

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Ronald Eric Johnson entitled "Focus on Frequency: A Comparison of First-year German Vocabularies." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in German.

Chauncey J. Mellor, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Stefanie Ohnesorg

Sébastien Dubreil

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges
Vice Provost and
Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

**Focus on Frequency: A Comparison of First-year German
Vocabularies**

**A Thesis
Presented for the
Master of Arts
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville**

Ronald Eric Johnson

May 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank, first and foremost, my thesis advisor Jeff Mellor, for his unwavering and indefatigable support in the formulation and writing of this thesis. Writing this thesis would also have been impossible without the aid of Stefanie Ohnesorg and Sébastien Dubreil, both of whom gave me incredible insight on pedagogy and the craft in general. The German Department at UTK and its professors and instructors provided me an environment in which I have been able to grow and mature academically (as well as personally), and for that, I will be forever indebted.

I must of course also thank my family for never giving up hope, even as this project dragged on and on. To my friends, thank you for understanding why you did not see me for a year or so. A special thank you goes to Randall Jones and Erwin Tschirner for sharing their list with me. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the writers and publishers of the articles, textbooks, and dictionaries I used for their constant efforts in foreign language education.

ABSTRACT

Foreign language teachers, experts of pedagogy, and textbook publishers often cite frequency as an important tool in the creation of textbooks, as well as in teaching students a foreign language. These same figures, however, rarely question the application of frequency in these works. This thesis examines the application of frequency over a range of first-year German textbooks compared to a textbook that is explicitly based on a particular frequency dictionary. These textbooks are compared to each other and to the Jones and Tschirner Frequency Dictionary of German and Pfeffer's Grunddeutsch: Basic (Spoken) German Word List, Grundstufe.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: TEXTBOOKS AND METHOD	8
<i>The Role of Vocabulary in Textbooks</i>	8
<i>The History of Frequency in German</i>	10
<i>Vocabulary Frequency as a Topic in Pedagogy</i>	13
<i>Problems in Frequency Lists</i>	17
CHAPTER 2: MATERIALS AND METHODS	20
<i>Textbooks</i>	20
<i>Choices Made in the Comparison of Data</i>	22
<i>Presentation of Data</i>	23
<i>Comparison of Data</i>	25
<i>Comparison Between Jones-Tschirner and Pfeffer</i>	26
<i>Verb Frequency</i>	27
<i>Noun Frequency</i>	29
CHAPTER 3: CONCLUSIONS	32
<i>Verb Frequency</i>	34
<i>Noun Frequency</i>	37
<i>Uses of Frequency</i>	39
LIST OF REFERENCES	41
APPENDIX	47
VITA	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table A-1: Textbook Sales Ranks	47
Table A-1: Textbook Sales Ranks	48
Table A-2: Total tokens	49
Table A-3: Percentages	50
Table A-4: Hundred Most Frequent Words and Their Presence in the Textbooks Under Study	51
Table A-5: Top Hundred Verbs from Jones-Tschirner (JT)	54
Table A-6: Top Hundred Most Frequent Verbs from Pfeffer (P)	55
Table A-7: Verb Comparison of Pfeffer and Jones-Tschirner	56
Table A-8: Top Hundred Most Frequent Verbs (Jones-Tschirner) by Presence in Textbooks	58
Table A-9: Hundred Most Frequent Nouns from Jones & Tschirner	60
Table A-10: Hundred Most Frequent Nouns from Pfeffer	61
Table A-11: Noun Comparison of Pfeffer and Jones-Tschirner	62
Table A-12: Noun Comparison of Pfeffer and Jones-Tschirner	64

INTRODUCTION

Rather than acting simply as a reference work or a collection of salient exercises, the foreign language textbook informs the structure of a course, and orders the information the students are required to learn. Students see the textbook as the sum total of what is to be gained from a foreign language course. Furthermore, the textbook industry is sizeable, and foreign language programs have a plethora of available textbooks to choose from. Therefore, textbooks should be created with a great deal of foresight and planning. It is also true that the goal of any proficiency-oriented foreign language course, and by extension any foreign language textbook, is to make the learner as proficient as possible, giving even the least motivated of learners the skills necessary to communicate. Textbook producers are in the business of selling books. As such, they have a vested interest in reflecting current pedagogical trends, and conversely, pedagogy may be partially determined by sales of particular books over others.

To this end, many current textbooks attempt to deliver an “authentic” second language experience. There is no consensus on what this might actually mean, but common attempts toward this idea include the usage of texts written for native speakers, interviews, and the careful choice of vocabulary informed by frequency dictionaries. These attempts at the creation of comprehensive foreign language instruction have even become selling points in an attempt to maximize sales.

Much of the integration of target language texts, interviews, and other authentic sources appears to stem from an attempt to integrate culture through language. Even Paul Nation, one of the most often cited authors in the field of vocabulary acquisition, puts the size of vocabulary and skill in usage in a paradigm with what he calls “knowledge of the world (Nation (1990), 117),” or what we might call cultural competence. Nation does, though, make the important distinction: “The focus of teaching initially needs to be on increasing the size of the learners’ recognition vocabulary (Nation, 118).”

Building a learner’s vocabulary means maximizing the number of times a student is exposed to a word in such a way that the exposure will facilitate the learner’s acquisition of the word. The number of exposures necessary varies from learner to learner, as well as from study to study. According to Waring and Nation, studies in acquisition yield an average retention rate of only between 5.8% and 7.8% of the words in any text at the first exposure (Waring and Nation, 100). They also express a difference in the potential of word acquisition depending on the type of the word itself (Waring and Nation, 101). Furthermore, the same study estimates "vocabulary growth of between 150 to 300 words per year, not counting natural forgetting from the reading alone (Waring and Nation, 107)."

In light of this data, then, it is less than surprising that books strive towards pedagogically-grounded vocabulary sets in the hopes of creating textbooks attractive to foreign language programs that also make a careful selection of words

to develop language proficiency. Certain books, like McGraw - Hill's *Kontakte*, develop their vocabulary lists using frequency dictionaries in an attempt to maximize exposure to frequent words (*Kontakte*, xiii) . As the most frequent words make up the bulk of communication (Nation (1990), 119), more frequent exposure to the most frequent words should aid comprehension.

Clearly, basing textbook vocabularies on frequency dictionaries for the purpose of greater comprehension comes with its own problems. Choosing authentic texts and vocabulary sets appropriate for the learner still require textbook authors to make informed choices, and this editorial process introduces an inauthentic aspect. Interviews are also required to deal with a chosen aspect of vocabulary tied to the questions asked and topics addressed in order to be pedagogically relevant, especially in the first year, where a student's capability to negotiate unclear or uncertain language situations is at its lowest. It is then by design impossible to create a completely authentic experience, which is largely unpredictable, in the carefully structured environment of a foreign language classroom.

Moreover, appropriately authentic usage of the second language should presumably lead to active exposure to the most frequently used words. In English, the 4,000-5,000 most frequent words make up 95% of all written speech (Nation (1990), 119). Assuming this is indeed the case, using authentic texts, or those texts intended for native speakers of the language, could introduce to the learners a

wider range of vocabulary. Increasing the number of different words in a text limits a reader's repeated exposure to those words.

The question then becomes how best to implement vocabulary instruction. With the effectiveness of "authentic" texts called into question, books are less than unified regarding the approach used to promote vocabulary learning. Frequency-based learning is common, as is the "authentic" approach, which utilizes texts written for native speakers. Many textbooks even use combinations of structured texts intended for directed acquisition and authentic texts.

The purpose of this study is to examine five textbooks for instances of some of the most common German words with a view to establishing how closely their incorporation of common vocabulary items conforms to our understanding of the frequency of these words in general usage. One textbook serves as our baseline. This baseline will be a textbook that has been designed with the stated intention of using common German words as established in a frequency dictionary. The other four textbooks do not claim to base their selection of vocabulary on any published frequency dictionary.

The baseline textbook for this study is the sixth edition of *Kontakte*, published by McGraw - Hill. This textbook was chosen because of an explicit connection to a particular frequency dictionary - the *Frequency Dictionary of*

*German*¹, co-written by *Kontakte* editor Erwin Tschirner. As the “To the Instructor” section at the beginning of *Kontakte* states, “[c]hapter vocabulary has been revised with an eye to the *Frequency Dictionary of German* from Routledge (Jones and Tschirner, 2006).” *Kontakte* is also a popular choice among high school and college German classes based on comparison of sales figures (See Table A-1).

For comparison, I have chosen four other popular textbooks that do not have an explicit connection to any frequency dictionary. To make my choices, I was guided by sales figures from two of the most representative book sales websites, namely Amazon and Barnes & Noble. Because these two companies show markedly different sales figures, I have chosen the most popular textbooks (other than *Kontakte*) from each of the companies. Based on Amazon’s sales figures I have chosen *Neue Horizonte, Seventh Edition* (2009) from Houghton Mifflin, and *Treffpunkt Deutsch, Fifth Edition* (2008) from Prentice Hall. From Barnes & Noble, the highest sales ranks were for *Deutsch: Na klar!, Fifth Edition* (2008), published by McGraw - Hill, and *Vorsprung, Second Edition* (2007) published by Houghton Mifflin. These criteria are shown in Table A-1.

These texts will be examined for vocabulary entries listed in the *Frequency Dictionary of German*, hereafter referred to for brevity’s sake as Jones-Tschirner. The glossaries of the individual textbooks will be read and marked into a list containing all the words in that frequency dictionary. The works will then be

¹ Jones, Randall and Edwin Tschirner. *Frequency Dictionary of German*. Routledge

compared against each other and particularly against *Kontakte* for total percentage of common words. The results will then be cross-checked using an older frequency list, namely J. Alan Pfeffer's *Grunddeutsch: Basic (Spoken) German Word List*, referred to hereafter as Pfeffer. The details of form and method in the examination of these works will be presented in Chapter 2.

