

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University of Mohammed Seddik BenYahia, Jijel

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of English



**Students' Use of Academic Vocabulary in Essay-based Exams in the
Subject of Applied Linguistics**

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillments of the requirements for the degree of Master in
didactics of foreign languages

Submitted by

- Zineb CHABBI

Supervised by

-Dr. Mohammed BOUKEZZOULA

Board of Examiners

- **Chairperson:** Asma BENALILECHE, University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahya, Jijel
- **Supervisor:** Mohammed BOUKEZZOULA, University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahya, Jijel
- **Examiner:** Samira CHAIBEDRAA, University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahya, Jijel

2022-2023

Declaration

I hereby declare that the dissertation entitled “Students’ Use of Academic Vocabulary in Essay-based Exams in the Subject of Applied Linguistics” is my own work and all the sources I have used have been acknowledged by means of references. I also certify that I have not copied or plagiarized the work of other students or researchers partially or fully. In case any material is not documented, I shall be responsible for the consequences.

Signature

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized, cursive-like script.

Date

18 / 06 / 2023

Dedication

*“In the Name of **Allah**, the most Merciful, the most Compassionate”.*

*To my beloved **grandmother** whose soul gone, yet my heart never left*

*To my pride, **my father**, whose encouragement and faith have built the person I am today*

*To my dearest **mother** for being supportive and patient with me and for without whom I
would have never become the woman I am today*

*To my sturdy pillars, my siblings, **Mokhtar, Sohaib, Abdelatif, and Oumaima** who have
always been there for me, gracing my life with their radiant presence*

*To my special **teachers** without whom I would have never become the student I am today*

*To my treasured soulmate **Amira** for being my supporter, my confidant, and my rock through
thick and thin*

*To my invaluable best friends **Anfel and Anissa** for being always there, embracing me with
unwavering love and support*

*To the loveliest friends, **Karawan and Zina** for sharing memories and for reminding me of
the beauty of friendship*

*To **Chaima**, my cousin, and **Nour El-Imane.T** for their assistance and patience with me*

*To my exceptional **colleagues**-you know who you are- who have made this journey all the
more memorable*

To the ambitious child inside me

To the sleepless nights

To the aqueous language I spoke in my pain

*To my **persistent self** who has experienced moments of failure, yet refused to quit*

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, praise and glory to Allah for endowing me with strength and patience to fulfill this work.

Second, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my supervisor **Dr. Mohammed BOUKEZZOULA**, without whose invaluable expertise and guidance this piece of work would have never been successfully fulfilled.

Third, I would like to express my thanks to **Dr. Abdeldjalil BOUZENOUN** whom I owe a debt of gratitude for inspiring me to pursue this path.

Fourth, special appreciation goes to **Dr. Souheyla GHEBGHOUB** for her assistance throughout the fulfillment of this work.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to the members of the jury **Mrs. Asma BENALILECHE** and **Dr. Samira CHAIBEDRAA** for their precious efforts and time to review and evaluate this work.

Abstract

This study investigated Master One students' difficulties in using academic vocabulary in essay-based exams in the subject of Applied Linguistics. The aim of the present study was two-fold: determining the difficulties encountered by students in using individual academic vocabulary items as well as investigating the problems faced by the same learners in using this type of items at the discourse level. To achieve these two aims, a corpus analysis of thirty randomly selected essay-based exam papers written by a sample of Master One students of English at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahya University, Jijel, was conducted. The collected essays were codified and analysed based on Coxhead's (2000) Academic Word List and Xodabande et al.'s (2022) Academic Vocabulary in Applied Linguistics List. Moreover, the Compleat Lexical Tutor software was used to profile subjects' general academic vocabulary. The generated data was, then, analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The analysis of the results revealed that despite the fact that the students in question manifested an acceptable level of awareness regarding the rules governing the use of academic vocabulary in academic writing, in general, they faced a considerable number of problems concerning their use in essay-based exams both at the individual and discourse levels. The analysis of the results demonstrated, also, that students face an extensive number of challenges regarding the mastery of the use of academic vocabulary in their essay-based exams. Concerning the first aim, the analysis revealed that students' use of nominalization was scarce. The results also showed that First-year Master students still face difficulties in their spelling of lexical items. At the discourse level, the results demonstrated that the students resort to repetition instead of deploying diverse vocabulary items to increase cohesion in their writing production. In this regard, student essays were characterized by an insufficient frequency in the correct use of anaphoric references and a total absence of cataphoric references use.

Keywords: academic vocabulary, essay-based exams, Applied Linguistics

List of Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Symbols

AV: Academic Vocabulary

AVL: Academic Vocabulary List

AWL: Academic Word List

BNC: British National Corpus

COCA: Corpus of Contemporary American English

E: Essay

Es: Essays

E1: Essay number one

E2: Essay number two

E3: Essay number three

E4: Essay number four

E5: Essay number five

E6: Essay number six

E7: Essay number seven

E8: Essay number eight

E9: Essay number nine

E10: Essay number ten

E11: Essay number eleven

E12: Essay number twelve

E13: Essay number thirteen

E14: Essay number fourteen

E16: Essay number fifteen

E17: Essay number seventeen

E18: Essay number eighteen

E19: Essay number nineteen

E20: Essay number twenty

E21: Essay number twenty-one

E22: Essay number twenty-two

E23: Essay number twenty-three

E24: Essay number twenty-four

E25: Essay number twenty-five

E26: Essay number twenty-six

E27: Essay number twenty-seven

E28: Essay number twenty-eight

E29: Essay number twenty-nine

E30: Essay number thirty

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ESP: English for Specific Purpose

GSL: General Service List

% : percent

List of Tables

Table 01: The AWL vs. the AVL (Gholaminejad & Sarab, 2021, pp.170-171)	16
Table 02: The Frequency of Correct, Erroneous, and No Use of Nominalization in Essay-based Exams in Applied Linguistics.....	27
Table 03: The Frequency of Use of Individual Lexical Items in Essay-based Exams in the Subject of Applied Linguistics.....	30
Table 04: Top 10 Most Frequent General Academic Vocabulary Present in the Corpus.....	32
Table 05: Top 5 Domain-specific Academic Lexical Items Present in the Corpus.....	33
Table 06: The Frequency of Morphologically Correct and Misspelled Individual Academic Lexical Items in Essay-based Exams in Applied Linguistics.....	35
Table 07: The Frequency of Morphologically Correct and Misspelled General AV in Essay-based Exams in Applied Linguistics.....	36
Table 08: The Frequency of Morphologically Correct and Misspelled Domain-specific AV in Essay-based Exams in Applied Linguistics.....	38
Table 09: The Frequency Use of Correct, Erroneous, and No Use of Anaphoric References, Cataohoric References, and Repetition of Academic Vocabulary in Essay-based Exams.....	39
Table 10: The Frequency Use of Correct, Erroneous, and No Use of Anaphoric and Cataphoric References of General AV in Essay-based Exams.....	43
Table 11: The Frequency of Correct, Erroneous, and No Use of Repetition of General AV in Essay-based Exams.....	45
Table 12: The Frequency Use of Correct, Erroneous, and No Use of Anaphoric and Cataphoric References of Domain-specific AV in Essay-based Exams.....	48

Table 13: The Frequency of Correct, Erroneous, and No Use of Repetition of Domain-specific AV in Essay-based Exams.....50

Content

Declaration	i
Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract.....	iv
List of Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Symbols.....	vi
List of Tables	viii
Content.....	x
General Introduction.....	xiii
1. Background of the Study	1
2. Statement of the Problem.....	1
3. Aims of the Study	3
4. Methodology and Means of the Research.....	3
5. Structure of the Dissertation	4
Chapter One: Academic Writing: The Need for a Genre-based Writing Instruction	
Introduction.....	5
1.1. Academic Writing.....	5
1.1.1. Definition of Academic Writing	5

1.1.2. The Importance of Academic Writing in a Foreign Language	6
1.1.3. Approaches to Teaching Academic Writing.....	6
1.2. The Genre-based Approach to Writing.....	8
1.2.1. The Genre-based Approach to Teaching Writing.....	8
1.2.2. Advantages of the Genre-Based Approach to Teaching Writing	9
1.3. Aspects of English Academic Writing Style	9
Conclusion	11
 Chapter Two: The Role of Academic Vocabulary in Essay-based Exams: Case of Applied Linguistics	
 Introduction.....	 12
2.1. Vocabulary.....	12
2.1.1. Definition of Vocabulary	12
2.1.2. The Importance of Vocabulary in Academic Writing	12
2.1.3. The Typology of Vocabulary.....	13
2.2. Academic Vocabulary.....	15
2.2.1. Typology of Academic Vocabulary.....	15
2.2.1.1. General Academic Vocabulary	15
2.2.1.2. Domain-Specific Academic Vocabulary	18
2.3. Academic Vocabulary and Academic Writing: The Case of Applied Linguistics	19

2.3.1. The Role of Individual Lexical Items	19
2.3.2. The Role of Academic Vocabulary at the Discourse Level.....	20
2.3.2.1. Cohesion	21
2.3.2.2. Coherence	23
2.4. The Structure of a Well-Written Exam-based Essay	24
Conclusion	25
 Chapter Three: An Analysis of Students' Problems in Using Academic Vocabulary	
Introduction.....	26
3.1. The Corpus Analysis.....	26
3.1.1. The Sample	26
3.1.2. Description of the Corpora Analysis	26
3.1.3. Codification of the Sample	27
3.2. Data Analysis and Discussion of the Corpora Analysis	27
3.2.1. Nominalization in the Corpus	27
3.2.2. The Use of Individual Academic Lexical Items in The Corpus	30
3.2.2.1. The Use of General AV	36
3.2.2.2. The Use of Domain-specific AV	38
3.2.3. The Use of Academic Vocabulary at the Discourse Level	39
3.2.3.1. The Use of General Academic Vocabulary at The Discourse Level	43

3.2.3.1.1. The Use of Anaphoric and Cataphoric References of General AV	43
3.2.3.1.2. The Use of Repetition of General AV	45
3.2.3.2. The Use of Domain-specific Academic Vocabulary at The Discourse Level	47
3.2.3.2.1. The Use of Anaphoric and Cataphoric References of Domain-specific AV	47
3.2.3.2.2. The Use of Repetition of Domain-specific AV	50
3.3. Overall Analysis of the Results Generated by the Corpus Analysis.....	52
3.4. Limitations of The Study	53
3.5. Recommendations.....	54
Conclusion	54
General Conclusion.....	55
List of References.....	57
Appendices.....	64
Resumé.....	74
ملخص.....	76

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study	1
2. Statement of the Problem.....	1
3. Aims of the Study	3
4. Methodology and Means of the Research.....	3
5. Structure of the Dissertation	4

1. Background of the Study

An ever-increasing number of scholars have investigated EFL learners' problems in the use of academic vocabulary in different writing genres. For instance, Ashraf, Ajmal, and Rubab (2020) found that students face difficulties in organizing vocabulary in academic writing while Xodabande, Torabzadeh, Ghafouri, and Emadi (2022) concluded that the contribution of academic vocabulary in research articles in applied linguistics is very important in showcasing the writer's knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. In academic contexts, the essay genre represents an effective tool for evaluating students' grasp of disciplinary knowledge and their ability to express their ideas fluently and accurately. In this regard, O'Donovan (2005) argued that "in essay-based examinations, depth of understanding and a subsequent ability to apply knowledge to a specific problem is often considered a crucial facet of subject competence" (p. 397). This offers a good explanation for the prevalence of the use of the different essays in academic settings worldwide as means for assessing students' learning as well as mediums for providing constructive feedback to enhance the development of their writing skill. An important, but, most often than not, neglected area in the scoring of essay-based performances is individual and discourse levels use of vocabulary, in general, and academic vocabulary, in particular.

2. Statement of the Problem

In addition to grammar, vocabulary learning provides students with primordial resources for both grasping and expressing an adequate level of academic knowledge and disciplinary discourse, especially through the writing medium. According to Wilkin (1972, as cited in Rasouli & Jafari, 2016, p. 40), "while without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed" (pp. 111-112). Therefore, alongside the prominent position assigned generally to grammar in foreign language

teaching/learning, vocabulary learning should also be assigned as paramount given that it is impossible for learners to comprehend or compose meaningful texts without an adequate mastery of this aspect. Indeed, “vocabulary knowledge is often viewed as a critical tool for second language learners because a limited vocabulary in a second language impedes successful communication” (Alqahtani, 2015, p. 22). In other words, academic vocabulary is crucial for both the writer and the reader to participate successfully in the communication of ideas.

As far as the assessment of students’ development across the curriculum, essays are effective tools for gauging attainment and fostering further learning. As far as this issue, Womack (1993) claimed that the appropriate tool for assessing the intellectual, moral, and cultural qualities of a student is the essay because the latter offers the examiner a transparent window through which he/she can explain what goes on in the student’s mind (p.46). Besides, the adoption of essays as the main tool for assessment across the curriculum spurs students to improve their writing skills and scaffolds the development of their competence in writing longer and more demanding genres such as articles, dissertations, and Ph.D. theses. Thus, “the essay has a stronger grip on the life of an undergraduate than on that of a sixth-former; and when you come to do a Ph.D. the course and the essay have become identical” (Womack, 1993, p. 42). Having said that, however, academic writing is often perceived as overwhelming for English as a Second Language (ESL) learners due to their inability to deploy the necessary grammatical as well vocabulary resources (Giridharan, 2021, p. 2).

Equipping learners with the vocabulary knowledge they need to operate effectively in academic settings requires a better articulation of the teaching and learning of this crucial aspect across the curriculum. In this regard, Brun-Mercer and Zimmerman (2015) asserted that “effective writing entails not only knowing a lot of words, but knowing them

well” (p. 132). They, also, emphasized that knowing a word enough to be used in writing requires knowing its structure, meaning, and use (p. 132). Hence, the challenge of teaching vocabulary effectively is not a matter of quantity, but rather of quality. In other words, academic vocabulary should be taught in order to foster students’ capacity to produce an acceptable level of disciplinary discourse in different subject areas of the curriculum.

Based on the above, the present study aims at answering the following major research questions:

- 1- What are the difficulties encountered by students regarding the use of individual lexical items in essay-based exams in the subject of Applied Linguistics?
- 2-What are the discourse-related problems encountered by students regarding the use of academic vocabulary in essay-based exams in the subject of Applied Linguistics?

