 and 4, the familiar subject to the four stories was left out from the study.

E. Dependent Variables

Participants were asked to write the meaning or translation of boldfaced and underlined words in their L1, Persian, to assess their lexical inferencing. Subjects were instructed as what follows. 'You are going to read 4 brief stories in English in which each has 4 bold-face underlined words (e.g. Example). First, read the story completely and check the familiarity questionnaire below. Then, read the story again and guess the TRANSLATION of each of the 4 words based upon the context, and write the translation in the space provided next to the bold face underlined words. If you cannot think of an exact translation, give an approximate one, or describe what you think the word might mean. Immediately after you guessed the translation of each word, please check on a scale of 1–6 the degree of ease or difficulty in guessing the translation of the bold-face underlined word on the next page, inferencing questionnaire.' the instruction was explained orally as well. For lexical inferencing the following scoring was applied: incorrect = 0; partially correct = 0.5; correct = 1 (either the correct L1 translation, or a correct paraphrase or definition).

A Likert- scale questionnaire was applied to elicit the level of difficulty in lexical inferencing of target words. The following scale was used: 1 very difficult; 2 difficult; 3 moderately difficult; 4 moderately easy; 5 easy; 6 very easy.

To measure lexical retention, two tests were constructed, a test of translation production and a test of translation recognition_ multiple choice. All target words plus 8 additional nonsense distracters were included in both of them. The verbs were presented in their infinitives, and the nouns in the form which appeared in texts. For both measures, the test items were randomized to eliminate effects of memory for order of presentation of the TWs within the stories. Participants were required to provide a translation or explanation of each target word in their L1 by a translation production test. Retention was scored as follows: 0 incorrect; 5 partially correct; 1 correct.

A multiple choice translation recognition test required subjects to choose the translation of target words from a series of options in which the emphasis was on semantic, not syntactic, differences. Options included the correct translation of the target word, and three distracters. The following criteria were observed in constructing the distracters: (a) contextually close to the target word; (b) schematically appropriate; and (c) orthographically or phonologically close to another word in the L1 or L2 and plausible for the context. Options which were conceptually unusual were excluded.

F. Procedure

The study was conducted in two sessions. The study was led in a tester- guided fashion during both sessions, the tester accompanying participants during the study individually provided clarification when needed. In session 1, after reading each story, participants were required to check the familiarity questionnaire at the first place. Then, they had to read the stories again and infer the meaning, translation in L1, of the bold-face underlined target words as they advanced in the process of reading. Participants could ask the meaning of all words other than target words. They were required to check the corresponding inferencing questionnaire items for each target word after writing its translation in the provided space.

After completing plot familiarity questionnaire, inferencing phase, and level of difficulty in lexical inferencing questionnaire, participants went through the same self-paced online target word verification task to enhance elaborative processing of the target words in an error-free manner by confirming or correcting their guesses by which they could make connections between the new word context, its form, and its meaning in the story. Each target word was shown on a computer screen individually, in original sentences and in the order they had appeared in the texts. To confirm or correct their guesses of each word, and also to be sure they had comprehended the sentence before going to following sentences, the target word translation appeared in the right- hand margin of the computer screen. Subjects were taught to confirm and correct their guesses about target words and to be sure before going to the following sentences. To encourage integration of the target word meaning into the sentence and context, rather than mere memorization or just looking at the gloss, participants were told to predict questions about the sentences, but they were not told of the subsequent retention tests.

Two days later, again individually, to tap their retention of lexical knowledge, participants completed a translation production test. After the translation production test, they took the multiple choice translation recognition test.

IV. RESULTS

Plot familiarity (familiar-plot context vs. unfamiliar-plot context) served as the independent variable in the study. Paired t-tests, using an alpha level of .05, were conducted to answer research questions.

