

The Word Lists of Hospitality Service Review Construction

Piyapong Laosrirattanachai

Sugunya Ruangjaroon

Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand

Corresponding author's email: pukan_walker@hotmail.com

Received 23 August 2019; revised 26 September 2019; accepted 17

December 2019; online 30 May 2020

Abstract

Word lists have long been known as a form of learning material. Construction of any needed word lists can be a good way to facilitate student learning. As a hospitality learner, one should understand the reviews given by service users. This study aimed to construct word lists of hospitality service review. The data were collected from 30,000 reviews consisting of 3,012,612 tokens from www.tripadvisor.com. The range, frequency, keyword analysis, lexical profiling and experts' responses were used as the criteria for constructing the word lists. Three word lists were constructed: a Tourism Review Word List

(TRWL) comprising 242 words with coverage of 5.08 per cent of the Tourism Review Corpus (TRC), an Accommodation Review Word List (AcRWL) comprising 304 words with coverage of 4.24 per cent of the Accommodation Service Review Corpus (AcRC) and an Airline Review Word List (AiRWL) comprising 319 words with coverage of 4.98 per cent of the Airline Service Review Corpus (AiRC).

Keywords: Word list, Hospitality word list, Review word list, Vocabulary

1. Introduction

Teaching English comprises many agendas and issues concerning listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar and vocabulary, among which teaching vocabulary has been raised as one of the most important, being the most basic element that humans use for communication. Many scholars have considered and supported the idea of the importance of vocabulary (Wilkins, 1972; Nagy, 1988; Read, 1998; Lipson & Wixson, 20012. Nagy (1988), for example, claimed that vocabulary skill is prior knowledge required for learning a language. Wilkins (1972) also stated that the lack of grammar knowledge

results in a language user hardly understanding the language, but the lack of vocabulary knowledge means a language user understands nothing. Lipson and Wixson (2012) emphasized the importance of vocabulary for reading while Read (1998) emphasized its importance for writing. Even though many researchers have raised the issue of the importance of learning vocabulary, Zimmerman (1997) identified that teaching vocabulary has not received the attention it deserves, especially in the field of teaching English as a second language.

To address these problems, word lists have been provided to improve the situation. The main goal of a word list is to facilitate learning both inside and outside the class (Todd, 2017). As word lists have proven to be so useful in helping learners to improve their lexical competence, various word lists have been constructed depending on different specific purposes. There is no strict rule for constructing a word list. However, there are some common methods that word list constructors normally adopt to create their word lists including for example, frequency, range, lexical profiling and keyword analysis among others. Hyland and Tse (2007) also supported

this idea by stating that each discipline has different restrictions to constructing its word list. As far back as 1953, West created a General Service List of English (GSL) based on frequency. Later, in 2000, Coxhead created an Academic Word List (AWL) by integrating frequency with range, and excluded GSL from the list. Therefore, Nation (2001) categorized words into 4 categories: high-frequency words, academic words, technical words and low-frequency words. Various scholars have aimed to construct word lists for each category; for example, West constructed a GSL to facilitate the learning of high-frequency words, Coxhead constructed an AWL to facilitate academic word learning. Some scholars created word lists that facilitated learning of both academic and technical words by combining the required academic words and technical words in a specific discipline altogether in a word list (Wang, Liang, & Ge, 2008; Martinez, Beck, & Panza, 2009; Khani & Tazik, 2013; Valipouri & Nassaji, 2013; Muñoz, 2015; Yang, 2015; Lei, & Liu, 2016). Some even combined GSL, AWL and technical words into a list to facilitate learning in a specific area (Ward, 2009). Some scholars created some special word lists which are useful

as tools to create other word lists. For example, Nation (retrieved from <https://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/paul-nation>) constructed a Functional Word List (FWL), an Abbreviation List (AL) and a Proper Name List (PNL). This reflects that different word lists have different usages and benefits.

When considering the situation of the English competency of Thai students, many studies identified that Thai students encounter difficulties since they have inadequate English skills, especially in vocabulary, that are needed for learning at the university level or for their careers in real life (Ward, 2005; Ruangjaroon, 2013; Laosrirattanachai & Likitrattanaporn, 2018). Also, the mean TOEIC performance score for Thais in 2017 was 482 out of 990 points which was ranked an “intermediate” (TOEIC, 2017). This supports the contention that there is still a long way to go before Thais have good English skills. As a result, many Thai undergraduates are not offered jobs both domestically and internationally due to their low proficiency in English. On 5th December, 2018, www.businessinsider.com reported that Bangkok, Thailand was the most visited city globally in 2018, while Phuket

and Pattaya were ranked twelfth and fourteenth, respectively (Murray, 2018). Since Thailand is well-known for its hospitality resources and service, more and more people nowadays tend to work in this industry. This affects the decision of a number of students to study a hospitality business major at university level. Clearly, it is necessary for hospitality staff to have a good knowledge of vocabulary often used in reviewing service. However, it is impossible for learners to acquire vocabulary in a limited time from the GSL, AWL and technical words often used in reviewing. Furthermore, Todd (2017) stated that it can take about 1-2 hours to learn a word. This emphasizes that learning the GSL, AWL and technical words to understand how to review the service and how to be reviewed is out of the question. The easiest way to facilitate this problem is constructing a word list composed of words often used in reviewing hospitality services.