This study will be arranged into three chapters. The first will be an examination of the supporting literature, as well as evidence of the importance of exposure to words and the theory behind vocabulary acquisition. The next chapter will be the study itself, including a closer description of the textbooks in question, as well as their similarities and differences. The final chapter will consist of observations on the differences in vocabularies in first year textbooks, and whether explicit grounding in a certain frequency dictionary yields a higher percentage of frequent words.

This study comes with certain limitations. The most pressing limitation is that of focus, as I must, for the purposes of this study, select a small sample and use a small data set. Therefore, the results cannot be seen as absolutely applicable across the entire spectrum of foreign language textbooks. Moreover, the vocabulary data set is derived from the end vocabulary lists, which typically focus on the words intended for active mastery, but do not necessarily include all the instances of included words in the text. Similarly, this study will focus only on German textbooks with a German language set. Though the results will deal

exclusively with the German language, the approach and results may be extensible to other languages.

Despite these limitations, this study will provide a window into the effectiveness of planning vocabulary exposures in textbooks. It will also address these measures as selling points, and how frequency-based vocabulary extends past the budget sheet and into the classroom.

CHAPTER ONE: TEXTBOOKS AND METHOD

The Role of Vocabulary in Textbooks

It comes as little surprise that vocabulary acquisition is one of the most hotly debated areas of language pedagogy. The debate deals fundamentally with the most effective method of vocabulary delivery and acquisition. Some feel that, in a variant of the Direct Method of foreign language pedagogy, vocabulary is best delivered by authentic sources^{2, 3, 4}. These sources may frequently contain grammar and structures far beyond the comprehension of beginning students. Thus, careful selection of authentic texts is needed to keep the difficulty level of the language in the textbook within the bounds suggested by Krashen's ($i + 1$) principle (Krashen, 32). Another approach would be to construct the textbook and the texts in it with special focus on frequency dictionaries and a similar list of crucial, and frequent, grammatical structures in the target language. Textbooks produced in this way intend to maximize frequency of repetition of vocabulary and structures and do so within a level of proficiency carefully calibrated to resemble the student's

² Krashen, Stephen and Tracy D. Terrell. The Natural Approach. Hayward, California; Alemany Press, 1983.

³ Herron, Carol, Stephen P. Cole, Cathleen Corrie, and Sebastian Dubreil. *The Effectiveness of a Video-Based Curriculum in Teaching Culture*. The Modern Language Journal. Volume 83, Issue 4. P. 518-533.

⁴ Kramsch, Claire. Context and Culture in Language Teaching. Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1993.

established proficiency at the $i+1$ level. The graded readers of earlier decades illustrate this approach that Krashen later formalized in his Monitor Theory (Krashen, 32). The texts in these readers are often quite artfully constructed. However, even when produced by native speakers, they lack the authenticity of repurposed texts composed by native speakers for native speakers. Such texts, such as magazine or newspaper articles, book excerpts, and advertisements, are created to achieve purposes other than teaching non-natives the language involved, which appears to be the crucial defining quality of “authentic” texts.

Frequently, textbooks make their basis on theory explicit. In the section entitled “The Natural Approach” in the textbook *Kontakte*, published by McGraw - Hill, the authors state that “*Kontakte* is based on Tracy D. Terrell’s Natural Approach⁵, which originally drew on aspects of Stephen D. Krashen’s ‘Monitor Model’...⁶.” This approach is of course dynamic enough to require a study (or many more) of its own, but the most applicable to this discussion is a focus on comprehension of language, which, as will be discussed in depth later, must begin with vocabulary acquisition (Omaggio Hadley, 2001).

The Natural Approach and the Monitor Theory deal with the acquisition of grammar, vocabulary, and phrases through multiple avenues, including exercises,

⁵c.f. Krashen and Terrell’s The Natural Approach. P. 1. “The goal, then,...is to supply comprehensible input...and to bring the student to the point where he or she can understand language outside the classroom.”

⁶Also explained in The Natural Approach. P. 30. “This hypothesis states that conscious learning has an extremely limited function...: it can only be used as a **Monitor**, or an editor.”

listening comprehension, and the negotiation of conversation. What these varied means of acquisition have in common is a focus on input and communication, which in foreign language pedagogy will most often be words. The learning and acquisition of vocabulary lies at the heart of the foreign language classroom. In the beginner level foreign language classroom, vocabulary learning and recognition play the strongest role in the development of language proficiency.

Paul Nation treats this issue with an analogy to first language development: “[I]nitially first language learners’ skill in use depends on the size of their recognition vocabulary (Nation, 1993).” He goes on to draw a parallel to teaching methods, stating that the focus of the foreign language classroom must start with learning vocabulary.

The History of Frequency in German

How should one define the set of words to be learned in the beginning foreign language classroom? A reader of English who was familiar with the function word *the* could recognize approximately 7% of any written text (Nation, 1993), but would not yet have content words necessary to understand a text. In the same article, Nation develops strong parallels between language proficiency and the size and scope of personal lexicons, as well as cultural competence and vocabulary. With this example, the importance of frequent vocabulary is obvious.

Furthermore, readers require comprehension of about 95% of the vocabulary present to understand an academic text (Laufer, 2003). While students will not necessarily be trying to comprehend academic texts, the data does speak to a general level of comprehension necessary for understanding. Therefore, textbook authors have inferred that the acquisition of the most frequent words lead to a quicker and more thorough comprehension of written texts.

Despite this grounding in modern pedagogical theory, the careful structuring of texts is nothing new. In fact, foreign language texts have been using frequency dictionaries for at least the better part of a century. The first in a series of graded readers written by Erika Meyer, *Auf dem Dorfe*, published in 1949, states the following: “To provide a systematic linguistic training, these books have been carefully graded both for vocabulary and sentence structure...Purin’s *A Standard German Vocabulary* (D.C. Heath and Co., 1937) was used as a basis for vocabulary building (Meyer, vi).” What follows is a very detailed explanation of the exact words chosen for the learner. The vocabulary work referenced, Purin’s *A Standard German Vocabulary*, is a frequency word list published in 1937. This frequency word list is itself based on earlier frequency word lists by Wadepuhl and Morgan (published in 1928) and the New York State German Word and Idiom List from 1933. These lists were in turn based on Kaeding’s *Häufigkeitswörterbuch*,

compiled in 1897 as an improvement to stenography⁷. As if to drive the point home, the first sentence of Purin’s work informs us at this early date that “[t]he usefulness of frequency word lists in the learning and teaching of foreign languages is no longer questioned.”

Today, this approach continues in textbooks like *Kontakte*, where the vocabulary lists have been carefully constructed based on a particular frequency dictionary, much as the older texts had done. As previously stated, *Kontakte* itself purports to be based on Terrell’s Natural Approach. In addition, the authors of *Kontakte* based the vocabulary on another, more recent frequency list, namely Jones-Tschirner, published in 2006.

While other texts do not explicitly reference frequency dictionaries such as Purin or Jones-Tschirner, they quite evidently place great emphasis on maximizing acquisition of the most frequent vocabulary. *Vorsprung*, published by Houghton Mifflin, states that in the second edition, for instance, revisions had been made to highlight the highest frequency vocabulary. Other texts, while not explicitly mentioning frequency, have structured their vocabulary informed by theories such as the Natural Approach, where a distinction is made between vocabulary to be learned for active command and vocabulary to be recognized.

⁷Kaeding, F.W. *Häufigkeitwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Steglitz bei Berlin, Selbstverlag (gedruckt von E.S. Mittler & Sohn), 1897.

Vocabulary Frequency as a Topic in Pedagogy

Pedagogical studies relating to vocabulary also have a rich, if not quite as long, history. Often, the role of the vocabulary in question determines its delivery. A distinction often made is between functional and notional vocabulary. Functions in vocabulary are contextual uses of language - for example, shopping for food. This function contains many different notions - comparing prices, asking about quality, amount, and so forth (Finocchario, 12). By breaking the delivery of vocabulary into smaller organizational paradigms, Finocchario explains, a student is able to understand vocabulary as a necessary component of expressing certain ideas - thereby learning language as a method to communicate, rather than as variables in a grammatical system.

This method of organizing foreign language curriculum was developed to overcome the problem of deficient communicative abilities as a result of an audio-lingual method-organized curriculum, or one organized through grammar learning rather than vocabulary and communication. According to Finocchiaro and Brumfit: “Many methodologies seem to ignore the fact that the ability to use real, appropriate language to communicate is - and should be - the primary goal of most foreign language learning (Finocchiaro, 9).”

These problems themselves are what had inspired the articles by Marjorie Tussing and Jon Zimmermann^{8,9}. In their 1977 examination of the courses at California State University, Fullerton, they noticed a high rate of attrition in German classes, which they attribute in part to flawed first-year vocabulary sets. A lack of usable, important vocabulary taught as items to be learned frustrated the students to the point of forcing them out of the program.

In these studies, Tussing and Zimmermann first examined the vocabularies of first year textbooks to determine how well they conformed to frequency lists. They then followed this study up with a look at intermediate texts in 1980, which yielded surprisingly similar results, both in structure and content of the vocabularies. The intent of these comparisons was to show that a common, frequency-based source of vocabulary would have made the textbook vocabularies, and therefore the teachers and students using these books, more successful. It would be difficult to find more compelling evidence of the importance of vocabulary and the construction of vocabulary lists than this.

Frequency also plays a role in the simple acquisition of vocabulary. Rob Waring and Paul Nation's study on vocabulary needed to process English texts examines the vocabulary necessary for understanding, with an eye towards

⁸Tussing, Marjorie and Jon Zimmermann. "Vocabulary in First-Year German Texts." *Die Unterrichtspraxis*. Vol. 10, No. 2. Pp. 65-73.

