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1. Introduction
This paper is based upon an academic exchange of opinions, information, and critical comments between Professor Henning Bergenholtz, the Director of the Centre for Lexicography, Aarhus School of Business, University of Aarhus, Denmark and the present author. After the successful International Symposium on Lexicography, organized by the Centre for Lexicography at University of Aarhus in May 2008, I stayed in contact with the Centre to have further discussions on theory and practice in lexicography. The Centre for Lexicography is unique in the sense that they have developed a lexicographical theory, which is very theoretical in orientation, but, at the same time, very practical in actual applications. Henning Bergenholtz and Sven Tarp are the two primary figures who have developed the theory, called the “theory of lexicographical functions” (e.g. Bergenholtz and Tarp 2003), and I visited the Centre again in the summer of 2008 as an invited professor to discuss further details about their theory, as someone with experience in the field of dictionary user research (Tono 2001).

In the course of reading the papers by Bergenholtz and Tarp (2003, 2004), many questions arose as to their view about currently prevailing lexicographical practices as well as the approach that they have taken in their theory construction. I had a number of opportunities to present my views on user perspectives and a critical appraisal of the theory of lexicographical functions at the research meetings by the Centre staff. In response to my critical comments, Bergenholtz presented very inter-
estig counterarguments to the approach I have taken in my user studies. This led to a series of stimulating scientific discussions regarding the central issues of theory construction in lexicography and how user studies could possibly contribute to empirical validation of the theory. These activities gave us a growing awareness that more intensive theoretical discussions on various aspects of lexicographical practice are definitely needed.

This paper is an attempt to reproduce some of the discussions, but at the same time is an extension and further development. First, the theory of lexicographical functions will be briefly introduced. Then some of the fundamental questions about theory construction in lexicography will be raised, focusing on issues such as:

(i) Do we really need a “theory”?
(ii) Why bother to construct another theory of lexicography?
(iii) Can lexicography be really an independent scientific discipline?

Thirdly, some methodological issues in dictionary user studies will be discussed. The basic approach of user studies will be presented together with Bergenholtz’s critical assessment regarding the outcomes of those studies and the need for more research focusing on user functions. Then I will discuss the nature of scientific inquiry and how user studies in lexicography should be conducted in light of this. Finally, comments will be made as to what steps should be taken in order to approach the construction of lexicographical theories from a much broader perspective, by taking into account what is happening in the real world and what dictionary users really need.

2. A theory of lexicography: a brief introduction
In this section, I will briefly outline the function theory developed mainly by Bergenholtz and Tarp (2003) during the last 15 years at the Centre for Lexicography, University of Aarhus. This integrated lexicographic theory, known as function theory, is characterised by a concept of user needs, where the needs, by definition, are related not only to a specific type of user, but also to the specific types of social situation
where this type of user may have a specific type of lexicographically relevant needs that may lead to a dictionary consultation (Bergenholtz and Tarp 2003). In this theory, dictionaries are considered utility tools conceived to satisfy specific types of human needs.

According to Bergenholtz and Tarp, function theory is not only applicable to what are frequently called general dictionaries, including learner’s dictionaries, but also to every kind of specialised dictionary, including such lexicographic products as lexicons or encyclopaedias. Whatever methods and techniques are used in their conception, production and final presentation, they are all utility tools whose quality (i.e. usefulness) can be analysed and evaluated according to function theory.

The idea that dictionaries should be based on their users is actually not new. For instance, at the end of a classic conference on lexicography in the 1960s, Fred W. Householder made a famous recommendation that has been quoted repeatedly ever since, not least in English-language lexicography:

Dictionaries should be designed with a special set of users in mind and for their specific needs. (Householder 1967: 279)

Whilst it is hard to disagree with this recommendation, Bergenholtz claims that it lacks one vital factor that makes it difficult to use dictionaries in practice, and which therefore allows far too much latitude for subjective interpretations and preferences. That is, Bergenholtz believes that the needs of potential users are not clearly definable or circumscribable. No user has specific needs unless they are related to a specific type of situation. Consequently, it is not enough to define which types of user have which needs, but also the types of social situations in which these needs may arise. However, not all such situations are relevant for lexicography, only those in which the needs that may arise can be satisfied by consulting dictionaries.

It is claimed that this close relation between types of user, types of social situation and types of user need is the very nucleus of the lexicographic function theory. In this respect, a lexicographical function is defined as the satisfaction of the specific types of lexicographically rel-
relevant needs that may arise in a specific type of potential user in a specific type of extra-lexicographical situation (Tarp 2008a). According to this definition, each type of user in combination with each type of user situation triggers off a separate lexicographic function.

A specific dictionary may have one, two or several such functions. In order to produce a high-quality dictionary — but also to review such a dictionary in a qualified way — they argue that it is not enough to discuss or look at the dictionary “in itself”, i.e. in terms of the data contained, access routes and overall design. If this discussion is not related to the ostensible or declared functions of the dictionary, it runs the risk of derailing and turning into some academic exercise that is not relevant to actual users.

Many theoretical contributions discussing user needs do not relate them to specific types of users with specific types of needs. In most cases, the needs are determined with reference to user research without taking into account the specific characteristics of each type of user. In this way, specific needs are overshadowed by the battle to the abstract needs.

In order to draw a lexicographically relevant profile of potential dictionary users, a number of criteria should be taken into account. The most basic criteria are the following:

- Mother tongue (Danish/Japanese/etc.)
- Mother tongue ability
- Foreign language
- Foreign language ability
- Ability in a specific LSP domain in their mother tongue
- Ability in a specific LSP domain in a foreign language
- General cultural knowledge
- Knowledge of culture in a specific foreign-language area
- Knowledge about a specific subject or science

Based on these criteria, which are the most important lexicographically relevant criteria, it is possible to draw up a user typology for each dictionary.

A similar method should be used in order to determine the lexicog-
graphically relevant user situations, which are frequently called extra-lexicographic as they should be conceptually separate from the dictionary use situations. These use situations are traditionally divided into cognitive and communicative situations (although recently a third type of situation, the so-called operational situation, has been proposed, cf. Tarp 2008b). Cognitive situations refer to situations where the users for one or the other reason need to add to their existing knowledge, e.g. about a specific topic or a specific LSP, independently of a particular text, whereas communicative situations refer to situations where they have doubts or problems in a specific text-dependent context (Bergenholtz & Kaufmann 1997). There are various such communicative situations, of which the most important are:

- production of text in the mother tongue
- reception of text in the mother tongue
- production of text in a foreign language
- reception of text in a foreign language
- translation of text from the mother tongue into a foreign language
- translation of text from a foreign language into the mother tongue
- translation of text from one foreign language into another

In each of these seven types of user situation, a user with specific characteristics may have specific types of needs that can be met by consulting the lexicographic data contained in well-conceived dictionaries with easy access routes. In this way, the user needs, which are no longer defined as an abstractum, are the starting point that determines the data selection, access routes and the overall design of a given dictionary.

3. A theory of lexicography: speculations about its value
As I read the papers by Bergenholtz and Tarp about their theory of lexicographical functions, my first reaction was “Another theory?” and “Why bother?” There is an independent field “metalexicography” distinct from “lexicography”. The former is concerned with meta-research on the latter, which is practice of dictionary-making. My view is that
"lexicography" is not a science but the art and craft of dictionary-making, while "metalexicography" is an independent science, which has several subfields such as history of lexicography, general theory of lexicography, research on dictionary use, and criticism of dictionaries (Wiegand 1984). Some people (e.g. Hartmann and James 1998) do not like the term "metalexicography", preferring instead to talk about lexicographic practice (dictionary making) and lexicographic theory (dictionary research).

The field of metalexicography or dictionary research, whatever you choose to call it, is certainly necessary. It is important to do research on how to make dictionaries, how people use dictionaries, and how dictionaries can be improved on the basis of such research. However, I was not fully convinced we should have a "set theory" of lexicography for a number of reasons. First, there are many dictionaries already available on the market, most of which, I assume, were not based upon any particular theory of lexicography. Of course, there are some systematic steps or procedures of dictionary making, but by and large their products are the results of such practical considerations and not at all the end results of any single, unified theory of lexicography. They still exist, however, and people seem to find them useful. Secondly, even though people do not generally rely on a particular theory of lexicography as they produce dictionaries, they do follow a set of guiding principles in dictionary making. As is well expressed in Atkins and Rundell (2008), we do have a set of procedures to produce dictionaries and is it not sufficient? This is partly due to the negative connotations of the term "theory" for some people and the wrong impression that it may give of the relationship between theory and dictionary-making. The word "theory" often implies that your approach is superior to others. It is not a hypothesis, but a theory, which can explain something about life or the world. In a sense, it is a very strong claim that you are making when you claim that you "have a theory," because people usually never call for a theory in dictionary making after all. Also the word "theory" has more associative links with the hard sciences. A discipline such as lexicography is not considered a science by ordinary people,
thus it has no need of a theory. This is, in my opinion, rather a natural reaction toward the claim by Bergenholtz and Tarp.

It would also be interesting to ask whether it is necessary to claim that lexicography is an independent field of science. Whether or not a particular field of research is considered an independent field of science is mostly down to an individual researcher's point of view, since there are many subdivisions of science it is sometimes difficult to tell whether any one branch is independent or not. Some people feel that lexicography is a branch of applied linguistics. Many issues in lexicography are interrelated with other disciplines such as corpus linguistics, information sciences, language learning, and linguistics. Therefore, sometimes I feel it is more appropriate to study the role of dictionaries in each separate discipline, e.g. the use of corpora for dictionary making, the difference between dictionaries and search engines, the role of dictionaries in learning a foreign language, the refinement of linguistic descriptions in a dictionary based on current trends of linguistics and so on.

4. The value of constructing a theory
As we discussed the value of constructing a theory of lexicography in its own right, Bergenholtz pointed out a few important issues (Bergenholtz, personal communication). He said that, to him, as a university professor in a specialized field of lexicography, it is a matter of course to construct a theory in order to better understand his subject area. If your goal is simply to produce a dictionary for commercial purposes, you may not need a theory. You should be only concerned with practical considerations of how to produce it. However, if one wishes to do research in lexicography and consider it as an independent field of science, it would be definitely important to think about a theory and look at the phenomena from your theoretical perspective. Bergenholtz believes that whether you call that specialized field of research "metalexicography" or "dictionary research" does not really matter: it is more important to make a specific claim about a theory of lexicography and how to produce a dictionary.

While admitting the fact that there are many dictionaries in the real
world that were compiled without any explicit theoretical bases, Bergenholtz maintains that this should not be the reason for degrading the value of theory construction itself. Also he sees it from a slightly different viewpoint. First, many dictionaries were compiled based on certain guidelines or principles. He claims that some of the dictionaries have features which arguably stem from some kind of theory. For example, the first Danish monolingual dictionary was compiled by a Danish priest who had a very specific user situation in mind. The dictionary was first published in 1800, and the intended user group was young people whom he knew had serious reception problems in reading devotional literature. The subtitle of this dictionary gives a good description of its intended function: “Dansk Glossarium—til at hjælpe de af Lægfolk tilrette, som gjerne gåer læst en dansk Bog” (Danish Glossary—to help those laymen who would like to read a Danish book.) (Leth 1800). With this user group and this text genre in mind and with the knowledge of certain reception problems, the priest came up with a description of the function of the dictionary. Every decision in the dictionary making process was made based on this function: in particular, lemma selection and the style and extension of the meaning items. Thus, in Bergen­holtz’s view, if dictionary-making is based on a very clear definition of target user profiles and user situations and very well-defined lexicogra­phical functions in mind, such a work is highly theoretical even if it does not proclaim any particular theory behind it. Secondly, there are many dictionaries out in the real world, which have been produced by just following lexicographical traditions and conventions without seriously questioning the usefulness of the information they deal with. Bergen­holtz believes that such lexicographical conventions need serious rethinking. For this purpose, he argues that we definitely need a theory such as his function theory in order to critically review the current products and shape the future of lexicography.

It is true that the theory of lexicographical functions (Bergenholtz and Tarp 2003) aims to be a very general, holistic theory of lexicogra­phy, overarching all the subfields of lexicography. In this sense, their theory is comparable to Wiegand’s. The striking difference, however,
lies in the motivation for theory-building and the theoretical perspective regarding the role of lexicographical functions. In the view of Bergenholtz and Tarp (2003), the primary aim of theory construction is not to describe or systematically account for what has been done so far in the field but to construct a lexicographical theory to look ahead and produce something completely different and new for the future. This brings us to the distinction between contemplative and transformative theories (Tarp 2008b). Wiegand's theory is an example of a contemplative theory construction. A contemplative lexicography looks back on existing dictionaries, analyses the dictionaries and constructs a complete theory explaining the contents in those dictionaries. A transformative or generative lexicography will of course take current lexicographic traditions into account and try to build on existing dictionaries, but the real aim of their work is related to future dictionary-making and the construction of new concepts and theories based on a functionalistic view. Such new dictionaries could in part be similar to existing dictionaries, but normally they will not be, because they will usually be mono-functional or at least have a primary function and eventually one or more secondary or tertiary functions as well. They start from analysing user profiles, specific user situations and their needs, and decide which specific tools or dictionary functions should be developed to meet their needs sufficiently. The analysis of existing dictionaries also helps achieve this goal, but is not enough. A theoretical framework for lexicography should be clearly defined based on a function theory in order to produce lexicographical tools that can satisfy specific user needs. It is only through this kind of theory construction that new types of lexicographical tools can be imagined and developed. Therefore, their theory is looking ahead; it is a 'transformative' theory.

As I have argued earlier some people may react with "Not another theory!" Bergenholtz commented to me that it is quite natural that if one works in a certain disciplines of science, there are always more than a dozen theories. Sometimes they complement each other, sometimes they compete with each other. This is quite acceptable since they do not know for sure which one is the best. In many cases, theories are made
for small subsections of the field. In lexicography, there are many such
detailed sub-theories (or principles or guidelines, depending on how
you call them), but, in constrast, only a few general theories of lexicogra-
phy, viz. those by Scerba (1940), Kromann et al. (1984), Wiegand
(1998) and Bergenholtz and his colleagues. Thus they claim that their
theory should be a welcome addition to the development of lexicogra-
phy as a scientific discipline.

5. Theoretical positions of the function theory
In Bergenholtz and Tarp (2003), their primary concern is to refute
some of the theoretical claims by Wiegand and make clear the differ-ences between Wiegand’s position and theirs. Both Wiegand and Ber-
genholtz and Tarp agreed that lexicography should stand as an inde-
pendent discipline of science, but their theoretical foundations seem to
be totally different. Bergenholtz and Tarp argue that the theory of
lexicography must start from the careful analysis of situations and pro-
files of prospective users, which yield specific user needs, and that the
function(s) of a dictionary should be determined accordingly. They
criticized Wiegand because his theory was entirely dependent on exist-
ing dictionary typologies and linguistic criteria and was never based on
user needs and dictionary functions. These arguments sound very con-
vincing as far as comparisons with Wiegand’s theory are concerned.

Bergenholtz and Tarp (2003) break down each user type and identify
the needs for respective user type, and go on to determine the functions
of a dictionary suitable for those needs. Here are some questions that
may be asked:

(a) Are they thinking about a different dictionary for a different
function?
(b) If so, how specific should each function be?
(c) If poly- or multi-functional dictionaries are also acceptable, what
are the criteria for deciding to make one dictionary mono-func-
tional and another, multi-functional?
(d) Since there are many different ways to profile user types and
situations, do they intend to be comprehensive or problem-oriented? If the latter is the case, is their theory going to determine the framework alone?

Since their theory is closely linked to user typologies and needs analysis, I think that my previous research on users should have a role in it, but what role? This is a truly important question, if we really need a theory and a theory has to be verified by empirical findings. There is a possibility that the theory developed by Bergenholtz and Tarp could be strengthened by user research like the ones I have done. Here, Bergenholtz cast doubt on the results of previous user studies, which led us to another round of debate.

6. How to define functions
I raised a few questions earlier about how to proceed with the decision-making process in terms of limiting the number of user functions, or whether a particular dictionary should be mono- or poly-functional, and so forth. Since their theory is mainly concerned with lexicographic functions, it would be ideal if each specific lexicographic function should be taken care of independently by a specific tool. There are a set of defining terms for describing user situations:

- Cognitive
- Communicative
- Operative
- Interpretive

(Tarp 2008b)

The specification of individual user profiles and needs has to be dealt with in a specific theory of lexicographic functions. However, the above criteria will help to define a general framework, such as:

- Needs to solve knowledge problems about the history of Japan in the mother tongue
  [cognitive] + [user profile: mother tongue/subject field]
- Needs to solve reception problems in reading newspaper texts in
the mother tongue
[communicative] + [user profile: mother tongue/subject field]
- Needs to know how to operate on a new machine in a foreign country
[operative] + [user profile: foreign language/subject field]
- Needs to know what a sign says in a foreign country
[interpretive] + [user profile: foreign language]

Bergenholtz and Tarp seem to be aware that sometimes having multiple functions may not be possible due to limitations of space or budget and a very practical decision must be made. One way to solve this problem is to design a dictionary in such a way that you give priority to the primary function and make it as complete as possible. It is possible to have other functions as well, but they are only of secondary importance. One cannot control target users too strictly. Moreover, there is always the chance of users using a tool with an intention totally different from its developer’s, which cannot be helped (Bergenholtz, personal communication).

Such specific concerns, however, should not stop us from working out all the possible types and patterns of dictionaries for different user needs and functions. They claim that we first have to be freed from all sorts of practical considerations and start to think from scratch what kind of dictionary we can make when we focus on the user functions. Since this is a scientific endeavour, we need to distinguish what is theoretically possible from what is probable in actual situations. As Einstein once said, “To raise new questions, new possibilities, to regard old questions from a new angle, requires creative imagination and marks real advance in science.” (Einstein and Infeld 1938, quoted in Tarp 2008c). This is why they emphasize analysis before synthesis.

7. Further thoughts on function theory
It is genuinely interesting to ask what an ideal receptive dictionary will look like and how it will be different from its productive counterpart. Function theory seems to aim at that sort of function-specific dictionary making. My next question would be, then, “Does it really make a dif-
ference?" According to function theory, the steps to producing a dictionary are as shown in Figure 1:

**User profiles**

**User situations**

**User needs**

**Dictionaries as products**

Figure 1: Steps to producing dictionaries (the function theory approach)

Function theory also defines clearly the classifications of dictionaries based upon user functions. Figure 2 illustrates the basic classifications. Lexicographical reference works should serve three major situations: (i) *communication*-orientated user situations, (ii) *knowledge*-orientated user situations, and (iii) both communication- and knowledge-orientated situations.

**Figure 2: The classification of dictionaries in function theory**
The next step for actual dictionary production will be the selection of dictionary information for each type of user situation. Thus the end-results look like the ones in Figure 3:

![Diagram of dictionary selection](image)

**Lexicographical reference work**

For communication-oriented user situations:
- INF-a
- INF-b
- INF-k

For knowledge-oriented user situations:
- INF-c
- INF-e
- INF-i

For communication- & knowledge-oriented user situations:
- INF-a
- INF-b
- INF-c
- INF-e
- INF-x

Figure 3: The function theory approach to information selection for different types of dictionary

Here, we need to have a set of procedures defining the following in order to produce each type of dictionary based on user functions:

- **Categories of dictionary information (INF)** to be included in a specific dictionary type (i.e. specifications of INF-a, INF-b, etc. for a dictionary for communication-/knowledge-orientated user situations in Figure 3)
- **Relative importance of the dictionary information categories** (e.g. INF-a is more important than INF-b, and so on)
- **Relative amount of information for each information category** (e.g. INF-a will be 30% of the entire volume while INF-b should be limited to a half of INF-a)
• Relative importance and amount of information categories in the multi-functional dictionary

To my knowledge, there is no specific paper by Bergenholtz or Tarp, regarding the detailed procedure of selection of information categories for a particular function-based dictionary. If this selection procedure is not closely related to the typologies of user situations and functions, the final products could end up looking quite similar to existing dictionaries. Function theory does not have the power to produce anything new or different unless deliberate selections and weighting of the information specific to particular user functions are specified.

8. Critical evaluation of user perspectives by Bergenholtz
In the field of lexicographical research, there is an area called “dictionary user studies” or “research on dictionary use”. In the past few decades, there have been dozens of studies of dictionary users, but it is Bergenholtz’s belief that dictionary user studies require much rethinking and reformulating in their research questions and methodologies (Bergenholtz, personal communication). I will describe below some of his criticisms regarding user perspectives.

First of all, Bergenholtz believes that whilst it is important to investigate user needs in an empirical way, the range of target users seems to be very narrow and thus skewed. Most of the surveys conducted so far were based on student users. Bergenholtz claims that we need information from various other types of user, especially in such a case as his web-based Danish dictionary, where the target users are unknown, general users out there on the Internet. Very little research has been done on the behaviour of general users. The people at the Centre for Lexicography are planning to conduct a large-scale user survey using the log files of the web dictionary mentioned above. Care will be taken to select user groups properly from anonymous IP connections, and the information in the log files, such as how many people accessed which entries with which type of interfaces, will provide invaluable data on web dictionary user’s behavioural patterns (Bergenholtz and Johnsen 2005).
Secondly, he argues that the methods used in dictionary user surveys so far have been very indirect, and thus unreliable. Asking how users use a dictionary through a questionnaire is one of the worst ways to obtain behavioural data, as they will answer according to what they think they do (or ought to do), rather than what they actually do. He argues that we need to ask about user behaviour in a more direct way. He commented that some studies done by Lew (e.g. Lew and Dziemianko 2006) and myself (e.g. Tono 1984) are more sophisticated in this regard, though still not very reliable because they are based on relatively small samples and there have been no replications of the studies.

Thirdly, Bergenholtz contends that most user studies have not been based on any proper theory of lexicography such as his, thus end up reporting only anecdotal evidence of user habits and nothing very systematic in nature. Bergenholtz argues that the starting point for user studies should be the employment of more rigorous theoretical frameworks by defining user profiles more precisely and what variables to compare among different user groups that we can identify user needs and habits accurately and objectively.

9. Response to Bergenholtz’s criticism of user studies
I agree with some of Bergenholtz’s criticisms in the sense that most of the subjects in the user studies so far have been students and very little research has been done on general users. This is partly due to the fact that most user research has been done in the context of foreign language learning. I reviewed more than 20 to 30 previous studies in Tono (2001), and about 80 percent of the studies used students as their subjects, which is rather natural because their primary interest is in the behaviour of students. It would be interesting to conduct a survey of a much wider variety of dictionary users, including housewives, business executives, office workers, school teachers and their pupils, translators, doctors, scientists, etc. Bergenholtz (personal communication) notes, however, that the more specialized the professions of the subjects, the more likely it is that we would be able to identify their needs in dictionary use without doing any survey. This is an interesting claim, worth
investigating whether it is empirically true or not.

The second criticism relates to the issues of validity and reliability, which are very important in scientific research. Validity is the strength of our conclusions, inferences or propositions. If we want to know the needs of the dictionary users and link these needs to how often the subjects jog, our conclusion are likely to be totally irrelevant. Thus, in order to make your research valid, you will have to operationally define the constructs you will examine (e.g. users, dictionaries, user needs, user skills, etc.). I agree with Bergenholtz in that the research instruments employed in many user studies are very indirect and make it hard to identify actual user needs or behavioural patterns. Within the sciences, there are two different paradigms for research: normative and interpretive, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Differing approaches to the study of behaviour (based on Cohen and Manion 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Interpretive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society and the social system</td>
<td>The individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium/large-scale research</td>
<td>Small-scale research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal, anonymous forces regulating behavior</td>
<td>Human actions continuously recreating social life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model of natural sciences</td>
<td>Non-statistical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research conducted from the outside</td>
<td>Personal involvement of the researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalizing from the specific</td>
<td>Interpreting the specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining behavior/seeking causes</td>
<td>Understanding actions/meanings rather than causes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assuming the taken-for-granted</td>
<td>Investigating the taken-for-granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-concepts: society, institutions, norms, positions, roles, expectations</td>
<td>Micro-concepts: personal constructs, negotiated meanings, definitions of situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuralists</td>
<td>Phenomenologists, symbolic interactionists, ethnomethodologists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Researchers take differing approaches, depending on their orientation toward the behaviour they investigate. This difference is reflected in the way they design the research, collect and process the data, and in how they make sense of it. There are advantages and disadvantages to any research instrument, so what social scientists should basically try to do is to make every effort to investigate phenomena from multiple angles, with multiple instruments, using both qualitative and quantitative methods. This is what is meant by the term "triangulation" of data analysis: the bringing of multiple-methods to bear on a particular phenomenon.

Research should also be systematic in that all potential confounding variables should be controlled so that a third party can get the similar results to yours, or even interpret the results in a similar way. This is the concept of "reliability". Reliability is the consistency of measurement, or the degree to which an instrument (e.g. questionnaires, tests, etc.) measures the same way each time it is used under the same condition with the same subjects. Bergenholtz has criticized the published user studies, saying that they lack reliability. I would not agree with this statement because the lack of replication is not proof of unreliability. In the social sciences, as in the natural sciences, we do not have to replicate the experiments in our own single study. It is usually the case that someone else will replicate your study to reconfirm your results. It is crucial, therefore, to keep your research design as objective and explicit as possible for others to replicate it. If your design is low in replicability, then nobody can replicate your study and there is no possibility of refuting or falsifying your claims. This means that your study lacks falsifiability, thus will be dismissed as a bad example of scientific research. It is true that many of the present studies including mine have not yet been replicated by others, but this should not be taken as indicating that they have low reliability. Replication is a separate issue.

Bergenholtz's third criticism concerns the lack of theory. This seems to be a very important point. I must admit that the current dictionary user studies are mostly very fragmentary in nature. The findings are not very systematically analysed or interpreted, thus it is hard to obtain an
overall picture. One of the reasons is that, as Bergenholtz has noted, we
do not yet have a comprehensive theory explaining user behaviour sys­
tematically. The theory of lexicographical functions might have great
potential in this respect.
Another reason for the current lack of theoretical backing is that
many dictionary researchers still believe that we are at the stage of “de­
scription”, and not “explanation”. In scientific inquiries, it is often the
case that we will first start from observations. Accumulated observations
will provide us with the overall picture, which then takes us to the next
phase; identifying correlations between variables in the phenomena.
After looking at various correlations, we will assume certain cause-effect
relationships between particular variables, and this will take us to the
next step, an experiment, in which we test the cause-effect relationships
between variables by carefully manipulating independent (cause) and
dependent (effect) variables and controlling extraneous variables. Ex­
periments usually involve hypothesis testing. When you build your
hypothesis, you will start thinking about your theoretical framework.
After the experiment, you either validate your hypothesis or reject it
and reconstruct your hypothesis. Alternatively, you can start construct­
ing a theory to explain the phenomena at hand. So in short, this process
of (i) observation, (ii) correlation, (iii) experiment, (vi) theory develop­
ment, (v) verification of a theory, is a natural sequence in scientific in­
quiry. Bergenholtz’s criticism against the atheoretical user studies is
partly valid because there have been no solid theoretical frameworks so
far in most of the user studies. This is natural, however, because the
user studies at present are still largely at the stage of descriptions.

10. Mutual benefits: how user studies could contribute to the
function theory
In this section, I will consider how function theory can improve the
way user studies are conducted, and how user studies can in return be
used to validate some of the claims made by function theory, thus re­
sulting in a mutually beneficial engagement of ideas.
Most of the user studies conducted so far do not have a clear theo-
retical framework, but this does not necessarily mean that the authors did not care about the details of the user profiles or situations. On the contrary, dictionary user researchers are always keen to define their subjects’ profiles in a more systematic way and we welcome the possibility of doing this by using the function theory. For instance, the profiles of the subjects in my original study (Tono 1984) could be defined as follows:

- **Common profiles:**
  - Mother tongue: Japanese
  - Mother tongue mastery: native (university students)
  - L2: English as a foreign language (exposure in the classroom only)
  - Access to L1 during the learning process

- **Subject-dependent profiles:**
  - L2 proficiency level:
  - L2 learning experience:
    - Method of L2 instructions:
    - Textbooks used
    - Experience of dictionary skills training
  - Use of dictionaries in daily life

We could also define the user situations using the terms from function theory:

- **Basically it is “communication”-oriented**
- **Dictionary use for foreign language learning:**
  - Receptive purposes:
    - Decoding in L2 (reading comprehension)
    - L2/L1 translation (not as a professional translator, but as a method of teaching a foreign language)
    - Grammar exercises (multiple-choice; reordering)
  - Productive purposes:
    - Encoding in L2 (free composition)
    - L1/L2 translation (again, for practising language)
Function theory, by facilitating me in specifying the user situations for the subjects of my previous research more explicitly, it helps me identify the area which needs more improvement in design, especially regarding the definition of the subjects and the task selection. For instance, a more clear distinction should have been made between “cognitive” (thus, text-independent) and “communicative” (text-dependent) situations in the tasks given to the subjects, because, according to function theory, the information in the dictionary would be very different, depending on these different situations. Second, the tasks should also have been more carefully designed in order to distinguish simple reading comprehension from L2/L1 translation, both of which are quite distinct user needs in function theory. Third, in terms of user functions, it is not very clear which type of user needs and related information was investigated in my study. In sum, previous user studies could be reviewed and improved from the perspective of function theory. This may prove to be a useful new direction in the dictionary user research.

One thing which I do not yet have an answer to is the question of “how far can functions go?” In the case of Japanese-speaking learners of English, for example, it is common for them to have quite intensive grammar exercises using a grammar book as a part of their language tasks. If that is a specific user situation and need and if a dictionary has to be ideally mono-functional, can we make a dictionary for English grammar exercises? There seems to be no limit to such minor functions and needs, and thus no limit to the number of possible types of dictionary. Theoreticians can go on sub-dividing to infinity all these minor functions, but if it is a decent theory, it must have some sort of criteria for setting the thresholds in the number of functions to be included in a multi-functional dictionary or the thresholds in the granularity of the functions to be specified.

This is exactly where empirical validation is needed and thus the need for user studies. As Figure 4 shows, we can have a cycle of scientific inquiry as follows: (a) starting from function theory, (b) formulating specific hypotheses to be tested regarding the role of dictionaries
based on particular user functions in particular user situations, (c) designing and conducting research, (d) verifying or rejecting the hypotheses with empirical results, and (e) reformulating or modifying the theory if necessary according to the research results. This is the normal flow of scientific research, but very few dictionary user studies so far have taken this path, due to the lack of specific theories to fall back on. Function theory can be a good candidate for this if further refinements are made in line with specific areas of dictionary use.

Figure 4: A cycle for improving function theory through dictionary user research

11. Concluding remarks
I have discussed the validity of theory construction in lexicography and how dictionary user studies can contribute to such theoretical development. It is worth discussing various issues in lexicography from the
perspective of function theory, as it sheds light on the problems with the current market obsession with multi-purpose, multi-functional dictionaries in the market.

The one thing that struck me most in my discussions with Bergenholtz is that he has a very flexible view of what constitutes a dictionary. For him, the glossaries attached to English textbooks might well be called dictionaries, and even a telephone directory could be a type of dictionary. I showed him a very popular foreign language survival conversation book published in Japan, which is usually never classified as a dictionary in Japan, but he said “That’s a kind of traveller’s dictionary.” Bergenholtz has a very broad conception of “dictionary”, and this must be kept in mind in order to understand his theory.

Since his view of dictionaries is so expansive, it made me wonder whether or not what he is doing is the same as what Google are doing in terms of multilingual text understanding/translation. Begenholtz’s answer is “It could be.” However, his approach toward the same problem is very different. He is approaching the problem from a lexicographer’s viewpoint, not a natural language processing one. Bergenholtz also welcomes various on-going attempts at creating new types of dictionary. He praised some of the projects in Japan, such as the Eijiro, an electronic dictionary project by a group of translators, who are donating English-Japanese translation pairs, which contains now more than 170 million entries. I will continue to discuss with him the possibility of redesigning the interface of pocket electronic dictionaries on the Japanese market on the basis of the function theory. It would be very interesting if all the different dictionary contents can be searched via a user function-based menu.

Although more specific theories of lexicographical functions and detailed specifications of such function-based dictionaries are yet to come, Bergenholtz and I are looking forward to the opportunity of working together to develop scientific research in concert with one another’s approaches, which we hope will be beneficial for both theoreticians and practitioners working in the web of words.
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1. **Introduction**

This paper is a critical analysis of the *Merriam-Webster’s Advanced Learner’s English Dictionary* (2008) (hereafter abbreviated as *MWALED*). The dictionary is the first endeavor by the long-established American dictionary publisher, Merriam-Webster, to produce a dictionary specifically for learners of English as a second or foreign language, and in fact it is the first attempt ever by an American publisher to produce a full-sized EFL dictionary comparable to those published by British competitors. In 1997, the *Random House Webster’s Dictionary of American English* was published by an equally prestigious publishing house in the United States, but strictly speaking it is an ‘ESL’ dictionary. That is to say, it is a dictionary for learners of English as a ‘second’ language as it claims on the top cover, and it is much smaller in size, comprising 859 pages of A-Z dictionary text, as opposed to 1,909 pages of alphabetical entries in *MWALED*. Thus, until the advent of *MWALED*, the global market of EFL dictionaries featuring American English was lead by British publishers that produced American versions of their EFL dictionaries. Major works of that kind include the *Longman Advanced American Dictionary* (the latest (second) edition was published in 2007, abbreviated as *LAAD2* hereafter), the *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners of American English* (2002) and the *Collins COBUILD Advanced Dictionary of American English* (2007, hence-
We would like to examine what features the MWALED has as a truly American-born EFL dictionary of American English, and how it compares to its British-made counterparts of our time, including the seventh edition of the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (henceforth OALD7).

Merriam-Webster offers a free online version of MWALED. If you are hooked up to the Internet, you have free access to the A-Z full text of this dictionary, including audible pronunciation of the headword as well as verbal and pictorial illustrations. The publisher also offers a downloadable e-book version of the A-Z dictionary text of MWALED, readable on Mobipocket reader installed in your computer. The downloadable e-book version is not accessible to audible pronunciation and pictorial illustrations.

For the comparison between MWALED and other EFL dictionaries, all the entries taken from every 50 page (76 pages in total) and corresponding parts of other dictionaries are used for sampling except in Section 6. Other pages will also be examined whenever necessary.

2. Headwords, phrases and phrasal verbs in MWALED

In this section, the differences between MWALED and LAAD2 are discussed, focusing on their headwords, important words, and run-ons (including phrasal verb, idioms, and derivatives). These differences are observed from the viewpoint of the degree of Americanization, for one of the MWALED’s characteristic features is its full coverage of American English, as described in Preface as “unparalleled” (p. 7a). In 2.1, the format of each dictionary is analyzed, while 2.2 explores important words, 2.3 headwords, and 2.4 run-ons.

2.1. Format of each dictionary

First of all, the overall format including the treatment of number, abbreviation, and part of speech in each dictionary are discussed, followed by the comparison of number of items.
2.1.1. Formats

As in other learners’ dictionaries, the entries in *MWALED* “are arranged in alphabetical order according to their headwords” (p. 10a) although the order of headwords unrecorded and unreconstructed (p. 1800) seems to be wrong. Homographs have separate entries when they are related but have different parts of speech, and when they are unrelated. In this point, *MWALED* can be considered as adopting relatively “detached entry style,” referring to the style which presents information on different parts of speech of the same word separately in independent numbered headwords. The degree of detachedness, however, is greater for *LAAD2*.

In *MWALED*, geographical names are concentrated after the headwords pages (pp. 1910–1926), unlike in *LAAD2*, where they are contained in the dictionary text A-Z. This kind of separation is not unusual in the recent EFL dictionaries: for example, *COBAm* also divides geographical and nationality names from headwords. Other proper nouns such as biographical names are not included, which might be because they are more open-ended than geographical names. In the pages of Geographical Names, the major countries, islands, oceans, rivers, cities etc. are included, although the criterion of headword choice is not evident. From a pedagogical point of view, this might confer both advantages and disadvantages.

