



# Developing a Specialized Vocabulary Word List in a Composition Culinary Course through Lecture Notes

M.Nordin, N. R.

School of Language Studies & Linguistics, Faculty of Social Sciences & Humanities,  
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia.  
E-mail: nurrasyidah@uum.edu.my

Stapa, S. H.

School of Language Studies & Linguistics, Faculty of Social Sciences & Humanities,  
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia.

Darus, S.

School of Language Studies & Linguistics, Faculty of Social Sciences & Humanities,  
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia.

Doi:10.7575/aiac.all.v.4n.1p.78

Received: 04/12/2012

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.4n.1p.78>

Accepted: 03/01/2013

## Abstract

Learning to write in a composition culinary course is very challenging for L2 learners. The main barrier in writing proficiency within this discipline is the lack of vocabulary, specifically the lack of exposure towards specialized vocabulary. This study aims to provide a corpus of specialized vocabulary within a food writing course. By providing students with a word list of specialized vocabulary in the course, students may benefit by familiarizing with the language discourse which will aid in better comprehension of the course, and subsequently facilitate in their writing development. A compilation of all PowerPoint slides from one writing course was assembled and analyzed using the range and frequency program to identify the specialized vocabularies in a food writing course. The corpus was categorized using a four step rating scale, which identified 113 specialized vocabularies in food writing. The learning of specialized vocabulary specialized vocabulary is an important issue at the tertiary level in Malaysia, with educators' realization of the importance of discourse proficiency in ESP programs, thus many more research is yielded on the many new issues on the teaching and learning of specialized vocabulary particularly within the academic and professional context.

**Keywords:** Specialized Vocabulary, Corpus Research, Composition Culinary Course, Food Writing, Discourse

## 1. Introduction

In English for Specific (ESP) courses it is pertinent and wholly expected that students be directed towards fluency in both the language and content area in the discipline of study, in other words students must be able to communicate effectively within the discourse in their area of study. For instance, courses such as English for Hotels require students to be familiar to the language commonly used in connection with hotel facilities, hotel activities and hotel clientele and personnel. Similarly, a course in English for Tourism is focused on the training of oral and written skills employing travel related terminology. It also stresses the appropriate responses to requests, complaints and similar language functions common in the field. This good command of language in each distinct field applies to all ESP courses. Thus, it is no longer a debate that good communication skills are important for students to excel in their studies.

For L2 learners undergoing ESP courses some difficulties arises due to limited exposures to such language outside the classroom. Since each course poses a distinct discourse within a certain discourse community, thus it also poses a range of specialized or technical terminologies. Nation (2001:198) defines specialized vocabulary as one that is "recognizably specific to a particular topic, field or discipline". The grasp of these specialized vocabularies is crucial for ESP students to be able to be understood by the discourse community. However, many countries where English is a second or a foreign language, the only circumstances students come across these specialized terms is in the classroom. With very little exposure to specialized words other than those from inside the classroom, it is very challenging for L2 learners. The problem arises particularly when students are required to write within their discipline. These concerns arise due to the necessities of writing skills in today's globalised classrooms, where text is presented in different channels, such as Facebook, Twitter, Skype, weblogs, etc. (Ganapathy & Kaur, 2013). Kamida (2005) asserted that writing proficiency in the ESP classroom; particularly in Japan is very worrisome as "improving oneself through written communication without seeing the other person's face, which is increasingly important in a world of computers, emails and faxes, does not seem to be highly regarded" (p. 176). Thus, one solution to this dilemma would be to familiarize students to the

specialized vocabularies within the field of study before delving into the contents with further depth, by slowly introducing them (the specialized words) in written exercises and so forth.

In certain courses it is easier to identify the specialized vocabulary within the field, for instance in engineering, medicine and information technology. However, there are few courses which fall under a multi-disciplinary area which makes it more difficult to ascertain the specialized vocabulary within the field. Food writing is one instance of a multi-disciplinary course, where it is related specifically to both the culinary arts and journalism. The food writing course entails an introduction into the field of food writing or food journalism. Students will be exposed to different writing styles on topics related to food and other areas associated to the culinary world. Subsequently, students will also be introduced to various forms of technical or specialized words specifically used by food writers.