3. Aims of the Study

The present study seeks to achieve two major aims. The first aim is to investigate the difficulties students encounter with regard to the use of individual lexical items in essay-based exams in the subject of Applied Linguistics. The second aims, however, is to explore the discourse-related problems associated with the use of academic vocabulary in essay-based exams in the subject of Applied Linguistics as well. The findings of this research would, hopefully, yield valuable insights, which will aid in developing more adequate materials and methodologies for developing Algerian EFL learners’ proficiency in using lexical items in academic writing as well as their ability in deploying these items to produce coherent and cohesive texts.

4. Methodology and Means of the Research

To achieve the aims of this study, a corpus of 30 randomly selected essay-based exam papers in the subject of Applied Linguistics was compiled. The papers in question, which were written by master one students of English at the Mohammed Seddik Ben

Yahya University, Jijel, were then transcribed in Word format to serve as input for further analysis. The academic lexical items collected were all identified, classified, and analysed through the use of the Compleat Lexical Tutor software. The adoption of this computer program was chosen on purpose to analyse vocabulary with reference to its various types ranging from basic words to more advanced ones, i.e. academic vocabulary and technical ones, in addition to its time-saving advantage in analysing tokens. The Academic Vocabulary in Applied Linguistics List (Xodabande et al., 2022) was also adopted as a glossary of specialized vocabulary in the field of applied linguistics. To get an in-depth understanding of the issue under discussion, the corpus was analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively.

5. Structure of the Dissertation

The present dissertation consists of three chapters. The theoretical part encompasses two chapters while the practical part includes one chapter. The first chapter discusses the issue of academic writing, placing a central emphasis on the genre-based approach, a top-down approach for enhancing the students' awareness of the different ways of organising information in writing. As for the second chapter, it introduces the concept of academic vocabulary and its typology from an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) perspective. This chapter also explains the way academic vocabulary functions both as individual lexical items as well as at the discourse level in academic writing. It specifically presents the role of cohesion and coherence as crucial aspects of academic discourse.

The last chapter deals with the practical part of the study. It presents the data collection techniques, the sample, the adopted methodology for the analysis, and the discussion of the findings generated by the corpus analysis.

Chapter One: Academic Writing: the Need for a Genre-based Writing Instruction

Introduction	5
1.1. Academic Writing.....	5
1.1.1. Definition of Academic Writing.....	5
1.1.2. The Importance of Academic Writing in a Foreign Language.....	6
1.1.3. Approaches to Teaching Academic Writing	6
1.2. The Genre-based Approach to Writing	8
1.2.1. The Genre-based Approach to Teaching Writing	8
1.2.2. Advantages of the Genre-Based Approach to Teaching Writing	9
1.3. Aspects of English Academic Writing Style	9
Conclusion	11

Introduction

Over the past few decades, the advent of English as a lingua franca in international communication has contributed markedly to granting a prominent role to researching and teaching writing in this language. The present chapter, hence, aims at discussing the importance of academic writing and exploring the approaches to teaching it so as to showcase the need for adopting a genre-based approach in teaching academic writing.

1.1. Academic Writing

1.1.1. Definition of Academic Writing

Shedding light on the assessment of these students, the latter are often evaluated through institutionalized forms of writing to prove their mastery of the language in question. Hence, mastering writing should be the primary focus of EFL students as it is significant for them to successfully accomplish their assignments.

According to Dong (1997, as cited in Paltridge, 2004, p. 88), academic writing involves learning certain academic rules that are set by particular factors as well as learning how to use them accurately in different disciplines (p. 10). This implies that academic writing adheres to specific rules established by different disciplines. For instance, texts in applied linguistics differ from those in biology and physics. Moreover, scholars have argued on the nature of writing as being a social practice or merely a solitary one. On the one hand, Byrne (1988) claimed that writing is “essentially a solitary activity and the fact that we are required to write on our own, without the possibility of interaction or the benefit of feedback, in itself makes the act of writing difficult” (p. 4). Nonetheless, while writing is a means of communication, Byrne’s (1988) definition excludes the other essential aspects of this activity namely the audience and the context. On the other hand, Hyland (2022) argued that “writing is an attempt to achieve something while bearing readers in mind: it is the outcome of interactions with readers” (p. 1). This illustrates that

the act of writing involves more than just the writer on his own, factors such as the audience and the context also play a major role in shaping this process as well as its outcome. Therefore, writing is no more seen as a purely individualistic act that stresses the writer's role only; rather, it is a social practice that involves different stakeholders.

In a nutshell, academic writing is a process shaped by different factors; it is, today, known as a social practice that incorporates the interaction and involvement of various stakeholders to generate comprehensible outcomes.

1.1.2. The Importance of Academic Writing in a Foreign Language

Writing has played and continues to play an essential role in educational development. Consequently, educators across different disciplines assign this practice a high position. Hyland (2008a) stated that “Writing is central to our personal experience and social identities, and we are often evaluated by our control of it” (p. 9). Accurately, researchers are nowadays evaluated by their writing; and as already mentioned, students are usually assessed through written examinations. In addition, Boice (1990) pointed out:

I would urge you to write, not because it is a good thing, not because it is nice to see your name in print, not even because it is relevant to full membership in our SOCIety, but rather because you will really get to know a field only if you contribute to it Writing ultimately becomes important not only because of what it does for others but also for what it does for oneself.
(p. 7)

This quote addresses the value of writing as it contributes to one's self-reflection and personal growth. For students, then, Hyland (2013) wrote, “... writing in English assumes an enormous importance for students in higher education and on professional training courses” (p. 95).

1.1.3. Approaches to Teaching Academic Writing

In the last decades, several approaches to teaching writing emerged in the literature. Practitioners, then, usually adopt one of these approaches in an EFL context: the product, the process, and the genre approach. The label allotted to each approach denotes the main writing aspect of the approach in question.

First of all, the product approach can be received as the approach of writing that focuses mainly on the grammatical accuracy of the final product, which can be processed through imitating native models of texts and as a result generating parallel compositions (Khan & Bontha, 2015, p. 5). Simply, this approach is based on a behaviouristic view of repetition and imitation where students produce their works based on others' compositions. Nonetheless, opponents of this approach claim that the latter's emphasis is over the sentence level. Indeed, "Such an approach is consistent with sentence-level structuralist linguistics and bottom-up processing" (Nunan, 1999, as cited in Sarhady, 2015, p. 8).

In the 1970s, teachers started to feel that the teaching of academic writing was neglecting individuals' thoughts (Jordan, 1997, p. 164, as cited in Paltridge, 2004, p. 95). Consequently, the process approach emerged to fill the gap the product approach created. According to Sarhady (2015), "[The] Process approach ... focuses on the steps involved in drafting and redrafting a piece of work" (p. 8). This suggests that in the process approach, rather than focusing on correctness, the emphasis is on the procedure students pursue to generate a piece of writing. However, Ibrahim and Elashri (2013) stated that a criticism developed in many 'process writing' classrooms is that students process their writing based on personal experiences and fail to acquire techniques appropriate for other written genres (p. 6).

Finally, the genre-based approach to teaching writing is, according to Hyland (2008b), "... a robust pedagogical approach perfectly suited to the teaching of academic writing in many contexts as it serves a key instructional purpose: that of illuminating the

constraints of social contexts on language use” (p. 543). In other words, the genre-based approach focuses on teaching all writing genres that students may be assigned to develop in academic settings. In addition, the genre-based approach is also referred to as text-based instruction, for they both emphasize the use of text as a means of teaching language. Besides, the genre-based approach is devised to advocate language learning as a social practice (While, Feez & Joyce, 1998, as cited in Irawansyah, 2016, p. 76).

1.2. The Genre-based Approach to Writing

1.2.1. The Genre-based Approach to Teaching Writing

Essays, dissertations, Ph.D. theses, and research articles are all genres that abide by some discursive properties to ensure their accurate composition. In this respect, genre writing is a type of writing which has a typical style, a particular target of readers, and a specific purpose (Thoreau, 2006, as cited in Dirgeyasa, 2016, p. 46). In addition, it is concerned with making explicit what experts produce when they write” (Hyland, 2008b, p.543). In other words, in classrooms where genre-based approaches are implemented, the teaching of genres is made directly. Ibrahim and Elashri (2013) added, “They [Experts] regarded genres as devices for examining and teaching the written texts that students needed to master in specific settings like English for academic purposes and English for professional communication classrooms” (p. 9). Moreover, Hammond (1992, as cited in Burns, 2001) suggested, “a wheel model of a teaching learning cycle having three phases: modeling, joint negotiation of text by learners and teacher, and the independent construction of texts by learners” (p. 202). First, modeling refers to the phase in which students are presented with a model text to be analysed in order to detect its linguistic features. Second, in the joint negotiation phase, a discussion between the teacher and students about the genre in question is developed. Lastly, in independent construction, students generate actual texts through activities such as writing and researching

(Hammond, 1992, as cited in Burns, 2001, p. 202). Therefore, the genre-based approach to teaching writing perceives writing as “a practice based on expectations” (Hyland, 2008b, p.544). In brief, students produce their works following the particular genre their audience anticipates them to write in. For instance, lexical items used in different contexts may express different meanings depending on the intelligible relationship between the writer and the reader.

1.2.2. Advantages of the Genre-Based Approach to Teaching Writing

There are numerous advantages of the genre-based approach to teaching writing. According to Hyland (2008b), genre teaching can be: explicit, because it simplifies what is to be learned in order to facilitate the writing acquisition; systematic, for it offers a coherent template of both language and context; needs-based, in the sense that the objectives and content are deduced from students’ needs; critical, that it provides students with the resources to comprehend and challenge valued discourses; and conscious for boosting teachers’ awareness of texts confidently to support students on increasing writing (Hyland, 2008b, p. 547). Similarly, the genre approach aids students to contribute to the world around them, to understand writing as a means that they can use, and to comprehend how writers manage content to foster logical organization (Ibrahim & Elashri, 2013, p. 12). In other words, not only does the genre-based approach allow students to write appropriately, but it also offers them opportunities to improve themselves in a world of research. Hence, in the context of essay writing, the genre-based approach permits students, through making the teaching process explicit, to build more comprehension of what and how the audience expects them to write with regard to style and specific linguistic features including academic vocabulary specialized to the discipline in question.

1.3. Aspects of English Academic Writing Style

Following the ESP approach to teaching, academic writing, unlike standard writing,

adheres to a specific style the writer should take into account when crafting a writing piece. In fact, there is a significant number of aspects of the English academic writing style; for instance, formality, responsibility, objectivity, accuracy, complexity, etc. Mallia (2017) argued that “Academic writing has a more formal aspect and standard English is general[ly] used ... The accurate use of vocabulary is essential ... Strategies to develop cohesion among different sections need to be employed” (p. 8).

Highlighting complexity as a salient feature of the English academic writing style, it refers to deploying a considerable degree of lexical density such as collocations, academic and technical specialized vocabulary, and domain-specific vocabulary (Samigullina, 2018, p. 39). In this regard, complexity plays a crucial role in the overall structure of a piece of writing so that it can be considered academic. Added to these features is the aspect of nominalization. In brief, nominalization can be defined as “turning something into a noun” (Comrie & Thompson, 2007, p. 334). Also, Fowler et al. (1979, p. 14) stated that nominalization is “turning a verb into a noun” (as cited in Billig, 2008, p. 785). In addition, Fairclough (1992, as cited in Billig, 2008, p. 792) identified nominalization as a process of ‘conversion’, which allows the omission of the agency. Moreover, Halliday (1994, as cited in Pineh, 2022, p. 112) extended the definition of nominalization and stated that “SFL identifies nominalization as a lexicogrammatical feature and locates it at the ideational metafunction”. That is, Systemic-Functional Linguistics (SFL) views nominalization as an aspect of the interdependent field that joins vocabulary and grammar, which is also situated in a systematic cluster or group of semantic systems that makes meaning of related kind.

Nominalization is indispensable in academic writing. Holes (1995, as cited in Prasithrathsint, 2014, p. 2) said that nominalization authorizes the writer to deploy the required flavour of objectivity to his claims (p. 260). As academic writing style requires objectivity as a main feature, nominalization, then, through the deletion of agency and verb

conjugation, is the means by which this aspect may be achieved. Other scholars such as Biber (1988), Swales (1990), Halliday and Martin (1993), Francis (1994), Charles (2003), Hyland (2006), and Baratta (2010) agreed on the significance of nominalization in academic discourse as nominalized forms involve more intense information, establishes more discourse cohesion, and imparts an impersonal tone (as cited in Prasithrathsint, 2014, p. 2). Indeed, nominalization allows more information to be discussed coherently and objectively.

Conclusion

Developing proficiency in academic writing is primordial for students of English success in academic settings. This chapter, hence, aimed at presenting the concept of academic writing, its importance, and the three approaches to teaching this skill. Central to this discussion was the argument in favour for adopting a genre-based approach in teaching writing given its importance in describing scientific process and increasing the level of objectivity. the discussion tackled the significance of nominalization as a major aspect of the English academic writing style in composing high-stakes pieces of academic writing.

Chapter Two: The Role of Academic Vocabulary in Essay-based Exams in the Subject of Applied Linguistics

Introduction	12
2.1. Vocabulary	12
2.1.1. Definition of Vocabulary	12
2.1.2. The Importance of Vocabulary in Academic Writing	12
2.1.3. The Typology of Vocabulary	13
2.2. Academic Vocabulary	15
2.2.1. Typology of Academic Vocabulary	15
2.2.1.1. General Academic Vocabulary	15
2.2.1.2. Domain-Specific Academic Vocabulary	18
2.3. Academic Vocabulary and Academic Writing: The Case of Applied Linguistics	19
2.3.1. The Role of Individual Lexical Items	19
2.3.2. The Role of Academic Vocabulary at the Discourse Level	20
2.3.2.1. Cohesion	21
2.3.2.2. Coherence	23
2.4. The Structure of a Well-Written Exam-based Essay	24
Conclusion	25

Introduction

Learning English vocabulary is an essential requirement for EFL learners given the crucial role it plays in achieving success in mastering the language. There are three types of vocabulary items can be distinguished, general vocabulary, technical vocabulary, and academic vocabulary. EFL students are required to develop proficiency in all these categories with an intense focus on the latter, for it is the core component in written genres, precisely essay-based exams that serve as assessment tools. This chapter, therefore, aims at discussing vocabulary and its significance within academic settings, attaching high importance to academic vocabulary. Accordingly, it sheds light on the role of academic vocabulary as individual lexical items as well as at a discourse level, highlighting its contribution to establishing cohesion and coherence in written texts.

