

**A STUDY ON CREATING A CORPUS  
FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT**

Author: Işıl Gamze YILDIZ  
Advisor: Assist. Prof. H. Gülru YÜKSEL

A Master's Thesis

Submitted to the Department of English Language Teaching in Accordance with the  
Regulations of the Institute of the Social Sciences

Edirne  
Trakya University  
Institute of Social Sciences  
June, 2007

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to extend my gratitude to my advisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. H. Gülru YÜKSEL for her meticulous readings of and invaluable comments on this thesis is hardly concealable. Her ceaseless understanding, patience and cooperation of this work are most appreciated.

I would also like to thank my family for trusting and supporting me throughout my life.

I also thank to two precious friends, Res. Ass. Nur CEBECİ and Res. Ass. Emre GÜVENDİR for their endless help in my thesis. Their friendship and support will never slip our memories.

With his most adamant resilience, my husband and eternal friend, Deniz, has shouldered most of the burden. His moral and physical support to my thesis will always be remembered.

Finally, I would like to thank to my son, the source of my life, Doruk, just to be in my life.

**Title:** A Study on Creating a Corpus for ELT Department

**Author:** Işıl Gamze YILDIZ

### **ABSTRACT**

Nowadays learning a foreign language has become crucial. Therefore, the ELT departments at universities are raising foreign language teachers to supply this need. In order to teach a foreign language a teacher should know all the skills. Moreover she should know the vocabulary related with the language since teaching only the grammar of a language is not adequate to be competent on this field. Day by day, researches have been conducted on the importance of vocabulary teaching and they have been put forward thesis on how to teach more effectively.

The aim of this current study is to create a corpus consisting technical vocabulary of SLA and methodology classes at Trakya University ELT Department and to determine the vocabulary profile of undergraduate students via an instrument designed in accordance with that corpus. The study was conducted to 50 subjects at Trakya University ELT Department, in the second semester of the academic year 2006-2007. The subjects were given pre-test at the beginning of the study and they were given the same test at the end of the study as a post-test in order to find out if there was a significant difference between the results of two tests, and to determine the vocabulary profile of the subjects. According to the findings of the study firstly, a corpus was created including the technical vocabulary of the related field via a concordance program. Secondly, a significant difference was not found between the pre-test and post-test results. Besides, the technical vocabulary profile of undergraduate students was determined.

**Key words:** corpus, vocabulary profile, technical vocabulary, concordance program

**Başlık:** İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü İçin Bütünce Belirleme Çalışması

**Yazar:** Işıl Gamze YILDIZ

## ÖZET

Günümüzde yabancı dil öğreniminin önemi yadsınamaz. Bu nedenle üniversitelerde İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümlerinde bu amaca hizmet etmek adına yabancı dil öğretmenleri yetiştirilmektedir. Yabancı bir dili öğretebilmek içinse bir öğretmenin alana ilişkin bütün becerileri bilmesi gerekmektedir. Bunun yanı sıra öğretmenin dille alakalı kelimeleri de bilmesi beklenmektedir. Çünkü yalnızca dilbilgisi öğretimine yer verilmesi bu alanda yeterlilik sahibi olunmasına yetmemektedir. Her geçen gün kelime öğretimine önem veren araştırmalar yapılmakta ve kelimenin daha etkili bir şekilde öğretilmesine ilişkin tezler ortaya konulmaktadır.

Yapılan bu çalışmanın amacı, Trakya Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü'ndeki ikinci dil öğrenimi ve metod derslerinde geçen teknik kelimeleri içeren bir bütünce oluşturmak ve bu bütünceyi kullanarak geliştirilen bir araçla bölümdeki son sınıf öğrencilerinin teknik kelime bilgisi düzeylerini saptamaktır. Çalışma 2006-2007 eğitim-öğretim yılının ikinci yarısında Trakya Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü'nde gerçekleştirilmiş ve çalışmaya son sınıf öğrencilerinden 50 kişi dahil edilmiştir. Öğrencilere ilki öntest, sonuncusu ise sontest niteliğinde olan içeriği aynı iki test verilerek öğrencilerin bu testlerde verdiği cevaplar arasında bir fark olup olmadığını saptayabilmek ve öğrencilerin teknik kelime bilgisi düzeylerini belirleyebilmek amaçlanmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre ilk olarak sözcük dizini programı aracılığıyla alana ilişkin teknik kelimeleri içeren bir bütünce oluşturulmuştur. Araştırmanın gösterdiği diğer bir sonuca göre öğrencilerin öntest ve sontest sonuçları arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığı belirlenmiştir. Bunun yanı sıra, son sınıf öğrencilerinin kelime düzeyleri orta düzey olarak saptanmıştır.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** Bütünce, kelime düzeyi, teknik kelimeler, sözcük dizini programı

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	i
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	ii
<b>ÖZET</b> .....	iii
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	iv
<b>THE LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	vi

## CHAPTER I

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
1.1 The Problem .....	2
1.2 Aim .....	4
1.3 The Significance of the study .....	5
1.4 Assumptions .....	5
1.5 Restrictions.....	6
1.6 Terms and Concepts.....	6
1.7 Abbreviations .....	7
1.8 Literature Review .....	7

## CHAPTER II

<b>VOCABULARY TEACHING</b> .....	13
2.1 Lexical Approach.....	17
2.2 Corpus Linguistics .....	25
2.2.1 Who builds up a corpus? .....	28
2.2.2 What is a corpus for?.....	29
2.2.3 Outline of corpus creation .....	29
2.2.4 Corpus design .....	31
2.2.5 Clean-text policy .....	34
2.2.6 Different kinds of corpora .....	35
2.3 Concordancing.....	37
2.4 Why to teach technical vocabulary? .....	43

**CHAPTER III**

<b>THE RESEARCH</b> .....	47
3.1 Research Method .....	47
3.2 Population and Sampling .....	47
3.3 Data and Data Collection .....	48
3.4 Data Analysis .....	52

**CHAPTER IV**

<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b> .....	54
4.1 Results.....	54
4.1.1 Findings of the first research question .....	54
4.1.2 Findings of the second research question.....	58
4.2 Discussion .....	64

**CHAPTER V**

<b>CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS</b> .....	68
5.1 Conclusion.....	68
5.2 Suggestions.....	69
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	71

**APPENDICES**

Appendix 1: The List of technical and sub-technical vocabulary.....	80
Appendix 2: The List of Total Technical Words .....	93
Appendix 3: The Total List Of Sub-Lists In Frequency Order.....	106
Appendix 4: Technical Vocabulary Test on ELT .....	122
Appendix 5: Answer sheet & Key .....	128

**THE LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: The Subjects .....	46
Table 2: The List of Four Main Resource Books.....	47
Table 3: The Rating Scale for Finding Technical Words.....	48
Table 4: Inter-rater Reliability Score.....	49
Table 5: Sample Corpus in 8 Sub-lists .....	56
Table 6: Cronbach Alpha Reliability Scores .....	57
Table 7: List of Eliminated Words and Items.....	58
Table 8: Cronbach Alpha Reliability Scores After the Elimination .....	59
Table 9: One-Sample-Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test.....	59
Table 10: Statistical Analysis of Pre-Test and Post Test Results .....	60
Table 11: The Degree of Success in Separate Sub-Lists .....	61
Table 12: The Degree of Success in Total Sub-Lists .....	62

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary knowledge is of great importance in both foreign language teaching and learning, since as Scrivener states, “words are carriers of meaning” (1994; 73). Foreign language learners at beginner level often try to communicate by using words one by one. However, knowledge of grammar rules may not always be a strong facilitator in communication. For upper level foreign language learners, vocabulary knowledge has great significance. Upper intermediate and advanced level learners are usually able to communicate without making important grammar mistakes. But learners with limited lexical knowledge, though they can communicate sufficiently, may produce weak and childish discourses, and may not be able to express different proposals, associations and specific uses of meaning. This shows that lexical competence is an indispensable aspect of comprehending any kind of text.

Given the cost of running university level language programs, the lexical knowledge becomes more important. In order to understand the deep meaning of what a text actually includes, there needs to be the knowledge of technical vocabulary related with any specialized field. At universities where the academic studies are conducted in a foreign language, this necessitates the acquisition of field specific technical vocabulary. In this sense, every field has its own technical vocabulary and one needs to be competent in the technical vocabulary to be successful in his field. With this respect, a determination of technical vocabulary of each field -such as education, law, arts, medicine, engineering... etc.- should be beneficial for the sake of learners.

In order to determine the technical vocabulary of any field, the necessity of developing or creating a material is inevitable. In this study, it was decided to determine the technical vocabulary related to SLA and methodology classes at ELT Department in which academic studies have been conducted to be used in vocabulary teaching. Hence the material that was created for this study was *corpus* the term born from corpus linguistics. With this respect, it is possible to say that corpus linguistics opens a new dimension in vocabulary teaching with the impact of lexical approach. Taking the lexis as a basis in language teaching, corpus-based studies aim to help teachers to test and



improve the vocabulary knowledge of their students. Corpus which can simply be defined as a body occurred with the collection of various texts is the subject to our study. When the technical vocabulary of ELT is considered, it is possible to realize that there is a huge amount of vocabulary within the field. Hence, a limitation in determining the technical vocabulary of this field is needed. And, vocabulary of SLA and methodology classes was taken into consideration. In order to determine the corpus, concordance program was needed, since it is the only way to conduct corpus-based studies.

### **1.1 The Problem**

Lexical shortage presents learners with a twofold problem: on the reception side, they fail to understand any word, which falls even slightly outside ordinary language, and on the production side, they produce very plain utterances, which are unable to convey different emotional loads, or to express shades of intensity or connotation (Jullian, 2000; 37).

In addition to these, university level learners face with problems of learning and using academic vocabulary related with the field they study. In our country, this problem also effects the academic achievement of students in the universities giving education in foreign languages. Situation is the same for the students in foreign language education programs.

Experienced teachers of English as a second language know very well how important vocabulary is. When the problem is considered from the historical perspective, it can be seen that vocabulary knowledge and vocabulary teaching was ignored for a long time. Especially, the neglect in 1940-1970s was calling attention. One reason why vocabulary was neglected in teacher- preparation programs was that it had been emphasized too much in language classrooms during the years before that time. Indeed some practitioners had believed it was the only key to language learning. Learners often believed that all they needed was a large number of words. In addition to knowing English words and their meanings, one must also know how the words work together in English sentences. Unfortunately, teachers were just told about developments in grammar and the teaching of language skills, but learners could not

learn much about the ways of learning vocabulary.

The second reason of this neglect was that the meanings of words could not be adequately taught, so it was better not try to teach them. In the 1950s, many people began to notice that vocabulary learning is not a simple matter of learning and that a certain word in one language means the same as a word in another language.

As it can be seen, then the learning of word meanings requires more than the use of a dictionary, and vocabulary acquisition is a complex process (Allen, 1983; 1-2). So teachers of other languages should supply more help, in the field of vocabulary teaching.

In 1970s, with the growing interest in vocabulary teaching, many researches were done and articles were written. In the last decade, interest in this field grew much more. Today, with the researchers using the advantages of technological developments in foreign language teaching, and the different needs of learners, caused control of the vocabulary teaching and they destroyed the idea "...presenting the unknown words in a list, and writing equivalents of those in native language by grammar translation method" (Demirel, 2003; 30). Today, with the researches, educators relate the lexical problems with communication.

It is inevitable to study on the importance of vocabulary learning in the institutions training foreign language teachers. In this context, it is seen that, many teacher-preparation programs have focused on teaching. Therefore, many programs have been developed. Besides, the swift changes and developments in technology-affected language teaching process especially many programs related with vocabulary teaching have designed. One of these programs is concordancing. Concordancing program introduces students unfamiliar with the language of academic discourse to some of the most important, frequent and significant items of the vocabulary of academic English. Since concordancing programs have become available to teachers and students, their possibilities have been seen as offering new and exciting directions for developing teaching materials, enabling students themselves to make direct discoveries about language (Thurstun and Candlin, 1998; 267). The typical way of determining the importance of a word is by looking at its frequency and range of occurrence. The words that occur often in a range of uses of the language are called

high frequency words or general service words (Nation, 2001; 32). It is of obvious utility to learners of a language to know the most frequent words. The knowledge of high frequency words is fundamental for foreign language learners (Carter, 1998; 232). Moreover, the academic field vocabulary knowledge is also very crucial for university students. There have been many researches aiming to determine the relation between vocabulary acquisition of university students and vocabulary knowledge and, academic success (Schmitt 1998; Kojic-Sabo and Lightbown 1999; Wesche and Paribakht 2000; Qian 2002; Fan 2003; Morris and Cobb 2003). The researches determining technical vocabulary corpus for university students, have been carried out (Nation 2001; Chung and Nation 2003).

In this context, the students in English Language Teaching Department are expected to have the field-dependent vocabulary knowledge to be successful in their academic lives. For this reason, they have to know technical vocabulary related with the courses. Nevertheless, there is not enough research about technical vocabulary in English Language Teaching Department. The study, which is going to be held, necessitates a study in this field, because it was not done in Turkey.

Consequently, this study addresses the following questions:

1. How can technical vocabulary corpus related with the SLA and methodology classes in the field of English Language Teaching be created?
2. What is the technical vocabulary profile of under graduate students in English Language Teaching Department?
  - 2.1. Is the instrument reliable?
  - 2.2. Are the items (questions) in the test normally distributed?
  - 2.3. Is there a significant difference between the pre-test and post- test results?

## **1.2 Aim**

In this frame, with this study, it was aimed to create a corpus including the technical vocabulary related with SLA and Methodology classes in English Language Teaching Department via a concordancing program. Besides, it was aimed to determine the technical vocabulary profiles of under graduate students in Trakya University

English Language Teaching Department in accordance with the created corpus.

### **1.3 The Significance of the study**

In order to comprehend and interpret the texts, apart from grammar knowledge, vocabulary acquisition is needed. That is, the words in the text, may gain different meanings according to the readers. The studies have shown that there is a hard-relation between vocabulary knowledge level of students and their academic success. That is to say, technical field vocabulary knowledge is seen as a sign of academic performance. Thus, teaching technical vocabulary will enable students to gain competence in the target language. Therefore, it is expected from all undergraduate students at the universities, that they should be linguistically competent on their academic field. Linguistic competence is divided into categories as lexical, grammatical, semantic, phonologic, orthographic, orthoepic competences. Our study is restricted with only the assessment of lexical competence of the learners. With this respect, a corpus was created in order to assess the lexical competence of the students.

Sinclair clarifies the use of corpus by saying “...more and more people in every branch of information science are coming to realize that a corpus as a sample of the living language, accessed by sophisticated computers, opens new horizons” (1991; 14). In this point, determining technical vocabulary corpus in foreign language teaching departments gains importance. Such a study is necessary for increasing the technique and the activity types on vocabulary teaching, and also determining the content of language courses. This study will enable many contributions to foreign language field.

### **1.4 Assumptions**

In this study, it is assumed that the level of undergraduate students of Trakya University English Language Teaching Department is advanced. And it was also assumed that the subjects responded the questionnaire items objectively and without bias.

### 1.5 Restrictions

This study is restricted with;

1. The second semester of 2006-2007 academic year,
2. Undergraduate students of Trakya University Education Faculty English Language Teaching Department (n= 50),
3. The four academic resource books used in the courses of SLA and Methodology.

### 1.6 Terms and Concepts

**Academic Vocabulary:** It covers on an average 8.5% academic text, 4% of newspapers and less than 2% of the running words on novels. This vocabulary has been called academic vocabulary (Chung and Nation, 2003; 2).

**Concordancing Program:** A program constructing frequency of use a definite set of vocabulary in the corpus (Chandlin and Thurstun, 1998; 1-2).

**Corpus:** A collection of texts assumed to be representative of a given language, or other subset of a language, to be used for linguistic analysis (Francis, 1963; 109).

**Technical Vocabulary:** Terminological words, which define the field they belong and make it understandable (Chung and Nation, 2003; 4).

**Frequency of Vocabulary Use:** Vocabulary is divided into four levels as: high frequency words; academic vocabulary; technical vocabulary; and low frequency words. The range of occurrence of academic words as high frequency and low frequency words in a specific field can be determined as the frequency of vocabulary (Nation, 2001; 18-19).

## **1.7 Abbreviations**

**APP:** Appendix

**AWL:** Academic Word List

**BNC HFWL:** British National Corpus of High Frequency Word List

**EAP:** English for Academic Purposes

**EFL:** English as a Foreign Language

**EGP:** English for General Purposes

**ELT:** English Language Teaching

**ESL:** English as a Second Language

**ESP:** English for Specific Purposes

**L1:** First Language

**L2:** Second Language

**SEEC:** Student Engineering English Corpus

**SLA:** Second Language Acquisition

**TESL:** Teaching English as a Second Language

## **1.8 Literature Review**

Corpus creation has recently gained interest throughout lexicographers and teachers. Studies in the field of lexicography mainly deal with how to create a corpus for specific fields. The findings obtained from these studies have been used in the field of teaching to establish a frequency based corpus for different academic fields in order to 1) develop materials for classroom use and independent learning, 2) examine the potential offered by vocabulary profiles as predictors of academic performance in undergraduate programs, 3) identify the strategies that are conducive to learning vocabulary. The literature revealed that most of these studies have been conducted in the fields of engineering, science and medicine. Relatively, few studies exist in the field

of second language acquisition. In this respect, following researches were reviewed to help the researcher in finding out how a corpus can be created to be used for determining the technical vocabulary profiles of undergraduate ELT students.

One of the studies that conducted within this field was the Academic Word List (AWL) (2000) which was developed by Averil Coxhead at the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. The AWL was primarily made so that it could be used by teachers as part of a programme preparing learners for tertiary level study or used by students working alone to learn the words most needed to study at tertiary institutions. In the project a list containing 570 word families were selected according to principles of range, of frequency, and of uniformity of frequency. The list does not include words that are in the most frequent 2000 words of English. The AWL replaces the University Word List. The principle of range shows that the AWL families had to occur in the Arts, Commerce, Law and Science faculty sections of the Academic Corpus. The word families also had to occur in over half of the 28 subject areas of the Academic Corpus. Just over 94% of the words in the AWL occur in 20 or more subject areas. This principle ensures that the words in the AWL are useful for all learners, no matter what their area of study or what combination of subjects they take at tertiary level. According to the principle of frequency the AWL families had to occur over 100 times in the 3,500,000 word Academic Corpus in order to be considered for inclusion in the list. The last principle, uniformity of frequency, shows that the AWL families had to occur a minimum of 10 times in each faculty of the Academic Corpus to be considered for inclusion in the list. This principle ensures that the vocabulary is useful for all learners. The word list has been divided into 10 sub-lists based on the frequency of occurrence of the words in the Academic Corpus. The Academic Corpus contained journal articles, book chapters, course workbooks, laboratory manuals, and course notes. The texts were selected according to whether they were of suitable length (over 2,000 running words long) and were representative of the academic genre in that they were written for an academic audience. Any text not meeting these selection criteria was not included in the Academic Corpus. There were 414 texts in the Academic Corpus. Where possible, the texts were kept at their original length, although their bibliographies were removed. Whole texts provide greater opportunities for words to reoccur and longer texts allow

for greater frequency of occurrence as well as variety of vocabulary.

To introduce students unfamiliar with the language of academic discourse to some of the most important, frequent and significant items of the vocabulary of academic English Thurstun and Candlin (1998) conducted a research by using the concordancing program, Microconcord Corpus of Academic Texts (1993). In the project researchers developed materials for classroom use and independent learning intended for native speakers of English as well as students of non-English speaking backgrounds. The materials dealt in detail with frequently used words which were common to all fields of academic learning, not attempting to include specialized or technical vocabulary items associated with specific disciplines. It was found that by those working on the project were convinced of the value of concordancing in the development of teaching materials focusing on vocabulary and grammar and the line between them.

Chujo and Utiyama (2006) conducted a research project in order to find an easy to use, automated tool to identify technical vocabulary applicable to learners at various levels. Nine statistical measures were applied to the 7.3 million-word commerce and finance component of the British National Corpus. The resulting word lists showed that each statistical measure extracted a different level of specialized vocabulary as measured by word length, vocabulary level, US native speaker grade level, and Japanese school textbook vocabulary coverage, and that these measures produced level-specific words. In conclusion, it was found that these statistical measures are effective tools for identifying multi-level specialized vocabulary for pedagogical purposes.

Mudraya (2005) in her study titled 'Engineering English: A lexical frequency instructional model', searched for the integration of the lexical approach with a data-driven corpus-based methodology in English teaching for technical students, particularly students of Engineering. The study presented the findings of the author's computer-aided research, aiming to establish a frequency-based corpus of student engineering lexis. The Student Engineering English Corpus (SEEC) contained nearly 2,000,000 running words reduced to 1200 word families or 9000 word-types encountered in engineering textbooks that were compulsory for all engineering students, regardless of their fields of specialization. The most immediate implication arising from



the research was that sub-technical vocabulary as well as Academic English should be given more attention in the ESP classroom.

Another research was conducted by Chujo (2003) to create a tool for comparing the vocabulary levels of Japanese junior and senior high school (JSH) texts, Japanese college qualification tests, English proficiency tests, and EGP, ESP and semi-ESP college textbooks in order to determine what the vocabulary levels are, and what additional vocabulary was required for students to understand 95% of these materials. This was done by creating a lemmatized and ranked high frequency word list (BNC HFWL) from the British National Corpus. In the study it was found that most college entrance exams contained vocabulary that was significantly above the level of high school graduates. It was also found that specialized vocabulary lists could be helpful in bridging vocabulary gaps between various exams.

In the research conducted by Chung and Nation (2003) a scale especially developed to examine the nature and amount of technical vocabulary in two quite different technical texts; one using an anatomy text and the other an applied linguistics text, was used. Technical vocabulary was found by rating the words in the texts on a four step scale. It was found that technical vocabulary made up a very substantial proportion of both the different words and the running words in the texts, with one in every three running words in the anatomy text, and one in every five in the applied linguistics text being a technical word. A considerable number of technical words were from the first 2000 words of English and the AWL.

