ผลของการแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดด้วยตนเองผ่านอภิธานดรรชนีต่อการลดของคำปรากฏร่วมผิด

The Effects of Concordance-based Self-Correction on the Reduction of Collocational Errors

ไตรวุฒิ วาสนาม[1] และ สุขุม วสุนธราโศภิต[2]

Triwut Wasanam[1] and Sukhum Wasuntarasophit[2]

[1,2]สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์

[1,2]Department of English Language Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

[1,2]มหาวิทยาลัยขอนแก่น

[1,2]Khon Kaen University

บทคัดย่อ

คำปรากฏร่วม (Collocations) ก่อให้เกิดการใช้ภาษาอย่างมีประสิทธิภาพ ถึงแม้ว่าการใช้คำปรากฏร่วมจะเป็นสิ่งยากสำหรับผู้ที่ไม่ใช่เจ้าของภาษา (Lombard, 1997) คำปรากฏร่วมมักสร้างปัญหาการใช้ให้แก่ผู้เรียน ดังนั้น การศึกษาครั้งนี้จึงมุ่งศึกษาผลและความคิดเห็นของผู้เรียนต่อการแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดด้วยตนเองผ่านอภิธานดรรชนี (Concordances) โดยได้ทำการศึกษาในกลุ่มตัวอย่าง คือ นักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรี สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ ชั้นปีที่ 3 จำนวน 36 คน เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการเก็บข้อมูลคือ แบบทดสอบคำปรากฏร่วมก่อนและหลังเรียน แบบสอบถามความคิดเห็น และโปรแกรมอภิธานดรรชนีออนไลน์ โดยผลจากการศึกษาพบว่า การแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาด

ทางด้านคำปรากฏร่วมด้วยตนเองผ่านอภิธานดรรชนีช่วยลดจำนวนคำปรากฏร่วมผิด นอกจากนี้ผู้เรียนยังมีความคิดเห็นในเชิงบวกต่อการแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดด้วยตนเองผ่านอภิธานดรรชนี

คำสำคัญ : ปรากฏร่วม, คำปรากฏร่วมผิด, การแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดด้วยตนเองผ่านอภิธานดรรชนี

Abstract

Collocations benefit effective language use, albeit its difficulty for non-native learners (Lombard, 1997). Collocations are reportedly problematic for learners to use correctly. The current study aims to investigate whether concordance-based self-correction has an effect on the reduction of collocational errors in written form and the students' opinions on the concordance-based self-correction in general. Thirty-six third-year undergraduate students majoring in English were sampled for this study. A pretest-posttest, a questionnaire, and an online concordancer were used as the instruments to collect data for this study. The findings of the research disclosed positive effects of concordance-based self-correction as it could reduce collocational errors in the posttest. In addition, the findings also revealed students' positive opinions on concordance-based self-correction.

Keywords : Collocations, Collocational errors, Concordance-based self-correction

Introduction

According to Nation (1993), learners' skill in using a foreign language is heavily dependent on the number of words known by the learners. Vocabulary definitely plays a key role in various aspects of all four skills. It is assumed that effective communication can hardly be established unless speakers have sufficient vocabulary knowledge. One's vocabulary knowledge can reflect the significance of one kind of chunks called "collocations", which are defined as a combination of words used together e.g., do homework or give feedback. Although there are many kinds of chunks in the English language, collocations are acknowledged as the most important one (Hill, 2000). This may be due to the fact that "collocation is found in up to 70 per cent of everything we say, hear, read, and write" (Hill, 2000 p. 53). The significance of collocations has been acknowledged for decades and previous studies have overwhelmingly noted benefits as well as problems in collocations. Having a well-established knowledge of collocations is widely recognized as what is required to strengthen language competence and communicative competence (Hill, 2000; Lewis, 1997). Collocations lead to the native-like fluency as mentioned by Darvishi (2011), reinforce the reading speed, oral fluency and listening comprehension (Brown, 1974). It is also said to be essential for language learners in every stage, from learners who intend to master a high degree of competence in second language to those who have less ambition since collocations are the critical part of native speaker competence (Nesselhauf, 2003).

