Effects of Teaching Collocations on Academic Writing

Fatma Demiray Akbulut[1]

Abstract: Lexical knowledge is an essential part of gaining proficiency in a second language. Encouraging learners of second language to use different multi-word combinations and collocations is thought to extend their knowledge in language studies. In the field of ELT environment, a growing number of researchers suppose that after outlining reasonable vocabulary learning goals, educators should underline the importance of teaching lexical collocations reasonably. In countries where English is taught as a second language, learners should be promoted to gather lexical knowledge and achieve four English skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking). From beginning to advanced level, high-frequent collocations can be found mostly in speech and writing. In this study, Turkish EFL learners' lexical collocations knowledge and usage are analyzed in the reading and writing skills. From the results of this research, it can be concluded that teaching lexical and academic collocations provide learners to acquire language effectively and be more fluent in it prominently.

Keywords: Collocations, academic collocations, lexical knowledge, vocabulary teaching.

[1]Asst. Prof. Dr., Abant İzzet Baysal University, demiray_f@ibu.edu.tr

Introduction

Collocations as a part of formulaic language are combinations of words from the same or different parts of speech (adjective-noun, verb-noun, adverb-adjective etc…) such as *day trip, organic food, physical contact, to raise awareness* etc… Recent years, research on collocations has been enthusiasm in theoretical and pedagogical perspectives. Since they are assumed as a vital part in the learners' interlanguage development, collocations are essential to learning in second language environment to gain native-like fluency and competence. It can be proposed that the mastery and a well-built usage ability of collocations may let learners acquire natural fluency in English.

Collocations contain two or more vocabulary items and these items come together to compose a unit of meaning. For more than a decade, language instructors are interested in specifying usage of language after learners get a particular degree. One of the most important parts of this specifying term is teaching and learning word units, collocations and idiomatic expressions. There are some reasons for giving an importance to multi-word units. One of them is that English language teachers realize that fluent use of a language is based on learning to use these word groups and expressions (Kennedy, 2003). The other reason is that language learners believe that the production and usage of a new language will be easier after gaining some expressions as a whole; since they will not have to get vocabulary knowledge individually (Palmer, 1933).

Defining Collocation

The term "collocation" was first introduced in the literature by Firth (1957) and defined as a combination of words connected with other words. Collocations have been analyzed from two main approaches (Fernandez & Schmitt, 2015) as phraseological approach and statistical approach. The former approach examines collocations from word combinations aspect with different degrees of fixedness while the latter one investigates this term in different formulas which are used to construe corpora and also to explore the vocabulary items. Collocational usage can be seen as a basic aspect of idiomatic English. "Idiomatic" term refers to using expressions which sound more natural to a native speaker (Hornby, 2000) However, most ESL practitioners tend to produce more grammatical

sentences than idiomatic ones. The term collocation has been identified as prefabs, multi-word units, and idiomatic expressions.

Gitsaki (1999) proposed three main approaches as lexical, semantic and structural collocations. Firth's *lexical approach* analysis was to determine lexical relations and lexis as syntagmatic instead of paradigmatic ones. In other words, lexis and lexicology shouldn't be considered in grammar; they should be identified as a separate area of specialization. Halliday (1966) and Sinclair (1966, 1987, 1991) are the other followers who maintain the collocation term in lexicology. Halliday et al. (1964) defined this term as the tendency of a lexical item conveying one or more words. From *semantic approach*, researchers define collocations emphasizing the semantic features which determine the collocates (Lehrer, 1974; Cruse, 1986). The main aim in semantic approach is to come out the reason of why some vocabulary items collocate with certain words. From *structural approach*, collocations are divided into two as lexically and grammatically (Gitsaki,1999). In this approach, collocations should include grammar unlike lexical and semantic approaches since lexis and grammar cannot be distinct features. At this point, lexical collocations include nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs such as in; *additional information (Adj+N), apply (a) method (V+N), background knowledge (N+N), clearly evident (Adv+Adj), grow rapidly (V+Adv)*. Grammatical collocations consist of a lexical word and a preposition such as in, *marry +to, focus+on, good+at* etc…Although there is no certain definition of collocation, it can be defined as word combination from lexical or grammatical classes to produce native-like and natural-sounding English language.

