

MUĞLA UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

RETENTION AND USE OF LEXICAL COLLOCATIONS

**(verb + noun and adjective + noun) BY APPLYING LEXICAL APPROACH IN
A READING COURSE**

MA THESIS

ESER ÖRDEM

ASSIST.PROF.DR.TURAN PAKER

AUGUST, 2005

MUĞLA

MUĞLA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ

**RETENTION AND USE OF LEXICAL COLLOCATIONS (verb + noun and
adjective + noun) BY APPLYING LEXICAL APPROACH IN A READING
COURSE**

ESER ÖRDEM

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsünde

“Yüksek Lisans”

Diploması Verilmesi İçin Kabul Edilen Tezdir.

Tezin Enstitüye Verildiği Tarih:20/07/2005

Tezin Savunma Tarihi: 09/08/2005

Tez

Danışmanı : Yrd.Doç.Dr. Turan PAKER

Jüri Üyesi : Yrd.Doç.Dr. Eda ÜSTÜNEL

Jüri Üyesi : Yrd.Doç.Dr. Hasan ŞEKER

Enstitü Müdürü: Prof.Dr. Nihal ÖREN

AĞUSTOS, 2005

MUĞLA

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to find out whether teaching vocabulary via collocations would contribute to retention and use of foreign language. The data were collected through pre- and posttests, guided writing tasks and retention judgment test. The experimental group was taught collocations through lexical approach through ten different kinds of activities. The control group was taught in a traditional way, only focusing on word definitions from dictionary, antonyms, synonyms and guessing from the text. It was concluded that the experimental group outperformed the control group in all of the three instruments. Each group consisted of 60 participants, and the study lasted ten weeks. The study showed that a long treatment and exposure of collocations led the treatment group to remember and produce the collocations in the reading course more appropriately and less deviantly than the control group, implying that teaching collocation in the class systematically week by week, and scaffolding learners' progress could lead to better learners who can remember and use collocations in their communication in English.

KEY WORDS

Collocations, retention, lexical approach, lexical collocations, lexical phrases, pattern-centered learning

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı kelime birleşimleriyle kelime öğretiminin yabancı dilin kullanımına ve hatırlanmasına katkıda bulunup bulunmayacağını araştırmaktır. Veri toplamak için, ön ve son test, kontrollü yazı yazma aktivitesi ve hatırlama yargı testlerinden oluşan üç araç geliştirilmiştir. Deneysel gruba leksikal yaklaşımı yöntemiyle kelime birleşimleri öğretildi. Kontrol grubuna ise sadece sözlükten kelime tanımı, benzerlik, zıtlık, tahmin etme gibi geleneksel yöntemle kelime öğretimi yapılmıştır. Her bir grup 30 katılımcıdan oluştu ve çalışma on hafta sürdü. Her üç ölçme aracının sonucu göstermiştir ki deneysel grup, kontrol grubundan daha başarılı olmuştur. Çalışma, leksikal yaklaşımı yöntemiyle kelime birleşimlerini uzun süre öğretme ve öğrenciyi uzun süre bu birleşimlerle karşı karşıya bırakmanın, deneysel grubun, kontrol grubundan bu birleşimleri daha az sapma göstererek ve daha doğru hatırladığını ve doğru yazdığını göstermiştir. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışma, sistematik olarak kelime birleşimlerini leksikal yaklaşımı yöntemiyle öğretmenin, öğrencinin gelişmesine yardımcı olacağını ve İngilizcede iletişim esnasında kelime birleşimlerini hatırlayabilen ve kullanabilen daha iyi öğrenciler ortaya çıkaracağını da öngörmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler

Kelime birleşimleri, hatırlama, leksikal yaklaşım, leksikal kelime birleşimleri, leksikal öbekler, örüntü-temelli öğrenim

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I send my special thanks to my advisor Assistant Professor Dr. Turan Paker who always encouraged me to study and run after my study giving constructive feedback. I have learnt quite a lot thanks to him while preparing this thesis.

I owe much to Assistant Professor.Dr. Şevki Kömür who shared everything he had and showed an unbelievable patience during my study. I have never met a humanitarian like him. His feeling of sharing and never rejecting me has always tempted me to study more.

I wish to acknowledge Assistant Professor Dr. Hasan Şeker for the feedback he gave, and Assistant Professor Ömer Aydoğdu for his encouragement.

I also send my thanks to my beloved one who has always transmitted her positive energy when I felt sick, bad or pessimistic, and who has always succeeded in smiling even in her plight.

Lastly, I send my thanks to my family, especially my mother, who always supported me spiritually, although they were quite far away from me.

APPENDIX 1

PRE- AND POST-TEST

1. The police are going to the damages and then give a report to the head of the accident department.
a) assess b) evaluate c) value d) rate
2. The killing of two students a violent rebellion.
a) triggered off b) caused c) led d) generated
3. Exactly how children learn to speak is a problem which linguists no less now than twenty years ago.
a) baffles b) astonishes c) surprises d) confuses
4. A argument about who should go and fetch the bread from the kitchen was going on between Martin and Paul when I came in.
a) unimportant b) insignificant c) trivial d) inconsequential
5. The fashion for women to have their hair short is unfeminine.
a) now b) instant c) current d) present
6. The accident confidence in his driving ability.
a) cracked b) tore c) shattered d) broke
7. We decided to roses in the front garden.
a) rear b) grow c) breed d) bring up
8. Agatha was a strict teacher who occasionally showed she could be a person. She sometimes allowed too much freedom in the class.
a) gentle b) possessive c) lenient d) permissive
9. During their holiday , they had to a leaking tent and hurricane winds.
a) manage b) deal with c) take care of d) handle
10. There is nothing shocking in this film for a(n) audience.
a) adult b) mature c) grown up d) developed
11. He had a look in his eyes , which meant that he had thought up a good plan.
a) crafty b) tricky c) shrewd d) cunning
12. The guest was rude about everything, from the food to the sheets on his bed.
a) distasteful b) obnoxious c) unpleasant d) undesirable
13. He up her flagging confidence by assuring her she was well-liked.
a) backed up b) bolstered c) endorsed d) supported
14. He the fact that he had to leave until the evening of his departure because he didn't want anybody to know it. It was so private.
a) covered b) concealed c) hid d) secreted
15. The dog his bone in the garden so that the cat couldn't have it.
a) hid b) concealed c) stored away d) covered
16. The girl's dress was the first thing that him to her.
a) tempted b) lured c) attracted d) provoked

17. Some scientists say that if develop devices, we can solve ecological problems very easily.
- a) sophisticated b) grown up c) progressed d) processed
18. They the dying soldier long enough to learn where the enemy was hiding out.
- a) resurrected b) revitalized c) revived d) relieved
19. Iskenderun sea was by poison gas leaking from huge ships.
- a) infected b) released c) contaminated d) polluted
20. By a process of research and correspondence David ancestors to the 11 Th century.
- a) followed b) traced c) found d) detected
21. Trust yourself. You have your own image and personality. Do not feel inferior. There is no need to the image of the other person.
- a) increase b) heighten c) affect d) inflate
22. The father vowed he would his daughter marrying the man.
- a) prevent b) avert c) forestall d) frustrate
23. Danger was only by a matter of seconds.
- a) prevented b) averted c) forestalled d) cautioned
24. His behavior was not intentional but we could tell that he did not like us.
- a) overt b) open c) obvious d) visible
25. No woman ever goes out without checking her make up in the mirror.
- a) smart b) well dressed c) elegant d) well groomed
26. My long held belief that our bodies are unimportant was
- a) broken b) cracked c) fractured d) shattered
27. She eye brow pencil and false eyelashes because she had to look elegant at the party.
- a) implemented b) practiced c) applied d) second hand
28. First we are going to the candidate's abilities to recruit them.
- a) rate b) evaluate c) value d) assess
29. I had a(n) dinner party last night. Everything was badly organized.
- a) unruly b) ghastly c) unattractive d) shocking
30. How do we clear up misunderstandings and.....doubts?
- a) disperse b) spread c) scatter d) break up
31. These days people are looking for love because love affairs on Internet are so boring and false.
- a) authentic b) genuine c) factual d) actual
32. My father is addicted to drugs and alcohol. He often has a row with my mum and us. He damage to our family life.
- a) makes b) does c) sends d) gives
33. My father always temper in our family. We often feel restless and uneasy.
- a) increases b) causes c) promotes d) raises

34. The authorities in the country have to lots of demanding and hard economic and social problems and have to solve them if they want to be among the most developed countries.

- a)deal with b) cope with c)handle d)involve

35. Recent studies have shown that there are differences between human and monkeys.

- a) deep b)profound c) weighty d) discerning

36. The spice trade aims to bring in a lot of money into the company because they have spent a lot of money on advertisement.

- a) profitable b)monetary c) financial d)lucrative

37. My father has always tried to find a way to tension at home. He does his best to solve the problems at home.

- a) dissolve b)solve c) resolve d) reveal

38. Turkey is.....from being traditional to being democratic and liberal.

- a)converting b) modifying c)altering d) shifting

39. We should find a(n) worker who is self- driven and can make serious contributions to his own department.

- a) effacious b) efficient c) affective d) impressive

40. Dirt disease. You should keep your room clean.

- a) rears b) brings up c) breeds d) generates

APPENDIX 2

GUIDED WRITING TASKS

- 1) Some ideas about body image have been above. Discuss the importance and advantages of body image by giving specific examples and using the words given in the box. (200 words)

Assess – evaluate – attractive – charming – smart – plight – situation – generate – produce – overt – assertive – dissect – satisfy – consider – think – well groomed – well dressed

“Body image is strongly related to self-esteem”

“People who are satisfied with their faces are more self confident.”

“People who have above average positive body images indicate that they are more likeable than the average person.”

“People who are happy with their bodies may actually be more assertive and likeable than those who have negative body images”

- 2) Our planet is faced with serious problems such as

- Nuclear energy
- Population bomb
- Earthquakes
- Futurism/Predictions

Choose one of the topics or all of them above and Write an essay discussing the reasons or effects of them using the words in the box (200 words). You can write four separate paragraphs about each topic

Damage- harm- shake- tremble- hazardous- perilous – prevent- forestall – effective- efficacious- potent- powerful- destroy- devastate- contaminate – pollute – puzzle- baffle – sophisticated – reckless- adventurous- deteriorate

3) Write an essay choosing one of the topics below and using the words given in the box (200 words).

a) Discuss the topics given

- In retrospect do you think your parents brought you up well?
- For which things are you particularly grateful to them?
- Which things do you wish they had done differently? Are you going to bring up your children in the same way?
- Do you feel you owe them something? If so, how do you pay the debt you have?

b) Argue for or against the following statements.

- Children are being pushed into adulthood too early.
- Youngsters have no respect for soft and lenient teachers.
- Children sometimes should be punished.

Rear- bring up – grow – harass- bother- tease- lenient-permissive- change-alter- shift-sacrifice-relieve-dissolve – comfort- responsibility – extramural- pervasive

4) There are some questions and topics given below. Write an essay discussing the characteristics of love and love affairs using the words given in the box (200 words).

- Why do you think people have difficulty finding partners and have to advertise or go to agencies?
- Would you consider doing this?
- Do you think it is easier to find a partner in our life these days?
- What has changed in love affairs with the emergence of Internet?
- Your experience of love (problems, events, memories...)
- Compare the attitudes to sexual relations and marriage described here with those prevalent in your country. Would you like to see any changes in the laws or social norms concerning sexual behavior?
- Emotional love and family affairs

- How love is experienced in Turkey
- Do you think age difference affects love negatively? Is age important in love?
- What features (social – financial-physical) do you want in a boy or girl when you decide to date someone?
- Do you think love disappears when marriage starts? What can be some reasons that cause love to vanish?
- Would you marry someone from a different religion background?(Buddhist-Christian-Atheist –Catholic ..) Why or why not?
- Concurrently you have just fallen in love with someone and also have been offered a good job abroad, which will help you have a good career. Which one would you choose?
- Do we have to love someone in our life? Is there a must like this in your life? Would you want to die without loving someone in your life?

conceal – obnoxious- bolster- inflate- belittle – unfold- satisfy- furtive- mutual- justify- predict- deviant- caring – resort to- express- achieve- odd- dainty- provide- approximate- acquire

APPENDIX 3

RETENTION JUDGEMENT TEST

Check whether the word combinations given below are correct. Remember that there aren't any grammatical mistakes in the sentences. The sentences have been taken from your essays written in the first term. Check the usage of words.
1. This topic made me dissect myself and have realized that there are other things as well in life.
2. Earthquakes infested Turkish cities in the last decade.
3. This proposal can offer only a respite for people living around.
4. Environmental deterioration may have disastrous consequences.
5. In Istanbul there are unsightly houses which should have already been destroyed.
6. The baffling complexity of the math problem caused the students in the class to feel depressed.
7. The government has to disperse doubts . Otherwise, the public will go on strike.
8. The ecologists are trying to forestall the troubles caused by humans.
9. Many series and advertials deluge people at every moment of our life. They seem unavoidable.
10. In Turkey the government is trying to help ones who want to pursue vocational goals .
11. In Turkey parents never let their children take a laissez faire attitude .
12. In post modernist life and big cities people are often under heavy strain .
13. If you do not set aside your beliefs when you teach your students, they will not respect you.
14. In Turkey the slim majority still think that we cannot access EU.
15. There is a pervasive tendency between students that the teachers are not good enough to teach.
16. Some students use physical strength to assert themselves especially during puberty.
17. After the football match the police tried to dissolve tension resorting to violence again. They could relieve tension convincing them actually.
18. Teenagers often ask themselves "Do we have to stick to the rules of our parents?" They are right in a sense.
19. Teaching a new foreign language can also be done through extramural activities .
20. To know teenage rebellion is kind of normality may comfort parents .
21. Juvenile delinquency is getting widespread in New York. The state should do something to forestall it.
22. If we inflate the image of the others during presentation, we feel restless and excited.
23. Some football critics belittle the importance of statistics of football . Because what they support is that football is something unpredictable.
24. If one has distinctive characteristics such strength, charisma, ability to succeed, s/he will feel self confident.
25. A young girl should wear dainty clothes in order to impress others.
26. Some girls seem unfeminine because they wear odd clothes .
27. In my opinion women prefer to praise or even exaggerate their physical attributes .
28. I need to find a meaningful relationship in my life with possibility of marriage.

29. The professor quoted another innovated writer : “Carpe Diem!”
30. The proposal he made in the government never became law .
31. We, humans, are inclined to satisfy our needs such as confidence, sociality and psychology.
32. We all need genuine love . If we become greedy in love affairs, this presupposes that the tragedy is at the door.
33. If your friends show deviant behaviors , you should let us know.
34. Traditional families are prone to make sacrifices for their children.
35. Young people should gain experience by dealing with households/jobs at home.
36. The parents should, in my idea, diminish the control over the teenagers.
37. The teacher often gives my son extra reading and extra attention . He is also made responsible for ringing the bell at break time.
38. Money is often assumed to be a superficial matter before marriage.
39. My cat sports a small sweater .
40. Turkish girls do not want to lose their virginity owing to social norms.
41. There are just many more important matters in my life than school.
42. I must learn to connect my body with the rest of myself.
43. I tend to label beautiful girls shallow and narrow minded.
44. Thanks to our survey, we tested the relationship on a more diverse group of people.
45. Some students have negative body images and low self esteem due to family background.
46. Some people overlook the connection between body image and self esteem.
47. I have never doubted my intellectual abilities .
48. I know I have an accurate body image picture .
49. What I believe is that a good friend may increase my self esteem .
50. Some people watching Kurtlar Vadisi may mutter dirty things to their girlfriends..
51. The proposal they made may resolve the economic problem in the country.
52. Colossal streets should be constructed in order to prevent traffic accidents.
53. Overcrowding in Istanbul may cause hazardous side effects .
54. If a country does not have sophisticated devices , one cannot expect the country to make progress.
55. New changes in the global and postmodernist world reshape the nature of families and couples.
56. If you, as a father, do not abandon your principles temporarily, you cannot help your children develop in a healthy way.
57. I am new here. I don't have to accept the heavy responsibilities here.
58. I, as a teenager, should have the right to entertain my friends at home .
59. My friends are always teasing me at school, which causes me to have low self esteem.
60. Unspoken truths are sometimes more important than what we have talked openly.
61. Mutual affection is vital in my life, a girl said.
62. I had an unsuccessful experience .
63. Everybody needs genuine love these days.
64. These days we do courting on internet.
65. The police are going to assess the damage .
66. How children learn to speak has baffled linguists .
67. The accident shattered his confidence in his driving ability.
68. My father always raises temper in our family.
69. Dirt breeds disease .
70. He did damage to our happy life. I hate him.
71. USA is trying to forestall illegal entrance to the country these days.

72. The government is trying to pass the legislation in order to help USA access through Turkey.
73. Last night I had a ghastly party because some people had a row between each other.
74. My father is often under heavy strain because he has to work hard and send me money in order to continue my school life.
75. Unless the party members clear up misunderstandings , I do not think that the people will vote for them.
76. I need emotional security because I am far away from my family and friends.

YEMİN

Yüksek lisans tezi olarak sunduğum “Retention and Use of Lexical Collocations (verb + noun and adjective + noun) by Applying Lexical Approach in a Reading Course” adlı çalışmanın, tarafımdan bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurulmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin Kaynakça’da gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanmış olduğunu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

...../...../....

Eser ÖRDEM

YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM KURULU DOKÜMANTASYON MERKEZİ			
TEZ VERİ GİRİŞ FORMU			
YAZARIN		MERKEZİMİZCE DOLDURULACAKTIR.	
Soyadı: ÖRDEM			
Adı: Eser		Kayıt No:	
TEZİN ADI: RETENTION AND USE OF LEXICAL COLLOCATIONS (verb + noun and adjective + noun) BY APPLYING LEXICAL APPROACH IN A READING COURSE Türkçe: OKUMA DERSİNDE LEKSİKAL YAKLAŞIMI KULLANARAK LEKSİKAL KELİME BİRLEŞİMLERİNİN (fiil + isim ve sıfat + isim) KULLANIMI VE HATIRLAMA DÜZEYİ			
TEZİN TÜRÜ:	Yüksek Lisans	Doktora	Sanatta Yeterlilik
	☒	☐	☐
TEZİN KABUL EDİLDİĞİ			
Üniversite	:MUĞLA ÜNİVERSİTESİ		
Fakülte	:EĞİTİM FAKÜLTESİ		
Enstitü	: SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ		
Diğer Kuruluşlar	:		
Tarih	: 09/08/2005		
TEZ YAYINLANMIŞSA			
Yayınlayan	:		
Basım Yeri	:		
Basım Tarihi	:		
ISBN	:		
TEZ YÖNETİCİSİNİN			
SOYADI, ADI	:PAKER, TURAN		
ÜNVANI	:YRD.DOÇ.DR.		

TEZİN KONUSU (KONULARI)

- 1) Is there a significant difference in learning collocations between the participants in the experimental and the control group when we apply lexical approach in the reading course?
- 2) Is there a significant difference in retention of lexical items after implementation of lexical approach between the students exposed to the lexical approach (the experimental group) and those who are not exposed to (the control group) it?
- 3) Does using lexical approach affect their production of collocations in guided writing tasks?

TÜRKÇE ANAHTAR KELİMELEER:

1. Kelime Birleşimleri
2. Hatırlama
3. Leksikal Yaklaşım
4. Leksikal Kelime Birleşimleri
5. Leksikal Öbekler
6. Örüntü Temelli Öğrenim

İNGİLİZCE ANAHTAR KELİMELEER

1. Collocations
2. Retention
3. Lexical Approach
4. Lexical Collocations
5. Lexical Phrases
6. Pattern-centered Learning

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1-Tezimde fotokopi yapılmasına izin vermiyorum | O |
| 2-Tezimden dipnot gösterilmek şartıyla bir bölümünün fotokopisi alınabilir | O |
| 3- Kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin tamamının fotokopisi alınabilir | O |

Yazarın İmzası:

Tarih : .../.../...

