Correlation Between Usage of Academic Word List and Journal Rankings on English Studies in Indonesia

Mohamad Syafri[1], Najmi Hillaliyati[2], Nanik Shobikah[3], Nurfauziah Mansur[4]

[1]*UIN Datokarama Palu*, Indonesia, *email*: syafri@uindatokarama.ac.id
[2]*UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten*, Indonesia, *email*: najmi.hillaliyati@uinbanten.ac.id
[3]*IAIN Pontianak*, Indonesia, *email*: nanikshobikah@iainptk.ac.id
[4]*UIN Datokarama Palu*, Indonesia, *email*: nurfauziah@uindatokarama.ac.id

DOI : https://doi.org/10.30983/mj.v4i2.8538

Submission: August 1, 2024	*Revised: December 23, 2024*	*Published: December 31, 2024*

Abstract

The development of scientific articles has dynamically improved, including in the English disciplines. Therefore, this study explores the relationship between using the Academic Word List (AWL) and the ranking of journals in English studies in Indonesia, with a particular focus on writing characteristics. Given the growing importance of academic vocabulary in language learning and the pivotal role of writing in academic success, this research aims to provide insights into how academic word usage correlates with journal quality. This study itself is quantitative research. 180 articles from 18 Sinta-accredited journals were analyzed using an electronic text analysis approach. The journals were chosen proportionally based on their Sinta's rank. AntConc is used as the main application to analyze the lexical richness of the articles. The findings reveal that the overall lexical richness of the articles is 7.23%, with AWL words comprising 4.04% of the total vocabulary used. Despite these findings, statistical analysis indicates no significant correlation between the frequency of AWL usage and the journals' rankings. These results suggest that while AWL contributes to the lexical profile of academic writing, it does not directly influence journal ranking. Reasons could be assumed regarding these findings, such as journal's editorial policies, authorial preference, and disciplinary variations. This study enhances our understanding of the elements of high-quality academic writing and offers valuable insights for teaching and learning academic writing. Teachers and lecturers of academic writing courses could explore and elaborate on AWL's role in their teaching.

Keywords: academic word list, journal ranking, academic writing quality, lexical richness

Abstrak

Perkembangan artikel ilmiah semakin dinamis, termasuk pada disiplin ilmu bahasa Inggris. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini mengeksplorasi hubungan antara penggunaan Academic Word List (AWL) dan pemeringkatan jurnal dalam studi bahasa Inggris di Indonesia, dengan fokus khusus pada karakteristik penulisan. Mengingat semakin pentingnya kosakata akademis dalam pembelajaran bahasa dan peran penting menulis dalam keberhasilan akademis, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk memberikan wawasan tentang bagaimana penggunaan kata akademis berkorelasi dengan kualitas jurnal. Penelitian ini sendiri merupakan penelitian kuantitatif. 180 artikel dari 18 jurnal terakreditasi Sinta dianalisis menggunakan pendekatan electronic text analysis. Jurnal telah dipilih secara proporsional berdasarkan rangking Sinta. Dalam melakukan analisis terhadap lexical richness digunakan aplikasi AntConc. Temuannya mengungkapkan bahwa keseluruhan kekayaan leksikal artikel adalah 7,23%, dengan kata-kata AWL mencakup 4,04% dari total kosakata yang digunakan. Meskipun ada temuan ini, analisis statistik menunjukkan tidak ada korelasi yang signifikan antara frekuensi penggunaan AWL dan peringkat jurnal. Hasil ini menunjukkan bahwa meskipun AWL berkontribusi terhadap profil leksikal penulisan akademik, namun tidak secara langsung berhubungan dengan peringkat jurnal. Beberapa alasan yang diasumsikan menjadi dasar dari temuan, diantaranya kebijakan editorial dari jurnal, kecenderungan gaya menulis, dan ragam disiplim keilmuan. Studi ini meningkatkan pemahaman kita tentang unsur-unsur penulisan akademik berkualitas tinggi dan menawarkan wawasan berharga untuk pengajaran dan pembelajaran penulisan akademik. Para pengajar bagi kelas academic writing dapat secara lebih mengkaji dan mengelaborasi fungsi AWL dalam pembelajaran.