Even though collocations are acclaimed for their significance; they are contrastingly reported to be problematic for learners (Stubbs, 1999) especially those who are non-native speakers (Wray, 2002). It is observed that even advanced learners also sometimes confronted with problems about collocations (Nesselhauf, 2003). Regarding the difficulties using collocations, it is said that this problem stems from the way learners deal with collocations. The formulaic language such as

collocations and idioms are used by non-native learners by putting them together in the way that they think "appropriately formed" (Durrant & Schmitt, 2009). This contrasts with the native learner's use of collocations which intuitively produce collocations as they are naturally exposed to collocations by hearing and speaking (Duan & Qin, 2012). The collocation problems as faced by both ESL and EFL learners are reported in numerous studies (e.g., Bennui, 2008; Huang, 2001; Phoocharoensil, 2011; Wasuntarasophit, 2015). The previous studies disclose a huge number of collocation problems among ESL and EFL learners. Moreover, the factors that lead to those problems have also been detected. It seems that problems related to collocations are inevitable for learners in all levels of proficiency. This subject demands an investigation for an effective way to help learners to use collocations correctly and to check the grammaticality. The statement made by Woolard (2000) can be summarized as that the arbitrary nature of collocations is appropriate for independent learning which can lead to self-correction combined with concordance to correct collocational errors.

In order to measure the effectiveness of concordance-based self-correction (henceforth CBSC), this study has been carried out to investigate whether CBSC can have an effect on the reduction of collocational errors including students' opinions on CBSC. Two main research questions are set up to find answers for:

(1) What is the effect of the CBSC on the reduction of collocational errors?

(2) What are students' opinions on the CBSC?

Literature Review

Collocations, collocational errors, and language proficiency

Vocabulary knowledge is said to underpin the development of language abilities (Ma, 2013) and considered as one of significant aspects of language learning (Akbarian, 2010). Vocabulary knowledge is, therefore, crucial for learners to improve and enlarge so that they can effectively enhance the language

proficiency. As there are many ways to raise vocabulary knowledge, knowing the types of words, combinations and collocations are aspects learners need to learn (Duan & Qin, 2012). According to Woolard (2000), collocations refer to "words which are statistically much more likely to appear together than random chance suggests" (p.24). Significantly, collocations have been shown to benefit language learning in previous studies. Hill (2000) proposed that collocations are found in everything we say, hear, read, and write up to 70 per cent. It is well established that learners with large collocational knowledge can outperform those with less collocational knowledge. Collocational knowledge appears to enhance writing quality and enrich the native-likeness in written production (Shin, 2007), increase learners' listening comprehension, reading speed, and oral fluency (Brown, 1974). Learners with collocational competence seem to communicate more productively than those with less collocational competence since they have what that Lewis (1997) considered as "the ability to say more of what they want to say with the limited language resources at their disposal" (p.33). The previous studies have also suggested that collocations should be taught and learnt (e.g., Lewis, 2000; Nesselhauf, 2003; Wasuntarasophit, 2015).

Although collocations are vital; collocation problems among learners in various levels of proficiency have been reported. It has been found that learners in advanced level also confront collocation difficulties (Bahns & Eldaw, 1993). The previous studies have revealed problems using collocations among learners (e.g., Phoocharoensil, 2013; Wasuntarasophit, 2015). For example, Phoocharoensil (2013) found that Thai students had produced numbers of English collocational errors e.g., takes care me, my home stays at Nakhon Si Thammarat, listen music or Wasuntarasophit (2015) reported that intensifying adverbs were collocations that caused the most errors among Thai students. It seems these errors obstruct effective performance in language use. The results from previous

studies have disclosed some sources of collocational errors, negative transfer of first language, inadequate collocational knowledge, the use of synonyms, overgeneralization, the influence of cultural stereotype, the strategies of avoidance and analogy, ignorance of rule restrictions, infrequent practice and intuitive knowledge of collocations (Chen, 2008; Darvishi, 2011; Huang, 2001; Phoocharoensil, 2011; Wasuntarasophit, 2015; Yumanee & Phoocharoensil, 2013). Apart from the aforementioned sources, Liu (1999) also proposed some sources of collocational errors namely, false hypotheses, word coinage, and approximation.

Problems using collocations undermine effective language use as noticed by Hill (1999) that learners with inadequate collocational knowledge are likely to produce unnecessarily long sentence since they do not know the words or collocations that can exactly express what they want to convey, which also might lead to collocational errors. Consequently, using correct collocations is indispensible for learners who wish to achieve fluency since Nation (2001) postulated that "all fluent and appropriate language requires collocational knowledge" (p.318).