In the case where a user notices that the word he/she wants to look up is such a geographical one and knows that *MWALED* has separate pages for geographical names, a detached list may be less demanding, because the number of words is much more limited. Moreover, due to its focus on geographical names, *MWALED* has achieved a bigger word list than *LAAD2*: for example, while the latter contains capital cities of countries or states, the former includes not only capital cities but also non-capital ones.

However, when a user does not know that the word is geographical or that *MWALED* adopts the detached system, he/she might not be able to find the word with ease. Atkins and Rundell (2008) argue that from a theoretical viewpoint, the detached system “meant a ‘purer’
headword list, but from the point of view of users (who don’t normally care about such things) it was simply another obscure idiosyncrasy of dictionary editors.” This is why “[c]urrent practice is to include all headwords in one single list” (p. 179), which is opposite from the MWALED system.

When considering the importance of including proper nouns such as geographical names in dictionaries, it might have become less necessary, for it may be the case that a user would search for proper nouns on the Internet rather than look them up in a paper dictionary. Taking this point into consideration, it might be suggested that the necessity of including proper nouns is decreasing.

As for treatment of number, MWALED spells out numbers: for example, catch-22 appears between catchphrase and catch-up. LAAD2, on the other hand, introduces numbers before “A” except in cases where a headword starts with a number, which is spelled out as in MWALED. Therefore, in LAAD2, catch-22 comes before catchall.

As regards abbreviation, a label abbr is attached to abbreviated entries in MWALED in order to indicate that the entry words are abbreviated variations, while LAAD2 implies abbreviation by writing “the abbreviation of . . .” in the definitions. The followings are examples of yd. from the two dictionaries.

\[
\text{yd. abbr yard (MWALED)}
\]

\[
\text{yd. a written abbreviation of yard or yards (LAAD2)}
\]

Although the question of which system is more user-friendly depends on users, the LAAD2 system (i.e. beginning the definition with a phrase “the abbreviation of . . .”) might be space-consuming but is easier to understand for those who do not know the meaning of the label.

2.1.2. Number of words

Comparing MWALED and LAAD2, LAAD2 contains more words than MWALED in respect of headwords, while with regard to run-ons MWALED surpasses LAAD2 in numbers (see Table 2.1 and 2.2).
Table 2.1 The number of headwords in sample pages and corresponding estimated word number in MWALED and LAAD2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MWALED</th>
<th>LAAD2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample pages</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per page</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total no.</td>
<td>39707</td>
<td>44368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 The number of run-ons in sample pages and corresponding estimated word number in MWALED and LAAD2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MWALED</th>
<th>LAAD2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample pages</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per page</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total no.</td>
<td>8781</td>
<td>7180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This difference in the number of words is mainly due to the different way of treating of proper nouns: while LAAD2 incorporates various kinds of proper nouns, such as biographical names and geographical names, MWALED detaches geographical names, as mentioned in 2.2.1, and excludes biographical names, which could be considered to follow the tradition of Merriam-Webster style. However, MWALED makes “honourable exceptions for proper names with metonymic force” (Atkins and Rundell 2008: 187) such as White House and “cultural entities” such as Big Brother, since it could cause users difficulty in grasping their additional meanings or connotations. Although recent trends have been moving toward including proper nouns as headwords, according to Atkins and Rundell (2008), “[t]he actual decision about what to include and what to exclude will depend on how important the various classes of proper name are for the dictionary’s intended market” (p. 187). In the case of MWALED, as is stated in Preface, it is aimed at “learners of English as a second or foreign language” (p. 7a), and these learners would be predicted to look up words which are relatively common in the corpus. In this sense, MWALED can be said to have made a rational headword choice, for its main focus in choosing entries “has been to include the language that people are most likely to need and encounter in their daily lives” (p. 7a) and the evidence used in head-
word choice was drawn from their database of texts, resources from the Internet, and the enormous databases of Lexical-Nexis.

Besides, the gap in the word number is also caused by the richness of compounds and derivatives. Unlike *MWALED*, *LAAD2* tends to include compounds whose meaning can be easily guessed from their constituents. Although there exist some claims that users may “fail to find them as full headwords because they expect them to be tucked away in the entry for the first element” (Atkins and Rundell 2008: 181), it is logical to treat compounds as headwords given their behaviour as a single word in English grammar. *LAAD2* also includes a large amount of derivatives with suffix such as -ed, -ing, and -ly, which are run-ons in *MWALED*. While the style of *LAAD2* is slightly more space-consuming, including them as run-ons may make it more difficult for users to find the words.

### 2.2. Important words

*MWALED* defines its important headwords as “3000 basic English words.” These words are underlined in blue. According to the explanation in Using the Dictionary, they are “selected by Merriam-Webster editors as being the most important for learners to know” (p. 10a). The importance of headwords is described differently in each dictionary. For example, *LAAD2* also chooses 3000 headwords as the most frequent and important words. Not only being highlighted in red, they have tags which refers to their place in “the most frequent 1000/2000/3000 words in spoken English” and “written English” (p. ix). The number and the choice of important words are, however, not radically different in the two dictionaries: important words found only in *MWALED* (33 words = 18.6%), while those found only in *LAAD2* (35 words = 19.8%).

### 2.3. Headwords

As mentioned in 2.1.1, the number of headwords was significantly larger for *LAAD2* than *MWALED*. This tendency can be observed even more clearly when the number of headwords which are found
exclusively in either dictionary is counted: while the number of headwords found only in *MWALED* is 196 words, one found only in *LAAD2* is 418 words. Figure 2.1 shows the characteristics of these words are analyzed, which were arbitrarily classified by the author for convenience.

**Figure 2.1** The categories and the number of headwords found only in *MWALED*.

Here, although compounds are the most frequent, it cannot be considered as a unique feature of *MWALED* because compounds also can be found in the words appearing only in *LAAD2*. Derived forms and British terms, however, seem to be relatively specific to *MWALED*. Although many derivatives with common suffix achieve a status as a headword in *LAAD2*, as mentioned in 2.1.2, a great number of derived forms have their own entries in *MWALED*; they are mainly informal words, or those with a prefix un-, a suffix -man which refers to a male having a specified occupation. What is notable here is that *MWALED* includes many British usages which might be rare in the United States. For example, Inland Revenue is one of the British government departments, which is not related to the US, and snook is a British informal word which is nearly exclusively used in a phrase “cock a snook at.” Thus, it could be suggested that *MWALED* has a stronger “Britishness” compared with other American dictionaries, namely
LAAD2. From the viewpoint of Americanization, these words may not be necessary, although they could of course be encountered by English learners.

2.4. Run-ons

Run-ons can be divided into three groups: phrasal verbs, idioms, and derivatives. First, as for phrasal verbs, no definite characteristics could be observed notwithstanding that many of those are found in the entries of the main verbs, that is, they are contained as a part of the definition of the verb. This tendency also applies to idioms, where the definitions of main words cover major idioms. With regard to derivatives, although both dictionaries assign a run-on status to derivatives with suffix such as -ing, -ly or -tion of headwords, MWALED makes more use of run-ons to a slight extent: MWALED contains more run-ons than LAAD2 (See Table 2.2 in 2.1.2), and includes more words which have the same form as the headwords but of a different part of speech, which are entered as headwords or omitted in LAAD2. Because this tendency is different from the main style of MWALED, it can be suggested that the words with low frequencies do not follow the detached entry style but have a more integrated entry style. In this style, blocks of information on different parts of speech of a word and/or run-on information are incorporated in one entry under a headword.

2.5. Conclusion

In conclusion, MWALED can be regarded as a standard dictionary with a rational style, in spite of the fact that there are claims suggesting that its style of separating geographical names from the body of the dictionary is different to the current norm. In addition, although it includes more British English words than other American dictionaries, it also contains plentiful headwords of Standard American, which follows its objective of providing coverage of both American and British English.

(R. Aoki)
3. Pronunciation

This section compares the phonetic transcription of MWALED with that of three dictionaries, COBAm, LAAD2, and the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English, seventh edition (hereafter OALD7). The differences between the transcription of MWALED and MWCD11 will also be discussed. In MWALED, “Pronunciations are shown between a pair of slashes / / following the entry word” (Using the Dictionary, p. 11a). Websterian dictionaries such as MWCD11 are generally known for their use of a diacritical system in which the pronunciation is transcribed by diacritics based on orthography. In contrast, MWALED uses a rewriting system in which the pronunciation is rewritten using symbols from the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) (Using the Dictionary, p. 11a).

MWALED does not specify its model pronunciation; it only explains that the pronunciation provided in this dictionary is the most “commonly used” (Using the Dictionary, p. 11a). Since MWALED targets learners of American English, users can assume that its model pronunciation is General American (GA), which “is spoken by the majority of Americans, namely those who do not have a noticeable eastern or southern accent” (LPD3, p. xx). As for variants, “Only one pronunciation is given for most words . . . Additional pronunciations are shown when the word can be pronounced in different ways that are equally common . . .” (Using the Dictionary, p. 11a). When variants are presented, they are divided by a comma. According to the preface (p. 8a), “The pronunciations throughout the dictionary were provided by Joshua S. Guenter.”

3.1. Symbols overview

The phonetic symbols used in MWALED are listed in Pronunciation Symbols (p. 22a) and are divided into three groups: Vowels, Consonants, and Other Symbols. Each vowel and consonant symbol is introduced along with keywords. The consonant symbols used in MWALED are basically the same as those in other dictionaries that use the IPA. Among consonant symbols, two are given with diacritics /ŋ, ǀ/. These are used
when both /n, l/ function as syllabic consonants, as in button and pedal. Four symbols are listed in the section titled Other Symbols: the label Brit, which indicates British pronunciation; a slash; and two stress marks.

The characteristics of MWALED can be observed in vowel symbols. Table 3.1 summarizes the vowel symbols of the four dictionaries by categorizing the vowels into three groups. Symbols for each vowel are introduced on the basis of Wells’ (1982) Standard Lexical Sets (SLS).

Table 3.1 Comparison of vowel symbols

| SLS  | MWALED | COBAm | LAAD2 | OALD7 (RP|GA) |
|------|--------|-------|-------|-------------|
| TRAP | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| LOT  | æ      | æ     | æ     | b|æ: |
| DRESS| æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| KIT  | i      | i     | i     | i           |
| FOOT | ù      | ù     | ù     | ù           |
| STRUT| æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| COMMA| æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| FLEECE | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| GOOSE | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| THOUGHT | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| PALM  | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| NURSE | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| FACE  | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| PRICE | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| MOUTH | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| CHOICE | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| GOAT  | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| START | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| SQUARE | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| NEAR  | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| FORCE/NORTH | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |
| CURE  | æ      | æ     | æ     | æ           |

Table 3.1 shows that few differences are observed in the category of short vowels. One is the transcription of lot words, which will be discussed in 3.4.1. The use of length marks for long vowels is one characteristic of MWALED. Among the four dictionaries, MWALED and OALD7 use length marks. “Vowel length in American English is generally considered to be conditioned by phonological environment”
(EPD17, p. ix), and because of this, length marks are often not used in the description of American English pronunciation. However, length marks are helpful for learners who have a length contrast in their mother tongue, such as in Japanese. In MWALED, only the nurse vowel does not accompany the length mark, but no explanation has been given for this. For diphthongs, a slight difference is observed in which vowel symbol each dictionary uses as its starting quality.

### 3.2. Two versions of symbols for diphthongs and long vowels

As shown in Table 3.1, two different symbols are given for diphthongs and long vowels /iː, uː, æ/. This is explained in Pronunciation Symbols (p. 22a): "the second symbol is used when the sound occurs immediately before another vowel and the first symbol is used elsewhere." The following are examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-vocalic positions</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>diet /ˈdaiət/</td>
<td>die /ˈdai/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heroic /ˈhɪˈrowɪk/</td>
<td>hero /ˈhɪroʊ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theater /ˈθiːətər/</td>
<td>theme /ˈθiːm/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When close vowels or closing diphthongs are followed by another vowel, [j] or [w] is inserted as a glide (Takebayashi 1996: 340). Thus, the transcription of MWALED may be phonetically correct. However, to assign two different symbols to one vowel may be confusing for learners of English.

### 3.3. Rhotic vowels

MWALED is different from the other dictionaries in regard to the transcription of rhotic vowels. Table 3.1 shows that only MWALED consistently uses a hooked schwa /ə/ for all rhotic vowels. The only exception is the use of /ə/ for nurse words in LAAD2. All the other dictionaries employ the sequence of a vowel symbol followed by /r/ to transcribe rhotic vowels. Takebayashi (1987) argues that transcribing rhotic vowels by combining a vowel and /r/ is not accurate and it is also misleading for learners of English. For example, the symbol /ər/ or /əːr/
for nurse words indicates that the vowel sound consists of two different qualities, but in fact, the vowel is a monophthong, and its quality does not change throughout its production. The application of a hooked schwa for rhotic vowels in GA should be welcomed from the pedagogic point of view.

3.4. Open back vowels

In general, both GA and RP are said to have the three-way contrast of open back vowels. For both GA and RP, an open unrounded /ɑ:/ is assigned to palm, and an open back rounded /ɔ:/ is assigned to thought. The length mark may or may not be present for GA. In the case of lot words, an unrounded /a/ is used in GA while a rounded /ɒ/ is used in RP. Finally, for cloth words, GA speakers use /ɔ:/ and RP speakers use /ɒ/. In general, in spite of a distributional difference, both GA and RP speakers use three vowels in contrast. Nevertheless, the recent pronunciation change in GA is most noticeable in vowels of the open back area. Subsections 3.4.1—3.4.3 discuss the description of open back vowels in MWALED in more detail.

3.4.1. LOT-PALM merger

The distinction between GA and RP lot vowels is lip-rounding; the former uses an unrounded vowel, while the latter uses a rounded one. In addition, lot vowels in GA have been lengthened and have become equivalent to palm vowels (Wells 1982: 246, Trudgill and Hannah 2008: 43). Table 3.2 compares the transcription of the two vowels in the five dictionaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOT (e.g., bomb)</th>
<th>PALM (e.g., balm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWALED</td>
<td>a:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAm</td>
<td>ɒ</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAAD2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWCD11</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OALD7 (RP</td>
<td>GA)</td>
<td>ɒ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 shows that the recent dictionaries reflect the LOT-PALM merger of GA in their transcription. Except for COBAm, which distinguishes the two vowel phonemes by assigning a different symbol to each group, the other dictionaries use the same symbol for both vowel phonemes reflecting the merger. Even MWCD11, which uses a diacritical system, rewrites LOT vowels with the symbol \(\text{ā}\). By using the length mark, MWALED also emphasizes the lengthening of LOT vowels.

### 3.4.2. LOT-THOUGHT merger

Recently, the merger of /aː/ in LOT and PALM and /ɔː/ in CLOTH and THOUGHT has been observed in GA. Wells calls this the LOT-THOUGHT merger and explains that “what may once have been a western Pennsylvania regionalism is now clearly very much more widespread” (1982: 473). The development seems to have spread such that “fewer and fewer Americans distinguish these two vowel sounds [= LOT and THOUGHT] from one another” (LPD3, p. xxi). In addition, Trudgill and Hannah (2008) say that the spread of this merger is ongoing in some regions but complete in others.

According to Wells (1982: 474), the quality of the merged vowel is unrounded. Similarly, Ladefoged (2006: 89) explains that the quality of the merged vowel is closer to /a/. In other words, the LOT-THOUGHT merger resulted in the disappearance of a long back rounded vowel /ɔː/ from the vowel system of GA. The following table compares the transcription of LOT and THOUGHT vowels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOT (e.g., cot)</th>
<th>THOUGHT (e.g., caught)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWALED</td>
<td>(\text{ā})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAm</td>
<td>(\text{æ})</td>
<td>(\text{ɔ})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAAD2</td>
<td>(\text{α})</td>
<td>(\text{ɔ})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OALD7 (RP</td>
<td>GA)</td>
<td>(\text{ɔ})[aː]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 shows that only MWALED reflects the LOT-THOUGHT merger. The other dictionaries still distinguish the two vowels by using separate symbols. LAAD2 refers to the LOT-THOUGHT merger in its sec-
tion titled “Pronunciation-American English” and explains that “the vowels /o/ and /a/ are both shown, but many speakers do not use the sound /ɔ/. These speakers say /a/ in place of /ɔ/ . . .” However, the merger is not reflected in its transcription. *MWCD11* provides two possibilities for some words. For example, it only gives /o/ for *caller* and *stalk* but gives both /o/ and /a/ for *caught*, *dawn*, and *naughty*. Still, it presents /o/ as the primary pronunciation. *MWALED* is the only dictionary that consistently transcribes *LOT* and *THOUGHT* words with one vowel symbol, /a:/.

**3.4.3. CLOTH words**

An investigation of the transcription of all CLOTH words listed by Wells (1982) shows that most CLOTH words such as *off*, *loss*, *soft*, *cost*, *gone*, *coffee*, and *office* are transcribed with /a:/ in *MWALED*. Even for words such as *gong*, *long*, and *wash*, which Wells (1982) describes as showing fluctuation among regions, *MWALED* consistently uses /a:/.

The only exception is CLOTH vowels which appear in front of the inter-vocalic /r/, for example, in words like *authority*, *horrible*, and *quarrel*. For these words, *MWALED* uses /o/ and not /a:/.

In short, the three-way contrast of open back vowels in GA is completely lost in the transcription of *MWALED*, as Table 3.4 summarizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PALM</th>
<th>LOT</th>
<th>CLOTH</th>
<th>THOUGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MWALED</strong></td>
<td>a:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phonetic transcription in *MWALED* is innovative in that it correctly reflects the quality of current GA vowels. It may be simple and easy for learners because the number of symbols is reduced. At the same time, it may not be pedagogic because important information such as the distinction between free and checked vowels is lost. Also, the faithful reflection of vowel mergers in GA results in widening the
distance between American and British pronunciation. Learners who want to know the British pronunciation using MWALED need to be careful.

3.5. Vowels before intervocalic /r/

It is said that vowel neutralization is often observed in front of the intervocalic /r/. In particular, the distinction between /æ/ and /e/ is often lost in this position (Cruttenden 2008: 84). Table 3.5 summarizes the transcription of three groups of vowels followed by /rV/.

Table 3.5  The transcription of dress, square, and trap followed by the intervocalic /r/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dress + /rV/</th>
<th>Square + /rV/</th>
<th>Trap + /rV/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g., merry, very)</td>
<td>(e.g., Mary, vary)</td>
<td>(e.g., marry, narrow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWALED</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>er or er, ær</td>
<td>ær</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAm</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>ër</td>
<td>ær</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAAD2</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>ær</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWCD11</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>ær, ær</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OALD7 (RP</td>
<td>GA)</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>ær</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5 shows that only MWALED uses one symbol for all three groups. The other dictionaries use either a three-way distinction or a two-way distinction for the three word sets. Here again, MWALED tries to reflect the vowel merger in the current GA.

3.6. Weak vowels

The distribution of weak vowels is said to fluctuate between accents and speakers. It is said that RP speakers tend to use /ɪ/ while GA speakers prefer /ə/. Also, the increased use of /ə/ is observed among young RP speakers. To observe the transcription of weak vowels in MWALED, 15 suffixes whose pronunciation is said to be different between RP and GA speakers are surveyed (Takebayashi 1996: 276).

Fourteen of the 15 suffixes are said to have /ə/ in GA but /ɪ/ in RP. They are -ace as in furnace, -et as in carpet, -ice as in justice, -id as in liquid, -ily as in happily, -in as in cabin, -ine as in doctrine, -is as in basis, -ist as in chemist, -it as in credit, -ization as in
civilization, -ed (the marker of the past tense and past participle), -es (the marker of the plural and third-person singular present tense), and -est (the marker of the superlative). Despite variation among individual words, suffixes, and dictionaries, a general tendency is that both MWALED and MWCD11 favor /ɑ/, whereas COBAm, LAAD2, and OALD7 use /ɪ/. The only exception is the suffix -ist, for which even MWALED and MWCD11 use /ɪ/. On the other hand, the suffix -acle as in miracle is said to show the opposite pattern, that is, /ɪ/ in GA but /ɑ/ in RP. For this suffix, both MWALED and MWCD11 use /ɪ/ whereas the other three dictionaries use /ɑ/. For the suffixes -ed, -es, and -est, both MWALED and MWCD11 provide not only /ɑ/ as the primary pronunciation but also /ɪ/ as the secondary one. To conclude, the analysis of the transcription of suffixes shows that the two Merriam-Webster dictionaries prefer /ɑ/ in unstressed syllables where other dictionaries use /ɪ/.

3.7. Yod-dropping

Compared to vowels, consonants do not show regional differences, and the transcription does not vary greatly among dictionaries. Thus, the consonant transcription of MWALED is not very different from that of other dictionaries. Minor differences can be observed in yod-dropping, that is, the elision of /j/ when preceding /u:/ (Wells 1982: 206). This phenomenon shows regional variation. According to Takebayashi (1996: 253), /j/ is elided when following alveolars /t, d, n/, and a dental /d/ in GA. MWALED as well as OALD7 transcribes words such as tube, dew, new, and enthusiasm without yod for GA but with yod for RP. In contrast, COBAm and LAAD2 only provide the pronunciation without yod. In MWALED, yod is preserved when following /z/ as in presume, whereas it is dropped in both GA and RP when following /s, ʃ/ as in assume and absolute respectively. When we focus on yod-dropping in unstressed syllables as in attitude, avenue, and residue, we can see that yod is elided for GA but preserved for RP in MWALED.
3.8. Stress and weak forms

*MWALED* marks the stress pattern of a word by putting the symbol ' in front of a syllable that carries the primary stress and the symbol , in front of a syllable that carries the secondary stress. *MWALED* calls the primary stress "high stress" and the secondary stress "low stress" (Pronunciation Symbols, p. 22a). *LAAD2*, *MWCD11*, and *OALD7* use the same symbols. *COBA* uses a different system in which it underlines the vowel symbols that carry stress. Let us compare the following transcriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>personality</strong></th>
<th>&lt;MWALED&gt;</th>
<th>/ˈpɜːsəˌnæləti/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;COBA&gt;</td>
<td>/pərsəˌnæləti/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MWALED* marks all monosyllabic words with the primary stress symbols, as *MWCD11* and *COBA* do.

Next, we compare the transcription of weak forms. *MWALED* is different from other dictionaries in that it presents the strong form of function words first. Most function words possess weak forms, which are the default pronunciation unless the function words are emphasized. Thus, most dictionaries provide weak forms first for the function words, and many even use special labels to highlight the difference between weak and strong forms. To illustrate, the transcriptions of the word **them** are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>them</strong></th>
<th>&lt;MWALED&gt;</th>
<th>/ðəm, əm/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;COBA&gt;</td>
<td>/əm, STRONG əm/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;LAAD2&gt;</td>
<td>/əm, əm; strong əm/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;MWCD11&gt;</td>
<td>/ð(θ)əm, 'them, after p, b, v, f, also 'm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;OALD7&gt;</td>
<td>/əm; strong form əm/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although *MWALED* is a learner's dictionary, its transcription of function words is not user-friendly.

3.9. American and British pronunciation

With regard to regional differences, Pronunciation Symbols (p. 22a) states as follows: “British pronunciations are shown in this dictionary when the most common British pronunciation is very different from the
American pronunciation.” The label Brit is used to indicate British pronunciation. Also, in Pronunciation Symbols (p. 22a), the vowel symbols /ɒ, ɔː, æ, ə, ə, ə, ʊə/ are introduced with keywords, and it is explained that these symbols are specifically used for British pronunciation.

In MWALED, both American and British pronunciations are consistently provided for bath words such as ask and example. /æ/ is used in GA and /aː/ is used in RP. In contrast, only GA pronunciation is provided for cloth words. As for rhoticity, the pronunciation difference between GA and RP is not systematically transcribed. However, for individual words, MWALED tries to describe the difference between the two varieties as much as possible. Examples of words for which COBAm and LAAD2 do not provide British pronunciation but MWALED does are as follows: advertisement, ate, clerk, cuckoo, docile, erase, figure, herb, laboratory, lieutenant, of, primarily, quinine, schedule, shone, tomato, and Z.

3.10. Conclusion

In summary, the phonetic transcription system in MWALED is simple: for example, the number of vowel symbols is reduced by applying vowel mergers, and the number of variants and the allophonic information provided are kept to minimum. However, characteristics such as the use of two symbols for diphthongs and long vowels, and the transcription of weak forms, may be difficult and confusing for learners. The most conspicuous and innovative characteristic of MWALED is its faithful and exhaustive reflection of the latest change in American pronunciation. Examples of this include the consistent transcription of the LOT-PALM, LOT-THOUGHT, and /ærV/-/ɜːrV/ mergers.

(J. Sugimoto)

4. Definitions

This section discusses the definitions of MWALED mainly based on the comparison of the definitions of other EFL dictionaries. The following sections begin with the discussion of defining vocabulary (4.1),
and then move on to sense descriptions (4.2), and labels (4.3).

For the examinations of each aspect, basically 76 sample pages (two-page spread of every 50 pages of *MWALED*; see Section 1 for details) are used. Other pages used will also be mentioned whenever necessary. Definitions of *COBAm*, *LAAD2*, the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, fifth edition (henceforth *LDOCE5*) and *OALD7* are compared to reveal the features of *MWALED*.

### 4.1. Defining Vocabulary

It is now customary for ordinal EFL dictionaries to claim that they use a limited number of words for their definitions, called “defining vocabulary” (henceforth DV), and *MWALED* is no exception. According to the blurb on the back cover, the words and phrases in the dictionary are defined with “3,000 core vocabulary words.” However, the list of DV does not appear in the dictionary itself; the user can only access the list through the Internet. The following discussion will be based on this online list and will conclude that it is not DV in a strict sense.

Although *MWALED* claims to use 3,000 core words, the list which appears on the website actually contains more than 3,000; to be exact, 3,541 words are listed. However, every part of speech of each word is included as separate items; for example, both *worry* (noun) and *worry* (verb) are listed. The number of types in the list is 2,804. The following are some random examples:

- above (preposition), absent (adjective), become (verb), British (adjective), child (noun), Christmas (noun), different (adjective), fine (adjective), hide (verb), left (adjective), load (verb), mine (noun), mine (pronoun), nature (noun), paint (verb), people (noun), radio (noun), seal (verb), some (adjective), teacher (noun), unique (adjective), upstairs (adjective), wait (verb), welcome (noun), young (adjective)

As is seen from the above items, no phrases or idioms are included in the DV. However, the definitions of *MWALED* are, of course, not free from phrases, as the following definitions show (underline mine):
babysit: to take care of a child while the child’s parents are away
harem 2 informal: a group of women who are associated with one man

Because the meanings of phrases are often not the sum of the words used, they should also be listed as in *LAAD2* and *OALD7*, to draw the user’s attention to such idiomatic items.

Generally, words which are not included in DV but used in the definitions are marked in some way. For example, *LAAD2* uses small capitals as follows:

<**LAAD2**>

baby blues: a feeling of depression that some women suffer from after they have had a baby

However, *MWALED* does not employ any graphical markings for non-DV items. Consider the following definitions where the words not in the DV list are underlined by the author.

<**MWALED**>

on/at the receiving end ⇔ If you are *on/at the receiving end* of something bad or unpleasant, you are the person it is directed at.

never/not in a thousand/million/billion years — used as a strong way of saying that something is extremely unlikely or impossible

This policy of not marking non-DV items should not be welcomed in terms of user-friendliness as long as the dictionary claims to use restricted vocabulary for its definitions. On the other hand, we might assume that the list provided on the website is not intended as the list of DV in a strict sense. Rather, it might be the list of frequently used vocabulary which the user might therefore need to know to understand the entries. The reason for claiming to have used a core of 3,000 words in the definitions may be closely connected with dictionary makers’ commercialism (cf. Kawamura 2000). Without specifying the range of words used in the definitions, the dictionary might look much more advanced or even give the wrong impression that the dictionary is in-
tended for native speakers, which may have a serious impact on sales. Also, in the context of this new learner’s dictionary, it might be necessary for the publisher to put a restriction on the defining vocabulary to clearly distinguish it from their non-learner’s dictionary, that is, *Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*. While it might be true that too strict a use of DV may result in awkward definitions (cf. Hanks 2009), the absence of markings on words not included in the list may be a drawback from the perspective of user-friendliness.

4.2. Sense description

One of the most striking features of the definitions in *MWALED* is that it marks definitions according to their types by using a colon ( : ), dash (—), or star (☆). This subsection addresses features of each definition type and examines whether they are employed systematically.

4.2.1. Features of each definition type

4.2.1.1. Colon type

A colon indicates that the definition is basically a paraphrase of the headword. The following serves as an example:

**baby** 1 a: a very young child

This is the most common type, as indicated in the preface: “most definitions begin with a boldface colon” (13a), which accords with a general principle of lexicography, that a definition should be substitutable (Svensén 1993, Jackson 2002).

4.2.1.2. Dash type

A dash precedes definitions that begin with “used,” as the following definition illustrates:

**baby** 3 b — used as an informal way of addressing a lover, friend, etc.; used especially by men to address women and by women to address men

Heuberger (2000) calls this rule-based definition, which is particularly
useful in defining idioms and functional words.

In the sample pages, the most common verb that follows “used to” is describe (33 times), followed by say (30 times) and refer (10 times).

ample 2 — used to describe a person's (especially a woman's) body as being large in usually an attractive way
as a matter of form — used to say that something is done because it is polite, usual, or required
we 1 — used to refer to the speaker and another person or group of people as the subject of a verb

The definitions beginning with “used to describe” are mostly observed in the entries of adjectives such as ample, reciprocal and double-blind. The ones beginning with “used to say” are often colloquial phrases such as as a matter of fact, shit happens and that is that. “Refer” is mainly used in the definitions of pronouns and deictic items such as we, right and that.

This type of definition is effectively used in MWALED. Compare the following definitions of consumable from OALD7 and MWALED.

**consumable**

<OALD7>
intended to be bought, used and then replaced

<MWALED>
— used to describe products that need to be replaced after they have been used for a period of time

Clearly, MWALED's definition is much easier to understand, since it refers to the hypernym “product.” In addition, this type seems to work to avoid the circularity of definitions (cf. Svensén 1993: 126). The following are the definitions of deserving from LAAD2, OALD7 and MWALED (underline mine):

**deserving**

<LAAD2>
2: to deserve something

<OALD7>
: that deserves help, praise, a reward, etc

<MWALED>
—used to say that someone or something should have or be given something

Because *deserving* is the adjectival form of the verb *deserve*, using *deserve* in the definition is not an ideal way of defining the derived forms. However, *LAAD2* and *OALD7* employ it in their definitions. On the other hand, *MWALED* employs a rule-based definition that is easy to understand for the user without using the verb *deserve*.

One regrettable thing is that the same symbol is also employed to introduce notes and usages that begin with "used". Consider the following taken from *hot water*:

*hot water*: a difficult situation: *TROUBLE* — used with *in* or *into*

Since exactly the same symbol is used in both definitions and notes, the user may well wonder whether it is a definition or a note. It might be better to use other symbols for usage notes, such as a circle or triangle, to avoid such confusion.

4.2.1.3. Sentence definition

A star represents that the definition is given in a full sentence. The following definition, taken from the entry of *back*, is a case in point:

*watch your back*: ◇ If people tell you to *watch your back*, they are telling you to be careful.

This type of definition is also employed in other dictionaries. Particularly, *COBA*m defines every meaning in full sentences. Consider the following definition of *baby*:

*C<COBA*m>*

*baby*: 1: A baby is a very young child, especially one that cannot yet walk or talk.

The advantages of sentence definition can be summarized as follows: it indicates the typical collocations and colligations, provides constructional information, and adds encyclopedic information about the definiendum (Rundell 2006). The following definition of *lay up* best describes these features:
lay up If someone is laid up with an illness, the illness makes it necessary for them to stay in bed.

This definition not only tells the user about the meaning of this phrase, but also provides collocational information that the phrase can be followed by “with” and constructional information that the phrase is often used in the passive form (cf. Rundell 2006). However, in spite of these attractive advantages, according to Rundell (2006), full sentence definition has not replaced all of the other definitions used in EFL dictionaries. This is due to the fact that it is space-consuming, overspecifies the context, and requires new conventions to understand full sentence definitions (ibid.). He continues that it is important to keep in mind that full sentence definitions are not always the best choice for the definition and should be used case by case. This is what MWALED has attempted explicitly for its entries, highlighting them with star marks. Such indication is highly useful for the user, and it is no doubt a welcome feature that, I believe, should be employed in future versions of other EFL dictionaries as well.

Let us now examine how this type of definition is used in MWALED. As far as the sample pages are concerned, full sentence definitions are used effectively to provide collocational and constructional information. Consider:

by a nose ⊳ If an animal wins a race by a nose, it wins by a very short distance.  
cut from the same cloth ⊳ If people or things are cut from the same cloth, they are very similar to each other.

In the former example, it is explicit from the definition that the phrase by a nose is mainly used with the verb win to describe a situation with racing animals. In the latter example, the definition indicates that cut from the same cloth is generally used in the passive construction.

However, there are three points to note here. First, MWALED does not seem to systematically employ full sentence definitions. Consider
the following:

**catch somebody’s eye**

<LAAD2>
to attract someone’s attention and make them look at something

<OALD7>
to attract sb’s attention

<MWALED>
▽ If someone or something *catches your eye*, you notice that person or thing.

In this example, *MWALED*’s definition does not provide any collocational or constructional information, and the definitions in *LAAD2* and *OALD7* suffice to convey the meaning of the phrase. Since full sentence definitions tend to be lengthy, they should be used only when they are effective enough.

Second, there are some definitions that seem to be a mixture of a definition and a note. The following serves as an example:

**a hostage to fortune** ▽ In British English, *a hostage to fortune* is something (such as a promise or an action) that someone has made or done that may cause problems in the future. In U.S. English, this phrase is much less common and is usually understood to mean a person whose future success or failure is controlled by luck or fortune.

Although this conveys much information, it should not be welcomed because the user may need to read the whole entry to understand the meaning of the phrase. Rather, the definitions should be separated as *OALD7* does:

<OALD7>
**a hostage to fortune**: something that you have, or have promised to do, that could cause trouble or worry in the future

Finally, it is regrettable again that the same symbol is also used to introduce notes that are written in a sentence. Consider:

**poll tax**: a tax that each adult has to pay in order to vote in an election ▽ Poll taxes are no longer legal in the U.S.
Using the same symbol for both definitions and notes cannot be justified because it may confuse the user.

4.2.2. Sense describing policy of MWALED

One of the features of MWALED’s definitions is that definitions are given from various perspectives. According to the preface, “the inclusion of multiple definitions thus helps learners both to expand their vocabularies and to gain a fuller picture of a word’s meaning by approaching it from a slightly different direction” (7a). The following definitions are cases in point:

- **baby**
  1: to treat (someone) like a baby: to be kind or too kind to (someone)

- **brilliant**
  1: very bright: flashing with light

- **amuse**
  1: to make someone laugh or smile: to entertain (someone) in a light and pleasant way

Multiple definitions add information useful for understanding the nuance of the word. In the definition of baby, for example, the second definition tells the user that a typical way of treating someone like a baby is to be too kind to him/her. In addition, this policy contributes to avoiding ambiguity in a definition (cf. Landau 2001: 170). For example, if the definition of brilliant were only “very bright,” the user might wonder which meaning of bright should be used in this context (bright has five senses according to MWALED).

Such specifications, however, are usually given as selectional restrictions in parentheses as in OALD7:

- `<OALD7>`
  - **brilliant**
    4 (of light or colours) very bright

This implies that MWALED’s policy of using multiple definitions is not always justified. It should also be noted that giving synonyms may suffice to indicate the content of the second definition. Consider the definitions of amuse in LAAD2 and OALD7:

- `<LAAD2>`
  - **amuse**
2 to make someone spend time in an enjoyable way, without getting bored \textit{entertain} \textit{<OALD7>}

2 \textit{vn} to make time pass pleasantly for sb/yourself \textit{entertain}

Indicating \textit{entertain} as a synonym of \textit{amuse}, which concisely represents the second definition of \textit{MWALED}, may be enough in this case. Although multiple definitions may be helpful for the user in some cases, it seems that they are not user-friendly in all cases, in that they require the user to read the whole entry to understand the definiendum.