2.1. Vocabulary

2.1.1. Definition of Vocabulary

According to the Longman Dictionary (Online Dictionary, 1995), vocabulary refers to “all the words that someone knows or uses”. In addition, Hatch and Brown (1995) defined vocabulary as a set of words that communicate meaning and are used by particular language speakers (as cited in Meutia, Sahardin, & Peutra, 2023, p. 464). Similarly, Harida (2017) wrote that vocabulary is the collection of words (p. 236). Correspondingly, Alqahtani (2015) concluded that “vocabulary is the total number of words that are needed to communicate ideas and express the speakers' meaning” (p. 25). In brief, vocabulary is the tool by which people communicate their ideas.

2.1.2. The Importance of Vocabulary in Academic Writing

Vocabulary is undeniably one of the most crucial units of language. Muslih (2021) asserted that “vocabulary has an essential role because it is the primary instrument of language” (p. 9). In other words, vocabulary is the major component of language, for it

allows people to communicate meanings. Accordingly, Rivers and Nunan (1991, as cited in Alqahtani, 2015, p. 22) claimed that the acquisition of a considerable size of vocabulary is necessary for successful second language use because unless there is an extensive vocabulary, the use of structures and functions learned for comprehensible communication might not be possible. That is, grammar and functions are not sufficient to decode a text if there exists not sufficient vocabulary knowledge in one's lexicon. Accurately, it is impossible to convey meanings in a language without a comprehensible grasp of its vocabulary. In the same vein, Wilkins (1972, as cited in Rasouli & Jafari, 2016, p. 40) stated that "while without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed" (pp. 111-112). Hence, despite the importance grammar weighs, vocabulary is indispensable; and language cannot be deciphered unless this component is present. Further, vocabulary is a linguistic aspect that affects the expansion of communicative competence and students' language skills (Brown, Waring, & Donkaewbua, 2008; Meara & Jones, 1990; Moir & Nation, 2002; Schmitt, 1998; Schmitt, Wun-Ching, & Garras, 2011; as cited in Viera, 2017, p.90). Also, Zhihong (2000, as cited in Ashraf, Rubab, & Ajmal, 2020, p. 2768) asserted that a person with a limited vocabulary cannot communicate successfully and that a limited vocabulary may impede learners' ability to acquire a foreign language efficiently. Therefore, vocabulary contributes to one's communicative competence; an adequate size of vocabulary warrants people to communicate properly and develop their communicative skills by which meanings are conveyed intelligibly.

2.1.3. The Typology of Vocabulary

Scholars identify different types of vocabulary, each according to his perspective. For instance, some educators assert that there are four categories of vocabulary: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Others such as Gogi (2015) identified two types of

vocabulary: active vocabulary and passive vocabulary. Nation (2001), on the other hand, proposed three tiers of vocabulary: high-frequency words, academic words, and technical and low-frequency words (p. 11). Nation's (2001) classification is the primary consideration in this section.

In the first place, high-frequency vocabulary, according to Nation (2001), refers to those words that make up at least 80% of a text (about 2000 words) (p. 14). Indeed, high-frequency words are those which are frequently used in written or spoken discourse such as *with, of, represent, government, educate*, etc. This estimation is based on Michael West's (1993a) General Service List (GSL) of English Words, which includes around 2000 word families.

Additionally, technical vocabulary includes words that are particularly specific to a given area but are less frequently used elsewhere (Nation, 2001, p. 12). For instance, the word *indigenous* is common in the humanities but not in the field of mathematics. It is worth noting that technical terms require scientific knowledge to decode their meanings. Ultimately, there can be said to exist another type of vocabulary which is low-frequency words. According to Nation (2001), this kind of vocabulary "includes all the words that are not high-frequency words, not academic words, and not technical words for a particular subject" (p. 12). To be more specific, low-frequency words are those words that appear in only 5% (Nation, 2001, p. 12) of formal documents.

Occurring between high-frequency words and technical words is the academic vocabulary. this type of vocabulary covers around 9 % of running words in academic texts (Nation, 2001, p.12). As the term implies, academic words can be said to refer to those words that are typically used in academic texts such as dissertations, Ph.D. theses, essays, and articles. Paquot (2010) claimed that "The term [academic vocabulary] often refers to a set of lexical items that are not core words but which are relatively frequent in academic

texts” (p. 9). Accordingly, academic words are a type of jargon specific to academic writing.

2.2. Academic Vocabulary

Academic vocabulary, also known as sub-technical vocabulary (Anderson, 1980; Yang, 1986, as cited in Hyland & Tse, 2007, p. 235), refers to a set of lexical items that are used in academic settings but not common to everyday conversation. Further, Coxhead and Nation (2001, as cited in Hyland & Tse, 2007, p. 235) said that academic vocabulary has been operationalized relatively as the words that appear with reasonably higher frequency across different academic genres (such as research articles) but are less common in other text types. Examples of academic vocabulary include *adult, chemical, colleague, and consist* (Coxhead, 2000) (Paquot, 2010, p. 9). In addition, Warnby (2022) wrote, “Academic vocabulary consists of words that often occur across a wide range of disciplines without being too general or too technical and it encompasses a broad range of words with respect to frequency” (p. 28). To be more specific, academic vocabulary occurs between high-frequency words and low-frequency words or technical words; they are neither too general nor too specific. Besides, there exist several word lists that may be referred to as lists of academic vocabulary such as Coxhead’s (2000) Academic Word List (AWL), Gardner and Davies’ (2014) Academic Vocabulary List (AVL), the British National Corpus (BNC) list, and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) list.

2.2.1. Typology of Academic Vocabulary

2.2.1.1. General Academic Vocabulary

According to Nagy and Townsend (2012), “General academic words are used in academic language with greater frequency than in non-academic language, but they are used across disciplines” (p. 96). That is, general academic vocabulary is the type of

academic vocabulary used in academic texts but not specifically in particular disciplines, rather, it corresponds to all the academic disciplines; for instance, applied linguistics, chemistry, physics, etc. Nagy and Townsend (2012) added that “General academic words are often abstract words, and their dictionary entries tend to include many definitions” (p.96). Further, these words are crucial for EFL learners to comprehend the academic discourse they are exposed to at university as well as to generate academic pieces of writing they are required to produce in their academic evaluations. *Purpose, exposition,* and *retain* are examples of general academic words (Fitzgerald, Relyea, & Elmore, 2021, p. 65). In this regard, Coxhead’s (2000) AWL and Gardner and Davies’ (2014) AVL are the main lists for identifying general academic words. Accordingly, Nagy and Townsend argued that Coxhead’s (2000) AWL does extremely assist learners to identify actual words and types of words to accomplish their academic texts. Likewise, Gholaminejad and Sarab (2021) in an attempt to compare the AWL and the AVL to each other stated that “Program administrators, EAP 6 teachers, or materials developers may now be in a dilemma in the selection of the best academic wordlist” (p.169). The optimal choice for university students is Coxhead’s (2000) AWL due to Gardner and Davies’ (2014) AVL’s exclusion of academic words used in textbooks that university students might be exposed to. Besides, other attributions that contribute to the superiority of the AWL over the AVL are summarized in the following table extracted from Gholaminejad and Sarab’s (2021) study.

Table 01

The AWL vs. the AVL (Gholaminejad & Sarab, 2021, pp. 170-171)

Aspect	AWL	AVL
1. Corpus Size	3.5 million tokens	120 million tokens
2. Types of Corpus Text	Textbooks, book chapters, laboratory manuals,	Academic journals, academically oriented magazines, and

	journal articles	newspapers.
3. Sources of Corpus Text	64% in New Zealand, 20% in Britain, 13% in the USA, 2% in Canada, and 1% in Australia.	100% in the USA
4. Text Balance	Equal numbers of total tokens in each discipline. Also, equal numbers of short texts, medium texts, and long texts.	Not specified
5. Disciplines	28 subject areas organized into 7 general areas within 4 disciplines: Arts, Commerce, Law, and Science	9 disciplines: 1) Education, 2) Humanities, 3) History, 4) Social Science, 5) Philosophy, religion, psychology, 6) Law and Political Science, 7) Science and technology; 8) Medicine and Health, 9) Business and Finance
6. Counting Unit	Word family	Lemma
7. Wordlist Items	570 word families (3,112 items) No familiar item included	3,015 lemmas (1,991 word families) Extremely familiar items included such as 'study', 'group', or 'system'.
8. Method for Excluding High-Frequency Words	The word should not be included in the GSL	The frequency of the lemma must be 50% higher in the

		academic corpus than in the non-academic one.
9. Minimum Frequency	100 times in the whole corpus	Not specified
10. Method for Excluding Technical Words	Range	1) Range 2) Dispersion 3) Discipline measure
11. Sequence of Items	Items are grouped into 10 sub-lists arranged by frequency of word family, and each sublist is arranged alphabetically.	Items are grouped into an entire list with frequency rank of lemmas from 1 to 3015.
12. Lexical Coverage	10%	14%

2.2.1.2. Domain-Specific Academic Vocabulary

Discipline-specific academic words or domain-specific academic vocabulary, as the concept implies, refer to the words that are specific to a particular discipline. Nagy and Townsend (2012) stated that discipline-specific vocabulary “includes words that are typically unique to individual academic disciplines (p. 97). To be more specific, these are words that occur in a certain subject area and not in another. For instance, the word *cytoplasm* is a domain-specific word that is typically employed only in science (Nagy & Townsend, 2012, p. 97). Similarly, Bailey (2007) and Nagy and Townsend (2012) claimed, “Domain-specific academic vocabulary is defined as a lexicon of relatively low-frequency words that are unique to a particular academic discipline” (as cited in Fitzgerald, Relyea, & Elmore, 2021, p. 65). In addition, Nagy and Townsend (2012) asserted that “Discipline-

specific words can be technical or abstract, and understanding them is essential to building conceptual knowledge in the disciplines in which they are used” (p. 97). In this respect, discipline-specific academic words are more specific than general academic words, and acquiring knowledge in this sort of vocabulary is crucial for students to comprehend the discipline they are immersed in. To illustrate, possessing knowledge of the specialized vocabulary in Applied Linguistics enables students to develop a deeper understanding of the discipline in question. Considering the references for identifying domain-specific academic vocabulary, both the BNC and the COCA lists are considered key reference lists; and despite their inclusion of the general academic vocabulary, they are more specific in signalling domain-specific academic words. Highlighting the field of Applied Linguistics, Xodabande et al.’s (2022) Academic Vocabulary in Applied Linguistics List is an optimal reference to be adopted in specifying academic words related to this discipline.

2.3. Academic Vocabulary and Academic Writing: The Case of Applied Linguistics

Both grammar and knowledge are important in writing, yet they are not sufficient to produce a whole piece of writing such as an essay, especially an academic one. According to Engber (1995, as cited in Maamujav, 2021, p. 1), “lexicon is a significant component in both the construction and interpretation of meaningful text (p. 141). Authentic academic writing, then, necessitates the use of academic vocabulary as a fundamental component that students must deploy to substantiate their arguments, and as a result, convince their audience.

2.3.1. The Role of Individual Lexical Items

Writing is the bridge through which the writer and the reader interact. As Thompson (2001) claimed, “proficient writers attempt to second-guess the kind of information that readers might want or expect to find at each point in the unfolding text, and proceed by anticipating their questions about, or reactions to, what is written” (p. 58). In this respect,

the writer is required to generate a well-structured piece so that the communication between him and the reader is successful. Maamuujav (2021) said that “Both the breadth and depth of students’ academic vocabulary ... are crucial components that contribute to the quality of their academic writing” (p. 1). Also, possessing a rich, complex, and wealthy knowledge of the academic register is highly demanded to be involved in academic discourse (Maamuujav, 2021, p. 1). In fact, intelligible communication between the writer and the reader is significant, and lexical sophistication highly assists in the comprehension of academic texts. For instance, specialized academic vocabulary in applied linguistics provides the reader with a perception that the work he is reading relates to the field of applied linguistics. Additionally, “lexical sophistication is an important component of language and strong predictor of writing quality based on the notion that proficient writers with greater vocabulary skills use sophisticated words and expressions” (Crossley & Kyle, 2018, as cited in Maamuujav, 2021, p. 4). That is to say, the use of advanced lexical items strongly affects students’ writing quality to fit in academia.

2.3.2. The Role of Academic Vocabulary at the Discourse Level

According to McCarthy (1991), “... it would be irresponsible to suggest that it will take care-of itself in some ideal world where language teaching and learning are discourse-driven” (p. 64). To clarify, academic words do not function in isolation in a certain discourse. Hence, deploying them properly in relation to the context in which they occur is of great significance for the text’s coherence. Similarly, “... being able to use an item of academic vocabulary means being able to use it in service of the functions of academic language” (Nagy & Townsend, 2012, p. 96). Besides, a word’s meaning in a discourse depends on the surrounding environment in which it occurs. Nagy and Townsend (2012) explained, “A word’s meaning consists not only of what it refers to but also of its relationship to other words that might be used for that concept or related concepts” (p. 96).

Placing academic vocabulary in a discourse must be a conscious process due to the influence it imparts in that discourse. Further, Halliday and Hasan argue that there is an effect of lexical choice on the reader/listener's comprehension of connected discourse (Stotsky, 1983, p. 430). The words' choice is, then, not only supposed to be related to the discipline in which a text is written but also to the discourse in which it occurs. Academic vocabulary plays the role of discourse-organizing words in academic texts. Simply, its role is to coherently organize the writer's ideas. Commenting on a text where the words *issue*, *problem*, and *assessment* are central, McCarthy (1991) wrote: "We shall call words such as *issue*, *problem* and *assessment* *discourse-organizing words*, since it is their job to organize and structure the argument, rather than answer for its content or field" (p. 75). Further, academic vocabulary allows the reader to build up expectations about the shape of the whole discourse (McCarthy, 1991, p. 76). Therefore, not only does it organize the academic discourse, but it also signals its structure and allows the reader to predict its framework through both processes of cohesion and coherence.

