ResearchGate

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350389179

Promoting the Effectiveness of Language Teaching Through Online Academic Word Lists and Extensive Reading in the COVID-19 Pandemic

Chapter · March 2021

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-6745-6.ch009

CITATIONS
2

READS
196

2 authors:

Rifat Kamasak
Yeditepe University
60 PUBLICATIONS **642** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Tuğçe Ezgi Soyaltin
T.C. Istanbul Kultur University
6 PUBLICATIONS **2** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

All content following this page was uploaded by Rifat Kamasak on 07 May 2021.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.

Chapter 9
Promoting the Effectiveness of Language Teaching Through Online Academic Word Lists and Extensive Reading in the COVID-19 Pandemic

Rifat Kamasak
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8768-3569
Yeditepe University, Turkey

Tugce Ezgi Soyaltin
Istanbul Kultur University, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Restricted online class times and limitations of online teaching along with the emotional and psychological challenges faced by students require adequate pedagogical implementations in the COVID-19 pandemic. In line with this requirement, while academic word lists can help students to focus on prioritised vocabulary, extensive reading can create a pleasant reading environment which might motivate students in unprecedented conditions. Thus, this study aims to propose some pedagogical suggestions such as academic word lists and extensive reading which might contribute to language learning performance of students in the COVID-19 pandemic.

INTRODUCTION

Language education in schools has been severely affected after the emergence of the Covid-19 pandemic and this extraordinary situation compelled nearly every institution to conduct its educational activities online. Every new change brings its own ritual, thus to some extent compulsory online education system required teachers to use technology-related pedagogy and find adequate solutions to increase the effec-

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-6745-6.ch009

Copyright © 2021, IGI Global. Copying or distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of IGI Global is prohibited.

tiveness of language teaching. In fact, the stakeholders of language education who were influenced by the pandemic were not only teachers but also students. The transition from in-class to online teaching and the lockdown enforcements have changed particularly the duration of time that students allocated for studying and extended the hours they spent at home (Mishra, Gupta, & Shree, 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). The compulsory changes on time management in learning and teaching hours compelled teachers to offer more to the point and compact solutions i.e. academic word lists (AWL) on the way of helping students to tackle their language learning challenges. Yet, the students did experience not only linguistic but also social and emotional related challenges in the context of pandemic. Coupled with the anxiety of pandemic, the implementation of lockdown led students and teachers to experience state of feelings like loneliness, isolation, stress and depression (Yavuz, Ozbilgin, & Kamasak, 2019; Mosanya, 2020). Thus, emotional states of students has become more important than ever in current much demanding unprecedented education contexts.

Studies (i.e. Bakla, 2020**;** Renandya & Jacobs, 2016) find that extensive reading (ER) or pleasure reading which appeal to the needs and expectations of language learners might improve learning performance through increasing the pleasure or interest of students without loading additional productive tasks or follow-up language work on their shoulders. Therefore, this paper aims to suggest some language learning methods i.e. AWL and ER which might be useful and motivating for students spending most of their time at home and studying online. The paper starts with detailed explanations on technical sides and linguistic benefits of AWL and ER then continues with how they can contribute to language learning of students in the Covid-19 pandemic. In the final part, some practical implications about the issue are discussed.

BACKGROUND

The Role of Academic Word Lists and Extensive Reading in Language Classrooms

Language learning is a demanding procedure. In particular, academic communication where a dense language (Coxhead, 2000; Wray, 2002) is used, requires learners to have an extensive knowledge of vocabulary which includes words that vary in meanings in specific contexts (Hyland & Tse, 2007; Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010). However, neither instructors can teach nor students can learn every single word within limited online classroom times. Therefore, academic word lists that provide a small number of general high-frequency words can be useful for learners for recognising a large proportion of different discourse types, both academic and non-academic in the context of pandemic.

The strong relationship between vocabulary knowledge of learners and success in second language acquisition (SLA) is evident in the linguistics literature (Carver, 1994; Evans & Morrison, 2011; Laufer, 1992; Milton, Wade, & Hopkins, 2010; Nation, 2006, 2013; Schmitt et al., 2017; Uchihara & Harada, 2018). Alderson (2000) claims that "vocabulary knowledge is not only the single best predictor of text comprehension, but also a strong indicator of listening, speaking, and writing proficiency" (p. 35). Although vocabulary size and language learning relationship is extensively documented, the issues like how much vocabulary is needed by learners for better SLA performance and which words should be prioritised and taught by teachers are still controversial (Coxhead, 2000, 2011; Dang, Coxhead, & Webb, 2017; Gardner & Davies, 2014; Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010). Vocabulary is typically classified into

two groups: technical (academic) vocabulary and general service vocabulary (Coxhead, 2016; Hyland & Tse, 2007). While technical vocabulary refers to academic lexical items that are generally used in English for academic purposes (EAP) programmes, general service vocabulary items are found in most of texts of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) as well as EAP (Coxhead, 2000; Staehr, 2008; West, 1953). Thus, "which words are worth focusing on" (Coxhead, 2000, p. 213) in valuable study times becomes a key question to be answered.

Vocabulary teaching outside the traditional class environment i.e. online education where SMS or mobile assisted language leaning (MALL) applications has been attracting the attention of linguistic scholars nearly for the last twenty years (Kamasak et al., 2020a; Wu, 2015; Derakhshan & Kaivanpanah, 2011; Lu, 2008). The study by Wu (2015) that was conducted on a sample of 70 medical students investigated the ability of online teaching to improve learners' ability to retain English vocabulary. The findings revealed that the students in the online study group remembered nearly 89 more new words than the ones in the face to face group. Similarly, Lu (2008) compared the effectiveness of conventional class based and online technology based vocabulary teaching. The study was conducted on a sample of vocational high school students through a two-week experiment. The results of the study showed that mobile group's vocabulary retention scores were significantly higher than the class based group. These results offered evidence to the claims which suggest that technology oriented and MALL type of AWL applications can be more effective for vocabulary teaching.