4.2.3. Arrangement of senses

In an ordinary learner’s dictionary, each sense is usually given in order of frequency, and \textit{MWALED} follows this trend. However, in some cases, etymological criteria seem to be employed. \textit{Brilliant} and \textit{radio} are cases in point:

Table 4.1 The sense order of \textit{brilliant}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>brilliant</th>
<th>\textit{MWALED}</th>
<th>\textit{COBAm}</th>
<th>\textit{LAAD2}</th>
<th>\textit{OALD7}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very bright (color)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 The sense order of \textit{radio}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>radio</th>
<th>\textit{MWALED}</th>
<th>\textit{COBAm}</th>
<th>\textit{LAAD2}</th>
<th>\textit{OALD7}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>device</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first definition of each in \textit{MWALED} is given below:

\textit{brilliant} 1: very bright: flashing with light
\textit{radio} 1: the system or process that is used for sending and receiving signals through the air without using wires

These meanings are undoubtedly less frequent than other meanings, as is clear from the fact that other dictionaries do not place them first.
MWALED may need to be more consistent with respect to its policy of listing senses.

Since MWALED is a dictionary of American English, senses that are mainly used in the United States are listed first. Consider:

**big dipper** 1. the **BIG** Dipper **US:** a group of seven stars in the northern sky that form a shape like a large dipper or ladle 2. **Brit,** *old-fashioned:* roller coaster

In LDOCE5 and OALD7 the order is the opposite; the second meaning precedes the first. It should be noted in passing that this Americanism naturally contributes to the wider coverage of American English. For example, the first meaning of **big wheel** below is only covered in MWALED:

**big wheel** 1 *chiefly US, informal:* a powerful or important person: 
BIG SHOT 2 **Brit:** FERRIS WHEEL

These facts firmly indicate that MWALED is a dictionary of American English.

4.3. Labels

This subsection deals with the labels in MWALED. MWALED has labels of grammar, region, status, register and subject. The following list is taken from the front matter:

Grammatical labels:
- Nouns: [count] [noncount] [singular] [plural]
- Verbs: [+ obj] [no obj] [auxiliary verb] [linking verb] [modal verb] [phrasal verb]
Regional labels: **US, chiefly US, Brit, chiefly Brit**
Status labels: slang, offensive, obscene, impolite
Register labels: informal, formal, literary, old-fashioned, humorous, technical, disapproving, approving
Subject labels: medical, law, baseball etc.

In terms of grammatical labels, the system is relatively simple compared with other EFL dictionaries. As a result, descriptions of meanings are not sufficient in some cases. Let us consider the description of
the verb **amuse**. First, here is the definition of *OALD*:

Games:<oald>

**amuse** 1 to make sb laugh or smile: [vn] *My funny drawings amused the kids. This will amuse you.* [vn to inf] *It amused him to think that they were probably talking about him at that very moment.*

[vn] indicates that the verb is used with a noun and [vn to inf] means that the verb can be used in the sequence of "verb + noun + to + verb" as in "It amused him to think ...".

On the other hand, *MWALED* does not provide the latter constructional pattern as a grammatical label. Rather, it is given as an example as indicated below (underline mine):

Games:<mwaled>

**amuse** 1: to make someone laugh or smile: to entertain (someone) in a light and pleasant way [+ obj] *His silly jokes amused the audience. = The audience was amused by his silly jokes. [= the audience found his silly jokes funny/entertaining/amusing] It amuses me to think of how he looked when I last saw him. That joke doesn’t amuse me. [= I don’t think that joke is funny] The loss did not amuse the coach. [= the coach was not happy about the loss] [no obj] a funny story that never fails to amuse

This can be a reflection of the *MWALED*’s policy that “the real heart of the dictionary is its examples” (7a) (see Section 5 for details). However, the absence of grammatical labels is entirely user-unfriendly because it is unlikely that the user can generalize the grammatical pattern from a single example. The simplicity and transparency of grammatical labels are of course important for EFL dictionaries, but oversimplification may result in missing necessary information for the user.

As for the regional labels, although only *US* and *Brit* labels are listed, some other labels are employed whenever necessary. For example, *chiefly Scotland* is used in the definition of **bonny**:

**bonny** *chiefly Scotland*: very pretty or attractive

Turning to the register labels, it should be pointed out that
MWALED does not have the labels of spoken and written. One may think that such distinction can be covered by employing formal and informal labels, considering that spoken items are often informal and written ones are formal. There are, however, some expressions that are formal but spoken, and informal but written. Consider the following examples taken from OALD6 (cf. Komuro et al. 2006):

**lots of love (from)**  
(written, informal) used at the end of a letter to a friend or to sb you love, followed by your name  
**son 4 (my son)**  
(spoken, formal) used by a priest to address a boy or man

This implies that the lack of spoken and written labels cannot be filled by informal and formal labels, and that the exclusion of these labels may be a drawback of MWALED’s labeling system.

### 4.4. Conclusion

In this section, definitions of MWALED were examined. Although the blurb on the back cover claims to use 3,000 core words, the list appears only on the website, and they are not strictly employed as defining vocabulary. One of the most remarkable features of the sense describing policy is that the types of definitions are indicated by symbols. This surely helps the user to quickly understand the definitions, though it is regrettable that the same symbols are used for usage notes immediately after the definition as well. Words are defined with several definitions in many cases to convey the nuances correctly; however, they are sometimes redundant and space-consuming compared with the way other EFL dictionaries employ. MWALED uses a relatively simple labeling system; on the one hand, it makes descriptions more transparent and easy to understand, but on the other hand, some important information might be missing at times. Overall, although the definitions of MWALED have many attractive features, there is still much that needs improvement.

(S. Uchida)
5. Illustrative Phrases and Sentences

*MWALED* makes the following claim in its blurb: “More than 160,000 example sentences—the most of any learner’s dictionary.” The publisher attaches considerable weight to example sentences. They explain the reason for doing so in the front matter (p. 7a): “In writing this book we have devoted a great deal of care and attention to creating simple and accurate definitions, but our feeling throughout has been that the real heart of the dictionary is its examples.” The truth of the above assertion is also suggested by the dictionary’s following external characteristics:

(1) The example sentences are highlighted by using “the blue text”, which is adopted to allow “users to find the information they want quickly” (p. 8a). The use of a blue font also impresses on users the considerable space used for example sentences.

(2) Unlike most other EFL dictionaries, almost every run-on entry comprises example sentences.

(3) Some additional information is added to example sentences through the use of paraphrases. These paraphrases are placed after equal marks (=). Several types of information are added using this notation.

One of the most striking facts about the examples found in *MWALED* is that most of them are “made-up” ones. The editors argue that the examples “have been carefully written to show words being used in appropriate contexts which accurately reflect their uses in actual speech and writing” (p. 7a). This seems to buck the growing trend of relying upon citations from corpora. Indeed, in his latest review of this dictionary, Hanks (2009) criticizes some of these “made-up” examples (according to his estimate, they amount to 30,000) as unnatural. He argues that “Each example is there, not to illustrate idiomatic usage, but to support a definition—a preconceived theory, as it were, about the word’s meaning.” It may certainly be dangerous for non-native lexicographers to follow this format, but it seems unlikely that the experienced editors at Merriam-Webster would come up with seriously misleading example
sentences. Actually, Hanks’ citations (p. 309) inadvertantly reveal that
the problem he points to is not really serious. In other words, the
problems are exclusively confined to the encyclopedic knowledge of the
featured words and the context in which they are used. He admits, “[F]
or the most part, they do their job” (p. 314).

What indispensable prerequisites should the example sentences be
satisfying? These, in our opinion, can be outlined as follows: (1) ade­
quate illustration of the usage of a lexical unit, and (2) provision of
clues to remind users of the usage. In the latter respect, “made-up”
sentences are actually advantageous: the editors can present the relevant
information in simple sentences, eliminating distracting details that are
necessarily involved in citations from corpora. The opinion of native
English speakers on this point might be at variance with that of non-na­
tive speakers; for non-native speakers, sentences that are “perfectly natu­
ral but too detailed to remember” are more troublesome than those that
are “slightly odd but readily understandable and easy to learn by heart.”

Nevertheless, as stated in the preface (p. 7a), some examples are cited
from British and American classic works by authors like Shakespeare,
Henry D. Thoreau, and Stowe. (Thus Hanks’ comment that “The
illustrative examples in MWALED are not taken from a corpus, nor
even from MW’s collection of citations” is not true.) This is in line
with Merriam-Webster’s established tradition (for instance, MWCD11
abounds with those citations). These examples are especially effective
when used to illustrate archaic usages and obsolete meanings. Although
the pedagogical advantage of the examples cited from famous works is
not attested, this kind of example is certainly an appropriate way of il­
lustrating archaic usages and supplying users with cultural knowledge.

Another policy the editors seemed to have followed is of using as few
symbols as possible — a policy that vests the example sentences found
in MWALED with myriad functions. For example, as the front matter
suggests — and our subsequent analysis proves — the examples in this
dictionary are used in lieu of synonym articles, definitions of run-on
entries, usage notes, etc., and are usually supplemented by paraphrases,
as mentioned above. The pros of this policy are:
(1) Users can use the dictionary without referring to the extra columns that are dispersed over the pages of the other famous EFL dictionaries.

(2) Instead of formally defining it, the editors can describe a subtle nuance of a phrase or a structure by explaining its meaning through a paraphrase, which leads to a wider coverage of idiomatic phrases, idiomatic structures, and discourse markers.

Of the abovementioned advantages, the latter has important implications. The explanatory comments introduced by equal marks are given with respect to specific contexts and are easily comprehensible. They also contribute to the conciseness of some definitions, as shown below.

On the other hand, one of the aforementioned policy’s cons is that users have to “read” the dictionary closely and carefully as opposed to “search for information” in it. They are obliged to struggle through a lot of examples before getting the relevant information. Although this can be considered a pedagogically desirable situation, some keys like the “signposts” found in LDOCE5 might as well be introduced. Moreover, users might have some trouble comparing the context in which they come across certain words or phrases with the context in which the dictionary gives specific explanations of the said words and phrases using paraphrases. In other words, users might wonder whether the explanation (i.e., paraphrase) is applicable to the expression or structure whose meaning they want to know.

On the basis of the above argument, we can conclude that both the major advantages as well as disadvantages regarding the examples incorporated in MWALED lie in the use of paraphrases. Therefore, we focus on the use of paraphrases in the dictionary’s example sentences in the following subsections.

5.1. The functions of the paraphrases attached to words/ phrases/ sentences in MWALED’s verbal illustrations:

The editors briefly describe the usage of the dictionary’s featured examples comprising paraphrases in the front matter:
Many examples include synonymous words or phrases shown within brackets, thus allowing the reader either to learn a new word or to have the connection between the meanings of words reinforced. Examples also often include glosses, so that phrases and compound terms whose meanings are not obvious can be explained clearly and simply. And we have very frequently explained the meaning of entire phrases and sentences by restating them with other, simpler words. Many examples also show how the same word can be used in slightly different ways—or how related words can be used in different ways—to say the same thing. . . . (8a)

In addition to the above specifically stated functions of the paraphrases found in the dictionary, we found a few additional ones that the editors do not mention. Here, we will classify the usage of paraphrases according to their grammatical contexts, that is, the words, clauses, or sentences to which paraphrases are attached. We then discuss functions of paraphrases in each context.1)

5.1.1. Functions of the paraphrases attached to words

The paraphrases that are attached to words are mainly used to present synonyms and quasi-synonyms. The relevant point here is how (or, in what respect) these synonyms or quasi-synonyms differ from the entry words.

(1) To present synonyms

\text{**yak**} Half the people on the train were \textit{yakking} \([=\textit{yammering}]\)
(away) on their cell phones.

As stated above, the advantage of this paraphrase type is that through it, the editors can present those synonyms that are appropriate to the relevant context. Consider the following example:

\textit{inkling} a slight, uncertain idea about something: a slight amount of knowledge about something.

I didn’t have an \textit{inkling} \([=\textit{clue}]\) of what it all meant. • Nothing gave me any \textit{inkling} that it would happen.

The paraphrase used here indicates clearly the difference between the
meanings of the headwords in the first and the second examples.

(2) To present equivalents in the major English variations
*yard Children were playing out in the yard. [= (Brit) garden]
*cubicle Brit: a small space in a public room (such as a bathroom) that has walls for privacy; a shower/toilet cubicle [= (US) stall]

(3) To present figurative meanings
*"nose 2: the ability to smell things; the sense of smell...often used figuratively; He is a good reporter with a nose for news. [= he's a reporter who is good at finding news] • a baseball scout with a nose for talent [= a scout who is good at finding new talent]

(4) To present the meanings of words used in non-compositional compounds
*X-rated an X-rated [= pornographic] Web site

(5) To present more commonly used words
*doppelgänger I saw your doppelgänger [= (more commonly) double] yesterday.

(6) To present the more polite forms of words
*fat 1: She's gotten really fat. [= (more politely) big, heavy]

(7) To present the meanings of the run-on entry words
—faultless a faultless [= perfect, flawless] performance

How should these types of information be dealt with? Type (2) paraphrases, especially those similar to the first citation, are usually found at the beginning of the entry in other EFL dictionaries. On the other hand, types (4) and (5) are usually explained through some kind of independent article, such as “thesaurus,” “usage,” etc. A comprehensive comparative discussion of the features of this and other EFL dictionaries is undertaken in 5.3 below.

5.1.2. Functions of the paraphrases attached to phrases

Paraphrases of this type are chiefly adopted to explain the meanings of non-compositional phrases.
(1) To present the meanings of non-compositional phrases or phrases with low compositionality

- X-ray adj, always used before a noun • X-ray radiation [= radiation from X-rays] • X-ray machines [= machines that use X-rays]

1cuff 3: The nurse put a blood-pressure cuff [= a cuff that measures blood pressure]

(2) To present the meanings of affixes in their specific contexts

1-y 1a: full or having a lot of something

a muddy river [= a river with a lot of mud in it]

(3) To present figurative meanings

1knee . . . bring (someone) to his/her knees: to completely defeat or overwhelm (someone) . . . often used figuratively • The increase in oil prices could bring the economy to its knees. [= it could greatly hurt the economy]

(4) To present contextual meanings

y or Y 4: Turn left when you come to the Y. [= when the road/path splits like the top half of a Y]

2yard . . . the whole nine yards EVERYTHING • I served a huge Thanksgiving dinner: turkey, mashed potatoes, pumpkin pie — the whole nine yards. [= all the foods that are traditionally served for Thanksgiving dinner]

(5) To present more common phrases

descend to (something) She was desperate for money, but she would not descend to [= (more commonly) stoop to] asking her friends for help.

(6) To present equivalents in the major English variations

2dormitory Brit: lived in by people who go to another town or city to work • a dormitory town [= (US) bedroom community]

(7) To present cross-references

1cult 2: a cult of personality = a personality cult

(The definition of “a personality cult” is given under the entry of personality.)

(8) To present definitions for idiomatic phrases with relatively low frequency, which are often highlighted in bold face in the verbal illustrations.
1father 1: He’s a single father. [= a father who does not have a wife or partner]

As regards this example type, some readers might complain that in the case of some examples, similar example sentences are repeated within the entry:

2line . . . line up 1: to form a line . . . (US) People lined up [= (chiefly Brit) queued up] at the theater waiting to buy tickets. 2 line (people or things) up or line up (people or things): to put (people or things) into a line · (US) People were lined up [= (chiefly Brit) queued up] at the theater waiting to buy tickets.

3mark 8: to show that (someone or something) is special or different in some way · Her very first book marked her as a great poet. [= showed that she was a great poet] · She was evidently marked [= destined] for greatness. . . . mark out 3 mark (someone or something) out or mark out (someone or something) chiefly Brit: to show that (someone or something) is special or different in some way · Her very first book marked her out as a great poet. [= showed that she was a great poet] · She was marked out [= destined, marked] for greatness.

However, although the above sentence examples are seemingly repetitive and redundant, they clearly illustrate the difference between the transitive and the intransitive structures comprising the entry word—a feature that is certainly useful for users.

5.1.3. Functions of the paraphrases attached to sentences

The last paraphrase type (or restatements, as some of them should be called) is mainly used to give syntactic or pragmatic, rather than semantic, explanations.

(1) To present another example sentence with the same truth-conditional meaning, using an equal mark without square brackets

bring 1: to come with (something or someone) to a place . . . I’ll bring you another drink. = I’ll bring another drink to you.

This type of paraphrase is often used to show the variety of construc-
tions the entry word can take.

2fathom to understand the reason for (something) • I couldn’t fathom why she made such a foolish decision. = I couldn’t fathom her reasons for making such a foolish decision.

The problem is that some sets of paraphrases of this type are not used to explicate the usage of the entry word; rather, they are used to show the usage of other phrases. Look at the citation below:

1fault 1a: a bad quality or part of someone’s character: a weakness in character • In spite of her faults, she’s a loyal friend. = For all her faults, she’s a loyal friend.

This kind of “diversion,” however, often provides culturally important information. Consider the following:

1go 27 of a sports team or player: to have a specified record ... The shortstop went two for four in yesterday’s game. [= the shortstop had two hits in four times at bat in yesterday’s game]

Sometimes both the [= ... ] and = ... patterns are used side by side.

1catch 4: to affect (someone) in a sudden and surprising way • They were caught unprepared by the crisis. = The crisis caught them unawares. [= they were not prepared when the crisis occurred]

(2) To present contextual meanings

2yank 2: to quickly or suddenly remove (something or someone) • The show was yanked off the air. [= the show was suddenly canceled; it was suddenly decided that the show would no longer be broadcast]

cuddle 2: He cuddled up with a good book. [= he sat down in a comfortable position and began reading a good book]

Sometimes, example sentences that have paraphrases attached to one of their words are restated through a whole sentence, which explains the contextual meaning.

1dope 3: What’s the dope [= skinny, scoop] on the new guy? [= what do you know about him?]
(3) To present figurative meanings

**engrave** to cut or carve lines, letters, designs, etc., onto or into a hard surface... often used figuratively. That incident was *engraved* in my memory. [= That incident *engraved* itself on my memory. [= I will never forget that incident]

(4) To explain the meanings of discourse markers

**yeah** 2 “I’m from Maine.” “*Oh yeah?* [= really?] I didn’t know that”

(5) To present the contextual meanings of the example sentences in the non-defined run-on entries

—**amply** You will be *amply* rewarded for your efforts. [= you will be given a large reward for your efforts]

### 5.2. The relation between the definition and example types

As we have discussed in Section 4, there are three types of definitions in *MWALED*:

(1) Sentence definitions, marked with “◇”

(2) Synonym definitions (Heuberger 2000), marked with “:”

(3) Rule-based definitions (Heuberger 2000), marked with “—used”

Examples with “=” notations are usually employed with type (2) definitions. Rule-based definitions (type (3)) are often followed by this kind of example, but sentence definitions (type (1)) are rarely accompanied by it. This may be because sentence definitions themselves are rarely included in this dictionary. The statistics gathered from the sample pages are given in Table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition Type</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonym</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule-based</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 The Relation between the Definition and Example Types
In the examples following type (1) definitions, the paraphrase tends to be attached to a phrase. As for type (2) definitions, there seems to be an interesting correlation between the elaborateness of the definitions and the existence of examples with paraphrases. Example sentences following type (3) definitions are often supplemented by restatements. These observations will be closely examined by comparing the definitions and the examples of some major EFL dictionaries in the following discussion.

5.3. Comparison of several American English EFL dictionaries

5.3.1. Examples used with sentence definitions

*MWALeD* comprises a small number of definitions that adopt the sentence-definition form. A paraphrase explaining the meaning of the relevant phrase is often used in these examples.

*MWALeD>*

◇ If you *take something hard* you are very upset or hurt by it. She *took it hard* [= she was very upset] when he left.

*LAAD2>*

7 *take something hard* informal to feel upset about something, especially bad news:
*Dad didn’t say much, but I could tell he took it hard.*

The paraphrase explains the situation well in the citation below:

*MWALeD>*

◇ A *death knell* is a sign or indication that something will fail or end soon.
Many people thought that the Internet would *sound/ring/toll the death knell* for newspapers. [= cause the end of newspapers]

*LAAD2>*

d*death knell* a sign that something will soon stop existing or stop being used:
*Plans for a new bridge sounded the death knell for ferry services.*

Often, the editors add examples of the figurative usages of the phrases in question — a format to which the paraphrase lends itself well.
If you are (flat) on your back you are lying with your back against the ground, on a bed, etc.

The accident left him (lying) flat on his back (in bed) for two weeks. This phrase is sometimes used figuratively. The stock market has been flat on its back [= has been doing very poorly] in recent weeks.

17 be (flat) on your back to be so sick that you cannot get out of bed:
He’s been flat on his back in the hospital for a week.

5.3.2. Examples used with synonym definitions

In some entries, MWALED adopts brief and abstract synonym definitions and supplements the provided information with paraphrases or restatements. For example, in their entries for ire, both MWALED and LAAD2 adopt the same strategy:

ire: intense anger . . . The proposal has raised/roused/provoked the ire of environmentalists. [= had made environmentalists angry]

ire anger: raise/draw somebody’s ire (= make someone angry)

Cf. <COBAm>
Ire is anger. [FORMAL] Their ire was directed mainly at the government.

However, LAAD2 often applies the contrary strategy: it provides diversified and elaborated definitions and gives fewer examples:

unreasonable 1 not fair or sensible:
I don’t want to argue, but I think you’re being unreasonable.
It is unreasonable to do something
It’s unreasonable to expect a child to sit still for two hours.
unreasonable demands/expectations etc.
Don’t let your boss make unreasonable demands on you.
2 unreasonable prices, costs etc. are too high

COBAm, which solely uses sentence definitions, explains the entry word through several definitions.

<COBAm>
1 If you say that someone is being unreasonable, you mean that they are behaving in a way that is not fair or sensible.
The strikers were being unreasonable in their demands, having rejected the deal two weeks ago. It was her unreasonable behavior with a Texan playboy which broke up her marriage.

2 An unreasonable decision, action, price, or amount seems unfair and difficult to justify.
... unreasonable increases in the price of gas.

Compare the above citations with the following citation from MWALED:

<MWALED>
unreasonable: not fair, sensible, or appropriate: not reasonable · I told him that I wouldn’t pay unless he sent me a replacement. Am I being unreasonable? ... You are entitled to compensation for unreasonable delays. unreasonable demands/expectations · The prices were not unreasonable. [= were not too high]

The appropriateness of the followed format depends on the users’ reading comprehension ability. MWALED might prove somewhat demanding for intermediate learners as it requires them to infer the meaning of the word or phrase in question on the basis of examples. A paraphrase or a restatement should be added to every given example if the editors provide brief synonym definitions.

The construal of noun phrases often depends on the user’s cultural background. In those cases, the use of “=” has some advantage. Consider the examples below:

<MWALED>
unreliable 1: not able to be trusted to do or provide what is needed or promised · Public transportation here is unreliable. The buses never come on time. · an unreliable car [= a car that breaks down often]
The local bus service is unreliable.

Cf. <COBAm>
Diplomats can be a notoriously unreliable and misleading source of information. His judgment was unreliable.

If they give only example sentences or phrases, editors often have to look for appropriate nouns that refer to typically "unreliable" referents (for example, some diplomats might complain about the example in COBAm); on the other hand, by using "=" and describing the meaning of the example sentence or phrase, they can adopt examples easily.

5.3.3. Examples used with rule-based definitions
Rule-based definitions are likely to be abstract and difficult to understand. Paraphrases or restatements are often used to supplement these types of definitions. In LAAD2, this type of definition is sometimes given in a sentence definition. Compare the following citations:

<MWALED>
the other way around 2 — used to say that the opposite situation is true. . . . "I thought he wanted a divorce." "No, it was the other way around." [= she wanted a divorce]

<LAAAD2>
9 the other way around if the situation, process etc. is the other way around, it is actually the opposite of how you thought it was: Students translate from French to English and the other way around.

<MWALED>
forgiving 2 — used to describe something that produces good results even when it is not used perfectly. The tennis racket is designed to be forgiving. [= designed to produce good shots even when the ball is not hit perfectly]

<LAAAD2>
forgiving 2 if something is forgiving, it does not matter if you make small mistakes with it: This recipe is very forgiving.
Although these paraphrases are useful, a problem might arise from applying them to the context a user wants to understand. Especially in cases like the other way around, sufficient examples with paraphrases are indispensable.

5.4. Another function of examples

Some technical terms or geographic names are explained in examples (and/or their paraphrases), which are often explained in the definition or other information categories in other EFL dictionaries.

<MWALED>
transitive adj, grammar, of a verb: having or taking a direct object • a transitive verb • In “I like pie” and “She makes hats,” the verbs “like” and “makes” are transitive.

<LAAAD2>
ENG. LANG. ARTS a transitive verb has an object. For example, in the sentence “I hate bananas,” “hate” is transitive. Transitive verbs are marked [T] in this dictionary.

<MWALED>
cubic 1 — used to describe a measurement that is produced by multiplying something’s length by its width and its height • one cubic centimeter [= a measure of volume that is one centimeter long, one centimeter wide, and one centimeter high]

<LAAAD2>
MATH a measurement of space which is calculated by multiplying the length of something by its width and height: What’s the cubic capacity of this engine?

<MWALED>
Norman adj, always used before a noun • the Norman conquest [= the time when Normans conquered England in 1066]

<MWALED>
the Pacific Northwest [= the northwestern part of the U.S. near the Pacific coast]

<LAAAD2>
the Pacific Northwest the area of the U.S. that includes the states
of Oregon and Washington, and can include the southwestern part of British Columbia, Canada

Although users are not likely to face any problems in acquiring adequate information through this kind of entry, some dictionary makers would criticize it for not being well-organized.

5.5. Conclusion

The editors of *MWALED* give considerable importance to examples. Their attitude is reflected through two characteristics: (1) the use of made-up phrases or sentences, and (2) the addition of paraphrases or restatements. Both of them suggest that the editors want users to understand the meaning of a headword by carefully reading the whole entry rather than by "searching" the entry for the information they need at the time of consulting. This attitude signals a complete departure from the trend followed by the current EFL dictionaries. Some users would probably find this dictionary difficult to use. Teachers, however, might appreciate the policy adopted by the dictionary because it presents a pedagogically desirable situation for students and they themselves can use it to obtain useful example phrases or sentences while taking their classes. Therefore, we conclude that the evaluation of this dictionary varies according to reviewer ability and social or cultural milieu.

(M. Ryu)

6. Boxed Notes in *MWALED*

According to our count, there are 154 boxed notes throughout *MWALED*. They may be categorized into four types according to their format as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>‘Do not confuse A with B’</th>
<th>those titled ‘synonyms’</th>
<th>those titled ‘usage’</th>
<th>untitled</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1. ‘Do not confuse A with B’ type notes

Boxed notes of this type are basically presented in pairs and trios in *MWALED*. That is, if one headword has a ‘Do not confuse A with B’ (henceforth DNC) note, the other word(s) mentioned in the note should also have a DNC box in the corresponding entry, with only one exception, which we deem to be an accidental omission. The notes are given in order to tell the user not to confuse homophones, quasi-homophones and words with similar spellings but different pronunciations. Notes of this type are presented in quite a simple pattern, without any further distinction of pronunciation or meaning:

Do not confuse *allude* with *elude*.  
(s.v. *allude*)

In the entry of the counterpart, the headword of the entry is mentioned first:

Do not confuse *elude* with *allude*.  
(s.v. *elude*)

The pairs and trios that we found in *MWALED* are as follows:

Homophones and quasi-homophones (24 pairs and 3 trios):

*allude/elude*, *allusion/illusion*, *arrant/errant*, *bare/bear*,
*boor/bore*, *capital/capitol*, *¹complement/¹compliment*,
*²complement/²compliment*, *complementary/complimentary*,
*council/counsel*, *counselor/counselor*, *currant/current*,
*discreet/discrete*, *eminent/imminent*, *faze/phase*,
*hoard/horde*, *inequity/iniquity*, *parlay/parley*,
*principal/principle*, *review/revue*, *stationary/stationery*,
*their/there/they’re*, *to/too/two*, *troop/troupe*, *trooper/trouper*,
*who’s/¹whose/²whose*, *your/you’re*

Words with similar spellings but different pronunciations (6 pairs):

*apprise/appraise*, *bouillon/bullion*, *censor/censure*,
*climactic/climatic*, *dessert/desert*, *exalt/exult*

Of the 30 couples and 3 trios above, *faze/phase* distinction is given
only at faze, making the count of DNC notes 68. This sort of information used to draw the users’ attention to confusing words using conspicuous notes can be found in other EFL dictionaries such as LAAD2 and OALD7, as well. However, they are in the form of WORD CHOICE notes in the case of LAAD2 (e.g. distinction of affect and effect presented at the entry of affect, with cross-reference from effect) or WHICH WORD? notes in OALD7 (e.g. pairing of compliment and complement at compliment, without any cross-reference from complement that appear two pages before compliment), and they include an extensive explanation of meaning distinctions as well as illustrative sentences. MWALED’s system is much more laconic than LAAD2 or OALD7, calling for users to look up the counterpart entries if they want to know the distinction, but such a system allows MWALED to present information on look-alike words much more casually and extensively, taking much less space. In fact, DNC information, which may be quite helpful for language learners, appears much more abundant in MWALED than in other EFL dictionaries.

6.2. ‘Synonym’ notes

We recognized 28 groups of synonyms presented in boxed notes in MWALED. When we looked at the eleventh edition of a very popular collegiate dictionary from the same publisher, Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (hereafter MWCD11), clearly, most of the boxed synonym notes in MWALED are adaptations from synonym notes in MWCD11. Thus:

**synonyms** HIGH, TALL, and LOFTY mean being above the usual level in height. HIGH is used for things and not people, and it refers to distance from the ground or some other surface. ☐ A high fence surrounded the house. TALL is used for both people and things. ☐ tall buildings ☐ She is tall for her age. LOFTY is a literary word that is used for something that rises to a very great or impressive height. ☐ lofty mountains

(s.v. high in MWALED)
**syn** HIGH, TALL, LOFTY mean above the average in height. HIGH implies marked extension upward and is applied chiefly to things which rise from a base or foundation or are placed at a conspicuous height above a lower level *<a high hill> <a high ceiling>*. TALL applies to what grows or rises high by comparison with others of its kind and usu. implies relative narrowness. *<a tall thin man>*. LOFTY suggests great or imposing altitude *<lofty mountain peaks>*.  

(s.v. **high** in **MWCD11**)

The format is nearly the same in both dictionaries, but the explanation of distinction, meaning, and connotation of the constituent words, as well as illustrative phrases and sentences are completely rewritten to be of more help to EFL users. The choice of words in each group is also reorganized. The following are words referred to in the comparable synonym differentiations in **MWALED** and **MWCD11**. Synonyms are presented in the listed order, in small capitals in both dictionaries, and the first word in each group (tabulated cell) below is the headword under which synonym distinctions are made.

**Table 6.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MWALED</strong></th>
<th><strong>MWCD11</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anger, rage, fury, wrath</td>
<td>anger, ire, rage, fury, indignation, wrath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciate, value, prize, treasure, cherish</td>
<td>appreciate, value, prize, treasure, cherish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assert, declare, affirm, avow</td>
<td>assent, consent, accede, acquiesce, agree, subscribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempt, try, endeavor, strive</td>
<td>attempt, try, endeavor, essay, strive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful, pretty, lovely, handsome</td>
<td>beautiful, lovely, handsome, pretty, comely, fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clothing, clothes</td>
<td>— (no synonym comparison note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concise, terse, succinct, laconic, pithy</td>
<td>concise, terse, succinct, laconic, summary, pithy, compendious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deadly, mortal, fatal, lethal</td>
<td>deadly, mortal, fatal, lethal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decay, decompose, rot, putrefy, spoil</td>
<td>decay, decompose, rot, putrefy, spoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destiny, fate, lot</td>
<td>fate, destiny, lot, portion, doom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat, consume, devour</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are seven groups of synonyms not found in *MWCD11*, most of which we regard as welcome additions. **Clothes/clothing** and **speak/talk** distinctions may not be necessary for native speakers of English who are the main target of *MWCD11*, but they could present basic uncertainties for learners of English, and so could the differentiation of **price, charge, cost** and **fee**. On the other hand, *MWALED* may have been too selective in drawing and refashioning only 21 synonym groups from the copious synonym resources presented in *MWCD11*. For instance, many learners of English would like to have **declare** and **announce**, **decline** and **refuse**, **decide** and **determine** contrasted respectively, to name a few, which *MWCD11* does in its

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear, dread, alarm, fright</th>
<th>Fear, dread, fright, alarm, panic, terror, trepidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaze, gape, stare, glare</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High, tall, lofty</td>
<td>High, tall, lofty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement, tool, instrument, utensil</td>
<td>Implement, tool, instrument, appliance, utensil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injure, hurt, harm, damage, impair</td>
<td>Injure, harm, hurt, damage, impair, mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail, prison, penitentiary</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, rule, regulation, statute, ordinance</td>
<td>Law, rule, regulation, precept, statute, ordinance, canon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lean, thin, skinny</td>
<td>Lean, spare, lank, lanky, gaunt, rawboned, scrawny, skinny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meager, scanty, sparse</td>
<td>Meager, scanty, scant, skimpy, spare, sparse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moist, damp, dank</td>
<td>Wet, damp, dank, moist, humid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscure, vague, ambiguous</td>
<td>Obscure, dark, vague, enigmatic, cryptic, ambiguous, equivocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old, ancient, antique, archaic</td>
<td>Old, ancient, venerable, antique, antiquated, archaic, obsolete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plentiful, abundant, ample</td>
<td>Plentiful, ample, abundant, copious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, charge, cost, fee</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remark, observation, comment</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak, talk</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task, duty, job, chore</td>
<td>Task, duty, job, chore, stint, assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
synonym distinction notes, but *MWALED* fails to do. Today's EFL dictionaries give quite generous and sophisticated synonym distinction information as extra notes, and there should certainly be many more synonyms that EFL learners may want to discern than *MWALED* has.

Also, the restriction of words to be treated in synonym notes from *MWCD11* to *MWALED* is sometimes puzzling. *MWALED* may not have needed to cross out *wet* and *humid* from *moist, damp* and *dank* group, when the omitted two may well have an overlapping use and meaning with the remaining three, and probably respectable corpus frequency. So is the omission of *ire* and *indignation* from the 'anger' group, which the advanced learners of English may well encounter as they read English (they may at times encounter the former in newspaper headlines, as it is the shortest among the words with similar meanings.)

We may say that taking resources from *MWCD11* synonym information was not a wrong starting point for *MWALED*, but we expect some more sophistication in the future regarding the number and selection of the synonyms and synonym groups to be discussed in *MWALED* boxed notes, from the standpoint of providing more useful information to EFL learners.

