

COLLOCATION USED IN TEFL TEACHERS' RESEARCH PROPOSALS

A THESIS
BY
CHAYUTINIT SOMKANAE



Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts Degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language
at Srinakharinwirot University

June 2016

COLLOCATION USED IN TEFL TEACHERS' RESEARCH PROPOSALS



Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts Degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language
at Srinakharinwirot University

June 2016

Copyright 2016 by Srinakharinwirot University

Chayutinit Somkanae. (2016). *Collocation Used in TEFL Teachers' Research*

Proposals. Thesis, M.A. (Teaching English as a Foreign Language). Bangkok:
Graduate School, Srinakharinwirot University. Thesis Major-advisor: Assist.
Prof. Dr. Anchalee Jansem, Thesis Co-advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nitaya
Suksaeresup.

This research study is aimed to analyze the collocation knowledge of teachers who teach English as a foreign language. The participants of this study consisted of 15 Thai graduate students in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) program over the course of the 2011-2014 academic years. The data was collected from the first drafts of the research proposals of the participants. The types and frequency of English collocational errors were investigated and the sources of errors were discussed. The results of the study showed that the participants made more lexical collocational errors than grammatical ones. Among the lexical collocational errors, it was revealed that the participants made errors related to verbs followed by nouns most frequently. However, the study also showed that the participants made the most errors with nouns followed by verbs and the least errors with adjectives followed by adverbs. In terms of grammatical collocational errors, the results showed that the most frequently found errors were related to nouns followed by a preposition and verbs followed by prepositions and an object. The least frequently found errors involved verbs followed by the gerund and verbs followed by an object and infinitive. Moreover, the major sources of collocational errors include first language transfer, ignorance of rule restriction, overgeneralization, approximation, false concept hypothesis and synonym strategy.

The thesis titled
“ Collocation Used in TEFL Teachers’ Research Proposals ”

by
Chayutinit Somkanae

has been approved by the Graduate School as partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Master of Arts degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language
of Srinakharinwirot University.

..... Acting Dean of Graduate School
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Parin Chaivisuthangkura)

Thesis Committee

.....Major-advisor
(Assist. Prof. Dr. Anchalee Jansem)

..... Co-advisor
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nitaya Suksaeresup)

Oral Defense Committee

.....Chair
(Dr. Sirinan Srinaowaratt)

.....Committee
(Assoc. Prof. Tipa Thep-Ackrapong)

.....Committee
(Assist. Prof. Dr. Anchalee Jansem)

.....Committee
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nitaya Suksaeresup)

คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะในเค้าโครงปริญญานิพนธ์ของครูสอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ



เสนอต่อบัณฑิตวิทยาลัย มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ เพื่อเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษา
ตามหลักสูตรปริญญาการศึกษามหาบัณฑิต สาขาการสอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

มิถุนายน 2559

ชยุตินิตย์ สมคะเน. (2559). คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะในเค้าโครงปริญญานิพนธ์ของครูสอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะ

ภาษาต่างประเทศ. ปริญญานิพนธ์ ศศ.ม. (การสอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ). กรุงเทพฯ:

บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ. อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาปริญญานิพนธ์: ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร.

อัญชลี จันทร์เสม, รองศาสตราจารย์ ดร. นิตยา สุขเสรีทรัพย์.

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีจุดประสงค์เพื่อวิเคราะห์ความรู้ในการใช้คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะของนักศึกษาปริญญาโท

จำนวน 15 คน ในสาขาวิชาการสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ ช่วงปีการศึกษา 2554-2557 โดยรวบรวมข้อมูล

จากงานเขียนเค้าโครงปริญญานิพนธ์ฉบับต้นร่างในหัวข้อภูมิหลัง เพื่อศึกษาประเภทของข้อผิดพลาด ความถี่ของ

ข้อผิดพลาด และสาเหตุของข้อผิดพลาด ผลการวิจัยพบว่า ข้อผิดพลาดจากการใช้คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะทางด้านคำศัพท์

ถูกพบมากกว่าด้านไวยากรณ์ ผลการวิจัยยังพบว่า ข้อผิดพลาดจากการใช้คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะทางด้านคำศัพท์ ถูกพบ

มากในชนิดของการใช้คำกริยาที่ตามด้วยคำนาม ในส่วนของข้อผิดพลาดจากการใช้คำปรากฏร่วมจำเพาะทางด้าน

ไวยากรณ์ ถูกพบมากในชนิดของการใช้คำนามที่ตามด้วยคำบุพบทและการใช้คำกริยาที่ตามด้วยบุพบทและกรรม ส่วน

สาเหตุของหลักที่ทำให้เกิดข้อผิดพลาดมาจากอิทธิพลของภาษาแม่เป็นส่วนใหญ่

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to both of my advisors, Assistant Professor Dr. Anchalee Jansem and Associate Professor Dr. Nitaya Suksaeresup, for their kind encouragement and strong support both academically and spiritually.

I am deeply indebted to all specialists whose works have been applied in this study and largely have made this study possible.

I have also received invaluable feedback from both of the advisors and the committee for their comments. They have had a great influence on the study and I am very grateful to them.

I also appreciate all of my friends in the TEFL program as they allowed me to use their research proposals.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to my family. Without their encouragement, I would not have been successful.

Please accept my sincerest appreciation.

Chayutinit Somkanae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	
Background.....	1
Objectives of the Study.....	4
Research Questions.....	4
Significance of the Study.....	5
Scope of the Study.....	5
Definitions of Terms.....	6
2 REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	
Definition of Collocation.....	7
Classification of Collocations.....	7
Factors Causing Collocational Errors of EFL Learners.....	14
First Language Transfer or L1 Transfer.....	14
Synonymy Strategy.....	15
Overgeneralization.....	15
Ignorance of Rule Restrictions.....	16
False Concepts Hypothesized	16
Paraphrase.....	17
Previous Research on English Collocation.....	17

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter	Page
3 METHODOLOGY	
Selection of Materials.....	23
Procedures.....	23
Data Collection	23
Data Analysis.....	24
4 FINDINGS	
Frequency of Each Type of Collocational Errors.....	26
Lexical Collocational Errors Found More Often.....	28
Plausible Explanations of Collocational Errors.....	28
Summary of the Findings.....	43
5 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION	
Conclusion.....	44
Discussion.....	49
Application.....	51
Limitations.....	52
Suggested Topics for Further Studies	52
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	54
APPENDIX.....	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Lexical Collocations Categorized by Benson et al.....	8
2 Grammatical Collocations Categorized by Benson et al.....	9
3 Classification of Collocations Categorized by Lewis (2000).....	12
4 Number of Collocational Errors Found in the Research Proposals.....	26
5 The Total Number of Collocational Errors Produced in Each group...	28
6 Collocational Errors Resulting from False Concepts Hypothesized...	29
7 Collocational Errors Resulting from Overgeneralization.....	30
8 Collocational Error Resulting from Synonym Strategy.....	32
9 Collocational Errors Resulting from Ignorance of Rule Restriction...	33
10 Collocational Errors Resulting from First Language Transfer.....	36
11 Collocational Errors Resulting from Approximation.....	41
12 Percentage of the Sources of Collocational Errors Found.....	42

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

English vocabulary is considered one of the essential elements in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' communication (Boonyasquan, 2005; Mart, 2012; Tunnites, 2009). Similarly, Wilkins (1972) stated that people cannot convey a message or information if they do not know a vocabulary word despite knowing grammar rules. Therefore, it is important that EFL learners acquire a sufficiently large body of vocabulary (Lewis, 2000). In English vocabulary, of which a large stock of chunks and expressions are composed of, one major element that we should focus our attention on is collocation (Lewis, 2000).

Collocation is the way that two or more words are likely to appear together (Conzett, 2000; Woolard, 2000; McCarthy & O'Dell, 2005) in a predictable way but it cannot be used based on individual creation (Hill, 2000). For example, *cold* and *water* go together, as do *white* and *wine*; *have* goes with *meals* and *drink* with *milk*. These are combinations which are easily understood and produced by the learners without causing problems because they are obvious (McCarthy & O'Dell, 2005). However, some co-occurring words with less connection such as *do homework* (not *make homework*) and *make mistakes* (not *do mistakes*) can cause problems of using wrong collocation. Although these less obvious combinations are not completely wrong, because some people can understand what they are meant, the pair or group of words that are misused by EFL learners may make the native speakers doubt about language proficiency of the EFL learners (Wattanapichet, 2012; McCarthy & O'Dell, 2005).