Self-correction, concordances, and collocation learning

Engaging learners with various strategies to help them to become independent editor of their own texts and lead to a better writing is the ultimate goal of error correction (Lee, 1997). As a myriad of methods to correct errors have been proposed, self-correction can significantly impact learners' error correction (Chandler, 2003; Onodera, 2007). Self-correction is a term referred to a method that provides students an opportunity to correct their own errors with some assistance from teachers. The previous studies have found that learners' linguistic competence can be activated if learners were able to correct their own errors (Makino, 1993). In some cases, learners learned more when they were engaged with

self-correction since they felt that they were taken part in a correcting procedure (Chandler, 2003). Similarly, self-correction is found to prevent the same types of errors to occur repeatedly in the subsequent compositions while learners themselves believed that self-correction helped them to produce more accurate writing (Onodera, 2007).

According to Frankenberg-Garcia (2005), concordance refers to a list of the concordance of a target word, combinations of words, or part of a word, together with their contexts, within a corpus of text. Concordance is the result obtained from searching through a concordancer, a program used to access to a corpus. It is claimed to benefit vocabulary as well as collocation learning since it engages learners with the actual language as appearing in various contexts. This property of concordance is congruent with the notion of knowing a word which requires learners to be exposed to words in various contexts (Nation, 2001). Concordance facilitates collocation learning by exposing learners to examples of collocations use in various contexts, which have been found to be beneficial for the acquisition of collocations (Chan & Liou, 2005). By using concordance, learners will pay attention to the contexts where the collocations appear in the real contexts and this procedure provides learners with the collocational knowledge (Jafarpour, Hashemian, & Alipour, 2013). Moreover, Ohtake & Morren (2003) reported that learners self-discover the syntactic and collocational properties of words when they engage with concordance.

Collocations themselves have an arbitrary nature which is appropriate for independent learning (Woolard, 2000). Therefore, self-correction lets learners independently correct their errors, is suitable for collocation learning. Furthermore, the assistance from concordance might be effectively overhaul learners' collocation use and help in reducing collocational errors.

Methods

Participants

The study was conducted with 36 third year Thai undergraduate students studying English as major at Khon Kaen University, Thailand. Subjects were selected by purposive sampling technique as the study required that participants meet the requirements. The participants were selected based on two main criterions. First, their English proficiency is at the required level as it was suggested that students with adequate level of proficiency such as having enough background of grammatical knowledge were found to be able to retrieve the correct forms from a concordance (Tasanameelarp & Laohawiriyanon, 2011) and a successful self-correction is heavily relied on the ability to induce the valid from on concordance (Todd, 2001). Second, it was reported in the recent study that students in this major had problems using collocations (Wasuntarasophit, 2015). Therefore, these students were selected to join the study.

Research Instruments

Pretest-Posttest

As the purpose of the study was to investigate the effectiveness of CBSC, a pretest-posttest method was adopted. 30 collocational errors were collected from the results of the previous studies (Li, 2005; Phoocharoensil, 2011; Yong, 1999; Yumanee & Phoocharoensil, 2013) and "English Collocations in Use" a book by McChathy & O'Dell (2005). Collocations were selected based on the collocational framework by Benson, Benson & Ilson (1986) which categorized collocations into two main groups, grammatical collocations and lexical collocations. However, in this study, only lexical collocations were included in the test as they do not contain initiatives, prepositions and adverbs (Benson, et al., 1986) which might cause confusion and complexity for students. In addition, most of the target word combinations used in the test were listed in the general service

list (NGSL) by West & West (1953) while others are basic vocabulary which the participants were frequently exposed to. Therefore, it can be assumed that each word used in word combination is already known to the participants. Each collocation was put in a sentence where it is appropriately formed in the context, one collocation per sentence. It should be noted that each targeted collocation was underlined to assist the self-correction process (Chandler, 2003). The participants were required to self-correct on their own without any assistance in the pretest whereas they were assisted by concordance in the posttest.

Training materials

The training materials were used to train and familiarize the participants with concordance and collocations. The production of training material was based on Nation (1974) which emphasizes providing a variety of interactive activities to participants. In the material, the concept of collocations and exercises on self-correction were given to the participants. The rationale behind the training proposed by Nation (2001) suggested that training should be provided to learners on how to deal with concordance.

The online concordancer at www.lextutor.ca (Cobb, 2004)

The concordancer is a source for the participants to obtain the results from concordance to self-correct collocational errors. The concordancer, which was developed by Tom Cobb (2004), is a website which provides teaching and learning resources such as tests, interactive exercises, and concordancers. In the website, many kinds of concordancers are available such as text-based concordancers, corpus-based concordancers, and story concordancers. Nonetheless, only the corpus-based concordancer in English was adopted as the instrument in the study. The concordancer itself provides various corpora e.g., British National Corpus, Brown Corpus, and General Academic Corpus.