--

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1. A Schematic representation of the design of the study.....	46
2. Descriptive statistics of YDS exam scores.....	47
3. Descriptive statistics of Michigan Proficiency exam scores.....	47
4. Results of the independent t test between the groups	49
5. Correct answers given between the frequency of 25 and 30 in the posttest.....	50
6. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 25and 30 in the posttest.....	52
7. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 20and 24 in the posttest.....	54
8. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 15 and 19 in the posttest.....	55
9. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 10 and 14 in the posttest.....	56
10. Overall results of the retention judgement test according to the frequency criterion.....	58
11. Sentences correctly judged between 25-30 frequency.....	59
12. Sentences wrongly judged between 10 and above frequency.....	60
13. Sentences wrongly judged between 5 and 9 frequency.....	61
14. Sentences unsurely judged between 10 and above frequency.....	63
15. Adjective + noun collocations correctly judged between 25 -30 frequency.....	65
16. Adjective + noun collocations wrongly judged between 10 and above frequency.....	66
17. Adjective + noun collocations unsurely judged between 10 and above frequency.....	66
18. Verb + noun collocations correctly judged between 25 -30 frequency.....	67
19. Frequency of verb+noun collocation wrongly judged between 25-30 frequency.....	69
20. Frequency of verb+noun collocation cnsurely judged between 25- 30 frequency.....	70
21. Number of deviant verb+noun and adjective noun collocations.....	73
22. Number of deviant verb+noun collocations.....	74

23. Frequency of overall deviant verb+noun collocations	74
24. Number of deviant adjective+noun collocations.....	75
25. Frequency of overall deviant adjective+noun collocations.....	75
26. Frequency of questionable collocation.....	79
27. Number of verb + noun collocations marked as questionable.....	80
28. Frequency of verb + noun collocations marked as questionable.....	80
29. Number of adjective + noun collocations marked as questionable.....	81
30. Frequency of adjective + noun collocations marked as questionable.....	81
31. Number of deviant nouns with verbs.....	84
32. Synonymous pairs of verbs and adjectives.....	87
33. Results of the independent t test between the groups.....	88
34. L1 influence in groups.....	92
35. Number of confused words in both groups.....	93
36. Overall results of questionable collocations.....	95

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
Abstract.....	i
Özet.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of contents.....	iv
List of tables.....	vii
 CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	 1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.3. Significance of the Study.....	4
1.4. Limitations of the Study.....	6
1.5. Research Questions.....	6
 CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	 7
2.1. Introduction.....	7
2.2. Vocabulary Teaching	9
2.3. Lexical Approach.....	11
2.4. Psychological Processing and Collocations.....	18
2.5. The Role of Teachers.....	20
2.6. The Role of Students in Learning Collocations.....	22
2.7. The Role of Instructional Material.....	23
2.8. Empirical Studies on Collocations.....	28
2.9. Conclusion.....	29
 CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY.....	 31
3.1. Introduction.....	31
3.2. The Participants of the Study.....	31
3.3. Data Collection.....	32
3.3.1. Instruments	33
3.3.1.1. Pre- and Post-tests.....	34

3.3.1.2. Guided Writing Tasks.....	34
3.3.1.3. Retention Judgment Test.....	34
3.3.2. Procedures.....	35
3.3.3. Materials.....	36
3.3.3.1. Reading Course.....	42
3.4. Coding.....	42
 CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS.....	 45
4.1. Introduction.....	45
4.2. Results.....	45
4.2.1. Homogeneity tests.....	45
4.2.2. Pretest and posttest.....	47
4.2.1.1. Frequency and comparison of answers given in both groups in the posttest.....	48
4.2.1.2. Correct answers given between the frequency of 25 and 30 in the posttest.....	48
4.2.1.3. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 25 and 30.....	50
4.2.1.4. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 20 and 24.....	51
4.2.1.5. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 15 and 19....	53
4.2.1.6. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 10 and 14.....	54
4.3. Results of retention judgement test.....	55
4.3.1. Overall results according to the frequency criterion.....	55
4.3.2. Frequency of collocations correctly judged.....	56
4.3.3. Frequency of collocations wrongly judged.....	58
4.3.4. Frequency of collocations unsurely judged.....	60
4.3.5. Frequency of <i>adjective+noun</i> collocations in retention judgement test	62
4.3.5.1. Frequency of <i>adjective+noun</i> collocation correctly judged.....	62
4.3.6. Frequency of <i>verb+noun</i> collocations in retention judgement test.....	65
4.3.6.1. Frequency of <i>verb+noun</i> collocation correctly judged.....	65
4.3.6.2. Frequency of <i>verb+noun</i> collocation wrongly judged between 25-30 frequency.....	66
4.3.6.3. Frequency of <i>verb+noun</i> collocation unsurely judged between	

25-30 frequency	67
4.4. Collocations judged in common by both groups.....	69
4.5. Results of writing task.....	70
4.4.1. Deviation in lexical collocations.....	70
4.5.1.1 Deviant verb + noun collocations.....	71
4.5.1.2. Deviant adjective + noun collocations.....	72
4.5.2. Questionable collocations.....	76
4.5.2.1. Verb + noun collocations marked as questionable.....	78
4.5.2.2. <i>Adjective + noun</i> collocations marked as questionable.....	79
4.5.2.3. Deviations resulting from only nouns.....	82
4.6. Conclusion.....	84
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION.....	86
5.1. Introduction.....	86
5.2. Systematicity.....	86
5.3. Length of Time	89
5.4. Explicit Teaching.....	90
5.5. L1 Influence	91
5.6. Confused Words	93
5.7. Questionable Collocations.....	95
5.8. Psychological Processing	96
5.9 Conclusion.....	97
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION.....	98
6.1. Introduction.....	98
6.2. Summary of the Study.....	98
6.3. Implications of the Study.....	100
6.4. Suggestions for Further Research.....	101
References.....	103
Appendix 1.....	108
Appendix 2.....	111
Appendix 3.....	114

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1. A schematic representation of the design of the study.....	46
2. Descriptive statistics of YDS exam scores.....	47
3. Descriptive statistics of Michigan Proficiency exam scores.....	47
4. Results of the independent t test between the groups	49
5. Correct answers given between the frequency of 25 and 30 in the posttest.....	50
6. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 25and 30 in the posttest.....	52
7. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 20and 24 in the posttest.....	54
8. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 15 and 19 in the posttest.....	55
9. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 10 and 14 in the posttest.....	56
10. Overall results of the retention judgement test according to the frequency criterion.....	58
11. Sentences correctly judged between 25-30 frequency.....	59
12. Sentences wrongly judged between 10 and above frequency.....	60
13. Sentences wrongly judged between 5 and 9 frequency.....	61
14. Sentences unsurely judged between 10 and above frequency.....	63
15. Adjective + noun collocations correctly judged between 25 -30 frequency.....	65
16. Adjective + noun collocations wrongly judged between 10 and above frequency.....	66
17. Adjective + noun collocations unsurely judged between 10 and above frequency.....	66
18. Verb + noun collocations correctly judged between 25 -30 frequency.....	67
19. Frequency of verb+noun collocation wrongly judged between 25-30 frequency.....	69
20. Frequency of verb+noun collocation cnsurely judged between 25- 30 frequency.....	70

21. Number of deviant verb+noun and adjective noun collocations.....	73
22. Number of deviant verb+noun collocations.....	74
23. Frequency of overall deviant verb+noun collocations	74
24. Number of deviant adjective+noun collocations.....	75
25. Frequency of overall deviant adjective+noun collocations.....	75
26. Frequency of questionable collocation.....	79
27. Number of verb + noun collocations marked as questionable.....	80
28. Frequency of verb + noun collocations marked as questionable.....	80
29. Number of adjective + noun collocations marked as questionable.....	81
30. Frequency of adjective + noun collocations marked as questionable.....	81
31. Number of deviant nouns with verbs.....	84
32. Synonymous pairs of verbs and adjectives.....	87
33. Results of the independent t test between the groups.....	88
34. L1 influence in groups.....	92
35. Number of confused words in both groups.....	93
36. Overall results of questionable collocations.....	95

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Grammar teaching and communicative approach were dominant between 1960 and 1980, and downgraded the explicit teaching of vocabulary with the idea that learners can learn vocabulary on their own with implicit strategy, guessing and inferring from the context (Conzett, 2000, p.70; Bahns, 1993, p.56). Language teaching has long regarded grammar and vocabulary as a dichotomy, and it has also long been thought that the former focused on structure, the latter on single words (Harwood, 2002, p.140). As Harwood (2002) puts it, vocabulary was secondary in importance for nearly two decades.

Although Natural Approach focuses on lexicon, the problem in Natural Approach is the premise that learning does not lead to acquisition (Krashen, 1981) because learning is conscious; acquisition is subconscious and unplanned. However, according to researchers of collocation (Nesselhauf, 2005; Lewis, Michael, 2000; Conzett, 2000; Lewis, Morgan, 2000; Pawley & Syder, 1983), studying lexis explicitly and consciously facilitates retrieval of lexis from mental lexicon. That is, intensive attention and awareness on collocation may lead to acquisition. In the first phases of recording collocations, it may require a great cognitive effort for the learner to write the collocations. However, in later phases, it will be easier for learners to retrieve and use the target language as appropriately as possible (Nesselhauf, 2005).

Collocation is the key term in our study and often used in different and vague senses. As Nesselhauf (2005, p.33) indicates, “word combinations cannot be clearly delimited.” Collocation was first defined by Firth (1957, pp.12 – 26) as “an abstraction at the syntagmatic level, and is not directly concerned with the

conceptual or idea approach to the meaning of words.” Howarth (1998, p. 27) classifies collocations as lexical and grammatical units, and explicates that “lexical collocations consist of two open class words (verb +noun, adjective + noun), while collocations between one open and one closed word are grammatical.” Lewis (1993, p.93) emphasizes that “collocations describe the way individual words co-occur with others.” According to Sinclair (1991, p.170), collocation is “the occurrence of two or more words within a short space of each other in a text.” Collocations are mostly seen as either phraseological or frequency based units (Nesselhauf 2005; Cowie, 1981).

Pedagogic value of collocation has been emphasized by researchers in recent years (Lewis, 1998, p.32, 1993, p.119, 2000, pp.13-17; Woolard, 2000, pp. 29-33). Lewis (1998) asserts that “collocations provide learners with a powerful organizing principle for language.” Learning in chunks is more effective than breaking into pieces. Raising learners’ awareness of collocation will help them feel self confident during production, and thus studying on collocations “increases learners’ communicative power” (Lewis, 1998, p.33). In this sense, teachers should encourage learners to keep a vocabulary notebook and record collocations and help them “identify collocations in texts” (Woolard, 2000, pp.30-31).

Collocation studies mostly focus on lexical category (Howarth, 1998; Biskup, 1992; Al-Zahrani, 1998; Nesselhauf, 2005) because their number, which amounts to tens of thousands, outweighs collocations of grammatical category (Bahns, 1993, p.56; Nesselhauf, 2005, p.9). Another for choice of lexical collocation in this study is that they are “among the most difficult for the learner” (Nesselhauf 2005, p.9) and also “tend to form the communicative core of utterances where the most important information is placed” (Altenberg, 1993, p.227). It was found that verbs are the most frequently deviant element and the second most frequently deviant nouns. Some researchers (Laufer, 1991, p.9; Kallkvist, 1999, pp.167-190; Nesselhauf, 2003, p.239) have stressed the difficulty of learning verb combinations because in terms of linguistic account, verbs are

arbitrarily restricted in its combinability. This nature of arbitrariness of language makes usage of verbs more difficult because word combinations are social institutions and naturally arbitrary (Lewis, 1993, 2000). Howarth's findings (1996) have also focused on the importance of verbs and nouns in that collocations can be corrected by changing either the verb or the noun. In this study, I will take Nesselhauf's definition (2003, 2005) as a criterion because she divides restricted collocations into two categories as RC1 and RC2. As this study is concerned with restricted collocations, her definition of collocations is more appropriate to shed light on the collocations to be used.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The effect of generative grammar and communicative approach belittled the importance of vocabulary teaching (Howarth, 1998). However, recent EFL course books have started to place a great importance on collocation activities (Flower & Berman, 1989; Harmer & Rossner, 1991; Harrison, 1990; Mc Carthy & O'Dell, 1994; Redman & Ellis, 1991; Rudzka et al., 1981; Wellman, 1992). The purpose of this study is to check whether focusing on collocation via the implementation of Lexical Approach is effective in foreign language classrooms. In recent decades it has been found that focusing on collocations enhances retention and retrieval of lexis because collocations help learners use more "cognitive energy" while recording but less cognitive effort while retrieving, and may lead them to memorize lexis in chunks (Howarth, 1998; Hill, 2000; Nesselhauf, 2005). However, the researchers in this field have often stated that collocation studies are inadequate and should be widespread in order to get satisfactory results, prove its efficiency in language learning and reveal that learners produce fewer collocations than native speakers (Howarth, 1998; Nesselhauf, 2005). It has also been put forward that "learners are not aware of the restrictions" (Nesselhauf, 2005, p. 8; Herbst, 1996; Howarth, 1996) while using lexis. Another problem diagnosed is that "learners are insecure in the production of collocations and that the collocation problems are more serious than general vocabulary problems" (Nesselhauf, 2005,

p.8; Bahns and Eldaw, 1993). Morgan Lewis (2000, p.17) focuses on the heart of the problem saying that “lexical deficiencies” lead to grammatical errors, and more lexical work instead of grammar correction should be done together with intermediate and advanced learners. In the same way, Wilkins (1990) emphasizes the significance of lexis indicating with a motto “without grammar little can be conveyed; without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed.” Collocation studies have brought a new perspective to vocabulary teaching, deviating from traditional vocabulary teaching because unless students know how to collocate the words, they are bound to make long syntactic sentences so that they can express the ideas in the target language clearly and precisely. In this sense collocations challenge traditional vocabulary teaching which is mostly definition and translation based. In addition to these ideas, word combinations can be easily recognized and understood by the learners but “it takes a greater degree of competence with the language to combine them correctly in productive use” (Oxford collocations dictionary for students of English 2002, p.vii). Another problem stated in vocabulary teaching is that conscious activity does not result in acquisition and thus noticing and awareness does not aid acquisition of lexis (Krashen, 1981). However, recent studies have proved that noticing language as chunks aids storage as chunks. It therefore aids acquisition (Lewis, 2000, p.181). Development of collocations in one’s repertoire helps him/her express him/herself appropriately and accurately. This ten week experimental study aimed to find out whether studying vocabulary through collocation technique would enhance retention and production of collocations.

1.3. Significance of the Study

Collocations are very important in language teaching in that they help learners remember lexis easier and produce the target language appropriately and fluently. Nesselhauf states that “collocations are of particular importance for learners striving for a high degree of competence in the second language and enhancing fluency as well as accuracy” (2003, p.223). According to Oxford

Collocations dictionary for students of English (2002, p.vii), “the right collocation will make his speech and writing sound much more natural, more native speaker like.” Use of right collocations will provide “precise meaning” in a context and this precise meaning will lead to “clearer understanding” (Oxford Collocations Dictionary for students of English 2002, p. vii). It is not demanding or hard to recognize and understand collocations in a context but what is problematic in collocations is “attention” (Lewis, 2000, p.17). Extra attention should be given to collocation while reading a text. Collocations are also word combinations which especially advanced learners do not expect to find together and often skip attention (Woolard, 2000, p. 29). If students understand collocations as “word grammar” (Woodard, 2000, p. 45) , they will direct their attention on collocations, chunks, phraseology, formulas, prefabricated or ready made language (Pawley & Syder, 1983; Howarth, 1998; Nesselhauf, 2005, 2003). Hill (2000, pp. 53 -56) focuses on some criteria while explaining the importance of collocations such as collocational competence, collocation’s arbitrariness, predictability, facilitating retention and retrieval, fluency, chunks, which implies characteristics and facilitative ways of collocations. Lewis (2000, p. 203) states that “if learners are to move off the intermediate plateau, they need substantial lexical input which will be predominantly collocations.” In the same way, Lewis (2000, pp.17-20) focuses on the importance of collocations in advanced learners who cannot produce the target language effectively and easily and also questions the term “advanced learner” stating the importance of collocations in organizing learners’ communicative competence. From my observations, for nearly 7 years I have also realized that advanced students in the class have difficulty producing the target language or choosing the right word. They often hesitate to speak in the classroom environment. Most of them recurrently express that they know grammar and have large repertoire of lexis but cannot produce it. This can be most probably due to lack of “attention” (Sousa, 2000; Jensen, 2000). If learners direct their attention to collocations and ready made chunks, they can remember and retrieve words more easily in order to produce the target language accurately and fluently. Studying

lexis through collocation helps learners not to break language into pieces but rather learn the target language in chunks, which facilitates retrieving from mental lexicon. A learner should be exposed to a large number of words and chunks so that they can make generalizations about lexis and its collocational restrictions (Lewis, 2000, p.173).

1.4. Limitations of the Study

The study has several limitations. Firstly, as the participants were exposed to too many word combinations in a lesson, they had difficulty keeping their attention constantly because fewer word combinations could be studied and recycled more than twice or three times because humans have limited working memory capacity while learning something (Sousa, 2000). Secondly, the information about whether the participants come from the same background and have often been exposed to native speaker language was not obtained. Thirdly, vocabulary knowledge of the participants was not measured in detail, and they were given only Michigan Proficiency Test, which measured only general knowledge of vocabulary.

1.5. Research Questions

- 1) Is there a significant difference in learning collocations between the participants in the experimental and the control group when we apply lexical approach in the reading course?
- 2) Is there a significant difference in retention of lexical items after implementation of lexical approach between the students exposed to the lexical approach (the experimental group) and those who are not exposed to (the control group) it?
- 3) Does using lexical approach affect their production of collocations in guided writing tasks?

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter will deal with the topics of background of vocabulary teaching, essential features of Lexical Approach, roles of teachers, learners and instructional materials, psycholinguistic accounts of lexis and empirical studies in collocation area. This study is essentially and foremost related to vocabulary teaching. Importance of teaching vocabulary has been recognized by researchers in the last two decades. Especially emergence of lexical approach and development of corpora studies have directed studies into lexis (Pawley & Syder, 1983; Sinclair, 1991; Nesselhauf, 2005; Lewis, 1993, 1998; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992). The lexical nature of language represents a considerable challenge to conventional language teaching (Lewis, 2000, p.173). Psycholinguistic evidence of memorization, phraseology, chunks in lexical approach has given momentum to lexis. In this study, I use the term “lexis” in Harwood’s sense. He defines lexis “as strings of words which go together (i.e. prefabs and collocations) as opposed to single words language teaching traditionally called vocabulary” (Harwood, 2002, p.140). Lexis is also thought to be important in psycholinguistic processing too because words are stored not only as “individual words but also lexical phrases and chunks and often retrieved from memory in these pre-assembled chunks” (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992, pp.31-32).

Significance of collocations have been recognized by many researchers in recent years (Lewis, Morgan, 2000; Woolard 2000; Hill, 2000; Conzett 2000; Lewis, Michael 1998, 2000; Hoey, 2000; Nesselhauf, 2003, 2005; Howarth, 1998; Bahns, 1993). A language teaching method based on intuition cannot be accepted but rather should be on data obtained from authentic resources. If language learning focuses on the “real nature of both language and learning”, it can be efficient in the classroom environment (Lewis, 1998, p. 44). In the last two decades

collocation studies have started to increase. However, different researchers have defined collocations in different ways. J.R.Firth (1957, pp.12-20) defines collocation as “an abstraction at the syntagmatic level and is not directly concerned with the conceptual or idea approach to the meaning of words.” Sinclair (1991, p.170) states that “collocation is the occurrence of two or more words within a short space of each other in a text.” Lewis defines the collocation nearly the same as Sinclair’s and puts forward that “collocations describe the way individual words co-occur with others” (Lewis, 1993, p.93). Nattinger and De Carrico state that “collocations are strings of specific lexical items.”, or in a larger definition, collocations are also defined in terms of “paradigmatic and syntagmatic axis consisting of a node with a span of words in either side” (1992, p.20). Collocations are mostly categorized within two criteria, phraseological and frequency based units (Nesselhauf, 2003). Howarth (1998, p.24) states that “collocations are combination of words with a syntactic function as constituents of sentences.” A more operational and functional definition of collocation is that “collocation is the way words combine in a language to produce natural-sounding speech and writing”, which emphasizes production in the target language rather than only comprehension (Oxford Collocations Dictionary for students of English 2002, p.vii).

Since collocations are regarded as word combinations, two basic distinctions between combinations are made, which are free combinations and restricted collocations. While “free combinations are composed of elements used in their literal meaning and freely substitutable”, restricted collocations have one component that is used in specialized, often figurative sense only found in the context of a limited number of collocates (Howarth, 1998, p. 28). In preparing collocation dictionaries too, “free combinations are excluded because restricted collocations are regarded as specific, specialized and precise” (Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English 2002, p.vii-viii; Howarth 1998, p.28). Collocations combinable with only a very small number of nouns such as *run a*

risk can be said to highly restricted in their combinability , and will be referred to as RC1 collocation or simply RC1 (for ‘restricted collocation type 1’). Collocations combinable with a fairly large number of nouns which do not constitute a clearly delimitable semantic group such as *perform an experiment* can be said to be less restricted in their combinability, and will be referred to as RC2 collocations or RC2 (for ‘restricted collocation type 2’) (Nesselhauf, 2003, pp.232-233).

