

Keywords in Written Academic Legal Texts: A Corpus-Derived List

Abdullah A. Alasmary¹

¹ Department of English Language & Translation, College of Languages and Translation, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Abdullah A. Alasmary, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: aasmary@KSU.EDU.SA

Received: February 10, 2019 Accepted: March 3, 2019 Online Published: April 6, 2019

doi:10.5539/ijel.v9n3p40 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n3p40>

Abstract

This study presents the Written Academic Legal Vocabulary (WALV), a discipline-specific genre-focused list of keywords in a corpus of academic legal texts. To generate this list, a purpose-customized corpus of full-length academic texts is created and analyzed with the help of corpus-based analytical tools. Items on the list are chosen based on criteria such as frequency of occurrence, range and keyness. The keywords recur more frequently in a specialized corpus than in a general reference corpus, a finding that attests to the pedagogical utility of these expressions as possible focus of explicit instruction. The final list consists of 298 headwords and 219 families (lemmas). Findings also indicate that the list includes words belonging to different grammatical types, the most common of which are nouns. The list also incorporates a large number of abbreviations, shortenings and acronyms.

Keywords: keywords, legal discourse, corpus linguistics, academic vocabulary

1. Introduction

Legal language requires that learners, particularly those for whom English is a second or foreign language, exhibit a greater understanding of and familiarity with a wide range of specialized vocabulary. However, gaining control over a large inventory of such vocabulary is not an easy task, given the general consensus among scholars that students find it challenging to achieve specific reading and writing purposes due to deficiencies in their lexical knowledge (Lei & Liu, 2016). The literature on teaching and learning second language vocabulary is replete with tips and techniques on how to expand learners' lexical knowledge. One way to support learners' lexical knowledge is to draw their attention to key lexical items typical of a specific discipline (e.g., Coxhead, 2000; West, 1953). Not only were these lists received with appreciation, but they also made their way into second language pedagogy: textbooks, methodology manuals and teaching resources.

The study of legal language has attracted the attention of several researchers (Berman, 2013; Bhatia, 1987; Maley, 1994; Tiersma, 2000; Williams, 2004). The central role that language plays in the legal discourse is captured by Maley (1994, p. 11) who maintains that language is the “medium, process and product in the various arenas of the law where legal texts, spoken or written, are generated in the service of regulating social behavior”. In a similar vein, Berman (2013, p. 87) holds that language is implicated in several legal discourse settings including “law-making, judging, regulating, negotiating, and other processes of creating, changing, or terminating rights and duties”. Tiersma (2000, p. 4) points out that legal language is increasingly seen as “a monolithic system” which “exhibits greater variation, depending on the place where it is used, whether it is written or spoken, the level of formality, the genre in which it appears, and other factors”. Several legal terms in English, Tiersma (2000) adds, can be traced back to Latin (e.g., *actus reus*) or French (e.g., *misdeemeanor*). In a much register-focused study, Williams (2004) explores the characteristics of written legal English, concluding that the specialized nature of vocabulary represents a challenge for non-experts as it contains several archaic expressions (e.g., *hereinafter* and *arraign*) and words of Latin and French origin (e.g., *attainder* and *profits à prendre*). On a sentence level, Williams (2004) observes that legal writings are inherently complex, relatively long and highly impersonal and contain a great number of passivized forms and nominal patterns.

In a seminal work, Bhatia (1987) discusses the distinctive attributes of the legal language, dividing it into spoken and written, with each branching out into smaller sub-types. The spoken legal language, on the one hand, is represented by lectures and moots, student-student interactions, client-lawyer discussions, talks between

counsels and witnesses, and jury instructions. The written legal language, on the other hand, includes three major forms: academic, juridical and legislative. Journals and textbooks represent the academic language whereas cases and judgements denote juridical language. Legislations involve several forms of writings, including contracts, agreements, rules and regulations. By focusing on a specific register (law) and a specific genre type (full-length textbooks), this study aims to present legal students and practitioners with a corpus-derived list of keywords which occur more often in a specialized group of texts than in a larger, though general, reference corpus.

A robust way of unveiling important vocabulary in a corpus of naturally-occurring language is to adopt a *keyword approach* (see Bondi & Scott, 2010). In this model, key vocabulary refers to “words which are significantly more frequent in a sample of text than would be expected, given their frequency in a large general reference corpus” (Stubbs, 2010, p. 25). Using this approach as a framework, this study hopes to present to language educators, materials designers and textbooks authors with a resource of key vocabulary typical of the legal language that can be used in contexts of language training programs and preparatory sessions.

2. Overview of Academic Vocabulary

Academic vocabulary has been the subject of extensive scholarly activity throughout the past decades (for a review see Nagy & Townsend, 2012). Knowledge of academic English vocabulary is essential for mastering a wide range of skills such as reading comprehension (Qian, 2002), speech (Dang, 2018; Dang & Webb, 2014), reading and writing (Malmström, Pecorari & Shaw, 2018) and general language proficiency (Webb & Paribakht, 2015). Developing a thorough understanding of and familiarity with academically oriented words and expressions has long been a goal of language preparation programs and intensive English language courses. Mastery of academic vocabulary allows non-native English students and novices to navigate complex texts in their specialist fields and to contribute to the construction and dissemination of discipline-specific knowledge (Nation, 2013). Possessing receptive as well as productive knowledge of domain-specific vocabulary is not an easy task, given the wide-ranging scope of this type of vocabulary, on the one hand, and the scarce classroom time that is available to practitioners, on the other hand.