In Malaysia, ESP courses are taught in all institutions of higher education. However, the culinary arts discipline is somewhat new to Malaysian students as there is only one public university in Malaysia which offers the food writing course; which is Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), even so not all UiTM campuses offer this subject as it is only offered within the Faculty of Hotel and Management in Shah Alam, Selangor. Therefore, students enrolled in the food writing course would have had very little exposure to the arts of food writing. Moreover, courses which specialize in writing specifically in the culinary discipline are scarce, as argued by Brien (2007:1) “internationally, the emergent subject area of food writing is more often located either in Food History and Gastronomy programs or as a component of practical culinary skills courses than in Writing or Publishing programs”. Thus, there are a great deal to learn of the culinary education in Malaysia with the emergence of culinary studies in the higher institutions, particularly in the ESP courses more research is needed in aiding students and educators in gaining proficiency in terms of academic literacy in culinary related fields (Nur Rasyidah, Siti Hamin & Saadiyah, in press).

## 2. Identifying specialized vocabulary in ESP

Although the learning of English through specialized context such as ESP is not novel in countries of non-native English speakers (NNES), however it has sparked some interest especially on specialized vocabulary research “due to the increasing demand for instruction for NNES in different contexts and backgrounds” (Martinez, Beck, & Panza, 2009). These differences elucidate the fact that learners in a particular discipline have their own entirety of needs. Thus, Martinez et al. (2009) suggest that there is a “need to produce field-specific academic word list” which “incorporate all frequent academic lexical items necessary for the expression of the rhetoric of the specific research area” (p. 183). The need for field-specific vocabularies is also important as some words which may occur more frequently in one field may not be present in another (Xue & Nation, 1984). With the growing needs of specialized word list in specific disciplines, it would also be of benefit to culinary students undergoing a food writing course to own these vocabularies for academic reference. There has yet been a corpus specific to food writing, thus this study aims to identify the specialized vocabularies in food writing.

Previous studies on identifying specialized vocabularies are scarce, but it is notably growing due to a study by Chung (2003) which is the first study conducted in identifying specialized vocabularies. In her study, Chung developed a four-step rating scale to investigate the specialized vocabulary in the field of anatomy. Although, it was used within the anatomy discipline the scale can be adapted to any topic, field or discipline. Chung & Nation (2003) also compared the specialized vocabulary within two fields; namely anatomy and applied linguistics. To illustrate, the identification of words from the anatomy text (Table 1) presents the four categories of words. The identification was done to figure out whether the words in the text were technical or non-technical. The specialized or technical terms are placed within Step 3 and Step 4 respectively.

Table 1. A rating scale for finding technical words (as applied to the anatomy text)

Step 1
Words such as function words that has no particular relationship with the field of anatomy, that is, words independent of the subject matter. Examples are; <i>the, is, between, it, by, 12, adjacent, amounts, common, commonly, directly, constantly, early, and especially.</i>
Step 2
Words that have a meaning that is minimally related to the field of anatomy in that they describe the positions, movements, or features of the body. Examples are: <i>superior, part, forms, pairs, structures, surrounds, supports, associated, lodges, protects.</i>
Step 3
Words that have a meaning that is closely related to the field of anatomy. They refer to parts, structures or functions of the body, such as the regions of the body and systems of the body. Such words are also used in general language. The words may have some restrictions of usage depending on the subject field. Examples are: <i>chest, trunk, neck, abdomen, ribs, breast, cage, cavity, shoulder, girdle, skin, muscles, wall, heart, lungs, organs, liver, bony, abdominal, and breathing.</i> Words in this category may be technical terms in a specific field like anatomy and yet may occur with the same meaning in other fields and not be technical terms in those fields.

#### Step 4

Words that have a meaning specific to the field of anatomy and are not likely to be known in general language. They refer to structures and functions of the body. These words have clear restrictions of usage depending on the subject field. Examples are: *thorax, sternum, costal, vertebrae, pectoral, fascia, trachea, mammary, periosteum, hematopoietic, pectoralis, viscera, intervertebral, demifacets and pedicle*.