2.3.2.1. Cohesion

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), "The concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and which define it as a text" (p. 4). Additionally, they argue that cohesion occurs when an element within a text is interdependent on another (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 4). A word's interpretation depends on the context in which it occurs, i.e. its neighbouring words. Cohesion is said to be expressed partly through grammar and partly through vocabulary. Hence, there are two categories of cohesion: grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. The former can be expressed through the grammatical system of a language such as references (anaphoric and cataphoric references), ellipsis, substitution, and conjunction (Poudel, 2018, p. 4); while the latter expresses "the semantic relationships created by specific lexical items" (Stotsky,

1983, p. 430) such as reiteration and collocation. Halliday and Hasan (1976) added that the distinction between the two is not a big deal since they both express a semantic relation (p.6). Accordingly, cohesion is the core component that permits the reader to comprehend what a discourse is about.

First, references which “in English include pronouns (e.g. *he, she, it, they*, etc.), demonstratives (e.g. *this, that, these, those*), the article *the*, and items like *such a*” (McCarthy, 1991, p. 35), to create grammatical cohesion, are of high significance in establishing coherence in academic texts. Among these are anaphoric and cataphoric references. McCarthy (1991) claimed that anaphoric reference entails looking backward to a certain item by means of what can be a reference; whereas, cataphoric reference is the opposite: it involves looking forward for an item by means of what can be a reference (pp. 36-42). Consider the following example:

- (1) “Applied Linguistics is an interdisciplinary field of inquiry that addresses a broad range of language-related issues in order to understand their roles in the lives of individuals and conditions in society. **It** draws on a ...” (American Association of Applied Linguistics, n.d.).

In (1), “it” is an anaphor referring to “Applied Linguistics” which is the antecedent. The interpretation of the anaphor depends on the knowledge of “Applied Linguistics”.

- (2) During **his** investigation, the researcher discovered that pupils learn better through realia.

In (2), the possessive adjective “his” which is a cataphor is used to refer forward to the linguistic expression “the researcher”. The former’s interpretation depends only on our knowledge of the latter. In other words, unless someone continues reading the second clause, the interpretation of the cataphor is impossible.

Second, lexical cohesion, as already mentioned, can be expressed either through

reiteration which refers to “a phenomenon in which one lexical item refers back to another to which it is related by having a common referent” (Stotsky, 1983, p. 432) such as repetition and synonym, or through collocation which refers to the co-occurrence of lexical items (Poudel, 2018, p. 4). Yet, McCarthy (1991) reported:

Here, therefore, we shall consider the term 'lexical cohesion' to mean only exact repetition of words and the role played by certain basic semantic relations between words in creating textuality, that property of text which distinguishes it from a random sequence of unconnected sentences. (p. 65)

Additionally, McCarthy (1991) believed that students find it easier to opt for repetition rather than synonymy because the latter requires a large amount of vocabulary to be appropriately implemented (p. 68). Consider, for instance, a student writing about communication:

- (3) “Psychologists found that it is only through **communication** that father and son can build a strong relationship. **Communication** is defined as the system through which individuals exchange meanings and ideas”.

In (3), the second “communication” refers to the first “communication”. Both of the words have the same meaning, yet this repetition is intentional to emphasize the role of communication in the discourse.

2.3.2.2. Coherence

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), “A text has a texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text, and the property of being a text is texture” (p. 2). Texture refers, then, to something that is tied up by cohesive devices to be a unit, in other words, coherence. Taboada (2004) maintained, “Coherence is the hanging together of the text with relation to its context of situation or culture” (p. 158). Coherence is “everything fitting together well, and it is not something that exists in words or

structures, but something that exists in people” (Yule, 2005, p. 126). Kehler (2002) explained that while a tie between sentences is not explicitly stated, it is a natural one to draw under the assumption that the utterances relate to each other which is that the discourse is coherent. He exemplifies:

(4) “John took a train from Paris to Istanbul. His family is there” (p. 2).

(5) “John took a train from Paris to Istanbul. He likes Spanish” (p. 2).

In (4), Kehler said that even though it is not an explicit one, still there is a natural relationship between the two utterances. Whereas in (5), despite the grammatical correctness the two utterances bear, there still exists an odd relationship between them (p.2). Consequently, a text’s coherence is the implicit relationship its utterances display to create a meaningful discourse, and this relation is only realised when the reader/listener’s background knowledge is quite sufficient to decode the sense of connection (Poudel, 2018, p. 6).

2.4. The Structure of a Well-Written Exam-based Essay

Academic essays are undeniably one of the most important assessment tools students are required to produce to succeed in their exams. Accordingly, a well-structured essay can particularly pave the way for a student to achieve his/her objective as an EFL learner. Although essays differ from each other, they share the same structure as Taylor (2009) suggested: “a structure with an introduction, middle, and an end. The introduction states your case, the middle justifies it, and the end reflects on the beginning and the middle” (p.93). Stonehouse (2018) emphasized that “The type of assessment will dictate if a particular format is required ... However, generally speaking, there should be an introduction, main body and conclusion” (p. 292). He, then, explains: your introduction should inform the reader about what you are going to do in order to expand it in the main body. In the main body, then, state what you said you are going to do by splitting the body

into different paragraphs each with its main idea. Lastly, in your conclusion restate what you have done (Stonehouse, 2018, p. 292-293). In brief, the structure of a well-written essay can be summarized in Dale Carnegie's words: "Tell the audience what you're going to say, say it; then tell them what you've said". An academic essay should, therefore, consist of three parts: an introduction, a body, and a conclusion.

Conclusion

This chapter was devoted to demonstrating the importance of academic vocabulary in academic writing. It highlighted the dual role of academic vocabulary as individual lexical items and at the discourse level. Besides, it discussed the structure of a well-written essay as an essential evaluation tool that contributes to EFL learners' success.

Chapter Three: An Analysis of Students' Problems in Using Academic Vocabulary

Introduction	26
3.1. The Corpus Analysis	26
3.1.1. The Sample	26
3.1.2. Description of the Corpora Analysis	26
3.1.3. Codification of the Sample	27
3.2. Data Analysis and Discussion of the Corpora Analysis	27
3.2.1. Nominalization in the Corpus	27
3.2.2. The Use of Individual Academic Lexical Items in the Corpus	30
3.2.2.1. The Use of General AV	36
3.2.2.2. The Use of Domain-specific AV	38
3.2.3. The Use of Academic Vocabulary at the Discourse Level.....	39
3.2.3.1. The Use of General Academic Vocabulary at The Discourse Level.....	42
3.2.3.1.1. The Use of Anaphoric and Cataphoric References of General AV.....	43
3.2.3.1.2. The Use of Repetition of General AV	45
3.2.3.2. The Use of Domain-specific Academic Vocabulary at The Discourse Level.....	47
3.2.3.2.1. The Use of Anaphoric and Cataphoric References of Domain-Specific AV	47
3.2.3.2.2. The Use of Repetition of Domain-specific AV	49

3.3. Overall Analysis of the Results Generated by the Corpus Analysis	52
3.4. Limitations of the Study	53
3.5. Recommendations	54
Conclusion	54

Introduction

The present chapter deals with the practical part of the study. It presents the methodology implemented for the data analysis of this piece of research. First, it provides a description of the sample as well as the corpora analysis in question. Then, it describes, analyses, and interprets the findings of the study, which was conducted to investigate the problems students encounter in the use of academic vocabulary in essay-based exams in the subject of Applied Linguistics, based on Coxhead's (2000) AWL and Xodabande et al.'s (2022) Academic Vocabulary in Applied Linguistics List. Moreover, it presents an analysis of the essay-based exams by Algerian Master One students specializing in didactics of EFL at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahya University, Jijel with reference to two levels of academic vocabulary.

3.1. The Corpus Analysis

3.1.1. The Sample

The corpus analysed in this study was compiled by a systematic selection of 30 essay-based exam papers in the subject of Applied Linguistics written by EFL master one students at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yayha University, Jijel. It is also worth mentioning that the sample was randomly selected.

3.1.2. Description of the Corpora Analysis

This study was conducted in an attempt to analyse students' use of academic vocabulary in essay-based exams in the subject of Applied Linguistics. The sample under study consists of 30 essay-based exam papers in the subject of Applied Linguistics generated by Master One students of English at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahya University, Jijel. The essays were first collected and then transformed into Microsoft Word files so as to facilitate the analysis, assisted by the Compleat Lexical Tutor software. The latter is an online software designed to profile vocabulary level and the complexity of the text. More

precisely, the software compares the loaded corpora against available vocabulary lists namely the GSL (West, 1953) (1000/2000/ 1-2K-level), the AWL (Coxhead, 2000) (570/ 3K-level), and others such as the BNC and the COCA lists. Adopted in this study was the AWL (3K-level) which profiles general academic vocabulary. Besides, Xodabande et al.'s (2020) Academic Vocabulary in Applied Linguistics List was also adopted as a reference to identify specialized academic vocabulary in applied linguistics.

3.1.3. Codification of the Sample

In the current study, codification to preserve the complete anonymity of the writers was settled upon. The exam papers constituting the analysed sample, then, were codified in the form of one letter and a number. The first letter refers to “Essay” followed by a number from 1 to 30; for instance, E2.

3.2. Data Analysis and Discussion of the Corpora Analysis

3.2.1. Nominalization in the Corpus

Table 02

The Frequency of Correct, Non, and Erroneous Use of Nominalization in Essay-based Exams in Applied Linguistics

	Obligatory context	Correct use (%)	Example (s)	Non-use (%)	Example (s)	Erroneous use (%)	Example (s)
Nominalization	342	65,79	The application of language..., the study of language...	32,16	He claimed that ..., he argued that ...	4,09	How much the performance is

							obligati on for ...
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------

Table 2 demonstrates that Master One students of Didactics of English at Mohammed Seddik Ban Yahya Univesity, Jijel, to some extent, adopt nominalization in their papers. This aspect is manifested in three categories: correct, non, and erroneous use. The first category which is correct use, as shown in the table, occupies the highest frequency (65,79%) among the other two categories which represent 32,16% and 1,75% of the total tokens of nominalized forms for non-use and erroneous use, respectively.

Considering that nominalization is one of the most crucial features of academic writing style due to its contribution to generating complexity in academic discourse; it is a must for students to deploy an adequate size of its correct use. Not only does nominalization create complexity, but it also assists in establishing detachment in the academic discourse which implies “the separation of one’s self from the environment or absence of personal involvement” (Prasithrathsint, 2014, p. 5) and so increases the level of objectivity in the discourse. Besides depersonalizing the agent and directing the whole focus on the process, nominalization helps to eradicate the time of performing a certain action. Nonetheless, students, as the table indicates, seem to be unaware of implementing this aspect of academic writing style given that its correct use is 65,79% which is far below what the context imposes (based on the obligatory context). In addition, the frequency of no use (32,16%) is elevated, and so is the case for erroneous use (1,75%). It is, thus, a serious issue that such an aspect’s use in academic papers is inadequate. An example of the correct use of nominalization can be detected in E14 in which the student nominalized the verb **apply** into: “**The application** of language should not concern only speaking ...”

which could have been written as “people should not apply language only in speaking ...”. Another example of this category can, also, be seen in E24 in which the student wrote: “... **the analysis** of the context where ...” which could have been written as: “... an individual **analyses** the context where ...”.

In the previous examples, it seems that students implemented correct forms of nominalization. Yet, there are some, if not many, situations where students tended to use direct verbs rather than required nominalized ones, according to the principles of obligatory context. The frequency of these situations accounted for 32,16% which is an elevated one that should not be detected in academic writing. For instance, in E4, the student stated: “he **claimed** that ...”; however, for a better focus on the process which is the claim and an intention to objectify the sentence, writing “**his claim** was that ...” or “**the claim** was that ...” is more appropriate. The student here continued to centralize the person rather than to depersonalize him and place the emphasis on the process of claiming. Another exemplification of non-use is when, in E10, the student wrote “He **develop** The ethnography of speaking ...” instead of writing “**his development/ the development** of the ethnography of speaking ...”. A small comment that can be inserted here is that the student failed to conjugate the verb in the correct tense. Thus, nominalization of the verb **develop**, in addition to focusing on the process, could have restrained the production of such an error.

Further, students also failed to implement nominalized forms in their right places with a frequency of 1,75% which should be way less in academic discourse. For instance, they implemented a certain nominalized form where an adjective is the correct part of speech to be used. In E18, for instance, the student stated “... the performance is **obligation** for a better ...” instead of “... the performance is **obligatory** for a better ...”. A second instance of erroneous use can also be identified in E27 in which the student wrote

“The second one is the communication act and it **relation** to the activities ...” instead of “The second one is the communication act and it **relates** to the activities ...” so as to be in parallel with what has been said above.

3.2.2. The Use of Individual Academic Lexical Items in The Corpus

Table 03

The Frequency of Use of Individual Lexical Items in Essay-based Exams in the Subject of Applied Linguistics

Vocabulary	Words N°	Frequency of Use (%)
General AV	1470	11,02
Domain-specific AV	689	5,17
Other Types	11176	83,81
Total	13335	100

Table 3 represents the frequency of use of individual academic (general and domain-specific AV), and non-academic lexical items in essay-based exams in the subject of Applied Linguistics generated by EFL Master One students at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahya University, Jijel. As shown in table 3, students tend to deploy both academic and non-academic vocabulary. First of all, non-academic vocabulary, including words from the GSL, proper nouns, and technical words, occupies the first rank with a considerable number accounted for 11176 tokens of the total tokens and providing 83,81% coverage of the entire corpus. In the second rank, the general academic vocabulary covers the corpus with a total numbering of 1470 tokens and a frequency of 11,02%. Comes in the last rank with the lowest number of tokens accounted for 689 and a very low frequency of 5,17% of the corpus is the domain-specific academic vocabulary. Yet, important in this study is the general and domain-specific academic vocabulary.