Restricted collocations are also substitutable to some extent and have arbitrary value as well as non literal meaning (Nesselhauf, 2005: 14; Hill, 2000, pp.53 -56). They are arbitrary because they are also related to “psychological processing owing to nature of arbitrariness and non literal meaning of collocations” (Howarth, 1998, p.28). In this sense, extra attention and cognitive effort should be needed to record restricted collocations. Attention and noticing add quite a lot to learning a target language in terms of implicit and explicit learning (Laufer & Huljstin, 2001, p.9). Learners also should understand the power of “pragmatic value of collocations” (Nattinger and DeCarrico, 1992, pp.6-17) and record collocations which satisfy their needs in everyday life (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p.136). They should not record every collocation they have encountered. “Commutability (substitutability), transparency, frequency and arbitrarily restricted combinability” are dominant features of restricted collocations stressed by different researchers (Cowie, 1981; Aisenstadt, 1979, 1981; Mel’cuk, 1998; Nesselhauf, 2005; Benson, 1997).

2.2. Vocabulary Teaching

Vocabulary teaching has developed a lot in ELT recently, especially via computer aided research and psycholinguistics studies focusing on lexis (Ooi & Seah, 1996; McCarthy, 1991). Traditionally, vocabulary teaching has focused on teaching word meaning, synonyms, antonyms, which has been thought that words have been taught well in doing so (Oxford & Crookall, 1990). The first systematic approach was proposed by Ogden (1930), who claimed that 850 words can be

adequate to speak Basic English in daily life. He asserted that the words provided by him would help the learners express even their complex ideas and facilitate their communicative competence basically. However, Nation (1983) put a counterargument to this proposal and showed that 850 words of Basic English would be equal to 12,425 meanings. After Ogden's explanation about vocabulary, West (1953) published a book called "General Service List" which dwelt on 2000 words with semantic and frequency information obtained from a corpus of two to five million words. However, this list too was criticized by Richards (1974) who claimed that some important words such as *carpenter*, *plumber* and *mason* were not included in the list. However, vocabulary teaching has started developing after 1980s. Some issues such as memorization, vocabulary acquisition, word difficulty, role of words in interlanguage, concrete, non-concrete items in vocabulary, familiarity with words, psycholinguistics accounts of lexicon have been discussed in vocabulary teaching (Krashen, 1981; Nation, 1982; Meara, 1982; Nation, 1983; Cohen & Aphek, 1980; Kellerman, 1983; Meara, 1984).

Vocabulary teaching has focused on teaching of antonyms, synonyms for a long time due to the effect of two important linguists, Leech (1974) and Lyon (1977). Vocabulary teaching was first under the influence of structuralism which seconded the idea that structural patterns precede word knowledge, and suggested that vocabulary should be taught in order to reinforce structure (Frie, 1945). The emphasis for small vocabulary and larger structure stems from the belief that first language acquisition occurs with a small vocabulary until structural patterns are mastered (Rivers, 1968). From 1945 to 1970, vocabulary teaching was under the influence of structuralism, teaching syntactic patterns with small vocabulary, the idea of which led to Audiolingual method that focused on memorization of sentences and repetition drills (Carter & McCarthy, 1996). The first criticism against the emphasis on structuralism came from some researchers towards the last years of 1970s (Wilkins, 1972; Twaddle, 1973; Nilsen, 1976; Donley, 1974). It was Richards (1976) who concentrated on the importance of words systematically and

developed some important assumptions about words such as knowing a word means knowing its limitations of use according to function and use, its syntactic behavior, its underlying forms and derivations, its place in a network of associations with other words in the language and its semantic value.

In the late 1970s, it was Natural Approach that stressed the importance of vocabulary supported by comprehensible input from the teacher or textbooks (Terrell, 1982; Krashen, 1981). At around the same time, applied linguists made use of the field of lexical semantics focusing on sense relations and collocations (Cowie, 1978; Wilkins, 1972). After 1980s, vocabulary teaching, which was ignored for nearly five decades, has made a great progress in applied linguistics. Concepts of corpus, psycholinguistics accounts of vocabulary, L2 vocabulary acquisition, vocabulary storage in memory, vocabulary retrieval, and lexical phrases have emerged through different researchers in recent years. In the early 1990s, Lewis (1993) improved Lexical Approach, which has brought quite a new perspective to vocabulary teaching area.

2.3. Lexical Approach

Lexical Approach (LA) has emerged against the dichotomy of grammar and vocabulary with the former emphasizing structures and the latter focusing on single words (Harwood, 2002). According to Lewis (1998), the concept of a large vocabulary is extended from word to lexis in LA, but the essential idea is that fluency is based on the acquisition of a large store of fixed and semi fixed prefabricated items and adds that the individual words may be familiar but the collocations, fixed phrases and idioms provide a real bar to understanding. At the heart of Lexical Approach is the stress on teaching real English based on a number of corpus studies providing teachers and learners with frequencies of lexical items, collocations and prevalent grammatical patterns of the lexis (Harwood, 2002, pp.140-141). Therefore, the approach stresses the necessity of using corpora to inform pedagogical materials and the importance of Recycle and Revisit

strategy(R&R) which should be at the core of Lexical Approach. However, what should be done is that teachers and material writers should implement R&R strategy, in an interesting and refreshing way, so that the learners' interests are still engaged (Harwood, 2002).

Lexical Approach is related to lexis which meant “strings of words which go together” (Harwood, 2002, p.140). Strings of words contain collocations, prefabricated items, and institutionalized expressions. The basic motto of LA is that language consists of grammaticalised lexis, not lexicalised grammar, and lexis is the core of language (Lewis, 1998, 2000). Lewis (1993) replacing lexis with the divide of pattern generating quality of grammar and arbitrary nature of individual vocabulary items claims to bring a radical and profound change in the way we see and analyze language. In addition, he asks the question of what we are to understand by the term of lexical item and adds that the question is as profound as asking the nature of language itself. Lewis (1993, p.89), therefore, brings three characteristics of lexical items:

Meaning is not totally predictable from form.

Each is a minimum unit for certain syntactic purposes.

Each is a social institution

According to LA (Lewis, 1993), lexical items mostly consist of multi word units. In the same way McCarthy (1991) states that native speaker language is, to a great extent, formulaic. Nattinger and Decarrico (1992) also assert that more recent research puts formulaic speech at the very centre of language acquisition and sees it as basic to the creative rule forming processes which follow. Lewis gives different kinds of lexical items such as words, multi-word items, polywords, collocations and institutionalized expressions (1993, pp.91-95; 1998, pp.7-12).

WORDS

Words are defined as the most basic kind of lexical items and also the most familiar. However, words alone are of little use to learners because learners probably carry chunks in their mind rather than single word units. A great deal of language is stored in units larger than the individual words. For example, only one single word is required in the example of *Could you please pass me the..... (Salt/pepper) please?* This category is by far the largest of the four categories in the lexicon.

POLYWORDS

Like single words, polywords are frequently found in dictionaries. They are relatively short – two or three words. Some examples are given below:

<i>Record player</i>	<i>put off</i>	<i>of course</i>	<i>by the way</i>
<i>Ghastly party</i>	<i>look up</i>	<i>at once</i>	<i>the day after tomorrow</i>

COLLOCATIONS

One of two central ideas of Lexical Approach is collocations. Collocations describe the way individual words co-occur with others. Possible two word combinations vary from totally unexpected novel free collocation (want *a present/a book*) to the rigidly institutionalized fixed collocation (catch *a cold*). This is not a dichotomy but a spectrum between fixed and free poles.

Fixed collocations are one kind of polywords. Free collocations are, by definition, entirely novel and therefore lie towards the creative grammatical competence based pole of language. Collocations like individual words are neither pragmatically tied, nor pragmatically identifiable. In that sense, they differ from institutionalized expressions.

INSTITUTIONALIZED EXPRESSIONS

Institutionalized expressions are pragmatic in nature. These institutionalized multi-word units provide the efficient processing both receptively and productively. Despite their essential role and wide applicability, they are ignored in language teaching. Broadly, these fixed items can be categorized under three sub-headings:

- Short, hardly grammaticalised utterances: *Not yet, certainly not, just a moment, please....*
- Sentence heads or frames: *Sorry to interrupt, I see what you mean, I wonder if.....*
- Full sentences readily identifiable pragmatic meaning: *Can I help you, I am fine, I will give you a ring....*

A good knowledge of the grammar of English and an extensive vocabulary is not sufficient to ensure that the learner speaks English native speaker-like or speaks even well or effectively. In addition, if students become exposed to written language and formal grammar, they may experience considerable difficulty in understanding native speakers and much worse; the language they will produce will deviate to such an extent from what is natural as to cause serious problems of comprehension.

Institutionalized expressions will be of great help to any non-native learner. Clearly a repertoire of such phrases is an important part of fluency for the intermediate and more advanced learner. Institutionalized expressions also provide a way of increasing the elementary students' communicative resources rapidly, and at the same time provide accurate and natural data against which other novel utterances may be monitored and a valuable resource contributing to the acquisition of competence.

In Lexical Approach, the procedure that will be followed while giving an example should be focused on situation + co-text and archetypical utterance based on real language data rather than only practice structures often using single sentence de-contextualized examples. Students can be helped by being presented with a sufficiently large number of adequately contextualized examples. The choice of examples is critical compared with the artificially created examples of old fashioned structuralism. The examples in Lexical Approach should:

- be readily accepted by native speakers as institutionalized utterances
- reflect instantly identifiable pragmatic meaning.
- exhibit different degrees of variability from fully fixed sentences to those exhibiting limited paradigmatic substitution
- cover a representative range of possible (grammatical) subjects, reflecting frequency of occurrence in real world data.

Lewis (1993) claims that researchers, teachers and material writers following the procedure mentioned above will get expected results in both writing and speaking. Especially archetypical examples are vital in forming schemata in learners' mind because they are based on real data, not only to the immediate text but also to other corpora or concordance studies. Archetypical examples may also be collected by learners. Lewis (1993, p.97) cites his idea by giving an example of archetypical utterances containing 'll

I'll get it.

I'll give you a ring.

I'll be in touch

I'll drop you a line.

I'll see what I can do.

I'll see you later.

I'll take time.

That'll do.

It'll be all right.

We'll see.

Lewis (1993) states that the example just given above are more authentic and natural than the language we often associate with elementary textbooks.

In Lexical Approach, Lewis (1993) does not offer a lexical syllabus but rather proposes lexis in the syllabus. Lexis in the syllabus focuses on collocational power for semantically powerful words and longer multi-word items, particularly institutionalized sentences. According to this view, the skills syllabus should be supported and detailed with lexis. Two skills central to LA are developing the students' ability to use the dictionary as a learning resource rather than reference work, and most importantly of all helping learners to identify lexical phrases in text.

Another important element of LA is chunking. In the very basic sense, "chunking can be defined as a meaningful grouping of stimuli that can be stored as a unit in a short term memory" (Feldman, 1997, pp. 188-189). Nattinger (1992,

pp.31-32) argues that “a great part of the learners’ task is to chunk unfamiliar material in meaningful ways and create more effective lexical phrases.” In the same way, Sousa (2000, pp.109-112) contends that “the more a person is able to chunk, the more expert the person becomes” and adds that chunking enables learners to get information in a few large blocks rather than many small single units or fragments. Lewis (1998) contends that materials related to chunking should be presented to the learners and be one of the central activities of language teaching. Chunks are also important in terms of facilitating retention, organizing easily remembered information into meaningful units, aiding our recall of unfamiliar material (Myers, 1999). Nattinger (1992) suggests that words are stored not only as individual morphemes but also as parts of phrases or as longer memorized chunks of speech, and that they are often retrieved from memory in these pre-assembled chunks (Bolinger, 1975). According to psychological processing explanations, even though these chunks may be larger and contain more information than discrete items, their number still remains fairly constant in memory (Simon, 1974), and their size increases as we become more familiar with remembered material permitting us to store and recall information. A great deal of the learning task is thus to chunk unfamiliar material in meaningful way and create more effective lexical phrases.

Lewis (1998) gives the readers a checklist of points to be considered while implementing LA. This checklist is important in that it gives researchers what areas of LA are emphasized. In this checklist, while more attention should be on lexis, different kinds of multi word chunks, organizing learners’ notebooks to reveal patterns and aid retrieval, preparing learners to get maximum benefit from text, the use of dictionary as a learning resource and activities based on L1 /L2 comparisons and translation, less attention should be given to uncollocated nouns, sentence grammar, recording all new words and talking in L2 for the sake of it and communicative approach.

2.4. Psychological processing and Collocations

Studies on memory and psychological processing of lexis have contributed a lot to collocation studies (Jiang, 2000; Levelt, 1989). However, as Weinert (1995, p.199) puts it, “we need to know much more about learners’ own processes of memory and analysis.” As Nesselhauf (2005, p. 2) puts it, “psycholinguistics evidence indicates that the human brain is much better equipped for memorizing than for processing.” Memorization in LA is assumed to lead to better processing during production in L2. Learners do not memorize structures or vocabulary in or outside the class in its traditional sense. Rather, it is teachers who often recycle and revisit lexical phrases preparing different and challenging activities focusing on the same lexical units until they are sure that learners have acquired them (Lewis, 2000). In this study, retention is the key term in terms of psychological processing. Retention has been defined in different senses by the researchers. Sousa (2000, p.85) defines retention as “the process whereby long term memory preserves a learning in such a way that it can locate, identify, and retrieve it accurately in the future.” Catania (1998, pp. 319 -334) states that remembering issue can explained via three components, which are “the initial learning of an item, the passage of time, and then an opportunity for recall” and adds that storage is related to initial learning item and the passage of time, and retention is about the opportunity for recall and the time between storage and retrieval. In this study, collocation will be taken as phraseological and compositional units in order that importance of retention function can be demonstrated (Cowie, 1981) because phraseological units are stored in chunks in the memory, which facilitates remembering (Feldman, 1997; Sousa, 2000; Myers, 1999). The phraseological approach requires that the elements of collocations should be syntactically related (Nesselhauf, 2005, p.17). These are defined as combinations of words with “a syntactic function as constituents of sentences” (adjective+ noun, verb+noun, noun verb, verb+adverb...) (Howarth, 1998, p.27). They can be considered most centrally involved in the process of composition at clause level, therefore potentially sensitive indicators of

learners' acquisition. Compositional units are, like phraseological approach, have a syntactic function in the clause or sentence and generally best seen as realization of phrase structures such as prepositional phrases, noun phrases etc. Benson (1985) divides composite units into grammatical and lexical categories, depending on the word class of their constituents and adds that lexical collocations consist of two open class words (verb + noun – *make a claim*, adjective + noun - *handsome man*), while collocations between one open and one closed class word are grammatical: preposition + noun (*in advance*), adjective + preposition (*fond of*). Lexical collocations are compositional as well as phraseological. Compositional units include lexical phrases. It has been found that human speech is mostly based on compositions (Simon, 1974; Becker, 1975). Composites and phrases have syntactic functions, which facilitates retention and retrieval of lexis. Teaching vocabulary discretely makes retrieval of lexis harder. Lexicalized sentence stems, ready made chunks and memorized strings provide fluent speech even in native language. Words are stored not only as individual words but also as chunks, parts of phrases or as longer memorized chunks (Bolinger, 1975).

Repetition, recycle, revisit and memorization have been vital in acquiring lexical competence, which will change production for the better (Pawley & Syder, 1983; Jiang, 2000). Especially limited processing capacity in human brain puts a serious obstacle to second language production, and learners do not have the chance to remember everything they have received as input but rather they behave selectively (Izumi, 2003, p.178). This explanation of psychological process supports the idea of giving attention on collocations or in a wider term, on lexical phrases which will meet their need in everyday life. Especially advanced students can guess what collocations they will choose pragmatically for their everyday life. "Attention is prerequisite for learning to take place" (Izumi, 2003, p.178). Schmidt (2000) describing the importance on attention states that while involuntary attentional processes cause slow and possibly vague learning, intentionally focused attention leads to successful learning. The importance of attention to input for

explicit and implicit learning has been stressed (Schmidt, 1994). Lexical selection activates grammatical encoding (Levitt, 1989). Anderson (2000, p.89) states that “people must focus attention on a stimulus before they can synthesize its features into a pattern.” In this sense, while grammatical collocations activate lexical ones, lexical collocations help learners activate syntactic function in the brain. The limited capacity of the human attentional system, in a sense, forces collocational studies to focus on space and span of collocations to be taught. As Sousa (2000) puts it, less is better and shorter is better while teaching something, which implies that it is important not to teach too many chunks in a lesson because adults can store 7 chunks averagely in a lesson in the working memory and 3-5 chunks in young learners, and it is better to take attention time into consideration because adults’ attention span is mostly only 20 minutes and 10-15 minutes in young learners. It has also been found that learning in chunks is more efficient than discrete items. A collocation is thought to facilitate acquisition, and in this sense, helps development of lexical competence, which leads to an easy retrieval and automaticity in natural communication (Jiang, 2000, pp.65-66).

2.5. The Role of Teachers

Being aware of importance of collocations helps teachers arrange their tasks and teaching style in the class (Nesselhauf, 2003, Nesselhauf, 2005). One of the vital roles of the teachers is that they should make learners aware of collocations and convince learners that they do not know a word till they know how it operates with others (Conzett, 2000, pp.83) because even much and long exposure to a target language does not result in acquisition of collocation or, in a wider term, lexical phrases. Consciousness raising technique should also be used by the teacher (Lewis, 1998). Students should also be encouraged to record collocations outside the class. Collocation dictionaries as well as mono/bilingual dictionaries should be used in the class. Explicit teaching of collocation can also add a lot to the learners. The teacher should also urge learners to record and recycle collocations. However, careful consideration should be given while teaching because recurrent focus on

collocations via explicit teaching may hinder learners to produce the target language because learners this time will be obsessed with appropriate use of collocations. Therefore, collocations can be studied more with advanced learners who have the communicative competence in production. However, learners' deviant production of collocations should not be corrected immediately. Otherwise, learners will feel frustrated owing to the obsession of grammar accuracy, lexis acceptability and appropriateness in the class.

Different researchers (Lewis, Morgan, 2000; Woolard, 2000; Hill, 2000; Conzett, 2000; Lewis, Michael, 2000; Hoey, 2000) have stated different roles for teachers. Teachers have taken on new roles in lexical approach which focuses on lexical phrases (Lewis, Morgan, 2000; Woolard, 2000; Hill, 2000; Conzett, 2000; Lewis, Michael 2000; Hoey, 2000). They should ask questions that drive learners to focus on collocations such as *what is the verb before suicide*. Instead of explaining the differences between words, they should help learners explore on their own making use of the text. Learners can get the difference studying on the text (Lewis, 2000). Teachers should also extend students' collocational competence with words what they already know because collocations often skip their attention. Teachers should not focus on every collocation but rather take collocational strength into consideration. Not all collocations are worth recording. Teachers should focus on more lexis and less grammar in order that learners can be both collocationally and communicatively competent. Teachers should be careful in the class not to use only individual collocations but relate it to context. Teachers should not place them as teachers or knowers in the class but rather assist learners to discover on their own (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). They also put forward that teachers should also train themselves in the area of concordance so that they can help learners develop autonomy in use of the technological system.

2.6. The Role of Students in Learning Collocations

Students have new roles while studying collocations (Lewis, Morgan 2000; Woolard, 2000; Hill, 2000; Conzett, 2000; Lewis, Michael 2000; Hoey, 2000). They are seen as data and discourse analysts and responsible for their own learning in and outside class. They should not only notice collocations but also select collocations which will meet their immediate needs in everyday life. Learners also do not need teachers' generalization of lexis rules just like in grammar rules. They can build their own linguistic generalizations making use of texts (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Input and intake are important to acquire a target language because intake rather than input is used for further processing for learning (Izumi, 2003, p.174; Izumi, 2003, p.179) but intake is what learners consciously notice (Lewis, 2000, pp.155-185). In other words, what is not noticed cannot be intake. The more students analyze and scan corpora, the more generalizations they can make. Teaching should tempt learners to search many different small patterns constantly rather than repeatedly practicing few large patterns of traditional grammar. Lewis (2000) puts forward the idea that Lexical Approach is more grammatical than that of traditional grammar. However, there is a difference between two approaches. The latter prefers to teach large patterns mostly deductively, whereas the former requires learners to search for many different small patterns and form their own grammar. Therefore, it can be said that in Lexical Approach, there is not an absolute or intuitive grammar but rather there are grammaring, grammaticalization and patterns to be elicited where learners make their own inferences from lexical items they have scanned and studied (Lewis, 1998, p.102). Lewis (2000, pp 155-185) calls this teaching method **pattern-centered** teaching. If learners do not code, record and recycle word combinations by giving extra attention, they may have to make negative transfer from L1 because the effect of L1 on L2 cannot be ignored in language learning (Jiang, 2000; Nesselhauf, 2005). For example, in the study carried out by Nesselhauf (2005, pp.193-194), the verb most frequently exerting such an influence is *machen* in German language. German students produced

deviant collocations related with *machen* while transferring into English. The verb *machen* in German means *make/do* in English. The examples are as follows:

make an experience	make practical studies
make a career	make a step
make a trip	make homework

There were also some other verb + noun collocations from German to English were mistransferred. The collocations in brackets are the appropriate ones.