Kata Kunci: *academic word lis, ranking jurnal, kualitas menulis akademik, kekayaan leksikal*

1. Introduction

Writing, a fundamental aspect of language study, has become one of the most interesting and crucial subjects. It is not just a medium to deliver information or one of the language skills, but an indicator of the quality of civilizations. The same idea remains now; the development of a country's science and civilization can still be seen from the number of scientific writings it produces, such as articles, books, and others.

Using that perspective, language experts try to explore writing as the research subject. How people develop ideas, teaching methods, and many other writing-related subjects are among the many questions that need to be answered. One of the related aspects of scientific writing is the use of words. The study of words has a significant role in language studies. Mozaffari and Moini (2014) state that language is based on grammaticalized lexis, not lexicalized grammar.

Linguists, especially with technology development, develop a study that focuses on how to analyze language from a bigger perspective using genuine, authentic, and extensive collections of language. This is called Corpus Linguistic (Arum & Winarti, 2019; Pusparini, 2022; Samsi, 2019). The trend of analyzing language using a corpus has greatly attracted many researchers, studies, developing tools, and many others because of its practicality and ability to examine various linguistic problems (Sulong & Ghazali, 2021). Corpus linguistics emphasizes empirical data, and statistical analysis enables experts to present results that reflect trends and patterns that were not offered by traditional methods (Hernina et al., 2023; Irham, 2022). The effect can be seen in various findings that offer more specified and clear characteristics, including in the world of language for academic purposes.

In their collective pursuit to understand the nuances between language used for general and academic purposes, language experts have fostered a strong sense of collaboration. Innovations and inventions like the Academic Word List (Coxhead, 2006) and Academic Vocabulary List (Gardner & Davies, 2014) have paved the way in this field, enriching the field of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and revolutionizing the writing of academic texts. This pioneering work has not only inspired a multitude of experts to contribute but has also led to the development of academic word lists tailored for various disciplines such as medicine (Lei & Liu, 2016), education (Mozaffari & Moini, 2014), engineering (Hsu, 2014), and many more. This collaborative spirit has been instrumental in the progress of our field, making each contribution significant and valuable.

Using the linguistic corpus perspectives, both Coxhead and Gardner explain that there are specific words that are used more often in the academic field than in general writing. Those words are commonly known as academic words (Nation, 2001). Academic words are one of the keys to language learning (Lei & Liu, 2016). It is defined as words with high frequency, wide range, and even distribution in a corpus that represents different academic subjects (Dang et al., 2017). Numerous research studies have shown that academic words have a positive, direct, or indirect effect on the quality of teaching, especially writing (Therova, 2021; Wangdi & Shimray, 2022).

Understanding patterns for academic words used in academic writing can help develop a more suitable teaching method. In Indonesia's context, this role is becoming more prominent by the day, especially as Indonesian academic writing trends are constantly improving.

The academic writing trend in Indonesia can be seen from its current rank in Scimago. Currently, Indonesia is ranked 2nd in Southeast Asia and 7th in Asia. In 2012, Indonesia was 4th in Southeast Asia and 11th in Asia (SCImago, 2023). With a higher ranking, articles are also expected to be written more comprehensively and standardized. Well-constructed articles, originality, and the use of academic writing and vocabulary become the considerations of credible publishers or journals. This reality can be seen by numerous publishers and journals that highlight language quality in their templates, for some even provide standardized translators or proofreaders.

In Indonesia, the government has its own journal indexation body that controls and evaluates Indonesia's journals. According to Sinta, the number of journals has also increased significantly. There are more than 9.000 journals, hundreds of which focus on the study of language (Sinta Kemendikbud, 2024). Sinta then classified those journals into six levels based on their quality, commonly known as Sinta 1 to Sinta 6.