The results obtained indicate that EFL students are aware of the use of academic vocabulary in academic discourse, precisely essay-based exams in this study. The coverage of students' use of general academic vocabulary, based on the AWL, in the corpus occupies a frequency of 11,02% which is very approximate to the finding obtained in Vongpumivitch, Huang, and Chang's (2008) and Matinparsa, Xodabande, Ghafouri, and Atai's (2002) studies in which the AWL covers 11,17% corpus of Applied Linguistics research articles and 11,46% of the corpus of Applied Linguistics research articles as well, respectively. It is also a bit higher than the coverage Coxhead and Nation (2001) claim to be involved in academic texts (8,5-10%) (Vongpumivitch, Huang, and Chang, 2008, p.33). Examples of general academic words generated by students in their essays are **communication, investigate, adequate, perspective, culture, crucial, acquire, and identify**. Therefore, the coverage of 11,03% of the academic words in this corpus shows that general academic vocabulary plays a crucial role in students' essay-based exams, precisely in the subject of Applied Linguistics. Accordingly, Santos' (2008) findings revealed that the language and content of an exam paper are usually evaluated separately, and linguistic errors are often tolerated when the content is understood (Ashraf, Rubab, & Ajmal, 2020, p.2768). The importance of deploying general academic vocabulary in essay-based exams, then, is embodied in the latter's ability to effectively communicate a comprehensible explanation of the topic in question.

Further, the table above shows that domain-specific academic vocabulary covers a frequency of 5,17% of the corpus, based on Xodabande et al.'s (2022) AV in Applied Linguistics List, which is the lowest in the whole corpus. Logically, this low frequency is due to the narrow demands of the exam question. Examples of specialized vocabulary present in the corpus are **linguistics, competence, empirical, ethnography, utterances, and genre**. This coverage, hence, elucidates that the use of specialized academic

vocabulary is essential in essay-based exams in the subject of Applied Linguistics due to its contribution to conveying a comprehensible message about the nature of the subject area as well as the topic under discussion.

However, covering such a frequency in the use of both general and domain-specific academic vocabulary is subject to criticism in the corpus under study. Although numbers show a high coverage of such words' deployment, students frequently reiterate limited academic vocabulary over the whole corpus. For this reason, Table 4 and Table 5 below are generated to illustrate the most frequent general and domain-specific academic vocabulary, respectively.

Table 04

Top 10 Most Frequent General Academic Vocabulary Present in the Corpus

Rank	Words	Frequency	Rank	Words	Frequency
1	Communication	172	6	Culture	51
2	Context	76	7	Norms	46
3	Communicative	70	8	Abstract	34
4	Concept	56	9	Analysis	32
5	Community	53	10	Approach	29
Total			619		

Table 4 represents the top 10 most frequent words in the corpus, based on the AWL. It shows that the word **communication** covers a considerable number of words (172 tokens) and occupies the first rank as the most used word among the other general academic vocabulary, followed by the word **context** with a number of 76 tokens, then comes the word **communicative**, which belongs to the family of **communication**, with a number of 70 tokens. Then, there is the word **concept** which occurred 56 times in the

corpus followed by **community** (53 tokens), and then **culture, norms, abstract, analysis,** and **approach** accounted for 51, 46, 34, 32, and 29 tokens, respectively. The overall count of these top 10 general academic words accounted for 619 out of 1470 tokens, in other statistics 42,11% of the total numbering of general academic vocabulary, which is a significant number compared to what has not been mentioned.

Given the fact that the academic writing style requires the manifestation of academic words, especially general academic ones, it is a necessity to take the lexical diversity of these words into account besides their lexical sophistication. For instance, in E27, the word **communication** occurred 24 times, 11 of them in the same 7 line-paragraph. It also occurred 13 times in E13 and 12 times in E25. The word **culture** as well was deployed 14 times in E28. Reiteration of such key terms is, for sure, logical due to the subject matter at hand that implies discussing competence and performance; nevertheless, overusing them at the expense of other academic words denotes students' lack of general academic vocabulary knowledge, and create a sense of inappropriate redundancy that renders the essay incoherent.

Table 05

Top 5 Most Frequent Domain-specific Academic Vocabulary Present in the Corpus

Rank	Word	Frequency
1	Competence	205
2	Ethnography	108
3	Linguistics	99
4	Grammatical	34
5	Discourse	17
Total		463

Table 5 represents the top 5 most frequent domain-specific academic vocabulary present in the corpus. It shows that students, to an extent, deploy such types of words that are extremely related to the topic. The table then shows that the use of the word **competence** occurred 205 times followed by **ethnography**, **linguistics**, **grammatical**, and **discourse** which accounted for 108, 99, 34, and 17 tokens, respectively. Thus, the overall number of these words is 463 out of 689 of the total domain-specific vocabulary, in other numbers 67,20% out of the total specialized lexical items, which is a very high coverage compared to the average they should entail to maintain balance with other specialized words.

Considering the importance of domain-specific academic vocabulary in academic writing, students are required to manifest such words to achieve cohesion and coherence in their texts. Yet, as previously stated, the excessive use and reiteration of specialized vocabulary yield perceptions of chaos and disrupt the flow of ideas being expressed. To illustrate, the use of the word **competence** in E14 accounted for 18 times out of the total 31 tokens of domain-specific vocabulary. Although important in the context, redundant iteration of the same keywords does not always emphasize their significance, it only establishes a sense of disorder and disconnection between ideas. Taking into account that this word accounted for 28,00% of the total coverage of specialized vocabulary, its occurrence is considerably elevated compared to the others of the same type. This entails that, as reported with regard to the use of general academic vocabulary, students lack specialized academic vocabulary knowledge in Applied Linguistics as well as its use, which is quite problematic.

The implementation of academic vocabulary in essay-based exams, however, is not always manifested correctly in terms of morphology and spelling. Table 6 is an attempt to present the morphologically correct and misspelled academic lexical items, each type

accompanied with examples of use.

Table 06

The Frequency of Morphologically Correct and Misspelled Individual Academic Lexical Items in Essay-based Exams in Applied Linguistics

Academic Vocabulary	Total	Correct Items (frequency) (%)	Example (s)	Misspelled Items (frequency) (%)	Example (s)
General AV	1470	95,24	communication, context, concept, analyse, abstract, acquire.	4,76	consept, appropriatness, cominicate, emphazize, abstracties
Domain-specific AV	689	94,48	Ethnography, competence, linguistics, sociolinguistic	5,52	normes, genere, competant, gramatical, homogenous, utterences

Table 6 depicts the frequency of morphologically correct and misspelled academic lexical items produced by EFL Master One students at Mohammed Seddik Bon Yahya University, Jijel, in their papers. The use of such lexical items is embodied in two categories: morphologically correct items and misspelled items. The data revealed that students are aware of using academic vocabulary in academic genres, in this research,

exam-based essays. For the first type of academic vocabulary which is general academic vocabulary, the table shows that the first category covers a very high frequency, accounted for 95,24%, compared to the second category, misspelled items, which manifests a low one (4,76%). On the other hand, the frequency of the first category, which is correct items, in domain-specific academic vocabulary (94,48%) is way higher than that of the second category which refers to the frequency of the misspelled items. The frequency of the latter accounted for 5,52%.

Table 6 also shows that the frequency of correct items in the first type of academic vocabulary, which accounted for 95,24% of the total general academic tokens, is a bit more than that of the domain-specific academic words type (94,48%); whereas the frequency of misspelled items in the latter (5,52%) is more than that of general academic vocabulary that accounted for 4,76%.

The analysis of each type is provided separately below.

3.2.2.1. The Use of General AV

Table 07

The Frequency of Morphologically Correct and Misspelled General AV in Essay-based Exams in Applied Linguistics

Academic Vocabulary	Correct Items (frequency) (%)	Example (s)	Misspelled Items (frequency) (%)	Example (s)
General AV	95,24	communication, context, concept, analyse,	4,76	consept, appropriatness, cominicate, emphazize,

		abstract, acquire.		abstracties
--	--	-----------------------	--	-------------

As table 7 shows, the use of general academic vocabulary was divided into two categories namely correct items and misspelled items. As it is seen, the use of correct items is of high frequency compared to the use of misspelled items. The former covers a considerable frequency that accounted for 95,24% of the total general AV tokens while the latter covers merely 4,76% of the concerned tokens.

Highlighting the fact that general academic vocabulary assists students to generate academic pieces of writing that are considered appropriate by the discourse community, in addition to its role in conveying coherent interpretations, the fully morphologically correct manifestation of this aspect is required in academia. However, EFL students still fail to achieve such a requirement which may, hence, result in incoherent texts that impede the audience's decipherment of the message. Instances of morphologically correct deployment of this type of vocabulary include **community**, **component**, **concept**, and **theory** in E2; **abstract**, **maintain**, **perspective**, and **sufficient** in E11; and **analysis**, **communication**, **context**, and **reject** in E19. Thus, in such instances, students successfully spelled these items in their papers. Nonetheless, there were discovered other misspelled items in these essays. To illustrate, in E6, the student wrote **unappropriate** instead of **inappropriate** which indicates his/her lack of knowledge concerning the use of prefixes. Another misspelled use of the same item root was detected in E7 in which the student wrote **appropriatly** instead of **appropriately** which demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the spelling rules when adding suffixes (the rule of when to drop the "e" and when not to). Further, the word **communication** and its family is another item students fail to spell; for example, in E11, the student wrote **cmmicate** once, **commication** twice, and **commicative**

six times, still they wrote the word **communicative** correctly once.

In brief, EFL Master One students seem to manifest an adequate amount of morphologically correct items of the overall number of this type of vocabulary which aids in producing coherent essays, yet the implementation of misspelled items still represents an issue that may hinder the intelligible communication between the writer, who should convey a clear message, and the reader whose understanding necessitates coherent ideas.

3.2.2.2. The Use of Domain-specific AV

Table 08

The Frequency of Morphologically Correct and Misspelled Domain-specific AV in Essay-based Exams in Applied Linguistics

Academic Vocabulary	Correct Items (frequency) (%)	Example (s)	Misspelled Items (frequency) (%)	Example (s)
Domain-specific AV	94,48	Ethnography, competence, linguistics, sociolinguistic	5,52	gener, competant, gramar, homogenous, verbale, utterences

Table 8, in which the use of domain-specific AV is divided into two categories of morphologically correct items and misspelled items, demonstrates that students manifest a high frequency of the use of morphologically correct items accounted for more than 90% (94,48%). The latter is significantly higher than the frequency of misspelled items which represents 5,52% of the total tokens of domain-specific AV.

Taking into consideration that domain-specific AV is a crucial aspect to be deployed

in specific subject matters such as Applied Linguistics in this research, its fully morphologically correct implementation is required to deliver accurate messages which can only be interpreted in the specialized subject in question. Although EFL Master One students of English employ such a frequency of well-spelled individual specialized lexical items, it is a bit lower than what the demands of Master One students' level, given that they are advanced, especially when the misspelled ones are key terms. Examples of morphologically correct specialized AV are **competence**, **linguistics**, and **utterances** in E1; **ethnography**, **genre**, and **linguists** in E10; and **cohesive**, **grammatical**, and **vocabulary** in E13. Nonetheless, in E8, the student spelled the word **grammatical** as **gramatical** while another student in E29 spelled it correctly once and incorrectly as **grammatical** also twice. Another common misspelled item that was detected in students' essays is the word **genre** which was spelled as **gener** in E5, E19, and E26. Other common misspelled words such as **utterances**, **atrances**, **competent**, **criticized**, **schoolars**, **homogenous**, etc., were also located in the corpus.

In simple words, albeit students showed a relatively high level, yet not perfect, of correctly spelled domain-specific AV in their essays, they still lack writing proficiency. Correspondingly, they seem to be indecisive about certain spelling rules, for in the same essays, different forms of such words occur.

3.2.3. The Use of Academic Vocabulary at the Discourse Level

Table 09

The Frequency Use of Correct, Erroneous, and Non-Use of Anaphoric References, Cataphoric References, and Repetition of Academic Vocabulary in Essay-based Exams

Academic vocabulary	Feature	Total number	Correct use (frequency)	Example(s)	Erroneous use (frequency)	Example(s)	Non-use (frequency)	Example(s)

lary		ber of use	ncy) (%)		ncy) (%)		ncy) (%)	
Genera l acade mic vocabu lary	Anaph oric referen ce	81	72,84	it, its	27,16	Its	00,00	
	cataph oric referen ce	1	00,00		100,00	its	00,00	
	Repeti tion	478	85,56	Communi cation, communic ative event, speech communit y	11,51	Approa ch, context	0,84	Culture, speech communit y
Domai n- specifi c acade mic	Anaph oric referen ce	110	61,82	It, his	23,64	It, itself,	14,55	It, this
	Cataph oric	00	00,00		00,00		00,00	

vocabulary	reference							
	Repetition	327	83,18	The ethnography of communication, competence, communicative competence	14,37	The ethnography of speaking	2,14	the ethnography of Communication

Table 9 demonstrates EFL Master One students' use of anaphoric references, cataphoric references (grammatical cohesion), and repetition (lexical cohesion) which is divided into three categories: correct, erroneous, and non-use for both types of AV: general AV and domain-specific AV. As it is shown, in their papers, students to a certain degree refer to the use of anaphoric references of general AV. The frequency of the first category, which is the correct use, for this type is the highest. The former accounted for 72,84% followed by that of erroneous use, representing 27,16%, while the non-use category ranks last with zero frequency. Nonetheless, in using the second feature which is the cataphoric reference for AV, students showed almost zero use of this feature, it occurred only one time and it was incorrect. Thus, the frequencies of cataphoric reference of general AV are 00,00%, 100,00%, and 00,00% for correct, erroneous, and non-use categories, respectively.

Additionally, students seem to repeat the general academic vocabulary, whether correct or erroneous, in their papers to a considerable level while to a lower percentage, they forget to repeat it. The frequency of the correct manifestation is the highest among that of erroneous and non-use. It represents 85,56% of the total use of repetition while the frequency of erroneous use and no use are accounted for 11,51% and 0,84%, respectively.

Further, the use of anaphoric references of domain-specific AV was detected in students' essays, manifested in the three already mentioned categories. The correct use of this feature shows a considerable frequency (61,82%) followed by that of erroneous use (23,64%) and then by that of non-use (14,55%). However, the use of cataphoric references is null in the corpus. Additionally, as in general AV, students tended to repeat domain-specific AV in their papers. Again this repetition is manifested in the three categories of correct, erroneous, and non-use. The frequency of the first category for this type of AV accounted for 83,18% while the second and the third category represent frequencies of 14,37% and 2,17%, respectively.

