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ABSTRACT

English is the contemporary lingua franca; almost three quarters of the world’s population is comprised of English-native or nonnative speakers. English proficiency is widely believed to determine one’s academic and career success. To this end, English education is essential in many countries throughout the world.

English education has been formally part of the curriculum in Cyprus since 1935 because it is necessary for the island’s economic development and participation in international politics. It is also important for students to attain English-language proficiency because many high school graduates continue their education at universities in English-speaking countries. Students who attend the University of Cyprus also need to take English courses as a requirement for the completion of a degree.

This project offers methods for English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) undergraduate students to improve their English skills following a lexical approach to language incorporating the methodology of corpus linguistics research. It is hoped that EFL teachers and students will revisit language teaching and learning from this innovative perspective.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Background of the Project

The Role of English in Cyprus

English is the contemporary lingua franca—the world language. People communicate in English for business, politic, economic, and other purposes. Approximately three quarters of the world's population use English, as it has become the language of international business, politics, and diplomacy. Thus, English language is a necessity for those who expect to achieve career development and social advantages.

Because Cyprus is a country whose economic development depends on tourism, English has become indispensable; employees and employers in hotels, restaurants, and professions that deal with international business are required to have English proficiency.

Moreover, Cyprus has been a member of the European Union since May 1, 2004. Under this condition, citizens of Cyprus have the obligation to meet European standards in all fields; therefore, English education has become a foremost area of attention.
The History of English Education in Cyprus

In 1935, English language became part of the curriculum of the last two levels of the largest elementary schools in Cyprus. However, students' English education was not satisfactory because of the inadequate preparation of teachers in language teaching and methodology.

Because Cyprus was a British colony until 1960, Cypriots began to think that learning English was a betrayal of their country, and spread an anti-British feeling (Ioannou-Georgiou & Pavlou, 1999). Their determination to preserve their ethnic identity ended with the abolishment of English-language teaching in all Cypriot elementary schools in May 1959.

One year later, the political status in the country changed; Cyprus gained independence and set out to modernize as a developing country. To this end, English as a foreign language was re-introduced and became officially part of the syllabus in all elementary schools during 1965-1966 (Ioannou-Georgiou & Pavlou, 1999). Students began learning English at the age of ten—the fifth year of school—for two 40-minute periods a week. Teachers often had little or no specialization in English-language
teaching, and the books imported from England followed a structural/traditional approach.

These conditions persisted until 1992 when the Ministry of Education of Cyprus introduced English as a subject in the fourth year of school for only a 40-minute period a week. The Ministry of Education’s Curriculum Development Unit prepared new books that emphasized the communicative approach. The subject was augmented to two 40-minute periods a week in 1993, and the new curriculum was instituted in 1996 (Ioannou-Georgiou & Pavlou, 1999).

Current English Education in Cyprus

According to the Cyprus National Curriculum for Primary Schools, English is a compulsory subject. Students start their English education at the age of nine and continue until they graduate from high school.

English is a secondary rather than a major subject in elementary education. It is only taught twice a week in 40-minute periods. Teachers place emphasis on listening in the early stages of English-language learning. Reading skills develop during the third year of elementary English education. Despite the emphasis on all four language skills, writing and speaking skills receive the least attention during the first three years of English education in Cyprus. Speaking is not encouraged enough
because of lack of instructional time, and writing is still at the sentence level or early paragraph level. Testing students' proficiency in English uses the traditional paper-based-test format. Teachers, however, are encouraged not to mark the tests or give a score because students' interest in learning a foreign language might decrease.

When students proceed to middle school, English is a primary course, taught twice a week in 50-minute periods. Testing in middle- through high-school years is required, and students must take a final test that affects their grade point average (GPA) at the end of each school year.

According to the Ministry of Education, after 2006, high-school graduates' GPA will determine their acceptance in universities. For this reason and because instructional time in public schools is very limited, parents encourage their children to attend private English institutes in the afternoon to improve their competency in English. The tuition at these institutes varies according to the number of students and the experience level of the teachers.

After students graduate from high school, they take the General Certificate of Education (GCE) in English language. GCE is similar to the Test of English as a Foreign Language test (TOEFL) required for their
acceptance in universities abroad. Both GCE and TOEFL exams primarily test students’ vocabulary and grammatical competence, whereas speaking skills have not received any attention yet. Hence, private institutes also emphasize grammar-based instruction and vocabulary learning.