Knowing collocation can be essential for EFL learners in many ways. According to Boonyasquan (2005) and McCarthy and O'Dell (2005), being able to use correct collocation to communicate will help EFL learners to become more native-like. In addition, Lewis (2000) stated that collocation can help learners express complex ideas more precisely and concisely. Normally, EFL students with little knowledge of collocation tend to use longer expressions to communicate something which native speakers would express with a precise phrase and little grammar (Boonyasquan, 2005; Hill, 2000; Hill, Lewis & Lewis 2000; Sadeghi, 2010). For example, if someone wants to describe the movement of raising his/her shoulders and then lower them so as to say that he/she does not know about or is not interested in something, instead of using this description, the word *shrug* can be used to collocate with *shoulders* as *someone shrugs his/her shoulders*. Moreover, a variety of collocation can improve one's writing style. In agreement with Hill et al. (2000) and McCarthy and O'Dell (2005), [EFL] learners may not always want to use the same few adjectives to describe a noun or pronoun, so it is a good idea to use other adjectives to collocate with a noun to make that noun more interesting and expressive such as *a substantial meal* instead of saying *a big meal*. Furthermore, Lewis (2000) suggested that collocations also have "immediate pragmatic force or are situationally evocative" (p. 15). He also gave an example as follows:

It is hard to think in which situation someone might say: This is a corner. But if I say to you: This is a dangerous corner, it immediately suggests two people in a car as they approach a corner where lots of accidents have happened. The collocation *dangerous corner* is immediately evocative of a situation or a speech event. (Lewis, 2000, pp. 15)

Regarding the wrong use of collocation, several researchers found that factors leading to failure of successful communication are first language (L1) interference,

synonymy strategy, overgeneralization, and so on (Bennui, 2008; Boonyasquan, 2005; Hussein, 1998; Poocharoensil, 2011; Suksaeresup, 2008; Watcharapunyawong & Usaha, 2012; Yumanee & Phoocharoensil, 2013). From these findings, it is urgent for every English lesson planner or EFL teacher to emphasize collocation to students as an important part in his/her teaching from lesson one (Hill, 2000; Lewis, 2000).

Apart from the factors involving collocation use among students, the teacher's understanding of collocation also plays a major role in encouraging students' appropriate use of collocated words (Conzett, 2000; Lewis, 2000; Woolard, 2000). Moreover, in teaching vocabulary, the teacher's support is needed more than other aspects of language learning (Conzett, 2000; Lewis, 2000; Woolard, 2000; Hazrat & Hessamy, 2013). Furthermore, Laufer (1998) stated that, "second language learners' passive vocabulary is much more than their active vocabulary." Moreover, Laufer and Goldstein (2004) also suggested that "many words are first acquired passively and that active knowledge is a more advanced degree of knowledge." These suggestions can be assumed that in learning co-occurring words, teachers are essential so that focusing on teachers' abilities will be interesting as they play the key role of teaching English collocations to students. Ball, Thames, and Phelps (2008), Buchman (1981), and Richard (2011) also stated that EFL teachers should have content knowledge of the subjects they teach. In addition, Seidlhofer (as cited in Richards, 2011) and Murphy and Smith (2012) also claimed that teachers who have insufficient content knowledge will eventually affect the quality of teaching and learning.

Nevertheless, most of the studies above normally analyzed collocation errors which were produced by EFL students at different levels and the results have shown that most EFL learners have difficulty using appropriate collocation and have low knowledge of collocational skills (Bennui, 2008; Hussein, 1998; Poocharoensil, 2011; Suksaeresup,

2008; Watcharapunyawong & Usaha, 2012; Wu & Garza, 2014; Yumanee & Phoocharoensil, 2013). Hardly any studies have been undertaken to detect EFL teachers' collocational competence. In this case, the study focused on English teachers teaching English at schools in Thailand for at least 2 years.

In order to analyze Thai EFL teachers' collocational skills, an academic writing was an appropriate tool to analyze teachers' skills as the academic writing focused on accurate uses of words, phrases, collocations, and other chunks which were essential for effective communication (Lewis, 2000). Therefore, it was my suggestion that research proposals from Thai EFL teachers should be suitable data to be analyzed in my study.

Thus, this study EFL teachers' collocational knowledge in their research proposals was analyzed to find out why they made such errors. The research results could be used as guidelines for the students to avoid making the mistakes which later passed on to their students.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were the following.

1. To investigate English collocational knowledge of Thai EFL teachers.
2. To investigate what types of English collocational errors were made by Thai EFL teachers.
3. To find out the sources of collocational errors made by Thai EFL teachers.

Research Questions

This study was aimed at answering these questions.

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

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

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

Significance of the Study

The study on collocational errors in research proposal writing of Thai EFL teachers is significant as follows:

1. To raise awareness of EFL teachers of the collocational knowledge in writing.
2. To show how competent Thai EFL teachers are in terms of collocation use.
3. To develop learning and teaching in collocation.

Scope of the Study

The scope of the study is limited to the following.

1. Benson, Benson, and Ilson (1986a)'s categorization comprising grammatical collocation and lexical collocation was used to analyze the data.

2. EFL teachers in this study referred to Thai graduate students in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) program from academic year 2011-2014 at Srinakharinwirot University, with at least 2 years of teaching experience in English. However, graduate students in TEFL program who are not Thai citizens will not be included.

3. All possibly found research proposals of EFL teachers in both weekday and weekend TEFL programs from academic year 2011-2014 at Srinakharinwirot University were analyzed.

4. All possibly found research proposals of EFL teachers were the first draft and were not corrected by any peers or professors.

5. All direct quotations without paraphrasing were not analyzed.

6. English collocations in this study are based on American English because they are widely used due to exposure through movies and music (Hammond, 2012).

Definitions of Terms

Some words used in the study need to be defined as follows.

1. Collocation

Collocation in the study refers to English collocation whereby a combination of words is likely to appear together in a predictable way (Hill, 2000).

2. Collocational errors

Collocational errors in this research refer to English words or phrases that sound inappropriate to native English speakers. Types of collocational errors will be based on the framework of Benson, Benson, and Ilson (1986a)'s categorization.

3. Research proposals

Research proposals in this study refer to the first section of the first draft of Thai EFL teachers' proposals.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

To provide background information of collocation and related theories, this chapter is divided into four parts. The first part is definition of collocation. The second is the classification of collocations. Next, factors causing collocational errors of EFL learners are presented to give examples of learners' problems in learning a foreign language. Finally, previous research on English collocation is reviewed.

Definition of Collocation

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

To recap, collocations are the way that two or more words are likely to appear together in a predictable way and sound natural to native speakers.

Classification of Collocations

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

collocations are into eight. 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 (see Table 1). On the contrary, grammatical collocations are combinations comprising a content word such as a noun, a verb, or an adjective and a preposition or grammatical structure such as an infinitive or clauses (see Table 2).

Table 1

Lexical Collocations Categorized by Benson et al.

Type	Pattern	Example
L1	verb (denoting 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

Table 1

Lexical Collocations Categorized by Benson et al. (continued)

Type	Pattern	Example
L7	verb + adverb	walk slowly work hard

Table 2

Grammatical Collocations Categorized by Benson et al.

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

Table 2

Grammatical Collocations Categorized by Benson et al. (continued)

Pattern	Example
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.
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.
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.

Pattern	Example
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.

Lewis (2000) suggests that words or groups of words regularly found together should be divided into many different kinds of items (p. 133). He also states that all his classifications are the expression that native speakers or EFL learners readily recognize and the expressions are regularly found together (see Table 3).

Table 3

Classification of Collocations Categorized by Lewis (2000)

Type	Example
1. adjective + noun	regular exercise
2. verb + noun	give a presentation
3. noun + noun	a road accident
4. verb + adverb	whisper softly
5. adverb + adjective	bitterly cold
6. verb + adjective + noun	learn a foreign language
7. noun + verb	snow falls
8. discourse marker	in other words
9. multi-word prepositional phrase	for a long time
10. phrasal verb	call in
11. adjective + preposition	interested in
12. compound noun	bus stop
13. binomial	safe and sound
14. trinomial	mind, body and soul

Table 3. Classification of Collocations Categorized by Lewis (2000) (continued)

Type	Example
15. fixed phrase	on the contrary
16. incomplete fixed phrase	a couple of...
17. fixed expression	Not half!
18. semi-fixed expression	See you soon/ later/on Sunday.
19. part of a proverb	Too many cooks
20. part of a quotation	To be or not to be

Hill (2000) classifies collocations into four kinds depending on their strength and flexibility between words as follows:

1. Unique collocations: This category refers to groups of words that cannot be replaced by others. For instance, the noun *bill* in the collocation *foot the bill* cannot be changed to *invoice* as in *foot the invoice* because of the uniqueness of the verb *foot*.