The purpose of the study conducted by Morris and Cobb (2004) was to examine the potential offered by vocabulary profiles as predictors of academic performance in undergraduate TESL programs. To this end, vocabulary profiles were established for 122 TESL students by means of an analysis of 300-word samples of their writing. The students' scores on each profile component were then correlated with the grades they were awarded in two of the grammar courses in their program of study. Finally, the effect of the students' mother tongue on both their vocabulary profiles and academic results was considered. The findings of the study reveal that the students' vocabulary profile results correlated significantly with grades in the more procedurally oriented of the two courses. Furthermore, vocabulary profiles proved to be useful in carrying out a

finer assessment of the language skills of high proficiency non-native speakers than oral interviews can offer.

The aims of project conducted by Fan (2003) were threefold. The first aim was to find out the vocabulary size of the tertiary students and whether they needed help with academic vocabulary. Second was to identify the strategies that were conducive to learning vocabulary in general and the strategies that were especially useful for learning high and low frequency words in particular. The last aim of the study was to look at the discrepancies among the frequency of use, the perceived usefulness, and the actual usefulness of vocabulary strategies. The results of the study not only indicated the strategy profile of the learners in general but also indicated the complexity involved in strategy use. Strategies which were relevant to the learning of L2 vocabulary as well as high and low frequency words were identified and their implications were thoroughly discussed.

In our country there is only one study in the field conducted by Anđ (2006). In her study she aimed to examine the effectiveness of corpus consultation through concordancing on non-native English speaker freshman students' use of the formulaic language features characterizing the summary of a research article and the rhetorical moves of the research paper introduction within a genre-specific perspective. The pre-test and post-test was assessed two different groups of subjects who were freshman ELT students. The experimental group that used concordancing included 30 and the control group 28 participants. Independent samples t-test was used to analyze the data. The findings of the study showed that the means of the three measurements of summary writing for the experimental group did not differ significantly from those for the control group. However, the findings of the study indicated that the concordancing helped learners gain awareness of the formulaic academic language used by expert writers, and such activity needed to be tailored to individual differences through challenging and motivating task design.

It is obvious that the studies conducted had a difference with the implementation procedure they had during the study, although they had similarities in their content of using a concordancer program to create a corpus mostly in the field of foreign language teaching. Our study differs from the previous studies mentioned as did not include an

implementation, but the process of determining the technical vocabulary profile of the undergraduate students.

## CHAPTER II

### VOCABULARY TEACHING

This chapter briefly provides historical background of vocabulary teaching and learning. Besides, it reviews the techniques and methods in vocabulary teaching and lastly explains the term corpus and concordance as one of these techniques.

It is known by all the teachers of other languages that vocabulary teaching has the utmost importance in teaching a language. For many years however, programs that prepared language teachers gave little attention to techniques for helping students learn vocabulary. Besides some books appeared to be telling teachers that students could learn all the words they needed without help. In fact, teachers were sometimes told that they ought not to teach many words before their students had mastered the grammar and the sound system of the language (Allen, 1983; 6). Though, teaching of the structure is a crucial point in second language teaching the importance of vocabulary can not be denied.

When we look through the history of vocabulary teaching, it is clear that the status of vocabulary within the curriculum has seen various and contrary thesis over the years. The view largely dominated in 1940s, 1950s and 1960s was the influential tendency emanating from American linguistics, to push vocabulary into the background and to relegate its importance to a secondary level in the teaching of foreign languages. Fries (1945;7) believed that the problem of learning a new language was not, first and foremost, learning its vocabulary, but mastering its sound system and its grammatical structure; all the learner needs at first is enough basic vocabulary to practice the syntactic structures. With respect to those aspects, structuralism and contrastive analysis, gave rise to the audio-lingual method which is against the teaching of too much vocabulary and for the mastery of structure (McCarthy and Carter, 1988). Hence, this neglect during the fifties and sixties were resulting from the dominant influence of Audiolingualism on methodology (Nunan, 1997; 57). Likewise Allen points out the reason of this neglect by drawing attention to classroom practices and says that “supporters of audiolingual method advocate the idea that grammar should be emphasized more than vocabulary, because vocabulary was already being given too

much time in language classrooms” (Allen, 1983; 3). In a way, this was resulting from the strong emphasis of the audio-lingualists on the acquisition of the basic grammatical patterns of the language. It was believed that if learners were able to internalize these basic patterns, then building a large vocabulary could come later.

There is no doubt at all of the overriding influence of this view for many years. The shift to transformational linguistics in the 1960s under Chomsky’s banner only served to reinforce the idea that lexis was somewhat peripheral, an irritating irregularity in an otherwise ordered grammar (Mc Carthy and Carter, 1988).

Allen in her book explains two more reasons for this neglect. According to her, the first reason is the fear of specialists in methodology that students would make mistakes in sentence construction if too many words were learned before the basic grammar had been mastered. Consequently, teachers were led to believe it was best not to teach much vocabulary. In learning a second language, as Gleason (1961; 21) mentions, one can find vocabulary is comparatively easy, in spite of the fact that it is vocabulary that students fear most. Actually the harder part is mastering new structures in both content and expression. Allen clarifies the third reason of this neglect as the belief that word meanings can be learned only through experience, so they cannot be adequately taught in a classroom. As a result, little attention was directed to techniques for vocabulary teaching. One of the most influential structural linguists of the day Hockett (1958; 55) reflects this belief by saying that “vocabulary was the easiest aspect of a second language to learn and it hardly required formal attention in the classroom”.

As a result, for many years, vocabulary learning occupied an uncertain position in the second language teaching. The neglected position of vocabulary is described by Carter as “...the poor relation of language teaching” (2000; 184), hence vocabulary was seen as a minimally related area of the field. In order to eliminate this neglect on vocabulary since 1970s there has been a growing appreciation of the importance of vocabulary, and new methodologists started to come into fashion by the effect of some new approaches, especially with the development of communicative approaches to language teaching. Advocates of the new methodologies such as Caleb Gattegno, Georgi Lozanov, Stephen Krashen started to advise language educators to re-consider the role of vocabulary in second language learning. Krashen and Terrell (1983) rejected

earlier methods of language teaching, like the Audio-lingual method, which viewed grammar as the central component of language. What Krashen and Terrell did was to describe the nature of language emphasizing the primacy of meaning by saying that “acquisition can take place only when people understand messages in the target language” (1983; 19). Hence, in order to provide communication, lexicon constructs the scaffolding of structure which enhances the meaning and messages and they are interdependent. The view that a language is essentially its lexicon and only inconsequently the grammar that determines how the lexicon is exploited to produce messages resulted in the revival of interest in vocabulary (Richards and Rodgers, 2001; 180).

With the realization of the importance of vocabulary there were various attempts on that issue in order to overcome this neglect. Allen states two main reasons for the present emphasis on vocabulary (1983; 5-6). The first is the disappointing results attained in EFL classes even where teachers have devoted much time to vocabulary teaching. Many of the words that are most needed have never been learned. Especially in countries where English is not the main language of communication, many teachers want more help with vocabulary instruction than they used to receive. The second reason is the fact that scholars are taking a new interest in the study of word meanings. A number of research studies have recently dealt with lexical problems (problems related to words). Through research the scholars are finding that lexical problems frequently interfere with communication; communication breaks down when people do not use the right words.

It is clear that methodologists and linguists have increasingly been turning their attention to vocabulary, stressing its importance in language teaching and reassessing some of the ways in which it has been taught and learnt. As a result teachers and learners are expected to have the same kind of expertise in vocabulary as they do in the structure. Wilkins in his book emphasizes this balance by saying that “without grammar very little can be conveyed; without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed” (1972; 111). Carter and McCarthy points out “while it is indeed true that to learn nothing but words and little or no structure would be useless to the learner, useless too would be to learn all the structure and no vocabulary” (1988; 42). Likewise Harmer stresses this importance through an analogy and says, “if language structures make up the skeleton

of language, then it is vocabulary that provides the vital organs and the flesh” (1991; 153). That is to say, structure when thought as a skeleton which means the main body for a living thing, vocabulary can be seen as the organs that give life to that body which really makes it a living thing. Hence, without vocabulary grammar is like a body with no sign of life so they are strictly interrelated. A learner may be good at with the form of a language but not with the vocabulary. Then he cannot be successful in understanding and conveying the meaning. Thus, an ability to manipulate grammatical structure does not have any potential for expressing meaning unless words are used. Therefore, we can not deny that students should learn grammar but grammar should involve words, since it will be nonsense to learn the grammar apart from the meaning that the words give. Then, it is true that students must learn both in an adequately manner. Consequently, learning the vocabulary or the structural pattern of a language means nothing when considered separately.

In the light of these matters, teachers and methodologists are currently trying to find out answers to the questions on how to teach vocabulary more effectively. Allen classifies some of these questions that have been raised when the teachers come together for professional discussions (1983; 6):

1. Which English words do students need most to learn?
2. How can we make those words seem important to students?
3. How can so many needed words be taught during the short time our students have for English?
4. Which aids to vocabulary teaching are available?

Similarly, Thornbury surveys the principles underlying the acquisition of vocabulary in a second language in relation to the following questions (2002; 13-31):

- How important is vocabulary?
- What does it mean to know a word?
- How is word knowledge organized?
- How is vocabulary learned?
- How many words does a learner need to know?
- What are the implications for teaching?

- Why do we forget words?
- What makes a word difficult?
- What kind of mistakes do learners make?
- How are words remembered?

Thornbury, after suggesting answers to those questions, points out that vocabulary is learned either actively or incidentally from various sources like; lists, coursebooks, vocabulary books, the teacher and other students, short texts, books and readers, dictionaries and corpus data (2002; 32-74). According to the thinker among those sources corpus data, which is mentioned as the latest additional resource available for the vocabulary input, “are particularly useful for providing attested examples of language in use, as well as frequency and collocational information” (2002; 74).

The recognition of the importance of vocabulary in 1970s brought new challenges towards the hegemony of grammar. Thornbury (2002) points out two key developments in this challenge. One of these is the lexical syllabus, which is based on those words that appear with a degree of frequency in spoken and written English. The other is the recognition of the role of lexical chunks in the acquisition of language and in achieving fluency (2002; 14). Both these developments were fuelled by Lexical Approach and by the discoveries arising from the new science of corpus linguistics. The effect of these developments has been to raise awareness as to the key role vocabulary development plays in language learning.

## **2.1 Lexical Approach**

Language teaching has traditionally viewed grammar and vocabulary as a divide, with the former category consisting of structures (the present perfect, reported speech) and the latter usually consisting of single words. The structures were accorded priority, vocabulary being seen as secondary in importance, merely serving to illustrate the meaning and scope of the grammar (Sinclair and Renouf 1988). Due to the renewal of interest in vocabulary in recent years, the Lexical Approach to second language teaching has received respect as an alternative to grammar-based approaches. The lexical approach develops many of the fundamental principles advanced by proponents of Communicative Approaches. The most important difference is the increased



understanding of the nature of lexis in naturally occurring language, and its potential contribution to language pedagogy (Lewis, 2002). A lexical approach in language teaching emphasizes that constructional pieces of language learning and communication are not grammar, functions, notions, or some other unit of planning and teaching, but lexis, that is, words and word combinations. The most important contribution of Lewis, the forerunner of this approach, was to highlight the importance of vocabulary as being basic to communication. It is true that if learners do not recognize the meaning of keywords they will not be able to participate in the conversation, even if they know the morphology and syntax. This does not mean that lexical approach neglects grammar, but supports that they are both important in teaching. Thus, it is not the case to substitute grammar teaching with vocabulary teaching.

Accordingly, lexical approach brings forward different notions and favors the teaching of language combinations presenting different instances. Lewis states key notions of lexical approach as (1993; 96):

- Lexis is the basis of language.
- Lexis is misunderstood in language teaching because of the assumption that grammar is the basis of language and that mastery of the grammatical system is a prerequisite for effective communication.
- The key principle of a lexical approach is that “language consists of grammaticalized lexis, not lexicalized grammar.”
- One of the central organizing principles of any meaning-centered syllabus should be lexis.

As the key notions suggest lexis is in the core of language and it may be considered as the focal point of language teaching process. Moreover, grammar can not be considered as an isolated unit since language in use provides different word combinations and situational instances. In this respect, identifying and presenting these situations is important and language should be considered as something beyond grammar. Mastery of structure only helps learners form grammatically correct sentences, but what about the meaning? Every sentence that is grammatically correct may be inadequate and or in terms of conveying meaning. Besides language choice is a vital part of communication and a grammatically correct but an informal utterance may

be inappropriate for a formal situation. Therefore, language choice is vital in terms of enabling communication among participants of a given society. Lewis (2002; 109) focuses on the term grammaticalized lexis and emphasizes the construction of grammatically correct lexical units as a means of easing target language comprehension. By stating that one of the central organizing principles of any meaning-centered syllabus should be lexis, Lewis centers lexis into the core of any activity that aims to convey and teach meaning (2002; 110). With all these aspects the lexical approach can be considered as a crucial part of comprehensive language learning.

The lexical approach discriminates between vocabulary—traditionally understood as individual words with fixed meanings—and lexis, which includes not only the single words but also the word combinations that we store in our mental lexicons. Lexical approach supporters argue that “language consists of meaningful chunks that, when combined, produce continuous coherent text, and only a minority of spoken sentences are entirely novel creations” (Mudraya, 2001; 1-2). Lexical approach in language teaching emphasizes the centrality of the lexicon to language structure, second language learning, and language use, and in particular to multiword lexical units or “chunks” (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). That is to say, the lexical approach concentrates on developing learners' proficiency with lexis, or words and word combinations. It is based on the idea that an important part of language acquisition is the ability to comprehend and produce lexical phrases as unanalyzed wholes, or “chunks,” and that these chunks become the raw data by which learners perceive patterns of language traditionally thought of as grammar (Lewis, 1993; 95). As Lewis states, lexical approach deals with combinations of language which are available in frequently spoken language. These are mostly common expressions such as ‘I am sorry’ ‘that will never happen to me’ (1997a; 212).

Lewis himself insists that his lexical approach is not simply a shift of emphasis from grammar to vocabulary teaching, as ‘language consists not of traditional grammar and vocabulary, but often of multi-word prefabricated chunks’ (1997a; 215). Chunks include collocations, fixed and semi-fixed expressions and idioms, and according to him, occupy a crucial role in facilitating language production. Therefore, it is essential to make students aware of chunks, give them opportunities to identify, organize and record these. However, identifying chunks is not always easy, and at least in the

beginning, students need a lot of guidance. So teachers should make their students subject to any kind of language chunks rather than teaching them grammar and vocabulary as two separate items. Since lexical approach is inspired by communicative approaches, language use is more significant for students. Thus teachers should teach students how to use the given words instead of giving direct definitions. In this respect a wide range of examples and contextual instances may increase lexical awareness of students and make them comprehend the language chunks with ease. Another way of drawing the attention of students to different chunks is presenting them different situational contexts. For instance, formal and informal situations covering similar language uses may draw the attention of students to the vocabulary acquisition. After students identify these instances, teacher may make them compare the different lexical units which refer to the same meaning but different forms. Thus, it would be easier for students to remember the chunks.

As it can be understood, the importance of lexical units both in first and second language teaching and learning cannot be denied. Of course, words mean something when they are used separately but with the existence of other lexical units these words might gain other meanings in different situations. Cowie argues that “the existence of lexical units in a language such as English serves the needs of both native English speakers and English language learners, who are as predisposed to store and reuse them as they are to generate them from scratch” (1988; 126). Knowing the lexical units enables learners to learn the new vocabulary and use the needed vocabulary when necessary in a meaningful context.

Since lexical units form the lexis Lewis suggests the following taxonomy (1997b; 255-270):

- Words (e.g., book, pen)
- Polywords (e.g., by the way, upside down)
- Collocations, or word partnerships (e.g., community service, absolutely convinced)
- Institutionalized utterances (e.g., I’ll get it; we’ll see; that’ll do; if I were you)

- Sentence frames and heads (e.g., That is not as ... as you think) and even text frames (e.g., in this paper we explore...; firstly...; secondly....)

A relatively small group of lexical items is the words and polywords. They have usually been considered as essential vocabulary for learners to memorize. Word can be defined as the smallest of the linguistic units which can occur on its own in speech or writing (Richards, Platt and Platt, 1992; 406). So, words occur as the minimal but the most important one of the lexical items. Without words there is no meaning or explanation of any kind of thought. Hence, words which are necessary to use a language should be taught to students. It must be one of the primary missions of a language teacher.

The third group of lexical items in the taxonomy is the collocations. The term collocation can be defined as a sequence of words or terms which co-occur more often than would be expected by chance. It refers to the restrictions on how words can be used together, for example which prepositions are used with particular verbs, or which verbs and nouns are used together. Lewis defines collocation as “the readily observable phenomenon whereby certain words co-occur in natural text with greater than random frequency” (1997a; 8). Collocation is not determined by logic or frequency, but is arbitrary, decided only by linguistic convention (Lewis, 2002; 111). And collocation is understood as the way in which words typically occur with each other, i.e. combinations of words in natural speech with a certain frequency. Native speakers intuitively ‘know’ which words frequently combine and which do not. To a native speaker, they just do not sound right. Knowing frequent collocations is essential for accurate, natural English.

Within the lexical approach, special attention is directed to collocations and expressions that include institutionalized utterances and sentence frames and heads. Hill explains the reason of this special attention by saying that “most learners with good vocabularies’ have problems with fluency because their collocational competence is very limited (1999; 3-6). This means that a learner may have the capacity to understand many words; however s/he may not use the appropriate word in the context because of not having the collocational competence. Therefore, the idea of what it is to ‘know’ a word is also enriched with the collocational component. As Lewis maintains, “instead of words, we consciously try to think of collocations, and to present these in expressions.

Rather than trying to break things into ever smaller pieces, there is a conscious effort to see things in larger, more holistic, ways" (1997a; 204). Being able to use a word involves mastering its collocational range and restrictions on that range (Lewis, 1993; 98-100). Thus, a word gains meaning through knowing its collocations. Additionally, he claims "language should be recorded together which characteristically occurs together" (1993; 100), which means not in a linear, alphabetical order, but in collocation tables, mind-maps, or word trees. He also suggests the recording of whole sentences to help contextualization.

It is important to establish clear ways of organizing and recording contextualized vocabulary. While learning vocabulary in second language students should be expected to learn the collocations of the words in order to be successful in their learning process. Lewis in his book mentions the use of real or authentic material from the early stages of learning, because "acquisition is facilitated by material which is only partly understood" (1993; 186). Although he does not supply evidence for this, it is true that students need to be given tasks they can accomplish without understanding everything from a given text, because this is what they will need as users of the language. He also suggests that it is better to work intensively with short extracts of authentic material, so they are not too overwhelming for students and can be explored for collocations. Similarly, Kavaliauskienė and Janulevičienė, (2001) in their article on the importance of lexical chunks in EAP, claim that students have to learn high-priority lexis, which needs to be selected and included into learning materials and class activities. Obviously, students do not need to distinguish which category lexical phrases belong to. According to them what is important in order to ensure their effective learning is that students turn a high proportion of the input to which they are exposed into intake. The question which arises to every teacher at this point is how to maximize the probability of learners turning input into intake. Here, Lewis's idea of making students aware of the existence of chunks is important. Most learners equate 'vocabulary' with 'words', and there is a tendency among learners to translate any professional text word-for-word. Kavaliauskienė and Janulevičienė (2001) see raising students' awareness of the existence of lexical items as the most basic role of the teacher.

Another important point is that language units should be learned and taught in context. Lexical items can be, in theory, learned de-contextualized, but it does not

ensure mastery of the item. Contextualized learning is preferable, because learning vocabulary is not a simple memorization of lexical phrases. They must be integrated into the learner's linguistic resources so that they are spontaneously available when needed. Vocabulary usage is not the same as its knowledge. And it is a teacher's job to activate these items in a classroom. This means that learners must process this newly acquired vocabulary. Kavaliauskienė and Janulevičienė (2001) offer a logical follow-up for this procedure to the teachers dealing with this issue as; checking comprehension of authentic passages, providing more practice, revision and the consolidation. Nattinger suggests that “teaching should be based on the idea that language production is the piecing together of ready-made units appropriate for a particular situation”. Comprehension of such units is dependent on knowing the patterns to predict in different situations. Instruction, therefore, should center on these patterns and the ways they can be pieced together, along with the ways they vary and the situations in which they occur. Activities used to develop learners' knowledge of lexical chains include the following (Mudraya, 2001; 2-3):

- Intensive and extensive listening and reading in the target language.
- First and second language comparisons and translation—carried out chunk-for-chunk, rather than word-for-word—aimed at raising language awareness.
- Repetition and recycling of activities, such as summarizing a text orally one day and again a few days later to keep words and expressions that have been learned active.
- Guessing the meaning of vocabulary items from context.
- Noticing and recording language patterns and collocations.
- Working with dictionaries and other reference tools.
- Working with language corpuses created by the teacher for use in the classroom or accessible on the Internet to research word partnerships, preposition usage, style, and so on.

As it can be seen from the discussions above, the lexical approach regards intensive, roughly-tuned input as essential for acquisition, and maintains that successful communication is more important than the production of accurate sentences. Hence,

using the right and suitable grammar patterns in a convenient way would not help the learners to communicate. Knowing the meanings and pragmatic usage of words with all its aspects enables learners to achieve communicative competence. And the only way to achieve communicative competence is to have the lexical competence. The studies that have been conducted demonstrate that lexical competence recently has been identified to be the most significant predictor to general language ability (Carter and McCarthy, 1988; 97). However, it is also identified by most learners to be one of the biggest challenges of language learning (Coady and Huckin, 1997; Cobb, 1999). Fortunately, with the advent of technology, a new view of learning and teaching has emerged; attempts to integrate computers as tools in language classrooms and facilitate the learning have been made (Chen, 2004).