Regarding the negative emotional impact of online teaching emerged from the atmosphere of Covid-19 pandemic, ER as a teaching method can increase pleasure, interest and joy of students. Thus, ER which is defined as "the reading of a large amount of material in the second language (L2) over time for personal pleasure or interest, and without the addition of productive tasks or follow-up language work" (Hafiz & Tudor, 1989, p. 4) might particularly offer a motivational effect for students in lockdown periods.

ER is sometimes used interchangeably with free reading or free voluntary reading (Krashen, 2004), pleasure reading (Kavi, Tackie, & Bugyei, 2015; Mikulecky, 1990), sustained silent reading (Grabe, 1991; Macalister, 2008), or book flood (Elley & Mangubhai, 1983; Lin, 2010) in the L2 literature. ER which differs from the intensive reading (IR) activities "in terms of the quantity of reading, the difficulty level of the reading, the freedom students have to choose books, the degree of autonomy enjoyed by the students, and the motivation to continue reading" (Nakanishi, 2015, p. 9), can be considered as a useful approach to improve learners' second language proficiency (Beglar, Hunt, & Kite, 2012; Day & Bamford, 1998; Grabe, 2009; Horst, 2005; McLean & Rouault, 2017) particularly during the time of Covid-19.

The underlying theoretical frameworks along with the effectiveness of word lists that are used in EAP settings along with the benefits of extensive reading are analysed in the following section. First, the theories behind construction of word lists and challenges such as size, representation, word selection and organisation in developing an academic corpora (Coxhead, 2000; Laufer & Ravenhorst-Kalovski, 2010; Staehr, 2008) is explored, then the appropriateness and effectiveness of word lists and extensive reading in L2 learning is discussed.

MAIN FOCUS OF THE CHAPTER

The Development and Effectiveness of Academic Word Lists

In order to address the challenge of selecting English vocabulary for English language classrooms, researchers developed several word lists. West's (1953) General Service List (GSL), Coxhead's (2000) Academic Word List (AWL), Simpson-Vlach and Ellis' (2010) Academic Formulas List (AFL) and Gardner and Davies's (2014) Academic Vocabulary List (AVL) are among the lists which include the words that learners are most likely to encounter in EAP or in ESL and EFL programmes. Yet, "the language necessary for proficiency in academic contexts is quite different from that required for basic interpersonal communicative skills" (Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010, p. 487) and research (Aguilar, 2016; Banister, 2016; Dang et al., 2017; Harrington & Roche, 2014) shows that students need to put considerable amount of additional efforts in EAP settings for successful comprehension. Besides, in line with the variations in the practice and discourse of each discipline where "specific language features and particular subject matter needs" (Hyland & Tse, 2007, p. 236), the academic word lists can be established from different corpuses.

The term academic vocabulary is defined as "the items which are reasonably frequent in a wide range of academic genres but are relatively uncommon in other kinds of texts" (Hyland & Tse, 2007, p. 235). In parallel to this idea, researchers created academic vocabulary lists based on several selection principles of words (Coxhead, 2000; Gardner & Davies, 2014). The roots of academic vocabulary lists trace back to 1953 when West developed a list that was derived from a corpus of five million words. The logic of instruction of these list was simple, "the more frequent items [specific to academic discourse] have the highest utility and should therefore be taught and tested earlier" (Nation, 2001, p. 12). Despite the considerable value of West's (1953) list in teaching the most frequently occurring words in texts, it has been criticised for its huge size, age and need for revision (Coxhead, 2011; Engels, 1968; Richards, 1974). Thus, it has been replaced by the well-known AWL of Coxhead (2000) which contains 570 word families selected from an academic written corpus of 3.5-million running words. Yet, the interest of researchers to identify the most necessary and important words for EAP success has been continuing (Yeldham, 2018; Wright, 2019).

A vocabulary list should cover millions of running words (Simpson-Vlach & Leicher, 2006; Sinclair, 1991), however word selection should not be limited to one or two sources or a few disciplines (Gardner & Davies, 2014). Therefore, a delicate combination of millions of running (Sinclair, 1991) high-frequency occurring words in academic texts (Lessard-Clouston, 2012/2013) "from a wide range of academic disciplines (i.e. arts, commerce, law, and science) and sources such as university textbooks, articles, book chapters, and laboratory manuals" (Dang, 2017, p. 25) on the way of creating an effective academic vocabulary list can become a real challenge. From this point of view, the design of corpus and the criteria for the word selection are the most critical issues in forming an academic vocabulary list because "different criteria can lead to different results" (Coxhead, 2000, p. 217). Dang (2017) states that "AWL was developed from a larger, more balanced, and representative corpus than those used to create previous word lists" (p.25). The validity of AWL was examined in an academic corpus and a non-academic corpus and it was ensured (Dang, 2017; Lesaux et al., 2010; Nation, 2016). The influence of AWL in improving multiple aspects of L2 learning and teaching practice has been empirically proven by intervention studies which measured the differences between treatment and control groups on comprehension of academic texts and achievement (e.g., Lesaux et al., 2010; Matsuoka & Hirsh, 2010; Townsend & Collins,

2009; Townsend et al., 2012). Furthermore, Matsuoka and Hirsh (2010) who regarded Laufer's (1992) 95% lexical coverage threshold as acceptable for adequate comprehension compared the text coverage of different vocabulary lists with the AWL by analysing the entire 44,877-token *New Headway Upper Intermediate Student's Book* (Soars & Soars, 2005). While other lists reached to 93.4% text coverage, the AWL achieved 95.5% text coverage, thus the researchers suggest that pre-teaching the book's lexical units from the AWL would provide additional contribution to overall comprehension.

Despite its widespread use, the AWL raised concerns for two main reasons: "its [poor corpus size and] coverage in particular disciplines and genres" (Hyland & Tse, 2007, p. 238), the limited use of multi-word units and reliance on tokens that are single word units (Gardner & Davies, 2014; Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010) and its weakness to improve academic speaking and writing comprehension of learners (Dang et al., 2017). Hyland and Tse (2007) claim that they offer a new, up-to-date and improved corpus which was developed from nearly 4 million running words including student-generated material (nearly 50%). In contrast to Hyland and Tse (2007), AWL included expert-generated material which aims to improve *receptive* vocabulary knowledge of students. Schmitt (2010) and Nation (2013) identify two aspects of vocabulary knowledge: *receptive* and *productive*. While receptive vocabulary "use means perceiving the form of a word through listening or reading and retrieving its meaning, productive vocabulary use means expressing its meaning though speaking and writing and retrieving and producing the relevant spoken or written form of the word" (Dang, 2017, p. 15).