2. Strong collocations: This type is not unique but quite strong and usually has only a few possible collocates. For example, the adjective *rancid* in *rancid butter* can co-occur with not only *butter* but also *oil* and *cheese*.

3. Weak collocations: Collocations in this group can go with a lot collocates such as *green tea*, *green apples*, *green eyes*, *green shirt*, *green vegetable*.

4. Medium-strength collocations: These refer to collocations that are in the middle of strong and weak collocations. For example, EFL learners might know the words *see* and *a doctor*, but may not know that they can use *see a doctor* as a single item.

Factors Causing Collocational Errors of EFL Learners

From findings of previous studies, factors that cause EFL learners to make collocational errors in the use of English language are as follows.

First Language Transfer or L1 transfer

Native language influence or first language transfer is one of the main factors causing collocational errors of EFL learners (Bennut, 2008; Boonyasquan, 2005; Li, 2005, Liu, 1999; Phoocharoensil, 2011; Yumanee & Phoocharoensil, 2013). This happens because some words that second language learners want to use in English are actually used by other words in their native languages. For example, many Thai EFL learners refer to *start business* as *open business* which is assumed to be directly translated from *peid thurkic*; /*peid*/ 'open' + /*thurkic*/ 'business'. Likewise, Li (2005) 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 is possibly caused by the structures that learners want to create. It seems that there is non-congruence between the structures of learners' language and the target language. In Liu's (1999) study, collocational errors from the negative transfer of the first language can be found from phrases such as *listen his advice* and *wait your phone call*. Liu also explains that the words such as *listen* and *wait* are intransitive verbs which cannot be directly followed by a noun, but in Chinese the rule does not exist (Liu, 1999). As a result, learners are likely to omit an obligatory English preposition after a verb (Phoocharoensil, 2011).

Furthermore, another factor causing this source of errors is that learners are likely to add an unnecessary preposition to a verb (Phoocharoensil, 2011). This happens because some verbs in Thai require a preposition to follow them such as, **leave from*, and **affect to*. Another type of L1 transfer is associated with an incorrect choice of preposition. To make it more specific, Phoocharoensil (2011) 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 *klai chid*, *close*, usually precedes the preposition *kab*, *with*.

Synonymy Strategy

Synonymy strategy is the strategy that EFL learners develop when they want to use a word that has very close meaning to replace other word without awareness of making grammatical error (Nation, 2001; Phoocharoensil, 2011; Ridha, N.S.A. & Al-Riyahi, A.A., 2011). According to Phoocharoensil (2011), the verbs *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 possibly results from the confusion of the use of confusing word. According to Yumanee and Phoocharoensil (2013), they 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) 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 acceptable to say so.

Overgeneralization

Overgeneralization is another factor that EFL learners use in their writing (Boonyasquan 2005; Phoocharoensil, 2011; Richards, 1971). This error involves “the creation of one deviant structure in place of two regular structures” (Richards, 1971, p.

208). For example, instead of using *He can swim.* or *He swims.*, learners create a sentence like *He can swims.* Another example of the overgeneralization that Phoocharoensil (2011) found in his research is the use of *very* in Thai learner's writing, such as the sentences *The room that I very like is the dining room.* and *I very love to stay at home.* He explains that *very* was an adverb used to emphasize an adjective and modify an adverb, such as *very cold*, and *very slowly* respectively. Therefore, *very like* and *very love* are considered ungrammatical.

Ignorance of Rule Restrictions

According to Richards (1971), ignorance of rule restriction refers to “the application of rules to contexts where they do not apply” (p. 210). He also stated that this source of error results from learners' faulty analogy. Once learners encounter a preposition which concerns one type of verb, they will attempt to apply the same preposition with a verb that they assume similarity due to analogy. It happens as a result of learners' limited exposure to the target language. To be specific, learners would use *about* for the verb *think* as they see that other thinking verbs such as *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 a 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* (Richards, 1971).

False Concepts Hypothesized

False Concepts Hypothesized occurs when learners fail to clearly understand the distinction between their language and the target language (Liu, 1999; Richards, 1971).

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) are not de-lexicalized verbs. As a result, they cannot be substituted for one another freely. For example, some students used *do plans* instead of *make plans* (Liu, 1999). Another example is the use of *was* as a marker of past tense in *He was played in the street*. (Richards, 1971)

Paraphrase

Paraphrases can be categorized into two types (Liu, 1999). One is word coinage which refers to the way of making up a new word to communicate the idea. For example, the phrase *to see sun-up* instead of *to see the sunrise* was a collocational errors resulted from word coinage (Liu, 1999). Another type of paraphrase is approximation which is the use of an incorrect vocabulary item or structure that shares some properties (Liu, 1999). For instance, the word *middle* and *midterm* which are the adjectives can confuse learners which one collocates with the noun *exam*, and the one that suits the noun *exam* is *midterm*.

In conclusion, factors causing collocational errors of EFL learners are first language transfer, synonymy strategy, overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restrictions, false concepts hypothesized, and paraphrase.

Previous Research on English Collocation

The previous research on collocations is reviewed both foreign and local. Foreign studies are first discussed, followed by local studies.

The Studies of Other EFL Countries

Park (2003) investigated Korean EFL college students' lexical collocation use. Her purposes were to find factors affecting the collocational competence, the most

problematic of collocation types on Korean EFL college learners, and give plausible explanations for possible causes of collocation errors. There were 133 participants who were divided into 3 groups according to their English proficiency. They were asked to take two tests: a collocation test and a vocabulary test. The results showed that all three groups made the most mistakes on the adverb + adjective lexical collocation, whereas the noun + verb type was the least problematic. Moreover, most of the collocational errors made by the low and the intermediate group were caused by first language transfer. In addition, the errors made by the advanced group were blending which was the strategy that advanced students used when they did not know the words to collocate. They tried to substitute the word with other words which had the closest meaning.

In Taiwan, Li (2005) studied collocation error types in ESL/EFL college learners' writing. The researcher collected 38 assignments and 38 in-class practices from 38 sophomores at Ming Chuan University. The researcher used the *BBJ Dictionary of English Word Combinations*, the *British National Corpus*, and *TANGO* to analyze collocational errors and he also made suggestions for correction. The results showed that grammatical collocation errors were three times more mistakes than the lexical collocation type, and the major source of collocation errors was ignorance of rule restriction.

Another study conducted in Taiwan was by Kuo (2009), who examined intermediate Taiwanese EFL learners' knowledge of collocations. Ninety-eight writing samples under two topics which were written by 49 students were analyzed by using the online British National Corpus and the collocation checker, which is a collection of collocational errors collected from Taiwanese students. Moreover, all of the participants' writing was also checked by two native speakers. Two main types of collocations, which were verb + noun and adjective + noun collocation based on the framework of Benson et

al. (1986) were studied. The results showed that the participants made more mistakes on verb + noun collocation than adjective + noun collocation, which could be concluded that the verb + noun collocation was more difficult for Taiwanese EFL students to master.

Farghal and Hamly (2007) examined lexical collocations of Kuwait University EFL learners' essay writing in order to pinpoint problems and find sources of errors. There were 100 participants who were English majors enrolled in an essay writing course. The results showed that the majority of KU English majors had serious problems in the area of lexical collocations. Most of the collocation errors were verbal collocations (87%), whereas prepositional collocations were the least (13%). The researchers also emphasized that lexical collocations should be given more attention.

In 2012, Sadeghi and Panahifar (2013) did a study on the use of different types of collocations in oral production of 30 intermediate Iranian EFL learners. The scholars used *Oxford Collocation Dictionary for Students of English* and *the British National Corpus* to help decide on the acceptability of the learner-made collocations. The participants' spoken data were rated by two raters using Weir's speaking rating criteria. The results showed that 790 collocation produced by the samples can be categorized into seven types: verb + preposition, noun + preposition, adjective + preposition, verb + noun, adjective + noun, adverb + adjective, and verb + adverb. The most and the least frequent types of collocations were adjective + noun and verb + adverb, respectively. Moreover, the corpus analysis revealed that preposition-based collocations and verb-preposition collocations were the most problematic types for Iranian learners of English, and negative transfer from the first language was the major factor accounting for collocation errors.

From the studies of other EFL countries above, lexical and grammatical collocation of the participants at different levels of English proficiency were analyzed and

the results showed that most of the participants had difficulties in using correct collocation especially lexical collocation.