Consequently, it is obvious that advances in computer-based studies of language referred to as corpus linguistics, have provided a huge, classroom-accessible database for lexically based inquiry and instruction. These studies have focused on collocations of lexical items and multiple word units. A number of lexically based texts and computer resources have become available to assist in organizing and teaching the lexicon (Richards and Rodgers, 2001; 132-133). Considering the facts related with the lexical approach, it is obvious that a learner should be competent in the subject of vocabulary learning via considering the lexical terms such as words and collocations in order to be successful in second language learning. Besides, the knowledge of those helps the learners studying in different fields of linguistics. In addition knowing them is crucial mostly in acquiring special or technical vocabulary of a specific field, since one word of a field may not mean the same thing for another. Learning EAP in multi-word chunks means a change for the better in the L2 vocabulary acquisition. It is not only desirable and beneficial, but also indispensable, because learners become involved in the process of becoming aware of and identifying lexical phrases, processing them orally or in writing, distinguishing between high-frequency and low frequency lexical items. Accordingly, this study covers technical word determination in the area of applied linguistics, related with the second language acquisition and methodology classes in the ELT department. Therefore, vocabulary is the subject matter of this study and it is designed with regards to technical vocabulary of the field in relation to words and collocations.

## 2.2 Corpus Linguistics

Corpus linguistics is a methodology which can be described as a study of natural language on examples of real life language use via a corpus defined as a body of text that is representative of a particular variety of language and is stored on a computer (Mudraya, 2005). Corpus linguistics can simply be defined as a methodology using and analyzing the collected data which is related with the language and stored on a computer.

Corpus linguistics as a method of text analysis based on electronic tools have been started in the 60s-70s with the compilation of the Brown and the LOB corpora, two collections of 1 million words and 500 sample-texts each, of American and British English respectively. While these corpora provided material for pioneering work in corpus linguistics and in many ways constituted the basis of modern corpus linguistics (Francis, 1992; 17), at the time when they were created, they raised more doubts than interest in the linguistic community whose dominant paradigm was Chomsky's paradigm (Gavioli 2005; 17). According to the view of Chomsky, performance, or externalized language is affected by factors which may inhibit competence and in this sense it does not provide an adequate mirror of it. Therefore, it is thought that the corpora are by their very nature collections of language performance and as such they were considered to impede rather than help the description of cognitive, rationalistic models of language performance (Mc Enery and Wilson, 1996; 4-8). In a way, the importance and benefit of corpora is denied. Sinclair explains this position as (2004; 1);

*"...cornucopia has not been welcomed with open arms, neither by the research community nor the language teaching profession. It has been kept waiting in the wings, and only in the last few years has any serious attention been paid to it by those who consider themselves to be applied linguists. For a quarter of a century, corpus evidence was ignored, spurned and talked out of relevance, until its importance became just too obvious for it to be kept out in the cold"..*

Thus only after 90s corpus linguistics, which had mostly contributed to the areas of lexicography and grammar, started to provide insights into the areas of register variation (e.g., spoken versus written language, across academic disciplines, stylistic variation), language change over time using historical or diachronic corpora, studies of gender differences, and, more recently the area of second language studies (Reppen 2001; Granger, 2003).



With this development, corpus linguistics has become to have superiority mostly in the field of ELT and the usage of computerized corpora of native speaker English has increased. In a way an initial breakthrough was the COBUILD project led by John Sinclair (Gavioli, 2005). In particular, “the pioneering work of John Sinclair, has been crucial in shedding light on the benefits of corpus-based descriptions of English in teaching and learning and in producing better ELT tools such as dictionaries and grammar textbooks” (Partington, 1998; 5). This project was of an applied nature as its purpose was to produce more realistic descriptions of English for teaching purposes, and the materials it produced were intended for the language classroom. The COBUILD catch phrase is helping students with real English, and it seemed to imply equivalence between a corpus and a real language and a corpus-based descriptions and more realistic students’ language production.

With this project, the interest in the use of language corpora and computer analysis tools for language education has grown tremendously in the past decade. Articles, written for language teachers, have emphasized the use of corpora and computers in the classroom. They tried to demonstrate and explore how findings from corpus-based studies can help enhance, refine and complement the information contained in learners’ dictionaries and other reference tools, and provide some very practical suggestions for using authentic data in the classroom to favor inductive learning and consciousness raising (Krieger, 2003; Conrad, 1999; Nation, 2001; Flowerdew, 1998).

During the last decade there has been a discernible shift in the use of computerized text corpora from pure linguistic research to a more applied corpus linguistic perspective where the focus is on the learner in some way (Flowerdew, 1998). With the usage of these computerized texts, the focus of corpus linguistics mainly altered to the learner in time. Since computers and the machine readable texts are available for teachers and learners, it would be easy for them to work and analyze the issues they wish. Corpus linguistics is, however, not the same as mainly obtaining language data through the use of computers. Actually corpus linguistics is the study and analysis of data obtained from a corpus. Hence, the main task of a corpus linguist is not to find the data but to analyze it. Computers are the tools that serve for this aim. Corpus linguistics is mainly used to find out the linguistic features of a language and the

significance of it in the area of language learning and teaching is attained through realizing the substance of corpora. As a result of the recognition of the importance of language corpora as a basis for acquiring facts about the language to be learned corpus linguistics started to be used in the service of language teaching. The term exactly gives the name of the corpus linguistics is *corpus*. From this point on, we will try to deal with what corpus is and how it is created.

In literature many definitions exist. In principle any collection of more than one text can be called a corpus. But the term "corpus" when used in the context of modern linguistics tends most frequently to have more specific connotations than this simple definition. McEnery and Wilson define corpus as "any body of text, that is, any collection of recorded instances of spoken or written language" (1996; 197). For example, a pile of written assignments waiting to be marked is, roughly speaking a corpus. Crystal and Davy make the definition of corpus as "a collection of linguistic data, either written texts or a transcription of recorded speech, which can be used as a starting-point of linguistic description or as a means of verifying hypotheses about a language" (1975; 69). Sinclair describes it as "a collection of naturally occurring language text, chosen to characterize a state or variety of a language" (1991; 115) and Francis describes it "as a collection of texts assumed to be representative of a given language, or other subset of a language, to be used for linguistic analysis" (1963; 109). According to Hasselgard the term corpora, plural term of a corpus, refers to "electronic authentic language databases that can be available via internet or as software installed in desktops" (2001; 1-2).

In the above definitions though the wordings differ, the thinkers in the field seem to have a consensus on what a corpus is. But Hasselgard emphasizes its electronic nature. In linguistics and lexicography, corpus means a body of texts, utterances, or other specimens considered more or less representative of a language, and usually stored as an electronic database. Currently, computer corpora may store many millions of running words, whose features can be analyzed by means of tagging (the addition of identifying and classifying tags to words and other formations) and the use of concordancing programs. Corpus linguistics studies data in any such corpus (McArthur and McArthur, 1992; 11).

A corpus is a remarkable thing, not so much because it is a collection of language text, but because of the properties that it acquires if it is well-designed and carefully-constructed. Whereas large-scale corpora such as Brown and LOB were used for development of linguistic patterns, insights from the exploration of these two corpora gradually have begun to feed into various aspects of language teaching (Kjellmer, 1987; 133-140, Holmes, 1988; 21-44). Thus, developing corpora is now becoming an increasingly significant additional aspect of corpus work in the sense that learners' needs are governing decisions about where to undertake descriptive research for various pedagogical purposes. Corpus which was once used just for the compilation of dictionaries and grammar (Sinclair, 1987;26), is currently used not only to inform syllabus design and materials production (Willis and Willis, 1989) but also to create teaching materials (Tribble and Jones, 1989:13). As a result, corpora have been introduced into other linguistic disciplines as well, and have succeeded in opening up new areas of research or bringing new insights to traditional research questions.

After considering the possible definitions of corpus, it is important to determine how a corpus can be created. Since the beginning of any corpus study is the creation of the corpus itself. The decisions that are taken about what is to be in the corpus, and how the selection is to be organized, control almost everything that happens subsequently. The results are only as good as the corpus (Sinclair 1991; 13). If it is not designed properly to serve for the aims, the following steps will not work because the corpus generates the falsified results from the very beginning till the end. Thus, corpus designers should follow certain steps determined by Sinclair (1991). But before dealing with these steps, following Sinclair, it would be better to consider two important questions: 1) Who builds up a corpus? 2) What is a corpus for?

### ***2.2.1 Who builds up a corpus?***

Ideally a corpus should be designed and built by an expert in the communicative patterns of the communities who use the language that the corpus will mirror. Quite regardless of what is inside the documents and speech events, they should be selected as the sorts of documents that people are writing and reading, and the sorts of conversations they are having. Within this perspective on the studies related to second language learning and teaching building the corpus by using authentic materials rather

than using the meta-language is needed. However when the aim is to teach and learn the technical vocabulary of a specific field and be successful in academic life, ingredient of the corpus should cover the meta-language more than using the authentic materials designed to develop the communicative skills. Yet the design of the corpus depends on the aim of the study. Hence the person who builds up a corpus should consider his aim in designing it, what he is representing, and to whom he will apply it. Therefore anyone who is competent in the field and has a specific aim on a subject can build up a corpus.

### ***2.2.2 What is a corpus for?***

Since a corpus is a collection of any written or spoken texts of a language, it is made for the study of language. So a well-designed corpus reflects the aim of studying language specifically. Accordingly, the contents of the corpus should be chosen to support the purpose, and therefore in some sense represent the language from which they are chosen. This means that a corpus should represent the vocabulary profile of a specific field. Hence a corpus is like a mirror of the field that it is created from. Corpus can be regarded as a convenient tool for the different kinds of studies on various fields. Corpus as composed of machine readable texts downloaded on computer enables the user to find the needed material simply and rapidly. This makes the corpus a milestone for the vocabulary studies for many academic fields and for -one of those-EAP as well.

Our study is carried out in the field of EAP. This caused a necessity to collect various texts related with applied linguistics and convert them by optical scanning which enabled the creation of a corpus.

Considering the facts of what is a corpus for, subsequent steps to be taken were suggested by Sinclair (1991).

### ***2.2.3 Outline of corpus creation***

The beginning of any corpus is the creation of the corpus itself. The decisions that are taken about what is to be in the corpus, and how the selection is to be organized, control almost everything that happens subsequently. Flowerdew notes that the extent to which the corpus is processed affects the data resulting from the concordance (1991;

43). Hence, “it is clear that the results are only as good as the corpus” (Sinclair, 1991; 13). Making a list of what to include in a corpus is an important point that should be considered in advance. Renouf states that until we know a lot more about the effects of our design strategies, we must rely on publishing a list of exactly what is in a corpus (1987; 14). Therefore making an outline of what to include in a corpus is needed. In order to clarify what a corpus includes, the two practical matters, which are named as *electronic form* and *permissions*, should be considered beforehand.

Computer-held corpus has to have the material in electronic form since the study will be held on a computer. There are three normal methods of text input at the present time:

1. Adaptation of material already in electronic form. This method is related with the studies where the collections that create the corpus are taken from an electronic data base. These texts are already in electronic form but needs some improvement in order to be used for the study.
2. Conversion by optical scanning (machine reading). This method is needed if the study will be conducted in an electronic format. Hence, huge amount of the texts are in written form that belongs to a published work. In this study the second method, conversion by optical scanning is used since the main materials were books. For the mass of books printed by conventional methods, scanning is much the best alternative.
3. Conversion by keyboarding. This method presents results for the designer who may not be able to use the second method and have to write down all the sources on a computer by keyboarding. Conversion by keyboarding can also be used together by optical scanning. Because some kind of written texts may be converted by optical scanning and others that remain may not be appropriate for that application.

The other practical problem is the securing of permission to put the text into electronic form, and to quote selections of it in a very detailed study where the created corpus will be used as a dictionary or a world-wide source. Hence, this is a sensitive area of law and it leads to the problems in designing a corpus. However, the Council of Europe is alert to this problem and may use its influence to further corpus creation in

the languages of Europe. So that in the future there may be fewer legal problems and less unnecessary paperwork.

#### ***2.2.4 Corpus design***

In the light of these practical matters, the criteria for selection of text should be criticized. Since selection of texts plays an essential role in creating a corpus. In all cases, the knowledge of specialized vocabulary is required, chiefly in the form of academic and technical word combinations and collocations. But here the question is that which lexical items make up the core of professional vocabulary to be studied in university, which is indispensable in future careers of English language teachers? The question should be addressed by a learner-centered corpus design that is effective at both academic and professional planes. This is attained, from our perspective on EAP learning, through the compilation of recently published English books in key subject areas. The selection of books is based on the required reading lists for subjects on the curriculum at our institution covering specific issues and topics. For instance, the core field of methodology and second language acquisition is part of several subjects studied in the specialist area of English Language Teaching. Recent books (published in the last couple of years) dealing with methodology and second language acquisition should then be classified according to thematic variables. The complete corpus should be restricted to few but representative sources in the demarcate area of methodology and second language acquisition classes within these academic boundaries.

- **Spoken and written language**

The designer should pay attention to the components of a corpus to decide on whether they should be written texts or spoken transcripts or both. It is clear that the transcripts of spoken language are more realistic in teaching a language since it shows the real use of it. And many language scholars and teachers believe that the spoken form of the language is a better guide to the fundamental organization of the language than the written form (Sinclair, 1991; 15). Although transcripts of a spoken language as authentic materials present a more realistic use of a specific language, it is hard to use them in specific positions as in academic based studies. Therefore, in the studies which deal with the technical vocabulary of a field using written texts from several sources is

much more beneficial. These written texts present the accurate usage of words in right contexts.

- **Formal and literary language**

After deciding on whether the corpus will contain only written texts, or only spoken transcriptions, or both, another point that should be considered is to determine that the texts or transcripts will confirm formal or literary language. The material ranges from formal to informal, from literary to ordinary. Here the important fact is that to determine your aim and decide on what kind of a language will represent it as in the selection of spoken or written language. If the aim is to work on the texts that represent the formal usage of language and to teach it, then the selection of texts should support it. That is to say the language of the texts should be formal whether they are spoken transcripts or written ones. However, when the aim necessitates working on more academic fields, then the literary language should be used. It is clear that the usage of the formal or literary or another kind of language is strictly related with the aim of the study that will be conducted.

- **Typicality**

According to Sinclair, one of the principle uses of a corpus is to identify what is central and typical in the language. In order to reflecting the aim of the study, content of the corpus should mirror the language that is central to it (1991; 17). On a study aiming to teach English as a second or foreign language via using the literary language, the designer should study the texts seriously. Yet, if the work of established writers is dominant in the corpus, it will have little or no value as a point of normative reference. It may not represent the language that is needed for such kind of a study where the main aim is to provide materials in order to teach English as a second or foreign language that have no strict relation with an academic study. However, the use of literary language on an academic field would be helpful when the texts that are carefully selected. The texts should supply the necessary content for the study. Besides, the designer should deal with the works of the writers who can be utilized as authority on their fields.

- **Period**

Most corpora attempt to cover a particular period of time, and use the clearest time indicator, which is the time of first utterance or publication. That is because these kinds of corpora can be static in their content covering the issues serving for the entire period of English usage. However, a sample corpora dealing with the field of ELT needs to be developed via innovations on this academic field. Although the main technical terms within this area are everlasting since they have validity, there needs to make some alternations, reorganizations, or editing in the corpora due to the changes in the language itself. Therefore, the designer is expected to follow up the innovations in the field and consider these current changes and adapt those to his corpus.

- **Overall size**

The dimensions of a corpus are of prime concern to most researchers in the initial conceptualization, and in the public statements. The corpus should be as large as possible, and should keep on growing. In order to study the behavior of words in texts, we need to have available quite a large number of occurrences.

- **Sample size**

In addition to overall size, there happens sample size which is regarded as a suitable size for any sample. Also, a corpus which does not reflect the size and shape of the documents from which it is drawn is in danger of being seen as a collection of fragments where only small- scale patterns are accessible. Therefore, a corpus should reflect the size and shape of the documents in order to be effective and to form a meaning whole and avoid to be regarded as a collection of fragments. Selected text should be interrelated in order to form a whole.

- **Whole documents**

The alternative is to gather whole documents, by this way the collection of texts can not be regarded as fragments since they are taken from a whole. Then, there is no worry about the marked differences that have been noted between different parts of a text. However, using whole documents may not be as good as a collection of small



samples since it may resemble an individual style or topic. This can be seen as the shortcoming of using the whole documents.

- **Minimal criteria**

It is obvious that there are a large number of criteria that can be used while selecting the convenient texts to form a corpus. It would be beneficial to agree on the smallest set of criteria that can be justified in the circumstances, so that the number of different documents is as small as possible. It would be expedient in keeping detailed records of the material so that the documents can be identified on grounds other than those which are selected as formative in the corpus. It would be better for the designer to use a specific source while creating a corpus.

- **Provisional corpus**

Using this procedure, there should be a useful small general corpus to be located somewhere between ten million and twenty words. This kind of corpus will be adequate for the study of the fairly frequent patterns and meanings of many thousands of words, but will not be adequate for a reliable description of the language as a whole.

- **Processing**

In order to retrieve information from such a corpus, it would be beneficial to agree on standard practices in the representation of text in a computer. At the time writing, an international Text Encoding Initiative is in progress, devising conventions for text storage which will be much more sophisticated than most current conventions, which may well lead to standardization in the near future.

### ***2.2.5. Clean-text policy***

In the early days of corpus work the text of other scholars was normally unable to be used by anyone else because there were no standards, and analytic marks were mixed up with the language. Recently, being in danger of having problematic analytical systems that have been imposed on the designers, caused from traditions of language analysis which have in the past rejected corpus evidence. Although in recent years computational linguistics has switched in its attitude to corpora, models of language

which are not justified by the evidence they now have retained. Therefore, it is for the designer's own sake to pay attention to keep text as it is without making any contribution to the original text. This policy, unprocessed and clean off any other codes would be a guide for the ones who use a determined corpus as a reference.

### ***2.2.6. Different kinds of corpora***

Corpora are designed to serve different needs of various studies. After deciding on the several issues related to the corpus creation the kind of corpora that will be used in a specific study should be selected. Sinclair in his book makes explanation of mainly two different kinds of corpora (1991; 23-26).

**1) Sample Corpora:** It is about thirty years since the pioneers in this field, Kucera and Francis (1967; 34), set about creating a corpus of major importance, and their foresight continues to be acknowledged as still more investigations commence using the Brown corpus. These corpora have made it possible for research workers to inspect physically texts of greater length than was previously possible, and to visualize the further possibilities of using longer texts. The main features of these corpora can be summarized as:

- a classification into genres (15) of printed text;
- a large number (500) of fairly short extracts (2,000 words), giving a total of around one million words;
- a close to random selection of extracts within genres ( Sinclair, 1991; 23-24).

Although a sample corpus will be discontinuous, and its subdivisions will not stand as samples themselves, with the dimensions of extracts, and their relationships, a great amount of useful information can be extracted with ease from these corpora.

**2) Monitor Corpora:** The rush in the activity and sharp rise in dimension has come about partly because of technological developments. With the usage of computers more excessively and effectively the limits of corpus studies have started to change. It is now possible to create a new kind of corpus, one which has no final extent because, like the language itself, it keeps on developing. Most of the material comes in from machine-readable sources, and it is examined for

the purposes of making routine records. Two major features of monitor corpus are that, it has a capacity to hold the state of the language for research purposes and sampling can be done according to individual requirements on gigantic stores of text, and detailed evidence of language evolution can be held efficiently. Since the information which a sample corpus cannot provide can be retrieved by manipulation of a monitor corpus.

Apart from the distinction of Sinclair, Tribble and Jones make a differentiation on the kinds of corpora as (1990; 15-16):

- 3) **Specialist Corpora:** In order to investigate the linguistic features that characterize a particular type of text, such as modern short stories in general, or newspaper reports, or advertisements, simply a corpus consisting of several examples of texts of the appropriate type. This type of corpus can be determined as specialist corpora.
- 4) **General Corpora:** General corpus, a collection of texts of as many different types as possible, is needed when a designer wants to study the features of the language in general, independently of the styles of particular types of text. A designer can build up a general corpus by using various specialist corpora. Hence, one way to proceed can be regarded as to accumulate several specialist corpora-for example, one of newspaper reports, another of business letters, a third of short stories- to which the designer add entire documents as he/she acquires them. He/she can then build his/her own general corpus by combining extracts from all of these in such a way that he/she achieves balance and variety while still remaining within whatever limits on overall size he/she is forced to respect. As the specialist corpora grow, so the texts in general corpora become more numerous and varied and, if necessary, shorter.

As a conclusion, it can be said that corpus linguistics can be seen as the study of linguistic phenomena through large collections of machine readable texts that can be called as corpora. Corpus linguistics makes the analysis of what is obtained from a corpus. As McEnery and Willson (1996; 95) state in their book, corpus linguistics is a methodology which can be described as a study natural language on examples of real life language use via a corpus, defined as a body of text that is representative of a

particular variety of language and is stored on a computer. The availability of language corpora to language learners and teachers add a fresh dimension to the criteria for success in learning a language. In particular, computerized text analysis programs which are called as concordancers are now available for use on personal computers and are valuable recourses for both teachers and learners (Ghadessy, 2001; 95). With the advent of computer and use of it in corpus linguistics, many researches have been carried out for working with large corpora of millions of words and small corpora as well.

### **2.3 Concordancing**

With the developments in corpus-based language studies and pedagogical materials, it is possible to see the improvements on the corpus-based research related with language structure and use, as well as on language learning and teaching (Hunston, 2002; 14).

Corpus use contributes to language teaching in a number of ways (Aston, 2000; 7-17). The insights derived from native-speaker corpora contribute to a more accurate language description, which feeds into the compilation of pedagogical grammars and dictionaries (Kennedy, 1992; 335-378). Research on learner corpora also contributes to our understanding of language learning process. Corpora of language teaching course books enable the examination of the language to which learners are exposed, and when compared to L1 corpora, facilitate the development of more effective pedagogical materials. Therefore both native-speaker corpora and learner corpora can be used as materials in language learning and teaching.

Corpora can be used in language teaching in two ways (Leech, 1997; 10). One of them is the soft version. It requires only the teacher to have access to, and the skills to use, a corpus and relevant software. The teacher prints out examples from the corpus and devises the tasks. Learners work with these corpus-derived and corpus-based materials (Bernardini, 2004; 15-36). Corpus examples are usually in the form of a concordance, where the word or structure being examined in the task is in the middle, so that patterns are more easily discernible. The hard version requires learners to have direct access to computer and corpus facilities and have the skills to use them (Aston, 1996). Tasks can be devised by the teacher or chosen by the learners with or without the

guidance of the teacher.