In this paper, we argue for the model using the parameter settings of range, frequency, lexical profiling, keyword analysis and experts' responses as the criteria to construct the word list of hospitality service review. In addition to considering the coverage of the constructed

word lists, the 1st 1,000 words in the GSL and FWL, AL, PNL word lists were added to the corpus of hospitality service review.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Background of Word List

One of the conventional word lists, still having a big impact on learning vocabulary is the General Service List (GSL) of English first proposed by West in 1953. After this contribution, many specialized word lists for specific purposes were created, for example an Academic Word List (AWL) by Coxhead, and a Business Word List (Konstantakis, 2007). The AWL covers words mostly used in academic fields. Discussing the influence of word lists on the words used in many texts, Nation and Waring (1997) claimed that GSL covers approximately 80 percent of a text, AWL covers about 10 percent of a text (Coxhead, 2000) and the remaining 10 percent comprises technical words and low-frequency words. Normally, low-frequency words are ignored. The main goal of a learning vocabulary is to learn all the words contained in GSL, AWL and technical words used in a field

depending on the learner. Even though the GSL, which comprises 2,000 generally used words, is well-known as the oldest and most influential word list, it has been criticized for its size that makes it difficult for students to memorize all the words it contains (Engels, 1968; Ward, 2009). GSL has inspired the creation of many word lists, which has resulted in an increased number of specialized word lists. One of the most well-known specialized word lists used in a specific purpose is the AWL containing 570 words used in an academic context. Among many specialized word lists, the AWL has been criticized for using the GSL as stopwords. Generally, the term ‘stopwords’ refers to words commonly used in a language and are therefore ignored and filtered out when processing data. However, when constructing word lists, not only commonly used words but any words can be used as stopwords. It depends on the word list itself. The best example is AWL. To construct AWL, Coxhead ignored any words that appear in GSL and filtered them out of AWL. Even though there has been many criticisms, there is no doubt that the AWL is still very useful for non-native English speakers. The GSL and AWL together comprise

2,570 words. This makes the task of memorizing vocabulary even more difficult. When considering the purposes of this study, in our view, memorizing all the words in the GSL and AWL just to understand hospitality reviews is too broad for specific users. So, constructing a word list specifically used in understanding the hospitality review is obligatory.

2.2 Construction of Word List

There are many criteria used by word list creators use to construct a word list. However, it is subjective to pinpoint which criterion is the best among a number of word lists. At least, no empirical data can prove which criterion constitutes the best method of constructing a word list. From the historical perspective, word list construction has included a number of studies on building word lists, frequency and range, followed by lexical profiling, keyword analysis and experts' response (West, 1953; Coxhead, 2000; Konstantakis, 2007; Wang, Liang, & Ge, 2008; Ward, 2009; Martinez et al., 2009; Valipouri & Nassaji, 2013; Khani & Tazik, 2013; Tangpijaikul, 2014; Muñoz, 2015; Yang, 2015; Lei & Liu, 2016; Todd, 2017). Each criterion has its advantages and disadvantages.

Frequency is surely an important phenomenon in linguistics (Lindquist, 2009). However, constructing a word list solely based on frequency would give you a biased word list (Coxhead, 2000) because the length of a text affects the frequency of a word, with the longer the text is, the higher the word frequency is. This means that the high-frequency words used in the corpus may be of any significance regarding the word in the entire corpus, but merely the reflect the written style of the author. To solve the problem, many scholars also used range as one of the criteria to increase the reliability lacking by using frequency alone. The literature has shown that lexical profiling was first used by Coxhead (2000) in order to create the Academic Word List (AWL). She removed any words that appeared in the GSL from the AWL. However, some scholars argued against this method since there are some restrictions, i.e. they pointed out that it would be more reasonable to add more words in the AWL than in the GSL, since the frequency of words used in academic areas is higher than those in general contexts (Billuroglu & Neufeld, 2005; Paquot, 2007; Valipouri & Nassaji, 2013; Gardner & Davies, 2014). Keyword analysis is one of the

methods recently used in constructing a word list and is widely used in the field of corpus linguistics (Gabrielatos & Marchi, 2011). To consider only keywords is not to determine whether the word appears with a high frequency, but to consider the statistics like log-likelihood (LL) or chi-square calculated by comparing the frequency of the word's appearance in the referent corpus and the target corpus (Scott, 1997; Anthony & Gladkov, 2007). The point is that the statistic shows only the calculated value of the number, but to choose which words can be categorized as keywords depends on the word list constructor. Also, if one uses only a keyword analysis method to construct a word list, some relevant words may be deleted as they do not occur in that high frequency in the target corpora. This would result in words having a high-range value being deleted just because they do not occur as often as other words. To conclude, even though there are many criteria used to construct a word list, there is no suggestion which one fares better than the others. Therefore, mixed criteria should be adopted to create a word list.

3. Methodology

3.1 Making the Corpus

The final corpus of this study called the “Hospitality Service Review Corpus” (HRC) comprising the Tourism Review Corpus (TRC), the Accommodation Service Review Corpus (AcRC) and the Airline Service Review Corpus (AiRC) was built by collecting language data used in reviewing the hospitality service in three fields (tourism, hotels and airlines) from the website www.tripadvisor.com. Each year, www.tripadvisor.com ranks the top-10 or top-25 of many hospitality categories, for example, hotels, landmarks, destinations, airlines, and restaurants, and also allows any service users to leave their comments. The latest (2018) 1,000 reviews from the places or companies ranked in the top-10 of only landmarks, airlines, and hotels were gathered. In total, the HRC contained 30,000 reviews consisting of 3,012,612 tokens (TRC, 631,863 tokens; AcRC, 1,429,302 tokens; AiRC, 951,447 tokens).