Nation (2013) argues that it is important for second language learners to demonstrate knowledge of a wide array of academic vocabulary. The importance of this type of vocabulary, Nation continues to argue, lies in four factors. First, “academic vocabulary is common to a wide range of academic texts, and not so common in non-academic texts”. As for the second factor, vocabulary of academic nature “accounts for a substantial number of words in academic texts” (Nation, 2013, p. 291). A third factor is that academic vocabulary is not as “well-known as technical vocabulary” (p. 292), implying that learners are more likely to skip academic words and expressions and focus more on technical vocabulary. Finally, instructional intervention is expected to be successful, given the nature of this vocabulary which does not require specialist background from the part of instructors.

There have been several attempts to foster knowledge of academic vocabulary (Alamri & Rogers, 2018; Horst, Cobb, & Nicolae, 2005; Scammacca & Stillman, 2018; Thurston & Candlin, 1998). One way to help ESL students recall the meanings of academic words and less known expressions is to offer them access to a web-based platform where they can acquire knowledge of these lexical items and participate in a series of interactive activities that help in the productive use of the recently acquired vocabulary (Horst et al., 2005). In a similar vein, Thurston and Candlin (1998) allowed university-level students to access a concordance program in order to enhance knowledge of expressions of general academic use. Opinions gleaned from the students indicated that exposure to this type of vocabulary instruction is conducive to better retention of academic lexis. Alamri and Rogers (2018) tested several explicit ways of teaching technical and academic vocabulary and concluded that pre-instructional exposure to domain-specific terms with the help of a visual aid had a positive impact on the learning of academic vocabulary. Repeated exposure to subject-matter vocabulary is investigated by Scammacca and Stillman (2018) who noticed that allowing low-level students the opportunity to read texts several times made them aware of a wide range of vocabulary in the domain of social studies.

These studies seem to concur that there are several ways instructors can draw on to foster knowledge of academic vocabulary. One approach is to synthesize a pedagogically sound list of key academic words and expressions that can be used to inform classroom practices. The following section sheds light on some studies which have produced listings of academic and technical vocabulary throughout the past years.

3. Lists of Academic Vocabulary

The need to build lists of key vocabulary takes root in the seminal work of West (1953) whose pioneering attempt has drawn the attention of scholars from a range of different specialties. Despite its profound influence, West’s General Service List (GSL) is not without problems, the most obvious of which is the presence of some function words whose meanings pose no challenge to the students. Another attempt to create a list of useful

vocabulary was carried out by Coxhead (2000) who, considering the students' academic needs, created a 3.5-million-word corpus representing four key domains: art, commerce, law and science. Although Coxhead's Academic Word List (AWL) is more specialized than the GSL, thus accounting for items of academic nature, it is criticized for overlooking differences in vocabulary use within domains. A third notable list of key vocabulary was produced by Gardner and Davies (2014) who suggested a 500-word list of academic vocabulary based on a 120-million-word corpus representing a range of disciplines such as education, humanities, history, medicine and health, and law and political science. The list is comprised of items of different types which are elicited according to a set of predefined criteria such as range, frequency and the academic nature of the word. Words in the list are assigned to grammatical categories such as verbs (e.g., provide, include and develop), nouns (e.g., study, group, system) and adjectives (e.g., social, important, human).

The criticism leveled against the use of a general-purpose discipline-transcending list of vocabulary for fostering lexical knowledge irrespective of the field of the study (Hyland & Tse, 2007) has apparently encouraged scholars to investigate vocabulary in a range of domains such as medicine (Lei & Liu, 2016; Wang, Liang, & Ge, 2008), nursing (Yang, 2015) engineering (Watson Todd, 2017), agriculture (Martínez, Beck, & Panza, 2009), pharmacology (Grabowski, 2015) and finance (Tongpoon-Patanasorn, 2018). Martínez et al. (2009) contrasted a list of words from a corpus of journal articles in the field of agriculture to items on Coxhead's (2000) list, reporting that a total of 1941 word types uncovered in the agriculture list are also found in the AWL. These shared word types are not evenly distributed across the journal subparts, as the Results Section has the lowest number of types and the Discussion Section has the highest number. With respect to the meanings conveyed by these lexical items, the analysis shows that the same word in both lists may convey different meanings. For example, the word *culture* carries a different meaning in agriculture than in humanities, thus alerting specialists to the fact that even in cases where the same word occurs across disciplines, it should be noted that the meaning may differ according to the context under study. Lei & Liu (2016) compiled a list of academic words in the medical domain by applying a series of selection and filtering criteria. Drawing on a 2.7-million-word corpus of medical journal articles, the list is compared against a similar domain-specific corpus made up of textbooks. The list is comprised of 819 lemmas, half of which are nouns, 219 adjectives, 133 verbs and 23 adverbs. The list is said to offer "substantially more coverage while containing significantly fewer items" (p. 47). Yang (2015) developed a 676-item list of vocabulary expressions in a corpus of journal articles in the field of nursing. The list is built around word families which are both highly frequent and widely distributed.

A prime concern for the lists compilers has been the approach that they take when identifying and selecting words for the list from a corpus of naturally-occurring content. For example, Grabowski (2015) used a corpus with four divisions, each of which represents a distinct subgenre of the pharmacological studies. The next step was to use a software program to generate a keyword list typical of each sub-register by comparing the items on the keyword list against other corpus subparts. Lei and Liu (2016) applies a series of criteria, among the most important of which are the frequency of occurrence, distribution across texts making up the entire corpus and the extent to which the sequence fulfills a discipline-specific meaning. Tongpoon-Patanasorn (2018) appears to supplement her corpus-derived list with opinions of experts regarding the potential usefulness of the items for classroom teaching.

