The Development of a Vocaburary Test at the 100 Word Level

Westrick, Paul
Research Center for Higher Eduation : Associate Professor

Lake, J
Fukuoka Jo Gakuin Junior College : Lecturer

https://doi.org/10.15017/6139

出版情報：言語文化論究. 19, pp.97-112, 2004-01-31. 九州大学大学院言語文化研究院
バージョン：
権利関係：

The Development of a Vocabulary Test at the 1000 Word Level

Paul Westrick* and J. Lake**

Abstract

The Vocabulary Levels Test (VLT) (Nation, 1983; 1990) is widely used in language education research for estimating vocabulary sizes of ESL/EFL students (Nation, 2001; Beglar, 1999; Schmitt, N, Schmitt, D. & Clapham, C., 2001; Read, 2000). The VLT is used to correlate vocabulary size with other linguistic research, as part of a test battery in placement tests, to gauge the appropriate range of graded readers for extensive reading, to gauge vocabulary size for materials development and other pedagogical purposes. Traditionally the levels have been at the 2000, 3000, 5000, 10,000 and the University Word Level. The 2000 word level tests include items from the 1-1,000 and the 1,001-2,000 level; however, in an EFL context or with lower ability students there may be a need to assess more precisely below the 2,000 word level. A study by Kudo (2001) makes the point identified by many teaching beginning or low language ability students that "a new test that includes a lower level such as the 1,000-word level should be developed.... However, this lower level test does not yet exist. This is surprising because it is not known how much vocabulary relatively low-level EFL learners have actually learned."

The Westrik 1000-word level test has been designed to meet this need. Used with other frequency-based levels tests such as those by Beglar & Hunt (1999) or by Schmitt (2000) and Schmitt, Schmitt, and Clapham (2001) more detailed and accurate knowledge of a low English language ability student can be measured. In this paper, the development, analysis and validity of this 1,000 word level test are explained.

* Associate Professor, Research Center for Higher Education **Lecturer, Fukuoka Jo Gakuin Junior College

The Importance of Vocabulary

Recently in the field of second language learning, renewed interest has been given to learning vocabulary because of its central role in language. Nation's *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language* (2001) is close to a comprehensive summary of the state of the art in vocabulary learning, but there is also Schmitt's *Vocabulary in Language Teaching* (2000), a broad overview of the field, Read's *Assessing Vocabulary* (2000) on vocabulary and testing, and edited collections *Vocabulary*: *Description, acquisition and pedagogy*, by Schmitt & McCarthy (1997) and *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition*, by Coady & Huckin (1997). First language researchers have known of the strong correlation between vocabulary and reading abilities, as Stahl (1999, p.3) put it, "One of the oldest findings in educational research is the strong relationship between vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension." However, in the field of English as a Second Language (ESL) vocabulary it is now seen as important for the development of all language skills. "Vocabulary is an essential building block of language" note Schmitt, Schmitt, & Clapham, (2001, p.55). The same point was made by Read (2000, p.1), "words are the basic building blocks of language, the units of meaning from which larger structures such as sentences, paragraphs and whole texts are formed." The importance of vocabulary for ordinary communication is known intuitively by most learners; Krashen (1989) noted that students tote dictionaries around with them instead of grammar books, and that they acknowledge that their inadequate vocabularies are problematic.

Given the importance of vocabulary, how should it be learned? Nation (1990; 2001) argues that since most text is covered by the most frequent words across all text types, learners should first focus on these high-frequency words. For example, Nation estimates that the most frequent words up to 1000 words covers 73.5% of academic text, 75.6% of newspaper text, 82.3% of fictional text, 84.3% of conversation. The importance of these words cannot be dismissed, and gaps of knowledge at this level must be addressed. It is generally accepted that the first 2000 of the most frequent words should be focused on before going on to academic vocabulary and other specialized vocabulary. "In general, high-frequency words are so important that anything that teachers and learners can do to make sure they are learned is worth doing" (Nation, 2001, p.16).

