

verb: Vocabulary Education and Research Bulletin

Winter 2022

Volume 11, Issue 2

Welcome to the Winter 2022 issue of VERB, the Vocabulary Education and Research Bulletin. We hope that many of you were able to attend the Vocabulary SIG Symposium at Tokyo International University in October or the JALT2022 conference in Hakata in November. It has been refreshing to enjoy many in-person conferences this year. We are currently planning the Vocabulary SIG Symposium for 2023 and will be able to give more details in the Summer 2023 issue.

In this issue, we have three articles that we hope you will enjoy. First up, **Seamus Johnston** demonstrates how to identify the most useful units of a textbook by using an online text analysis tool. Next, **Abram E. Leon** uses a corpus of English-language travel guidebooks to create of a high-frequency lexical bundle list for students of English for Tourism Purposes. And finally, **Brian Pickering** examines the differences in the amount of general academic vocabulary and domain-specific vocabulary in academic texts written by both foreign language learners and native English speakers.

Again, we hope that you enjoy the articles in this issue, and we will look forward to your submissions for 2023.

Michael McGuire & Jenifer Larson-Hall, VERB editors

About VERB:

The Vocabulary Education and Research Bulletin (VERB) is a biannual publication focusing on short research articles relating to the role of vocabulary in second language learning. VERB is produced by the Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT) Vocabulary Special Interest Group (SIG).

The JALT Vocabulary SIG provides a venue for discussion and research into second language vocabulary acquisition and assessment, particularly as they pertain to language education in Japan.

Table of Contents

Short Articles

Seamus Johnston	3
<i>Selecting Coursebook Content: A Lexical Approach</i>	
Abram E. Leon	10
<i>'Some of the Best': A High-Frequency Lexical Bundle List for Students of English for Tourism Purposes</i>	
Brian Pickering	22
<i>Exploring Ratios of General Academic & Domain-specific Vocabulary use in University Student Writing</i>	
SIG News	32
VERB Call for Papers	34
VLI Call for Papers	35

VERB salutes the cooperation and hard work of our reviewers:

Phil Bennett	Jenifer Larson-Hall	James Rogers
Thuy Bui	Mimi Masson	Rachel Ruegg
John Collins	Stuart McClean	Jeff Stewart
David Coulson	Michael McGuire	Tim Stoeckel
Tomoko Ishii	Atsushi Mizumoto	Raymond Stubbe
Magda Kitano	Ian Munby	Haidee Thomson
Brandon Kramer	John Racine	Yuka Yamamoto

Short Paper**Selecting Coursebook Content: A Lexical Approach**

Seamus Johnston sjohnsto@reitaku-u.ac.jp

Introduction/Background

“There is no one coursebook to suit all situations” is a common trope heard in English language teaching circles. Teachers are generally required to adapt mandated material to best fit their classroom. This can be a daunting, time-consuming, and ultimately subjective task. A detailed needs analysis may be necessary to determine how materials should be selected or supplemented, but there are occasions where this does not have to be the case.

If a group of learners’ lexical needs can be determined, the problem can be addressed using Nation’s (2013) “cost/benefit principle.” This refers to how much time should be spent learning vocabulary items (the cost) versus how frequently they occur and, as such, how much they aid understanding (the benefit). For example, current corpus linguistics research suggests that beginner English learners should concentrate on a core 2800 high-frequency words that will help them understand approximately 92% of the majority of general English books, newspapers, and magazines. This percentage increases for TV shows and movies (Browne, 2021). For higher proficiency learners, wordlists that go beyond the initial 2800 are available for reference, including Gardner and Davies’ (2013) and Browne’s (2014) academic word lists. Special-purpose wordlists are also available, including wordlists for those studying for specific exams (Browne et al., 2013a). As such, once the learners’ vocabulary levels and the course learning goals have been established, it is possible to analyze the lexical content of a coursebook with free online text analysis tools and use that analysis to determine the most beneficial elements.

Aims

From the perspective of Nation’s cost/benefit principle, this research aims to demonstrate how an online text analysis tool can be employed to identify and select the most beneficial units of a coursebook for a class of pre-intermediate year two Japanese undergraduate students studying for the TOEIC exam. The method can be used or adapted to allow teachers to identify the most beneficial units in a given coursebook for almost any group of learners.

Sample

The coursebook in question was *Barron’s Essential Words for the TOEIC* (Lougheed, 2014), which contained 50 units, each beginning with a wordlist of twelve

headwords to prepare learners for the subsequent material. These wordlists were analyzed to determine the benefit of each unit. A significant majority of the headwords contained in each wordlist were nouns, verbs, adjectives, or adverbs (565 items). The remaining items were phrasal verbs (27 items) or idioms (eight items). The wordlists were presented with definitions and two usage examples for each word. Where possible, each headword's verb, noun, adjective, and adverb equivalent were also provided. Each unit had several writing and listening exercises that required productive and receptive knowledge of its corresponding wordlist.

Methods

Tools

Two high-frequency wordlists were used to identify the most beneficial units: the New General Service List (NGSL) and the TOEIC Service List (TSL). The first list, the NGSL, contains 2800 headwords covering 92.34% of the Cambridge English Corpus (Browne, 2021). The second list, the TSL (based on a 1.5-million-word corpus of TOEIC coursebooks, practice tests, and corpora), when combined with the NGSL, offers 98.5% coverage of the vocabulary present in the TOEIC test (Browne, 2021). As the TSL does not contain any of the words in the NGSL, the two lists can be used in combination and without overlap. Essentially with regards to TOEIC preparation, the TSL begins where the NGSL ends.

The Online Graded Text Editor (OGTE) was used to determine the benefit of each word in each unit wordlist by establishing where it was situated within the NGSL and the TSL. The OGTE is an online tool created by Browne and Waring (2015) that allows the user to input text and determine the frequency of each word with respect to several different wordlists including the NGSL (Browne et al., 2013b), the TSL (Brown et al., 2013a), the Academic Word List (Coxhead, 2000), and others.

