

【原著】

The Influence of Basic Words on Japanese EFL Learners' Estimated Vocabulary Size

Hitoshi Yashima

基本語彙が推定語彙サイズに与える影響

八 島 等

Abstract

The study examines the Japanese EFL learners' vocabulary at the elementary 1,000- to advanced 3,000-word levels, using a vocabulary estimation test. The data are analyzed according to participants' grades, schools, and groups classified by their success rates in answering at elementary 1,000- or elementary 1,000- to intermediate 1,000-word levels. It also examines the correlation between the receptive knowledge at these levels and participants' estimated vocabulary size (EVS). The study attempts to clarify differences in the EVS among and within these groups. Results show the relatively or rather strong correlation between the receptive knowledge of these levels and participants' EVS. There was a significant difference in the means in EVS among these groups with some exceptions. However, there is no difference in the means in EVS within these groups with some exceptions. I conclude that educators should recognize the knowledge of these basic words greatly influences students' EVS and should devise ways of teaching these words.

1. Introduction

Educators need to determine students' vocabulary size to help them develop their English skills. Yashima (2004) estimated the vocabulary of Japanese EFL high school and university students, using the Vocabulary Estimation Test (VET) at 1,000- to 4,000-word levels. The test was a multiple-choice test with 100 items at each level, an appropriate number to test receptive knowledge (Schmitt, 2000: 166). The average vocabulary for first-year students was 1458.92 words while third-year students' was 2826.95. However, the vocabulary at 5,000- to 6,000-word levels were not measured, so Yashima (2005) estimated the vocabulary size of Japanese EFL learners, using a revised VET at 1,000- to 6,000-word levels. The means in EVS for first-year students was 2,025.23 words while those of third-year students was 3630.32. The study also showed four words difficult even for sophomores to learn at the 1,000-word level, while there were four words whose success rates for first-years were over 70 percent at the 6,000-word level. This showed a need to reclassify all the target words and distractors into six word levels, not according to frequency of students' success rates in answering. Yashima (2006, 2007b) examined the success rate of all these words. According to the results, Yashima (2007a) re-classified 1,800 words used in the VET at the 1,000-

to 6,000-word levels into six word levels: elementary 1,000-, intermediate 1,000-, intermediate 2,000-, advanced 1,000-, advanced 2,000-, and advanced 3,000-word levels (E1,000, I1,000, I2,000, A1,000, A2,000, and A3,000 respectively) and examined participants' vocabulary. The results seemed to show the knowledge of E1,000-word level influenced participants' EVS. This paper attempts to find the influence of the receptive knowledge of E1,000-word level or E1,000- to I1,000-word levels on participants' EVS.

2. The study

2.1. Purpose

The study attempts to clarify how the receptive knowledge of E1,000-word level or E1,000- to I1,000-word levels influences participants' EVS. Classifying participants into four or five groups according to their success rates in answering at these two levels, I examine the difference in their mean EVS among and within these groups.

2.2. Hypotheses

With the above points in mind, I have constructed the following hypotheses:

- (1) There is a strong correlation between the receptive knowledge of E1,000-word level or E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and participants' estimated vocabulary regardless of grades.
- (2) There is a significant difference in the mean total vocabulary among groups classified according to their success rates in answering at these two levels regardless of grades.
- (3) There are no significant differences in the mean total vocabulary within these groups.

2.3. Participants

Participants in this study were 149 first-year students from one Tokyo high school (School A), 319 second-year students from 3 Tokyo high schools (Schools A, B, and C), 147 third-year students from two Tokyo high schools (Schools A and C), and 32 sophomores from a science university. They had been learning English for 3 to 7 years. They were classified into four groups according to their success rates in answering at E1,000-word level: G1 (100%), G2 (95% or more to less than 100%), G3 (90% or more to less than 95%), and G4 (less than 90%). They were also classified into five groups according to their success rates in answering at E1,000- to I1,000-word level: G1 (100%), G2 (95% or more to less than 100%), G3 (90% or more to less than 95%), G4 (80% or more to less than 90%), and G5 (less than 80%).