Theoretically, specialized vocabulary does not have a specific distinction in its own right. This is because specialized vocabularies can also come from general words of English. To be precise these general words are the most frequent 2,000 words of English, otherwise known as the General Service List (GSL) (West, 1953). The GSL is considered high frequency words as they “typically covers around 80% of the running words of academic texts and newspapers, and around 90% of conversation and novels” (Chung & Nation, 2003). Besides the GSL, specialized vocabulary can also come from the Academic Word List (AWL) (Coxhead, 2000) which contains words that frequently appear in academic texts regardless of the subject areas. Lastly, specialized vocabularies may also derive from low frequency words, which are all the remaining words of English. Thus, what makes vocabulary specialized is the semantic meaning it is associated to through the field or discipline. Therefore, a word may be specialized in one field but not in another. In some circumstances, the specialized terms may also mean many things within one discipline. In business communication for instance, the word *delivery* is most misunderstood as it can mean loading on a ship, shipping out the door of a factory, or delivery to a customer (Kameda, 2005). Therefore, there are no standardized systems in obtaining a specialized wordlist for every field, despite this fact Chung’s (2003) rating scale is a good starting point in identifying specialized vocabulary.

Building on the work by Chung & Nation (2003), Fraser (2006) had also established a new category for specialized vocabulary in the pharmaceutical field, which are divided into:

- 1) Fully technical: words which are specific to a field and not likely to be known in general language.
- 2) Cryptotechnical: consists of polysemous words, which may be obscure to a non-specialist.
- 3) Lay technical: technical words that can be understood by someone without specialist knowledge in the field.
- 4) Academic categories: discourse-structuring words and words with an analytic and an evaluative role. Coxhead (2000) Academic Word List (AWL) best represent this category.

Although the rating scale by Fraser (2006) is more comprehensive than Chung’s (2003), it is however still in need of further research. As Fraser suggested, the new category included known as ‘cryptotechnical’ word needs further validation. Therefore, the four-step rating scale by Chung (2003) is adapted for this study to identify the specialized vocabulary in food writing. Specifically, the objective of the study is to come up with a specialized vocabulary word list in one composition culinary course known as food writing. This study was not intended to construct a generalization of food writing vocabularies; however its purpose is to come up with a word list based on the corpus from one particular food writing course in Malaysia. Thus, it may not be representative to other food writing courses, but the findings may benefit students and instructors of L2 background in understanding and applying the use of specialized vocabularies within a specific field (such as food writing). To achieve the objective, this study will attempt to answer the following Research Questions:

1. What is specialized vocabulary in Food Writing?
2. What word levels (GSL, AWL and low frequency words) constitute the specialized vocabulary in Food Writing?

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Research Site and Course

The research was conducted in Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM). UiTM is the first public university in Malaysia to offer a B. Sc (Hons) in culinary arts management and a master’s program in gastronomy, thus it is considered a pioneer in culinary education. For this study, the research was conducted in the campus located in Shah Alam, Selangor. The reason for choosing this particular campus in Shah Alam is because it is the main campus for the Faculty of Hotel and Tourism Management. There are four departments under the faculty which include Hotel, Tourism, Food Service and Culinary Arts.

The course which is chosen for this study is the food writing course. This course provides an introduction into the field of food writing or food journalism. It also introduces and exposes students on the writing identification for the preparation of food articles and to develop attitude and awareness towards becoming a good and effective writer, where food writing is most prevalent such as reviewing restaurants, writing articles for magazines or newspapers. The course is compulsory for students majoring in the culinary arts. It is also made compulsory for students majoring in hotel, tourism and food service with a minor in culinary arts. The researchers chose this course mainly because of the scarcity of research within this area in Malaysia, however with the growth of interest in culinary arts, this study is merely a stepping stone in the enormous amount of study needed in the teaching and learning within the culinary arts.

### 3.2 Research Corpus

In order to answer Research Question 1, a corpus will need to be assembled. To come up with the research corpus, a compilation of the lecture notes were collected which is made up of all the PowerPoint slides used in the food writing course. Altogether there were 11 PowerPoint slide presentations (Table 2). The purpose of choosing Power Point presentations as the corpus is because it is the most frequent exposure students obtain all through the semester. Students may also read other materials from the internet or books but it will not be a reliable source as they may differ from one student to another. Furthermore, some students may not even have the time to read other materials due to their busy class schedules. Therefore, it is most appropriate for this study to analyze a text which all the students in the class are exposed to.