Cypriot undergraduate students at the University of Cyprus (UCY) or at universities abroad—mainly in England and the United States of America—face difficulties in using English throughout their education. Introductory English courses are required in all programs at UCY with emphasis on speaking and listening skills. However, students are often not confident enough to speak English because they have not practiced their speaking skills sufficiently throughout their nine-year English education.

The exam-oriented educational system in Cyprus will not undergo any radical changes in the near future; tests will continue to rely on grammar and vocabulary. University-level courses, in which there is an attempt to develop all four language skills—mainly speaking and listening—may benefit greatly from the lexical approach presented in this project; that is, the emphasis on teaching lexical items rather than grammar rules.
Target Teaching Level—University Undergraduates

This project addresses college-level instruction as the target teaching level. College-students have developed extensive vocabulary knowledge and have mastered a great deal of English grammar. However, they have yet to acquire extensive speaking and listening skills.

University instructors are able to construct their lesson plans without any supervision from the Ministry of Education. This freedom gives instructors the opportunity to teach what they believe is important for undergraduate students: oral presentation skills. These skills are valuable and necessary throughout each person's academic and professional career.

Purpose of the Project

This project discusses in depth the area of corpus linguistics that emphasizes the lexical approach to college-level foreign-language teaching. Second-language vocabulary acquisition is modeled in a lexical approach, in which the lexical item is the central unit of language. Corpus linguistics research offers large corpora in which students can locate and examine linguistic features like collocations. Using these corpora, students will be able to encounter contextualized examples of natural occurring
language rather than study invented texts. Therefore, this project aims to present the findings of contemporary research in corpus linguistics, concordance, collocation, the lexical approach, and second-language vocabulary acquisition, propose a theoretical framework combining these five areas in college-level foreign-language teaching, and offer a curriculum based on the framework. The objective of the unit plan is to offer samples of how corpus linguistics in a lexical approach can be applied in foreign-language pedagogy to improve students' English proficiency.

Content of the Project

This project consists of five chapters. Chapter One introduces the background of English education in Cyprus, and the purpose, content, and significance of the project. Chapter Two presents the literature review pertinent to corpus linguistics, concordance, collocation, the lexical approach, and second-language vocabulary acquisition. Chapter Three discusses the interrelationship of the five concepts mentioned earlier, and proposes a theoretical framework based on the literature review. A curriculum design based on the theoretical framework is presented in Chapter Four. Finally, Chapter Five discusses the
assessment of the five lesson plans presented in the Appendix.

Significance of the Project

This project synthesizes theoretical concepts and proposes a curriculum that addresses the needs of university-level English-as-a-foreign-language students. Corpus linguistics in a lexical approach can play a significant role in language teaching if utilized carefully. Students can participate in lexical-based instruction in English, in which grammar rules are subordinated to language use. The lesson plans that are featured in the Appendix emphasize the development of presentation skills—listening and speaking. It is hoped that this project will offer valuable information about English teaching through a lexical approach.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Corpus Linguistics

Corpus linguistics is a growing area of study and research applied to teaching/learning English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL). This section addresses the pedagogical purposes and benefits of corpus linguistics, beginning with its definition and historical synopsis. Current corpus-based research is presented next. Finally, this section explains how corpus linguistics may be applied in education as a resource, and indicates some of its limitations in EFL/ESL environments.

Definition and Historical Overview of Corpus Linguistics

Corpus linguistics is the study of language using a source of human language data on which studies are based, a corpus (plural: corpora). A further analysis of the term corpus is necessary to understand the purpose of corpus linguistics. A historical overview and a list of seven types of corpora and their use are presented next.

Corpus, meaning body in Latin, is used refer to a large collection of authentic written and spoken language (Free Software Foundation, 2005). Early corpus linguistics predating 1950 referred to parent diaries, which were
composed of children’s early utterances, and were analyzed by linguists to establish norms of development (McEnery & Wilson, n.d.). Language corpora continued to grow as corpus-based research was launched. Linguists at that time, however, came across many difficulties because it was impossible to study large amounts of texts and control multiple language variables manually.

It was falsely believed that corpus linguistics was abandoned during 1960s and 1980s because of the difficulties linguists encountered regarding the processing of texts. However, during these years pioneers of corpus linguistics such as Francis and Kukera had been working on the production of representative corpora, such as the now-famous Brown corpus in 1961. Later on, John McHardy Sinclair founded the Collins Birmingham University International Language Database (COBUILD), a project also known as the Bank of English corpus (McEnery & Wilson, n.d.).