⁹Tussing, Marjorie and Jon Zimmermann. "Vocabulary in Intermediate German Texts." *Die Unterrichtspraxis*. Vol. 13, No. 1. Pp. 76-86.

frequency.¹⁰ Moreover, this study clearly shows a strong correlation between exposure count and vocabulary retention and acquisition, which once again connects the concept of frequency, more frequent words, and the ability to acquire vocabulary.

The same also applies to the development of appropriate teaching materials. In the article “‘Learn to Speak German:’ How the Course is Structured,” Jeff Mellor explicitly references frequency with regard to the development of a course, using a selection of the most frequent words (i.e., function words, modals, prepositions, etc.) as items to be learned in the first two chapters of *Learn to Speak German*¹¹. Rodney Swenson’s study on West German newspapers from 1976 is one of the more often cited examples, examining vocabulary required to effectively understand certain newspapers¹². He states that any reader with a firm grasp of the 1506 frequent words listed in his study would be able to understand the bulk of German newspaper articles in the time period listed. These findings run parallel to the theoretical framework established by Nation and Waring, who also examined advertisements in their study on reading comprehension. These studies,

¹⁰Nation, Paul and Rob Waring. “Second Language Reading and Incidental Vocabulary Learning.” *Angles on the English Speaking World*. Vol. 4, 2004. Pp. 97-110.

¹¹Mellor, Jeff. “‘Learn to Speak German:’ How the Course is Structured.” *Die Unterrichtspraxis*. Vol. 30, No. 2. Pp. 185-190.

¹²Swenson, Rodney. “A Vocabulary Frequency Count: Based on Three Leading West German Newspapers.” *Die Unterrichtspraxis*. Vol. 3, No. 2. Pp. 22-32. This list also signals a pedagogical shift in the choice of texts to be read—away from readers carefully constructed by persons such as Erika Meyer, Peter Hagboldt and Goedsche-Glaettli to authentic, ‘relevant,’ contemporary newspaper texts.

however, do invoke the question of time and appropriateness of certain words as a function of the time period.

The use of frequency lists and dictionaries in the development of pedagogical materials has an equally rich history. Beginning with the publication of Kaeding's *Häufigkeitswörterbuch*, German-language frequency work increased by leaps and bounds. This advantage has led to a long tradition of frequency in German language pedagogy.

The prevalence of Purin's list as a vocabulary basis in textbooks is made evident in the preface for another reader, the *Elementary German Series* by Peter Hagboldt. According to Werner F. Leopold, the author of the preface, Hagboldt himself collaborated with Purin and B. Q. Morgan to "[write] a series of readers with a vocabulary based on actual frequency counts (Hagboldt, iv)." This decision was, according to Leopold, revolutionary due to the objective nature of selecting vocabulary based on frequency. Moreover, this method results in a highly useful, if smaller, vocabulary set (Hagboldt, iv). This quick preface comes perhaps the closest to explaining the benefit of frequency-based vocabulary. By minimizing editorial choice, and instead focusing on words most frequently used in conversation, students can, theoretically, obtain a useful vocabulary set.

As previously stated, the series of graded readers written by Erika Meyer used the contemporary frequency lists to develop a vocabulary designed to improve a student's vocabulary as quickly as possible. These were based on

Purin's frequency list. Meyer's work was far from the only one of its kind. Another set of readers based on the same frequency list are the *Cultural Graded Readers* published in 1955 by the D. Van Nostrand Company and written by C. R. Goedsche and W. E. Glaetli. An alternate set of readers published in 1957 and written by the same authors arranges its vocabulary based again on Purin's list.

This approach continues in books like *Kontakte*, which bases its vocabulary on Jones-Tschirner. Though this book is directly derived from a corpus, the authors have also created it with an eye to the history of frequency studies already established. Among the references, one finds Pfeffer's *Basic (Spoken) German Word List*¹³, B.Q. Morgan's *German Frequency Word Book*¹⁴, and of course, Kaeding's *Häufigkeitwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Therefore, it becomes abundantly clear that one can trace a rich, highly interwoven tradition from the beginning of frequency study to the work being done today.

Problems in Frequency Lists

Based on the foregoing, it is quite clear that vocabulary is recognized as crucial to foreign language learning and is thus incorporated with a great deal of forethought into foreign language textbooks. Frequency, however, changes over

¹³Pfeffer, J. Alan. Grunddeutsch: Evolution of the Basic (Spoken) German Word List. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1963.

¹⁴Morgan, B. Q. German Frequency Word Book. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1928.

time as the language changes. For example, the Swenson frequency lists of the early 1970's list the word *Truppe* (1445) with a much higher frequency than one would find today, possibly due to the Vietnam War. Similarly, frequency lists from that era will predictably have very low frequencies for the word *Computer*, and will have none for the word *Internet*, both of which rank as very frequent words today, #739 and #588, respectively, in Jones-Tschirner.

Therefore, a simple focus on frequency can be a double-edged sword. Frequency lists are up to date at the time of their publication, which will sometimes yield a forward-thinking, pedagogically sound vocabulary system. The ever-changing nature of language, however, can quickly render textbooks and frequency lists outdated (Swenson, 22).

Another potential problem with frequency-focused vocabulary deals with the nature of language. These frequent words are more frequent in communication regardless of their status in any dictionary. Well-formed, grammatical speech will by its nature have a higher percentage of the most frequent words.

It is primarily in response to this potential problem that this study is set up – in other words, to find out how textbooks conform to frequency standards. Accepting the general rule that words more frequent in speech and writing will occur more frequently in textbooks, which are designed to mimic authentic language, a frequency-based textbook vocabulary should not provide students with

a personal vocabulary with a higher percentage of frequent vocabulary than another textbook intended for beginning learners.

CHAPTER 2: MATERIALS AND METHODS

For the purposes of this study, I have chosen five textbooks. One of those, *Kontakte*, will be the control. The other four were chosen based on public sales figures with a view to survey the most common and therefore most influential textbooks in the current landscape. These textbooks will be used to compare the results of explicitly using a particular frequency dictionary in the development of textbook vocabulary and development not explicitly using a frequency dictionary.

As previously stated, the sales figures on the textbooks are quite variable (see Table A-1). However, *Kontakte* is high on the list for both sources. Therefore, we can derive from these figures that *Kontakte* is a popular textbook and can therefore be taken as representative of the current textbook landscape.

Textbooks

Kontakte, published by McGraw-Hill Higher Education, highlights the fact that it is “based on and inspired by the Natural Approach, pioneered by the late Tracy D. Terrell (Tschirner, xiii),” who was one of the book’s original authors. The textbook has made every attempt to be as current as possible. For example, the

sixth edition implements the most recent German spelling reforms, based on the 26th edition of Duden. Mixed media used in the book have been updated, and even the activities have been revised “to reflect the **interests and needs of today’s students** [their emphasis] (Tschirner et al., ¹⁵.)”

Most importantly for this study, the chapter vocabularies are based on a specific frequency dictionary, namely Routledge’s *Frequency Dictionary of German*, written by Erwin Tschirner, another author of *Kontakte*, and Randall L. Jones. As the only book selected that is explicitly based on a specific frequency dictionary, this combination serves as the control of this study.

Deutsch: Na Klar!, published by McGraw-Hill and written by Robert Di Donato, Monica D. Clyde, and Jacqueline Vansant, does not have vocabulary based on any frequency dictionary, and frequency is not mentioned. However, authentic texts are treated in depth (Di Donato, xvii).

Neue Horizonte, published by Houghton-Mifflin and written by David B. Dollenmayer and Thomas S. Hansen, has a detailed vocabulary system, complete with crosslisting in chapters and the glossary. This vocabulary, however, is not explicitly based on any particular frequency dictionary. The seventh edition is being used in this study.

The textbook *Vorsprung* is also published by Houghton-Mifflin and was written by Thomas Lovik, J. Douglas Guy, and Monika Chavez. I am using the

¹⁵Tschirner, Erwin, Brigitte Nikolai, and Tracy D. Terrell. *Kontakte: A Communicative Approach*. McGraw – Hill Higher Education.

second edition. *Vorsprung* makes reference to a focus on high-frequency phrases. The *Vorsprung* authors indicate that they have increased focus on high-frequency phrases (Lovik et al., IAE-12), but do not cite any frequency list or dictionary that they have used for this purpose.

Treffpunkt Deutsch was written by E. Rosemarie Widmaier, Fritz T. Widmaier, and Margaret Gonglewski and is published by Prentice Hall. For this study, I am using the 4th edition. This book makes no explicit reference to frequency with regard to vocabulary.

Choices Made in the Comparison of Data

In the selected textbooks, certain choices were made with respect to how words are included in the glossaries. Rather than simply exclude any entry in the glossary not directly matching the corresponding entry in the frequency dictionary, I have attempted to understand the spirit of the inclusion and the considerations that lead to it, and include appropriate tokens.

To this end, I have included verbs when listed with an appropriate preposition as expressions of the “feste Verbindungen” concept. An example of this is the verb *achten* – in certain glossaries, it is simply listed as is, and in others, it is listed with the preposition *auf*. Both entries (*achten* or *achten auf*) communicate the meaning of the verb clearly, and have therefore been included.

Verbs not included are verb compounds. Verbs such as *kennenlernen* have not been counted as tokens of either *kennen* or *lernen* because of the significant difference in meaning¹⁶. Adjectival forms have not been included as tokens of corresponding verbs (*c.f.* beleuchtet, beleuchten).

Homonyms have been separated into their respective semantic categories and counted as such, resulting, for example, in two entries for *sein*. Entries such as *diese, dieser, dieses* have also been counted as tokens of *dies*.