A questionnaire

A construction of a questionnaire was prepared based on principles outlined in Dörnyei & Taguchi (2010). The questionnaire is divided into three main parts: general information, closed-ended questions and open-ended questions. The questionnaire was presented to the participants in Thai as it is more comprehensible and prevents misinterpretation. In the questionnaire, the participants had to rate their level of agreement with each statement. The questionnaire ends with open-ended questions for the participants to give additional information and express their feeling regarding the study. The interpretation of participants' responses is based on a scale of 1 to 5 in which 1 represents "strongly disagree" and 5 represents "strongly agree".

Data Collection

The participants first took the pretest to measure their prior knowledge. The training took place from the second week to the sixth week of the semester, twice a week. Each session lasted 90 minutes. During the training session, the participants were introduced to collocations and did some exercises on collocations to raise their awareness of collocations. Likewise, trainings on concordance and self-correction were also provided to the participants to develop their inducing skill and familiarize themselves with self-correction and concordance. In the seventh week, the participants were required to take the posttest with assistance from concordance on www.lectutor.ca and complete the questionnaire. This data collection process took seven weeks.

Results

The effect of CBSC on collocational errors

Table 1 Students' pretest and posttest mean scores analyzed by a paired samples t-test

Test	*n*	Mean	S.D.	*t*	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pretest	30	12.08	2.33	-4.950	0.000
Posttest	30	14.41	3.37		

*$p < .01$

From Table 1, the mean-score of the pretest is 12.08, and the standard deviation is 2.33. However, after the students were engaged with the CBSC on collocational errors, the mean score has increased from 12.08 to 14.41. This indicates that the CBSC helped reduce collocational errors. Furthermore, there was a statistical significant of the difference between the pretest and posttest score was at the 0.000 level while the t-test score was at - 4.950 distinctively. This indicates that the CBSC on collocational errors could help students to reduce collocational errors.

Table 2 The number of collocational errors which the students could self-correct in the pretest and the posttest

Collocations	No. of Correction		Collocations	No. of Correction		Collocations	No. of Correction	
	Pre	Post		Pre	Post		Pre	Post
heavy traffic	2	17	made an argument	4	12	give feedback	7	15
make an impression	24	30	win the prize	11	21	do business	17	19
strong coffee	5	2	do homework	36	36	stage a strike	1	1
reach an agreement	2	10	do activity	15	17	film end	22	20
answers the telephone	7	10	car (was) damaged	1	0	make a mistake	12	29

Collocations	No. of Correction		Collocations	No. of Correction		Collocations	No. of Correction	
	Pre	Post		Pre	Post		Pre	Post
have children	32	28	make an effort	6	23	make friend	15	26
make a decision	30	33	watch TV	36	36	speak French	36	36
take action	1	4	spend money	23	28	heavy rain	24	32
make donation	2	19	see a film	5	4	tell lie	7	19
acquired/gain knowledge	2	7	review film	0	0	organize/ have a barbecue	6	2

Table 2 shows the number of collocational errors which the students could self-correct in the pretest and the posttest. In the data collection process, the students were required to analyze the results derived from concordance to self-correct collocational errors. There were higher numbers of corrected collocations found in the posttest, 19 corrected collocations. This indicates the impact of the CBSC on students' collocational knowledge. However, six other collocations were found to have less numbers of corrected collocations in the posttest compared to the pretest. In addition, five other collocations were found to have equal number of correction in the pretest and the posttest. Summary, the CBSC could reduce the overall numbers of collocational errors. However, the students still had difficulties with some collocations.

The students produced collocational errors during the pretest and the posttest which were not targeted in the study. It can be presumed that students had inaccurately self-corrected or accepted incorrect collocation patterns in concordance. Collocational errors which were found in this study were presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Examples of inaccurate self-corrected collocations

Targeted Collocations	Inaccurate Self-Corrected Collocations
heavy traffic	thick traffic, hard traffic, crowded traffic, busy traffic
make an impression	create an impression, do an impression,
answers the telephone	accept the telephone, reply on the telephone, receive the telephone
have children	get children
make a decision	get a decision
make donation	give donation, send donation, do donation
acquired/ gain knowledge	learn knowledge, get knowledge, obtain knowledge, have knowledge, know knowledge
made an argument	have an argument, do an argument
win the prize	receive the first prize, get the first prize,
make an effort	have an effort, do an effort, give an effort, put an effort
spend money	use money, take money
do activity	attend activity
do business	run business, make business, build business, start business
give feedback	present feedback, show feedback, get feedback
film end	film finish, film done
make a mistake	do a mistake
make friend	have friend
heavy rain	hard rain, strongly rain
tell lie	say lie, talk lie
speak French	talk French

The students' opinions on CBSC

The findings from the questionnaire suggest the positive opinions on the CBSC. Further, some difficulties with concordance lines also were revealed results as similar to what had been reported in previous studies. Table 4 shows the results of the students' opinions on the CBSC in terms of its effectiveness.

