TRACING NEGATIVE TRANSFER IN THE LEXICAL COLLOCATIONS USED BY TURKISH LEARNERS OF ENGLISH IN WRITTEN TEXTS

Kutay UZUN[1]

ABSTRACT

A category within lexical transfer, collocation transfer is a significant phenomenon within language production which may have negative effects on writing quality when demonstrated in the form of negative transfer. However, studies on collocation transfer in the texts written by writers of English as a Foreign Language appear to be somewhat limited. In this respect, this study aimed to reveal if the frequently used lexical collocations by undergraduate learners of English with a Turkish L1 background in their written production demonstrated negative collocation transfer. To this end, a corpus of 160 literary analysis essays written by 2nd year undergraduate students of an English Language Teaching (ELT) department in Turkey were investigated to trace negative collocation transfer from Turkish to English. The Detection, Explanation, Evaluation model was used for the analysis of the collocations. The findings indicated that around a quarter of the collocations used by the writers in their texts were negatively transferred from Turkish. The results highlighted the importance of teaching collocations in EFL contexts.

Keywords: Collocation Transfer, Language Transfer, Lexical Transfer, Negative Transfer

İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENEN TÜRKLERİN YAZILI METİNLERİNDE KULLANDIKLARI SÖZCÜKSEL EŞDİZİMLİLİKLERDE OLUMSUZ DİL AKTARIMININ İNCELENMESİ

ÖZ

Sözcük aktarımı içindeki bir kategori olan sıralama aktarımı, dil aktarımı bağlamında olumsuz aktarım şeklinde gerçekleştiğinde yazma kalitesini olumsuz yönde etkileyebilecek önemli bir olgudur. Ancak, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce dilinde yazılmış metinler çerçevesinde eşdizimlilik aktarımı çalışmalarının sınırlı sayıda olduğu görülmektedir. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışmada anadili Türkçe olan lisans öğrencilerinin sık kullandığı sözcüksel eşdizimlilik örneklerinde olumsuz eşdizimlilik aktarımı bulunup bulunmadığını göstermektedir. Bu amaçla, Türkiye'deki bir İngiliz Dili Eğitimi bölümünün 2. Sınıf lisans öğrencileri tarafından yazılan 160 edebi inceleme kompozisyonundan oluşan bir bütünce oluşturulmuştur. Sözcüksel eşdizimlilik örneklerinde olumsuz dil aktarımı tespiti için Gilguin'in (2008) Tespit, Açıklama, Değerlendirme modeli kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, yazarların metinlerinde kullandıkları sözcüksel eşdizimliliklerin yaklaşık dörtte birinin Türkçe'den olumsuz biçimde aktarıldığını göstermiştir. Çalışmanın bulguları yabancı dil eğitimi bağlamında eşdizimlilik öğretiminin önemini vurgulamaktadır.

Keywords: Eşdizimlilik Aktarımı, Dil Aktarımı, Sözcüksel Aktarım, Olumsuz Aktarım

[1] *Trakya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, kutayuzun@trakya.edu.tr,* https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8434-0832

1.INTRODUCTION

A large body of theoretical and empirical research studies within the domain of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) point to the fact that oral or written production in a second language (L2) is influenced by one's first or native language (L1) (Gass, Behney & Plonsky, 2013). Referred to as language transfer or interference, the mentioned influence of L1 on L2 is generally defined as a situation in which the speaker or writer of an L2 utilizes an aspect of his/her L1 partially or fully in terms of structures, lexis or phonemes in written/spoken production (Hummel, 2014). A complex psycholinguistic phenomenon, the issue of language transfer has been at the heart of SLA research for decades.

Despite the negative connotation imposed by the expression interference, not all types of transfer are considered problematic within the domain of SLA research. According to Brown (2004), a previously known item may sometimes be applied to a present language requirement accurately, in which case transfer is referred to as positive transfer. Interference, on the other hand, also known as negative transfer, is defined as the interference of a previously learned item with a present requirement, resulting in an inaccurate outcome, disrupting performance (Brown, 2004). In this respect, the term interference can be concluded to refer to negative transfer in Brown's terms.

The concept of transfer also has outcomes which cannot be traced back to a direct translation which works or does not work in a given L2. According to Ellis (1997), avoidance and overuse may also stem from transfer or the lack of it. For instance, a structure which is absent in L1 may be avoided in an L2 by the learner and similarly, a highly frequent structure in the learner's L1 may also be frequent in the L2 output of the same learner. Therefore, it can be stated that transfer may also influence the frequency in the use of certain structures according to their presence or absence in a learner's L2.

According to Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), language transfer can be identified in nine distinct categories as syntactic, morphological, phonological, orthographic, semantic, pragmatic, discursive, socio-linguistic and lexical transfer. As the names suggest, syntactic transfer refers to the process of transferring structures, morphological transfer refers to the transferring of morphemes and phonological transfer refers to the transferring of phonemes from L1 to L2. Orthographic transfer is defined as the influence of the writing system of L1 on the written productions of a learner in L2 while semantic transfer is related to the semantic range of L1 words and how they influence the production/comprehension of L2 words. From a functional perspective, pragmatic transfer is the transferring of speech acts from L1 to L2 and related to this, the presentation of social norms in L1 and their transfer into L2 is called socio-linguistic transfer. Another related concept to pragmatic and socio-linguistic transfer, discursive transfer is the transferring of the ways contextualization of ideas occurs in L1 into L2. Lastly, lexical transfer is used to refer to the influence of L1 lexical knowledge on the production or reception of L2 (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008).

Of particular interest to the present study, Jarvis (2009, p. 99) defines lexical transfer in a later study as "The influence that a person's knowledge of one language has on that person's recognition, interpretation, processing, storage and production of words in another language". In the literature, the process of lexical transfer has been shown to be influenced by the linguistic distance between a given L1 and L2 (Cenoz, 2001), the learner's proficiency level in both L1 and L2 (Herwig, 2001), the status of both L1 and L2 (De Angelis & Selinker, 2001) and how recently L1 is used at the time of L2 use (Hammarberg, 2001).