Table 2. Number of slides, words and lines in each presentation slides

PowerPoint presentation slide	No. of slides	No. of words	No. of lines
1	7	267	130
2	8	246	90
3	6	196	73
4	8	174	90
5	10	270	111
6	8	259	94
7	17	543	194
8	18	596	217
9	9	330	109
10	16	599	214
11	9	218	103
Total	116	3698	1425

### 3.3 Procedure for Corpus Analysis

Firstly, in order to ensure the corpus collected through the lecture notes from the food writing course is compatible with the software used in this study, the slide presentations are converted into word documents before they were analyzed using the RANGE and FREQUENCY computer program (Heatly, Nation, & Coxhead 2002).

The RANGE software (Heatley et al. 2002) will provide every word within the corpus which will be categorized into four groups. The first and second group are the first 1000 and second 1,000 most common words in English determined through the GSL (West, 1953), the third group belongs to the AWL (Coxhead, 2000), and the final group of words are considered low frequency words. Through this program, it would allow for the calculation of percentages of words from the four groups in each text as well as the entire corpus. The RANGE program also counts the total number of words in the corpus known as tokens, and the total number of different types of words in the corpus known as word types. For this study, the words are counted using word types, for instance, if a word occurred many times in the corpus, it is still counted as one, as it computes it through word types. However, the RANGE computer program cannot identify specialized vocabulary. The identification of specialized vocabulary would need to be done manually using the FREQUENCY program. The FREQUENCY computer program (Heatley et al. 2002) lists how frequently the words in the corpus appear in descending order without dividing each word into different categories.

Both RANGE and FREQUENCY program are Open Source software and are made accessible to the public via this website <http://www.vuw.ac.nz/lals/>. These programs are also widely used in corpus linguistic research to determine vocabulary size and acquisition (Klinmanee & Sopprasong, 1997; Laufer & Paribakht, 1998; Nation & Wang, 1999; Coxhead, 2000; Nation & DeWeerd, 2002; Ryan, 2010). For instance, Ryan's (2010) research which looked into the specialized vocabulary within a theology course utilized these softwares and came up with 50 specialized words from the corpus she collected. The percentage, number and frequency of occurrences of these specialized vocabularies were also counted using the RANGE and FREQUENCY computer program in order to observe how far these lexical items may lead to incidental learning. According to Heatley, Nation & Coxhead, (2002) the RANGE program can also be used to compare a text against vocabulary lists to see what words in the text are and are not in the list, and to see what percentage of the items in the text are covered by the lists. It can also be used to compare the vocabulary of two texts to see how much of the same vocabulary they use and where their vocabulary differs. Thus, this study will also benefit from the RANGE and FREQUENCY program in answering the Research Objective of this study; what is specialized vocabulary in food writing?

Subsequently, in order to answer the first Research Question, the FREQUENCY program is used to ascertain the specialized vocabulary in food writing. The frequency list of all the words in the corpus can be obtained through the FREQUENCY program. From the frequency list the identification of specialized vocabulary is done using Chung's (2003) four-step rating scale (Table 1). As discussed earlier, the rating scale is used to categorize the words in the corpus. From the list which was ran through FREQUENCY the words were categorized accordingly where non-specialized vocabulary are categorized in Step 1 and Step 2, and specialized vocabulary are categorized in step 3 and Step 4. To validate the categorization of the words using the scale, the data will be approved by a specialist in the field. The specialist is a lecturer from Segi, who also has experience teaching in UiTM. She is a senior lecturer with 5 years experience teaching the food writing course.

The second Research Question on the other hand is answered using the RANGE computer program, where the corpus is analyzed to produce a list of words each belonging to the different level groups (GSL, AWL, and low frequency words). Thus, this will ascertain what word level the specialized vocabulary obtained in Step 3 and Step 4 belong to, simply by referring to the word list from the RANGE program.

#### 4. Results and discussions

The focal point of this corpus study was to develop a specialized vocabulary word list of food writing, which is specifically taught for tertiary level ESL learners in a culinary program. The corpus is made up of the most important element students are exposed to, which is the PowerPoint slide presentation used by the lecturer of the class throughout the semester. Altogether there were 11 slide presentations compiled and analyzed to come up with a specialized vocabulary word list in a food writing course. Table 3 illustrates the details of the entire corpus analyzed.

