คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะในเค้าโครงปริญญานิพนธ์ของครูสอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ[1]

Collocation Used in TEFL Teachers' Research Proposals

ชยุตินิตย์ สมคะเน[2]
Chayutinit Somkanae

อัญชลี จันทร์เสม[3]
Anchalee Jansem

นิตยา สุขเสรีทรัพย์[4]
Nitaya Suksaeresup

---

[2] นิสิตปริญญาโท ภาควิชาสาขาการสอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ E-mail: tellingmay@hotmail.com

[3] รองคณบดีฝ่ายวิชาการและวิเทศสัมพันธ์ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ
E-mail: anchalej@swu.ac.th

[4] รองศาสตราจารย์ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ E-mail: nitayas@swu.ac.th

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีจุดประสงค์เพื่อวิเคราะห์ความรู้ในการใช้คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะของนักศึกษาปริญญาโทจำนวน 15 คน ในสาขาวิชาการสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ ช่วงปีการศึกษา 2554–2557 โดยรวบรวมข้อมูลจากงานเขียนเค้าโครงปริญญานิพนธ์ฉบับต้นร่างในหัวข้อภูมิหลัง เพื่อศึกษาประเภทของข้อผิดพลาด ความถี่ของข้อผิดพลาด และสาเหตุของข้อผิดพลาด ผลการวิจัยพบว่า ข้อผิดพลาดจากการใช้คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะทางด้านคำศัพท์ถูกพบมากกว่าด้านไวยากรณ์ ผลการวิจัยยังพบว่า ข้อผิดพลาดจากการใช้คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะทางด้านคำศัพท์ ถูกพบมากในชนิดของการใช้คำกริยาที่ตามด้วยคำนาม ในส่วนของข้อผิดพลาดจากการการใช้คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะทางด้านไวยากรณ์ ถูกพบมากในชนิดของการใช้คำนามที่ตามด้วยคำบุพบทและการใช้คำกริยาที่ตามด้วยบุพบทและกรรม ส่วนสาเหตุของหลักที่ทำให้เกิดข้อผิดพลาดมาจากอิทธิพลของภาษาแม่เป็นส่วนใหญ่

Abstract

This research study is aimed at analyzing collocation knowledge of teachers who teach English as a foreign language. The participants of this study are 15 Thai graduate students in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) program, academic year 2011–2014. The data is collected from the first draft of participants' research proposals in the part of background of the study. Types and frequency of English collocational errors are investigated and the sources of errors are discussed. The results of the study show that the participants made more lexical collocational errors than grammatical ones. Among the lexical collocational errors, it is revealed that the participants make errors on verbs that are followed by a noun the most. However, the study shows that the participants make errors on nouns that are followed by a verb and adjectives followed by an adverb the least. In terms of grammatical collocational errors, the results show that the errors on nouns followed by a preposition and verbs followed by a preposition and an object are found the most, whereas the errors on verbs followed by gerund and verbs followed by an object and infinitive are found the least. Moreover, the major sources of collocational errors are the first language transfer, followed by ignorance of rule restriction, overgeneralization, approximation, false concept hypothesized and synonym strategy.

คำสำคัญ: คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะ, ครูสอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ, ปริญญานิพนธ์
Keyword: Collocation, Teaching English as a Foreign Language Teacher, Theses

1. Introduction

Teachers teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) should have content knowledge of the subjects they teach (Ball; Thames; & Phelps. 2008: 389; Buchman. 1981: 1; Richards. 2010: 1). Seidlhofer (as cited in Richards. 2010. *Competence and Performance in Language Teaching*. p. 2) and Murphy and Smith (2012: 77) also claimed that teachers who have insufficient

content knowledge will eventually affect the quality of teaching and learning. Findings of some research studies revealed that collocational competence is an indicator to measure English ability of learners (McCarthy; & O'Dell. 2012: 4-5; Nitaya Suksaeresup. 2008: 1-3; Sirinna Boonyasaquan. 2005: 1). The studies further recommended that collocation should be taught to EFL students (Hill. 2000: 47-69; Lewis. 2000: 9). Therefore, EFL teachers themselves should be equipped with collocational competence to strengthen knowledge base. Since no study has been done to detect EFL teachers' collocational competence, this study aims to investigate collocational knowledge of EFL teachers in order to show how competent Thai EFL teachers are in terms of collocation use.

