The Most Frequent General Words in Nursing Journals

Yadollah Pournia[1*]

[1]*Department of English Language, Faculty of Medicine, Lorestan University of Medical Sciences, Khorramabad, Iran.*

Author's contribution

The sole author designed the study, collected the data, interpreted the results, and prepared the final manuscript.

Article Information

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

Background: General vocabulary is important in language learning. The frequency of general English vocabulary in nursing journals was investigated in the present study.
Materials and Methods: This is the report of the second part of a research on a corpus (collection of texts) of English nursing articles consisting of 2851 full-text and peer-reviewed articles with more than eight million words. The frequency of the general word types (WTs) was investigated, and a list of the most frequent 1000 general English word families (WFs), in two lists of 500, was selected.
Results: A total of 159 WTs covered 50% of all the words in the nursing journals. The two selected lists of 500 WFs covered 73.50% and 9.02% (82.52% in total) of all the words in the nursing journals, respectively
Conclusions: The two 500-WF lists of general English introduced in the present study can help nursing students to comprehend about 82% of all the words in English nursing journals.

1. INTRODUCTION

English is undoubtedly the first international language of academic research and the medium of instruction in countries where English is not spoken as a first language [1]. English is now an instruction medium in university-based nursing educational programs in many countries [2].

_____

Corresponding author: Email: ypournia@yahoo.com;

Limited English proficiency in nursing students can result in various academic and language barriers including difficulty understanding lectures, reading comprehension, taking notes, and academic writing, which impede their success in nursing educational programs [3]. In clinical contexts, competency in English for nursing is essential to protect the public since an inappropriate level of English can potentially threaten safe patient care [4].

Vocabulary plays a major role in language learning. Vocabulary knowledge in language learning is often considered a critical tool for language learners since limited vocabulary impedes successful communication [5]. English language learners with limited English vocabulary are less able to comprehend texts compared to their English-speaking peers [6]. It is generally assumed that vocabulary knowledge is a good predictor of language proficiency, and vocabulary size in English plays a crucial role in the development of the skills of listening, reading, and writing [7]. In addition, vocabulary size can predict speaking ability [8].

The importance of general English has been neglected in learning English since most of the attention has been paid to English for Specific Purposes (ESP) [9], which is the English required for specific fields of study. Proficiency in general English is critical for undergraduate university students since most students fail in English due to their inappropriate level of general English [10]. Most faculty members have considered general English, including general vocabulary, as more important than ESP for non-native speakers in university classes [11]. General English words have constituted a great majority of the words in different texts and articles in different fields of study, including nursing [12-14], medicine [15,16], engineering [17,18], and business [19], among others.

A comprehensive study was conducted on 2851 articles from thirteen high impact factor English nursing journals by the researcher of the present study [20]. Although the study was primarily conducted to extract the most frequent academic words, it showed that the first 3000 English WFs, as general English vocabulary, covered 87.55% of all the words in the nursing journals [20]. The present article is the report of the second part of that major study. Since general vocabulary is important in language learning, the frequency of general English vocabulary in the nursing journals was investigated, and the most frequent

general English WFs were exclusively introduced in the present study.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This is the report of the second part of a research on a corpus of English nursing articles consisting of 2851 articles with more than eight million words [20]. The detailed information about the journals, the articles, the preparation of the corpus, and the software is presented in the first article extracted from the study [20]. The corpus was analyzed in the present article for a completely different purpose using two free text analysis software programs of Range and Frequency [21]. Two different analyses were performed on the corpus. First, the frequency of the most frequent general WTs was investigated using the Frequency software. Second, a list of the most frequent 1000 general English WFs, in two lists of 500, was selected using the Range software. In this step, to make better comparisons between the first 3000 English WFs and to choose the most frequent WFs more easily, they were divided into six lists of 500 WFs arranged from the most frequent to the least frequent. The two 500-WF lists of general English were, in fact, the first two lists with the highest frequency.

In the present study, the definition of a "word family" (WF) is a word and all the derivations and forms which it has [22]. Therefore, the word "nurse" and its derivations and forms including "nursed", "nurses", and "nursing" constitute one WF and four "word types" (WTs). When these four WTs appear 1000 times in a corpus, then we will have one WF, four WTs, and 1000 "tokens" (running words) for the basic word of "nurse".