Jarvis (2009) identifies two forms of lexical transfer as lexemic and lemmatic. In this categorization, lexemic transfer is the transfer of graphemes and phonemes related to a given word in L1. On the other hand, lemmatic transfer is the transfer of syntactic and semantic qualities of a given word from L1 to L2. In other words, while the transferring of the surface features of words (e.g. letters or sounds that make up a word) is considered lexemic transfer, the transfer of deeply rooted qualities related to words, such as their function or meaning, is called lemmatic transfer.

Regarding how lexical transfer occurs, especially within the context of negative transfer, Alonso (1997) describes the use of false cognates, making erroneous substitutions and interference rooted in L1 or the L2 itself. On this matter, a more thorough classification is put forth by Meriläinen (2010), who classifies lexical transfer in 3 subheadings as word form, word meaning and word use. According to this classification, word form-based transfer occurs through substitutions, relexifications as well as orthographic, phonetic and morphological types of transfer. Word meaning-based transfer takes place through loan translations (translation of lexical combinations such as compound nouns) and semantic extensions, which can be identified in the overgeneralization of semantic properties from L1 to L2 (Ringbom, 1987). Word use-based transfer happens when a function word or a collocation is transferred from L1 to L2 (Meriläinen, 2010).

Among the different forms of lexical transfer identified in the literature, the collocation transfer seems to be among the under-researched subheadings. In general, a collocation is defined as "associations between lexical words, so

that the words co-occur more frequently than expected by chance" by Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad and Finegan (1999, p. 988). According to Carter (1987) and Howarth (1998), Adjective + Noun, Verb + Noun, Noun + Noun, Verb + Prepositional Phrase, Adverb + Adjective, Verb + Adverb pairs in spoken or written pairs can be counted as collocations. However, it should also be noted that collocations are also classified as grammatical collocations, which include function words along with content words such as Noun + Preposition, Noun + To-infinitive or Noun + That Clause pairs, and lexical collocations, which are made up only of lexical words such as adjectives, adverbs or nouns, composing word pairs such as Verb + Noun, Adjective + Noun or Noun + Noun etc. (Sinclair, 1991; Lewis, 2000).

The study of collocations within SLA contexts is considered to be a worthy endeavor because part of lexical competence in a language is comprised of a knowledge of collocations or knowing how words are combined (Henriksen, 2013). Moreover, lack of a knowledge of collocations is thought to affect language performance negatively and the presence of it contributes to spoken fluency (Namavar, 2012). Better use of collocations also seems to be associated with an increased writing quality and the production of more natural-looking texts (Monya, 2010).

Several causes behind collocation errors seem to have been identified in the relevant literature. For instance, vocabulary use strategies such as substitution of certain words with synonyms (Phoocharoensil, 2011), repetition of words owing to the learner's low vocabulary range (Shih, 2000) and overgeneralization in the form of semantic extension (Zughol & Abdul-Fattah as cited in Shitu, 2015) have been reported to be among the causes of collocation errors. Apart from strategies, collocations are also known to be transferred from L1 into L2 (Laufer and Waldman, 2011; Nesselhauf, 2003; Zingräf, 2008) which places language transfer among the causes of collocation errors (Lewis, 2000). Yamashita and Jiang (2010) confirm this by stating that L1 congruency and the amount of input are among the factors that have effects on collocation acquisition and L1-incongruent collocations often lead to errors. According to Wang and Shaw (2008) the level of linguistic distance between a given an L1 and L2 influences collocation transfer errors, too.

The literature relevant to collocation transfer appears to be rather limited. In Dağdeviren Kırmızı's (2018) study, 297 undergraduate-level essays are subjected to error analysis and it is put forward that linguistic calques as lexical transfer are the most common type of lexical errors within the corpus of the study, 10% of which being collocation errors. In a Persian EFL context, Sadighi (2012) finds that more than one third of the responses to a lexical collocation test include collocation transfer from Persian to English. Wang (2011) also discovers that around a half of the responses to a collocation test consists of Chinese to English transfer errors. Analyzing transfer error in more depth, Ye (2019) analyses a learner corpus of the texts written by Chinese students and reveals that around half of the lexical transfer errors are due to polysemes, approximately one third of them are collocation transfer errors and about one fifth of them are due to multi-word unit errors. Yıldız's (2016) study can also be considered to have related findings to collocation transfer in that Turkish learners of English in this study demonstrate avoidance behavior when it comes to the use of phrasal verbs in general and figurative phrasal verbs in particular, both of which are non-existent word combinations in Turkish.

Considering the scarcity of similar studies especially from the same context, the prevalence of collocations in language (Hill, 2000) and that the use of collocations is a significant factor in the formation of an L2 learner's lexicon (Nesselhauf & Tschichold, 2002), the present study aims to find out if negative transfer occurs in the frequent lexical collocations used by undergraduate learners of English with an L1 background of Turkish.

1.1. Purpose of the study

Taking the relevant literature on language transfer and collocations into account, the study aimed to reveal if the frequently used lexical collocations by undergraduate learners of English with a Turkish L1 background in their written production demonstrated negative collocation transfer. To this end, the following research questions were formulated:

1- What are the most frequently used lexical words in a corpus of literary analysis essays produced by undergraduate learners of English with an L1 background of Turkish?
2- What are the lexical collocates of the most frequently used lexical words in the corpus?
3- How frequent are the lexical collocates of the most frequently used lexical words in the corpus that are not congruent with the English language?
4- How frequent are the lexical collocates of the most frequently used lexical words in the corpus which are incongruent with English but congruent with Turkish?
5- What are the types of lexical collocations in the corpus that are congruent with Turkish but incongruent with English?

2. METHODOLOGY

A quantitative and descriptive design was preferred in the study since the aims of the study centered around exploring the texts within the corpus in terms of the lexical collocations they included and the collocations potentially transferred by the writers from their L1, which was Turkish. In quantitative research, the data that are of interest to the research are converted into numerical values, allowing for the standardization of different variables of the same type, and analyses are performed by making use of these numerical values (Dörnyei, 2007). Descriptive research, on the other hand, aims to reveal the present situation in a given data set without attempting any manipulation on any of the variables (Creswell, 2002). When the aims of the study, which were to find out how lexical collocations were used in a corpus and which lexical collocations may have been transferred from L1, were considered, a quantitative and descriptive design was thought to have been the most suitable type of research design.