2. Literature review

To provide background information of collocation and related theories, this chapter is divided into three parts, definition of collocation, classification of collocations, and factors causing collocational errors of EFL learners.

2.1 Defining collocation

Most linguists define collocation in a similar way. According to McCarthy and O'Dell (2005: 4-5), collocation refers to combination of English words that are associated with each other in a natural way. Conzett (2000: 73) views collocation as "two or more words that tend to occur together". Accordingly, Lewis (2000: 166) states that collocations are not only words that are put together but also words that naturally occur together. Likewise, Richards (2000: 76) defines collocation as "the tendency of two or more words to co-occur in discourse". Meanwhile, Hill (2000: 51) gives the meaning of collocation as "a predictable combination of words" as in "get lost, make up for lost time, speak your mind". To recap, collocations are the way that two or more words are likely to appear together in a predictable way, and they sound natural to native speakers.

2.2 Classification of collocations

Collocations can be classified in various ways. Benson, Benson, and Ilson (1986: Online) categorize collocation into two groups: grammatical collocations and lexical collocations. Lexical collocations are divided into seven types, whereas grammatical collocations are divided into eight.

2.2.1 Lexical collocations

Lexical collocations are composed of two or more content words such as verb+noun, adjective+noun, noun+verb, noun1 of noun2, adjective+adverb or adverb+adjective, and verb+adverb. The examples are presented below.

Type	Pattern	Example
L1	verb (donating creation or activation)+noun	make a wish
		conduct research
L2	verb (meaning eradication or nullification)+noun	reject an offer
		revoke a law
L3	adjective+noun	big difference
		strong wind
L4	noun+verb	lions roar
		bombs explode
L5	noun1+of+noun2	a crate of apples
		a bottle of wine
L6	adjective+adverb/ adverb+adjective	sound asleep
		strongly recommended
L7	verb + adverb	walk slowly
		work hard

2.2.2 Grammatical collocations

Grammatical collocations are combinations of a content word such as a noun, a verb, or an adjective and a preposition or grammatical structure like an infinitive or clauses. The examples are presented below.

Type	Pattern	Example
G1	noun+preposition	experience in
G2	noun+to+infinitive	They have the ability to work under pressure.

Type	Pattern	Example
G3	noun+that clause	I make a wish that I would win a lottery.
G4	preposition+noun	on average
G5	adjective+preposition	I am good at skiing.
G6	adjective+to+infinitive	I am ready to go.
G7	adjective+that clause	It is essential that you go to see the doctor.
G8	There are 19 patterns in G8	
G8(a)	verb+direct object+to+indirect object = verb+indirect object+direct object	He lent a book to me. He lent me a book.
G8(b)	verb+direct object+to+indirect object (verbs in G8(b) do not allow dative form)	Teachers explain the rule to their students.

	Pattern	Example
G8(c)	verb+direct object+for+indirect object = verb+indirect object+direct object	Jane bought a gift for Mary. Jane bought Mary a gift.
G8(d)	verb+preposition+object (or) verb+object+preposition+object	My uncle came by train. My friend invited me to the meeting.
G8(e)	verb+to+infinitive	I decided to go abroad.
G8(f)	verb+infinitive	I would rather go.
G8(g)	verb+gerund	My father enjoys watching television.
G8(h)	verb+object+to+infinitive	Mary asked John to leave.
G8(i)	verb+object+infinitive	She made a boy cry.