Process

The unit wordlists were entered manually into a Microsoft Word file before being copied and pasted into the OGTE. The option titled "TOEIC Service List and NGSL" was selected from the "Select Wordlist" dropdown menu, and "TSL Level 12" was chosen from the "Select Level" dropdown menu. The OGTE produced a corresponding frequency level for each word in the wordlist that appeared in the NGSL or TSL. Each word was then given a score that corresponded to its level; for example, if the frequency level of a word was 1 (the highest frequency words), it was allocated a score of 1. Scores ranged from 1 to 18, representing the five frequency levels of the NGSL (scores of 1–5), the 12 frequency levels of the TSL (scores of 6–17), and an extra level entitled Outside

Word Lists (OWL) for those words not found in the NGSL or TSL (a score of 18). As phrasal verbs and idioms are not accounted for in the NGSL or TSL, they were treated as OWL words. The results were then tabulated to establish the number of words at each frequency level and produce an overall score for each unit. For the students in the current study, the lower the overall score, the more beneficial it was deemed to be, as this indicated a higher number of high-frequency words. The same process was repeated for all subsequent unit wordlists.

Results

Table 1 below shows the number of words in each unit that appear across the five frequency bands of the NGSL, the 12 frequency bands of the TSL, and the OWL. The scores for each of these categories are displayed under New General Service List Score (NGSLS), TOEIC Service List Score (TSLs), and Outside Wordlists Score (OWLS). The first column indicates the unit number, and the final column displays the overall score for each unit.

For example, contained in the 12 headwords for unit number 1 were eight words from the NGSL, consisting of one word from frequency band one (one point), four words from frequency band two (two points each), two words from frequency band three (three points each), and one word from frequency band four (four points), equaling an NGSLS of 19. There were three words from the TSL, consisting of one word from frequency band nine (nine points), one word from frequency band 16 (16 points), and one word from frequency band 17 (17 points), equaling a TSLs of 42. Finally, one phrasal verb was assigned to the OWL (18 points). Altogether, these headwords returned a unit score of 79.

The overall score indicates the most beneficial units for the students in question. Where two overall scores were the same, the more beneficial unit was determined by how low the NGSL score was. If two or more results were still the same, the more beneficial unit was determined by how low the TSL score was. A final measure for identical scores was the OWL score. Using this method, the five most beneficial units were defined as 25, 3, 50, 4, and 46, respectively, as they offered the greatest coverage of high-frequency words that appear in the TOEIC.

Table 1

Results of the Online Graded Text Editor Analysis

Unit Number	Number of words per list			Word frequency scores			Unit Score
	NGSL	TSL	OWL	NGSLS	TSLS	OWLS	
1	8	3	1	19	42	18	79
2	8	2	2	23	25	36	84
3	11	1	0	27	7	0	34
4	11	0	1	27	0	18	45
5	8	2	2	21	25	36	82
6	5	4	3	12	47	54	113
7	4	4	4	12	39	72	123
8	3	3	6	8	31	108	147
9	9	2	1	22	20	18	60
10	6	6	0	17	73	0	93
11	5	2	5	19	16	90	125
12	8	1	3	21	14	54	89
13	7	1	4	19	12	72	103
14	7	2	3	19	18	54	91
15	7	3	2	22	38	36	95
16	7	4	0	18	40	0	58
17	7	1	4	20	6	72	98
18	5	5	2	16	48	36	100
19	9	2	1	23	22	18	63
20	8	3	1	31	36	18	85

Unit Number	Number of words per list			Word frequency scores			Unit Score
	NGSL	TSL	OWL	NGSLS	TSLS	OWLS	
21	5	4	3	17	37	54	108
22	4	4	3	8	37	54	99
23	7	2	3	15	25	54	94
24	4	4	4	17	25	72	114
25	10	2	0	25	19	0	34
26	1	5	6	3	47	108	158
27	7	2	3	20	22	54	96
28	2	5	5	7	55	90	152
29	8	2	2	21	12	36	69
30	4	5	3	9	60	54	123
31	9	1	2	26	8	36	70
32	6	3	3	15	23	54	92
33	8	1	3	26	8	54	88
34	5	3	4	15	32	72	119
35	8	2	2	23	18	36	77
36	4	6	2	11	39	36	86
37	5	5	1	14	70	18	102
38	5	5	2	20	49	36	105
39	7	3	2	14	21	36	71
40	7	2	3	22	31	54	107
41	8	1	3	20	12	54	86

Unit Number	Number of words per list			Word frequency scores			Unit Score
	NGSL	TSL	OWL	NGSLS	TSLS	OWLS	
42	10	1	1	24	12	18	54
43	7	2	3	18	34	54	106
44	10	1	1	32	10	18	60
45	6	4	2	19	30	36	85
46	10	2	0	24	22	0	46
47	5	4	3	16	52	54	122
48	8	3	1	25	25	18	68
49	8	3	1	22	26	18	66
50	11	1	0	29	6	0	35

Conclusions

Although attitudes towards coursebooks vary amongst professionals, teachers are often mandated to use them. As such, decisions must be made regarding how to get the maximum benefit from the material within the limited time available. By applying scores to coursebook unit wordlists based on frequency, this study has used Nation's (2013) cost/benefit principle to demonstrate how high-frequency word lists, special purpose lists, and free online tools can be used for a lexical approach to making those decisions. An approach like this provides a simple and versatile way for teachers to determine which elements of a coursebook are the most beneficial for their students based on the learning goals of the course and their current vocabulary level. For teachers unsure of their students' level regarding high-frequency vocabulary, both Browne and Nation (2013b) have readily available tests to determine this.

Future Directions

The treatment of OWL words will affect how each unit's benefit is perceived. As OWL words have been allocated the maximum score of 18 in this study, they have the potential to significantly impact a unit's overall score. For example, four of the five most beneficial units, as identified by this research, 25, 3, 50, and 46, contained no OWL words.

If a single NGSL word was replaced with an OWL word in any of these units there would be a unit score increase of 12 to 17 points. As such, a more nuanced approach may be necessary for dealing with phrasal verbs and idioms.

Assigning a value to such language items could be achieved using a purely subjective approach based on a teacher's knowledge of the students and the course. Alternatively, analyzing corpus data using a website like the Corpus of Contemporary American English (Davies, 2012) could be used to establish high-frequency lexical chunks allowing a teacher to use that information to determine a point value. Further analysis focusing on how phrasal verbs and idioms are treated would serve as an important contribution to this research.