According to its level, every journal requires specific criteria and quality for the article to be published. It is important to note that to improve the intellectual capability of Indonesian researchers, especially in the language field, one should be able to know the whats and hows of high-quality research articles. Therefore, the primary concern of this article is to find out the relevance of the use of academic words in language research articles.

Previously, there have been several researchers that have tried to unveil the use of academic word lists in academic writing (Csomay & Prades, 2018; Lailiyah & Setiyaningsih, 2021; Sulaiman et al., 2018). However, most of the previous research focuses on students' writing or understanding of academic words. The closest one is the research conducted by Jemadi and colleagues, in which they tried to elaborate on the use of academic words in articles' abstracts for the English field (Jemadi et al., 2019). However, the current trends of journal standardization, such as Sinta grading from 1-6, create an unexplored gap for research. The current research then tries to unveil those unexplored aspects. This research not only focuses on the use of academic words in research articles but also specifies the quality of the articles. In this research, the quality of the articles is determined by the grade of their publishers or journals based on Sinta's level. Using Academic Word List as a variable to see how it correlates with articles' lexical richness on various journals' rankings.

The research findings of this current study are expected to provide a clearer perspective on the differences between higher-tier and lower-tier articles, specifically between articles published in grade 1 Sinta and those published in lower grades, in using academic words.

2. Method

This research is quantitative research as its variables are measured and calculated on the measurement of quantity (Creswell, 2014; Kothari, 2004). Two variables are trying to be tested in this research; the first one is Coxhead's Academic Word List, and the second is the English articles' quality. The reason behind the use of Coxhead's AWL is due to its representativeness in terms of disciplines and corpus sources (Coxhead, 2006; Gholaminejad & Sarab, 2021). The design of this research is electronic text analysis. This analysis is an analysis that analyses text using computerized application (Adolphs, 2006). This design is commonly used to analyze large-scale texts, especially

in the linguistic corpus field. To sum up, the research aims to see the usage and distribution of Coxhead's Academic Word List in English studies articles published by Sinta-accredited journals, ranging from Sinta 1 to Sinta 6 journals. The reasons of choosing Sinta accreditation as the main indicator for the articles due to its credibility as the leading journals' accreditation in Indonesia. Sinta also includes integration with external systems, including Google Scholar, Web of Science, and Garuda (Sinta, 2023).

In collecting the data, articles were taken from 18 Sinta-accredited journals in the English field. The journal's ranks were from Sinta 1 to Sinta 6. As a corpus-based study, the data taken should be representative in scale. Therefore, this research uses 180 articles from 18 journals, ten articles per journal. For each Sinta level, three journals were chosen. The publication year was 2019-2024 to ensure that the articles used match the rank of the journals, as Sinta accreditation lasts for five years. In order to have better originality and fairness, this article only took the article's introduction as a data source. The articles' introductions represent researchers' ideas and interference with the research findings, which could lead to bias, as it follows research methodology. Another criterion given is the author(s) of the articles. This research just uses articles that were written by Indonesian author(s). This is to ensure that the author(s) have the same social background as non-native speakers. It is important to exclude international authors due to several reasons, international authors with English as their first and second language will likely have a broader range of vocabularies. On the other hand, those from different countries will probably have different constructs in developing and expressing ideas. Minimalizing those external variables becomes the main reason to exclude international authors. Journals and articles were chosen using a random sampling technique. Therefore, all articles have the same possibility to be selected (Creswell, 2014; Neuman, 2014). Though Sinta has been featured with a proper database, some journals still have technical problems, such as web-crash. Fortunately, the number of English journals in Indonesia is quite big; therefore, options are still available.

Articles that have been collected and then analyzed digitally using AntConc. AntConc is an application that was developed by Laurence Anthony. This application is used for language analysis in the Linguistic-Corpus field (Anthony, 2005). AntConc is also known as one of the most popular applications in Corpus-Linguistic research and has been used by many experts in this field (Arum & Winarti, 2019; Iswari et al., 2021; Zih et al., 2020). This application is user-friendly and updated quite often. Another reason that this application is a better option is the maker of AntConc, Anthony, also provides step-by-step tutorials that support research in Corpus Linguistic fields.