	Pattern	Example
G8(j)	verb+object+gerund	I remember John buying that shirt.
G8(k)	verb+a possessive and gerund	I cannot stand her singing in the shower.
G8(l)	verb+(object)+that-clause	The teacher advised me that I be on time.
G8(m)	verb+object+to be+complement	I considered him to be an excellent teacher.
G8(n)	verb+object+complement	Jim painted the wall green.
G8(o)	verb+object+object	John asked Jane a question.
G8(p)	verb+(object)+adverbial	The police took the thief to the station.
G8(q)	verb+(object)+wh-clause	Bill asked John where the kitchen was.
G8(r)	verb+object+to infinitive or verb+object+that-clause	We need someone to help us. He convinced me that I was wrong.
G8(s)	verb+complement (adjective or noun)	The soup smells good. She was a nurse.

2.3 Factors causing collocational errors of EFL learners

Factors that cause EFL learners to make collocational errors in the use of English language are as follows.

2.3.1 First language transfer or L1 transfer

According to the studies conducted by Chittinan Yumanee and Supakorn Phoocharoensil (2013: 90), Supakorn Phoocharoensil (2011: 103), Pairote Bennui (2008: 73), Sirinna Boonyasaquan (2005: 97), and Chia (2005: online), native language influence or first language transfer is one of the main factors causing collocational errors of EFL learners. This happens because the words that second language learners want to use in English are other words in their native languages. It happens when EFL learners replace the English word with their native word that has the same meaning. This results in collocational errors. For example, many Thai EFL learners refer to start business as open business which is assumed to be directly translated

form *Peid thurkic; /Peid/ 'open' + / thurkic/ 'business'.* In agreement with the above-mentioned researchers, Chia (2005: Online) states that many Chinese EFL learners refer to take medicine as eat medicine because the noun medicine in Chinese regularly collocates with the verb eat rather than take.

Moreover, this source of collocational error can be caused by the language structures that learners want to create. There appears non-congruence between the structures of learners' language and the target language. In Liu's study, collocational errors from the negative transfer of the first language can be found in phrases such as listen his advice and wait your phone call. Liu also explains that the words like listen and wait are intransitive verbs which cannot be directly followed by a noun, but in Chinese the rule does not exist (Liu. 1999: 485). The other example can be found as in take care me. Supakorn Phoocharoensil (2011: 111) states that in Thai the verb *dūlaē,* take care is a transitive verb, so no following preposition is needed. As a result, learners are likely to omit an obligatory English preposition after a verb (ibid: 111-112).

Furthermore, SupakornPhoocharoensil (2011: 113) also states that another factor causing this source of errors is that learners are likely to add an unnecessary preposition to a verb. This happens because some verbs in Thai require a preposition after them such as, *leave from*, and *affect to*. Another type of L1 transfer is an incorrect choice of preposition. To make it more specific, Supakorn Phoocharoensil (2011: 112) gives an example of *close with*. He suggests that *close* and *with* is a collocational deviation, and the correct preposition is to. He also states that in Thai, the word *Klī chid,* close, usually precedes the preposition *kạb, with.*

2.3.2 Synonymy strategy

Synonymy strategy is the strategy that EFL learners develop when they want to use a word that has a very close meaning to replace other word without being aware that it can cause grammatical errors (Nation. 2001: 317; Ridha; & Al Riyahi. 2011: 44; Supakorn Phoocharoensil. 2011: 113). According to Supakorn Phoocharoensil (2011: 106), the verb *ask*, which is used in the form of *ask someone to do something* and *plead,* in the pattern of *plead with someone to do something*, are semantically similar. Furthermore, this strategy can result from the confusion of the use of confusing word. According to Supakorn Phoocharoensil (2013: 113), he gave some examples of deviant combinations influenced by synonymy such as *peaceable home* for *peaceful home* and *authentically believe* for *truly believe*. In addition, Liu (1999: 490) also discovered that learners used *receive other people's opinion* instead of *accept other people's opinion.* Although the phrases are perfectly correct in terms of grammar, it would not be used in spoken communication among English native speakers. As a result, they might not be able to understand the speakers' need.