In the early 1980s, computer technology improved and helped corpus-based research overcome size limitations because of the ability to store and process large texts of language within seconds. A primary use of corpora was the compiling of dictionaries for English language learners (Biber & Conrad, 2001). Now corpus linguists focus
principally on corpora to investigate the way specific linguistic features function in language use, and to examine new aspects of language that were impossible to notice before and are useful in English pedagogy. As Table 1 shows, the area of corpus linguistics has developed dramatically since 1965.

Table 1. Number of Studies in Corpus Linguistics During 1965-1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To 1965</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1970</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1975</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1980</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1985</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-1991</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: McEnery & Wilson (n.d.).

More specifically, corpora have been widely used in translation and language teaching and learning. Teachers may search a corpus and gather information about lexical and grammatical features that native speakers' intuition cannot access. A corpus also provides authentic examples of language, as opposed to invented texts in textbooks that students usually find monotonous. Improved syllabi
and materials should be designed on the basis of corpus linguistics for more effective educational outcomes. Similarly, students may themselves search a corpus to discover similarities and differences of linguistic features between their native and target language, and study new aspects of language of which they were previously unaware.

Furthermore, translators utilize “comparable corpora to compare the use of apparent translation equivalents in two languages, and parallel corpora to see how words and phrases have been translated in the past” (Hunston, 2002, pp. 13-14). Linguists and language teachers consider corpora important not because they provide new information about language, but because this information is processed in ways that makes patterns easier to observe. These ways are discussed next.

As was mentioned earlier, computer-supported software—known as concordance programs or concordancers—are used as search-tools to process a corpus based on what a researcher is particularly looking for in a data sample. It is therefore worthless for one to have a corpus alone without a concordancer. Showing frequency, phraseology, and collocation are three ways in which concordance programs search a corpus (Hunston, 2002). These three
terms will be briefly presented here because a further discussion is provided in other sections.

The Linguistic Use of Corpora

Linguists issue useful information from frequency word-lists to study particular linguistic features in more detail. As Hunston (2002) mentioned, different corpora can be examined to indicate which words occur in high frequencies, so that researchers may compare particular words across corpora and register, and then make inferences about the way these words function within a language.

What is interesting when processing a corpus is the vast collection of utterances that can show how a word is used in language through the display of concordance lines. One may observe alternative occasions of a word in language (phraseology) because concordance programs can locate and gather them altogether (Hunston, 2002). Concordance lines thus allow users to study the phraseology of lexical and grammatical linguistic features so that students can be more aware when encountering them in the future.

The ability to study collocations is another benefit users obtain from studying phraseology, that is, showing which words tend to co-occur (collocate) with other words
(Hunston, 2002). "Collocation is the way words combine in a language to produce natural-sounding speech and writing" according to Crowther, Dignen, and Lea (2002, p. vii). As learners observe the way specific words (lexical or grammatical) function in nativelike language, they also examine which words tend to precede and follow them according to context and register.

The word head, for example, has two lexical types of collocations that indicate (a) the upper part of the body, as in He shook his head, and (b) a person in charge, as in head office. Head also has six grammatical collocates: (a) possessives as in my head, (b) of as in head of department, (c) over as in beat someone over the head, (d) on as in hit someone on the head, (e) back as in back of the head, and (f) off as in head off somewhere (Hunston, 2002). Thus, concordance lines provide essential information for users, who improve their collocational competence to become fluent and competent English speakers.

Because language is complex, researchers have produced different types of corpora to address different language purposes and to meet particular research objectives. Six types of corpora are so far compiled and used in language teaching: (a) the specialized corpus,
(b) the general corpus, (c) the comparable corpora, 
(d) the parallel corpora, (e) the learner corpus, and 
(f) the pedagogic corpus (Hunston, 2002). A brief 
description of each type is presented next.

Specialized corpora are compiled from particular 
types of texts such as “newspaper editorials, geography 
textbooks, academic articles in a particular subject, 
lectures, casual conversations, essays,” and other 
build specialized corpora to represent specific types of 
language for study. Two common corpora of this type are 
the Cambridge and Nottingham Corpus of Discourse in 
English (CANCODE), which includes informal registers of 
British English; and the Michigan Corpus of Academic 
Spoken English (MICASE), which contains spoken registers 
of American academic language (Hunston, 2002).