As it can be seen from the explanation related with the usage of corpora in language teaching, a concordancer is needed throughout the applications of the corpora.

Various definitions have been made on what a concordance is. Here are some of these definitions. A concordance with its simplest definition can be made as an alphabetical list of the principal words used in a book or body of work, with their immediate contexts. Kettelman defines the concordance as “a list of occurrences of a particular word, part of a word or combination of words, in its contexts drawn from a text corpus” (1995; 307) . Hadley states that “concordancing is a technique in which a large body of text (called a corpus) is analyzed by a computer program to discover the regular patterns and lexical sets that are associated with a specific word or phrase” (2006; 1-3). By studying this data, teachers and students can make certain generalizations as to how a certain lexical item is normally used. Flowerdew states that “concordancing is a means of accessing a corpus of text to show how any given word or phrase in the text is used in the immediate contexts in which it appears” (1993; 214). By grouping the uses of a particular word or phrase on the computer screen or in printed form, the concordancer shows the patterns in which the given word or phrase is typically used.

Levy defines it as “a collection of all the occurrences of a word, each in its own textual environment together with references and word frequencies” (1990; 178). Chan mentions that “tools developed for mainframes, computers and operating systems for conducting searches for words, or strings within a word, and then, in a matter of seconds, exhaustively listing the occurrences of that word (or string) in the electronic corpus, together with the contexts in which the words or strings occur in the source text” (2002; 1–2). Sinclair clarifies the concordance as “a collection of the occurrences of a word-form, each in its own textual environment. In its simplest form, it is an index. Each word-form is indexed, and a reference is given to the place of each occurrence in a text” (1991; 32). Tribble and Jones describe it as “...in its original sense a concordance is a reference book containing all the words used in particular text or in the works of a particular author, together with a list of the contexts in which each word occurs” (1990; 7).

Although definitions on what a concordance is vary it is obvious that they mean the same thing in their core. As a result, a concordance can simply be defined as a tool that is applicable on computers in order to work on the specific words in various texts that are collected within a corpus. Therefore the analysis of a corpus necessitates the usage of a concordance in a detailed and specific vocabulary study. There are many reasons showing the benefits of using concordances. It would be valuable to explain these reasons in order to represent the utilities of using those.

Krishnamurthy states that by the late 1980s, with the increase in corpus sizes and improvement in computer technology, concordances are now viewed on screen, and single keystrokes allowed users to dictate sub-corpus sampling and sample size, to select single words, word families, or multiword units, to resort concordances to the left or right, to vary the amount of context, to restrict concordances by word class, genre, variety or collocational information (2005; 25). Concordances are the undeniable tools for everyday life of a lexicographer. And it is obvious that concordances help the lexicographers to study on huge amounts of subjects related to vocabulary from a single word to the collocations of it. Besides, now, in the field of pedagogy rapid developments are taking place. In the field of pedagogy, concordances enable learners to view many examples of the same item simultaneously, and make and internalize generalizations about the item in their own way and at their own pace. Retention is improved, confidence is strengthened, and motivation and general linguistic awareness are heightened by such discovery procedures. Teachers can also edit concordances for teaching materials and classroom exercises, for example by deleting key words or elements in the contextual environment. Considering these facts, the great public availability of concordancing software and the realization that smaller user-built corpora are sufficient for many pedagogical purposes have contributed to the popularity of concordancing as learning and teaching tool (Krishnamurthy, 2005; 17). Language teachers can use concordances to produce vocabulary exercises to help their students understand word partnerships. The concordance data can make language facts more explicit by isolating common patterns in authentic language samples, the point of a concordance being to present abundant examples of a word in its usual contexts. By seeing the contexts and collocates, the learners can get a much better idea of the use of the word than they would achieve by merely looking it up in the dictionary.

Furthermore, by drawing students' attention to collocates of the keyword, such kind of a study has considerable potential for expanding student vocabulary (Mudraya 2005; 3).

Concordances are a convenient way of presenting learners with data for analysis, from which they can work out the regularities and patterns associated with selected words (Thornbury, 2002). The purpose of concordances as software programs is to display words or simple grammatical items with their surrounding context (Conrad, 1999; 2).

The usefulness of concordancing for vocabulary and grammar development is noticeable because it facilitates the use of authentic language, makes students more active and independent analyzers of language, and provides empirical evidence about language use (Johns, 1986; 151). A concordance allows users to interact with a selected corpus. When a keyword or phrase is typed, the system will search for and then display occurrences of the word or phrase in its immediate context and allow learners to discover the patterns and adjust their misconceptions by observing extensive naturally occurring examples in real texts. These patterns refer to language rules that are grammatical or lexical. Since a concordance can extract numerous examples of a particular language use, it helps learners discover rules by retrieving instances of similar language use (Sun, 2003; 602).

Nattinger states that guessing vocabulary in context is the most frequent way we discover the meaning of new words (1988; 63). Similarly, Johns (1991; 29) argues that the central justification for using concordance-based materials is that they can help to develop the ability to guess the meaning and use of unknown words from context. It is clear that, corpus-based materials provide more than just vocabulary learning. They provide a rich experience of the language with insights into collocations and contextualized grammatical structures linked to opportunities to develop students' analytical abilities (Thurstun and Candlin, 1998; 277). Moreover, Johns (1991; 14) describes concordancing activities effective for academic reading abilities and writing achievement. Besides, Ketteman describes the use of concordancing in the teaching of EFL as motivating and rewarding (1995; 3-6). Concordancing describes a possible way of having students approach certain language phenomena in an inductive and learner centred way. Concordances give easy and immediate access to typical patterns.

As a result, it is true that "...concordancing gives you a way of seeing patterns in language in use that would remain hidden under other circumstances. Once you have chosen or prepared the software you want to use and have put together a body of texts for study, you have access to a uniquely powerful way of studying language" (Tribble and Jones, 1989; 24). Considering these aspects, concordances are now used worldwide in lexicography and pedagogy for the studies basically dealing with vocabulary most respectively in vocabulary studies.

After deciding on for what purpose the concordancing will be used, it would be beneficial to mention about the types of concordances in brief. Tribble and Jones put forward three main types of concordancing software (1989; 13-14):

1. *Streaming concordancers* are those that read a text line by line and produce concordanced text either to screen, printer or disk as they chunk through the documents you are analyzing. This sort of concordancer is generally not limited to a particular size of text file and is very useful if one is handling files with more than about 50,000 words.
2. *Text-indexers* are those that create an index of your text in one (sometimes lengthy) operation and then permit a large variety of text retrieval activities, including concordancing. This type is very useful if one is dealing with large texts and has fairly sophisticated computing facilities (e.g. an IBM AT compatible and a hard disk).
3. *In-memory concordancers* are the ones which read the whole text into memory and then proceed to operate on it. The third type makes possible a very large set of instant-response operations using the minimum of computing facilities, but is limited in the size of texts it can deal with.

Choosing the type of concordancer that will be used, the next step is to look for the sort of features in texts. Having collected the texts, it is important to decide on what features will be searched for. This depends on whether the designer is dealing with native speaker texts or learner texts. Tribble and Jones in their book categorize texts as learner texts and native speaker texts, and indicate their uses as follows (1989; 22-23):

*Learner texts* are recently being studied. As it has become easier to prepare text



for computerized analysis and as more and more students write directly into a computer, the possibilities for concordance studies of learner language become correspondingly greater. These studies can begin to deal with topics such as those given below:

- Most common misuses of words (misunderstandings)
- Most common inappropriate uses of words (mistakes of style/register)
- Most common lexical errors of particular language groups or levels of learner (source codes identify nationality and level).

*Native speaker texts* traditionally have been the main area for concordance-based research. The concordance provides invaluable information concerning what actually happens in language use and they manipulate very large quantities of data to produce statistically significant samples. It is possible to make an outline of the main types of information that can be obtained by native-speaker text:

- Most common meanings ascribed to particular words
- Most common general contexts for particular words (genre, field)
- Most common immediate collocates (other than fixed phrases and idioms)
- Most common phrase/clump contexts
- The range of vocabulary (type token ratio) used by particular writers or in particular types of text.

In our study, in order to find out the range of vocabulary used by particular writers in various types of texts native speaker texts were used. Here, it would be beneficial to mention briefly about the last item that is the range of vocabulary, in order to comprehend its content.

The range of vocabulary can be understood as one's existing vocabulary size. But, there is a difference between the size of a student's vocabulary and the range of the vocabulary. Vocabulary size refers to the total number of words known, whereas the vocabulary range refers to someone's vocabulary knowledge of a specific topic or theme.

The 'tokens' of a corpus refers to the simple word count, the number of running words in the corpus. The number of 'types' in a corpus refers to the number of different

words in the corpus. These are the words that appear in a word index . Simply defined, every occurrence of a word in a text is called a *token* and the technical term *type* means word as a distinct item in a list (Bloomer, Griffiths and Merrison, 2005; 137-138).

Considering these facts in the perspective of EAP, obtaining the range of vocabulary becomes crucial. Hence, learners are not only expected to know the huge amounts of words but also to know the words related with a specific field that are mostly technical or academic.

#### **2.4 Why to teach technical vocabulary?**

Although technical vocabulary is an important task, it is hard to define what actually technical vocabulary means. While there is considerable research evidence about the nature and coverage of high frequency and academic words, there has been little investigation of technical vocabulary. Mudraya (2005; 2) strictly defines the technical vocabulary as “the vocabulary which is characterized by the absence of exact synonyms, resistance to semantic change, and a very narrow range”. Nation (2001; 18-19) divides vocabulary into four levels as: high frequency words; academic vocabulary; technical vocabulary; and low frequency words.

*“High frequency words are the most frequent 2,000 words of English. And West (1953) called these words a general service vocabulary because they were of use (or service) no matter what the language was being used to do. This vocabulary typically covers around 80% of the running words of academic texts and newspapers, and around 90% of conversation and novels. It includes virtually all of the function words of English (around 176 word families), but by far the majority of high frequency words are content words (Nation, 2001; 13-16). For learners with academic goals, the 570 word family Academic Word List (Coxhead, 2000) is like a specialized extension of the high frequency words. It covers on average 8.5% of academic text, 4% of newspapers and less than 2% of the running words of novels. This vocabulary has been called academic vocabulary (Martin, 1976), sub-technical vocabulary (Cowan, 1974) or semi-technical vocabulary (Farrell, 1990). There has been a lot of discussion and some research on academic vocabulary (Nation and Coxhead, 2001). This vocabulary is common to a wide range of academic fields but is not what is known as high frequency vocabulary and is not technical in that it is not typically associated with just one field. It is however more closely related to high frequency vocabulary than to technical vocabulary. It was thought that the third level of vocabulary, technical words, covered about 5% of the running words in specialised texts, and was made up of words that occurred frequently in a specialised text or subject area but did not occur or were of very low frequency*

*in other fields (Nation, 2001: 18-19). Technical vocabulary is largely of interest and use to people working in a specialized field. The fourth level of vocabulary consists of all the remaining words of English, the low frequency words. There are thousands of these words (Goulden, Nation and Read, 1990) and they typically cover around 5% of the running words in texts.”*

As English has become the *de facto* language of science and commerce, more and more non-English speaking countries start English instruction earlier in their pupils' lives, make English language courses compulsory for increasingly broader segments of their societies, and expand their offerings of subject-matter courses taught exclusively in English for non-English majors at university level (<http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v1n12004/tschirner.htm>). However, vocabulary levels of students still are not appropriate for the increased demand for academic uses of English while studying at university. This has led to the occurrence of many researches on vocabulary teaching and learning, such as teaching technical vocabulary. Knowing technical vocabulary of any field gives the specialists an essential competence on that area. Therefore, the need for the knowledge of technical vocabulary in a specific field is inevitable. With this respect, technical vocabulary can be taught in every level of education, however at universities where more academic studies are carried out, the necessity to teach technical vocabulary cannot be denied. In this study, the technical vocabulary knowledge of the undergraduate students in ELT department is taken as a subject matter since technical vocabulary related with the English language teaching, is an essential factor in the professional lives of the students. What is more students' vocabulary profiles can be used as feedback for the revision of curriculum content?

Teaching English at a university means you are already teaching to adults. And adults learning English bring to the task a mature personality, many years of educational training, a developed intelligence, a determination to get what they want, fairly clear aims, and above all strong motivation to make as rapid progress as possible. An adult is no longer constrained by the obligatory educational system or parental pressure to learn English, so the problems of dealing with conscripts do not exist. Since people choose to be present in an English class, the teacher's task is to utilize and channel his student's motivation so that his specific needs and aims are optimally fulfilled (Brumfit, 1978). And the task of the English teachers who are at an English Language teaching Department is much harder. Moreover in the countries like Turkey, particularly where

English is a foreign, rather than a second language, it is very common for a teacher to be confronted with a group of students in the ELT department who have little existing knowledge of technical terms in English and demand to be taught how to read their books and journals covering the technical terms and words in second language acquisition and methodology classes.

Advanced learners can generally communicate well, having learnt all the basic structures of the language. However, they need to broaden their vocabulary to express themselves more clearly and appropriately in a wide range of situations. Students might even have a receptive knowledge of a wider range of vocabulary, which means they can recognize the item and its meaning. Nevertheless, their productive use of a wide range of vocabulary is normally limited, and this is one of the areas that may need greater attention.

At this stage we are concerned not only with students understanding the meaning of words, but also being able to use them appropriately, taking into account factors such as oral / written use of the language; degree of formality, style and others. Therefore, at first sight, vocabulary does not seem to be a problem for many advanced foreign learners. In fact, their vocabulary range is often greater than that of many native speakers. However the problem lies here is that the preparatory class students in the ELT department, even they are advanced, are not necessarily adequate in identifying and knowing the technical words and collocations related with the second language acquisition and methodology classes that they will take during their education period. They are expected to learn these vocabulary and collocations while they are attending those classes. It is obvious that some of the students have an intake of these, while others just have the input. After the following years they may forget the necessary vocabulary related to the field. Although students mentioned here have a deep knowledge of vocabulary that can serve for their needs and enable them to go on their lives as students, the lack of technical vocabulary causes them to be unsuccessful in those classes and in their academic lives. Both of these classes are central for a learner who is going to be a foreign language teacher. Without the knowledge on these classes a learner can not be successful during the school life and his professional life.

Here the important point is to recognize that these classes cover a special

vocabulary within themselves that can be called as the technical vocabulary. The acquired technical vocabulary also helps the learners in other fields of their academic lives. Grobe (1981; 14) states that in written work, what teachers currently see as good narrative writing is closely linked to vocabulary diversity. Chall suggests that also in reading, it is content knowledge, especially knowledge of word meanings and the rules for their use, that is the key to mastering texts and gaining entry to the culture of literacy (1987; 37). In order to read and understand a text in any field needs vocabulary knowledge with all its rules and usage.

In ESL education, Saville-Troike (1984) sees vocabulary knowledge as the most important aspect of oral proficiency for academic achievement in another language. Likewise, Garcia claims that ESL students' dearth of adequate English vocabulary severely affects their reading comprehension and their academic progress (1991:41). In addition Laufer and Sim (1985) consider vocabulary size as an important predictor of efficient reading and of academic success in general. As it can be inferred from the above, the technical vocabulary of the field enables learners to read and comprehend materials such as: the articles, essays and journals etc. Then this technical vocabulary is not only used in their academic lives in order to be dominant in their field, but also start to serve them in their daily lives too. What the crucial task of the learners who attend the ELT department is to gain much more technical vocabulary within this field.

Therefore, learners in the ELT department are expected to acquire the technical vocabulary during their educational period in university just after they start to take second language acquisition and methodology classes. Yet, students are expected to have the knowledge of technical vocabulary on this field a determination of these vocabulary was needed. And in order to determine the vocabulary a corpus should be created because there is not a specific corpus showing the technical vocabulary of this field. By this respect, it would be possible to check the knowledge of the students on the related issue.

## CHAPTER III

### THE RESEARCH

This chapter includes research method, population and sampling, data and data collection, data collection tool, and data analysis sections.

#### 3.1 Research Method

In this study, during the data collection and analysis are descriptive research methods were used. Since the aim of the study was to create a technical vocabulary corpus for ELT, SLA and methodology classes and to investigate the technical vocabulary profiles of undergraduate students, quantitative research type, which was used for determining information about a given population, was used. Therefore, the data gathered from pre-test and post-test results were statistically analyzed.

#### 3.2 Population and Sampling

The population of this study included 50 fourth year undergraduate students of English Language Teaching Departments at Trakya University. The sample is also the population since the data collection tool was administered to all undergraduate fourth year students of this study was composed of two fourth year undergraduate students (see table 1).

**Table 1:** The subjects

<b>Class</b>	<b>Number of subjects</b>
4-A	<b>24</b>
4-B	<b>26</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>

### A. Data and Data Collection

In order to answer the research questions, the following data collection procedures were applied. For determining technical vocabulary corpus related with the SLA and methodology classes in the field of English Language Teaching, four main resource books -being used during the courses- were selected in advance. The selection was done with informal interview. A list of books determined by the researcher (10 different books by different writers) and then, the lecturer of the course was consulted for a further limitation. She was asked to determine the most frequently used ones and limit the list to four main books. The list of the books chosen is given below (table 2):

**Table 2:** The list of four main resource books

<b>SLA resource books</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freeman L. D. (1986) <i>Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching</i>. OUP</li> <li>• Cook V. (2001) <i>Second Language Learning and Language Teaching</i>. OUP</li> </ul>
<b>Methodology resource books</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brown H. D. (2000). <i>Principles of Language Learning and Teaching</i>. Longman</li> <li>• Richards C. J. and S. T., Rodgers. (2001). <i>Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching</i>. Cambridge University Press</li> </ul>

As a second step, by using optical scanning technique, these four books were downloaded into computer. This data was processed in concordancing program *Concordance 2000*. The data were transmitted to the concordancing program which presents the general word list of those books. Using the frequency list obtained from the concordancer, words related with the field were selected. The technical words in the field were found using, a rating scale, which was adapted from Chung and Nation (2003; 105). Words were classified as being technical or non-technical words by rating them on a four point scale designed to measure the strength of the relationship of words

to a particular specialized field. The scale used was shown in Table 3. Items classified at step Step 1, mostly presents the words such as function words that has no particular relationship with the field. Step 2 includes the words that have meaning minimally related to the field. However, step 3 and 4 were considered to be technical words and items.

**Table 3:** The rating scale for finding technical words

---

### **STEP I**

Words such as function words that have a meaning that has no particular relationship with the field of methodology and language acquisition classes, that is, words independent of the subject matter. Examples of these words are *look, ideas, major, although, involve, real, various, long, support, further, hence, deal, appear, describe, extra..*

---

### **STEP II**

Words that have a meaning that is minimally related to the field of methodology and acquisition classes in that they describe the general characteristics that are used in a language text. Examples of these words are *foreign, information, messages, macro, puberty, strategic, filter, productive, classroom, rote, development, storage, critical, native, goal.*

---

### **STAGE III**

Words that have a meaning that is closely related to the field of methodology and language acquisition classes. Such words are also used in general language. The words may have some restrictions of usage depending on the subject field. Examples of these words are *learning, teachers, English, learner, students, style, level, achievement, proficient, instrument, competencies, process, target, mistake, social.*

---

### **STEP IV**

Words that have a meaning specific to the field of methodology and language acquisition classes and are not likely to be known in general language. These words have clear restrictions of usage depending on the subject field. Examples of these words are *acquisition, bottom-up, background knowledge, code-switching, counseling-learning, discourse analysis, input, interlingual, learner autonomy, linguistic devices, long-term memory, monitoring, multilingual, multi-competence, task-based teaching.*

---

Words at step 3 may have polysemes that occur in general use, and in some



cases occur in general use with little change in meaning. Step 4 includes words like acquisition and code-switching which may be known in other fields but which have a technical flavour.

In order to make sure that the scale could be applied consistently in the present research an inter-rater reliability check was carried out. The researcher's task in the inter-rater reliability check was to assess the degree of specificity of the meaning of the words in the text to the fields. 60 words were randomly chosen to be used for inter-rater reliability. The rater in inter-rater reliability check was also a qualified and experienced specialist who is an expert in the field. In order to ensure the reliability, the specialist was blinded to the study. 60 randomly selected words, 15 from the each of the four steps, were analyzed by the rater independently. This number of words (15) at each step was much greater than the minimum of three needed to establish rating accuracy from four groups at the 0.05 level significance (Rosenthal, 1987; 64). The reliability accuracy score was used to estimate the degree of agreement between the researcher's results and that of the rater's. The degree of agreement of rating at each step of the rating scale was compared in order to find any tendencies of bias at particular steps. Rosenthal (1987; 67) states that "a raw accuracy score of 0.7 is desirable for rating items in four groups". Inter-rater reliability accuracy score calculated by the number of words assigned to the four steps by the rater and by the researcher. As a result of the calculation, we found a 0.96 raw accuracy score which indicated a high reliability (table 4).

**Table 4:** Inter-rater reliability score

Steps chosen By the rater	Steps chosen by the researcher				Total words assigned by the rater
	1	2	3	4	
<b>1</b>	15				<b>15</b>
<b>2</b>		13			<b>13</b>
<b>3</b>			15		<b>15</b>
<b>4</b>		2		15	<b>17</b>
Total words assigned by the researcher	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	Accuracy score = (15+13+15+15)÷60 = 0.96

At this step, a determination of the technical and sub-technical vocabulary belonging to these areas was done to form a technical word list (see App. 1). This process was mostly done by consulting the *Language Teaching and Applied Linguistic Dictionary* (1992). Yet, the researcher used her own knowledge of the field in determining the technical vocabulary as well. Every technical vocabulary was analyzed separately and a list was designed (see App. 2) and their collocations which form a technical term were found. With this regard, the concordancer helped us to find out those collocates and the frequency order of these vocabulary. By taking the frequency order of the data into consideration, a list consisting of eight sub-lists was formed (see App. 3). Each sub-list included 70 word types and 560 words in total ( $70 \times 8 = 560$ ). While sub-list 1 presenting the high frequency words, sub-list 8 presented us the low frequency words that were obtained in the result of the concordancer (see Table 5). The sub-lists were formed by taking the Academic Word List (AWL) as model.