References

- Browne, C. (2014). A new general service list: The better mousetrap we've been looking for? *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, 3, 1–10.
- Browne, C. (2021). The NGSL project: Building wordlists and resources to help EFL learners (and teachers) to succeed. In A. B. Gallagher, D. Jarrell, B. Kirchmeyer, L. Ohashi, & J. York (Eds.), *Teaching with technology 2020: Selected papers from the JALTCALL 2020 conference* (pp. 1–18). JALT CALL SIG.
- Browne, C., Culligan, B., & Phillips, J. (2013a). New academic word list. <http://www.newgeneralservicelist.org/nawl-new-academic-word-list>
- Browne, C., Culligan, B., & Phillips, J. (2013b). New general service list. <http://www.newgeneralservicelist.org/>
- Browne, C., & Waring, R. (2015). The online graded text editor. <http://www.er-central.com/ogte/>
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587951>
- Gardner, D., & Davies, M. (2013). A new academic vocabulary list. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 305–327.
- Lougheed, L. (2014). *Essential words for the TOEIC with MP3 CD* (5th ed.). Barron's Educational Series.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *What should every EFL teacher know?* South Korea: Compass Publishing.

Short Paper

**‘Some of the Best’:
A High-Frequency Lexical Bundle List for Students of
English for Tourism Purposes**

Abram E. Leon

leon@oiu.jp

Introduction

In Japan, recent years have seen an increasing number of international tourists (JNTO, 2022), and notwithstanding the recent pullback in tourism due to COVID-19, this trend is likely to continue. Despite English’s role as a lingua franca for interactions with foreign tourists, issues in oral communication between visitors and locals persist in Japan (Fujita, 2020; Fujita et al., 2017). To deal with this problem, English for Specific Purposes courses geared toward learners preparing for careers in tourism have become more common at Japanese universities in recent years (Iwai, 2012). ESP methods can serve as a lens for identifying concrete needs and specific learning objectives for students of tourism, particularly in the area of vocabulary instruction. Building on previous studies, this paper documents the creation of a list of high-frequency lexical bundles for Japanese students of English for Tourism Purposes (ETP).

ETP and Vocabulary

Corpus linguistics approaches are commonly used in ESP to identify lexicogrammatical features of a given genre (Hyon, 2018). General frequency-based lists such as the New General Service List (Browne et al., 2013) are often the primary target for vocabulary learning, because high-frequency words offer a greater return on investment for time spent studying (Nation, 2008, 2013). These are often followed by lists of technical or semi-technical words particular to a given field, derived from specifically generated corpora. For example, corpora representing the airline, hotel, and travel agency industries have been compiled to identify vocabulary items of value for Japanese tourism majors (Fujita, 2010; Fujita & Tsushima, 2010). Similarly, texts involving sight-seeing, shopping, dining, and hands-on experiences were used to form the Kyoto-Guide Corpus, which was then used to create vocabulary lists for students of various proficiency levels (Chujo et al., 2006). Such approaches can provide clear, quantitative data to inform teachers and learners about appropriate learning objectives for ETP.

For students to master language as it is used in their field, it is important to move beyond the study of individual words and investigate lexical patterning such as multi-word units, collocations, and lexical bundles (Hyland, 2008; Woodrow, 2018). Previous studies have indicated that targeted attention to such formulaic sequences can help Japanese learners improve performance in measures of oral fluency (McGuire & Larson-Hall, 2021; Wood, 2009). Hyland (2008) emphasized the prevalence of lexical bundles in professional discourse while highlighting how the most common bundles can vary greatly across academic genres. For students of ETP, it would be useful to identify the form and function of the most common bundles used in authentic genres directed at tourists.

Travel Guidebook Corpus

As described above, field-specific corpora can aid in identifying useful vocabulary items and lexical bundles for learners of ETP. For Japanese students of ETP, an ideal corpus might include texts aimed at introducing tourists to various aspects of the tourism experience, including transportation, sights, food, lodging, and cultural experiences unique to Japan. One genre which fits this description but remains largely unexplored is the travel guidebook; guidebooks are commercially available and can easily be explored in digital format using concordance software. In this study, a corpus of English-language travel guidebooks about Japan was compiled and analyzed. Frequently occurring lexical bundles were identified, ultimately forming a list which can serve as one of the learning objectives in a ETP course for students of international tourism at a Japanese university. The study addresses the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the most frequently occurring lexical bundles specific to English-language travel guidebooks about Japan?

RQ2: How can the most frequent bundles be organized into a study list for use with undergraduate students of international tourism?

Methods

Creating the Corpus

To create the corpus used in this study, 11 English-language guidebooks about Japan were initially collected and inspected. Five titles were selected for inclusion in the Travel Guidebook Corpus, forming a total of approximately 1,500,000 words (see Table 1). These titles were selected primarily due to availability of an electronic version, which facilitated conversion to text files for examination with the corpus analysis tool AntConc 3.5.9 (Anthony, 2020). The files include all text from captions, maps, glossaries, and

indices. While this could be viewed as a limitation of this study, given the focus on high-frequency bundles, it is thought that influence on the results is minimal.

Table 1

Guidebooks included in the Travel Guidebook Corpus and their word counts

Text Title	Word Count
National Geographic Traveller: Japan (National Geographic, 2020)	161,372
DK Eyewitness: Japan (DK Eyewitness, 2019)	102,534
The Rough Guide to Japan (Drew et al., 2020)	485,085
Lonely Planet Japan (Milner et al., 2019)	469,091
Fodor's Essential Japan (Clancy et al., 2019)	274,244
Total	1,492,326

Analyzing the Corpus

The corpus was analyzed using the AntConc N-Gram function to search for the most frequent 3-word, 4-word, and 5-word lexical bundles. Given the small number of texts in the corpus, a minimum range of four out of five guidebooks was set to ensure that the bundles were typical of the genre. A minimum frequency of 30 (approximately 20 per million words) was used. The lists were exported into spreadsheets, and key words from the 150 most frequent 3-word bundles were used as search terms in order to identify and group overlapping items, resulting in a complete list of high-frequency bundles. Additionally, concordance data for each item on the list was further analyzed to identify how it functioned in context. The stance and referential expressions identified by Biber et al. (2004, pp. 384-387) served as a point of reference for classification.

Results

A selection of the most frequent bundles is presented in Table 1. Searching for 3-word bundles returned 973 types and 65,987 tokens, while 4-word bundles returned 155 types and 8,738 tokens, and 5-word bundles were much less frequent at 23 types and 966 tokens. In line with previous research (e.g., Hyland, 2008), significant overlap was found across lists; for example, *one of the* is both the most frequent 3-word bundle, and a main constituent of the common 4-word bundle *is one of the* and the 5-word bundle *is one of the most*.