1. win sb's interests (arouse sb's interest)

Interess gewinnen

2. unfold one's personality (develop one's personality)

seine Persönlich entfalten

3. become problems with (have problems with)

probleme bekommen mit

4. consume drugs (take drug)

drogen konsumieren

Negative L1 influence was seen and analyzed on verb + noun collocation in Nesselhauf's study (2005, p.194). Thus, her study showed the great influence of L1 in collocation transfer.

2.7. The Role of Instructional Material

Learners can develop use of collocations practicing with explicit teaching (Biskup, 1992). Preparing the appropriate task for teaching and learning

collocations is vital in language learning. Since Sinclair (1991) put forward his ideas about language studies, corpora studies and texts have been popular in language teaching but teachers should be careful to choose the right text and a small, carefully selected corpus –also called genre-specific corpora- so that learners can focus on collocations in detail considering human information processing capacity (Lewis, 2000, pp.186-204) because if students become exposed to rich corpora in the lesson, and unless teachers get well prepared before presenting corpora, use of it may be useless in language learning. Human's information processing capacity, teacher training and preparing learners to study corpora tasks are among some problems that can be encountered in the class. Another kind of task that can be used in the class is concordance “allowing the user to explore the collocations with ease” (Lewis, 2000, pp.186-204). When a teacher hands out a text to learners in the class, frequency and suitability of words should be considered (Hill, 2000). Lexical notebooks should be kept by learners. Some activities to study collocations are “find a better word, sorting word combinations, rapid sorting, difference of synonyms, five word stories, collocation games, the strongest and most frequent collocations, recording collocations, the missing verb, writing not using any word more than once, matching word combinations, find strong combinations from the words given, collocate deletion...” (Lewis 1993, pp.29-32, 1998, pp.86-107, 2000, pp.88-117 ; Hill et.al 2000, pp.88-118). Some important activities that should be followed have been given below:

1. Recording Collocations

Students are asked to record collocations in a notebook stressing verb + noun or adjective + noun, other lexical or grammatical categories or chunks.

Apply for a	A job
Be out of	
Find a	
Hunt for a	

They can also write chunks, fixed or semi fixed expressions in the notebook such as:

Anything else?

Are you OK?

Something wrong?

Could you tell me the time please?

2. Find a better word

The students are given a noun, a verb or an adjective, and asked to bring an adjective or verb before noun without looking up in the collocation dictionary. Later, this time they are asked to look up in the dictionary and find a better word for the noun given. For example, the word *effect* is given to the students, and they are asked to find the adjective or verb that the noun will take.

1. Effect

a bad effect

a big effect

an effect which helps

an effect nobody expected

a very funny effect

an effect that puts things right

3. Five word stories

In this activity, five collocations of each noun is found from the collocation dictionary, and the students are asked to invent a story using the five collocations before noun. For example, let's take the word *letter*:

Write, send, receive, dictate, post **a letter**

4. Collocation game

The teacher reads out five strong collocations that a noun or verb can take, and then the students are asked to guess which word it is. For example, the collocations that *theory* takes are read out to the students:

Test, advance, refute, put forward, corroborate, and outline **a theory**

5. The missing verb

Three or more nouns are given to the students and asked to find the appropriate word. The strongest collocations are given. For example, three collocations that the verb *express* are given to the students:

1. feelings

ideas

opinions

6. Odd verb/adjective out

In this exercise, several verb or adjectives are given to the learners, and they are asked to find the collocation that does not collocate with the noun.

Accept, act on, disregard, follow, ignore, make, take

ADVICE

7. Find the right collocations

The students are given two or three words and asked to match or find the collocations that they will take. This exercise can be done especially with synonyms or confused words such as take, get, have, make, do....

How many expressions can you make which use?

a. the verb *have* with

b. the verb *give* with

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 1. a party | 6. a cup of tea |
| 2. lunch | 7. time to..... |
| 3. a pound | 8. a hand |
| 4. a present for.... | 9. a cold |
| 5. a present to | 10. the chance to |

8. Make collocations

The students are given nouns and are asked to create or find word partnerships with the nouns given.

- | | |
|---------------|-------------|
| 1. weather | 4. sympathy |
| 2. operation | 5. job |
| 3. experience | 6. effort |

Although exercises mentioned are thought to be useful, some researchers (Nesselhauf, 2005; McCarthy 1991; Bahns, 1997; Sinclair, 1991) find these exercises unsuitable or inadequate because most exercises focus on nouns, whereas

verbs should also be concentrated on. Different collocation exercises should be prepared for different types of collocations (Nesselhauf, 2005). Exercises of semantic prosody and collocational grids stressing verbs should be prepared. Semantically similar verbs should be taken into consideration. Another recommendation about exercises of collocations is that systematicity should be followed by teachers. Collocations should also be taught as wholes because only focusing on word combinations in a short space will not be sufficient to remember during production.

2.8. Empirical studies on collocations

In recent years, empirical studies have emerged in collocation treatises (Nesselhauf, 2003, 2005; Howarth, 1998; Marton, 1977; Biskup, 1990; Channel, 1981; Granger, 1998; Herbst, 1996; Bahns & Eldaw 1993; Biskup, 1992; Al-Zahrani, 1998). These empirical studies are mostly based on elicitation tests, production data and cloze tests. In Herb's study (1996), it is seen that advanced learners show much more variations than native speakers. Shei's (1999) results show that Chinese advanced learners make more deviations in collocations than European learners. These results support Morgan Lewis' (2000) idea that "the language which helps learners to communicate more complicated ideas is not convoluted grammar structures but different kinds of multi word phrases, particularly densely-packed noun phrases" (pp.17-18). Advanced learners have to use longer expressions because they use fewer collocations, which frustrate advanced learners to produce the target language. Eker's (2001) study of collocations with four-year period advanced learners in ELT department shows that advanced learners are stricter in their first years but more flexible in later years. The reason for this may be that advanced learners give up constructing sentences based on strict rules but rather they themselves create their own word combinations, which is also a sign of flexibility of Turkish culture. This study supports the study carried out by Marton (1977) and Biskup (1990). Their study show that Polish students use collocations more appropriately than German

learners owing to differences of both cultures that reflect accuracy and fluency respectively. Howarth's study (1990) also shows that learners use fewer collocations than native speakers. Another study carried out by Zhang (1993) shows that there is a correlation between learners' proficiency and use of collocations whose results are contrary to Howarth's study (1990) that there seems no correlation between learners' proficiency and use of collocations. Bahns and Eldaw's findings (1993) show that collocation is really a big problem for learners and learners are hesitant to use collocations. Nesselhauf's findings (2003) have also shown that non-native speakers have considerable difficulties in the production of collocations. As Nesselhauf (2005, p.2) puts it, "psycholinguistics evidence indicates that the human brain is much better equipped for memorizing than for processing."

2.9. Conclusion

This chapter dealt with the assertions of vocabulary teaching, Lexical Approach, importance of psycholinguistic accounts in collocation studies, roles of teachers, students and instructional materials and empirical studies in collocation field.

Firstly, it was shown that vocabulary teaching was not dominant and was secondary in language teaching from 1930 to the early 1980s (Carther & Mc Carthy, 1996). However, after 1980s, the researchers realized that vocabulary teaching should be stressed and included into the curriculum. Secondly, the theory and influence of Lexical Approach were presented, and it was indicated that lexical phrases are important and of great help to second language acquisition. Thirdly, psycholinguistic studies in vocabulary show that learning in wholes and unanalyzed chunks aid a lot to retention and retrieval in memory. Fourthly, the role of teachers has altered from transmitting and explaining the meaning of vocabulary and grammar to helping learners become data analysts, discoverer of his/her own learning, careful notebook recorders of collocations. Fifthly, students in Lexical

Approach are not passive learners of vocabulary and grammar. Rather, they are fully active participants, organizers and creators of their own vocabulary and grammar eliciting from lexical items. Sixthly, the type of materials and exercises is different from the traditional ones because examples of fixed, semi-fixed expressions, collocations and archetypes should be created in order to reinforce learning lexis and grammar together. Lastly, empirical studies turned out to be inadequate in collocations studies.

In methodology part, three instruments developed by the researcher will be detailed, and the exercises and procedures suggested by the researchers in Lexical Approach (Lewis, 1993, 1998, 2000; Hill, 2000; Nesselhauf, 2005) were carefully implemented in order to find out whether there was going to be a significant difference between the treatment and control groups.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the information about the research design, the participants, the instruments, the procedure, the materials to collect data, and the methods for data analysis.

The aim of this study was to find out whether teaching vocabulary through collocations would affect learners' retention and production level positively in the reading courses, and for this purpose, a quasi-experimental design was formed at the ELT department of Faculty of Education, Muğla University. The design of the study was prepared according to the study carried out by Nesselhauf (2005).

3.2. The participants of the study

The study included 60 participants. They were all students at the ELT department, Muğla University. Two groups as treatment and control were formed. The treatment group comprised of 30 participants. In the same way, the control group composed of 30 participants. The groups did not attend preparatory classes, and Turkish was the only native language of the participants who studied English at high school for four years. The participants also received writing, listening, speaking and grammar courses in the first year while studying collocations in the reading course. According to the curriculum designed for 2004-2005 period, the writing courses aimed to teach the participants how to write through topic sentences to argumentative essays. The listening course required the participants to acquire the skills of sound discrimination, some sound differences between American and British English and note taking from lectures. The speaking course intended to assist learners to talk about some topics related to culture, family issues, natural disasters, American and British culture and other related everyday

topics. The objective of grammar courses was to teach the participants advanced grammar. The reading course aimed to help the participants acquire the skills of answering skimming and scanning questions and also make comments on critical-thinking questions based on the text and their experience. Another objective of the course was to carry out a range of both basic and advanced strategies for effective reading of different kinds of texts including comprehension, analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

3.3. Data collection

Quasi-experimental design, composed of three instruments, was formed to collect data. The reason why true experiment was not implemented was that the researcher could not intervene the curriculum at the university, and had only two classes, which did not give any chance to apply random assignment because true experimental study differs from quasi-experimental design in that the former is carried out with random assignment (Nunan, 1992; Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Nunan (1992) and Campbell and Stanley (1963) assert that since it is not always possible to carry out true experimental studies, and the impossibility of randomly assigning subject to experimental and control groups may occur, a quasi-experimental study can be conducted. In quasi-experimental design, there are pre- and post-test and experimental and control groups but no random assignment of participants. Instead of random assignment, matching assignment, one of the main characteristics of quasi-experimental design, was conducted. Both groups were matched according to the criterion of sameness level. The disadvantage of quasi-experimental design is the lack of random assignment and not being able to manipulate unexpected variables in the study (Cook and Campbell, 1979).

The data for this study was collected through pre- and post-tests, guided writing tasks and retention judgement test. Firstly, pre-test was given to the participants to see whether the scores obtained from it was homogenous and to check whether there was going to be a significant difference in the immediate post

test. The purpose of having two groups in the study is that if one group is treated in one manner, and another in a different manner and their post- treatment behaviors differs, we can conclude that the behaviors differs as a consequence of different treatments to different groups (Campbell and Stanley, 1963).

Another technique used to collect data in this study is elicitation technique, which is widely common in applied linguistics, and includes studies based on the stimulus such as picture, diagram or standardized test, and also covers questionnaires, surveys avhvmnd interview data (Nunan, 1992). For this purpose, two elicitation tasks were used in the study to collect data. The first is guided writing task, which aimed to look at the performance of collocations in writing. A tentative disadvantage of elicitation tasks is that the learners may not want to use the language items presented (Nunan, 1992). The disadvantage of this elicitation production task was that the learners had difficulty writing in a guided way because they preferred to write freely. However, the design and scope of the study did not let the participants write freely. Rather, they were asked to write about the topics given using the words ranging from 15-20 in the box. The second elicitation task was retention judgement test, which intended to collect data by giving judgement on the sentences given. Although retention judgement test is not found in the literature, this test can be called a kind of elicitation task because the test was prepared in the form of a questionnaire, and since questionnaires are a kind of elicitation techniques (Nunan, 1992), it can be regarded as a kind of elicitation technique. In addition, judgement test aims to elicit information required from the participants.

3.3.1. Instruments

The instruments were developed according to the research questions and the literature reviewed by the researcher on the various elements of LA techniques. Accordingly, three instruments, which were pre- and post-test, guided writing tasks and retention judgement test, were used in this study.

3.3.1.1. Pre- and post test

A test composed of 40 question items, 25 of which were verb + noun, and 15 of which were adjective + noun collocational relations was used to see whether there was going to be a significant difference between the two groups in the post-test (see Appendix 1). The sentences of question items were taken from the text book. The question items were chosen according to the criterion of importance of words in the text book determined by Rudzka et al. (1981) who gave collocational grids and collocations of active vocabulary in the text book.

3.3.1.2. Guided writing task

In order to see the performance of both groups in a productive skill, four guided writing tasks were given to the participants. Each guided writing task was presented at the end of each unit. The participants were given the words ranging from 15 to 20 in a box to write a 200 word essay using the words given in the box (see Appendix 2). None of them were timed. The important and active words specified by Rudzka et al. (1981) were given in the box. In the guided writing tasks, the participants wrote about the subtopics related to the unit topic they studied. The participants did not have only one chance to write but rather various subtopics were presented so as to facilitate their writing (Hughes, 1996). The essays consisted of non academic and non technical argumentative essays; rather general essays arguing a point with four topics were chosen from the textbook. Turkish was the only native language of the participants who studied English for four years at high school. Later, all lexical combinations were extracted from the essays and checked whether they used the appropriate collocation in the essays. The analysis was done manually.

3.3.1.3. Retention judgement test

A retention judgement test was given to the participants in order to see to what extent they could remember and make judgements on the collocations they

studied (see appendix 3). The test was composed of 76 sentences, 42 of which were verb + noun and 32 of which were adjective + noun collocations. Non – restricted collocations were not given in the test because free combinations are not hard for L2 learners at all (Nesselhauf, 2003). RC1 and RC2 collocations were scanned and given to the participants. The test was presented to the participants four months later because they were exposed to different vocabulary in the reading course in the spring term for 14 weeks. By doing so, the internal validity of the test was provided because if the test had been given only two or three weeks later, the validity of the test might not be strong. All sentences were deliberately chosen as true collocations in the retention test, and extracted from the passages they have read for ten weeks. A three point scale of judgement composed of **true**, **false** and **unsure** was given to the participants. Collocation changes were not made but only some minor changes such as subject or tense of the sentences were made.

3.3.2. Procedures

Pre-and post-tests were designed taking examples from the textbook. Since the textbook was used by different researchers (Carter & McCarthy, 1996; Nesselhauf, 2005; Ooi & Seah, 1996) in applied linguistics, the questions were formed basing on the sentences in the textbook. The collocations that addressed the design of the study were only 50 questions. However, since this study focused on only verb + noun and adjective + noun collocations, ten lexical collocations were excluded from the poll because they were either adverb or noun collocations. The collocations mentioned in the passages were chosen from the textbook because there were also other sentences including collocations not mentioned in the textbook. That is, Rudzka et.al. (1981) added some other words from different books or dictionaries into his book, which were not used in this study.

The guided writing tasks were formed according to the criterion of active role of word combinations in the text. Whether the word combinations were active in the text was based on the presence of words in collocational grids in the exercise

part of the textbook. The students were not also given only one topic to write but rather different subtopics were given so that the participants could write with no force (Hughes, 1996). The participants were not given time limit because asking the learners to write in a guided way requires more time and effort than in a free way. They were asked to write an essay consisting of 200 hundred words. The essays were non–argumentative and non-scientific. The topics they wrote depended on mostly their impressions from the passages they wrote or the experiences they had from everyday life.

The passages in four units were scanned to form the retention judgement test, and the most active lexical collocations were extracted from the textbook and presented to the participants. There were 42 verb+ noun and 34 adjective + noun collocations. The participants were given three point scale of judgement consisting of **true**, **false** and **unsure**. In order to test the participants' judgement, all sentences were deliberately chosen as true collocations in the retention test. Minor changes were made in the sentences; some of them were nativized without changing the meaning of word combinations. For example,

*In America, **the slim majority** still think that they are unhappy.*

nativized to

*In Turkey **the slim majority** still think that we cannot access to EU.*

As seen in the example, the word combination **the slim majority** was not changed at all. These changes were made to measure whether the participants could remember and judge word combination in a different context, even if it is used in a sentential context.

3.3.3. Materials

It was important to find the appropriate textbook and to develop the suitable materials for the experimental group in order to see whether the treatment group

would differ from the control group. As a textbook, *The words you need* by Rudzka et.al (1995) was used in the reading course. This textbook was chosen because it was one of the best books that focused on collocation grids, restricted collocations and semantic prosody, and mostly provided the differences of collocations of synonymous words totally vital to students' learning. The importance of the book selected was also stressed and used by different researchers since it emerged in the market (Carter & McCarthy, 1996; Nesselhauf, 2005; Ooi & Seah, 1996). The control group was not taught collocation grids, restricted collocations and semantic prosody, and studied vocabulary in a traditional way. Word definitions, synonyms, antonyms and guessing from the context were used with the control group. There were 10 units in the textbook but the first, second, fifth and seventh units of the book were chosen according to the interests of the participants in order for them to be motivated during the lessons. The first unit was about body image telling the importance of body image and self esteem in daily life. The second chapter was about natural disasters mentioning about earthquakes, nuclear energy, futurism, population bomb and green revolution. The fifth unit was related to family affairs giving some examples from families about their conflicts, generation gap and some solutions to family problems. The seventh unit was about love telling the importance of love in daily life, love affair problems sent to the writer in the newspaper in order to solve the readers' emotional problems. Each unit was composed of four passages focusing on the same idea from different perspectives. This kind of choice was important to study collocations because reading only one passage about one topic would not be effective in the collocation study, but rather, for the purpose of the study, different passages on the same idea would function as corpus to be scanned by the participants and to study collocations, and as Tulving (1983) puts it, richness of the material is vital to retention. Four reading topics were studied for ten weeks, and each week the participants attended the reading course for six hours. 15 hours, nearly two and half weeks, was spent for each topic.

The activities used in both groups were different. The control group was taught vocabulary teaching in a traditional way, focusing antonyms, synonyms, word definitions and guessing. However, eight different kinds of collocation exercises were presented to the experimental group.

1. Recording a notebook of collocation

The participants of the experimental group are required to keep a notebook of collocations. They are asked to write word combinations they regard as necessary and useful in their daily life and to record collocations which will meet their immediate needs. They scan the text and record collocations or fixed expressions as chunks. The notebook looked as follows:

<i>Advertisements deluge us daily</i>	<i>Disperse doubts</i>
<i>High/low self esteem</i>	<i>Clear up misunderstandings</i>
<i>Assess damage/ ability</i>	<i>Dissolve tension</i>
<i>Inflate the image of others</i>	<i>Slam the door</i>

2. Use of collocation dictionary

The students are asked to use Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English (2002) in order that they can see other collocations the words take. By doing so, they are given an opportunity to see the restrictions of the words they study. They are not asked to write all collocations they look up in but rather the ones they see necessary, useful and strong.

3. Collocation game

In this exercise, the students are divided into two groups and are asked to read out the most important and the strongest nouns so that the other group can judge which adjective or verb it is. One of the students in the group reads out the

strongest collocations to the other group to guess. For example, a student reads out the nouns below:

damage, ability, evidence, performance, importance

The other group tries to guess what verb it is. For example, one of the students says:

The word is *ASSESS*

4. Correcting collocation mistakes

In this exercise, the students are given some sentences extracted from the book. In each sentence, there is a collocation mistake, and the students are asked to write the right collocation. This exercise is done in pairs. For example,

*The woman **implemented** eye brow pencil*

The true collocation in the sentence above would be as follows:

*The woman **applied** eye brow pencil*

5. Match collocations

In this exercise, the students are given words in two columns and asked to match the appropriate collocations. The exercise is as follows:

<i>Disperse</i>	<i>Dams</i>
<i>Clear up</i>	<i>Doubts</i>
<i>Environmental</i>	<i>Silts</i>
<i>Fertile</i>	<i>Misunderstandings</i>
<i>Colossal</i>	<i>Deterioration</i>

6. Five word story

In this exercise, the students are given five collocations that a verb or an adjective takes, and are asked to talk about the word using the collocations. For example,

Forestall *an accident – somebody's action – a surprise attack – an attempt – somebody's intention*

7. Find the right collocation with synonymous pairs

As the collocations that synonymous words take are different, this exercise is important to show the restrictions and differences between the synonymous words. They are given two words similar to each other semantically and asked to find the right collocations that each word could take.