#### ***Data Collection Tool***

In order to investigate the vocabulary profiles of the students a data collection tool was designed by the researcher. At this step a limitation was needed because it was not possible to test such a large amount of vocabulary. The limitation was done by random selection of 7 words and / or their collocations from each sub-list. After the limitation, a total of 56 words were chosen ( $7 \times 8 = 56$ ).

The last step was to design an instrument including the selected 56 technical words to check the technical vocabulary profile of undergraduate students in English Language Teaching Department at Trakya University. The development of the instrument was strictly related with the determination of a corpus via a concordancing program mainly used for the lexical studies enabling to find out the range and frequency of the words.

The instrument as a vocabulary test was designed in accordance with the results of the concordance program. It aimed to assess the students' lexical competence on the level of technical vocabulary recognition. It consisted of 56 fill-in type test items for testing the technical words randomly selected from the eight sub-lists. The test was not

contextualized, but consisted of items assessing the technical vocabulary knowledge. 56 technical vocabulary were given in a separate paper as an answer sheet and the students were asked to read the sentences of which gives the definition of the technical vocabulary in the list and try to find the exact match. All the words chosen as technical vocabulary from 8 sub-lists were presented in the answer sheet randomly.

The answer key of the instrument was prepared by the researcher. 56 technical vocabulary in the list were grouped within their sub-list from 1-8 (*see App.4*). In the process of assessing the learner's ability in the test, the answers were noted related to the sub-lists by dividing those answers into eight groups. For each participant, the correct answers were identified that how many vocabulary was done exactly in each separate sub-list. Then, those correct answers are added in order to determine the percentage of the students' success. Each item was evaluated out of one points and the test was 56 points in total since there were 56 items to be answered in fill-in form.

The pre-test was applied to the undergraduate students in two classes at the same time. Four weeks later, the post-test was applied for making comparison with the pre-test results. The research was completed within Spring semester in 2006-2007 Academic Year.

### **3.4 Data Analysis**

The statistical analysis of the data gathered from the pre-test and post-tests was done by using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) 15.0 for Windows. In relation to research questions, following techniques were used:

1. Four main resource books related with the SLA and methodology classes were scanned on a computer, and analyzed by a concordance program to find out the technical vocabulary of the field. In order to determine technical vocabulary corpus related with those classes in the field of English Language Teaching, the data gathered via a concordancer.
2. A pre-test and a post-test including the 56 technical vocabulary related with the field were assigned to the undergraduate students in order to find out the technical vocabulary profile of under graduate students in English Language

Teaching Department. The reliability of the instrument was questioned via Cronbach Alpha method. After this process in order to achieve reliability elimination was done on the vocabulary list and eight sub-lists within the corpus. *The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test* was used to look for the significance in the normal distribution of the questions in the vocabulary test. Then, *Paired-Samples T Test* was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the pre and post-test results. And lastly, the frequency method was used to determine the technical vocabulary profile of the undergraduate students.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter includes the results of the research questions which were found after concordancing studies and statistical analysis, and the discussion of the findings.

#### 4.1 Results

The results related to each research question were given and discussed separately.

##### 4.1.1 Findings of the first research question

The first question of the study was: “How can technical vocabulary corpus related with the SLA and methodology classes in the field of English Language Teaching be created?”

This question requires creation of a technical vocabulary corpus. In the process of corpus creation the steps in the outline of corpus creation suggested by Sinclair (1991) as mentioned in chapter 2 was followed. With regards to this outline, the following steps were taken:

1. *Text conversion*: Conversion by optical scanning (machine reading) was done since this method can be used if the study will be conducted in an electronic format. It was required to have the material in electronic form since the study would be held on a computer.
2. *Determination of design criteria*: The next step was to determine the design criteria of the corpus. It was important to decide on which lexical items make up the core of professional vocabulary to be studied in university, which is indispensable in future careers of English language teachers. The only way to obtain this was to design a learner-centered corpus that is effective at both academic and professional planes. This was attained, from our perspective on EAP learning, through the compilation of recently published English books in key subject areas. The selection of the books was based on the

required reading lists for subjects on the curriculum at our institution covering specific issues and topics.

3. *Determination of text kind*: The next step followed by the researcher was to pay attention to the components of a corpus to decide on whether they should be written texts or spoken transcripts or both. We selected resource books to be used since the components of the corpus were the written texts. And, these components were in literary form because we were trying to identify the technical words.
4. *Centrality and typicality*: The content of the corpus should mirror the language that is central to it. One of the principle uses of a corpus is to identify what is central and typical in the language. The selection of the texts mirror the aim of our study in the way they are presenting the necessary data for such kind of a study.
5. *Period*: The following step was to consider the period that corpus covered. In this study the corpus covered a specific time to be used. Additions, changes and innovations can be done throughout the time with the occurrence of new resources in the field. Therefore, the designer should follow these innovations and reorganize the corpus that she had determined. When the overall size of the corpus is considered, it was obvious that it should cover large proportions of occurrences. This means that selected text should be interrelated in order to form a whole. By this way, it can serve for the needs of the field.

In the study all these steps were carefully followed to supply the aim of the study.

The type of the corpus was inspired by Sinclair's sample corpora. These kinds of corpora have made it possible for researchers to inspect physically texts of greater length than was previously possible, and to visualize the further possibilities of using longer texts.

In order to answer the first research question, in the light of these steps that were mentioned in the outline of corpus creation, firstly, four main resource books were selected by the researcher and they were scanned on a computer (see Table 2). Then the data was transmitted to a concordancing program aiming to find out the range and the

frequency of the words in those books. As mentioned in data and data collection procedures in chapter 3 in detail, the technical vocabulary of the field was determined by adapting four point rating scale for finding technical words (see Table 3). In order to make sure that the scale could be applied in the study, an inter-rater reliability check was carried out (see Table 4). In the determination of the technical vocabulary, a language teaching and applied linguistic dictionary and the knowledge of the researcher in the field is used. After this step, the technical of the vocabulary was analyzed separately and a list was designed (*see App 2*). The concordance program helped the researcher to find out the collocates and the frequency order of technical vocabulary. The list consisting of eight sub-lists was formed with the help of the previous data. The total number of the words within these eight sub-lists included 560 words (see App 3), yet, after the limitation the total number of those words became 56 which were determined in the light of the frequency order.

As a result of a technical vocabulary corpus related with the SLA and methodology classes in the field of English Language Teaching was created. Table 5 displays the technical vocabulary list within 8 sub-lists.

**Table 5:** Sample corpus in 8 sub-lists

<b>Technical Vocabulary List</b>			
<b>Sub-list 1</b>	<i>f</i> order	<b>Sub-list 2</b>	<i>f</i> order
Acquisition	199	interference	45
Cognitive	171	suggestopedia	41
Competence	132	interlanguage	38
Bilingual	94	code-switching	27
Natural approach	74	contentbased language teaching	27
Discourse	71	inductive	26
task-based language teaching	50	Corpus	19
<b>Sub-list 3</b>		<b>Sub-list 4</b>	
input hypothesis	17	Usage	11
Neurolinguistics	17	Schema	9
cognitive domain	15	decoding	8
acculturation	14	learner autonomy	8
Coherence	15	authentic materials	7
rode-learning	12	bottom-up	7
syllabus design	11	Intake	6
<b>Sub-list 5</b>		<b>Sub-list 6</b>	
illocutionary act	5	self-monitoring	3
deductive reasoning	5	Affective filter hypothesis	3
structural approach	4	UG theory	3
discourse analysis	4	humanistic approach	2
behaviourist theory	4	Coding	4
extrovert learner	4	applied linguistics	3
Peripheral learning	4	information-gap	2
<b>Sub-list 7</b>		<b>Sub-list 8</b>	
consciousness raising	2	Monitor theory	1
Pattern practice	2	counselling-learning theory	1
Concordancing	2	metacognitive strategies	1
Scaffolding	2	constructivist view	1
Metalanguage	2	rhetorical device	1
socio affective	2	Auditory learners	1
Nurture	2	reinforcement theory	1



#### 4.1.2 Findings of the second research question

The second question of the study was: “What is the technical vocabulary profile of under graduate students in English Language Teaching?”

Undergraduate students in ELT department were considered as advanced students. Therefore, they were expected to know the technical vocabulary of the field. After the sample corpus creation, to identify the profile of these students on technical vocabulary of the field, a 56 item fill-in test was designed by selecting equal number of words from each sub-list (see *App 4*). The test was administered twice. The post-test was assigned to the students four weeks after the pre-test.

The subjects were expected to find out the appropriate answers and fill in the blanks. Subjects’ correct responses were marked as 1, and wrong answers were marked as 0. The total number of correct and wrong answers for each sub-list was noted down. The pre and post test results were statistically analyzed by using *Cronbach Alpha* to determine the reliability of the instrument. In table 6 reliability results of pre-test and post-test were shown separately.

**Table 6** Cronbach alpha reliability scores

<b>Results</b>	<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>N of Items</b>
<b>Pre-test</b>	,615	56
<b>Post-test</b>	,688	56

Results indicated that KR-21 was 0.615 for pretest, and 0.688 for the posttest. This result presented a low score of reliability since it was determined that some of the items were not applicable in the instrument. In order to reach a high reliability score the items which were not reliable were eliminated from the data. The list of eliminated words and items were given in table 7.

**Table 7:** List of eliminated words and items

Sub-list	Words	Item number
Sub-list 1	Acquisition	36
	Natural approach	3
Sub-list 2	Suggestopedia	6
	Corpus	10
Sub-list 3	Rote learning	16
	Syllabus design	17
Sub-list 4	Decoding	19
	Learner autonomy	20
Sub-list 5	Illocutionary Act	24
	Discourse Analysis	41
Sub-list 6	Self-monitoring	43
	Applied Linguistics	48
Sub-list 7	Socio-affective	30
	Nurture	29
Sub-list 8	Auditory Learners	33
	Reinforcement Theory	34

The total of 16 words was omitted from the data. The subjects' responses to these items were not taken into consideration. Hence the instrument was reorganized without those questions. After this elimination, a total of 40 words were used (5 words for each sub-list) for further reliability analysis. Cronbach alpha reliability method was

reapplied to both tests. Table 8 represents the results of reliability after this process.

**Table 8:** Cronbach alpha reliability scores after the elimination

Results	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Pre-test	,725	40
Post-test	,733	40

Results displayed the KR-21 as 0.725 for pretest, and 0.733 for the post-test. The results indicated a high range of reliability in those tests ( $KR-21 > .70$ ). Thus, it was possible to consider the instrument as reliable.

After the reliability analysis, the significance of the normal distribution of the test items was sought for via *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test* (see Table 9).

**Table 9:** One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		PRETOT	POSTTOT
N		50	50
Normal Parameters(a,b)	Mean	14,2400	14,3600
	Std. Deviation	4,55605	5,09405
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,105	,082
	Positive	,105	,066
	Negative	-,086	-,082
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		,740	,577
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,645	,893

PRETOT: pre-test total

POSTTOT:post- test total

Values assessed by the analysis of the calculated data indicated a normal test distribution. With respect to the previous analysis the question of “is there a significant difference between the pre and post test results?” should be answered. Within this process, in order to answer this question, the results of the pre/post tests were analyzed by using *Paired-Samples T Test*. The findings were shown in Table 10.

**Table 10:** Statistical Analysis of pre / post tests results

	<b>n</b>	$\bar{X}$	<b>sd</b>	<b>Df</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>Pre-test</b>	50	14.24	4.55	49	-0.323	0.748
<b>Post-test</b>	50	14.36	5.09			

The findings indicated that there was not a significant difference between pre-test and post-test results. The mean value of the post-test was a little higher than that of the pre-test (14.36 (sd= 5.09) and 14.24 (sd= 5.09)). This minimal difference might be caused from the students' prior knowledge of the words that came from the application of the pre-test. With this respect, it was obvious that there was not a significant difference in the results of both tests. The standard deviation of the pre-test was 4.55, while the standard deviation of the post-test was 5.09. As shown in table 10, there was no statistically significant difference between the two means ( $p= 0.748$ ).

The next step was to use the frequency method to identify the number of students who gave correct answers to each word in separate sub-lists, and their percentage. Since no significant difference was found between the pre and post-tests results, the post-test results were used in this analysis. Three success levels were determined to identify the subjects' degree of success. Accordingly, the students who gave 4or 5 correct answers in each sub-list were considered to have high-success. Those who knew 2-3 answers were considered to have medium-success, while others who knew between 0 and 1 have low-success. This degree of success was shown in Table 11.

**Table 11:** The degree of success in separate sub-lists

			Sublists							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Success levels	High	n	16	7	11	2	3	1		2
		%	32	14	22	4	6	2		4
	Medium	n	30	25	30	19	16	19	18	24
		%	60	50	60	38	32	38	36	48
	Low	n	4	18	9	29	31	30	32	24
		%	8	36	18	58	62	60	64	48

As can be understood from table 11, 16 students (%32) had a high-success, 30 students (%60) had a medium success, and 4 students (% 8) had a low-success in sub-list 1. 7 students (%14) had high-success, 25 students (%50) had medium success and 18 students (%36) had low-success in sub-list 2. 11 students (%22) had high-success, 30 students (%60) had medium-success and 9 students (%18) low-success in sub-list 3. 2 students (%4) had high-success, 19 students (%38) had medium-success, and 29 students (%58) had low-success in sub-list 4. 3 students (%6) had high-success, 16 students (%32) had medium-success, and 31 students (%62) had low-success in sub-list 5. 1 student (%2) had high-success, 19 students (%38) had medium success, and 30 students (% 60) had low-success in sub-list 6. No student (%0) had high-success 18 students (%36) had medium-success and 32 students (% 64) had low-success in sub-list 7. Lastly, 2 students (%4) had high-success, 24 students (%48) had medium-success and 24 students (%48) had low-success in sub-list 8.

When the high-success within 8 sub-lists is considered, it is obvious that number of the students in that column showed a variety from 16 to 0. A numeration can be done as: sub-list 1>sub-list 3>sub-list 2>sub-list 5>sub-list 4=sub-list 8>sub-list 6>sub-list 7. This meant that the number of students who had a high-success is the biggest in sub-list

1, and smallest in sub-list 7. In this study all the technical vocabulary were determined by the frequency order obtained by the concordancer program. Hence, sub-list 1 consisted of the most frequent (high-frequency) words, and sub-list 8 of the least frequent (low-frequency) words. Although the students' achievement was expected to be higher in sub-list 1 and lower in sub-list 8, the degree of success was the lowest in sub-list 7.

After this process, students' degrees of success in total were determined via frequency method. By this respect, the degree of success was determined in three parts. Subjects who gave 0-13 correct answers were considered to have low-success, 14-26 to have medium success and 27-40 to have high-success degree related to the technical vocabulary test. The list showing the number and percentage of students within the degree of success are shown below (Table 12).

**Table 12:** The degree of success in total sub-lists

<b>Success</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percentage of Success %</b>
<b>High (27-40)</b>	0	0 %
<b>Medium(14-26)</b>	27	54 %
<b>Low (0-13)</b>	23	46 %

When the results are considered, 23 students -46% of the total class- can be considered to have a low-success in the vocabulary test. While 27 students -54% of the total class- had a medium success in the test, there were not any students who had a high-success in the test. The results indicated that the high percentage of students had a medium-success degree in the vocabulary test (%54). The technical vocabulary profile of undergraduate students related with SLA and methodology classes at Trakya University ELT Department was *medium* with respect to the findings of the study.

## 4.2 Discussion

Returning to the research questions given at chapter 1, it is time to consider our findings in light of the goals of the study.

With respect to the first research question on how can technical vocabulary corpus related with the SLA and methodology classes in the field of English Language Teaching be created was tried to be discussed with regards to the findings of several studies. As was previously mentioned, there were several steps to be taken in order to create a corpus including the technical vocabulary related with SLA and methodology classes.

The first step was the text selection phase, since the texts should be proper to the aim of the study. This means that the texts covering the technical vocabulary related with the field, with a length of 2000 and more were selected. With this regard, four main resource books were selected. Similarly, the texts in AWL (2000) were determined by considering a suitable length (over 2,000 running words) and representativeness of the academic genre in that they were written for an academic audience. Hence, any text not meeting these selection criteria was not included in the academic corpus. The point where AWL and our study differed was that AWL corpus contained various texts taken from journal articles, book chapters, course workbooks, laboratory manuals and course notes, while the corpus in our study was consisted of four main resource books, and not any other kind of texts. Likewise, Mudraya (2005), in her study, aimed to create a corpus for engineering students, however, unlike our study she disregarded the students' field of specialization. The study conducted by Chung and Nation (2003) aimed to examine the nature and amount of technical vocabulary in two quite different technical texts. Hence, in the study different from our study, two distinct texts were selected. Morris and Cobb (2004) examined the potential offered by vocabulary profiles as predictors of academic performance in undergraduate TESL programs and used 300-word samples of students' own writings in their study.

The second step of corpus creation was to find out the technical words related with SLA and methodology classes in ELT department. These technical vocabulary were obtained via a concordancer program (concordance 2000), that determined the

frequency of those words in four resource books. Similarly, in their study Thurstun and Candlin (1998) used a concordancing program *Microconcord Corpus of Academic Texts*, to find out the frequency order of vocabulary. Moreover, other studies conducted by Coxhead (2000), Mudraya (2005), Chujo (2003), Chung and Nation (2003) and, Morris and Cobb (2004), were also designed in accordance with the principle of frequency order of the words.

The next step was to form a list by considering the frequency order. Coxhead (2000) divided the list that he prepared into 10 sub-lists based on the frequency of occurrence of the words in the academic corpus. Similar to that study, we divided the main list into 8 sub-lists based on the frequency order. The number of words in total consisting of 560 word types was large to design an instrument in determining the vocabulary profiles of the subjects. Therefore, the number of words within our corpus was decreased to 56, with 7 different word types in a sub-list. 56 word-types determined for the list representing the technical vocabulary related with a specific field. As mentioned in chapter 4, in order to attain the reliability of the tests some words were eliminated from the list and a total of 40 words were used for profiling.

In his study, Coxhead (2000) used 570 word families, since it was a general corpus. However, the content of the corpus was including the academic words that belong to arts, commerce, law and science faculties. Similarly, Thurstun and Candlin (1998) selected the frequently used words which were common to all fields of academic learning, not attempted to include specialized or technical vocabulary items associated with specific disciplines. The researchers selected 1200 word families or 9000 word-types which were considered to be as technical vocabulary that were compulsory for all engineering students, and those words were not field specific. The study conducted by Chujo (2000) was aiming to compare same kind of coursebooks and qualification tests in order to determine what the vocabulary levels were, and what additional vocabulary were required for students to understand 95% of these materials.

With respect to the second research question, the other aim of this study was to determine the technical vocabulary profile of undergraduate students within two courses; SLA and methodology. With this regard, corpus was used to design an instrument in order to find out this profile. To this end, the instrument was conducted as



pre-test and post-test without any implementation. The reason of neglecting the implementation was to restrict the study within the determination of vocabulary profiles. The focus was not on the effectiveness of corpus on the side of teaching, but on the determination of technical vocabulary profile instead. The pre-test and post-test was consisted of 56 items –technical vocabulary- before the elimination took place in attaining the reliability of the test. Then the items in the test were determined as 40, with included 5 technical words from each sub-list. The pre-test and post-test results were analyzed by using paired sample t-test. The results indicated that there was not a significant difference between the two. The next analysis was done via frequency method by considering the students' degree of success in each separate sub-list. The findings of the frequency analysis indicated the technical vocabulary profile of undergraduate students. When the results were considered sub-list by sub-list it was found that the subjects of this study were more successful in sub-list 1 and least successful in sub-list 7. This might be resulting from the fact that all the technical vocabulary were determined by the frequency order obtained by the concordancer program. Hence, sub-list 1 consisted of the most frequent (high-frequency) words, and sub-list 8 of the least frequent (low-frequency) words. Although the students' achievement was expected to be the highest in sub-list 1 and lowest in sub-list 8, the degree of success was the lowest in sub-list 7. This might mean that the frequency order of technical vocabulary determined via concordancer 2000 within four main resource books might not be similar to those of the students'. These four books might not include the most common words of the field in high frequency range or the least common words of the field in small frequency range, since the technical vocabulary belonging to eight sub-lists were determined via using only these books. The corpus represented the frequency order of the technical vocabulary that took place in those books. The assessment was done related with them. Therefore, the degree of success was assessed parallel to those four resource books. Another, yet related, reason might be that the technical words frequently used and emphasized by the lecturers' might be different from that of the writers. As a result, students might not know those words.

When the students' degrees of success in total were considered we found that the high percentage of the students had a medium-success degree in the vocabulary test (%54). The technical vocabulary profile of the senior undergraduate students was under

the expectations. This might closely be related to the current curriculum. In the 1998 curriculum no specific vocabulary courses exist. Thus, the students were not exposed to the technical vocabulary in the field, and as a result did not have the chance develop their own corpus.

In the studies mentioned so far, the corpora created in those studies were aiming to be used in implementation. This means that, the corpora were used to teach the words determined via a concordance program and the data was used as a material both in and outside the classroom. In contrast, in this study the corpora were not used to teach the vocabulary, but to design an instrument for determining the vocabulary of the specific field.

It would be significant to mention a study which was conducted in Turkey by Anđ (2006). The study, similar to the previously mentioned studies aimed to use the created corpora in teaching the determined vocabulary. In the study, the corpus was used to teach the vocabulary via a concordance program. The pre-test and post-test was assigned to two different groups of subjects. Independent samples t-test analysis had shown that the means of the three measurements of summary writing for the experimental group did not differ significantly from those of the control group. However, the findings indicated that the concordancing helped learners gain awareness of the formulaic academic language used by expert writers, and such activities were needed to be tailored to individual differences through challenging and motivating task design. This study with its focus on implementation was also differed from our study.

With respect to the studies mentioned above, it was obvious that this study had a difference in its aim by creating a corpus including the technical vocabulary related with SLA and methodology classes, and using this corpus to design an instrument in order to determine the technical vocabulary profiles of undergraduate students at ELT departments.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter includes the conclusion based on the findings and interpretations of the study and some suggestions will be proposed.