The Studies of Thailand

In Thailand, many scholars have also been interested in analyzing students' English collocational abilities as follows:

In 2005, Boonyasaquan did a research to raise awareness in teaching collocations to EFL and ESL students. She investigated the students' ability in translating a business text from Thai into English and gave plausible explanations for the collocational errors. The informants were 32 fourth-year English majors at Srinakharinwirot University in Bangkok. Findings revealed that the students' abilities in translation were low, and the adjective + noun pattern of collocation errors was the most violated one, while the preposition + noun type was the lowest. She also explained that the major source of collocation errors was the lack of knowledge of collocations, so she suggested related personnel to emphasize collocations in their EFL/ESL classes.

Suksaeresup (2008) also studied types, frequency, and causes of collocation errors in translating from Thai into English. The participants were second-year university students who studied translation in the first semester of academic year 2008. All of them had to take a 50-item exam on translation from Thai into English, and the tests were rated by two native speakers of English. The results showed that the type of errors that students made most was verb phrase, and the sources of errors were the students' low ability to use collocation and insufficient supply of vocabulary to translate. She also suggested that collocation should be taught in every English language classroom and be integrated into the teaching of other language skills.

Another study was done by Tunnites (2009) in the topic of English collocation in the movie script *The Pacifier*. The purpose of this research was to explore English

collocation patterns that were found in the dialogues of the movie script *The Pacifier*. The scholar used the frameworks based on Benson (1985) and Hill (2000). The grammatical collocations and lexical collocations used in the movie script were analyzed. The findings showed that in the category of grammatical collocations, the proposition + noun type was found at the highest level, followed by the verb + preposition, and the adjective + preposition. Meanwhile, the adjective + noun collocation was found at the highest level, and the noun + of + noun type was the lowest in the category of lexical collocation patterns. Moreover, the findings based on Hill (2000) revealed that most of the movie scripts were written with weak collocations, whereas unique collocations were used at the lowest level. From these results, it could be summarized that the language used in the movie script, *The Pacifier*, was simple rather than complicated or formal.

Phoocharoensil (2011) conducted a research study aiming at examining Thai EFL learners' descriptive essay writing focusing on English collocation errors and the sources of errors. The participants were 90 first-year undergraduates who were separated into two different levels of English proficiency, high and low. The framework based on Benson et al. (1997) was used, and only the incorrect collocations were examined. The results showed that the high-proficiency participants made more errors on the lexical collocations than the grammatical ones, and the lexical collocation that appeared to be the most troubled one was verb + noun combinations. In the case of the low-proficiency participants, the results showed that the errors in lexical collocations were obviously higher than those in grammatical ones with the verb + noun collocation being the most problematic. The sources of collocational errors were first language transfer, synonymy, and overgeneralization.

Later, Yumanee and Phoocharoensil (2013) analyzed collocational errors produced by Thai EFL students at two different proficiency levels and also investigated plausible sources of errors. Sixty high school students were recruited in their study. All the participants were required to take two collocation tests, which were a multiple-choice test and a translation test. The results showed that the strategy the students used most when they confronted with difficulties in using English collocations was mother-tongue transfer, and the factors that caused EFL learners to make collocational errors were the synonymy strategy, the learners' creative invention and the strategy of analogy, the paraphrasing strategy, and low collocational skills.

To sum up, most studies conducted by Thai EFL researchers were analyzing EFL students' collocational errors by using translation tests or checking EFL students' writing, and the results showed that most Thai EFL students did not have sufficient English collocational knowledge.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter gives information regarding the informants and the procedures used to collect and analyze the data.

Selection of Materials

The materials in this study were the first draft of research proposals of Thai EFL graduate students who were in the TEFL program during the academic years of 2011-2014 at Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok. The Thai EFL graduate students 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.

Procedures

Data Collection

The data collection was administered in the following stages.

1. The researcher approached graduate students who were in TEFL program during the academic years of 2011-2014. Then the researcher asked for a permission to use the first draft of their research proposals. The first draft was a version of writing that was not checked by any professors or peers.
2. Only background or statement of problems of the research proposal was analyzed.
3. There were two raters in this study. Both of them were native English speakers, an American and a British, with at least ten years of teaching experience in college level. They analyzed the data based on the framework of Benson, Benson, and Ilson (1986a) which comprises grammatical collocation and lexical collocation.

4. The rubric (Appendix B) was validated by three experts, my advisor, and co-advisor, and one of the raters.

Data Analysis

Part 1

Step 1: Research proposals of 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 (1986a).

Step 2: The two raters checked incorrect collocations individually.

Step 3: The two raters corrected the errors.

Step 4: The researcher counted the score based on the rubric. (Appendix B)

Step 5: The researcher calculated the correlation coefficient from the formula of the Pearson Product-moment correlation and the correlation was significant at 0.494 at the level of significance of 0.01.

Step 6: The researcher used the correlations in Step 5 to calculate inter-rater reliability by using Spearman-Brown formula and it was found that the inter-rater agreement from the rater1 and the rater 2 was 0.935. This value led to the conclusion that the reliability was very high.

Part 2

Data were analyzed for the purpose of finding types, frequency, and the possible main sources of collocational errors in the participants' research proposals.

Step 1: The researcher classified all errors into groups based on Benson, Benson, and Ilson (1986a)'s categorization (Appendix C)

Step 2: The researcher identified the plausible explanations of sources of collocational errors.

In brief, this chapter provided details about participants and procedures which were used to collect and analyze the data.



CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this chapter, the findings of the study are presented. The first is frequency of each type of collocational errors found in Thai EFL teachers' proposals. Second, lexical collocational errors are found more often than grammatical ones. Finally, the plausible explanations of collocational errors are discussed.

Frequency of Each Type of Collocational Errors

The results of the study reveal that there are 15 collocational error types which are made by the participants as shown below.

Table 4

Number of Collocational Errors Found in the Research Proposals

Types	Patterns of Collocation	Total	Percentage
L1	verb (denoting creation or activation)+noun	19	33.93
L2	verb (meaning eradication or nullification)+noun	2	3.57
L3	adjective+noun	7	12.50
L4	noun+verb	1	1.79
L5	noun1+of+noun2	2	3.57
L6	adjective+adverb/ adverb+adjective	1	1.79
L7	verb + adverb	2	3.57

Table 4

Number of Collocational Errors Found in the Research Proposals (continued)

Types	Patterns of Collocation	Total	Percentage
G1	noun+preposition	6	10.71
G2	noun+to+infinitive	2	3.57
G4	preposition+noun	2	3.57
G5	adjective+preposition	2	3.57
G8(d)	verb+preposition+object (or) verb+object+preposition+object	6	10.71
G8(g)	verb+gerund	1	1.79
G8(h)	verb+object+to infinitive	2	3.57
G8(i)	verb+object+infinitive	1	1.79
Total		56	100

Table 4 shows types of collocational errors found in the research proposals.

Among these errors, the L1 errors are found at the highest level (33.93%), followed by the pattern of L3 (12.50%), G1 and G8(d) (10.71%). The errors of L2, L5, L7, G2, G4, G5,

G8(h) are found at the same rate (3.57%), and the errors of L4, L6, G8(g) and G8(i) are at the lowest level (1.79%).

Lexical Collocational Errors Found More Often

The collected data are analyzed to examine which group of collocational errors is found more often as shown in Table 5.

Table 5

The Total Number of Collocational Errors Produced in Each group

Types of Errors	Number of errors	Percentage
Lexical Collocational Errors	34	60.72
Grammatical Collocational Errors	22	39.28

Table 5 shows the total number of 56 collocational errors: 34 lexical errors and 22 grammatical errors. Thus, the results reveal that the participants make more lexical collocational errors (60.72%) than grammatical collocational errors (39.28%).

Plausible Explanations of Collocational Errors

In order to gain insights in the sources of collocational errors EFL teachers made, the researcher needs to investigate why the TEFL teachers made such errors. Examples of errors were grouped and given explanation to delineate the sources of errors as the following.

False Concepts Hypothesized

False Concepts Hypothesized occurs when learners fail to clearly understand the distinction between their language and the target language (Liu, 1999; Richards, 1971). For instance, 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) are not de-lexicalized verb. As a result, they cannot be substituted for one another freely. The example is shown in Table 6.

Table 6

Collocational Errors Resulting from False Concepts Hypothesized

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
1	L2	Foreign language students do not know what to say or how to <u>speak</u> something.	Foreign language students do not know what to say or how to <u>say</u> something.

Table 6 presents the error the participants made such as *(1) *speak something* instead of *say something*. The word *speak* means *to say words* and the word *say* means *to pronounce words* (Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2008). Both of these words have similar meanings, but they cannot be used interchangeably.

Overgeneralization

This error involves “the creation of one deviant structure in place of two regular structures” (Richards, 1971, p. 208). For example, instead of using “He can swim.” or

“He swims.”, learners create the sentence like “He can swims.” The examples found in this study are as follows.