6.3. 'Usage' notes

There are different sorts of information presented in *MWALED*'s boxed notes entitled 'usage.' Most of them are concerned with usage as the title goes, but as the term 'usage' is quite a comprehensive notion, possibly comprising anything from the word grammar to geographical (mainly American and British) difference as regards the use of a word, *MWALED*'s usage notes comprise a wide variety of elements. The following is a list of items with usage notes in *MWALED* and the summaries of the comments provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items in question</th>
<th>Summaries of remarks in the usage notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actor</td>
<td>some women prefer to use 'actor' to 'actress'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affect</td>
<td>do not confuse the verbs <em>affect</em> and <em>effect</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ain’t</td>
<td>usually regarded as an error, but commonly used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alright</td>
<td>regarded by some people as an error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>altogether</td>
<td>do not confuse <em>altogether</em> with <em>all together</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American English</td>
<td>in the US, only used to distinguish from other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kinds of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount</td>
<td>sometimes used with plural count nouns disputably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td>usage of <em>some</em> in contrast with <em>any</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anymore</td>
<td>in some parts of the US it is used informally in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>in the US it refers to East Asian, in Britain it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>refers to South Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can</td>
<td>on <em>can/could</em> and <em>be able to</em> in reference to ability, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot</td>
<td><em>can’t</em> and <em>cannot</em> in speech and formal writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleanse</td>
<td>difference of <em>clean</em> and <em>cleanse</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td>plural in form but used with both plural and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>singular verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deceased</td>
<td>gentler term compared to <em>dead</em>, and used for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>friends etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different</td>
<td>whether it is followed by <em>from, than</em> (in the US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or <em>to</em> (in Britain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dinner</td>
<td>meaning of <em>dinner</em> and <em>supper</em> in the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t</td>
<td>sometimes used as a contraction of “does not”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disputably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either</td>
<td>in informal English, a plural verb could be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after <em>either of</em> . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td>American English: + plural verb, British English: + singular/plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female (n.)</td>
<td>refers to a human only scientifically or humorously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish</td>
<td>plural form: <em>fish</em> for more than one fish, <em>fishes</em> for plural species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fizzle</td>
<td>in the US, <em>out</em> is optional, in Britain, almost always used with <em>out</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flaunt</td>
<td><em>flaunt</em> in the sense of “flout” is popular but disputable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fortuitous</td>
<td><em>fortuitous</em> in the sense of “fortunate” is popular but disputable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goddamn</td>
<td>an angry word that many people find offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have (sense 24)</td>
<td>shortened form regarding <em>have</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have got (s.v. have)</td>
<td>use of <em>have got</em> in place of <em>have</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insane</td>
<td>use of the word <em>insane</em> for the mentally ill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less</td>
<td>distinction of <em>less</em> and <em>fewer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let</td>
<td>followed by an infinitive verb without to; not used in the passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>like (as)</em></td>
<td>adverb uses in informal speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>like</em></td>
<td>use of <em>like</em> as a conjunction is disputable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely</td>
<td>use of <em>likely</em> in the sense of <em>probably</em> is common but disputable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>male</em></td>
<td>refers to a human only scientifically or humorously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matter (sense 4)</td>
<td>difference of “<em>What’s the matter?</em>” and “<em>What’s the matter with you?</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>on the use of <em>me</em> instead of <em>I</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>most common term now as opposed to offensive “(American) Indian”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither</td>
<td>in informal English, a plural verb could be used after <em>neither of</em> . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>shop</em></td>
<td>difference of uses of <em>shop</em> and <em>store</em> in American and British English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff</td>
<td>may be used as a plural noun to mean the members of a staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sulfur</td>
<td>in the US, the spelling <em>sulphur</em> is also used in nontechnical writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>take</em></td>
<td><em>bring</em> and <em>take</em> are sometimes used in opposite meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>than</code></td>
<td>prepositional <code>than</code> is disputable, but <code>than me</code> is especially common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>that (conj.)</code></td>
<td>often omitted in informal speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>that (relative pron.)</code></td>
<td>often omitted in informal speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>this</code></td>
<td>&quot;Is this John?&quot; (US) / &quot;Is that John?&quot; (UK) is used on the phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>used to</code></td>
<td>usually used in the form <code>use to</code> when it occurs with <code>did</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>whom</code></td>
<td>more formal than <code>who</code> and is uncommon in ordinary speech &amp; writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 49 usage notes in *MWALED*, 8 (alright, amount, don’t, flaunt, fortuitous, `like`, likely, `than`) may be identified as referring to various sorts of disputed usage, or the discrepancies between the popular or rather common usage and what is supposed to be ‘right’ or appropriate, with such comments as "it is usually regarded as an error" and "it is considered by many people to be incorrect." *MWCD11*, which is noted for its abundance of usage notes on disputed usage, attaches usage notes to only three of them (amount, don’t and `like`). Being a dictionary for non-native learners of English, the *MWALED* editors may have felt more need to ostensibly warn the users of their linguistically controversial status than the editors of *MWCD11*. Also, several informal expressions are commented with usage notes in *MWALED* (ain’t, alright, have got, `like` and me (as in ‘taller than me’)), indirectly eliciting the user’s attention to its casualness and suggesting that they are not appropriate in formal or written language. Incidentally, in *LAAD2*, the disputed or informal items mentioned in usage notes in *MWALED* are only endowed with status labels (e.g. SPOKEN for don’t, SPOKEN INFORMAL for `like`, SPOKEN, NONSTANDARD for ain’t and NONSTANDARD for alright) or just left uncommented.

Also, a number of usage notes in *MWALED* refer to the difference between usages, meanings and/or connotations in the American and British English (Asian, different, family, fizzle, shop and this) or
makes reference to usage in the United States (dinner and sulfur). One usage note even comments on some regional American usage (any­
more), which is information not found in any other EFL dictionaries.

There are three usage notes which are more or less related to political
correctness: notes for actor, insane and Native American. The number may be too small and not quite representative of the whole host
of presumed PC-related lexical items and notions born in the home
country of considerations for the rather underprivileged. There may
even well be an extensive ‘usage note’ for the entries of ‘politically
correct’ and/or ‘politically incorrect’ that MWALED has as headwords
without any usage note at present. Learners of English would certainly
want to know how far the political correctness is actually in operation
in the U.S. and how much consideration they are supposed to give to
that matter in actual practice when they use the English language in
America. Such information doubtlessly strengthens the identity of and
reliability of the purely American-born EFL dictionary.

We noticed one usage note in MWALED that may be quite helpful
for the learners of English to grasp the meanings of fundamental Eng­
lish verbs. That is the one attached to the first sense of the entry take,
which expounds as follows:

usage The verbs bring and take are sometimes used in a way that
shows that they have opposite meanings. When this is true, bring
suggests that something is moving toward someone or something,
and take suggests that something is moving away. Here, I
brought you some flowers. May I take your luggage to your room
for you?

Such an explanation may be very effective when presented as an usage
note that highlights the difference normally unnoticed only by reading
the definitions of each verb.

6.4. Untitled notes

There are 9 untitled boxed notes in MWALED. One is at the entry
at, which explains the use of ‘at’ and ‘@’ in e-mail. Two of them are
paired, for maybe and perhaps, which compares each other and ex-
pounds their common meaning and uses. These three may well have been titled 'usage.' Another untitled note is for 'bail,' that consists of additional information to the definition. The note goes: "The bail paid by a person accused of a crime is returned when the person comes back to court for a trial," followed by collocations and idioms using the word 'bail.' The format of the boxed note for this entry appears rather haphazard, and the idioms and collocations there could well be presented outside the box.

6.5. Conclusion

Of the four (or three major) types of boxed notes in *MWALED*, DNC notes may be quite successful in that they draw attention to much more misleading look-alikes than any other comparable EFL dictionaries, by giving them in a very laconic but quite systematic fashion. Synonym information presented in boxed notes in *MWALED* may have room for future sophistication and enrichment. Usage notes in *MWALED*, which embraces quite a few interesting features, including representation of a number of notes on disputed usage, may be still a little too reserved in number. Generally speaking, one of the advantages of boxed notes in dictionaries (especially in monolingual dictionaries) is that they stand out to allow the information presented in them to catch the user's eyes quite easily (in fact, that is what the boxed notes are designed for and aimed at). *MWALED* presents essential information such as grammatical points on plurality in quite an effective way using boxed notes, as long as it is presented in boxed notes at all! Only 154 boxes throughout a dictionary of 1,909 page A-Z text may well be regarded as too reserved. Also, specific and readable information on American language and culture in greater numbers may elicit and contribute to the keener interest of the users of the dictionary and are awaited.

(T. Kokawa)

7. Concluding Remarks

*MWALED* has a number of unique and appealing features, such as faithfully reflecting on current American pronunciation changes, apro-
pos use of different definition types and their user-friendly demarcation before the definitions, effective and generous use of paraphrases for verbal illustrations as well as the integrated structure of the entry and copious examples that may allow a reader of the whole entry to grasp the lexical item in question more pertinently. However, there is room for future improvement as well. As an indigenous American EFL dictionary, more entry and treatment of American-proper lexical and culture specific or encyclopedic items (as headwords and in other information categories), more cultural/cross-cultural notes, as well as more contrastive information regarding American and British language and culture which is unique to MWALED and may not be found in British-born EFL dictionaries are awaited. The birth of an EFL dictionary produced by a highly reputable American publisher is a welcome beginning of a new era of learner’s lexicography. We hope to witness the development of MWALED and other prospective American-born competitors into a comparable genre of EFL dictionaries with their British counterparts.

NOTES

Section 1
1) http://www.learnersdictionary.com
2) amoral—analogous, b—back1, bidet—bilateral, brickwork—bring, cataclysm—catchment area, closed-captioned—clove1, constrained—contact1, crystalized—culture2, dervish—designate1, dope2—double bokey, energy—enigmatic, fat2—favor1, forgave—format1, glow2—go1, hard-and-fast—harlequin, host1—hot-water bottle, injury time—inquest, kittenish—knife1, limited—lined, mark1—married name, money-back—monorail, Nordic—nosejob, outlive—outsourcing, perambulator—perfect pitch, politic—pom-pom, protectionism—province, recapitulate—recitative, rickets—right1, scenic—sciatica, ship2—shock2, sneak3—snoozer, starch2—start2, sunstroke—supplant, thankful—thaw2, transact—transliterate, unready—unseasoned, way2—wean, X-rated—year

Section 3
1) Whenever a phonetic symbol of MWCD11 is referred to within the text, a symbol will be given between inverted slashes, as presented in MWCD11.

Section 4
1) http://www.learnersdictionary.com/browse/words3k/
2) In COBAm, the relevant sense is indicated in the form of a sentence as follows: brilliant 3: A brilliant color is extremely bright.

3) COBAm has both labels and LAAD2 has a spoken label. Although both spoken and written were used in OALD6, OALD7 abandons them. See Komuro et al. (2006) for details.

Section 5
1) Almost all the citations have been taken from the sample pages.
2) Italics are not used consistently in the example sentences. We have made no alterations here.

Section 6
1) OALD7 differentiates declare, state, indicate and announce in its highlighted SYNONYMS box (s.v. declare), with special focus on declare and announce, while LAAD2 lists refuse, turn sth down, say no and decline in contrast to reject for distinction in one of its also highlighted THESAURUS note (s.v. refuse). LAAD2 also distinguishes make up your mind, choose, resolve, determine, and come down in favor in the entry decide.
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1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to review the fifth edition of *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (abbreviated as *LDCE5*), which came out in 2009, six years after its previous edition. When we consider the intervals between the publication of the previous editions, in which the second edition (henceforth *LDCE2*) came in 1987, the third edition (henceforth *LDCE3*) in 1995, and the previous fourth edition (henceforth *LDCE4*) in 2003, the period of six years this time is two years shorter than the ordinary *LDCE* interval of eight years. Moreover, if we take into consideration the publication of the updated edition of the fourth edition (henceforth *LDCE4v2*) in 2005, the interval is only four years.

On the other hand, considering the fact that other major monolingual English dictionaries for advanced learners, that is, the seventh edition of *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* (abbreviated as *OALD7*) (2005) and the second edition of *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (abbreviated as *MED2*) (2007) are published just five years after their previous editions, the publication time of *LDCE5* might be safely claimed to be reasonable, that is, not too quickly.¹

However, commercial purposes of the publication set aside, it is quite natural that one should expect adequate reasons, explicit or implicit, for the new edition being published. In other words, one wonders what
kind of advances have been incorporated into the new edition. Moreover, *LDCE5* was compiled under a new editorial director, Michael Mayor, whose name is not present in the lists of the editors in *LDCE4* and *LDCE4v2*; having said that, he has worked on other learners’ dictionaries from Longman. Thus, a large portion of our analysis is devoted to the comparison with the previous edition from a variety of aspects together with occasional references to other related dictionaries.

The introduction to *LDCE5*, co-written by Mayor and Chris Fox, a managing editor, states that this edition focuses on “three key areas; collocation, synonym, and register.” In fact, one can easily locate these new features — more or less related to the productive activity of the learners — together with the newly introduced labeling for the words on the *Academic Word List*, which can be detected by a cursive scanning of several pages of *LDCE5*. *LDCE4* and *LDCE4v2* had been already equipped with collocation notes, but *LDCE5* makes them more explicit by adding the title COLLOCATIONS to each note. We will look at this new feature in more detail in 4.3. Another key area “synonym” mentioned above can be noticed in the Thesaurus Notes in the dictionary body part, which replace the Word Choice Notes and the Word Focus Notes in the previous editions. The detailed discussion on the Thesaurus Notes is given in 5.5. Register Notes are new to *LDCE* series, and we will examine this topic in more detail in 4.5.

Since its third edition, the *LDCE* series has been accompanied by the corresponding CD versions: one CD for *LDCE3* and *LDCE4*, and two CDs for *LDCE4v2*. In the latest edition the media for the electronic version is replaced with a massive DVD. One can conjecture that the replacement is to deal with bulky audio files for pronunciation; but on the other hand, one may also reasonably wonder what would become of other items previously included. Thus, although not all items are covered on account of space considerations, thorough and critical analysis is also made on *LDCE5*-DVD for the following items in particular: entries, pronunciation, examples, collocations, and illustrations.

This paper consists of eight sections. Section 2 deals with entries and Academic vocabulary. Section 3 covers pronunciation. In Section 4, we
examine various information concerning how to use entries in question, thus, grammar, examples, collocation, pragmatics, and register. The semantics of entries, that is, the definition and the thesaurus, are in Section 5. Then, we look at illustrations in Section 6. Lastly, Section 7 is devoted to a user study to see how the participants evaluated some features of LDCE5 we have examined. Our concluding remarks are given in Section 8.

2. Entries and Academic Word List

2.1. Entries

In this section we examine entries in LDCE5. First, we briefly review the way the dictionary presents its entries. Then, we examine the quantitative aspects of the dictionary, that is, how many entries are included in LDCE5, in comparison with the second edition of Longman Advanced American Dictionary (abbreviated as LAAD2) (2007), LDCE4, and LDCE4v2. Lastly, we look at the qualitative aspects, that is, which entries are newly added or deleted in the new edition of LDCE.

2.1.1. Manner of presentation

The overall manner of presentation of entries in LDCE5 is basically the same as its previous editions, LDCE4 and LDCE4v2: Main entries are typed in blue-colored boldface sans serif unless they are one of the Longman Communication 3000 words, which, instead, are printed in red letters. However, some minor changes are also observable. For example, in addition to headwords, LDCE5 also lists its run-on entries in blue letters so that users can easily locate derivatives of the main entries. The hanging indentation of main entries, together with the indentation of phrasal verbs, is discarded. As a result, phrasal verbs look more like independent main entries.1)

One new feature to be mentioned here is the treatment of entries written in Arabic numerals. These entries are collected and listed together on an independent page before the A-Z part in LDCE5: the same method to deal with numbers already introduced in OALD7, MED2, and the third edition of Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (ab-
breviated as *CALD3*) (2008). There are 24 entries on the page with the title “Numbers,” but, as we see, it might be possible to claim that a standard style of treatment for these entries is not yet firmly established in the *LDCE* series. Some entries on the list, 2.2 and 24–7, for example, are repeated in the A-Z part, but some others like 22, 2.1, and 419 *scam* are not. Two entries, 4x4 and 4WD, lack pronunciation, for which, especially the former, it is easily expected that users might wonder how to pronounce. 8 is once listed in the A-Z part of *LDCE4*, and it is also included in its CD version. In *LDCE4v2* the entry is listed as 8 in the print version, but *eight* in the CD version. In *LDCE5* the entry is included in the DVD version as 8, but it is abandoned in the print version although the new “Numbers” page is added to the dictionary. We must, then, point out that as for the treatment of these entries with Arabic numerals, there remains some room for improvements in the next edition.

2.1.2. Comparison

In this part we investigate entries in *LDCE5* in terms of numerical aspects. The sample material basically covers the same ranges from the A-Z part of the dictionary as those employed in Ichikawa *et al.* (2005), but for the sake of easy calculation of the total number of entries, we add several extra entries so that the first entry of each range is also the first entry of the page which lists that entry, and the last entry of each range is also the last entry of the page which lists that entry. As a result, our sample material covers the following pages in *LDCE5*: 1–12 (A¹ — accuse), 540–552 (edge city — emergency brake), 1,063–1,074 (mandolin — mass³), and 1,594–1,604 (set² — shed²). For the purpose of comparative analysis, the same ranges of entries are examined in *LAAD2*, *LDCE4*, and *LDCE4v2*.

2.1.2.1. Quantitative aspects

Table 2.1 shows the number of entries in the print versions of each dictionary within the range of our sample material. *LDCE5* contains a total of 1,203 entries in which 1,028 are main entries and 175 are run-
ons. Figures in ‘‘+/-’’ columns indicate the increase or decrease in the number of entries in comparison with the previous version. Thus, *LDCE5* has 15 more main entries (which is 1.5% of the number of main entries in *LDCE4v2*) and two fewer run-on entries (which is 1.1% of the number of run-on entries in *LDCE4v2*) than its previous version *LDCE4v2*. Likewise, *LDCE4v2* contains 1,013 main entries and 177 run-on entries, which means 13 (1.3%) more main entries and one (0.6%) more run-on entry than *LDCE4*.5)

Our sample material covers 48 pages, which represents approximately 2.35% of the 2043-page A-Z part in *LDCE5*. The estimated numbers of entries in *LDCE5* derived by calculation is given in brackets.

Table 2.1 Number of entries listed in print versions (focusing on main/run-on differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAAD2</th>
<th>LDCE4</th>
<th>LDCE4v2</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>+13 (+1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-on</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>+1 (+0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>+14 (+1.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since all the four dictionaries compared in our analysis are accompanied by CD/DVD versions, we also count entries contained in these electronic counterparts. The result of our survey is shown in Table 2.2, in which figures represent the numbers of entries available in CD/DVD versions of the dictionaries, but not in their printed counterparts. Note that within the range of our sample material, we find no cases in which the print version of *LDCE5* contains entries which are not contained in its DVD version. Thus, we have 1,311 (1,028 + 283) main entries and 181 (175 + 6) run-on entries in our sample material from *LDCE5*-DVD, with an estimated number of main entries being about 55,800, and that of run-on entries being about 7,700. The figure “0” in the *LAAD2* column indicates that *LAAD2*-CD does not have any extra entries in addition to those available in its print version.
Table 2.2  Number of entries only listed in CD/DVD versions (focusing on main/run-on differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAAD2-CD</th>
<th>LDCE4-CD</th>
<th>LDCE4v2-CD</th>
<th>LDCE5-DVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>283 [12,043]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>206+1 (+0.5%)</td>
<td>283 [12,043]</td>
<td>+77 (+37.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Run-on</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 [255]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>5+0 (+0.0%)</td>
<td>6 [255]</td>
<td>+1 (+20.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>289 [12,298]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>211+1 (+0.5%)</td>
<td>289 [12,298]</td>
<td>+78 (+37.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted here that the number of increases in the category of main entries in the print version of LDCE5 is rather small: 1.5%. When we recall the result of the sampling survey of the print versions of LDCE3 and LDCE4 by Ichikawa et al. (2005), in which the rate of the total number of increase in the category of headwords and phrasal verbs, which corresponds to the category of main entries in our survey, is 8.3%, we can point out here that the addition of entries in the print version of LDCE5 is not as much as the one in LDCE4. On the other hand, note that the rate of the total number of added entries only included in the DVD version is 37.4%, which indicates that, at least in terms of the quantitative aspects of the dictionary, one of the main features of LDCE5 is the additional input of entries in the DVD version of the dictionary. In fact, the proportions of entries in the CD/DVD versions to those in the print versions among LDCE4, LDCE4v2, and LDCE5 are 100: 117.9, 100: 117.7, and 100: 124.0, respectively, in which we see a higher rate in the case of LDCE5.

Next, an examination will be done on the forms of entries themselves. Table 2.3 shows the number of entries focusing on whether they are one-word entries; multi-word entries, which include compound words, hyphenated words, person's names, and so on; or affixes. The bottom row gives additional information of whether the first letter of each entry begins with a capital letter or an Arabic numeral. Figures in parentheses show the proportions of each category to the total number of entries in each dictionary. Thus, LDCE5 has 974 one-word entries, which corresponds to 81.0% of the total number of entries in the dictionary.
Table 2.3 Number of entries listed in print versions (focusing on the forms of entries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAAD2</th>
<th>LDCE4</th>
<th>LDCE4v2</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-word</td>
<td>990 (75.4%)</td>
<td>963 (81.9%)</td>
<td>968 (81.3%)</td>
<td>974 (81.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-word</td>
<td>311 (23.7%)</td>
<td>202 (17.2%)</td>
<td>211 (17.7%)</td>
<td>218 (18.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>12 (0.9%)</td>
<td>11 (0.9%)</td>
<td>11 (0.9%)</td>
<td>11 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning with a capital letter or an Arabic numeral</td>
<td>150 (11.4%)</td>
<td>58 (4.9%)</td>
<td>60 (5.0%)</td>
<td>69 (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see, the three LDCEs share basically the same ratios: 81.0–81.9% for one-words, 17.2–18.1% for multi-words, and 0.9% for affixes. The proportion of multi-words in LAAD2 looks relatively higher than the LDCE series, but the disparity might be attributed to the fact that entries contained in the print version of LAAD2 are identical to those in the CD version of the dictionary. Look at Table 2.4, in which figures represent the number of one-words, multi-words, and affixes which only occur in the CD/DVD versions of the dictionaries.

Table 2.4 Number of entries only listed in CD/DVD versions (focusing on the forms of entries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAAD2</th>
<th>LDCE4</th>
<th>LDCE4v2</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-word</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79 (37.6%)</td>
<td>79 (37.4%)</td>
<td>100 (34.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-word</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131 (62.4%)</td>
<td>132 (62.6%)</td>
<td>189 (65.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning with a capital letter or an Arabic numeral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210 (100%)</td>
<td>211 (100%)</td>
<td>289 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we have already pointed out, LAAD2-CD does not contain any extra entries distinct from its printed counterpart. One should notice that the numbers of one-word entries are overwhelmed by those of multi-word entries in each edition of the LDCE series, and in the case of LDCE5, more than 65% of the total number of entries listed only in its DVD version are multi-words. Table 2.5 gives figures available by combining the data in Table 2.3 and Table 2.4.
Table 2.5 Number of entries listed in CD/DVD versions (focusing on the forms of entries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAAD2</th>
<th>LDCE4</th>
<th>LDCE4v2</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-word</td>
<td>990 (75.4%)</td>
<td>1,042 (75.2%)</td>
<td>1,047 (74.7%)</td>
<td>1,074 (72.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-word</td>
<td>311 (23.7%)</td>
<td>333 (24.0%)</td>
<td>343 (24.5%)</td>
<td>407 (27.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>12 (0.9%)</td>
<td>11 (0.8%)</td>
<td>11 (0.8%)</td>
<td>11 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning with a capital letter or an Arabic numeral</td>
<td>150 (11.4%)</td>
<td>268 (19.3%)</td>
<td>271 (19.3%)</td>
<td>358 (24.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result, when we look at the proportion of one-word, multi-word, and affix entries without giving any specific consideration to the forms of media, LAAD2 has the least proportion of multi-words among the four dictionaries, and LDCE5 proves to have a relatively higher proportion of multi-words than other dictionaries.

It should be also noted here that while the proportions of entries beginning with a capital letter or an Arabic numeral in the LDCE series are 4.9–5.7% in Table 2.3, the figures spike to 100% in Table 2.4. This means that those extra entries only included in the CD/DVD versions of the LDCE series are all written with their initial letters being either capitals or Arabic numerals. In the case of LDCE5-DVD, 282⁰ out of 289 entries are retrievable from the search table under the tab “CULTURE,” which shows that they are basically the members of the encyclopedic vocabulary. Moreover, recall that the addition of entries to the DVD version is rather remarkable in LDCE5 compared with the addition of entries to its print version, and that we have, thus, pointed out that one of the main features of LDCE5 is the addition of entries in the DVD version of the dictionary. This, in the end, indicates that LDCE5 as a whole, virtually the DVD version, contains more encyclopedic information than its predecessors.

2.1.2.2. Qualitative aspects

Now we move on to the discussion of the qualitative aspects of the entries in LDCE5. In this part we examine how many entries in LDCE5 are the same as or different from entries in LAAD2, LDCE4, or
LDCE4v2, by checking whether entries in our sample material are present or missing in each dictionary.5)

Let us begin by comparing LDCE5 and LAAD2. In the print versions, the LAAD2 sample material contains 264 entries which are not included in the LDCE5 sample material. Out of these 264 entries, 84—all beginning with a capital letter—are included in LDCE5-DVD. The remaining 180 entries are not given the entry status in LDCE5, but one can spot some of them as idioms, phrases, or examples of other entries. Thus, LAAD2 entry egg white, for example, can be found in an example of the entry egg¹ in LDCE5. On the other hand, 163 entries in the LDCE5 print version sample material are missing in the LAAD2. However, some of them are present in LAAD2 as idioms, phrases, or examples of other entries. One can locate the LDCE5 phrasal verb emanate from sth in an example given in the entry emanate in LAAD2. When it comes to phrasal verbs, LAAD2 has 31 phrasal-verb entries in our sample material, and one entry shake on sth is absent in LDCE5. On the other hand, six phrasal verbs in LDCE5 (emanate from sth, map onto sth, map sth ↔ out, settle back, sex something ↔ up, and shake sb/sth ↔ off) are not present as independent entries in LAAD2.

There are some cases in which a main entry in one dictionary is given run-on status in the other. Thus, nine LAAD2 main entries (abductee, abductor, abnormally, abuser, accidentally, accreditation, accrual, emblazon, and emboss) are all present as run-on entries in LDCE5, and eight LDCE5 main entries (edifying, efficacy, electromagnetic, embossed, manicurist, manorial, marcher, and martyred) are listed as run-on entries in LAAD2.

Since LAAD2-CD does not contain any extra entries which are absent in the print version, there are no such entries which are only present in LAAD2-CD but not in LDCE5-DVD. On the other hand, 206 LDCE5-DVD entries are absent in LAAD2. Note that these entries all begin with a capital letter or an Arabic numeral.

As is easily conjectured, the results of the comparison between LDCE4 and LDCE5, and LDCE4v2 and LDCE5 show quite similar
patterns in terms of the qualitative differences of their entries. The comparison between the print versions of each dictionary reveals that four entries, that is, 8; AAA; Maris, Roger; and be shorn of sth, are present in _LDCE4_ but not in _LDCE5_. The only difference between _LDCE4_ and _LDCE4v2_ lies in the fact that Maris, Roger is deleted in the print version of _LDCE4v2_ and is only included in the CD version. As we have pointed out in 2.1.1, 8, although it is not included within the range of our sample material, is listed before the A-Z part in _LDCE5_, and is also included in the DVD version together with AAA. The phrasal verb be shorn of sth, listed under the entry for shear in _LDCE4_ and _LDCE4v2_, has lost entry status in _LDCE5_ but is present as an idiom or a phrase under the entry shear. To the contrary, the following 17 entries are absent in _LDCE4v2_ but present in _LDCE5_:

A*; Abdication; ablative; ABTA; acai berry; ACAS; accelerant; El Dorado; electrosmog; Elysium; Man Friday; Marie Celeste, the; Mary Poppins; mash-up; shagpile; shalwar kameez; Shangri-La

It should be noted here that seven underlined entries are not actually newly added to the _LDCE_ series in that they are already present in the CD versions of _LDCE4_ and _LDCE4v2_. That is, they are, in a sense, promoted from somehow supplementary materials up to the main-stream dictionary entries. Nine entries, that is, A*; Abdication; acai berry; accelerant; electrosmog; Elysium; Mary Poppins; mash-up; and shagpile are not included in either of _OALD7_, _MED2_, _CALD3_, or the sixth edition of *Collins COBUILD Advanced Dictionary* (abbreviated as _COBUILD6_) (2009), _ACAS_ is included only in _OALD7_, and El Dorado, only in _MED2_. The following 15 entries are added to the above-mentioned 17 entries when we pick up entries which are absent in _LDCE4_ but present in _LDCE5_, in which — egosurfing is a run-on entry under egosurf, which is also in the list, and sex something ↔ up is a phrasal verb of sex.

access point; EDT; egosurf; — egosurfing; Eid ul-Adha; Eid ul-Fitr; electronic paper; elimination diet; embed²; embed-
ded journalist; manga; seviche; sex bias; sex something ↔ up; sexed-up

We find only two cases in which run-on entries in LDCE4 and LDCE4v2 are treated as main entries in LDCE5: electromagnetic; mashed.

As far as our survey is concerned, entries only included in the CD versions of LDCE4 and LDCE4v2 but not in their corresponding printed counterparts are much more similar than those in print versions — in essence, they are basically the same. The result of the comparison of entries only present in the CD/DVD versions of each dictionary shows that the following eight entries are included in LDCE4 and LDCE4v2, but not in LDCE5:

ACAS; Eire; El Dorado; Elysium; Man Friday; Marie Celeste, the; Mary Poppins; Shangri-La

However, as we have seen, seven underlined entries above are listed in the print version of LDCE5, which indicates that two entries, that is, be shorn of sth and Eire are deleted in LDCE5-DVD.

As for the exchange between the main entry and the run-on entry, only — Shakespearean, a run-on entry under Shakespeare, William, in LDCE4 and LDCE4v2, is elevated to a main entry in LDCE5.

In LDCE4, the following 87 LDCE5 entries are absent, of which Maris, Roger, as we have seen, is listed in the print version of the dictionary. Then LDCE4v2 shares those 86 entries without Maris, Roger, which the dictionary includes in its CD version.

A&W; Ab Fab; Abacha, General Sani; Abba; Abdul-Jabbar, Kareem; Abramovich, Roman; Absolutely Fabulous; Abu Ghrabi prison; Abu Nidal; Academe; Academy; Access; Edmonds, Noel; Edwards, Gareth; Eggo waffles; EHIC; El Al; Electrolux; Elland Road; Ellis, Brett Easton; Ellis, Perry; Ellis, Ruth; Ellison, Larry; Els, Ernie; Elstree; Elton, Ben; Elvis sighting; Elway, John; Manic Street Preachers, The; Manilow, Barry; Mansell, Nigel; Manson, Marilyn; Mantle, Mickey; Manuel; Mapplethorpe, Robert; Maradona, Diego; Marceau, Marcel; Marching Season, the; Marchioness, the;
Marconi; Marcos, Ferdinand; Marcos, Imelda; Marines, the; Marino, Dan; Maris, Roger; Markova, Dame Alicia; Marks and Spencer; Marlboro; Marley tiles; Marriner, Sir Neville; Marriott; Mars Bar; Marsh, Ngaio; Martello tower; Martin, Dean; Martin, Sir George; Martin, Steve; Martinez, Pedro; Marvin, Lee; Mary Quant; Masai; — Masai; Maskell, Dan; Mason, Jackie; Setanta; Seven Samurai, The; Sex and the City; SFO, the; Shadow Cabinet, the; Shaffer, Sir Peter; Shaker; Shakers, the; Shameless; Shankly, Bill; Shard London Bridge, the; Sharif, Omar; Sharp; Sharp, Cecil; Sharples, Ena; Shatner, William; Shavian; Shaw, Artie; Shaw, Sandie; Shawnee; — Shawnee; Shea Stadium; Shearer, Alan

The four underlined entries above, **EHIC; Setanta; Shameless;** and **Shard London Bridge, the,** are also absent in the third edition of *Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture* (2005).

Table 2.6 shows the summary of the aforementioned result of our survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAAD2 Only in</th>
<th>LAAD2 Only in LDCE5</th>
<th>LDCE4 Only in</th>
<th>LDCE4 Only in LDCE5</th>
<th>LDCE4v2 Only in</th>
<th>LDCE4v2 Only in LDCE5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only in CD/DVD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print ↔ CD/DVD</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in the third row show the number of entries which are included in the print version of one dictionary but only in the CD/DVD version of the other dictionary, and the third columns under each dictionary title show roughly how much *LDCE5* shares entries with *LAAD2, LDCE4,* and *LDCE4v2.* Thus, in the case of the comparison between the print versions of *LDCE4v2* and *LDCE5,* the number of entries which are included only in *LDCE5* is 17. To recall the figures in Table 2.1, the total number of entries in the print version of *LDCE5*
is 1,203, thus, we see 1,186 entries, that is, roughly 98.6% of the *LDCE5* print version entries are shared by the *LDCE4v2* print version. By using the same method, we can see that 70.2% of the *LDCE5-DVD* entries are also included in *LDCE4v2-CD*. The third row in Table 2.6 indicates that nine entries are included in the print version of one dictionary, while the other dictionary contains them in its CD/DVD version; that is, these entries are not unique to either *LDCE4v2* or *LDCE5*. Therefore, a total of 94 entries in our sample material are unique to *LDCE5*. In the end, 93.7% of the *LDCE5* entries are shared by *LDCE4v2*. Table 2.6 also shows that as high as 92.7% of *LDCE5* entries are also included in *LDCE4*, while *LDCE5* shares 75.3% of its entries with *LAAD2*. It is, then, obvious that *LDCE5* actually inherits the tradition of *LDCE* series in terms of the type of entries it contains.

(Section 2.1. by Osada)

2.2. Academic Word List

2.2.1. Academic vocabulary

*LDCE5* is in tune with the idea proposed by Nation, “When learners have mastered the 2,000–3,000 words of general usefulness in English, it is wise to direct vocabulary learning to more specialised areas . . . it is possible to specialise by learning the shared vocabulary of several fields of study, for example academic vocabulary . . .” (2001: 187). Nation enumerates the reasons for the importance of academic vocabulary: being common to a wide range of academic texts, accounting for a substantial number of words in academic texts, being generally not as well known as technical vocabulary, and being the kind of specialised vocabulary that teachers can usefully help learners with (ibid.: 189–191). He goes on to state, “For learners studying English for academic purposes, academic vocabulary is a kind of high-frequency vocabulary and thus any time spent learning it is time well spent” (ibid.: 196). Little, however, has been done on the frequency of specific academic words in academic and non-academic texts, and Coxhead (2000) is a corpus-based study into academic vocabulary.
2.2.2. Academic Word List in LDCE5

Coxhead’s Academic Word List (henceforth abbreviated to AWL), originally publicized in the monograph *An Academic Word List* (1998), came to be widely known by her 2000 article. It was first introduced in *Longman Exams Dictionary* (abbreviated as *LED*) (2006) and *Longman Study Dictionary of American English* (2006), followed by *LAAD2*. No mention, however, is made of AWL in the introduction in *LDCE5*. *LDCEs* have focused on the most frequent 3000 words in written and/or spoken English, and, for the next step toward vocabulary expansion, the Longman dictionary range attempt to put a great emphasis on academic vocabulary as well as the addition of numerous entries in specific domains or fields.

*LDCE5* follows *LED*, but, strangely enough, an explanation is provided in its DVD, not in the book. The explanation contains the same content as that in *LED*. Below is given a quotation from Coxhead’s introduction in *LED*.

The Academic Word List (AWL) is a list of 570 word families that are commonly found in academic texts. This list was selected by examining a large corpus (or collection) of written academic texts and selecting the words that occurred:

1. In texts from all four academic faculty sections: Arts, Commerce, Law and Science.
2. Over 100 times in the corpus overall.
3. At least 10 times in each academic faculty section.
4. Outside the 2000 most frequent words on Michael West’s *General Service List* (GSL). The GSL includes everyday words such as I, *house* and *do*.

These principles ensured that only words that occurred reasonably frequently in a variety of study areas were selected.

The AWL targets vocabulary that occurs most often in written academic texts. These words also occur in newspapers but not as often as they do in academic textbooks. The AWL words appear even less in fiction . . . .

The AWL is organized into Word Families. Word families are made up of the ‘parent word’ and ‘family members.’ Take for example the word *maximise*. Its family members include inflections of the verb such as *maximised*, *maximises*, and *maximising* as well as the noun *maximum*. The word family also includes the British spelling of the noun *maximisation*, as well as *maximization*, the US spelling. (*LED*: 1809)

The description makes it reasonable to think that 570 word families include several times as large as the number even if the AWL includes the words without family members such as *behalf*, *nevertheless* and *nonetheless*. Coxhead (2000: 227) says 3,110 types are included there.