The Vocabulary Levels Test

Estimating a learner's vocabulary knowledge requires testing, and in 1983, Nation introduced the Vocabulary Levels Test, a matching test that tested words at the 2000, 3000, and 5000 word levels, words from the University Word List (UWL), and then words at the 10000 word level. Each section of the original test has 18 items arranged into six clusters. Each cluster has three definitions and six possible answers. Here is an example from Nation (1990):

1. business
2. clock _____ part of a house
3. horse _____ animal with four legs
4. pencil _____ something used for writing
5. shoe
6. wall

To avoid giving testees clues, the clusters are organized by parts of speech. The first three clusters contain only nouns; the fourth and fifth clusters contain only verbs; and the sixth cluster contains only adjectives. Additionally, the test is sensitive in that it does not include words with similar meanings or spellings; there is no attempt to trick the students with slight differences.

Words for the test were drawn from The Teacher's Word Book of 30,000 Words (Thorndike & Lorge, 1944), and crosschecked with The General Service List of English Words (West, 1953), and the Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English (Kucera & Francis, 1967). At the 2000 word level, the definitions are written using the first thousand words of English, and all the possible answers are from the second thousand words of English. At the 3000 word level, the definitions are written using the first two thousand words of English, and all the possible answers are from the third thousand words of English. The higher level sections follow this pattern. For the UWL level, words were taken from Campion and Elley's (1971, cited in Nation, 1990) An Academic Vocabulary List.

Over the years, interest in the VLT grew, and with it came support, additions, criticisms, and revisions. Read (1988) conducted a study with 81 students and found the VLT to be a valid instrument, and student scores scaled downwards as the levels rose. At each level, Read considered a score of 16 out of 18 (89%) as demonstrating mastery of the words at that level. A few years later, Schmitt (1993, cited in Read, 2000) created three additional forms of the VLT, but with the increased popularity came increased scrutiny. Beglar and Hunt (1999) studied only the 2000 word level and UWL sections of the tests, and they found that the average test scores of their 496 students were nearly two points apart on Form B and D of the 2000 word level section and over four points between Forms A and D of the UWL section. They also found that the reliability of the scores varied between all four forms, and that some of the items were not discriminating between the higher level and lower level students very well. They created two revised forms (with 27 items) of the 2000 word and UWL levels using some of the original items from the VLT and new items. In a follow-up study, the descriptive statistics for the revised forms were very similar. By the following year, Schmitt had "written two new and equivalent versions of the Vocabulary Levels Test" (2000, p.174). The two new forms of the VLT, detailed in Schmitt (2000) and Schmitt, Schmitt, and Clapham (2001), each consist of 30 items in ten clusters (five for nouns, three for verbs, and two for adjectives). As Coxhead's (2000) Academic Word List (AWL) had come to be accepted as a replacement of the dated UWL, Schmitt replaced the UWL level section with an AWL level section.

Despite this progress, it did not address the need for a cluster format test at the 1000 word

level. The biggest problem has been defining these basic words. Read (2000, pp.168 – 169) observed that "many of the words in the first 500 to 1000 frequency range are almost impossible to define or explain using words of similar frequency," so test makers have opted for other test formats.

Three alternatives to using English only clusters at the 1000 word level are True – False sentence tests, checklist tests, and translation tests, but there are drawbacks with these test formats. The two forms of Nation's (1993) True – False 1000 word level test do not provide the accuracy that the VLT provides. The strength of the VLT is that the format reduces successful guessing. A person randomly guessing on a section of the VLT should get only five or six items out of 30 correct and have an estimated 17% to 20% knowledge of the words at that level. With a True – False format, a random guesser should get 50% of the items correct and have an estimated 50% knowledge of the words at that level. With the percentage of correct answers falling between 50% and 100%, it is far more difficult to estimate a student's knowledge than with the VLT. Another testing format is the use of checklists in which known items are checked off (Nation, 2001), but like the True – False format it is different from the widely used VLT format used for higher level words. Kudo (2001) introduced a 1000 word level section using the VLT cluster format, but at all levels of his test the definitions were written in Japanese, which may be valid in some testing situations.