#### 5.1 Conclusion

The main findings that emerged from the study aiming to create a corpus related with the SLA and methodology classes in ELT department and to find out the technical vocabulary profile of senior undergraduate students in the ELT department can be stated as;

1. The findings indicated that a small sample corpus including the technical vocabulary related with SLA and methodology classes in the field of ELT can be created by using and transferring different written sources on a concordance program presenting all the simple words, frequency order of those words, and the words with their collocations where possible. The created corpus was used as a data to develop an instrument in order to check the vocabulary profiles of undergraduate students within this field.
2. As a result of the vocabulary profile test we found that the senior undergraduate students had a *medium-success* level in recognizing the technical vocabulary in the field. The term medium-success was determined by the researcher to clarify the degree of success during the statistical analysis of the results. That is to say, the results gathered via the instrument designed in the light of the created corpus indicated the vocabulary profiles of these students as middle.
3. During the study the researcher experienced some problems due to different reasons. One of them was to scan four resource books and to transfer them on a concordance program. This was an inevitable, but a very time consuming process. It took several months to complete. The other problem was learning to use the concordance program for a detailed study, since the researcher was not familiar with that kind of a computer program. The process of finding out the technical terms (the words and their collocates forming a technical term) was hard to accomplish because each word / chunk which can be considered as a

technical word was analyzed separately and its left and right collocations are tried to be find out one by one. Another problem was to implement the pre / post tests to the undergraduate students since they were lack of time because of their lessons and projects. Therefore it was hard to set a time for implementing the test. The last problem was to analyze the test items belonging to 8 different sub-lists. It was hard to analyze those because the items were randomly selected and used in the test and the researcher had to identify the results of every separate sub-list for each student.

4. As a result, it can be concluded that creating a small sample corpus including technical vocabulary related with the SLA and methodology classes in the field is possible by using various written sources and a concordance program. And with the help of created corpus it is possible to identify the technical vocabulary profile of the students. The findings indicate that the study was successfully carried out.

## **5.2 Suggestions**

The findings of the study can make it possible to give following suggestions to the academicians, program designers, researchers, and teachers dealing with teaching foreign language and to the ones who are interested in such kind of a subject.

1. The findings of the study should be confirmed by several ways. Our study was restricted with the senior undergraduate students at Trakya University ELT Department. Therefore, the study should be repeated with larger subject groups such as undergraduate students at different universities. It should also be implemented to the students in second or third classes of that field.
2. In addition to four resource books used in the study, various written or spoken resources should be used to create a corpus of technical vocabulary. All the resource books, articles, essays should be used as written resources and the conversations converted into written form should be used as spoken resources in order to achieve the authenticity.
3. Researchers aiming to create a corpus on that field should learn how to use a concordance program in order to find out effective and valid results. These

programs give an opportunity to conduct a detailed study and make the hardest work possible especially in the fields based on vocabulary.

4. Any other concordancer should be used to identify this vocabulary since there are many kinds available to the researchers.
5. In this study there was not a teaching phase Therefore, an implementation between the pre-test and post-test can be done if the aim of the researcher is to teach the technical vocabulary of the field.
6. Further comparative studies on that field are also required. The technical vocabulary of other fields -except from SLA and methodology classes- related with ELT should be compared. Also a much larger corpus should be created including all the technical vocabulary related with ELT.
7. Researchers should keep in mind that creating a corpus for determining the technical vocabulary has many opportunities. Detailed studies on vocabulary or grammar can be done. The corpus could not only be used to determine the technical vocabulary or grammar profile of the students but also to design classes with those fields. Many vocabulary and grammar exercises can be done with the help of concordancers.

When concordancing is used in the classroom, it eases the work of the teacher and puts the responsibility to the side of students. And it enables to make various studies outside the classroom. As a result the data gathered via corpus can also be used as a resource for the teachers and researchers who are willing to work on that field both in and outside the classroom environment.

It is obvious that, the most immediate implication arising from the results of the researches mentioned so far was that technical vocabulary should be given more attention in the ESP classroom. As a conclusion, the integration of the lexical approach with a corpus linguistic methodology can enrich the learners' language experience and raise their language awareness, bringing out the research in them (Mudraya, 2005:1). That is to say, the growing field of corpus linguistics offers much more for

teachers who want to understand language use and design effective materials for their students. In fact, even if teachers do not have computer expertise or computer facilities in their schools, corpus-based studies can be valuable resources for them.

## **REFERENCES**

- Aijmer, K., Altenberg, B. (eds), (1991): *English Corpus Linguistics: Studies In Honour of Jan Svartvik*. London: Longman
- Allen, F. A. (1983): *Techniques in Teaching Vocabulary*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Anđ, F. (2006): *Effectiveness of Corpus Consultation through Concordancing on the Formulaic Academic Language Use of Freshman ELT Students* (Boğaziçi University Institution of Social Sciences-published master thesis)
- Aston, G. (1995): "Corpora in language pedagogy: matching theory and practice", in Cook, G., Seidlhofer, B. (Eds), *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aston, G. (1996): "The British National Corpus as a Language Learner Resource". Paper presented at the second conference on Teaching and Language Corpora, Lancaster University, UK, <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/using/papers/aston96a.htm>.
- Aston, G. (2000): "Rethinking language pedagogy from a corpus perspective: Papers from the third International Conference on Teaching and Language Corpora", in. Burnard, L.and. McEnery, T. (Eds.) *Corpora and language teaching*. Hamburg: Peter Lang.
- Bernardini, S. (2004): "Corpora in the classroom: An overview and some reflections on future developments", in Sinclair, J. (Ed.), *How to use corpora in language teaching*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bloomer, A., Griffiths, P., Merrison, J. A. (2005): *Introducing Language In Use. A Coursebook*, London: Routledge..
- Brown H. D. (2000): *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, London: Longman.
- Brumfit,C.J. (1978): *Teaching English As a Foreign Language*, UK: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Carter.R. (1998): *Vocabulary: Applied Linguistic Perspectives*, London: Routledge.
- Carter, R., McCarthy, M. (1988): *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*, London: Longman.
- Carter, R. (2000): *Vocabulary: Applied Linguistic Perspectives*, London: Collins, 2nd edition.
- Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (1988): *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*, New York: Longman
- Chall, J.S (1987): "Two vocabularies for reading : Recognition and meaning" in McKeown, M.G. and Curtis, M.E (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.



- Chan, K.M. (2002): "Concordancers and concordances: Tools for Chinese language teaching and research," *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association* 37.2 (2002).
- Chen, Y.H. (2004): "The Use of Corpora in the Vocabulary Classroom." <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Chen-Corpora.html> *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. X, No. 9, September 2004
- Chujo, K. (2003): "Measuring Vocabulary Levels of English Textbooks and Tests Using a BNC Lemmatised High Frequency Word List, English Corpora under Japanese Eyes" *Language and Computers*, pp. 231-249
- Chujo, K., Utiyama, K. (2006): "Selecting Level-Specific Specialized Vocabulary Using Statistical Measures", *System*, 34 (2), pp.255-269
- Chung, T., Nation, P. (2003): "Technical Vocabulary in Specialized Texts" *Reading in a Foreign Language*, Volume 15, Number 2.
- Coady, J., Huckin, T. (eds) (1997): *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition. A Rationale for Pedagogy*, USA: Cambridge University Press:
- Cobb, T. (1997): "Is there any measurable learning from hands-on concordancing?" *System* 25, 301-315.
- Cobb, T. (1999): "Breadth and Depth of Lexical Acquisition with Hands-on Concordancing," *CALL Journal* 12 (4), pp. 345-360.
- Conrad, S.M. (1999): "The importance of corpus-based research for language teachers," *System* 27.1-18.
- Cook V. (2001): *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*, London: OUP
- Cowie, A.P. (1988): "Stable and Creative Aspects of Vocabulary Use", in: Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (eds). *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*, 126-137. England: Longman.
- Coxhead, A. (2000): "A new academic word list", *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 213-238.
- Crystal, D. & Davy, D. (1975): *Advanced Conversational English*, London: Longman Group Limited:
- Daniel, K. (2003): "Corpus Linguistics: What It Is and How It Can Be Applied to Teaching," *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. IX, No. 3, March 2003
- Demirel, Özcan (2003): *Yabancı Dil Öğretimi*, Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık
- Fan, M. (2003): "Frequency of Use, Perceived Usefulness, and Actual Usefulness of Second Language Vocabulary Strategies: A Study of Hong-Kong Learners," *The Modern Language Journal* 87,ii. America: University of Wisconsin.

- Flowerdew, J. (1991): "Corpus-Based Course Design", in Milton, J.C. and Tong, K. (eds) *Text Analysis in Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31-43. Hong Kong: The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology and the City Polytechnic of Hong Kong
- Flowerdew, J. (1993): "Concordancing as a tool in course design" *System* 21(2): 213-29.
- Flowerdew, L. (1998): "Concordancing on an Expert and Learner Corpus for ESP," *CALL Journal* 8 (3), 3-7.
- Francis, W. N. (1963): *Word-making: some sources of new words. In the English language: an introduction*, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- Francis, W.N., Kucera, H. (1964): "Brown Corpus Manual: Manual Of Information to Accompany. A standard Corpus of Present- Day Edited American English, for use with digital computers", *Internet: <http://khnt.hit.uib.no/icame/manuals/brown/> INDEX. HTM*
- Francis, W. N (1992): "Language corpora B.C.", in: Svartvik, Jan (ed.): *Directions in Corpus Linguistics. Proceedings of Nobel Symposium 82, Stockholm, 4-8 August 1991 (= Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 65)*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter 17-32.
- Freeman L. D. (1986): *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*, Oxford: OUP.
- Fries, C.C. (1945): *Teaching and Learning English - As a Foreign Language*, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Galina, K. Violeta, J. (2001): "Using the Lexical Approach for the Acquisition of ESP Vocabulary," *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. VII, No. 3, March 2001.
- Garcia, G. (1991): "Factors influencing the English reading test performance of Spanish- speaking Hispanic students" *Reading Research Quarterly*.
- Gavioli, L. ( 2005): *Exploring Corpora for ESP Learning*, Amsterdam. NLD: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ghadessy, M. (2001): *Small corpus studies and ELT. Theory and Practice*, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gleason, H. A. (1961): *An introduction to descriptive linguistics*, New York: Henry Holt, 372
- Granger, S., Hung, J. and Petch-Tyson, S. (Eds.) (2002): *Computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Granger, S. (2003): "The International Corpus of Learner English: a new resources for foreign language learning and teaching and second language acquisition research." *TESOL Quarterly* 37, 538-546.
- Grobe, C. (1981): "Syntactic maturity, mechanics, and vocabulary as predictors of quality ratings. Research in the teaching of English" in *Teaching of English* 15, 75-88.
- Hanson-Smith, E. (1993): "Dancing with concordances," *CAELL Journal* 4, 40.
- Harmer, J. (1991): *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, Essex: Longman.
- Hasselgard, H. (2001): "Corpora and their use in research and teaching," Retrieved from <http://folk.uio.no/hasselg/UV-corpora.htm>.
- Hill, J. (1999): "Collocational competence" *English Teaching Professional*, 11, pp. 3-6.
- Holmes, J. (1998): "Doubt and Certainty in ESL Textbooks," *Applied Linguistics* 9 (1), 21-44.
- Hunston, S. (2002): *Corpora in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johns, T. (1986): "Micro-concord: a language learner's research tool," *System* 14,151.
- Johns, T. (1991): "Should you be persuaded: Two examples of data-driven Learning. Classroom Concordancing," *English Language Research Journal*, 4:1-16.
- Johns, T. (1991): "From printout to handout," *ELT Journal*, 4, 27-46.
- Jullian, P. (2000): "Corpus," *ELT Journal Volume 54/1*, Massachusetts: Oxford University Press.
- Kavaliauskiene, G. and Janulevieiene, V. (2001): "Using the Lexical Approach for the Acquisition of EDP Vocabulary," *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. VII, No. 3.
- Kennedy, G. (1992): "Preferred ways of putting things with implications for language teaching", in Svartvik, J. (Ed.), *Directions in corpus linguistics*. Proceedings of Nobel Symposium 82, Stockholm, 4-8 August 1991 (pp. 335-378). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kettemann, B. (1995): "Concordancing in Stylistics Teaching", in Grosser, W., Hogg, J. and Hubmayer, K. (eds.), *Style: Literary and Non-Literary. Contemporary Trends in Cultural Stylistics*. New York, 307-318.
- Kirkgöz Y. (2007): "Designing a Corpus Based English Reading Course for Academic Purposes," *The Reading Matrix*, December.

- Kjellmer, G. (1987): "Aspects of English Collocations", in Meijs, W. (ed), *Corpus Linguistics and Beyond*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 133-140.
- Kojic-Sabo, I., Lightbown, P. (1999): *The Modern Language Journal*, 83 ii. America: University of Wisconsin.
- Krashen, S., and Terell, T.D. (1983): *The Natural Approach, Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. New Jersey: Press Regents Prentice Hall.
- Krishnamurthy, R. (2005): "Corpus Lexicography", in K. Brown (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd Ed, Vol. 3, Oxford: Elsevier, 250-254.
- Kucera and Francis, W.N. (1967): *Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English*. Providence, America: Brown University Press.
- Laufer, B. and Sim, D.D. (1985): "Measuring and explaining the threshold needed for English for Academic Purposes texts", *Foreign Language Annals*, 18, 405-413.
- Leech, G. (1997): "Teaching and language corpora: A convergence", in. Wichmann, A., Fligelstone, S., McEnery, T. and Knowles, G. (Eds.), *Teaching and language corpora* New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1-23.
- Levy, M. (1990): "Concordances and their integration into a word-processing environment for language learners", *System* 18(2):177-188.
- Lewis, M. (1993): *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and the way forward*, England: Language Teaching Publications.
- Lewis, M. (1997a): *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*, England: Language Teaching Publications.
- Lewis, M. (1997b): "Pedagogical implications of the lexical approach", in Coady, J. and Huckin, T. (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 255-270.
- Lewis, M. (2002): *The Lexical Approach. The State of ELT and a Way Forward*, Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Marjorie K., Chan, M. (2002): *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, Volume 37:2. May 2002. Pages 1-58.
- McArthur and McArthur (1992): *The Oxford Companion to the English Language, A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, Oxford: Blackwell, 3rd Edition.
- McCarthy, M. (2004): *Touchstone: From Corpus to Course Book*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mc Enery, T and. Wilson, A. (1996): *Corpus Linguistics*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Meyer, C. (2002): *English Corpus Linguistics*, Port Chester, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, L., Cobb, T. (2003): "Vocabulary Profiles as Predictors of the Academic Performance of Teaching English as A Second Language Trainees" [www.elsevier.com/locate/system.]
- Mudraya, O. (2005): "Engineering English: A Lexical frequency instructional model", The American University. Published by *Elsevier Ltd*.
- Nation, P. (1990): *Teaching and Learning vocabulary*, New York: Newbury House Publishers.
- Nation, P. (2001): "Using Small Corpora to Investigate Learner Needs" in *Small Corpus Studies and ELT*, Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nattinger, James R. and DeCarrico Jeanette S. (1992): *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nattinger, J. (1988): "Some current trends in vocabulary teaching", in Carter & McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary and language teaching*, New York: Longman.
- Nunan, D. (1997): *Language Teaching Methodology*, New York: Prentice Hall.
- Partington, A. (1998): *Patterns and Meanings: Using Corpora for English Language Research and Teaching*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Renouf, A. (1987): "Corpus Development" in Sinclair, J. M. (Ed) 1987.
- Reppen, R. (2001): "Elementary student writing development: Corpus-based perspectives" in Simpson, R. and Swales, J. (eds) *Corpus Linguistics in North America: selections from the 1999 Symposium*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 211-225.
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2001): *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J., Platt, H. (1992): *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, England: Longman.
- Rosenthal, R. (1987): *Judgment studies: Design, analysis, and meta-analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1984): "What really matters in second language learning for academic achievement?" *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 199-219.
- Schmitt, N. (1998): "Tracking the Incremental Acquisition of Second Language Vocabulary: A Longitudinal Study" in *Language Learning* 48, America: University of Michigan.

- Scrievener, J. (1994): *Learning Teaching*, Oxford: Macmillan .
- Sinclair, J.M. (1987): *Looking Up: An Account of the COBUILD Project in Lexical Computing*, London: Collins.
- Sinclair, J. and Renouf, A. (1988): “A lexical syllabus for language learning”, in Carter, R. and McCarthy, M., *Vocabulary and language teaching*. London: Longman, 140–58.
- Sinclair, J. (1991): *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. (2004): *How to Use Corpora in Second Language Teaching*, Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Stevens, V. (1995): “Concordancing with language learners: Why? When? What?” *CAELL Journal* 6, 2-10.
- Sun, Y. (2003): “Learning process, strategies and web-based concordances: a case study” *British Journal of Educational Technology*, Vol 34 No 5. 601-613.
- Taylor, M. (1991). “Discovering concordancing” *CAELL Journal* 2, 25-26.
- Thornbury, S. (2002): *How to Teach Vocabulary*, England: Longman.
- Thurstun, J., Candlin, N.C (1998): “Concordancing and the Teaching of the Vocabulary of Academic English” *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol. 17, No.3, 267-280.
- Tribble, C., Jones, G. (1990): *Concordances in the Classroom*. Harlow: Longman.
- Qiao, H., Sussex, R., (1996): “Using the Longman Mini- Concordancer on tagged and parsed corpora, with specific reference to their use as an aid to grammar learning.” *System* 24, 41-64.
- Qian, D. (2002): “Investigating the Relationship Between Vocabulary Knowledge and Academic Reading Performance: an Assessment Perspective” in *Language Learning* 52:3, America: University of Michigan.
- Wesche, Marjorie and Parikbakht, Sima. (2000): “Reading-based Exercises in Second Language Vocabulary Learning: an Introspective Study” in *Modern Language Journal*. America: University of Wisconsin.
- Willis, D., Willis, J. (1989): *Collins COBUILD English Course, Books 1-3*. London: Collins.
- Wilkins, D. (1972): *Linguistics in Language Teaching*, London: Edward Arnold.
- <http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v1n12004/tschirner.htm> 1.12.2006.

# **APPENDICES**

**App. 1:** The List of technical and sub-technical vocabulary

<b>WORDS</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>
Second Language	879
Language Teaching	669
Language	638
Use	617
Language Learning	471
First Language	304
Vocabulary	285
Pattern Practice	279
Foreign Language	263
Language Acquisition	255
Acquire	239
Target Language	228
Goals	228
Techniques	227
Reading	219
Linguistic	211
Speech	208
Communicative	203
Syllabus	201
Pronunciation	200
Approach	194
L2	185
Acquisition	184
Writing	176
structure	173
View	173
Cognitive	171
L2 Learning	159
Instruction	159
SLA	158
Strategies	157
Errors	157
Native Language	144
Listening	142
Interaction	140
Competence	132
Exercises	124
Language Learners	122
Speaking	122
Linguist	122



Messages	103
Objectives	100
Input	97
Communicative Language	95
Bilingual	94
Teaching Methods	90
Models	90
L2 Learners	89
Task	89
Curriculum	88
Communicative Approaches	84
Performance	80
Methodology	80
Oral	78
Feedback	78
Theories	76
TPR	75
Natural Approach	74
L2 Users	71
Discourse	71
Styles	70
Phonemes	68
Direct Method	67
Mistakes	67
Drill	65
Lexical	64
Authentic	60
Transfer	59
Learning Process	56
Communicative Competence	56
Language teachers	53
ESL	47
EFL	47
Audiolingual	46
Morphemes	46
Comprehension	45
Interference	45
Situational Language Teaching	44
Phonetic	44
Aptitude	43
Grammar Translation Method	43
Audiolingualism	42
Fluency	42
Language Use	42
Suggestopedia	41

Accent	40
Pedagogical	40
Self-esteem	39
Audiolingual Method	38
Monitor	38
Interlanguages	38
Grammar Translation Method	36
Contrastive	36
Community Language Learning	35
Language Learning Theory	35
Content-based	35
Monolinguals	35
Spoken Language	34
Learners' needs	34
Evaluation	34
Language skills	33
Accuracy	33
Teaching Techniques	32
Communication Strategies	32
Imitation	32
Learning Strategies	31
Laterilization	30
Language Instruction	30
Assessment	29
Language Learning Tasks	28
TBLT	28
Comprehensible Input	27
Codeswitching	27
Syntax	27
Communicative Teaching	26
Inductive	26
Phonetics	26
Cooperative Learning	25
Interactive	25
Perception	25
Behaviorist	25
Retention	24
Multilingual	24
Collocation	24
Consonants	23
Oral Approach	23
Task-based Language Teaching	22
Teaching Styles	22
Strategic Competence	22
Language Input	22
Audiolingual Style	22
Critical	22

Pragmatic	22
Stimulus	22
Teaching Materials	21
Teaching Activities	21
Instructional Materials	21
Notions	21
Task based Language Learning	20
Grammatical Structures	20
Reinforcement	20
CAH	20
English Language	19
Teaching Style	19
Task-based	19
Immersion	19
Corpus	19
Linguistic Theory	18
Linguistic System	18
Intelligences	18
Output	18
Competency-based	18
CBLT	18
Semantic	18
Language Development	17
Learning Activities	17
Lexical Approach	17
Writing System	17
Input Hypothesis	17
Role-play	17
Idiosyncratic	17
Neurolinguistics	17
Multiple Intelligences	16
Humanistic	16
Deductive	16
Counseling-learning	16
Chunks	16
Consonant	16
Surface	16
VOT	16
Vowel	16
L2 Teaching	15
Cognitive Domain	15
Cognitive Process	15
Affective Domain	15
Affective Factors	15
Theme-based	15
Coherence	15
Written Language	14

Teaching Approaches	14
Acquisition Process	14
Cognitive Strategies	14
Intrinsic	14
Acculturation	14
Culture Learning	13
Communicative Function	13
Linguistic Forms	13
Affective Filter	13
Cognates	13
Fossilization	13
Long-term	13
Short-term	13
Eclecticism	13
Learning Experience	12
Learning Method	12
Learning Styles	12
Rote learning	12
L2 Acquisition	12
Linguistic Competence	12
Listening Comprehension	12
Integrative Motivation	12
CL	12
Morphology	12
Multi-competence	12
Overgeneralization	12
Self-correction	12
Cohesion	12
Listening-based	11
Naturalistic	11
Language Proficiency	11
Linguistic Features	11
Authentic Language	11
Adult Learners	11
L2 Use	11
Language Practice	11
Writing Skills	11
Syllabus Design	11
Student-teacher Interaction	11
Counseling	11
Sociolinguistics	11
Problem-solving	11
Introversion	11
Psycholinguistics	11
Usage	10
Language Theory	10
Communicative Activities	10