Learning Collocations in ESL Setting

The importance of collocational structures is coming from the reasons underlying the pedagogical aspects. For ESL learners, acquiring productive skills is more dominant and important than receptive skills. In this aspect, learning collocations enables them to be more productive, more understandable and helps them improve their writing abilities (Hunston & Francis, 2000; Wray, 2002). However, mis- or disuse of this pattern discourages L2 learners to learn the nature of collocational use. One of the difficulties arises from the structural differences between two languages. For instance, in English for the collocations "make a mistake (V+N)" and "do

homework (V+N)" are used with different verbs while in Turkish the same verb "do (yapmak)" (hata yapmak or ödev yapmak in Turkish) is used for both of them. Another difficulty occurs because of idiosyncratic nature of collocations as in the examples of "powerful car" and "strong tea". Although *powerful* and *strong* have the same meaning, in other words, they are synonyms of each other, *powerful* cannot be used with "tea" and similarly, *strong* cannot be used with "car" (Halliday, 1966). In fact, as Fan (2008) mentioned, the biggest problem is the lack of exposure to the target language. Native speakers of English acquire collocations inductively and subconsciously, however, non-native speakers do not have a chance to acquire collocation knowledge if they learn this language only in the classroom.

Studies on L2 Collocations

There are many studies on collocations from different perspectives. Some of them have analyzed collocations from lexical perspectives while some have analyzed functional ways of collocations. From lexical perspective, some studies examined verb+noun collocations (Al-Zahrani, 1998; Howarth, 1998), adverb+adjective collocations (Granger, 1998b; Lorenz, 1999) or adjective+noun collocations (Siyanova & Schmitt, 2008). In recent decades, studies on collocations are widely used by native speakers and it can be seen that this formulaic sequences mostly benefit L2 learners to gain a native-like proficiency. In terms of receptive and productive skills, the lack of collocational knowledge can lead to miscomprehension or unnatural usage ability of language (Barfield & Gyllstad, 2009; Martinez&Murphy, 2011). There is a question arising from this knowledge that how much L2 learners know about collocations. In some cases, researchers believe that the ability of collocational use is lower than native speakers since L2 learners make many mistakes (Granger, 1998; Howarth, 1998; Laufer & Waldman, 2011). In a learner-centered perspective, it is believed that L2 learners do not even know collocations since they have no idea about them (Farghal & Obeidat, 1995). In a learning-centered perspective, without explicit approach and teaching deductively, it will not be possible to make L2 learners use these sequences (Peters, 2012).

Although there are lots of studies on learning and teaching environment, Siyanova & Schmitt (2008) have shown that non-native speakers can produce a large number of collocations. In their

67

research, they studied on 81 adjective-noun collocations (based on frequency and mutual information scores) which learners produced and found that 45% of them were acceptable. Laufer & Waldman (2011) also revealed that L2 learners produced non-standard collocations when they were compared to native speakers. Durrant & Schmitt (2009) found out that Turkish and Bulgarian EFL learners tend to use frequent premodifier-noun collocations similar to native speakers. In a parallel way to frequency levels of collocations, Fernandez & Schmitt (2015) tested 108 Spanish learners of English to analyze their productive knowledge of collocations. They found that L2 learners produced 56.6% correct collocations and this knowledge of collocations correlated with both corpus frequency (.45) and everyday exposure to English (also outside the classroom) in reading activities, movies, social networking etc…

In Turkish ESL environment, there are a few studies on collocations. Gençer (2004) revealed the fact from corpus-driven study analyzing the effect of explicit collocation instruction. It was shown that the group who has taken the instruction (upper-intermediate participants) outperformed the other group who has not taken any instruction in producing collocations. Akıncı (2009) studied on verb+noun collocations and found that explicit instruction and integrated method groups preceded the data-driven learners group, however, there was no significant difference between them. Tekingül (2013) studied on collocation teaching effect on reading comprehension in an EFL setting in Turkey. She has found that there were no significant differences between collocational teaching treatment and single-item vocabulary instruction treatment. There is also a study on EFL teachers' and learners perceptions of collocations (Mutlu & Kaşlıoğlu, 2016). In this study, teachers have an awareness of the importance of teaching collocation to promote vocabulary knowledge. On the other hand, L2 learners do not agree with their teachers in terms of collocation teaching practices and the activity time dedicated to collocations in the classes.

In Turkish EFL environment, L2 learners have problems using or realizing collocations. Besides, they tend to use one-word vocabulary items instead of formulaic sequences and even they do not recognize that using formulaic language sounds more native-like and natural. Also, they should know the fact that collocations will probably bring them more fluency and accuracy.

This research aims to answer the following research questions:

1. Does deductive collocational teaching help students to improve vocabulary knowledge?

2. Does collocational teaching have a positive effect on academic writing?

Method

Participants/subjects

This research took place at a Turkish state university, Translation and Interpreting Department. 76 first year under-graduate student, who were aged 17-19, (31 female, 27 male) attended the study. The level of all participants was supposed to be almost equal since they were tested at the beginning of the semester by "Proficiency and Placement Test" applied by School of Foreign Languages department. The participants were all Turkish students. In fact, there were also students who came to the university as part of Erasmus Exchange Programme; however, they were removed from the study not to affect the reliability and validity of the study and not to include first language effect on vocabulary development. Besides, it was assumed that the participants in the research had the same proficiency level with respect to their vocabulary knowledge of English. Even so, they were tested with Vocabulary Level test (Nation, 2001) to be sure their knowledge was of approximately at the same standard (also see 2.2.1.).