Table 4 The effectiveness of the CBSC

Topics	Levels of Opinions		Interpretation of Mean Score
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	
2. CBSC for collocational errors is the effective way to check the use of collocations.	3.89	0.887	Agree
3. I learn more about collocations when I am engaged with CBSC for collocational errors.	4.28	0.849	Agree
4. I feel confident on collocation use after checked against concordance.	3.86	0.899	Agree
9. I will use CBSC for collocational errors.	3.94	1.218	Agree
10. I will recommend others to use CBSC for collocational errors.	3.81	0.980	Agree
11. Concordance should be brought to the class-room for collocation learning.	3.86	1.073	Agree

According to Table 4, the results show that the students had positive opinions on the CBSC in terms of its effectiveness. The statements in number 2, 3, and 4 indicate how students perceived the method. For the statement in number 2 which states "CBSC for collocational errors is the effective way to check the use of collocations", the students' responses were interpreted at an agree level of (= 3.89, S.D.= 0.887). The statement in number 3, asks if students had learned more about collocations when they were engaged with the CBSC for collocational errors, yielded an agree level of ($\bar{X}$ =4.28, S.D.= 0.849). This is congruent with students' comments:

"I have learned more about collocations which can further be useful"

"After used the program, I have learn a lot about collocations. It is easy to use..."

When the students were asked if they felt confident on collocation use after checking against concordance in number 4, they held positive opinions to this statement at an agreement level of ($\bar{X}$ =3.86, S.D.= 0.899).

The overall opinions on the CBSC positively show that the students ranked all of statements about its effectiveness at an agree level. This finding leads to positive responses for further usage and the implementation of concordance in the classroom. In statement number 9, which states that "I will use CBSC for collocational errors", students provided opinions at an agree level to this statement ($\bar{X}$ =3.94, S.D.= 1.218). Moreover, statement in number 10 which asked if students will recommend others to use CBSC for collocational errors, students responded at an agreed level of ($\bar{X}$ =3.81, S.D.= 0.980). When the students were asked about their opinions on if concordance should be brought to the classroom for collocation learning, they perceived this at a an agree level of ($\bar{X}$ =3.86, S.D.= 1.073).

The survey showed that students saw the CBSC as an effective alternative to check collocation use. Also, they felt confident and had learned more about collocations when they used the CBSC. These effective aspects of the CBSC lead students to positively recommend of the CBSC to others as well as in the classroom.

Table 5 The negative opinions on the CBSC

Topics	Levels of Opinions		Interpretation of Mean Score
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	
5. I enjoyed with CBSC for collocational errors.	3.50	0.845	Neutral
6. I tried hard to induce the results obtained from concordance to self-correct collocational errors.	3.92	0.841	Agree
7. I need help from teacher or friends while using CBSC for collocational errors.	3.42	1.079	Neutral

Based on the findings in Table 5, the students had responded to problems they had faced from the CBSC. The statements in number 5, 6, and 7 negatively disclose how students perceived these problems, In regard to the enjoyment they had received when engaged with the CBSC for collocational errors, they shown a neutral level of agreement ($\bar{X}$ =3.50, S.D.= 0.845). This might imply that the students were confronted with some problems that led to the reduction of enjoyment of the students as some comments had voiced difficulties of using the CBSC.

