**ONLINE SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS**

# **Appendix 1. Fifty word list studies being reviewed in the present study**

## **2013**

1. Ackermann, K., & Chen, Y. H. (2013). Developing the Academic Collocation List (ACL) – A corpus driven and expert-judged approach. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *12*, 235–247.
2. Browne, C. (2013). The New General Service List: Celebrating 60 years of vocabulary learning. *The Language Teacher*, *4*(37), 13–16.
3. Browne, C., Culligan, B., & Phillips, J. (2013). *A new academic word list*. http://www.newacademicwordlist.org/
4. Chon, Y. V., & Shin, D. (2013). A corpus-driven analysis of spoken and written academic collocations. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, *16*(3), 11–38.
5. Khani, R., & Tazik, K. (2013). Towards the development of an academic word list for applied linguistics research articles. *System*, *44*(2), 209–232.

## **2014**

1. Gardner, D., & Davies, M. (2014). A new academic vocabulary list. *Applied Linguistics*, *35*(3), 305–327.
2. Hsu, W. (2014a). Measuring the vocabulary load of engineering textbooks for EFL undergraduates. *English for Specific Purposes*, *33*, 54–65.
3. Hsu, W. (2014b). The most frequent opaque formulaic sequences in English-medium college textbooks. *System*, *47*, 146–161.
4. Tangpijaikul, M. (2014). Preparing business vocabulary for the ESP classroom. *RELC Journal*, *45*(1), 51–65.
5. Wood, D., & Appel, R. (2014). Multiword constructions in first year business and engineering university textbooks and EAP textbooks. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *15*, 1–13.

## **2015**

1. Brezina, V., & Gablasova, D. (2015). Is there a core general vocabulary? Introducing the New General Service List. *Applied Linguistics*, *36*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt018
2. Garnier, M., & Schmitt, N. (2015). The PHaVE List: A pedagogical list of phrasal verbs and their most frequent meaning senses. *Language Teaching Research*, *19*(6), 645–666.
3. Grabowski, L. (2015). Keywords and lexical bundles within English pharmaceutical discourse: A corpus-driven description. *English for Specific Purposes*, *38*, 23–33.
4. Greene, J. W., & Coxhead, A. (2015). *Academic vocabulary for middle school students: Research-based lists and strategies for key content areas*. Brookes Publishing.
5. Liu, J., & Han, L. (2015). A corpus-based environmental academic word list building and its validity test. *English for Speciﬁc Purposes*, *39*, 1–11.
6. Yang, M.-N. (2015). A nursing academic word list. *English for Specific Purposes*, *37*, 27–38.

## **2016**

1. Dang, T. N. Y., & Webb, S. (2016). Making an essential word list for beginners. In *Making and Using Word Lists for Language Learning and Testing* (pp. 153–167). John Benjamins.
2. Lei, L., & Liu, D. (2016). A new medical academic word list: A corpus-based study with enhanced methodology. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *22*, 42–53.
3. Maher, P. (2016). The use of semi-technical vocabulary to understand the epistemology of a disciplinary field. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *22*, 92–108.
4. Nation, I. S. P. (2012). *The BNC/COCA word family lists* [Computer software]. http://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/paul-nation
5. Nation, I. S. P. (2016). *Making and using word lists for language learning and testing*. John Benjamins.

## **2017**

1. Cunningham, K. J. (2017). A phraseological exploration of recent mathematics research articles through key phrase frames. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *25*, 71–83.
2. Dang, T. N. Y., Coxhead, A., & Webb, S. (2017). The academic spoken word list. *Language Learning*, *67*(4), 959–997.
3. Ha, Y. H. H., & Hyland, K. (2017). What is technicality? A Technicality analysis model for EAP vocabulary. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *28*, 35–49.
4. Watson-Todd, R. (2017). An opaque engineering word list: Which words should a teacher focus on? *English for Specific Purposes*, *45*, 31–39.