Before the treatment and study, all participants were applied Language History Questionnaire and according to the descriptive statistics, they have learned English at the age of nearly 9 (M=8.72; SD=3.76). 72.4% of participants learned English at the high school for 4 years. Most of them (88%) indicated that their productive skills are better than receptive skills. They also expressed that instructors do not give enough emphasis and importance to the vocabulary knowledge in their department. After this questionnaire, they were handed out the Vocabulary Level Test worksheets and the results have been reported on the next section.

Pilot Study

In this study, a pilot study with 12 participants was applied to see the instruments' reliability and validity. For internal validity testing, the academic collocation list was taken from Pearson PTE Academic site and the frequency of the 60 chosen academic collocations was analyzed by giving the students a list of them. Before the treatment, they were asked whether they were familiar

with these collocations or not. The students scored their knowledge rate from 1 to 4 as in the example (adapted from Tekingül, 2013).

1. I have not seen this collocation before.

2. I have seen this collocation, but I have no idea about its meaning.

3. I have seen this collocation before and I know its meaning.

4. I know this collocation, its meaning and I can use it in a sentence.

After this self-report study, the collocation list was analyzed and sorted according to their familiarity and frequency level taken from population's score (Appendix A). After this pilot study, a test-retest reliability analysis using Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated by statistics experts. According to the results, internal consistency coefficient for the 60 collocational expressions (divided into two as pre-and post test before the treatment) was measured as (0.76) and the experts found the instruments and collocations list as reliable.

Instruments

Nation's Vocabulary Level Test

All participants in the study have taken the same Vocabulary Level Test (Nation, 2001) to be sure of comparability of both groups in terms of vocabulary usage level before the treatment. After the test, they were divided into two as experimental and control groups. This test consists of three different parts emphasizing different word levels (2.000,3.000,5.000 vocabulary items) and in each part, there are 10 different sections. These sections include 6 different vocabulary items and 3 different meanings or synonyms. After this test was presented, the participants were asked to choose the correct item and write a number of them as shown below.

1. cap

2. education   ___2___ teaching and learning

3. journey   ___5___ numbers to measure with

4. parent   ___3___ going to afar place

5. scale

6. trick

After vocabulary level test, the statistics results have been found that there were no significant differences between two groups in terms of vocabulary size (t (37)= 2.47, p = .83).

Academic Collocations Test

Teaching "Academic Collocations" is a precious part of English lexis course. The participants from both groups have been presented with a list of academic collocations. In this task, there are 60 noun+verb academic collocations which are used in three reading texts. The participants were given only verb parts of these collocations and instructed to find the noun parts according to the first two letters which were given them as key factors. For instance, as the verb part "apply", they were expected to find the noun part of this collocation "theory" from the first two letters which were written.

e.g. apply   th……. (apply theory)

The same test was given before pre- and post-reading texts to see whether there would be an improvement in awareness of collocations after the treatment. According to the results, there is a significant development of participants' awareness scale. The findings obtained from pre-awareness test showed that there was no significant difference between both groups (t (37)= 1.83, p=.64). After the treatment, the same test was given and the results indicate that there is a significant difference between both groups (t (37)= -2.77, p=0.002) and it already proved the improvement process of experimental group analyzing and awareness of collocations. These results proved in a way that collocational instruction and emphasizing academic collocations in teaching process increased second language learners' vocabulary knowledge.

Reading Texts

After the Language History Questionnaire and Vocabulary Level Test, the participants were divided into two as experimental group (n=38) and control group (n=38). Both groups were applied to three different reading passages including academic collocational words. This study was adapted from Zaabalawi & Gould's (2017) study, however, unlike their study, three different reading texts were used in this research and they were produced by course instructor who consulted with native

71

English teachers at the university. Also, academic collocation list was used in this study. In the texts, there were 15, 20 and 25 collocational expressions respectively and they were all underlined by the researcher. In this task, increasing number of collocations was used not to expose the participants many collocational structures from the beginning of the study since it could cause overloading word process.

Research Design

In this study, experimental research design has been used and pre-test/post-test paradigm has been applied to see the effectiveness of collocational treatment. The course test intervention is composed of 40 hours of lexical and collocational teaching (especially academic collocations) during 10 weeks and four hours for each week. At the beginning of the research, before treatment, each group was given three reading passages consisting of collocations which were all underlined by the researcher. These passages were specifically selected because they were written according to their interests and they were asked to read them carefully and then rewrite these texts from memory. At this point, they were not exposed to any time-limit or word number limit. After they had finished reading the first text, they were shown a list of guided expressions to help them to write as much as they could and the same process was applied for the next two reading texts. After they had completed their rewrite activities, they all were instructed to hand out the new texts.