Despite the intense scholarly activity shaping the domain of the English for Specific/Academic Purposes (ESP/EAP) nowadays, it seems clear that legal studies have not received much attention. This study is expected to provide the legal community and the English instructors with a list of key vocabulary. To narrow the scope of the study, the list includes items derived from written academic texts, as these text types are expected to be encountered in various academic contexts. The list components are synthesized and discussed using a combination of corpus tools and genre analysis.

4. Methodology

This section sheds light on the corpora that are used to generate the list of words typical of the legal discourse. The second part is concerned with the refinement procedures taken to address some problems with retrieval of some items.

4.1 Corpora

This study draws on a 10-million-word corpus of written, full-length academic texts in the legal domain (see Table 1). Hyland (2009, p. 112) points out that academic textbooks are "indispensable to academic life, facilitating the professional's role as a teacher and constituting one of the primary means by which the concepts and analytical methods of a discipline are acquired". Textbooks as such have a number of situational characteristics (Biber & Conrad, 2009). They are normally written by professionals and are intended to address a

wider base of scholarly readership, including novices and less informed specialists. Textbooks come in a writing format and, unlike other registers such as speech, are subjected to rounds of revising, editing, proofreading, deletion and addition before they are available as a final product. In terms of their communicative purposes, textbooks seem to convey information and clarify concepts, thus combining both descriptive and explanatory features.

Texts making up the study corpus (SC) amount to fifty-five and cover a wide range of legal areas such as private law, internet law, cooperative law, European criminal law, international economic law, human rights law and energy law. Although this study strives to attain a higher level of representativeness, thus drawing on several legal areas, it should be noted that this corpus is not comprehensive enough to account for all divisions of the legal discourse, as such goal is difficult to fulfil, given the diversity of the discipline, on the one hand, and the wide-ranging scope of legal genres, on the other hand. Selected texts for analysis are cleared from the publishers' information, table of contents, table of figures, references, and table of cases and statutes (but not the cases and statutes themselves) prior to corpus treatment.

To elicit keywords typical to the legal domain, it is necessary to use a reference corpus (RC). The written section in the British National Corpus (BNC) is chosen as a reference corpus against which patterns in the study corpus are compared and contrasted. With a size totaling 100-million words, the BNC is "one of the largest and most representative corpus of general English currently available" (Durrant & Schmitt, 2009, p. 166). The reference corpus is approximately eight times larger than the study corpus, and the selection of a large reference corpus to detect keywords in a study corpus is a methodologically robust way, as is pointed out by Scott and Tribble (2006).

Keyness is calculated using *WordSmith Tools 7*, a software program which allows for a list of words in the Study Corpus to be generated using the *WordList Function*. Then the *Keyword Function* is used to compare the frequency of each word in the previously generated wordlist in the (SC) against the frequency of the same word in the reference corpus (RC). Keywords are elicited using log likelihood test with a minimum frequency of 25 times per million word and *p* value adjusted at 0.000001.

4.2 List Refinement

The corpus-derived list of the keywords in the corpus is not without problems. First, the list includes names of well-known regions, countries and cities such as Canada, Australia, Britain, the Netherlands, Europe, Berlin, the Hague and Geneva. Names of countries are deleted from the list as they pose no challenge to the students. Other words which are of no pedagogical value to the students either because they are quite common (e.g., internet) or are context-dependent proper names (e.g., Springer) are also removed from the list. These refinement procedures are carried out to ensure that items on the list are useful for the students with different study goals: furthering their subject-matter knowledge, pursuing an academic degree or participating in a career development program.

Table 1. Corpora description

Key statistics	Study Corpus (SC)	Reference Corpus (RC)
Tokens (running words)	10,178,964	87,814,984
Tokens used for word list	9,469,708	86,402,664
Types (distinct words)	6,401	338,302
type/token ratio (TTR)	0.07	0.39
Standardized TTR	36.77	43.16
Mean word length (in characters)	4.88	4.72
Word length std.dev.	2.72	2.60

5. Results

The analysis of the legal corpus has led to the retrieval of 499 headwords and 242 families which make the academic legal list (WAVL). In this section, items on the list will be compared against similar items in three academic lists, namely the Academic Word list (AWL), the General Service List (GSL) and the Academic Vocabulary List (AVL). Then, the legal vocabulary included in the first hundred words will be discussed with a particular attention being paid to some tendencies in the list.

5.1 Comparison with the AWL, GSL and AVL

Academic Legal List of keywords meeting the criteria for inclusion is presented in the Appendix. Since the purpose of this research is to provide learners with a manageable set of key vocabulary items, the list is

shortened to approximately 500 headwords and 242 families. The total occurrences of the headwords amount to 1,322,789 million times, accounting for 13.9% of all tokens in the corpus. Such percentage is greater than Coxhead's (2000) estimate which reported that items on the *Academic Word List* covered 10 % of all tokens in her 3-million corpus of academic materials. This discrepancy may be due to differences in the components of each corpus, as the present study draws on texts specific to law and legal studies whereas Coxhead's corpus comprises texts of distinct academic areas. Another reason lies in the differences in the corpus size, as it is clear that the corpus upon which this study is based is three times larger than that of Coxhead. As can be seen in Table 2, there are thirty-two words in Coxhead's list that are also found in our list. Examples of these words include nouns such as *access*, *principle* and *chapter*, verbs such as *establish*, *submit* and *conclude*, and adjectives such as *valid*, *adequate* and *legal*. When compared with West's (1953) *General Service List*, it becomes clear that there is much overlapping between items in both lists. The number of words that are found in the West's *GSL* and our list amounts to eighty-six (see Table 3). Examples of shared words include *court*, *moral*, *reasonable*, *law* and *case*. The greatest number of shared items is found between the WAVL list and that of Gardner and Davies' (2014), with a total of 135 words occurring in both lists. The top 40 overlapped words are reported in Table 4.