As this research focuses on using AWL then, the GSL words are excluded. To ensure the coverage of the words, the range was put in 50%, and the ratio was 28,5 per million. These standards are aligned with Coxhead's AWL and some other experts (Coxhead, 2006; Kwary & Artha, 2017; Mozaffari & Moini, 2014; Simbuka et al., 2019). Therefore, with the data source amounting to 180 articles from 18 journals, the words should be at least found in 90 articles in total or 15 articles per level. To strengthen the analysis, statistical analysis, Pearson Product Moment, was conducted to determine whether there is a correlation between the journal's rank and the use of academic words in the articles.

3. Results and Discussions

As previously mentioned, this research used 180 articles from 18 Sinta-accredited journals. All journals focused on English language learning or applied linguistics. From each journal, the researchers chose ten articles randomly. The criteria given are that the article should be written by Indonesian author(s) and published after 2019.

To ensure equal representatives, the journals were divided into 6 clusters based on their rank in Sinta (Sinta 1 to Sinta 6). Therefore, there were three journals per Sinta rank. From all articles, the articles' introductions were taken and put in order before the analysis using AntConc. All parts of the writing besides the introduction were taken away. The second step was constructing the corpus into 7 clusters those are General Sinta Corpus, Sinta 1 Corpus, Sinta 2 Corpus, Sinta 3 Corpus, Sinta 4 Corpus, Sinta 5 Corpus, and Sinta 6 Corpus. General Sinta Corpus is the corpus that was made using all 180 articles from 18 journals. This Corpus became the beacon of the other six corpus.

The last step is analyzing all six Corpuses using the AntConc. The results are in the following table.

Table 1. The General Construction of the Corpuses

	Tokens	**Types**	**Lexical richness**
General Sinta Corpus	180.501	13.055	7,23%
Sinta 1 Corpus	30.088	4.999	16,61%
Sinta 2 Corpus	25.281	4.566	18,06%
Sinta 3 Corpus	34.283	4.763	13,89%
Sinta 4 Corpus	31.037	4.293	13,83%
Sinta 5 Corpus	31.534	4.336	13,75%
Sinta 6 Corpus	28.278	4.228	14,95%

From the table above, it can be seen that the total tokens and running words from all articles are 180.501, with types and individual words being 13.055. Therefore, the lexical richness of the words when comparing types and tokens is 7,23%. The highest number of tokens from the six corpora comes from Sinta 3 Corpus, while the highest number of types comes from Sinta 1 Corpus. In terms of lexical richness, Sinta 2 Corpus has the highest score, with 18,06%. On the other hand, the smallest number of tokens comes from Sinta 2 Corpus, and the smallest types come from Sinta 6 Corpus. Sinta 5 Corpus also becomes the least rich in terms of lexical richness.

Based on these findings, it can be stated that articles published in Sinta 3 journals for the English field tend to be longer than other-level articles. However, those published in Sinta 1 use more variety of words. In other words, the articles tend to be richer in words. Despite the number of tokens and types, Sinta 2 Corpus comes as the highest in lexical richness.

The findings also show that Sinta 2 articles are shorter than other articles. On the other hand, despite being written longer, articles published in Sinta 6 have fewer types. The same goes for the Sinta 5 Corpus, which also has higher tokens but less in terms of lexical richness.

On average, the six corpora, from Sinta 1 Corpus to Sinta 6 Corpus, have 30.083 tokens, 4.530 types, and 15,18% lexical richness. Based on this finding, the corpus could be divided into two categories: above and under-average. In terms of word types, all high-tier journals, Sinta 1, Sinta 2, and Sinta 3 articles are above the average for word types. In terms of lexical richness, only Sinta 1 Corpus and Sinta 2 Corpus have scored above the average. It could be concluded that, in general, Sinta 1 and Sinta 2 articles tend to have more various words than other articles.

After identifying the general characteristics of the articles, the following analysis was conducted to determine the number of words that met the criteria for the research. The following table shows the result of the analysis.