Presentation of Data

The first task with the data was to compare the total number of tokens corresponding with Jones-Tschirner in each book. To determine the result of a focus on frequency in vocabulary, I have compared the textbooks on the basis of total tokens, which also appeared in the frequency dictionary by Jones-Tschirner.

Overall, two books exhibited a relatively high degree of congruence between Jones-Tschirner frequency list and their vocabulary list: *Kontakte* and *Deutsch: Na Klar!*. Somewhat surprisingly, *Kontakte*, the textbook with a vocabulary explicitly created with reference to this particular frequency dictionary, did not contain the highest number of frequent words in it. Even so, *Deutsch: Na*

¹⁶For consistency, even verb constructions like *spazieren gehen*, although not differing significantly in meaning, have not been included.

klar!(~55%) had less than one percent more than *Kontakte*(~55%). Those two are subsequently followed by *Vorsprung*, *Treffpunkt: Deutsch*, and *Neue Horizonte*, with approximately 41%, 36%, and 29%, respectively.

However, when the percentages are examined, the vocabularies of certain books are comprised of a much higher percentage of the most-frequent words (see Table A-3). In fact, the highest percentage was found among the book with the lowest total number of most frequent words – *Neue Horizonte* (See Table A-3). It should also be mentioned again that this book made no reference to basing its vocabulary on frequency. *Kontakte*, though a close second in total number of most frequent words and the single book based on a particular frequency dictionary, has the lowest percentage of most frequent words in its glossary.

Among those words not included in certain books, we can discern certain trends. The most common verbs are equally represented – “sein,” “haben,” “werden.” However, *Treffpunkt: Deutsch* and *Neue Horizonte* would appear to have omitted personal pronouns from the end vocabulary list; regardless, they are treated systematically in the grammar. Similarly, these two books do not list definite articles in the end vocabulary, and *Neue Horizonte* also does not include indefinite articles. These items, however, are included as topics in the text as grammatical features to be learned. In these cases, their absence in the glossary is not taken to indicate an absence in the book. Therefore, these will not be considered as oversights in the subject matter, but rather as editorial choices in

constructing the glossary. *Vorsprung* also does not include certain prepositions – “durch,” for example. There are also a few omissions that cannot readily be explained by reference to a grammatical set of words that are treated systematically in the text, such as prepositions and numerals.

With these considerations, the top hundred most frequent words are, with the exception of *Vorsprung*’s lack of *oben* and *durch*, equally represented in all the textbooks. The consistent treatment of these words in the textbooks supports the general thesis that the most frequent words are presented in the textbooks and indicates significant consensus on the part of the authors that these words are essential in beginning German.

Comparison of Data

Table A-3 illustrates the similarities and differences in the treatment of the hundred most frequent words in Jones-Tschirner. These words are listed in the left column in table A-4, along with an “X” under each book in the header row indicates that that word is present in its glossary. As might be expected, the works with the highest count of frequent words also have the highest count among these 50 most frequent words. The data has been arranged in the following section in tables with short introductions. Those items treated in the text but not present in

the glossary have been marked with a (*) to differentiate them from those items not present at all and those items present in the glossary.

With these additions, the top 100 words are almost universally included as items to be learned in the textbooks. Glossary omissions, on the whole, follow clear patterns. For example, *Neue Horizonte* and *Treffpunkt Deutsch* clearly omit articles from their glossaries while including them in the text.

Comparison Between Jones-Tschirner and Pfeffer

With the verbs and nouns, I have compared the hundred most frequent verbs in Jones-Tschirner and in Pfeffer's *Basic (Spoken) German Word List*. As previously stated, the correlation between the verbs was 69%, and the correlation on the nouns was 60%. While this correlation is not extremely high, it is high enough for the 31% and 40% of words not correlating on each list to conceivably be variations based on data sources, vocabulary changes over time, and pure chance.

For example, the Pfeffer list is, as the title suggests, based upon oral sources, namely 409 topical discussions gathered specifically for the development of this list (Pfeffer, 9). The Jones-Tschirner list is, in contrast, based upon the Leipzig/BYU Corpus of Contemporary German, containing "4.2 million words of spoken and written German (Jones-Tschirner, 2)." This is, of course, not to say that

one should be taken as more comprehensive or developed than the other. Instead, these two lists have yielded remarkably similar lists based on frequency from disparate sources.

Changes in vocabulary over time can be significantly harder to measure. The Leipzig/BYU Corpus of Contemporary German includes, according to the introduction of Jones-Tschirner, sources ranging from 1989 to 2002. Even the oldest of these sources is, of course, newer than Pfeffer's list. Therefore, it includes words like *der Euro*, which is a concept that, while now ubiquitous in German language and culture, had yet to be developed and introduced during the development of Pfeffer's list.

Verb Frequency

The hundred most-frequent verbs according to the *Frequency Dictionary of German* are listed in Table A-5 in order of their frequency. To support the objectivity of this study, this list was compared to the hundred most-frequent verbs from Pfeffer's *Basic (Spoken) German Word List* (see Table A-6). In this comparison, the individual frequencies of each word have been ignored as these differences are, for the purposes of comparison, relatively unimportant. Pfeffer and Jones-Tschirner list the same 69 verbs in the category of the 100 most frequent verbs. Since Pfeffer explicitly focuses on spoken German, whereas Jones-

Tschirner use texts as the basis of their count, this degree of congruence seems quite high and gives added confidence that these 69 verbs have a consistently high frequency of usage in both speech and writing.

Of the hundred most frequent verbs, 73% were listed in all five textbooks. 12% were present in four, 5% were present in three, 9% in two, and only 1% appeared in only one text. *Deutsch: Na klar!* has 99% of the hundred most frequent verbs. *Kontakte* lists 96% of the sample, *Neue Horizonte* has 81%, *Treffpunkt Deutsch* 82%, and *Vorsprung* includes 90% of the most frequent verbs.

The prevalence of most-frequent verbs with entries in all five glossaries indicates that with regard to verbs, explicitly basing a vocabulary on a particular frequency dictionary does not necessarily result in an inclusion of a higher percentage of more frequent verbs. The majority of the verbs that did not occur in all five glossaries were among the less frequent in the sample. This apparent agreement between the textbook authors shows a prevalence of most-frequent verbs, regardless of whether the texts were explicitly based on a frequency list, or on none at all.

Twenty-six verbs, then, failed to appear in at least one textbook. Of these, twelve ranked at or below #80 in the frequency ranking. Twenty out of twenty-six ranked at or below #60 in frequency. It is encouraging to note that the omissions occur among the less frequent verbs and suggests that the authors of all the textbooks might be attempting to focus their attention on the most frequent verbs

with a view towards increasing the exposure rate of the students to these verbs, thereby fostering especially the acquisition of these words.

Out of 73 verbs present in all five textbooks, all modals are included. 38 of the included verbs are strong, and 35 are weak. There were three separable-prefix verbs (*vorstellen*, *aussehen*, *anfangen*), and ten inseparable prefix verbs were included in all texts (*verstehen*, *bekommen*, *erzählen*, *erklären*, *gehören*, *verstellen*, *verlieren*, *erkennen*, *bedeuten*, *vergleichen*). Two of these verbs were –*ieren* verbs (*interessieren* and *studieren*; not including *verlieren*, which ends in –*ieren* but is not related morphologically). Only two present in every text require a dative object (*gehören*, *helfen*).

The verbs that were excluded within this sample do not constitute any discernible group, nor is there any apparent justification for their omission from the glossary and thereby from the text as items to be learned. Unlike the systematic absence of articles explained previously, these words are not treated as items to be learned in the texts.

Noun Frequency

The hundred most-frequent nouns according to the *Frequency Dictionary of German* are listed in Table A-9 in order of their frequency. As was done with the verbs, this list was compared to the hundred most-frequent nouns from Pfeffer's *Basic (Spoken) German Word List* (see Table A-10). In this comparison, the

individual frequencies of each word have been ignored as these differences are, for the purposes of comparison, trivial. These two lists agree on 60% of words, suggesting that these most-frequent nouns maintain high frequency counts in both writing and speech.

Of the hundred most frequent nouns, 71% were listed in all five textbooks. 13% were present in four, 7% were present in three, 3% in two, and only 2% appeared in only one text. *Deutsch: Na klar!* has 99% of the hundred most frequent nouns. *Kontakte* lists 96% of the sample, *Vorsprung* includes 90% , *Treffpunkt Deutsch* 82%, and *Neue Horizonte* has 80% of the most frequent nouns. This shows an extremely high correlation between the textbooks, indicating a strong presence of the most frequent nouns regardless of vocabulary basis.

Of the words present in all five textbooks, 19 are neuter nouns, 29 are feminine, and 20 are masculine. Two are plural nouns without easily discernable singular counterparts (*Leute* – *Person* or *Mensch*, *Eltern* – *Elternteil*). The nouns also represent many German plural forms. As stated, two of the nouns are already plural. Another three have no change in their plurals. One is an uncountable noun, meaning it has no plural – *Wasser*. Two pluralize with only *¨*. 14 of the nouns take the *–e* plural. Eight of the nouns use the *¨e* plural. Sixteen are *–en* plurals. Four use the plural *–er*, and five take the *¨er* plural. Sixteen use the *–n* plural. Of the 8 plural microclasses recognized by Klaus-Michael Köpcke (Behrens and Kai, 1), all

8 are represented across the textbooks¹⁷. This can be considered important because the complete representation of plural forms in the nouns in all five textbooks. Their inclusion, then, may not be based solely on frequency, but also on an editorial choice to represent all possible pluralizations.

These words also represent a wide range of semantic categories. For example, nine are words relating to time. Eight are in some way geographical. Four are personal relationships, and including these, nine are classifications of people. These categories are in no way comprehensive; such semantic classifications are tenuous at best and are therefore included here only by way of example.