2.4. Materials

In Yashima (2006, 2007b), participants were tested on 1,800 words used in the VET at the 1,000- to 6,000-word levels taken from the *JACET List of 8000 Basic Words* (JACET 8000). All words were re-classified into six word-levels according to the participants' success rates: E1,000-, I1,000-, I2,000-, A1,000-, A2,000-, and A3,000-word levels. Each word level had 300 words and their success rates were 90.61 percent or more, 70.20 to 89.66 percent, 50.07 to 69.79 percent, 30.22 to 49.75 percent, 21.83 to 30.12 percent, and 21.54 percent or less respectively. Each target word had two distractors at each level, based on Shizuka's (2003) study. Words which were almost the same

in percentage terms at each level were selected as a target word and its two distractors, and words whose percentage was in the middle of the three words were selected as target words in principle. Only nouns, verbs, and adjectives were used.

2.5. Procedure

Participants were given the test at the E1,000- to I2,000- to A1,000- to A3,000-word levels according to school grades. Participants answered as many questions as possible in order of numbers and levels.

2.6. Scoring

If participants could answer one question at each level, they were deemed to have 10 words; regardless of levels. However, there were two cases where participants could choose the correct answer; even when they did not know its meaning. If participants put a circle round the number at the side of the item, they could answer it at a guess with a probability of one in three, so they were regarded as having 3.3 words. If they put a triangle round it, they could answer it because they knew the other two options, so they were regarded as having 6.7 words.

3. Results

3.1. Correlation between the knowledge of the E1,000-word level or the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and participants' EVS

Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations in scores and EVS for first- to third-year senior high school students and sophomore university students. There is little difference among school grades at the E1,000-word level. The means in success rates of 100 target words were more than 95 percent regardless of school grades. Less than 90 percent meant the knowledge of the level was far below the average. The participants were therefore classified 4 ways. The last one consisting of the participants whose success rates was less than 90 percent. Table 1 also shows the means of success rates (even for first-years) are more than 80 percent at the I1,000-word level. The figure was much higher than Yashima (2007), but even in the previous data, the means in success rates were more than 85 percent at the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels regardless of school grades. Less than 80 percent meant the knowledge of these two levels was far below the average. Therefore, participants were classified into five groups with the last one consisting of the participants whose success rates were less than 80 percent. Table 2 shows the correlation between the receptive knowledge of the E1,000-word level or the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and participants' EVS. It was relatively or rather high regardless of levels: $r = .504$ to $.848$ at each level between the E1,000-word level and any EVS except between the E1,000-word level and total EVS for second-years ($.493$). It was also $.713$ to $.941$ at each level between the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and any EVS. It is natural that it was the highest between E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and EVS①, but the figure of $.774$ in total between the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and EVS③ is quite high.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations in Scores and EVS for First- to Third-Year Senior High School Students and Sophomore University Students

<i>Word level</i>		<i>1st years</i> <i>N = 149</i>	<i>2nd years</i> <i>N = 319</i>	<i>3rd years</i> <i>N = 147</i>	<i>Sophomores</i> <i>N = 32</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 647</i>
E1,000	Mean	977.06	991.24	987.92	977.40	986.54
	SD	31.08	14.64	22.57	47.15	23.94
I1,000	Mean	800.86	904.32	914.59	891.78	882.21
	SD	151.82	90.52	94.28	120.07	118.43
E1,000 to I1,000	Mean	1779.92	1895.56	1902.51	1869.18	1868.74
	SD	175.94	99.44	107.02	161.08	135.31
I2,000	Mean	525.93	699.16	775.82	741.24	678.76
	SD	185.76	169.40	165.91	190.12	194.72
EVS①	Mean	2303.86	2594.72	2678.33	2610.41	2547.51
	SD	341.47	249.76	252.97	333.41	310.01
A1,000	Mean		487.83	533.51	525.72	503.72
	SD		172.14	200.68	167.79	180.58
EVS②	Mean		3135.15	3226.01	3136.13	3159.70
	SD		362.96	415.87	477.31	390.42
A2,000	Mean		364.71	372.95	393.72	372.98
	SD		134.54	195.21	187.08	171.83
A3,000	Mean		253.85	173.55	247.17	216.80
	SD		121.17	162.93	121.09	146.13
EVS③	Mean		3687.42	3772.51	3777.02	3739.65
	SD		564.44	699.70	740.26	634.42

Note. EVS①: E1,000- to I2,000-word levels EVS②: E1,000- to A1,000-word levels

EVS③: E1,000- to A3,000-word levels

Table 2

Correlation between the Receptive Knowledge of the E1,000-Word Level or the E1,000- to I1,000-Word Levels and Participants' EVS① to ③