Development of the cluster format tests at the 1000 word level

In light of the importance of the first thousand words of English, the lack of an English only cluster format test at the 1000 word level that could be used in conjunction with the higher level sections of the VLT (or the VLT in its entirety) with students who do not share a common L1, this test has been needed. Over a period of four years, a number of vocabulary tests have been used to access the levels of vocabulary knowledge possessed by students from five countries (Japan, China, South Korea, Bangladesh, and Thailand) studying at three Japanese universities and one junior college.

The first study was conducted in 1999 at Hagi International University (HIU) with students from Japan, The People's Republic of China, South Korea, and Bangladesh. In the first semester of the first school year, it became apparent that students in the English classes had widely different levels of proficiency, and consequently it was decided to assess the students with a vocabulary test for possible placement purposes. The test had two parts. The first part consisted of 75 items in the cluster format; 54 items were from Beglar and Hunt's revised 2000 word level test (Forms A and B) and 21 new items based on an unofficial list of the first thousand words of the GSL. Students also took a 50 item vocabulary test in which they had to match the English words with black and white drawings of the words. In this paper only the results of the cluster test are analyzed.

The test results with the students at HIU strongly suggested that most students did not

have a mastery of the first thousand words of English, and that they were considerably weaker at the 2000 word level. Looking at the central tendency (mean, median, mode, and midpoint) and the dispersion on the 1000 level test, the students' scores were spread out in a fairly normal distribution. At the 2000 word level, the scores were positively skewed, as can be seen from the stark differences in the mean, median, mode and midpoint. A small number of strong students pulled the mean up to 18.53, but half the students scored 15 or lower (out of 54) on the 2000 word level section, slightly above the guessing level. As can be seen from the 1000, 2000 and combined high scores, there were students who displayed a high degree of mastery of the first 2000 words of English, as had been anticipated from their classroom performance and oral interviews, but they were the exceptions. The reliability estimate of the scores for the 1000 word level test was an acceptable .83 using the conservative K-R21 (Brown, 1996). The reliability coefficients for the longer 2000 word level and total test scores were higher, as anticipated, as longer tests generally produce higher score reliability estimates.

Table 1 HIU 1999, 1000 & 2000 Word Levels

	1000 test	**2000 test**	**Combined**
N	81.00	81.00	81.00
k	21.00	54.00	75.00
Mean	10.53	18.73	29.26
Median	11.00	15.00	25.00
Mode	13.00	11.00	22.00
Midpoint	10.50	27.00	39.00
Range	20.00	47.00	63.00
High	20.00	50.00	70.00
Low	1.00	4.00	8.00
S	4.98	13.66	15.39
K-R21	0.83	0.95	0.96
SEM	2.07	2.99	3.03
Correlation			0.80

In 2000 and 2001, it was again decided at HIU that a vocabulary levels test would be used for placement purposes, but the students would be tested at the 2000 and 3000 word levels. The rationale for this change was that with a more difficult test, high level students would be separated from lower level students more distinctly than with a test at the 1000 and 2000 word levels. These students would then be placed in an advanced class, and the remaining students would be placed into intermediate or low-level classes. For this reason, the 2000 and 3000 word level sections from versions A and B of the original VLT were used in 2000, and the corresponding sections from

versions C and D were used in 2001.

Table 2 HIU 2000, VLT, 2000 & 3000 levels Forms A & B

	Intl. Studies	Informatics	All students
N	52.00	62.00	114.00
k	72.00	72.00	72.00
Mean	30.27	22.65	26.12
Median	29.00	19.50	24.50
Mode	12.00	19.00	25.00
Midpoint	38.50	27.50	36.00
Range	58.00	46.00	63.00
High	67.00	50.00	67.00
Low	10.00	5.00	5.00
S	14.52	9.78	12.71
K-R21	0.93	0.85	0.91
SEM	3.85	3.79	3.82

Only the data from 2000 was available for analysis and displayed in Table 2. Scores were not separated by test sections, but by departments. The highest level students answered 93 % of the items correctly, but the majority of students were very low, answering less than 35% of the items correctly. The Informatics students who made up the majority of the incoming class were clearly weaker than the International Studies students, and the median for the Informatics students was just above the guessing level. Even the best score (50 out of 72) in the Informatics department was far from displaying a mastery of the first 3000 words of English. Overall, due to the wide range of scores, the reliability estimates for the test were high with very low SEMs, but testing at the 2000 and 3000 word levels only separated the few strong students from the mass of weak students in the incoming classes. Most students were bunched together at the low end of the scale, but a placement test should spread students out. In three years of testing, the only test section that had spread students out in a fairly normal distribution over almost the entire scale had been the 1000 word level test administered in 1999.