Table 7

Collocational Errors Resulting from Overgeneralization

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
1	L1	Schools <u>lack of</u> the opportunities.	Schools <u>lack</u> the opportunities.
2	L1	The teacher <u>emphasizes on</u> the result.	The teacher <u>emphasizes</u> the result.
3	L1	It is difficult to teach and also to learn because it <u>comprises of</u> some difficult parts of grammar and even vocabulary.	It is difficult to teach and also to learn because it <u>comprises</u> some difficult parts of grammar and even vocabulary.
		or	It is difficult to teach and also to learn because it <u>is comprised of</u> some difficult parts of grammar and even vocabulary.
4	L3	Students would build a <u>precisely</u> understanding.	Students would build a <u>precise</u> understanding.

Table 7

Collocational Errors Resulting from Overgeneralization (continued)

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
5	L4	<u>Learners are</u> lack of knowledge of lexical and grammatical form.	<u>Learners lack</u> knowledge of lexical and grammatical form. or <u>Learners have</u> a lack of knowledge of lexical and grammatical form.
6	G4	<u>Regarding to</u> the sheltered and adjunct models,...	<u>Regarding</u> the sheltered and adjunct models,...
7	G4	<u>Regarding to</u> the wrong use of collocation,...	<u>Regarding</u> the wrong use of collocation,...

Table 7 shows errors from overgeneralization. For example, *(1) *to lack of something* is a combination of *to have a lack of something* and *to lack something*. *(2) *to emphasize on the result* is a mixed structure of *to put emphasis on something* and *to emphasize something*. *(3) *to comprise of something* is also a mixture of *to be comprised of something* and *to comprise something*. *(5) *to be lack of something* is a combination of *to have a lack of something* and *to lack something*. *(6, 7) *regarding to* is the mix of *in/with regard to something* and *regarding something*. In terms of *(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.

Synonym Strategy

Synonymy strategy is the strategy that EFL learners develop when they want to use a word of which meaning is close to the other word without awareness of making grammatical error (Nation, 2001; Phoocharoensil, 2011; Ridha & Al-Riyahi, 2011).

Some examples are as follows.

Table 8

Collocational Error Resulting from Synonym Strategy

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
1	L1	It is teacher's responsibility to find out the techniques to <u>promote</u> students' writing <u>ability</u> .	It is teacher's responsibility to find out the techniques to <u>improve</u> students' writing <u>ability</u> .

Table 8 shows the error which results from the use of synonym. *(1) *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*. As seen from the sample in Table 8, it can be explained that the participants might think that the verbs *to improve* and *to promote* which in Thai have similar meaning, *to get better*, were interchangeable.

Ignorance of Rule Restriction

According to Richards (1971), ignorance of rule restriction refers to “the application of rules to contexts where they do not apply” (p. 210). He also stated that this

source of error results from learners' faulty analogy (Richards, 1971). For example, learners once encounter the preposition which concerns with one type of a verb, so they are likely to apply the same prepositions with verbs that they assume similar due to the analogy. It happens as a result of learners' limited exposure to the target language.

Table 9

Collocational Errors Resulting from Ignorance of Rule Restriction

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
1	L3	Several researchers conducted <u>many researches</u> .	Several researchers conducted <u>a great deal of research</u> .
2	G1	The <u>demand of</u> English is growing.	The <u>demand for</u> English is growing.
3	G1	Consideration of the <u>importance of</u> teaching...	Consideration of the <u>importance in</u> teaching...
4	G1	EFL students have to have enough basic <u>knowledge in</u> English.	EFL students have to have enough basic <u>knowledge of</u> English.
5	G1	Students had <u>problem in</u> English reading comprehension.	Students had <u>problem with</u> English reading comprehension.
6	G1	It is a <u>challenge of</u> EFL teachers.	It is a <u>challenge for</u> EFL teachers.
7	G2	The Basic Education Core Curriculum requires students to <u>have ability of understanding and interpreting</u> what they have read.	The Basic Education Core Curriculum requires students to <u>have the ability to understand and interpret</u> what they have read.
8	G2	A child's <u>opportunity of</u> succeed...	A child's <u>opportunity to</u> succeed...

Table 9

Collocational Errors Resulting from Ignorance of Rule Restriction (Continued)

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
9	G5	Communicative approach with communicative grammar activities is <u>effective to teach</u> grammar.	Communicative approach with communicative grammar activities is <u>effective in teaching</u> grammar.
10	G5	The finding of study can be <u>valuable by</u> English teachers.	The finding of study can be <u>valuable for</u> English teachers.
11	G8(d)	<u>learn</u> English <u>by</u> native speakers	<u>learn</u> English <u>with</u> native speakers
12	G8(d)	My goal is to <u>contribute</u> language learning by using CBI approach.	My goal is to <u>contribute to</u> language learning by using CBI approach.
13	G8(d)	Students are expected to <u>interact to</u> each other.	Students are expected to <u>interact with</u> each other.
14	G8(d)	<u>integrate</u> this technology <u>in</u> English class	<u>integrate</u> this technology <u>into</u> English class
15	G8(d)	<u>referring</u> Kim and Gilman	<u>referring to</u> Kim and Gilman
16	G8(g)	Multimedia teaching model <u>involves</u> students <u>build</u> positive motivation.	Multimedia teaching model <u>involves</u> students <u>building</u> positive motivation.

Table 9

Collocational Errors Resulting from Ignorance of Rule Restriction (Continued)

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
17	G8(h)	Most of those students are from high-income families that <u>want</u> <u>their children get</u> more opportunities.	Most of those students are from high-income families that <u>want</u> <u>their children to get</u> more opportunities.
18	G8(h)	It <u>enables the learners learn to</u> construct knowledge.	It <u>enables the learners to learn to</u> construct knowledge.
19	G8(i)	<u>help</u> family <u>working</u> for a living	<u>help</u> family <u>work</u> for a living

Table 9 shows the errors of ignorance of rule restriction which were found in the research proposals. *(1) *many researches* was the ignorance of rule restrictions on the word *research* which is an uncountable noun. Moreover, the errors such as *(2) *demand of*, *(3) *importance of*, *(4) *knowledge in*, *(5) *problem in*, and *(6) *challenge of* are the errors concerning a noun followed by a preposition. These errors of G1 showed that each noun is followed by specific preposition. For example, the noun, *demand* is followed by the preposition, *for*.

*(7) *ability of* and *(8) *opportunity of* are the errors of G2 which concern a noun followed by the to-infinitive. Besides, *(9) *effective to* and *(10) *valuable by* show the errors of G5 which are about an adjective followed by the preposition. Next, *(11) *learn by someone*, *(12) *contribute something*, *(13) *interact to*, *(14) *integrate something in*,

and *(15) *refer someone* revealed the misuse of G8 (d) which are about prepositions after verbs. *(16) *involve build*, *(17)-(18) *want /enable someone do something*, and *(19) *help someone doing* are the errors concerning verb followed by gerund, verb followed by someone and to-infinitive, and verb followed by someone and infinitive without to, respectively.

First Language Transfer or L1 Transfer

Native language influence or first language transfer is one of the main factors causing collocational errors of EFL learners (Bennut, 2008; Boonyasquan, 2005; Li, 2005; Liu, 1999; Phoocharoensil, 2011; Yumanee & Phoocharoensil, 2013). To begin with, there is an adding of an unnecessary preposition to a verb in English because some verbs in the Thai language require a preposition. For example, in English *affect* is a transitive verb, so an object is only needed after this verb without a preposition. The examples are as the following.

Table 10

Collocational Errors Resulting from First Language Transfer

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
1	L1	There are various factors <u>affecting to</u> English learning.	There are various factors <u>affecting</u> English learning.
2	L1	The casual factors <u>affecting to</u> English achievement are self-concept, learning attitude...	The casual factors <u>affecting</u> English achievement are self-concept, learning attitude...

Table 10

Collocational Errors Resulting from First Language Transfer (continued)

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
3	L1	The potential use of CBI <u>affects to</u> the students.	The potential use of CBI <u>affects</u> the students.
4	L1	Teachers <u>are</u> the key <u>role</u> .	Teachers <u>play</u> the key <u>role</u> .
5	L1	Writing is an activity to <u>encourage students' thinking system</u> .	Writing is an activity to <u>benefit students' thinking system</u> .
6	L1	<u>enhance students to the English exposure</u>	<u>benefit students through exposure to English</u> or <u>provide students with English exposure</u>
7	L1	This research aims to see how the use of CBI works by <u>examining with</u> Thai contexts.	This research aims to see how the use of CBI works by <u>examining</u> Thai contexts.
8	L1	Parents <u>get</u> a low income.	Parents <u>have</u> a low income.
9	L1	A well-designed CBI lesson <u>enhances students</u> to understand...	A well-designed CBI lesson <u>helps students</u> to understand... or A well-designed CBI lesson <u>enhances students' ability to</u> understand...