<i>Word level</i>	<i>1st years</i> <i>N = 149</i>	<i>2nd years</i> <i>N = 319</i>	<i>3rd years</i> <i>N = 147</i>	<i>Sophomores</i> <i>N = 32</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 647</i>
E1,000 vs EVS①	.762**	.570**	.530**	.848**	.650**
E1,000 vs EVS②		.504**	.511**	.781**	.525**
E1,000 vs EVS③		.493**	.509**	.694**	.531**
E1,000 to I1,000 vs EVS①	.941**	.877**	.885**	.940**	.912**
E1,000 to I1,000 vs EVS②		.808**	.855**	.882**	.822**
E1,000 to I1,000 vs EVS③		.713**	.833**	.793**	.774**

Note. ** $p < .01$

3.2. Difference in the means in EVS among groups classified according to participants' success rates in answering at the E1,000-word level or the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels

Tables 3 to 5 show the means and standard deviations in EVS① to ③ according to participants' success rates in answering at the E1,000-word level. The means vary according to groups regardless of word levels. A one-way ANOVA shows a significant main effect for groups in EVS① to ③ ($F(3, 643) = 136.51, p < .001, F(3, 334) = 40.93, p < .001, F(3, 199) = 26.98, p < .001$, respectively). A multiple comparison analysis using Tukey HSD's multiple range test shows a

significant difference in the means in EVS① to ② among almost all groups at $p < .001$. There was, however, no significant difference between them for G3 and G4. There was also a significant difference between the means in EVS③ for G1 and G2, G3, and G4 at $p < .001$ and for G 2 and G3 and G4 at $p < .01$ respectively. There was, however, no significant difference between them for G3 and G4.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS① according to Participants' Success Rates in Answering at the E1,000-Word Level

<i>Word level</i>		<i>G1</i> <i>N = 301</i>	<i>G2</i> <i>N = 310</i>	<i>G3</i> <i>N = 29</i>	<i>G4</i> <i>N = 7</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 647</i>
E1,000	Mean	1000.00	982.65	922.03	846.99	986.54
	SD	.00	11.48	15.59	32.67	23.94
EVS①	Mean	2703.07	2469.01	1956.22	1715.64	2547.51
	SD	194.92	267.05	329.18	498.40	310.01

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS② according to Participants' Success Rates in Answering at the E1,000-Word Level

<i>Word level</i>		<i>G1</i> <i>N = 182</i>	<i>G2</i> <i>N = 142</i>	<i>G3</i> <i>N = 11</i>	<i>G4</i> <i>N = 3</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 338</i>
E1,000	Mean	1000.00	984.60	921.15	826.63	989.43
	SD	.00	10.52	15.47	15.23	22.65
EVS②	Mean	3308.78	3042.10	2436.10	2335.27	3159.70
	SD	306.35	365.41	309.74	627.74	390.42

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS③ according to Participants' Success Rates in Answering at the E1,000-Word Level

<i>Word level</i>		<i>G1</i> <i>N = 99</i>	<i>G2</i> <i>N = 93</i>	<i>G3</i> <i>N = 8</i>	<i>G4</i> <i>N = 3</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 203</i>
E1,000	Mean	1000.00	982.80	922.88	826.63	986.52
	SD	.00	11.48	12.83	15.23	26.52
EVS③	Mean	4044.29	3527.89	2872.86	2565.27	3739.65
	SD	508.52	572.91	475.48	581.76	634.42

Tables 6 to 8 show the means and standard deviations in EVS① to ③ according to participants' success rates in answering at the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels. The means vary according to groups regardless of word levels. The one-way ANOVA shows a significant main effect for groups in EVS① to ③ ($F(4, 642) = 576.39, p < .001, F(4, 333) = 623.88, p < .001, F(4, 198) = 82.55, p < .001$, respectively). The multiple comparison analysis using Tukey HSD's multiple range test shows a significant difference in the means in EVS① to ② among all groups at $p < .001$. There was also a significant difference in the means in EVS③ among all groups at $p < .001$ except the case between G3 and G4 at $p < .01$.