Items from the 1000 word level test at HIU written by Westrick (2001) had been used and an additional nine items (three clusters) at the 1000 and 2000 word level were used as part of a placement test (Lake, 2001; Brown & Lake, 2002) given to 3,580 students at Kyushu Sangyo University (KSU). A vocabulary subsection was included because there were many low English ability students that were in the "guessing" range for the TOEFL and previous placement test. In a pilot test given to 384 university students, high frequency vocabulary words were shown to be very effective in registering scores for the lowest level students. The vocabulary items had high item

discrimination indexes (Brown, 1996) that spread out scores. The vocabulary subsection had the highest reliability of any subsection of the pilot with a KR-20 reliability of .90.

Another reason a vocabulary subsection was created was so that level descriptors for different levels of English ability could include a vocabulary component. Information about vocabulary size at different levels could aid teachers in choosing and creating materials. Teachers using graded readers could advise students on the right level of graded readers for either a university-wide extensive reading program or for an independent program in their own classes. For students, knowing their vocabulary level would be useful so they would know where to concentrate their vocabulary studies. Students, teachers and administrators found the placement test to be better at placing students than the ITP TOEFL or the previous placement test, and it continues to be in use. For the year 2002 administration, the vocabulary subsection had a Cronbach alpha of .89.

The results in Table 3 strongly suggest that, although there were perfect scores, the majority of the incoming students did not have a mastery of the first thousand words of English. The reliability of the scores, using the K-R20 formula was acceptable at 0.89, as was the low SEM. For norm-referenced test purposes, it appears that the vocabulary items were written at a level that matched the testees.

Table 3 KSU 2002, 1000 Word Level

N	3,580.00
k	30.00
Mean	19.63
Median	21.00
Mode	22.00
Midpoint	15.50
Range	30.00
High	30.00
Low	1.00
S	6.18
K-R20	0.89
SEM	2.05

In 2002, HIU decided to abandon the English placement system, so university wide testing ceased. At the classroom level, Westrick decided to test students at the 1000 level at the beginning of each semester. In April 2002, Westrick created two new tests of the first thousand words of English based on the Brown corpus (Francis & Kucera, 1982). Some of the items from the original 1999 version were used, but many new items were created to develop two 30 item versions of a 1000 word level test that followed the format created by Schmitt (2000) and Schmitt, Schmitt, and Clapham (2001). In an initial piloting of the tests at HIU (Table 4), the student scores ranged across most of the scales for both tests, but the student scores on version B were noticeably lower.

One possible reason for the wide disparity is that the tests were not equally difficult. Another possible explanation is that some of the students gave up on the second test and answered fewer questions, thereby getting fewer points by guessing. In two follow up pilotings of the tests with technology and retake students (students who had not received credit for an earlier English course they had enrolled in) at Kyushu University (KU), students were alternately given either form A or form B first and the other version second. As expected, these students scored much higher than the students at HIU, and the descriptive statistics (Table 5) were very similar on both forms for both the central tendency and the dispersion, suggesting that the forms were of equal difficulty and that the students at HIU had simply given up on their second test. As reliability is a characteristic of the scores (Thompson, 2003), and the scores of the students at KU were negatively skewed and fell in a narrow range, the reliability estimates for their scores were considerably lower than those for the scores at HIU. Combining the scores (Table 6) for the students at both schools naturally raised the reliability estimates.