3.2 Software used for Analysis

Three software programs were used in this study: AntWordProfiler (Anthony, 2014), AntConc (Anthony,

2018) and Key-BNC (Graham, 2014). Different programs were used to analyze different purposes. AntWordProfiler was used to analyze lexical profiling. Lexical profiling involves categorizing whether a word is matched with the referent word lists, for example, the GSL and AWL. However, since this study aimed to create word lists used in reviewing, the word lists included the second 1,000 words in the GSL, AWL, and the technical terms used in hospitality service. The words belonging to the first 1,000 words in the GSL, the Functional Word List (FWL), the Abbreviation List (AL), and the Proper Name List (PNL) were eliminated from the lists. FWL, AL, and PNL were created by Nation and presented in the .txt file which is convenient to use in many software programs. They are available to be downloaded at <https://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/paul-nation>. AntWordProfiler was also used to calculate the frequency and range of the words used in all 30,000 reviews. To do a keyword analysis, Key-BNC was used to calculate the log-likelihood of the words in the TRC, AcRC, and AiRC, compared to the British National Corpus (BNC).

3.3 Data Processing

This study aimed to develop a word list for reviewing hospitality service including tourism destinations, accommodations, and airlines. Word lists are normally constructed based on frequency and range. However, Hyland and Tse (2007) stated that each discipline has different restrictions for constructing its word list. This means that different word lists need different methods of construction depending on the area of use for the word list. In this paper, we chose range, frequency and lexical profile using the first 1,000 words in the GSL, FWL, PNL and AL as the stopwords, and keyword analysis to construct the hospitality review word list. The reason that we did not use all 2,000 words in the GSL but only the first 1,000 words was due to the poor English proficiency level of Thais mentioned earlier. Though GSL comprises the 2,000 most common and frequently used words, that does not mean Thai students are familiar with and able to use all those words. So, the second 1,000 words in the GSL are still needed. Another issue focused on in this study was to present the word lists in ‘word families’ form as has been done in the GSL and AWL. Many researchers

also support the idea of presenting a word list using word families. For example, Coxhead (2000) claimed that one could easily understand any derived or inflected words if the base words are known. If a word list constructor creates a word list in the ‘type form,’ the word list will be much longer than if the word families form is applied. Definitely, a long list of words makes it much more difficult for a student to use the list. As a result, to facilitate learners to understand the meaning of the words used in reviewing hospitality service in a limited period of time, the word lists were constructed based on a combination of the second 1,000 words in GSL, the AWL, and specific words often used in reviewing.

To accomplish the purposes of this study, AntWordProfiler, AntConc, and Key-BNC were used to analyze the data. The following criteria were set in order to construct a Tourism Review Word List (TRWL), an Accommodation Review Word List (AcRWL), and an Airline Review Word List (AiRWL):

- Range – There is no fixed rule about determining the range value of a word to be included in a word list. In this study, we adopted Coxhead’s method. She

included any words in her corpus if they were in 15 or more of the 28 subject areas, which is approximately 53.57 % of all subject areas. In this study, any words that occurred in more than 50% of the 10 tourism sites' reviews in the TRC, in more than 50% of the 10 hotels' reviews in the AcRC, and in more than 50% of the 10 airlines' reviews in AiRC had a chance to be included in the TRWL, AcRWL, and AiRWL, respectively.

- Frequency – According to Nation (2005), there is no strict rule about defining a cut-off point as a high-frequency rate. Again, we followed Coxhead's frequency rate (Coxhead, 2000). In her study, Coxhead defined as high-frequency words any word appearing at least 100 times from the entire corpus containing 3,500,000 words. That means the frequency rates calculated in this study was $(631,863 \times 100)/3,500,000$, $(1,429,302 \times 100)/3,500,000$, and $(951,447 \times 100)/3,500,000$, respectively; Thus, any words appearing at least 18 times in the TRC, 41 times in the AcRC, and 27 times in the AiRC was included in the TRWL, AcRWL, and AiRWL respectively.

- Lexical Profiling – Normally, if we want to construct a technical word list, the lexical profiling method is very useful since it can be used to remove irrelevant words from the technical list. However, different word lists with different usages need different methods of construction. This study planned to construct a Hospitality Review Word List (HRWL) comprising the often-used words in hospitality service reviewing extracted from the second 1,000 words in the GSL, AWL, and technical words, and to group them altogether. Lexical profiling was used to eliminate the words from the referent word list (the first 1,000 words in the GSL, FWL, PNL and AL). The reasons that this study used the FWL, PNL, and AL as the stopwords were: 1) the FWL comprises functional words which should already be known by the students; 2) the PNL is composed of the names of countries and cities around the world which appear a lot in the corpora, and they needed to be eliminated so that only necessary words would be left in the lists; and 3) the AL contains the English abbreviations commonly

used. Deleting those abbreviations helps the student to focus on the necessary words in the lists.

- **Keyword Analysis** – Considering “keyness” as one of the factors of a word list construction is being adopted increasingly these days. In the hospitality fields, some words are defined as polysemic since their meanings can vary by context. For example, the word “site” which means “a place” in a general context can be interpreted as “an attraction or a destination” in the tourism context. These plain words have a high chance to be listed in the first 1,000 words in the GSL so the keyword analysis was used to draw those polysemous words from the first 1,000 words in the GSL. However, the word list constructors using keyword analysis rarely justify the reason for determining the cut-off point. Since the lists should not be so long and should also be comprised only needed-to-known words, the cut-off point was the first 100 words with the highest log-likelihood values. Any word that passed the range and frequency criteria and appeared in the first 1,000 words in the GSL were

added to the list. However, any word that appeared in the FWL were not included.

- Experts’ response – The questionnaires with the full lists of words resulting from the earlier steps were distributed to the experts. Each word list was responded to by one lecturer in that field and by two English lecturers. All lecturers had experience at teaching for more than five years.

4. Findings

4.1 Number of the word tokens and types in the three corpora

According to the three corpora, the numbers of word tokens and types are shown in the Table 1.