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS① according to Participants' Success Rates in Answering at the E1,000- to I1,000-Word Level

<i>Word level</i>		<i>G1</i> <i>N = 27</i>	<i>G2</i> <i>N = 322</i>	<i>G3</i> <i>N = 174</i>	<i>G4</i> <i>N = 95</i>	<i>G5</i> <i>N = 29</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 647</i>
E1,000 to I1,000	Mean	2000.00	1951.39	1849.04	1715.84	1431.48	1868.74
	SD	.00	26.17	33.56	66.33	139.77	135.31
EVS①	Mean	2893.40	2739.41	2467.51	2199.21	1699.06	2547.51
	SD	106.48	143.50	133.57	145.80	234.84	310.01

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS② according to Participants' Success Rates in Answering at the E1,000- to I1,000-Word Level

<i>Word level</i>		<i>G1</i> <i>N = 22</i>	<i>G2</i> <i>N = 201</i>	<i>G3</i> <i>N = 85</i>	<i>G4</i> <i>N = 21</i>	<i>G5</i> <i>N = 9</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 338</i>
E1,000 to I1,000	Mean	2000.00	1952.91	1850.14	1706.51	1499.88	1902.76
	SD	.00	25.71	38.74	51.15	121.92	104.04
EVS②	Mean	3627.38	3325.01	2912.46	2547.64	2087.90	3159.70
	SD	250.03	249.32	309.74	170.54	205.87	390.42

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS③ according to participants' Success Rates in Answering at the E1,000- to I1,000-Word Level

<i>Word level</i>		<i>G1</i> <i>N = 15</i>	<i>G2</i> <i>N = 110</i>	<i>G3</i> <i>N = 58</i>	<i>G4</i> <i>N = 14</i>	<i>G5</i> <i>N = 6</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 203</i>
E1,000 to I1,000	Mean	2000.00	1952.08	1846.09	1706.61	1472.98	1894.25
	SD	.00	27.38	43.58	57.54	144.03	112.68
EVS③	Mean	4606.38	4012.40	3338.95	2985.67	2206.45	3739.65
	SD	509.33	400.07	361.05	369.32	197.37	634.42

These results were almost the same as those according to grades. The exception in the case according to success rates in answering at the E1,000-word level was, as there were no or few G4 members for second- and third-years and university sophomores, the statistical results were different from the ones above. There was also one exception in the case according to success rates in answering at the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels for university sophomores, there was no significant difference in the means in EVS① to ③ between G1 and G2. This is also because there were only two members in G1.

3.3. Difference in the means in EVS within groups classified according to participants' success rates in answering at the E1,000-word level or E1,000- to I1,000-word levels

Tables 9 to 11 show the means and standard deviations in EVS① to ③ for G1 at the E1,000-word level according to participants' school grades. The means do not vary much according to grades. A one-way ANOVA shows a significant main effect for grades in EVS① to ③ for G1 ($F(3, 297) = 19.15, p < .001, F(2, 179) = 6.02, p < .01, F(2, 96) = .88, n.s.,$ respectively). A multiple

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS① for G1 according to Grades

<i>Word level</i>		<i>1st years</i> <i>N = 43</i>	<i>2nd years</i> <i>N = 164</i>	<i>3rd years</i> <i>N = 78</i>	<i>Sophomores</i> <i>N = 16</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 301</i>
EVS①	Mean	2547.38	2693.16	2794.01	2794.70	2703.86
	SD	177.29	185.22	176.12	114.77	194.38

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS② for G1 according to Grades

<i>Word level</i>		<i>1st years</i> <i>N = 0</i>	<i>2nd years</i> <i>N = 117</i>	<i>3rd years</i> <i>N = 49</i>	<i>Sophomores</i> <i>N = 16</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 182</i>
EVS②	Mean		3251.65	3413.66	3405.32	3308.78
	SD		298.45	315.11	233.58	306.35

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS③ for G1 according to Grades

<i>Word level</i>		<i>1st years</i> <i>N = 0</i>	<i>2nd years</i> <i>N = 34</i>	<i>3rd years</i> <i>N = 49</i>	<i>Sophomores</i> <i>N = 16</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 99</i>
EVS③	Mean		3967.29	4057.34	4167.93	4044.29
	SD		468.13	538.07	500.56	508.52

comparison analysis using Tukey HSD's multiple range test shows a significant difference in the means in EVS① between first- and second-years, first- and third-years, first- years and university sophomores, and second- and third-years at $p < .001$ respectively, and also in the means in EVS② between second- and third-years at $p < .01$. There was, however, no significant difference in them in the other cases.