Table 2. Word Analysis

	Types	**Words**
General Sinta Corpus	13.055	99
Sinta 1 Corpus	4.999	92
Sinta 2 Corpus	4.566	79
Sinta 3 Corpus	4.763	126
Sinta 4 Corpus	4.293	128
Sinta 5 Corpus	4.336	110
Sinta 6 Corpus	4.228	113

The analysis is based on the following criteria: the word range should be at least 50%, and the ratio should be more than 28.5 per million. The criteria are based on Coxhead's AWL criteria (Coxhead, 2006). Therefore, the words that could be included in General Sinta Corpus should at least have been found in 90 articles and used not less than six times. Meanwhile, for Sinta 1 to Sinta 6 Corpus, words should at least be found in 15 articles. However, as the articles come from the same discipline, sub-corpus criteria are not used in this analysis.

Table 2 clearly shows that 99 words out of 13.055 in the General Sinta Corpus met the criteria. This means that there is only less than one percent (0,76%) of words from the total types. Almost similar conditions apply in Sinta 1 and Sinta 2 Corpus, with less than 100 words that met the criteria or less than 2%. In contrast, the highest result is from Sinta 4 Corpus, with 128 words (2,98%). With an average of 108 words, only Sinta 1 and Sinta 2 Corpus are below the average.

However, these words then become the basis for the main analysis, which is to find out the number of Academic Words used in Sinta 1 Corpus to Sinta 6 Corpus. The next step is reducing all non-academic words. In this analysis, this research used the Academic Word List (AWL) developed by Coxhead, which consists of 570-word families.

Table 3. Academic Word Lists Percentage

	Words	**AWL**
General Sinta Corpus	99	4,04%
Sinta 1 Corpus	92	7,60%
Sinta 2 Corpus	79	3,79%
Sinta 3 Corpus	126	7,93%
Sinta 4 Corpus	128	6,25%
Sinta 5 Corpus	110	2,73%
Sinta 6 Corpus	113	5,31%

Based on the findings regarding the percentage of academic words in articles published in Sinta-accredited journals, the number of AWL words in the General Sinta Corpus is 4,04%. However, if the analysis is specified based on the Sinta ranks, percentage differences exist between one corpus and another. Sinta 1 Corpus and Sinta 3 Corpus are the only categories that have more than 7% AWL in their texts. While Sinta 5 Corpus is the lowest among others, with only 2,73% of its words classified as academic. On average, the use of academic words from Sinta 1 Corpus to Sinta 6 Corpus is 5,6%. Therefore, three corpora use Academic Words above the average; those are Sinta 1 Corpus, Sinta 3 Corpus, and Sinta 4 Corpus. On the other hand, Sinta 2 Corpus, Sinta 5 Corpus, and Sinta 6 Corpus are below the average.

On the surface, it can be seen that the results of academic word usage in articles are varied from one corpus to another. To strengthen the result, statistical analysis was conducted. Statistical analysis was used to know whether there is a correlation between the usage of academic words and the journal ranks. Pearson Product moment analysis was used because the data is considered bivariate and parametric (Martin & Bridgmon, 2012; Sugiyono, 2007). The result of the analysis is in the following table.

Table 4. The Correlation Analysis

		AWL
CORPUS	Pearson Correlation	.421
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.406

The statistical analysis's significance is 0.406. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no correlation between the usage of academic words and the ranks of journals in English fields. The findings of this study, which analyzed the introductions of 180 articles from Sinta-accredited journals using AntConc, provide significant insights into the characteristics and quality of English language learning and applied linguistics research publications in Indonesia. This discussion will interpret the key results, highlight their implications, and suggest directions for future research.

The analysis revealed a noteworthy variation in article length and lexical richness across different Sinta ranks. Articles from Sinta 3 journals contained the highest number of tokens,

suggesting that these articles are longer than those from other ranks. This could indicate a preference for more comprehensive explorations of topics in these mid-tier journals. In contrast, Sinta 2 journals, while having the highest lexical richness at 18.06%, featured shorter articles. This finding suggests a focus on concise and diverse lexical usage in Sinta 2 journals, possibly reflecting a high standard for clarity and precision in these publications.