Table 1

Numbers of word tokens and types in the three corpora

Corpus	Token	Type
Tourism Review Corpus (TRC)	631,863	14,804
Accommodation Service Review Corpus (AcRC)	1,429,302	22,077
Airline Service Review Corpus (AiRC)	951,447	17,616
Hospitality Service Review Corpus (HRC)	3,012,612	34,536

As shown by Table 1, the AcRC, with 1,429,302 words in the corpus, had the largest corpus size compared to the other two corpora with double the number in the TRC, from which it could be inferred that the customers spend more time writing reviews after using hotel services than tourism services. When the three corpora were combined, the HRC with 3,012,216 was created.

4.2 Range criterion

Table 2
Number of words reaching the range criterion

Word List	Criterion	Number of the types reaching the range criterion
TRWL	50%	2,086/14,804
AcRWL	50%	4,429/22,077
AiRWL	50%	4,036/17,616

We then determined the range criterion in more than 50% of the 10 tourism sites’ reviews in the TRC, in more than 50% of the 10 hotels’ reviews in the AcRC, and in more than 50% of the 10 airlines’ reviews in the AiRC. The results (Table 2) were: 2,086 out of 14,804 types in

the TRWL, 4,429 out of 22,077 types in the AcRWL and 4,036 out of 17,616 types in the AiRWL. Thus, these passed types had a chance to be included in the lists, but they still need to be investigated using the other criteria.

4.3 Frequency criterion

Table 3 shows the results from determining the frequency criterion for at least 18-time occurrences in the TRC, 41-time occurrences in the AcRC and 27-time occurrences in the AiRC.

Table 3
Number of words satisfying the range and frequency criteria

Word List	Criterion	Number of types satisfying the frequency criterion	Number of types satisfying the range and frequency criteria
TRWL	18	1,740/14,804	1,451/14,804
AcRWL	41	2,247/22,077	2,016/22,077
AiRWL	27	2,109/17,616	2,050/17,616

Table 3 shows that based on the results of frequency alone, 1,740 out of 14,804 in the TRWL, 2,247 out of 22,077 types in the AcRWL and 2,109 out of 17,616 types in the

AiRWL satisfied the criteria. However, to consider putting a word in the list, it had to pass both the range and frequency criteria. So, the number of the types which were capable of being put in the TRWL, AcRWL, and AiRWL were 1,451, 2,016 and 2,050 types, respectively.

4.4 Lexical profiling criterion

All the words in the three lists were analyzed using lexical profiling to remove any words that appeared in the first 1,000 words in the GSL and FWL, PNL and AL. The number of words in each word list after analysis using AntWordProfiler are shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Number of words after removing words in the first 1,000 words in the GSL and FWL, PNL and AL

Word List	Number of words shared			Number of types included in the lists	Total
	with				
	the 1 st 1,000				
	words in GSL and FWL	PNL	AL		
TRWL	993	7	2	449	1,451
AcRWL	1,198	21	3	794	2,016

Word List	Number of words shared with			Number of types included in the lists	Total
	the 1 st 1,000				
	words in GSL and FWL	PNL	AL		
AiRWL	1,128	78	7	837	2,050

The result of the words belong to the first 1,000 words in the GSL and FWL, PNL and AL are shown in the same column because some of the words in the FWL are also included in the first 1,000 words in the GSL. So, we decided to include the first 1,000 words in the GSL and FWL as one group. The total types in each word list were: 449 types in the TRWL, 794 types in the AcRWL, and 837 types in the AiRWL.

4.5 Keyness criterion

The Key-BNC program was used to analyze the keyness of the words in each corpus by considering log-likelihood values. The number of words from each corpus was 100 words each. Any words from the first 100 highest log-likelihood values that passed the range and frequency

criteria and appeared in the first 1,000 words in the GSL were added to the list. The results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Number of words from the 100 highest LL values that passed the range and frequency criteria and appeared in the first 1,000 words

Word List	Number of types	Total types in the list
TRWL	36	485
AcRWL	26	820
AiRWL	32	869

We ran the Key-BNC program to analyze the log-likelihood values of the words in the lists. The extracted words were the same that passed both the range and frequency criteria. Comparing the lists appearing in the first 1,000 words in the GSL in Table 4 with the lists calculated by the Key-BNC program, 36 types, 26 types, and 32 types were extracted. Consequently, we added these words to the lists, TRWL, AcRWL, and AiRWL, respectively. The total number of the words in the lists were then: 485 types in the TRWL, 820 types in the AcRWL, and 869 types in the AiRWL.

4.6 Form of word lists

As mentioned earlier, the study aimed to present the word lists in word families form. The number of the words after changing from the word type form into the word families form are shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Number of words in word families form

Word List	Number of word families
TRWL	408
AcRWL	663
AiRWL	711

To decrease the size of the word lists, we changed the lists and presented them in word families form, which lowered the number of the words, i.e. 408 words in the TRWL, 663 words in the AcRWL and 711 words in the AiRWL.

4.7 Experts' Response

The last stage of the word list construction was to ask the experts from each field if they agreed with the words in the lists. The experts were one tourism business lecturer, one hotel business lecturer, one airline business

lecturer, and two lecturers in English for hospitality. All had experience teaching in their fields for more than five years. At least two experts had to agree to include any word in a list. Any words that should already have been known by a learner were excluded from the lists. The number of the words in the lists after this final stage are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7
Number of words after the final stage

Word List	Number of word families
TRWL	242
AcRWL	304
AiRWL	319

Based on the experts’ responses, a great number of words were excluded from the lists, leaving 242, 304 and 319 words in the TRWL, AcRWL, and AiRWL, respectively. One main reason why there was a great number of words excluded was that many words in hospitality fields were proper names, for example, tourist destinations, hotels, airlines, and some places around the world. Also, these proper names have not been included in Nation’s PNL, so

the lexical profiling method could exclude only some proper names from the lists.