Tables 12 to 14 show the means and standard deviations in EVS① to ③ for G2 at the E1,000-word level according to participants' school grades. The means do not much vary according to grades, either. The one-way ANOVA shows a significant main effect for grades in EVS① to ③ for G2 ($F(3, 306) = 18.12, p < .001, F(2, 139) = .06, n.s., F(2, 90) = .80, n.s.,$ respectively). The multiple comparison analysis using Tukey HSD's multiple range test shows a significant difference in the means in EVS① between first- and second-years, and first- and third-years at $p < .001$ respectively, and first-years and university sophomores at $p < .01$. There was, however, no significant difference

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS① for G2 according to Grades

<i>Word level</i>		<i>1st years</i> <i>N = 87</i>	<i>2nd years</i> <i>N = 148</i>	<i>3rd years</i> <i>N = 62</i>	<i>Sophomores</i> <i>N = 13</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 310</i>
E1,000	Mean	980.69	984.60	981.73	977.96	982.65
	SD	11.82	10.77	11.67	13.21	11.48
EVS①	Mean	2308.34	2513.82	2575.35	2545.55	2469.79
	SD	247.96	245.62	246.49	262.34	266.88

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS② for G2 according to Grades

<i>Word level</i>		<i>1st years</i> <i>N = 0</i>	<i>2nd years</i> <i>N = 92</i>	<i>3rd years</i> <i>N = 37</i>	<i>Sophomores</i> <i>N = 13</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 142</i>
E1,000	Mean		986.63	981.90	977.96	984.60
	SD		9.09	11.51	13.21	10.53
EVS②	Mean		3039.92	3056.06	3017.85	3042.10
	SD		348.81	401.22	402.50	365.41

Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations in EVS③ for G2 according to Grades

<i>Word level</i>		<i>1st years</i> <i>N = 0</i>	<i>2nd years</i> <i>N = 43</i>	<i>3rd years</i> <i>N = 37</i>	<i>Sophomores</i> <i>N = 13</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>N = 93</i>
E1,000	Mean		985.04	981.90	977.96	982.80
	SD		10.58	11.51	13.21	11.48
EVS③	Mean		3520.38	3515.74	3587.33	3527.89
	SD		480.34	654.73	646.77	572.91

in them in the other cases.

The results for G3 and G4 at the E1,000-word levels and for G1 to G4 at the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels were almost true of the ones above. There was a significant difference in the means in EVS① between first-years and the other school grades in G3 and G4 at $p < .001$, $p < .01$, or $p < .05$ respectively in almost all cases at the E1,000-word levels, and in the means in EVS② between second- and third-years in G2 at the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels. There was, however, no significant difference in them in the other cases.

4. Discussion

Table 2 shows the relatively or rather strong correlation between the receptive knowledge of the E1,000-word level or the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and participants' EVS: r = about .500 to .850 at each level between the E1,000-word level and any EVS. It was also about .710 to .940 at each level between the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and any EVS. It is natural that it was the highest between the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and EVS①: r = .912 in total because these two levels are next to each other, but the figures of .532 in total between the E1,000-word level and EVS③ and of .774 in total between the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and EVS③ are surprisingly high. The results at the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels greatly influence participants' total EVS. My first hypothesis could be accepted.

Tables 3 to 5 show there is a clear difference in the means in EVS① to ③ among groups classified according to participants' success rates in answering at the E1,000-word level. The results of the one-way ANOVA confirm there was a significant difference in the means in EVS① to ③ among all groups at the E1,000-word level except the case between G3 and G4. Tables 6 to 8 also show there is a clear difference in the means in EVS① to ③ according to participants' success rates in answering at the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels. The results of the one-way ANOVA

also confirm there was a significant difference in the means in EVS① to ③ among all groups at the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels. The results according to school grades were also almost the same as the ones above. The second hypothesis could be accepted.

Tables 9 to 11 show little difference in the means in EVS① to ③ within G1 classified according to participants' success rates in answering at the E1,000-word level. The results of the one-way ANOVA confirm there was no significant difference in the means in EVS① to ③ within G1 at the E1,000-word level regardless of school grades except the cases in the means in EVS① between first-years and the other school grades and between second- and third-years and in the means in EVS② between second- and third-years. Tables 12 to 14 also show there is little difference in the means in EVS① to ③ within G2 classified according to participants' success rates in answering at E1,000-word level. The results of the one-way ANOVA confirm there was no significant difference in the means in EVS① to ③ within G2 at the E1,000-word level regardless of school grades except the case in the means in EVS① between first-years and the other school grades. The results for G3 and G4 at the E1,000-word levels and for G1 to G4 at the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels were almost true of the ones above. The third hypothesis could also be accepted.

