Abstract
Research has shown that non-native speakers tend to overuse some language patterns and avoid some others (e.g. Ellis 1997). The paper compares the use of selected items of academic vocabulary (e.g. *focus*, *dissertation*, *current*) in native and non-native, namely Slovak, academic writing in English. Drawing on data from several corpora of academic writing, I examine the frequency and relevant collocations of these items. The study points to differences between synonymous expressions and has implications for teaching academic writing to non-native speakers.
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Introduction

Previous research into second language acquisition has shown that learners, compared to native speakers, tend to overuse or avoid some language patterns, mostly due to the negative transfer from their first language, known as L1 transfer (Ellis, 1997, pp. 51-52). In some cases, failure to approximate the performance level of native speakers may result in partial or full rejection of the speech community. Such is the case of academic writing, where high profile journals expect all authors, including non-native ones, to meet the demands of well-polished writing. For instance, *Linguistics*, a journal published by de Gruyter, explicitly asks “contributors whose native language is not English [to] have their manuscripts read by a qualified native speaker before submission” (Instructions for authors). Knowing which patterns in academic writing are a result of L1 transfer and as such non-idiomatic can therefore be highly beneficial for a non-native writer. The present paper aims to investigate some language patterns in native writing, considering them as model, on one hand and on the other hand to compare these model patterns to those used by Slovak learners. These patterns concern lexical choice only, as previous research has shown that for Slovak students it is the second most problematic area of academic writing (Chamonikolasová – Stašková, 2005; Walková, 2014).

Methods

The study compares the use of some selected lexical items in native and non-native academic writing. The items were chosen on the basis of my personal experience with non-native academic writing. The items were not taken from a list of academic vocabulary (e.g. Davies – Gardner, s. a.; Coxhead, 1998), as such lists include primarily words which typically do not pose a problem to learners (e.g. *study*, *group*, *social*, *research*, *level* among the top ten in Davies – Gardner, s. a.) or which are even cognates (e.g. *system*, *process*, *data*, *information*, *university*). I focus instead on such lexical items which have been shown to be problematic for Slovak learners in my previous research (Walková, 2014). Their list is given in (1).

(1) *focus*$_{V}$ – *concentrate*$_{V}$, *focus*$_{V}$PASS – *focus*$_{V}$ACT, *propose*$_{V}$ – *suggest*$_{V}$, *thesis*$_{N}$ – *dissertation*$_{N}$ – *dissertation thesis*$_{NP}$ (sic), *annex*$_{N}$ – *appendix*$_{N}$, *figure*$_{N}$ – *image*$_{N}$, *various*$_{ADJ}$ – *different*$_{ADJ}$, *specific*$_{ADJ}$ – *concrete*$_{ADJ}$, *up-to-date*$_{ADJ}$ –
Notice that most of the items come in apparently synonymous pairs or groups. Given the principle of economy of language, absolute synonymy is rare (e.g. Finegan, 1999, p. 195). Therefore, we can assume that two synonymous items will differ in frequency and/or collocations. A native writer is naturally aware of such nuances of use and connotations. In contrast, a non-native speaker might not feel the difference between synonyms or even be aware of a synonymous expression. In such cases, a non-native writer might prefer a lexical item which is a cognate in his/her own language. Accordingly, I compared the items in (1) in native and non-native, namely Slovak, academic writing in terms of frequency and use.

To examine the actual use of the items, several corpora were used, see Table 1 for details. For native writing, I used the British Academic Written English Corpus (BAWE)\(^{32}\), the academic writing subcorpus of the British National Corpus (BNC)\(^{33}\), and the academic writing subcorpus of the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)\(^{34}\). A disclaimer has to be made regarding their nativeness: In fact, these corpora contain writing by non-native speakers as well, yet at proficient level and that was assessed/edited by respective universities/journals. In other words, it is at a near-native level and meets the criteria of accomplished writing. For simplicity I will refer to these native and near-native samples of writing as “native corpora” in the rest of the paper.