Considering the discrepancy between the frequencies of anaphoric references' use for general AV and domain-specific AV, the frequencies of correct use and erroneous use of the former (72,84% and 27,16%, respectively) are a bit higher than the frequencies of correct use and erroneous use of the latter (61,82% and 23,64%, respectively). However, the frequency of non-use of domain-specific AV (14,55%) is way far from that of general AV which is null (00,00%). In addition, both types of AV showed almost no implementation of cataphoric references, except that there occurred a single erroneous cataphor of general AV in the whole corpus. Lastly, the frequency of correct use of repetition of general AV in the corpus (85,56%) slightly exceeds the domain-specific AV's (83,18%). Yet both the frequencies of erroneous and non-use of domain-specific AV (14,37% and 2,17%, respectively) are higher, to an extent, than the frequencies of

erroneous and non-use of general AV (11,51% and 0,84%, respectively).

3.2.3.1. The Use of General Academic Vocabulary at The Discourse Level

3.2.3.1.1. The Use of Anaphoric and Cataphoric References of General AV

Table 10

The Frequency Use of Correct, Erroneous, and Non-Use of Anaphoric and Cataphoric References of General AV in Essay-based Exams

Academic vocabulary	Feature	Total number of use	Correct use (frequency) (%)	Example (s)	Erroneous use (frequency) (%)	Example (s)	Non-use (frequency) (%)	Example (s)
General academic vocabulary	Anaphoric reference	81	72,84	it,	27,16	It, itself, they	00,00	
	Cataphoric reference	1	00,00		100,00		00,00	

Table 10 shows the use of anaphoric references and cataphoric references of general AV is divided into three categories. For anaphoric references, the table also demonstrates that the frequency of correct use of this type of vocabulary is the topmost (72,84%) among the frequencies of erroneous use (27,16%) and non-use (00,00%). Considering the frequency of the first category, the findings revealed that the students do not demonstrate complete proficiency in this feature, which may affect their essays in terms of coherence.

In addition, and regarding the frequency of erroneous use of anaphoric references, the of erroneous use (27,16%) and non-use (00,00%), together, explain that these students are aware of the fact that anaphoric references are essential in their writing; nonetheless, they fail to implement them appropriately.

Given that these cohesive ties of grammatical cohesion (*it, they, their, etc.*) enable the smooth transition between ideas, sentences, and paragraphs to build a logical and coherent structure, the full mastery of such ties' use is, to a significant degree, required. An example of the correct use of anaphora to refer to a general AV in the corpus can be detected in E7 in which the student stated "... in analysing speech event which are: communication event ... Communication act ... communicative scene ... finally speech community refers to ... In addition to **these** concepts Hymes also ...". In this example, the writer implemented the demonstrative adjective to refer to what occurred before **communication event, Communication act, communicative scene, and speech community** altogether. Another example of this category can be seen in E15 in which the student wrote "Communication situation; **it** is used to identify the ...". In this example, the personal pronoun **it** in the new clause is used to refer backward to **Communication situation** and explain the concept.

Despite such correct uses of anaphoric references, students' essays contain a considerable number of erroneous use. For instance, "... Dell Hymes see language as a communicational medium in which **its** focused on transmitting ...". In E17 here, the student deploys the possessive adjective **its** incorrectly; it is irrelevant to use such an item in this sentence. This misuse of the possessive adjective **its** resulted in the production of a grammatically incorrect utterance.

Further, given the significance of cataphoric references of general AV in academic writing in terms of organising the discourse's ideas, the complete correct implementation

of such a feature is highly required in students' essays. However, the latter showed only one use, which is erroneous, in the whole corpus. Both categories of correct and non-use of cataphoric references showed a zero frequency while the category of erroneous use demonstrated a frequency of 100,00%. The example of erroneous use of the feature in question is seen in E16 in which the student wrote "In any speech community and in its daily life, individuals use language in different situations ...". In this instance, the student deployed the possessive adjective **its** instead of **their** to refer forward to the word **individuals**. Unaware of this use, the student intended to refer backward to **speech community**; however, the reference to be implemented in this sentence is of a cataphoric nature not an anaphoric one.

3.2.3.1.2. The Use of Repetition of General AV

Table 11

The Frequency of Correct, Erroneous, and Non-Use of Repetition of General AV in Essay-based Exams

Academic vocabulary	Feature	Total number of use	Correct use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	Non-use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)
General academic vocabulary	Repetition	478	85,56	Communication, communicative event, speech community	11,51	Approach, reaction, context	0,84	Culture, speech community

As table 11 demonstrates, the use of repetition of general AV as a feature of lexical cohesion is manifested in three categories. The table shows that the correct use of the former covers a frequency of 85,56% which is the highest among the two other categories of erroneous use and non-use which represent 11,51% and 0,84% of the total use, respectively. The findings elucidate that EFL Master One students are aware of the use of repetition. Nevertheless, they still to a certain degree misuse it or in other words overuse it.

The appropriate implementation of repetition in essays is of great significance due to its role in creating emphasis on key terms as well as contributing to the overall structure of the essay which should be written coherently. An instance of correct manifestation of repetition of general AV can be seen in E7 in which the student stated: “He claimed that competence; which is the underlying knowledge that an **individual** possesses ... Performance is the actual use of the knowledge and the linguistic systems an **individual** has in mind ...”. Although the ungrammaticality of the passage, the use of the academic word **individual** is necessary to emphasize that this knowledge is of the **individual**. Other instances of this category can also be seen in different essays such as in E27 in which the student wrote “... for the ethnographic study of communication which are: **communication event, communication act, communication situation, and speech community**. First, **communication event** is ... Second, **communication act** is ... Third, **communication situation** is used... The fourth and the last one’s **speech community** which ...”. In this example, the student tended to repeat the keywords **communicative event, communicative act, communicative situation, and speech community** to emphasize and explain each one of them individually and, consequently, impart a coherent organization and interpretation of what he/she seeks to clarify.

It is undeniable that the use of repetition is beneficial for creating emphasis on key

terms; nevertheless, the overuse of such a feature creates a sense of redundancy which affects the essay's freshness, originality as well as clarity. An example of erroneous use of repetition of general AV can be seen in E30 in which the student stated "... so he used what he called "antheptic approach" and this **approach** help him to understand the structure. and this this **approach** help him to understand the structure. Because the language were not recaded at all. and through this **approach**, he can find the narrative ...". Regardless of the ungrammaticality of the sentence, the exaggerated use of the word **approach** yielded a sense of disorder.

In the passage of E6, the student wrote "Moreover, Dell hymes point out that language and culture are part and parcel of each other and cannot teach one without another, in another word they should be tought in parallel ...". This could have been more appropriate to repeat the concept of **culture and language** to emphasize what should be taught together by saying "Moreover, Dell hymes point out that **language and culture** are part and parcel of each other and cannot [be taught separately]. In [other words], [**language and culture**] [should be taught] in parallel ...".

Comparing the use of anaphoric references and the repetition of general AV, it yielded a paradox between the two in the sense that the increase in the frequency of erroneous use or the overuse of repetition resulted in a decrease in the correct use and non-use of anaphoric references. That is to say, students tend to overuse repetitions at the expense of anaphoric references.

3.2.3.2. The Use of Domain-specific Academic Vocabulary at The Discourse Level

3.2.3.2.1. The Use of Anaphoric and Cataphoric References of Domain Specific AV

Table 12

The Frequency of Use of Correct, Erroneous, and Non-Use of Anaphoric and Cataphoric References of Domain-specific AV in Essay-based Exams

Academic vocabulary	Feature	Total number of use	Correct use (frequency) (%)	Example (s)	Erroneous use (frequency) (%)	Example (s)	Non-use (frequency) (%)	Example (s)
Domain-specific academic vocabulary	Anaphoric reference	110	61,82	it, its	23,64	Itself, it, they	14,55	
	Cataphoric reference	0	00,00		00,00		00,00	

The use of anaphoric references of domain-specific AV, as shown in table 12, is embodied in three categories: correct use (61,82%), erroneous use (23,64%), and non-use (14,55%). As can be identified, the frequency of correct use is the highest among the frequencies of the other two categories, yet the latter are also elevated compared to the frequency they should cover. Besides, the frequency of the first category is, also, a bit approximate to the frequency of correct use of the general AV. This entails that the students, again, do not have a full mastery of the appropriate use of such a feature in regard to domain-specific vocabulary. One of the reasons why these students lack proficiency in such use can be their belief that repetition of key concepts results in establishing emphasis

on the latter.

An example of the correct use of anaphoric reference to domain-specific vocabulary can be seen in E7 in which the student stated “The ethnography of communication mainly focuses on the language user using language to communicate in real situations and not on the native speaker producing grammatically correct sentences. **It** also focuses on the exploration and ...”. Here the writer used the personal pronoun **it** to refer to the concept of **the ethnography of communication** and avoid redundancy. Another instance of this category is in E18 in which the writer stated “Unlike chomesky’s idea which focuses on competence and **its** perfection and ...”. The student here used the possessive pronoun to refer backward to **competence** and avoid incorrect repetition.

However, the correct manifestation of anaphora of domain-specific AV is not consistent in students’ essays. These students also tended to erroneously implement such a feature. An example of erroneous use of anaphoric references can be detected in E8 in which the student wrote “... and he is careful that point out that social linguistics norms is not end in **itself** and ...”. Regardless of the grammatically incorrect sentence, the student tended to use the reflexive pronoun **itself** to refer backward to **linguistic norms** instead of using **themselves** for the fact that **linguistic norms** are plural.

Finally, an instance of students’ non-use of anaphora of domain-specific AV can be seen in E3 in which the student stated: “The ethnography of communication is an approach to language research that develops a view in anthropology that culture to a large extent is expressed through language and develops a view in linguistics ...”. In this sentence, there are two clauses; the first one is “The ethnography ... language” while the second one is “develops a view in linguistics ...”. As it is seen, the second one does not have a subject which could be the personal pronoun **it**, yet the student omits it and tries to relate the two clauses using **and** which is grammatically incorrect.

3.2.3.2.2. The Use of Repetition of Domain-specific AV

Table 13

The Frequency of Correct, Erroneous, and Non-use of Repetition of Domain-specific AV in Essay-based Exams

Academic vocabulary	Feature	Total number of use	Correct use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	Erroneous use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)	Non-use (frequency) (%)	Example(s)
Domain-specific AV	Repetition	349	83,18	The ethnography of communication, competence, communicative competence	14,37	Ethnography of speaking	2,17	The ethnography of communication

Table 13 shows that the frequency of use of repetition of domains specific AV is, again, manifested in three categories, correct, erroneous, and non-use. The table also reveals that students' essays contain a considerable amount of the correct use of this feature accounted for 83,18% of the total repetitions in the corpus. In addition, the frequency of erroneous use of this feature represents 14,37% of the whole while that of no use represents 2,17%.

Given the fact that repetition of domain-specific AV in Applied Linguistics strengthens the student's argument, demonstrates his domain knowledge, and helps connect different parts of the text, making the essay flow more smoothly and enhancing the logical progression of ideas, the fully appropriate manifestation of this category is necessary. Nonetheless, although the fact that the frequency of correct use of repetition of this type of AV is the highest among the two other categories, 83,18% is not an adequate frequency. An illustration of the correct use of this aspect in the corpus can be seen in E1 in which the student stated "Correspondingly, Hymes introduced the term **Communicative Competence** to contrast Chomeskey's linguistics competence. By definition, **Communicative competence** is the tacit knowledge a speaker ...". Regardless of the incorrect capitalization, in this passage, the student tended to repeat the concept of **communicative competence** to centralize it and thus grasp the reader's attention to the concept itself, which is the main concern of the exam's question. Another exemplification of this use can be detected in E13 in which the writer stated "Second, Hymes suggested also what [is] called **the ethnography of communication** which is an approach or a method ... **The ethnography of communication** has [four] main basic concepts ...". In this example, the student iterated the use of the concept **the ethnography of communication** to emphasize its function in the essay.

Further, as already mentioned, repetition of keywords is crucial, particularly

specialized words, yet the overuse of such a feature diminishes the sense of coherence in a particular text. An example of students' erroneous use of repetition of domain-specific AV in the corpus can be seen in E8 in which the student wrote, "First of all, dell hymes is best known for his founding role of [the] **ethnography of speaking** and propose the term of **ethnography of speaking** to describe a new approach ...". In this passage, the repeated term **ethnography of speaking** is incorrect, for it is needless and makes the sentence ungrammatical. It is more appropriate to use a relative pronoun and write "First of all, Dell Hymes is best known for his founding role of [the] **ethnography of speaking** which is a new approach ...".

Concerning the last category which is the non-use of repetition of domain-specific AV in the corpus, there can be found an example in E22 in which the student wrote: "This crucial change contributed in the rise of the concept of **ethnography of communication** as a method to scientifically study the situated ...", and then started a new paragraph with "The method initiated by Dell Hymes ..." instead of "**The ethnography of communication** ...". Such non-use may negatively affect the connection between the essay's ideas, sentences, and paragraphs and decentralize the main concept discussed in the essay. Besides, E21 shows almost no repetition for the concept of **ethnography of communication**.

Drawing a comparison between the use of anaphoric references and repetition as two major aspects of grammatical and lexical cohesion, respectively, there exists a correlation between the two in which the increase of erroneous repetition results in a decrease in the correct use and non-use of anaphora of domain-specific AV. That is to say, students tend to overuse the repetition of domain-specific AV at the expense of anaphoric references.

3.3. Overall Discussion of the Results Generated by the Corpus Analysis

The findings obtained revealed that EFL Master One students tend to use verbal

sentences instead of nominalized ones, which in turn weakens their academic writing style. One of the major difficulties of this use is that they aim to be clear and direct while one of the essential features of the academic writing style is complexity. As far as the use of individual academic lexical items is concerned, the results showed the frequency of such implementation is adequate for general academic vocabulary based on the AWL as well as for specialized words. Yet, this manifestation is not diverse as it should be. Hence, students face difficulty in using such vocabulary due to their lack of academic vocabulary knowledge. Additionally, the results also demonstrated that despite some students' knowledge of academic vocabulary, the latter's spelling; in other words, morphological features, i.e. affixes, display a major challenge. This implies that students lack spelling rules knowledge and that they sometimes write words as they are pronounced. Furthermore, the findings showed that students do not possess the necessary skills to ensure agreement between anaphoric references and their antecedents. In addition, they tend to overuse repetition at the expense of anaphoric references which results in monotonous essays, in other words, incoherent essays. The finding also showed that students' papers lack the use of cataphora due to their unawareness and lack of confidence in implementing such a feature. Therefore, students are deficient in implementing grammatical and lexical cohesion in academic writing.