## **2018**

1. Coxhead, A., & Demecheleer, M. (2018). Investigating the technical vocabulary of Plumbing. *English for Specific Purposes*, *51*, 84–97.
2. Dang, T. N. Y. (2018a). A Hard Science Spoken Word List. *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *169*(1), 44–71.
3. Dang, T. N. Y. (2018b). The nature of vocabulary in academic speech of hard and soft sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, *51*, 69–83.
4. Green, C., & Lambert, J. (2018). Advancing disciplinary literacy through English for academic purposes: Discipline-specific wordlists, collocations and word families for eight secondary subjects. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *35*, 105–115.
5. Lei, L., & Liu, D. (2018). The academic English collocation list. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *23*(2), 216–242.
6. Lu, X., Yoon, J., & Kisselev, O. (2018). A phrase-frame list for social science research article introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *36*, 76–85.
7. Malmström, H., Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2018). Words for what? Contrasting university students’ receptive and productive academic vocabulary needs. *English for Specific Purposes*, *50*, 28–39.
8. Tongpoon-Patanasorn, A. (2018). Developing a frequent technical words list for finance: A hybrid approach. *English for Specific Purposes*, *51*, 45–54.

## **2019**

1. Coxhead, A., McLaughlin, E., & Reid, A. (2019). The development and application of a specialised word list: The case of Fabrication. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, *71*(2), 175–200.
2. Green, C., & Lambert, J. (2019). Position vectors, homologous chromosomes and gamma rays: Promoting disciplinary literacy through Secondary Phrase Lists. *English for Specific Purposes*, *53*, 1–12.

## **2020**

1. Bancroft-Billings, S. (2020). Identifying spoken technical legal vocabulary in a law school classroom. *English for Speciﬁc Purposes*, *60*, 9–25.
2. Brysbaert, M., Keuleers, E., & Mandera, P. (2020). Which words do English non-native speakers know? New supernational levels based on yes/no decision. *Second Language Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658320934526
3. Bi, J. (2020). How large a vocabulary do Chinese computer science undergraduates need to read English-medium specialist textbooks? *English for Specific Purposes*, *58*, 77–89.
4. Dang, T. N. Y. (2020). The potential for learning specialized vocabulary of university lectures and seminars through watching discipline-related TV programs: Insights from medical corpora. *TESOL Quarterly*, *54*(2), 436–459.
5. Liu, D., & Myers, D. (2020). The most-common phrasal verbs with their key meanings for spoken and academic written English: A corpus analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, *24*(3), 403–424.

## **2021**

1. Cobb, T., & Laufer, B. (2021). The Nuclear Word Family List: A list of the most frequent family members, including base and affixed words. *Language Learning*, *71*(3), 834–871.
2. Otto, P. (2021). Choosing specialized vocabulary to teach with data-driven learning: An example from civil engineering. *English for Specific Purposes*, *61*, 32–46.
3. Roesler, D. (2021). When a bug is not a bug: An introduction to the computer science academic vocabulary list. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *54*, 101044.
4. Rogers, J., Müller, A., Daulton, F. E., Dickinson, P., Florescu, C., Reid, G., & Stoeckel, T. (2021). The creation and application of a large-scale corpus-based academic multi-word unit list. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *62*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.01.001
5. Schmitt, N., Dunn, K., O’Sullivan, B., Anthony, L., & Kremmel, B. (2021). Introducing knowledge‐based vocabulary lists (KVL). *TESOL Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.622

## **2022**

1. Alasmary, A. (2022). Academic lexical bundles in graduate-level math texts: A corpus-based expert-approved list. *Language Teaching Research*, *26*(1), 99–123.
2. Arndt, R. (2022). A specialized vocabulary list from an original corpus of digital science resources for middle school learners. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2022.101187.
3. Benson, S., & Coxhead, A. (2022). Technical single and multiword unit vocabulary in spoken rugby discourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, *66*, 111–130.

## **2023**

1. Drayton, J., & Coxhead, A. (2023). The development, evaluation and application of an aviation radiotelephony specialised technical vocabulary list. *English for Specific Purposes*, *69*, 51–66.
2. Heidt, J., Pinchbeck, G. G., & Rodgers, M. P. H. (2023). The Good Gaming (GG) List: Key vocabulary in videogames. In B. L. Reynolds (Ed.), *Vocabulary Learning in the Wild* (pp. 143–161). Springer.