The legal list of key academic vocabulary incorporates headwords and families. The word *law*, for example, appears first in the list since it occurs far more frequently than the three other related forms: *laws*, *lawful* and *unlawful*. Presenting different forms of the same word offers the students and professionals the knowledge they need about a range of rhetorical devices that can be used for different communicative purposes in the legal domain.

Table 2. Words found in the WAVL and AWL

word	word	word
access	clause	internal
context	commission	justify
establish	conclude	legal
principle	conduct	mechanism
submit	consent	participate
valid	contract	prior
code	criteria	promote
adequate	ensure	regime
chapter	framework	regulate
circumstance	implement	specific
civil	impose	

Table 3. Shared words in WAVL list and GSL

word	word	word
court	purpose	exception
moral	property	arrest
reasonable	criminal	harm
law	justice	citizen
case	financial	mechanism
member	duty	remedy
international	agency	republic
rule	safety	lawyer
article	respect	universal
decision	program	customary
person	review	interference
apply	prevent	weapon
shall		

Table 4. Shared words in the WAVL and AVL (lemma)

word	word	word	word
form	assistance	support	standard
focus	resolution	organization	design
individual	result	increase	state
establish	experience	general	recognize
act	human	article	context
apply	thus	determine	relation
range	control	present	concept
conduct	international	measure	design
journal	individual	specific	purpose
specifically	support	author	benefit

5.2 Overview of the List Components

A quick look at the list reveals that it is dominated by nouns, representing roughly 75% of all words in the first one hundred words. Other forms are also represented, including verbs, adjectives and adverbs. The list also consists of a great deal of abbreviated forms, acronyms and shortenings.

The ubiquitous use of nouns is a distinct feature of the legal text. The list comprises a large number of nouns and fewer verbs and adjectives. The grammatical status of certain expressions can be determined only if concordance lines are checked, as they may belong to more than one grammatical category (e.g., conduct). The singular form of some nouns recurs more frequently than the plural form, giving an indication that the emphasis has been placed on single instances rather than collective ones. The noun *law*, for example, is encountered 60,000 times whereas the plural form *laws* is seen only 7000 times. This holds true with several other forms such as *state*, *court*, *member*, *article*, *rule* and *principle* in which the singular form recurs far more frequently than the plural form. Several nouns in the first 100 words have undergone a process of nominalization in which “verbs are transformed into nouns” (Williams, 2004, p. 115). Examples include nouns such as *decision*, *protection*, *organization* and *drafting*.

Beside nouns, the list comprises a large number of adjectives, the most recurrent of which are *legal*, *international* and *cooperative*. Some adjectives help characterize certain laws such as *international*, *general*, *federal* and *civil* whereas some others appear to provide more details about the nouns modified by these adjectives (e.g., limited, relevant and specific). Some other adjectives help show more about the distinctive characteristics of the following nouns. Examples include expressions such as *mutual*, *general* and *moral*.

It is clear from the list (see the Appendix) that verbs occur far less frequently than nouns and adjectives. The first verb form in the list is *apply* which reflects a state of action by parties for whom a specific legislation has been created. The modal verb *shall* is characteristic of the legal discourse as it is communicatively used to spell out regulations and assign rights and obligations (Breeze, 2013). Other verbs in the list such as *conduct*, *respect*, *establish* and *ensure* appear to emphasize the binding nature of rules and legislation.

The keywords list contains a number of acronyms, abbreviations and shortenings which need to be explained by referring the students to the full range of words represented by these acronyms. Some of the abbreviated forms stand for government agencies and international organizations such as the European Court of Justice (ECJ), International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the Department of Justice (DOJ) and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), while others refer to treaties and legislations such as TEFU (Treaty on the Functioning of European Union) and ECLI (European Case Law Identifier). The list also consists of common scholarly abbreviations and symbols such as *sec* for section, *cha* for chapter, and *vol* for volume. Some of the abbreviations represent similar entities such as *BER* and *DER*, which are used to refer to both *basic encoding rules* and *distinguished encoding rules*, respectively. It is worth mentioning that a single abbreviation may refer to two different entities, depending on the context in which it occurs. An example includes the abbreviation IAEA which can be interpreted as denoting to either the *International Atomic Energy Agency* or *Independent Administration of Estates Acts*. If left unexplained, these abbreviations will present a challenge for the students who may revert to inaccurate guessing.

6. Discussion

The purpose of this paper is to generate a list of key vocabulary that can be incorporated into an ESP or EAP course or training program for law students and non-native English professionals who aspire to expand their knowledge of legal language. The list of key academic words comprises a total of 498 headwords and 219

families. The coverage of headwords in the corpus, as is computed by the total number of occurrences, is at 13%, a proportion higher than the one reported by Coxhead (2000). It seems clear that the list is dominated by words and expressions typical of the legal discourse, a finding that is consistent with the conclusion noted by Hyland and Tse (2007) who doubted the usefulness of general vocabulary lists and called for more domain-specific ones that meet the needs of individual learners.