"The program is difficult to use, the obtained results are unclear"

"...it takes quite a long time to check"

The students voiced that they had tried hard to analyze the results obtained from concordance to self-correct collocational errors ($\bar{X}$ =3.92, S.D.= 0.841). Some students' comments on the problems encountered in obtaining results from concordance are given below:

"It is an applied program so that it is hard to search and check"

"Concordancer is a bit difficult to search for collocations"

When they were asked if they need help from teacher or friends while using the CBSC for collocational errors, the students responded at a neutral level with $\bar{X}$ =3.42 and S.D. 1.079. In regard to all difficulties that the students had while using CBSC, students agreed that training on concordance is essential for the effectiveness of using the CBSC for collocational errors ($\bar{X}$ =4.00, S.D.= 0. 862). The followings are such suggestion about training:

"...Basic training is also needed to provide to students"

Table 6 The students' awareness of collocations

Topics	Levels of Opinions		Interpretation of Mean Score
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	
1. CBSC for collocational errors helps raising awareness on using collocations correctly.	4.19	0.668	Agree

As shown in Table 6, which states "the CBSC for collocational errors helps raising awareness on using collocations correctly", the students ranked this with an agree level (=4.19, S.D.= 0. 668). This finding implies that the CBSC has its property to raising the students' awareness on using collocations correctly. Furthermore, the raised awareness of collocations from the CBSC would lead the students to positively respond to the statements about the effectiveness of the CBSC. Importantly, the awareness of collocations might also encourage the students to recommend that other people use the CBSC and that CBSC be used in the classroom teaching.

Discussion and Conclusion

The current study found that the CBSC could reduce collocational errors. Moreover, the data from the questionnaire also revealed the positive opinions of the students on the CBSC. The overall results are theoretically discussed as follows:

The effectiveness of the CBSC

As concordance provides learners with language that is naturally used in real contexts, engaging students with the concordance will expose them to authentic language use and lead them to do the correction of the language that is incorrectly produced (Hill, 2000). In the pretest and the posttest, collocations from the

concordance were presented to the students to help them gain collocational knowledge. When the students are able to recognize the contexts in which collocations are used, they are said to have the collocational knowledge (Jafarpour, et al., 2013). According to the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), the students will gain collocational knowledge from the concordance that they are engaged with if they are exposed to the collocations used in different contexts. In this process, they noticed the use of collocations in the concordances and found out the appropriate patterns of collocations. Consequently, the students who were able to appropriately self-correct collocations would be those who were able to notice the language input or the appropriate patterns of collocations. It is believed that when the notice of language input occurs, the acquisition would take place.

In addition, in this study, the students had to analyze the results obtained from concordance to self-correct collocational errors which involve inductive learning in the process as inductive learning encourages the learners to develop their own hypotheses generalized from the given information. In this case, the students used the results obtained from the concordance to self-correct collocational errors. While engaged with concordance, they had to find and induce the correct collocations based on the results provided by the concordance lines. The induced collocations will be applied to self-correct collocational errors. Likewise, Data-Driven Learning (henceforth DDL) which is an inductive approach may have played role in the present study. DDL encourages learners to look for answers to the linguistic questions themselves by applying authentic language obtained from a corpus. The concept of DDL can lead students to observe authentic language derived from the corpus for finding the answers. In this case, the students had to apply the results from the concordance lines, which are presented in the KWIC format, as to get appropriate collocation patterns and apply what they had observed for self-correction of the collocational errors. DDL is said to foster an active role for

exploring the language (Boulton, 2009). This might encourage students to free and dependent learning which resulted in the positive opinions on the CBSC.

Regarding self-correction, previous studies discovered that the students effectively self-correct if some assistance is given (Chandler, 2003; Makino, 1993). Makino (1993) has specifically suggested that underlining words is a way to help student to self-correct since the more detailed cues might lead to a higher rate of self-correction. In the pretest and the posttest, the collocations were underlined to help the students to identify the targeted collocational errors. Therefore, the effectiveness of the CBSC on collocational errors might be caused partly due to word-underlining. Finally, the resources from concordancer and corpora provide learners with a large numbers of contexts in which collocational words occur (Nation, 2001). Therefore, engaging students with the concordance expose them to various examples of actual use of collocations in various contexts. Therefore, the students who participated in this study might have obtained some knowledge from frequent exposure to words as well as to collocations in different contexts provided by concordance. The properties of concordance may have an impact on the effectiveness of the CBSC.

The Positive Opinions on the CBSC

The positive opinions on the CBSC might have derived from various aspects. Firstly, the students were agreed that the CBSC for collocational errors was the effective way to check the use of collocations. It result may be because concordance has its own property to provide the students with examples of collocations used in varying contexts. Having the students been frequently exposed to collocation uses may facilitate collocation learning (Liu & Ma, 2011). This possibility is in line with the students' comments stating that they had learned more about collocations with the concordance. The scores from the pretest and

the posttest also support the effectiveness of the CBSC in some extent. Secondly, the CBSC had the students to learn more about collocations, which indicates that engaged the students with the CBSC were resulted in the increase of collocational knowledge.