# **Appendix 2. Nation’s (2016, p.131-132) framework of evaluating word lists**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Focus | Questions |
| Purpose  | Was the target population for the word list clearly describes? |
| Was the purpose of the list clearly described? |
| Unit of couniting   | Was the unit of counting suited to the purpose? |
| Was the unit of counting clearly defined, including issues such as UK vs US spelling, alternative spelling, part of speech, abbreviation, and number? |
| Was the unit of counting explicitly well-justified? |
| Main word lists        | Was there an explicit description of what would be counted as words and what should not be included? |
| Were homoforms dealt with? |
| Were proper names dealt with, including proper name homoforms? |
| Were content bearing proper names distinguished? |
| Were hyphenated word dealt with? |
| Were transparent compounds deals with in a way consisten with hyphenated words? |
| Were acronyms dealt with, including acronym homoforms? |
| Were the proper name lits and other lists revised on the basis of initial output? |
| Other lists  | were marginal words dealt with? |
| where any other supplementary lists used? |
| Corpus     | Was the content of the corpus suited to the purpose of the list |
| Was the corpus large enough to get reliable results? |
| Was the corpus divided into sub-corpora so range and dispersion could be measured? |
| Were the sub-corpora large enough, of equal size, and coherent? |
| Was the corpus checked for errors? |
| Making the lists    | Were the criteria for including and ordering in the list (frequency, range, dispersion or some composite measure) clearly described and justified? |
| Were the criteria for making sub-lists clearly described and justified? |
| Were any subjective criteria used? Were they described and justified? |
| Were the list checked against competing list not just for coverage but also for overlapping and non-overlapping words? |
| Self-criticism | Are the weaknesses of the lists clearly acknowledged |
| Availability | Are the list readily available in electronic form for evaluation? |