Sinta 1 journals, as the top tier, demonstrated the highest number of word types, underscoring a diverse vocabulary usage that aligns with expectations of high-quality academic writing. Despite the substantial length and richness in word types, these articles did not necessarily exhibit the highest lexical richness percentage. This could imply that while a broad vocabulary is used, the density of unique words relative to the total word count is moderated, possibly to maintain readability and coherence.

A crucial part of this study was evaluating the presence of Academic Word List (AWL) words within the corpora. The findings show that the General Sinta Corpus had 4.04% of its words classified as academic. Notably, Sinta 1 and Sinta 3 corpora had the highest percentage of AWL words, over 7%, suggesting a higher incorporation of academic vocabulary in these publications. These results are far higher than the average of 5,6%. This contrasts with Sinta 5 Corpus, which had the lowest academic word percentage (2.73%).

The average proportion of academic words in Indonesian articles, specifically in English fields, is still below Coxhead's analysis, which is an average of about 10% (Coxhead, 2006). This result is also still below the finding of the coverage of academic words in Brazilian academic writing for social sciences, which stands at 8,9% (Goulart, 2018), or Academic Textbook Corpus, which stands at 5,99% (Andrew Newman & Andrew, 2016). However, there is a tendency for higher-level journals (Sinta 1) to have more coverage compared to lower-level journals.

These differences highlight the varying levels of academic rigor and lexical sophistication across journal ranks. The higher use of AWL words in top-tier journals is expected, as these journals likely enforce stricter standards for academic language, contributing to the perceived quality and impact of the research they publish. Conversely, lower-tier journals might prioritize accessibility and practical relevance over strict adherence to academic vocabulary standards. Specifically, for Indonesian authors, article publications become one of the main indicators to measure researchers' and lecturers' quality. Therefore, those who publish in top-tier journals will probably supported by the institutions, not only in research methodology or funding, but also in language aspects. The researchers' self-awareness to develop their own academic writing skills is also not to be forgotten.

Interestingly, the Pearson Product Moment analysis revealed no significant correlation between the usage of academic words and the journal ranks (significance = 0.406). This finding suggests that while there are observable differences in academic word usage across journal ranks, these differences are not statistically significant. This finding is somehow in line with the study of Alhojailan, where academic vocabulary usage does not correlate with writing (Alhojailan, 2019). From the perspective of the nature of writing. Undoubtedly, writing is quite a complex process, and several factors and variables affect the quality of writing, especially academic writing.

In conclusion, the analysis regarding the correlation between the usage of Academic Word List and the quality of journals could be due to several factors:

1. Journal's Editorial Policies: Different journals, regardless of their rank, might have varying editorial policies and review standards that influence the lexical characteristics of their published articles. Therefore, the authors' writing style will most likely be to follow these policies.
2. Authorial Preferences: Authors' individual writing styles and vocabulary preferences could vary widely, contributing to inconsistencies in academic word usage that are not strictly tied to journal rank.
3. Disciplinary Variations: Even within the field of English language learning and applied linguistics, there may be sub-disciplinary differences that affect the usage of academic vocabulary.

To sum up, the findings of this research also highlight some aspects that could be considered to improve academic writing, especially research writing, for publication. Mastering academic vocabularies, such as AWL, will most likely help researchers enrich their writing quality. Though the findings show no correlation between the usage and journals' ranking, the percentage of academic words used in scientific articles, despite the ranks, is still considered high. Not to mention, Sinta 1 journals, as the highest rank in the Sinta index, have a 7,6% proportion of AWL, higher than Academic Textbook Corpus (5,9%). English tutors, teachers, and lecturers, especially those who handle writing and academic writing courses, should put more consideration into academic words in the learning process. Developing modules and learning materials that could enhance familiarity with academic words will most likely boost the mastery of academic vocabulary.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study thoroughly examines the lexical characteristics of articles in Sinta-accredited journals, revealing significant variations in length, richness, and academic word usage across different journal ranks. These insights contribute to a deeper understanding of the standards and expectations in academic publishing within the field of English language learning and applied linguistics, offering valuable guidance for authors, reviewers, and editors alike.