2.3.3 Overgeneralization

Overgeneralization is another factor that EFL learners use in their writing (Richards.

1971: 206; Supakorn Phoocharoensil. 2011: 115). This error involves "the creation of one deviant structure in place of two regular structures" (Richards. 1971: 206). For example, instead of using *He can swim.* or *He swims.*, learners create the sentence like *He can swims.* Another example of the overgeneralization that Supakorn Phoocharoensil (2011: 115) found in his research is the use of very in Thai learner writings, such as the sentences *The room that I very like is the dining room.* and *I very love to stay at home.* He gave some details that very was an adverb used to emphasize an adjective or modify an adverb, such as *very cold,* and *very slowly* respectively. Therefore, *very like and very love* were considered ungrammatical.

2.3.4 Ignorance of rule restrictions

According to Richards (1971: 206), ignorance of rule restriction refers to "the application of rules to context they do not". He also stated that this source of error results from learners' faulty analogy (ibid: 206). Once learners encounter the preposition concerning with one type of verb, they will attempt to apply the same prepositions with verbs that they assume similarities due to the analogy. It happens as a result of learners' limited exposure to target language. To be specific, learners would use about for the verb *think* as they see that other thinking verbs like *know and understand* all can go with this preposition. However, this rule cannot be applied to the verb *rethink.* Another example caused by this source of error is from the construction of verb pattern which students assume that the distribution of the verb *make* should be *make someone to do something.* For example, *to make a girl to clean her room* was a false analogy of the causative verb. This happens because learners might practice using a *to-verb infinitive after allow, decided*, and *want* (ibid: 207).

2.3.5 False concepts hypothesized

False Concepts Hypothesized occurs when learners fails to clearly understand the distinction between their language and the target language (Liu. 1999: 490; Richards. 1971: 210). To be specific, the verbs such as *make* and *do* which have nearly the same meaning as *to produce and create something* (Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2008: online) are not de-lexicalized verbs, verbs that are commonly used with others noun as a chunk of meaning. As a result, they cannot be substituted for one another freely. For example, students used *do plans* instead of *make plans* (Liu. 1999: 490). Another example was the use of was as a marker of past tense in *He was played in the street.* (Richards. 1971: 210).

2.3.6 Paraphrase

According to Liu (1999: 491), paraphrases can be categorized into two types. One is word coinage which refers to the way of making up a new word to communicate the ideas. For example, the phrase *to see sun-up* instead of *to see the sunrise* was a collocational errors resulted from word coinage (ibid: 492). The other type of paraphrases is approximation which is the use of an incorrect vocabulary item or structure that share some properties (ibid: 495).

For instance, the word *middle* and *midterm* which are adjectives can make learners confused which one collocates with the noun *exam*. The one that suits the noun *exam is midterm.*

3. Research questions

This study is aimed at answering these questions.

1. How many frequencies of each type of collocational errors made by Thai EFL teachers are there?

2. Which group of collocational errors, lexical or grammatical errors are found more often?

3. What are plausible explanations to account for the collocational errors?

4. Research methodology

4.1 Data collection

4.1.1 Selection of materials

The materials in this study were the first draft of 15 research proposals of Thai EFL graduate students who are in TEFL program in the period of 2011-2014 at Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok. However, Thai EFL graduate students whose writing were analyzed studied English as a foreign language in high school in Thailand for six years, graduated from university in Thailand, and now they are English teachers at school.

4.1.2 Elicitation task

Research proposals of 15 EFL graduate students in TEFL program were analyzed by two native English speakers, and the analysis was based on the framework of Benson, Benson, and Ilson (1986: online). The two raters checked incorrect collocations, and correct them. Then the researcher counted the score so as to calculate the correlation coefficient from the formula of the Pearson Product-moment correlation and calculated inter-rater reliability by using Spearman-Brown formula.

4.2 Data analysis

Data were analyzed for the purpose of finding types, frequency, and plausible explanations to account for the collocational errors in the participants' research proposals. First, the researcher classified all errors into groups based on the categorization of Benson, Benson, Ilson (1986: online). Then, the plausible explanations of sources of collocational errors were identified.