A general corpus is comprised of many kinds of texts 
such as spoken and/or written language produced in one or 
more countries. Even though there is a wide range of 
texts, these do not represent language sufficiently. This 
type of corpus serves to further language learning and 
translation. The 100-million-word British National Corpus 
(BNC), the 400-million-word Bank of English corpus, and 
the 1-million-word Brown corpus are the most common
general corpora used by researchers and educators (Hunston, 2002).

Comparable and parallel corpora consist of two or more corpora that have texts in different languages such as in English and Spanish, for example. Translators and English language learners mainly use it to discover similarities and differences, and similar expressions between two languages. The most common comparable corpus is the International Corpus of English (Hunston, 2002).

Texts written by English-language learners are put together to produce a learner corpus, which is then compared to another corpus made up of nativelike English texts. The purpose of this comparison is for teachers to define the ways in which English-language learners' language use differs from each other and from native speakers. The best known of learner corpora is the International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE), and a comparable corpus to this is the Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays (LOCNESS) (Hunston, 2002).

English teaching materials are often invented and do not reflect the authenticity of English accurately; therefore, teachers now have the ability to gather a collection of texts for English language learners, and compare it with authentic language. This collection
comprises a pedagogic corpus, and it may be also used for raising students' awareness about language to which they have already been exposed (Hunston, 2002).

In a nutshell, a large collection of texts—a corpus—can be stored and accessed electronically to examine particular lexical or grammatical features by showing frequency lists, phraseology, and collocation. Different types of corpora are used depending on the purposes of research and language study.

**Corpus-Based Research**

Linguists and researchers often rely on their intuitions about language use to produce materials for ESL/EFL purposes, such as texts in textbooks, exams, and other materials. Because human intuition is not always correct, ESL/EFL materials do not reflect the accuracy of the way speakers and writers use language in authentic situations. As empirical analyses on corpora took place, researchers noticed unexpected findings about language use.

During the 1970s and 1980s researchers studied grammatical features using authentic texts. However, the sample of texts was not representative of language as a whole because it was small and focused on one register. Biber (2001) argued that when analyzing grammatical
patterns of language use, a variety of registers and large
amounts of texts are important because “characteristics of
the textual environment interact with register
differences, so that strong patterns of use in one
register often represent only weak patterns in other
registers” (p. 104).

Corpus linguistics allows researchers to use a
representative sample to study language across registers,
and make valid generalizations. Biber (2001) conducted
three case studies to show the ways grammar use and
register interact. In all three studies, four registers
were considered based on the Longman Spoken and Written
English (LSWE) corpus, and each of them included
approximately four to five million words. The four
registers were (a) conversation, (b) fiction,
(c) newspaper language, and (d) academic prose, and
differed “with respect to mode, interactiveness,
production circumstances, purpose, and target audience”
(Biber, 2001, p. 104).

Many common lexical verbs are used in English, and
one might assume that there are no particularly frequent
verbs. According to Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and
Finegan’s study (1999), only 12 lexical verbs occurred
most frequently in the LSWE Corpus. These verbs are say,
get, go, know, think, see, make, come, take, want, give, and mean. These verbs are important mainly in conversation. The lexical verb say has the highest frequency in newspaper language, which is obvious because speakers and writers mainly use this verb to report what other people say. Another finding is that the verb get is interestingly highly frequent in conversation. The verb get is extremely common in English because it carries different meanings, such as (a) to obtain something, (b) to possess something, (c) to move to or away from something, and other meanings. This study indicated that “different registers show strikingly different preferences for particular verbs” (Biber, 2001, p. 108).

Another misconception about language is that the progressive aspect is most commonly used in conversation. Many ESL/EFL textbooks include invented dialogues, which overuse progressive verbs (Biber, 2001). The second case study of Biber et al. (1999) showed that progressive verbs are indeed more frequent in conversation than in academic prose. However, the simple aspect proved to be the most common verb aspect in all four registers, with conversation having the highest frequency use. Therefore, authors should consider such findings when producing ESL/EFL materials.
It is further important for linguists to examine the different ways lexical verbs are used to convey different meanings, and how often these verbs occur across registers. Two verbs, \textit{stand} and \textit{begin}, were examined; one might assume that they can both typically occur in all four different patterns: (a) simple intransitive, (b) intransitive with an optional adverbial, (c) transitive with a noun phrase as direct object, and (d) transitive with a complement clause as direct object. The corpus-based analysis, however, showed that \textit{stand} and \textit{begin} have valency differences as well as register differences. The results indicated that \textit{stand} occurs more frequently as an intransitive verb with an optional adverbial, whereas \textit{begin} is used more commonly as a transitive verb with a complement clause. Moreover, conversation showed a high preference for the pattern \textit{begin + complement clause}, whereas intransitive \textit{begin} occurred more frequently in news and academic prose (Biber et al., 1999).