Table 4 HIU 2002, Brown Corpus 1000 Word Level

	1000 A	**1000 B**	**Combined**
N	33.00	33.00	33.00
k	30.00	30.00	60.00
Mean	16.24	13.79	30.30
Median	17.00	12.00	28.00
Mode	12.00	12.00	24.00
Range	29.00	27.00	52.00
High	29.00	28.00	56.00
Low	1.00	2.00	5.00
S	7.55	7.43	14.59
K-R21	0.90	0.90	0.95
SEM	2.39	2.35	3.26
Corr. A B			0.89

Although the 1000 level test based on the Brown corpus appeared promising, for a 1000 word level test to be accepted as a supplement to the VLT, the Thorndike and Lorge (1944) list and the GSL would also have to be used. The items from the Brown corpus based 1000 word level test were crosschecked with the first thousand words of English in the Thorndike and Lorge list and the GSL. Items and distractors from the original tests that were not found in the Thorndike and Lorge list or in the GSL were discarded, and new items and distractors were created.

Table 5 KU 2002, Brown Corpus 1000 Word Level

	1000 A	1000 B	Combined
N	72.00	72.00	72.00
k	30.00	30.00	60.00
Mean	28.39	28.10	56.49
Median	29.00	29.00	57.00
Mode	29.00	29.00	57.00
Range	9.00	10.00	14.00
High	30.00	30.00	60.00
Low	22.00	21.00	47.00
S	1.72	1.75	2.86
K-R21	0.50	0.43	0.61
SEM	1.21	1.32	1.80
Corr. A B			0.36

Table 6 HIU & KU 2002, Brown Corpus 1000 Word Level

	1000 A	1000 B	Combined
N	105.00	105.00	105.00
k	30.00	30.00	60.00
Mean	24.57	23.60	48.17
Median	28.00	27.00	56.00
Mode	29.00	29.00	59.00
Range	30.00	29.00	56.00
High	30.00	30.00	60.00
Low	1.00	2.00	5.00
S	7.19	7.98	14.95
K-R21	0.95	0.95	0.97
SEM	1.68	1.74	2.42
Corr. A B			0.94

Between June 2002 and October 2003, 490 students at a private university and a junior college in Kyushu took both versions of the new test, and the results were quite promising. As can be seen in Table 7, the means and medians for both versions were within one point of each other, and the dispersion of scores were nearly identical. The standard deviations were nearly identical, as were the SEMs, and the reliability coefficients for the scores were both 0.91 using the K-R20. The

correlation between the two forms was 0.89.

Table 7 KSU & FJG, 2002 – 2003, Revised 1000 Word Level

	Test A	Test B	Combined
N	490.00	490.00	490.00
k	30.00	30.00	60.00
Mean	19.41	18.68	38.09
Median	20.00	19.00	39.00
Midpoint	16.50	16.00	33.00
Range	28.00	29.00	55.00
High	30.00	30.00	60.00
Low	3.00	2.00	6.00
S	6.87	7.00	13.49
KR-20	0.91	0.91	0.95
SEM	2.06	2.10	3.02
Correlation A & B	0.89		

Although there were a few perfect scores among the 490 students who took both forms of the test, there remained a question of whether certain items were too difficult for second language learners to understand due to awkward definitions as Read (1988) suggested was possible. In a follow up study, 66 KU students took form A of the Westrick 1000 word level test and the 2000 and 3000 word level sections of version 1 of the VLT (Schmitt, 2000).

Table 8 KU 2003, 1000, 2000, & 3000 Word Levels

KU 2003	W 1000 A	S 2000 V1	Combined	S 3000 V1	S 3000 V1 *
N	66.00	66.00	66.00	46.00	20.00
k	30.00	30.00	60.00	**30.00**	**27.00**
Mean	29.09	26.88	55.97	21.91	20.55
Median	29.00	27.00	56.00	21.50	21.00
Mode	30.00	29.00	56.00	21.00	21.00
Midpoint	28.00	24.5	54.00	17.50	17.50
Range	5.00	12.00	13.00	20.00	20.00
High	30.00	30.00	60.00	30.00	27.00
Low	26.00	19.00	48.00	11.00	8.00

* Note that one class had only 27 items on their 3000 word level test. Three items were deleted because of a printing error.

The descriptive statistics in Table 8 suggest that the items were not so awkwardly written that more advanced EFL students could understand them. The mean and median for the 1000 level test were both at 29, and the mode, the most common score among the students, was a perfect 30 out of 30. The students' mean and median scores declined, and the ranges expanded, at the 2000 and 3000 levels, scaling much as Read (1988) found in his study of the full VLT.