5. Findings and Discussion

The results of the study show that the participants made more lexical collocational errors (60.72%) than grammatical collocational errors (39.28%). Among lexical collocational errors, it is

revealed that 33.93% of L1 which is about verbs followed by a noun causes the participants to make errors the most, while only 1.79% of L4 and L6 which is about nouns followed by a verb is the least. Besides, the results show that G1 which is about nouns followed by a preposition and G8(d) which is about verbs followed by a preposition and an object are found the most at the rate of 10.71%, whereas G8(g) and G8(i) are found with the same rate at 1.79%. Moreover, the major source of collocational errors found in the research proposals is first language transfer or L1 transfer at the rate of 41.07%, followed by ignorance of rule restriction at 33.93%, overgeneralization at 12.50%, approximation at 8.93%, and 1.79% of false concept hypothesized and synonym strategy.

Some examples of collocational errors found in the research proposals, as well as plausible explanations of sources of collocational errors are given in 5.1

5.1 Sources of collocational errors

5.1.1 False concepts hypothesized

False Concepts Hypothesized occurs when learners fails to clearly understand the distinction between their language and the target language (Liu. 1999: 490; Richards. 1971: 210). To be specific, the verbs such as *make* and *do* which have nearly the same meaning as *to produce and create something* (Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2008: online) are not de-lexicalized verb. As a result, they cannot be substituted for one another freely. In this research, the example is as follows.

(1) * Foreign language students do not know what to say or how to speak it.

As in 1, the participants made errors such as **speak something instead of say something* because the word *speak means to say words* and the word *say* means to *pronounce words* (Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2008: online). Even though both of these words have similar meanings, they cannot be used interchangeably.

5.1.2 Overgeneralization

This error involves "the creation of one deviant structure in place of two regular structures" (Richards. 1971: 206). In 2 and 3 show errors from overgeneralization which were found in the participants' writing samples.

(2) * Schools lack of the opportunities.

(3) * The teacher emphasizes on the result.

The miscollocations in 2 **to lack of something* is a combination of *to have a lack of something* and *to lack something* and 3 **to emphasize on the result* is a mixed structure of *to put emphasis on something* and *to emphasize something*.

(4) * Students would build a precisely understanding.

It is assumed that 4 **a precisely understanding* is a misconception of the word *understand.* Actually, the word, *understand,* is a verb which is *possibly* collocated with the

adverb, precisely. In contrast, the word *understanding* is a noun, it must be an adjective to describe the noun.

       5.1.3 Synonym strategy

       Synonymy strategy is the strategy that EFL learners develop when they want to use a word that has a very close meaning to replace other English word without being aware that it can cause grammatical errors (Ridha; & Al Riyahi. 2011: 44; Nation. 2001: 317; Supakorn Phoocharoensil. 2011: 113). The example is as follows:

       (5) * It is teacher's responsibility to find out the techniques to <u>promote</u> students' writing <u>ability.</u>

       In 5, *to promote ability* is an unacceptable collocation. As the noun, *ability*, can collocate with the verbs such as, *to improve*, *to develop,* and *to enhance.* It can be explained that the participants understand that the verbs to *improve* and *to promote* which have similar meaning in Thai, *to get better,* were used interchangeably.

       5.1.4 Ignorance of rule restriction

       According to Richards (1971: 206), ignorance of rule restriction refers to "the application of rules to context they do not". He also stated that this source of error results from learners' faulty analogy (Richards. 1971: 206). One of the ignorance of rule restriction errors is when learners once encounter a preposition which concerns with one type of a verb, they will attempt to apply the preposition with other verbs that they assume similarities due to the analogy as seen in 6-10.

       (6) * The <u>demand of </u>English is growing.

       (7) * Consideration of the <u>importance of </u>teaching

       (8) * EFL students have to have enough basic knowledge in English.