Treatment

Students in the experimental group were taught collocational expressions. After teaching period, the importance of formulaic sequences in English was emphasized. This treatment lasted about 10 weeks and each week, different reading texts including collocations were introduced to the learners. In total, they experienced 20 reading texts and after they had read them, they were asked to rewrite these texts using guided vocabulary setting, dictionaries and reference books about collocations (i.e. Lewis, 2000; McCarthy, O'Keeffe, Walsh, 2010; McCarthy, O'Dell, 2006). Aside from reading activities, the students were exposed to additional instructional material on formulaic sequences, multi-word verbs, phrasal expressions and collocations in contexts. To sum up, students in experimental group had a chance to get more vocabulary knowledge on collocations and to practice more exercises. On the other hand, students in control group were introduced the same 20

reading passages during 10 weeks-period, however, they were not exposed to the same activities emphasized on collocations. The vocabulary was taught by using synonyms, antonyms or giving translation without focusing on collocations. After reading, they were also requested to rewrite the reading passages just like experimental group.

After ten-week treatment, the three texts which participants from both groups were supposed to rewrite using collocations in the first week were presented again. They were asked to rewrite the same reading passages using the guided vocabulary list presented to them via PowerPoint software. The long period between the pre and post-test ensured the researcher a reliable and verified research since none of the participants recalled the activities (three reading passages) which were given them in week one. During the post-test period, students in each group were expected to read and reproduced the reading passages. This matched-pair design would let the researcher see whether participants in experimental group used more qualified and native-like collocations or not. After the hand-outs were taken from the same students group, the texts were compared with the ones given in week one. The number of collocational usage errors was measured in each test comparatively for each student and the statistical data was given in the following section.

Findings

This research was used to test the hypothesis whether the deductive collocational teaching process helps students to have larger vocabulary knowledge and a better writing ability or not. The results were based on pre- and post- reading texts rewrite activities including academic collocations. Both groups took these reading texts and after the data was collected, the results of the study were analyzed with the help of paired samples t-test in SPSS-20. Besides, the proportion of errors has been indicated to see concretely the results of the participants (see Table 1.)

TEXT-1	M	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 Exprecoll - Coprecoll	.21053	3.78588	,343	37	.734
Pair 2 Expreerror - Copreerror	,97368	1,90996	3,143	37	,003
Pair 3 Expostcoll - Copostcoll	4,23684	2,88926	9,040	37	,000
Pair 4 Exposterror -Coposterror	,63158	1,96484	1,981	37	,055

Table 1. Results of Reading Passage Rewrite Activity-1 (Paired Samples Statistics and Differences) (For the values shown in both text and tables, full-stops should be preferred instead of commas.)

*Exprecoll: Collocations in pre-test of experimental group   *Expostcoll: Collocations in post-test of the experimental group

*Coprecoll: Collocations in pre-test of control group   *Copostcoll: Collocations in post-test of the control group

73

The findings obtained from Text-1 pre-tests for both groups have shown that there were no significant differences between them ((t (37)=0.34, p=0.734). Before treatment, both groups have used more or less the same collocational expressions in their rewrite texts. However, the errors in their collocational usages for pre-tests of both groups were not similar to each other. Experimental group has made more mistakes than the control group and there was a significant difference between them ((t (37)=3.143, p=0.003). There could be some guided effect which has been applied in the class since for the first reading passage experimental group exposed to less guidance than the control group. That is the reason why there were no significant differences between both groups in post-tests collocational errors ((t (37)=1.981, p=0.055).On the other hand, in terms of collocational usage which was indicated in post-test, there was a significant difference between both groups ((t (37)=2.889, p=0.000).

TEXT-2	M	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 Exprecoll - Coprecoll	,31579	4,38736	,444	37	,660
Pair 2 Expreerror - Copreerror	,07895	2,89810	,168	37	,868
Pair 3 Expostcoll - Copostcoll	2,52632	4,18322	3,723	37	,001
Pair 4 Exposterror -Coposterror	-,60526	2,50987	-1,487	37	,146

Table 2. Results of Reading Passage Rewrite Activity-2 (Paired Samples Statistics and Differences)

After the first reading passage, the participants were given the second one which also included collocational expressions, however this time, the number of them was more than the first one. According to the second text's statistics, before the treatment, there were no significant differences between two groups in terms of both collocational usage and errors which were made by the participants (Coll.usage pre-test: ((t (37) =0.444, p=0.66; Coll.errors pre-test ((t (37)=0.168, p=0.868). Prior to treatment of collocations, these results indicated that the vocabulary knowledge between two groups was similar to each other. When the post-findings were analyzed, it was found out that there were significant differences between two groups in terms of their usage of collocations in rewrite activity ((t (37)= 3.723, p=0.001). Although there is no significant difference between collocational errors made by experimental and control group ((t (37)=-1.487, p=0.146), it

74

can be easily understood that the number of control group's errors did not change substantially and this fact can be seen in the table which has shown the proportion of errors (see Table 4. and 5.)