To examine the use of the lexical items in (1) by Slovak writers, I created a small untagged corpus of Slovak academic writing in English (from now on referred to as SAWE). The corpus consists of English abstracts of Slovak PhD dissertations from various disciplines submitted to various universities in Slovakia in the years 2012-2015. The abstracts were accessed via The Central Registry of Theses and Dissertations (Centrálny register záverečných a kvalifikačných prác). I decided to use abstracts of PhD dissertations for two reasons. First, my previous research (Walková, 2014) showed that the academic writing of graduating PhD students does not markedly differ from the writing of students at Bachelor’s and Master’s level. Second, PhD students at the time of submitting their dissertation are junior researches, possibly embarking on a career in academia. Their writing is therefore informative of language use in young Slovak scholars with some, but relatively short experience with academic writing.

It has to be noted that the native corpora I used contain full papers, so the examined native and non-native corpora are not qualitatively equivalent. However, the large amount of data I needed was more easily accessible in the form of abstracts than full papers. The overall size of the corpus is 1,005,140 words, which is

---

\(^{32}\) The data in this study come from the British Academic Written English (BAWE) corpus, which was developed at the Universities of Warwick, Reading and Oxford Brookes under the directorship of Hilary Nesi and Sheena Gardner (formerly of the Centre for Applied Linguistics [previously called CELTE], Warwick), Paul Thompson (Department of Applied Linguistics, Reading) and Paul Wickens (Westminster Institute of Education, Oxford Brookes), with funding from the ESRC (RES-000-23-0800). The data drawn from this corpus are identified with a code starting with “BAWE” followed by the number of subcorpus, discipline, and the first word(s) of the title of the respective paper.

\(^{33}\) Data cited herein have been extracted from the British National Corpus (BNC), distributed by Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium. All rights in the texts cited are reserved. The data drawn from this corpus are identified with a code starting with “BNC”. The rest of the code is a text identifier and a sentence number.

\(^{34}\) Data extracted from Davies, Mark (2008-) The Corpus of Contemporary American English: 450 million words, 1990-present. The data drawn from this corpus are identified with a code starting with “COCA”, followed by the year, subcorpora, and the first word(s) of the title of the particular text.
comparable to similar corpora, e.g. Scientext English Learner corpus (1,078,105 words). However, the fact that the corpus only contains abstracts rather than full papers or dissertations has to be taken into consideration when interpreting the results.

In the native corpora, I determined the frequencies and collocations. Verbs and nouns were searched as lemmas. Only relevant collocations were considered, i.e. those meeting the following criteria: (i) collocations with content words, disregarding function words, (ii) collocations with highest frequency, and (iii) such collocations which revealed the connotations of the given lexical item. From the learner corpus, only frequencies but not collocations were extracted. Since SAWE is not tagged for parts of speech, the results had to be sorted manually in some cases. Alternative spellings were also considered, e.g. in practice/practice in all corpora, and dissertation, disertation (sic), and dizertation (sic) in the learner corpus.

Table 1 The corpora used in the study. POS – part of speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORPUS</th>
<th>kinds of writing</th>
<th>size/words</th>
<th>POS tagging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BNC – subcorpus</td>
<td>academic books, journal articles</td>
<td>17,831,029</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic writing</td>
<td>journal articles, university essays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAWE</td>
<td>student writing</td>
<td>6,506,995</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCA – subcorpus</td>
<td>journal articles</td>
<td>91,066,191</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWE</td>
<td>abstracts of PhD dissertations</td>
<td>1,005,140</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

The results for the frequency of individual lexical items (1) in all corpora are given in Table 2. The table shows both raw frequencies and normalized frequencies per 100,000 words for each corpus. The total normalized frequency in the native corpora is also calculated.