3. RESULTS

Analyzing the corpus for the most frequent general English WTs showed that a total of only 159 WTs covered 50% of all the words in the nursing journals (Table 1). The results of the frequency of the six lists of 500 WFs arranged from the most frequent to the least frequent are presented in Table 2. According to this table, the first two 500-WF lists covered 73.50% and 9.02% (82.52% in total) of all the words in the nursing journals, respectively (Table 2) (Appendices 1 and 2).

4. DISCUSSION

This research was carried out on a corpus of English nursing articles consisting of 2851

Table 1. The first 159 WTs in the journals

WT	Frequency	Cumulative Percentage	WT	Frequency	Cumulative Percentage	WT	Frequency	Cumulative Percentage
the	447014	5.45	than	14550	38.76	new	8021	45.55
of	294160	9.04	nurse	14305	38.94	her	8001	45.65
and	292811	12.61	when	14219	39.11	years	7986	45.75
to	226164	15.37	use	14214	39.29	found	7968	45.85
in	171435	17.46	time	14172	39.46	being	7941	45.94
a	148226	19.27	clinical	14076	39.63	only	7864	46.04
for	98612	20.48	practice	13846	39.80	would	7794	46.13
with	84083	21.50	treatment	13674	39.97	quality	7792	46.23
that	81665	22.50	used	13537	40.13	e	7739	46.32
is	71904	23.38	students	13512	40.30	physical	7726	46.42
as	60434	24.11	been	13299	40.46	need	7719	46.51
was	52805	24.76	cancer	13112	40.62	many	7653	46.61
or	50873	25.38	such	12492	40.77	what	7645	46.70
were	49891	25.99	data	12353	40.92	into	7443	46.79
be	46054	26.55	but	11336	41.06	both	7396	46.88
are	45073	27.10	between	11171	41.20	first	7354	46.97
on	44187	27.64	because	11169	41.33	although	7309	47.06
this	40444	28.13	studies	10969	41.47	among	7281	47.15
care	40436	28.62	education	10952	41.60	p	7257	47.24
patients	39181	29.10	should	10946	41.73	management	7242	47.32
by	38084	29.57	risk	10804	41.87	disease	7237	47.41
their	36066	30.01	information	10632	42.00	symptoms	7184	47.50
an	33610	30.42	work	10559	42.12	you	7178	47.59
from	32070	30.81	based	10460	42.25	through	7152	47.68
not	31416	31.19	most	10426	42.38	could	7135	47.76
al	30609	31.56	reported	10226	42.50	important	7096	47.85
health	30585	31.94	family	10211	42.63	results	7045	47.93
et	30466	32.31	group	10042	42.75	significant	7016	48.02
have	28566	32.66	during	9910	42.87	process	6945	48.11
s	28432	33.00	support	9836	42.99	do	6789	48.19
nurses	28283	33.35	after	9730	43.11	high	6772	48.27

WT	Frequency	Cumulative Percentage	WT	Frequency	Cumulative Percentage	WT	Frequency	Cumulative Percentage
study	26958	33.68	those	9720	43.23	healthcare	6765	48.35
nursing	26458	34.00	if	9452	43.34	included	6709	48.43
patient	26369	34.32	related	9431	43.46	level	6707	48.52
at	25694	34.64	each	9415	43.57	factors	6670	48.60
they	24001	34.93	staff	9096	43.69	them	6664	48.68
it	23794	35.22	program	9034	43.80	learning	6583	48.76
may	22261	35.49	well	8991	43.91	provide	6580	48.84
can	20965	35.75	women	8922	44.01	medical	6509	48.92
more	19983	35.99	some	8831	44.12	role	6497	49.00
who	19699	36.23	will	8735	44.23	associated	6446	49.08
these	18492	36.46	however	8683	44.33	needs	6444	49.16
i	17748	36.67	no	8651	44.44	within	6400	49.23
one	17502	36.89	older	8562	44.54	hospital	6375	49.31
also	16562	37.09	experience	8542	44.65	analysis	6353	49.39
participants	16032	37.28	self	8540	44.75	she	6353	49.47
about	15758	37.48	two	8488	44.86	outcomes	6347	49.54
had	15609	37.67	using	8479	44.96	including	6321	49.62
other	15416	37.85	how	8203	45.06	members	6249	49.70
research	15103	38.04	there	8171	45.16	pain	6207	49.77
has	15091	38.22	we	8159	45.26	did	6181	49.85
all	15042	38.41	life	8127	45.36	social	6153	49.92
which	14833	38.59	knowledge	8072	45.46	often	6092	**50.00**