All three case studies (Biber et al., 1999) indicated the importance of examining linguistic features across registers. Corpus linguistics offers the opportunity to study large amounts of authentic language, and make
noteworthy inferences that are largely inaccessible on the level of conscious awareness (Biber, 2001).

Hand in hand with native-speaker fluency goes the mastery of idioms. Authors of ESL/EFL materials find it difficult to choose which idioms to include “given the vast inventory of idioms in a native speaker’s repertoire” (Simpson & Mendis, 2003, p. 419). Simpson and Mendis (2003) carried out a quantitative analysis using the MICASE corpus, with 1.7 million words of academic discourse. This study focused on the distribution and function of idioms across registers within academic spoken language, areas that had not been adequately addressed as yet. Their findings showed that idioms occurred neither rarely nor frequently in general academic discourse. Idioms showed insignificantly higher frequencies in the monologic than the interactive speech events (Simpson & Mendis, 2003). Another finding indicated slight differences among subregisters, so Simpson and Mendis concluded that idioms are not content-related; they rather address features of one’s language repertoire. It was thus essential to point out the importance of idiom use because idioms fulfill essential functions: (a) evaluation, (b) description, (c) paraphrase, (d) emphasis, (e) collaboration, and (f) metalanguage. Because MICASE is
a relatively small corpus, the frequency of idioms was low. Therefore, teachers and material writers would benefit more if idiom research were based on a larger corpus.

ESL/EFL textbooks and grammar books represent would-clause adjacent to conditional if-clause, a structure that is not entirely correct according to the findings of quantitative and qualitative analyses based on three corpora: (a) the Brown corpus, (b) the Santa Barbara corpus of spoken American English (SBC), and (c) the MICASE corpus. The research questions this study examined were as follows: (a) how many would-clauses occur with adjacent if-clauses? and (b) what are the functions of the would-clauses that occur without adjacent if-clauses, and how frequent are such functions? The study discovered that would-clauses with adjacent if-clauses accounted for almost 20% in all three corpora. The qualitative analysis revealed that would-clauses with nonadjacent if-clauses fulfilled six functions: (a) conditional frames, (b) tentativeness and varying degrees of commitment, (c) emphatic negativity, (d) hypothetical environments, (e) counterfactual environments, and (f) displaced perspectives in demonstrations (Frazier, 2003). These findings pointed out the need to revise the conditional
structures that ESL/EFL materials feature based on authentic corpora.

All languages consist of lexical chunks that are learned intuitively and do not follow any particular language rules. Adverbs that co-occur with adjectives to construct phrases are part of idiomatic language. However, as Biber and Conrad (2003) claimed, a closer look at language corpora reveals unexpected functions of some linguistic features. Kennedy (2003) examined linguistic data that indicated specific collocations between specific degree adverbs and adjectives. The investigation was based on the British National Corpora (BNC). The results showed that some amplifiers such as very, really, particularly, highly, and extremely, appear to be synonymous and interchangeable, and tend to collocate with useful, and interesting, whereas some other amplifiers such as clearly, badly, heavily, greatly, considerably, and severely are not synonymous and interchangeable. Thus, more attention should be given to such linguistic features that are fixed in a language to encourage nativelike speech and writing.

Many linguists were interested in examining the behavior of verbs in language use. Two theoretical linguists, Van Valin and Wilkins (Tao, 2001), analyzed the
verb *remember* based on the framework of *Role and Reference Grammar* in 1993. However, because their study was nonempirical and was based on intuition, the sentences they examined were out of context, and their findings were untrue, according to Tao (2001), who investigated the same verb based on four corpora: (a) the Cambridge University Press and Cornell University (CUPCO) Corpus, (b) the Corpus of Spoken American English (CSAE), (c) the Corpus of Spoken Professional American English (CSPAE), and (d) the Brown Corpus. The purpose of this study was to examine the ways the verb *remember* is used in spoken discourse. The results indicated that (a) *remember*-associated structures tend to function as independent, highly mobile units of some sort, (b) *remember* is mainly used with first-person utterances, and (c) its functions describe it as an "epistemic marker and metalinguistic device in conversational English," rather than as a predicate-center verb that focuses exclusively on postverbal complements (Tao, 2001, p. 140). Obviously, a closer look at language reveals important information.