Coxhead maintains, “The AWL is intended as a reference for students who are studying or preparing to study at a tertiary level in English . . . I was aware of the difficulties that students had in *mastering the vocabulary necessary for written assignments*. The AWL does not include ‘content’ vocabulary for particular subjects which students obviously need to learn . . . The AWL focuses instead on the non-subject-specific vocabulary that students of any discipline will need to master in order to *produce coherently-structured written assignments* . . . The AWL covers up to 10% of the vocabulary covered in written academic texts. This means that, on average, one word in 10 in an academic textbook is in the AWL . . .” (*LED*: 1809). (The emphasis added is the present writer’s.) The AWL does not cover technical vocabulary but non-technical words for advanced learners at a university level: the minimum vocabulary for writing assignments (i.e., for encoding) rather than for reading academic texts (i.e., for decoding).

A comparison of AWL is drawn between *LED* and *LDCE5*. Out of 1,451 highlighted entries in *LED* (1811–1817), *LDCE5* fails to attach the AC label to seventeen entries (the label shows that the headword is among AWL): *academy*, *adapt*, *analyze*, *coincidence*, *commit*, *commitment*, *committed*, *commodity*, *communication*, *community*, *discrimination*, *edit*, *founding*, *issue*¹ (n), *licence* (n), *logic*, and *trend* (*founding* is not so labeled because of a run-on entry)⁹. A consistent description is essential in a learners’ dictionary if
emphasis is placed on any feature. Moreover, it is a disappointment that the DVD, either in the list of AWL or in the search results box in the advanced search of the AWL, fails to show AC in these entries, causing us to doubt its usefulness

It is also not necessarily clear how selection was made of AC words in LDCE5. The AWL includes ten Sublists in order of frequency, i.e. the words in Sublist 1 are the most frequent, which can be found at http://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/resources/academicwordlist. For example, Sublist 6 includes instruct and its family members of instruction, instructed, instructing, instructions, instructive, instructor, instructors, and instructs. Four of these are labeled AC: instruct, instruction, instructive and instructor. The other conjugated verb forms and inflected (plural) noun forms are usually not so labeled. Some include words with an affix: illegal1 and legally, for example. Run-on entries in LDCE5 are not labeled AC either. The label is not reasonably nor consistently attached to 60 parent words in Sublist 1. Most are labeled: economic, economical, economically, economics, economist and uneconomical, for example. Nevertheless, the reason some are not labeled nor highlighted is not convincing and, what is worse, this is again the case in the advanced search: analyze (variant form) mentioned above, approachable (unapproachable is labeled), conceptualize (-ise) (cf. revolutionize (-ise) in Sublist 9), distributor (cf. inspector in Sublist 8) and significance (cf. assurance in Sublist 9), for example. There is some room for improvement in labeling. The misleading AC labeling in LDCE5 might confuse learners.

It remains to be seen whether Coxhead’s AWL will continue to be used, will be revised or replaced in future advanced learners’ dictionaries, because not all scholars concur with her AWL. Paquot (2007), or Hyland and Tse (2007), for example, put forth their own revisions or recommendations. There has been, and will be, heated debate going on and a new project is in progress to create a corpus-based dictionary of academic English (Kosem and Krishnamurthy 2007). The AWL could be regarded for the time being as “a quick reference” for academic vocabulary until more research bears fruit (cf. Section 7.6.).
3. Pronunciation

3.1. Pronunciation in the printed edition

3.1.1. Scheme for transcription

The scheme for transcribing pronunciation in *LDCE5* is the same as that in the previous edition, except for a subtle change in the form of the dollar mark with a slant line across the “S” instead of the vertical one; therefore, we do not need to make further reference to it here. However, it should be noted that the shortcomings of the scheme we have pointed out (Shimizu *et al.*, 1990: 42; Urata *et al.*, 1999: 73; Ichikawa *et al.*, 2005: 14) still remain unchanged in this edition.

3.1.2. Stress shifts

Stress shifts in compounds ceased to be indicated because of the change in the method of depicting stress patterns in *LDCE4* (Ichikawa *et al.*, 2005: 16). Part of this inconvenience has been mitigated in *LDCE5*-DVD, since not only entry words but also phrases and sentences given in the printed edition have come to be pronounced: a stress shift in *tongue-in-'cheek* and *size 'zero*, for example, is not visually indicated either in the printed edition or in *LDCE5*-DVD, but the compounds are read as *toungue-in-'cheek* in “I love that kind of *toungue-in-'cheek* wit” and *size ,zero* in *size ,zero 'models* (stress marks by the author), respectively, such that the user will notice that these undergo a stress shift. However, this is not always the case: with such compounds as *chrome 'yellow* and *chief-superin 'tendent*, the user will not have the opportunity to notice that these also undergo a stress shift because no such example sentences or phrases have been given to them. We hope that the indication of the stress shift in compounds will be restored one way or the other. If it is deemed necessary to indicate stress shifts with one-word entries, so it is with compounds, and moreover, it would not take much space to insert a wedge mark or some such indicator after every compound that undergoes a stress shift, as *chrome 'yellow ◄* and *chief-superin 'tendent ◄*. 
3.1.3. Choice of variants

By a careful check on “words with uncertain pronunciation” in the second edition of Longman Pronunciation Dictionary (abbreviated as LPD2) (2000: xii), and the third edition of Longman Pronunciation Dictionary (abbreviated as LPD3) (2008: xviii) as well as other entry items, we could safely say that pronunciations given to individual entry items are the same as in the previous edition. However, this does not necessarily mean that we do not have to make any further comments on this topic. Considering the fact that there have been very few changes in the choice of variants after LDCE3, we are afraid there are likely to be lags between the given variants and the current trends in pronunciation. As discussed in Section 3.2.4., some of the pronunciations newly recorded for the LDCE5-DVD are not in accordance with the variants appearing first in the transcriptions. It may be time for a wide-ranging review of the choice of variants.

3.2. Pronunciation in the DVD-ROM
3.2.1. Introduction of spoken examples

What is remarkable with LDCE5-DVD is that it includes spoken examples: Pronunciations of all the example phrases and sentences given in the printed edition have been recorded in British English. We estimate this improvement highly because it enables the user to listen to the pronunciation of entry words not only in isolation but also in connected speech, which consequently helps him/her get used to English rhythm, sentence stress, and intonation.

A small blue mark in the shape of a speaker indicates the beginning of a spoken example in LDCE5-DVD. However, we are afraid this might be associated with American pronunciation, since a somewhat larger blue mark of the same shape indicates the American pronunciation of entry words in isolation whereas a red one indicates British pronunciation. A small red mark in place of a blue one will be more adequate because every example is read in British English.
3.2.2. /ɔ/ and /ʌ/

There has been a little change in phonetic transcriptions: Somehow, the symbols /ɔ/ and /ʌ/, which are still used in the printed edition, have been abandoned in LDCE5-DVD. They have been separated into series of variants, /a/, /i/ and /u/ respectively, with /a/ always given the first place, as in the case of basis (/'beisəs/ → /'beisəs, 'beisis/) and document (/'dokjʊmənt $dɔːk-/ → /'dokjʊmənt, 'dokju- $dɔːk-/). We do not know why these symbols have been abandoned nor why /s/ has been chosen as the first (and sometimes the only) variant, but we are sure that this change has lead to further discrepancies between the transcriptions and the recorded pronunciations: Despite the fact that /ɔ/ always comes first in transcriptions as shown above, the readers, British or American, did not choose it and pronounced basis as /'beisis/ and document as /'dokjumənt $dɔːk-/.

3.2.3. Discrepancies resolved by re-recording

Some of the entries have been re-recorded in British English, whereas exactly the same recordings in American English as heard in LDCE4-CD have been used again in LDCE5-DVD. Table 3.1 shows the entries cited as examples of discrepancy in Ichikawa et al. (2005: 17–18) along with their transcriptions and recorded pronunciations in LDCE4-CD and LDCE5-DVD for comparison. As in cases like garage, Advent calendar and advanced level in Table 3.1, some of the discrepancies in LDCE4-CD seem to have been resolved in the re-recording because the newly recorded pronunciations now correspond to the first variants in the transcription. Such cases seem to be relatively few, but we could cite gnu /nu:/ as another example, which is pronounced as /nju:/ in LDCE4-CD but later as /nu:/ in LDCE5-DVD.

3.2.4. Discrepancies caused by re-recording

On the other hand, there occurred numerous cases of discrepancies caused by the re-recording of the entries in the case of which no such problems existed in LDCE4-CD. As in the case of cigarette in Table
3.1, the newly recorded pronunciations are somehow different from those in *LDCE4-CD*, and consequently, these no longer correspond to the first variants in the transcription since the transcriptions themselves have remained the same. Plenty of such cases have been found through a survey of “words of uncertain pronunciation” (see Section 3.1.3.) beginning with a, b, and c, which suggests that the discrepancy is even more serious in *LDCE5-DVD* than in *LDCE4-CD*. Other examples include *absorb*, *absolute*, *baptize*, *capsize*, *clandestine*, *communal*, *contribute*, *controversy*, and *create*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 Pronunciations in <em>LDCE4-CD</em> and <em>LDCE5-DVD</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(The pronunciations that do not correspond to the first variants in the transcription are shaded.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.5. Current trends reflected in the DVD-ROM

Some of the examples cited in Section 3.2.4. seem to reflect current trends in British English. For example, /əbˈzɔːb/ for absorb, as heard in LDCE5-DVD, is different from the transcription /əbˈsɔːb/, but corresponds to the pronunciation preferred by 83% of British speakers according to LPD3, whereas /əbˈsɔːb/, heard in LDCE4-CD, is preferred only by 17% of them. In the same way, the recorded pronunciation for contribute has changed from /kənˈtrɪbjuːt/ to /ˈkɒntrɪbjuːt/, whereas the transcription /kənˈtrɪbjuːt/ has remained the same. The pronunciation heard in LDCE5-DVD seems to be increasing in popularity, since LPD3 says that more than half of the younger British speakers prefer /ˈkɒntrɪbjuːt/ to /kənˈtrɪbjuːt/, although the majority of those born before 1942 show a preference for /kənˈtrɪbjuːt/. We welcome such newly recorded pronunciations because they reflect the current trends, however, if this is the case, the transcriptions ought to have been revised to match the recordings.

3.2.6. Some problems with recording

Other examples, such as cigarette, capsize, chromosome, and many others, do not reflect current trends in pronunciation but personal preferences or sometimes even idiosyncrasies of the reader. As shown in Table 3.1, cigarette is pronounced with the primary stress on the first syllable, but this variant is preferred only by 15% of British speakers according to LPD3. The other variant with the primary stress on the third syllable as shown in transcription is far popular and both LPD3 and the 17th edition of English Pronouncing Dictionary (abbreviated as EPD17) (2006) show it as the first variant. Therefore, it is not likely that this entry was re-recorded in order to update the pronunciation. Likewise capsize, pronounced as /ˈkæpsaɪz/ in LDCE5-DVD,
appears in LPD3 and EPD17 with /kæpsaiz/ as the first variant. It is hard to find a valid reason for replacing this latter pronunciation as heard in LDCE4-CD with the former, sacrificing the correspondence between the sound and transcription. Furthermore, the newly recorded pronunciation for chromosome could phonologically be transcribed as /krəʊməsəʊm/, but in realization, the second element of the diphthong /əu/, which appears twice in the word, lacks lip-rounding to the extent that the average user might take it for something like /ɔi/. It is not desirable to use this kind of pronunciation as a model for the user to imitate. Such cases as the one discussed above make us wonder why they had to be re-recorded in the first place and whether the recordings were conducted along any coherent principles.

3.2.7. Treatment of “culture” words

The pronunciation of encyclopedic words, both transcribed and recorded in British and American English, has been introduced into LDCE5-DVD. We welcome this innovation in the treatment of encyclopedic (or “culture”) words, since it is often too difficult for the user to guess the pronunciations of such words, often of foreign (i.e., non-English) origin, only from the spellings.

3.2.8. Inconsistency in the transcription scheme

However, it is regrettable that inconsistency in the scheme for phonetic transcription is frequently found in those entries. Somehow, the old scheme used in LDCE2 has been employed for transcribing some of such entries, while others are transcribed according to the present scheme: New Yorker, for example, is transcribed as /nju:jəkɔr/ in LDCE-5DVD when it ought to be /nju:jərkər/ according to the present scheme and /'æləməu/ for Alamo ought to be /'æləməʊ $ -mou/.

A few more such cases are shown below, with the adequate transcriptions within <> symbols:

Adenauer /'ædənəʊər/ <,ədənəʊər $ -nəʊər>
Acapulco /ˌækəˈpɔlkəʊ $ ,əkə 'pulːkəʊ/ <ˌækəˈpɔlkəʊ $ ,əkə 'pulːkəʊ>
Salvador /'sælvə,doːr/ <'sælvə,doːr>-dør>
Alonso /æ'lɔnsoʊ $ -'lɔn-sɔʊ/ <æ'lɔnsoʊ $ -'lɔn-sɔʊ>
Almodóvar /ælməʊ'ðɔvər/ <æləmɔʊ'ðɔvə> $ -mʊðɔvər:-

It can easily be imagined that the user will be confused by this mixture of the old and new schemes employed in the same DVD. Since most of the proper names seem to have been transcribed according to the old scheme, the present transcription for every such entry containing the diphthong of note and/or word-final “r” needs rewriting.

3.2.9. Pronunciation of “culture” words

It is not surprising that discrepancies between the recorded pronunciations and the first variants given in the transcription is far more frequent with “culture” words than with other entry items, since there are plenty of words that the readers themselves may not be familiar with. Acapulco, for example, is pronounced as /ə'kɑːpɑlkɔʊ $ ,əkɑː 'pɑlkɔʊ/, whereas the transcribed pronunciation is /ə'kɑːpɑlkɔʊ $ ,əkɑː 'pɑlkɔʊ/ (rewritten by the author) and Alonso, transcribed as /æ'lɔnsoʊ $ -'lɔn-sɔʊ/ (rewritten by the author), is pronounced with /z/ instead of /s/ in both the British and American pronunciations.

Instead of citing the problematic cases one by one, we sampled the first 100 “culture” items that the average native speaker is not likely to be familiar with. The list begins with Abacha and ends with Annan, including such items as Abu Dhabi, Aga, Alitalia, Alka Seltzer, Akihito, and Al-Qaeda, and contains mostly biographical and geographical names of foreign (i.e., non-English) origin as well as newly coined trademarks.6)

Out of the 100 items, 23 showed a discrepancy between the first variants in the transcription and the recorded pronunciations either in British or American English. This is not surprising if we think of the cases of discrepancy found with more familiar words; however, all the more careful recordings are desirable with such unfamiliar items.

There are cases of inadequate transcription in 34 items, such as those cited in Section 3.2.6. Words like Adidas and Afghanistan are each counted as discrepancies, and at the same time counted among the cases
of inadequate transcription: Adidas, transcribed as /ædədəs, 'ædidas/ and pronounced as /ædidas/ in both British and American English, is counted as a case of inadequate transcription because if the symbol /s/ had been used as in the printed edition, the discrepancy in British English would not have occurred. Likewise Afghanistan — transcribed as /æf'gænəsta:n, æf'gænɪsta:n, -sta:n $ æf'gænəsta:n/ pronounced as /æf'gænɪsta:n $ æf'gænəsta:n/ — is also counted as one from the same reason.

Transcriptions are lacking in the case of 5 items on the display, namely, Abuja, Allahabad, Almaty, Amarillo and Anguilla, although their pronunciations are recorded just like other items.

Through this brief survey, only 437 out of the 100 items examined have been found to be adequately transcribed and pronounced in accordance with the first variants in the transcription. This result suggests that more than half of these items have a flaw (or flaws) of some kind related to pronunciation, even if we assume that there are no problems concerning the choice of variants themselves.

3.2.10. Pronunciation of personal names

The way in which personal names are read is somewhat inconsistent: With Wozniak, Steve, for example, the full name is transcribed whereas only the family name is read by both British and American readers in the recording. On the other hand, with Woods, Tiger, only the family name, /wudz/, is shown in the transcription but both British and American readers pronounce his full name. Furthermore, in the case of Woolf, Virginia, only the family name is transcribed whereas the British reader pronounces her name in full while the American reader pronounces only the family name. There do not seem to be any principles underlying how to read personal names, and we do not know what we should expect to hear until we listen to the recordings.

We highly estimate the efforts devoted to introducing the pronunciation of “culture” words into LDCE5-DVD, and expect that the shortcomings mentioned above will be remedied in the next edition through careful recordings and by doubly checking the transcriptions.
3.2.11. Pronunciation search

Except for the change in the arrangement of keys, there has been little change in “Pronunciation search.” We welcome two instances of improvement: One is that the confusion in LDCE4-CD caused by the two keys equally labeled as (u) has been remedied, and the other is that the misleading pop-up explanation for (ua), which used to be “as in sure” in LDCE4, has been changed to “cure, poor, jury” in LDCE5-DVD. (See Table 3.1 and Note 2 above.)

As pointed out in Ichikawa et al. (2005: 19), it is hoped that this system will have more tolerance of ambiguity to allow the user to arrive at the targeted word even if he/she does not know the right phonetic symbols, because even advanced learners are not likely to have much knowledge of phonetics.9)

(Section 3. by Shimizu)

4. Grammar, Examples, Collocation, Pragmatics and Register

4.1. Grammatical information

4.1.1. Grammar codes and patterns

LDCE5 uses exactly the same grammar codes and grammar patterns as LDCE4, and the type of grammatical information given (indicating parts of speech, the distinction between countable and uncountable nouns, transitive and intransitive verbs, inflections, attributive only/predicative only, etc; common prepositions, and other grammatical patternings) is also the same in both editions. See Ichikawa et al. (2005: 457) for a detailed discussion about grammar codes and patterns in LDCE.10)

4.1.2. Grammar boxes

One feature in LDCE that deals with grammatical points is the use of notes or boxes labeled GRAMMAR. There are many more grammar boxes in LDCE5 than in LDCE4, and the notes in LDCE5 are more plentiful and more systematically presented. LDCE4 has 36 boxes devoted to grammar notes, while LDCE5 contains 97 (the entries so1 and
what each have two boxes). LDCE5 includes 25 of the 36 grammar boxes found in LDCE4, along with 72 new additions.

Some grammar boxes in LDCE5 are almost unchanged from those in LDCE4, but most have been rearranged and more or less modified. Compare, for example, the explanations about the object of the verb pay1 in the two editions.

[LDCE4] The verb pay is followed directly by a noun when you are talking about paying a person: I’ll pay you tomorrow. | I haven’t paid my accountant yet. Pay is also followed directly by a noun when you are talking about the amount of money you pay: I’ve already paid £700.

[LDCE5] The object of pay can be the person you give money to or the amount of money you give: I’ll pay you in advance. | I’ve already paid £700.

In this case, LDCE5 provides a much more concise and space-saving account.

Out of 95 grammar boxes in LDCE5, 30 (or approximately 30 percent) of them — for the entries advice, baggage, data, each, equipment, every, everyone, everything, food, fruit, furniture, glass, half, homework, majority, neither, none, number, percentage, person, plenty, police, rest1, sport, staff, they, transport, variety, vegetable, and work — deal with number (countable/uncountable, single/plural).

Other grammatical points explained in the boxes include tense (for the entries before, if1, until, when, while, will1, wish1, would, and yet) and word order or position in a sentence (for bit1, especially, mainly, rarely, still, too, and yet1).

LDCE5’s grammar boxes contain information found in LDCE4 in boxes other than those labeled GRAMMAR. In LDCE4 the information for the entries each, every, front, less, say, and since is found in boxes labeled WORD CHOICE. Similarly, grammatical accounts for different, glasses, police, and what are given in the form of warning notes in LDCE4. Further, gotten is covered in a box labeled US/UK DIFFERENCE in LDCE4. In LDCE5, grammatical points for some words are still explained in the form of warning notes, as in LDCE4,
with modifications: For example, compare \([LDCE5]\) "Enjoy always has an object and is never followed by a preposition or an infinitive with to ..." with \([LDCE4]\) "Enjoy is never followed by a preposition, and almost always has an object."

Lastly, let us point out some possible misrepresentations in grammar boxes. There are cases where notes in grammar boxes do not answer grammatical questions at all. The grammar box for \textit{front}, for example, does not discuss a grammatical point, but just explains how different \textbf{in front of} and \textbf{opposite} are in meaning.

In \textit{LDCE5}, the explanation in the second grammar box for \textit{what} (sense 3) seems to be rather misleading. The third definition of \textit{what} reads, "the thing which: Show me what you bought. | I believe what he told me. | I could get you a job here if that's what you want. | What he did was morally wrong. | She gave him what money she had (= all the money she had, although she did not have much)." The corresponding grammar box states that "\textbf{What} is not a relative pronoun and should not be used to begin a clause after a noun or pronoun. Use \textbf{that} instead: \textit{There are so many things that (NOT things what) can go wrong.}"

4.2. Examples

4.2.1. The number of examples

The "official" number of examples in \textit{LDCE4} is given as 155,000, while the back cover of \textit{LDCE5} says that it contains 165,000, an increase of 10,000 over the previous edition.

First, let us compare the examples in \textit{LDCE4} with those in \textit{LDCE5}, focusing on those entries that lack newly designed collocation boxes in the new edition. The examples in both editions are based on the Longman Corpus Network and the Longman Web Corpus. "Based on the corpora" in this case means that the \textit{LDCE} makes use of real sentences from the corpora but usually slightly edits or modifies them (\textit{LDCE5}, p. xii).

A comparison of \textit{LDCE4} with \textit{LDCE5} shows instances where examples have been replaced, modified or newly added in the new edition, as illustrated in the cases described below.
Replacements
In the entry for eliminate, for the collocation pattern eliminate a need/possibility/risk/problem etc, LDCE4 gives two example sentences, one of which is replaced by a totally new sentence in LDCE5.

[LDCE4]  The teacher should try to eliminate the possibility that the child has a hearing defect.

[LDCE5]  There is no solution that will totally eliminate the possibility of theft.

Additions (new examples)
In the entry for electricity, LDCE4 offers no example for the second sense “a feeling of excitement,” for which LDCE5 adds the example “There was electricity in the air between the two of them.” For the collocation Roman/Greek etc god, found in the entry for god, LDCE5 includes the newly added example “Zeus was one of the most well-known Greek gods.”

There are cases in LDCE5 where new phrases appear which, together with example sentences, modify the content of LDCE4. For example, in the LDCE5 entry for elephant, the phrase the elephant in the (living) room has been added, along with the example “The race issue is the elephant in the room.” The same is true for mark (noun) and suggest. The new phrases close to the mark and something suggests itself were added with a new example for each. In the case of efflorescence, the definition from LDCE4 was slightly modified, and then used with a new example in LDCE5.

4.2.2. Examples and collocation boxes
It is now widely accepted that the leading aim of examples, especially in learners’ dictionaries, is to show how a word is typically used in sentences, with a special focus on giving collocation information. Examples and collocations are interrelated in dictionaries. Thus, it is natural that a change in or rearrangement of collocation boxes would involve corresponding changes in example sentences. More collocations should mean more examples. This is what has happened in the new edition of LDCE.
Take the example of sense 1 of the entry *exam* ("a spoken or written test of knowledge").

[LDCE4] At the end of each level, you *take an exam*.

*pass/fail an exam*  Did you pass the exam?  |  He failed the school’s *entrance exam*.

*chemistry/French etc exam*  How did you do *in your exams*?

*the stresses of final exams*  *The exam results* will be posted up tomorrow.

*oral/written exam*  *Drivers have to take a written exam as part of their tests.  *sit an exam* (= *take an exam*  BrE formal:  He’ll sit his exams next summer.

[LDCE5] At the end of each level, there’s an exam.

How did you do *in your exams*?

On the surface, the number of examples has been drastically cut for the new edition. In fact, LDCE5 provides more examples for *exam* than LDCE4, through the introduction of a collocation box that includes the following: "We have to take exams at the end of each year.  |  Did you pass your final exam?  |  If you fail the exam, you can retake it.  |  Maria always did well in her exams at school.  |  She has to study for her exams.  |  Don’t worry—I’m sure you’ll sail through all your exams.  |  I knew I wouldn’t pass the German exam.  |  There is a written exam at the end of the course.  |  I have my French oral exams next week.  |  He did well in the mock exams.  |  The school achieves consistently good exam results.  |  I’ve still got dozens of exam papers to mark.  |  Read the exam questions carefully before writing your answers."

In LDCE5, these types of sentences are almost always grouped by collocation patterns in the collocation boxes (see Section 4.3.2.). A few example sentences stay unchanged or are only slightly modified from those in LDCE4; other sentences have been replaced, and some new sentences have been added to explain specific collocations. Thus, overall, the total number of examples in LDCE5 has increased by, officially, 10,000 from the previous edition.

4.2.3. Additions on the DVD-ROM

LDCE4 provides additional sentences on the accompanying CD-ROM. You can bring them onto the screen from two of the smaller
windows or boxes called “collocations” and “examples bank.” From “collocations” you can select sentences grouped by collocates (and further grouped by parts of speech). (See Ichikawa et al. 2005: 79–82.) The examples bank constitutes a database of real sentences from (1) other entries of the dictionary (extra dictionary examples), and (2) the corpus (sentences from books, newspapers, etc.). On LDCE4-CD, the user can view the extra examples in corpus mode or KWIC format. On LDCE5-DVD, too, you can view extra sentences from the examples bank. (Sources are renamed (1) “Other dictionary examples,” and (2) “Examples from the corpus”). However, on LDCE5-DVD, example sentences are not viewable in corpus mode or KWIC format.

Both editions claim to contain 1 million additional corpus examples. Still, sentences from the examples bank are not identical in both editions. Some stay and others have gone, with many additions.\(^3\)

In the collocation boxes in the book version, not all collocations are given illustrative examples, while many of those missing examples (not given, perhaps, for space reasons) are supplied on the DVD-ROM. Take the example of food. In the category ADJECTIVES, the food collocations good/excellent, delicious/tasty, fresh, and healthy are provided with one example each in both versions. However, the book provides no examples for nourishing/nutritious, plain/simple, spicy, hot, cold, Italian/French/Chinese etc, exotic, or fatty, while the DVD does provide sentences for those food collocations (“The food was nourishing but not particularly tasty. | He liked eating simple food, nothing spicy. | Spanish food is not usually very spicy. | She wanted a rest and some hot food. | The cafeteria only serves cold food. | The restaurant serves delicious Italian food. | The shop specializes in selling exotic food like kangaroo and crocodile meat. | Limit your intake of fatty food”). The DVD also gives the example “Starch foods include bread, rice, pasta, and potatoes,” for the additional, DVD-only collocation starch foods. (See Section 4.3.4. for more about DVD-only collocations and examples.) Similarly, in the VERB category of food collocations, the DVD provides examples for serve, enjoy, chew, swallow, digest, food tastes, and good/delicious, etc. Therefore, example sentences on the DVD
vastly outnumber those in the print version.

4.3. Collocation
4.3.1. Collocation boxes

The introduction to *LDCE5* states that "Collocations . . . are already a key feature of the fourth edition which has proved popular with both students and teachers," and adds that the authors "have developed this feature further — transforming it into an integrated collocations dictionary which now contains over 65,000 common collocations" (p. ix). It is true that collocations are a key feature not only of *LDCE*, but also of other major English learners' dictionaries. Showing common collocations in bold type (in many cases in example sentences) has become a common practice of those dictionaries. (*LDCE* introduced this practice in their third edition.)

*LDCE* already has collocation boxes to list major word partnerships but *LDCE5* has improved on *LDCE* in almost every way. The new edition contains an "Integrated Collocations Dictionary with over 65,000 collocations" (back cover). This seems to suggest that the collocation boxes taken altogether comprise content so rich and organized that it constitutes a whole dictionary.

Collocation boxes in *LDCE5* are placed at the end of an entry (but before the thesaurus box where applicable) and usually refer to the first sense of the entry — if another sense is involved, the sense number is given as, for example, **COLLOCATIONS — MEANING 3** (e.g., *term*). When more than one sense share the same collocations sense, numbers are indicated as **MEANINGS 1 & 2** (e.g., *law*). When collocations are different for different senses, they are treated in separate boxes (e.g., *balance, chance, record, signal*).

The number of collocation boxes in *LDCE* and *LDCE5* is significantly different: *LDCE5* has 469 (for 461 entries) as opposed to 299 (for 298 entries) in *LDCE4*. Both editions have such boxes for the same 163 entries, which means that 135 entries lost collocation boxes, while 298 gained them. In *LDCE5*, entries with a collocation box are predominantly nouns (455), while 3 are adjectives (*ill, illegal* and *obvious*) and
3 are verbs (regret, sit and sleep). The numbers for LDCE4 are 272, 16, and 9 respectively, and out of the 25 non-noun words with collocation boxes in LDCE4, only ill and sleep continue to have a collocation box in the new edition.

4.3.2. Categories of collocation patterns

The way in which collocation boxes are organized differs between LDCE4 and LDCE5.

In LDCE4, collocations are listed together in a special box with some semantic explanations or glosses in brackets, but corresponding example sentences are given below the box and collocations and examples are not near enough to each other to see their relationship. In LDCE5, collocation boxes are rearranged and reorganized; an example comes just after the relevant collocation and their relationship is very clearly understood. In LDCE4 collocations patterns are just listed without any indication of their type, while in LDCE5 collocations in the box are grouped by the types of collocation or category of collocation patterns: [VERBS], [ADJECTIVES], [ADJECTIVES/NOUN +], [+ NOUN], [ADVERBS], [PHRASES]. For some entries, a note called [COMMON ERRORS] is also provided. Examples of how these groupings are used in LDCE5 are given below.

[VERBS]: This category includes both <verb + noun> and <noun + verb> combinations, with the former combinations being more numerous (e.g., have a problem, cause a problem, pose a problem, deal with a problem; a problem arises/occurs, the problem lies in/with sth; a fish swims, a fish bites; the wind picks up).

[ADJECTIVES]: This category indicates typical adjectives which accompany nouns, predominantly <adjective + noun> combinations like a simple calculation, a rough calculation; an important decision, a big decision. Predicative as well as attributive adjectives are included (e.g., strong, light/gentle for wind as in “The wind was so strong... | Winds tomorrow will be light.”)

[ADJECTIVES/NOUN +]: This category actually appears in the dictionary as, for example, [ADJECTIVES/NOUN + fire]. This differs...
from the category [ADJECTIVES] in that it includes <noun + noun> combinations as well as <adjective + noun> combinations such as a big/major fire, a forest fire, a house fire.

+ NOUN: This category is shown as <the word in question + NOUN> (e.g., illegal + NOUN): an illegal weapon, illegal drugs; a hill country; cough medicine/cough mixture/cough syrup.

ADVERBS: This category is exclusively for adverbs that modify adjectives and verbs (e.g., seriously ill, gravely ill; completely/totally illegal; glaringly/blindingly obvious; deeply/greatly regret)

PHRASES: This category includes phrases as disparate as a piece of wood; a shoal/school of fish; a wave of panic/relief/sympathy; My guess is (that), at a guess, I’ll give you three guesses; let your imagination run wild; there is no accounting for tastes, and so forth.

COMMON ERRORS: This category contains such warning notes as “! Do not say ‘instructions how to do something’ or ‘instructions to do something’. Say instructions on how to do something.” Or, “Do not say ‘she’s doing a diet.’ Say she’s on a diet. Do not say ‘keep a diet.’ Say stick to a diet.” (66 boxes have this category.)

Sometimes the criteria for assigning the categories can be confusing. For course, for example, the category [ADJECTIVES] includes such collocations as a language/art/design etc course and a training course as well as a full-time course and an intensive course. Nouns (language/art/design) are included in those examples; shouldn’t they belong in the [ADJECTIVES/NOUN + ] category, rather than in the [ADJECTIVES] category with examples such as a company/po­lice car, a road/traffic accident, an iron will, the stopping/braking distance, and breathing difficulties? Similarly, the collocation box for the entry address lists an address book in [PHRASES] to­gether with sb’s name and address, a change of address, and of no fixed address. Is this treatment reasonable? It would be more reasonable to put the phrase in the [+ NOUN] category like, for example, a phone number.  

There are exceptions to the categories of collocation patterns
adopted. **Eye, hair** and **cake** receive a totally different or more irregular treatment than other entries. In the case of **eye** the categories of the collocation patterns are **COLOUR** *(brown/blue/grey/green)*, **SHAPE/POSITION** *(big, round/wide, sunken)*, and **SHOWING YOUR FEELINGS/CHARACTER** *(sleepy/tired, sad, tearful/moist/misty, red/bloodshot, hungry)*, as well as the regular **VERBS**/ **PHRASES**, and **COMMON ERRORS**. Likewise, collocations for **hair** are grouped into categories like **COLOUR** *(dark, fair, auburn)*, **LENGTH** *(short, shoulder-length)*, **TYPE** *(straight, curly, frizzy)*, **CONDITION** *(in good/bad/terrible etc condition, glossy/shiny)* as well as **VERBS**, **hair + NOUN**, **PHRASES**, and **COMMON ERRORS**. And **cake** has **TYPES OF CAKE** *(a birthday/Christmas/wedding cake, a home-made cake, a fruit cake)* in addition to **VERBS** and **PHRASES**, and **COMMON ERRORS**.

Likewise, there is an *ad hoc* category, **NOUNS**. In the entry for **concert**, a **concert performance**, a **concert tour**, and so forth are listed in the category **NOUNS**, which is not a regular category. Collocations like **the city centre**, **the city limits**, and **course material** are also categorized as **NOUNS**. There is no good reason to introduce a new category. These should be in the **+ NOUN** category just as **a blood test** is.

### 4.3.3. Collocation information found elsewhere

As has already been stated, in **LDCE5**, collocations are highlighted in the example sentences or listed in the collocations boxes at the end of the entries. However, these are not the only places where you can find information about collocation in **LDCE5**. Such information can also be found elsewhere in the dictionary. Additional information can be found in the COLLOCATIONS CHECK section in some Thesaurus Notes. For example, the thesaurus box in the entry **modern** includes a collocations check that says something to the effect that **latest** goes well with **technology/equipment/news**, **up-to-date** is often used with **equipment/information**, and so on. Similar information is given at entries like **cheap, comfortable, poor, rich, rough, rude, sad, secret, soft**, and
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**young.** Moreover, a warning note as found in sting (verb) can be viewed as a note for collocation ("! A bee, wasp, scorpion, or plant can sting you. For a mosquito, ant, or snake, use bite").

**4.3.4. Additions on the DVD-ROM**

Thus far, we have looked, for the most part, at the print version of the dictionary. When we turn our attention to the DVD-ROM, a new picture emerges in terms of collocation information in *LDCE5.*

In *LDCE4,* the accompanying CD-ROM contains all the same collocation information as the book version, plus sentences from the example banks (those from books, newspapers, etc.). On the other hand, *LDCE5-DVD* also provides additional collocations (usually together with additional example sentences) in the normal layout (which means that you don’t have to click and select examples from other windows; they are just shown as part of the text in the same format as in the book). Even for entries that already have collocation boxes in the book, *LDCE5-DVD* often provides additional sentences, especially when the book provides collocations but not examples. For example, the entry concert includes such collocations as a concert hall, a concert ticket, and a concert pianist, with no example sentences provided for them, but the DVD provides sentences like “On the last night, the concert hall was packed. | Concert tickets are available from $17.50. | Her ambition was to become a concert pianist” for the collocations.

In many cases, collocations are added to what the print version already provides by the addition of one or more boxes to those that already exist. The entry number, for example, already has a collocation box for sense 5 ("an amount of something that can be counted" as in "The numbers of cars on our roads rose dramatically last year") in the book. On the DVD-ROM there is another box for sense 1 ("a word or sign that represents an exact amount or quantity" as in "an even/odd number").

We haven’t counted up all the collocation boxes on the DVD but it is certain that it includes hundreds more such boxes than the print version. On the DVD-ROM, verbs (break, condemn, drive, excite,
pose, watch, etc.) and additional adjectives (exclusive, official, popular, viable, etc.) are provided with new collocation boxes. Collocation boxes for adverbs such as sharply have also been added to the DVD-ROM.

It is to be noted that the addition of a collocation box in an entry or addition of example sentences in collocation boxes on the DVD does not affect the description in the rest of the entry text. What is written outside the collocation box in an entry is exactly the same as in the book version, even if a collocation box or sentences are added. No editing has been done to the rest of the entry.