4.8 Corpora coverage of word lists

To see the coverage of the word lists, we used AntWordProfiler to compare the lists to their corpora, i.e. the TRWL was compared with the TRC, the AcRWL was compared with the AcRC, and the AiRWL was compared with the AiRC. In addition, the first 1,000 words in the GSL and FWL, PNL and AL were compared with the corpora to consider the proportions of corpora coverage. The results are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8
Corpora coverage of word lists

Corpus	First 1,000			HRWL			ETC.	Total
	words in GSL + FWL	PNL	AL					
				TRWL	AcRWL	AiRWL		
TRC	500,998	12,816	543	32,077	-	-	85,429	631,863
	(79.29%)	(2.03%)	(0.09%)	(5.08%)			(13.51%)	(100%)
AcRC	1,098,425	21,347	915	-	60,515	-	248,100	1,429,302
	(76.85%)	(1.49%)	(0.06%)		(4.24%)		(17.36%)	(100%)
AiRC	736,553	22,673	1,334	-	-	47,292	143,595	951,447
	(77.41%)	(2.38%)	(0.14%)			(4.98%)	(15.09%)	(100%)

The coverage proportions of the lists were: the TRWL covered 5.08% of the TRC, the AcRWL covered 4.24% of the AcRC, and the AiRWL covered 4.98% of the AiRC. Combining the first 1,000 words in the GSL, FWL, PNL and AL, and TRWL/AcRWL/AirWL made up 86.49%, 82.64%, and 84.91% of each corpus, respectively. The words in the ETC. group were the unused second 1,000 words in the GSL, AWL, or other words that occurred at a low frequency. To make sure that learners would know at least 90% of the words in each corpus, we brought back the words in the word families form before the exclusion by experts' for analysis. As a result of the experts' responses, 159, 359, and 389 words excluded from the TRWL, AcRWL, and AiRWL should have been known by a learner. They covered 63,120 tokens (9.99%) of the TRC, 162,854 tokens (11.39%) of the AcRC, and 118,300 tokens (12.43%) of the AiRC. Combining them together, learners should have the ability to understand the words in the corpora as follows: 96.48% for the TRC, 94.03% for the AcRC, and 97.34% for the AiRC, which indicated they reached approximately 95% of each corpus. The remaining 15% could be the second 1,000

words in the GSL, AWL, or other words that occurred at a low frequency which had lower priority.

4.9 Shared words among the three word lists

Since the three word lists (TRWL, AcRWL and AiRWL) are word lists used in the hospitality business, there was a tendency for words to occur in all three domains. We used AntWordProfiler to analyze the shared words among the three word lists. The results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9
Shared words among the three word lists

Word belongs to	Number	Example
TRWL, AcRWL and AiRWL	53	ambience, breeze, dedicate, fabulous, hassle
TRWL and AcRWL	38	complex, exquisite, overwhelm, spectacular, stun
AcRWL and AiRWL	64	accommodate, cater, decent, flawless, spacious
TRWL and AiRWL	26	apparent, approach, fee, narrow, site
TRWL only	125	admire, carve, courtyard, marvel, ornate

Word belongs to	Number	Example
AcRWL only	149	accompany, authentic, balcony, boutique, complement
AiRWL only	176	aboard, awful, blame, bulkhead, carousel

Table 9 suggests that there was a chance for a word to appear in more than one word list, especially when word lists are related, for example, the tourism, accommodation, and airline businesses in this study. In addition, Table 9 suggests that when students study these overlapping 53 words in all fields, they automatically learn the lexicon from all fields.

5. Discussion

5.1 Word List, Construction and its Form

Since a word list is beneficial to learning vocabulary in many areas, on the teaching side, teachers should learn how to construct a word list, not by guessing a long list of words they think students may not know, but by using a systematic process to facilitate teaching. On the learning side, learners should spend their time learning

and trying to become familiar with the words contained in the lists. In this study, the Hospitality Service Review is useful for learning in class, practice outside class, and also during future careers, since the students will be capable of understanding and communicating with the service users properly.

The results supported the statement “different disciplines have different restrictions for constructing its word list” proposed by Hyland and Tse (2007). We believe that the word lists we designed can shed some light on the debate over whether or not some of the words belonging to the GSL and AWL should be included in the constructed word list. In a Thai education context, most of the courses taught to Thai undergraduate students last 45 hours each semester. This limited time makes it virtually impossible to learn the GSL, AWL and technical words one after another to study the words used in reviewing service. Instead, students should learn the words listed specifically for them to facilitate student learning as in this study; the TRWL to facilitate understanding tourism service review, the AcRWL for accommodation service review, and the AiRWL for

airline business service review. In conclusion, a word list is a great shortcut to expanding a student's vocabulary repertoire.

The forms of the word proposed in the list are also an important issue that scholars have debated. According to many scholars, learners will easily understand any derived words if they know the root of the word (Bauer & Nation, 1993; Coxhead, 2000; Read, 2000). However, this issue still needs to be investigated and verified since the argument about the size of a word list is also an important issue. To avoid the size issue, the word families form is normally presented since it is smaller than the lemma and type forms. Based on the current study, we believe that undergraduate students should possess the ability to understand derived words. Furthermore, to make the word lists as short as possible to facilitate the learning of the students, we presented the word lists in the word families form.

When comparing our word lists with previous studies, one obviously different method of constructing word list is that, one way or another, previous studies applied frequency or keyness in their studies. Differently,

we applied both frequency or keyness in constructing word lists. As a result we could draw out polysemous words which have similar form with GSL but have a different meaning when used in hospitality service context. Hence, we suggest applying both frequency and keyword analysis when constructing specialized word lists.