Table 2

Most frequent 3-, 4-, and 5-word bundles in the 1.5-million-word Guidebook Corpus

3-Grams	Freq.	4-Grams	Freq.	5-Grams	Freq.
one of the	1100	one of Japan's	281	one of Japan's most	90
as well as	768	is one of the	241	is one of Japan's	66
it's a	605	one of the most	169	is one of the most	50
there's a	576	in the ~th century	167	one of the city's	49
of Japan's	569	of the city's	142	at the end of the	48
if you're	562	in front of the	134	at the top of the	48
the city's	462	there's also a	129	is a great place to	47
of the city	447	of Japan's most	121	one of the world's	46
is one of	412	if you want to	107	this is one of the	46
the ~th century	389	as well as the	105	in the middle of the	43

Notes: -th (as in the final part of the word 19th) and contractions such as -'s are categorized as separate words by AntConc.

The complete list of 120 unique 3-word bundles can be found in the Appendix. The list was sorted into units of eight to twelve words based on common constituents or content (e.g., *'s*, *of the*, *to*, etc.); grouping common patterns into units may help to make them more salient, thus raising students' awareness of key grammatical structures. Where applicable, overlapping 3-, 4-, and 5-word bundles are presented alongside the main list to further reinforce frequent patterns. The 12-unit list is designed to fit into a 15-week undergraduate course, and forms part of the course's targets for vocabulary building and fluency development.

Items on the list have also been classified into the following three functions: A) Information; B) Location; and C) Recommendation.

A) Information

Biber et al. (2004) classified "identification/focus" bundles as referential expressions (p. 387); in the travel guidebook genre, these bundles are used to provide the tourist with information while emphasizing unique or exceptional qualities of a location. For example, *one of Japan's* and *of the city's* were commonly used to provide information about one-of-a-kind sights and experiences. These phrases were commonly followed by superlatives such as *most*, *best*, *finest*, *oldest*, etc.

B) Location

As in the “time/place/text references” described in previous research (Biber et al., 2004, p. 388), these bundles orient readers in time and space. For example, phrases such as *the end of the* were used to describe locations as in *at the end of the street* but were also commonly used for time expressions, as in *by the end of the 16th century*. Directions to particular locations were often used in combination with landmarks such as *the station*.

C) Recommendation

Certain bundles were used to evaluate and make recommendations. As would be expected from a tour guide, the guidebook genre offers advice, warnings, and recommendations for a successful journey. Common bundles included personal directives, such as *you’ll need to*, and impersonal directives, such as *it’s best to*. This function differs from the Information function above due to its expression of opinion, as seen in the “attitudinal/modality stance” (Biber et al., 2004, p. 385).

Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that travel guidebooks can be exploited to identify lexical bundles particular to the tourism industry. As research suggests, Japanese people engaged in the tourism industry feel a need to improve oral skills; explicit practice with the lexical bundles identified in this study may help learners develop oral fluency while also building knowledge of authentic texts relevant to their field. The list of bundles compiled in this study forms part of an ETP course designed specifically for Japanese undergraduate students of international tourism. Furthermore, the corpus has proven to be a useful reservoir of supplemental material for the author’s seminar courses relating to research in ETP. Exploring corpus linguistics techniques has helped my students notice how patterns of language function, while revealing ‘some of the best’ patterns for tourism majors.

One limitation of the present study is that the travel guidebook is a written genre and may not represent an appropriate target for students interested in improving oral communication. To address this, future research might compare travel guidebooks with specifically-generated corpora derived from oral genres, such as transcriptions from tourist information centers or guided tours. Such a study would provide additional evidence as to whether the list of lexical bundles obtained here is generalizable to related genres in the tourism industry.

References

- Anthony, L. (2020). *AntConc (Version 3.5.9) [Computer Software]*.
<https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004). If you look at ...: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(3), 371–405.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.3.371>
- Browne, C., Culligan, B., & Phillips, J. (2013). *The new general service list*.
<http://www.newgeneralservicelist.org/>
- Chujo, K., Utiyama, M., & Oghigian, K. (2006). *Selecting level-specific Kyoto tourism vocabulary using statistical measures*. November 2014.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228920791>
- Clancy, J., Farris, J., Goss, R., Morel, R., Sasagawa, A., & Willson, C. (2019). *Fodor's Essential Japan* (R. Roth (ed.); 1st Ed.). Fodor's Travel.
- DK Eyewitness. (2019). *DK Eyewitness Japan*. DK Publishing.
- Drew, K., Hallett, R., Lee, O., & Zatko, M. (2020). *The rough guide to Japan* (8th ed.). APA Publications.
- Fujita, R. (2010). Kankō-gaku senkō no gakusei no tame no eigo goi risuto sakusei no kokoromi [Generating English vocabulary lists for students majoring in tourism]. *Journal of Tourism Research*, 51, 76–83.
- Fujita, R. (2020). English for tourism and hospitality. In H. Terauchi, J. Noguchi, & A. Tajino (Eds.), *Towards a new paradigm for English language teaching: English for specific purposes in Asia and beyond* (pp. 172–180). Routledge.
- Fujita, R., Terui, M., Araki, T., & Naito, H. (2017). An analysis of the English communication needs of people involved in tourism at Japanese rural destinations. *Journal of Global Tourism Research*, 2(1), 53–58.
https://doi.org/10.37020/jgtr.2.1_53
- Fujita, R., & Tsushima, T. (2010). Toward creating a specialized vocabulary list for tourism majors: Analysis of its profile and receptive knowledge among university students. *JACET Journal*, 51, 1–13.
- Hyland, K. (2008). As can be seen: Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(1), 4–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2007.06.001>
- Hyon, S. (2018). *Introducing genre and English for specific purposes*. Routledge.
- Iwai, C. (2012). Kankō-kei gakubu ni okeru kankō-gaku ni toku-ka shita eigo kyōiku: Zenkoku ankēto chōsa no kekka kara [ESP education for tourism at universities in Japan: Based on the results of questionnaire research]. *Gengo to Bunka*, 11, 19–32.
- JNTO. (2022). *Trends in visitor arrivals to Japan*.
<https://statistics.jnto.go.jp/en/graph/#graph--inbound--travelers--transition>

- McGuire, M. and Larson-Hall, J. (2021). The contribution of high-frequency multi-word sequences to speech rate and listening perception among EFL learners. *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, 10(2), 18–29. <https://doi.org/10.7820/vli.v10.2.mcguire.larson-hall>
- Milner, R., Bartlett, R., Bender, A., d’Arc Taylor, S., Forge, S., McLachlan, C., Morgan, K., O’Malley, T., Richmond, S., Tang, P., & Walker, B. (2019). *Lonely Planet Japan* (16th ed.). Lonely Planet Global Ltd.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2008). *Teaching vocabulary: Strategies and techniques*. Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- National Geographic. (2020). *National Geographic traveler: Japan* (6th ed.). National Geographic.
- Wood, D. (2009). Effects of focused instruction of formulaic sequences on fluent expression in second language narratives: A case study. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 20. <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19898>
- Woodrow, L. (2018). *Introducing course design in English for specific purposes*. Routledge.