The nouns are not quite as consistently distributed as the verbs. Regardless, it would seem that explicitly basing a vocabulary on a particular frequency dictionary does not necessarily result in a higher percentage of more frequent nouns, though our control textbook does have a much higher percentage than three other textbooks. The justification of noun inclusion is slightly different from that of the verbs, as nouns are often taught in thematic groups, often related to the verbs also being taught.

¹⁷ Behrens, Heike and Kai Kiekhoefer. *Identification of inflectional paradigms: the acquisition of the German plural*. Leipzig; Max-Planck-Institut für evolutionäre Anthropologie.

CHAPTER 3: CONCLUSIONS

In researching the topic of frequency, many justifications for basing vocabularies on frequency dictionaries were given, ranging from pedagogical efforts to inculcate basic vocabulary to marketing considerations that the textbooks be viewed as "up to date" or "relevant." Frequency dictionaries give textbook writers and editors an objective source from which they may select their vocabulary. Objectivity constitutes an oft-stated reason for using frequency in vocabulary, as Werner Leopold wrote in his introduction to Hagboldt's *Elementary German Series*. Basing textbooks on frequency also provides another pedagogical grounding, which raises the profile of a textbook and adds value in interpretation of authentic oral and written materials, potentially improving sales.

As stated before, textbooks might also base their vocabulary on frequency to produce the most useful possible vocabulary base in students - in knowing more frequently-used words, a student would, theoretically, be better able to interpret target language texts and media and express themselves intelligibly for target language speakers. Textbooks with a higher number of these words, and curricula informed by these textbooks, would then better prepare students to navigate target-language situations. Also a high degree of agreement on the vocabulary to be emphasized in first -year texts responds to the situation identified by Tussing-

Zimmermann that greatly disparate vocabulary lists in first year books made second-year instruction particularly difficult in that the students had little or no common ground on which to build further proficiency.

The data did not explicitly show the control textbook to have a much higher percentage of words in the frequency dictionary than those that were not reported to have been based on published frequency dictionaries. In fact, one of those books had a higher percentage than the control, and the only other book mentioning frequency, *Vorsprung*, came in a distant third. The other books were not always lacking in vocabulary; instead, these books made certain editorial choices. Some books did not include words in the glossaries that they did treat in the text. As a result, one must accept this as a choice made in the creation of the glossary that does not impact the breadth of the vocabulary set treated in the textbook. Despite the potential variation in editorial and content choices made in the textbooks and their respective vocabularies, the textbooks had a surprisingly high correlation in the most-frequent words present across all textbooks.

On the other hand, there are certain vocabulary entries that cannot be explained in this way. For example, the verb “bestehen” is present in only two textbooks, despite the word’s potential use as a “classroom word” - i.e., a word chosen not solely on the basis of the frequency or usefulness of the word in regular target-language conversation, but rather to facilitate communication within the

classroom. The absence of this word in the glossary does, in this case as well as in others, indicate an absence of the word as an item to be learned in the text.

For this reason, although systematic omissions from the glossary that are otherwise treated in the text have not been discounted in the closer study, non-systematic omissions representing items NOT treated by the text have been highlighted. Those non-systematic omissions represent the choices made in the subject matter of the textbooks, and these words are where the efficacy of frequency-based vocabularies will come into play. For example, it is sensible (but not mandated) that vocabulary lists should be gender-balanced regardless of frequency.

Verb Frequency

The distribution of the hundred most-frequent verbs was remarkably regular. Out of this sample, not one verb was absent from every text, and only one verb, *entsprechen*, was present in a single glossary, in this case *Deutsch: Na klar!*. This book also happens to be the book with the highest percentage of most-frequent words. The set of verbs listed in two books is larger than that of those listed in three books, but smaller than that listed in four or five books. This data “anomaly” indicates simply the high number of most frequent words in two of the texts, namely *Deutsch: Na Klar!* and *Kontake*, compared to the other three.

Contrary to the absence or presence of articles, prepositions, and others, the presence or absence of particular verbs in the glossaries cannot be explained as systematic editorial choices. Verbs cannot easily be divided into subject or concept groups the way these other categories can. Moreover, these particular verbs cannot be grouped into discernable categories. Verbs are then indications of inclusions or omissions in the words to be taught in the textbooks.

The percentages of verbs present in three and four textbooks (5% and 13%, respectively) cannot be explained solely on a frequency basis. Similarly, the high percentage of words present in two books (9%) does not support or refute the efficacy of frequency-based vocabulary. This can most likely be explained by the much higher percentage of most-frequent words in two books over the other three.

That said, the extremely low percentage (1%) of words present in only one textbook lies counter to the thesis that a focus on a particular frequency dictionary results in a higher percentage of more frequent words. A higher percentage here would indicate that the one textbook explicitly based on a frequency dictionary had a higher percentage of words than the others. Therefore, analysis of the verbs indicates that the development of a textbook vocabulary based on a particular frequency dictionary does not result in a higher percentage of more frequent words.

In the data, I have broken down the verbs present in all five textbooks into morphological and grammatical categories. The wide spectrum of types of verbs

indicates choices based not solely on frequency, but also on representation of grammatical types. Also, certain verbs, such as *studieren*, represent both a morphological example (in this case, *-ieren* verbs) and a word with classroom utility, much the same as *bestehen*, mentioned earlier. Most textbooks introduce this word relatively early, so that students can communicate personal information, such as their major for *studieren* and their score on a test with *bestehen*.

The concept of introducing words for classroom utility is popular in modern pedagogy. According to Omaggio Hadley, “[s]tudents should be encouraged to express their own meaning as early as possible after productive skills have been introduced in the course of instruction.” To reach these goals and foster productive language use, textbooks and curricula are often planned with words that communicate concepts common in classroom conversations.

Therefore, among verbs, frequency is most likely not used unchecked, but rather as one of many possible considerations in a more varied and planned verb selection based on other pedagogical criteria including morphological and grammatical categories and classroom utility.

Noun Frequency

Out of the hundred most-frequent nouns, not one noun was absent from every text, and two nouns were present in single glossaries. The percentage of nouns present in only one book is the lowest (2%), followed by those present in two (3%), then three books (7%), then four (13%), and finally the vast majority were present in all five textbooks (75%).

Nouns are often grouped thematically. In fact, there are entire textbooks, such as *Mastering German Vocabulary: A Thematic Approach* by Gabriele Forst and Veronika Schnorr, which are based on the premise of grouping noun vocabulary thematically. However, there are problems in interpreting nouns in groups. For one, these thematic groups are subject to interpretation and are by no means definitive. Also, the nouns here do not necessarily belong to any easily discernable group. The presence or absence of nouns will be considered as indications of inclusions or omissions in the words to be taught in the textbooks.

Regardless, semantic classification plays a major role in the selection of nouns for inclusion in textbooks. *Neue Horizonte*, and *Deutsch: Na klar!* specifically mention grouping chapter vocabulary thematically. The previously mentioned *Mastering German Vocabulary* is a popular work based purely on learning vocabulary thematically. Even *Kaleidoskop*, an intermediate textbook

published by Houghton Mifflin, groups vocabulary semantically, even while basing the vocabulary on authentic texts.

Much like the verbs, the extremely low percentage of nouns present in only one glossary (2%), as well as the high percentage present in all five (75%), indicates that most textbooks, regardless of whether they have a glossary explicitly based on a particular frequency dictionary, mostly contain the same set of most-frequent nouns. A higher percentage here would indicate that the one textbook explicitly based on a frequency dictionary had a higher percentage of most-frequent nouns than the others. Therefore, analysis of the nouns indicates that the development of a textbook vocabulary based on a particular frequency dictionary does not result in a higher percentage of more frequent words.

In much the same way that verbs belong to many different categories, the nouns represent all three genders and the common German plural forms. Therefore, it is also conceivable that these nouns were chosen for each book because of their representative nature rather than solely on the basis of frequency. However, it is also possible that over a set of a hundred nouns, the chances of finding all plural subcategories represented is quite high.

Uses of Frequency

Though the data collected for this study did not bear out any increases in frequently used vocabulary when a textbook is based upon a frequency dictionary, this is not to say that the use of a frequency dictionary is without merit.

As previously stated, frequency dictionaries provide an objective basis from which to develop a vocabulary.

The usage of frequency lists has also changed over time. The Pfeffer list, compiled explicitly for a pedagogical approach often considered outmoded, was produced to provide “basic source materials urgently needed to produce contemporary German texts utilizing the audio-lingual approach (Pfeffer, flap).” The audio-lingual method, or ALM, did not treat grammatical concepts as concepts to be learned consciously. Instead, the grammar inherent in a language was seen almost as a machine, with certain outputs desired from certain inputs.

In contrast, Tony McEnery and Paul Rayson assert in the introduction to the Routledge series to which Jones- Tschirner belongs that “frequency information should [not] be used slavishly. It would be a pity if teachers and students failed to notice important generalizations across the lexis presented in these dictionaries (Jones-Tschirner, vii).” This would seem to indicate a general shift away from frequency as the primary determining factor in vocabulary creation; as pedagogical theory, the creators of source materials, and the instructors move

away from the audio-lingual method, frequency is not to be used unchecked as a source for vocabulary. Even so, it appears that the great divergence in vocabulary choice that Tussing and Zimmerman identified in beginning textbooks has been reduced and that contemporary authors have achieved a substantial consensus on vocabulary appropriate for introductory German textbooks.

