



**University of Mohagheh Ardabili**  
**Faculty of Literature and Human science**  
**Department of English**

**Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of**  
**M.A. in Teaching English**

Title:

**The effect of concordancing-based teaching on learning lexical and  
grammatical collocations in intermediate learners' writing**

Supervisor(s):

**Afsaneh Saedadhtar (Ph.D)**

Advisor(s):

**Reza Abdi (Ph.D)**

By:

**Sahar Seyedasgary**

September 2016

Family name: Seyedasgary	Name: Sahar
Title of Thesis: The effect of concordancing-based teaching on learning lexical and grammatical collocations in intermediate learners' writing	
Supervisor(s): Dr. Afsaneh Saeedakhtar Advisor(s): Dr. Reza Abdi	
Graduate Degree: M.A. Major: English language University: Mohagheghe Ardabili Graduation date: 95/6/14	
Specialty: English language teaching Faculty: Literature and Human Science Number of pages: 87	
<p>Abstract:</p> <p>The present study intended to explore the role of concordancing in learners' productive knowledge of lexical and grammatical collocations as well as the differential influence of output when learners take advantage of concordancing to learn L2 collocations. It also investigated which type of collocations (i.e., lexical or grammatical) is more problematic to L2 learners. Furthermore, it elicited learners' attitudes toward the role of concordancing and output in learning collocations. To this purpose, a total of 45 volunteer Iranian intermediate learners of English were randomly divided into an output group, a nonoutput group, and a control group. During a 6-session treatment, the output group received a topic along with a list of related nodes to search concordancing, find the appropriate collocates, and perform a story-writing task embedding the targeted collocations. The nonoutput group, however, was only required to search those collocations in concordancing, read the examples, and pay attention to the collocations without any production. The control group only performed the story-writing tasks without having access to concordancing. The results indicated that the experimental groups outperformed the control group in producing collocations both in the immediate and delayed posttests. However, findings showed that there was no significant difference between the performance of the experimental groups in the immediate posttest while there was a significant difference between them in the delayed posttest. The findings also showed that lexical collocations posed more challenge to learners both in the immediate and delayed posttests. The results of the questionnaire revealed that all learners had positive attitudes toward the effect of both concordancing and output on learning L2 collocations.</p>	
Keywords: Concordancing, grammatical collocations, lexical collocations	

## Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	III
List of Figures.....	IV
List of Abbreviations.....	V

### **Chapter One: Introduction**

1.1. Preliminary Remarks.....	2
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	5
1.3. Significance of the Study.....	7
1.4. Purpose of the Study.....	7
1.5. Research Questions.....	8
1.6. Research Hypotheses.....	8
1.7. Definition of Key Terms.....	8
1.8. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study.....	9

### **Chapter Two: Literature Review**

2.1. Introduction.....	12
2.2. Collocation.....	12
2.3. Concordancing.....	16
2.4. Output.....	18
2.5. Empirical Studies.....	19

### **Chapter Three: Method**

3.1. Introduction.....	34
3.2. Participants.....	34
3.3. Instruments.....	34
3.4. Procedure.....	37



## **Chapter Four: Results and Discussion**

4.1. Introduction.....	41
4.2. Quantitative Data Analysis.....	41
4.3. Qualitative Data Analysis.....	48
4.4. Discussion.....	51

## **Chapter Five: Conclusion**

5.1. Introduction.....	56
5.2. Conclusion.....	56
5.3. Implications.....	57
5.4. Suggestions for Future Research.....	57

<b>References.....</b>	<b>59</b>
------------------------	-----------

## **Appendices**

Appendix A: Pretest.....	73
Appendix B: Immediate Posttest.....	74
Appendix C: Delayed Posttest.....	75
Appendix D: Questionnaire.....	76
Appendix E: Treatments.....	78
Appendix F: List of Collocations.....	84

## List of Tables

Table 3.1: Summary of the Study.....	39
Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics for the Proficiency Test.....	41
Table 4.2: The ANOVA Results for the Proficiency Test.....	42
Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics for the Pretest.....	42
Table 4.4: The ANOVA Results for the Pretest.....	42
Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics for the Immediate Posttest.....	43
Table 4.6: The ANOVA Results for the Immediate Posttest.....	43
Table 4.7: The Results of the Scheffe Post-hoc Test for the Immediate Posttest.....	43
Table 4.8: Descriptive Statistics for the Delayed Posttest.....	44
Table 4.9: The ANOVA Results for the Delayed Posttest.....	44
Table 4.10: The Results of the Scheffe Post-hoc Test for the Delayed Posttest.....	45
Table 4.11: Descriptive Statistics for the Types of Collocations in the Immediate Posttest....	46
Table 4.12: Multivariate Tests of the Immediate Posttest.....	47
Table 4.13: Descriptive Statistics for the Types of Collocations in the Delayed Posttest.....	47
Table 4.14: Multivariate Tests of the Delayed Posttest.....	48
Table 4.15: Experimental Groups' Responses to the First Section of the Questionnaire.....	49
Table 4.16: Experimental Groups' Responses to the Second Section of the Questionnaire....	50
Table 4.17: Experimental Groups' Responses to the Third Section of the Questionnaire.....	51