Appendix
The Travel Guidebook Lexical Bundle List

Unit	Freq	Key 3-Word Bundle	Related 3- to 5-Word Bundles	Function
Unit 01: 's (contraction)	605	it's a	it's a good it's a great	Rec.
	576	there's a	and there's a there's no there are a few	Inf.
	200	there's also	there's also a there are also	Rec.
	180	but it's		Rec.
	124	and it's		Rec.
	115	it's worth		Rec.
	101	it's not		Inf.
	97	it's best	it's best to	Rec.
	Unit 02: <i>is</i>	185	this is the	
184		this is a		Rec.
161		is home to	is home to the home to the	Inf.
158		is a good	is a good place to	Rec.
141		is a great	is a great place to this is a great	Rec.
110		is the best	is the best way	Rec.
101		is said to	is said to have	Inf.
101		is the most		Inf.
100		is also a		Inf.
Unit 03: 's (possessive)		569	of Japan's	one of Japan's most some of Japan's of Japan's best
	462	the city's	of the city's the city's most	Inf.
	203	Japan's most	Japan's most famous	Inf.
	192	the world's	the world's largest	Inf.
	178	the island's		Inf.

	141	the country's		Inf.
	130	the town's		Inf.
	121	's most famous		Inf.
	113	the temple's		Inf.
	101	the area's		Inf.
Unit 04: determiner+ <i>of</i>	1100	one of the	is one of the most one of the few this is one of the	Inf.
	324	some of the	some of the best	Rec.
	221	a couple of		Inf.
	204	part of the		Inf.
	193	most of the		Inf.
	169	a variety of		Inf.
	164	a number of	are a number of	Inf.
	129	the rest of	the rest of the	Inf.
	124	many of the		Inf.
	99	much of the		Inf.
Unit 05: Location+ <i>of the</i>	261	side of the	the west side of the on the west side of on the east side of	Loc.
	252	end of the	at the end of the	Loc.
	182	east of the	east of the city	Loc.
	172	south of the	km south of the	Loc.
	162	north of the	just north of the	Loc.
	161	the top of	the top of the at the top of to the top of	Loc.
	158	front of the	in front of the	Loc.
	136	out of the		Loc.
	129	the heart of	in the heart of the	Loc.
Unit 06: <i>of the</i> +noun phrase	447	of the city	one of the city's east of the city	Loc.
	180	of the station		Loc.
	171	of the island	of the island's	Inf.
	145	of the main		Loc.
	143	of the best	one of the best	Rec.

			some of the best	
	119	of the castle		Loc.
	115	of the world	one of the world's	Inf.
	103	of the country	of the country's	Inf.
Unit 07:	562	if you're		Rec.
<i>you</i>	357	you'll find	you'll find the you'll find a where you'll find	Inf.
	265	where you can		Inf.
	180	you can also		Rec.
	158	you'll need	you'll need to	Rec.
	141	you'll be		Inf.
	137	and you'll		Loc.
	137	you want to	if you want to	Rec.
	121	if you have	if you have a	Rec.
	118	you don't	if you don't you don't have	Rec.
	113	you can see		Inf.
	99	you'll have	you'll have to	Rec.
Unit 08:	270	in front of	in front of the	Loc.
<i>in</i>	147	in the world		Inf.
	147	in the ~-s	in the 1990s	Loc.
	143	in the city		Inf.
	134	in the area		Inf.
	122	in the early	in the early -th century	Loc.
	111	in addition to		Inf.
	99	in the late	in the late -th	Loc.
	99	in the middle	in the middle of the	Loc.
Unit 09:	768	as well as	as well as the as well as a	Inf.
<i>as & on</i>	177	is on the		Loc.
	157	on the JR	on the JR ~- line	Loc.
	139	known as the		Inf.
	138	on the island		Inf.
	129	station on the		Loc.
	120	such as the		Inf.

	104	on the main		Loc.
	98	also known as		Inf.
Unit 10:	159	up to the		Loc.
to	138	to see the		Rec.
	137	to get to		Rec.
	125	next to the		Loc.
	125	to the west	to the west of to the east to the north to the south	Loc.
	117	the entrance to	the entrance to the	Loc.
	109	be sure to		Rec.
	102	close to the		Loc.
	99	to the public		Inf.
	93	back to the	date back to the	Loc.
Unit 11:	389	the -th century	in the late -th century in the early -th century in the -th century the mid -th century	Loc.
Place/Time reference	258	the train station	of the train station from the train station	Loc.
	212	from the station	walk from the station	Loc.
	180	museum of art		Inf.
	179	World War II		Inf.
	125	the main road		Loc.
	122	the sea of	the Sea of Japan	Loc.
	121	the Edo period	during the Edo period	Loc.
	113	the tourist office		Inf.
	104	the Imperial Palace		Loc.
	102	the main hall		Loc.
	95	the inland sea		Inf.
	94	the Meiji restoration		Loc.
Unit 12:	204	tourist information center		Inf.
Miscellaneous				

192	walk from the	-minute walk from the short walk from the	Loc.
173	look for the		Loc.
159	views of the		Inf.
159	English speaking staff		Inf.
153	a short walk		Loc.
145	rent a car		Inf.
135	don't miss		Rec.
134	known for its		Inf.
117	a great place	is a great place a great place to	Rec.
115	more than a		Inf.
112	famous for its	is famous for its	Inf.
101	can be found		Inf.