Table 2. Frequency of the six 500-WF lists in the journals

500-WF lists	Tokens (%)	WTs (%)	WFs
1st 500	6024,573 (73.50)	3005 (3.66)	500
2nd 500	738,975 (9.02)	2720 (3.31)	500
3rd 500	266,254 (3.25)	2342 (2.85)	500
4th 500	102,782 (1.25)	2171 (2.64)	500
5th 500	35,778 (0.44)	1803 (2.19)	500
6th 500	8180 (0.10)	1261 (1.54)	490
Not in the lists	1020,411 (12.45)	68,843 (83.81)	????

articles with more than eight million words [20]. The results showed that a total of only 159 WTs covered 50% of all the words in the nursing journals, and only five WTs of "al", "e", "et", "healthcare", and "p" were outside the first 3000 English WFs (Table 1). "Et" and "al" are the two sections of the expression "et al" meaning "and others", which is common in articles, "e" and "p" are two alphabet letters, and "healthcare" is a compound word combined of "health" and "care" which both exist in the 3000 WFs of English.

Most of the words in Table 1 are the function words, which are the words related to the grammar not to the meaning of the sentence, including articles (the, a, an), prepositions (of, to, in, for, for, with, etc.), pronouns (that, this, they, it, etc.), auxiliary verbs (is, was, were, be, are, etc.), and conjunctions (and, or, but, if, etc.). This result is consistent with the results of the studies conducted by Nor Mohamad and Jin [13] and Budgell et al. [14] which reported the function words as the most frequent words in nursing textbooks and journals, respectively. This result is indicative of the importance of the function words, as the most frequent general words in English.

The words "she", "her", and "women" were, but the words "he", "his", "him", "man" and "men" were not among the first 159 WTs (Table 1), and this is in line with Budgell et al.'s study [14] which reported female words to be more frequent than their male equivalents in musing journals. This result may suggest a kind of gender bias in nursing vocabulary.

In the present study, the most frequent content words, which are words carrying a particular meaning, were "care", "patients", "health", "nurses", "study", "nursing", and "patient" (Table 1), being consistent with the results of Nor Mohammad and Jin, reporting "patients", "patient", "care", and "health" [13], Budgell et al., reporting "nurse", "patient", and "care" [14], and

Muhammad et al., reporting "patient", "care", "study", "health", and "nurses" [23] as the most frequent content words in nursing textbooks and journals. The high frequency of these words implicitly signifies the important role of nurses and the nursing profession in patient care and health.

The results showed that the six 500-WF lists of general English covered approximately 87% of all the words in the nursing articles (Table 2). This result is consistent with the coverage of 70.68% in medicine [15], 88.63% in engineering [18], and 88.47% in business texts [19], highlighting the importance and the high coverage of the first 3000 general English WFs. The results of the frequency of the six 500-WF lists showed that the first and the second lists covered 73.50% and 9.02% (82.52% in total) of all the words in the nursing journals, respectively (Table 2) (Appendices 1 and 2). This result suggests that all the first 3000 English WFs do not have high frequency since approximately 82 out of every 100 words in the nursing journals belonged to the first two 500 WFs. The sixth 500 WFs covered only 0.10% of all the words in the nursing journals, and the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth 500-WF lists, consisting of 2000 WFs altogether, covered only 5.04% of all the words in the nursing corpus (Table 2). This result highlights the importance of the first two 500-WF lists introduced in this study presented in Appendices 1 and 2.

5. CONCLUSION

Learning general words is important in learning English. The two 500-WF lists of general English introduced in the present study with a coverage of 82.52% and the academic word list as well as other words with limited meaning loads presented in the first article extracted from this research (20) can help nursing students to comprehend more than 91% of all the words in English nursing journals.