TEXT-3	M	SD	*t*	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 Exprecoll - Coprecoll	-,50000	2,97512	-1,036	37	,307
Pair 2 Expreerror - Copreerror	,23684	2,76498	,528	37	,601
Pair 3 Expostcoll - Copostcoll	2,89474	3,55489	5,020	37	,000
Pair 4 Exposterror - Coposterror	-,39474	2,23655	-1,088	37	,284

Table 3. Results of Reading Passage Rewrite Activity-3 (Paired Samples Statistics and Differences)

The last reading passage consisting of 25 collocational expressions was applied to the participants to make them rewrite the text and the results were not surprising again. Before the treatment, collocational usage and errors did not differ between two groups (Coll.usage pre-test: ((t (37) =-1.036, p=0.30; Coll.errors pre-test ((t (37)=0.528, p=0.60). After the teaching process of collocational expressions, the results showed that this process was helpful for learners to use collocations more effectively ((t (37)=5.020, p=0.000). Similar to the first two texts, the number of collocational errors made by the participants was similar to each other, however, as it was mentioned before, the results of the proportion of errors should be analyzed in terms of the exact correlation between the errors.

Texts	Experimental Group			Control Group		
	Number of Collocational Uses	Number of Errors	Proportion of Errors	Number of Collocational Uses	Number of Errors	Proportion of Errors
Text One	223	130	0.58	215	93	0.43
Text Two	339	146	0.43	327	143	0.44
Text Three	350	172	0.49	369	163	0.44
Total	912	448	0.49	911	399	0.44

Table 4. Collocational Usage and Proportion of Errors in Pre-Test

To analyze the unexpected result of significance between experimental and control group in the first reading passage, the proportion of errors has been analyzed as seen in Table 4. In the pre-test, the number of errors made by the experimental group for the first text was 130 out of 223 collocations, while the number of errors made by control group was 93 out of 215 collocations. At that point, although both groups have been distributed according to vocabulary test result, this was

75

an unexpected and enigmatic result. However, when the proportion of errors was analyzed for both groups, (0.58-0.43), it was understood that it could be a normal process. Besides, there could be other effects such as the apprehension of new terms, different course design or uneasiness of reading an academic text for the first time. Thus, the design of the study was not changed until the result of the second reading passage was seen for the next week. According to the second re-write text result, the proportion of errors were similar to each other in both groups (0.43-0.44) and the last text's result for the following week was similar to each other (0.49-0.44) again. The final decision was given after these three texts' results and the design of the study was not changed in terms of treatment process or type. After the treatment process for 10 weeks, the following results were taken from both groups (see Table 5).

Texts	Experimental Group			Control Group		
	Number of Collocational Uses	Number of Errors	Proportion of Errors	Number of Collocational Uses	Number of Errors	Proportion of Errors
Text One	398	105	0.26	237	81	0.34
Text Two	459	124	0.27	363	147	0.40
Text Three	507	137	0.27	397	152	0.38
Total	1364	366	0.27	997	380	0.38

Table 5. Collocational Usage and Proportion of Errors in Post-Test

To analyze the nonsignificant effect in a post-test number of errors for all texts between two groups, the proportion of errors results has been gathered. As seen in Table 5, the errors made by both groups were similar to each other computationally. However, when the number of collocational usages was identified, in the first text, while experimental group made 105 errors out of 398 uses of collocations, control group made 81 errors out of 237 uses of collocations. Similarly, for the second text, the experimental group made 124 errors out of 459 collocational uses whereas control group made 147 errors out of 363 collocational uses. Finally, in the last text, the total number of errors made by experimental group was 137 out of 507 collocations; however, 152 errors out of 397 collocations were made by the control group. In brief, the nonsignificant effect between proportions of errors appeared possible while so many collocations were used by the experimental group.

When the proportion of results was defined for the first text, the experimental group made a great success (PoE: from 0.58 to 0.26) while the control group took a small step during the 10-

week process (PoE: from 0.43 to 0.34). In fact, this result could be seen as an achievement for them but it should not be compared with the experimental group. The achievement of the control group was because of too much exposure to vocabulary items during one semester normally. For the experimental group, similar results can be observed for the second (PoE: from 0.43 to 0.27) and the third text (PoE: from 0.49 to 0.27). On the other hand, the control group did not earn a remarkable success when their results were compared with the experimental group. For instance, in the second text, similar to the first one, the proportion of errors increased from 0.44 to 0.40 and in the final text, it increased from 0.44 to 0.38.