Note: Inf. = Information, Loc. = Location, Rec. = Recommendation

Frequencies reported are the number of times the phrase appeared in the 1.5-million-word Travel Guidebook Corpus. Frequencies listed for the key 3-word bundles; frequencies for related 3- to 5-word bundles have been omitted.

Short Paper

Exploring Ratios of General Academic & Domain-specific Vocabulary use in University Student Writing

Brian Pickering

Background

An awareness of academic vocabulary and the ability to understand and implement it in writing is an essential tool for university students in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programs (Nation, 2001). The application of academic vocabulary in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) student writing is also an essential measurement of lexical quality. In university contexts specifically, studies have sought to identify general and academic vocabulary that students are likely to encounter and use in writing (Yan & Staples, 2017; Csomay & Prades, 2018; Durrant, 2016) which, in turn, may influence future language teaching practices through the development of vocabulary lists (Csomay & Petrovic, 2012). Recent corpus-driven research has provided statistical analysis on the quantity of academic vocabulary in second language learner texts (Csomay, 2020; Lailiyah et al. 2021) using such vocabulary lists as the Academic Word List (AWL; Coxhead, 2000) and the Academic Vocabulary List (AVL; Gardner & Davis, 2014). In addition to academic vocabulary, technical vocabulary concerns specialized words belonging to a particular discipline such as Medicine, Law, or History which are often not present in core academic word lists due to their specificity. An important observation from the Csomay (2020) study was the lower percentage of words from the AVL in student texts from certain courses. It was speculated that “students may use words that are not on the core AVL but perhaps on a more specialized, domain-specific vocabulary list” (Csomay, 2020, p. 24). This opens the door to focused studies on the use of general academic and domain-specific vocabulary in foreign language learner writing in specific disciplines with a starting point being to “highlight the ratio between AVL words and the words listed on the domain-specific list” (Csomay, 2020, p. 24).

Aims

This study aims to produce exploratory findings in the quantities of general academic vocabulary and domain-specific vocabulary in academic texts written in the discipline of education by foreign language (L2) learners as well as native English speaker (L1) learners for comparative purposes. The research questions (RQs) are as follows:

- 1) Is there a significant difference in the ratio of general academic and domain-specific vocabulary used in L2 learner academic writing in the discipline of education?
- 2) Does the ratio of general academic and domain-specific vocabulary found in L2 learner writing differ from that found in L1 learner academic texts in the discipline of education?

Method

Data

Two sets of data were collected for analysis in this study. A sample of ten original academic texts were collected from Japanese university students. All text authors are native speakers of Japanese and are senior undergraduates in the department of humanities at the same institution (L2 learners). All texts were written on a specific topic in the context of education chosen by the authors after completing 8-week education courses and were collected immediately after composition.

Ten education (EDU) discipline academic texts authored by senior undergraduate students with English as a native language (L1 learners) were randomly selected from the Michigan Corpus of Upper-Level Student Papers (MICUSP). The corpus interface had various filters that allowed easy access to texts that met the specified criteria. Furthermore, texts from this particular corpus were chosen as the texts in MICUSP all received A grade (O'Donnell & Romer, 2012) which serve as suitable models of L1 learner academic written language in American university contexts (Aull & Lancaster, 2014).

Quoted citations were removed from all texts to ensure only language produced by the author was used in the analysis and then the texts were saved as .txt files. Table 1 provides a summary of the data collected.

Table 1

Number of texts, total number of words and text length information

Data Set	Number of texts	Total number of words	Average text length	SD	Range text Length
L2 Learner Texts	10	12,589	1259	460.5	729-1979
L1 Learner Texts	10	19,526	1953	470	1074-2719

Vocabulary Lists

Following previous research on academic vocabulary in learner texts, specific vocabulary lists were utilized to calculate the findings in this study. To identify general academic vocabulary in the data, the Academic Word List (AVL) developed by Gardner and Davis (2014) was used in the statistical analysis (see Appendix A). This list was chosen as it “provides twice the coverage of academic texts in English as the AWL (AVL 14% vs. AWL 7.2%) and reflects a more accurate and contemporary picture of academic word use” (Csomay, 2020, p. 12). For domain-specific vocabulary, all the words that qualified as domain-specific in education through the statistical applications of Gardner and Davis (2016) highlighted in the 20,000-word downloadable Excel file of the Corpus of Contemporary American English (Davis, 2008) was collated in an individual word list (see Appendix B). The final number of words in these lists were AVL = 3000, domain-Specific = 870.

Analysis

Quantitative calculations were conducted using the AntConc program (Anthony, 2020). The program scanned the texts individually for each lemmatized word from the modified AVL and then the domain-specific word list. The number of tokens found in the texts belonging to each list was then calculated as a proportion of the total number of tokens in each text (a percentage), with all values rounded to the nearest whole number making comparisons possible as this normed the figures to a text length of 100 words (Csomay, 2020). Using percentage calculations also nullified the significant size difference in the word lists being used in the analysis.

To provide further clarity, a Cohen’s *d* measure will be applied to the findings to provide a magnitude of effect size. Looking at the effect size will “provide an estimate of the actual strength of the relationship” (Plonsky, 2015, p.36).

Results

To address RQ1, the average percentage of AVL words present in the L2 learner texts ($M = 14$) was higher than that of the domain-specific vocabulary ($M = 9$). The effect size ($d = 2.12$) was found to exceed Cohen’s (1988) convention for a large effect ($d = 0.8$). In addition, the standard deviation (SD) figures given in Table 2 indicate that there was very little variation between the use of general academic and domain-specific vocabulary in the L2 learner texts (AVL = 2.09, domain-specific = 2.36).

Table 2

Descriptive statistics of average percent values of AVL & Domain-specific vocabulary in learner produced L1 and L2 texts

Data set	AVL		Domain-specific	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
L2 learner texts	14	2.09	9	2.36
L1 learner texts	12.2	2.31	7.6	1.56

Turning to RQ2, L1 learner texts yielded a lower average percentage in both domain-specific vocabulary ($M = 7.6$) and AVL words ($M = 12.2$) than in the L2 learner texts. The difference in average proportions of AVL and domain-specific vocabulary between the L1 and L2 learners was very similar: 1.8% and 1.4% respectively.

Conclusions & Future Directions

From an overall perspective, the findings indicate that L2 learners utilize higher proportions of general academic and domain-specific vocabulary in the discipline of education. The findings of this study provide no indication that education domain texts produced by L2 learners with a lower proportion of AVL vocabulary may be due to a higher frequency of domain-specific vocabulary use “and not because they use other, non-academic words” (Csomay, 2020, p.22). However, further investigation of learner-produced texts in education as well as other academic domains may have provided a deeper understanding of such a relationship between these types of vocabulary.