In the modern environment, then, texts are created using frequency as one of many factors determining the inclusion of vocabulary. In most currently popular pedagogical theories, grammar is treated to some degree as a concept to be learned. Therefore, vocabulary chosen to be part of a text should be indicative of the variations in grammar for the target language, so that the words learned may both be learned for the sake of the lexical entry and for the grammatical concepts, like plurals, conjugations, and the like, that they may demonstrate. Furthermore, the two should be combined organically, as they are cooperative parts of the same system.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Behrens, Heike and Kai Kiekhoefer. *Identification of inflectional paradigms: the acquisition of the German plural*. Leipzig; Max-Planck-Institut für evolutionäre Anthropologie.

Bialystok, Ellen. Communication Strategies. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1990.

Brumfit, C.J. and J.T. Roberts. A Short Introduction to Language and Language Teaching with a Comprehensive Glossary of Terms. London: Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd., 1983.

Di Donato, Robert, Monica D. Clyde, and Jacqueline Vansant. Deutsch: Na Klar! An Introductory German Course. New York: McGraw - Hill, 2008.

Forst, Gabriele, Veronika Schnorr, Martin Crellin, and Adelheid Schnorr-Dümmeler. Mastering German Vocabulary: A Thematic Approach. Hauppauge: Barron's Educational Series, 1995.

Gass, Susan M. and Larry Selinker. Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 2001.

Hadley, Alice Omaggio. Teaching Language in Context. Boston: Thomson Higher Education, 2001.

Herron, Carol, Stephen P. Cole, Cathleen Corrie, and Sebastian Dubreil. *The Effectiveness of a Video-Based Curriculum in Teaching Culture*. The Modern Language Journal. Volume 83, Issue 4. P. 518-533.

Jones, Randall L. and Erwin Tschirner. Frequency Dictionary of German: Core Vocabulary for Learners. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Kaeding, Friedrich Wilhelm. Häufigkeitwörterbuch der Deutschen Sprache. Berlin; Steglitz, 1898.

Kramsch, Claire. Context and Culture in Language Teaching. Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1993.

Krashen, Stephen D. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford; Pergamon Press, 1982.

Krashen, Stephen D. and Tracy D. Terrell. The Natural Approach. Hayward, California; Alemany Press, 1983.

Mellor, Jeff. "Learn to Speak German: How the Course Is Structured." Die Unterrichtspraxis. Vol. 30, Number 2. 1997: 185 - 190.

Moeller, Jack, Winnifred R. Adolph, Barbara Mabee, and Simone Berger.
Kaleidoskop: Kultur, Literatur und Grammatik. Sixth Edition. Boston:
Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002.

Morgan, B. Q. German Frequency Word Book. New York: The MacMillan
Company, 1928.

Nation, Paul. "Vocabulary Size, Growth, and Use." The Bilingual Lexicon. 1993:
115 - 134.

Pfeffer, J. Alan. Grunddeutsch: Basic (Spoken) German Word List. Grundstufe.
Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Pfeffer, J. Alan. Grunddeutsch: Evolution of the Basic (Spoken) German Word
List. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1963.

Purin, C. M. A Standard German Vocabulary. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company,
1937.

Schmidt, Gabriele. "Teaching Culture and Language for Specific Purposes: An
Approach to the Development of Appropriate Teaching Material."

- Australian Review of Applied Linguistics. Vol. 14. 1997: 135 - 146.
- Sevin, Dieter and Ingrid Sevin. Wie geht's? Eighth Edition. Boston: Thomson Higher Education, 2007.
- Sommer, Harold M. "Hörspiele: A Comparative Study of Appropriate Reading Vocabularies." *Die Unterrichtspraxis*. Vol. 13, Number 1. P. 76-86.
- Swenson, Rodney. "A Vocabulary Frequency Count: Based on Three Leading West German Newspapers." *Die Unterrichtspraxis*. Vol. 3, Number 2.
- Tschirner, Erwin, Brigitte Nikolai, and Tracy D. Terrell. Kontakte: A Communicative Approach. Sixth Edition. New York: McGraw - Hill Higher Education.
- Tussing, Marjorie and Jon Zimmermann. "Vocabulary in First-Year German Texts." *Die Unterrichtspraxis*. Vol. 10, Number 2.
- Tussing, Marjorie and Jon Zimmermann. "Vocabulary in Intermediate German Texts." *Die Unterrichtspraxis*. Vol. 13, Number 1.
- Wadepuhl, Walter, and B. Q. Morgan. Minimum Standard German Vocabulary.

New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1934.

Waring, Rob and Paul Nation. "Second Language Reading and Incidental Vocabulary Learning." Angles on the English Speaking World. Vol. 4. 2004: 97 - 110.

Weissenborn, Jürgen, Helen Goodluck, and Thomas Roeper. Theoretical Issues in Language Acquisition. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1992.

APPENDIX

Table A-1: Textbook Sales Ranks

	<i>Amazon</i>	<i>Amazon Rank</i>	<i>Barnes & Noble</i>	<i>Barnes & Noble Rank</i>
<i>Kontakte</i>	98569	1	155231	2
<i>Deutsch: Na Klar!</i>	238792	4	74550	1
<i>Neue Horizonte</i>	134856	3	267976	5
<i>Treffpunkt Deutsch</i>	535531	5	179353	4
<i>Vorsprung</i>	650657	6	169197	3

Table A-2: Total tokens

	Kontakte	Neue Horizonte	Treffpunkt: Deutsch	Vorsprung	Deutsch: Na klar!
Total	2213	1159	1452	1645	2240

Table A-3: Percentages

Treffpunkt Deutsch	3328	1452	44%
Vorsprung	3181	1645	52%
Kontakte	4997	2213	44%
Na Klar	5197	2240	43%
Neue Horizonte	1768	1159	66%

Table A-4: Hundred Most Frequent Words and Their Presence in the Textbooks**Under Study**

Token	Kontakte	Vorsprung	Na Klar!	Neue Horizonte	Treffpunkt Deutsch
der, die, das	X	X	X	*	*
und	X	X	X	X	X
sein	X	X	X	X	X
in	X	X	X	X	X
ein	X	X	X	*	X
zu	X	X	X	X	X
haben	X	X	X	X	X
ich	X	X	X	*	*
werden	X	X	X	X	X
sie	X	X	X	*	*
von	X	X	X	X	X
nicht	X	X	X	X	X
mit	X	X	X	X	X
es	X	X	X	*	*
sich	X	*	X	X	*
auch	X	X	X	X	X
auf	X	X	X	X	X
für	X	X	X	X	X
an	X	X	X	X	X
er	X	X	X	*	*
so	X	X	X	X	X
dass	X	X	X	X	X
können	X	X	X	X	X
dies	X	X	X	X	X
als	X	X	X	X	X
ihr	X	X	X	*	X
ja	X	X	X	X	X
wie	X	X	X	X	X
bei	X	X	X	X	X
oder	X	X	X	X	X
wir	X	X	X	*	*
aber	X	X	X	X	X
dann	X	X	X	X	X
man	X	X	X	X	X

Table A-4, Continued: Hundred Most Frequent Words and Their Presence in the Textbooks Under Study

da	X	X	X	X	X
sein	X	X	X	*	X
noch	X	X	X	X	X
nach	X	X	X	X	X
was	X	X	X	X	X
also	X	X	X	X	X
aus	X	X	X	X	X
all	X	X	X	X	X
wenn	X	X	X	X	X
nur	X	X	X	X	X
müssen	X	X	X	X	X
sagen	X	X	X	X	X
um	X	X	X	X	X
über	X	X	X	X	X
machen	X	X	X	X	X
kein	X	X	X	X	X
Jahr	X	X	X	X	X
du	X	X	X	*	*
mein	X	X	X	*	X
schon	X	X	X	X	X
vor	X	X	X	X	X
durch	X	*	X	X	X
geben	X	X	X	X	X
mehr	X	X	X	X	X
andere (r, s)	X	X	X	X	X
viel	X	X	X	X	X
kommen	X	X	X	X	X
jetzt	X	X	X	X	X
sollen	X	X	X	X	X
mir	X	X	X	*	*
wollen	X	X	X	X	X
ganz	X	X	X	X	X
mich	X	X	X	*	*
immer	X	X	X	X	X
gehen	X	X	X	X	X
sehr	X	X	X	X	X

Table A-4, Continued: Hundred Most Frequent Words and Their Presence in the Textbooks Under Study

hier	X	X	X	X	X
doch	X	X	X	X	X
bis	X	X	X	X	X
groß	X	X	X	X	X
wieder	X	X	X	X	X
Mal	X	X		X	X
zwei	X	X	X	*	*
gut	X	X	X	X	X
wissen	X	X	X	X	X
neu	X	X	X	X	X
sehen	X	X	X	X	X
lassen	X	X	X	X	X
uns	X	X	X	*	*
weil	X	X	X	X	X
unter	X	X	X	X	X
denn	X	X	X	X	X
stehen	X	X	X	X	X
jede (r, s)	X	X	X	X	X
Beispiel	X	X	X	X	X
Zeit	X	X	X	X	X
erste (r, s)			X		
ihm	X	X	X	*	*
ihn	X	X	X	*	*
wo	X	X	X	X	X
lang	X	X	X	X	X
eigentlich	X	X	X	X	X
damit	X	X	X	X	X
selbst, selber	X	X	X	X	X
unser	X	X	X	*	X
oben	X		X	X	X

Table A-5: Top Hundred Verbs from Jones-Tschirner (JT)