Table 2. Frequencies of the lexical items listed in (1) in corpora. TOT NAT – total native corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>corpus</th>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>BAWE</th>
<th>COCA</th>
<th>TOT NAT</th>
<th>SAWE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frequency/item</td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>per 10^5</td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>per 10^5</td>
<td>raw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus v</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>26,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concentrate v</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>4,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus v PASS</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus v ACT</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>17,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propose v</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>9,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggest</td>
<td>9,537</td>
<td>53.49</td>
<td>4,844</td>
<td>74.44</td>
<td>47,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now of course for many of these items the collocations are much more revealing than mere frequencies. The relevant collocates from the native corpora are listed in Table 3. Some items from (1) are not listed in Table 3, as collocations could not be drawn for them for their high complexity or low frequency in the corpora.
Table 3. Collocations of the lexical items listed in (1) in native writer corpora.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item/corpus</th>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>BAWE</th>
<th>COCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>focus&lt;sub&gt;V&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>attention, it, we, study, research, discussion, project, work, analysis</td>
<td>I, essay, we, research, study, attention</td>
<td>attention, spotlight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concentrate&lt;sub&gt;V&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>it, he, attention, we, research, chapter, study, programme</td>
<td>it, I, effort</td>
<td>efforts, wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propose&lt;sub&gt;V&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>government, model, solution, change, he, I, we, reform, scheme</td>
<td>theory, he, I, model, we, hypothesis</td>
<td>alternative, solution, hypothesis, framework, legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggest&lt;sub&gt;V&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>this, he, evidence, I, study, we, result, finding, strongly, data</td>
<td>evidence, theory, we, I</td>
<td>finding, evidence, strongly, tentatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thesis&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>doctoral, PhD</td>
<td>PhD, MSc</td>
<td>doctoral, M.A., PhD, senior, Master(s), graduate, BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissertation&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>doctoral, PhD, undergraduate</td>
<td>PhD, MSc</td>
<td>doctoral, PhD, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annex&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>country, list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appendix&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>see, fig., chapter</td>
<td>see, show, table</td>
<td>see, table, list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>figure&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>show, see, [numbers]</td>
<td>show, [numbers]</td>
<td>[numbers], show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>image&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>we, use, create</td>
<td>display, visual, create</td>
<td>body, God, digital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>various&lt;sub&gt;ADJ&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>way, form, kind, type, aspect, part, time, reason, level, factor</td>
<td>different, factor, form, method, way, group</td>
<td>aspect, kind, form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different&lt;sub&gt;ADJ&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>very, way, type, quite, kind, many, form, part, significantly, slightly</td>
<td>type, many, way, very, group, people, level</td>
<td>type, significantly, quite, somewhat, radically, entirely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific&lt;sub&gt;ADJ&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>example, general, issue, area, problem, purpose, activity, case</td>
<td>area, example, group</td>
<td>feedback, culturally, tailor, generic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concrete&lt;sub&gt;ADJ&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>term, more, example, abstract, situation, proposal, experience, expression, evidence</td>
<td>labour, abstract, evidence</td>
<td>abstract, situation, reality, abstraction, proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up-to-date&lt;sub&gt;ADJ&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>information, report, register, developments</td>
<td>information, research, project</td>
<td>information, keep, provide, knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current&lt;sub&gt;ADJ&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>practice, state, research, expenditure</td>
<td>asset, situation, system, problem</td>
<td>study, situation, trend, debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual&lt;sub&gt;ADJ&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>potential, practice</td>
<td>value, result, response, data</td>
<td>perceived, ideal, virtual, usage, anticipated, fictional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topical&lt;sub&gt;ADJ&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>treatment, steroids, issues</td>
<td>time, area, issue, treatment</td>
<td>antibiotic, steroids, therapy, treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in practice&lt;sub&gt;PP&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>difficult, theory</td>
<td>theory</td>
<td>theory, principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practically&lt;sub&gt;ADV&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>impossible, possible</td>
<td>use, impossible</td>
<td>speak, impossible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ratios of the items in pairs or groups are shown in Figures 1 and 2, for native and non-native writing, respectively.