CONSENT

Not applicable.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

COMPETING INTERESTS

Author has declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Flowerdew J. English for specific academic purposes (ESAP) writing: Making the case. Writing & Pedagogy. 2016;8(1):5-32.
   DOI: 10.1558/wap.v8i1.30051
2. Suliman WA, Tadros A. Nursing students coping with English as a foreign language medium of instruction. Nurse Educ Today. 2011;31(4):402-7.
   DOI: 10.1016/j.nedt.2010.07.014
3. Starkey TJ. The critical factors that influence faculty attitudes and perceptions of teaching English as Second Language nursing students: A grounded theory research study. Nurse Educ Today. 2015;35(5):718-25.
   DOI: 10.1016/j.nedt.2015.01.017
4. Glew PJ. Embedding international benchmarks of proficiency in English in undergraduate nursing programmes: challenges and strategies in equipping culturally and linguistically diverse students with English as an additional language for nursing in Australia. Collegian 2013;20(2):101-8.
   Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colegn.2012.04.002
5. Alqahtani M. The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. International Journal of Teaching and Education 2015;3(3):21-34.
   Available:http://dx.doi.org/10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002
6. August D, Carlo M, Dressler C, Snow C. The critical role of vocabulary development for English language learners. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice.2005; 20(1):50-7.
   DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-5826.2005.00120.x
7. Stæhr LS. Vocabulary size and the skills of listening, reading and writing. Language Learning Journal 2008:36(2):139-52.
   Available:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571730802389975
8. Uchihara T, Clenton J. Investigating the role of vocabulary size in second language speaking ability. Language Teaching Research 2018;1-17.
   Available:https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362168818799371
9. Seedhouse P. Needs analysis and the General English classroom. ELT Journal. 1995;49(1):59-65.
   Available:https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.1.59
10. Babu AR. The school of English decadence: a study on progress of general English at undergraduate level in Satavahana university, Karimnagar. Journal of English Language and Literature (JOELL). 2015:2(2):185-9.
11. Johns AM. Necessary English: A faculty survey. TESOL Quarterly 1981;15(1):51-7.
    Available: https://doi.org/10.2307/3586373
12. Yang MN. A nursing academic word list. Engl Specif Purp 2015;37: 27-38.
    Available:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.05.003
13. Nor Mohamad AF, Jin NY. Corpus-based studies on nursing textbooks. Advances in Language and Literary Studies. 2013;4 (2):21-8.
14. Budgell B, Miyazaki M, O'Brien M, Perkins R, Tanaka Y. Developing a corpus of the nursing literature: A pilot study. Japan J Nurs Sci 2007;4:21-5.
    Available: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-7924.2007.00071.x
15. Hsu W. Bridging the vocabulary gap for EFL medical undergraduates: The establishment of a medical word list. Language Teaching Research 2013;17(4):454-84.
    Available:https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813494121
16. Lei L, Liu D. A new medical academic word list: A corpus-based study with enhanced

methodology. Journal of English for Academic Purposes 2016;22:42-53.
Available:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.01.008

17. Todd RW. An opaque engineering word list: Which words should a teacher focus on?. Engl Specif Purp. 2017;45:31-9.
Available:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.08.003

18. Hsu W. Measuring the vocabulary load of engineering textbooks for EFL undergraduates. Engl Specif Purp 2014;33:54-65.
Available:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2013.07.001

19. Hsu W. The vocabulary thresholds of business textbooks and business research articles for EFL learners. Engl Specif Purp. 2011;30:247-57.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.04.005

20. Pournia Y. A study on the most frequent academic words in high impact factor English nursing journals: A corpus-based study. Iranian J Nursing Midwifery Res 2019;24:11-7.
DOI: 10.4103/ijnmr.IJNMR_190_17

21. Heatley A, Nation IS, Coxhead A. Range and Frequency Programs; 2002.
Available:http://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/paul⬜nation. [Last accessed on 2014 Sep 10].

22. Nation IS. How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? Can Modern Lang Rev 2006;63:59-82.
Available:http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/cml.2006.0049

23. Muhammad MM, Hamzah SG, Bin Abdullah SK, Jack CS. A study of closure in a nursing textbooks and journals: A corpus based study. International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences 2017;4(2): 96-105.
Available:https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2017.02.017