There are some misrepresentations of collocations on the DVD. In some cases non-collocations are included in example sentences from 'collocations' from the corpus. Consider such examples as the following: “Review your notes to make sure that behavioral observations are stated and are not arbitrary judgments.” (cf. observation); “In car manufacturing alone, the state has seen employment jump by 25 percent between 1989 and the end of 1994.” (cf. manufacture1); “In every case two chemicals are mixed to produce the reaction.” (cf. reaction) Many others involve wrongly assigned parts of speech. For example, collocations for pressing (noun) available from the collocations from other entries (a pressing problem; a pressing need) are both the same as those given for pressing (adjective). Among collocations for joke (verb) available on the DVD, those coming from other entries (black joke, dirty joke, see the joke, etc.) are identical to those for joke (noun). Additionally, the collocations you can retrieve from other entries are identical for both manual the adjective and manual the noun (a manual/blue-collar worker, a training manual, an instruction book/manual, manual dexterity, manual occupations/blue-collar occupations, manual work). Further, the collocation box for the noun approach appears in the entry for the verb.9)

(Sections 4.1–4.3. by Asada)
4.4. Pragmatics

4.4.1. Information in LDCE

Pragmatic information could be shown in some ways in learners' dictionaries: labels (such as disapproving and taboo), language notes (on modal verbs), usage notes (on addressing people), phrases or examples (with formality shown), comments (on politeness) and so forth. An attempt was made to "capture 'the guidelines' of pragmatic usage by three means" in LDCE2 (1987: F13): Usage Notes, Language Notes, and comments and examples within the entry. LDCE3 (1995), however, gives no explicit language notes, while LDCE4 (2003) shows "Pragmatics" as one of the topics in Language notes (1146–1149). LDCE5 focuses in the middle matter on "Formality in spoken and written English" (A1–A16), a revised description of pragmatics in language notes in LDCE4.

LDCE4 is considered to be basically based on LDCE2 and partially owes to "Essential Communication" in the first edition of Longman Essential Activator (abbreviated as LEA1) (1997: 871–910) followed by its new edition (henceforth LEA2) (2006: 855–894). LEAs show the instructive information for encoding purposes rather than for decoding. In comparison with nineteen topics in LEA2 of advice, *suggestions, offers, invitations, *requests, asking for permission, complaining, *apologizing, *saying thank you, directions, *opinions, *agreeing, *disagreeing, saying yes, saying no, *saying hello, *saying goodbye, talking on the phone, and having a conversation (linking words, and positions and direction excluded), LDCE5 shows the asterisked nine topics and related expressions\(^10\). A few topics in LDCE4 are included in the other topics: advising someone, inviting someone, giving permission, and refusing permission. A few are newly introduced in LDCE5: opinions, suggestion, hello, goodbye, thank you. The language note attempts to "focus on functional language — language you use to do something, such as agreeing with someone or asking someone to do something for you — contrasting synonymous words and phrases to explain which ones are more appropriate for formal written contexts and which are more suited to informal spoken contexts" (A1). LDCE5 places more
emphasis on formality, and on the differences between spoken and written medium.

### 4.4.2. Comparison between LDCE5 and LDCE4

Yang (2007) looks into pragmatic information in LDCE4. A brief comparison of LDCE5 and Yang makes it clear that not many striking differences could be found between the two LDCEs. Here a comparison is drawn of the information on functional language. As is mentioned above, the number of chosen topics is narrowed down to nine, including new ones. For reasons of space, the topic of apologizing is selected for comparison. Some everyday or formal expressions are listed as well as expressions used when replying to an apology. Compared with LDCE4, the new edition provides more expressions and information on functional language. Some are shown as everyday English: sorry/I’m sorry, excuse me/pardon me, I beg your pardon, forgive me, I owe you an apology, I feel bad/terrible/awful about something. Some are given as formal English: I apologize/we would like to apologize, please accept my/our apologies for something, and I/we regret something. Some usage notes are also attached: In Forgive me it is “used when saying you feel sorry about something, especially when you have said or done something that might upset, annoy, or offend someone” (A6) and that the expression “sounds very polite” (A6).

This type of description is quite instructive for foreign learners, but it is also vital that the same information should be found in the related entries. For example, the expression I owe you an apology is found in the entry apology in its collocation box and in the entry owe, but both entries show no information on formality. The same is true of the expressions please accept my/our apologies for something. Or pragmatic information on the expressions, such as no worries, forget it, and apology accepted, is not given in the LDCE text. Information on formality and medium should be provided when more emphasis is placed in the new edition, or such a detailed description could be provided in the related entries in the DVD because space is not a concern there.
4.4.3. Information in LDCE5-DVD

Regrettably, no more detailed description is provided in the DVD, which does not contain the language note of “Formality in spoken and written English.” The DVD will make it technically feasible to provide more information on pragmatics in the column such as Longman Language Activator in Thesaurus box, given that the same kind of information is provided on the formality and the function of the related expressions. It is desirable to make the most of the cutting-edge technology for advanced users who need more information for encoding purposes.  

4.5. Register Notes

Register is defined in LDCE5 as “the words, style, and grammar used by speakers and writers in a particular situation or in a particular type of writing” (s.v. register (2)). This new feature in LDCE5 is explained in the introduction as follows: “Being aware of the different register of closely related words and phrases is a common problem for learners of English. Spoken language can sound unnatural if the words and phrases are too formal or high level; conversely, written assignments are marked down if the language is that of spoken English . . . you will find hundreds of Register notes, focusing precisely on this problem area” (p. ix). This type of information is already given in Longman production dictionaries, Longman Language Activator (1993) (abbreviated as LLA1) and LEAs: ALONE (1), for example, in LEA2 enumerates the expressions alone/on your own/by yourself with the following note attached. Compare it with the counterpart in LDCE5, which clearly shows that the LDCE5 description roughly correspond with LEA2’s.

LEA2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal or informal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **On your own** and **by yourself** are more informal than **alone**.  
**Alone** is often used in written stories and descriptions. |
In everyday English, people often say *by yourself* or *on your own* rather than *alone*: *She lives by herself/on her own.*

A note of this kind is considered to be instructive for learners of English because they tend to express themselves in (rather) formal English in speaking the language. 47 notes of this type are found in A section, for example. Some notes are quite similar to those in LEA2 as is shown above. Below is quoted another example of *accumulate* in the second sense “to gradually increase in numbers or amount until there is a large quantity in one place,” which is not covered in LEA2 (cf. Thesaurus Note in LDCE5-DVD).

In everyday English, people usually say *build up* rather than *accumulate*: *These chemical tend to build up in the soil.*

The Register Note is placed just below the related sense/entry and shown in a blue colored box with the blue colored REGISTER. Users should be careful to remember that the note is to be found not in the entry *build*¹ or the phrasal verb *build up* but in the entry *accumulate*: More Register Notes are located in a more formal entry. There is not always cross reference in the entry of everyday English. Compare the following notes of *about*² (adv) and *approximate*¹. *Approximately* is treated as a run-on without sense, and is found as a synonym in the Thesaurus Note in *approximate*¹.

The Register Note in *about*²

In written English, people usually prefer to use *approximately*, as it sounds more technical: *The cost to taxpayers is approximately $200 billion.*
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LDCE5  The Register Note in approximate

REGISTER
In everyday English, people usually say rough rather than approximate: Can you give me a rough idea of how much it would cost?

LDCE5  The Thesaurus Note in approximate

THESAURUS
approximately more or less than a number or amount — used especially in technical or scientific contexts: (no example quoted here)
about more or less than a number or amount. ‘About’ is the usual word to use in everyday English: (no example quoted here)
(no other synonyms quoted here)

The Register Note, although shown in a limited number of senses/entries (397 notes), is highly valued from the pedagogical viewpoint of encouraging learners to become well aware of everyday spoken English. It is intended for production by those learners who want to get accustomed to everyday English rather than formal English, although it is more often given under the dictionary’s one-way system.

(Sections 4.4. and 4.5. Dohi)

5. Definition
5.1. Overview
We will discuss the definitions in LDCE5 in this section. In the last review, we examined the definitions in LDCE4 in terms of their user-friendliness and considered whether the changes made to them were favorable for people using the dictionary (Ichikawa et al. 2005: 20).

We will examine the definitions in LDCE5 from the same perspectives, citing examples from our sample pages. Where necessary, additional examples will be cited from other parts of LDCE5.
5.2. Data analysis

Our samples show that the definitions in LDCE5 have not changed much from those in the previous edition. Table 5.1 presents the number of changes in the definitions in LDCE5.

Table 5.1 The Number of Changes in the Word Senses in the Sample Pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample pages</th>
<th>Unchanged</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Deleted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A²-account¹</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edgy-embroider</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manic depression-Mason jar</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>set²-shave¹</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 5.1, the total number of senses in our sample pages is 1,681. Of these, 1,645 senses are identical to those in LDCE4, that is, approximately 98% of the senses remain unchanged in LDCE5. None have been deleted. The modified and newly added senses account for approximately 0.7% and 1.5%, respectively.

5.2.1. Modifications of definitions in LDCE5

Most of the modifications applied to the definitions in LDCE4 remain as they are in LDCE5. For instance, the definitions of the entry items cited as examples in the previous review — abyss n and accommodate v 2 — have not changed in LDCE5. The set phrases in the entry for shadow¹ — 4 (without/beyond a shadow of a doubt) and 6 (be a shadow of your former self) — have also remained the same.

It is interesting to note that the definition of without/beyond a shadow of a doubt, is introduced by a clause beginning with used in LDCE4 and LDCE5; it was not so in LDCE3. The phrase beginning with used first appears in the definitions in LDCE4 and is used profusely thereafter. The practice of using such a clause in the definitions is discussed in Section 5.2.3.

Full-sentence definitions (FSDs) are sometimes used in LDCE5 as in LDCE4. The second sense of accede v is defined in a full sentence.
The definition is identical to that in *LDCE4*. The only difference is the reference to the noun *accession* in the entry in *LDCE5*:

**accede v**

*LDCE4* 2 if someone accedes to the THRONE, they become king or queen.

*LDCE5* 2 if someone accedes to the THRONE, they become king or queen → *accession*.

### 5.2.2. Rephrased definitions

Some definitions are slightly rephrased in *LDCE5*. Take the definition for the second sense of *accident* as an example:

*LDCE4* 2 a crash involving cars, trains, planes etc.

*LDCE5* 2 an event in which a car, train, plane etc is damaged and often someone is hurt.

The reason for this rephrasing is not clear, since the word “crash” is included in the Longman Defining Vocabulary (LDV) in *LDCE5*. However, the rephrased definition makes it explicit that one can be injured in a crash. Perhaps the definition was rephrased in order to state this point clearly.

The definition for *accident and emergency n* provides another example of rephrasing. The first part of the if-clause “if they have an accident” in *LDCE4* is rephrased as “if they are injured” in *LDCE5*. It may have been rephrased to make it clear to the users that the facility is for the injured:

**accident and emergency n**

*LDCE4* the room or department in a hospital where people go if they have an accident or suddenly become ill.

*LDCE5* the room or department in a hospital where people go if they are injured or suddenly become ill.

### 5.2.3. Definitions beginning with especially or used

Additional information is included in a definition using a phrase or clause beginning with *especially* or *used (to show)* in *LDCE5*, as in
For example, the phrase beginning with *especially* is used in the definition for the second sense of *sever*. In fact, the definition is identical in the two editions. In this case, the phrase beginning with *especially* indicates that the verb is used when a relationship with someone or a connection with something ends because of a disagreement between the two involved:

**sever**  
2 to end a relationship with someone, or a connection with something, especially because of a disagreement.

A phrase beginning with *used* often introduces pragmatic information in *LDCE4*, and *LDCE5* inherits this practice. The following example shows that the entry item is used when showing disapproval:

**shackle**  
1 to put many limits on what someone can do — used to show disapproval.

The phrase beginning with *used* is sometimes embedded in a definition in *LDCE4*, and *LDCE5* inherits this practice as the following example shows:

**elderly**  
1 used as a polite way of saying that someone is old or becoming old.

The use of the phrase beginning with *used* is rather inconsistent, since a pragmatic or style label sometimes replaces the phrase, as in the example below:

**shagged**  
*BrE* informal not polite very tired.

In this case, the style label *informal not polite* is used instead of a phrase beginning with *used*.

The phrase beginning with *used* sometimes introduces the definition of an entry item in *LDCE4* and *LDCE5*. This is often the case in the definitions for set phrases. It can be inferred that the clause "it is" is
omitted before *used*. The following definitions are identical in both *LDCE4* and *LDCE5*:

**shade¹ n**

8 shades of sb/sth used to say that someone or something reminds you of another person or thing.

**shadow¹ n**

4 without/beyond a shadow of a doubt used to say that something is definitely true.

The former definition may originally have been “it is used to say that someone or something reminds you of another person or thing,” and the latter may have been “it is used to say that something is definitely true.”

This type of definition is also used for defining function words such as modal verbs, conjunctions, and articles in *LDCE5*. The entries for *shall* (modal verb) and *that* (conjunction) are quoted as examples:

**shall modal verb**

1 shall I/we . . . ? spoken used to make a suggestion, or ask a question that you want the other person to decide about.

2 I/we shall especially BrE formal used to say what you will do in the future.

3 formal or old fashioned used to emphasize that something will definitely happen, or that you are determined that something should happen.

4 formal used in official documents to state an order, law, promise etc.

**that conjunction**

1 used after verbs, nouns, and adjectives to introduce a clause which shows what someone says or thinks, or states a fact or reason.

2 used after a phrase with ‘so’ or ‘such’ to introduce a clause that shows the result of something.

3 used to introduce a clause that refers to a fact, when describing it.

4 in order that something may happen or someone may do something.
used to express a wish for something to happen or be true, especially when this is not possible.

The meaning of the definite article the is divided into 17 senses, and the definition for all but one sense is introduced by a phrase beginning with used.

5.2.4. The use of single-clause when-definitions

Single-clause when-definitions are used in some cases in LDCE5, as in LDCE4. According to Atkins and Rundell (2008: 443), it is "a style of definition that begins with 'when' but (unlike the FSD) consists of a single clause and has no main verb." This type of definition is used "mainly for defining nouns that refer to states or situations," (ibid.: 444). While it has some advantages, this type of definition can mislead dictionary users:

The risks of misinterpretation are especially high when the same word-form can be either a noun or a verb, and the noun is defined in this way. For example:

**delay** *n* when someone or something has to wait (LDOCE-4 2003)

Dziemianko and Lew (2006) report two empirical studies with Polish students: the results are not conclusive, but in one of the studies users had real problems in identifying the wordclass of the item being defined. On the whole, this style is best avoided, at least until we have a clearer idea of how users cope with it.

(ibid.: 444)

The definition for **delay** *n* remains the same, and other similar examples in LDCE5 are presented below:

**march** *n* 2 when soldiers walk with firm regular steps from one place to another.

**shampoo** *n* 2 when someone washes your hair using shampoo.

**March** and **shampoo** can be used either as nouns or verbs without changing their word-form. Their single-clause when-definitions may
obscure the fact that the definitions cited above are for their noun forms that denote acts.

"Someone" or "people" is often used as the subject in a single-clause when-definition in order to give the impression that a state or a situation described applies to people in general. If "you" is used as the subject, the definition can sometimes sound awkward:

**severance n**
1 when you end your relationship or connection with another person, organization, country etc, especially because of a disagreement.

In the above case, the subject "you" can be applied not only to personal relationships but also to relationships with an organization or a country. However, this may not have been the intention of the person who wrote the definition as shown in the example sentence: the severance of diplomatic ties between the two countries. This sentence describes the severance of the relationship between the two countries, not that of the relationship between a country and a user of *LDCE5* who may be addressed as "you."

Hanks (1987: 125) says that "the majority of the verb explanations in the Cobuild dictionary begin with the words 'if you..." because "one of the most common selection preferences shown by verbs is for a human subject." The Cobuild dictionary surely has set the trend, but this practice should be applied with care in order not to mislead dictionary users.

### 5.2.5. Definitions of encyclopedic entries

Encyclopedic entries are included in the newly added senses in *LDCE5*. Encyclopedic information is given as the definition in those cases. For example, in the entry for **elementary adj.**, a piece of encyclopedic information is given for the set phrase "Elementary, my dear Watson".

**elementary adj**
4 Elementary, my dear Watson. People sometimes use this ex-
pression humorously to say how easy something is to solve. Some people think that the phrase comes from the Sherlock Holmes stories by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. Holmes says this to his friend Watson when explaining how easy it is to understand something about a crime. In fact, the phrase does not appear in the books.

Here is another interesting example.

**Marie Celeste, the**

A sailing ship that was found in the Atlantic Ocean in 1872, with no one on it. The ship was undamaged, and a table was prepared for a meal. No one knows why the sailors left the ship, or what happened to them. People sometimes describe a place that is deserted (= nobody is there) as being like the Marie Celeste.

For further discussion on entry words in *LDCE5*, see Section 2.

As mentioned above, some new entry items in *LDCE5* are encyclopedic. Verbal definitions are sometimes not enough to give clear image of what a definiendum looks like in such cases. Illustrations may help as visual aids. Look at the entry items below.

**marten** *n*

A small animal with a long body and a tail that lives mainly in trees and that eats smaller animals.

Many kinds of animals live in trees and eat smaller animals. We doubt that this definition provides the users with enough information to identify the defined animal.

Another example is the definition for **shalwar kameez**.

**shalwar kameez** *(also salwar kameez)* *n*

Loose trousers which are narrow at the bottom and a long loose shirt, worn by some South Asian women and, in some countries, men.

This definition is also vague. It is difficult for dictionary users who have never actually seen the clothing to imagine what it looks like. An illustration or a photograph may help convey a clearer image.

Unfortunately, neither the print version of *LDCE5* nor *LDCE5-
DVD provides the two entry items with illustrations or photographs. If there were some sort of visual aids, the dictionary users could mentally capture an image of each item, even though they might not be able to find the corresponding word in their native language. For further discussion on illustrations in *LDCE5*, see Section 6.

### 5.3. Codes used with definitions

Signposts are short definitions placed before the full definitions that help users to identify the definition they are searching. The design of signposts changed in *LDCE5*. A blue rectangle containing white bold-faced letters is used as the symbol for signposts in *LDCE5*, and a pale blue rectangle containing black bold-faced letters is used in *LDCE4*. Synonyms of entry words are shown after the sign [SYN], and antonyms are shown after the sign [OPP]. The following are examples of synonyms and antonyms provided in entries:

**severe adj**
someone who is severe behaves in a way that does not seem friendly or sympathetic, and is very strict or disapproving [SYN] stern.

**sharp1 adj** having a very thin edge or point that can cut things easily [OPP] blunt.

These labels may be more distinct in their meaning than an equal sign (=) or a sign of inequality (≠), which preceded synonyms and antonyms, respectively, in *LDCE4*. For a discussion on the effect that these codes have on the dictionary users, see Section 7.

### 5.4. Longman Defining Vocabulary in *LDCE5*

#### 5.4.1. Data analysis

There are 2,152 words designated as LDV in *LDCE5*, an increase of 52 words from that in *LDCE4*. The newly added LDVs are as follows: which, while (conj), whip, whistle, white (adj, n), who, whole, whose, why, wide, width, wife, wild (adj, adv), will, willing, win (v), wind, window, wine (n), wing (n), winter, wire (n), wise (adj), wish, with, within, without, woman, wood, wooden, wool, word
(n), work, world, worry, worse, worst, worth, would, wound, wrap (v), wrist, write, wrong (adj, adv, n), year, yellow, yes, yet, you, young (adj), your(s) and zero. Three LDVs are deleted in LDCE5: look sth up, make into (v), and thousandth. Forty-three words are commonly used as LDVs in both LDCE4 and LDCE5, but their wordclass labels differ in the two editions. They are listed in Table 5.2.
### Table 5.2 Differences in the wordclass labels of LDV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LDCE4</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>above</td>
<td>adv, prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>adv, conj, prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>beyond</td>
<td>adj, adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>church</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>cook</td>
<td>n, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>adj, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>crash</td>
<td>n, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>adj, predeterminer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>dress</td>
<td>n, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>drive</td>
<td>n, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>fail</td>
<td>adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>adj, determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>forest</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>last</td>
<td>adv, determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>laugh</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>length</td>
<td>adv, pron, determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>make up</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>next</td>
<td>adv, adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>adv, determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>pink</td>
<td>adj, n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>probably</td>
<td>adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>quiet</td>
<td>adj, n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>rid</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ring</td>
<td>n, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>score</td>
<td>v, n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>second</td>
<td>adv, n, determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>separate</td>
<td>adv, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>show</td>
<td>n, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>shy</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>silver</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>sky</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>prep, determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>sting</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>supply</td>
<td>n, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>n, v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>conj, pron, determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>pron, determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>thousand(th)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>adv, prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>upstairs</td>
<td>adj, adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>what</td>
<td>predeterminer, determiner, pron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>adv, conj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The order of the labels is changed. The reason is unclear.
As shown in Table 5.2, the wordclass labels of 30 words are deleted in LDCE5. The terms “determiner” and “predeterminer” are no longer used as wordclass labels in LDCE5. However, the labels for less and no are exceptions. The wordclass label for length is “adv, pron, determiner” in LDCE4. This may be a careless error, but the label is not corrected in LDCE5. In fact, it is simply deleted in LDCE5. Fail was labeled as “adj” in LDCE4, but the label is corrected as “v” in LDCE5.

5.4.2. Unclear definitions

The limiting of the vocabulary that can be used to define a word sometimes leads to unclear definitions. This is especially true when defining encyclopedic entry items (see Section 5.2.5.). Vagueness is avoided in LDCE5 by using the vocabulary outside the LDV whenever necessary, as the following case shows.

**elephant n**

1 a very large grey animal with four legs, two TUSKS (= long curved teeth) and a TRUNK (= long nose) that it can use to pick things up.

However, there seems to still be room for improvement. Look at the following example.

**abscess n**

a painful swollen part of your skin or inside your body that has become infected and is full of a yellowish liquid.

The expression “a yellowish liquid” is rather vague. The definition may be made clearer by replacing “a yellowish liquid” with the word “pus.” Since the noun is outside LDV, the meaning should be added in parentheses: a painful swollen part of your skin or inside your body that has become infected and is full of PUS (= a yellowish liquid produced by infection).

(Sections 5.1.–5.4. by Takahashi)
5.5. Thesaurus Notes

As Cowie explains (1999: 5.6.), *LDCE1* through *LDCE3* make occasional reference to synonymous expressions in usage notes. Following *LDCE3*, *LDCE4* lists them in Word Focus and Word Choice, which *LDCE5* integrates into GRAMMAR and THESAURUS[^{2}]. The Thesaurus Notes are in principle placed at the end of the entry, and do not always contain the description of the key word (cf. Kanazashi *et al.* 2009: 57–61). The book contains 514 notes, while the guided tour in *LDCE5-DVD* explains that it contains almost a thousand (cf. 1,052 key words in *LLA1*). *LDCE5* (2,043 pages) has over six percent more text pages than *LDCE4* (1,922 pages) partly because the Thesaurus Notes take up far more space. Table 5.3 below shows that more than a fourth (134) of the Thesaurus Notes in *LDCE5* correspond with Word Focus and Word Choice Notes in *LDCE4[^{3}]*. In terms of the number of thesaurus type notes, *LDCE5* outnumbers its competitors *CALD3* and *OALD7*: The former contains “around 200” notes (p. IX) and the latter 213 notes (Notes on usage: Synonyms R94–96).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>LDCE4[^{4}]</em></th>
<th><em>LDCE5</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Focus</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Thesaurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Choice</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Thesaurus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note) The number in parentheses shows the corresponding notes are different ones that contain synonymous expressions.

The reason more Word Focus Notes are integrated into Thesaurus Notes is that synonyms are often enumerated in Word Focus, while differences in meaning are described with examples given in Word Choice (cf. Kanazashi *et al.* 2009: 60). It looks as if *LDCE5* took the last review article into consideration which states that “those that list only similar words . . . seem to need some improvement” (Ichikawa *et al.* 2005: 63). The enlargement is presumably for “presenting learners with more specific alternatives to frequently-used core-vocabulary items . . . or providing learners with notes that point out the differences between closely related (yet non-interchangeable), easily confused words” (De...
Cook and Granger 2005: 80) given that students’ “lexical repertoire tends to be impoverished and lacking in nuance. One typical symptom . . . is the tendency to fall back on very general descriptive terms . . ., with a resulting loss of clarity, variety, vividness, and stylistic appropriacy [sic]” (Rundell 1999: 38). Nothing, however, is mentioned in LDCE5 of whether or how Longman Learner’s Corpus5) contributed to the preparation and revision of the Thesaurus Notes, but it seems to have been done because the introduction reads, “Vocabulary building was identified as the key need for learners of English . . . The Longman Language Activator database was used as the starting point for creating the Thesaurus notes for this new edition. For the first time users have a Thesaurus integrated into LDOCE—making it easier and quicker for them to find the most appropriate word or phrase. The Thesaurus notes contain information on 18,000 related words and phrases—with an additional 30,000 on the DVD-ROM” (p. ix). It also says that in addition to synonyms, antonyms, and related words after the definition indicated by the signs [SYN] and [OPP], the Thesaurus Notes “explain the difference between words similar in meaning and give examples that show how they are used differently” (p. xiii).

The notes in some entries in LDCE4 are divided into more than one in LDCE5: important is expanded into important and unimportant, for example. The largest six divisions are to be found in the superordinate entry of sound1. Some opposite words are found under separate words: honest and dishonest, obey and disobey, for example. Some entries contain more than one division in terms of degree of intensification or a particular meaning: angry and strong, for example. Increasing the number of thesaurus notes as well as providing a fitting description makes it clear that LDCE5 aims to serve the dual purposes of encoding and decoding, although the primary aim seems to clarify the receptive knowledge. The fact that 480 key words out of 514 are within the scope of the Longman Communication 3000 makes it reasonable to assert that “the key words of the thesaurus boxes are the basic meanings of the core of English” (LLAI: F26).

Atkins and Rundell (2008: 409) maintain that the following features
are required in definitions for encoding: the precise semantic features, the collocational and selectional preferences, the sociolinguistic features in terms of register, regional distribution and so on, and the pragmatic and connotative features. LLA1 was compiled with these principles taken into account. As a result, the presentation in the Thesaurus Note in LDCE5 in principle imitates LLA1 style, granted that the latter undoubtedly contains more comprehensive description for encoding purposes. In the Thesaurus Note the key word comes first, but not always, followed by some related expressions with definitions and examples given. The same number of related expressions is not found in each Thesaurus Note. Synonymous expressions are considered to be given in frequency order (cf. LLA1: F6). The randomly chosen adjectives (in the Thesaurus Notes) below show not only definitions but information on grammar, collocations (in bold), formality, spoken and/or written medium, selection preference, connotation, and pragmatics where necessary.

**close** very similar: *The film bears a close resemblance to real life (= is very similar). | The painting is remarkably close to the original.*

**fat** ... It is rude to tell someone that they are fat. It is also better not to use any of these words when talking directly someone about their body.

**mad** [not before noun] informal angry: *Dad was mad at me for damaging the car.*

**lovely** especially BrE spoken used when saying that something looks, feels, or sounds very nice: *What a lovely day! | a lovely voice*

**plump** a woman or child who is plump is slightly fat, especially in a pleasant way: *Her mother was a plump, cheerful woman.*

A simple comparison of a few adjective descriptions between LDCE5 definitions, the Thesaurus Note⁶), and LLA2 in LDCE5-DVD reveals that the same descriptions are not always provided. Advanced learners who take a particular interest in the distinction of synonyms or vocabulary building are able to refer to the Thesaurus Notes for more information. The Thesaurus Notes enrich LDCE5 definitions, as the quotations below show (cf. Bogaards 1996: 303–304). The notes include synony-
mous words, phrases, and idiomatic expressions, where users cannot always be referred to the Thesaurus Notes. For reasons of space, the key or general terms nice used for person and beautiful used for women are chosen for comparison, with the examples deleted. (Note that LDCE4 lists lovely, pleasant, charming, sweet, and adorable in Word Focus Note for nice.)

**LDCE5** definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nice</th>
<th>friendly, kind, or polite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td>friendly, polite and easy to talk to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGISTER**

In everyday English, people usually say something or someone is nice rather than pleasant...

- sweet: kind, gentle and friendly
- charming: very pleasing or attractive
- engaging: pleasant and attracting your interest
- likable, likeable: likable people are nice and easy to like
- good-natured: naturally kind and helpful and not easily made angry
- great: *especially spoken* very good
- lovely: *informal especially BrE* friendly and pleasant

**LDCE5** The Thesaurus Note in nice

- nice *especially spoken* friendly, kind, or polite. In written and formal English, it is better to use a more specific and interesting adjective than nice
- pleasant friendly, polite, and easy to talk to — used especially about someone that you do not know very well
- sweet very kind and gentle
- charming behaving in a polite and friendly way, which makes people like you and want to do things for you
- engaging interesting or amusing in a way that makes people like you — a rather formal word
likeable  easy to like and seeming nice and friendly

good-natured  having a nice kind character and not getting angry easily

great  informal  used about someone who you like and admire a lot

lovely  especially BrE informal  very nice, kind, and friendly

LLA2

nice  especially spoken  friendly and kind

pleasant  friendly, polite, and easy to talk to—use this especially about someone you do not know well

likeable  nice, and easy to like

lovely  especially British, informal  very nice, kind, and friendly:

good-natured  also  good-humoured  British  |  good-humored  American  someone who is good-natured is kind, helpful, and does not get angry easily

sweet  informal  someone who is sweet is kind and gentle, and tries to make other people happy

charming  able to make people like you or do things for you because you are attractive and have good manners

lovable  also loveable  a lovable person is friendly and gentle in a way that is very attractive

endearing  an endearing quality, habit etc is one that makes you like the person who has it

engaging  formal  interesting or amusing in a way that makes people like you

adorable  someone, especially a child or an animal, that is adorable is very attractive and makes you feel a lot of love towards them

The quotations indicate that it is a demanding job to make a subtle distinction of synonymous expressions. LDCE5 often relies on the use of synonym definitions, or the entries are similarly explained by the defining vocabulary, such as friendly, kind, polite, pleasant, attractive and nice.
The definitions in the Thesaurus Note are in principle given in much the same way as in \textit{LDCE5} definitions or those in \textit{LDCE5} are differently phrased. A few expressions in \textit{LLA2} are not found in the other two: \textit{lovable, endearing} and \textit{adorable}. A few additional or slightly changed descriptions are found. \textit{LDCE5} has a Register Note on the difference between \textit{nice} and \textit{pleasant}, but in \textit{nice} shows no label \textit{especially spoken} found in the Thesaurus Note and \textit{LLA}. The Thesaurus Note describes \textit{nice} as one of the overused words that should be replaced by other synonyms in written and formal English. \textit{LDCE5} makes no mention of the usage of \textit{pleasant} used about someone you do not know well. It labels \textit{great especially spoken}, while the Thesaurus note indicates \textit{informal}. \textit{LDCE5} has no label in \textit{sweet} and \textit{engaging}, while \textit{sweet} is shown to be \textit{informal} in \textit{LLA} and \textit{engaging formal} in the Thesaurus Note and \textit{LLA}. The frequency order in the Thesaurus Note and \textit{LLA2} does not completely correspond, although their database is regarded as the same.

Below are shown the quotations for another key word\textit{ beautiful}.

\begin{quote}
\textit{LDCE4} Word Choice (An example deleted.)

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{beautiful} & is used to describe someone, usually a woman or child, who is attractive in a very special and noticeable way \\
\textbf{pretty} & is usually used to describe a girl or woman who is good-looking, with regular features. It can also be used to describe a boy or young man who has an attractive but feminine face. \\
\textbf{handsome} & is usually used to describe a a man or boy who is good-looking, with strong features. It can also be used to describe a woman, usually an older woman, who has attractive but masculine features. \\
\textbf{good-looking} & can be used to describe anyone who you think is nice to look at. \\
\textbf{attractive} & is used to describe someone who looks good in a way that attracts sexual interest \\
\textbf{gorgeous} and \textbf{stunning} & are emphatic ways of saying that someone is very attractive. \textit{Gorgeous} is used mostly in spoken English.
\end{tabular}
\end{quote}
**LDCE5** definitions (The examples and a Register Note deleted.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>beautiful</strong></td>
<td>someone or something that is beautiful is extremely attractive to look at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>good-looking</strong></td>
<td>someone who is good-looking is attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>attractive</strong></td>
<td>someone who is attractive is good looking, especially in a way that makes you sexually interested in them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pretty</strong></td>
<td>a woman or child who is pretty has a nice attractive face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>handsome</strong></td>
<td>a woman who is handsome looks attractive in a strong healthy way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gorgeous</strong></td>
<td><em>informal</em> extremely beautiful or attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>stunning</strong></td>
<td>extremely attractive or beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cute</strong></td>
<td>very pretty or attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>lovely</strong></td>
<td><em>especially BrE</em> beautiful or attractive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LDCE5** The Thesaurus Note in **beautiful** (The examples deleted.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>beautiful</strong></td>
<td>a beautiful woman or child has perfect good looks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>good-looking</strong></td>
<td>a good-looking person looks nice. <strong>Good-looking</strong> is very common in spoken English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>attractive</strong></td>
<td>an attractive person looks nice, especially in a way that makes you feel sexually interested in them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pretty</strong></td>
<td>a pretty girl or woman looks nice — used especially about a woman who has a nice face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>handsome</strong></td>
<td>a handsome man or boy looks nice — used especially about a man who has a nice face. <strong>Handsome</strong> is also sometimes used, especially in literature, to describe a woman who is good-looking and has a strong face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gorgeous/stunning</strong></td>
<td><em>spoken</em> extremely attractive. <strong>Gorgeous</strong> is used especially by women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cute</strong></td>
<td><em>spoken</em> nice to look at — used about animals, babies, children, and young adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>lovely</strong></td>
<td><em>especially BrE spoken</em> used when saying that someone looks very nice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LLA2** (The examples deleted. Six synonyms nowhere found in the others are deleted: nice-looking, glamorous, elegant, striking, ravishing and a woman of great beauty.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>形容語</th>
<th>意味</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>use this about a woman who is extremely attractive in a way that is fairly unusual and special, so that people notice and admire her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-looking</td>
<td>use this about a woman who is nice to look at and has an attractive face and body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>use this about a young woman or girl who has an attractive face and is good-looking, but not in an unusual way:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>use this about a woman who is good-looking, especially in a way that makes people sexually interested in her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cute</td>
<td>especially American, spoken use this about a girl or young woman who is pretty and sexually attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gorgeous</td>
<td>especially spoken use this to emphasize that a woman is extremely attractive, in a sexual way:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stunning</td>
<td>use this about a woman who is extremely beautiful and sexually attractive, in a way that everyone notices and admires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lovely</td>
<td>especially British if a woman looks lovely, she looks very attractive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LDCE5** depends on synonym definitions in some entries, where the entries are explained by the defining vocabulary of *beautiful* and *attractive*. The Thesaurus Note, as well as **LDCE4**, shows that *beautiful*, which is more extensively defined in *LLA*, has selection preference to be used for women or children. However, **LDCE5** does not note this. The Thesaurus Note states that *good-looking* is very common in spoken English, of which none of the others makes any mention. *Attractive* is the only case where the descriptions agree. The descriptions for *pretty* are slightly different: The Thesaurus Note says that it is used especially about a woman who has a nice face, while **LLA2** notes that it is used about a “young” woman who is good-looking, but not in an unusual way. The Thesaurus Note says that *handsome* is sometimes
used for women, especially in literature, but nothing of the sort is referred to in *LDCE5* (cf. *LDCE4*). The Thesaurus Note labels *gorgeous*, *stunning*, *cute* and *lovely* as *spoken*, but no mention is made in *LDCE5*, while *LLA2* shows that *cute* is used especially in American English but that *stunning* and *lovely* are not labeled as *spoken*. Only the Thesaurus Note has an additional description that *gorgeous* is used by women. The descriptions make us realize that the Thesaurus Notes often provide an additional description of *LDCE5* with the phrase "(used) especially about . . .," or with the above-mentioned features Atkins and Rundell point out (2008: 409). Compared with the Note, *LLA2* often contains longer definitions because there are no space restrictions, but it does not necessarily mean that it contains more descriptive features.