At first glance, it appears that testing these students at the 1000 word level is unnecessary because their scores are so high, but that is not true. When looking only at their scores at the 2000 word level, it seems that the group contains students with widely different vocabulary levels. The highest students scored 30 out of 30 on the 2000 word level section, and it can be estimated that they know 100% of the first two-thousand words of English. On the other hand, one student scored only 19 out of 30, and it can be estimated that he knows only 63% of the first 2000 words, about 1,267 of those words. With the 1000 word level test, we can see that he scored 29 out of 30, and that means he knows an estimated 967 of the critical first thousand words. Now looking at his 2000 word level score as a percentage of only the second thousand words of English, it can be estimated that he knows 633 of those words. Combined, it can be estimated that he knows 1,600 of the first two thousand words, a more accurate estimate than the 1, 267 words estimated by the 2000 word level test alone.

Conclusion

In this paper, evidence for the validity of this test has been shown by demonstrating that the range of difficulty of the items is closely matched to students with lower levels of English ability. The need to accurately measure students' knowledge of the first thousand words of English, the most important words that students must learn, has existed in EFL situations and for low level students, but it has not been adequately addressed until now. The studies at HIU strongly suggested that the 2000 and 3000 word level sections of the VLT and revised VLT were inappropriate for students with lower levels of English ability. In the recent study with 490 students, the test items were more appropriate for the group of students examined. These tests could be used as a supplement to the VLT, as part of a battery of tests or as a subsection of a larger test. The two forms of the test showed that they were similar in their central tendencies, distributions, score reliability estimates, and SEMs. Future research on these new 1000 word level tests is needed, and refinements may be forthcoming.

References

Beglar, D. & Hunt, A. (1999). Revising and validating the 2000 word level and university word level vocabulary tests. *Language Testing, 16,* 131 – 162.

Brown, K. & Lake, J. (2002). *Kyushu Sangyo University English Education Program Placement Test II* (including test book, test guidelines, answer key, and tape). Fukuoka: Kyushu Sangyo University English Education Program.

Brown, J. D. (1996). *Testing in language programs.* Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Prentice Hall Regents.

Coady, J. & Huckin, T. (Eds.). (1997). Second language vocabulary acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coxhead, A. (2000). A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly, 34* (2), 213-238.

Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 440-464.

Kucera, H. & Francis, W. N. (1967). *Computational analysis of present-day American English.* Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University Press.

Kucera, H. & Francis, W. N. (1982). *Frequency analysis of English usage: Lexicon and grammar.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Kudo, Y. (2001). Measuring L2 vocabulary. In T. Hudson & J. D. Brown, (Eds.), *A focus on language test development: Expanding the language proficiency construct across a variety of tests* (Technical Report #21, 75-112). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Lake, J. (2001). "Placement testing and placement testing issues." Presentation for Fukuoka JALT on December 1, 2001.

Nation, I. S. P. (1983). Testing and teaching vocabulary. *Guidelines, 5,* 12 – 25.

Nation, I. S. P. (1993). Measuring readiness for simplified material: a test of the first 1,000 words of English. In M.L. Tickoo (Ed.), *Simplification: Theory and application* (193 – 203), RELC Anthology Series, 31.

Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Read, J. (1988). Measuring the vocabulary knowledge of second language learners. *RELC Journal 19,* 12 – 25.

Read, J. (2000). *Assessing vocabulary.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmitt, N. & McCarthy, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition, and pedagogy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmitt, N., Schmitt, D. & Clapham, C. (2001). Developing and Exploring the Behaviour of Two New Versions of the Vocabulary Levels Test, *Language Testing, 18,* 55 – 88.

Stahl, S. (1999). *Vocabulary development.* Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

Thompson, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Score reliability: Contemporary thinking on reliability issues.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Thorndike, E. L. & Lorge, I. (1944). *The Teacher's Word Book of 30,000 Words.* New York: Columbia University Teachers College.

West, M. (1953). *The General Service List of English Words.* London: Longman, Green & Co.

Westrick, P. (2001). "Making placement decision vocabulary tests for vocabulary size and placement decisions." Presentation for Fukuoka JALT. December 1, 2001.