2.1. The Corpus

The corpus of the study consisted of 160 Literary Analysis Essays written by 40 students of ELT at a public Turkish university. According to the preliminary findings, the corpus was comprised of 48866 words. The longest essay in the corpus had 845 words and the shortest one had 57 words. The average word count per essay within the corpus was 305.

A literary analysis essay within the context of the corpus that was used in the present study was a short argumentative/expository essay, whose introduction paragraph included a background to the literary work being analyzed and a thesis statement as a direct response to the essay question/prompt. The main body paragraphs elaborated on that response on an argument – support – conclusion sequence and a conclusion paragraph consolidated the thesis and closed the essay with a subjective account of the writer regarding the essay topic (Uzun, 2016).

2.2. Data Analysis

For the analysis of the data, AntConc, a concordance analysis software which can also perform keyword, word frequency and collocation analyses was used (Anthony, 2014). Since the study focused on lexical collocations, which did not include function words (Sinclair, 1991; Lewis, 2000), the function words list of English by Cook (1988) was used as a stop list with AntConc for the extraction of the most frequent lexical words only. Following the extraction of 20 most frequent lexical words within the corpus which were all used more than 100 times, the left and right-hand lexical collocates of each of these words were identified using AntConc. In order to avoid the chance factor in the co-occurrence of two words, only the results which had a minimum mutual information score of 3.00 were accepted as collocations (Church & Hanks, 1989). A manual review of the collocation hits was also performed by the researcher to eliminate the comma separated lists, words in different sentences and collocations with proper names from the list of lexical collocations.

To trace the instances of negative transfer in the corpus, Gilquin's (2008) detection, explanation, evaluation (DEE) model which was derived from Granger's (1996) and Jarvis's (2000) models for transfer research was used. According to the model, the detection of transfer requires the identification of a similarity between a learner's native language and interlanguage by translating utterances back into the learner's native language for comparison. Since the present study focused on detecting negative transfer, the collocations were initially searched on British National Corpus (BNC) (British National Corpus, 2007) and American National Corpus (ANC) (American National Corpus, 2002; Ide & Suderman, 2004) to eliminate the instances of accurate collocations and positive transfer. After the collocations which returned hits either in BNC or ANC were eliminated, the rest of the remaining collocations were translated back into Turkish by the researcher, considering multiple translation possibilities where applicable. For instance, due to the syntactical differences between Turkish and English languages, noun (subject) + verb collocations in the corpus were also searched as relative clauses. As an example, the collocation 'play consists' was translated as 'oyun içerir' and 'oyun içermektedir' both of which are direct translations of the noun (subject) + verb sequence in the text. However, since objects are placed between the subject and the verb in Turkish unlike English, these direct translations would naturally not return any hits in the corpus. For this reason, the collocation was also translated as a relative clause ('içeren oyun') to allow the words to occur together accurately and naturally.

In the explanation and evaluation phases of Gilquin's (2008) model, cross-linguistic equivalence is investigated by means of computing mutual translatability or using another corpus for comparison to parallelize the corpus comparisons between the learner's native and target languages together with interlanguage, which also helps make assumptions regarding the distance between two languages. To complete this phase, Turkish National Corpus (TNC) (Aksan et al., 2012; Turkish National Corpus, 2018), was used. Since all the collocations which were detected had already been searched in BNC and ANC, no further comparison was made in these corpora. The

translations produced in the detection phase were searched in TNC only. This comparison allowed the researcher to identify L1-congruent and L1-incongruent deviations (Wu, 2016) from the standard forms of collocations in English.

Normalized frequencies were also reported in the findings as the frequency of each word of interest in one million words.

3. FINDINGS

Preliminary analyses showed that the corpus of 160 literary analysis essays had 3499 word types and 48866 word tokens. Among these, there were 3313 lexical word types, 186 grammatical word types, 24138 lexical word tokens and 24728 grammatical word tokens.

The first research question aimed to find out the most frequently used lexical words in the corpus. The findings are shown in Table 1.

Table 1.
The Most Frequent Lexical Words in the Corpus

Rank	Word	*f*	*nf*
1	play	375	7674.05
2	love	282	5770.88
3	death	240	4911.39
4	father	228	4665.82
5	theme	209	4277.00
6	one	186	3806.33
7	story	165	3376.58
8	revenge	161	3294.72
9	people	159	3253.80
10	wants	158	3233.33
11	written	152	3110.55
12	novel	144	2946.83
13	period	137	2803.59
14	marriage	136	2783.12
15	other	129	2639.87
16	important	123	2517.09
17	example	115	2353.37
18	first	113	2312.45
19	life	109	2230.59
20	being	108	2210.13

As seen in the table, the most frequently used lexical words in the corpus was '*play*' (*f* = 375, *nf* = 7674.05), '*love*' (*f* = 282, *nf* = 5770.88), '*death*' (*f* = 240, *nf* = 4911.39), '*father*' (*f* = 228, *nf* = 4665.82) and '*theme*' (*f* = 209, *nf* = 4277.00).

The second research question aimed to identify the lexical collocates of the most frequently used lexical words in the corpus. Since a large number of collocates were identified in the analyses, their frequencies are initially presented in Table 2.

Table 2.
Frequencies of the Collocates of the Most Frequent Lexical Words

Word	Collocate Types	Collocate Tokens	Left-Hand	Right Hand
people	57	89	66	23
play	44	105	62	43
love	44	81	49	32
period	43	112	96	16
one	41	67	30	37
death	41	53	25	28
other	37	76	8	68
first	37	60	12	48
life	36	69	55	14
being	31	39	10	29
important	29	56	5	51
story	27	55	22	33

Kutay UZUN

Table 2. continued

Word	Collocate Types	Collocate Tokens	Left-Hand	Right Hand
example	26	47	38	9
revenge	24	78	68	10
marriage	24	26	18	8
novel	23	38	12	26
theme	23	35	29	6
wants	15	24	21	3
father	15	21	5	16
written	9	24	23	1
TOTAL	626	1155	654	501

Analyses showed that a total number of 1155 collocates had a mutual information score of 3.00 or above around the most frequently used lexical words in the corpus. Among these, 654 left-hand collocates and 501 right-hand collocates were identified. 626 different collocate types were also identified. Some of the left and right-hand collocates of the most frequent lexical words in the corpus are given below in Table 3.