# **Appendix 3. Word lists used in lexical profiling studies published in 2013-2023**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Studies | Specific kind | Word lists |
| Rolls & Rodgers (2018) | Science fiction fantasy texts | the EAP Science List (Coxhead & Hirsh, 2007) |
| Coxhead, Rahmat, & Yang (2020) | EFL textbooks in Indonesia and China | AWL (Coxhead, 2000), AVL (Gardner & Davies, 2014), ACL (Ackerman & Chen, 2013), AFL (Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010) |
| Dang (2020) | Medical television programs | Medical Spoken Word List (Dang, 2020) |
| McQuillan (2020) | Novels  | AWL (Coxhead, 2000) |
| Dang & Long (2023) | Online news | AWL (Coxhead, 2000), AVL (Gardner & Davies, 2014), ASWL (Dang et al., 2017), AFL (Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010), PHRASE list (Martínez & Schmitt, 2012) |
| Webb & Macalister (2013) | Graded readers, text written for L1 children, text written for L1 older readers | BNC 14,000 |
| Dang & Webb (2014) | Academic lectures & seminars | BNC 14,000 |
| Kaneko (2014) | TOELF iBT reading texts | BNC 14,000 |
| Kaneko (2015) | TOELF iBT listening texts | BNC 14,000 |
| Webb & Paribakht (2015) | Reading & listening texts in standardized language tests | BNC 14,000 |
| Nurmukhamedov (2017) | TED Talk | BNC 14,000 |
| Nation (2014) | Novels | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Hsu (2014) | Engineering textbooks | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| McQuillan (2016) | Novels | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Tegge (2017) | Teacher-selected songs & chart songs | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Coxhead (2017) | Teacher talk in EAL, Math, and Science courses at international secondary schools | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Coxhead et al. (2017) | University labs and tutorials | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Coxhead & Boutorwick (2018) | EAL, Math, and Science materials in an international school | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Coxhead & Demecheleer (2018) | Learning materials (spoken & written) in vocational college | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Hsu (2019) | Online news | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Nguyen (2020) | Reading texts in high school EFL textbooks in Vietnam | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Sun & Dang (2020) | High school EFL textbooks in China | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Yang & Coxhead (2020) | High school EFL textbooks in China | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Rodgers & Heidt (2020) | Video games | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Dang (2022a) | Academic lectures  | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Dang (2022b) | Conference presentations | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Arndt (2022b) | Digital science resources for middle school students | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Benson & Coxhead (2022) | authentic spoken interactions in a rugby setting & ruby TV commentary | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Lu & Dang (2022) | EAP learning materials in China | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Bergström et al. (2022) | Secondary school EFL textbooks in Sweden | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Nguyen (2023) | TED ED video | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
| Candarli (2023) | Youtube video | BNC/COCA 25,000 |
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# **Appendix 4. Published word lists in recent studies on lexical profile of student writing and speaking (2013-2023)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Word lists | Purposes/Studies |
| AWL (Coxhead, 2000) | The use of academic vocabulary (as an index of lexical sophistication) (Mazgutova & Kormos, 2015) |
| AWL (Coxhead, 2000) & GSL (West, 1953) | The use of academic vocabulary and words that are not general service words (as indices of lexical sophistication) (Zheng, 2016) |
| AVL (Gardner & Davies, 2014) | The use of academic vocabulary (Csomay et al., 2018; Durrant, 2016; Olsson, 2021) |
| AWL (Coxhead, 2000), NAWL (Brown et al., n.d), GSL (West, 1953), & NGSL (Brown et al., 2013), | The use of academic vocabulary and words that are not general service words (as indices of lexical sophistication) (Higginbotham & Reid, 2019) |
| the AFL (Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010), the ASWL (Dang et al., 2017), AWL and AVL, GSL and BNC/COCA 5000 lists | The use of academic vocabulary and words that are not general service words (Smith et al., 2020) |
| AWL (Coxhead, 2000) & GSL (West, 1953) | The use of academic vocabulary and words that are not general service words (as indices of lexical sophistication) (Zaytseva et al., 2021 |
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# **Appendix 5. Word lists used in vocabulary test developed in the last decade**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Word lists | Test |
| BNC/COCA 5000 (Nation, 2012, 2016) | Updated Vocabulary Levels Test (Webb et al., 2017) |
| BNC/COCA 5000 (Nation, 2012, 2016) | Listening Vocabulary Levels Test (McLean et al., 2015) |
| BNC/COCA 5000 (Nation, 2012, 2016) | receptive/orthographic (RecOrth) vocabulary knowledge test, the productive/orthographic (ProOrth) vocabulary knowledge test and the productive/phonological (ProPhon) vocabulary knowledge test (Cheng and Matthew, 2016) |
| BNC/COCA 25,000 (Nation, 2012, 2016) | Vocabulary Size Test (Coxhead et al., 2015; Nation & Coxhead, 2021) |
| BNC/COCA2000, 3000, 5000, and 10,000 (Nation, 2012, 2016) | CATSS (Aviad-Levitzky & Laufer, 2019) |
| BNC/COCA 3000 (Nation, 2012, 2016) | Receptive Collocation Test (Nguyen & Webb, 2017) |
| AVL (Gardner & Davies, 2014) | New Academic Vocabulary Levels Test (Pecorari et al., 2019) |
| AVL (Gardner & Davies, 2014) | Depth test of academic vocabulary (Read & Dang, 2022) |
| New GSL (Brown et al., 2014) | New General Service List Test (Stoeckel & Bennett, 2015) |
| ACL (Ackerman & Chen, 2013) | Academic Collocation Tests (Nguyen et al., 2023) |
| Phrasal verb list (Liu, 2011) | Aural phrasal verb meaning recall test (Cheng et al., 2023) |
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# **Appendix 6. Overview of Burkett (2015), Banister (2016), and Thompson and Alzeer (2019)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Categories | Burkett (2015) | Banister (2016) | Thompson and Alzeer (2019) |
| Methods | Questionnaires + follow-up interviews | Questionnaires + follow-up interviews | Questionnaires + follow-up interviews |
| Investigated lists | AWL and a range of other lists | AWL | AWL and a range of other lists |