The limitations of this research currently lie in the number of articles used. Therefore, the data obtained are limited. Expanding data sources beyond Indonesia's journals will be beneficial as it will help to see how Indonesian authors are characterized in non-Indonesian journals. Another point to be highlighted is the discipline studied, English. This research still has not classified the discipline into sub-themes, such as language learning, literature, ESP, technology-assisted language Learning, or linguistics. Specifying the category into more themes could give a broader perspective, especially if one theme is likely written differently than others. All in all, it explores how academic writing is made, especially scientific articles. Researchers can explore other variables such as writing style, efficiency, and readability.

These findings have important implications for authors, reviewers, and editors in English language learning and applied linguistics. For authors, understanding the lexical expectations of

different journal ranks can guide them in tailoring their manuscripts to meet the standards of their target publications. For reviewers and editors, these results emphasize the need to consider the length and lexical richness of submissions and the appropriate balance of academic vocabulary to enhance both readability and academic rigor. For universities or research centers, providing academic writing goals training or workshops could enhance the quality of the researchers. Elements in constructing the learning material should relate to academic writing purposes, including the use of academic words such as Coxhead's AWL or Gardner's AVL.

Furthermore, the lack of a significant correlation between journal rank and academic word usage suggests that the lexical characteristics of the articles do not solely determine quality and impact. Other factors, such as the originality of research, methodological rigor, and practical relevance, likely play crucial roles in defining the prestige and influence of academic journals.

Future research could build on these findings by exploring several additional dimensions:

1. Longitudinal Analysis: Examining how articles' lexical characteristics evolve over time could provide insights into trends and shifts in academic writing standards. Putting chronological range, such as five years or decades, in measuring the usage of AWL.
2. Comparative Studies: Comparing the lexical characteristics of Indonesian journals with those from other countries could highlight unique features and areas for improvement. Scopus or Web of Science (WoS) indexed journals could become some of the considerations.
3. Impact Metrics: Investigating the relationship between lexical characteristics and other impact metrics, such as citation rates and download counts, could offer a more comprehensive understanding of what drives academic influence.

References

Adolphs, S. (2006). *Introducing Electronic Text Analysis*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203087701

Alhojailan, A. I. (2019). The Effect of Academic Vocabulary Use on Graduate Students' Writing Assignment Scores. *English Language Teaching*, *12*(9), 33. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n9p33

Andrew Newman, J., & Andrew, J. (2016). *A Corpus-Based Comparison of the Academic Word List and the Academic Vocabulary List* [Brigham Young University]. https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd

Anthony, L. (2005). AntConc: Design and Development of a Freeware Corpus Analysis Toolkit for the Technical Writing Classroom. *IEEE International Professional Communication Conference*, 729–737. https://doi.org/10.1109/IPCC.2005.1494244

Arum, E. R., & Winarti, W. (2019). the Use of Antconc in Providing Lexical and Sintactical Information of the Texbook of Radiographic Positioning and Related Anatomy: a Corpus Linguistic Study. *Jurnal Sosioteknologi*, *18*(1), 106–112. https://doi.org/10.5614/sostek.itbj.2019.18.1.8

Coxhead, A. (2006). A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 235–257.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publication, Inc.