In order to master a word, learners should know it both receptively and productively (Nation, 2013; Webb, 2009), yet receptive knowledge of a word is learned easier and faster than productive knowledge and it is considered as a first step to prepare learners for reading and listening to academic university-level texts (Coxhead, 2000; Dang, 2017; Schmitt, 2010). Therefore, Hyland and Tse's (2007) corpus selection seems to contradict with the nature of vocabulary lists by mixing in student- with expert-generated material and the researchers do not provide a sufficient justification of mixing these two different sources that makes the ultimate aim of the corpus confusing. Another criticism by Hyland and Tse (2007) is that certain disciplines were represented unequally in the AWL (i.e. 25% to law), yet the number of running tokens used in each subdivision was more or less the same (between 874,723 and 883,214), thus no foundation was seen for this argument. Finally, Hyland and Tse (2007) highlight the importance of field-specialised vocabulary as "all disciplines shape words for their own uses seriously undermines attempts to describe a core academic vocabulary (p. 240).

Indeed, members of an extensive word family may show differences in their core meanings (Nagy & Townsend, 2012). Through a striking example, Gardner and Davies (2014) explain "the differences in primary meanings between react (respond), reactionary (strongly opposed to social or political change), reactivation (to make something happen again), and reactor (a device or apparatus)" (p. 307). These meaning differences may even become more dramatic "as members of word families cross over the various academic disciplines" (Hyland &Tse, 2007, p. 245). Considering the meaning variations, some researchers (i.e., Hancioglu, Neufeld, & Eldridge, 2008; Neufeld, Hancioglu, & Eldridge, 2011) argue that a distinction between academic and general high-frequency words is not useful. Yet, the idea of developing discipline-specific vocabulary lists deserves attention (Dang et al., 2017; Gardner & Davies, 2014; Nation, 2012; Yang, 2015; Kamasak et al. (2020b). Gardner and Davies (2014) suggest that "meaning-variation could be applied to any high-frequency list of English that is based on forms of words, and on different disciplines of the language" (p. 310). However, how much specialisation is needed for the students who prepare for studying at an English medium university and don't know what discipline they want to specialise in yet, seems a question to be answered. Besides, studying or teach-

ing multiple academic vocabulary lists does not seem a realistic option for learners and teachers within limited classroom time.

Regarding the second concern, corpus linguistics states that "recurrent sequences of words, variously called lexical bundles, chunks, multi-word expressions (*inter alia*) are not only salient but also functionally significant" (Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010, p. 487), thus the multi-word units, phrases and formulaic structure of words are crucial for quality of vocabulary knowledge and fluency in processing (Biber, Conrad, & Cortes, 2004; McEnery & Wilson, 1996). Wray (2002) notes that "lexical bundles form the basic building blocks of discourse" (p. 203) and allow speakers to "process and interact, and express their identity with a group" (Coxhead 2008, p. 150). According to the main linguistics theories (i.e. functional, cognitive and usage-based), the entrenchment of language of knowledge is achieved by constructions that are form-meaning mappings in a learner's mind (Ellis, Frey, & Jalkanen, 2009; Goldberg, 2006; Robinson & Ellis, 2008).

Constructions that are "acquired through engaging in meaningful communication" (Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010, p. 488) have strong associations with semantic, pragmatic, and discourse functions. When constructions that constitute multi-word units form a structured inventory of knowledge in a learner's mind, more automatized processing in working memory and easier retrieval in long term memory occur, thus fluency and comprehensive language production can be achieved (Ellis, 2009; Kuiper, 1996; Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010). In line, Simpson-Vlach and Ellis (2010) created an academic formulaic language (AFL) by using recurring strings of 3, 4, or 5 tokens instead of isolated words, thus they aimed to ensure that individual words can be analysed with their collocational and semantic behaviour.

Thus, in response to Hyland and Tse (2007) who claim that "academic words should all be considered only in light of the rhetoric of each discipline" (p. 247), the AFL offered a formulaic structure that might reduce the likelihood of including words that differ in meaning and become useless in different disciplines. Exclusion of the words that were likely to appear together by chance, inclusion of the formulaic words with strong lexical associations, and conduct of word selection to a more comprehensive methodology rather than relying on frequency alone are considered as the main strengths of the AFL (Gardner & Davies, 2014; Nation & Webb, 2011). Simpson-Vlach and Ellis (2010) suggest that their methodology "privileges functional formulas that are most relevant and useful while putting ones that don't merit high priority lower on the list" (p. 494). Furthermore, lexical items are classified based on their "discourse-pragmatic functions" (ibid, p. 497). Against all these strengths, the development of AFL seems complicated and the methodology that AFL employed is not thoroughly explained. Yet, Simpson-Vlach and Ellis (2010) state that the AFL may not be a *resource* to be directly used in the classroom but rather as a *tool* for developing materials that "address the lexical items in context to suit learners' needs" (p. 502).

AWL is not a newly invented teaching tool as aforementioned above. However, considering the restricted online class times and the limitations of online teaching such as lack of technical equipment, technology related problems and internet availability, AWL can be more beneficial and effective for language learners since it may help students to prioritise their specific language learning needs and using their time more economically in the context of pandemic.

The Affective and Motivational Benefits of Extensive Reading

The direct impact of ER on language learning proficiency was generally evaluated by research designs that employed control (or comparison) and treatment groups along with pre-test and post-test measure-

ment methods (Grabe, 2009; Suk, 2017). While some authors found statistically significant differences between the control and ER treated groups based on their pre-test and post-test scores of reading proficiency (i.e. Tanaka & Stapleton, 2007; Lee, 2007), in other studies (i.e. Greenberg et al., 2006; Hitosugi & Day, 2004), groups which underwent ER treatment did not perform better than control groups on post-test measures.