| Participants  | 95 teachers, administrators, curriculum/assessment developers, coordinators, and researchers in 657 university intensive English programs. Most of these participants were working in institutions in the US (60%), Canada (10.53%), UK (10.53%), and Australia (3.16%). The percentage of respondents from other countries is very small and limited to only 6 countries: United Arab Emirates (5.26%), Turkey (4.21%), Kuwait (3.16%), Bahrain (1.05%), China (1.05%), and the Czech Repulic (1.05%).  | 193 EAP teachers. Of the 135 teachers who indicated their place of employment, 118 indicated working in higher education institutions and 97 were UK based. Banister did not provide further information about the backgrounds of those who did not work in higher education institutions nor outside the UK.  | 74 language teachers, learners, researchers, and test and material developers who had experienced working and/or studying in ESL/EFL contexts. However, Thompson and Alzeer did not report the countries from which these participants taught and learned English. More than 60% of the participants worked in EAP/ESP programs, about 40% worked in General English, and nearly 3% worked in professional settings. |
| Suitability/usefulness/importance of these lists  | \* 84.21% of the participants indicated that these lists were either very suitable or somewhat suitable. \* 85.26% indicated that these lists were either very important or somewhat important. | Of the 83 teachers reporting, 81 out of 83 teachers who reported using the AWL with their students provided further evaluation of the list. 88% of them found the AWL either extremely useful or quite useful, 11% did not find the list that useful, and 1% did not find the list useful at all. ***Reasons for positive attitude***When teachers who have used the AWL and had positive opinions were asked about the reasons for their positive attitude toward the AWL,70 responded. The five most common reasons were ‘the AWL contains relevant vocabulary’ (rated as either strongly agreed or agreed by 94.29%), ‘this type of general academic vocabulary will be useful for students’ (rated as either strongly agreed or agreed by 91.43%), and ‘the AWL is based on corpus research not teacher judgement (rated as either strongly agreed or agreed by 85.71%), the AWL set a clear vocabulary learning goals (rated as either strongly agreed or agreed by 65.71%), ‘the AWL is easy to incorporate into my lesson’ (rated as either strongly agreed or agreed by 62.86%). ***Reasons for the negative attitude***When teachers who have used the AWL and had negative opinions were asked about the reasons for their negative attitude toward the AWL, the top reasons for their negative opinion were ‘using a word list is not communicative’ (either agreed or strongly agreed by more than 70%), ‘dullness of the list’ (either agreed or strongly agreed by 52%), ‘content of the list’ (either agreed or strongly agreed by 55%).  | 60.81% of the participants indicated that word lists in general are useful, 18.92% had negative ideas about word lists, and 20.27% did not responses. ***Problems of word lists***When being asked about the problem of word lists, size was considered the most problematic (mentioned by 43.24% of the participants). Next is a lack of explanation (mentioned by 29.73%), format (mentioned by 8.11%) and access (mentioned by 6.76%).The open-ended questions also raised some other problems with word list, including: (a) Items presented without context, (b) issues with consistency and validity in the development of word lists, (c) lack of supplementary materials used with the lists, and (d) rote learning items from word lists demotivating learning. |
| Familiarity with published lists | 76.84% of the participants indicated either very familiar or somewhat familiar with available frequency-based word lists.  | 72.54% of the participants confirmed recognizing the AWL.  | N/A |
| Formally used vocabulary lists in their courses | 50.53% of the participants reported using a vocabulary list, 33.68% reported not using, and 14.74% did not respond to the question.  | 43% reported having used the AWL with their students directly, 16.06% reported having not used, 1.04% reported unsure, and 39.90% did not answer the questions.  | 79.72% of the participants used word lists in their context while 20.27% did not.  |
| Word lists used in their courses | 1. AWL (indicated being used by 48.42% of the participants)
2. GSL (11.58%)
3. Oxford 3000 (6.32%)
4. an institutionally developed list (6.32%)
5. Nations’s list based on the BNC1 (2.11%)
6. The Word Frequency List of American English2 (2.11%).
 | N/A | Among the 59 participants who indicated using word lists, 54.24% combined published lists and self-made lists, 32.20% used ready-made published lists, and 20.34% used self-made lists. When asked to specify the name of the word lists that they used, 53 participants responded to the question, the AWL was the most popular (used by 35.85% of the participants). It was followed by the AVL (15.09%), the BNC/COCA and the GSL (11.32% each), the new general service list3, the new-GSL (have 26.09%), and Browne’s new-AWL (5.66%). |
| How word lists were used in their courses | Teaching was the most popular applications (indicated by 53.68% of the participants). It was followed by learning (46.32%), developing materials (25.26%), and developing tests (21.05%). The majority of the participants indicated providing word lists with practice materials for self-study (27.37%), providing them as discrete list for self study (26.32%), or not explicitly providing but incorporating word lists into materials (17.94%). A small number of them (3.68%) indicated using word lists in the classroom.  | Two-thirds of the survey respondents reported that they only introduced the AWL briefly and let students to use then as self-study tools. Banister did not report precisely what the remaining participants did.  | Language teaching and language learning were the most popular applications, indicated by 40.54% and 32.43% of the participants, respectively. They were followed by language testing (21.62%), material development (21.62%), course design (16.22%), and research purposes (16.22%).  |
| Teacher perception of good word lists | N/A | N/A | When asked about the features of good word lists, 51.32% indicated ‘being topic-related’. Other features were ‘based on corpus evidence’ (40.54%), based on subjective judgement for selection and raking (29.73%), and based on statistical measures for selection and raking (28.38%), and small in size (25.68%).  |

1,2 Burkett did not mention which lists are but could be Nation’s BNC lists and Nation’s BNC/COCA lists

3 It is not clear from the participants’s response whether the Browne et al.’s or Brezina and Gablasova lists.