3.4. Limitations of The Study

Similar to any research endeavour, the process of conducting the study brought forth pertinent issues which can be summarized in the following points:

- The inaccessibility of some resources, especially books and articles.
- Difficulty of the adopted software to profile specialized terminology or vocabulary.
- Lack of specialized academic vocabulary lists in Applied Linguistics.
- Students' grammatical errors which might affect the data and analysis' overall

quality and validity.

3.5. Recommendations

The findings of the second part yield some recommendations to be considered.

- 1) As far as academic vocabulary is concerned, it is advisable to consider the following:
 - Developing a comprehensive glossary of academic vocabulary tailored to the field of Applied Linguistics which covers key terms, concepts, and terminology commonly used in the field.
 - Incorporating explicit instruction on specialized academic vocabulary into the curriculum.
 - Further research on the use of cataphoric references of academic vocabulary in essay-based exams.
- 2) Besides academic vocabulary, further research is recommended to:
 - Investigate other aspects of language including grammar and punctuation.

Conclusion

The current chapter dealt with the practical part of the study. It covered a corpus analysis of essay-based exams in the subject of Applied Linguistics of EFL Master One students at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahya University, Jijel. The chapter began with a description of the research methodology including the sample and corpora analysis using the Compleat Lexical Tutor software. The research findings revealed that EFL Master One students' writing style lacks a significant aspect namely nominalization in this study. Additionally, the results also showed that these students failed to deploy diverse and correctly spelled academic vocabulary items in their papers. As for the discourse level, the corpora analysis showed that students face challenges in deploying vocabulary items to increase the level of cohesion in their compositions by dint of anaphora, cataphora, and repetitions of academic vocabulary.

General Conclusion

Vocabulary learning plays a pivotal role in the development of EFL learners' language proficiency and enhancing their disciplinary knowledge. Nonetheless, students of English in the Algerian context still face enormous difficulties mastering this aspect both in terms of using individual items and the deployment of vocabulary items to formulate adequate disciplinary discourses especially in writing. The present study aimed at investigating the challenges encountered by students of English at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahya University, Jijel, regarding the use of academic vocabulary, be it general or specialized. In order to achieve this aim, a corpus of thirty randomly selected essay-based exam papers of the students in question was compiled. The investigation was carried out to analyse mastery of the use of individual lexical items as well as their ability to implement these items to compose cohesive and coherent pieces of written at a discourse in essay-based exams in the subject of Applied Linguistics. Hence, two research questions were raised: 1) what are the difficulties encountered by students regarding the use of individual lexical items in essay-based exams in applied linguistics? and 2) what are the discourse-related problems encountered by students regarding the use of academic vocabulary at the discourse level? It is noteworthy that in order to answer these questions, the Coxhead's (2000) Academic Word List and Xodabande et al.'s (2022) Academic Vocabulary in Applied Linguistics List were used. These ground works were adopted to ensure higher levels of reliability and validity of the results.

The analysis of the results of the present study revealed that students face numerous challenges in using academic vocabulary in their essay-based exams. First of all, at the individual level, students' use of nominalization, an important tool for describing scientific process and achieving higher levels of objectivity, in students' papers was characterised by low frequency and high level of errors. The analysis revealed that students exhibited a low

level in using academic lexical, a strong indicator of their lack of the required academic vocabulary knowledge. In addition, the results showed that students face enormous difficulties in their spelling of individual academic lexical items. At the discourse level, the results demonstrated that students' papers lack an inadequate level in deploying the right vocabulary skills to achieve acceptable levels of cohesion in their writing production. Student essays were characterized by an insufficient frequency in the correct use of anaphoric references. Besides, the high level of the observed repetition of the same lexical items indicated low proficiency in vocabulary knowledge. Another critical issue revealed by the findings is the total absence of the resort to using cataphoric references in students' essay-based exam papers. This absence can be explained as students lack of confidence in using such ties due to the latter's complexity.

Although the results of the present study were indicative rather than conclusive, the findings demonstrated that students of English at advanced levels face enormous problems in mobilising appropriate vocabulary resources, be they generic or specific, both at the individual and discourse levels to compose an acceptable quality of prose in the domain of their specialization. Thus, teachers and curriculum designers should find ways in developing more effective materials and methodologies to enhance students' mastery of this crucial aspect. The genre-based approach to teaching writing offers a plausible solution to tackle this issue.

List of References

- Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, III(3), 21–34.
<https://doi.org/10.20472/te.2015.3.3.002>
- American Association for Applied Linguistics [AAAL]. (n.d.). About applied linguistics. Retrieved from <https://www.aal.org/about-applied-linguistics>
- Ashraf, M., Rubab, I., & Ajmal, M. (2020). Investigating the problems of organization and vocabulary in academic writing encountered by students at postgraduate level. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(8), 2766–2779.
- Billig, M. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: the case of nominalization. *Discourse & Society*, 19(6), 783–800. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508095894>
- Boice, R. (1990). *Professors as writers: A self-help guide to productive writing*.
- Brun-Mercer, N., & Zimmerman, C. L. (2015). Fostering academic vocabulary use in writing. *The CATESOL Journal*, 27(1), 131–148. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1111751.pdf>
- Burns, A. (2001). *Genre-based approaches to writing and beginning adults ESL learners*. Routledge.
- Byrne, D. (1988). *Teaching writing skills*. Longman Group UK Limited.
- Comrie, B., & Thompson, S. C. (2007). Lexical nominalization. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks* (pp. 334–381). <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511618437.006>
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3587951>
- Dale Carnegie Quotes. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://quotation.io/page/quote/tell-audience-youre-going-say-say-tell-youre>

- Dirgeyasa, I. W. (2016). Genre-based approach: What and how to teach and to learn writing. *English Language Teaching*, 9(9), 45. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n9p45>
- Fitzgerald, J., Relyea, J. E., & Elmore, J. (2021). Academic vocabulary volume in elementary grades disciplinary textbooks. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 114(6), 1257–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000735>
- Francis, A., & Armstrong, S. (2018). Academic vocabulary: A developmental reading research agenda. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 42(1), 1–7.
- Gholaminejad, R., & Sarab, M. R. A. (2021). A comparison of the academic word list and the vocabulary word list: Should the AVL replace AWL? *TEFLIN Journal*, 31(1), 167–182. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v32i1/167-182>
- Giridharan, B. (2021). Identifying gaps in academic writing of ESL students. *Curtinedu*, 1–15. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/50621615/Identifying_Gaps_in_Academic_Writing_of_ESL_Students
- Gogi, G. (2015). Vocabulary: Active and passive vocabulary: Various techniques of teaching vocabulary. *The Criterion: An International Journal in English*.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Harida, E. S. (2017). An evaluation on students' reading motivation and their reading comprehension of the English department students iainpadangsidempuan. *Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu-ilmu Sosial Dan Keislaman*, 3(1), 183–194. <https://doi.org/10.24952/tazkir.v3i1.817>
- Hyland, K. (2008a). Understanding writing: Exploring texts, writers and readers. In W. Siew Mei, T. F. Tupas, C. MohLeen, M. C. Sandora, & C. Varaprasad (Eds.), *The English Language Teaching and Learning Landscape* (pp. 9–19). Centre for English Language Communication National University of Singapore.

- Hyland, K. (2008b). Genre and academic writing in the disciplines. *Language Teaching*, 41(4), 543–562. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444808005235>
- Hyland, K. (2013). ESP and writing. *The Handbook of English for Specific Purpose*, 95–113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118339855.ch5>
- Hyland, K. (2022). Ken Hyland’s essential bookshelf: Academic writing. *Language Teaching*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444822000118>
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2007). Is there an “Academic vocabulary”? *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 235–253. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00058.x>
- Ibrahim, I., & Elashri, E. A. (2013). *The effect of the genre-based approach to teaching writing on the EFL Al-Azhr secondary students’ writing skills and their attitudes towards writing*. (PhD dissertation). Mansoura University.
- Irawansyah. (2016). Genre based approach: A way to enhance students’ writing ability. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 9(1), 74–88.
- Kalbarinda, Y., Regina, & Wardah. (2018). The use of journal writing to teach students’ writing skill on recount text. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa (JPPK)*. <https://doi.org/10.26418/jppk.v7i10.29175>
- Kehler, A. (2002). *Coherence, reference, and the theory of grammar*. CSLI publications. Retrieved from <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA61097870>
- Khan, K., & Bontha, U. R. (2015). How blending process and product approaches to teaching writing helps EFL learners. In *Advances in educational technologies and instructional design book series* (pp. 1–21). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-6619-1.ch007>
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (1995). Longman Group Ltd.

- Maamuujav, U. (2021). Examining lexical features and academic vocabulary use in adolescent L2 students' text-based analytical essays. *Assessing Writing*, 49, 100540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100540>
- Mallia, J. G. (2017). Strategies for developing English academic writing skills. *Arab World English Journal*, 8(2), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no2.1>
- Matinparsa, H., Xodabande, I., Ghafouri, M., & Atai, M. R. (2022). Academic vocabulary in applied linguistics research articles: A corpus-based replication study. *Research Square (Research Square)*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2092705/v1>
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Muslih, M. (2021). The influence of the students' mastery of vocabulary on paraphrasing ability. *Indonesian Journal of Instructional Media and Model*, 3(1), 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.32585/ijimm.v3i1.925>
- Mutia, A., Sahardin, R., & Putra, G. M. (2023). The impact of vocabulary instruction on vocabulary achievement. *English Education Journal*, 13(4), 464–477. <https://doi.org/10.24815/eej.v13i4.30005>
- Nagy, W. E., & Townsend, D. (2012). Words as tools: Learning academic vocabulary as language acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(1), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.011>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
- O'Donovan, N. (2005). There are no wrong answers: An investigation into the assessment of candidates' responses to essay-based examinations. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(3), 395–422. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980500222114>

- Paltridge, B. (2004). Academic writing. *Language Teaching*, 37(2), 87–105.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444804002216>
- Paquot, M. (2010). *Academic vocabulary in learner writing from extraction to analysis*.
 Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Pineh, A. (2022). Exploring nominalization use in EFL students' argumentative writing over a genre-based teaching and learning approach. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 110–122. <https://doi.org/10.22055/rals.2022.17429>
- Poudel, A. P. (2018). Academic writing: Coherence and cohesion in paragraph. *ResearchGate*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Prasithratsint, A. (2014). Nominalization as a marker of detachment and objectivity in thai academic writing. *MANUSYA: Journal of Humanities*, 17(3), 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/26659077-01703001>
- Rasouli, F., & Jafari, K. (2016). A Deeper understanding of L2 vocabulary learning and teaching: A review study. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 4(1), 40. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20160401.16>
- Samigullina, A. D. (2018). Teaching first year students features of academic writing (complexity, formality, objectivity, responsibility). *DOAJ (DOAJ: Directory of Open Access Journals)*, 2(14), 38–41. <https://doi.org/10.18454/rulb.2018.14.2.2>
- Sarhady, T. (2015). The effect of product/process-oriented approach to teaching and learning writing skill on university student performances. *International Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 7–12.
- Sari, D. (2019). An overview of genre based approach in EFL writing class. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics*, 1 (1), 31–39.
- Stonehouse, D. (2018). How to write a good essay: General principles for success?, *British Journal of Healthcare Assistants*, 12(6), 292–295.
<https://doi.org/10.12968/bjha.2018.12.6.292>

- Stotsky, S. (1983). Types of lexical cohesion in expository writing: Implications for developing the vocabulary of academic discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 34(4), 430–446. <https://doi.org/10.2307/357899>
- Taboada, M. (2004). *Building coherence and cohesion: Task-oriented dialogue in English and Spanish* (Vol. 129). Simon Fraser University.
- Taylor, G. (2009). *A student's writing guide: How to plan and write successful essays*. Retrieved from <http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ref/id/CBO9780511609749>
- Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in academic writing: learning to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 58–78. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.1.58>
- Viera, R. T. (2017). The importance of vocabulary knowledge in the production of written texts: A case study on EFL language learners. *Revista Tecnológica ESPOL – RTE*, 30(3), 89–105.
- Vongpumivitch, V., Huang, J., & Chang, Y. (2009). Frequency analysis of the words in the academic word list (AWL) and non-AWL content words in applied linguistics research papers. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28(1), 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2008.08.003>
- Warnby, M. (2022). Academic vocabulary knowledge among adolescents in university preparatory programmes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 61, 101203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2022.101203>
- Womack, P. (1993). What are essays for. *English in Education*, 27(2), 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-8845.1993.tb01101.x>
- Xodabande, I., Torabzadeh, S., Ghafouri, M., & Emadi, A. (2022). Academic vocabulary in applied linguistics research articles: A corpus-based study. *Journal of Language and Education*, 8(2), 154–164. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2022.13420>

Yule, G. (2005). *The study of language* (3rd ed.). United States of America: Cambridge University Press, New York www.cambridge.org.

Appendices

E1

Applied Linguistics

Acquiring a foreign language necessarily needs the mastery of a set of skills to achieve an adequate level in that language. More precisely, to be “competent” in the target language. The term “Competence” gained much importance in the field of applied linguistics and was the main concern of myriads of researchers in SLA domain. This latter was the birth place for raising debatable discussions about two major concepts “ Competence” and “ Performance” as far as the ideal speaker/hearer is concerned.

Noam Chomesky, founding father of SLA, introduced the term “Linguistic Competence” viewing language as an abstracted set of rules. He argued that competence is the ideal language system that enables speakers to produce and distinguish the grammatical sentences from ungrammatical ones. He believed, therefore; that competence is the tacit knowledge one has about the language, eventually language is perfect. Simultaneously, Chomesky claimed that language can be studied independently from language use (performance).

This clear distinction and separation of competence from performance received remarkable critics from Dell Hymes, who claimed that Chomesky’s theory had no empirical basis and Therefore failed to explain linguistic variations and solve the various language problems encountered in the actual use of language.

Correspondingly, Hymes introduced the term “ Communicative Competence” to contrast Chomesky’s linguistic competence. By definition, Communicative Competence is the tacit knowledge a speaker has and the ability to use it in different social contexts. In this

regard, four major components of communicative Competence were proposed; the grammatical competence, the sociolinguistic competence, the strategic competence and discourse Competence. From Hyles' point of view, for someone who has a linguistic competence only, it would be quite difficult for him/her to communicate properly. Additionally the speaker would be a kind of social monster producing grammatical utterances totally disconnected from the situation or the context in which they occur.