## **List of Figures**

Figure 3.1: A Screenshot of Concordancing.....	36
Figure 4.1: The Performance of Three Groups throughout the Study.....	45

## **List of Abbreviations**

**ANOVA:** Analysis of Variance

**BNC:** British National Corpus

**CALL:** Computer Assisted Language Learning

**CV:** Communicative Value

**DDL:** Data Driven Learning

**EMP:** English for Medical Purposes

**ILH:** Involvement Load Hypothesis

**MANOVA:** Multivariate Analysis of Variance

**MELPT:** Michigan English Language Proficiency Test

**MI:** Mutual Information

**MTELP:** Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency

**PET:** Cambridge Preliminary English Test

**TOEFL:** Test of English as a Foreign Language

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. Preliminary Remarks

To, date different studies (e.g., Bahns & Eldaw, 1993; Celce-Murcia, 2001; Moreno, 2007; Nesselhauf, 2003; Youmei & Yun, 2005; Zarei & Koosha, 2002) have elicited L2 collocations at different levels of proficiency and have unanimously concluded that even advanced learners fail to produce collocations accurately. Sinclair (1991) defined the term collocation as the frequent co-occurrence of two or more words in a text such as *protect against*, *do laundry*, and *strong tea*. Collocations commonly consist of a node serving as the head word that carries the meaning (e.g., *protect*, *laundry*, and *tea*) and a collocate which comes on the right or left of the node (e.g., *against*, *do*, and *strong*).

Brown (1974) believes that learning collocations improves learners' oral skills and reading speed. Some researchers (e.g., Shin & Nation, 2008) have concluded that collocational knowledge can improve learners' speaking and writing. Other researchers (e.g., Hsu & Chiu, 2008; Lin, 2002) concluded that collocational knowledge enhances the learners' writing and reading skills. But lack of collocational knowledge can decrease both comprehensibility and productivity of learners' expressions (Laufer & Waldman, 2011). McArthur (1992) and McCarthy (1990) also believe that the lack of collocational knowledge is the most important trace of foreignness among foreign language learners. Hill (1999) argues that developing collocational competence is a must for achieving native-like proficiency. In light of the above-mentioned findings it is clear that developing collocational knowledge is of paramount importance for achieving L2 proficiency.

A look into the literature demonstrates that some researchers have measured learners' receptive performance of collocations (e.g., Al-Zahrani, 1998; Kiaee, Moghaddam, & Hosseini, 2013), some others have examined their productive performance (e.g., Ebrahimi Bazzaz & Abd Samad, 2011; Eidian, Gorjian, & Aghvami, 2013; Karami, 2013; Laufer & Waldman, 2011; Nesselhauf, 2003; Wu, Witten, & Franken, 2010), and some others have measured both receptive and productive performance of collocations (e.g., Jafarpoor, Hashemian, & Alipour, 2013; Lin, 2002; Rezaee, Marefat, & Saeedakhtar, 2015). Results of all these studies have indicated that learners are poor in terms of recognizing and producing L2 collocations.

To overcome some of these collocation deficiencies, different researchers have examined the role of different pedagogical interventions in teaching collocations to L2 learners. Some researchers have stressed the importance of explicit teaching of collocations (e.g., Nesselhauf, 2003; Willis & Willis, 1996) and some others have advocated implicit teaching of collocations (e.g., Nation, 2001). Implicit instruction is "the unselective and passive aggregation of information" (Hyes & Broadbent, 1988, p. 251) "which occurs as a by-product of language usage, without the intended purpose of learning a particular linguistic feature" (Schmitt, 2010, p. 29). Doughty and Williams (1998) claim that implicit instruction intends to catch the attention of learners to linguistic forms without hindering meaning. However, explicit instruction is "a systematic method of teaching with emphasis on proceeding in small steps, checking for student understanding, and achieving active and successful participation by all students" (Berliner & Rosenshine, 1987, p. 34).

Some studies (e.g., Doughty, 1991; Ellis, 2002; 2005; 2008; Ghonsooli, Pishghadam, & Mahjoobi, 2008; Harley, 1998; Izumi, 2002; Leow, 1997; Lin, 2002; Macaro & Masterman, 2006; Nesselhauf, 2003; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Radwan, 2005; Sun & Wang, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; White, 1998) are in favor of explicit instruction while some others (e.g., Jenson & Vinther, 2003; Shook, 1994; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993) advocate implicit instruction. Those in favor of explicit instruction argue that directing the learner's attention to the target

learning objectives in highly structured settings are of great benefit to L2 learners (e.g., Boers, Eyckmans, Kappel, Stengers, & Demecheleer, 2006; Schmitt & Zimmerman, 2002). Ellis (2001) also believes that explicit instruction is more beneficial to learning than the implicit one, because it speeds up the learning process. However, in explicit instruction, because of learners' limited attention span (Skehan, 1998), only limited number of words can be selected and taught each session.