Although the list is generated from domain-specific texts, it seems clear that there is some overlapping between items here and items compiled by West (1953), Coxhead (2000) and Gardner and Davies (2014). Domain-transcending expressions include examples such as *clause*, *submit*, *purpose* and *form*. The presence of these items across different lists may be interpreted in two different ways. First, it seems clear that some items here carry different senses. The word *clause* is used in legal contexts to refer to a specific item in a legislation. This is rather different in a domain such as linguistics where the term *clause* is used to indicate a grammatical unit larger than the phrase. Another reason lies in the fact that some items are more likely to occur in several disciplines, given their broader rhetorical function in the written discourse (e.g., assume).

Another group of words in the list carry technical meanings. The words *article* and *code* are assigned highly specialized meanings that are tied to the legal discourse. When these two terms are used in domains such as linguistics and computer programming, they are more likely to convey different senses. The tendency for some expressions to have domain-specific meanings has been noticed by some researchers. Martínez et al. (2009) pointed out that the word *culture* in a corpus of texts on agriculture had a rather different, more specialized meaning. The list compiled by Grabowski (2015) has also similar terms that have dual meanings, that is, one general meaning and another more specialized one. The meanings fulfilled by expressions such as *trial* and *investigation* are largely typical of pharmacology where a specific medication undergoes extensive trial and experimentation before being produced for the public use.

Another tendency in the list is the prolific use of subject-matter abbreviations, shortenings and acronyms. Technical writing manuals (e.g., Tebeaux & Dragga, 2015) make a distinction between three types: abbreviations, acronyms and shortenings. Abbreviated forms such as the UK and the USA are spelled as single letters whereas acronyms such as the UNICEF are produced as words. The third type involves shortenings which consist of two or three letters representing a full-length expression. The list has several short forms such as vol. for volume, sec. for section and chap. for chapter.

7. Pedagogical Implications

There are several methodological and pedagogical implications of this study. Instructors can draw on the list for preparing vocabulary-focused materials. The procedure may involve categorizing items into grammatically distinct groups, that is, nouns are extracted and placed in a single group, verbs in second group, adjectives in a third group and so on. It is also possible that instructors select words that pose a challenge for learners and make a list of activities that alert learners to the meanings served by these items. Another implication is for textbook authors and materials designers who may find the list a good starting point while preparing ESL programs. Items on the list could also be used to measure the extent to which ESP and EAP materials deal with discipline-specific lexical knowledge. Finally, the list could be used to inform writing instruction in ESP/EAP contexts. It seems clear from some previous research (e.g., Candlin, Bhatia, & Jensen, 2002) that written legal content is not accessible for some students. Words presented in the WALV can be delivered using a freely accessible platform for learning and practice.

8. Conclusion

This study presents a discipline-specific genre-focused list which contains lexical items typical of the type of vocabulary normally encountered by the students and professionals in the domain of academic legal studies. The selection of items is driven by frequency of occurrence, range and keyness. The analysis of the corpus has uncovered a total of 498 headwords and 219 families. The pedagogical usefulness of items in the list, however, can be further strengthened if a “hybrid approach” (Tongpoon-Patanasorn, 2018) is pursued. In this approach, the corpus-derived list is presented to a group of experts in order to rank-order all lexical items on a scale of usefulness. Items which rank higher on the keyness scale, but are judged as unimportant or irrelevant by the panel of experts, are excluded from the final list. The list presented in this study can be useful for the students of law and legal studies, textbook authors, materials designers and language instructors. They can draw on items on the list while preparing language-preparation materials or teaching an English for Academic Purposes course.

Acknowledgement

The Author extends his appreciation to the Deanship of Scientific Research at King Saud University for funding

this work through the Research Project No R5-16-01-31.

References

- Alamri, K., & Rogers, V. (2018). The effectiveness of different explicit vocabulary-teaching strategies on learners' retention of technical and academic words. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(5), 622–633. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1503139>
- Berman, H. J. (2013). *Law and Language: effective symbols of community*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139519717>
- Bhatia, V. K. (1987). Language of the law. *Language Teaching*, 20(4), 227–234. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S02614448000464X>
- Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511814358>
- Bondi, M., & Scott, M. (2010). *Keyness in texts* (Vol. 41). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.41>
- Breeze, R. (2013). Lexical bundles across four legal genres. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 18(2), 229–253. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.18.2.03bre>
- Candlin, C. N., Bhatia, V. K., & Jensen, C. H. (2002). Developing legal writing materials for English second language learners: problems and perspectives. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21(4), 299–320. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(01\)00029-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(01)00029-1)
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587951>
- Dang, T. N. Y. (2018). The nature of vocabulary in academic speech of hard and soft-sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 51, 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.03.004>
- Dang, T. N. Y., & Webb, S. (2014). The lexical profile of academic spoken English. *English for Specific Purposes*, 33(1), 66–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2013.08.001>
- Durrant, P., & Schmitt, N. (2009). To what extent do native and non-native writers make use of collocations? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(2), 157–177. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2009.007>
- Gardner, D., & Davies, M. (2014). A New Academic Vocabulary List. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 305–327. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt015>
- Grabowski, L. (2015). Keywords and lexical bundles within English pharmaceutical discourse: A corpus-driven description. *English for Specific Purposes*, 38, 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.10.004>
- Horst, M., Cobb, T., & Nicolae, I. (2005). Expanding Academic Vocabulary with an Interactive On-Line Database. *Language Learning & Technology*, 9(2), 90–110.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2007). Is there an “academic vocabulary”? *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 235–253. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00058.x>
- Lei, L., & Liu, D. (2016). A new medical academic word list: A corpus-based study with enhanced methodology. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 22, 42–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.01.008>
- Maley, Y. (1994). *The language of the law* (J. Gibbons, Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Malmström, H., Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2018). Words for what? Contrasting university students' receptive and productive academic vocabulary needs. *English for Specific Purposes*, 50, 28–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2017.11.002>
- Martínez, I. A., Beck, S. C., & Panza, C. B. (2009). Academic vocabulary in agriculture research articles: A corpus-based study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28(3), 183–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2009.04.003>
- Nagy, W., & Townsend, D. (2012). Words as Tools: Learning Academic Vocabulary as Language Acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(1), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/RRQ.011>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858656>