Foreign culture	10
Academic Knowledge	10
Background Knowledge	10
Content Words	10
Language Content	10
Consciousness	10
Student-student Interaction	10
Behavioral	10
Prescriptive	10
Stimulus-response	10
Language Structure	9
Competency-based Language Teaching	9
Language Learning Theories	9
Schema	9
Metacognitive Strategies	9
Deviation	9
Dichotomy	9
ESP	9
Prepositions	9
TBI	9
Innate	9
Language Pedagogy	8
Autonomous Learning	8
Communicative Goals	8
Social Interaction	8
Affective Feedback	8
Arbitrary	8
Decoding	8
Meaning-based	8
Modal	8
Phonemic	8
Storage	8
Classroom based language Teaching	8
Task Instruction	7
Advanced Learners	7
Language Competence	7
Learning Experiences	7
Language Learning Objectives	7
Language Learning style	7
Communicational Activities	7
Sociolinguistic Competence	7
Authentic Materials	7
Critical Thinking	7
Constructivist	7
Bottom-up	7
CLI	7
Declarative	7

Descriptive	7
Grammar-based	7
Pronoun	7
Lexis	7
Linguistically	7
Language Curriculum	6
Language Learning Skills	6
Audiolingual Teaching	6
Task-based Teaching	6
Communicative Method	6
Cross-linguistic	6
Positive Reinforcement	6
Top-down	6
Behaviorism	6
Copula	6
Higher-order	6
Intake	6
Intercultural	6
Learner-centered	6
Pretask	6
Cognitive-code	6
Interim+grammar	6
Multiculturalism	6
Task-based Approach	6
Activities based	6
Group Activities	6
Linguistic Principles	6
Linguistic Structures	6
Grammatical Competence	6
Cognitive Psychologists	6
Cognitive Development	6
Reading Comprehension	6
Reading Skills	6
Language Education	5
Language Learning Principles	5
Conscious Learning	5
Content-based Teaching	5
Communicative Strategies	5
Learner Strategies	5
Native like	5
Interactional Activities	5
Deductive Reasoning	5
Interlingual Transfer	5
Follow-up	5
CBE	5
Field-dependent	5
Holistic	5

Imperatives	5
Illocutionary acts	5
Minority-language	5
Notional-functional	5
SBI	5
Self-evaluation	5
Synonymous	5
Macro-skills	5
Vocabulary Selection	5
Grammatical Knowledge	5
Language Knowledge	5
Linguistic Knowledge	5
Linguistic Devices	5
Cognitive Code	5
Collaborative Learning	4
Peripheral Learning	4
Language Awareness	4
Communicative Skills	4
Learner Autonomy	4
Functional Approach	4
Situational Approach	4
Structural Approach	4
Cognitive Process	4
Communicative Process	4
Interaction Activities	4
Behaviorist Theory	4
Explicit/Implicit Knowledge	4
Learning outcomes	4
Linguistic Development	4
Background Information	4
Intrinsic Motivation	4
Materials based	4
Material Development	4
Linguistic Content	4
Audiolingual Drills	4
Discourse Analysis	4
Discourse Competence	4
Discourse Level	4
Language Performance	4
Monitor Hypothesis	4
Autonomy	4
Intralingual	4
Intralingual Transfer	4
Interlingual	4
Information-gap	4
Extrovert	4
Aural-oral	4

CALP	4
Coding	4
Field-independent	4
Audio-Visual	4
MLAT	4
Structuralism	4
Vocabulary Lists	3
Learning Goals	3
Language Function	3
Young Learners	3
Communicative View	3
Audio-visual Method	3
Acquisition Theory	3
Learning Materials	3
Applied Linguistics	3
Linguistic Information	3
Affective Filter Hypothesis	3
Monitor Model	3
Metacognitive Intelligence	3
PPP	3
Structuralist	3
Acquisition/learning	3
Audiolingualists	3
Internalization	3
MLA	3
RP	3
Multisensory Activities	3
Process-oriented	3
Self-monitoring	3
SLT	3
Structural-situational	3
TESOL	3
Text-based	3
TL	3
TOEFL	3
Multiple Intelligences Model	3
Lexical Collocations	3
Lexical Usage	3
Writing Tasks	3
Self-directed Learning	3
Comprehension Approach	3
Comprehension Activities	3
Task-based Activities	3
SLA Theory	3
UG Theory	3
Listening Tasks	3
Cognitive Structures	3



Speaking Skills	3
Content-based Approach	2
Humanistic Approach	2
Reading-based Approach	2
Notional-functional Approach	2
Communicative Task	2
Communicative Techniques	2
Task-based Methods	2
Natural Acquisition	2
Discourse Acquisition	2
L2 Stages	2
Analytical Approach	2
Academic Language	2
Effective Language Learning	2
Competitive Learning	2
Cognitive Theory	2
Educational Theory	2
Psychological Theory	2
Schema Theory	2
Structural Theory	2
Follow-up Activities	2
Information-gap Activities	2
Problem-solving Activities	2
Process Information	2
Process Writing	2
Implicit Response	2
Interactive Communication	2
Metacognitive Background	2
Inductive Approach	2
Inductive Reasoning	2
Concordancing	2
Conditioned response	2
Consciousness-raising	2
Context-embedded	2
Reading Task	2
Task based	2
Task Cycle	2
Culture Acquisition	2
Cognitive Models	2
Process Writing	2
Illocutionary Competence	2
Textual Competence	2
Auditory Input	2
Learner Input	2
Learning Competencies	2
Linguistic Appropriateness	2
Linguistic Context	2

Linguistic Functions	2
Interaction Hypothesis	2
Interaction Skills	2
Listening Skill	2
Top-down Listening	2
Language Discourse	2
Critical Stage	2
Context-reduced	2
Contextualizing	2
Corpus-based	2
Learner-generated	2
Information-processing	2
LSP	2
Intrinsic-extrinsic	2
Metalanguage	2
Nurture	2
Open-ended	2
Multiple-slot activities	2
Pattern-practice	2
Perlocutionary acts	2
Portfolios	2
Scaffolding	2
Skills-based	2
Socioaffective	2
Transformational Generative Linguistics	2
Topic-based	2
Strategies-based	2
Strategy-training	2
Structure-based	2
ESL Learners	2
Visual Learners	2
Content Selection	2
Teaching Strategies	2
Learners' competence	2
Vocabulary Teaching	2
Unconditioned Response	1
Lexical Analysis	1
Lexical Patterns	1
Functional View	1
Behaviorist View	1
Counseling-learning View	1
Critical Questioning	1
Acquisition-promoting Content	1
Syllabus based	1
Language Corpora	1
Language Counselor	1
Language Task	1

Language Usage	1
Teaching Cycle	1
Teaching ideologies	1
Teaching Outcomes	1
Communicational Teaching	1
English-Language Teaching	1
Foreign-language Teaching	1
Integrated Teaching	1
Listening-based Teaching	1
Textbook-oriented Teaching	1
Learners' awareness	1
Auditory Learners	1
Extrovert Learners	1
Foreign Learners	1
Monitor Theory	1
Schemata Theory	1
Structuralinguistic Theory	1
Vocabulary Frequency	1
Vocabulary Range	1
Vocabulary Strategies	1
Audiolingual Theory	1
Cognitive-code Theory	1
Constructivist Theory	1
Counseling-learning Theory	1
Humanistic Theory	1
Linguistic Input	1
Linguistic Intelligence	1
Linguistic Tasks	1
Material Adaptation	1
Psychological Strategies	1
Socioaffective Strategies	1
Sociolinguistic Strategies	1
Aural-oral Materials	1
Listening-based Materials	1
Reading Methods	1
Monolingual Competence	1
Suggestopedic Method	1
Acquisition Strategies	1
Grammatical Acquisition	1
Vocabulary Acquisition	1
L2 Strategies	1
Computer assisted Language Learning	1
Content-based Language Teaching	1
Literary Language Teaching	1
Naturalistic Language	1
Theme-based Language Teaching	1
Aural-oral Approach	1

Cognitive Approach	1
Content-centered Approach	1
Instructional Approach	1
Integrated Approach	1
Lexis-based Approach	1
PPP Approach	1
Skill-based Approach	1
Structuralist Approach	1
Structure-based Approach	1
Theme-based Approach	1
Cognitive-code Learning	1
Role-play Activities	1
Deductive Learning	1
Organizational Competencies	1
Interactive Language	1
Metacognitive	1
Metacognitive Performance	1
Constructivist Model	1
Constructivist Perspectives	1
Constructivist View	1
Intralingual Effects	1
Intralingual Factors	1
Intralingual Strategies	1
Interlingual Interference	1
Notional	1
Reinforcement Theory	1
Interlanguage Analysis	1
Interlanguage Hypothesis	1
Punitive Reinforcement	1
Innate Capacities	1
Inductive Learning	1
Learners Output Hypothesis	1
Deductive Thinking	1
Acculturation Factor	1
Psychomotor Tasks	1
Rhetorical Devices	1
Action-based drills	1

**App. 2:** The List of Total Technical Words

<b>Head word</b>	<b>Occurences</b>	<b>High frequency words</b>
Language	5243	1
Learning	1977	2
Teaching	1606	3
Learners	956	4
Use	741	5
Teachers	621	6
English	768	7
Communicative	521	8
Learner	481	9
Method	511	10
Acquisition	477	11
L2	474	12
Approach	450	13
Languages	439	14
Native	437	15
Activities	344	16
Methods	332	17
Learn	331	18
Foreign	325	19
Theory	325	20
Process	309	21
Principles	300	22
Vocabulary	298	23
Knowledge	280	24
Practice	279	25
Course	282	26
Target	279	27
Linguistic	278	28
Information	274	29
Strategies	261	30
Task	246	31
Materials	243	32

Approaches	240	33
Culture	228	34
Reading	236	35
System	223	36
Skills	221	37
cognitive	213	38
Writing	209	39
Speech	208	40
Competence	203	41
Style	213	42
Level	202	43
Pronunciation	200	44
Content	195	45
structure	185	46
Techniques	183	47
View	180	48
context	179	49
Syllabus	179	50
Listening	174	51
Instruction	168	52
Natural	167	53
Input	166	54
Needs	163	55
SLA	161	56
Structures	161	57
Errors	157	58
Goals	152	59
Social	151	60
Situation	149	61
Interaction	141	62
functions	128	63
Response	125	64
Speaking	125	65
Styles	123	66
Motivation	123	67
Affective	121	68
Activity	119	69

Memory	116	70
Objectives	107	71
Behaviour	105	72
Oral	103	73
Audiolingual	102	74
Linguists	102	75
Procedures	97	76
stages	97	77
Production	93	78
Models	92	79
Processing	90	80
Design	89	81
Case	89	82
Lexical	89	83
Applied	88	84
Structural	87	85
Goal	87	86
Discourse	87	87
Feedback	86	88
Comprehension	85	89
Performance	85	90
Acquire	84	91
Acquiring	82	92
Curriculum	80	93
Authentic	78	94
Task-based	78	95
Technique	78	96
Communicate	77	97
Theories	77	98
Cultural	75	99
Training	75	100
Situational	72	101
Functional	69	102
Exercises	68	103
Transfer	68	104
Acquired	67	105
Methodology	67	106

Mistakes	67	107
Drill	65	108
Notion	64	109
Conscious	63	110
Views	63	111
Cooperative	62	112
Designed	61	113
Background	60	114
Critical	59	115
Exercise	56	116
Message	56	117
Linguistics	50	118
ESL	49	119
Observations	48	120
Messages	47	121
EFL	47	122
Morphemes	46	123
Bilingual	45	124
Comprehensible	45	125
Interference	45	126
Aptitude	43	127
Phonemes	43	128
Audiolingualism	42	129
Fluency	42	130
Accent	40	131
Pedagogical	40	132
Self-esteem	39	133
Intelligences	38	134
Integrative	37	135
Suggestopedia	37	136
Contrastive	36	137
Rote	36	138
Puberty	35	139
Tongue	35	140
Evaluation	34	141
Syllabuses	34	142
Treatment	34	143



Accuracy	33	144
Content-based	33	145
Imitation	32	146
Interlanguage	32	147
Bilingualism	31	148
Competencies	30	149
Laterilazation	30	150
Monitor	30	151
TPR	30	152
Assessment	29	153
Integrated	28	154
Interactive	28	155
Strategic	28	156
TBLT	28	157
Codeswitching	27	158
Syntax	27	159
Monolingual	25	160
Perception	25	161
Phoneme	25	162
Reinforcement	25	163
Retention	24	164
Cognition	23	165
Consonants	23	166
Instructions	23	167
Interactional	22	168
Interpersonal	22	169
Inductive	21	170
Notions	21	171
CAH	20	172
Intuitive	20	173
Linguist	20	174
Clauses	19	175
Collocations	19	176
Filter	19	177
Humanistic	19	178
Immersion	19	179
Interactions	19	180

Phonetic	19	181
Output	19	182
Bilinguals	18	183
Competency-based	18	184
Deductive	18	185
Intrinsic	18	186
Phonology	18	187
Role-play	18	188
Counseling-learning	17	189
Consciousness	17	190
Implicit	17	191
Multilingual	17	192
Pragmatic	17	193
Stimulus	17	194
Theme-based	17	195
Audio-lingual	16	196
Autonomy	16	197
Analytical	16	198
Chunks	16	199
Consonant	16	200
Corpus	16	201
Morpheme	16	202
Surface	16	203
VOT	16	204
Vowel	16	205
Acculturation	15	206
CBLT	15	207
Conditioning	15	208
Elementary	15	209
Neurolinguistic	15	210
Peripheral	15	211
Stimuli	15	212
Analytic	14	213
Competency	14	214
Counseling	14	215
Curricula	14	216
Idiosyncratic	14	217

Orientations	14	218
Sociolinguistics	14	219
Usage	14	220
Behaviorist	13	221
Behavioristic	13	222
Cognates	13	223
Cognitively	13	224
Communicatively	13	225
Fossilization	13	226
Long-term	13	227
Metacognitive	13	228
Methodologies	13	229
Problem-solving	13	230
Proficient	13	231
Short-term	13	232
CL	12	233
Listening-based	12	234
Morphology	12	235
Naturalistic	12	236
Overgeneralization	12	237
Semantic	12	238
Comprehending	11	239
Constructivist	11	240
Intermediate	11	241
Intralingual	11	242
Introversion	11	243
Behavioral	10	244
Contextualized	10	245
Inductively	10	246
Interlingual	10	247
Monitoring	10	248
Monolinguals	10	249
Multi-competence	10	250
Operational	10	251
Prescriptive	10	252
Productive	10	253
Stimulus-response	10	254

Acquirer	9	255
Deviation	9	256
Dichotomy	9	257
ESP	9	258
Impulsive	9	259
Prepositions	9	260
Self-correction	9	261
TBI	9	262
Arbitrary	8	263
Coherence	8	264
Contextual	8	265
Decoding	8	266
Meaning-based	8	267
Modal	8	268
Notional	8	269
Phonemic	8	270
Storage	8	271
Top-down	8	272
Transitional	8	273
Acquirers	7	274
Bottom-up	7	275
CLI	7	276
Coherent	7	277
Cohesive	7	278
Collaborative	7	279
Declarative	7	280
Descriptive	7	281
Eclectic	7	282
Follow-up	7	283
Grammar-based	7	284
Grammar Translation Method	7	285
Lexis	7	286
Linguistically	7	287
Multilingualism	7	288
Phonetics	7	289
Pronoun	7	290

Pronouncing	7	291
Psycholinguistics	7	292
Schema	7	293
Stimulation	7	294
Structuring	7	295
Acquires	6	296
Aural-oral	6	297
Behaviorism	6	298
Copula	6	299
Corpora	6	300
Cross-linguistic	6	301
Eclecticism	6	302
Higher-order	6	303
Information-gap	6	304
Innate	6	305
Intake	6	306
Intercultural	6	307
Interlanguages	6	308
Interim	6	309
Intrapersonal	6	310
Learner-centered	6	311
Monitors	6	312
Perceiving	6	313
Semantics	6	314
Structurally	6	315
Structure-dependency	6	316
Activation	5	317
Attainment	5	318
Battery	5	319
CBE	5	320
Cohesion	5	321
Collocation	5	322
Comprehensibility	5	323
Deductively	5	324
Extrovert	5	325
Field-dependent	5	326
Holistic	5	327

Imperatives	5	328
Illocutionary	5	329
Internalized	5	330
Minority-language	5	331
Modality	5	332
Notional-functional	5	333
Pragmatics	5	334
SBI	5	335
Schemata	5	336
Self-evaluation	5	337
Synonymous	5	338
Audiovisual	4	339
CALP	4	340
Coding	4	341
Field-independent	4	342
Innatist	4	343
Instrument	4	344
Instruments	4	345
MLAT	4	346
Nonconscious	4	347
PPP	4	348
Pretask	4	349
Psycholinguistics	4	350
Reconstructive	4	351
Self-conscious	4	352
Sociolinguistics	4	353
Structuralism	4	354
Structuralist	4	355
Suggestopedic	4	356
Unconsciously	4	357
Acquisition/learning	3	358
Audio-Visual	3	359
Audiolingualists	3	360
Behaviourist	3	361
Build-up	3	362
CBT	3	363
Choral	3	364

Cognitive-code	3	365
Comparative	3	366
Contentbased	3	367
Facilitators	3	368
Idiosyncrasies	3	369
Infantilization	3	370
Integrative-Instrumental	3	371
Intensively	3	372
Internalization	3	373
Lingua	3	374
MLAT	3	375
Multicultural	3	377
Multisensory	3	378
Nonlinguistic	3	379
Operants	3	380
Operationalize	3	381
Process-oriented	3	382
Reinforcing	3	383
RP	3	384
Self-corrected	3	385
Self-determination	3	386
Self-management	3	387
Self-monitoring	3	388
SLT	3	389
Structural-situational	3	390
Structural-dependent	3	391
TESOL	3	392
Text-based	3	393
TL	3	394
TOEFL	3	395
Beginning-level	2	396
Behaviorists	2	397
Concordancing	2	398
Conditioned	2	399
Consciousness-raising	2	400
Context-embedded	2	401
Context-reduced	2	402

Contextualizing	2	403
Corpus-based	2	404
Decision-making	2	405
Holistically	2	406
Humanism	2	407
Hypothesis-testing	2	408
Information-processing	2	409
Inputs	2	410
Intrinsic-extrinsic	2	411
Learner-generated	2	412
Loopholes	2	413
LSP	2	414
Metalanguage	2	415
Multi-competent	2	417
Multiculturalism	2	418
Multiple-slot	2	419
Neurolinguistics	2	420
Nurture	2	421
Open-ended	2	422
Operationalizing	2	423
Oral-based	2	424
Over-differentiations	2	425
Pattern-practice	2	426
Perlocutionary	2	427
Portfolios	2	428
Pre-intermediate	2	429
Pre-task	2	430
Problem-posing	2	431
Product-oriented	2	432
Psychomotor	2	433
Rhetorical	2	434
Scaffolding	2	435
Sensorimotor	2	436
Skills-based	2	437
Socioaffective	2	438
Sociobiological	2	439
Sociopragmatic	2	440



Strategies-based	2	441
Stereotyped	2	442
Strategy-training	2	443
Structure-based	2	444
Topic-based	2	445
Transformational	2	446
Action-based	1	447

**App. 3: The Total List Of Sub-Lists In Frequency Order****Sublist I**

Second Language	1064	1
Language Teaching	669	2
Language	638	3
Use	617	4
Language Learning	476	5
First Language	304	6
Vocabulary	289	7
Pattern Practice	279	8
Foreign Language	310	9
Language Acquisition	255	10
Acquire	239	11
Target Language	231	12
Goals	228	13
Techniques	227	14
Reading	219	15
Linguistic	211	16
Speech	208	17
Communicative	203	18
Syllabus	201	19
Pronunciation	200	20
Approach	194	21
Acquisition	199	22
Writing	176	23
structure	173	24
View	173	25
Cognitive	171	26
L2 Learning	159	27
Instruction	159	28
SLA	158	29
Strategies	158	30
Errors	157	31
Native Language	144	32
Listening	142	33
Interaction	140	34

Competence	132	35
Exercises	124	36
Language Learners	122	37
Speaking	122	38
Linguist	122	39
Communicative Approaches	115	40
Messages	103	41
Objectives	100	42
Input	97	43
Bilingual	94	44
Teaching Methods	90	45
Models	90	46
L2 Learners	89	47
Task	90	48
Curriculum	88	49
Performance	80	50
Methodology	80	51
Oral	78	52
Feedback	78	53
Theories	76	54
TPR	75	55
Natural Approach	74	56
L2 Users	71	57
Discourse	71	58
Styles	70	59
Phonemes	68	60
Direct Method	67	61
Mistakes	67	62
Drill	65	63
Lexical	64	64
Authentic	60	65
Transfer	59	66
Learning Process	56	67
Communicative Competence	56	68
Language teachers	53	69
Task-based Language Teaching	50	70

**Sublist II**

ESL	47	71
Audiolingual	46	72
Morphemes	46	73
Comprehension	45	74
Interference	45	75
Situational Language Teaching	44	76
Phonetic	44	77
Aptitude	43	78
Grammar Translation Method	43	79
Language Use	42	80
Audiolingualism	42	81
Fluency	42	82
Teaching Style	41	83
Suggestopedia	41	84
Accent	40	85
Pedagogical	40	86
Self-esteem	39	87
Audiolingual Method	38	88
Monitor	38	89
Intelligences	38	90
Interlanguages	38	91
Grammar Translation Method	36	92
Contrastive	36	93
Community Language Learning	35	94
Language Learning Theory	35	95
Monolinguals	35	96
Spoken Language	34	97
Learners' needs	34	98
Evaluation	34	99
Language skills	33	100
Accuracy	33	101
Teaching Techniques	32	102
Communication Strategies	32	103
Imitation	32	104
Learning Strategies	31	105