How many expressions can you make which use?

a. the verb *cope with* with

b. the verb *deal with* with

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>a job</i> | 4. <i>the matter</i> |
| 2. <i>young offenders</i> | 5. <i>difficulties</i> |
| 3. <i>obstacles</i> | 6. <i>the question of discipline</i> |

8. Cloze test

Short cloze tests are given to the students in order to put the right collocation into the blank. The sentences are again extracted from the text book. The sentences nearly in all exercises are taken from the text book because by doing so recycle and revisit strategy is followed insistently.

The new breed often a laissez faire attitude, but the strain is not felt by the children. The new breeds usually their beliefs and their children flexibly. However, this causes some problems in the families.

9. Find your partner

In this exercise, the students are asked to scan the text and write down the collocations in pairs. The class is divided into two groups as noun and verb group. They are asked to find their partner by reading out the verb or the noun attached to them. The same exercise can be done with category of adjective. For example,

One of the students in the verb group says “I am *DISSOLVE* and looking for my partner. One of the students in the noun group answers “I am your partner. I am *TENSION*.” Later, they both read loudly “*DISSOLVE TENSION*”.

After this exercise is completed, the students are asked whether they remember the collocations their friends have played.

10. Find as many as you can

In this activity, the students are again divided into two groups, and were asked to find as many collocations as they can. A student comes in front of his/her group and reads out a verb, his friends in the group try to find collocations as many as they can. For example,

A student in the group says “*evaluate!*”

The group starts finding collocations the verb can take, and they say for example:

Ability, performance, contribution.....

If the group cannot find any other collocation of the word read out, the student passes on another word because they are asked to be able to produce more words and more collocations in two minutes.

3.3.3.1. Reading Course

The reading course generally aimed to have the learners acquire the skills of answering skimming and scanning questions and talk about the critical-thinking questions based on the texts used in the class. The participants were at intermediate level, and the course intended to advance them through upper intermediate level. They were required to make relations between what they have read in the class and experienced in daily life, so that they can transfer what they have learnt easily into everyday life. Another objective of the course was to carry out a range of both basic and advanced strategies for effective reading of different kinds of texts including comprehension, analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

3.4. Coding

Judgement on collocations is difficult even if there is a huge corpus. As Nesselhauf (2005) puts it, the fuzziness in the area of collocation is relatively great.

In this study, Nesselhauf's (2005) five point scale of acceptability was used. However, in this study, five point scale of acceptability was reduced to three point of acceptability for practical reasons. Two types of sources were used to determine the degree of acceptability of collocations produced by the learners in guided writing task. The former is dictionaries, which are Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary (1988), Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2003) and Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English (2002). The latter is native speakers, who were two Americans and one British, three of whom were college graduates and spent most of their time in English speaking countries. The combinations were presented to them in context so as to make learners' intended meaning as clear as possible. The scale was composed of acceptable (A), questionable (Q), unacceptable (UA). The essays were analyzed by the native speakers. If native speakers and dictionaries approve what the participants wrote down, it was accepted as acceptable (A). If it is found in the dictionaries but native speakers are not sure, it was taken again as acceptable (A). If it is not in the dictionary but the native speakers accept it as questionable, it was accepted as questionable (Q). If sources, native speakers and dictionaries do not accept the usage of collocation written, it was accepted as unacceptable (UA). If it is not found in the dictionaries but the native speakers say we do not clearly say in this way, it was again accepted as unacceptable (UA). If native speakers judged the combinations unacceptable, they were asked to provide an acceptable or better option to express the intended meaning. This coding should not be taken to mean that all judgements are absolute but rather tentative.

Table 1

A Schematic Representation of the Design of the Study

Treatment Group	Control Group
1. Pre test	1. Pre test
2. Treatment Group Session One I. Reading a passage ii. Ask the students to focus on collocations with the words they know. iii. Ask the students to select which collocations are vital to their needs. iv. Request them to ask each other comprehension questions v. Focus on discussion questions vi. Five word passage story telling collocation activity in groups vii. Give collocation exercises and games viii. Recycle and revisit collocations studied in the previous lesson(s). Session 2-10 The above was repeated	2. Control Group Session One i. Reading a passage ii. Presenting the vocabulary with their meaning and definitions iii. Answering comprehension questions iv. Focus on discussion questions v. Group activity to talk about the body image problems in Turkey Session 2-10 The above was repeated
3. Guided Writing Task i. Guided writing task given at the end of each unit	3. Guided Writing Task i. Guided writing task given at the end of each unit
4. Immediate Post Test 5. Retention judgement test i. 76 sentences given 4 months later	4. Immediate Post Test 5. Retention judgement test i. 76 sentences given 4 months later

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter will deal with the results of pre- and post-tests, guided writing tasks and retention judgement test. Each result of the instrument was discussed in detail, and comparative explanations and comments related to the results between the treatment and control groups were made in order to show the differences and similarities in retention and production of the collocations taught for 10 weeks.

4.2. Results

The main aim of this study was to find out whether focusing on collocations would make a significant difference between the two groups in terms of retention and production of collocations. The results have been discussed with the titles of homogeneity tests, results of pre- and post-test, retention judgement test and guided writing tasks.

4.2.1. Homogeneity tests

In order to test the homogeneity of two groups, Michigan Proficiency Test was implemented to the participants. The test results showed that there was no significant difference between the groups. In addition, the list and results of YDS (National University Entrance Exam) were also taken from the faculty. It was concluded that the scores the participants received from YDS were in the same range. Results of both tests showed parallelism in terms of significance statistically.

Table 2

The means, standard deviation and t values of treatment and control group for YDS exam

YDS	Groups	N	X	SD	D	t	P
Results	Control	30	363.84	2.64	58	2.19	.320
	Treatment	30	362.57	1.75			

Table 3

The means, standard deviation and t values of treatment and control group for Michigan Proficiency test

Michigan test	Groups	N	X	SD	D	t	P
Results	Control	30	61.129	10.22	58	1.33	.187
	Treatment	30	64.451	9.35			

It is clear from Table 2 and 3 that there is no significant difference between the control and treatment groups. In Table 2, while the mean for the treatment group is 362.57, the mean for the control group is 363.84, which implies that there is homogeneity in the scores they obtained from YDS exam. In the same way, there is no significant difference between the groups ($p > .005$). In Table 3, while the

mean for the treatment group is 64.451, the mean for the control group is 61.129, which indicates the groups are similar to each other in terms of their homogeneity. There is also no significant difference between the groups ($p > .005$).

4.2.1. Pre-test and post-test

Independent t sample test was used to compare the mean of both groups and see whether there was a significant difference between the groups in terms of their learning collocation, the scoring of pre- test and post- test was done by giving one point to each correct answer and zero point to each wrong answer. Totally 60 students participated in the study.

Table 4

Result of the independent t test between the groups

Tests	Groups	N	X	SD	D	t	P
Pre-test	Control	30	15.03	3.35	58	-108	1.00
	Treatment	30	15.12	3,25			1.00
Post-test	Control	30	23.03	3.91	58	5.45	.000
	Treatment	30	27.93	2.97			.000

An examination of Table 4 shows that in pretest, the mean for the treatment group was 15.12 and the standard deviation 3.25, while the mean for the control group was 15.03 and the standard deviation 3.35. There was no significant difference between the groups in pretest results ($p > .001$). When looked at the post

test results in Table 4, the mean for treatment group was 27.93 and the standard deviation 2.97 while the mean score for control group was 23.03 and the standard deviation 3.91. There was a significant difference between the groups ($p < .001$). The post-test results show that the treatment group exposed to 10 week collocations study in the reading course performed much better than the control group.

4.2.1.1 Frequency and comparison of answers given in both groups in the post-test

In addition to independent t test, the frequency of the collocations answered in the post test was analyzed in order to get more precise results, and make correlations between retention and the post-test. Different frequency ranges were presented in the analysis. The range of frequency analysis changes from 25 to 10. The highest and lowest frequency was taken as a criterion in order to see the differences and similarities between the groups. There were 40 multiple choice items, 25 of which were verb + noun, and 15 of which were adjective + noun collocational relations.

4.2.1.2. Correct answers given between the frequency of 25 and 30 in the post test

The treatment group outperformed the control one. The former is nearly three times more successful than the latter. The frequency of correct answers given by both groups between 25 and 30 is as follows:

Table 5

Correct answers given between the frequency of 25 and 30 in the post-test

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	23
Control	8

Collocations correctly answered in common by both groups were as follows:

5 th	<i>current fashion</i>
7 th	<i>grow roses</i>
9 th	<i>deal with the leaking tent</i>
19 th	<i>contaminated by poison gas leaking</i>
29 th	<i>a ghastly dinner party</i>
30 th	<i>disperse doubts</i>

When looked at the common collocations answered correctly by both groups, the fifth, seventh and ninth collocations seem to be familiar with the participants. The 19th collocation was expected to be answered more by the treatment group because they were given the differences in meaning between the words *contaminate* and *pollute*. The participants of both groups may have been familiar with the verb *contaminate*. Another factor may be that they remember the meaning and collocation of the verb from the context because the key word *contaminate* they have studied in the text was very important. The 29th collocation

was not known by the participants before the treatment. However, both groups remembered the meaning and collocation of the adjective *ghastly* correctly. The 30th collocation was metaphorical and has restricted collocation. When it is used metaphorically, it can be called RC1 because it is often demanding and hard for non native speakers to know and use it (Nesselhauf, 2005). It may be that they remember it from the context because in the text the sentence was in the question form as follows:

How do we clear up misunderstandings and *disperse doubts*?

This example also shows that metaphorical meaning of word combinations deserve to be focused on in the classroom so that learners can use it actively because metaphorical usage falls into the category of collocations arbitrarily restricted (Lewis, 1993).

4.2.1.3. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 25 and 30 in the post test

As Nesselhauf (2005) states, it is important to analyze deviant collocations in order to see where frequent deviations occur. The deviant collocations seen in the frequency of 25 and 30 are as follows:

Table 6

Wrong answers given between the frequency of 25 and 30 in the post-test

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	3
Control	2

The only collocation wrongly judged in common by both groups was as follows:

21st *inflate the image of others*

The possible reason why both groups perceived the word **inflate** as deviant is due to the effect of semantic similarity with the verb **increase**. In guided writing task too, the word **inflate** was misused by the participants and confused with the meaning of **increase**. Another finding about it is that the treatment group produced the word **inflate** once questionable, whereas the control group produced it 4 times questionable and twice unacceptable. There was a difference in production but not in the post test. That may be due to usefulness of multiple choice tests because the participants often have the chance to compare the word with the others and recognizing in other choices. Otherwise, they had to retrieve the word **inflate** correctly from their mental lexicon.

4.2.1.4. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 20 and 24 in the post test

After the highest frequency of deviant collocations, it is also worth analyzing the frequency of wrong answers given by both groups between 20 and 24 frequency in order to see whether there is a significant difference in remembering the right word.

Table 7

Wrong answers given between the frequency of 20 and 24 in the post-test

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	5
Control	6

There were three collocations judged wrongly in common

11th *shrewd looks*

16th *attract someone*

18th *revive the dying soldier*

What is interesting among these collocations is the 16th one, because they could not answer it correctly although all of the participants were familiar with the meaning of it. This also shows that knowing the meaning of a word is not adequate alone. The 11th and 18th ones could be done wrong by both groups because they were not much familiar with two of them. They were not much exposed to the words *shrewd* and *revive*. Therefore, the frequency of encountering words and word combinations is vital to non native speakers (Lewis, 1998, 2000). In this

frequency range too, there is not a significant difference between the groups. They are almost similar to each other.

4.2.1.5. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 15 and 19 in the post-test

In order to see the details of this study, frequency range of the collocations should be insistently followed. There is not much significant difference between both groups. The treatment seems more successful but the frequency of wrong answers is nearly similar to each other.

Table 8

Wrong answers given between the frequency of 15 and 19 in the post-test

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	5
Control	7

Collocations wrongly answered in common by both groups are as follows:

2nd *cause a rebellion*

6th *shatter confidence*

8th *a lenient person*

28th*assess the ability*

The sixth collocation was pointed deviantly due to the possible reason of extending the meaning of the word **break** because there was a difference in both verbs collocationally, although the verb **break** and **shatter** sound synonymous. Learners have often been observed to confuse synonymous words not only because of their differences in meaning but also in collocations they take. That is why Rudzka et.al (1981) has focused on the collocations synonymous words take in his book. However, the problem in the textbook is that there are many collocations that learners cannot keep in their minds, so that they can recall them later. The eighth collocation, in the same way, was confused with the synonymous word **permissive**. In fact, they are different in both meaning and the collocations each takes. They are similar to each other only in general meaning. However, the learners preferred to circle the adjective **permissive** because the word **permissive** associates them the verb **permit**. However, the word **lenient** was quite a new word to them. That's why they preferred to choose the word **permissive** instead of **lenient**. The same explanation is valid for the verbs **assess and cause** because the verbs were associated with the word **evaluate** and **trigger off** as synonymous pairs respectively. These results show that the collocation that synonymous pairs take should be recycled and revisited more often than other collocation types.

4.2.1.6. Wrong answers given between the frequency of 10 and 14 in the post test

Although the highest frequency of wrong answers do not show significant differences between the groups, the frequency of wrong answers given by both groups between 10 and 14 shows significant differences. Table 9 shows the results as follows:

Table 9

Wrong answers given between the frequency of 10 and 14 in the post-test

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	3
Control	14

In Table 9, there is a significant difference between both groups in terms of the frequency. The treatment group is four times more successful than the control group. Collocations wrongly answered in common by both groups are as follows:

1st *assess the damage*

15th *profound differences*

39th *efficacious worker*

Especially the 1st collocation ***assess the damage*** was also done better in retention judgement test by the treatment group. While the control group judged it 12 times correctly at frequency, the treatment group judged it correctly 16 times. The 15th and 39th were classified as RC1 because the collocations of ***profound and efficacious*** is quite restricted because there is a difference between ***deep*** and ***profound***, and ***efficient*** and ***efficacious*** in terms of collocations they take. Their meanings are synonymous but the collocations they take are different, which is the property of arbitrariness of collocations.

4.3. Results of retention judgement test

76 sentences were given to the 60 participants to judge whether the verb + noun and adjective + noun collocations in the sentences were correctly judged. 42 out of 76 collocations were verb + noun, and 34 out of 76 were adjective + noun collocations. A three point scale of judgeability composed of *true*, *false* and *unsure* was given to the participants. Later, frequency of the answers was analyzed manually one by one, and both groups were compared according to the answers they gave to each three point scale of judgeability.

4.3.1. Overall Results According to the Frequency Criteria

Before analyzing the verb + noun and adjective + noun collocations in detail, it can be useful to give the overall results of retention judgement test according to the frequency criterion.

Table 10

Overall results of the retention judgement test according to the frequency criteria

GROUPS	Correctly judged collocations	Wrongly judged collocations	Unsurely judged collocations
Treatment	1704	264	320
Control	1409	430	449

As seen above, the treatment group judged collocations 1704 times correctly, whereas the control group judged only 1409 times correctly. When

looked at the collocation judged wrongly, it can be seen that the control group judged the collocations out of 76 sentences 430 times wrongly while the treatment group judged them only 269 times wrongly. The collocations unsurely judged by the control group were 449, whereas the treatment group judged the collocations 320 times unsurely. In overall results, it is seen that the treatment group remembered and judged collocations better than the control group.

4.3.2. Frequency of Collocations Correctly Judged

The highest frequency was taken as a criterion to see the difference between both groups. The highest frequency correctly judged was between 25 and 30. The results show that treatment group is more successful than the control group in that the former judged 20 lexical collocations higher than the latter. The result is shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Collocations correctly judged between 25 and 30 frequency

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	34
Control	14

Some lexical collocations occurring between the frequency of 25 and 30 were judged in the same frequency. There were 7 lexical collocations correctly judged in common in the same frequency by both groups:

4 th collocation	<i>environmental deterioration</i>
12 th collocation	<i>heavy strain</i>
18 th collocation	<i>stick to the rules</i>
21 st collocation	<i>juvenile delinquency</i>
24 th collocation	<i>distinctive characteristics</i>
26 th collocation	<i>odd clothes</i>
31 st collocation	<i>satisfy our needs</i>

The 12th and 21st were RC1 collocations. RC1 collocations seem easier to remember to some extent. The fact that all RC1s are easier to remember is tentative. If the learners frequently face the same collocations, and the collocations they encounter are strictly restricted, they will probably remember them easier. Since the word combinations *environmental deterioration*, *stick to the rules*, *distinctive characteristics*, *odd clothes*, *satisfy our needs* are, to some extent, semantically motivated, they were also judged correctly. For example, the word ***eat*** entails the combinations such as *a meal, breakfast, lunch or dinner*, which shows that the word ***eat*** is semantically motivated to ***meals***.

4.3.3. Frequency of Collocations Wrongly Judged

The highest frequency range in judging the collocations wrongly was 10 or more. In both groups, 10 and above frequency was taken as a criterion to see the difference in both groups. The result shows that the treatment group judged the collocation wrongly twice less than the control group. The results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Collocations wrongly judged between 10 and above frequency

Groups	Total
Treatment	5
Control	10

Some sentences occurring between the frequency of 10 and more were judged in the same frequency. There were three collocations wrongly judged in common in the same frequency by both groups. These are as follows:

28th collocation *a meaningful relationship*

37th collocation *give attention*

42nd collocation *connect my body*

The first word combination in the 28th sentence is *adjective + noun* collocation. The possible reason of wrong judgement of *a meaningful relationship* is that its metaphorical combination with the noun *relationship*. The second word combination is *verb + noun*. The collocation *give attention* may be wrongly judged, although many learners overuse the verb *give* in the literature (Eker, 2001). The third one is *connect my body*. The possible wrong judgement of this word combination is metaphorical meaning of the verb *connect* because the word *connect* is largely associated with technology but not with the body.

Table13

Collocations wrongly judged between 5 and 9 frequency

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	11
Control	30

The result shows that the control group judged the collocations wrongly more than the treatment group between 5 and 9 frequency. The collocations judged wrongly in common by both groups are as follows:

<i>17th collocation</i>	<i>dissolve tension</i>
<i>32nd collocation</i>	<i>genuine love</i>
<i>43rd collocation</i>	<i>label beautiful girls shallow</i>
<i>52nd collocation</i>	<i>colossal streets</i>
<i>53rd collocation</i>	<i>hazardous side effects</i>

The 17th collocation is mostly confused with ***solve*** and ***resolve*** because in writing task too the same mistakes were repeated by the participants, which shows that words similar to each other semantically and phonologically are easier to miscollocate. The 32nd collocation ***genuine love*** is again confused with ***real***. Although both take the same noun, one can say ***real love*** or ***genuine love***, the learners are inclined to collocate love with the adjective ***real*** because they are mostly faced with ***real*** in reading or speaking contexts. It can be said that of the

two collocations taking the same collocation, the one frequently encountered will be remembered better. The 43rd, 52nd and 53rd collocations were wrongly judged by the participants. It can be due to the fact that students met these words and collocations less than the other words. Meeting word combinations less will probably harden retention of lexis from mental lexicon.

4.3.4. Frequency of Collocations Unsurely Judged

The highest frequency range in judging the collocations unsurely was 10 or more. In both groups, 10 and above frequency was taken as a criteria to see the difference in both groups. The result shows that the treatment group judged the collocations 11 times less than the control group. The results are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Collocations unsurely judged between 10 and above frequency

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	7
Control	18

The same collocations unsurely judged in both groups were only four collocations, all of which were verb + noun collocations.

29 th sentence	<i>quote a writer</i>
65 th sentence	<i>assess the damage</i>
71 st sentence	<i>forestall illegal entrance</i>
72 nd sentence	<i>pass the legislation</i>

The reason why both groups judged the 29th collocation unsurely may be due to the fact that the word **quote** can take direct object without a preposition. L1 influence can be seen here because in Turkish one does not say “Yazarı alıntı yaptım” but rather “*Yazardan alıntı yaptım*”. One in Turkish uses **ablatum** “-den-dan” whereas in the verb **quote** does not need to take **ablatum**. The 69th collocation was *assess the damage*. The participants cannot think of someone’s assessing damage, one can easily see that the extension of **assess + noun** collocation should be learnt by the students because this may be also owing to the effect of L1 influence because in Turkish one does not say “*kazayı değerlendireceğiz*”, which sounds strange to Turkish native speakers. In Turkish, one often says “birinin *sinavını, yeteneğini, performansını değerlendireceğiz*” (*assess one’ exam paper, ability and performance but not accident*). Not only restrictions of collocations should be learnt but their extended collocations as well. The 71st collocation *forestall illegal entrance* may be due to not remembering the meaning of **forestall** or not knowing the extension of collocation of **forestall**. Another possible explanation is that the word **forestall** is associated with the meaning of **foresee** because the prefix **-fore-** reminds the learners of something that happens in advance. It is surprising that both groups judged this collocation unsurely in the same frequency because the treatment group studied the difference between **prevent** and **forestall** because the treatment group was expected to perform better than the control group. The last collocation unsurely judged in the same frequency was *pass the legislation*. This is probably due to not being aware of the transitive

usage of the verb *pass*. This shows that explicit teaching of words between the two languages is important to form appropriate collocations.