The difference between in the mean percentages of AVL and domain-specific vocabulary is also very similar ($L1 = 4.6\%$, $L2 = 5\%$). This, along with the differences of mean percentage for each type of vocabulary between the learners, indicates that in this study, L2 learner writing does not differ from that found in L1 learner academic texts in the discipline of education.

L2 learner texts yielding a slightly higher average percentage from both word lists seems to be contradictory to literature regarding vocabulary use in L1 and L2 learner writing (Adel & Erman, 2012; Siyanova & Schmitt, 2007, Chen & Baker, 2010; Durrant & Schmitt, 2009; Granger, 1998; Wray, 2002). However, vocabulary goes beyond individual words (Nation, 2013) so it can be speculated that the exclusion of Academic formulas (Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010) in this analysis may have affected the quantity of academic language found in the L1 learner texts as previous research has shown that

L1 learners' ability to utilize formulaic sequences in academic registers is substantially different to L2 learners (Schmitt, Grandage & Adolphs, 2004).

As an exploratory study, this research has a number of limitations. Principally, it was only possible to include a relatively small number of texts in the sample and only one academic discipline could be investigated. In addition, the size of the domain-specific vocabulary list utilized was substantially smaller than that over the AVL. Although using percentage calculations provided a compensation, using vocabulary lists of comparable sizes may, in future studies, help to create more accurate representation of such ratios. Furthermore, expanding the corpus of academic texts as well as conducting parallel analyses of texts from other academic disciplines present in COCA would give learners and educators a stronger understanding of vocabulary uses in their field.

References

- Ädel, A., & Erman, B. (2012). Recurrent word combinations in academic writing by native and non-native speakers of English: A lexical bundles approach. *English for specific purposes*, 31(2), 81–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.08.004>
- Anthony, L. (2020). *AntConc* (Version 3.5.9) [Computer software]. <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>
- Aull, L. L., & Lancaster, Z. (2014). Linguistic markers of stance in early and advanced academic writing: A corpus-based comparison. *Written communication*, 31(2), 151–183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088314527055>
- Chen, Y. H., & Baker, P. (2010). Lexical bundles in L1 and L2 academic writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(2), 30–49.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Csomay, E. (2020). A corpus-based study of academic word use in EFL student writing. In U. Römer, V. Cortes, & E. Friginal (Eds.), *Advances in corpus-based research on academic writing* (pp. 9–32). John Benjamins.
- Csomay, E., & Petrović, M. (2012). “Yes, your honor!”: A corpus-based study of technical vocabulary in discipline-related movies and TV shows. *System*, 40(2), 305–315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.05.004>
- Csomay, E., & Prades, A. (2018). Academic vocabulary in ESL student papers: A corpus-based study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 33, 100–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.02.003>
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213–238. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587951>

- Davies, M. (2008) The corpus of contemporary American English (COCA). <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>
- Durrant, P. (2016). To what extent is the Academic Vocabulary List relevant to university student writing? *English for Specific Purposes*, 43, 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.01.004>
- Durrant, P., & Schmitt, N. (2009). To what extent do native and non-native writers make use of collocations? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(2), 157–177. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2009.007>
- Gardner, D., & Davies, M. (2014). A new academic vocabulary list. *Applied linguistics*, 35(3), 305–327. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt015>
- Gardner, D., & Davies, M. (2016). A response to “To what extent is the Academic Vocabulary List relevant to university student writing?” *English for Specific Purposes*, 43, 62–68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.03.001>
- Granger, S. (1998). Prefabricated patterns in advanced EFL writing: Collocations and formulae. In A.P. Cowie (Ed.), *Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications* (pp. 79–199). Oxford University Press.
- Lailiyah, M., & Setyaningsih, L. A. (2021, December). Academic vocabulary of EFL students’ writing: A corpus-based study. In *Proceedings of the SENARILIP IV Conference* (Vol. 5, pp. 28–32). Politeknik Negeri Bali.
- Nation, P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524759>
- Nation, P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (2nd ed). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858656>
- O'Donnell, M. B., & Römer, U. (2012). From student hard drive to web corpus (Part 2): The annotation and online distribution of the Michigan Corpus of Upper-level Student Papers (MICUSP). *Corpora*, 7(1), 1–18.
- Plonsky, L. (2015). Statistical power, p values, descriptive statistics, and effect sizes: A “back-to-basics” approach to advancing quantitative methods in L2 research. In L. Plonsky (Ed.), *Advancing quantitative methods in second language research* (pp. 23–45). New York: Routledge.
- Schmitt, N., Grandage, S., & Adolphs, S. (2004). Are corpus-derived recurrent clusters psycholinguistically valid. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *Formulaic sequences: Acquisition, processing and use* (pp. 127–151). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Simpson-Vlach, R., & Ellis, N. C. (2010). An academic formulas list: New methods in phraseology research. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(4), 487–512 <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp058>

- Siyanova, A., & Schmitt, N. (2007). Native and nonnative use of multi-word vs. one-word verbs. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 45(2), 119–139. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IRAL.2007.005>
- Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511519772>
- Yan, X., & Staples, S. (2017, March 18-21). *Characterizing types of lexical bundles used in second language (L2) academic writing across developmental levels* [Paper presentation]. AAAL Conference, Portland, OR, United States.