Although the ultimate aim of ER (like other reading approaches) is to develop grammar knowledge, vocabulary growth, and reading comprehension and speed of language learners (Grabe, 2009; Nakanishi, 2015), evidence about its direct impact on the improvement of L2 linguistics skills is inconclusive (Suk, 2017; Yamashita, 2008). Against lack of statistical evidence on the direct relationship between ER treatment and reading performance, in their study, Hitosugi and Day (2004) suggested that participants who were treated with ER programmes "developed more positive attitudes towards their study of Japanese than did the students in the regular class by the end of the semester" (p. 34). Similarly, Kreft and Viebrock (2014) who point out the affective benefits of ER programmes state that ER leads to a significant increase in the amount of foreign or second language materials read by learners through affecting learners' enjoyment of reading. Besides, the autonomy and freedom of learners to choose the reading material at their interests and proficiency levels is considered as a reward to them (Day & Bamford, 1998; Bamford & Day, 2004). Kirchhoff (2013) acknowledges ER as "a teaching practice that is likely to positively influence L2 students' reading motivation" (p. 196). According to Lee, Schallert and Kim (2015), ER "engenders positive attitudes because reading depends on positive attitudes to become a frequent activity in a language learner's life" (p. 42). Therefore, ER creates positive effects on attitude, and L2 reading motivation of learners (Elley, 1991; Mason & Krashen, 1997; Mikami, 2017; Takase, 2007) and it "entails learners reading as much as possible" (Al-Homoud & Schmitt, 2009, p. 383).

The affective benefits of ER such as generation of "feeling of joy while reading" (Lee et al., 2015) and improvement of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to read have been empirically investigated (Al-Homoud & Schmitt, 2009; Hitosugi & Day, 2004; Mikami, 2017; Takase, 2007) in the literature. The study by Takase (2007) have examined the factors that affect L2 reading motivation along with the relationship between reading motivation and performance (amount of L2 reading) on 219 Japanese students who have participated in a one year-long ER programme. The findings indicated L2 reading material, autonomy over choice of materials, and time/external work constraints as the most significant predictors of L2 reading motivation.

Briggs and Walter (2016) carried out an extensive research based on a systematic review of 30 empirical studies of ER and learners' motivations and attitudes. The study provided evidence that "L2 reading proficiency, pre-ER attitudes towards L2 reading, L2 reading material, the interplay between L2 text readability and L2 reading proficiency, autonomy, and time/external work constraints" (p. 6) made the most difference to L2 reading motivation and attitudes in young language learners (11-18 years old).

Despite the contribution of Briggs and Walter's (2016) research on ER's affective benefits on young language learners, especially the dynamic nature of ER implementation necessitates to continue ER effectiveness related studies in different contexts and settings (Ro, 2016). The study by Mikami (2017) investigates the attitudes and motivation of 141 Japanese first- to third- year university students from a private university in the west of Japan towards ER for language learning in language classrooms. The author highlights the contribution of the study by asserting that most of the studies looking at ER implementation and effectiveness on language learning are conducted outside of language classrooms. No sufficient evidence or referencing on this argument was seen in the article. However, the reluctance of teachers to engage in ER practices in language classrooms resulting from contextual factor restrictions

such as limited class time and limited reading material (Day & Bamford, 1998; Grabe, 2009) is mentioned in the literature, thus the contribution of study can be considered adequate from this point of view.

In order to reveal the previous ER instruction methods along with the content (what kind of texts, books, etc.) and amount of ER (reading time per week) that the students received and to understand how they feel towards ER, and what motivates or demotivates them, a 6-item questionnaire which consists qualitative and quantitative parts was established. The 3-item quantitative part collected data regarding the past and current ER practices of students with a 5-point Likert scale and Yes/No answer options whereas 3-item qualitative part used open-ended questions like "Why did you respond so? Write the reasons for the response freely" (p. 488) to obtain richer data. Having administered the questionnaire, quantitative findings were counted as descriptive data and qualitative findings underwent to a content-analysis.

The results showed that only 6% of the students had experienced ER practices as part of their English instruction and 4% of the participants stated that they regularly read books like short stories, folk tales and magazines in English other than academic textbooks. Students' reading time per week widely varied from 5 to 420 minutes. These findings make the calculation of average reading time of the sample meaningless. Given the limited ER instruction experience and English book reading habits of the sample, most of the complementary and insightful data come from qualitative findings.

114 students (80% of the sample) explained their feelings and related factors that made students either willing or reluctant to read more English books. Students' answers were classified as negative, positive and ambivalent feelings towards reading in English. While 13% of students showed ambivalent feeling and 46% of them expressed their negative feelings and demotivating factors as, difficulty of reading material, no interest, lack of English ability, lack of confidence, and lack of opportunity, 41% stated positive reasons as, to improve English abilities, interest, to create life opportunities, to increase English input, and to satisfy their desires of using English. The author speculates that limited past ER practice of the participants might be related to the Japanese EFL context. Although it is difficult to establish a certain link between little practice of ER in language learning and Japanese national education policy based on the findings of this study, the explanation of Mikami seems logical in a sense that the standardised textbook based 6 year Japanese pre-university EFL context which doesn't "provide enough opportunity for students to read extensively in English" (p. 481) might create ambivalent feelings or even dislike of English reading among students. Therefore, this finding supports Briggs and Walter's (2016) findings on pre-ER attitudes towards L2 reading. Furthermore, the study shares similar findings with those of Briggs and Walter (2016) in that it confirms the importance of L2 reading material's level of difficulty and its attractiveness along with L2 reading proficiency of learners. However, the small sample size, lack of interviews in the qualitative part, and reliance of findings mostly to descriptive data limit generalisability of the findings across other university settings.

As another study, Ro (2016) explored the relationship between ER and motivation for 37 international students aged from 18 to 46 at an American University who were treated with different ER practices by two different teachers in the course of English for Academic Purposes (EAP).

The teachers implemented two different ER practices to their students who had been studying English for 8.5 years average. Teacher 1 (T1) implemented a 75-min programme twice a week for 16 weeks to improve critical thinking and reading skills in English which mainly used a textbook but utilised some complementary ER activities such as "literature circle" (a small group critical thinking activity continuing with a presentation based on the articles selected by the students) and "reading debates" (a class discussion based on several reading texts associated with the topic). 20 students of T1 took the programme in a classroom setting.