4.3.5. Frequency of *adjective + noun* Collocations in Retention Judgement Test

In this study, there were 34 *adjective + noun* collocations out of 76. The frequency of collocations was analyzed. This frequency analysis aimed to see whether there was a significant difference between both groups in order to find out which group performed better. The frequency range in this part was between 25 - 30 and 10 and above. The highest and the lowest frequency range were taken as a criterion.

4.3.5.1. Frequency of *adjective + noun* Collocation Correctly Judged

The highest frequency was taken as a criterion to find out whether there was a significant difference between both groups. As seen in Table 14, the treatment group performed better in *adjective + noun* collocations than the control group.

Table15

Adjective + noun Collocations Correctly judged between 25 -30 Frequency

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	17
Control	8

3 *adjective + noun* collocations were judged in the same frequency. These collocations are as follows:

12th collocation *heavy strain*

21st collocation *juvenile delinquency*

26th collocation *odd clothes*

12th and 21st collocations are RC1 collocation types. The words **juvenile** and **delinquency** are used with only the ones that are not adults but only young people, so both entail coming together at syntagmatic and paradigmatic level. The 12th collocation is metaphorical and a restricted collocation. The noun ***strain*** was associated with the adjective ***heavy*** by the participants. They stored them as restricted collocations in their mental lexicon. This result implies that if learners can store strictly restricted collocations, they can judge them correctly. In this sense, RC1 collocations help learners store them appropriately. The 26th collocation was judged in the same frequency by both groups, possibly due to flexible usage of the adjective ***odd*** because it can be used with different nouns and can be classified in RC2 category.

Table16

Adjective + noun Collocations wrongly judged between 10 and above frequency

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	2
Control	5

The treatment group, as seen in Table 16, judged *adjective + noun* collocations wrongly less than the control group. However, there is not much significant difference between them. The treatment group judged the two collocations *the baffling complexity* and *meaningful relationship* as wrong, while the control group interpreted the five collocations *unsightly houses*, *the slim majority*, *meaningful relationship*, *accurate body image picture*, *unsuccessful experience* wrongly.

Table17

Adjective + noun Collocations unsurely judged between 10 and above frequency

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	2
Control	2

The treatment group as seen in Table 17 judged adjective + noun collocations unsurely no less than the control group. The treatment group judged the two collocations *accurate body image picture* and *unsuccessful experience* unsurely, whereas the control group judged the two collocations *the baffling complexity and ghastly party*. It is seen from the Tables 16 and 17 that both groups judged nearly the same collocations either as wrong or unsure. The treatment group is more successful only in two collocations, which are *unsightly houses* and *the slim majority*. The former collocation is semantically motivated, whereas the latter is metaphorical and restricted collocation. The other collocations judged wrongly

or unsurely in common by both groups are all restricted collocations. Restricted collocations can be remembered if they are encountered more often. If restricted collocations are not recycled or revisited, or skip attention, they will probably not be remembered. For example, the collocation *meaningful relationship* was judged wrongly by both groups, although this collocation sounds very easy. That's why even the most familiar words should be recorded with its combinations because recognition of and understanding words while reading do not guarantee retrieval of its word combinations during production. Another problematic collocation for both groups was *the baffling complexity*. It was probably due to the first time they encountered the word *baffle*, and since they were not exposed to this word combination for a long time, they could not remember it precisely and therefore judged it as wrong or unsure. In the same way, the collocation *accurate body image picture* could not be judged correctly by both groups. The possible reason is that they forgot the collocation the word *accurate* would take, which implies that teachers should not give up teaching lexis till they are sure of learners' storing the collocations the word takes in their mental lexicon..

4.3.6. Frequency of *verb + noun* Collocations in Retention Judgement Test

In this study there were 42 *verb + noun* collocations out of 76. The frequency of collocations was analyzed. This frequency analysis aimed to see whether there was a significant difference between both groups in order to see which group performed better in *verb + noun* collocations.

4.3.6.1. Frequency of *verb + noun* Collocation Correctly Judged

Correctly judged collocations were within the same range of frequency. There was no significant difference between the groups.

Table18

Verb + noun Collocations Correctly Judged between 25 -30 Frequency

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	14
Control	14

Both groups judged verb + noun collocations in the same frequency, which proves that verb + noun collocations are stored better in the mental lexicon (Nesselhauf, 2005) because verb + noun collocations have syntactic functions in the language (Howarth, 1996). 6 collocations correctly judged in common by both groups are as follows:

7 th	<i>disperse doubts</i>
11 th	<i>assert themselves</i>
31 st	<i>satisfy needs</i>
51 st	<i>clear up misunderstandings</i>
68 th	<i>raise temper</i>
75 th	<i>resolve the economic problems</i>

The 7th, 51st and 68th collocations were metaphorical. What is interesting in this part is that although metaphorical usage of words requires great effort to judge correctly, both groups were able to do recall and make correct judgements. However, the 7th, 51st and 68th collocations were quite active and vital in the text.

This result implies that even if the word combinations are arbitrarily restricted and metaphorical, they can be recalled only if they are strong metaphorical collocations and in the position of active lexis in the text. The 11th, 31st and 75th collocations are more semantically motivated. Therefore, they are naturally easier to remember from mental lexicon.

4.3.6.2. Frequency of *verb + noun* Collocation Wrongly Judged between 25-30 frequency

Especially detailed examination of deviant *verb + noun* collocations are very important in understanding in terms of where the learners often make errors because *verb + noun* collocations help learners use them syntactically. If learners' appropriate retention and use of *verb + noun* collocations are increased, they can gain communicative competence in syntactic processing.

Table19

Frequency of *verb + noun* Collocation Wrongly Judged between 25-30 frequency

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	0
Control	0

It is seen in the table 19 that there is no deviation in judging the *verb + noun* collocations at the frequency of 25-30 in both groups, which implies that the participants did remember *verb + noun* collocations at a high level correctly because learners can be said to store *verb + noun* collocations better than other

lexical and grammatical categories. However, retention of verb +noun collocations does not guarantee retrieval from the mental lexicon.

4.3.6.3. Frequency of *verb* + *noun* Collocation Unsurely Judged between 25-30 frequency

The treatment group is more successful in judging the collocations surely than the control group. The result shows that the treatment group judges *verb* + *noun* collocations unsurely more precisely than the control group because the latter answered 12 times more unsurely than the treatment group.

Table 20

Frequency of *verb* + *noun* Collocation Unsurely Judged between 25-30 frequency

Groups	Number of words
Treatment	5
Control	17

There were 4 *verb* + *noun* collocations unsurely judged by both groups in common. These collocations are as follows:

29 th	<i>quote a writer</i>
65 th	<i>assess the damage</i>
71 st	<i>forestall illegal entrance</i>
72 nd	<i>pass the legislation</i>

The reason why both groups judged the 29th collocation unsurely is due to the effect of L1 influence. L1 influence can be seen here because in Turkish one does not say “Yazarı alıntı yaptım” but rather “*Yazardan alıntı yaptım*”. One in Turkish uses **ablatum** “-den-dan” whereas in the verb *quote* does not need to take **ablatum**. The participants cannot think of someone’s *assess damage*, one can easily see that the extension of *assess + noun* collocation should be learnt by the students because this may be also owing to the effect of L1 influence because in Turkish one does not say “*kazayı değerlendireceğiz*”, which sounds strange to Turkish native speakers. In Turkish, one often says “birinin *sınavını, yeteneğini, performansını değerlendireceğiz*”(*assess one’ exam paper, ability and performance but not accident*). The 71st collocation was judged unsurely due to rare encountering the word *forestall* confusing its real meaning with the word *foretell* due to the possible effect of prefix-*fore*, which causes both words to be confused. The 72nd collocation was also judged unsurely. This is probably due to not being aware of the transitive usage of the verb *pass*. This shows that semantic value of words and explicit teaching of lexis such showing the differences between L1 and L2 are important to form appropriate collocations.

4.4. Collocations Judged in Common by Both Groups

The collocations judged in the same frequency by both groups were given below. Collocations judged in common by both groups as follows:

Correctly judged	wrongly judged	unsurely judged
<i>environmental deterioration</i>	<i>a meaningful relationship</i>	<i>quote a writer</i>
<i>heavy strain</i>	<i>give attention</i>	<i>assess the damage</i>
<i>stick to the rules</i>	<i>connect my body</i>	<i>forestall illegal entrance</i>
<i>juvenile delinquency</i>	<i>dissolve tension</i>	<i>pass the legislation</i>
<i>distinctive characteristics</i>	<i>genuine love</i>	

<i>odd clothes</i>	label beautiful girls shallow
<i>satisfy our needs</i>	colossal streets
<i>disperse doubts</i>	hazardous side effects
<i>assert themselves</i>	
<i>clear up misunderstandings</i>	
<i>raise temper</i>	
<i>resolve the economic problems</i>	

11 correctly, 8 wrongly and 4 unsurely judged collocations were among the collocations judged in the same frequency and in common by both groups. Totally 23 out of 76 collocations were in common, which shows that there is a significant differentiation in 63 collocations. 9 and 14 of them are adjective + noun and verb noun collocations respectively.

4.5. Results of the guided writing tasks

Totally the participants were given 93 words to use them in guided writing task. Each participant was asked to write a 200 word essay using the words given in the boxes (See appendix 2). They were given four topics to write about what was studied in the course throughout ten weeks. 33 of them were adjectives, 7 nouns and 54 verbs. However, the participants used only 70 of the words (verbs, adjective and noun). 34 out of 71 words were verbs, 29 adjectives, and 7 nouns.

Three point scale of acceptability was used. The scale was composed of acceptable (A), questionable (Q), unacceptable (UA). The essays were analyzed by one British and two American native speakers. Three dictionaries were also used. If native speakers and dictionaries approve what the participant wrote down, it was accepted as acceptable (A). If it is not in the dictionary but the native speakers accept it as questionable, it was accepted as questionable (Q). If sources, native

speakers and dictionaries do not accept the usage of collocation written, it was accepted as unacceptable (UA). If it is not found in the dictionaries but the native speakers say we do not clearly say in this way, it was again accepted as unacceptable (UA). If native speakers judged the combinations unacceptable, they were asked to provide an acceptable or better option to express the intended meaning.

4.5.1 Deviation in lexical collocations

It is vital to see deviant collocations and analyze which words are miscollocated. Overall results show that the treatment group produced more appropriate collocations in the guided writing task. Table 21 shows the overall results.

Table 21

Overall results of deviant verb + noun and adjective noun collocations

Groups	Q	UA
Treatment	19	17
Control	16	30

19 word combinations were brought together as questionable by the treatment group, whereas the control group produced 16 word combinations as questionable. Unacceptable collocations written by the treatment group were 17 while those by control group were 30 in the occurrences. In occurrences of

unacceptable collocations, the treatment group was more successful than the control group.

4.5.1.1 Deviant verb + noun collocations

It was one of the aims of this study to see whether the treatment group would produce verb + noun collocation better than the control group. In Table 22 and 23 deviations in verb + noun collocations are shown.

Table 22

Number of deviant verb + noun collocations

Groups	Verb +noun deviation
Treatment	10
Control	11

Considering only the numbers given in Table 22, performance in the control group seems similar to the treatment group. However, when the frequency table is analyzed, it is seen as follows:

Table 23

Frequency of overall deviant verb + noun collocations

Groups	Verb + noun deviation
Treatment	28
Control	49

It is seen in Table 23 that the treatment group produced verb + noun collocations more appropriately than the control group.

4.5.1.2. Deviant adjective + noun collocations

Nouns are modified by different adjectives, and it can be said that it is more difficult for the learners to produce the appropriate adjective + noun collocations than the appropriate *verb + noun* collocations. In Table 24 and 25, it is seen that the treatment group produced *adjective + noun* collocations more appropriately than the control in terms of both number and frequency.

Table 24

Number of deviant adjective + noun collocations

Groups	Adjective +noun deviation
Treatment	4
Control	15

Table 25

Frequency of overall deviant adjective + noun collocations

Groups	Adjective +noun deviation
Treatment	8
Control	30

In Tables 24 and 25, number and occurrences of deviant *adjective + noun* collocations are less in the treatment group than the control group. Collocations used by the participants and judged by the researchers as deviant have been given below. Deviant verb+ noun and adjective + noun collocations were given separately. The results show that the treatment group was more careful in using verb + noun collocations. However, the control group was not aware of the restricted collocations that the verbs take. Since the treatment group studied *verb+ noun* collocations not only from the text but also from the Oxford Collocation Dictionary, they probably had more collocations in their mental lexicon to retrieve the appropriate collocation to the collocator, that is, the verbs and adjectives studied in the reading course. If the learners in foreign language classrooms are not aware of these restrictions, they will use collocations which sound appropriate to them and will be based on only their intuitions. In Eker's (2001) study too, it was found out that the students in the department of ELT use collocations more deviantly in their writing course as time passes because while the students were more careful with using the collocations during the first year, they tended to use collocations in their writing more deviantly in later years. This study shows that if learners are long exposed to collocation study through recycle and revisit strategy

and lexical approach exercises and constant attention on word combinations, they will probably produce appropriate collocations that sound strong and native-like. The numbers given first indicate the number of occurrences, and those in brackets the number of learners.

Deviant verb + noun collocations

Control group

belittle behaviors 2 (2L)

bolster body 4 (4L)

unfold relationship 4 (4L)

acquire to care life 7(7L)

forestall the future 1(1L)

don't baffle!!! 3(3L)

produce new abilities 1(1L)

generate abilities 3(3L)

sophisticate people1(1L)

trace parents9 (9L)

shift children 5(5L)

dissolve problems 14(13L)

withdraw from what she said 2(2L)

No deviation

Treatment group

belittle the person 1 (1L)

bolster body1(1L)

unfold a situation 1(1L)

No deviation

forestall the future1(1L)

No deviation

No deviation

No deviation

No deviation

trace parents 8(8L)

do a shift 1(1L)

dissolve the problem3(3L)

No deviation

satisfy appearance 1(1L)

No deviation	harness the quake 4(4L)
No deviation	deluge someone 1(1L)
No deviation	dissect facial expression 1(1L)
No deviation	provide both sexes 2(2L)
Deviant adjective + noun collocations	
Control group	Treatment group
deviant parents 4(4)	deviant parents1(1L)
obnoxious with marriage 4 (4L)	No deviation
adventurous people 4(4L)	No deviation
effective on people 3(3L)	No deviation
efficacious nuclear power2(2L)	efficacious on people 1(1L)
hazardous subject/devastation 3(3L)	No deviation
potent quakes3(3L)	No deviation
unsightly energy 1(1L)	No deviation
overt to people3(3L)	overt belief 2 (2L)
sophisticated matter/roads5(5L)	No deviation
powerful buildings1(1L)	No deviation
elegant speech 1(1L)	No deviation
the furtive behaviors 1(1L)	furtive behaviors 2(2L)

pervasive person1(1L)

pervasive way/parents 2(2L)

No deviation

inscrutable deaths 3 (3L)

4.5.2. Questionable collocations

In this study, there are a great many of collocations judged by neither native speakers nor dictionaries. Questionable collocations were difficult in this study to make comments because as Nesselhauf (2005) states, even the largest corpora of BNC (British National Corpus) may not help researchers judge on collocations. Since collocations are inherently arbitrary and cultural, sometimes it is difficult even for native speakers to judge whether it is appropriate or not. The researchers studying on collocations may not know whether the collocations produced by the learners are true by looking up in several dictionaries. It is worth showing the results of questionable collocations. For overall results in this study, Table 26 can be of help.

Table 26

Frequency of questionable collocations

Groups	Questionable collocations
Treatment	16
Control	19

As seen in Table 26, in overall results, there is not a significant difference, which shows that collocations are demanding to learn and requires a great cognitive energy. Arbitrariness of collocations is one of the reasons for this

hardship. Other reasons may be classified as inadequate attention and awareness on collocations because less attention on word combinations will result in the difficulty of remembering and retrieving the appropriate collocation. Constant awareness should also be provided by the teachers because learners may tend to read the text fast and pass on to the next text. More time should be spent on the text in order to store the word combinations into mental lexicon regularly. The problem may also stem from the function of human memory processing because adults can store 7 chunks averagely in a lesson in the working memory (Sousa, 2000). If the learners are exposed to quite a lot of collocations in a reading course, they will probably forget most of them because short term memory system is limited in capacity (Jensen, 2000). This problem is also among the limitations of the study because learners were exposed to a great many of collocations in the reading courses.

4.5.2.1. Verb + noun collocations marked as questionable

Table 27 and 28 shows which group produced more precise verb + noun collocations.

Table27

Number of verb + noun collocations marked as questionable

Groups	Verb + noun
Treatment	11
Control	11

Table 28

Frequency of verb + noun collocations marked as questionable

Groups	Verb +noun
Treatment	25
Control	36

Verb + noun collocations as marked questionable by both groups show that there is not a significant difference between them. There is differentiation only in the frequency, which can be considered relatively an important factor because this shows that the treatment group produced *verb + noun* collocations more precisely.

4.5.2.2. *Adjective + noun* collocations marked as questionable

Since questionable adjective + noun collocations also have the property of arbitrariness just like *verb + noun* collocations, it was not easy to judge them absolutely. Table 29 and 30 shows which group produced more precise verb + noun collocations.

Table 29

Number of *adjective + noun* collocations marked as questionable

Groups	Adjective + noun
Treatment	6
Control	5

Table 30

Number of adjective + noun collocations marked as questionable

Groups	Adjective + noun
Treatment	13
Control	12

The treatment and control groups have produced *adjective + noun* collocations almost similar to each other. Questionable *adjective + noun* collocations in both groups were almost in the same frequency range. Word combinations are arbitrarily restricted and fuzzy, complete judgements are at times hard to make (Nesselhauf, 2005). In this study, nearly a quarter of the collocations could not be judged completely. Collocations used by the participants and judged by the researcher as questionable in Table 29 and 30 have been given below:

Questionable *verb* + *noun* collocations

Control group

Bolster the facts 2(2L)

Unfold furtive life/heart 2(2L)

resort to each other 1(1L)

provide knowing 2(2L)

acquire girls1(1L)

forestall ourselves1(1L)

evaluate body image1 (1L)

produce a good life 3(1L)

dissect qualities 3(2L)

sophisticate people 1(1L)

breed children 6(4L)

relieve someone 5(3L)

inflate oneself 6(6L)

No questionable collocation

No questionable collocation

Treatment group

bolster children 2 (2L)

unfold beliefs 1(1L)

No questionable collocation

provide needs 1(1L)

acquire mutual affection 2(2L)

No questionable collocation

No questionable collocation

produce situation 5(4L)

dissect two people 3(3L)

No questionable collocation

breed a child 1(1L)

relieve someone 1(1L)

inflate individualism 1(1L)

belittle important features1 (1L)

destroy health 1(1L)

Questionable *adjective*+ *noun* collocations

Control group	Treatment group
Perilous behavior 1(1L)	No questionable collocation
No questionable collocation	inscrutable idea 1(1L)
Be reckless to a problem ¹ (1L)	reckless ideas 2(2L)
Potent way 1(1L)	No questionable collocation
Satisfy a grimy woman 1(1L)	No questionable collocation
Sophisticated about the quake ³ (3L)	sophisticated thoughts ³ (3L)
Furtive things 2(2L)	furtive towards s.o. ¹ (1L)
Extramural life 1(1L)	No questionable collocation
No questionable collocation	overt thoughts 4(4L)
No questionable collocation	filthy setting 1(1L)

4.5.2.3. Deviations resulting from only nouns

Seven nouns given and used by the participants were used as deviant. 7 nouns were used after verbs. The treatment group showed more deviation than the control group, which implies that *nouns* should also be emphasized in order to form appropriate *verb* + *noun* or *adjective* + *noun* collocations.