For research question 1, addressing the effects of plot familiarity on lexical inferencing, the combined scores revealed that more than two thirds of the TWs were successfully inferred ($M = .760$, $SD = .3467$). The number of correct inferences from familiar-plot stories ($M = .799$, $SD = .3411$) was considerably greater than unfamiliar-plot stories ($M = .720$, $SD = .3482$). In some cases all target words from familiar-plot stories were guessed successfully.

Using the paired t-test to compare impacts of the independent variable plot familiarity, familiar-plot vs. unfamiliar plot, results revealed, by rejecting the null hypothesis of the t-test, there is a privilege for those who are familiar with the plot of the story than those unfamiliar with it ($t = 3.299$, $df = 303$, $p = .001$).

Results obtained regarding research question 2 indicated a moderate ease in inferencing target words (combined $M = 4.41$, $SD = 1.245$, scale of 1-6).

Guessing of target words from familiar-plot stories was considered easier than that of unfamiliar-plot stories, and scores showed slightly more variability in ratings in familiar-plot stories compared to unfamiliar-plot stories (familiar-plot $M = 4.872$, $SD = 1.2105$; unfamiliar-plot $M = 3.941$, $SD = 1.0975$).

To calculate the effect of plot familiarity on inferencing difficulty, two sets of scores, familiar-plot vs. unfamiliar-plot, concerning inferencing difficulty were compared using paired t-test. Results suggested significantly easier inferencing for familiar-plot stories compared to unfamiliar-plot stories ($t = 10.489$, $df = 303$, $p = .000$).

For research question 3, concerning lexical retention, on average scores were better on multiple choice recognition measure (combined $M = .66$, $SD = .475$) compared to production measure (combined $M = .517$, $SD = .4611$). Scores revealed a better performance of memory for both production and recognition of target words in familiar plot contexts (production $M = .541$, $SD = .4640$; recognition $M = .68$, $SD = .467$) compared to target words in unfamiliar plot contexts (production $M = .493$, $SD = .4577$; recognition $M = .63$, $SD = .483$).

By applying paired t-test to investigate the effect of the independent variable plot familiarity on lexical retention, results indicated a significant impact of being familiar with story plot on lexical retention measured through production ($t = 2.069$, $df = 303$, $p = .039$); however, statistic regarding lexical recognition test did not reach the pre-established level of significance ($t = 1.813$, $df = 303$, $p = .071$).

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This section provides a specific discussion for each research hypothesis. The present study aimed at examining the effects of plot familiarity on EFL lexical inferencing, lexical inferencing ease, and lexical retention. In general, findings suggest a significant relationship between plot familiarity and the dependent variables investigated in the study, pointing to a facilitative effect of being familiar with the plot of the stories.

Plot familiarity had a significant effect on EFL lexical inferencing. Comparing the two types of stories, familiar-plot vs. unfamiliar-plot, the study showed that there were substantially more correct target word inferences when reading familiar-plot stories than when reading

unfamiliar-plot stories. Background knowledge may have been the important factor helping learners to more efficiently focus attention on input while reading plot familiar stories. Ongoing textual interpretations, and in turn, form-meaning mappings for new words must have been constrained as a result of holding the pragmatic, semantic, syntactic knowledge, involved in constructing the meaning of the text, activated by the local and global context cues.

These results confirms previous research reported above that investigated learners using background knowledge during think-aloud tasks in lexical inferencing research models, or that studied impacts of topic familiarity. The results also give deeper insight to the role of background knowledge in vocabulary development that begins during reading by studying learners' initial meaning assignments to new words. Results concerning research question 1 were indicative of the strong role plot familiarity has in lexical inferencing phase in acquisition of words.

As for lexical inferencing difficulty, the target words from familiar-plot passages were easier to guess, and were also guessed correctly more often. Scores of perceived ease rated by participants for familiar plot stories were considerably greater than unfamiliar plot stories. In other words, words in familiar-plot stories are easier to infer. This advantage may likely have come from a situation model for passages. The results furnish more knowledge to our understanding regarding inferencing ease factors.