In contrast, some other researchers believe that explicit instruction cannot be very effective, since sufficient exposure to the target items can lead to learning those items (e.g., Celce-Murcia, 2001; Gass, 1999). They believe that in implicit instruction "learners learn the target items as a by-product of reading a text for comprehension of the content rather than for learning that items in that text" (Zaferanieh & Behrooznia, 2011, p. 122). According to Schmitt (2008), words should be seen eight times, so that they can be learned effectively. In order to expose learners to words eight times through implicit instruction, we need an ample amount of input which makes learning a very slow process. In order to obviate the problems associated with both explicit and implicit instruction in teaching collocations, technological tools have been resorted to.

In the age of ever-developing technology, many researchers have tended to focus on teaching collocations through different technological tools. They have concluded that computer assisted language learning (CALL) has positive influence on classroom activities and L2 learning (e.g., Lee, Cheung, Wong, & Lee, 2013; Wu et al., 2010). One of these tools which has been intimately used in teaching collocations is concordancing. "Concordancers allow learners to search for a node and find it in an expanded context along with what precedes and follows the node" (Rezaee, Rouhi, & Saedadkhtar, 2013, p. 154). Through this program, learners can find a selected word along with a large pool of authentic sentences containing that word (Jafarpoor & Koosha, 2006). Some studies (e.g., Çelik, 2011; Jafarpoor et al., 2013; Jafarpoor & Koosha, 2006; Kheirzadeh & Marandi, 2014; Pirmoradian & Tabatabaei, 2012; Rezaee et al., 2015; Sun

& Wang, 2003; Wu et al., 2010) have examined the role of concordancing in learning collocations and most of them have demonstrated that concordancing is one of the most effective ways of teaching collocations which leads to long-lasting learning.

Previous studies have investigated the role of concordancing in learning collocations but the influence of output in benefiting from concordancing has remained a less-attended area. Furthermore, the studies conducted on the role of output in L2 learning have yielded contradictory results. Some studies (e.g., Jezo, 2011; Russell, 2014) concluded a positive role for output, but Rezvani (2011) found that there was no significant difference between the output and non-output groups. A look into the literature reveals that a few studies have been carried out on the role of output in benefiting from concordancing in learning lexical and grammatical collocations. The present study intends to shed some light on the influence of output when learners take advantage of concordancing to learn lexical and grammatical collocations. It also investigates which type of collocations (i.e., lexical or grammatical) is more challenging to learners. Moreover, it tries to elicit learners' attitudes toward both concordancing and output.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

Many applied linguists have emphasized the importance of drawing language learners' attention to standardized multi-word expressions such as collocations and idiomatic expressions (e.g., Celce-Murcia, 2001; Lewis, 1993; Pouralvar, 2007; Zhang, 1993). According to McCarthy (1990), the knowledge of collocation can differentiate native speakers from non-native speakers. So, developing collocational competence is the most important factor in L2 learning (e.g., Lewis, 1997; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Richards & Rodgers, 2001) and different studies (e.g., Durrant, 2008; Fan, 2009; Hill, 2000; Lin, 2002; Motallebzadeh, Beh-Afarin, & Rad, 2011) have emphasized that collocations should be incorporated into L2 syllabus.

Different studies (e.g., Bahns & Eldaw, 1993; Celce-Murcia, 2001; Moreno, 2007; Nesselhauf, 2003; Youmei & Yun, 2005; Zarei & Koosha, 2002) have shown the incompetency of L2 learners in comprehending and producing L2 collocations, so, different researchers have

tried to teach them through different ways including explicit teaching (e.g., Doughty, 1991; Ellis, 2002; 2005; 2008; Harley, 1998; Izumi, 2002; Leow, 1997; Lin, 2002; Macaro & Masterman, 2006; Nesselhauf, 2003; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Radwan, 2005; Sun & Wang, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; White, 1998), implicit teaching (e.g., Jenson & Vinther, 2003; Shook, 1994; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993). Recently, with the advent of technology, many researchers (e.g., Çelik, 2011; Jafarpoor et al., 2013; Jafarpoor & Koosha, 2006; Kheirzadeh & Marandi, 2014; Pirmoradian & Tabatabaei, 2012; Rezaee et al., 2015; Sun & Wang, 2003; Wu et al., 2010) have resorted to technological tools, such as corpora and concordancing in learning L2 collocations. The results of all these studies have shown that concordancing as one of the recent and efficient ways of teaching collocations has great effect on the learners' L2 collocational knowledge. The present study intended to explore the efficiency of concordancing in intermediate learners' lexical and grammatical collocational knowledge.

Although previous studies have proved the positive role of concordancing in learning L2 collocations, there are few studies about the role of output in making use of concordancing to learn L2 collocations. So, in this study, it is tried to investigate the role of output in the context of concordancing to learn lexical and grammatical collocations. Because according to Liming (1990), in order to learn the second language successfully, we should not look at input or output in isolation, rather we need to pursue an amalgamation of both.