Discussion and Results

The paired sample statistics results of pre-test rewrite activity have shown the answer to the first research question on whether deductive collocational teaching helps students to improve vocabulary knowledge or not. The answer of this question is more or less positive from the point of the first class of Translation and Interpreting department students. The result of second research question on whether collocation knowledge has a positive effect on academic writing or not could be seen on paired sample statistics results of post-test rewrite activity. The treatment section for 10 weeks and four hours are considered to be adequately effective.

The current study investigated the collocation vocabulary size of Translation and Interpreting first class students in Turkey and the nature of collocational awareness which do not exist in their native language. In other words, it brings out that although the source language does not have any collocational expressions or structures, the use of such corpus can be raised with sufficient practices and instructions.

The fundamental contribution of this study is that the supplying of lexical approach or vocabulary-based language teaching environment is an effective way to improve second language ability. Besides, imposing these considerations into the pedagogical connections dealing with English language teaching is another beneficial point of view which should be emphasized in this study. Before the treatment period, it was observed that there was no improvement, production or specification of collocations. After this period, collocational guideline improved the vocabulary specification and reproduction process increasingly.

77

These results show that collocational instruction and teaching academic vocabulary with collocations increased second language learners' vocabulary knowledge and made them recognize vocabulary items in reading and writing passages alternately. According to the results, there is a strong relationship between collocational vocabulary size and effective writing. Participants in experimental group outperformed the control group. One of the reasons for this success is that 10 weeks instruction period was efficient for teaching collocational expressions to them. On the other hand, the similar improvement could not be seen in control group's performance, however, they had an improvement in their general vocabulary size because of too much exposure to vocabulary activities and practices on account of English Lexis course for four hours each week. The vital impact of collocational instruction process included of recognizing and combining vocabulary items together meaningfully to construct a new lexeme. The findings of this study propose that this guideline leads students to produce more effective writing and to gather reading passages without difficulty. Using a lexical approach in a second language teaching environment directs learners to develop their writing ability, to improve reading capacity, and also to get accurate knowledge from native speakers directly. The findings of this study give attention to the development of vocabulary size of Turkish students in a non-native environment. There is a conclusion which should be underlined that collocational teaching experience adds learners' vocabulary knowledge a positive effect. After this period, it can be easily observed that students in lexis course can build their own collocational input automatically and then tend to reproduce them. In any time, EFL learners omit complex utterances and instead of them they tend to use simple and single words; however, they should know that using these one-word items in written or spoken language, in other words, in productive areas, indicates them as non-native speaker exactly. If the learners want to be seen as more native-like and sound more natural, they should use more combined vocabulary items and collocational instructions. One way to solve this unnatural language usage problem is to show them the master ability of using complex and compound sentence structures decorated with fluid native-like language structures. This research also emphasizes some remarkable consequences for English lexis or similar courses.

On the other hand, one of the shortcomings of this study is that the research is limited to only one university and the treatment was limited to 76 students with only three reading passages.

78

Besides, the usage of academic reading passages is another limitation of this study, because there is a possibility that students are good at understanding high-frequency collocational items in reading and producing them in writing instead of academic ones. The last but not least, the analysis period might have been done more systematically by analyzing every two or three-week periods to see the performance of them in every new period.

References

Akıncı, M. (2009). Effectiveness of corpus consultancy in teaching Verb+Noun collocations to first-year EST student. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University. İstanbul.

Al-Zahrani, M.S., (1998). Knowledge of english lexical collocations among male Saudi college students majoring in English at a Saudi university. Ph.D. UMI, Ann Arbor, MI.

Barfield, A., & Gyllstad, H. (2009). Introduction: Researching L2 collocation knowledge and development. In Researching collocations in another language (pp. 1-18). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Cruse, D. A. (1986). Lexical semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Durrant, P., & Schmitt, N. (2009). To what extent do native and non-native writers make use of collocations? IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 47(2), 157-177.

Fan, M. (2009). An exploratory study of collocational use by ESL students–A task-based approach. System, 37(1), 110-123.

Farghal, M. & Obiedat, H. (1995). Collocation: A Neglected Variable in EFL. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 33,315-317.

Fernández, B. G., & Schmitt, N. (2015). How much collocation knowledge do L2 learners have?. ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 166(1), 94-126.

Firth, J.R., (1957). Papers in Linguistics 1934–1951. Oxford University Press, London.

Gençer, B. (2004). Raising EFL learners' awareness of verb+noun collocations through chunking to extend their collocational knowledge of familiar nouns. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Gitsaki, C. (1999). Teaching English collocations to ESL students. NUCB journal of language culture and communication, 1(3), 27-34.Granger, 1998;

Halliday, M.A.K., (1966). Lexis as a linguistic level. In: Bazell, C.E., Catford, J.C., Halliday, M.A.K., Robins, R.H. (Eds.), In Memory of J.R. Firth, pp. 148–162.