- Qian, D. (2002). Investigating the relationship between vocabulary knowledge and academic reading performance: An assessment perspective. *Language Learning*, 52(3), 513–536. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00193>
- Scammacca, N. K., & Stillman, S. J. (2018). The Effect of a Social Studies–Based Reading Intervention on the Academic Vocabulary Knowledge of below-Average Readers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 34(4), 322–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2018.1446855>
- Scott, M., & Tribble, C. (2006). *Textual patterns: key words and corpus analysis in language education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.22>
- Stubbs, M. (2010). Three concepts of keywords. In M. Bondi & M. Scott (Eds.), *Keyness in texts* (pp. 21–42). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.41.03stu>
- Tebeaux, E., & Dragga, S. (2015). *The essentials of technical communication*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press Oxford.
- Thurston, J., & Candlin, C. N. (1998). Concordancing and the teaching of the vocabulary of academic English. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17(3), 267–280. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(97\)00013-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(97)00013-6)
- Tiersma, P. M. (2000). *Legal language*. University of Chicago Press.
- Tongpoon-Patanasorn, A. (2018). Developing a frequent technical words list for finance: A hybrid approach. *English for Specific Purposes*, 51, 45–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.03.002>
- Wang, J., Liang, S., & Ge, G. (2008). Establishment of a Medical Academic Word List. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(4), 442–458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2008.05.003>
- Watson, T. R. (2017). An opaque engineering word list: Which words should a teacher focus on? *English for Specific Purposes*, 45, 31–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.08.003>
- Webb, S., & Paribakht, T. S. (2015). What is the relationship between the lexical profile of test items and performance on a standardized English proficiency test? *English for Specific Purposes*, 38, 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.11.001>
- West, M. (1953). *A general service list of English words*. London: Longman.
- Williams, C. (2004). Legal English and plain language: An introduction. *ESP Across Cultures*, 1(1), 111–124.
- Yang, M.-N. (2015). A nursing academic word list. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.05.003>

Appendix A

No	Key Word	Lemmas/explanation of short forms
1.	Law	Laws, unlawful, lawful
2.	State	Stated, states, stating
3.	Case	cases
4.	Court	Courts, court's
5.	Legal	Legally, legality
6.	Member	Members, membership
7.	Rights	
8.	International	Internationally
9.	Rule	Ruled, rules, RUL
10.	Article	Articles, Art
11.	Decision	decisions
12.	Act	acts
13.	Cooperative	Cooperatives, Cooperation
14.	Person	persons
15.	Para (paragraph)	Paras, Paragraph, paragraphs
16.	General	
17.	Principle	principles
18.	Regulation	regulations, regulate regulate, regulated, regulates, regulating
19.	ET (et al) and others	
20.	Protection	Protect, protected, protecting, protects
21.	Human	Humanitarian, Humanity
22.	Apply	application, applied, applying
23.	Provision	Provisions, Provisional

24.	Contract	Contracting, contracts, contractual
25.	Shall	
26.	Commission	Commissioner
27.	Agreement	agreements
28.	Organization	Organizations, organizational
29.	Purpose	purposes
30.	Regard	Regarding [, regards, regardless
31.	Thus	
32.	Property	
33.	Convention	Conventions
34.	Treaty	Treaties [1617]
35.	PP	From Latin (Per procuracionem) meaning by agency, that is, signing on behalf of other.
36.	Competition	
37.	Obligation	obligations
38.	Risk	risks
39.	Framework	frameworks
40.	Criminal	Criminality
41.	Civil	
42.	Requirement	Requirements, require, requires, requiring
43.	Procedure	Procedures
44.	Justice	justice
45.	Security	securities
46.	Measures	
47.	Parties	
48.	ECLI	European Case Law Identifier
49.	ECI	Effectively Connected Income
50.	Access	accessed
51.	Activities	
52.	Financial	
53.	Copyright	
54.	Directive	directives
55.	Liability	Liabe, liabilities
56.	Duty	duties
57.	Relevant	Relevance
58.	Specific	
59.	SEQ	"and the following
60.	EC	European Commission
61.	Legislation	
62.	Chapter	
63.	Related	
64.	Basis	
65.	Adopt	Adopted, adopting
66.	Conduct	Conducted, conducting
67.	Agency	Agencies
68.	Victim	victims
69.	Recognition	
70.	Safety	
71.	Mutual	
72.	Interests	
73.	Cannot	
74.	Judicial	
75.	Respect	
76.	Limited	
77.	Ensure	ensuring
78.	Context	
79.	Issues	
80.	Objective	objectives
81.	Consumer	consumers
82.	Disaster	disasters
83.	Circumstance	Circumstance, circumstances
84.	Proceedings	
85.	Statute	Statutes
86.	Conflict	
87.	Code	codes
88.	Standards	
89.	Assistance	
90.	Program	programs