Table 10

Collocational Errors Resulting from First Language Transfer (Continued)

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
10	L1	Writing a story which is related to students' lives will <u>enhance students to use</u> their ideas.	Writing a story which is related to students' lives will <u>benefit students to use</u> their ideas.
11	L1	Thai instructors should <u>rethink about</u> their method of teaching.	Thai instructors should <u>rethink</u> their method of teaching.
12	L1	Many students <u>intimate difficulty</u> analyzing the important context.	Many students <u>have difficulty</u> analyzing the important context.
13	L1	A habitual learning style <u>promotes students to learn English</u>	A habitual learning style <u>encourages students to learn English</u>
14	L3	<u>Skills in reading expository texts</u> were not proficient.	Students are not proficient in reading expository texts.
15	L3	People use <u>wrong grammar</u> in communication.	People use <u>incorrect grammar</u> in communication.
16	L3	<u>beneficial instruction</u>	<u>effective instruction</u>
17	L5	in the <u>present globalization</u>	in the <u>present era of globalization</u>
18	L5	EFL learners have low <u>knowledge of collocational skills</u> .	EFL learners have low <u>knowledge of collocation</u> .

Table 10

Collocational Errors Resulting from First Language Transfer (Continued)

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
19	L6	People are <u>high proficient</u> in English.	People are <u>highly proficient</u> in English.
20	L7	English has been <u>used widespread</u> in many areas.	English has been <u>used widely</u> in many areas.
21	L7	Many countries around the world <u>firstly consider...</u>	Many countries around the world <u>primarily consider</u> .
22	G1	an effective way <u>in</u> promoting students' engagement	an effective way <u>of</u> promoting students' engagement
23	G8(d)	<u>studying in</u> a higher level	<u>studying at</u> a higher level

Table 10 presents the errors found in this study. *(1,2,3) *affect to* may originate from the Thai equivalent *mī p hol*, *affect*, which always needs the preposition *t̃x*, *to*. *(7) *examining with* is another example. The word *examine* is also a transitive verb in English, but in Thai *trwc s xb*, *examine*, is followed by the preposition *k̃ab*, *with*. *(11) *rethink about* are also the adding of unnecessary prepositions. In Thai *khid h ım̀*, *rethink*, is usually paired with *keı̃yw k̃ab*, *about*.

*(22) *way in* and *(23) *study in* are also the errors of L1 transfer which is caused by the wrong choice of preposition. In Thai **way in* is likely to be derived from *n̄æwthāng*, *way*, which can be followed by *nı*, *in*. On the other hand, in English *way* can

be followed by *of*. In case of the error, **study in*, the appropriate preposition is *at*, but in Thai, the word *reīyn*, *study* usually precedes the preposition *nī*, *in*.

Apart from the problems with prepositions above, Thai EFL learners also seemed to have trouble with mother tongue interference (Phoocharoensil, 2011). In this study the participants produced collocations like **(4) to be the role*, **(5) encourage thinking system*, **(6,9,10) enhance someone*, **(8) get an income*, **(12) intimate difficulty*, **(13) promote someone*, **(14) proficient skills*, **(15) wrong grammar*, **(16) beneficial instruction*, **(17) present globalization*, **(18) knowledge of skills*, **(19) high proficient*, **(20) used widespread*, **(21) firstly consider* out of word-for-word translation. These errors occurred because the participants failed to observe the restrictions on the collocability of *be* and *role*, *encourage* and *something*, *enhance* and a person noun, *get* and *income*, *intimate* and *difficulty*, *promote* and *someone*, *proficient* and *skills*, *wrong* and *grammar*, *beneficial* and *instruction*, *present* and *globalization*, *knowledge* and *skills*, *no* and *enough room*, *high* and *proficient*, *used* and *widespread*, *firstly* and *consider*.

Approximation

According to Liu (1999), 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 which related to word coinage, so the errors below belong to approximation. Table 11 presents the examples found in this study. The examples are as follows.

Table 11

Collocational Errors Resulting from Approximation

No.	Types	Misused Collocations	Target collocations
1	L1	students who want to <u>attain in</u> this class	students who want to <u>attend</u> this class
2	L1	learning environment and student motivation helps to improve the learning outcomes, inspire and <u>boot</u> the learning spirit	learning environment and student motivation helps to improve the learning outcomes, inspire and <u>boost</u> the learning spirit
3	L2	<u>build connectivity</u> with the teacher	<u>build connection</u> with the teacher
4	L3	Writing is <u>one of producing language skills</u>	Writing is <u>one of productive skills in language</u>
5	L3	<u>education institutions</u>	<u>educational institutions</u>

Table 11 presents the examples. *(1) *attain in this class* and *(2) *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 taking notice of the spelling.

*(3) *build connectivity*, *(4) *producing skills*, *(5) *education institutions*, were the participants' errors which occurred in the misunderstanding as a result of the use of an

inappropriate word choice that shares some properties. To make it more specific, both of the words *connectivity* and *connection* are the nouns that can make the participants confused. They were not sure which one collocates with the verb *build*. Moreover, **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 **education institutions*, it is said that *educational* is an adjective and *education* is a noun, so the adjective *educational* is the correct word to describe the noun *institutions*. Nevertheless, nouns in English can sometimes be used as adjectives such as *education process* and *education news*.

Table 12

Percentages of the Sources of Collocational Errors Found

Sources of Errors	Number of errors	Percentage
False concept hypothesized	1	1.79
Overgeneralization	7	12.50
Synonym strategy	1	1.79
Ignorance of rule restriction	19	33.93
First language transfer or L1 transfer	23	41.07
Approximation	5	8.93

As seen in Table 12, it can be concluded that the sources of collocational errors found in order of frequency were first language transfer or L1 transfer (41.07%), ignorance of rule restriction (33.93%), overgeneralization (12.50%), *approximation* (8.93%), false concept hypothesized and synonym strategy (1.79%).

Summary of the Findings

The findings in this chapter have provided answers to the three research questions. First, the participants made more lexical collocational errors (60.72%) than those in the grammatical collocational category (39.28%). Among lexical collocational errors, the findings revealed that 33.93% of L1 (verb+noun) was the highest frequency made by the participants, while only 1.79% of L4 (noun+verb) and L6 (adjective+adverb/ adverb+adjective) were the lowest frequency made. Besides, the results showed that G1 (noun+preposition) and G8(d) (verb+preposition+object) were found the highest frequency (10.71%), whereas G8(g) (verb+gerund) and G8(i) (verb+object+infinitive) were found with the same frequency (1.79%). Finally, the major sources of collocational errors found in the research proposals, in order of frequency, were first language transfer or L1 transfer (41.07%), ignorance of rule restriction (33.93%), overgeneralization (12.50%), *approximation* (8.93%), and false concept hypothesized as well as synonym strategy (1.79%).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND DISSCUSSION

Conclusion

As previously stated, the first purpose of this study was to investigate English collocational knowledge of Thai EFL teachers. Fifteen first drafts of research proposals of Thai graduate students in TEFL program from academic years 2011-2014 were collected. Only the part of background of the research proposals were checked to find incorrect collocations by two native English speakers and both two checkers corrected the mistakes. The scores were counted based on the rubric (Appendix B). Later, the correlation coefficient from the formula of the Pearson Product-moment correlation was calculated, and the correlation was significant at 0.494 at the level of significance of 0.01. Then the correlation coefficient was used to find inter-rater reliability by using Spearman-Brown formula and it was found that the inter-rater agreement from the rater1 and the rater 2 is 0.935. This value leads to the conclusion that the reliability is very high.

The second purpose was to analyze what types of English collocational errors were made by Thai EFL teachers. Since the analysis was based on the framework of Benson, Benson, and Ilson (1986a), the collocations were categorized into two groups: grammatical collocations and lexical collocations. Lexical collocations are divided into seven types, whereas grammatical collocations are divided into eight. 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. On the contrary, grammatical collocations are combinations comprising a content word such as a noun, a verb, or an adjective and a preposition or grammatical structure like an infinitive or clauses.

The third purpose was to find out the sources of collocational errors made by Thai EFL teachers. It was probable that the major sources of collocational errors were due to the first language transfer followed by ignorance of rule restriction, overgeneralization, approximation, false concept hypothesized and synonym strategy.