**Figures 1 and 2.** The ratio of the lexical items in native (Fig. 1, left) and non-native (Fig. 2, right) corpora. A: focus\textsubscript{V}, concentrate\textsubscript{V}, B: focus\textsubscript{V PASS}, focus\textsubscript{V ACT}, C: propose\textsubscript{V}, suggest\textsubscript{V}, D: thesis\textsubscript{N}, dissertation\textsubscript{N}, dissertation thesis\textsubscript{NP}, E: annex\textsubscript{N}, appendix\textsubscript{N}, F: figure\textsubscript{N}, image\textsubscript{N}, G: various\textsubscript{ADJ}, different\textsubscript{ADJ}, H: specific\textsubscript{ADJ}, concrete\textsubscript{ADJ}, I: up-to-date\textsubscript{ADJ}, current\textsubscript{ADJ}, actual\textsubscript{ADJ}, topical\textsubscript{ADJ}, J: in practice/practise\textsubscript{PP}, in praxis\textsubscript{PP}, practically\textsubscript{ADV}, K: in other words\textsubscript{PP}, i.e.\textsubscript{ABBR}, respectively\textsubscript{ADV}.

**Discussion**

When we compare the use of the verbs *focus* and *concentrate* in native corpora, we can see that *focus* is used much more often, especially in American English. The trend is even stronger in SAWE. As the collocations reveal, both verbs collocate with both animate and inanimate entities, as shown in the examples in (2), so there is no obvious semantic difference.

(2) a. *Here I will concentrate on* (BAWE2:Politics:AGetsB)
   
b. *it [the text] will predominantly concentrate on* (BAWE3:Business:AsCollective)
   
c. *This essay will firstly focus on* (BAWE1:Philosophy:WhatDoes)
   
d. *In this essay, ..., we shall particularly focus on* (BAWE8:Classics:Discuss)

However, Slovak writers overuse the passive voice with the verb *focus*, which is only marginal in native writing, where the active form is preferred (3).

(3) a. *This chapter focuses in particular on the legal issues* (BNC AN5 1165)
   
b. *In particular, attention is focused on girls’ ... engagement* (BNC CLW 1291)
   
c. *The presented dissertation thesis is focused on the ... aspects* (SAWE)

In native writing, the verb *suggest* is used at least five times as often as its synonym *propose*. In addition, the collocates show that *propose* has a meaning of putting something, such as solutions and legislation, by persons, bodies, or even theories, forward for consideration (4a-b). *Suggest* is, in addition to the meaning ‘make a proposal’ (4c), used in the meaning ‘indicate’ – that is what *evidence, findings, results, and data* all do (4d). The fact that *suggest* collocates also with adverbs such as *strongly* and *tentatively* highlights the semantic difference between the two verbs. In contrast, in SAWE *propose* is used more frequently than *suggest*. This, however, may come from the authors’ attempt to highlight their contribution to research rather than from overuse – the examples form the SAWE corpus illustrate correct use of both verbs (4e-g).
(4) a. solutions proposed by each team (COCA:2010:ACAD:ComCollR:Balancing)
b. This influential theory proposed that (BAWE1:Psychology:TheEffects)
c. We suggest, therefore, that biology educators consider the entire learning landscape experienced by students… (COCA:2012:ACAD:Bioscience:Energy)
d. our data strongly suggest that (BNC HU3 154)
e. These results suggest that mechanisms… (SAWE)
f. Based on personal experience and practice of a performing artist, we … suggest solutions to possible technical pitfalls. (SAWE)
g. In this dissertation thesis we propose three new algorithms (SAWE)