Table 3.
Some Collocates of the Most Frequent Lexical Words

Left-Hand Collocates	Word	Right-Hand Collocates
comedy, performed, tragic, tragedy, whole	play	starts, begins, becomes, mainly, within
true, book, expresses, unanswered, passionate	love	conquers, wins, solves, sign, true
avoid, brings, unpredictable, persons, mysterious	death	scene, affects, brings, occur, creates
deny, step, acting	father	died, dead, accidentally, appear, nonetheless
dominant, conflicts, significant, widespread, striking	theme	affects, summarize, composes, influences
third, second, last, soulmate, proceeds	one	day, thing, wither, sprawling, evening
whole, entire, tragedic, contacts, tragic	story	begins, especially, ends, takes, starts
take, taking, takes, gets, vowed	revenge	tragedies, interrelate, grudge, costs, starting
other, greedy, native, wealthy, deceits	people	think, believe, thought, understood, tree
familiars, whoever, mom, Spaniard, traveller	wants	help
novel, tragedy, comedy, work, novels	written	years
English, whole, adventure, finish, drama	novel	tells, written, involves, effect, belongs
Renaissance, Victorian, Jacobean, Romanticism, Augustan	period	characteristics, comedies, time, besides, aim
ideal, sees, inquired, unexpected, lovely	marriage	come, based, etc, perfectly, showed
steal, born, finished, deceiving, deceives	other	hand, people, nobles, side, death
really, given, three	important	thing, works, role, character, plays
another, first, last, best, good	example	reflects, income, learning, built, initially
witty, goals, deaths, ways, negative	first	sight, example, acted, published, part
social, sea, double, real, romantic	life	firstly, finally, later, ideas, days
likewise, discuss, wandering, suicide, problems	being	greedy, arrogant, rich, master, stuck

Lots of different lexical words were found to collocate with the most frequent lexical words in the corpus. Among the ones which had the highest number of collocate types, the word 'people' was seen to have words such as 'other', 'greedy' or 'native' as its left-hand collocates and 'think', 'believe' or 'thought' as its right-hand collocates. Another lexical word with a large number of collocate types, namely 'play', was seen to have words such as 'comedy', 'performed' or 'tragic' as its left-hand collocates and 'starts', 'begins' or 'becomes' as its right-hand collocates. The word 'written' was seen to be the one with the lowest number of collocate types with 'novel', 'tragedy' and 'comedy' as its left-hand collocates and 'years' as its only right-hand collocate type.

The third research question aimed to reveal the frequency of the lexical collocates of the most frequently used lexical words in the corpus which were not congruent with the English language based on the comparisons with BNC and ANC. The findings are tabulated in Table 4.

Table 4.
Collocations Incongruent with English

Word	Collocate Types	$f_{incongruent}$	$\%_{incongruent}$
theme	23	18	78.26
revenge	24	17	70.83
marriage	24	17	70.83
father	15	10	66.67
written	9	5	55.56
love	44	24	54.55
death	41	20	48.78
novel	23	11	47.83
example	26	11	42.31
period	43	17	39.53
play	44	15	34.09
other	37	11	29.73
story	27	8	29.63
one	41	12	29.27
people	57	16	28.07
life	36	10	27.78
important	29	8	27.59
wants	15	3	20.00
being	31	6	19.35
first	37	6	16.22
TOTAL	626	245	39.14

Analyses revealed 245 collocate types out of 626 which did not return any results in BNC and ANC ($\% = 39.14$). Comparisons of the collocate types with the most frequently used lexical words in the corpus revealed that most of the collocates of the words '*theme*' ($f_{incongruent} = 18$, $\%_{incongruent} = 78.26$), '*revenge*' ($f_{incongruent} = 17$, $\%_{incongruent} = 70.83$) and '*marriage*' ($f_{incongruent} = 17$, $\%_{incongruent} = 70.83$) in the corpus were actually incongruent with the English language as searches did not result any hits either in BNC or in ANC. Some examples of collocations that did not return any results in the corpora were '*theme affects*', '*revenge action*' and '*looks marriage*'. On the other hand, the collocates of lexical words '*wants*' ($f_{incongruent} = 13$, $\%_{incongruent} = 20.00$), '*being*' ($f_{incongruent} = 6$, $\%_{incongruent} = 19.35$) and '*first*' ($f_{incongruent} = 6$, $\%_{incongruent} = 16.22$) returned hits either in BNC or ANC.

The fourth question aimed to find the frequency of the lexical collocations in the corpus which were incongruent with English but congruent with Turkish based on their translation. Manual searches of all collocation types on AntConc revealed that 57 of them were either comma separated lists (e.g. '*certainty, death...*') or words belonging to different sentence (e.g. '*river. Theme...*'), therefore, they were eliminated. For this reason, 188 collocation types translated into Turkish were searched in TNC for comparison. The findings are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.
Collocations Congruent with Turkish

Word	Collocate Types	$f_{congruent}$	$\%_{congruent}$
play	12	9	75.00
theme	15	10	66.67
life	8	4	50.00
first	2	1	50.00
important	7	3	42.86
one	7	3	42.86
people	13	5	38.46
marriage	13	5	38.46
death	14	5	35.71
wants	3	1	33.33
love	21	7	33.33
example	7	2	28.57
revenge	13	3	23.08
father	9	2	22.22
written	5	1	20.00
period	12	2	16.67
other	8	1	12.50
novel	10	1	10.00

Table 5. continued

Word	Collocate Types	$f_{congruent}$	$\%_{congruent}$
story	5	0	0.00
being	4	0	0.00
TOTAL	188	65	34.57

The results revealed that 65 of 245 lexical collocate types returned hits in TNC ($\% = 34.57$) Among them, the lexical collocates of the words '*play*' ($f_{congruent} = 9$, $\%_{congruent} = 75.00$), '*theme*' ($f_{congruent} = 10$, $\%_{congruent} = 66.67$) and '*life*' ($f_{congruent} = 4$, $\%_{congruent} = 50.00$) returned the highest number of hits. Some examples of such collocations were '*play reflecting*' (TR: '*yansıtan oyun*'), '*(an) intense theme*' (TR: '*çarpıcı bir konu*') and '*others' life*' (TR: '*başkalarının hayatları*'). The lowest number of hits in TNC were observed when the translations of the collocate types of the words '*period*' ($f_{congruent} = 2$, $\%_{congruent} = 16.67$), '*other*' ($f_{congruent} = 1$, $\%_{congruent} = 12.50$) and '*novel*' ($f_{congruent} = 1$, $\%_{congruent} = 10.00$) were searched. No hits were returned by TNC for the translations of the collocate types of '*story*' and '*being*'.