The results of the study could be summarized as follows:

1. The research evidence showed conclusively that TEFL teachers no matter how L2 proficient they were, still had collocational problems. Lexical collocational errors were found more often than grammatical ones.

2. The results of the study revealed that there were 15 collocational error types which were made by the participants. Among these errors, the pattern of L1 errors were found at the highest level (33.93%), followed by the type of L3 (12.50%), G1 and G8(d) (10.71%), L7 (3.57%). The errors of L2, L5, G2, G4, G5, G8(h) were found at the same rate (3.57%), and the errors of L4, L6, G8(g) and G8(i) were at the lowest level (1.79%). Some of the examples of each type of collocational errors found are shown below.

2.1 Lexical collocation

2.1.1 verb (donating creation or activation)+noun : L1

Incorrect: Schools lack of the opportunities.

Correct: Schools lack the opportunities.

Explanation: The verb *lack* are transitive verb which can be directly followed by a noun.

2.1.2 verb (meaning eradication or nullification)+noun : L2

Incorrect: Foreign language students do not know what to say or how to speak something.

Correct: Foreign language students do not know what to say
or how to say something.

Explanation: People *say something*, not to *speak something*.

2.1.3 adjective+noun : L3

Incorrect: Several researchers conducted many researches.

Correct: Several researchers conducted a great deal of research.

Explanation: The word *research* is an uncountable noun, so the adjectives which can be collocated with *research* are such as a lot of and a great deal of.

2.1.4 noun+verb : L4

Incorrect: Learners are lack of knowledge of lexical and grammatical form.

Correct: Learners have a lack of knowledge of lexical and grammatical form.

: Learners lack knowledge of lexical and grammatical form.

Explanation: The noun *learners* can collocate with the verbs such as to have something and to lack something.

2.1.5 noun1+of+noun2 : L5

Incorrect: EFL learners have low knowledge of collocational skills.

Correct: EFL learners have low knowledge of collocation.

Explanation: The noun *knowledge* cannot be collocated with the noun *skills* as it sounds unnatural to native speakers.

2.1.6 adjective+adverb/ adverb+adjective : L6

Incorrect: People are high proficient in English.

Correct: People are highly proficient in English.

Explanation: The adjective *proficient* can be collocated with the adverb *highly* not the adverb *high*.

2.1.7 verb + adverb : L7

Incorrect: English has been used widespread in many areas.

Correct: English has been used widely in many areas.

Explanation: The verb *use* can be collocated with the adverb *widely* not the adjective *widespread*.

2.2 Grammatical collocation

2.2.1 noun+preposition : G1

Incorrect: The demand of English is growing.

Correct: The demand for English is growing.

Explanation: The noun *demand* is followed by the preposition, *for*.

2.2.2 noun+to+infinitive : G2

Incorrect: The Basic Education Core Curriculum requires students to have ability of understanding and interpreting what they have read.

Correct: The Basic Education Core Curriculum requires students to have the ability to understand and interpret what they have read.

Explanation: The noun *ability* is used with to infinitive.

2.2.3 preposition+noun : G4

Incorrect: Regarding the sheltered and adjunct models,...

Correct: Regarding the sheltered and adjunct models,...

Explanation: *regarding to* is the mix of *in/with regard to something* and *regarding something*, which is incorrect. In this example, *regarding* is used as a preposition, so its correct form is *regarding something*.

2.2.4 adjective+preposition : G5

Incorrect: Communicative approach with communicative grammar activities is effective to teach grammar.

Correct: Communicative approach with communicative grammar activities is effective in teaching grammar.

Explanation: The word *effective* is an adjective which is normally used with a preposition *in*.

2.2.5 verb+(object)+preposition+object : G8 (d)

Incorrect: Students are expected to interact to each other.

Correct: Students are expected to interact with each other.

Explanation: The verb *interact* is used with the preposition *with*.

2.2.6 verb+gerund : G8 (g)

Incorrect: Multimedia teaching model involves students build positive motivation.

Correct: Multimedia teaching model involves students building positive motivation.

Explanation: The verb *involve* is used with gerund.

2.2.7 verb+object+to infinitive : G8 (h)

Incorrect: It enables the learners learn to construct knowledge.

Correct: It enables the learners to learn to construct knowledge.

Explanation: The form of the verb *enable* is *to enable someone to do something*.

2.2.8 verb+object+infinitive : G8 (i)

Incorrect: help family working for a living

Correct: help family work for a living

Explanation: The verb pattern of *help* is *to help someone do something* or *to help someone to do something*.

3. The sources of collocational errors which were found in this study were first language transfer or L1 transfer (41.07%) followed by ignorance of rule restriction (33.93%), overgeneralization (12.50%), approximation (8.93%), and false concept hypothesized and synonym strategy (1.79%).

In summary, both lexical and grammatical collocational errors are the problem with EFL teachers. Because of the difference between EFL teachers' first language and the target language, EFL teachers with less awareness tend to make errors. The strategy that they use most in order to transfer their idea is first language transfer.

Discussion

The results of the study can be discussed as follows:

1. The result reveals that the participants in this study, Thai EFL teachers, still lack collocational skills, especially lexical collocations. The finding supports the previous findings of Phoocharoensil (2011) and Ridha & Al-Riyahi (2011). In Phoocharoensil (2011), his study has analyzed Thai EFL learners in their acquisition of English collocations. The participants are separated into high and low proficiency groups, and the data are collected from essay writing. The result shows that both high and low proficiency learners make lexical collocational errors more than grammatical ones. Furthermore, Ridha & Al-Riyahi (2011) also conducts research to investigate lexical collocational errors in the essay writing of Iraqi EFL learners. The findings of their study reveal that lexical collocations still cause confusion among Iraqi EFL learners, even at advanced level. However, this result seems incongruous with the study of Li (2005). The result of Li's shows that 38 sophomores of Taiwan EFL college learners make grammatical collocations in their writing more than lexical ones. This can be assumed that participants at different levels at different parts of the world reflect differences of findings.

2. Among lexical collocations, the findings of this study show that the errors of verb + noun are found the most. The findings are supported by the study of Li (2005), Phoocharoensil (2011), and Ridha & Al-Riyahi (2011). Also, Kuo (2009)'s has analyzed two main types of lexical collocation of the college students in Taiwan at the intermediate level. The results show that between verb+noun and adjective+noun, the participants make the errors of verb+noun more often than the other type. Moreover, Wongsirisombat (2011) has investigated Thai EFL learners' ability in using collocation. The findings shows that the pattern of verb+noun is the highest problematic. In contrast, in

Boonyasquan (2005), her study has showed that the collocational errors of adjective+noun are found at the highest level.

3. In grammatical collocations, this study found that errors of the types of noun+preposition and the verb+(object)+preposition+object are found at the highest level in comparison with others' grammatical collocations. Similarly, the research results of Li (2005) and Phoocharoensil (2011) have supported this study. Li and Phooscharoensil have found out that the type of verb+(object)+preposition+object occur most frequently in the EFL learners' writing.

4. In this study the strategy on which EFL teachers seems to rely is their native language, Thai. In agreement with the studies of Phoocharoensil (2011) and Ridha & Al-Riyahi (2011), native language transfer is the major source of collocational errors. However, in Kuo (2009) negative transfer strategy is the lowest ratio as the EFL learners do not make many mistakes in this area. Approximation is likely to be produced more compared to other strategies. In Li (2005), the result has showed that ignorance of rule restrictions seems to be the most convenient strategy for EFL learners to use when they are writing.

Application

The application of this research in collocation can be adapted in teaching and learning as follows.

1. Knowing collocation is an important skill to be acquired, teachers should teach collocation to learners at an early stage so that they can identify collocations in texts and they are used to taking notice of them and be able to maximize their knowledge about

collocation both inside and outside the classroom. Moreover, it is a top priority in every language class to teach collocation to learners for the very first time (Boonyasquan, 2005; Lewis, 2000; Suksaeresup, 2008).

2. Since learners need guidance from EFL teachers to be able to widen the understanding of collocation, it is crucial for EFL teachers to have a clear understanding of different kinds of collocation. This suggestion is supported by the advice of Lewis (2000) and Suksaeresup (2008).

3. Teachers should be well-equipped to teach collocation and have a positive attitude in presenting collocation in the classroom and in real life situation.

Limitations

There were some limitations in this study.

1. The number of the participants were limited to a small number of EFL teachers in TEFL program. This may not be adequately generalized in all teaching and learning situations.

2. Due to the resource restrictions, the data collected in this study were only pieces of writing. Consequently, only a part of the EFL teachers' performance was investigated and could not represent the whole population of EFL teachers.