On the other hand, the most problematic type of collocation (i.e., lexical or grammatical) is considered in this study, because previous studies (e.g., Benson, Benson, & Ilson, 1997; Ceh, 2005; Chen, 2008; Hassan Abadi, 2003; Keshavarz & Salimi, 2007; Le, 2010; Li, 2005; Sadighi & Sahragard, 2013; Shokouhi & Mirsalari, 2010; VanPatten, 1985) have indicated contradictory results. Finally, by giving a questionnaire to the experimental groups, their attitudes toward this study is inspected.

### **1.3. Significance of the Study**

Collocations are common in all languages and they constitute about 70% of our utterances in language (Hill, 2000). By carrying out this study, I want to emphasize the importance of collocations and CALL in second language learning. As the participants of this study stated in the questionnaire, collocations have been neglected in Iranian classrooms and text-books. So, the results of this study encourages syllabus designers and material developers to incorporate collocations into text-books, and if possible, technology-enhanced tools such as concordancing in L2 classrooms to let learners develop their collocational competence along with other competences. This study will also inspire teachers to pay more attention to the importance of collocations in developing the language and try to teach them to learners through recent technological tools. It will make learners aware of their poor knowledge as to collocations and encourage them to learn collocations as enthusiastically as possible through novel and modern technology-enhanced tools.

### **1.4. Purpose of the Study**

Different scholars from various fields (e.g., Bahns & Eldaw, 1993; Nation, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001) have emphasized teaching collocations. But previous studies have shown that language learners use very few collocations than native speakers (Webb & Kagimoto, 2011). Therefore L2 researchers and practitioners attempt to teach collocations to L2 learners through different pedagogical ways such as explicit instruction, implicit instruction, and concordancing-based instruction. The purpose of this research is to investigate the role of concordancing in learning lexical and grammatical L2 collocations. It also explores the role of output in the context of concordancing which is a questionable area in L2 learning. Then it discovers the most challenging type of collocations (i.e., lexical or grammatical), and finally, it surveys the experimental groups' responses to the questionnaire.

### 1.5. Research Questions

The following four research questions are addressed in the present study:

1. Would concordancing-based teaching improve Iranian intermediate learners' productive performance of lexical and grammatical collocations?
2. Would output practice enhance the effectiveness of concordancing-based teaching in learning lexical and grammatical collocations?
3. Which collocations are more problematic for the output and nonoutput groups: Lexical or grammatical?
4. What is the learners' attitudes toward collocations, concordancing, and output?

### 1.6. Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are formulated for the given research questions:

- 1- Concordancing-based teaching would not improve intermediate learners' productive performance of lexical and grammatical collocations.
- 2- Output practice has no influence on benefiting from concordancing-based teaching to learn lexical and grammatical collocations.
- 3- There is no significant difference between the performance of learners in lexical and grammatical collocations.

### 1.7. Definition of Key Terms

#### Collocations

"Collocations are words that occur together with frequency and refer to the combination of words that have a certain mutual expectancy" (Özgül & Abdülkadir, 2012, p. 23). *Heavy traffic, trust in, on purpose, and cast doubt* are examples of collocations.

#### Lexical Collocations

Lexical collocations are the go-togetherness of two content words, including verb-noun (*allocate blame*), verb-adverb (*walk briskly*), adjective-noun (*strong wind*), adjective-adverb

(*sound sleep*), adverb-adjective (*utterly stupid*), noun-noun (*bars of soap*), and noun-verb (*temperatures rise*) collocations (Benson et al., 1997).

### **Grammatical Collocations**

Grammatical collocations are the go-togetherness of content and function words such as: Preposition-noun (*at risk*), noun-preposition (*addiction to*), adjective-preposition (*aware of*), noun-to infinitive (*years to come*), noun-that clause (*the fact that*), adjective-to infinitive (*ready to go*), and adjective-that (*afraid that*) collocations (Benson et al., 1997).

### **Concordancing**

Concordancing is a tool to use corpus software for finding every occurrence of a particular word (O'Keefe, McCarthy, & Carter, 2007). Through concordancer, learners can search for a node and find the collocate that precedes or follows the node in a context (Rezaee et al., 2013).

### **Output**

English language learners need opportunities to practice language at their level of English language competency. This practice with English-speaking peers is called comprehensible output. Swain (1985, p. 249) believes that comprehensible output is "a message conveyed precisely, appropriately, and coherently" and an output that fails to meet these three criteria is incomprehensible output.

### **1.8. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study**

The present study is not free from deficiencies. First of all, the participants of this study were just intermediate level learners. Maybe other levels of proficiency would lead to different results. The second limitation is that the participants of each group were limited to 15 learners. The third limitation is that all participants were volunteer and they were interested in learning L2 collocations.

One of the delimitations of the current study refers to limiting the frequency of nodes to levels 3 and 4. Exposing learners to other levels of frequency may lead to different results. Also

the collocates were chosen on the basis of the highest mutual information (MI), the strength between the node and collocate. Collocates with lower MI may cause different findings.

The next chapter will explain in detail the definition, origin, and development of collocations, concordancing, and output. It also introduces their beneficency to L2 learners in the learning process. Then some empirical studies around the concept of collocations, concordancing, and output will be introduced in detail.