Csomay, E., & Prades, A. (2018). Academic Vocabulary in ESL Student Papers: A Corpus-Based Study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *33*, 100–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.02.003

Dang, T. N. Y., Coxhead, A., & Webb, S. (2017). The Academic Spoken Word List. *Language Learning*, *67*(4), 959–997. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12253

Gholaminejad, R., & Sarab, M. R. A. (2021). A Comparison of the Academic Word List and the Academic Vocabulary List: Should the AVL Replace the AWL? *Teflin Journal*, *32*(1), 167–182. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v32i1/167-182

Hernina, H., Karlina, Y., & Puspitasari, D. A. (2023). The Indonesian Terms of Disease Names: A Corpus Linguistic Study. *OKARA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *17*(1), 14–31. https://doi.org/10.19105/ojbs.v17i1.8571

Irham, I. (2022). Wacana Imigran dan Pekerja Asing di Indonesia: Studi Analisis Wacana Berbasis Linguistik Korpus. *Dialektika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Budaya*, *9*(1), 44–57. https://doi.org/10.33541/dia.v9i1.4008

Iswari, W. P., Suhatmady, B., Asih, Y. U., Wardani, I., Ramadhan, A., & Anastasya, D. (2021). Using Concordance Software to Generate Academic Words in Applied Linguistics. *Educational Studies: Conference Series*, *1*(1), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.30872/escs.v1i1.882

Jemadi, F., Wati, F., & Iku, P. F. (2019). Academic Words in the English Research Article Abstracts: the Coverage and Frequency. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, *8*(2), 133–140. https://doi.org/10.21580/vjv8i23935

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology Methods and Techniques* (Second). New Age International Publishers.

Kwary, D. A., & Artha, A. F. (2017). The Academic Article Word List for Social Sciences. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *41*(4), 1–11.

Lailiyah, M., & Setiyaningsih, L. A. (2021). Academic Vocabulary of EFL Students' Writing: A Corpus-based Study. *SENARILIP V*, *5*(Senarilip V), 28–32.

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

Martin, W. E., & Bridgmon, K. D. (2012). *Quantitative And Statistical Research Methods - from Hypothesis to Results*. Jossey-Bass.

Mozaffari, A., & Moini, R. (2014). Academic Words in Education Research Articles: A Corpus Study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 1290–1296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.545

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language* (C. A. Chapelle & S. Hunston (eds.)). Cambridge University Press.

Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Pearson Education, Ltd.

Pusparini, N. M. D. U. (2022). The Use of Corpus Linguistics in Preparing English Teaching Materials for Specific. *World Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *1*(1), 61–70.

Samsi, Y. S. (2019). Teaching Critical Discourse Analysis to ELT Learners through Corpus Based Approach. *Academic Journal Perspecitve: Education, Language, and Literature*, *7*(1), 33–40. https://doi.org/10.33603/PERSPECTIVE.V7I1.1814

Simbuka, S., Hamied, F. A., Sundayana, W., & Kwary, D. A. (2019). A Corpus-Based Study on the Technical Vocabulary of Islamic Religious Studies: A Publication on the Teaching and Learning of English. *TEFLIN Journal*, *30*(1), 47–71. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1223774

Sinta. (2023). *Manual Book - Author*.

Sugiyono. (2007). *Statistik Untuk Penelitian*. Alfabeta.

Sulaiman, N. A., Salehuddin, K., & Khairuddin, R. (2018). Academic Word List Knowledge of Malaysian ESL Undergraduates. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *18*(4), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2018-1804-01

Sulong, W. M. W., & Ghazali, R. M. (2021). Using Hadith Corpus in Learning Arabic as a Second Language. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematic Education*, *12*(14), 5126–5133. https://turcomat.org/index.php/turkbilmat/article/view/11533

Therova, D. (2021). A Case Study of Academic Vocabulary in a Novice Student's Writing at a UK University. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, *6*(3), 557. https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v6i3.609

Wangdi, T., & Shimray, R. (2022). Investigating the Significance of Coxhead's Academic Word List for Self-Access Learners. *SiSal Journal*, *13*(3), 367–388. https://doi.org/10.37237/130305

Zih, H., El Biadi, M., & Chatri, Z. (2020). Evaluating the Effectiveness of Corpus Linguistic Software in Analyzing the Grammatical Structure: LancsBox and AntConc as Case Studies. *Colloquium in Information Science and Technology, CIST*, *2020-June*, 515–519. https://doi.org/10.1109/CiSt49399.2021.9357285