The fifth and the last research question aimed to identify the types of the lexical collocations that were congruent with Turkish but not English. The results are given in Table 6.

Table 6.
Types of Collocations Congruent with Turkish

Collocation Type	f	$\%$
Adj + Noun	24	36.92
Noun + Noun	12	18.46
Verb + Noun	12	18.46
Noun + Verb	10	15.38
Noun + Adv	4	6.15
Noun + Adj	2	3.08
Adv + Noun	1	1.54
TOTAL	65	100.00

Analyses revealed that a majority of the lexical collocations which were congruent with Turkish but not English were adjective + noun (e.g. '*unanswered love*'), noun + noun (e.g. '*marriage forcement*') and verb + noun (e.g. '*creates revenge*') combinations. On the other hand, noun + adverb (e.g. '*people anymore*'), noun + adjective (e.g. '*love true*') and adverb + noun (e.g. '*basically theme*') were the least frequent lexical collocation types congruent with Turkish.

4.DISCUSSION

This study aimed to find out if negative transfer could be found in the lexical collocations in a corpus of literary analysis essays written by undergraduate students of ELT in Turkey whose L1 background was Turkish. The findings showed that 'play', 'love' and 'death' were the most frequent words in the corpus and the highest number of collocate types belonged to 'people', 'play' and 'love'. The findings also revealed that more than one third of those collocate types were not congruent with the English language as they were present in neither BNC nor ANC. When those collocations were translated into the participants' L1, it was seen that about one third of them returned hits in TNC, signaling congruence with the Turkish language. Adjective + noun, noun + noun and verb + noun combinations were the most frequent types of collocation among those that were congruent with Turkish.

The findings were in line with those of Dağdeviren Kırmızı (2018) and Wang (2011) since their studies also indicated the existence of collocation transfer from L1 to L2 in varying levels. In addition, the present study produced almost the same results with the findings of Sadighi (2012) and Ye (2019) in that both of those studies concluded that around one third of the collocation errors committed by their participants were due to collocation transfer. Considering that all these studies were conducted in EFL contexts, the findings can be said to have confirmed theirs within the Turkish EFL context.

The findings were also parallel to those of Laufer and Waldman (2011), Lewis (2000), Nesselhauf (2003) and Zingräf (2008) in terms of corroborating that transfer could, indeed, be among the causes of collocation errors. Belonging to different language families, the linguistic distance between Turkish (a Turkic language with SOV syntax) and English (a West Germanic language with SVO syntax) may also have contributed to the collocation errors in the corpus by limiting the number of L1-congruent collocations in English and thus, the writers of the texts may have resorted to direct translations from Turkish to English, resulting in collocation transfer errors (Wang & Shaw, 2008). Being in an EFL setting where receiving L2 input was also limited to the classroom, the lack of sufficient exposure to English may also have pushed the writers of the texts towards transferring L1 collocations into L2 (Yamashita & Jiang, 2010).

4.CONCLUSION

The results of the study showed that around a third of the lexical collocations used in the literary analysis essay written by Turkish ELT students were actually products of collocation transfer from Turkish to English. Interestingly, the findings were identical to other studies conducted in Persian and Chinese EFL contexts. Apparently, around a third of the lexical collocations used by EFL writers in theirs texts tend to be transferred from their L1 and they are mainly adjective + noun collocations.

As for the implications that can be drawn from the findings, teachers of English should keep in mind that L1 transfer may, indeed, interfere with learners' writing performance and better use of collocations leads to increased fluency (Namavar, 2012) as well as writing quality (Monya, 2010). Also reckoning with the fact that vocabulary use strategies (Phoocharoensil, 2011) and the range of one's vocabulary (Shih, 2000) are related to collocation errors, the teaching of collocations should be an integral part of teaching vocabulary for better performance in written language production.

It should also be kept in mind that the corpus of the study included literary analysis essays written by 2nd year ELT students only, therefore, the genre put into analysis and the proficiency levels of the writers, which were regarded as close to one another, should be considered as limitations. Moreover, due to the unavailability of different L1 backgrounds among the writers of the texts in the corpus, no comparison with a different L1 group was made. Lastly, individual differences were not controlled for in the study. Since a significant portion of the lexical collocations in the corpus of this study resulted from negative transfer, further studies should be conducted to observe the effects of teaching lexical collocations to learners of EFL on L2 writing performance.

REFERENCES

Aksan, Y., Aksan, M., Koltuksuz, A., Sezer, T., Mersinli, Ü., Demirhan, U. U., Yılmazer, H., Kurtoğlu, Ö., Atasoy, G., Öz, S., & Yıldız, İ. (2012). *Construction of the Turkish National Corpus (TNC)*. Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluations, Istanbul, Turkey. Retrieved March 14, 2019 from http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2012/pdf/ 991_Paper.pdf

Alonso, M. R. (1997). Language transfer: Interlingual errors in Spanish students of English as a foreign language. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses, 10*, 7-14. doi: 10.14198/raei.1997.10.01.

American National Corpus (2002). Linguistic Data Consortium, University of Pennsylvania. Available from http://www.anc.org/

Anthony, L. (2014). *AntConc* (Version 3.4.3) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Retrieved October 28, 2018 from http://www.laurenceanthony.net/.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.