Appendix 1. The first 500 general English WFs in the nursing journals

The	All	Measure	Could
Be	Develop	Factor	Service
Of	Which	Well	Vary
And	She	Two	Centre
To	Than	Process	Child
A	Program	Person	Question
In	When	Age	Therapy
For	We	New	Limit
That	Family	Lead	Current
With	High	Through	Receive
Nurse	Increase	Help	Function
They	Inform	Able	Safe
Have	Support	However	Effective
As	Cancer	No	Employ
This	Result	Self	Problem
Or	Manage	Adult	Feel
Care	Year	Set	Sample
On	Such	Outcome	Complete
Use	Data	Follow	Control
Patients	Risk	Knowledge	Medical
Study	Level	System	Compare
By	Some	Disease	Consider
Not	Individual	Score	Pain
Health	Active	How	Describe
From	Add	Life	Model
It	Identify	Role	Participate
Patient	But	Behavior	Response
At	Assess	Review	Reduce
I	Change	Physical	Show
Provide	Between	There	Within
Can	Because	Member	Social
May	Make	Rate	Team
Include	Base	Require	Know
Who	Should	Focus	Present
More	Most	Effect	Environment
Work	Improve	Test	Evidence
Do	Day	Evaluate	Organize
Research	Hospital	Quality	Number
Participant	Learn	Would	Continue
Other	Profession	Only	Give
Clinic	Intervene	What	Any
Relate	Associate	Many	Communicate
Need	Significant	Take	Often
Educate	Old	Understand	State
Treat	Staff	Mean	Issue
One	Woman	Three	Plan
Time	During	Into	Prevent
Student	Will	Specific	Method
Practice	After	Both	Decision
Experience	If	Important	Skill
Find	You	First	Population
Also	Symptom	Indicate	Occur
Report	Each	Discuss	Home
Group	He	Although	Train
About	Analyze	Among	Perform

Involve	Great	Impact	Collaborate
Case	Different	Statistic	Even
Think	Available	Then	Unite
Meet	Out	Note	Begin
Critic	Area	Further	Observe
Depress	Faculty	Particular	Per
Strategy	Resource	Before	School
Examine	Scale	Reflect	Where
Value	Occupation	Previous	Engage
Survey	Literature	Special	Better
Unit	Range	Advance	Obtain
People	Address	Tool	Reason
Table	Over	Large	Interest
Injure	Article	Opportunity	Get
Suggest	Design	Demonstrate	Sex
Act	Blood	Total	Overall
Determine	Difficult	Project	Guideline
Item	Hour	Maintain	Five
Term	Sleep	Status	History
Interview	Ask	Point	Dose
Ill	Define	Parent	Theme
Long	Respond	Allow	Facilitate
Approach	Possible	Contribute	Negative
So	Lack	Success	Site
Potential	Several	Fall	Share
Live	Likely	Every	Investigate
Recommend	Standard	Interact	Write
Regard	Assist	Apply	Same
Month	Goal	Disorder	Rely
Common	Another	Body	Guide
Type	Exercise	Monitor	Establish
Less	Benefit	Exist	Multiple
Must	Emotion	Therefore	Category
Community	Early	Perceive	Stage
Survive	Place	Say	Like
Mental	Concept	Low	According
General	Nation	Lower	Satisfaction
See	Stress	Screen	Purpose
Up	Affect	Responsible	Graduate
Cause	Promote	Future	Few
Conduct	Four	Go	Very
Part	Situation	Competent	Characteristic
Drug	Become	Severe	Aware
Primary	Expect	End	Small
Week	Appropriate	Event	Own
Example	Create	Access	Necessary
Teach	States	Content	Deliver
Positive	Challenge	Author	Heart
Difference	Collect	Whether	Facility
Culture	Second	Period	Document
Course	Influence	Form	Ensure
Condition	Prepare	Human	Clear
Reside	Refer	Without	Explain
Way	Stroke	Breast	Initial
Implement	Cost	Pressure	Session
Decrease	While	Offer	Institution
Concern	Similar	Procedure	Disabled

Perception	Record	Due	Complex
Select	Death	Enhance	Department
Explore	Express	Achieve	View
Barrier	Psychiatry	Minute	Prior
Predict	Frequent	Strong	Attitude
Man	Brain	Good	Theory
Direct	Criteria	Figure	Correlate
Initiate	Recognize	Instruct	Final
Represent	Consistent	Agent	Might
Short	Job	Psychology	Component
Loss	Remain	Want	Call
Infect	Trial	Degree	Structure
Visit	Best	Expose	Encourage