The positive opinions on the CBSC led the students to positively respond to the further use of the CBSC for collocational errors and the recommendation of this method to others. They also requested the implementation of concordance to the classroom for collocation learning. Therefore, the aforementioned students' responses can be clearly seen as positive opinions that the students held toward the CBSC.

Implications for collocation learning and teaching

The results demonstrate that the CBSC on collocational errors is effective tool to reduce the numbers of collocational errors. Nonetheless, the results show that collocations seem to be problematic for the students. The data from the study reveals some implications for productive ways to deal with collocations. Like vocabulary, collocations should be presented to students in different contexts because collocation learning can be facilitated by being frequently exposed to collocations in various contexts (Liu & Ma, 2011). Engaging with concordance is reported to help learners to self-discover the syntactic and collocational properties of words (Ohtake & Morren, 2003). Therefore, concordance should be employed in the classroom and introduced to students as it would benefit collocation learning and teaching.

It must bear in mind that collocational errors occur naturally and they are normal phenomenon of the learning process. Consequently, teachers should make use of collocational errors to raise students' awareness (Woolard, 2000). Importantly, awareness rising on collocations will encourage students to find

collocational knowledge from other resources such as dictionaries or reading (Yong, 1999). However, there is a demand for a study to investigate effective ways to raise students' awareness on collocations.

Likewise, students should be trained and introduced to methods such as concordancer, collocation dictionaries, or corpora, using it as a tool to self-check their collocation use. Likewise, training on how to effectively use this tool must be provided to students. Obviously, teachers have to consider the level of proficiency of learners because some language might be higher than learners' proficiency.

Conclusion

The findings disclose that the CBSC could reduce the number of collocational errors. While adopting the CBSC, students were exposed to collocations in concordance which is actually used in real contexts. This provides students collocational knowledge and helps them to discover collocational properties of words. Most students held positive opinions on the CBSC even though they had experienced some difficulties obtaining accurate results from concordance. Consequently, collocations should be brought to classroom for learners at all levels. Thus, learners should be introduced to other effective ways to productively deal with collocations and importantly to minimize collocational errors in their language production. Finally, the issues concerning collocations are still need for more studies to reveal the more intricate and insightful aspects to make full use of collocations pedagogically and practically.

References

Akbarian, I. (2010). The relationship between vocabulary size and depth for ESP/EAP learners. **System**, 38, 391-401.

Bahns, J., & Eldaw, M. (1993). Should we teach EFL students collocations?. **System**, 21(1), 101-114.

Bennui, P. (2008). A study of L1 interference in the writing of Thai EFL students. **Malaysian Journal of ELT Research**, 4, 72-102.

Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1986). **Lexicographic description of English**. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Boulton, A. (2009). Data-Driven Learning: Reasonable fears and Rationale reassurance. **Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics**, 35(1), 81-106.

Brown, D. F. (1974). Advanced vocabulary teaching: the problem of collocation. **RELC Journal**, 5, 1-11.

Chan, T., & Liou, H. C. (2005). Effects of web-based concordancing instruction n EFL students' learning of verb-noun collocations. **Computer Assisted Language Learning**, 18(3), 231-51.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 12, 267-296.

Chen, M. (2008). **A study of English collocations competence of college of students in Taiwan**. Master Thesis in Applied Linguistics, Department of Applied Foreign Languages, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology.

Cobb, T. (2004). The Compleat Lexical Tutor, v.4. **Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language**, 8(3), Retrieved on January 5, 2014, from http://tesl-ej.org/ej31/m2.html.

Darvishi, S. (2011). The investigation of collocational errors in university students' writing majoring in English. **2011 International Conference on Education, Research and Innovation IPEDR**. 18, 52-56.

Duan, M., & Qin, X. (2012). Collocation in English teaching and learning. **Theory and Practice in Language Studies**, 2(9), 1890-1894.

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

Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). **Questionnaires in second language research: construction, dministration, and processing**. 2nd ed., New York: Routledge.

Frankenberg-Garcia, A. (2005). Pedagogical uses of monolingual and parallel concordances. **ELT Journal**, 59(3), 189-198.

Hill, J. (1999). Collocational competence. **English Teaching Professional**, 11, 3-7.