1.sein	26.halten	51.versuchen	76.reden
2.haben	27.nennen	52.schreiben	77.aussehen
3.werden	28.mögen	53.laufen	78.erscheinen
4.können	29.zeigen	54.erklären	79.bilden
5.müssen	30.führen	55.entsprechen	80.anfangen
6.sagen	31.sprechen	56.sitzen	81.erwarten
7.machen	32.bringen	57.ziehen	82.wohnen
8.geben	33.leben	58.scheinen	83.betreffen
9.kommen	34.fahren	59.fallen	84.warten
10.sollen	35.meinen	60.gehören	85.vergehen
11.wollen	36.fragen	61.entstehen	86.helfen
12.gehen	37.kennen	62.erhalten	87.gewinnen
13.wissen	38.gelten	63.treffen	88.schließen
14.sehen	39.stellen	64.suchen	89.fühlen
15.lassen	40.spielen	65.legen	90.bieten
16.stehen	41.arbeiten	66.vorstellen	91.interessieren
17.finden	42.brauchen	67.handeln	92.erinnern
18.bleiben	43.folgen	68.erreichen	93.ergeben
19.liegen	44.lernen	69.tragen	94.anbieten
20.heißen	45.bestehen	70.schaffen	95.studieren
21.denken	46.verstehen	71.lesen	96.verbinden
22.nehmen	47.setzen	72.verlieren	97.ansehen
23.tun	48.bekommen	73.darstellen	98.fehlen
24.dürfen	49.beginnen	74.erkennen	99.bedeutend
25.glauben	50.erzählen	75.entwickeln	100.vergleichen

Table A-6: Top Hundred Most Frequent Verbs from Pfeffer (P)

1. sein	26. finden	51. bitten	76. danken
2. haben	27. arbeiten	52. versuchen	77. schwimmen
3. werden	28. dürfen	53. verstehen	78. freuen
4. können	29. lassen	54. stellen	79. einrichten
5. müssen	30. nehmen	55. ankommen	80. studieren
6. sagen	31. denken	56. laufen	81. helfen
7. machen	32. kennen	57. beschäftigen	82. setzen
8. kommen	33. bringen	58. kochen	83. feststellen
9. gehen	34. anfangen	59. schreiben	84. treffen
10. geben	35. brauchen	60. fragen	85. erinnern
11. wollen	36. lernen	61. führen	86. dauern
12. wissen	37. bleiben	62. aussehen	87. merken
13. sehen	38. wohnen	63. fallen	88. schaffen
14. sollen	39. hören	64. leben	89. verdienen
15. fahren	40. interessieren	65. tragen	90. bezahlen
16. erzählen	41. essen	66. zeigen	91. verlieren
17. glauben	42. halten	67. ziehen	92. holen
18. heißen	43. gefallen	68. legen	93. anziehen
19. spielen	44. nennen	69. singen	94. ansehen
20. mögen	45. kriegen	70. vorstellen	95. bieten
21. liegen	46. besuchen	71. unterhalten	96. durchführen
22. bekommen	47. sitzen	72. suchen	97. selten
23. stehen	48. bauen	73. treiben	98. trinken
24. sprechen	49. gehören	74. kennenlernen	99. warten
25. lesen	50. kaufen	75. passieren	100. wählen

Table A-7: Verb Comparison of Pfeffer and Jones-Tschirner

Both	Only Jones,Tschirner	Only Pfeffer
(JT1)(P1)sein	(JT23)tun	(P39)hören
(JT2)(P2)haben	(JT35)meinen	(P41)essen
(JT3)(P3)werden	(JT38)gelten	(P43)gefallen
(JT4)(P4)können	(JT43)folgen	(P45)kriegen
(JT5)(P5)müssen	(JT45)bestehen	(P46)besuchen
(JT6)(P6)sagen	(JT49)beginnen	(P48)bauen
(JT7)(P7)machen	(JT54)erklären	(P50)kaufen
(JT8)(P10)geben	(JT55)entsprechen	(P51)bitten
(JT9)(P8)kommen	(JT58)scheinen	(P55)ankommen
(JT10)(P14)sollen	(JT61)entstehen	(P57)beschäftigen
(JT11)(P11)wollen	(JT62)erhalten	(P58)kochen
(JT12)(P9)gehen	(JT67)handeln	(P69)singen
(JT13)(P12)wissen	(JT68)erreichen	(P71)unterhalten
(JT14)(P13)sehen	(JT73)darstellen	(P73)treiben
(JT15)(P29)lassen	(JT74)erkennen	(P74)kennenlernen
(JT16)(P23)stehen	(JT75)entwickeln	(P75)passieren
(JT17)(P26)finden	(JT76)reden	(P76)danken
(JT18)(P37)bleiben	(JT78)erscheinen	(P77)schwimmen
(JT19)(P20)liegen	(JT79)bilden	(P78)freuen
(JT20)(P18)heißen	(JT81)erwarten	(P79)einrichten
(JT21)(P31)denken	(JT83)betreffen	(P83)feststellen
(JT22)(P30)nehmen	(JT85)vergehen	(P86)dauern
(JT24)(P28)dürfen	(JT87)gewinnen	(P87)merken
(JT25)(P17)glauben	(JT88)schließen	(P89)verdienen
(JT26)(P42)halten	(JT89)fühlen	(P90)bezahlen
(JT27)(P44)nennen	(JT93)ergeben	(P92)holen
(JT28)(P20)mögen	(JT94)anbieten	(P93)anziehen
(JT29)(P66)zeigen	(JT96)verbinden	(P96)durchführen
(JT30)(P61)führen	(JT98)fehlen	(P97)selten
(JT31)(P24)sprechen	(JT99)bedeuten	(P98)trinken
(JT32)(P33)bringen		
(JT33)(P64)leben		
(JT34)(P15)fahren		
(JT36)(P60)fragen		
(JT37)(P32)kennen		
(JT39)(P54)stellen		
(JT40)(P19)spielen		
(JT41)(P27)arbeiten		
(JT42)(P35)brauchen		
(JT44)(P36)lernen		
(JT46)(P53)verstehen		
(JT47)(P82)setzen		
(JT48)(P22)bekommen		
(JT50)(P16)erzählen		
(JT51)(P52)versuchen		
(JT52)(P59)schreiben		
(JT53)(P56)laufen		
(JT56)(P47)sitzen		
(JT57)(P67)ziehen		

Table A-7, Continued: Verb Comparison of Pfeffer and Jones-Tschirner

(JT59)(P63)fallen
(JT60)(P49)gehören
(JT63)(P84)treffen
(JT64)(P72)suchen
(JT65)(P68)legen
(JT66)(P70)vorstellen
(JT69)(P65)tragen
(JT70)(P88)schaffen
(JT71)(P25)lesen
(JT72)(P91)verlieren
(JT77)(P62)aussehen
(JT80)(P34)anfangen
(JT82)(P38)wohnen
(JT84)(P99)warten
(JT86)(P81)helfen
(JT90)(P95)bieten
(JT91)(P40)interessieren
(JT92)(P85)erinnern
(JT95)(P80)studieren
(JT97)(P94)ansehen

Table A-8: Top Hundred Most Frequent Verbs (Jones-Tschirner) by Presence in**Textbooks**

Five Entries	Four Entries	Three Entries	Two Entries	One Entry
JT1.sein	JT30.führen	JT67.handeln	JT45.bestehen	JT55.entsprechen
JT2.haben	JT38.gelten	JT75.entwickeln	JT61.entstehen	
JT3.werden	JT43.folgen	JT81.erwarten	JT62.erhalten	
JT4.können	JT51.versuchen	JT93.ergeben	JT73.darstellen	
JT5.müssen	JT68.erreichen	JT97.ansehen	JT78.erscheinen	
JT6.sagen	JT70.schaffen		JT83.betreffen	
JT7.machen	JT79.bilden		JT85.vergehen	
JT8.geben	JT87.gewinnen		JT90.bieten	
JT9.kommen	JT88.schließen		JT96.verbinden	
JT10.sollen	JT92.erinnern			
JT11.wollen	JT94.anbieten			
JT12.gehen	JT98.fehlen			
JT13.wissen				
JT14.sehen				
JT15.lassen				
JT16.stehen				
JT17.finden				
JT18.bleiben				
JT19.liegen				
JT20.heißen				
JT21.denken				
JT22.nehmen				
JT23.tun				
JT24.dürfen				
JT25.glauben				
JT26.halten				
JT27.nennen				
JT28.mögen				
JT29.zeigen				
JT31.sprechen				
JT32.bringen				
JT33.leben				
JT34.fahren				
JT35.meinen				
JT36.fragen				
JT37.stellen				
JT38.spielen				
JT41.arbeiten				
JT42.brauchen				
JT44.lernen				
JT46.verstehen				
JT47.setzen				
JT48.bekommen				
JT49.beginnen				
JT50.erzählen				
JT52.schreiben				
JT53.laufen				
JT54.erklären				

**Table A-8, Continued: Top Hundred Most Frequent Verbs (Jones-Tschirner) by
Presence in Textbooks**

JT56.sitzen
JT57.ziehen
JT58.scheinen
JT59.fallen
JT60.gehören
JT63.treffen
JT64.suchen
JT65.legen
JT66.vorstellen
JT69.tragen
JT71.lesen
JT72.verlieren
JT74.erkennen
JT76.reden
JT77.aussehen
JT78.anfangen
JT82.wohnen
JT84.warten
JT86.helfen
JT89.fühlen
JT91.interessieren
JT95.studieren
JT99.bedeutend
JT100.vergleichen