Halliday, M.A.K., McIntosh, A., Strevens, P., (1964). The linguistic sciences and language teaching. Longman, London.

Hornby, A.S. (2000). Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, OUP, Oxford.

Howarth, P. (1998). Phraseology and second language proficiency. Applied Linguistics, 19(1), 24-44.

Hunston, S., & Francis, G. (2000). Pattern Grammar: a corpus-driven approach to the lexical grammar of English. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kennedy, G. (2003). Amplifier collocations in the British National Corpus: Implications for English language teaching. Tesol Quarterly, 37(3), 467-487.

Laufer, B., & Waldman, T. (2011). Verb-noun collocations in second language writing: A corpus analysis of learners' English. Language Learning, 61(2), 647-672.

Lehrer, A., (1974). Semantic fields and lexical structure. North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

Lewis, M. (2000). Materials and resources for teaching collocation. Teaching collocation: Further development in the lexical approach, 186-204.

Martinez, R. & V. Murphy. (2011). Effect of frequency and idiomaticity in second language reading comprehension. TESOL Quarterly. 45, 267-290.

McCarthy, M., & O'Dell, F. (2006). English collocations in use: How words work together for fluent and natural English; self-study and classroom use. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

McCarthy, M., O'Keeffe, A., & Walsh, S. (2010). Vocabulary matrix: Understanding, learning, teaching. Andover, UK: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Mutlu, G., & Kaşlıoğlu, Ö. (2016). Turkish EFL Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions of Collocations. Sakarya University Journal of Education, 6/3, pp. 81-99.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). Learning vocabulary in another language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palmer, H. E.(1933). Second interim report on English collocations. Tokyo: Kaitakusha. Peters, 2012.

Sinclair, J.M., (1966). Beginning the study of lexis. In: Bazell, C.E., Catford, J.C., Halliday, M.A.K., Robins, R.H. (Eds.), In Memory of J.R. Firth, pp. 410–430.

Sinclair, J. M. (1987). Collocation: a progress report. In R. Steele & T. Threadgold (Eds.), Language topics: Essays in honour of Michael Halliday (Vol. 2, pp. 319-331). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sinclair, J. M. (1991). Corpus, Concordance, Collocation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Siyanova, A., & Schmitt, N. (2008). L2 learner production and processing of collocation: A multi-study perspective. Canadian Modern Language Review, 64(3), 429-458.

Tekingül, B. (2013). Collocation teaching effect on reading comprehension in advanced EFL setting. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70, 1078-1089.

Wray, A., (2002). Formulaic language and the lexicon. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Zaabalawi, R. S., & Gould, A. M. (2017). English collocations: A novel approach to teaching the language's last bastion. Ampersand, 4, 21-29.

https://pearsonpte.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/AcademicCollocationList.pdf

Appendix A. Academic Collocations Awareness Test (Verb+Noun)

	VERB	NOUN		VERB	NOUN
1	acquire	kn……………	31	obtain	da……………
2	add	in……………	32	obtain	re……………
3	apply	th……………	33	offer	op……………
4	attend	co……………	34	perform	ta……………
5	begin	pr……………	35	play	ro……………
6	carry out	re……………	36	present	su……………
7	collect	da……………	37	promote	de……………
8	complete	ta……………	38	provide	op……………
9	conduct	re……………	39	provide	da……………
10	consider	as……………	40	provide	ma……………
11	contain	in……………	41	provide	re……………
12	contribute	de……………	42	publish	jo……………
13	create	pr……………	43	raise	aw……………
14	describe	me……………	44	reach	ag……………
15	develop	ap……………	45	receive	fe……………
16	discuss	to……………	46	record	da……………
17	enhance	le……………	47	report	fi……………
18	experience	pr……………	48	resolve	co……………
19	face	di……………	49	seek	he……………
20	get	fe……………	50	serve	fu……………
21	give	fe……………	51	set	go……………
22	have	st……………	52	share	in……………
23	identify	fe……………	53	show	te……………
24	improve	co……………	54	store	da……………
25	improve	pe……………	55	support	ar……………
26	improve	wo……………	56	take	cr……………
27	increase	aw……………	57	take into	co……………
28	learn	st……………	58	take	re……………

29	make	co…………….	59	use	me…………….
30	meet	ex…………….	60	use	st…………….