Teacher 2 (T2) implemented a 65-min academic English programme four times a week for 8 weeks in which he utilised ER approaches such as reading various texts from "newspapers, poems, critical pieces, short academic articles" (p. 34) and doing reading exercises. The programme also included none-ER activities such as making vocabulary logs, writing, and reading comprehension exercises. 17 students of T2 took none-ER part of the programme in the classroom but for the ER part they were free to go to library and borrow whichever book they wanted. While the ways of approaching ER of the teachers differed, T2's approach seemed more ER-oriented. Yet, since the programmes included both ER and non-ER activities, how much of the activities implemented can be counted as ER is not very clear.

In order to understand how reading motivation of students towards ER changed before and after ER implementation, a pre- and post-test through a reading motivation questionnaire with 43 items on a 5-point Likert scale and 5 open-ended questions derived from the studies of Eccles and Wigfield (1995) and Gardner (2001) was conducted. The questionnaire has 5 reading motivational constructs that are expectancy of success, intrinsic value, extrinsic utility value, cost (how time spent for reading was evaluated), and favourable attitudes for other language communities (integrative orientation). However, no result for construct validity and reliability was reported. The open-ended questions included statements like "what you liked/disliked about ER? and would you like to continue ER after the course?" (p. 35). Furthermore, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 7 students at the end of the semester. Therefore, this type of a mixed-methods approach for collecting descriptive and in-depth and rich data is considered robust. The amount of reading was measured through the students' book reports that included number of pages read by students but this kind of performance measurement might embody the weakness of self-report. The quantitative data were analysed by multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) whereas qualitative data underwent to content analysis.

Considering the duration of the courses, T1's class read on average of 581 pages ranging from 176 to 2264 pages in 16 weeks whereas T2's class averaged 311 pages ranging from 55 to 632 pages in 8 weeks. However, the range and standard deviations extremely varied for both classes, thus comparison of the effectiveness of T1 and T2's ER practices on reading amount does not provide sufficient evidence. The findings of MANOVA and pre- and post-tests indicated that students' motivation towards reading has significantly increased in both teachers' courses. MANOVA results confirmed that ER significantly affected all constructs of reading motivation. According to pre- and post-tests, specifically, while increase in intrinsic value was the greatest for T1's class (from 3.90 to 4.26), extrinsic utility value was the greatest for T2's class (from 3.84 to 4.04). Enhancement in intrinsic value might be associated with the ER practices of T1who aims to create an encouraging classroom environment for reading, whereas extrinsic value of motivation might be related with the ER practices of T2 whose goal is to have students to read as much as possible for proficiency improvement. These findings once more support the conclusions drawn from Briggs and Walter (2016), in regard to ER's positive impact on student motivation. Additionally, content analysis of open-ended questionnaires revealed that nearly 85% of students of both classes liked ER and wanted to continue ER activities because ER helped them improve their L2, gave them freedom to select their own books (autonomy) which were easy to read, interesting, enjoyable, relaxing, and useful. In parallel, students who expressed negative attitudes towards ER stated that they disliked ER because of lack of time, boring and/or difficult L2 reading material and uselessness of ER for developing L2 English proficiency. These results were consistent with Briggs and Walter's (2016) report considering L2 reading material, L2 reading proficiency, autonomy, and time/external work constraints as the factors that make the most difference to L2 reading motivation.

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper investigates the potential linguistic and emotional benefits of AWL and ER on students' learning performance in the context of Covid-19 pandemic. Yet, it is essential to consider some issues before deciding to use AWL. Firstly, for younger learners who aim to study in EMI contexts, a general academic vocabulary list can be a starting point. These students may prefer learning general high-frequency academic words to the alternative of not learning them at all until they reach to a certain level of English and decide on their area of specialisation. As a further step, the fields-specific vocabulary can be introduced to learners. Secondly, the purpose of the word list study should be clarified (i.e., receptive or productive) and the level of word families should match the specific purpose (Dang, 2017; Nation, 2016). This will enable learners "to see that word forms with the same stems are related to each other" (Dang, 2017, p. 12). Thus, finding for a learner whether "to recognise or learn a word which is morphologically related to a known word rather than a totally unrelated word" (ibid, p. 12) becomes much easier.

In addition to the use of AWL, ER which can foster learners' initiative through creating an attractive reading environment and an inviting reader community to maintain a life-long reading habit can be very helpful for students particularly in the Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, engaging students in ER through integrating some practices into a reading curriculum should be a target for teachers. In university settings, ER activities can be carried out in online classes, libraries, labs, or at home. For motivational purposes, the teacher-as-role-model should be joining to the online session but might only disrupt his/her silence to help students with difficulty in reading. In combination with short online reading sessions, a regularly scheduled free-reading time outside the online class (at home) where students can choose their own books should be embedded into the curriculum. After free-reading, a conversation on what students read and what they found interesting can be conducted in the online class.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Language learning is a complex phenomenon and the effectiveness of different language teaching methods and tools particularly in the Covid-19 pandemic is a relatively new area that needs to be investigated through additional studies. The integration of mobile technologies that use AWL and ER applications is likely to become more popular in online teaching contexts yet we are in a very early stage to have a concrete conclusion about their effectiveness. Therefore, more sophisticated research designs that include interventions and pre- and post-tests can be used to measure the effectiveness of AWL and ER in online teaching contexts.

CONCLUSION

It should be noted that "knowing a word is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon" (Dougherty-Stahl & Bravo, 2010, p. 567) and teaching words in isolation or just for receptive purposes can be problematic. Although individual words can be formulaic as Wray (2002) says "words or word strings … processed without recourse to their lowest level of composition" (p. 4), phrases should be practiced in context to develop productive tasks. Formulaic language should mean fixed or semi-fixed multi-word expressions which have different and independent meanings than their individual parts. The interest and required

skills of learners should be understood to decide which multi-word expressions are needed. While some fixed expressions such as "please hold the line" are only used in listening or speaking practices, others like "yours faithfully" are only used in writing activities. As Simpson-Vlach and Ellis (2010) state, the vocabulary syllabus should also consider pedagogical choices and inform instructors how to teach the vocabulary such as which exercises (i.e., noticing, retrieval or generative) can be used to teach verb noun collocations.