Table 31

Number of deviant nouns with verbs

Groups	Noun deviation
Treatment	5
Control	4

Control group

Use laissez faire

Do delinquency

Give harm

Do a shift

No deviation

No deviation

No deviation

Treatment group

take laissez faire

no deviation

no deviation

do a shift

make legislation

follow parents' trace

give a respite

This result indicates that only giving the meaning of *nouns* or *verbs* is not adequate alone. Studies based on only *verbs* may not give expected results. In order to help learners use *nouns* with *verbs* appropriately, they may be given first nouns and then are asked to guess which verbs it takes. The procedure may be from *noun*

towards *verb*. For example, the noun ***cake*** can be given, and the learners are asked to use or guess the appropriate *verbs* related to the noun ***cake*** :

make, bake, cut, dress

CAKE

Especially semantically motivated *verb* + *noun* relations can be stressed in classroom environments. Arbitrarily restricted verb +noun relations naturally require more effort and cognitive energy due to the property of arbitrariness of language. However, in both situations, the focus should also be on *nouns*.

4.6. Conclusion

In this chapter, the results of three instruments were shown. Firstly, the outcomes of post test showed that there was quite a significant difference between the treatment and control group. The frequency of the post test was also given and the results indicated that the treatment group outperformed the control group. Secondly, according to the criterion of frequency, the results of retention judgement test demonstrated that the treatment group remembered and judged better than the control group. Lastly, the outcomes of guided writing tasks pointed out that the treatment group produced the collocations less deviantly and more appropriately in writing than the control group. However, during production of guided writing tasks, we have seen that *nouns* should be emphasized more in order to produce appropriate collocations. In the light of these data, the results will be discussed in seven principles in the next chapter in order to get a more precise schema of the study.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

In this chapter, results of the findings will be discussed in several dimensions. Systematicity, length of time, explicit teaching, confused words, L1 influence, questionable collocations and psychological processing will be taken into consideration while discussing the results.

5.2. Systematicity

Systematicity is vital in collocation studies in teaching reading because randomly taught collocations may not be retrieved easily from mental lexicon. Systematicity in vocabulary teaching has been emphasized and is thought to lead to acquisition (Nation, 1990; Nesselhauf, 2005, pp.264-266). Nattinger & DeCarrico (1992, pp.133-134) state that since formulaic phrases are taught in any systematic way in second language classes, non native speakers often do not recognize the relationship of its parts and classify how to teach lexical phrases systematically. In course books, useful expressions are given in a certain part systematically but as Nesselhauf (2005) points out, researchers do not have necessary instruments and materials to teach collocation systematically. Some vocabulary books such as “*The words you need, More words you need, series of Vocabulary in use and Target vocabulary, The Right Word*” can be followed. If course books are supported together with vocabulary books given above can help L2 learners gain awareness on collocations. These books follow a systematic way to teach not only words alone but also word combinations. Teachers, in this sense, should revise their curriculum. In addition, revisit and recycle is another part of systematicity. After non native speakers have scanned and recorded collocations they have studied in the texts, they can also be given vocabulary books in order to reinforce the collocations they have learnt or recorded in their vocabulary notebooks. In this

study, verbs, nouns and adjectives were studied systematically. Repetition, recycle and revisit were applied throughout the study. In this sense, the students were told what words they were going to learn and that they were going to be exposed to only limited vocabulary but more on their combinations. 14 synonymous pairs from 4 units were chosen deliberately to see whether there was going to be a significant difference between the treatment and control groups.

Table 32

Synonymous pairs of verbs and adjectives

Synonymous pairs of verbs	Synonymous pairs of adjectives
Assess/evaluate	Overt/open
Deal with/cope with	Profound /deep
Contaminate/pollute	Well groomed/well dressed
Bolster/support	Obnoxious/unpleasant
Prevent/forestall	effective/efficacious
Shatter/break	
Cause/trigger off	
Conceal/hide	
Alter/shift/change	

These synonymous words were taken from the textbook *The words you need*. Their combinations were explained in the textbook in detail.

Table 33

Results of the independent t test between the groups for synonymous pairs

synonymous pairs	Groups	N	X	SD	D	t	P
---------------------	--------	---	---	----	---	---	---

pretest	Control	30	8,333	2,2488	58	540	,591
	Treatment	30	8,066	1,7489			,596

Post-test	Control	30	11,133	2,0800	58	4,653	,000
	Treatment	30	13,545	2,0324			

As Table 33 shows, while the treatment group's mean score is 8.06 and the standard deviation 1.74 in the pre-test, the control group's mean score is 8.33 and the standard deviation 2.24, and there is no significant difference between the control and treatment groups ($p > .005$). In the post-test, the treatment group's mean score is 13.54 and the standard deviation 2.03, while the control group's mean score is 11.13 and the standard deviation 2.08, and there is a significant difference in the post test between the groups ($p < .005$). This study supports the idea that only descriptive studies of learners' essays are not beneficial alone; rather, learners' performance should be checked week by week and be given feedback so that they can focus on slight differences between similar words. For example, the words *assess* and *evaluate* have the same meanings. However, the collocations they take are different from each other to some extent. While the word *assess* is used with the collocation of *damage*, the word *evaluate* cannot be used. Another example is the synonymous pair words *shatter* and *break*. Native speakers of English use the verb *shatter* with the collocational words *confidence*, *belief* and *hope*, whereas the verb *break* cannot be used with these collocations. The treatment group in this study was asked to focus on these differences and since *recycle and revisit strategy* (R&R) was vital in teaching these differences, it was followed insistently. However, one disadvantage of this kind of study was the abundance of collocations that the synonymous words take because as mentioned before, short term capacity and attention time are limited in storing learning items.

5.3. Length of time

Without adequate time, it is hard to keep words and word combination in the mental lexicon in order to retrieve them later. Incidental vocabulary may help learners remember and use some words but the collocation studies show that it may not help learners form appropriate word combinations. Length of time means sustaining teaching the same vocabulary, and drives the learners to focus on the word combinations of the words they have learnt. Revisit and recycle strategy can be seen as a waste of time by teachers or learners. However, frequent recycle and

revisit strategy in collocation studies is of great importance. Therefore, throughout the study revisit and recycle strategy was applied; different activities such as *five word stories* the *missing verb* and *match collocations* were also given to the treatment group because EFL learners are easily bored in classroom environments. Following learners' progress week by week may both require a long time and help learners acquire collocations systematically and accurately. Fruitful results cannot be expected from collocation studies in a short time. In this study too, a period of 15 hours was spent for each unit and the collocations studied were often recycled and revisited.

5.4. Explicit teaching

Some findings (Nesselhauf, 2003; Lewis, 2000; Howarth, 1998) about collocational competence show that even if a learner has long been exposed to English in English speaking countries, it has been seen that it had a slight effect on collocational accuracy and had no effect in language classrooms. It is assumed that explicit teaching help learners gain awareness on what they have been learning. In this study too, learners were often given explicit teaching. The participants were given the chance of making comparisons between their L1 and L2 in order to focus on word combinations. One of the activities stated in Lewis' (1998) exercise is translation from L2 to L1. He puts forward the idea that translating from L2 to L1 is important in gaining awareness of the differences in collocations in separate languages, so in Lexical Approach, translation activity is regarded as a positive element. In addition, incidental learning is not sufficient for collocation studies because even if learners are exposed to learning words randomly, they may have difficulty producing L2 lexis appropriately. Explicit teaching triggers awareness in learners and drive them to notice on collocations. Learners may require explicit teaching activities. They may want to translate from L1 to L2. Translation activities may help them understand the arbitrariness of collocations. In this study,

explicit teaching activities such as matching, fill-in the blank, cloze tests were implemented to the treatment group. Especially during oral production in the class, the errors of students were corrected by giving them different word combinations to choose the right word. For oral production, five minute oral activity was taken from Hill's article (2000). Since repetition is an important element in Lexical Approach and should be prepared in a challenging way, repetition of word combinations learnt was applied in the class because encountering words only once or twice is not enough. As Lewis states (1998), a learner should meet a word or lexis at least seven times in order to store it in the long term memory. If the learners had still been unaware of slight differences or appropriate word combinations, new exercises were given in different formats stressing the same word combinations.

There are also two important criteria stressed by Nesselhauf (2003). The first, collocations should be taught not only with grids but also with entire combinations including prepositions, articles etc. The second, L1-L2 differences should be focused on explicitly. Not only impossible collocations of a word should be taught, but also frequent and acceptable collocations should be presented to L2 learners.

5.5. L1 influence

Although some researchers (Martin, 1984; Dechert & Lennon, 1989; Lennon, 1989) state that L1 influence is not much important in the area of lexis, recent research findings (Biskup, 1990; Nesselhauf, 2003, 2005; Bahns & Eldaw, 1993; Biskup, 1992) have discovered that L1 influence seems unavoidable in collocation studies. There is frequent transfer by advanced learners, and such an influence is likely (Nesselhauf, 2005, p.180). In her study she states that verbs and nouns form the higher degree of L1 influence. 200 verbs and 76 nouns out of 476 words were influential in her study. Verbs in collocations are often transferred. The rate of transfer occurs higher than in free combinations. This situation shows

that cognitive energy is needed to lessen the rate of L1 transfer. L1 influence seems to be unavoidable in collocation studies. In this study too, L1 influence was observed in the production of the guided writing tasks. The numbers given first indicate the number of occurrences, and those in brackets the number of learners. For example, two groups wrote the collocations transferred from L1 as follows:

Control group	Treatment group
Give harm 13 (12 L)	give harm 1(1L)
Do a shift 5(5L)	do a shift 1(1L)
Make legislation1 (1L)	make legislation1 (1L)
Provide knowing ourselves2 (2L)	provide someone to understand 1(1L)
Adventurous government4 (4L)	No L1 influence
Powerful buildings 1(1L)	No L1 influence
Generate new abilities3 (3L)	No L1 influence
Trace my parents 9 (9L)	Trace my parents 8(8L)
Effective on someone3 (3L)	No L1 influence
Shift someone 5(5L)	No L1 influence
No L1 influence	achieve to do something

In Table 34, the differences between the groups are shown to explain L1 influence. The treatment group showed less L1 influence in production than the control group.

Table34

L1 influence in groups

Groups	Number of words	Frequency
Treatment	6	12
Control	10	46

The control group transferred 10 words from L1, whereas the treatment group transferred only 6 words but frequency of transfer between the groups was high. The control group's frequency was 46, whereas the treatment group's was 12. This result tentatively shows that the group exposed to collocation study was less influenced by L1. The reason why the treatment group transferred fewer collocations from L1 can be due to the effect of explicit teaching and translation activity because translating from L2 to L1 makes learners aware of collocations between the two languages.

5.6. Confused words

Another problem in collocation studies appear confused words stemming from either expanded meaning of affix or phonological similarities which caused learners to produce deviant collocations or different collocations each takes.

Table35

Number of confused words in both groups

Groups	Number of words confused
Treatment	5
Control	5

Table 35 shows that there is no difference between both groups. This implies that the learners are inclined to confuse similar words semantically and phonologically, and that more attention should be given while teaching word combinations. The confused words produced by both groups were given below. The words written in brackets were intended meanings.

Control group

Forestall the future (foresee)

Treatment group

forestall the future (foresee)

Inflate the number	(increase)	belittle someone (humiliate)
Dissolve problems	(solve)	dissolve the problem (solve)
Overt to me	(open)	overt to me (open)
Trace children	(follow)	trace children (follow)

The examples show that the *verb* + *noun* collocation *forestall the future* was probably associated with *foresee*. The problem possibly stemmed from the prefix *-fore-* which demonstrates that something will happen in the future. In the same way, *inflate* was associated with *increase* because *inflation* is a kind of *increase* of something technically. The word *trace* was confused with *follow*. In addition, *overt* was confused with *open*. *Dissolve*, *resolve* and *solve* were all used in the same meanings, whereas *dissolve* was totally different from *resolve* and *solve*. This may be due to phonological similarity and dominant meaning of the verb *solve*. It seems that both groups perceived their meanings in the same way, and that may be the reason why they used the same collocations. Due to attention and large data problems, these slight differences were nearly impossible to expect the learners to produce accurately.

5.7. Questionable collocations

Questionable collocations imply that collocations deserve more attention than it does now (Nesselhauf, 2005). Learners should choose the collocations which will meet their immediate needs. Arbitrariness of collocations is a relatively big problem in terms of both diminishing the influence of L1 and the learners who want to learn them appropriately because word combinations are arbitrarily restricted and fuzzy; complete judgements are hard to make from time to time. In this study, nearly a quarter of the collocations could not be judged completely. The overall result in Table 36 is as follows:

Table 36

Overall results of questionable collocations

Groups	Questionable collocations
Treatment	17
Control	16

The Table 36 shows that there is a great similarity between the treatment and control groups in terms of questionable collocations. As Nesselhauf (2005) states, even the largest corpora of BNC (British National Corpus) may not help researchers judge on collocations. As an alternative to this problem, Nesselhauf (2003) proposes that frequent and acceptable collocations should be taught to learners. For example, if a teacher is in a class for ESP, the learners in the class can be taught some collocations about business such as *demanding- stimulating-/interesting job*.

5.8. Psychological processing

In literature, psychological processing has not been dwelt on in detail. In most surveys, psychological process is often mentioned with two or three statements (Nesselhauf, 2003, 2005). However, it deserves more attention than it is mentioned. Without knowing the mechanisms of psychological processing while teaching collocation, expected results may not be taken. Sousa (2000) and Eric (2000), brain researchers, stressed the importance of attention in processing information and added new categories into short and long term memory systems. As Sousa (2000) puts it, less is better and short is better for attention. In this sense, one cannot expect L2 learners to learn entire collocations in a short time because in

learning collocations cognitive energy is required and arbitrariness of word combinations pose another problem for learners. Only scanning and recording collocations from texts or corpora or concordances is not enough because learners thus become exposed to a large pile of data. Rather, according to Sousa (2000) and Jensen (2000), mostly adults have the ability to store only 7 chunks in a lesson. Paradoxically, teachers and learners are faced with a large group of combinations while reading a text. Understanding the text at sentence and collocation level require a great effort for learners. That's why teachers should spend a lot of time on texts both chunks and collocations via recycle and revisit strategy in the lesson. Recent brain studies in collocations can be one of the solutions as to why even advanced learners in English speaking countries or EFL classrooms make lots of collocational errors. In this sense, as Nesselhauf (2005) suggests, systematicity is vital to help learners acquire collocations. One more option can be included into her principle of systematicity. Attention issue should be taken into consideration while teaching collocations systematically.

5.9. Conclusion

This chapter dealt with the principles of systematicity, length of time, explicit teaching, confused words, L1 influence, questionable collocations and psychological processing in order to put the results of the study into a coherent and cohesive frame.

Firstly, it was discussed that systematicity is the widely encountered problem in collocation studies and is one of the central issues in collocation studies to be studied. Secondly, length of time is important in order to get expected results because unless there is long exposure to collocations, the learners will not remember and retrieve what they have studied in the reading course and vocabulary teaching. Thirdly, explicit teaching covering attention, awareness was discussed to be vital in learning and remembering collocations in vocabulary teaching. Therefore, translation activity can be arranged by the teachers in order to show the

collocational differences between the two languages. Fourthly, confused words often cause problems in learners in terms of not only meaning but the collocations each takes. Fifthly, L1 influence seems unavoidable; therefore translation can be suggested in collocation studies. Sixthly, there are some collocations neither dictionaries can be of help nor native speakers of that language can make judgements on whether it is appropriate in the language. Lastly, psychological processing and accounts of collocations were discussed, and was concluded that more research related to processing information should be carried out in order to get expected results in collocation area.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1. Introduction

In this chapter, a summary of the study is given. It presents the reasons for investigating this topic, what literature was reviewed for the study, who the participants were, how the data were collected and the research questions are given. In addition, this chapter will deal with implications of the study and suggestions for further research.

6.2. Summary of the study

This study intended to find out whether there was going to be a significant difference in retention and production of lexical collocations via Lexical Approach in the reading courses. Therefore, a quasi-experimental design, composed of one treatment and one control groups, was formed. The study has concluded that there

is a significant difference between the control and the treatment group in terms of retention and production of lexical collocations.

The first reason for investigating this topic was to contribute to the literature on collocation studies since there is still much to do in this area, and there are inadequate experimental studies. The reason why an experimental study was conducted was that research in collocation area was mostly descriptive, and this is one of the first studies conducted experimentally aiming to fill a gap in this area. Another reason was to find out whether long exposure to collocations via Lexical Approach would result in better results.

The literature related this study puts forward the idea that Lexical Approach and collocations studies have brought a new perspective to language teaching, learning, and vocabulary teaching and learning and also applied linguistics (Lewis, 1993, 1998, 2000; Nesselhauf, 2003, 2005; Harwood, 2002; Nattinger & Decarrico, 1992; Pawley & Syder, 1983). The theory stresses the advantages of collocation studies and lexical items. It is also emphasized in the literature that corpus and concordance studies have contributed a lot to emergence of lexical approach, which implies that this theory is based on real data rather than intuition.

The participants of this study were the first year students at the ELT department, Muğla University. There were two groups, one experimental and one control group, each consisting of 60 participants. The homogeneity of the groups was provided through YDS (National University Entrance Exam) and Michigan Proficiency tests, so the groups were homogenous while starting the study.

Three instruments, composed of pre- and post tests, retention judgement test and guided writing tasks, were used in order to find out whether there was going to be a significant difference in retention and production of lexical collocations via Lexical Approach. Independent t sample test and detailed frequency analysis were carried out in order to compare both groups.

The first research question was as follows: “Is there a significant difference in learning collocations between the participants in the experimental and the control group when we apply lexical approach?” The results show that there is a significant difference between the groups. The treatment group did *verb + noun* and *adjective + noun* collocations better than the control group in the post test. This result turned out to be as expected because **gaining awareness** about collocations in the reading course could lead to significant difference between the groups. Studying collocation is not adequate alone but rather recycle and revisit strategy is vital to learning and remembering collocations because if the length time of the study for each unit had been only week, this result would not emerge positively. Therefore, the researchers implementing the collocation technique in the class should be careful with the length time of the study. In this study some students commented that they got tired of focusing on the same things but at the end of 10 week study, they said they learnt a lot from the collocation study. Some said it was enjoyable to learn lexis appropriately and focus on collocations. In collocation studies, the teachers or researchers should sustain a great effort to convince and ensure that the students have really learned the word combinations. They can do this via recycle and revisit strategy.

The second research question was “Is there a significant difference in retention of lexical items after implementation of lexical approach between the students exposed to the lexical approach (the experimental group) and those who are not exposed to (the control group) it?” It was found that the treatment group was more successful in overall results and in the detailed analysis of frequency.

The third research question was “Does using lexical approach affect their production of collocations in guided writing tasks?” The results show that the treatment produced more appropriate collocations than the control group because their level of retention becomes higher and more careful than the latter. The

treatment group produced verb + noun and adjective + noun collocations more precisely than the control group.

The three instruments showed that there was a significant difference between the groups. The results clearly imply that if the collocations studies are carried out longer, the expected results can be taken.

6.3. Implications of the study

Several implications can be elicited for teachers, material writers, testing and researchers through this study.

First, teachers have new roles in collocation studies because not only students but also teachers have much to learn from collocation studies. Only knowing the meaning of the words and teaching meaning are not adequate alone. Rather, lexical items should be stressed in reading courses and vocabulary teaching. In addition, teachers should know how to use corpus and concordance in collocation studies. They should help and encourage learners to regard the texts as corpora to scan and record collocations they have read.

Secondly, material writers, while preparing course books or developing materials, should present the same collocations in different activities and a challenging way, which will facilitate learners' retention of collocations. They should also sustain collocation activities in the next chapters. They should not present lexis only once in the units but rather use the strategy of recycle and revisit systematically, which is at the heart of Lexical Approach. In addition, they should give concordance and corpus examples so that the learners can make generalizations from patterns in the unit. This can be of help to learners in that they can study word grammar through concordances. They should also design activities which will direct the learners into the text again and re-scan the text in order to

focus on collocations and other lexical items such as fixed and semi-fixed expressions.

Thirdly, testers should prepare exams which stress not only meaning of the word but also word combinations. Lewis (2000) gives an example of collocation to be used in testing. He states that only one sentence to elicit word meaning is not enough. More than one sentence should be given while preparing a sentence so that the learners can retain the meaning in his/her mind because the sentences should be in a kind of co-text, which will sound meaningful to the learners. The tester should also ask the word combinations based on real language, that is, corpora studies. Lastly, the researchers studying on collocation area should focus on lexical collocations, which have syntactic functions in language production. Systematicity can be developed through analysis of learner corpus studies as in Nesselhauf's study (2005).

6.4. Suggestions for further research

This study aimed to investigate whether there was going to be a significant difference in retention and production of lexical collocations via Lexical Approach. Further studies can be conducted to examine not only lexical collocations but also grammatical collocations relations because studies in this area mostly have focused on lexical collocations, *verb + noun* relations so far. If other collocation categories are examined in detail, the problem of systematicity can be solved in this area. What is needed in this area is the re-analysis of corpus studies and learner corpus in second and foreign language settings, so that researchers can put forward systematic approach in collocation studies.

