We have then applied this factor structure to item difficulty in a variety of word knowledge tasks.

METHODS

- Brysbaert, Mandera, McCormick, and Keuleers (2019) created a factor analysis based on 2,000 words. They reported eight latent factors, which explained 73% of the variance:
  - Frequency, concreteness, concreteness, similarity, length, valence, arousal, and gender.

- For our replication, we focused on 3,000 academic words from the Academic Word List (AWL; Coxhead, 2000).
  - These words frequently occur in academic texts, are used in diverse subjects, and are not the most frequent 2000 words.
  - The AWL has been a pivotal piece of research due to the vast coverage of academic texts.
  - Interventionists have focused on these words to improve argumentation and academic writing (Lawrence et al., 2015).

- Next, we collected objective word feature data.
  - We excluded all behavioral and subjective measures, such as lexical decision times and concreteness ratings, and instead focused on 19 objective variables (e.g., word length and number of meanings).

RESULTS

- We conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) so that we could explore the replicability of previous analyses without forcing variables to any particular factor, and because our sample of words was strictly academic words.

- We extracted five factors, which explained 63% of the variance.

- When comparing these factors to Brysbaert et al.’s eight factors, the objective factors are consistent:
  - Our orthographic complexity is approx. the length factor; *proximity* is approx. similarity; and frequency is unchanged. *Semantic dispersion* is a grouping of the objective measures on the prevalence factor and senses a grouping of the objective measures on the concreteness factor.

The gist: The factor structure for the word features of academic words versus general words are consistent and coherent.