Table A-9: Hundred Most Frequent Nouns from Jones & Tschirner

1.Jahr	26.Schule	51.Stelle	76.Eltern
2.Mal	27.Woche	52.Form	77.Straße
3.Beispiel	28.Vater	53.Mark	78.Minute
4.Zeit	29.Seite	54.Entwicklung	79.Gruppe
5.Frau	30.Leben	55.Monat	80.Wert
6.Mensch	31.Mutter	56.Familie	81.Gesicht
7.Kind	32.Grund	57.Morgen	82.Sprache
8.Tag	33.Auge	58.Abund	83.Anfang
9.Mann	34.Wort	59.Aufgabe	84.Ort
10.Land	35.Geld	60.Universität	85.Moment
11.Frage	36.Sache	61.Sinn	86.Folge
12.Haus	37.Art	62.Staat	87.Interesse
13.Fall	38.Bereich	63.Ziel	88.Milliarde
14.Leute	39.Weg	64.Freund	89.Rolle
15.Arbeit	40.Stunde	65.Thema	90.Tür
16.Prozent	41.Name	66.Person	91.Schüler
17.Hand	42.Geschichte	67.Euro	92.Bedeutung
18.Stadt	43.Gesellschaft	68.Nacht	93.Text
19.Herr	44.Kopf	69.Ding	94.Ergebnis
20.Teil	45.Paar	70.Raum	95.Krieg
21.Problem	46.Möglichkeit	71.Blick	96.Weise
22.Welt	47.Unternehmen	72.Platz	97.Regierung
23.Recht	48.Bild	73.Zahl	98.Stück
24.Ende	49.Buch	74.System	99.Wohnung
25.Million	50.Wasser	75.Uhr	100.Gespräch

Table A-10: Hundred Most Frequent Nouns from Pfeffer

1.Jahr	26.Straße	51.Junge	76.Berg
2.Zeit	27.Frage	52.Wagen	77.Spaß
3.Schule	28.Stunde	53.Bauer	78.Reise
4.Kind	29.Frau	54.Aabend	79.Werk
5.Haus	30.Mädchen	55.Film	80.Form
6.Beispiel	31.Klasse	56.Zeitung	81.Mal
7.Tag	32.Sommer	57.Theater	82.Ort
8.Stadt	33.Leben	58.Freude	83.Platz
9.Leute	34.Seite	59.Grund	84.Verhältnis
10.Ding	35.Eltern	60.Wasser	85.Fernsehen
11.Sache	36.Krieg	61.Spiel	86.Interesse
12.Teil	37.Fall	62.Name	87.Rolle
13.Arbeit	38.Gebiet	63.Bild	88.Raum
14.Mensch	39.Geld	64.Sonntag	89.Freund
15.Beruf	40.Möglichkeit	65.Wald	90.Zug
16.Mann	41.Uhr	66.Geschichte	91.Mark
17.Vater	42.Winter	67.Garten	92.See
18.Land	43.Art	68.Musik	93.Ende
19.Lehrer	44.Sprache	69.Jugend	94.Nähe
20.Buch	45.Stück	70.Fahrt	95.Schloss
21.Familie	46.Betrieb	71.Weg	96.Herr
22.Mutter	47.Dorf	72.Aufgabe	97.Welt
23.Woche	48.Wetter	73.Gegend	98.Fach
24.Sport	49.Wort	74.Meter	99.Kurs
25.Schüler	50.Wohnung	75.Hand	100.Geschäft

Table A-11: Noun Comparison of Pfeffer and Jones-Tschirner

Both	Only Jones, Tschirner	Only Pfeffer
(JT1)(P1)Jahr	(JT16)Prozent	(P15)Beruf
(JT4)(P2)Zeit	(JT21)Problem	(P19)Lehrer
(JT26)(P3)Schule	(JT23)Recht	(P24)Sport
(JT7)(P4)Kind	(JT25)Million	(P30)Mädchen
(JT12)(P5)Haus	(JT85)Moment	(P31)Klasse
(JT3)(P6)Beispiel	(JT86)Folge	(P32)Sommer
(JT8)(P7)Tag	(JT33)Auge	(P38)Gebiet
(JT18)(P8)Stadt	(JT38)Bereich	(P42)Winter
(JT14)(P9)Leute	(JT43)Gesellschaft	(P46)Betrieb
(JT69)(P10)Ding	(JT44)Kopf	(P47)Dorf
(JT36)(P11)Sache	(JT45)Paar	(P48)Wetter
(JT20)(P12)Teil	(JT47)Unternehmen	(P51)Junge
(JT15)(P13)Arbeit	(JT51)Stelle	(P52)Wagen
(JT6)(P14)Mensch	(JT54)Entwicklung	(P53)Bauer
(JT9)(P16)Mann	(JT55)Monat	(P55)Film
(JT28)(P17)Vater	(JT57)Morgen	(P56)Zeitung
(JT10)(P18)Land	(JT60)Universität	(P57)Theater
(JT49)(P20)Buch	(JT61)Sinn	(P58)Freude
(JT56)(P21)Familie	(JT62)Staat	(P61)Spiel
(JT31)(P22)Mutter	(JT63)Ziel	(P64)Sonntag
(JT27)(P23)Woche	(JT65)Thema	(P65)Wald
(JT91)(P25)Schüler	(JT66)Person	(P67)Garten
(JT77)(P26)Straße	(JT67)Euro	(P68)Musik
(JT11)(P27)Frage	(JT71)Blick	(P69)Jugend
(JT40)(P28)Stunde	(JT73)Zahl	(P70)Fahrt
(JT5)(P29)Frau	(JT74)System	(P73)Gegend
(JT30)(P33)Leben	(JT78)Minute	(P74)Meter
(JT29)(P34)Seite	(JT79)Gruppe	(P76)Berg
(JT76)(P35)Eltern	(JT80)Wert	(P77)Spaß
(JT95)(P36)Krieg	(JT81)Gesicht	(P78)Reise
(JT13)(P37)Fall	(JT83)Anfang	(P79)Werk
(JT35)(P39)Geld	(JT88)Milliarde	(P84)Verhältnis
(JT46)(P40)Möglichkeit	(JT90)Tür	(P85)Fernsehen
(JT75)(P41)Uhr	(JT92)Bedeutung	(P90)Zug
(JT37)(P43)Art	(JT93)Text	(P92)See
(JT82)(P44)Sprache	(JT94)Ergebnis	(P94)Nähe
(JT98)(P45)Stück	(JT96)Weise	(P95)Schloss
(JT34)(P49)Wort	(JT97)Regierung	(P98)Fach
(JT99)(P50)Wohnung	(JT100)Gespräch	(P99)Kurs
(JT58)(P54)Abend		(P100)Geschäft
(JT32)(P59)Grund		
(JT50)(P60)Wasser		
(JT41)(P62)Name		
(JT48)(P63)Bild		
(JT42)(P66)Geschichte		
(JT39)(P71)Weg		
(JT59)(P72)Aufgabe		

Table A-11, Continued: Noun Comparison of Pfeffer and Jones-Tschirner

Both	Only Jones, Tschirner	Only Pfeffer
(JT17)(P75)Hand		
(JT52)(P80)Form		
(JT2)(P81)Mal		
(JT84)(P82)Ort		
(JT72)(P83)Platz		
(JT87)(P86)Interesse		
(JT89)(P87)Rolle		
(JT70)(P88)Raum		
(JT64)(P89)Freund		
(JT53)(P91)Mark		
(JT24)(P93)Ende		
(JT19)(P96)Herr		
(JT22)(P97)Welt		

Table A-12: Noun Comparison of Pfeffer and Jones-Tschirner

Five Entries	Four Entries	Three Entries	Two Entries	One Entry
JT1.Jahr	JT2.Mal	JT37.Art	JT53.Mark	JT54.Entwicklung
JT3.Beispiel	JT16.Prozent	JT38.Bereich	JT86.Folge	JT80.Wert
JT4.Zeit	JT23.Recht	JT47.Unternehmen	JT96.Weise	
JT5.Frau	JT39.Weg	JT74.System		
JT6.Mensch	JT45.Paar	JT87.Interesse		
JT7.Kind	JT46.Möglichkeit	JT92.Bedeutung		
JT8.Tag	JT52.Form	JT94.Ergebnis		
JT9.Mann	JT61.Sinn			
JT10.Land	JT78.Minute			
JT11.Frage	JT85.Moment			
JT12.Haus	JT91.Schüler			
JT13.Fall	JT93.Text			
JT14.Leute	JT97.Regierung			
JT15.Arbeit				
JT17.Hand				
JT18.Stadt				
JT19.Herr				
JT20.Teil				
JT21.Problem				
JT22.Welt				
JT24.Ende				
JT25.Million, Mio.				
JT26.Schule				
JT27.Woche				
JT28.Vater				
JT29.Seite				
JT30.Leben				
JT31.Mutter				
JT32.Grund				
JT33.Auge				
JT34.Wort				
JT35.Geld				
JT36.Sache				
JT40.Stunde				
JT41.Name				
JT42.Geschichte				
JT43.Gesellschaft				
JT44.Kopf				
JT48.Bild				
JT49.Buch				
JT50.Wasser				
JT55.Monat				
JT56.Familie				
JT57.Morgen				
JT58.Aabend				
JT59.Aufgabe				
JT60.Universität				
JT62.Staat				
JT63.Ziel				
JT64.Freund				

Table A-12, Continued: Noun Comparison of Pfeffer and Jones-Tschirner

JT65.Thema
JT66.Person
JT67.Euro
JT68.Nacht
JT69.Ding
JT72.Platz
JT73.Zahl
JT75.Uhr
JT76.Eltern
JT77.Straße
JT79.Gruppe
JT81.Gesicht
JT82.Sprache
JT83.Anfang
JT84.Ort
JT89.Rolle
JT90.Tür
JT95.Krieg
JT98.Stück
JT99.Wohnung
JT100.Gespräch

VITA

R. Eric Johnson was born in Knoxville, Tennessee to Ron and Leigh Ann Johnson. He has one sister, Lauren Johnson. After attending school in Knoxville, Eric continued his academic pursuits at the University of Tennessee. He obtained his Bachelor of Arts degree in 2006. In his Masters studies, Eric spent a year at Universität Stuttgart, continuing in his studies of German. He completed his Master of Arts degree in 2009, and is currently enrolled as a PhD student at the University of Tennessee.