**CHAPTER TWO**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1. Introduction

This chapter includes some theoretical background information about the dependent variable, i.e., lexical and grammatical collocations, as well as the independent variables, i.e., concordancing and output. Then some related empirical studies about different ways of teaching collocations and the role of concordancing and output in learning which have been investigated by different researchers are included.

#### 2.2. Collocation

The term “collocation” has its origin in the latin verb “collocare” which means “to set in order/to arrange” (Martynska, 2004, p. 2). For the first time, Firth (1957) introduced the term collocation but it was not taken seriously until Lewis (1993) paid attention to it in his lexical approach (Jafarpoor & Koosha, 2006). The term collocation has been labeled in a variety of ways, for example, prefabs, multi-word units, formulaic chunks, etc. It has also been defined in different manners in both linguistics and language teaching (Fan, 2009). Sinclair (1991), for example, defined collocations as the occurrence of two or more words within a short space in a text, for instance *do homework, take a shower, pay attention*. Benson et al. (1997) defined collocations as specified, identifiable, non-idiomatic, and recurrent combinations. Schmitt (2000) defined collocation as the inclination of two or more words to co-occur in language. Widdowson (2007) claimed that certain words tend to combine with others; in fact, there is a kind of mutual attraction that draws them together. But collocations go beyond the relationship between two lexical items in a noun phrase to include many other combinations in phrases like:

as a matter of fact, all things considered. Collocations have been differentiated from idioms. An idiom is known as a phrase which acquires a meaning different from the sum of its individual parts; for example, *kick the bucket* has nothing to do with bucket and kicking. Idioms are defined as proper language of a country or one culture and their meaning is particular to that language (Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology, 1966), and when they are translated into another language, they lose their actual meaning, because many idioms are specific to the culture (Universal Dictionary of the English language, 1958). According to Baker (1992), idioms are fixed expressions without any variation in form. A collocation is, on the other hand, the co-occurrence of two or more words whose meaning can be inferred from the parts, but it becomes less acceptable when one of the elements is replaced by a similar word. For example, *achieve a level* is common while *achieve a point* is not (Shei & Pain, 2000).

Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) pointed out that collocation includes a “node” which is the head word that carries the meaning (e.g., *homework, shower, and attention*) and a collocate which comes at the right or left of the node (e.g., *do, take, and pay*). The construction of a meaning for a node depends on the interpretation of a collocate whose reading is relative to the node (Almela & Sanchez, 2007).

A look into the literature shows that collocations have been categorized differently. For instance, Benson et al. (1997) classified collocations as lexical and grammatical ones. Lexical collocations are the co-occurrence of two content words including: verb-noun (*cast doubt*), verb-adverb (*disguise cleverly*), adjective-noun (*strong wind*), adjective-adverb (*sound asleep*), adverb-adjective (*totally haphazard*), noun-noun (*a pack of lies*), and noun-verb (*anxiety grows*) collocations. Grammatical collocations are the co-occurrence of content and function words such as: preposition-noun (*under stress*), noun-preposition (*addiction to*), adjective-preposition (*aware of*), noun-to infinitive (*an attempt to do*), noun-that clause (*my opinion that*), adjective-to infinitive (*happy to go*), and adjective-that (*confident that*) collocations.

Baker (1992) classified collocations in another way: *Open collocations* whose nodes can go with lots of words, like *big house, beautiful house*, and so on, and *restricted collocations* which are similar to idioms or fixed phrases, like *get away with, dogs eat dogs*, and so on. Lewis (1997) categorized collocations in different ways:

- 1- Strong: These collocations usually have few other collocates (e.g., *rancid butter*).
- 2- Weak: These collocations go together with random frequency and they can be guessed easily (*white wine*).
- 3- Medium strength: Some words go together with greater frequency than weak collocations. Learners know each individual words but they cannot use them together as collocations (e.g., *hold a meeting*).

To date different studies have shown that learners commit both lexical (e.g., Bahns & Eldaw, 1993; Nesselhauf, 2003; Siyanova & Schmitt, 2008) and grammatical (e.g., Hassan Abadi, 2003; Hill, 1999) collocational errors. So, collocations should be given “the same kind of status in our methodology as other aspects of language such as pronunciation, intonation, stress, and grammar” (Hill, 2000, p. 59). Altenberg and Granger (2001) and Nesselhauf (2003) claim that even advanced learners have problems with collocations. Zinkgräf (2008) believes that collocations should be taught from the beginning levels of language learning.

Some researchers like Benson et al. (1997) believe that grammatical collocations are more demanding on the part of learners, and teachers should devote more time to teach them than lexical collocations. Rezaee et al. (2013) believe that according to VanPatten’s (1985) communicative value (CV) perspective, grammatical collocations are more challenging because they have low CV and carry the features of – semantics and + redundancy, but lexical collocations are less challenging because they have high CV and carry the features of + semantics and – redundancy. Other researchers (e.g., Ceh, 2005; Chen, 2008; Keshavarz & Salimi, 2007; Sadighi & Sahragard, 2013) believe that lexical collocations are problematic for learners because they are difficult to be found in dictionaries. In addition to written collocational

errors, learners also have oral collocational errors but since oral collocational errors are more unplanned, more context-dependant, and less editable than written collocations, researchers are less inclined to investigate them (Wang & Shih, 2011).