The synonyms in the Thesaurus Notes and *LLA2* are a little different in frequency order. The introduction reads that the Thesaurus Notes are based on the database of *LLA*, but their descriptions differ in some details. It could be safely said, however, that the Thesaurus Notes as well as *LLA2* are designed to make *LDCE5* more informative. But users might be at a loss as to which to choose as an appropriate synonym, because their definitions and descriptions are not necessarily given in the same way. User research may be required since a host of dictionary users take a strong interest in synonyms and antonyms (see Section 7.6.).

The sample comparison makes us realize that dictionary users should take good care to read all the definitions and descriptions of the three, and that *LDCE5*, by revision and enlargement of the Thesaurus Notes, attempts to bridge the gap between a passive dictionary and an active one, or to be more encoding-oriented. *LDCE5* could be positively valued in giving more prominence to synonyms (and antonyms) under the frequent and basic key words for learners’ vocabulary expansion, although whether users will grasp fine differences of synonyms in the Thesaurus Notes or how users value the look-up approach of *LDCE5* may require further research.

(Section 5.5. by Dohi)
6. Illustrations

6.1. Comparison of LDCE5 and LDCE4 in book form

LDCE5 makes no explicit explanation of the number of illustrations (see Section 6.2. below). An overall comparison of LDCE5 and LDCE4 reveals that the number of entries with one or more than one illustration accompanied (322) in LDCE5 is approximately 30% larger than that in LDCE4 (250). The number of illustrated entries is by far the largest in nouns (268), followed by verbs (42) and adjectives (12). Nearly half (129) in the fourth edition are retained in the fifth. It seems that LDCE changes a large number of illustrations in each revision.

In the letter b, for example, 26 and 27 entries are given illustrations in the fifth and the fourth respectively. Some are new in the fifth: background, bar\(^1\), baseball, basketball, bend\(^1\), blind\(^2\), and button\(^1\). Some in the fourth are deleted: barrier, basket, bite, bonsai tree, bottle, and bundle. Some are found in a different entry in LDCE5: backhand (in the entry tennis), bat\(^1\) (in sports), and broken\(^2\) (in damage). Some are partially changed: bed\(^1\), bin\(^1\), box\(^1\), break\(^1\), and bridge\(^1\). Some are found in the previous editions: brass. Only in barbeque\(^1\) is given one illustration, while more than one is shown for reference or comparison in the other entries. The method of more than one illustration is considered to be more instructive than its DVD presentation (see Section 6.2. below, cf. Section 7.6.). Especially useful for learners are the illustrations in the entries that “group and disambiguate words that belongs to the same lexical field . . ., depicts the parts and components of concrete objects or contrast the various meanings of polysemous and homonymous terms” (Heuberger 2000: 36). Nearly 70% of the entries in LDCE5 show more than one illustration. The number of full-page color illustrations, however, was reduced from thirteen in LDCE4 to five in LDCE5: car, clean, fruit, office and vegetable, which are found in LDCE2 and/or LDCE3. Generally, the editorial principles for illustrations are not clear.

6.2. Illustrations in LDCE5-DVD

The guided tour in the DVD shows “See over 1500 pictures,” which

is almost the same as *LDCE*4-CD because the last review article writes, "When the ‘pictures’ option is selected while leaving the search box empty in the multimedia search function, the display shows that there are 1,499 candidates... This number seems to indicate the number of words with one or more illustrations" (Ichikawa et al. 2005: 82). A comparison is drawn of *LDCE*5 and its DVD to examine how the latter differs. The DVD outnumbers the book: It contains approximately five times as many illustrations in the letter b (the former has 133, while the latter 26), but usually one or very occasionally more than one illustration is given for an entry in the DVD, and many do not include what it calls labels.

Selection of “Picture” in the multimedia box in the advanced search (Dictionary Search) in the DVD does not display the list of all the entries in the search result box below: 115 out of 133 entries in b are shown, for example, and all the compound entries are found missing despite the fact that they are shown as an entry in the book as well as the DVD: Band-Aid, bar code, belly dance, big wheel, bird’s-eye view, bow tie, Brussels sprout, and Bulldog clip, for example. There is no good reason why the DVD contains such a defect.

The same illustration is sometimes displayed in more than one entry (see footnote two). The illustration in the entry body is a case in point. The same illustration is found in the related entries: artery, brain, heart, intestine, kidney, liver, lung, stomach, throat, and vein (but not in muscle and tissue). It is sometimes doubtful whether the same illustration is fully understood: bunch (with no label) and banana, or ballet dancer, ballet and ballerina. In the entry bag just a paper bag is displayed without a label, while several bags are shown in the book. Is the illustration typical or a prototype, if there is any, or will an illustration suffice? What the illustrations accurately describe is not occasionally so clear to follow: back. It would be even more instructive to show illustrations in encyclopedic entries: bald eagle, for example (cf. Section 5.2.5.).

The problem with the DVD is that it usually displays one illustration without labels, nor it includes full-page color illustrations. The DVD
abandons the principle in *LDCE2* (1987: F9): “In ... the use of illustrations, ... pictures have been devised to explain the meaning of words, by contrasting easily confused words ... , by showing groups of related words ... , or by clarifying the meanings of words that are usually used figuratively ... .” It does not display all the illustrations in the book, nor does clicking on a word display the extra illustrations for contrasting or grouping related words. It would be more desirable for users to look for more illustrations by clicking on something like ‘Illustration sets’ (cf. Word sets in Thesaurus box).

On the whole, it is quite doubtful whether the DVD surpasses the book as far as illustrations are concerned. Despite the clarity of the DVD’s illustrations, a similar statement of the review article of *LDCE4* applies to *LDCE5-DVD*: It does not live up to the expectation that all the entries illustrated in the book are shown in the DVD. Also, regretfully, the schemes for contrasting or grouping words are not at all exploited there (cf. Ichikawa *et al.* 2005: 69–70).

(Section 6. by Dohi)

7. User Study
7.1. Background

In order to understand how users evaluate various features of *LDCE5* and partially support the arguments made in the previous sections, we have conducted a user study among participants teaching or studying English in Japan. This section presents the data collected from the study and its analysis. The study constitutes a sixth installment of the series of user studies including the one on the first edition of *Longman Advanced American Dictionary* (abbreviated as *LAAD1*) (2000) (henceforth US-LAAD1, conducted in 2001 and reported in Dohi *et al.* (2002: 61–84)), on *LDCE4* (US-LDCE4, conducted in 2004 and reported in Ichikawa *et al.* (2005: 89–118)), on *OALD7* and *OALD7-CD* (US-OALD7, conducted in 2005 and reported in Komuro *et al.* (2006: 110–139)), on two business English dictionaries, *Longman Business English Dictionary* (abbreviated as *LBED*) (2000) and *Oxford Business English Dictionary for Learners of English* (abbreviated as *OBED*) (2005) (US-BEDs, conduct-

7.2. Tasks undertaken by the participants

The present user study comprises four parts.

Part 1: The first part involved a questionnaire survey, whose format is the same as the one used in US-LDCE4, US-OALD7, and US-LAAD2. The survey was prepared in Japanese, and the English version is reproduced in Appendix 1.

Part 2: This part entailed a composition task similar to that used in US-LAAD2. The participants were presented with nine Japanese sentences, each with a target word in English, and were asked to translate part of the sentences into English with reference to the target word. The participants’ look-up procedures are then evaluated in two respects: the success rate and the time required to access the relevant information. Three of the sentences used in US-LAAD2 are again adopted in the present study, with the dictionaries specified being different from those consulted in US-LAAD2. It may well be worthwhile to partially replicate the previous study and investigate how the difference in the dictionaries used affected the participants’ look-ups. The sentences and target words are reproduced in Appendix 2.

Part 3: This part comprised a comparison task within LDCE5, wherein the participants were asked to evaluate the usefulness of 11 features by ranking them in order of priority. The details of this task are provided in Appendix 3.

Part 4: This last part involved another comparison task, in which the participants were asked to compare three dictionaries in terms of definitions, examples, and collocations of six headwords, all in the reading context. This is a partial replication of the comparison task in US-BEDs. In the present study, the definitions and examples in LDCE5 are compared with those in two other dictionaries in each of the six questions. The task sheets were prepared in Japanese, and the English version of the passages is reproduced in Appendix 4, together with com-
plete references to the sources. Although the names of the dictionaries are provided in Appendix 4, they were replaced by "Dictionary A," "Dictionary B," etc., on the actual task sheet in order to avoid any bias or influence on the participant's responses, arising from preconceived ideas of the dictionaries themselves.

7.3. Participants in the study
A total of 93 people participated in the study, including 82 students and 8 English teachers from Japanese institutions and 3 other individuals. Of these, 50 were interviewed: They were classified into the Category Intv. The other 43 were not interviewed, but underwent either Parts 1 and 2 or Parts 1 and 3 as part of an in-class activity; they were labelled as Category Cl. These participants were classified differently, that is, on the basis of their proficiency levels in or exposure to English. Of the 50 whom we interviewed, there were 2 native English speakers from the U.S. (thus designated as Group E), 6 Japanese teachers of English (Group T), 16 Japanese students majoring in English (Group M), 20 advanced learners of English (Group A), and 6 non-English majors who did not prove to be advanced in English (Group N). We employed the snowball sampling technique.

7.4. Results of Part 1: Questionnaire survey
From this section on, we will present the results of US-LDCE5 in a manner similar to the results of US-BEDs and US-LAAD2 so as to facilitate an easy comparison.

A total of 91 participants, that is, all the participants except for the 2 in Group E, filled out the questionnaire. The answers to the first question "How many years have you studied English" ranged from "6 and a half years" to "54 years." The mean value for Category Intv (excluding the two English speakers) and that for Category Cl are 12.1 and 7.7, respectively.

The previous user studies have already revealed how popular handheld electronic dictionaries have become in Japan, a finding echoed in the responses we obtained to Question 2 "Please name the English dictionaries that you use most often. Is it a printed or electronic dic-
tionary?" and Question 3 "If you use a monolingual English dictionary, please name it. Is it a printed or electronic dictionary?" As far as the most frequently used dictionaries are concerned, 3 participants in Category Intv answered "printed," 43 answered "electronic," and 2 answered "both types"; the figures are 3, 40, and 0, respectively, in the case of Category Cl. This suggests that electronic dictionaries are becoming more readily available and popular. We should note, however, that there is a considerable discrepancy in the use of monolingual English dictionaries between the two categories. Of those in Category Intv, 7 answered they used "printed" ones, 35 answered "electronic," none answered "both types," while 6 answered that they did not usually use a monolingual English dictionary. The corresponding figures are 4, 23, 0, and 16 for Category Cl. In addition to the fact that hardly any in Category Cl are English majors or advanced learners, the low frequency of their dictionary look-up should be taken into account in the course of our data analysis in Sections 7.5–7.7.

The answers to Question (6) are summarized as follows: 44 participants said that they often consulted a printed or electronic dictionary for phonetic symbols, 23 said they used electronic dictionaries to listen to recorded sounds to understand pronunciation, and 24 said they did both equally frequently.1) The figures are 27, 9, and 12 for Category Intv, and 17, 14, and 12 for Category Cl, respectively. It would be worthwhile to examine the discrepancies between the groups consisting of participants with higher proficiency levels (Groups T and M) and those with lower proficiency levels (Groups A and N and all of Group Cl). The figures are 15, 0, and 7 for the former set of participants, and 29, 23, and 17 for the latter. Both of these sets of data seem to suggest a high dependency on recorded sounds by those who are not accustomed to reading phonetic symbols.

The participants’ answers to Questions (4) and (5) are shown in Tables 7.1 and 7.2, each further divided into smaller tables due to the horizontal spread. In each case, the participants chose their answers from <very often, often, sometimes, not usually, never>, which were replaced by the graded frequencies 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0, respectively, to
calculate the mean frequency of use.  

Table 7.1 Occasions on which participants in Categories Intv and Cl used a dictionary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>reading English</th>
<th>translating E into L1</th>
<th>writing English</th>
<th>translating L1 into E</th>
<th>broadening vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Intv</td>
<td>C Cl</td>
<td>C Intv</td>
<td>C Cl</td>
<td>C Intv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (very often)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (often)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (sometimes)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (not usually)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (never)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means (each group)</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means (both groups)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1 Occasions (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>writing English</th>
<th>translating L1 into E</th>
<th>broadening vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Intv</td>
<td>C Cl</td>
<td>C Intv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 Purposes for which participants in Categories Intv and Cl used a dictionary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>synonyms/antonyms</th>
<th>etymology</th>
<th>grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Intv</td>
<td>C Cl</td>
<td>C Intv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2 Purposes (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>cultural information</th>
<th>part-of-speech</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Intv</td>
<td>C Cl</td>
<td>C Intv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 Purposes (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>collocation</th>
<th>spelling</th>
<th>existence</th>
<th>pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intv</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Intv</td>
<td>Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants' general tendencies found in Tables 7.1 and 7.2 are as follows: (1) There is no extensive discrepancy between categories in occasions on which they use a dictionary. (2) They tend to use a dictionary less often in trying to broaden their vocabulary in English than on other occasions. (3) “Meaning” is by far the most frequently checked information category, followed by “grammar,” “collocation,” “pronunciation,” and “synonym/antonym,” which tied with “spelling” in the case of Category Intv; “spelling,” “pronunciation,” “part-of-speech,” and “synonym/antonym” in the case of Category Cl; and by “spelling,” “grammar,” “pronunciation,” and “synonym/antonym” for all the groups. (4) There are marked discrepancies between groups in “grammar,” “collocation,” “spelling,” and “part-of-speech.” To observe the discrepancies stated in (4) in further detail, it would be worthwhile to examine the discrepancies be-
tween the groups consisting of participants with higher proficiency levels (Groups T and M) and groups consisting of those with a lower proficiency level (Groups A and N and all the participants in Category Cl), as with the re-analysis of answers to Question (6). Those in the former set of participants tend to check "grammar" and "collocation" more frequently, the corresponding mean values being 2.91 and 3.00, and they check "spelling" and "part-of-speech" less frequently (2.18 and 1.36, respectively) than the latter set, the means being 2.49, 2.07, 2.90, and 2.36, respectively.

7.5. Results of Part 2: Composition task

The results of this composition task are tabulated and analysed in virtually the same way as in US-LAAD2. Tables 7.3.1–7.3.9 present the results of Part 2, with one table allotted for the tabulation of the results of one question. Each table is first divided into rows according to the groups; it is further divided into three rows to show the number of participants who gave the correct answer before referring to the dictionary, that of those who gave the correct answer thanks to a successful look-up, and the total number of those who were asked to use the dictionary (in this order, in the first row); together with the average time spent finding the correct answer by those who benefited from their look-ups (in the second row); and the number of unsuccessful look-ups (in the third row). The participants who gave the correct answer before referring to the dictionary are excluded from the second row, and only those who benefited from their look-ups, indicated by the figure in the middle of the first row, are counted. However, those who gave the correct answer before look-up but gave the wrong answer afterwards are included in the third row.

In addition to the familiar fact that the more advanced the participants are, the more likely they are to give the right answer, some discrepancies between the dictionaries that the participants referred to can be gathered from the tables above. Aware of the unfairness from comparing the five dictionaries on the basis of the responses to different questions by different numbers of participants given by referring to dictionary entries of different lengths and levels of complexity, we would like to summarize these results in Table 7.4.
Table 7.3.1 Question (1) We must save the patient’s life at all costs (or at any cost).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (n)</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>OALD7</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
<th>MED2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T (n=6)</td>
<td>1, 1/2</td>
<td>1, 0/1</td>
<td>1, 1/2</td>
<td>1, 0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 sec.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>48 sec.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group M (n=16)</td>
<td>3, 1/4</td>
<td>3, 1/5</td>
<td>2, 1/3</td>
<td>3, 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123 sec.</td>
<td>12 sec.</td>
<td>30 sec.</td>
<td>24 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (n=17)</td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
<td>2, 3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74 sec.</td>
<td>70 sec.</td>
<td>178 sec.</td>
<td>64 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (n=3)</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>1, 0/1</td>
<td>0, 0/1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96 sec.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=42)</td>
<td>5, 5/10</td>
<td>5, 5/11</td>
<td>5, 5/10</td>
<td>6, 4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79 sec.</td>
<td>64 sec.</td>
<td>122 sec.</td>
<td>54 sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3.2 Question (2) Don’t hang about/around. Our train is about to leave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (n)</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>LDCE4</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
<th>MED2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T (n=6)</td>
<td>0, 2/2</td>
<td>1, 0/1</td>
<td>9 sec.</td>
<td>156 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 sec.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 sec.</td>
<td>156 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group M (n=16)</td>
<td>0, 3/3</td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
<td>3, 2/5</td>
<td>2, 2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 sec.</td>
<td>62 sec.</td>
<td>54 sec.</td>
<td>30 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (n=17)</td>
<td>0, 3/4</td>
<td>1, 2/5</td>
<td>0, 3/4</td>
<td>1, 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49 sec.</td>
<td>27 sec.</td>
<td>25 sec.</td>
<td>60 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (n=3)</td>
<td>0, 0/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>1, 0/1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>210 sec.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=42)</td>
<td>0, 8/10</td>
<td>3, 6/11</td>
<td>4, 6/11</td>
<td>4, 4/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46 sec.</td>
<td>75 sec.</td>
<td>32 sec.</td>
<td>69 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3.3  Question (3) I often play the guitar to blow off steam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
<th>MED2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group T (n=6)</strong></td>
<td>0, 2/2</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 sec.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group M (n=16)</strong></td>
<td>1, 2/4</td>
<td>1, 4/5</td>
<td>0, 4/4</td>
<td>0, 3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 sec.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A (n=17)</strong></td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
<td>0, 2/4</td>
<td>1, 3/5</td>
<td>0, 4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 sec.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group N (n=3)</strong></td>
<td>0, 0/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n=42)</strong></td>
<td>2, 7/10</td>
<td>1, 7/11</td>
<td>1, 9/11</td>
<td>0, 10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 sec.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3.4  Question (4) This regulation is aimed at preventing traffic accidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>LDCE3</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group T (n=6)</strong></td>
<td>0, 2/2</td>
<td>0, 0/2</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 sec.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15 sec.</td>
<td>24 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group M (n=16)</strong></td>
<td>2, 1/4</td>
<td>0, 3/3</td>
<td>0, 3/5</td>
<td>0, 4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 sec.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A (n=17)</strong></td>
<td>1, 0/4</td>
<td>0, 1/4</td>
<td>0, 3/4</td>
<td>0, 3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group N (n=3)</strong></td>
<td>0, 0/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n=42)</strong></td>
<td>3, 3/10</td>
<td>0, 4/10</td>
<td>0, 8/11</td>
<td>0, 9/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 sec.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3.5  Question (5) The doctors were sure that the patient would pull through.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>LDCE5</em></th>
<th><em>LAAD2</em></th>
<th><em>COBUILD6</em></th>
<th><em>COBUILD5</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group T (n=6)</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 2/2</td>
<td>0, 2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96 sec.</td>
<td>24 sec.</td>
<td>84 sec.</td>
<td>140 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group M (n=16)</td>
<td>0, 4/4</td>
<td>1, 2/5</td>
<td>0, 3/3</td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81 sec.</td>
<td>119 sec.</td>
<td>118 sec.</td>
<td>62 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A (n=17)</td>
<td>0, 3/5</td>
<td>0, 2/4</td>
<td>0, 4/4</td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123 sec.</td>
<td>162 sec.</td>
<td>66 sec.</td>
<td>38 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group N (n=3)</td>
<td>0, 0/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>177 sec.</td>
<td>150 sec.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=42)</td>
<td>0, 8/11</td>
<td>1, 6/11</td>
<td>0, 10/10</td>
<td>2, 8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99 sec.</td>
<td>127 sec.</td>
<td>94 sec.</td>
<td>72 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3.6  Question (6) The student forgot to change into his school uniform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>LDCE5</em></th>
<th><em>LDCE4</em></th>
<th><em>LAAD2</em></th>
<th><em>COBUILD6</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group T (n=6)</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>1, 1/2</td>
<td>1, 1/2</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 sec.</td>
<td>36 sec.</td>
<td>18 sec.</td>
<td>18 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group M (n=16)</td>
<td>3, 2/5</td>
<td>1, 1/4</td>
<td>0, 3/3</td>
<td>2, 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105 sec.</td>
<td>30 sec.</td>
<td>38 sec.</td>
<td>96 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A (n=17)</td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
<td>2, 2/4</td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
<td>1, 3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 sec.</td>
<td>29 sec.</td>
<td>57 sec.</td>
<td>101 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group N (n=3)</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 0/1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 sec.</td>
<td>48 sec.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=42)</td>
<td>4, 7/11</td>
<td>4, 4/10</td>
<td>2, 8/10</td>
<td>3, 5/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53 sec.</td>
<td>31 sec.</td>
<td>44 sec.</td>
<td>83 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3.7  Question (7) He is charged with (or is facing the charge of) theft at present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>LDCE4</th>
<th>LDCE3</th>
<th>MED2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group T (n=6)</strong></td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 2/2</td>
<td>0, 2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 sec.</td>
<td>6 sec.</td>
<td>14 sec.</td>
<td>61 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group M (n=16)</strong></td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
<td>3, 1/5</td>
<td>2, 2/4</td>
<td>0, 3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 sec.</td>
<td>30 sec.</td>
<td>45 sec.</td>
<td>28 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A (n=17)</strong></td>
<td>0, 3/5</td>
<td>0, 4/4</td>
<td>0, 4/4</td>
<td>0, 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 sec.</td>
<td>70 sec.</td>
<td>61 sec.</td>
<td>40 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group N (n=3)</strong></td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>1, 1/2</td>
<td>0, 0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147 sec.</td>
<td>48 sec.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n=42)</strong></td>
<td>1, 8/11</td>
<td>3, 7/11</td>
<td>2, 8/10</td>
<td>0, 8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 sec.</td>
<td>52 sec.</td>
<td>45 sec.</td>
<td>41 sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3.8  Question (8) We are aware that many problems lie ahead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>LAAD2</th>
<th>OALD7</th>
<th>MED2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group T (n=6)</strong></td>
<td>1, 0/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>1, 1/2</td>
<td>1, 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>36 sec.</td>
<td>24 sec.</td>
<td>76 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group M (n=16)</strong></td>
<td>3, 1/5</td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
<td>2, 2/4</td>
<td>2, 1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 sec.</td>
<td>27 sec.</td>
<td>88 sec.</td>
<td>24 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A (n=17)</strong></td>
<td>2, 0/4</td>
<td>0, 3/5</td>
<td>0, 3/4</td>
<td>1, 2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45 sec.</td>
<td>76 sec.</td>
<td>92 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group N (n=3)</strong></td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104 sec.</td>
<td>174 sec.</td>
<td>42 sec.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n=42)</strong></td>
<td>6, 1/10</td>
<td>1, 8/11</td>
<td>3, 7/11</td>
<td>4, 5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 sec.</td>
<td>45 sec.</td>
<td>86 sec.</td>
<td>65 sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3.9  Question (9) The three have promised to stick together no matter what.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>LDCE3</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
<th>COBUILD5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T (n=6)</td>
<td>0, 2/2</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td>2, 0/2</td>
<td>1, 0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 sec.</td>
<td>102 sec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (n=16)</td>
<td>2, 1/3</td>
<td>1, 2/4</td>
<td>2, 2/4</td>
<td>4, 1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 sec.</td>
<td>80 sec.</td>
<td>84 sec.</td>
<td>114 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (n=17)</td>
<td>1, 2/4</td>
<td>2, 2/5</td>
<td>3, 1/4</td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 sec.</td>
<td>63 sec.</td>
<td>30 sec.</td>
<td>93 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (n=3)</td>
<td>0, 0/1</td>
<td>0, 1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>234 sec.</td>
<td></td>
<td>63 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=42)</td>
<td>3, 5/10</td>
<td>4, 6/11</td>
<td>7, 3/10</td>
<td>6, 5/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 sec.</td>
<td>104 sec.</td>
<td>66 sec.</td>
<td>91 sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4  Summary of the results of Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>LDCE4</th>
<th>LDCE3</th>
<th>LAAD2</th>
<th>OALD7</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
<th>COBUILD5</th>
<th>MED2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T (n=6)</td>
<td>2, 12/14</td>
<td>2, 2/4</td>
<td>0, 3/5</td>
<td>1, 3/4</td>
<td>2, 1/3</td>
<td>3, 7/10</td>
<td>1, 5/6</td>
<td>3, 5/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 sec.</td>
<td>21 sec.</td>
<td>43 sec.</td>
<td>26 sec.</td>
<td>24 sec.</td>
<td>45 sec.</td>
<td>73 sec.</td>
<td>76 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (n=16)</td>
<td>15, 18/36</td>
<td>5, 5/13</td>
<td>3, 7/11</td>
<td>2, 8/12</td>
<td>5, 3/9</td>
<td>9, 16/28</td>
<td>5, 11/16</td>
<td>8, 11/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69 sec.</td>
<td>49 sec.</td>
<td>53 sec.</td>
<td>54 sec.</td>
<td>63 sec.</td>
<td>58 sec.</td>
<td>48 sec.</td>
<td>37 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (n=17)</td>
<td>7, 20/38</td>
<td>3, 8/13</td>
<td>2, 7/13</td>
<td>1, 8/13</td>
<td>1, 6/8</td>
<td>6, 20/30</td>
<td>2, 13/17</td>
<td>4, 11/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53 sec.</td>
<td>49 sec.</td>
<td>61 sec.</td>
<td>79 sec.</td>
<td>73 sec.</td>
<td>69 sec.</td>
<td>47 sec.</td>
<td>78 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (n=3)</td>
<td>0, 2/5</td>
<td>0, 2/2</td>
<td>0, 1/2</td>
<td>0, 3/3</td>
<td>0, 2/2</td>
<td>2, 3/6</td>
<td>0, 3/3</td>
<td>0, 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93 sec.</td>
<td>129 sec.</td>
<td>234 sec.</td>
<td>110 sec.</td>
<td>135 sec.</td>
<td>169 sec.</td>
<td>144 sec.</td>
<td>42 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=42)</td>
<td>24, 52/93</td>
<td>10, 17/32</td>
<td>5, 18/31</td>
<td>4, 22/32</td>
<td>8, 12/22</td>
<td>20, 46/74</td>
<td>8, 32/42</td>
<td>15, 28/52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 sec.</td>
<td>55 sec.</td>
<td>65 sec.</td>
<td>67 sec.</td>
<td>77 sec.</td>
<td>68 sec.</td>
<td>61 sec.</td>
<td>60 sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(73.2%) (77.3%) (69.2%) (78.6%) (85.7%) (83.6%) (94.1%) (73.7%)
From Table 7.4, one can safely state that it did not take the participants long to find relevant information and understand it in the Longman dictionaries, particularly LDCE5 and LDCE4, as compared to OALD7, COBUILD6, and COBUILD5. However, their success rate was higher with the Oxford and COBUILD dictionaries than with the Longman ones. From Table 7.3, it can be surmised that the results of the tasks in which the participants had to find “be aimed at doing something” in Sentence (4), “pull through” in (5), “lie ahead” in (8), and “stick together” in (9) brought down the success rate with the Longman dictionaries. This would naturally lead us to examine how the definition and examples concerning Sentence (4) are provided in the dictionaries in question.

[LDCE5] 1 to try or intend to achieve something: ... (be) aimed at doing sth an initiative aimed at reducing road accidents
[LDCE3] (no relevant information)
[COBUILD6 and COBUILD5] 3 If an action or plan is aimed at achieving something, it is intended or planned to achieve it. □
The new measures are aimed at tightening existing sanctions. ... talks aimed at ending the war.

The COBUILD dictionaries provide two phrases — “is aimed at achieving,” and “are aimed at tightening” — that can directly be used to compose sentences such as “This regulation is aimed at preventing ...,” and one phrase, “talks aimed at ending ...” that indirectly shows the use of the verb in the passive voice. In contrast, LDCE5’s phrase does so only indirectly. LDCE3 presents no relevant information. This accounts for the participants outperforming with a COBUILD dictionary. Concerning Sentences (5), (8), and (9), we could infer — from the time spent on locating the necessary information, the success rates, and the participants’ opinions — that long entries in LDCE5 are relatively difficult to scan.

“Change into” in Sentence (6) is the only phrase that the participants located evidently more easily in LDCE5 than in COBUILD6. This can be attributed partly to LDCE5’s noticeable signpost [CLOTHES], and partly to COBUILD6’s non-division of senses according to the part-
of-speech. In \textit{COBUILD6}, the phrase "change into" only appears once as the third example "I changed into a tracksuit" in Sense 7 under \textit{change}. To put it simply, the necessary information stands out in \textit{LDCE5}, but is buried deep in the words in \textit{COBUILD6}.

In order to make up for the smallness of the data presented in Tables 7.3 and 7.4, we have devised an in-class written test using the same sentences. A limit of 45 minutes was allotted to the test, in which 24 participants in Category Cl had to answer the questions. They were further divided into four groups, each consisting of six participants, and they looked up the target words in one of the four sets of dictionaries such that the participants in each group would use \textit{LDCE5} in two or three different questions. Table 7.5 tabulates the number and percentage of correct answers with each dictionary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>LDCE4</th>
<th>LDCE3</th>
<th>LAAD2</th>
<th>OALD7</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
<th>COBUILD5</th>
<th>MED2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) cost</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) hang</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) steam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) aim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) pull</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) charge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) lie</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) stick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(success rate)</td>
<td>(48%)</td>
<td>(44%)</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(42%)</td>
<td>(48%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the success rates presented in Tables 7.4 and 7.5 will give us a somewhat different picture of the participants' reference skills. We can obtain an even clearer picture of which dictionary meets the participants' demands better if we combine the success rates in one table, as in Table 7.6 — one provided by those in Group Intv, regardless of whether they answered before looking up the target words in the dictionaries, and the other by those in Category Cl tabulated in Table 7.5, although the former, and presumably the latter, include those who
had already known the answer.

Table 7.6 Correct answers by the participants in Group C(6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>LDCE4</th>
<th>LDCE3</th>
<th>LAAD2</th>
<th>OALD7</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
<th>COBUILD5</th>
<th>MED2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) cost</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) hang</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) steam</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) aim</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) pull</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) change</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) charge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) lie</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) stick</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(success rate)</td>
<td>(65%)</td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td>(59%)</td>
<td>(55%)</td>
<td>(74%)</td>
<td>(73%)</td>
<td>(79%)</td>
<td>(66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The success rates show that the participants did not use LDCE5 or other Longman dictionaries better than COBUILD6 or COBUILD5, if OALD7 is excluded for lack of abundant data. If we do not take into account Question (4), for which the COBUILD dictionaries have an obvious advantage mentioned above, the situation will not change drastically, as the success rates with LDCE5, LDCE3, COBUILD6, and COBUILD5 are 66%, 70%, 75%, and 86%, respectively. As we will see in Section 7.7., the COBUILD dictionaries are the least popular of all the dictionaries except the fourth edition of Oxford Dictionary of Business and Management (abbreviated as ODBM4) (2006) used in Part 4. Apart from the results of Part 4, the COBUILD dictionaries are frequently criticized for its long definitions due to the full-sentence definition style,7) and its non-arrangement of senses according to part-of-speech. Thus, one might find the value of Part 2 in the fact that it suggests the possibility of revaluating the COBUILD dictionaries in light of the result that it is more difficult to scan the long entries in LDCE5 and other Longman dictionaries than in the COBUILD dictionaries in order to find either idioms such as “at any cost” and “blow off steam” or phrasal verbs such as “pull through” and “stick together.”
Another point to note about the COBUILD dictionaries is that the participants' answers to the researcher's question "Did you read and make use of this column [i.e., the Extra Column in COBUILD5]?" were found to be incompatible with what Masuda et al. (2008: 55) observe: "as a result of the deletion of the Extra Column, which is counted as one of the most remarkable changes between the two editions [i.e., COBUILD5 and Collins COBUILD Advanced Dictionary of American English (abbreviated as COBAm) (2007)], it [has become] very difficult to search phrases and phrasal verbs in COBAm." However, only one (in Group T) out of 42 answered affirmatively to the above-mentioned question.8)

7.6. Results of Part 3: Comparison task within LDCES59)

A total of 68 participants, including 48 in Category Intv (2 in Group E, 6 in Group T, 15 in Group M, 19 in Group A, and 6 in Group N) and 20 in Category Cl (all in Group N) evaluated the usefulness of the eleven features and ranked them in order of importance. If a participant ranked a particular feature most highly, we replaced the evaluation with 11 points. Likewise, the second highest evaluation has been replaced with 10 points, and the lowest evaluation with 1. Table 7.8 shows the total points assigned to each feature, its rank among the eleven, the number of participants who regarded the feature as necessary in their own dictionary, and its rank among these. The 8 English teachers in Groups E and T were asked to evaluate the features from the pedagogical viewpoint (i.e., what features they would like their students to refer to).
Table 7.8 Evaluation of the usefulness of the eleven features by all the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Rank</th>
<th>No. of those who regard the feature as necessary Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>461 6 61 3</td>
<td>(1) grammatical note with a warning sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499 3 59 5</td>
<td>(2) signpost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636 1 66 1</td>
<td>(3) part-of-speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359 7 40 8</td>
<td>(4) frequency labels S1–S3 and W1–W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 10 29 10</td>
<td>(5) label AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479 5 55 6</td>
<td>(6) phonetic symbols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199 11 22 11</td>
<td>(7) geographical labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283 9 35 9</td>
<td>(8) pictures and pictorial illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521 2 60 4</td>
<td>(9) grammar codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 8 42 7</td>
<td>(10) register and subject labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484 4 64 2</td>
<td>(11) synonym and antonym</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that the six features, “part-of-speech,” “grammar code,” “synonym and antonym headed by the labels |SYN| and |OPP|, respectively,” “signpost,” “phonetic symbols,” and “grammatical note with a warning sign” were ranked from the first to the sixth both in the total points and the number of those who regard the feature as being necessary in a learner’s dictionary. From this, we could infer that many participants were grammar-, meaning-, and text-oriented, rather than function-, or picture-oriented with respect to dictionaries. They also showed the tendency to prefer traditional features, the ones that we expect to find in most learner’s dictionaries such as “part-of-speech,” “grammar code,” “phonetic symbols.” New features like “frequency labels S1–S3 and W1–W3” and “label AC” proved to be less popular than the traditional ones, with the sole exception of “synonyms and antonyms headed by the labels |SYN| and |OPP|.” We will see in Section 7.7 how the participants evaluated the antonyms headed by the label |OPP| in the actual dictionary entries (for more information on the indication of synonyms and antonyms, readers are also referred to Section 5.5.).
To see the discrepancy between groups, the column for “points” and another column for its “rank” presented in Table 7.8 will be broken down into three columns, each representing the “points” and “rank” for Groups E and T, Group M, and Groups A and N in Table 7.9.

Table 7.9 Breakdown: evaluation by participants in Groups E and T, Group M, and Groups A and N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>feature \ group</th>
<th>Groups E and T</th>
<th>Group M</th>
<th>Groups A and N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>points</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) grammatical note with a warning sign</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) signpost</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) part-of-speech</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) frequency labels</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) label AC</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) phonetic symbols</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) geographical labels</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) pictures and pictorial illustrations</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) grammar codes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) register and subject labels</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) synonym and antonym</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A clear discrepancy in the rank is found at “signpost,” “phonetic symbols,” “register and subject labels,” and “synonym and antonym headed by the labels [SYN] and [OPP], respectively.” The participants in Group E, T, and M regard “phonetic symbols” more highly than the other groups. This is presumably because those in Groups A and N, owing to their low proficiency in English, have difficulty reading the phonetic symbols and tend to resort to the recorded sounds on a handheld electronic dictionary. The results of Questions (5) and (6) of the questionnaire support this fact (see Section 7.4.).