Appendix A

Academic Vocabulary List (Gardner & Davies, 2014) top 100 frequency list sample

Frequency Rank	Lemma	POS	Frequency Rank	Lemma	POS
1	study	n	51	base	v
2	group	n	52	population	n
3	system	n	53	international	j
4	social	j	54	technology	n
5	provide	v	55	individual	n
6	however	r	56	type	n
7	research	n	57	describe	v
8	level	n	58	indicate	v
9	result	n	59	image	n
10	include	v	60	subject	n
11	important	j	61	science	n
12	process	n	62	material	n
13	use	n	63	produce	v
14	development	n	64	condition	n
15	data	n	65	identify	v
16	information	n	66	knowledge	n
17	effect	n	67	support	n
18	change	n	68	performance	n
19	table	n	69	project	n
20	policy	n	70	response	n
21	university	n	71	approach	n
22	model	n	72	support	v
23	experience	n	73	period	n
24	activity	n	74	organization	n
25	human	j	75	increase	v
26	history	n	76	environmental	j
27	develop	v	77	source	n
28	suggest	v	78	nature	n
29	economic	j	79	cultural	j
30	low	j	80	resource	n

Frequency Rank	Lemma	POS	Frequency Rank	Lemma	POS
31	relationship	n	81	century	n
32	both	r	82	strategy	n
33	value	n	83	theory	n
34	require	v	84	product	n
35	role	n	85	method	n
36	difference	n	86	goal	n
37	analysis	n	87	likely	j
38	practice	n	88	note	v
39	society	n	89	represent	v
40	thus	r	90	general	j
41	control	n	91	article	n
42	form	n	92	similar	j
43	report	v	93	environment	n
44	rate	n	94	language	n
45	significant	j	95	determine	v
46	figure	n	96	structure	n
47	factor	n	97	section	n
48	interest	n	98	common	j
49	culture	n	99	occur	v
50	need	n	100	current	j

Appendix B

Domain-specific word list for education sample (every 10th word by frequency ranking up to 500) extracted from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (Davis, 2008)

Frequency Rank	Lemma	Frequency Rank	Lemma
1	student	251	two-year
11	participant	261	dissertation
21	training	271	accreditation
31	intervention	281	posttest
41	respondent	291	self-concept
51	lesson	301	self-reported
61	adolescent	311	secondary
71	institutional	321	enrichment
81	transfer	331	misconception
91	English	341	chi-square
101	organizational	351	trainee
111	meaningful	361	psychometric
121	cooperative	371	quiz
131	creativity	381	tutor
141	Hispanic	391	proficient
151	pupil	401	handicap
161	collaborative	411	handicapped
171	enrollment	421	prep
181	vocabulary	431	syllabus
191	functioning	441	extracurricular
201	longitudinal	451	preparedness
211	comprehension	461	intercollegiate
221	appraisal	471	first-year
231	predictive	481	civility
241	introductory	491	constructivism

SIG News

Message to Vocabulary SIG members,

Thank you so much for continuing to subscribe to JALT's Vocabulary SIG. We know that there are many options in terms of which SIGs you decide to join, and we appreciate that you chose the Vocabulary SIG. We hope you are satisfied with your membership of our SIG, and we welcome any feedback to help us improve the services that we provide to our members. Please feel free to drop us a line anytime at jaltvocab@gmail.com.

Here's some news on what has been happening in the SIG:

In October we held our 10th annual JALT Vocabulary SIG Symposium at Tokyo International University in Kawagoe, Saitama. It was a great success, with more than 50 attendees and a great slate of speakers and presentations. If you weren't able to attend this year we hope you'll join us for next year's event which is in the planning stages now. We'll keep you posted as details become available.

In November, the Vocabulary SIG held a poster session and Annual General Meeting (AGM) at the JALT International Conference in Fukuoka. We had seven members of the Vocabulary SIG display their posters for the hour-long session, and the event was very well attended. We also held our AGM where we discussed the state of the SIG and started the process of planning for our annual symposium for next year. The officers were also ratified for 2023, and are:

Mark Howarth, Coordinator

Jean-Pierre Richard, Treasurer

Aaron Gibson, Membership Chair

Jeffrey Stewart, Program Chair

Stuart McLean, Publicity Chair

Michael McGuire, Publications Chair

We will all continue to work hard to provide you, our members, with a high level of service.

Finally, if you are planning on attending the PanSIG Conference in Kyoto in 2023, please drop by our table and say hello. In fact, if you are able to volunteer to sit at our table for an hour or two at any time during the conference please let us know at

jaltvocab@gmail.com. We will also be holding a forum during the conference, which is also in the planning stages, so please keep an eye out for details in the next couple of months.

Thanks again for your continued support of the Vocabulary SIG. We hope you have a safe, healthy, and productive 2023!

VERB Call for Papers

The VERB welcomes submissions related to vocabulary research and education.

Short papers are peer reviewed and may require rewriting and resubmission for acceptance. They must not exceed 1500 words, excluding references, tables, and titles. Short papers fall into the categories of completed research, ongoing research, and teaching and learning in practice.

Other submissions encouraged are classroom activities related to vocabulary, book reviews, opinion pieces, and event reports and commentary. All submissions are expected to adhere to APA 7th edition formatting guidelines.

Summer Issue Deadline: March 15th each year

Winter Issue Deadline: September 15th each year

For submissions and all correspondence: <jaltvocabsig.verb@gmail.com>

Latest information: <https://jaltvocab.weebly.com/publications.html>

The following are guidelines for short paper submissions (please include these sections):

Completed research:

- * Background
- * Aims
- * Methods
- * Results
- * Conclusions
- * Future directions

Ongoing research:

- * Background
- * Aims
- * Methods
- * Sample
- * (Preliminary) Results
- * (Preliminary) Conclusions
- * Future directions

Teaching and learning in practice:

- * Theoretical framework
 - * Teaching context
 - * Procedure
 - * (Preliminary) Results
 - * (Preliminary) Conclusions
 - * Future directions
-

**If you are thinking about submitting, but your article doesn't fit into one of the above categories, please email us at the above address and let us know what you would like to submit, and we can discuss the possibility with you.

***Vocabulary Learning & Instruction* Call for Papers**

The Vocabulary SIG's *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction* (VLI) journal is calling for submissions for an upcoming issue. Submissions will be published online upon acceptance and combined into an issue later in the year.

VLI accepts long-form research papers (2000-7000 words) and brief reports, summaries, and commentaries (2000-3000 words) related to vocabulary acquisition, pedagogy, assessment, and lexical networks.

As an open journal, content is indexed on Google Scholar and made freely available on the internet without paywalls. Authors are free to also make their work available on sites such as academia.edu and ResearchGate.

All submissions are subject to a 2-step peer-review process:

A) Editors review manuscripts to ensure basic requirements are met, and that the work is of sufficient quality to merit external review. This process typically takes 1-2 weeks, at which point authors are informed of the outcome.

B) Submissions which meet these requirements are sent out for blind peer review by 2-3 experts in the field. This process takes approximately 1-2 months. Following external review, authors are sent copies of external reviewers' comments and notified of decisions (accept, accept pending changes, revise, and resubmit, or reject).

Please see <http://vli-journal.org/submissions.html> for details