Hill, J. (2000). Revising priorities: From grammatical failure to collocational success. In Lewis, M. (Ed.). **Teaching collocation: Further development in the lexical approach**. (pp.47-69). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huang, L. (2001). **Knowledge of English collocations: An analysis of Taiwanese EFL learners**. Retrieved January 17, 2012, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED465288.pdf

Jafarpour, A.A., Hashemian, M., & Alipour, S. (2013). A corpus-based approach toward teaching collocation of synonyms. **Theory and Practice in Language Studies**, 3(1), 51-60.

Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: some implications for teaching. **System**, 25(4), 465-477.

Lewis, M. (1997). **Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theories into practice**. London: Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (2000). **Teaching collocation: Further development in the lexical approach**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Li, C. (2005). **A study of collocational error types in ESL/EFL college learners' writing**. Master thesis in Applied English, College of Applied Languages, Ming Chuan University.

Liu, C.P. 1999. An analysis of collocational errors in EFL Writing. **The Proceedings of the Eight International Symposium on English Teaching**, (pp. 483-494). Taipei: Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.

Liu, S., & Ma, Z. (2011). An empirical study on concordance-based English collocation teaching. **International Journal of Education and Management Engineering (IJEME)**, 1(4), 46-52.

Lombard, J.R. (1997). **Non- native speaker collocations: A corpus- driven characterization from the writing of native speakers of Mandarin**. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas at Arlington, Texas.

Ma, Q. (2013). **Matching vocabulary learning process with learning outcome in L2 academic writing: An exploratory case study**. Linguistics and Education.

Makino, T. (1993). Learners self-correction in EFL written compositions. **ELT Journal**, 47(4), 337-341.

McCarthy, M., & O'Dell, F. (2005). **English collocations in use**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nation, I.S.P. (1974). Techniques for teaching vocabulary. **English Teaching Forum**, 12(3),18-21.

Nation, I.S.P. (1993). Vocabulary size, growth and use. In Schreuder, R. & Weltens, B. (Eds.) **The bilingual lexicon** (pp. 115-134). Amsterdam : Benjamins

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

Nesselhauf, N. (2003). The use of collocations by advanced learners of English and some implications for teaching. **Applied Linguistics**, 24(2), 223-242.

Ohtake, H., & Morren, B. (2003). Corpus evidence on English collocational patterns in scientific writing: Implications for effective writing development. **Studia Humanaet Naturalia**, 37, 1-22.

Onodera, N. (2007). **The efficacy of the feedback process on errors in student writing**. Master of Arts (Teaching English as a Foreign Language). Bangkok: Graduate School, Srinakharinwirot University.

Phoocharoensil, S. (2011). Collocational errors in EFL Learners' Interlanguage. **Journal of Education and Practice**, 2(3), 103-120.

Phoocharoensil, S. (2013). Cross-linguistic influence: Its impact on L2 English collocation production. **English Language Teaching**, 6(1), 1-10.

Schmidt, R.(1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. **Applied Linguistics**, 11, 129-158.

Shin, D. (2007). What collocations would be unpredictable for Korean EFL learners?. **Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics**, 23, 83-98.

Stubbs, M. (1999). Corpus evidence for norms of lexical collocations. In Guy, C. & Barbara, S. (Eds.) **Principles & Practice in Applied Linguistics**. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Stæhr, L.S. (2009). Vocabulary knowledge and advanced listening comprehension in English as a foreign language. **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, 31(4), 577-607.

Tasanameelarp, A., & Laohawiriyanon, C. (2011). Data-driven learning and low proficiency learner's capacity for self-correction on grammar. **NIDA Development Journal**, 51(4), 105-129.

Todd, R.W. (2001). Induction from self-selected concordances and self-correction. **System**, (1), 91-102.

Wasuntarasophit, S. (2015). Explicit instruction of collocation: An impact on Learners' use and opinions. **Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences**, 11(2), 21-56.

West, M., & West, M. P. (Eds.). (1953). **A general service list of English words: with semantic frequencies and a supplementary word-list for the writing of popular science and technology**. Addison-Wesley Longman Limited.

Woolard, G. (2000). Collocation - encouraging learner independence. In Lewis, M. (Ed.). **Teaching collocation: Further development in the lexical approach**. (pp.28- 46). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Yong, W. (1999). Teaching collocations for productive vocabulary development. **Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages**. New York, USA.

Youmei, G., & Yun, Z. (2005). A tentative corpus-based study of collocations acquisition by Chinese English language learners. **Canadian Social Science**, 1(3), 105-112.

Yumanee, C., & Phoocharoensil, S. (2013).Analysis of collocational errors of Thai EFL students. **Language Education and Acquisition Research Network**, 1(1), 90-99.