British National Corpus, version 3 (BNC XML Edition). (2007). Distributed by Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium. Available from http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk

Brown, H.D. (2004). *Principles of language learning and teach*ing. New York: Longman.

Carter, R. (1987). *Vocabulary applied linguistics perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Cenoz, J. (2001). The effect of linguistic distance, L2 status and age on cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 8–20). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Church, K., & Hanks, P. (1989). Word association norms, mutual information, and lexicography. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual Conference of the Association of Computational Linguistics* (pp. 76-83), Vancouver, British Columbia.

Cook, V. (1988). Designing a basic parser for CALL. *CALICO journal, 6*(1), 50-67.

Cresswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle Creek, NJ: Pearson Education.

Dağdeviren Kırmızı, G. (2018). Lexical Errors and Linguistic Calques as Lexical Transfer in EFL Writing: A Case Study. *Başkent University Journal of Education, 5*(2), 99-106.

De Angelis, G., & Selinker, L. (2001). Interlanguage transfer and competing linguistic systems in the multilingual mind. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 42–58). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1997). Second language acquisition. In *Oxford Introduction to Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gass, S.M., Behney, J., & Plonsky, L. (2013). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. New York: Routledge.

Granger, S. (1996), From CA to CIA and back: An integrated approach to computerized bilingual and learner corpora. In K. Aijmer, B. Altenberg & M. Johansson (Eds.) *Languages in Contrast. Papers from a Symposium on Text-based Cross-linguistic Studies*. Lund: Lund University Press. 37-51.

Hammarberg, B. (2001). Roles of L1 and L2 in L3 production. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 21–41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Henriksen, B. (2013). Research on L2 learners' collocational competence and development: A progress report. In C. Bardel, C. Lindqvist & B. Laufer (Eds.), *L2 vocabulary acquisition, knowledge and use: New perspectives on assessment and corpus analysis* (pp. 29–56). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Eurosla.

Herwig, A. (2001). Plurilingual lexical organization: Evidence from lexical processing in L1-L2-L3-L4 translation. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 115–137). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hill. J. (2000). Revising priorities: from grammatical failure to collocational success. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation* (pp. 47-67). London: Language Teaching Publications.

Howarth, P. (1998). Phraseology and second language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 24-44.

Hummel, K. M. (2014). *Introducing second language acquisition: Perspectives and practices*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ide, N., Suderman, K. (2004). The American National Corpus First Release. *Proceedings of the Fourth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC)* (pp. 1681 – 1684), Lisbon: ELRA.

Jarvis, S. (2000) Methodological rigor in the study of transfer: identifying L1 influence in the interlanguage lexicon. *Language Learning, 50*(2), 245-309.

Jarvis, S. (2009). Lexical transfer. In A. Pavlenko (Ed.), *Bilingual mental lexicon: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 99–124). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Cross linguistic influence in language and cognition*. New York, US: Routledge.

Laufer, B., & Waldman, T. (2011). Verb-noun collocations in second language writing: a corpus-analysis of learners' English. *Language Learning, 61*(2), 647-672.

Lewis, M. (Ed.). (2000). *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach*. London: Language Teaching Publications.

Meriläinen, L. (2010). Language Transfer in the Written English of Finnish Students. Publications of the University of Eastern Finland. In *Dissertations in Education, Humanities and Theology, 9*. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland. Retrieved from http://epublications.uef.fi/pub/urn_isbn_978-952-61-0230-6/.

Monya, A. (2010). *Teaching lexical collocations to raise proficiency in foreign language writing: a case study of first year English students of Guelma University*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Mentouri University, Algeria.

Namavar, F. (2012). The relationship between language proficiency and use of collocation by Iranian EFL students. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 18*(3), 41-52.

Nesselhauf, N. & Tschichold, C. (2002). Collocation in CALL: An investigation of vocabulary-building software for EFL. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 15*(3), 251-279.

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

Phoocharoensil, S. (2011). Collocation errors in EFL learners' inter language. *Journal of Education and Practice, 2*(3), 103-120.

Ringbom, H. (1987). *The role of the first language in foreign language learning.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sadighi, S. (2012). An account of English lexical collocations errors through L1 transfer. *Iranian EFL Journal, 8*(6), 38-49.

Shih, R. (2000). Collocation deficiency in a learner corpus of English from an overuse perspective. In *Proceedings of 14th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation* (pp. 281-288). Tokyo: PACLIC 14 Organizing Committee.

Shitu, F. M. (2015). Collocation Errors in English as Second Language (ESL) Essay Writing. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology International Journal of Cognitive and Language Sciences, 9*(9), 3270-3275

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Turkish National Corpus, v3.0 (2018). Available from https://www.tnc.org.tr.

Wang, Y., & Shaw, P. (2008). Transfer and universality: collocation use in advanced Chinese and Swedish learner English. *ICAME Journal, 32*, 201-232.

Wang, D. (2011). Language Transfer and the Acquisition of English Light Verb+ Noun Collocations by Chinese Learners. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 34*(2), 107-125.

Wu, Y. (2016). The effects of utilizing corpus to correct collocation errors in L2 writing – Students' performance, corpus use and perceptions. In S. Papadima-Sophocleous, L. Bradley, & S. Thouesny (Eds.), *CALL communities and culture – Short papers from EUROCALL 2016* (pp. 479-484). Dublin: Research-publishing.net. doi: 10.14705/rpnet.2016.eurocall2016.610.

Yamashita, J., & Jiang, N. (2010). L1 Influence on the Acquisition of L2 Collocations: Japanese ESL Users and EFL Learners Acquiring English Collocations. *TESOL Quarterly, 44*(4), 647–668. doi:10.5054/tq.2010.235998

Ye, Z. (2019). Chinese to English Lexical Transfer Errors in the Writing of Rural Senior High School Students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 9*(6), 645-654. doi: 10.17507/tpls.0906.06

Yıldız, M. (2016). A Cross-Linguistic Inquiry into the Potential Reasons for the Avoidance of English Phrasal Verbs: The Case of Turkish and Norwegian EFL Learners. *Linguitics Journal, 10*(1), 124-140.