5.2 A Word List and Pedagogy

Generally, a word list is created and proposed in the word family form perhaps because most programs used in constructing a word list tend to support the word family form. Also, most of the word list constructors claim that a word list should be created as concisely as possible. Among the three forms (word family, lemma and type form), a word list presented in the word family form is the smallest in size compared to the other two forms. Merely creating a word list does not suffice because learners gain little from reading just a word list without any other information provided. Consequently, it is crucial that implementation of a word list occur along with some meaningful and contextual exercise both in and outside a classroom. Metaphorically speaking, it would be

like your spending time building a home without knowing if anyone would be interested in living there. It would be a waste of time. Teachers should assess the learning process and the efficiency of the word lists they create so that they can improve their word lists or encourage their students to use the lists as autonomous supplementary material.

The most basic and easiest way to learn vocabulary is through rote memorization. Nation (1990) categorized vocabulary into two categories: receptive vocabulary and productive vocabulary. Receptive vocabulary is mostly used in listening and reading skills while productive vocabulary originates from acquiring receptive vocabulary and additionally is applied by a language user in speaking and writing. To apply Nation's idea to the word lists proposed in this study, a learner should memorize the lexicon and make use of it in reading the reviews first, then learners should be able to write reviews on their own. An actual example is illustrated below from one of the airline business service reviews.

“The business class *lounge* is not great at Manchester but once *aboard* we had an *excellent* journey with good service, food and *comfort* in quite *spacious* seats.”

As you can see from the extracted review, the italicized words were six of those appearing in the AiRWL. If the students learn the provided word list (the AiRWL here), they will be able to easily understand the extracted review. Becoming familiar with the reviews lets them apply the vocabulary they have learnt from the word list to writing reviews. This time, they use vocabulary as productive vocabulary.

Table 9 indicated there were 53 words appearing in all three word lists. To facilitate the step of learning, students should start by learning this group of words because understanding them will help learners to understand more about reviews in all domains at the same time. Some examples of review are provided below.

Thread I: ambience in the TRC, AcRC and AiRC

TRC: *One of the best monuments in India, and the government is clearly taking some effort to uplift the beauty and ambience around this place, I felt so*

lucky to be able to visit this 500yr old world wonder.

AcRC: *Very impressed with the exceptional high standard of service provided by the hotel. Wonderful ambience and stylish furnishing.*

AiRC: *Flying from Yangon to Singapore on mid-morning flight really showed that SilkAir struggles to match the product. To be fair, we were accommodated on an Airbus A330-300, which has seatback IFE, wider seats and a generally more spacious ambience.*

Thread II: breeze in the TRC, AcRC and AiRC

TRC: *The sea breeze on the island is cold, damp, and frequently harsh. Walking the hallways, touching the prison walls and cells, hearing the prisoner stories - all bring the history to the present.*

AcRC: *The resort is situated very close to the Male airport and is just a 20 mins ride by ferry. This is a real breeze compared to some of the other resorts which may require an additional seaplane/boat travel of over an hour.*

AiRC: *Premium economy on Air NZ is defiantly worth the extra. From the priority check in, hot towel once seated, the menu and fresh bread and multiple drinks trolley visits. And your bags come out first*

on the other end. Makes traveling with young ones a breeze.

Thread III: dedicate in the TRC, AcRC and AiRC

TRC: *It was a wonderful experience for both of us. We had our own dedicated Tuk Tuk driver for 3 days and felt very safe travelling around town.*

AcRC: *Every person you interact with during your stay is incredibly dedicated to ensuring you are having the best possible and perfect vacation.*

AiRC: *The chauffeur service included in your ticket price is superb - particularly when you arrive back to Heathrow and there is a dedicated lounge to grab a coffee and danish pastry whilst you wait the few minutes for your chauffeur to collect you right by the door.*

Thread IV: fabulous in the TRC, AcRC and AiRC

TRC: *Taj Mahal is a must visit. Get a good guide. A fabulous example of decadence from time gone by. Go at Sunset or Sunrise. After 0630 in the morning sees the rush gone and no need to queue.*

AcRC: *The spa treatments were fabulous and every time we left we felt like new people. And again, what makes the spa amazing (apart from the talents of the team) are the people - so friendly, welcoming, happy and a real joy to be around.*

AiRC: *The flight from Dubai to Glasgow was fabulous as well. The food was first class. The return flights home were every bit as good, as one lovely Irish flight attendant made me so comfortable as I had had an accident prior to leaving Glasgow and she couldn't do enough.*

Thread V: hassle in the TRC, AcRC and AiRC

TRC: *Fantastic place with the polishing of the tiles still practiced in nearby shops. We enjoyed very much but is a true hassle to get to the location from anywhere in India.*

AcRC: *Be careful of the floorboards. A large nail was sticking out of the floorboard on the top deck of our villa. My husband's toe got caught on it unknowingly and it ripped open quite deeply his big toes. He was bleeding a lot and it was very painful for him and a big hassle. We had to go to the neighbouring island to get a tetanus shot for him and every time we went swimming he had to wrap it up in plastic to try not to get it wet.*

AiRC: *Getting on board the aircraft at Gatwick was the most unpleasant experience. We had to wait at least 10 minutes before we reached the ground staff who just ignored our boarding passes and just let everyone cramp onto the escalator and once in the*

jetway. There is a reason why we book Business and that does not include having to hassle to get into the aircraft!

These examples show that some words convey similar meanings in the different word lists. However, in the example in thread 2, the word “breeze”, has different meanings in the TRC word list compared to the AcRC and AiRC word lists. “Breeze” in the TRC means “wind”, while it means “easy or with ease” in the AcRC and AiRC. As a consequence, teachers should create or design words lists in a way that facilitates learners’ ability to acquire polysemous words on their own.