In a similar vein, Dell Hyles had the firm belief that for any researcher to understand a speaker's behavior and its potentials, there must be a clear link between competence and performance. This highlights the fact that acquiring a L2 is not about only imparting grammatical rules and vocabulary lists in one's mind but also observing, evaluating, analyzing and assessing its actual use in different social contexts

The foregoing discussion sheds lights on the fact that learning a second language is a coin with two different sides. These two sides are believed to be the so called "Competence" and "Performance".

E7

Language has always been a controversial topic, Therefore many views regarding language. Two prominent linguists had different opinions when it comes to describing language and language use. Chomsky presented what is known as the competence and performance concept, which regarded lge as only abstract knowledge. This concept was later attacked by Del.Hymes” communicative competence and his famous study on the ethnography of communication. Del Hymes’ theories eventually came as an alternative to chomsky’s ideas.

Initially, the concept of competence and performance was introduced by Chomsky. He claimed that competence was introduced by Chomsky. He claimed that competence; which id the underlying knowledge that an individual possesses in his mind is crucial and important, and in other words perfect, while he considered performance as flawed and can be effected by many factors. Performance is the actuall use of the knowledge and the linguistic systems an individual has in mind about a certain language. In simpler words chomsky’s main focus was competence and the knowledge the lge user holds in mind about language, and he neglected the actual use of lge in real world situations.

Moreover, Del Hymes attacked chomsky’s ideas and presented his theory of communicative competence. His main claim was that relying on competence only is not enough so he made a shift from focusing on competence to focusing on performance saying that language must not only be used correctly but also appropriatly. he also presented four dimensions to his communicative competence. First grammatical competence, which is the accurate knowledge of grammar rules. sociolinguistic competence which deals with the appropriate use of the possessed knowledge. The third competence is related to the ability of managing communication effectively, in other words

recognizing and overcoming any communication breakdowns. The last competence is discourse competence, the ability to create written and spoken language, it mainly deals with cohesion and coherence.

Furthermore, Chomsky introduced his ethnography of communication, claiming that language can not be studied in isolation. However it must be studied in relation to social and cultural contexts. The ethnography of communication mainly focuses on the language user using language to communicate in real situations and not on the native speaker producing grammatically correct sentences. It also focuses on the exploration and documentation of the communicative competence within the members of a speech community. In a speech community the ethnographer must look for these basic concepts speech situation (setting and scene, the circumstances), speech event (the integral patterns that govern the speech situation, the interactions)? Speech act (different utterances that may perform the same action). Del Hymes also presented his speaking model to help ethnographers conduct their studies.

To sum up what have been said before, both Chomsky and Del Hymes had different views on language. for Chomsky it is all about the knowledge of the grammar and the rules so the main focus was on competence and what the individual possess in his mind about the language. Del Hymes on the other hand provided a shift and focused on performance and the actual use of language in real situations emphasizing the social and the cultural aspects saying that language is not abstract and should not be studied in isolation.

E13

Applied linguistics.

« Competence and performance »

Learning a language for linguists differs from one another. There are some think that learning a language needs only to know and learn the grammatical norms and vocabulary of that language. because language contains only the knowledge of these grammatical rules and vocabulary, in this side Chomsky convinced that competence is perfect and it is enough. while Dell Hymes thinks that competence is not enough and is must be related to performance. For that, Dell Hymes suggested arguments and models which are; the communicative competence and the ethnography of communication and the speaking model.

First, Hymes to convince his idea of language as a set of ways of speaking he added what called the notion of the communicative Competence. It refers to the ability of the learners to use and apply the grammatical rules in different context and situations. This communicative competence has four main components; the strategic competence which refers to the ability of using strategies in communication in order to avoid break downs. There is also the discourse competence in which learner can be able to use coherent structures and cohesive devices context. The grammatical Competence and it refers to the use of grammar norms and vocabulary in different communication situations. In addition to the sociolinguistic competence that tends to use different context in different situations.

Second, Hymes suggested also what called the ethnography of communication which is an approach or a method came as a reaction to the notion of communication competence and it seeks to study communication within a wider context in relation to the society and their cultures, norms, attitudes, and beliefs. The ethnography of

communication has four main basic concepts. The first one is the communicative event and it refers to a pattern part of society or social community like gossip sessions and talk shows. The second one is the communication act and its relation to the activities and actions of people like enjoying doing something like enjoying hiking. The third one is the communication situation which refers to the settings of a communication or activities where they happened and when. The last one is the speech community and it refers to a group of people in a society sharing the same beliefs, traditions, customs and so on so forth.

Third, the last argument for Hymes was the Speaking Model, it comes as a reaction to the idea of Chomsky of language. While each letter refers to a given setting. The “S” refers to the settings of the communication event where or female. “E” tends to the ends which are the goals and purposes of the communication. “A” refers to the acts or the order of the events. “K” for Keys, the manner if they are joking or sessions or even they “singing”. “I” for the instruments or the tools are they written or spoken. “N” for norms or which are the norms that a researcher may observe. “G” for genres or the types.

In conclusion, Chomsky thinks that competence or the knowledge of grammar rules and vocabulary is enough to learn a language, while Hymes thinks that competence and performance must be related to each other because they complete each other, for that he suggested three main notions= the communicative competence, the ethnography of communication and the Speaking model.

E27

Sociolinguist Dell Hymes said that in order to speak a language correctly, one needs not only to learn its vocabulary and grammar but also the context on which words are used. He was the founder of the idea of communicative competence which was a reaction to Chomsky's distinction between linguistic competence and linguistic performance. Chomsky introduced competence and performance. Competence is the knowledge that we have in our minds and performance is the actual use of this knowledge. Chomsky said that linguistics concerned only with competence not performance because competence is perfect and performance can be affected by some factors. Dell Hymes criticizes the idea of Chomsky and said that competence and performance should not be separated. He supports his idea of communicative competence and organizes it by three concepts: sociolinguistic competence, grammatical comp, strategic comp and later Canale added the fourth concept which is discourse comp. Dell Hymes proposed an approach in order to support his idea of communicative competence which is the ethnography of communication, and developed several concepts, also he developed a model as a framework which is the SPEAKING mnemonic.

First, the ethnography of communication is an approach, a perspective and a method to and in the study of culturally distinctive means and meanings of communication. The approach has been used to produce hundreds of research reports about locally patterned practices of communication, and has focused attention primarily on the situated use of language. It concerned with: linguistic resources people use in context, the various media used when communicating, the way verbal and non verbal signs create and reveal social codes of identity. This approach was founded by the well-known scholar Dell Hymes. He proposed the term ethnography of speaking later amended to ethnography of

communication, to describe a new approach to understand language in use. The goal of ethnography of communication is to study the communicative competence of a specific speech community by describing and analyzing patterns of communication that organize the use of language in particular communicative activities. Hymes proposed the ethnography of communication as an approach towards analyzing the language use within speech communities, in order to support his idea of communicative competence which itself is a reaction to Chomsky's distinction between linguistic competence and language performance.

Second, Hymes developed several concepts as basic units for the ethnographic study of communication which are: communication event, communication act, communication situation, and speech community. First, communication event is an integral pattern of social life. Second, communication act is a part of communication event, it is any individual act of communication. Third, communication situation is used to identify specific setting and scenes for communication. The fourth and the last one's speech community which is a group of people who share rules for using and interpreting at least one communication practice.

Third, Dell Hymes developed a model as a framework for the analysis of speech event within its cultural context, it is mnemonic are: S → Setting and scene: time, place and psychological setting. P → Participant: speaker, hearer and audience. E → Ends: purposes, goals and outcomes. A → Act sequence: message content and form. K → key: tone, manner and spirit of the speech act. I → Instrument: forms and styles of the speech. N Norms: social governing the event and the participant actions and reactions. G → Genre = the kind of speech act or event. The sociolinguist Dell Hymes developed the SPEAKING model to promote the analysis of discourse as a series of speech acts and speech events within cultural context.

To conclude, Dell Hymes is a well-known scholar who founded the approach of ethnography of communication in order to support his idea of communicative competence. The approach of ethnography of communication is an approach towards analyzing patterns of language use within speech communities. Dell Hymes developed several concepts and the mnemonic SPEAKING model for the ethnographic study of communication. Ethnography of communication is an approach to discourse analysis that is based on anthropology and linguistics.

E29

Language was set to be defined differently and viewed differently as well. Language with its all types and modes, whether it is written or spoken, is defined as a tool of communication. Chomsky said that language is all about competence, that is to say it is all about knowledge of language the one may have, and the idea that language is an abstracted set of rules; whereas Dell Hymes came with the outright refusal to this idea and stood behind the support of the idea that language is a performance.

Dell Hymes argued that there can not be any separation between competence and performance and we can not exclude one from the other, he added that language should not be limiting it self to the potential use of grammar and grammatical correct sentences in isolation from any factors. Hymes said : “A child from whom any and all grammatical sentences may come with equal likelihood would be a social monster.”.

Dell Hymes argued that language should be practiced and learned under different social factors and especially under the social context, in different societies with different group of people who shares the same beliefs. and this is what Dell Hymes named the communicative Competence, which is the ability to communicate under in a social context. this idea led after to the foundation of a field influenced by Hymes himself which is the ethnography of communication which in its role cares about the study of language under the social context and factors.

To conclude, Chomsky's idea that language is a set of rules or norms and competence is largely important than performance, was neglected by Dell Hymes' idea that language is a set of ways of speaking and its all about performance and there cannot be any separation between the two, in addition language cannot be limited mastery of grammatical correct sentences and a baggage of grammar rules in mind, but it must be affected.

Résumé

Ce document a présenté le résultat d'une enquête portant sur les obstacles que rencontrent les étudiants de la première année master lors de l'usage du vocabulaire académique dans les épreuves écrites dans le cadre des linguistiques appliqués. Le but de cette analyse est divisé en deux parties : définir les difficultés rencontrées par les étudiants lors de l'usage individuel du vocabulaire académique et aussi chercher les difficultés trouvées par les apprenants dans cet usage au niveau du discours. Pour réaliser ces deux cibles, on a mené l'analyse d'un corpus constitué de trente essais écrits par quelques étudiants choisis aléatoirement du département d'anglais à l'université de Jijel Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia. Les articles qu'on a rassemblé ont été codifiés et analysés à partir de Coxhead's (2000) academic words list et Xodabande et al.'s (2022) Vocabulaire académique dans la liste des linguistiques appliquées. Par ailleurs, le Compleat Lexical Tutor software a été utilisé pour présenter l'objectif général du vocabulaire académique. Ensuite on a analysé les données créées d'une façon quantitative et qualitative. L'analyse des résultats a montré que malgré le niveau stable des étudiants dans l'utilisation du vocabulaire académique dans le cadre de l'écriture académique en général, ils ont quand même rencontré un nombre considéré de difficultés concernant l'usage de ce dernier pendant les épreuves écrites dans les niveaux : individuel et le niveau du discours. Le résultat de cette enquête a montré que les étudiants rencontrent beaucoup de challenges face à la maîtrise du vocabulaire académique lors des épreuves écrites. Concernant la première partie, l'analyse a démontré que l'usage de la nominalisation chez les apprenants est insuffisant. Les résultats ont aussi montré que les étudiants rencontrent encore des problèmes dans les épellations des unités lexicales. En ce qui concerne le discours, les résultats prouvent que les étudiants dépendent de la répétition au lieu d'employer un vocabulaire plus riche qui est nécessaire pour une cohérence dans les productions écrites. En conclusion, les articles des étudiants sont caractérisés par une

reproduction insuffisante dans l'usage correct des préférences anaphoriques et une absence totale dans l'usage des références cataphoriques.

Mots clés : vocabulaire académique, épreuves écrites, linguistiques appliquées.

ملخص

تطرقت هذه الدراسة إلى التحقيق في الصعوبات التي يواجهها طلاب السنة الأولى ماستر في استخدام المفردات الأكاديمية في الامتحانات المبنية على المقالات في مادة اللسانيات التطبيقية. وقد كان الهدف من هذه الدراسة ذو شقين: تحديد التحديات التي تعترض الطلاب في استخدام المفردات الأكاديمية الفردية، وكذلك دراسة الصعوبات التي تعترض هؤلاء المتعلمين في استخدام هذا النوع من المفردات على مستوى الخطاب. بغرض تحقيق هذين الهدفين، تم إجراء تحليل لمجموعة من ثلاثين ورقة امتحان مبنية على المقالات تمت كتابتها من طرف عينة من طلاب تخصص اللغة الإنجليزية في جامعة محمد الصديق بن يحيى، جيبل. من الجدير بالذكر هنا إلى أن اختيار هاته الأوراق كان عشوائياً. تم تدوين المقالات التي تم جمعها وتحليلها بناءً على Coxhead's (2000) Academic Word List وXodabande et al.'s Academic Vocabulary in Applied Linguistics List. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، فقد تم تبني برنامج Compleat Lexical Tutor لتصوير المفردات الأكاديمية العامة ثم بعد ذلك تحليل البيانات كمياً ونوعياً. وكشف تحليل النتائج أنه على الرغم من أن الطلاب المعنيين أظهروا مستوى مقبولاً من الوعي فيما يتعلق بالقواعد التي تحكم استخدام المفردات الأكاديمية في الكتابة الأكاديمية، فقد واجهوا بشكل عام عدداً معتبراً من المشاكل المتعلقة باستخدام هذه المفردات على كلا المستويين الفرد والخطاب. كما أظهر تحليل النتائج أن الطلاب يواجهون عدداً كبيراً من التحديات بخصوص إتقان استعمال المفردات الأكاديمية في امتحاناتهم المبنية على المقالات. فيما يتعلق بالهدف الأول، كشف التحليل أن استخدام الطلاب للإسمية كان جديداً إضافة إلى الصعوبات التي يواجهونها في تهجئة المفردات المعجمية. أما على مستوى الخطاب فقد أسفرت النتائج احتواء أوراق الطلاب على عدد كبير من التكرار بدلاً من التنوع في المفردات لزيادة تماسك مقالاتهم. في هذا الصدد، اتسمت مقالات الطلاب بعدم كفاية التواتر في الاستخدام الصحيح للمراجع الترفيقية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المفردات الأكاديمية، اختبارات مبنية على المقالات، التطبيقات اللغوية،