NAME: _____ STUDENT NUMBER: _____ DATE: _____

MAJOR: _____ AGE: _____ GENDER: male female

This is a vocabulary test. You must choose the right word to go with each meaning.
Write the letter of that word next to its meaning.

Here is an example.

1 _____ part of a house	A. bus
2 _____ animal with four legs	B. clock
3 _____ something used for writing	C. horse
	D. pencil
	E. shoe
	F. wall

You answer in the following way.

1 __F__ part of a house	A. bus
2 __C__ animal with four legs	B. clock
3 __D__ something used for writing	C. horse
	D. pencil
	E. shoe
	F. wall

Some words are in the test to make it more difficult. You do not have to find a meaning for these words. In the example above, these words are bus, clock, and shoe.

Try to do every part. There are two parts, each with 30 questions, so there are 60 questions.

Westrick 1000-word level A

		A. member
1.	_____ open land	B. result
2.	_____ where you stop	C. field
3.	_____ one in a group	D. party
		E. cost
		F. end
		A. air
4.	_____ street	B. voice
5.	_____ what can be seen	C. office
6.	_____ people work in here	D. center
		E. road
		F. view
		A. son
7.	_____ what we eat	B. window
8.	_____ way to go	C. food
9.	_____ open space in a wall to see through	D. direction
		E. heart
		F. report
		A. thought
10.	_____ time before night	B. rule
11.	_____ idea	C. trouble
12.	_____ law	D. fire
		E. peace
		F. evening
		A. meeting
13.	_____ power	B. brother
14.	_____ woman	C. strength
15.	_____ how big or small something is	D. lady
		E. size
		F. bill
		A. reach
16.	_____ work for other people	B. need
17.	_____ must have	C. serve
18.	_____ talk	D. continue
		E. speak
		F. believe
		A. allow
19.	_____ go in	B. wish
20.	_____ fall	C. present
21.	_____ hope	D. accept
		E. drop
		F. enter
		A. kill
22.	_____ find	B. join
23.	_____ say	C. discover
24.	_____ put together	D. state
		E. deal
		F. fail
		A. important
25.	_____ small	B. real
26.	_____ not new	C. certain
27.	_____ sure	D. little
		E. old
		F. special
		A. fine
28.	_____ whole	B. complete
29.	_____ not right	C. cold
30.	_____ good	D. clear
		E. wrong
		F. foreign

Westrick 1000-word level B

		A.	nation
1.	_____ business	B.	force
2.	_____ place to study	C.	school
3.	_____ country	D.	company
		E.	name
		F.	war

		A.	condition
4.	_____ where you live	B.	moment
5.	_____ part	C.	reason
6.	_____ point in time	D.	home
		E.	experience
		F.	piece

		A.	purpose
7.	_____ kind	B.	sort
8.	_____ place to buy and sell	C.	arm
9.	_____ group of people	D.	club
		E.	market
		F.	movement

		A.	summer
10.	_____ cost	B.	price
11.	_____ big plant	C.	character
12.	_____ hot season	D.	game
		E.	river
		F.	tree

		A.	opinion
13.	_____ not a friend	B.	enemy
14.	_____ short record	C.	farm
15.	_____ what you think about something	D.	corner
		E.	note
		F.	hall

		A.	sit
16.	_____ get	B.	meet
17.	_____ give money for something	C.	increase
		D.	pay
18.	_____ grow	E.	receive
		F.	mean

		A.	add
19.	_____ come back	B.	lose
20.	_____ make ready	C.	prepare
21.	_____ put with something else	D.	form
		E.	return
		F.	explain

		A.	visit
22.	_____ hear	B.	listen
23.	_____ go see another person	C.	marry
24.	_____ become husband or wife	D.	agree
		E.	catch
		F.	lay

		A.	general
25.	_____ very good	B.	full
26.	_____ big	C.	large
27.	_____ able to do what you want	D.	human
		E.	great
		F.	free

		A.	low
28.	_____ of the present time	B.	due
29.	_____ difficult	C.	natural
30.	_____ not high	D.	wide
		E.	modern
		F.	hard