6. Limitation of the study

The main limitation of this study was that the word lists generated have not been tried out with students. Clearly, if any word list constructors want to make sure that their word lists are effective and have a good impact on their students, experiments should be conducted. To accomplish that task, we suggest trying out the constructed word lists with learners in future studies.

References

- Anthony, L. (2014). *AntWordProfiler (Version 1.4.1)* [Computer software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>
- Anthony, L. (2018). *AntConc (Version 3.5.7)* [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>.
- Anthony, M., & Gladkov, K. (2007). Rhetorical appeals in fundraising. In D. Biber, U. Connor, & A. Upton (Eds.), *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure* (pp. 121-151). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamin.
- Bauer, L., & Nation, P. (1993). Word families. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 6(4), 253-279.

- Billuroglu, A. & Neufeld, S. (2007). *BNL 2709: The essence of English* (4th ed.). Nicosia, Cyprus: Rustem Kitabevi.
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213-238.
- Engels, L. (1968). The fallacy of word counts. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 6, 213-231.
- Gardner, D., & Davies, M. (2014). A new academic vocabulary list. *Applied Linguistics*, 35, 305-327.
- Gabrielatos, C., & Marchi, A. (2012). Keyness: Appropriate metrics and practical issues. Paper presented at Corpus-assisted Discourse Studies International Conference, Bologna, Italy.
- Graham, D. (2014). *Key-BNC* [Computer software]. Retrieved from <http://crs2.kmutt.ac.th/Key-BNC/>.
- Hyland, H., & Tse, P. (2007). Is there an “academic vocabulary”? *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 235-253.
- Khani, R., & Tazik, K. (2013). Towards the development of an academic word list for applied linguistics research articles. *RELC*, 44(2), 209-232.

- Konstantakis, N. (2007). Creating a business word list for teaching business English. *Estudios De Linguistica Inglesa Aplicada (ELIA)*, 7, 79-102.
- Laosrirattanachai, P., & Likitrattanaporn, W. (2018). A case study of English lexical competence and performance in tour conducting used by hospitality students. *Veridian E-Journal*, 11(4), 1157-1174.
- Lei, L., & Liu, D. (2016). A new medical academic word list: A corpus-based study with enhanced methodology. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 22(2016), 42-53.
- Lindquist, H. (2009). *Corpus linguistics and the description of English*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lipson, M., & Wixson, K. (2012). *Assessment of reading and writing difficulties: An interactive approach, student value edition* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education.
- Martinez, I., Beck, S., & Panza, C. (2009). Academic vocabulary in agriculture research articles: A

- corpus-based study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28(3), 183-198.
- Muñoz, L. (2015). The Vocabulary of agriculture semi-popularization articles in English: A corpus-based study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 45(3), 26-44.
- Murray, T. (2018). *The 20 most visited cities around the world in 2018*. Retrieved January 6, 2019 from <https://www.businessinsider.com/most-visited-cities-in-the-world-2018-9>.
- Nagy, W. (1988). *Teaching vocabulary to improve reading comprehension*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Nation, P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Nation, P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, P. (2005). Teaching and learning vocabulary. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Nation, P., & Waring, R. (1997). Vocabulary size, text coverage and word lists. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary, description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 6-19). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Paquot, M. (2007). Towards a productively-oriented academic wordlist. In J. Walinski, K. Kredens, S. Gozdz-Roszkowski (Eds.), *PALC proceedings* (pp. 127-140). Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Read, J. (1998). Validating a test to measure depth of vocabulary knowledge. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *Validation in language assessment: Selected papers from the 17th language testing research colloquium* (pp. 41-60). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Read, J. (2000). *Assessing vocabulary*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruangjaroon, S. (2013). A study of the implement of the resource: Projects play & learn 1& 4 accompanying CD-ROM and website by the ministry of education. *Silpakorn University Journal*, 33(2), 31-59.

- Scott, M. (1997). PC analysis of key words – And key words. *Systems*, 25(2), 233-245.
- Tangpijaikul, M. (2014). Preparing business vocabulary for the ESP classroom. *RELC Journal*, 45(1), 51-65.
- Todd, R. (2017). An opaque engineering word list: Which words should a teacher focus on? *English for Specific Purposes*, 45(1), 31-39.
- TOEIC. (2017). *2017 Report on test takers worldwide*. Retrieved January 6, 2019 from <https://www.ets.org/s/toeic/pdf/2017-report-on-test-takers-worldwide.pdf>
- Valipouri, L., & Nassaji, H. (2013). A corpus-based study of academic vocabulary in chemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12(4), 248-263.
- Wang, J., Liang, S., & Ge, G. (2008). Establishment of a medical academic word list. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(4), 442-458.
- Ward, J. (2005). *The lexical aspect of reading English as a foreign language for engineering undergraduates* (Unpublished doctoral

- dissertation). University of Birmingham,
Birmingham, England
- Ward, J. (2009). A basic engineering English word list
for less proficient foundation engineering
undergraduates. *English for Specific Purposes*,
28(3), 170-182.
- West, M. (1953). *A general service list of English words*.
London, England: Longman.
- Wilkins, D. (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*.
London, England: Edward Arnold.
- Yang, M. (2015). A nursing academic word list. *English
for Specific Purposes*, 37(1), 27-38.
- Zimmerman, C. (1997). Historical trends in second
language vocabulary instruction. In J. Coady &
T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary
acquisition* (pp. 5-19). Cambridge, England:
Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX

Tourism Review Word List (TRWL)

absolute access admire adult advice ahead airport amaze
angle annoy apart apparent appreciate approach appropriate
approximate archaeology architect arrange artwork astonish
atmosphere attend attract audio available avoid aware
awesome bare beat behold beware bit bonus book bottom
breathtaking breeze brief brilliant bucket capture card
carve ceiling cell century code columns comfort complex
craftsmanship crowd cruise decorate definite disappoint
display dome enormous ensure enter entire era especial
essential exact exceed explore exquisite exterior
extraordinary extreme fabulous facilitate fantastic fascinate
feature fee forever forward gate gem glory gorgeous
govern grand grandeur guess hall hassle heritage hire
honest hop huge hype iconic imagine impressive incredible
inform informative inside insight inspiring interest interior
intricate involve issue item jaw journey landmark list
literally load locate lot luck magical magnificent maintain
majesty major marvel massive masterpiece memorable
mesmerizing mobile mobility monument multiply museum
narrow obvious origin ornate overall overwhelming pace

pack palace pants passport peak penny period perspective
pick picture picturesque plaza plenty precious premises
preserve previous prior probable process professional
purchase queue recommend reflect regret regular relax
rent require research restore review roof route row rubbish
rude ruin rush scale sculptures section secure selfie shade
shame sheer sightseeing significant similar site skip slight
slow smell soak somewhat souvenir specific spectacular
splendid staircase statues steep straight strict stuff stunning
style sunset superb surroundings symbol taxi thorough
tight tip tire toilet tower transport treat trip unbelievable
underground unique upper vast vendors venue wander
warn waste witness wonder worth worthwhile

Accommodation Review Word List (AcRWL)

absolute abundant access accommodate accompany adult
advice afford amaze ambience amenity anniversary apart
appreciate architecture arrange array aspect assign assist
atmosphere attend attitude attract authentic available avoid
aware awesome balcony beat beverage biking bliss bother
boutique brand breathtaking breeze brilliant bustle butler
cab calm cart carte casual cater celebrate challenge champagne

charm chic chill cocktail combine comfort comfy community
complain complement complex complimentary concierge
condition consist constant convenience courteous courtyard
cozy crew cruise crystal cuisine culinary decent deck
decorate dedicate definite delight deluxe departure deserve
dessert destination disappoint dish divine downside downtown
eager elegance elegant encounter enormous ensure entire
environment equip escort exact exceed exceptional exclude
excursion excursions exemplary exotic exquisite extraordinary
extreme fabulous facilitate factor fantastic fault feature
fed flawless folk forever forward fridge furnish gem
generous genuine gesture getaway glamour glory gorgeous
gourmet gracious grand grateful grill guess handle hassle
heartbeat hesitate hike hire honest honeymoon hopefully
hospitable hospitality host hotel housekeeping huge
humid hustle ideal immaculate immediate impeccable
impress improve incredible individual infinity inform
informative ingredients interior intimate intrusive
invite item itinerary jacuzzi jet keen knowledgeable
kudo landscape layout leisure list literally lobby locate
lot lounge lush magical magnificent maintain majestic
marble massive maximise memorable minor mosquito

multiply negate nestle notch oasis obvious onsite organic
orient origin overall overlook overnight overwhelming
palace palm pampered paradise passion pastries path patio
penny personable petal phenomenon plenty plunge policy
polite porch praise previous pricey pride prior pristine
privacy prompt proximity range refresh region regret
regular rent repeat reside residence roof room rustic
satisfy scenic scent seamless seclude serene session shade
shuttle sightseeing sincere slight spacious sparkle spectacular
spoil spotless steam steep stress stuff stun sumptuous
superb superior surpass surrounding tasty terrace terrific
theme thorough tire toast toiletry tranquil treat tremendous
tropical tub typical ultimate unbelievable unique unwind
upgrade vacation vary vibe vintage yoga yum

Airline Review Word List (AiRWL)

aboard absolute access accommodate adequate adult
advice aeroplane afford ahead aircraft airway amaze
ambience amenity announce appalling apparent appreciate
approach arrange arrogant asleep aspect assist assure
attend attentive avoid aware awesome awful barely
bearable behaviour belt blame blanket board book boring

bother bound breeze brilliant brush bulkhead cabin calm
carousel carrier cater cattle champagne chaos class coach
code comfort comfy compartment compensate compete
complain complimentary compute configuration consist
constant counter courteous cramped crew cruise cuisine
cup curry custom customer decent deck dedicate definite
delay delight depart destination device dirt disabled
disappoint disembarking disgust dish domestic downside
dreamliner duration ease economy edible efficiently elder
email encounter ensure entire equip error especial eventual
exact excellent excess extreme fabulous facilitate fantastic
fare fault feature fed fee feedback flat flawless fleet fly
folks forward frill frustrate fuss galley generous genuine
gluten grant guess handle hassle haul headphone hesitate
honest hopefully horrible hospitality hostess hub huge
hullo hunger ignorant immaculate immediate immigrate
impeccable impress improve inbound inconvenience
incredible individual inedible inflight interior internal isle
issue item jet journey kit lag lavatory lax layout layover
legroom list literally load locate lot lounge loyal luxury
maintain major massive mattress mediocre memorable
minimal minor mistake monitor multiply narrow navigate

neat negate nervous notch obvious occupy odd onboard
onwards opt option origin outbound overall overhead
oversea pack period personnel pillow pitch plenty policy
polite portion premium prior privacy probable proceed
prompt punctual range rear recline refreshment refund
regular relax rely remote rep reputation respond responsible
ridiculous roomy route row rude runway satisfy schedule
scream sector secure segment shame shock shuttle
significant site slight slipper slot slow smell smooth south
spacious spare spicy spotless steward stick stopover
storage straight stress stretch stuff sufficient suitcase
superb superior supervisor takeoff tasty tend terminate
terrible terrific thorough ticket tidy tight tiny tire toddler
toiletry transfer transit treat trolley turbulence typical
uneventful upgrade upper upright upset vary vegan
vegetarian voucher wheelchair worse zone