Another suggestion for the research in this area is that researchers should long expose learners to scan, study and record collocations in experimental studies. To solve the problem of questionable collocations, researchers should study with more researchers and relate their studies to larger corpus texts.

Lastly, following the progress of learners from elementary level through intermediate and advanced levels will give researchers an insight of to what extent collocations can be taught and what collocations should be taught first. L2 processing of collocations, in this sense, can also be studied for a better theoretical understanding of the theory.

REFERENCES:

- Aisenstadt, E. (1979). Collocability restrictions in dictionaries. In Reinhard R. K.Hartmann (Ed.), *Dictionaries and their Users. Papers from the 1978 B. A. A. L. Seminar on Lexicology (= ITL Review of Applied Linguistics, 45/ 46.)* (pp. 71– 74). Leuven: KatholiekeUniversiteit.
- Aisenstadt, E. (1981). Restricted collocations in English lexicology and lexicography. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics, 53, 53– 61.*
- Altenberg, B. (1993). Recurrent verb-complement constructions in the London –lund Corpus. In Jari Aarts, Pieter de Haan, and Nelleke Oostdjik (Eds.), *English language corpora: Design, analysis and exploitation. Papers from the Thirteenth International Conference on English Language Research and Computerized Corpora, Njmegen 1992, (pp.227-245).* Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Al-Zahrani, M.S. (1998). *Knowledge of English lexical collocations among male Saudi college students majoring in English at a Saudi University.* (PhD). Ann Arbor, MI: UMI.
- Anderson, J.R. (2000). *Cognitive psychology and its implications.* New York: Worth Publishers.

- Bahns, J. (1993). Lexical collocations: A contrastive view. *ELT Journal* 47(1), 56-63.
- Bahns, J., & Eldaw, M. (1993). Should we teach EFL students collocations? *System* 21(1), 101 – 14.
- Bahns, J. (1997). *Kollokationen und Wortschatzarbeit im nglischunterricht*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Becker, J. (1975). The phrasal lexicon. In B. Nash-Webber and R. Schank (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in natural language processing 1*. Cambridge, Mass: Bolt, Beranek, and Newman.
- Benson, M. (1985). Collocations and idioms. In R. Ilson (Ed.), *Dictionaries, Lexicography and language learning*. ELT Documents 120. Pergamon Press/British Council.
- Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1997). *The BBI dictionary of English word combinations*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Biskup, D. (1990). Some remarks on combinability: Lexical collocations. In Janusz Arabski (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition papers* (pp. 31– 44). Katowice: Uniwersytet Slaski.
- Biskup, D. (1992). L1 influence on learners' renderings of English collocations. A Polish/German empirical study. In Pierre J.L. Arnaud and Henri Bejoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*, (pp. 85-93). London: Macmilian
- Bolinger, D. (1975). Meaning and memory. *Forum Linguisticum* 1, 2 – 14.
- Campbell, D., & Stanley, J. (1963). *Experimental and quasi designs*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1996). *Vocabulary and language teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Catania, A.C. (1998). *Learning*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: A Pearson Education Company.
- Channell, J. (1981). Applying semantic theory to vocabulary teaching. *ELT Journal*, 35 (2), 115 – 122.
- Cohen, A. D., and Aphek, E. (1980). Retention of second language vocabulary over time: Investigating the role of mnemonic association. *System*, 8(3), 221 – 36.
- Collins Cobuild English language dictionary. (1988). London: Cobuild
- Cook, T., & Campbell, D. (1979). *Quasi- experimental designs*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Conzett, J. (2000) Integrating collocation into a reading and writing course. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation* (pp. 70-87). England: Language Teaching Publication.
- Cowie, A.P. (1978). Vocabulary exercises within an individualized study program. *ELT documents*, 103, 37-44. London: British Council.
- Cowie, A. P. (1981). The treatment of collocations and idioms in learners' dictionaries. *Applied Linguistics*, 2, 223– 235.
- Craik, F.I.M., & Tulving, E. (1975). Depth of processing and the retention or

- words in episodic memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 104, 268-94.
- Dechert, H.W., & Lennon, P. (1989). Collocational blends of advanced second language learners. A preliminary analysis. In Wieslaw Olesky (Ed.), *Contrastive pragmatics* (pp.131-68). Amsterdam:Benjamins.
- Donley, M. (1974). The role of structural semantics in expanding and activating the vocabulary of the advanced learner: The example of homophone. *Audio-Visual Language Journal*, 12(2), 81-9.
- Eker, S. (2001). *Development of collocational competence in a second language*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Uludağ, Turkey.
- Feldman, R.S. (1997). *Essentials of understanding psychology*. New York: The McGraw- Hill Companies, Inc.
- Firth, J R. (1951) Modes of meaning. In *Papers in Linguistics*, 190 – 215. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flower, J. & Berman, M. (1989). *Build your vocabulary*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.
- Harmer, J., & Rossner, R. (1991). *More than words*. London: Longman.
- Harrison, M. (1990). *Word perfect*. London: Nelson.
- Harwood, N. (2002) Taking a LA to teaching: Principles and problems. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 139-155.
- Herbst, T. (1996). What are collocations: Sandy beaches or false teeth? *English Studies*, 77 (4), 379– 393.
- Hill, J. (2000) Revising priorities: From grammatical failure to collocational success. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation* (pp. 47-69). England: Language Teaching Publication.
- Howarth, P. (1996). *Phraseology in English academic writing: Some implications for language learning and dictionary making*. Tübingen : Max Niemeyer.
- Howarth, P. (1998). Phraseology and second language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 24 – 44.
- Hughes, A. (1996). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Izumi, S. (2003). Comprehension and production processes in second language learning: In search of the psycholinguistic rationale of the output hypothesis. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(2), 168-196.
- Jensen, E. (2000). *Brain based learning*. San Diego, CA: The Brain Store Publishing.
- Jiang, N. (2000). Lexical representation and development in a second language. *Applied Linguistics* 21(1), pp. 64-65.
- Källkvist, M. (1999). *Form-class and task-type effects in learner English. A study of advanced Swedish learners*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Kellerman, E. (1983). Now you see it, now you don't. In Gass, S and Selinker, L. (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 12- 34). Massachusetts: Newbury House, Rowley.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

- Laufer, B. (1991). *Similar lexical forms in interlanguage*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Laufer, B. & Hulstijn, J. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics*, 22 (1), 1-26.
- Leech, G. (1974). *Semantics*. London: Penguin.
- Lennon, P. (1996). Getting “easy” verbs wrong at the advanced level. *IRAL*, 34, 23-36.
- Levelt, W.J.M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, MA: Bradford.
- Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach*. Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications
- Lewis, M. (1998). *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.
- Lewis, Michael. (2000). Learning in the lexical approach. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation* (pp.155-185). England: Language Teaching Publication.
- Lewis, Morgan. (2000). There is nothing as practical as a good theory. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation* (pp.10-27). England : Language Teaching Publication.
- Longman dictionary of contemporary English. (2003). England, Essex : Pearson Education Limited.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, M. (1984). Advanced vocabulary teaching: The problem of synonyms. *Modern Language Journal*, 68(2), 130-137.
- Marton, W. (1977). Foreign vocabulary learning as problem No. 1 of language teaching at the advanced level. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 2, 33-57.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Vocabulary*. Oxford: OUP.
- McCarthy, M., & O’Dell, F. (1994). *English vocabulary in use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Express.
- Meara, P.M. (1982). Word associations in a foreign language. *Nottingham Linguistic Circular*, 11(2), 29-38.
- Meara, P.M. (1984). The study of lexis. In Davies, A, Criper, C and Howatt , A (Eds.), *Interlanguage* (pp. 225-35). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Express.
- Mel’cuk, I. (1998). Collocations and lexical functions. In Anthony P. Cowie (Ed.), *Phraseology* (pp. 23– 53).
- Myers, D.G. (1999). *Exploring psychology*. New York: Worth Publishers .
- Nation, I. S. P. (1982). Beginning to learn foreign language vocabulary learning: A review of the research. *RELC Journal*, 13(1), 14-36.
- Nation, I. S. P. (1983). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. Wellington: English Language Institute, University of Wellington.
- Nattinger, J. and DeCarrico, J. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Express.
- Nesselhauf, N. (2003). The use of collocations by advanced learners of English and some implications for teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 24 (2), 223 – 242.

- Nesselhauf, N. (2005). *Collocations in a learner corpus*. U.S. : John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nilsen, D.L.F. (1976). Contrastive semantics in vocabulary instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(1), 99-103.
- Ogden, C.K. (1930). *Basic English: A general introduction*. London: Kegan Paul.
- Ogden, C.K. (1968). *Basic English: International second language*. Newyork: Harcourt Brace.
- Ooi, D. & Seoh, J. L.K. (1996). Vocabulary teaching: Looking behind the word. *ELT Journal Volume*, 50(1), 52-58.
- Oxford collocations dictionary for students of English*. (2002). Oxford: OUP
- Oxford, R., & Crookall, D. (1990). Vocabulary learning: A critical analysis of techniques. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7(2), 9-30.
- Pawley, A & Syder, F.H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J.C. Richards and R. W. Schimdt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp.191-226). New York : Longman.
- Redman, S. & Ellis, R. (1991). *A Way with words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Express.
- Richards, J. (1974). Word lists: Problems and prospects. *RELC Journal*, 5(2), 69-84.
- Richards, J. (1976). The role of vocabulary teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(1), 77-89.
- Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Express.
- Richards, J. & Schimdt, R. (1983). *Language and communication*. England: Longman.
- Rivers, W.M. (1968). *Teaching foreign language skills*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Rudzka, B., Channel, J., Putseys Y., & Ostyn, P. (1981). *The words you need*. Malaysia: Phoenix.
- Schmidt, R. (1994). Implicit learning and the cognitive unconscious. Of artificial grammars and SLA. In N.C. Ellis (ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp.165-210). London: Academic Press.
- Schmidt, R. (2000). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Express.
- Shei, C.C. (1999). A brief survey English verb noun collocation (sic!). <http://www.dai.ed.ac.uk/homes/shei/survey.html>
- Simon, H. (1974). How big is a chunk? *Science*, 183, 482-8.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sousa, A. D. (2000). *How the brain learns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Terrell, T.D. (1982). The natural approach to language teaching: An update. *Modern Language Journal*, 66(2), 121-32.
- Tulving, E. (1983). *Elements of episodic memory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Twaddle, F. (1973). Vocabulary expansion in the ESOL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 7, 61-78.
- Weinert, R. (1995). The role of formulaic language in second language acquisition: A review. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 180 – 205.
- Wellman, G. (1992). *Wordbuilder*. London: Heinemann.
- West, M.P. (1953). *A General service list of English words*. London: Longman.
- Wilkins, D.A. (1972). *Linguistics and language teaching*. London : Edward Arnold.
- Wilkins, D. (1990). *Lexical syllabus*. Great Britain: Collins Cobuild.
- Willis, J. (1990). *The Lexical syllabus*. London: Collins Cobuild.
- Woolard, G. (2000) Collocation - encouraging learner independence. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocations* (pp. 28 – 46). London: Language Teaching Publications.

APPENDIX 1

VOCABULARY ACHIEVEMENT

1. The police are going to the damages and then give a report to the head of the accident department.

a) assess

b) evaluate

c) value

d) rate

2. The killing of two students a violent rebellion.
a) triggered off b) caused c) led d) generated
3. Exactly how children learn to speak is a problem which linguists no less now than twenty years ago.
a) baffles b) astonishes c) surprises d) confuses
4. A argument about who should go and fetch the bread from the kitchen was going on between Martin and Paul when I came in.
a) unimportant b) insignificant c) trivial d) inconsequential
5. The fashion for women to have their hair short is unfeminine.
a) now b) instant c) current d) present
6. The accident confidence in his driving ability.
a) cracked b) tore c) shattered d) broke
7. We decided to roses in the front garden.
a) rear b) grow c) breed d) bring up
8. Agatha was a strict teacher who occasionally showed she could be a person. She sometimes allowed too much freedom in the class.
a) gentle b) possessive c) lenient d) permissive
9. During their holiday , they had to a leaking tent and hurricane winds.
a) manage b) deal with c) take care of d) handle
10. There is nothing shocking in this film for a(n) audience.
a) adult b)mature c)grown up d) developed
11. He had a look in his eyes , which meant that he had thought up a good plan.
a) crafty b) tricky c)shrewd d) cunning
12. The guest was rude about everything, from the food to the sheets on his bed.
a) distasteful b)obnoxious c) unpleasant d) undesirable
13. He up her flagging confidence by assuring her she was well-liked.
a) backed up b)bolstered c) endorsed d) supported
14. He the fact that he had to leave until the evening of his departure because he didn't want anybody to know it. It was so private.

- a) covered b) concealed c) hid d) secreted
15. The dog his bone in the garden so that the cat couldn't have it.
- a) hid b) concealed c) stored away d) covered
16. The girl's dress was the first thing that him to her.
- a) tempted b) lured c) attracted d) provoked
17. Some scientists say that if develop devices, we can solve ecological problems very easily.
- a) sophisticated b) grown up c) progressed d) processed
18. They the dying soldier long enough to learn where the enemy was hiding out.
- a) resurrected b) revitalized c) revived d) relieved
19. Iskenderun sea was by poison gas leaking from huge ships.
- a) infected b) released c) contaminated d) polluted
20. By a process of research and correspondence David ancestors to the 11 Th century.
- a) followed b) traced c) found d) detected
21. Trust yourself. You have your own image and personality. Do not feel inferior. There is no need to the image of the other person.
- a) increase b) heighten c) affect d) inflate
22. The father vowed he would his daughter marrying the man.
- a) prevent b) avert c) forestall d) frustrate
23. Danger was only by a matter of seconds.
- a) prevented b) averted c) forestalled d) cautioned
24. His behavior was not intentional but we could tell that he did not like us.
- a) overt b) open c) obvious d) visible
25. No woman ever goes out without checking her make up in the mirror.
- a) smart b) well dressed c) elegant d) well groomed
26. My long held belief that our bodies are unimportant was
- a) broken b) cracked c) fractured d) shattered

27. She eye brow pencil and false eyelashes because she had to look elegant at the party.

- a) implemented b) practiced c) applied d) second hand

28. First we are going to the candidate's abilities to recruit them.

- a) rate b) evaluate c) value d) assess

29. I had a(n) dinner party last night. Everything was badly organized.

- a) unruly b) ghastly c) unattractive d) shocking

30. How do we clear up misunderstandings and.....doubts?

- a) disperse b) spread c) scatter d) break up

31. These days people are looking for love because love affairs on Internet are so boring and false.

- a) authentic b) genuine c) factual d) actual

32. My father is addicted to drugs and alcohol. He often has a row with my mum and us. He damage to our family life.

- a) makes b) does c) sends d) gives

33. My father always temper in our family. We often feel restless and uneasy.

- a) increases b) causes c) promotes d) raises

34. The authorities in the country have to lots of demanding and hard economic and social problems and have to solve them if they want to be among the most developed countries.

- a) deal with b) cope with c) handle d) involve

35. Recent studies have shown that there are differences between human and monkeys.

- a) deep b) profound c) weighty d) discerning

36. The spice trade aims to bring in a lot of money into the company because they have spent a lot of money on advertisement.

- a) profitable b) monetary c) financial d) lucrative

37. My father has always tried to find a way to tension at home. He does his best to solve the problems at home.

- a) dissolve b) solve c) resolve d) reveal

38. Turkey is.....from being traditional to being democratic and liberal.

- a) converting b) modifying c) altering d) shifting

39. We should find a(n) worker who is self- driven and can make serious contributions to his own department.

- a) effacious b) efficient c) affective d) impressive

40. Dirt disease. You should keep your room clean.

- a) rears b) brings up c) breeds d) generates

1. The **baffling complexity** of the math problem caused the students in the class to feel depressed.

- | |
|--|
| 2. The government has to disperse doubts . Otherwise, the public will go on strike. |
|--|

- | |
|---|
| 3. The ecologists are trying to forestall the troubles caused by humans. |
|---|

4. Many series and advertials **deluge people** at every moment of our life. They seem unavoidable.

5. In Turkey the government is trying to help ones who want to **pursue vocational goals**.

6. In Turkey parents never let their children take a laissez faire attitude .
--

7. In post modernist life and big cities people are often under **heavy strain**.

8. If you do not **set aside your beliefs** when you teach your students, they will not respect you.

9. In Turkey the **slim majority** still think that we cannot access EU.

10. There is a **pervasive tendency** between students that the teachers are not good enough to teach.

11. Some students use **physical strength** to **assert themselves** especially during puberty.

12. After the football match the police tried to **dissolve tension** *resorting to violence* again. They could **relieve tension** convincing them actually.

13. Teenagers often ask themselves “Do we have to **stick to the rules** of our parents?”
They are right in a sense.

14. Teaching a new foreign language can also be done through **extramural activities**.

15. To know teenage rebellion is kind of normality may **comfort** parents.

16. **Juvenile delinquency** is getting widespread in New York. The state should do something to forestall it.

17. If we **inflate the image of the others** during presentation, we feel restless and excited.

18. Some football critics belittle **the importance of statistics of football**. Because what they support is that football is something unpredictable.

19. If one has **distinctive characteristics** such strength, charisma, ability to succeed, s/he will feel self confident.

20. A young girl should wear **dainty clothes** in order to impress others.

21. Some girls seem unfeminine because they wear **odd clothes**.

22. In my opinion women prefer to praise or even exaggerate their **physical attributes**.

23. I need to find a **meaningful relationship** in my life with possibility of marriage.

24. The professor **quoted another innovated writer**: “Carpe Diem!”

25. The proposal he made in the government never **became law**.

26. We, humans, are inclined to **satisfy our needs** such as confidence, sociality and psychology.

27. We all need **genuine love**. If we become greedy in love affairs, this presupposes that the tragedy is at the door.

28. If your friends show **deviant behaviors**, you should let us know.

29. Traditional families are prone to **make sacrifices** for their children.

30. Young people should **gain experience** by dealing with households/jobs at home.

31. The parents should, in my idea, **diminish the control** over the teenagers.

32. The teacher often **gives** my son extra reading and extra **attention**. He is also made responsible for ringing the bell at break time.

33. Money is often assumed to be a **superficial matter** before marriage.

34. My cat sports a small sweater.

35. Turkish girls do not want to **lose their virginity** owing to social norms.

36. There are just many more **important matters** in my life than school.

37. I must learn to **connect my body** with the rest of myself.

38. I tend to **label beautiful girls** shallow and narrow minded.

39. Thanks to our survey, we tested the relationship on a more **diverse group** of people.

40. Some students have **negative body images** and low self esteem due to family background.

41. Some people **overlook the connection** between body image and self esteem.

42. I have never doubted my intellectual abilities .

43. I know I have an accurate body image picture.
--

44. What I believe is that a good friend may increase my self esteem.

45. Some people watching Kurtlar Vadisi may **mutter dirty things** to their girlfriends..

46. The proposal they made may **resolve the economic problem** in the country.

47. Colossal streets should be constructed in order to prevent traffic accidents.
--

48. Overcrowding in Istanbul may cause hazardous side effects.
--

49. If a country does not have **sophisticated devices**, one cannot expect the country to make progress.

50. New changes in the global and postmodernist world **reshape the nature of families** and couples.

51. If you, as a father, do not **abandon your principles** temporarily, you cannot help your children develop in a healthy way.

52. I am new here. I don't have to accept the **heavy responsibilities** here.

53. I, as a teenager, should have the right to **entertain my friends at home**.

54. My friends are always **teasing me** at school, which causes me to have low self esteem.

55. **Unspoken truths** are sometimes more important than what we have talked openly.

56. Mutual affection is vital in my life, a girl said.

57. I had an **unsuccessful experience**.

58. Everybody needs **genuine love** these days.

59. These days we **do courting** on internet.

60. The police are going to assess the damage .
--

61. How children learn to speak has baffled linguists .
--

62. The accident shattered his confidence in his driving ability.
--

63. My father always **raises temper** in our family.

64. Dirt breeds disease.

65. He **did damage** to our happy life. I hate him.

66. USA is trying to **forestall illegal entrance** to the country these days.

67. The government is trying to **pass the legislation** in order to help USA access through Turkey.

68. Last night I had a **ghastly party** because some people had a row between each other.

69. My father is often under **heavy strain** because he has to work hard and send me money in order to continue my school life.

70. Unless the party members **clear up misunderstandings**, I do not think that the people will vote for them.

71. I need **emotional security** because I am far away from my family and friends.