Zingräf, M. (2008). V+N miscollocations in the written production of university level students. *ELIA, 8*, 91-116.

GENİŞ ÖZET

1. Giriş

İkinci dil edinimi (İDE) konusunda teorik ve ampirik olarak mevcut olan geniş alanyazın, ikinci bir dilde (D2) sözlü veya yazılı üretimin birinci veya ana dilden (D1) etkilendiğine işaret etmektedir. Dil aktarımı diye anılmakta olan D1'in D2 üzerindeki etkisi, genellikle bir D2 kullanıcısının, D1 özelliklerini kısmen veya tamamen yapılar, sözcükler veya birimsesler bakımından yazılı/sözlü olarak kullandığı bir durum olarak tanımlanır. Karmaşık psikodilbilimsel bir fenomen olan dil aktarımı konusu, on yıllardır İDE araştırmalarının temelinde yer almaktadır.

Bu çalışmanın odağında bulunan sözcük aktarımı ise kişinin bir dil hakkındaki bilgisinin o kişinin başka bir dildeki sözcükleri tanıması, yorumlaması, işlemesi, saklaması ve yazması üzerindeki etkisini tanımlamaktadır. Alanyazın sözlüksel aktarım sürecinin D1 ve D2 arasındaki dil mesafesinden etkilendiğini göstermektedir. Bunun yanında, öğrenenin D1 ve D2'deki yeterlik seviyeleri, D1'in D2 kullanım süresi arasındaki fark gibi etkenler de sözcüksel aktarım sürecini etkilemektedir.

İDE bağlamında eşdizimlilik çalışmalarının önemi şudur ki, bir dilde sözcüksel yetkinliğin bir kısmı eşdizimlilik ve sözcüklerin nasıl birleştiğinin bilgisidir. Ancak alanyazında tanımlanan farklı sözcük aktarım biçimleri arasında, eşdizimlilik aktarımı pek de araştırılmamış bir alan olarak dikkat çekmektedir. Ayrıca eşdizimlilik bilgisinde olabilecek eksikliğin dil performansını olumsuz yönde etkilediği düşünülmekte ve bu durum konuşmada akıcılığı da azaltmaktadır. Eşdizimliliğin daha iyi kullanılmasının yazma performansını artırdığı ve daha doğal görünen metinlerin oluşturulmasına olanak sağladığı düşünülmektedir.

Eşdizimlilik hatalarının sebeplerinden birinin dil aktarımı olduğu alanyazında belirtilmiştir. Ancak eşdizimlilik aktarımı konulu alanyazının oldukça sınırlı olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Bu nedenle çalışma, ana dili Türkçe olan İngiliz Dili Eğitimi lisans öğrencilerinin yazılı metinlerde olumsuz eşdizimlilik aktarımı yapıp yapmadığının tespit edilmesini amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla aşağıdaki araştırma soruları geliştirilmiştir:

1- Ana dili Türkçe olan İngiliz Dili Eğitimi öğrencilerinin yazdığı edebi inceleme kompozisyonlarından oluşan bir bütüncede en sık kullanılan içerikli sözcükler hangileridir?
2- Bütüncede en sık kullanılan içerikli sözcüklerin sözcüksel eşdizimlilikleri nelerdir?
3- Bütüncede en sık kullanılan içerikli sözcüklerin İngilizce dilinde bulunmayan sözcüksel eşdizimlilikleri nelerdir?
4- Bütüncede en sık kullanılan içerikli sözcüklerin İngilizce dilinde bulunmayan fakat Türkçe dilinde bulunan eşdizimlilikleri nelerdir?
5- Bütüncede Türkçe dilinde bulunan ancak İngilizce dilinde bulunmayan eşdizimliliklerin türleri nelerdir?

2. Yöntem

Araştırmada nicel ve betimleyici bir tasarım tercih edilmiştir, çünkü çalışmanın amaçları bütünce içindeki metinleri, içerdikleri sözcüksel eşdizimlilikleri ve ana dili Türkçe olan yazarlar tarafından potansiyel olarak D1'den aktarılan eşdizimlilikler bağlamında incelemeye odaklanmıştır. Bir bütüncede sözcüksel eşdizimliliklerin nasıl kullanıldığını ve hangi sözcüksel eşdizimliliklerin D1'den aktarılmış olabileceğini bulmak için yapılan araştırmanın amaçları göz önüne alındığında, en uygun araştırma türünün nicel ve betimleyici bir tasarım olduğu görülmüştür.

Çalışmanın kapsamı, Türkiye'de bir devlet üniversitesinde 40 İngiliz Dili Eğitimi öğrencisi tarafından yazılmış olan 160 edebi inceleme kompozisyonundan oluşmaktadır. İlk bulgulara göre bütünce 48866 sözcükten oluşup, bütünce içerisindeki en uzun kompozisyonun 845, en kısa kompozisyonun ise 57 sözcükten oluştuğu saptanmıştır. Bütünce içerisindeki kompozisyon başına düşen ortalama sözcük sayısı 305 olarak hesaplanmıştır.

Bütüncedeki olumsuz eşdizimlilik aktarımı örneklerinin tespiti için, Gilquin'in (2008) tespit, açıklama, değerlendirme (DEE) modeli kullanılmıştır. Modele göre, aktarımın tespiti, metnin karşılaştırma için öğrencinin ana diline çevirerek öğrencinin ana dili ve yabancı dili arasında benzerlik veya farklılığın tanımlanmasını gerektirir. Bu çalışma olumsuz aktarımın tespiti konusuna eğildiği için, ilk olarak bütünce içerisindeki sözcüksel eşdizimlilikler tespit edilmiştir. Tüm eşdizimlilikler İngiliz Ulusal Bütüncesi (BNC) ve Amerikan Ulusal Bütüncesi'nde (ANC) taranmış ve iki bütünceden en az birinde sonuç döndüren eşdizimlilikler elenmiştir. Sonrasında ise kalan tüm sözcüksel eşdizimlilikler karşılaştırma amacıyla Türkçe diline çevrilmiştir. Mümkün olan eşdizimliliklerde birden fazla çeviri kaydedilmiştir. Örneğin, Türkçe ve İngilizce dilleri arasındaki sözdizimsel farklılıklar nedeniyle, bütüncedeki isim (özne) + fiil kombinasyonları hem bire bir çevirisiyle, hem de sıfat cümleciği olarak çevrilmiştir. Örnek olarak, "play consists" eşdizimliliği, hem "oyun içerir/içermektedir" hem de "içeren oyun" olarak çevrilmiştir. Bu sayede Türkçe ve İngilizce arasındaki sözdizimsel farkların çalışmanın bulgularını etkilememesi amaçlanmıştır.