The independent variable plot familiarity was also determined to have effects on lexical retention. In spite of the previous studies mentioned above concerning topic familiarity, results showed a better performance of lexical retention for familiar-plot texts. Although scores in familiar plot recognition test were higher, the pre-set level of significance was not met.

The present study was an attempt to investigate the effects of plot familiarity on lexical inferencing, lexical inferencing ease, and lexical retention. Results were suggestive of being a significant relationship between plot familiarity and the parameters. Findings point out to the facilitative effects of being familiar with story plots on EFL learner's lexical inferencing, lexical inferencing ease, and lexical retention. The study expands upon our understanding regarding lexical development in second language acquisition. Furthermore, it suggests applying familiar plot contexts to teach vocabulary in our second language curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1982). Scripts and the recognition of unfamiliar vocabulary: enhancing second language reading skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66(2) 155-159.
- Allen, F.V. (1983). *Techniques in teaching vocabulary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Atkinson, R. C. (1975). Mnemotechnics in second-language learning. *American Psychologist*, 30(8), 821-828.

- Cain, K., Oakhill, J. V., & Lemmon, K. (2004). Individual differences in the inference of word meanings from context: the influence of reading comprehension, vocabulary knowledge, and memory capacity. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(4), 671-681.
- Ellis, N. (2001). Memory for language. In Robinson, P. (Eds), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 33–68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graesser, A., Singer, M., & Trabasso, T. (1994). Constructing inferences during narrative text comprehension. *Psychological Review*, 101, 371-95.
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: language acquisition in the classroom*. Hayward, CA: The Alemany Press.
- Laufer, B. (1997). *The lexical plight in second language reading*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Laws, G. (2004). Contributions of phonological memory, language comprehension and hearing to the expressive language of adolescents and young adults with down syndrome. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45(6), 1085–1095.
- Li, X. (1986). Effects of contextual cues on inferring and remembering meanings of new words. *Applied Linguistics*, 9(4), 402-413.
- Mondria, J., & M. Wit-de Boer (1991). The effects of contextual richness on the guessability and the retention of words in a foreign language. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(3), 249-267.
- Mondria, J. (2003). The effects of inferring, verifying, and memorizing on the retention of L2 word meanings. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25(4), 473-499.
- Moore, J. C., & Surber, J. R. (1992). Effects of context and keyword methods on second language vocabulary acquisition. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 17 (3), 286–292.
- Nash, H., & Snowling, M. (2006). Teaching new words to children with poor existing vocabulary knowledge: A controlled evaluation of the definition and context methods. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 41 (3), 335-354.
- Pulido, D. (2003). Modeling the role of second language proficiency and topic familiarity in second language incidental vocabulary acquisition through reading. *Language Learning*, 53(2), 233–284.
- Pulido, D. (2004). The effect of cultural familiarity on incidental vocabulary acquisition through reading. *Language Learning*, 4(2), 20-44.
- Pulido, D. (2007). The effects of topic familiarity and passage sight vocabulary on L2 lexical inferencing and retention through reading. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(1), 66–86.
- Rott, S. 2000. Relationships between the process of reading, word inferencing, and incidental word acquisition. In J. F. Lee and A. Valdman (eds), *Form and Meaning: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 255–82). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Wang, A. Y., & Thomas, M. H. (1995). Effects of keyword on long-term retention: Help or hindrance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(3), 468-475.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

You are going to read 4 brief stories in English in which each has 4 bold-face underlined words (e.g. Example). First, read the story completely and check the familiarity questionnaire below. Then, read the story again and guess the TRANSLATION of each of these 4 words based upon the context, and write the translation in the space provided next to the bold face underlined words. If you cannot think of an exact translation, give an approximate one, or describe what you think the word means. Immediately after guessing the translation of each word, please indicate on a scale of 1–6 the degree of ease or difficulty in guessing the translation of the bold-face underlined word on the next page, inferencing questionnaire.