Collocations cause more difficulties to L2 learners (Nesselhauf, 2003). Interlingual transfer is one of the most important reasons of producing miscollocations (e.g., Fan, 2009; Hussein, 1990; Jafarpoor & Koosha, 2006; Mahmoud, 2005; Nesselhauf, 2003; Sadeghi, 2009; Sadeghi & Panahifar, 2013). Negative transfer of L1 can occur at all levels of linguistic analysis such as grammar, lexis, phonology, and syntax (Oldin, 1989). It is obvious that collocation is another area of transfer, especially when the collocational patterns of L1 and L2 are different.

The learners' miscollocations can be explained resorting to Sinclair's (1991) *open choice* and *idiom principle*. The open choice principle is defined as "probably the normal way of seeing and describing language" which is in charge of operating semantic and syntactic rules. On the other hand, the idiom principle that is a "non-random nature of language" is in charge of operating formulaic chunks and collocations (Sinclair, 1991, p. 109). Since nonnative speakers use more open choice principles in producing language, they cannot use appropriate collocations and combinations (Rezaee, Saeadakhtar, Rouhi, 2014). Liu (1999) states that interlingual transfer and absence of familiarity with collocations are the major causes of miscollocations. Put differently, L2 learners' use of wrong collocations may be due to the differences of L1 and L2 or in other words L1 interference (interlingual errors) (e.g., Martelli, 1998; Sadeghi, 2009; Shalev, 2000). But sometimes the learners' L1 has positive influence on their choice, so, they choose the right collocate for each node. Moreover, there are some intralingual errors that cause miscollocations (e.g., the miscollocation of *chief* instead of *dean* for university). For removing interlingual errors, it is better to expose learners to the collocations through corpora of native English speakers and concordancing, and for teaching intralingual errors, teachers can juxtapose different meanings of a lexical item with different collocates to let learners notice the differences.

### 2.3. Concordancing

Nowadays technology is utilized in all aspects of our life including teaching and learning English. Computer assisted language learning (CALL) “aims to enhance the learning environment, meet individual learning requirements, enrich learning experiences, and diminish the conventional role of the teacher by overcoming the restrictions of traditional instruction” (Çelik, 2011, p. 273). Recently researchers have emphasized the role of inductive approaches against the deductive approaches in learning L2 collocations (Sun & Wang, 2003). Concordancing as an inductive way of learning collocations provides opportunities for discovery learning and improves learning lexical and grammatical collocations (Rezaee et al., 2015).

Johns (1990) defined corpora and concordance activities as data-driven learning (DDL). DDL is providing situations in which students can answer questions about language by studying corpus data through concordance lines or sentences (Hunston, 2002). Corpora can be either written texts such as extracts of newspaper, book, magazine, or spoken texts which are the recorded or transcribed form of radio or TV shows, conversations, and so on (Çelik, 2011). “Concordancing is one of the most frequently used tools to explore corpora, specifically with a view to examining collocational use” (Wu et al., 2010, p. 84). This program finds a selected word and lists authentic sentences containing that word (Jafarpoor & Koosha, 2006).

Concordancers might be monolingual, bilingual, or even multilingual. Through bilingual concordancers, contrastive contexts of language use examples are more easily accessible (Wang, 2001). In traditional approaches to language learning, dictionaries were the main source for finding the definition and examples, and were very time-consuming (Cobb, 2003). Using the concordance, learners are involved in a more speedy and efficient language learning process (Çelik, 2011). Tribble and Johns (1990) state that through concordance, learners can be exposed to different examples of authentic vocabulary, collocations, grammar, and so on. So, it may be a learner-centered process and learners become motivated to discover the rules and meanings.

In the age of technology, many researchers have tended to focus on teaching collocations through different technological tools. Concordancers are superior to conventional dictionaries, grammar books, and course books, because they expose learners to huge amounts of authentic language, improve their explicit knowledge of the L2, promote the learners' analytical capacities, and support the development of learner autonomy (Gabel, 2001). Cobb (2003) claims that when learners are presented with lots of examples to process, language learning happens better. So, using corpora can help learners to discover the patterns of the language and modify their misconceptions by observing authentic examples (Hill, 2000).

According to Laufer and Hulstijn's (2001) involvement load hypothesis, concordancing provides opportunities for triggering the three components of need, search, and evaluation. When learners are asked to produce a text, they feel the need for correct collocations in the given context. Then, they search and find lots of collocates for the intended node, and finally they evaluate those collocates and select one which fits the context (Wu et al., 2010). As a result of meeting those three components and high involvement load, the collocations remain in learners' long term memory for a long time (Rezaee et al. 2015).