91.	Freedom	freedoms
92.	Provides	
93.	Capacity	capacities
94.	Establish	Establishes, establishing
95.	Request	Requested, requesting, requests
96.	Commercial	
97.	Fundamental	
98.	Review	
99.	Federal	
100.	Applicable	
101.	Circumstances	
102.	DER	Distinguished encoding rules
103.	Extent	
104.	TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of European Union
105.	LTD	
106.	Jurisdiction	
107.	Determine	Determines, determining
108.	Impose	Imposed, imposes, imposing
109.	Interpretation	interpretations
110.	Compensation	
111.	Opinion	opinions
112.	Resolution	resolutions
113.	Instrument	instruments
114.	Recognize	Recognize, recognized, recognizes, recognizing
115.	Govern	Govern, governed, governing, governs
116.	Labor	
117.	Constitution	Constitutional, constitutions
118.	Matters	
119.	Concerning	
120.	Scope	
121.	Patent	Patented, patents
122.	Armed	
123.	Moral	
124.	Exempt	exempted
125.	Concept	
126.	Assessment	assessments
127.	Entity	entities
128.	Insurance	
129.	Supreme	
130.	Prevent	preventing
131.	Aircraft	
132.	Constitute	Constituted, constitutes, constituting
133.	Relation	
134.	Defendant	defendants
135.	Undertakings	
136.	Plaintiff	plaintiffs
137.	Institutions	
138.	Additional	
139.	Consideration	considerations
140.	Corporate	
141.	Comparative	
142.	Nations	
143.	Norm	Norm, norms
144.	Content	
145.	Guidelines	
146.	Exception	exceptions
147.	Administrative	
148.	Global	
149.	Infringement	infringements
150.	Practices	
151.	Par	“equal” In commercial law
152.	Conclusion	conclusions
153.	Criterion	criteria
154.	Implement	Implements, implemented, implementing
155.	Aspects	
156.	Judgment	
157.	Player	

158.	Permit	Permits, permitted
159.	Regime	regimes
160.	Arrest	
161.	Internal	
162.	Prohibition	prohibitions
163.	Definition	
164.	Amendment	amendments
165.	Implementation	
166.	Restriction	restrictions
167.	ff.	And the following pages
168.	Warrant	
169.	Dispute	disputes
170.	JHA	Justice and home affairs
171.	Prohibit	Prohibited, prohibiting, prohibits
172.	Ownership	
173.	Corporation	corporations
174.	Legislative	
175.	Introduction	
176.	Participation	
177.	Assembly	
178.	Shareholder	shareholders
179.	Intellectual	
180.	Prior	
181.	Actions	
182.	Operations	
183.	Transaction	transactions
184.	Enforcement	
185.	Agricultural	
186.	Draft	Drafted, drafting
187.	Consent	
188.	Relating	
189.	Owner	
190.	Accordance	
191.	Manner	
192.	Doctrine	doctrines
193.	Athlete	athletes
194.	Equal	
195.	Harm	Harmed, harms
196.	Perspective	perspectives
197.	CTH	Contract to hire
198.	Journal	
199.	Emergency	emergencies
200.	Citizen	citizens
201.	Discrimination	
202.	Territory	
203.	Governance	
204.	Reasonable	
205.	Sanction	sanctions
206.	Moreover	
207.	Regulatory	
208.	Competent	
209.	Declaration	declarations
210.	Minimum	
211.	Conclude	Concluded, concluding
212.	ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
213.	Compliance	
214.	Norms	
215.	Welfare	
216.	Mechanism	mechanisms
217.	Limits	
218.	Damages	
219.	Remedy	remedies
220.	Supra	
221.	Concerns	
222.	Undertaking	
223.	Republic	
224.	Liberty	

225.	Registration	
226.	Criteria	
227.	Athletic	athletics
228.	Membership	
229.	Accordingly	
230.	Participate	Participating
231.	Database	databases
232.	Promote	Promoting
233.	Recognized	
234.	Procedural	
235.	Lawyer	lawyers
236.	Entitled	
237.	Prisoners	
238.	Recommendation	recommendations
239.	Consequences	
240.	Documents	
241.	Breach	breaches
242.	Limitation	limitations
243.	Assets	
244.	Statutory	
245.	Granted	
246.	Collective	
247.	Physician	physicians
248.	Binding	
249.	Annex	annexes
250.	Societies	
251.	Operator	operators
252.	Associations	
253.	Registered	
254.	IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency, Independent Administration of Estates Act
255.	Exemption	
256.	PTY	Proprietary, used after names of private companies in some countries
257.	ALIA	Affordable Life Insurance Alliance
258.	Shareholders	
259.	Restrictions	
260.	Pursuant	
261.	Enforce	Enforced, enforcing
262.	Execute	executing
263.	EFTA	European free trade association
264.	Sec.	section
265.	Crimes	
266.	Author	
267.	Agriculture	
268.	Genetic	genetics
269.	Exclusive	
270.	Aviation	
271.	REV	Real Estate Valuation
272.	Abuse	
273.	Governing	
274.	Directors	
275.	Charter	
276.	Furthermore	
277.	Namely	
278.	Distinction	
279.	Establishment	
280.	Violate	Violated, violates, violating
281.	Violation	
282.	License	Licenses, licensing
283.	Judges	
284.	PRO	Pro (Latin meaning <i>in favor</i>)
285.	Likewise	
286.	Civilian	civilians
287.	Situations	
288.	Communities	
289.	Employee	
290.	Vol	Volume
291.	Conflicts	