5. Conclusion and implications

This study shows the relatively or rather strong correlation between the receptive knowledge of the E1,000-word level or the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and participants' EVS, especially between the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels and participants' EVS in total. The results indicate the knowledge of the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels greatly influence on participants' total EVS. These findings suggest educators should recognize they should devise ways to have their students acquire words at these levels. Moreover, Nation and Waring's (1997) claims a vocabulary size of 3,000 words is the key to success in performing functionally in English. Therefore, acquiring a vocabulary size of 2,000 to 3,000 words is essential to Japanese EFL learners.

This study also shows a significant difference in the means in EVS① to ③ among all groups at the E1,000-word level with some exceptions and there was also a significant difference in the means in EVS① to ③ among all groups at the E1,000- to I1,000-word levels. There were no significant differences in the means in any EVS even between G1 (100%) and G2 (95% or more to less than 100%) at the E1,000-word level there is only a slight difference in the receptive knowledge at the E1,000-word level greatly affects any EVS. In other words, it is important for Japanese EFL learners to acquire such basic words as those at the E1,000-word level perfectly. These words are high-frequency, and many third-year students are likely to encounter them when reading additional materials for university entrance examinations. However, as authorized textbooks are often the only source for first- and second-years, there is a chance some of these words don't or rarely appear. The more frequently they encounter them, the easier students acquire these words. These findings suggest educators should encourage their students, especially first- and second-years, to read and listen to additional materials.

There were no significant difference in the means in EVS① to ③ within groups at the both E1,000- and E1,000- to I1,000-word levels regardless of school grades with some exceptions in first-years' data indicate we can estimate learners' total vocabulary size based on their scores at

the E1,000- and/or E1,000- to I1,000-word levels. However, first-years are the exceptions because they generally don't have much vocabulary at I2,000- to A3,000-word levels. These findings suggest educators should encourage their students to enhance their vocabulary, estimating their total vocabulary size based on their scores at the E1,000- and/or E1,000- to I1,000-word levels. Based on this study, some words should be reclassified into another level. After changing the point at each level, I would like to measure learners' vocabulary achievement again.

Notes

1. This paper is based on the contents of a presentation titled "Identifying Words Difficult for Japanese EFL Learners to Acquire by a Revised Vocabulary Estimation Test" given at the 34th JASELE annual convention in Sapporo. Some of the data has been updated since the presentation.
2. All participants gave the author their consent to use any information gathered in this study.

References

- JACET Basic Words Revision Committee. (Ed.). (2003). *JACET List of 8000 Basic Words*. Tokyo: Japan Association of College English Teachers.
- Mochizuki, M. (1998). Nihonjin eigo gakushusha no tame no goi size test [The vocabulary size test for Japanese EFL learners]. *The IRLT Bulletin*, 12, 45–52.
- Nation, I. S. 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). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shizuka, T. (2003, August). *Can testers predict the worst-functioning distractors? Implications for multiple-choice item writing*. Paper presented at the 29th JASELE annual convention in Miyagi.
- Yashima, H. (2004, August). *The development of a vocabulary size estimation test for Japanese EFL learners*. Paper presented at the 30th JASELE annual convention in Nagano.
- Yashima, H. (2005, August). *Identifying words difficult for Japanese EFL learners to acquire by a revised vocabulary estimation test*. Paper presented at the 31st JASELE annual convention in Hokkaido.
- Yashima, H. (2006, August). *Words difficult for Japanese EFL learners to acquire*. Paper presented at the 32nd JASELE annual convention in Kochi.
- Yashima, H. (2007a, August). *The development of a vocabulary achievement test for Japanese EFL learners*. Paper presented at the 33rd JASELE annual convention in Oita.
- Yashima, H. (2007b, August). *Words easy or difficult for Japanese EFL learners to acquire*. Paper presented at the 31st KATE annual convention in Chiba.
- Wisdom English-Japanese dictionary*. (2003). Tokyo: Sanseido.

—2021年9月22日 受理—