To date, different studies have investigated the role of concordancing in EFL learning. For example, in learning collocation (e.g., Çelik, 2011; Jafarpour & Koosha, 2006; Jafarpour et al., 2013; Kita & Ogata, 1997; Rezaee et al., 2015), lexical acquisition (e.g., Cobb, 1999; Murphy, 1996), grammar (Tribble, 1990), writing (e.g., Todd, 2001; Weber, 2001). Through this program, learners can find a selected word along with a large list of authentic sentences containing that word (Jafarpour & Koosha, 2006). Some studies (e.g., Çelik, 2011; Jafarpour et al., 2013; Jafarpour & Koosha, 2006; Kheirzadeh & Marandi, 2014; Pirmoradian & Tabatabaei, 2012; Rezaee et al., 2015; Sun & Wang, 2003; Wu et al., 2010) have examined the role of concordancing in learning collocations and most of them have concluded that concordancing is very helpful in learning collocations but there is no study about the role of output in the effectiveness of concordancing.

## 2.4. Output

According to Krashen's input hypothesis (1985), the input that is comprehensible enough to the learners and is just beyond their current competence, i.e.,  $i + 1$ , is the most necessary condition for language learning, provided that the input is of interest, relevant to the learner, and the learner pays attention to it (Jezo, 2011). Swain (1985) questions Krashen's (1985) input hypothesis and claims that to learn a second language input is necessary but it is not enough. To learn the language, learners need output in addition to the received input. She states that language learners lack sufficient opportunities for second language production. During the L2 production, learners notice what they are unable to say in the target language (Jezo, 2011) which in turn can fortify learning. Swain believes that mere exposure to input and interaction is not enough and learners should produce something for the purpose of recognizing the gap between their output and the target language.

Swain (1995) and Swain and Lapkin (1998) have given four functions of output in second language acquisition: The first function is *noticing gaps*. It helps learners to notice their interlanguage gaps. The second function is to serve language learning through *hypothesis testing*. The third function is *metalinguistic* in nature, it serves to control and internalize linguistic knowledge. The fourth function is to *enhance fluency* through practice (De Bot, 1996).

Swain believed that the production of output helps learners to process language more deeply and attend to both meaning and form simultaneously (Swain, 1985; 1995). According to Swain's (1985; 1995; 2000; 2005) output hypothesis, output is not merely an end product of learning, but is an important factor to promote L2 learning. By attempting to produce output, learners notice what they do not know or know only partially. So, they try to fill that gap by turning to a dictionary, a book, or by asking peers or teachers (Russell, 2014). Some researchers (e.g., Ellis, 2001; Mitchell & Myles, 2004; Shehadeh, 2002) state that the role of output in second language learning has not been proved yet, because there is lack of research studies to prove this effective role of output in L2 learning.

## 2.5. Empirical Studies

A look into the literature shows that there are different ways for teaching collocations to L2 learners such as explicit instruction (e.g., Tseng, 2002; Webb & Kagimoto, 2009; 2011), implicit instruction (e.g., Durrant & Schmitt, 2010; Webb, Newton, & Chang, 2013), and concordancing-based teaching (e.g., Çelik, 2011; Chang & Sun, 2009; Jafarpoor et al., 2013; Jafarpoor & Koosha, 2006; Kheirzadeh & Marandi, 2014; Pirmoradian & Tabatabaei, 2012; Rezaee et al., 2015; Wu et al., 2010). Below some of these studies are explained in detail.

Some researchers (e.g., Asaei & Rezvani, 2015; Jafarigozar & Imanian, 2013; Karami, 2013; Mahvelati & Mukundan, 2012; Zarei & Tondaki, 2015) conducted similar studies to investigate the different influence of explicit and implicit instruction on the performance of L2 collocations by adopting different levels of proficiency. Mahvelati and Mukundan (2012), for example, conducted a research to compare the effects of input flood (i.e., implicit teaching) and consciousness raising (i.e., explicit teaching) on upper-intermediate learners' receptive and productive knowledge of lexical and grammatical collocations. Participants of their study were 95 Iranian learners who were randomly divided into two experimental groups (i.e., input flood and consciousness raising) and a control group. They were given a TOEFL paper-based test to measure their homogeneity before administering the treatment, and a background questionnaire to ensure that they had not received any collocation instruction before this study. In the second session, all participants took the pretest to ensure that they had little knowledge of the targeted collocations.

In the input flood group, learners were exposed to collocations in different texts and were supposed to focus on the gist of the text rather than collocations. In the consciousness raising group, the teacher tried to draw learners' attention to word combinations, chunks, and collocations through consciousness raising activities and web-based concordancing activities. In the control group, learners were exposed to neither explicit nor implicit instruction. All participants took an immediate posttest two days after the last session of the treatment, and a

delayed posttest two weeks later. The results showed that both the experimental groups outperformed the control group but the explicit group had better performance than the implicit one both in the immediate and delayed posttests. One of the complications of Mahvelati and Mukundan's (2012) study is that they included 10 types of collocations in their study (including *noun-noun*, *noun-verb*, *verb-noun*, *adjective-noun*, *adverb-adjective*, *verb-adverb*, *noun-preposition*, *preposition-noun*, *adjective-preposition*, and *linking verb collocations*). It would be better to incorporate less collocation types to focus on them easily.