1	acquire knowledge	21	give feedback	41	provide resource
2	add information	22	have a strategy	42	publish journal
3	apply theory	23	identify features	43	raise awareness
4	attend a conference	24	improve communication	44	reach an agreement
5	begin process	25	improve performance	45	receive feedback
6	carry out research	26	improve work	46	record data
7	collect data	27	increase awareness	47	report finding
8	complete task	28	learn strategy	48	resolve conflict
9	conduct research	29	make comment	49	seek help
10	consider aspect	30	meet expectations	50	serve function
11	contain information	31	obtain data	51	set a goal
12	contribute development	32	obtain result	52	share information
13	create problem	33	offer opportunity	53	show tendency
14	describe a method	34	perform a task	54	store data
15	develop approach	35	play a role	55	support argument
16	discuss topic	36	present summary	56	take credit
17	enhance learning	37	promote development	57	take into consideration
18	experience problems	38	provide an opportunity	58	take responsibility
19	face difficulties	39	provide data	59	use method
20	get feedback	40	provide material	60	use statistics

Appendix B. Reading Text-1 and Academic Collocation List

Attending a Conference

The conference is a vital place for you to meet new people, new points of views, new ideas and cultures. When you **attend a conference** which is related to your area of specialization, you will get opportunities to **acquire new knowledge** and **add information** to your existing capacity. If you are a presenter in this conference, before **completing a task** you should **collect the data** about it. Besides, you should **provide resources** to **carry out an effective research**. Later, you should **apply the theory** which is related to your area of expertise while **conducting the research**. This theory should be analyzed in detail and **contain enough information** to make the research clearer. If you prefer to test your theory, you can use a participant group to be practiced. At this point, you should **use a method** and **provide materials** on your topic. In the end, you should **present a summary** and a conclusion about your topic. Do not forget to practice your presentation and **get feedback** before taking the stage in front of the audience. It will help you **take into consideration** of any difficulties or problems you will face during the presentation.

Academic Collocation List

1	attend a conference	6	provide resource	11	use method
2	acquire knowledge	7	carry out research	12	provide material
3	add information	8	apply theory	13	present summary
4	complete task	9	conduct research	14	get feedback
5	collect data	10	contain information	15	take into consideration

Appendix C. Reading Text-2 and Academic Collocation List

Translator's Conference

81

An opportunity was offered us by a professor from a state university in Turkey. We **had a strategy** to **perform a task** and a project. First of all, we were supposed to have an interview with professional translators through a project that involves translation studies. We started our project by **creating a problem** and **describing a method** about translation. Then, the chosen **topics were discussed** in the classroom and everybody tried to **make comments** and **gave feedback** about the process so that they were able to **improve their work** and **obtain a result**. Thus, by interviewing translators, we were able to describe what made us **increase our awareness** of translation studies and through this, we have **developed an approach.** During this process, we **faced many difficulties** such as finding translators who were willing to make an appointment for an interview. Unfortunately, not all of them **met our expectations**. We **obtained data** through their answers and tried to find solutions to the **problems we experienced**, overall they **played an important role** in our success on this project. As a result of this study, we **have learned some strategies** about translations and studied it as a science. Hence, we have **enhanced our learning** about the process of translation and **identified features** of it.

Academic Collocation List

1	offer opportunity	6	discuss topic	11	increase awareness	16	experience problems
2	have a strategy	7	make comment	12	develop approach	17	play a role
3	perform a task	8	give feedback	13	face difficulties	18	learn strategy
4	create problem	9	improve work	14	meet expectations	19	enhance learning
5	describe a method	10	obtain result	15	obtain data	20	identify features

Appendix D. Reading Text-3 and Academic Collocation List

Experimenting to Improve PR Efficiency in Business

Setting a clear goal in a public relations (PR) movement **shows a tendency** of increase in the initiative capability of employees. It is an issue that requires **great raise in its awareness** in that, it plays out a vital role in **improving the performance** and the efficiency of PR missions such as **providing an opportunity** for the effective improvement, **reporting findings**, **sharing information** and **resolving conflicts** between separate ideas. Setting communication goals and aims creates lots of benefits. It helps employees know how to **consider the aspect** on planned tasks and to **improve communication** between participants. Many public relations experts are satisfied to express their intentions to **take the credit** for the results and **contribute to the development** in their area. To set a goal, employees first need to **provide data** on the projected action, for example, the **recorded data** which is found by **using statistics**. **Publishing a journal** assists employees in **seeking help** for their ideas through the **received feedback.** In detail, **supporting an argument** and discussing different ideas which **serve as an important function** in improving marketing efficiency **promote development** in this research. It helps employees to **take responsibility** for their actions to **begin to the process** of their research and it makes easier to analyze their **stored data** and to **reach an agreement** after all.

Academic Collocation List

1	set a goal	10	improve communication	18	receive feedback
2	show tendency	11	take credit	19	support argument
3	raise awareness	12	contribute development	20	serve function
4	improve performance	13	provide data	21	promote development
5	provide an opportunity	14	record data	22	take responsibility
6	report finding	15	use statistics	23	begin process
7	share information	16	publish journal	24	store data
8	resolve conflict	17	seek help	25	reach an agreement
9	consider aspect				