       (9) * Students had <u>problem in</u> English reading comprehension.

       (10) * It is a <u>challenge of</u> EFL teachers

       The errors 6-10,*demand of, *importance of, *knowledge in, *problem in, and *challenge of, are the errors concerning a noun followed by a preposition. These errors showed that each noun is followed by specific preposition. For example, the noun, demand is followed by the preposition, for, and the nouns, importance, knowledge, problem, and challenge are followed by in, of, with, and for respectively.

       Another problem related to the ignorance of rule restriction is about types of words and its modifier.

       (11) * Several researchers conducted <u>many researches.</u>

       In 11 *many researches* was the ignorance of rule restrictions on the word *research* which is an uncountable noun.

       (12) * The Basic Education Core Curriculum requires students to <u>have ability of</u>

<u>understanding and interpreting</u> what they have read.

(13) * A child's <u>opportunity</u> of succeed

In 12–13, both of the nouns, *ability* and *opportunity* reflect errors that are caused by the ignorance of rule restriction errors which concern a noun followed by the to-infinitive.

(14) * Communicative approach with communicative grammar activities is <u>effective to teach</u> grammar.

(15) * The finding of study can be <u>valuable by</u> English teachers.

In 14–15, *effective to* and *valuable by* show the errors of using preposition after adjectives. The adjective *effective* should be followed by the preposition *in*, and the preposition *for* is used with the adjective valuable.

(16) * Multimedia teaching model <u>involves</u> students <u>build</u> positive motivation.

In 16, the error is about the use of gerund after a verb. The verb *involve* is followed by gerund, so the correct sentence should be *Multimedia teaching model <u>involves</u> students <u>building</u> positive motivation.*

(17) * Most of those students are from high-income families that <u>want their children get</u> more opportunities.

(18) * It <u>enables the learners learn</u> to construct knowledge.

Apart from verb followed by gerund, the errors in 17–18 are about verb followed by someone and to-infinitive, so the correct ones should be *want their children to get and enable the learners to learn* respectively.

(19) * <u>help</u> family <u>working</u> for a living

In 19, the verb help is followed by someone and infinitive without to, so the phrase should be *help family work for a living.*

5.1.5 First language transfer or L1 transfer

According to the studies conducted by Chittinan Yumanee and Supakorn Phoocharoensil (2013: 90), Supakorn Phoocharoensil (2011: 103), Pairote Bennui (2008: 73), Sirinna Boonyasaquan (2005: 97), Chia (2005: online), and Liu (1999: 483), native language influence or first language transfer is one of the main factors causing collocational errors of EFL learners. To begin with the adding an unnecessary preposition to a verb, in Thai language some verbs require a preposition.

(20) * There are various factors <u>affecting to</u> English learning.

In Thai 20 affect to may originate from the Thai equivalent *Mī pȟol,* affect, which always needs the preposition *tx, to.*

(21) * This research aims to see how the use of CBI works by <u>examining with</u> Thai contexts.

Another example is *examining with.* The word *examine* is also a transitive verb

in English, but in Thai *Trwc sǐb,* examine, can be followed by the preposition *Kạb, with.*

(22) * Thai instructors should <u>rethink about</u> their method of teaching.

Moreover, *rethink about* are also the adding of unnecessary prepositions.   In Thai *Khid hı̄m, rethink,* is usually paired with *Keı̄yw kạb, about.*

Another type of L1 transfer which causes the participants in this study to have problems is choosing the wrong choice of preposition, as shown in

(23) * an effective way <u>in</u> promoting students' engagement́

(24) * <u>studying</u> in a higher level

In Thai, the error in 23 *way in is likely to be derived from *Næwthāng, way,* which can be followed by *Ni, in.*   On the other hand, in English way can be followed by of. Similarly, the problematic collocational error in 24 *study in,* the appropriate preposition is at, but in Thai, the word *Reı̄yn, study,* usually precedes the preposition *Ni, in.*

(25) * Teachers <u>are</u> the key <u>role.</u>

(26) * Writing is an activity to <u>encourage</u> students' <u>thinking system.</u>

(27) * People use <u>wrong grammar</u> in communication

(28) * in the <u>present globalization</u>

(29)* English has been <u>used widespread</u> in many areas.