292.	Intervention	interventions
293.	Images	
294.	Autonomy	
295.	Merger	mergers
296.	Employer	
297.	Dominant	
298.	Digital	
299.	Institutional	
300.	Transactions	
301.	References	
302.	Contrary	
303.	Provider	providers
304.	Supervision	
305.	Audit	auditing, audits
306.	Submit	submitted
307.	WTO	
308.	Amended	
309.	Protocol	
310.	Comply	
311.	Infringe	Infringed, infringes, infringing
312.	Doc	docs
313.	Creditor	creditors
314.	Clause	
315.	Tort	torts
316.	Specifically	
317.	Comprehensive	
318.	Specific	
319.	Sovereignty	
320.	Charitable	
321.	Evaluation	evaluations
322.	Substantive	
323.	Resulting	
324.	Terrorism	
325.	Categories	
326.	Adequate	
327.	Burden	burdens
328.	Facilitate	facilitating
329.	Adoption	
330.	Respective	
331.	Behavior	
332.	Prevention	
333.	Possession	
334.	Mandatory	
335.	Arbitration	
336.	Deemed	
337.	Legitimate	
338.	SCE	European Cooperative Society
339.	EEC	European Economic community
340.	Violations	
341.	Equality	
342.	Invention	inventions
343.	Bankruptcy	
344.	Competence	
345.	Coordination	
346.	Economics	
347.	Challenges	
348.	Privacy	
349.	Issuing	
350.	Reasoning	
351.	Permitted	
352.	Punishment	
353.	Offences	
354.	Disclosure	
355.	Functioning	
356.	Safeguard	safeguards
357.	Benefit	benefits
358.	Ethical	

359.	Handicapped	
360.	Jurisprudence	
361.	Enterprises	
362.	Characteristics	
363.	Valid	
364.	Refers	
365.	Justify	justified
366.	Guidance	
367.	RES	Latin term for "a matter [already] judged
368.	Banking	
369.	Integration	
370.	Definition	definitions
371.	Manual	
372.	Regulated	
373.	Consequently	
374.	Execution	
375.	Addressed	
376.	CIR	Circuit courts
377.	Discretion	
378.	Explicitly	
379.	Actors	
380.	Online	
381.	Tribunal	tribunals
382.	Contributions	
383.	IRS	Internal revenue services (overlooking taxes)
384.	Strict	
385.	Chap	Chapter
386.	Navigation	
387.	Korean	
388.	Normative	
389.	Validity	
390.	Intent	
391.	Lawyers	
392.	Trademark	trademarks
393.	Uniform	
394.	Equity	
395.	Disability	disabilities
396.	Sovereign	
397.	AEUV	A German abbreviation
398.	Universal	
399.	Nonetheless	
400.	Negligence	
401.	Recommendations	
402.	Ethics	
403.	Penalties	
404.	Engage	engaging
405.	DOJ	The department of justice
406.	Legislature	legislatures
407.	Inspection	
408.	Governmental	
409.	Render	rendered
410.	Nutrition	
411.	Lex	Lex loci. A Latin term meaning the "law of [the] place". The principle that the law of the place giving rise to particular rights is the law that governs the rights of parties to a legal proceeding.
412.	Litigation	
413.	Sect	Section
414.	Chicago	
415.	Limitations	
416.	Comprise	comprises
417.	Edn	Education law
418.	Toward	
419.	Appeals	
420.	Customary	
421.	Justification	justifications
422.	Nationality	
423.	Sufficient	

424.	Surrender	
425.	Jurisdictions	
426.	Implemented	
427.	Voting	
428.	Governed	
429.	Implementing	
430.	Arising	
431.	Representatives	
432.	Technologies	
433.	Preliminary	
434.	Exploitation	
435.	Surplus	
436.	Domain	
437.	Supp	Short for supplement
438.	Solely	
439.	Customs	
440.	Bargaining	
441.	Korea	
442.	Necessity	
443.	Facility	
444.	Effectiveness	
445.	Cited	
446.	Sustainable	
447.	Interpreted	
448.	Debtor	
449.	Recipient	recipients
450.	Enacted	
451.	Operational	
452.	Forum	
453.	Attorney	attorneys
454.	Defense	
455.	Judgments	
456.	Olympic	
457.	Supervisory	
458.	Geographical	
459.	Technological	
460.	fine	finest
461.	Autonomous	
462.	Expressly	
463.	Corresponding	
464.	Termination	
465.	Transparency	
466.	Exclusively	
467.	Enforced	
468.	Baseball	
469.	Compulsory	
470.	REG	Regulation
471.	Competitors	
472.	Gender	
473.	Unrelated	
474.	Peaceful	
475.	Conception	
476.	Proportionality	
477.	IMF	International Monetary Fund
478.	Responsibilities	
479.	Exclusion	
480.	Applicability	
481.	Decree	
482.	Refusal	
483.	Mandate	mandates
484.	IPR	Intellectual property
485.	Inherent	
486.	Extradition	
487.	Presumption	
488.	Basketball	
489.	IRC	International revenue code (a body of law that codifies all tax laws)
490.	Interference	

491.	Stipulates	
492.	Cartels	
493.	Vertical	
494.	Providers	
495.	Weapon	
496.	Investor	
497.	financial	
498.	Precedent	precedents

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author, with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).