As to the nouns thesis and dissertation, their individual frequencies are basically irrelevant. What I examine instead are one-left-hand-position collocates, i.e. collocations with a single immediately preceding word. As we can see in Table 3, university degrees as well as the adjective doctoral occur with both words. However, the two words themselves do not collocate with each other: dissertation thesis has a single occurrence in COCA and no occurrences in either BNC or BAWE. In other words, the combination is virtually non-existent in the native corpora and as such non-idiomatic. In contrast, SAWE contains a very high occurrence of dissertation thesis (5), probably due to L1 transfer (cf. dizertačná práca – lit. dissertation work, and záverečná práca – lit. final work). In fact, additional search reveals the use of still other non-idiomatic combinations: final thesis (13 occurrences), final work (2 occurrences with the intended meaning), doctoral work (1 occurrence), doctor work (2 occurrences). I conclude that such word combinations are a result of L1 transfer.

(5) a. The subject of the dissertation thesis is an analysis of the status (SAWE)
b. The submitted dissertation thesis is devoted to the … study (SAWE)

Annex as a noun is used only sporadically in the native corpora – in fact so sporadically that collocations could not be drawn from the two smaller British corpora. However, particular examples reveal that annex is used in the context of legislation (6a). In contrast, an appendix is part of a respective text, to which the author refers (6b). Comparing the results to Slovak writing, we see that annex is used much more frequently in SAWE than in the native corpora, to refer to a part of dissertation, besides appendix (6c-e). I conclude that annex is overused by Slovak writers.

(6) a. (see points I.A. and III.A. 3 of Annex I to the Directive), which are the operations to which the Commission expressly refers. (BNC FCJ 964)
b. An example letter to the defendants agreeing full facilities for a medical examination can be seen in Appendix 8C. (BNC J75 1469)
c. The thesis includes the annexes with the description of programme and worksheets used during the programme. (SAWE)
d. It is divided into 5 chapters and contains 32 tables, 14 graphs, 4 images, 5 diagrams and 2 annexes. (SAWE)
e. It contains 21 tables, 10 figures, 1 picture and 17 appendixes. (SAWE)

The noun figure is used at least twice as much as image in the native academic writing. Collocating with numbers, figure is typically used to refer to visuals accompanying the text (7a). In contrast, image is used to refer to a picture or impression (7b-c). In SAWE, however, the frequency is the other way round, image appearing about four times as much as figure. As shown in (6d-e), Slovak students use both words to refer to visuals accompanying the text, in effect overusing image.

(7) a. A mediated relationship, as shown in the bottom of Figure 1 (COCA:2012: ACAD:LanguageSpeech:Preliteracy)
b. taking a digital image for the website (COCA:2006:ACAD:AgricResrch: Remarkable)
c. the realm of eating disorders and body image dissatisfaction (COCA:2011:ACAD:JournalSchoolHealth:Predictors)

Turning to adjectives, different is used more frequently than various in both types of corpora. However, collocations reveal that while both adjectives are used with a range of nouns which can be various or different, such as ways, forms, types, and kinds, only different collocates with adverbs, e.g. significantly, very, quite, slightly (8a). A combination of the two adjectives is also possible (8b). All this evidence points in the direction that various describes a variety, i.e. a range of options, whereas different implies a qualitative difference. This nuance is not perceived by learners, who overuse different to mean ‘various’ (8c).

(8) a. which is not statistically significantly different from that for early-onset smokers (COCA:2012:ACAD:AmJPubHealth:Intergenerational)
   b. with electron transport by various different bacteria. (BAWE2:BiologicalSciences:Compare)
   c. The introductory part of the dissertation defines the theoretical framework of the research problem, describes the different options of risk measurement and describes the models of risk measurement. (SAWE)

   With another pair of adjectives, concrete is used in all corpora only marginally compared to specific. And as collocations show, concrete is the opposite of abstract and specific is the opposite of generic or general (9a-b). The difference, though, does not seem to affect the learners’ writing (9c-d).