Apart from the problems with prepositions, Thai EFL learners also had another trouble with mother tongue interference as shown in 25-29.   In this study the participants produced collocations like 25 *to be the role, 26 *encourage thinking system,* 27 *wrong grammar,* 28 *present globalization,* and 29 *used widespread out of word-for-word translation.   These errors occurred because the participants failed to observe the restricitions on the collocability of *be* and *role, encourage* and *something, wrong* and *grammar, present* and *globalization, use* and *accuracy and fluency,* and *used and widespread.*

5.1.6   Approximation

According to Liu (1999: 491), paraphrases can be categorized into two types.   One is word coinage which refers to the way of making up a new word to communicate the ideas, and the other one is approximation.   In this study, there were no collocational errors related to word coinage.   The following errors belong to approximation.

(30) * students who want to <u>attain in</u> this class̋

(31) * learning environment and st udent motivation helps to improve the learning outcomes, inspire and <u>boot</u> the learning spirit

In 30 *attain in this class and 31 *boot the learning spirit are the errors possibly resulted from the similarity of pronunciation of *attend this class* and *boost the learning spirit,* respectively.   As a result, the participants who were not aware of making errors would write without noticing the spelling.

(32) * <u>build connectivity</u> with the teacher

(33) * Writing is one of <u>producing language skills.</u>

(34) * <u>education institutions</u>

All the errors in 32-34 are the participants' errors which occur because of their misunderstanding of the use of an inappropriate word choice that shares some properties. To make it more specific, in 32 both of the words *connectivity* and *connection* are the nouns that can make participants confused which one collocates with the verb *build*. Moreover, in 33 *producing skills* is another example. *Producing* by itself is a noun, but it can become a modifier if it is paired with another noun like *data* in *producing data*. However, the word *productive* is an adjective which is correctly collocated with the noun *skills*. In 34 *education institutions*, it is said that *educational* is an adjective and *education* is a noun, so *educational institutions* is correct. Nevertheless, in English, nouns can sometimes be used as adjectives such as *education process* and *education news*. These can make TEFL learners confused.

6. Conclusion

The research shows conclusively that TEFL teachers still have problem with collocation no matter how L2 proficient they are. Most of lexical errors are found more often than grammatical ones, and the major source of errors is strongly influenced by their L1 knowledge. In addition to first language transfer, ignorance of rule restriction, overgeneralization, approximation, false concept hypothesized, and synonym strategy are also evidently regarded as sources of collocational errors.

7. Pedagogical implications

Collocation is found in everyday language, and it helps express the ideas more concisely and precisely. Moreover, if EFL learners know collocation, they no longer have to paraphrase as much and they will make fewer errors. Consequently, it is vital for TEFL teachers to introduce collocation to EFL learners and emphasize them by giving more attention to it. However, only teachers who have a clear understanding of collocations will be able to train their learners in an effective way. As a result, TEFL teachers themselves need to enhance their knowledge of collocation and try to raise awareness of its use in the language so that they are well-equipped to teach EFL learners to master collocational knowledge, both inside and outside the classroom. One possible practice to improve this type of knowledge for TEFL teachers is promoting professional developments, conducted by experts in grammar. Also, English curriculum designers should be aware when making a decision on courses offered to both pre-service and in service TEFL teachers

References

Ball, Deborah Loewenberg; Thames, Mark Hoover; & Phelps, Geoffrey.   (2008).
   Content Knowledge for Teaching: What Makes It Special?.   **Journal of Teacher**
   Education.   59(5): 389-407.   doi: 10.1177/0022487108324554

Benson, Morton; Benson, Evelyn; & Ilson, Robert.   (1986).   **The BBI   combinatory Dictionary**
   of English: A Guide to Word Combinations.   Retrieved August 12, 2015, from
   http://bbidict.narod.ru