Conversely, “signpost” is a feature that participants with lower proficiency levels tend to prefer. One might assume that their preference may depend not so much on their proficiency as on their actual
look-ups of dictionary entries where the signposts guided them to the information they were looking for. However, if we compare the results provided by 17 participants who underwent Part 3 before Part 2 and 26 who answered Part 3 after Part 2, we find only a slight difference in their evaluation of the signpost, with the latter higher in average points by 0.1 points. A conclusive argument would only be drawn from a grand-scale survey.

Three features, (5), (7), (8) proved to be unpopular with any of the groups. Judging from their comments, the participants do not seem to have been attracted by the geographical labels or the label AC, or found their usability. According to the partial results of an on-going user study, pictorial illustrations in LDCE5 were ranked higher, largely because of their location being next to the entry, than those in LAAD2, OALD7, and MED2. Taking into consideration the results of both of these studies and the fact that pictorial illustrations take up far more space than the ten verbal features dealt with in Part 3, we might as well say that learners need pictorial illustrations in EFL dictionaries less than the compilers have expected.

7.7. Results of Part 4: Comparison task between dictionaries

User studies such as US-LAAD1, US-LDCE4, US-OALD7, and US-BEDs include this type of task, and Part 4 of the present study is virtually the same as the comparison task in US-BEDs, although different sets of dictionaries are compared here. A total of 39 participants gave opinions on the entries on all or some task sheets, including at least Task sheets (1) and (2). The results are illustrated in Tables 7.10 and 7.11. Table 7.10 presents the number of participants who judged each dictionary entry as the best before the slash, and that of participants who judged it as the worst after the slash. The same format applies to Table 7.11, which is a breakdown of Table 7.10, presenting the number of participants in each group.
Table 7.10  Participants who judged each dictionary as the best/worst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>target word</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>LBED</th>
<th>OALD7</th>
<th>OBED</th>
<th>ODBM4</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
<th>MED2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) flagship (n=44)</td>
<td>20/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) high-profile (n=44)</td>
<td>6/22</td>
<td>27/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) liquidation (n=43)</td>
<td>33/2</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) glitch (n=40)</td>
<td>7/19</td>
<td>25/0</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) volatile (n=41)</td>
<td>12/15</td>
<td>10/15</td>
<td>19/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) disclosure (n=42)</td>
<td>19/9</td>
<td>16/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table that corresponds to Table 7.10 above, Kanazashi (2008: 46) concludes that we gather the general tendency that OBED is more popular than LBED, and that ODBM4, which is not an EFL dictionary but a specialized dictionary for English speakers, is disliked by most participants. The results tabulated in Table 7.10 seem to support the conclusion, although there is no task sheet in this study in which the participants compare the entries in LBED and OBED. Let us now take a closer look at each item.

Concerning Task sheet (1), only the entry in MED2 was severely criticized for its short definition and scarcity of information. Other dictionaries were generally welcomed.

Among the three dictionaries that the participants compared on Task sheet (2), only OBED was regarded by many as favourable, principally because it is the only dictionary to give more than one example. Of the two dictionaries that many participants regarded as unfavourable, COBUILD6 was criticized mainly for its full-sentence definition (by 10) and example (by 9), and 5 wrote more specifically. They specifically wrote that “the definition is not substitutable for the headword in context,” “the headword in the definition is not necessary,” “the inclusion of a personal name in the example is not suitable,” “the information in the example that many paid attention to Mr. Arafat is outmoded,” and “the word reception in the example is hard to understand.” LDCE5 was criticized for its definition (by 15), but 9 gave other specific reasons, 4 of whom cast doubt on the validity or usefulness of the inclusion of “usually deliberately” in its definition, and 5, of the
insertion of the antonym “\textbf{OPP} low profile” between its definition and example.

From the results of Task sheets (3) and (6), it is clear that the entries in \textit{ODBMAy}, which is aimed at native English speakers, are not learner-friendly in that they include difficult words but no example.

\textit{OBED} outperformed \textit{LDCE5} and \textit{COBUILD6} again on Task sheet (4), mainly for “the placement of the key word \textit{problem} near the beginning of the definition,” “the inclusion of the word successfully in its definition,” and “its use of a full-sentence definition,” all voiced by participants in Group M. On the other hand, the definition in \textit{LDCE5} was severely criticized for its over-specification. Its definition “a small fault in a machine or piece of equipment, that stops it working” does not apply to the usage of the word in the context of the newspaper article “We had a slow start and there were some marketing glitches in the early days.” All the 7 participants in Groups E and T evaluated \textit{LDCE5}’s entry as the worst, and 7 participants (both in Group E, 2 in Group T, 1 in Group M, and 2 in Group A) pointed out this particular problem in their own words. \textit{COBUILD6}’s use of a full-sentence definition seems to have cancelled off its merit of having a full-sentence example. Only those who answered in the questionnaire that they used one of the COBUILD dictionaries clearly voiced their preference for a full-sentence definition.

Concerning Task sheet (5), \textit{OBED} was praised for its example (by 14), as well as for its definition (by 10), particularly for the paraphrase in brackets in its example:

\textit{Food prices are highly volatile (= they rise or fall very suddenly).}

On the other hand, \textit{OALD7} was criticized more frequently for its scarcity of information (by 7) than its definition (by 3) and example (by 4), whereas \textit{LDCE5} was criticized for its full-sentence definition (by 8), for its example (by 6). However, only 1 expressed his dislike for the insertion of the antonym “\textbf{OPP} stable” between its definition and example.

As is the case with Part 3, it would be of great interest to analyse the differences between groups. The breakdown of the results shown in Table 7.10 is presented in Table 7.11, wherein the figures that display
a striking contrast between Group A and N and the other groups are underlined.

Table 7.11 Breakdown: participants in each group who judged each dictionary as the best/worst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target word</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>LDCE5</th>
<th>LBED</th>
<th>OALD7</th>
<th>OBED</th>
<th>ODBM4</th>
<th>COBUILD6</th>
<th>MED2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) flagship</td>
<td>E and T</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>2/9</td>
<td>0/8</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>6/4</td>
<td>7/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A and N</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>7/1</td>
<td>5/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) high-profile</td>
<td>E and T</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>5/0</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>8/3</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A and N</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>14/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) liquidation</td>
<td>E and T</td>
<td>5/0</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11/2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A and N</td>
<td>17/0</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) glitch</td>
<td>E and T</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>8/0</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A and N</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>14/0</td>
<td>1/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) volatile</td>
<td>E and T</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>5/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A and N</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>8/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) disclosure</td>
<td>E and T</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6/2</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A and N</td>
<td>12/4</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of US-BEDs have convinced us “that the participants in Group J [students at universities in Japan who are not advanced in English] tend to regard too long entries as bad, while those in Groups E [English speakers] and R [residents of England] tend to regard short entries as insufficient” (Kanazashi 2008: 47). In the present study, however, this holds true only for glitch and disclosure, where a lengthy definition or explanation was welcomed mainly by those in Groups E and T. On the contrary, MED2's short definition of flagship and ODBM4's lengthy explanation of liquidation were disliked by participants in all groups.
Apart from the questions on the task sheets, the researcher asked 24 participants to orally respond to two additional questions. The first concerns the insertion of [OPP] between the definition and example under the entries in LDCE5 on Task sheets (2) and (5). At first sight, this may appear disconcerting, since the user has to first read the definition of high-profile, then its antonym low profile [sic.], and then the example using high-profile again. The other question concerns the single-clause when-definition that appears in the definitions under the entries in LBED on Task sheets (3) and (6). The participants’ answers were summarized as follows. The answers by the participants who highly evaluated each feature are classified as A. The answers by the participants who did not express their preference for the feature, but were not bothered by it either, are marked as B. The answers that clearly expressed the participants’ dislike for or dissatisfaction with the feature are labeled as C. Table 7.12 shows the number of answers in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task sheet and the additional question</th>
<th>category</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) “[OPP] low profile” s.v. high-profile</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) “[OPP] stable” s.v. volatile</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) def. “when a company stops operating . . .” s.v. liquidation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) def. “when a person . . . gives information . . .” s.v. disclosure</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results concerning the definitions in Task sheets (3) and (6) can be analysed in another way. As a revision of Category A, Category A’ includes not only clear expressions of the preference of the when-definition, but also answers by those who regarded the entry in LBED as the best on grounds of its definition being easy to understand. Likewise, Category C’ includes not only answers that clearly expressed the participants’ dislike for or dissatisfaction with the feature, but also the selection of the reason “the definition is difficult to understand” as the reason why they regarded LBED as the worst. The remainder is classified as B’. The number of answers in each of the new categories is
shown in Table 7.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task sheet and the additional question category</th>
<th>A'</th>
<th>B'</th>
<th>C'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) def. “when a company stops operating…” s.v. liquidation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) def. “when a person… gives information…” s.v. disclosure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking into consideration the results concerning the entries on Task sheets (3) and (6) shown in Tables 7.10, 7.11, 7.12, and 7.13, the single-clause *when*-definition in *LBED* seems to be not as enthusiastically welcomed as the traditional, substitutable phrase definitions in *LDCE5*, although not many participants explicitly stated their dislike for it. This, in addition to the reasons mentioned in Section 5.2.4., might be the reason why *LDCE5* does not apply the single-clause *when*-definition as rigourously as *LBED*.\(^{11}\)

(Section 7. by Kanazashi)

8. Conclusion

Our analysis of *LDCE5* in book form has found a few small changes in the following parts: the number of entries, pronunciation, grammar codes and patterns, definitions that are more eye-catching with 52 new entries as the defining vocabulary, and pragmatic descriptions. In contrast, a few more space-consuming but attention-attracting descriptions can be found: examples in collocation boxes as well as Grammar, Collocation, Register and Thesaurus Notes for encoding as well as decoding purposes.

Significant changes or revisions are found in *LDCE5*-DVD. A host of entries are found there, especially encyclopedic ones, but their recorded pronunciation does not always match the transcription. The DVD contains unnumbered examples with or without collocations indicated, but does not live up to the expectation that all the entries illustrated in book form are shown there, and the approach of contrasting or grouping words is not at all exploited.

A user study concerning *LDCE5* and a few competing dictionaries
has revealed that, in regard to definitions, there seems to be ample room for improvement in part of the entries as well as for the long entries where idioms and phrasal verbs are not easy to locate. It also shows that, among eleven features of LDCE5 surveyed, the inconsistently labeled AC (see 2.3.2.), the geographical labels, and pictorial illustrations are unpopular, which should compel the dictionary editors to make them more usable or attractive, or to reconsider ways of presenting the same information.

It has been only six years since the previous edition entered the market. These days British mainstream learners’ dictionaries are revised at intervals of approximately five to six years (but CALD and COBUILD are exceptions). This forces the editors to make clever and utilitarian decisions about which existing descriptions require more elaboration or what new description could be provided for learners. From this point of view, it is quite plausible that LDCE5 aims to be a more production-oriented dictionary; as a consequence, the number of Grammar, Collocation and Thesaurus Notes as well as Register Notes has considerably increased. It is only stated in Common Error Notes that the notes are shown based on Longman Learner’s Corpus. Without the Corpus, it would be quite arbitrary or random to provide the Grammar, Collocation, and Thesaurus Notes in order to avoid the common or unnatural mistakes or the overuse of general descriptive words for production. LDCE5 in book form, as far as the survey is concerned, generally has not made any enormous changes in its revision, but the new key areas of description make us realize that it has gone a step further in approaching a more corpus-based learners’ dictionary for production. At the same time, our analysis makes us keenly aware that more research including user research is required of a dictionary in CD or DVD form. This is because an increasing importance is attached to the format as a convenient storehouse of far more information. We believe there is still room for improvement for the next edition.
NOTES

Section 1
2) To give some examples, his name is listed in the following Longman dictionaries.
   • the third edition of Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture (2005); as the publisher
   • Longman Exam Dictionary (2006); as the publisher
   • the second edition of Longman Essential Activator (2006); as the projects director
   • the second edition of Longman Advanced American Dictionary (2007); as the projects director
   • the fourth edition of Longman Dictionary of American English (2008); as the director
3) According to the introduction, other formats, online and mobile phones, are also available for the new edition. However, on account of limited space, the online and mobile-phone versions of LDCE5 are not covered in this paper.

Section 2
1) For this reason, we treat phrasal verbs as main entries in our comparative analysis in 2.1.2. below.
2) Of these 24 entries, Form 1040 and Form 1099 do not begin with numbers.
3) Note that phrasal verbs are counted as main entries in the table. The number of phrasal verbs in each dictionary is 31 in LAAD2, 36 in LDCE4, 37 in LDCE4v2, and 36 in LDCE5.
4) The following seven entries are not listed in the table for some reason we do not know:
   Abramovich, Roman; Academy; EHIC; Elba; Setanta; Shameless; Shard London Bridge, the
   However, it is obvious that these entries are to be also categorized as cultural or encyclopedic.
5) It should be noted here that some deliberate treatment is made in order to get rid of unnecessary complexity of the analysis, and in the following cases, for example, entries are considered identical:
   a) with or without “the”
      • Eiffel Tower, the (LDCE5) and Eiffel Tower (LDCE4v2)
   b) British spelling or American spelling
      • accoutrements (LDCE5) and accouterments (LAAD2)
   c) different indexing
      • above² (LDCE5) and above³ / above⁴ (LAAD2)
- marquee (LDCE5) and **marquee**¹ / **marquee**² (LAAD2)
  d) other minor differences
- **Eisenstein, Sergei** (LDCE5) and **Eisenstein, Sergei Mikhailovich** (LDCE4v2)
- **Mason-Dixon Line, the** (LDCE5) and **Mason-Dixon line** (LDCE4)
- **set square** (LDCE5) and **setsquare** (LDCE4)


7) *LED*’s Academic Word List is slightly different from APPENDIX A (Headwords² of the Word Families in the Academic Word List) in Coxhead’s 2000 article. The words in *LED* are given the parts of speech: abstract, for example, is divided into as an adjective, a noun and a verb. **Administrate** and **so-called** are given as headwords or parent words in Coxhead’s list but not in *LED*, while commodity is not treated as a parent word in *LED*. **Criteria** and **utilise** in the article are changed to the singular criterion (not treated as a parent word) and a variant utilize in *LED*.

8) Kosem and Krishnamurthy (2007) points out several problems related to AWL in *LED*. First, words among the 2,000 most frequent words in the General Service List are excluded and are not labeled **AC**, but many of the GSL words, like say, argue and note, have special meanings in academic English. Second, the AWL identifies only words, not senses, and therefore, polysemous words lack information on which senses or uses of the word are academic. Third, the AWL is based on a rather small corpus. They also claim that *LED* offers few examples that are recognisable from academic texts.

9) Ten of the seventeen entries, academy, adapt, commit, community, discrimination, edit, issue¹, licence, logic and trend, are what Coxhead calls “parent words.” Most of the entries are labeled **AC** in *LED* and *LAAD2*, but adapt, edit and issue¹ are only labeled in the latter, while founding and licence only in the former. It is not clear why the number of **AC** entries differs between *LED*, *LAAD2* and *LDCE5*.

10) The guided tour in the DVD includes the AWL, but its list again does not include all the highlighted entries in *LED* or those in its PDF: Lacking in the list are the following entries of adapt, benefit (n), channel (v), derivative (adj), edit, financial, injury, intelligent, issue (n), job, method, style (v), task (n), team (n), text, tradition, and trend. Who would know there is such a disagreement between the two? Inconsistent descriptions cause the dictionary to be unreliable.

11) Only analyze is labeled in *LED* and *LAAD2*. Approachable, distributor, and significance are labeled in the latter, while unapproachable is labeled in the former. The same defect in the footnote nine above applies here.
Section 3

1) The American pronunciation of finance, transcribed as /fə'næns/ in the printed edition, is transcribed as /fi'næns/ in LDCE5-DVD.

2) Oddly, sure is still given as a keyword for /oə/ in the Pronunciation table inside the front cover.

3) The transcriptions for finance in LDCE4-CD and LDCE5-DVD are strictly different because /ə/ in LDCE4-CD has been replaced with /a/ in LDCE5-DVD. This difference is not reflected in Table 3.1, since it is not relevant to judge whether the recorded pronunciations correspond to the first variants in the transcription.

4) Both LPD3 and EPD17 (see 3.2.6.) show /'lastrətɪv/ as the first variant in American pronunciation.

5) LDCE4 calls such words "encyclopedic words," whereas LDCE5-DVD lists them under the tab labeled "CULTURE."

6) Biblical names or those appearing in Greek and Roman myths have not been included even though they are of foreign origin.

7) The total sum is more than 100, since some are counted twice as mentioned above.

8) According to the user's guide to LDCE5 issued by Kirihara Shoten (2009: 28), the only way to arrive at the word psychic using "Pronunciation search" is to input [saik*] [sic] and click on the "search" tab, being very careful not to input any more sounds because inputting the whole sequence of sounds [saikik] [sic] would not generate any results. This strange explanation provides good evidence to support our claim, because even the person who wrote it did not have enough knowledge of phonetics to see that psychic is pronounced as /saikik/, not /saikik/.

Section 4

1) Let us point out two things, both related to grammar codes/patterns and (in)transitive verbs.

   Firstly, the list of grammar codes (p. ii) does not include passive-related codes for transitive verbs. Still, there are cases where such codes are employed in the dictionary: e.g., [T usually passive] for cost (sense 4) and [usually in passive (underline supplied by the reviewer)] for price (sense 1). Note, however, that such passive-related codes as [no passive] are not used even for the verbs like lack, unlike OALD.

   Secondly, some may question how the dictionary gives the pattern [+ that] to the verb joke while it treats the word as intransitive. MED, as well as LDCE4, treats the word in the same way.

   2) This grammatical note can be advice against the substandard use of "what" (= that, which, who), but here LDCE5 misleads the user to think (wrongly) that "what" is not a relative pronoun at all.

   3) One example sentence for clam (noun) available only on the DVD-ROM is "This shirt cost me fifty clams." "Clam" in this sentence means "dollar," a sense not listed in the dictionary. The same happens on LDCE4-CD.

   4) Sometimes, there are "extended" versions: sb answering a description; put your feelings into words; a court hears the case. Some may wonder if settle sth out of court fits comfortably into this category.

   5) In the collocation box for the entry tide, in the category [ADJECTIVES], there are
collocations the tide is in and the tide is out. This may be a minor quibble, but “in” and “out” should be described here as adverbs, not adjectives, as the dictionary itself says in the entry in\(^2\) (adverb, sense 10) “when the TIDE is in, the sea by the shore is at its high level \textbf{OPP} out,” along with the example “The tide was in, and the sea lapped against the harbour wall.” The same goes with out\(^1\) (adverb, sense 30). In a strict sense, therefore, these collocations should not belong here. Still, pedagogically speaking, giving more information about collocations may be much more important than being more grammatically correct.

6) \textit{LDCE5} claims on the back cover that the DVD-ROM contains 147,000 collocations, as opposed to 65,000 for the book.

7) On \textit{LDCE5-DVD} sense has four collocation boxes, three more than in the book.

8) This word and others, including \textit{attention}, \textit{connection}, \textit{exclusive}, \textit{foot}, and \textit{inspiration}, have collocation boxes in \textit{LDCE4} that reappear on \textit{LDCE5-DVD}, but some words, such as \textit{different}, did not make it back into \textit{LDCE5} in either the book or the DVD format.

9) We have a similar case in point, for example, at \textit{manufacture}\(^1\) (verb) and \textit{manufacture}\(^2\) (noun), the verb and noun sharing the same collocations coming from other entries in the dictionary.

10) Pragmatic information roughly equivalent to that in \textit{LDCE5} is also shown in the other advanced learners' dictionaries. \textit{MED1} and 2 provide “Ways of expressing . . .,” \textit{COBUILD6} “Brief Speaker’s Handbook,” and \textit{CALD3} “Let’s Talk: Conversation.” \textit{OALD7} shows such information in a few entries: \textit{of course} in the entry \textit{course}, for example. The table below shows whether the corresponding information in \textit{LDCE5} is provided in the others except in \textit{OALD7}: The check mark indicates that such information is shown in some way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\textit{LDCE5}</th>
<th>\textit{MED2}</th>
<th>\textit{COBUILD6}</th>
<th>\textit{CALD3}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreeing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologizing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hello</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodbye</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) The DVD is far more useful and instructive because pragmatic information could be exemplified in longer conversation examples or dialogues. It is not, however, always the case: For example, the entry of \textit{thank you} simply demonstrates that the set phrase is shown as a simple response to expressions of gratitude, so that dictionary users will be quite likely to think that that is all and nothing more is necessary. But the expression is usually followed by another expression or other expressions in social contexts, without which the speaker takes the risk of being considered to be fairly blunt or rude. For such
longer instructive dialogue, the DVD should play its key role.

12) Note that this type of information on formality is already shown in *Chambers Universal Learners’ Dictionary* (1980) with regard to the label *formal*: “Some words which are not particularly formal but which have a less formal, more commonly used equivalent have been labeled *more formal than*, eg *acquire* is labeled *(more formal than get)*; *regret* is labeled *(more formal than be sorry).* Similarly some words have been labeled *(less formal than)*, eg *phone* *(less formal than telephone)*” (p. xii).

Section 5

1) The following are the changes in the A section (*A*-account). The modified senses are: the third sense for *ABC*, the addition of the label “old use” to the definition for *abed*, the definition for *abide*, the sixth sense for *accept*, the second sense for *accident*, and the definition for *accident and emergency*. The newly added senses are: the definition for *Agrav* (a newly added entry item), the fourth sense for *ABC*, the definition for *abduction* (a newly added entry item), the definition for *ablative* (a newly added entry item), the eighth sense for *about1*, the definition for *ABTA* (a newly added entry item), the fifth sense for *academy*, the definition for *acaiberry* (a newly added entry item), the definition for *ACAS* (a newly added entry item), and the definition for *accelerant* (a newly added entry item).

The following are the changes in the E section (*edgy-embroider*). The modified senses are: the addition of the label “informal” to the definition for *effing*, the addition of the label “literary” to the definition for *efflorescence*, and the addition of the article “an” to the definition for *EKG*. The newly added senses are: the definition for *El Dorado* (*Eldorado*) (a newly added entry item), the definition for *electromagnetic* (a newly added entry item), the fourth sense for *elementary*, the second sense for *elephant*, and the definition for *Elysium* (a newly added entry item).

The following are the changes in the M section (*manic depression-Mason jar*). The newly added senses are: the definition for *many*, the definition for *the Marie Celeste* (a newly added entry item), the twelfth sense for *mark1*, the definition for *Mary Poppins* (a newly added entry item), the first sense for *mashed*, and the definition for *mash-up* (a newly added entry item).

The following are the changes in the S section (*set*-shave). The modified senses are: the change in the signpost for the fourth sense for *set*, and the shortened definition for *sex sth ↔ up*. The newly added senses are: the definition for *shagpile* (a newly added entry item), the definition for *shalwar kameez* (a newly added entry item), the definition for *Shangri-La* (a newly added entry item), and the third sense for *shatter*.

2) The corresponding information on synonymous expressions is also shown in the other learners’ dictionaries: *COBUILD6* makes reference to Thesaurus, *MED1* and *MED2* as well as *CALD3* shows “Other ways of expressions,” and *OALD7* lists related words and phrases in the Usage Notes of Synonyms and Vocabulary building.

3) A simple comparison of the number between *LDCE4* and *LDCE5* does not necessarily make sense because synonym descriptions in the former are shown in more than one in the latter, as is mentioned below.

4) The number in *LDCE4* is based on Ichikawa *et al.* (2005: 9.2. and 9.3.)

5) *LDCE5* makes a brief mention with reference to Common Error Notes (p. xii) of
the Longman Learner’s Corpus of 10 million words (a database of over 10 million words of English written by students from around the world), which remains the same as the database in *LDCE4* (cf. the Longman Corpus Network of 390 million words in *LDCE5* in comparison with 300 million in *LDCE4*). The corpus seems to have undergone little change in the last ten years because Rundell (1999: 47) mentions the same size of the corpus.

6) One inconsistent advantage of *LDCE5-DVD* that includes no cross reference to [THESAURUS] is that some entries in the Thesaurus Note contain the same description, so that users can refer to the notes on the spot: The DVD makes it possible to contain the same note not only in *nice* but also in *pleasant, engaging, likeable* and *good-natured*, for example. No Thesaurus Note, however, is found in *sweet, charming, great* and *lovely*. The same goes for the key word *beautiful*: No note is to be found for *attractive, pretty, stunning* and *lovely*, which makes us doubt the criterion of including the Thesaurus Note in the entry.

Section 6

1) Approximately 38% of the entries (122) with illustrations attached in *LDCE3* are found among the defining vocabulary. They are considered instructive because they usually show more than one illustration for distinguishing or expanding related vocabulary (cf. Heuberger 2000: 39 on *LDCE3*).

2) A survey reveals that illustrations are shown in 1,206 entries in the DVD and that the same illustrations, which amount to 482, are shown in 189 entries. The result is that 1,499 illustrations are found in the DVD. This number corresponds with that of *LDCE4* despite the DVD’s statement that it contains “over 1,500 pictures.”

3) Footnote two in this section makes it clear that, when all the same illustrations are counted as one, the total number in the DVD (1,206) is less than four times larger than that in the book (322). The count in book form, however, is based on the number of entries, not on that of all the illustrations.

Section 7

1) The figures exclude the participant’s answer who said he never referred to a dictionary to check pronunciation.

2) Note that the mean values indicated in Tables 7.1 and 7.2 are merely arithmetic averages calculated from the graded frequencies—and not means in the strict sense of the word—because the differences between consecutive numbers are not equal.

3) The percentage at the bottom of each column represents the success rate, although the figures immediately before the percentage indicate the number of those who gave the wrong answer.

4) If any figure is provided in a cell except the “Total” cell at the bottom, the total number of participants is always six.

5) It is not totally meaningless to take into account the answers by those who had given the correct answer before referring to the dictionary, since some of them were misled by the dictionary and gave the wrong answer later.

6) If any figure is provided in a cell except the “Total” cell at the bottom, the total number of participants is 17, if underlined, and 16, if not.
7) Rundell (2008: 200) lists "length," "overspecification," and "new conventions for old" as potential disadvantages with the full-sentence definition.

8) In response to Kanazashi’s oral presentation on this issue at the JACET Dictionary Research Group Workshop in March, 2010, James Ronald pointed out that the non-use of the Extra Column in COBUILD5 by the Japanese participants would be attributed to lack of proper instruction in Japan in the use of EFL dictionaries, which Kanazashi agreed with.

9) This part is different from Part 3: Evaluation task in US-LAAD2 in some respects. First, the information categories evaluated by the participants are different. We mainly deal with the labels and codes within entries, and they are relatively small in size. Notes and articles in separate boxes, which the participants in US-LAAD2 evaluated, is the focus of another on-going user study, whose content is similar to Part 4: Comparison task in US-LAAD2 (Kanazashi et al. 2009: 72). Second, the data provided by the participants in Category Intv are supplemented by those in Category Cl as in Part 2 of the present study.

10) Along the same lines, if we take into consideration the results of the questionnaire that the participants at a higher proficiency level tend to prefer phonetic symbols to recorded sounds, they may also be regarded as being text-oriented rather than sound-oriented.


**DICTIONARIES**


**LAAD2-CD:** Longman Advanced American Dictionary. (a CD-ROM version of LAAD2)


LDCE4-CD: *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. (a CD-ROM version of LDCE4)


LDCE4v2-CD: *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. (a CD-ROM version of LDCE4v2)


LDCE5-DVD: *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. (a DVD-ROM version of LDCE5)


LLA2: *Longman Language Activator*. (in LDCE5-DVD)


OALD7-CD: *Oxford Advanced Learner's Compass* (a CD-ROM version of OALD7).
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Appendix 1

Part 1: a questionnaire

(1) How many years have you studied English?

(2) Please name the English dictionaries that you use most often. Is it a printed or electronic dictionary?

(3) If you use a monolingual English dictionary, please name it. Is it a printed or electronic dictionary?

(4) How often do you use an English dictionary on the following occasions? Please circle one of the following choices that are the closest to the frequency of your dictionary use: <very often, often, sometimes, not usually, never>

- while reading English
- while translating English into your first language
- while writing English
- while translating your first language into English
- while trying to broaden your vocabulary

(5) How often do you use an English dictionary for the following purposes? Please circle one of the frequencies from <very often, often, sometimes, not usually, never>.

- finding synonyms and antonyms
- finding etymology
- finding cultural information
- checking part-of-speech
⑤ looking up meaning
⑥ finding collocations
⑦ checking spelling
⑧ checking whether a word exists
⑨ finding grammatical information
⑩ checking pronunciation

(6) If you check pronunciation, which do you often consult, a printed or electronic dictionary for phonetic symbols, or an electronic dictionary for recorded sound?

Appendix 2
Part 2: a composition task using LDCE5
Suppose you are to explain the situations (1)–(9), using the word in the parentheses. First, fill in the blanks without referring to the dictionary. Then, look up the word in the dictionary specified, and answer again.

(1) どんな犠牲を払っても、その患者の生命を救わなければならない。（cost）
We must save the patient’s life_____________________.

(2) ぐずぐずするな。電車が出てしまうぞ。（hang）
Don’t_____________________ Our train is about to leave.

(3) ストレス発散にギターを弾くことが多い。（steam）
I often play the guitar to_____________________.

(4) この規則の目的は、交通事故を防ぐことだ。（aim）
This regulation_____________________ preventing traffic accidents.

(5) 医者たちは、その患者が生き延びると確信していた。（pull）
The doctors were sure that the patient would_____________________.

(6) ある男子学生が学生服に着替えるのを忘れた。（change）
The student forgot to_____________________his school uniform.

(7) ある男性が現在、窃盗罪に問われている。（charge）
He_____________________theft at present.

(8) 前途にあまりにも多くの困難があることに、われわれは気づいている。（lie）
We are aware that so many problems_____________________.

(9) その 3 人は何があっても団結していようと約束した。（stick）
The three have promised to_____________________ no matter what.

Appendix 3
Part 3: a comparative task within LDCE5
The participants were asked to rank the eleven features of LDCE5 in order of importance, and state which of these features they would like to include in their dictionary if they were to compile one.

(1) the grammatical note headed by a red exclamation mark enclosed in a triangle to warn users against a misuse (s.v. intention and interested)

(2) the signpost (s.v. issue n.)

(3) the indication of the part-of-speech

(4) the frequency labels S1 - S3 and W1 - W3, each in white letters against a red background (s.v. island and issue)

(5) the label AC, in white letters against a red background, attached to the words from
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the Academic Word List (s.v. headwords with the label AC on pp. 932 and 933, such as irreversible and isolate)

(6) the phonetic symbols indicating both British and North American pronunciation (s.v. irresponsible)

(7) the geographical labels BrE, AmE, and AusE (s.v. lift² n.)

(8) pictures (s.v. island) and illustrations (s.v. insect)

(9) grammar codes (the list of grammar codes such as [C], [U], [I], [T] [not in progressive], and [only before noun] on the page before the title, and the actual code [usually before noun] s.v. double' adj.)

(10) the register and subject labels (the labels old-fashioned informal s.v. dotty and low s.v. double indemnity)

(11) the synonym and antonym headed by the labels SYN and OPP, respectively, each in white against a blue background (s.v. intentional)

In the brackets at the end of each item is the indication of the headwords etc. that the researcher showed the participants in case they wished to see what the feature looks like in LDCES.

Appendix 4
Part 4: a comparison task between dictionaries
Newspaper articles
(1) ‘Kurt Geiger makes steps across Europe’, Yorkshire Post, August 21, 2006
(4) ‘HK Disneyland to provide lessons for visitors’, Financial Times, September 5, 2006
(5) ‘The Reit way to invest in property, but will new tax rules swell the bubble?’, The Guardian, August 24, 2006

Task sheets
(1) The British retailer [Kurt Geiger] has entered into an exclusive partnership with the Italian firm [La Rinascente] to operate its shoe business at its flagship store.

★ Do you know the meaning of the underlined word?

[OBED] the most important product, service, building, etc. that an organization owns or produces: They are opening a new flagship store in Madrid. ◊ The software will continue to be our flagship. ☑ a flagship brand/product/store

[MED2] the biggest, most important, or best thing in a group: a flagship store

[LDCE5] the best and most important product, building etc that a company owns or produces: the flagship of the new Ford range | The firm has just opened a flagship store in Las Vegas. | the company’s flagship product

★ The best dictionary _____ The worst dictionary _____

Reasons:
( ) the definition is easy to understand  ( ) the definition is difficult to understand
( ) the definition is short  ( ) the definition is too short
( ) detailed explanation is given  ( ) the explanation is too short
( ) the example is easy to understand  ( ) the example is difficult to understand
( ) it gives the phrase similar to the one in the newspaper article  ( ) the examples are very different from the phrase in the newspaper article
( ) there is enough information  ( ) there is scarcity of information
( ) the entry is short  ( ) the entry is too long
Other reasons? Other reasons?

★ If you did not understand the underlined word before reading the dictionary entries here, can you write the meaning of the word? [The starred questions repeat themselves on each of the six task sheets.]

(2) Queues formed outside the court before the doors opened at 10am yesterday, with more than 2,000 people competing to secure one of 61 seats available to the public in one of Japan’s most high-profile court cases.

[LDCE5] attracting a lot of public attention, usually deliberately [OPP] low profile: a high-profile public figure

[COBUILD6] A high-profile person or a high-profile event attracts a lot of attention or publicity. □ . . . the high-profile reception being given to Mr Arafat.

[OBED] receiving a great deal of attention in the media; well-known: high-profile events such as boxing matches □ high-profile companies

(3) The bank’s initial owner, the Hong Kong-based Peregrine group, went into liquidation in 1998.

[LBED] FINANCE when a company stops operating because it is in financial difficulty and its assets are sold to pay its debts: Creditors have taken steps to force the studio into liquidation. □ No doubt more firms will go into liquidation because they took on too much debt.

[LDCE5] the act of closing a company by selling the things that belong to it, in order to pay its debts: Hundreds of small businesses went into liquidation (= were closed).

[ODBM4] The distribution of a company’s assets among its creditors and members prior to its dissolution. This brings the life of the company to an end. The liquidation may be voluntary or by the court.

(4) “We had a slow start and there were some marketing glitches in the early days.”

[LDCE5] a small fault in a machine or piece of equipment, that stops it working: a software glitch

[OBED] a small problem or fault that stops sth working successfully: Technical glitches delayed the launch of the service.

[COBUILD6] A glitch is a problem which stops something from working properly or being successful. □ Manufacturing glitches have limited the factory's output.
(5) With the stock market proving volatile, a vehicle that shelters investors from paying all but income tax on their property asset gains is likely to prove popular.

[OALD7] (of a situation) likely to change suddenly; easily becoming dangerous: a highly volatile situation from which riots might develop

[OBED] likely to change suddenly in value, state, etc: Food prices are highly volatile (= they rise or fall very suddenly). UK carmakers saw record losses in a volatile market last year.

[LDCE5] a volatile situation is likely to change suddenly and without warning

Disclosure of Airbus’ problems with the A380, the world’s largest passenger jet, forced EADS, the parent company, to issue a £2bn profit warning in June and prompted a steep decline in its share price.

[ODB4] The obligation, in company law, that a company has to disclose all relevant information and results of trading to its shareholders and other interested parties.

The information is normally given in the directors’ report and the annual accounts.

[ADE5] a secret that someone tells people, or the act of telling this secret: the disclosure of private medical information.

[LBED] LAW when a person or organization gives information that would normally be kept secret, for example when a bank gives information about a customer’s accounts to the police: In America ‘shield’ laws allow journalists to protect their sources, with certain exceptions, for example if public interest is better served by disclosure.
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編集後記 長い間、本誌 LEXICON の原稿取りまとめなどの事務を担当していただいた増田秀夫さんに代わって、赤須様さんがその役をこの 40 号から引き継いでくださっています。増田さんに厚くお礼を申し上げます。なお、今回の編集後記は、会長のご意向で臨時に私が受け持つことになった。

今号では LEXICON の看板論文となっているチームによる「辞書分析」2編のほかに、単著の辞書論考が加わっている。今後、このような個別の辞書学上の問題を扱う論究が増えたことを期待したい。
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