Table 3. Types of vocabulary in the corpus

Vocabulary level	Tokens / %	Types / %
1 <sup>st</sup> 1000 (GSL)	2806/75.9	589/54.2
2 <sup>nd</sup> 1000 (GSL)	305/8.2	144/13.2
AWL	232/6.3	133/12.2
Not found in any list	355/9.6	221/20.3
Total	3698	1087

After the words from the corpus were categorized accordingly to the steps from the rating scale, the words at Step 3 were further divided into 6 main groups that are related to the food writing discipline; mainly the ingredients, tools/utensils, methods, description and other words related to culinary arts and journalism as follows:

##### 4.1 Specialized vocabulary in food writing under step 3 from the rating scale

The selections of words under this step are further divided into the following categories:

- i) **Ingredients/food/drink:** tea, fruit, ice, juice, cakes, grains, meat, preservation-pickles, stew, cookies, beans, pasta, beer, chocolate, garlic, onions, mango, vegetables, banana, chutney, filet, herbs, salad, tofu, tomatoes, trout & yeast. (27)
- ii) **Tools/Utensils/Equipment:** pans, cups, freezer, oven & refrigerator. (5)
- iii) **Method:** cut, preserving, cook, baking, freeze, fry, grilling, chopped, peel, ginger-marinated & slice. (11)
- iv) **Description:** salty, western, vegetarian, Vietnamese, Asian, Italian, Mexican, organic, low-fat, delicious, tablespoons & teaspoons. (12)
- v) **Other words related to culinary arts:** produce, farming, measurements, servings, market, meal, handful, cooking, restaurants, reviews, health, flavors, kitchen, dining, dinner, dishes, taste, lunch, chef, culinary, diet, nutrients, cookbook, recipes, stylist, gourmet, nutrition, left-overs, cuisine, ingredient, caterers, carb & menu. (34)
- vi) **Other words related to journalism:** readers, articles, newspaper, audience, feature, publications, editor, topic, author, publisher, columns, deadline, feature-story, hard-news, soft-news, fiction, non-fiction, magazine, newsletters, pitch, critiques & essay. (22)

##### 4.2 Specialized vocabulary in food writing under step 4 from the rating scale

Food-talk & foodies (slang). (2)

It was found from the list that the major categories belong to the culinary arts, which is not surprising and was expected earlier on by the researcher that in food writing the dominating subject would be culinary arts. Thus, the implication suggests that the terms under culinary arts be taught much earlier before exposing students to the journalistic terms.

Through a pedagogic stance, the interdisciplinary structure of food writing should be given extra concern as the nature of multidisciplinary courses has significant differences in language. As apprehended by Davies & Devlin (2007, p. 5):

“Some of the disciplinary “vocabularies”, and the assumptions behind them, are commensurable with vocabularies from other discipline. ‘Mass’ to a physicist does not mean the same thing as ‘mass’ to an engineer or architect. The notion of a ‘fact’ and ‘evidence’ are largely matters of disciplinary definition. If there are differences in the use of single words, it can be expected that differences in the understanding of theoretical concepts will be vast”

Therefore, more focus should be placed in making definition of words to their context. For instance, words which may have multiple meanings should be taught explicitly to ensure that students are aware of its usage in the food writing context. The list of specialized vocabulary obtained from the PowerPoint presentation slides demonstrate that only 1% of the total corpus was made up of exclusive food writing words, which falls under Step 4 of Chung’s (2003) classification of specialized vocabulary. The other 99% of words belong to Step 3 which places words that can be found in other disciplines but regularly have a different or more a restricted usage in food writing. This confirms Nation’s (2001) findings which suggest that teachers/instructors should put more effort in teaching the words under Step 3 by informing students words with different meanings may also have similar underlying meanings. This type of teaching is considered strategies in vocabulary learning as appose to explicit teaching. This study would support the recommendation by Nation (2001) that specialized words, at least, could be given attention in the classroom. The large number of words under Step 3 implies that L2 learners may not even know the general meanings of those specialized words. As noted by Laufer (1997) and Schmitt (1998), students often do not learn second meanings of words once they have already learned one other meaning. In addition, under the L2 vocabulary testing research, Laufer & Nation (1999) have illustrated that specific ranges of vocabulary can provide the “enabling knowledge” required to be successful in other disciplines of language proficiency and these words can be taught to L2 learners directly.