Buchman, Margret.   (1981).   **The Flight Away from Content in Teacher Education and**
   Teaching.   East Lansing, MI: The Institute for Research in Teaching.
   Retrieved September 20, 2015, from http://education.msu.edu/irt/PDFs/
   OccasionalPapers/op038.pdf

Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary.   3rded.   (2008).   Retrieved May8, 2015,
   from http://cambridge-advanced-learner-s-dictionary2.software.informer.com/
   download

Chia, Chuan Li.   (2005).   **A Study of Collocational Error Types in ESL/EFL College**
   Learners' Writing.   Retrieved December 5, 2015, from http://ethesys.lib.mcu.edu.tw/
   ETD-db/ETD-search/getfile?URN=etd-0730105-205237&filename=etd-0730105-205237.pdf

Chittinan Yumanee; & Supakorn Phoocharoensil.   (2013).   Analysis of Collocational Errors
   of Thai EFL Students.   **LEARN Journal**.   6(1): 90-100.   Retrieved September 12, 2015,
   from http://164.115.22.25/ojs222/index.php/LEARN/article/view/230

Conzett, Jane, ed.   (2000).   Integrating Collocation into a Reading and Writing Course.
   In **Teaching Collocation**.   pp. 70-87.   London: Commercial Colour.

Hill, Jimmie.   (2000).   Revising Priorities: From Grammatical Failure to Collocational Success.
   In **Teaching Collocation: Further Development in the Lexical Approach**.
   Edited by M. Lewis.   pp. 47-69.   Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, Michael.   (2000).   **Teaching Collocation: Further Development in the Lexical Approach**.
   Hove, England: Language Teaching.

Liu, Chen Pin.   (1999).   An Analysis of Collocational Errors in EFL Writings.   **The Proceeding**
   of the Eighth International Symposium on English Teaching.   pp. 483-494.   Taipei:
   The Crane.

McCarthy, Michael; & O'Dell, Felicity.   (2005).   **English Collocations in Use Intermediate.**
   Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Murphy, Clona; & Smith, Greg.   (2012).   The Impact of a Curriculum Course on
   Pre-service Primary Teachers' Science Content Knowledge and Attitudes
   Towards Teaching Science.   **Irish Educational Studies**.   31(1): 77-95.

Nation, Paul. (2001). **Learning Vocabulary in Another Language**. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Nitaya Suksaeresup. (2008). **Thai Students' Collocation Errors in Translating from Thai into English.** Bangkok: Faculty of Humanities, Srinakharinwirot University.

Pairote Bennui. (2008). A Study of L1 Intereference in the Writing of Thai EFL Students. **Malaysian Journal of ELT Research**. 4: 72–102. Retrieved August 12, 2015, from http://www.melta.org.my/modules/tinycontent/Dos/PairoteBennui2008.pdf

Richards, Jack. (1971). A Non-contrastive Approach to Error Analysis. **English Language Teaching Journal**. 25: 204–219. doi:10.1093/elt/XXV.3.204

_____. (2000). **Vocabulary in Language Teaching.** Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2010). **Competence and Performance in Language Teaching**. Retrieved April 3, 2016, from http://www.professorjackrichards.com/wp-content/uploads/ competence-and-performance-in-language-teaching.pdf

Ridha, Nada Salih Abdul; & AlRiyahi, Alaa A. (2011). Lexical Collocational Errors in the Writings of Iraqi EFL Learners. **Journal of the College of Arts, University of Basrah**. 58: 24–51.

Sirinna Boonyasaquan. (2005). **An Analysis of Collocational Violations in Translation**. Bangkok: Department of Western Language, Srinakharinwirot University.

Supakorn Phoocharoensil. (2011). Collocational Errors in EFL Learners' Interlanguage. **Journal of Education and Practice**. 2(3): 103–120. Retrieved July 6, 2015, from http://iiste.org/Journals /index.php/JEP/article/view/204