(9) a. she held that both abstract and concrete points of view (BNC A64 493)
   b. has applied Althusser’s general theory to a specific case (BNC CMN 727)
   c. concrete solutions as well as from abstract point of view (SAWE)
   d. selected motoric abilities, both general and specific, were examined (SAWE)

   Further selected vocabulary comes in groups rather than pairs. The first such a group are adjectives up-to-date, current, actual, and topical. In both types of corpora, current is the most frequent, followed by actual and up-to-date. As revealed by collocations, while current and up-to-date mean ‘recent’ (10a-b), actual is the opposite of perceived, potential, ideal, etc. (10c). The adjective topical is typically used in native writing in the context of dermatological treatment (10d). Slovak learners, however, overuse both actual (cf. Slovak aktuálny ‘current’) and topical in the meaning ‘current’ (10e-f).

(10) a. cultural and technological changes are rendering many current practices obsolete (COCA:1997:ACAD:ComCollegeR:Reconciling)
   b. but no one up to date on recent historical literature (COCA:1999:ACAD:WorldAffairs:TheColdWar)
   c. their perceived or actual sexual orientation (COCA:2008:ACAD:SchoolPsych:Addressing)
   d. topical treatment with the local anaesthetic lidocaine (BNC HU4 5271)
   e. We analyze the history, actual crises and its impacts (SAWE)
   f. area of integration processes is topical in the educational process (SAWE)

   Another group of expressions involves in practise/practise (disregarding the spelling), in praxis, and practically. As the collocations show, both practically and in practice/se are used to contrast theory and actual practice (11a-b), so they are not semantically different (that is, apart from practically having also the meaning ‘virtually’). Therefore, they do not pose a problem for learners (11c-d). However, learners make use of in praxis (11e), whose frequency in native corpora is negligible, pointing to its non-idiomaticity in academic writing. This phrase is overused by Slovak learners probably due to its similarity to the corresponding Slovak phrase v praxi.
b. However, in practice the application of the theory is not always straightforward (BAWE1:Economics:ToWhatExtent)
c. The second part of the thesis demonstrates the theoretical knowledge practically (SAWE)
d. to verifying the applicability of the proposed process in practice. (SAWE)
e. cooperative methods, which are useable in praxis the most (SAWE)

The last group contains expressions in other words, i.e., and respectively. As the frequencies show, Slovak learners overuse respectively due to L1 transfer, cf. Slovak respektíve ‘that is; or’, at the expense of the correct expressions such as i.e. and in other words. As the following examples from the native corpora (12a-c) show, however, respectively ‘in the order given’ is semantically very different from i.e. ‘that is’ and in other words ‘put differently’. Slovak learners, however, do not always seem to be aware of this difference (12d-h) and tend to use respectively with the wrong meaning (12g-h).

(12)a. The language under discussion, i.e. language which is analyzed (BAWE9:Philosophy:IfMeaning)
b. what he says and how he says it, in other words his style (BNC EA3 819)
c. For a sample symbol for a verb and a preposition … consult Figures 1 and 2, respectively. (COCA:2012:ACAD:TechEngineerTeacher:Animation)
d. Written Translation and Oral Translation (i.e. Interpreting) (SAWE)
e. it is good to define professional requirements, or in other words, what professional area they want to deal with (SAWE)
f. Magnetic properties of the selected compounds were studied in the temperature range of 2–300K or 20–300K, respectively. (SAWE)
g. a detailed examination of the likely and foreseeable impacts of proposed construction, respectively activity on the environment (SAWE)
h. in education of student of pedagogical faculty, respectively in continuing education of teachers (SAWE)

Conclusion and implications

The paper examines selected academic vocabulary potentially problematic for non-native writers. The study has identified lexical items which are overused by Slovak learners. More specifically, Slovak students should be taught the correct names for their dissertation and its parts (appendix, figures) and the semantic differences between pairs such as appendix and annex, figure and image, and different and various. Classes of English for Academic Purposes should point out the false friends such as actual and respectively and explicitly teach to avoid such phrases as dissertation thesis and in praxis. In addition, topical in the meaning of current and to focus in the passive voice should be taught as non-preferred.
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