The small number of exclusive food writing words also implies that the corpus or text students were exposed to, were relatively easy or within the range of the students’ level. As the more specialized a text is, the harder it becomes for L2 learners to understand. Fraser (2006) agrees that if a text contains a high number of specialized words students with very low vocabulary range will have to disrupt their reading many times in order to look up the meaning, or in some cases students may guess the meaning of unknown words incorrectly. Therefore, providing students with an easy text is considered beneficial for under achievers of English, which is mainly the reason behind the instructor of the class in this study, in choosing a relatively easy text for the students to read. This decision however, has made the search for specialized vocabularies in food writing far more difficult. In terms of exposure to the specialized vocabularies as proposed by Krashen (2008) in the Comprehension Hypothesis, which asserts that vocabulary acquisition occurs through numerous exposures to comprehensible input under natural circumstances, there was very little repetition of the specialized vocabulary obtained through the corpus. Therefore, the amount of vocabulary exposures was far too small for vocabulary development. In a perfect world, students should be given numerous opportunities to encounter the specialized vocabularies for optimum vocabulary growth, but in reality as the data illustrates (Table 4 – Refer to Appendix A for full frequency list of the specialized vocabulary) students are not given frequent exposures. This phenomenon is the problem encountered by tertiary level L2 students nowadays, especially those undergoing ESP courses which require students to be an expert in their discipline of study as well as being proficient in the target language. However, between students’ high work load, lectures, research, assignments (writing), etc. there is very little time left for extra readings (or extensive readings) for them to be able to retain the specialized vocabularies.

Table 4. Ranges of specialized vocabulary in the corpus

78	Words appear in 1 input files
17	Words appear in 2 input files
4	Words appear in 3 input files
2	Words appear in 4 input files
3	Words appear in 5 input files
1	Words appear in 6 input files
1	Words appear in 7 input files
1	Words appear in 8 input files

As for research question 2, the distribution of GSL, AWL and low frequency words within the specialized vocabularies in food writing (Table 5), show significant difference from other corpus research (Chung & Nation, 2003; Fraser, 2006; Ryan, 2010) which usually produce outcomes with the specialized vocabularies being mostly from the GSL and AWL word level. These surprising data shows that the amount of low frequency words in food writing were much higher than the high frequency or GSL words. These findings, also agrees with Chen & Ge’s (2007) corpus in medicine and

Martinez, Beck & Panza's (2009) corpus in agriculture that a food writing corpus may not use a considerable number of the AWL word families. This corroborate with the findings of Hyland & Tse (2007) which asserts that it would be more effective to teach a discipline-specific list rather than a general list, as with a general list students might spend considerable time learning words they may not meet in their studies.

Table 5. Distribution of GSL, AWL and low frequency words in the specialized vocabulary corpus

WORD LIST	TOKENS/%	TYPES/%
GSL (First 1000)	12/10.6	12/10.6
GSL (Second 1000)	28/24.8	28/24.8
AWL	7/ 6.2	7/ 6.2
Low Frequency	66/58.4	66/58.4
Total	113	113

## 5. Conclusion

The objective of the study was to come up with a specialized vocabulary word list in food writing, which was obtained from the PowerPoint slide presentations used throughout one semester in a food writing course. The corpus analysis resulted in 113 specialized vocabularies. Among the specialized vocabularies in food writing obtained, only 1% of the words were fully technical, with the other 99% of words are those which can be found in other disciplines but regularly have a different or more a restricted usage in food writing. The 99% of specialized words which fall under Step 3 of Chung's (2003) four-step rating scale illustrates the importance of teaching these words to students prior to lectures/lessons. Another important observation in this study is that since the majority of the specialized vocabularies were not from the GSL or AWL list, more attention should be called to the low frequency words or discipline-specific list rather than the general list. By calling attention to discipline-specific words, students are more likely to pay attention to these words during their studies. The findings of this study may not be generalized to other food writing courses as its purpose was to come up with a word list based on the corpus from one particular food writing course in Malaysia. Therefore, the data may not be representative to other food writing courses, but it may benefit students and instructors of L2 background in understanding and applying the use of specialized vocabularies within a specific field (such as food writing).

## Acknowledgements

The researchers wish to express their profound gratitude to Puan Nazha Binti Mohamed Arip for her indispensable insights and guidance. We are also grateful to anonymous reviewers for their suggestions.