Karami (2013) performed a similar study to examine lower-intermediate learners' productive knowledge of collocations. Thirty-six pre-university Iranian EFL learners aging 18 and 19 were randomly divided into an experimental group who received the explicit teaching of collocations and a comparison group who received the implicit teaching. As the pretest, all participants were given some paragraphs to fill the gaps by some particular lexical or grammatical collocations. As the posttest, all participants were provided with three topics to write about them and incorporate the intended collocations. The results showed that the explicit group outperformed the implicit group in embedding accurate collocations in their writing. The study conducted by Karami suffers from some shortcomings too. She failed to administer a delayed posttest to investigate the long-term effect of the treatment and a control group to prove the effect of the treatment. She also has not determined which type of collocations, i.e., lexical or grammatical, was scrutinized.

Jafarigohar & Imanian (2013) in another study tried to compare explicit and implicit instruction on BA learners' receptive and productive knowledge of collocations. To this purpose, 27 Iranian female learners of English were recruited. Four of them were excluded because they had not attended all sessions. Their average age was 22. All participants were given a multiple-choice test as the pretest including 90 collocations. Then they selected 60 collocations that learners did not know in the pretest. Those 60 collocations were divided into three

نام خانوادگی دانشجو: سید عسگری	نام: سحر
عنوان پایان نامه: نقش آموزش واژه یاب-محور در یادگیری هم آیی های واژگانی و دستوری در متون نوشتاری زبان آموزان سطح متوسط	
استاد (اساتید) راهنما: دکتر افسانه سعیداختر استاد (اساتید) مشاور: دکتر رضا عبدی	
مقطع تحصیلی: کارشناسی ارشد	رشته: زبان انگلیسی
گرایش: آموزش زبان انگلیسی	دانشگاه: محقق اردبیلی
دانشکده: ادبیات و علوم انسانی	تاریخ دفاع: ۹۵/۶/۱۴
	تعداد صفحات: ۸۷
چکیده: این مطالعه به هدف بررسی نقش واژه یاب در مهارت تولید هم آیی های واژگانی و دستوری و همچنین تاثیر آموزش تولید-محور در یادگیری هم آیی ها از طریق واژه یاب پرداخته است. این تحقیق همچنین سخت ترین نوع هم آیی ها (واژگانی یا دستوری) برای زبان آموزان را بررسی نموده است. به علاوه، این مطالعه نگرش زبان آموزان را نسبت به واژه یاب و تولید در یادگیری هم آیی ها بررسی کرده است. به این منظور، ۴۵ زبان آموز ایرانی سطح متوسط که داوطلبانه در این تحقیق شرکت کرده بودند، به صورت تصادفی در سه گروه تولید-محور، غیر تولید-محور و کنترل طبقه بندی شدند. در طول شش جلسه آموزش، گروه تولید-محور، یک موضوع را به همراه لیستی از هسته های مرتبط برای جست و جو در واژه یاب دریافت کردند تا همراه های مناسب را پیدا کنند و با به کارگیری آن ها داستان بنویسند. گروه غیر تولید-محور صرفاً موظف به پیدا کردن همراه ها در واژه یاب بودند تا مثال ها را بخوانند و بدون هیچ تولیدی به آن ها توجه کنند. گروه کنترل بدون دسترسی به واژه یاب داستان نویسی کردند. نتایج نشان داد که گروه های آزمایشی، هم در پس آزمون بلافاصل و هم در پس آزمون تاخیری عملکرد بهتری نسبت به گروه کنترل در تولید هم آیی ها داشتند. یافته ها نشان دادند که تفاوت معناداری بین گروه های آزمایشی در پس آزمون بلافاصل نبود ولی این تفاوت در پس آزمون تاخیری معنادار بود. نتایج همچنین نشان دادند که هم در پس آزمون بلافاصل و هم در پس آزمون تاخیری هم آیی های واژگانی سخت تر بودند. نتایج پرسشنامه ها هم نشان داد که تمام زبان آموزان نگرش مثبتی نسبت به واژه یاب و تولید در یادگیری هم آیی ها داشتند.	
کلید واژه ها: هم آیی های دستوری، هم آیی های واژگانی، واژه یاب	



دانشکده‌ی ادبیات و علوم انسانی

گروه آموزشی آموزش زبان انگلیسی

پایان‌نامه برای دریافت درجه‌ی کارشناسی ارشد  
در رشته‌ی زبان انگلیسی گرایش آموزش زبان انگلیسی

**عنوان:**

**نقش آموزش واژه‌یاب-محور در یادگیری هم‌آیی‌های واژگانی و دستوری در متون  
نوشتاری زبان آموزان سطح متوسط**

استاد (اساتید) راهنما:

دکتر افسانه سعیداختر

استاد (اساتید) مشاور:

دکتر رضا عبدی

پژوهشگر:

سحر سید عسگری

تابستان ۱۳۹۵