Language Instruction	30	106
Laterilization	30	107
Assessment	29	108
Language Learning Tasks	28	109
Comprehensible Input	27	110
Codeswitching	27	111
Content-based Language Teaching	27	112
Syntax	27	113
Inductive	26	114
Phonetics	26	115
Cooperative Learning	25	116
Interactive	25	117
Perception	25	118
Behaviorist	25	119
Retention	24	120
Multilingual	24	121
Collocation	24	122
Oral Approach	23	123
Consonants	23	124
Strategic Competence	22	125
Language Input	22	126
Audiolingual Style	22	127
Pragmatic	22	128
Stimulus	22	129
Teaching Materials	21	130
Teaching Activities	21	131
Instructional Materials	21	132
Notions	21	133
Task based Language Learning	20	134
Reinforcement	20	135
CAH	20	136
English Language	19	137
Task-based	19	138
Immersion	19	139
Corpus	19	140

**Sublist III**

Linguistic Theory	18	141
Linguistic System	18	142
Intelligences	18	143
Role-play	18	144
Output	18	145
Competency-based	18	146
Semantic	18	147
Communicative Activities	17	148
Language Development	17	149
Learning Activities	17	150
Lexical Approach	17	151
Writing System	17	152
Input Hypothesis	17	153
Idiosyncratic	17	154
Neurolinguistics	17	155
Multiple Intelligences	16	156
Humanistic	16	157
Deductive	16	158
Counseling-learning	16	159
Chunks	16	160
Consonant	16	161
Surface	16	162
VOT	16	163
Vowel	16	164
L2 Teaching	15	165
Cognitive Domain	15	166
Cognitive Process	15	167
Affective Domain	15	168
Affective Factors	15	169
Theme-based	15	170
Coherence	15	171
Written Language	14	172
Teaching Approaches	14	173
Acquisition Process	14	174

Cognitive Strategies	14	175
Acculturation	14	176
Culture Learning	13	177
Communicative Function	13	178
Linguistic Forms	13	179
Affective Filter	13	180
Cognates	13	181
Fossilization	13	182
Long-term	13	183
Short-term	13	184
Eclecticism	13	185
Learning Experience	12	186
Learning Method	12	187
Learning Styles	12	188
Rote learning	12	189
Linguistic Competence	12	190
Listening Comprehension	12	191
Integrative Motivation	12	192
CL	12	193
Morphology	12	194
Multi-competence	12	195
Overgeneralization	12	196
Task-based Approach	12	197
Self-correction	12	198
Cohesion	12	199
Listening-based	11	200
Naturalistic	11	201
Language Proficiency	11	202
Linguistic Features	11	203
Authentic Language	11	204
Adult Learners	11	205
L2 Use	11	206
Language Practice	11	207
Writing Skills	11	208
Syllabus Design	11	209
Student-teacher Interaction	11	210

**Sublist IV**

Counseling	11	211
Sociolinguistics	11	212
Problem-solving	11	213
Introversion	11	214
Psycholinguistics	11	215
Usage	11	216
Language Theory	10	217
Foreign culture	10	218
Academic Knowledge	10	219
Background Knowledge	10	220
Content Words	10	221
Language Content	10	222
Consciousness	10	223
Student-student Interaction	10	224
Behavioral	10	225
Prescriptive	10	226
Stimulus-response	10	227
Competency-based Language Teaching	9	228
Language Learning Theories	9	229
Schema	9	230
Metacognitive Strategies	9	231
Deviation	9	232
Dichotomy	9	233
ESP	9	234
Prepositions	9	235
TBI	9	236
Innate	9	237
Language Pedagogy	8	238
Autonomous Learning	8	239
Communicative Goals	8	240
Social Interaction	8	241
Affective Feedback	8	242
Arbitrary	8	243
Decoding	8	244



Top-down	8	245
Meaning-based	8	246
Modal	8	247
Phonemic	8	248
Storage	8	249
Learner Autonomy	8	250
Classroom based language Teaching	8	251
Task Instruction	7	252
Advanced Learners	7	253
Language Competence	7	254
Learning Experiences	7	255
Language Learning Objectives	7	256
Language Learning style	7	257
Sociolinguistic Competence	7	258
Authentic Materials	7	259
Critical Thinking	7	260
Constructivist	7	261
Bottom-up	7	262
CLI	7	263
Declarative	7	264
Descriptive	7	265
Grammar-based	7	266
Lexis	7	267
Linguistically	7	268
Pronoun	7	269
Language Curriculum	6	270
Language Learning Skills	6	271
Audiolingual Teaching	6	272
Cross-linguistic	6	273
Positive Reinforcement	6	274
Behaviorism	6	275
Copula	6	276
Higher-order	6	277
Intake	6	278
Intercultural	6	279
Learner-centered	6	280

**Sublist V**

Pretask	6	281
Cognitive-code	6	282
Interim+grammar	6	283
Multiculturalism	6	284
Activities based	6	285
Group Activities	6	286
Linguistic Principles	6	287
Linguistic Structures	35	288
Grammatical Competence	6	289
Cognitive Psychologists	6	290
Cognitive Development	6	291
Reading Comprehension	6	292
Reading Skills	6	293
Language Education	5	294
Conscious Learning	5	295
Communicative Strategies	5	296
Learner Strategies	5	297
Native like	5	298
Interactional Activities	5	299
Deductive Reasoning	5	300
Interlingual Transfer	5	301
Follow-up	5	302
CBE	5	303
Field-dependent	5	304
Holistic	5	305
Imperatives	5	306
Illocutionary acts	5	307
Minority-language	5	308
Notional-functional	5	309
SBI	5	310
Self-evaluation	5	311
Synonymous	5	312
Macro-skills	5	313
Vocabulary Selection	5	314
Grammatical Knowledge	5	315

Language Knowledge	5	316
Linguistic Knowledge	5	317
Linguistic Devices	5	318
Cognitive Code	5	319
Collaborative Learning	4	320
Peripheral Learning	4	321
Language Awareness	4	322
Communicative Skills	4	323
Functional Approach	4	324
Situational Approach	4	325
Structural Approach	4	326
Cognitive Process	4	327
Communicative Process	4	328
Interaction Activities	4	329
Behaviorist Theory	4	330
Explicit/Implicit Knowledge	4	331
Learning outcomes	4	332
Linguistic Development	4	333
Background Information	4	334
Intrinsic Motivation	18	335
Materials based	4	336
Material Development	4	337
Linguistic Content	4	338
Audiolingual Drills	4	339
Discourse Analysis	4	340
Discourse Competence	4	341
Discourse Level	4	342
Language Performance	4	343
Monitor Hypothesis	4	344
Intralingual	4	345
PPP	4	346
Intralingual Transfer	4	347
Interlingual	4	348
Information-gap	4	349
Autonomy	4	350

**Sublist VI**

Extrovert	4	351
Aural-oral	4	352
CALP	4	353
Coding	4	354
Field-independent	4	355
Audio-Visual	4	356
MLAT	4	357
Structuralism	4	358
Learning Goals	3	359
Language Function	3	360
Young Learners	3	361
Audio-visual Method	3	362
Acquisition Theory	3	363
Learning Materials	3	364
Applied Linguistics	3	365
Linguistic Information	3	366
Affective Filter Hypothesis	3	367
Monitor Model	3	368
Metacognitive Intelligence	3	369
Structuralist	3	370
Audiolingualists	3	371
Internalization	3	372
MLA	3	373
RP	3	374
Multisensory Activities	3	375
Process-oriented	3	376
Self-monitoring	3	377
SLT	3	378
Structural-situational	3	379
TESOL	3	380
Text-based	3	381
TOEFL	3	382
Multiple Intelligences Model	3	383
Lexical Collocations	3	384
Lexical Usage	3	385

Writing Tasks	3	386
Self-directed Learning	3	387
Comprehension Approach	3	388
Comprehension Activities	3	389
Task-based Activities	3	390
SLA Theory	3	391
UG Theory	3	392
Listening Tasks	3	393
Cognitive Structures	3	394
PPP	3	395
Speaking Skills	3	396
Humanistic Approach	2	397
Reading-based Approach	2	398
Notional-functional Approach	2	399
Communicative Task	2	400
Communicative Techniques	2	401
Task-based Methods	2	402
Natural Acquisition	2	403
Theme-based Language Teaching	2	404
Discourse Acquisition	2	405
L2 Stages	2	406
Analytical Approach	2	407
Academic Language	2	408
Effective Language Learning	2	409
Competitive Learning	2	410
Cognitive Theory	2	411
Educational Theory	2	412
Psychological Theory	2	413
Schema Theory	2	414
Structural Theory	2	415
Follow-up Activities	2	416
Information-gap Activities	2	417
Problem-solving Activities	2	418
Process Information	2	419
Process Writing	2	420

**Sublist VII**

Implicit Response	2	421
Interactive Communication	2	422
Metacognitive Background	2	423
Inductive Approach	2	424
Inductive Reasoning	2	425
Concordancing	2	426
Conditioned response	2	427
Consciousness-raising	2	428
Context-embedded	2	429
Reading Task	2	430
Task based	2	431
Task Cycle	2	432
Culture Acquisition	2	433
Cognitive Models	2	434
Process Writing	2	435
Illocutionary Competence	2	436
Textual Competence	2	437
Auditory Input	2	438
Learner Input	2	439
Learning Competencies	2	440
Linguistic Appropriateness	2	441
Linguistic Context	2	442
Linguistic Functions	2	443
Interaction Hypothesis	2	444
Interaction Skills	2	445
Listening Skill	2	446
Language Discourse	2	447
Critical Stage	2	448
Context-reduced	2	449
Contextualizing	2	450
Corpus-based	2	451
Learner-generated	2	452
Information-processing	2	453
LSP	2	454
Intrinsic-extrinsic	2	455

Metalanguage	2	456
Nurture	2	457
Open-ended	2	458
Multiple-slot activities	2	459
Pattern-practice	2	460
Perlocutionary acts	2	461
Portfolios	2	462
Scaffolding	2	463
Skills-based	2	464
Socioaffective	2	465
Transformational Generative Linguistics	2	466
Topic-based	2	467
Strategies-based	2	468
Strategy-training	2	469
ESL Learners	2	470
Visual Learners	2	471
Content Selection	2	472
Teaching Strategies	2	473
Learners' competence	2	474
Vocabulary Teaching	2	475
Unconditioned Response	1	476
Lexical Analysis	1	477
Lexical Patterns	1	478
Functional View	1	479
Behaviorist View	1	480
Counseling-learning View	1	481
Critical Questioning	1	482
Acquisition-promoting Content	1	483
Syllabus based	1	484
Language Corpora	1	485
Language Counselor	1	486
Teaching Cycle	1	487
Teaching ideologies	1	488
Teaching Outcomes	1	489
English-Language Teaching	1	490

**Sublist VIII**

Foreign-language Teaching	1	491
Integrated Teaching	1	492
Listening-based Teaching	1	493
Textbook-oriented Teaching	1	494
Learners' awareness	1	495
Auditory Learners	1	496
Extrovert Learners	1	497
Foreign Learners	1	498
Monitor Theory	1	499
Schemata Theory	1	500
Structuralinguistic Theory	1	501
Vocabulary Frequency	1	502
Vocabulary Range	1	503
Vocabulary Strategies	1	504
Audiolingual Theory	1	505
Cognitive-code Theory	1	506
Constructivist Theory	1	507
Counseling-learning Theory	1	508
Humanistic Theory	1	509
Linguistic Input	1	510
Linguistic Intelligence	1	511
Linguistic Tasks	1	512
Material Adaptation	1	513
Psychological Strategies	1	514
Socioaffective Strategies	1	515
Sociolinguistic Strategies	1	516
Aural-oral Materials	1	517
Listening-based Materials	1	518
Reading Methods	1	519
Monolingual Competence	1	520
Suggestopedic Method	1	521
Acquisition Strategies	1	522
Vocabulary Acquisition	1	523
Computer assisted Language Learning	1	524



Literary Language Teaching	1	525
Naturalistic Language	1	526
Cognitive Approach	1	527
Instructional Approach	1	528
Integrated Approach	1	529
Skill-based Approach	1	530
Structuralist Approach	1	531
Structure-based Approach	3	532
Cognitive-code Learning	1	533
Deductive Learning	1	534
Interactive Language	1	535
Metacognitive	1	536
Metacognitive Performance	1	537
Constructivist Model	1	538
Constructivist Perspectives	1	539
Constructivist View	1	540
Intralingual Factors	1	541
Intralingual Strategies	1	542
Interlingual Interference	1	543
Notional	1	544
Reinforcement Theory	1	545
Interlanguage Hypothesis	1	546
Punitive Reinforcement	1	547
Innate Capacities	1	548
Inductive Learning	1	549
Deductive Thinking	1	550
Acculturation Factor	1	551
Rhetorical Devices	1	552
Action-based drills	1	553
Psychomotor tasks	1	554
Content-centered approach	1	555
L2 strategies	1	556
Theme-based lang. teaching	1	557
Aural-oral approach	1	558
Grammatical Acquisition	1	559
Lexis-Based Approach	1	560

**App. 4: Technical Vocabulary Test on ELT****VOCABULARY TEST**

This test is designed in order to check the academic vocabulary knowledge related with Second Language Acquisition and Methodology Classes. Read the sentences given below and look at the vocabulary list then try to fill in the blanks

1. In reference to language, ..... is one's underlying knowledge of the system of a language- its rules of grammar, its vocabulary, all the pieces of a language and how those pieces fit together.
2. .... refers to children who are in regular contact with more than one language for the purposes of daily living.
3. Rather than concentrating on consciously 'learning' the grammar and sounds of a language, the ..... insists on 'acquiring' the language through coming into extensive contact with authentic examples of the target language, always at a level of complexity at or slightly above the current level of proficiency of the language learner.
4. An institutionalized way of speaking that determines not only what we say and how we say it, but also what we do not say, besides ..... provides a unified set of words, symbols, and metaphors that allow us to construct and communicate a coherent interpretation of reality.
5. The effect of language learners' first language on their production of the language they are learning is ..... . The effect can be on any aspect of language: grammar, vocabulary, accent, spelling and so on.
6. A teaching method which is based on a modern understanding of how the **human brain** works and how we **learn** most effectively and some of the key elements of ..... include a rich sensory learning environment (pictures, colour, music, etc.), a positive expectation of success and the use of a varied range of methods: dramatised texts, **music**, active participation in songs and games, etc.
7. An emerging **linguistic** system known as ..... has been developed by a learner of a **second language** who has not become fully proficient yet but is only approximating the **target language**: preserving some features of their **first language** in speaking or writing the target language and creating innovations.

8. Most bilinguals, however, engaged in ..... (the act of inserting words, phrases, or even longer stretches of one language into the other), especially when communicating with another bilingual.
9. Rather than by having the rules explained or by consciously deducing the rules, ..... learning is to apply the rules of a language by experiencing the language in use.
10. A collection of linguistic data, either compiled as written texts or as a transcription of recorded speech. The main purpose of ..... is to verify a hypothesis about language.
11. "The hypothesis states simply", say Krashen and Terrell (1983:32), "that we acquire (not learn) language by understanding ..... that is a little beyond our current level of (acquired) competence".
12. .... is the science concerned with the human brain mechanisms underlying the comprehension, production, and abstract knowledge of **language**, be it **spoken**, **signed**, or **written**.
13. It includes the recall or recognition of specific facts, procedural patterns, and concepts that serve in the development of intellectual abilities and skills. Thus ..... involves knowledge and the development of intellectual skills.
14. The exchange of cultural features which result when groups come into continuous firsthand contact is determined as ..... Either or both groups of the original cultural patterns may be changed a bit, but the groups remain distinct overall.
15. Literally, the word means "to stick together." ..... in writing means that all the ideas in a paragraph flow smoothly from one sentence to the next sentence.
16. A technique which avoids understanding the inner complexities and inferences of the subject that is being learned and instead focuses on memorizing the material so that it can be recalled by the learner exactly the way it was read or heard. In other words, ..... is learning "just for the test".
17. The organization of the selected contents into an ordered and practical sequence for teaching purposes is determined .....
18. .... of language is the way in which words or phrases are actually used, spoken, or written in a speech community

19. .... is a mental activity and an element of reading strategies in which information is deconstructed into understandable or recognizable parts.
20. .... is essentially a matter of the learner's psychological relation to the process and content of learning and capacity for detachment, critical reflection, decision-making, and independent action.
21. They offer real language that is contextually rich and culturally pertinent and ..... can make language "come alive" for students of all ages in interesting and fun ways.
22. Language learning that starts with basic language units like words, and then moves on to more complex structures is .....
23. Krashen (1983) did suggest that input gets converted to ..... through a learner's process of linking forms to meaning and noticing "gaps" between the learner's current internalized rule system and the new input.
24. It is performed whenever we talk or write to each other and ..... is the minimal complete unit of human linguistic communication.
25. .... is logically valid and it is the fundamental method in which mathematical facts are shown to be true.
26. It emphasizes the most basic elements of the mind, primarily perceptions, that make up our conscious mental experiences. In other words, ..... is the study of the structure of the mind.
27. According to ..... , students can absorb information "effortlessly" when it is perceived as part of the environment, rather than the material "to be attended to.
28. A person which has a deep-seated need to receive ego enhancement, self-esteem, and a sense of wholeness from other people as opposed to receiving that affirmation within oneself is known as .....
29. In the ideology of ..... , there is no innate linguistic ability; and linguistic evolution occurs as a result of learning and cultural evolution, , rather than through natural selection.
30. As well as they help learners learn through contact and interaction with others, ..... strategies help learners regulate and control emotions, motivations, and attitudes towards learning,
31. .... suggests that as students learn, they do not simply memorize or

take on others' conceptions of reality; instead, they create their own meaning and understanding.

32. The emotional responses are central to the meaning of the work or speech, and should also get the audience's attention according to ..... which is a technique that an author or speaker uses to evoke an emotional response in his audience.
33. .... can interpret the underlying meanings of speech through listening to tone of voice, pitch, speed and other nuances.
34. ....is. a combination of rewards and/or punishments is used to support desired behavior or extinguish unwanted behavior.
35. The ..... approach stresses the role of the mind in processing the information acquired and states that learning is the perception, acquisition, organization, and storage of knowledge.
36. A subconscious and intuitive process of constructing the system of a language, not unlike the process used by a child to pick up a language is defined as .....
37. It explores how natural process can enhance learning in the classroom and ..... refers to an approach based on the use of the tasks as the core unit of planning and instruction in language teaching.
38. .... states that learning has only one function, and that is as an editor and that learning comes into play only to make changes in the form of our utterance, after it has been produced by the acquired system.
39. Charles Curran in his modal of education, named ..... was inspired by Carl Rodgers's view of education in which students and teacher join together to facilitate learning in a context of valuing and prizing each individual in the group.
40. .... involve thinking about the mental processes used in the learning process, monitoring learning while it is taking place, and evaluating learning after it has occurred.
41. The analysis of the relationship between forms and functions of language is commonly called ..... , which encompasses the notion that language is more than a sentence- level phenomenon.
42. .... states that human and animal behavior can and should be studied

in terms of physical processes only.

43. Correcting one's speech for accuracy in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, or for appropriateness related to the setting or to the people who are present is .....
44. Negative attitudes are preventing the learner from making use of input, and thus hindering success in language learning. Therefore ..... is based on the theory which states that successful second language acquisition depends on the learner's feelings.
45. Every speaker knows a set of principles which apply to all languages and also a set of parameters that can vary from one language to another, but only within certain limits. Therefore ..... claims that principles and parameters are built- in to the mind.
46. The development of human values, growth in self-awareness and in the understanding of others, sensitivity to human feelings and emotions and active student involvement in learning n the way learning takes place are the crucial principles for .....
47. .... is a research technique in which data have been collected are turned into classes or categories for the purpose of counting or tabulation.
48. The branch of **linguistics** known as ..... is concerned with using **linguistic theory** to address real-world problems which studies the fields of **language education** and **second language acquisition**.
49. .... is a situation in communication between two or more people where information is known by only some of those presents.
50. .... is a list of all the words which are used in a particular text or in the works of a particular author, together with a list of the contexts in which each word occurs.
51. .... is term which is used for interactional support, often in the form of adult-child dialogue that is structured by the adult to maximize the growth of the child's intrapsychological functioning.
52. .... is the language used to analyze or describe a language.
53. An approach to the teaching of grammar proposed as ..... in which instruction in grammar (through drills, grammar explanation and other form-focused activities) is viewed as a way raising learner's awareness of

grammatical features of the language.

54. .... refers to an approach to second language teaching in which teaching is organized around the content or information that students will acquire, rather than around a linguistic or other type of syllabus.
55. .... is the underlying structure which accounts for the organization of a text or discourse.
56. It is a technique commonly used in language teaching for practicing sounds or sentence patterns in a language, based on guided repetition or practice. A drill which practices some aspects of grammar or sentence formation is often known as .....

**App. 5: Answer sheet & Key****ANSWER KEY**

Competence-	1	bottom-up-	22
syllabus design -	17	Usage-	18
decoding -	19	Concordancing-	50
coding -	47	discourse -	4
affective-filter hypot.	44	constructivist view-	31
behaviorist theory –	42	consciousness raising-	53
bilingual -	2	learner autonomy -	20
auditory learners -	33	humanistic approach-	46
monitor theory -	38	pattern practice-	56
illocutionary act-	24	Intake-	23
neurolinguistics -	12	counseling learning theory-	39
Inductive-	9	Cognitive-	35
meta-language -	52	content-based language teaching	54
information-gap -	49	Scaffolding-	51
suggestopedia -	6	applied linguistics-	48
structural approach-	26	Interference-	5
TBLT -	37	code-switching-	8
schema -	55	rote learning-	16
discourse analysis-	41	cognitive domain-	13
corpus -	10	input hypothesis-	11
extrovert learner-	28	Nurture-	29
reinforcement theory-	34	rhetorical device-	32
self-monitoring -	43	Acquisition-	36
Interlanguage-	7	peripheral learning-	27
natural approach-	3	deductive reasoning-	25
UG theory -	45	authentic materials-	21
coherence -	15	Acculturation-	14
meta-cognitive strategies-	40	Socioaffective-	30