Gilquin'nin (2008) modelinin açıklama ve değerlendirme aşamalarında, karşılıklı çevrilebilirlik veya dilde eşdeğerliğin tespiti amacıyla bütünce kullanımı tavsiye edilmekte, bu sayede iki dil arasındaki mesafeye ilişkin çıkarımlarda bulunmak mümkün olmaktadır. Bu aşamayı tamamlamak için, Türkçe Ulusal Derlemi kullanılmıştır. BNC ve ANC'de tespit edilen tüm eşdizimlilikler zaten arandığından, bu bütüncelerde başka bir karşılaştırma yapılmamış, tespit aşamasında üretilen çeviriler yalnızca Türkçe Ulusal Derlemi'nde taranmıştır. Bu karşılaştırma sayesinde BNC ve ANC'de sonuç döndürmeyen sözcüksel eşdizimliliklerin Türkçe dilinden aktarılıp aktarılmadığının tespiti mümkün olmuştur.

3. Bulgular, Tartışma ve Sonuç

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de bir devlet üniversitesinde lisans düzeyinde eğitim alan ve ana dili Türkçe olan katılımcılar tarafından yazılmış olan bir edebi inceleme kompozisyonu bütüncesini kullanarak sözcüksel eşdizimlilik anlamında olumsuz dil aktarımı örnekleri bulmayı amaçlamıştır. Bulgular, "play", "love" ve "death" sözcüklerinin bütüncede en sık kullanılan sözcükler olduğunu ve "insanlara", "oyuna" ve "sevgiye" sözcüklerinin en fazla eşdizimliliğe sahip sözcüker olduğunu göstermiştir. Bulgular ayrıca, bu eşdizimlilik tiplerinin üçte birinden fazlasının ne BNC ne de ANC'de sonuç döndürdüğünü, bu bağlamda söz konusu eşdizimliliklerin İngilizce diline ait olmadıklarını göstermiştir. Bu eşdizimlilikler katılımcıların D1'lerine çevirilip Türkçe Ulusal Derlemi'nde arantıldığında yaklaşık üçte bir oranında sonuç elde edildiği görülmüştür. Sıfat + isim, isim + isim ve fiil + isim kombinasyonları, Türkçe ile uyumlu olan eşdizimlilikler arasında en sık kullanılan eşdizimlilik türleri olarak saptanmıştır.

Bütün bu çalışmaların "yabancı dil olarak İngilizce" bağlamında yapıldığı düşünüldüğünde, başka çalışmaların da bu çalışmanın bulgularını doğrular nitelikte olduğu görülmektedir. Farklı dil ailelerine ait olan, Türkçe (Özne + Tümleç + Yüklem sözdizimine sahip bir Türk dili) ve İngilizce (Özne + Yüklem + Tümleç sözdizimine sahip bir Batı Cermen dili) arasındaki dil mesafesinin, aynı anda hem D1'e hem de D2'ye uyumlu sözcüksel eşdizimlilik sayısını sınırlandırarak bulguların elde edilmesine neden olabileceği düşünülmektedir. Metinlerin yazarları bazı sözcüksel eşdizimlilikleri kullanırken Türkçe'den İngilizce'ye doğrudan çeviri yapmış, dolayısıyla eşdizimlilik aktarma hatalarını gerçekleştirmiş olabilirler. Ayrıca yabancı dil olarak İngilizce bağlamında D2 girdisi miktarının azlığı ve İngilizce diline yeterince maruz kalınamaması katılımcıları D1 eşdizimliliklerini D2'ye aktarma yönünde zorlamış olabilir.

Çalışmanın sonuçları ana dili Türkçe olan İngiliz Dili Eğitimi öğrencileri tarafından yazılan edebi inceleme kompozisyonlarında kullanılan sözcüksel eşdizimliliklerin yaklaşık üçte birinin aslında Türkçe'den İngilizce'ye aktarıldığını ortaya koymuştur. İlginç bir şekilde, bu çalışmayla aynı veya çok yakın bulgular Farsça ve Çince ana dil gruplarındaki öğrencilerle de elde edilmiştir. Görünen o ki, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce yazı yazan öğrenenlerin metinlerinde kullandıkları sözcüksel eşdizimliliklerin yaklaşık üçte birinin D1'den aktarıldığını ve bu eşdizimliliklerin çoğunlukla sıfat + isim kombinasyonlarından oluştuğunu söylemek yanlış değildir.

Bulgulara dayanarak yapılabilecek çıkarım ise D1 aktarımının gerçekten de öğrencilerin yazma performansını olumsuz etkileyebileceği ve eşdizimliliklerin daha iyi kullanılmasının yazmada akıcılığı ve kaliteyi artırabileceğidir. Ayrıca, sözcük kullanma stratejilerinin ve kişinin kezime haznesinin eşdizimlilik hataları ile ilişkilini olduğu da dikkate alındığında, eşdizimlilik öğretiminin yabancı dilde sözcük öğretiminin ayrılmaz bir parçası olduğu da ortaya konmaktadır.

ETİK BEYANNAME

Yapılan bu araştırmanın yazım sürecinde bilimsel ve etik kurallara tüm araştırmacılar tarafından uyulmuş, farklı eserlerden yararlanması durumunda atıfta bulunulmuş, kullanılan verilerde herhangi bir tahrifat yapılmamış, araştırmanın tamamı veya bir kısmı farklı bir akademik yayın platformunda yayınlatılmak üzere gönderilmemiştir. Tüm bu durumlardan araştırmada ismi bulunan yazarların bilgisi olduğunu ve gerekli kurallara uyulduğunu beyan ederim. 22/05/2020

Kutay UZUN