The effectiveness of ER is subject to "a significant effort to motivate students" (Grabe, 2009, p. 326). Therefore, constant participation of teachers in forms of "reading aloud to students, repeated timed reading, and multiple re-reading of a text" (Grabe, 2009, p. 327) can particularly help adult students grasp the excitement of reading (Stoller, 2015). Moreover, ER is dependent to the initiative of the learner and should not involve any coercion and compulsion (Day & Bamford, 1998). Given profound emotional and psychological consequences emerged from lockdown enforcements and disruption in students' daily routines and social interaction with friends and family members, creation of a pleasant teaching environment should be the priority of teachers.

REFERENCES

Aguilar, M. (2016). Seminars. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 335–347). Routledge.

Al-Homoud, F., & Schmitt, N. (2009). Extensive reading in a challenging environment: A comparison of extensive and intensive reading approaches in Saudi Arabia. *Language Teaching Research*, *13*(4), 383–401. doi:10.1177/1362168809341508

Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing Reading*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511732935

Bakla, A. (2020). Extensive reading and web 2.0 tools in tandem: A mixed-methods study. *Education and Information Technologies*, *25*(4), 3131–3160. doi:10.100710639-020-10103-9

Bamford, J., & Day, R. R. (2004). *Extensive Reading Activities for Teaching Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Banister, C. (2016). The Academic Word List: Exploring teacher practices, attitudes and beliefs through a web-based survey and interviews. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, *4*, 309–325.

Beglar, D., Hunt, A., & Kite, Y. (2012). The effect of pleasure reading on Japanese EFL learners' reading rates. *Language Learning*, *62*(3), 665–703. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00651.x

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004). If you look at . . .: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, *25*(3), 371–405. doi:10.1093/applin/25.3.371

Briggs, J. G., & Walter, C. (2016). *Read On! Extensive Reading and young second language learners' motivation and attitudes*. A report commissioned by Oxford University Press.

Carver, R. P. (1994). Percentage of unknown vocabulary words in text as a function of the relative difficulty of the text: Implications for instruction. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *26*(4), 413–437. doi:10.1080/10862969409547861

Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(2), 213–238. doi:10.2307/3587951

Coxhead, A. (2008). Phraseology and English for academic purposes: Challenges and opportunities. In F. Meunier & S. Granger (Eds.), *Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 149–161). John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/z.138.12cox

Coxhead, A. (2011). The academic word list 10 years on: Research and teaching implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, *45*(2), 355–362. doi:10.5054/tq.2011.254528

Coxhead, A. (2016). Reflecting on Coxhead (2000) "A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, *50*(1), 181–185. doi:10.1002/tesq.287

Dang, T. N. Y. (2017). *Investigating vocabulary in academic spoken English: Corpora, teachers, and learners* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

Dang, T. N. Y., Coxhead, A., & Webb, S. (2017). The academic spoken word list. *Language Learning*, *67*(4), 959–997. doi:10.1111/lang.12253

Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive Reading in the Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1177/003368829802900211

Derakhshan, A., & Kaivanpanah, S. (2011). The Impact of text-messaging on EFL freshmen's vocabulary learning. *EUROCALL*, 39-47.

Dougherty-Stahl, K. A., & Bravo, M. A. (2010). Contemporary classroom vocabulary assessment for content areas. *The Reading Teacher*, *63*(7), 566–578. doi:10.1598/RT.63.7.4

Eccles, S., & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the actor: The structure of adolescents achievement task values and expectancy-related beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*(3), 215–225. doi:10.1177/0146167295213003

Eldridge, J., Neufeld, S., & Hancioglu, N. (2010). Towards a lexical framework for CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, *1*, 80–95.

Elley, W. B. (1991). Acquiring literacy in a second language: The effect of book-based programs. *Language Learning*, *41*(3), 375–411. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1991.tb00611.x

Elley, W. B., & Mangubhai, F. (1983). The impact of reading on second language learning. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *9*(1), 53–67. doi:10.2307/747337

Ellis, N. C. (2009). Optimizing the input: Frequency and sampling in usage-based and form-focussed learning. In M. H. Long & C. Doughty (Eds.), *Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Teaching* (pp. 139–158). Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781444315783.ch9

Ellis, N. C., Frey, E., & Jalkanen, I. (2009). The psycholinguistic reality of collocation and semantic prosody (1): Lexical access. In U. Römer & R. Schulze (Eds.), *Exploring the Lexis-Grammar Interface* (pp. 89–114). John Benjamins. doi:10.1075cl.35.07ell

Engels, L. K. (1968). The fallacy of word counts. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *6*, 213–231.

Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2011). The first term at university: Implications for EAP. *ELT Journal*, *65*(4), 387–397. doi:10.1093/elt/ccq072

Gardner, D., & Davies, M. (2014). A new academic vocabulary list. *Applied Linguistics*, *35*(3), 305–327. doi:10.1093/applin/amt015

Gardner, R. C. (2001). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 1–19). University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Centre.

Goldberg, A. E. (2006). *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford University Press.

Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*(3), 375–406. doi:10.2307/3586977

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Greenberg, D., Rodrigo, V., Berry, A., Brink, T., & Joseph, H. (2006). Implementation of an extensive reading program with adult learners. *Adult Basic Education*, *16*(2), 81–97.

Hafiz, F., & Tudor, I. (1989). Extensive reading and the development of language skills. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *43*(1), 4–11. doi:10.1093/elt/43.1.4

Hancioglu, N., Neufeld, S., & Eldridge, J. (2008). Through the looking glass and into the land of lexico-grammar. *English for Specific Purposes*, *27*(4), 459–479. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2008.08.001

Harrington, M., & Roche, T. (2014). Identifying academically at-risk students in an English-as-a-lingua-franca university setting. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *15*, 37–47. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2014.05.003

Hitosugi, C. I., & Day, R. R. (2004). Extensive reading in Japanese. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *16*(1), 20–39.