## References

- Chung, T. M. (2003). A corpus comparison approach for terminology extraction. *Terminology*, 9, 221-246.
- Chung, T. M. & Nation, P. (2003). Technical vocabulary in specialized texts. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 15, 103-116. <http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/October2003/chung/chung.html> [15 May 2012].
- Chen, Q. & Ge, G. (2007). A corpus-based lexical study on frequency and distribution of Coxhead's AWL word families in medical research articles (RAs). *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 502-514.
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 213-238.
- Davies, M. & Devlin, M. (2007). *Interdisciplinary higher education: Implications for teaching and learning*. Retrieved November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2013 from <http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/>
- Fraser, S. (2006). Factors affecting the learnability of technical vocabulary: Findings from a specialized corpus. *Foreign Language Education and Research Center, Hiroshima University*, 15, 123-142.
- Ganapathy, M. & Kaur, S. (2013). Engaging ESL students in the writing classroom through the multiliteracy approach. *Pertanika Journals of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 21(2), 547-568.
- Heatly, A., Nation, I. S. P. & Coxhead, A. (2002). RANGE and FREQUENCY programs. [http://www.vuw.ac.nz/lals/staff/Paul\\_Nation](http://www.vuw.ac.nz/lals/staff/Paul_Nation)
- Hyland, K. & Tse, P. (2007). Is there an "academic vocabulary"? *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 235- 253.
- Kamida, N. (2005). A research paradigm for international business communication. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 10(2), 168-182.
- Klinmanee, N. & Sopprasong, L. (1997 ). Bridging the vocabulary gap between secondary school and university: A Thai case study. *Guidelines*, 19(1), 1-10.

- Krashen, S. D. (2008). Language education: Past, present, future. *RELC Journal*, 39, 178-187.
- Laufer, B. (1997). What's in a word that makes it hard or easy: Some intralexical factors that affect the learning of words. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 140-155). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Laufer, B. & Nation, I. S. P. (1999). A vocabulary size test of controlled productive ability. *Language Testing*, 16(1), 33-51.
- Laufer, B. & Paribakht, T. S. (1998). The relationship between passive and active vocabularies: Effects of language learning context. *Language Learning*, 48(3), 365-391.
- Martinez, I. A., Beck, S. C., & Panza, C. B. (2009). Academic vocabulary in agricultural research article: A corpus-based study. *English for Specific Purposes* 28, 183-198.
- Nation, I. S. P. 2001. *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P. & DeWeerd, J. P. (2002). A defence of simplification. *Prospect: Australian Journal of TESOL*, 16(3), 55-67.
- Nation, I. S. P. & Wang, K. (1999). Graded readers and vocabulary. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 12(2), 355-380.
- M. Nordin, N. R., Stapa, S. H. & Darius, S. (In press). Are my words good enough to eat?: The teaching and learning of specialized vocabulary in culinary studies. Paper presented at the International Conference of Social Sciences & Humanities (ICOSH 2012), 22-23 December, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, UKM Bangi, Malaysia.
- Ryan, G. (2010). *Specialized vocabulary acquisition through texts in the theology classroom*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Rosemead School of Psychology, Biola University.
- Schmitt, N. (1998). Tracking the incremental acquisition of second language vocabulary. *Language Learning*, 48, 281-317.
- West, M. (1953). *A General Service List of English Words*. London, United Kingdom: Longman, Green, & company.
- Xue, G. & Nation, I. S. P. (1984). A university word list. *Language Learning and Communication*, 3(2), 215- 219.





FOODIES	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FREEZE	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
FREEZER	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
FRUIT	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
FRY	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
GARLIC	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
GINGER-MARINATED	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
GOURMET	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
GRAINS	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
GRILLING	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
HANDFUL	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
HARD-NEWS	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HEALTH	4	6	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0
HERBS	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
ICE	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
INGREDIENT	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
ITALIAN	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
JUICE	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
KITCHEN	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LEFT-OVERS	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
LOW-FAT	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
LUNCH	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
MAGAZINE	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
MANGO	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
MARKET	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEAL	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
MEASUREMENTS	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0
MEAT	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
MENU	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
MEXICAN	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
NEWSLETTERS	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
NEWSPAPER	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
NUTRIENTS	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NUTRITION	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
ONIONS	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
OVEN	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
PANS	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
PASTA	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
PEEL	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
PITCH	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