Story: 1

The Shepherd Boy

There was once a young Shepherd Boy who tended his sheep at the foot of a mountain near a dark forest. It was rather lonely for him all day, so he thought upon a plan by which he could get a little company and some excitement. He rushed down towards the village calling out "Wolf, Wolf," and the villagers came out to meet him, and some of them stopped with him for a considerable time. This pleased the boy so much that a few days afterwards he tried the same serdal (.....) and again the villagers came to his barce (.....). But shortly after this a Wolf actually did come out from the forest, and began to worry the sheep, and the boy of course cried out "Wolf, Wolf," still louder than before. But this time the villagers, who had been deldged (.....) twice before, thought the boy was again deceiving them, and nobody stirred to come to his help. So the Wolf made a good meal off the boy's flock, and when the boy recleamed (.....) the wise man of the village said:

"A liar will not be believed, even when he speaks the truth."

Story: 2

The Fox and the Crow

A Fox once saw a Crow fly off with a piece of cheese in its beak and settle on a branch of a tree. "That's for me, as I am a Fox," said Master Reynard, and he walked up to the dreak (.....) of the tree. "Good-day, Mistress Crow," he cried. "How well you are looking to-day: how glossy your feathers; how bright your eye. I feel sure your voice must fedeal (.....) that of other birds, just as your figure does; let me hear but one geab (.....) from you that I may greet you as the Queen of Birds." The Crow lifted up her head and began to caw her best, but the moment she opened her mouth the piece of cheese leated (.....) to the ground,

only to be snapped up by Master Fox. "That will do," said he. "That was all I wanted. In exchange for your cheese I will give you a piece of advice for the future:

"Do not trust flatterers."

Story: 3

Hercules and the Waggoner

A Waggoner was once driving a heavy load along a very muddy way. At last he came to a part of the road where the wheels sank half-way into the bein (.....), and the more the donkey searded (.....), the deeper sank the wheels. So the Waggoner threw down his whip, and knelt down and labbered (.....) to Hercules the Strong. "O Hercules, help me in this my hour of delmack (.....)," quoth he. But Hercules appeared to him, and said: "Tut, man, don't sprawl there. Get up and put your shoulder to the wheel."

The gods help them that help themselves.

Story: 4

The Fox and the Lion

When first the Fox saw the Lion he was terribly frightened, and ran away and hid himself in the wood. Next time however he came near the King of Beasts he stopped at a safe sagear (.....) and watched him pass by. The third time they came near one another the Fox went straight up to the Lion and fleashed (.....) the time of day with him, asking him how his family were, and when he should have the pleasure of seeing him again; then turning his tail, he helted (.....) from the Lion without much kreap (.....).

Familiarity breeds contempt.

Appendix B

Target Words

	Familiar stories		Unfamiliar stories	
	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4
Nouns	serdal (trick)	dreak (foot)	sagear (distance)	bein (mire)
	barce (help)	geab (song)	creap (ceremony)	delmack (distress)
Verbs	deldge (fool)	federal (surpass)	fleash (pass)	seard (pull)
	recleam (complain)	leat (fall)	helt (part)	labber (pray)

Appendix C

Questionnaire: 1

Familiarity Questionnaire

Dear participant:

Before reading the story, was the story familiar to you?

Story: 1 Yes No

Story: 2 Yes No

Story: 3 Yes No

Story: 4 Yes No

Questionnaire: 2

Inferencing Questionnaire

Dear participant:

Please indicate on a scale of 1–6 the degree of ease or difficulty in guessing the translation of the bold-face underlined word. Numbers respectively represent: 1 very difficult; 2 difficult; 3 moderately difficult; 4 moderately easy; 5 easy; 6 very easy.

	very difficult			very easy		
1. Serdal	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
2. Barce	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
3. To delge	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
4. To recleam	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
5. Dreak	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
6. To fedéal	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
7. geab	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
8. to leat	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
9. Bein	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
10. To seard	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
11. To laber	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
12. Delmack	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
13. Sagear	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
14. To fleash	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
15. To helt	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
16. Kreap	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>