Horst, M. (2005). Learning L2 vocabulary through extensive reading: A measurement study. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *61*(3), 355–382. doi:10.3138/cmlr.61.3.355

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2007). Is there an "academic vocabulary"? *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*(2), 235–253. doi:10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00058.x

Kamasak, R., Özbilgin, M. F., Atay, D., & Kar, A. (2020a). The effectiveness of Mobile Assisted Language Learning (MALL): Some critical reviews. In A. S. Moura, P. Reis, & M. N. D. S. Cordeiro (Eds.), *Determining the Reliability of Online Assessment and Distance Learning* (pp. 194–212). IGI Global Publications.

Kamasak, R., Özbilgin, M. F., & Esmen, A. R. (2020b). The high stakes use of language proficiency tests as illusio and pyramid scheme: An evaluation of their social aspects, validity and reliability. In Y. Inoue-Smith & T. McVey (Eds.), *Optimizing Higher Education Learning through Activities and Assessments* (pp. 188–203). IGI Global Publications. doi:10.4018/978-1-7998-4036-7.ch010

Kavi, R. K., Tackie, S. N. B., & Bugyei, K. A. (2015). Reading for pleasure among junior high school students: case study of the Saint Andrew`s Anglican Complex Junior High School, Sekondi. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Retrieved from: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3251&context=libphilprac

Kirchhoff, C. (2013). L2 extensive reading and flow: Clarifying the relationship. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *25*(2), 192–212.

Krashen, S. D. (2004). *The Power of Reading: Insights from the Research* (2nd ed.). Libraries Unlimited.

Kreft, A., & Viebrock, B. (2014). To read or not to read: Does a suitcase full of books do the trick in the English language classroom? *CLELE Journal*, *2*(1), 72–91.

Kuiper, K. (1996). *Smooth Talkers: The Linguistic Performance of Auctioneers and Sportscasters*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Laufer, B. (1992). How much lexis is necessary for reading comprehension? In H. Bejoint & P. Arnaud (Eds.), *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 126–132). Macmillan. doi:10.1007/978-1-349-12396-4_12

Laufer, B., & Ravenhorst-Kalovski, G. C. (2010). Lexical threshold revisited: Lexical text coverage, learners' vocabulary size and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *22*, 15–30.

Lee, J., Schallert, D. L., & Kim, E. (2015). Effects of extensive reading and translation activities on grammar knowledge and attitudes for EFL adolescents. *System*, *52*(1), 38–50. doi:10.1016/j.system.2015.04.016

Lee, S. (2007). Revelations from three consecutive studies on extensive reading. *RELC Journal*, *38*(2), 150–170. doi:10.1177/0033688207079730

Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., Faller, S. E., & Kelley, J. G. (2010). The effectiveness and ease of implementation of an academic vocabulary intervention for linguistically diverse students in urban middle schools. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *45*(2), 196–228. doi:10.1598/RRQ.45.2.3

Lessard-Clouston, M. (2012/13). Word lists for vocabulary learning and teaching. *The CATESOL Journal*, *24*, 287–304.

Lin, C. C. (2010). "E-Book Flood" for changing EFL learners. *US-China Education Review*, *7*(11), 36–43.

Lu, M. (2008). Effectiveness of vocabulary learning via mobile phone. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *24*(6), 515–525. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2008.00289.x

Macalister, J. (2008). Implementing extensive reading in an EAP program. *ELT Journal*, *62*(3), 248–256. doi:10.1093/elt/ccm021

Mason, B., & Krashen, S. D. (1997). Extensive reading in English as a foreign language. *System*, *25*(1), 91–102. doi:10.1016/S0346-251X(96)00063-2

Matsuoka, W., & Hirsh, D. (2010). Vocabulary learning through reading: Does an ELT course book provide good opportunities? *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *22*, 56–70.

McEnery, T., & Wilson, A. (1996). *Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.

McLean, S., & Rouault, G. (2017). The effectiveness and efficiency of extensive reading at developing reading rates. *System*, *70*(1), 92–106. doi:10.1016/j.system.2017.09.003

Mikami, A. (2017). Students' attitudes toward extensive reading in the Japanese EFL context. *TESOL Journal*, *8*(2), 471–488. doi:10.1002/tesj.283

Mikulecky, B. S. (1990). *A Short Course in Teaching Reading Skills*. Addison-Wesley.

Milton, J., Wade, J., & Hopkins, N. (2010). Aural word recognition and oral competence in English as a foreign language. In Insights into Non-native Vocabulary Teaching and Learning (pp. 83–98). Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. doi:10.21832/9781847692900-007

Mishra, L., Gupta, T., & Shree, A. (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*. . doi:10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100012

Mosanya, M. (2020). Buffering academic stress during the COVID-19 pandemic related social isolation: grit and growth mindset as protective factors against the impact of loneliness. *International Journal of Applied Positive Psychology*. . doi:10.100741042-020-00043-7

Nagy, W., & Townsend, D. (2012). Words as tools: Learning academic vocabulary as language acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *47*(1), 91–108. doi:10.1002/RRQ.011

Nakanishi, T. (2015). A meta-analysis of extensive reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, *49*(1), 6–37. doi:10.1002/tesq.157

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139524759

Nation, I. S. P. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *63*(1), 59–82. doi:10.3138/cmlr.63.1.59

Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139858656

Nation, I. S. P. (2016). *Making and Using Word Lists for Language Learning and Testing*. John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/z.208

Nation, I. S. P., & Webb, S. (2011). *Researching and Analyzing Vocabulary*. Heinle, Cengage Learning.