Appendix 2. The second 500 general English WFs in the nursing journals

Recent	Full	Return	Accurate
Step	Cope	Class	Size
Young	Integrate	Science	Avoid
Importance	Certain	Play	Back
Progress	Sign	Room	Shift
Face	Least	Start	Schedule
University	Essential	Usual	Attention
Context	Perspective	Strength	Error
Anxiety	Open	List	Majority
Cell	Description	Believe	Answer
Administration	Approximate	Real	Contact
Major	Genetic	Admission	Independent
Instrument	Topic	Approve	Expert
Thus	Average	Either	Mother
Partner	Consent	Past	Actual
Toward	Prefer	Directed	Emergency
Surgery	Six	Rather	Locate
Policy	Various	Late	Especially
Normal	Read	Recruit	Choose
Move	Academy	Respect	Interpret
Order	Complicate	Oral	Material
Weight	Public	Board	Recover
Client	Grow	Appear	Adolescent
Technology	Attend	Publish	Versus
Agree	Implicate	Option	Now
Key	Across	Right	Skin
Task	Aspect	Reveal	Frequency
Accept	Seek	Spirit	Comfort
Adequate	Much	Despite	Keep
Combine	Discharge	Serve	Assign
Poor	Practitioner	Incorporate	Sense
Product	Belief	Non	Since
Protect	Position	Moral	Institute
Intense	Come	Curriculum	Tell
Phase	Depend	Discipline	Summary
Effort	Nature	Transition	Target
Just	Conclusion	Tradition	Estimate
Code	Percent	Post	Subject
Side	Valid	Failure	Pattern

Society	Fact	Ethnic	Spend
Friend	Comment	Device	Edit
Objective	Adapt	Suicide	Equipment
Food	Counsel	Deep	Version
Stay	Variety	Account	Emphasize
Little	Local	Operate	Field
Technique	Detect	Yet	Fit
Confidence	Amount	Contain	Sustain
Easy	Regulate	Trust	Confirm
Motive	React	Doctor	Head
Emerge	Bed	Simple	Register
Peer	Force	Detail	Alone
Connect	Comprehensive	Alcohol	Element
Source	Speak	Length	Bring
Thing	Random	Laboratory	Admit
Smoke	Walk	Regular	Capacity
Medicine	Hold	Male	Undergo
Committee	Language	Try	Volume
Fear	Balance	Serious	Priority
Drive	Telephone	Suffer	Near
Gender	Correct	Commit	Solution
Link	Sensitive	Whereas	Deal
Burden	Under	Produce	Last
Wide	Computer	Hear	Region
Single	Basis	Decline	Off
Aim	Desire	Grade	Personnel
Choice	Finance	Seven	Tissue
Hand	Company	Intent	Consume
Talk	World	Journal	Calculate
Framework	Diet	Die	Alternative
Search	Memory	Encounter	Resist
Adjust	Abuse	Mail	Mechanism
Still	Internal	Respective	Sufficient
Relative	Routine	White	Tend
Female	Consequence	Attribute	Along
Mortal	Via	Reach	Core
Gain	Seem	Propose	Pilot
Once	Basic	Insure	Network
College	Typical	Background	Mobile
Introduce	Consult	Stable	Never
Presence	Moderate	Infant	Violence
Unique	Veteran	Judge	Distribute
Build	Pay	International	Differ
Consist	Immediate	Why	Enter
Hope	Left	Image	Lose
Close	Colleague	Vulnerable	Miss
Line	Leave	Section	Around
Demand	Diverse	Agency	Enable
Next	Attempt	Too	Date
Power	Word	Until	Remove
Cover	Modify	Supervise	Extreme
Look	Main	Subsequent	Character
Relevant	Construct	Idea	Broad
Coordinate	Always	Half	Highlight
Free	Principle	Eight	Repeat
Country	Transfer	Formal	Elder
Oriented	Conflict	Together	Name

Handle	Equal	Office	Assume
Global	Disaster	Organ	Format
Muscle	Contrast	Stimulate	Law
Carry	Web	Furthermore	Enough
Theoretical	Separate	Restrict	Practical
Recognition	Eat	Decide	Private
Rapid	Foundation	Almost	True
Rights	Harm	Really	Tube
Aid	Disturb	External	Anticipate
Million	Dimension	Pregnant	Check
Threat	Worse	Inject	Exclude
Rural	Light	Concentrate	Damage
Down	Mark	Adopt	Weak
Translate	Career	Elevate	Confer
Drink	Minor	Incident	Immune
Fund	Familiar	Night	Black
Index	Advertise	Revise	Flow
Beyond	Efficient	Economy	Excellent
Gap	Turn	Senior	Significance
Delay	Mention	Legal	Mood
Extend	Gene	Upon	Video
Original	Secure	Generate	Master
Request	Vital	Above	Grant
Alter	Electronic	Already	Listen
Expand	Substance	Again	Entire
Ready	Radiate	Energy	Story
Clarify	Space	Against	
Acknowledge	Advocate	Cross	
Quantity	Put	Episode	
Annual	Mind	Feature	