Suggested Topics for Further Studies

There should be further research in this field of collocation using the following ideas.

1. This study only investigated EFL teachers who were in TEFL program at Srinakharinwirot University. Further studies should include EFL teachers in other academic and educational institutes.

2. The data used in this study were only the background of the study in research proposals of TEFL teacher. It would be much clearer if the data from other skills such as speaking were analyzed to make the study more comprehensive.





BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ball, D.L., Thames, M.H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(5), 389-407. doi: 10.1177/0022487108324554
- Bennui, P. (2008). A study of L1 interference in the writing of Thai EFL students. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 4. Retrieved from <http://www.melta.org.my/modules/tinycontent/Dos/PairoteBennui2008.pdf>
- Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1985). The structure of the collocational dictionary. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 2, 1-14. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ijl/2.1.1>
- Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1986a). The BBI combinatory dictionary of English: A guide to word combinations. Retrieved from <http://bbidict.narod.ru/>
- Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1997). *The BBI dictionary of English word combinations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Boonyasquan, S. (2005). An analysis of collocational violations in translation. *Humanities Periscope*, 27(2). Retrieved from <http://www.ejournals.swu.ac.th/>
- Buchman, M. (1981). The flight away from content in teacher education and teaching. *The Institute for Research in Teaching*, 38. Retrieved from <http://education.msu.edu/irt/PDFs/OccasionalPapers/op038.pdf>
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (3rd ed.). (2008). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Conzett, J. (2000). Integrating collocation into a reading and writing course. In Lewis. Editor, *Teaching collocation* (pp. 73). London: Commercial Colour Press.

- Farghal, M., & Hamly, M.A. (2007). Lexical collocations in EFL writing. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 4(2), 69-94. Retrieved from http://asiatefl.org/main/download_pdf.php?i=300&c=1419313853
- Hammond, A. (2012, August 14). Re: British English vs. American English [Web log message]. Retrieved from <http://blog.esl-languages.com/blog/learn-languages/english/british-american-english-differences-varieties/>
- Hazrat, M., & Hessamy, G. (2013). The impact of two types of vocabulary preparation on listening comprehension, vocabulary learning, and vocabulary learning strategy use. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(8), 1453-1461. Retrieved from <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/tpls/article/view/tpls030814531461>
- Hill, J. (2000). Revising priorities: From grammatical failure to collocational success. In Lewis. Editor, *Teaching collocation* (pp. 53). London: Commercial Colour Press.
- Hill, J., Lewis, M., & Lewis, M. (2000). Classroom strategies, activities and exercises. In Lewis. Editor, *Teaching collocation* (pp. 89). London: Commercial Colour Press.
- Hussein, R.F. (1998). Collocations revisited. *Lang. & Trans.*, 10, 39-47. Retrieved from <http://repository.ksu.edu.sa/jspui/bitstream/123456789/130/1/Collocations%20revisited.pdf>
- Kuo, C.L. (2009). An analysis of the use of collocation by intermediate EFL college students in Taiwan. *ARECLS*, 6, 141-155. Retrieved from http://research.ncl.ac.uk/ARECLS/volume_6/kuo_vol6.pdf
- Laufer, B. (1998). The development of passive and active vocabulary in a second language: Same or different? *Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 255-271. Retrieved from <http://applij.oxfordjournals.org/content/19/2/255.short>

- Laufer, B. & Goldstein, Z. (2004). Testing vocabulary knowledge: Size, strength, and computer adaptiveness. *Language Learning*, 54(3), 399-436. Retrieved from <http://u.arizona.edu/~rgolden/LanguageLearning.pdf>
- Lewis, M. (2000). *Teaching collocation*. London: Commercial Colour Press.
- Li, C.C. (2005). A study of collocational error types in ESL/EFL college learners' writing. Retrieved from <http://ethesys.lib.mcu.edu.tw/ETD-db/ETD-search/getfile?URN=etd-0730105-205237&filename=etd-0730105-205237.pdf>
- Liu, C.P. (1999). An analysis of collocational errors in EFL writings. *The proceeding of the eight International Symposium on English Teaching*. Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co.,Ltd.
- Mart, C.T. (2012). Developing speaking skills through reading. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(6), 91-96. doi: 10.5539/ijel.v2n6p91
- McCarthy, M. & O'Dell, F. (2005). *English collocations in use*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Murphy, C. & Smith, G. (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. Retrieved from eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ960285
- Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Park, S. (2003). Lexical collocation use. *SNU Working Papers in English Linguistics and Language*, 2, 19-40. Retrieved from http://s-space.snu.ac.kr/bitstream/10371/2021/1/workingpapers_v2_19.pdf

- Phoocharoensil, S. (2011). Collocational errors in EFL learners' interlanguage. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 2(3), 103-120. Retrieved from <http://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/204>
- Richards, J. C. (1971). A non-contrastive approach to Error Analysis. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 25, 204-219. doi:10.1093/elt/XXV.3.204
- Richards, J.C. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. (2011). *Competence and performance in language teaching*. The United States of America: Cambridge University Press.
- Ridha, N.S.A. & Al-Riyahi, A.A. (2011). Lexical collocational errors in the writings of Iraqi EFL learners. *Journal of the College of Arts*, 58, 24-51. Retrieved from <http://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=58096>
- Sadeghi, Z. (2010). The importance of collocation in vocabulary teaching and learning. *Translation Journal*, 14(2). Retrieved from <http://translationjournal.net/journal/52collocation.htm>
- Sadeghi, K., & Panahifar, F. (2013). A corpus based analysis of collocational errors in the Iranian EFL learners' oral production. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills* 4(4), 53-78. Retrieved from <http://jtls.shirazu.ac.ir/jufile?c2hvd1BERj0xMTM3Jl9h>
- Suksaeresup, N. (2008). *Thai Students' collocation errors in translating from Thai into English*. Unpublished manuscript, Faculty of Humanities, Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Tunnites, P. (2009). *English collocation in the movie script the PACIFIER*. Unpublished manuscript, Faculty of Arts, Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand.

- Watcharapunyawong, S. & Usaha, S. (2012). Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types: The interference of the first language. *English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 67-78. doi:10.5539/elt.v6n1p67
- Wattanapichet, W. (2012). *English by example, A: Dictionary of English collocations with Thai translations 6th ed.* Bangkok: Thaiways publications.
- Wilkins, D. (1972). *Linguistics and language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Wongsirisombat, N. (2011). A study of collocational errors in Thai EFL learners' writing. Retrieved from <http://digi.library.tu.ac.th/thesis/lg/0613/title-appendices.pdf>
- Woolard, G. (2000). Collocation-encouraging learner independence. In Lewis. Editor, *Teaching collocation* (pp. 29). London: Commercial Colour Press.
- Wu, H.P., & Garza, E.V. (2014). Types and attributes of English writing errors in the EFL context. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 5(6), 1256-1262. doi: 10.4304/jltr.5.6.1256-1262
- Yumanee, C.& Phoocharoensil, S. (2013). Analysis of Collocational Errors of Thai EFL Students. *LEARN Journal*, 6(1), 90-99. Retrieved from <http://164.115.22.25/ojs222/index.php/LEARN/article/view/230>



Appendix A: Consent Letter

To whom it may concern,

I am Chayutinit Somkane and I am also one of the students in Teaching English as a Foreign Language program. I am doing a research on the topic of *An Analysis of English Collocational knowledge in Research Proposals of Teaching English as a Foreign Language Teachers*, so I would like to ask for your permission to borrow your first draft of research proposal so that I can find some useful information about writing. All information found in my research will be kept secret.

If you have any question concerning this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me using the information provided below.

Name: Chayutinit Somkanae

Mobile: 081-3746246

Email: tellingmay@hotmail.com

Sincerely yours,

(Chayutinit Somkanae)

Appendix B: Holistic Rubric

Points	Description
4	In order to receive a 4 point score, there must be the percentage of incorrect use of English collocation between 0-25%
3	In order to receive a 3 point score, there must be the percentage of incorrect use of English collocation between 26-50%
2	In order to receive a 2 point score, there must be the percentage of incorrect use of English collocation between 51-75%
1	In order to receive a 1 point score, there must be the percentage of incorrect use of English collocation between 76-100%

Appendix C: Checking Table 1

Paper No. _____

[illegible]

Appendix D: Scoring Table

[illegible]





VITAE

Name: Miss Chayutinit Somkanae
Date of Birth: May 8, 1983
Place of Birth: Bangkok, Thailand
Address: 81/38 Senanikom1 Rd.,
Ladprao, Bangkok, Thailand 10230

Educational Background:

2005 Bachelor of Science from King Mongkut Institute of Technology
North Bangkok
2016 Master of Arts Degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language