Neufeld, S., Hancioglu, N., & Eldridge, J. (2011). Beware the range in RANGE, and the academic in AWL. *System*, *39*(4), 533–538. doi:10.1016/j.system.2011.10.010

Renandya, W. A., & Jacobs, G. M. (2016). Extensive reading and listening in the L2 classroom. In W. Renandya & H. Widodo (Eds.), *English language teaching today. English language education* (Vol. 5). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2_8

Richards, J. (1974). Word lists: Problems and prospects. *RELC Journal*, *5*(2), 69–84. doi:10.1177/003368827400500207

Ro, E. (2016). Exploring teachers' practices and students' perceptions of the extensive reading approach in EAP reading classes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *22*(1), 32–41. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2016.01.006

Robinson, P., & Ellis, N. C. (2008). *A Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203938560

Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching Vocabulary: A Vocabulary Research Manual*. Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9780230293977

Schmitt, N., Cobb, T., Horst, M., & Schmitt, D. (2017). How much vocabulary is needed to use English? Replication of van Zeeland & Schmitt (2012), Nation (2006) and Cobb (2007). *Language Teaching*, *50*(2), 212–226. doi:10.1017/S0261444815000075

Simpson-Vlach, R., & Ellis, N. C. (2010). An academic formulas list: New methods in phraseology research. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*(4), 487–512. doi:10.1093/applin/amp058

Simpson-Vlach, R., & Leicher, S. (2006). *The MICASE Handbook: A Resource for Users of the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English*. University of Michigan Press. doi:10.3998/mpub.101203

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance and Collocation*. Oxford University Press.

Soars, L., & Soars, J. (2005). *New Headway: Upper-intermediate Student's Book* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Staehr, L. S. (2008). Vocabulary size and the skills of listening, reading and writing. *Language Learning Journal*, *36*(2), 139–152. doi:10.1080/09571730802389975

Stoller, F. L. (2015). Viewing extensive reading from different vantage points. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *27*(1), 152–159.

Suk, N. (2017). The effects of extensive reading on reading comprehension, reading rate, and vocabulary acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *52*(1), 73–89. doi:10.1002/rrq.152

Takase, A. (2007). Japanese high school students' motivation for extensive L2 reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *19*(1), 1–18.

Tanaka, H., & Stapleton, P. (2007). Increasing reading input in Japanese high school EFL classrooms: An empirical study exploring the efficacy of extensive reading. *The Reading Matrix*, *7*(1), 115–131.

Townsend, D., & Collins, P. (2009). Academic vocabulary and middle school English learners: An intervention study. *Reading and Writing*, *22*(9), 993–1019. doi:10.100711145-008-9141-y

Townsend, D., Filippini, A., Collins, P., & Biancarosa, G. (2012). Evidence for the importance of academic word knowledge for the academic achievement of diverse middle school students. *The Elementary School Journal*, *112*(3), 497–518. doi:10.1086/663301

Uchihara, T., & Harada, T. (2018). Roles of vocabulary knowledge for success in English-medium instruction: Self-perceptions and academic outcomes of Japanese undergraduates. *TESOL Quarterly*, *52*(3), 564–587. doi:10.1002/tesq.453

Webb, S. (2009). The effects of receptive and productive learning of word pairs on vocabulary knowledge. *RELC Journal*, *40*(3), 360–376. doi:10.1177/0033688209343854

West, M. (1953). *A General Service List of English Words*. Longman.

Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511519772

Wright, H. R. (2019). Lexical bundles in stand-alone literature reviews: Sections, frequencies, and functions. *English for Specific Purposes*, *54*, 1–14. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2018.09.001

Wu, Q. (2015). Designing a smartphone app to teach English (L2) vocabulary. *Computers & Education*, *85*(1), 170–179. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2015.02.013

Yamashita, J. (2008). Extensive reading and development of different aspects of L2 proficiency. *System*, *36*(4), 661–672. doi:10.1016/j.system.2008.04.003

Yang, M.-N. (2015). A nursing academic word list. *English for Specific Purposes*, *37*, 27–38. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2014.05.003

Yavuz, M., Ozbilgin, M. F., & Kamasak, R. (2019). Exploring the interplay between deviance and loneliness. In N. Sharma (Ed.), *Analyzing Workplace Deviance in Modern Organizations* (pp. 48–65). IGI Global Publications.

Yeldham, M. (2018). The influence of formulaic language on L2 listener decoding in extended discourse. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *2*(2), 105–119. doi:10.1080/17501229.2015.1103246

Zhang, W., Wang, Y., Yang, L., & Wang, C. (2020). Suspending classes without stopping learning: China's education emergency management policy in the COVID-19 outbreak. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, *13*(55), 2–6. doi:10.3390/jrfm13030055

ADDITIONAL READING

Berman, R., & Cheng, L. (2001). English academic language skills: Perceived difficulties by undergraduate and graduate students, and their academic achievement. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*, 25–40.

Hsu, W. (2013). Bridging the vocabulary gap for EFL medical undergraduates: The establishment of a medical word list. *Language Teaching Research*, *17*(4), 454–484. doi:10.1177/1362168813494121

Hunston, S. (2019). Patterns, constructions, and applied linguistics. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *24*(3), 324–353. doi:10.1075/ijcl.00015.hun

Krashen, S., & Mason, B. (2017). Sustained silent reading in foreign language education: An update. *Turkish Online J. English Lang. Teach*, *2*(2), 70–73.

Malmström, H., Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2018). Words for what? Contrasting university students' receptive and productive academic vocabulary needs. *English for Specific Purposes*, *50*, 28–39. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2017.11.002

Maxim, H. H. III. (2002). A study into the feasibility and effects of reading extended authentic discourse in the beginning German language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *86*(1), 20–35. doi:10.1111/1540-4781.00134

Shi, Z., Luo, G., & He, L. (2017). Mobile-assisted language learning using Wechat instant messaging. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, *12*(2), 16–26. doi:10.3991/ijet.v12i02.6681

Tien, C. Y. (2015). A large-scale study on extensive reading program for non-English majors: Factors and attitudes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *4*(4), 46–54.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Academic Word List: A word list that provides a small number of general high-frequency words which can be useful for learners in a specific area.

COVID-19: A pandemic that has emerged in 2019.

English as a Foreign Language: The use of English by speakers from different native languages for communicating with each other.

Extensive Reading: Silent reading or free voluntary reading that is used to improve language learning performance.

Mobile Learning: Educational activities provided by mobile devices.

Mobile-Assisted Language Learning: A method that uses mobile equipment to teach language.

Online Teaching: Teaching that is conducted through online tools and methods.

Vocabulary: The body of words in a language.

View publication stats