Teaching authentic language means exploiting lexical phrases (chunks) that occur in idiomatic expressions within a pragmatic context, and in nativelike fluency.
According to Burdine (2001), non-native speakers should learn different ways to express disagreement instead of the common chunk *I disagree with that*, which is not always appropriate and might cause misunderstanding among speakers. Her research focused on teaching disagreement strategies in English, and was based on the comparison of three genre-specific corpora and five intermediate-level books on various disagreement expressions in a variety of communicative situations. Her findings revealed that more disagreement strategies occur in natural discourse than ESL textbooks suggest. As Burdine (2001) further explained, personal features such as directness, emotion, and personal style, as well as sociolinguistic features such as the formality of the speaker-listener relationship, influence these strategies. However, Burdine suggested that more research on paralinguistic features would expand the list and offer more useful strategies for expressing disagreement, such as coughing, or pausing, which cannot be indicated in corpora.

Many researchers use corpora to conduct empirical-based studies because they include "a large number of texts and a large number of linguistic features," according to Reppen (2001, p. 211). His study focused on the writing development of third- and
sixth-grade students, both L1 and L2 learners. He used a corpus-based method to obtain data from both English and Navajo learners in writing, and to compare the changes that occur in third and sixth grades. Reppen (2001) based his research on the Corpus of Elementary Student Speech and Writing (CESSW). The results revealed that both English and Navajo sixth-grade students used complex sentences and lexical variety in their writing. Because the corpus included a collection of fifth-grade student language, Reppen could apply it to measure the developmental changes in other grades. These findings also provided information about the differences of students with various L1 backgrounds. Such information is useful for teachers of L2 learners who want to upgrade their materials and to set “realistic goals [to] guide students toward literacy” (Reppen, 2001, p. 222).

Corpus-based research revealed information about patterns of language that could not be achieved based on native speakers’ intuition. Collocates and a variety of functions of linguistics features are now able to be retrieved by examining language through concordancers because they present linguistic information in a way that is not accessible to intuition. Studies that deal with corpora also examined the importance of teaching and
learning lexical chunks that compose a big part of the English language, as well as noticing what lexicon is used in different contexts and genres.

**Pedagogical Implications of Corpus Linguistics**

As more corpus-based studies occurred, researchers realized the close connection between corpora and language teaching, and slowly tried to implement their findings in pedagogy. Such applications refer to the production and development of new instructional materials, syllabus design, language testing, and other applications that are presented below.

Both educators and students can benefit from findings in corpora that native intuition cannot provide, such as authentic examples of language and the different ways linguistic features function within it (Biber, 2001). Corpus-based research can identify the possible language features and processes that speakers of English encounter. Teachers can then devote more instructional time to them in the classroom (Kennedy, 1998). As Biber suggested, teachers can use this information “to develop [instructional] materials that reflect the actual patterns of use in particular registers” (2001, p. 114).

Similarly, Burdine (2001) claimed that corpora are valuable resources for teachers to obtain and implement
lexical phrase patterning in their teaching because they can help students study accurate data that are authentically used in a variety of genres.

According to Biber and Conrad it is crucial for students to encounter all instances of the ways a lexical or grammatical feature functions across registers, because "strong patterns of use in one register often represent weak patterns in other registers" (2001, p. 332). Becoming aware of the variety of ways a pattern is used encourages nativelike English fluency. Overreliance on intuition, with regards to deciding which words and structures are most frequently used in English, is another dilemma that may be also overcome by corpus-based research, from which teachers, authors, and testing materials can benefit. In this way, teaching materials can include authentic language that complies with the target language norms.

Teachers may utilize a particular corpus that contains words related to a specific register to teach students how these words are used in contextualized natural language, rather than using these words in invented sentences. Students are more likely to find activities like these more fun and interesting. Another example is for teachers to use a corpus that includes high-frequency grammatical words such as prepositions.
Ample authentic examples of language are available for students to study and compare the ways different prepositions or any other linguistic feature functions.

Another study (Frazier, 2003) revealed new linguistics features that are underrepresented or not represented at all in ESL/EFL textbooks and grammar books. Frazier encouraged teachers and material writers to include in future textbooks a range of these features, and use authentic language examples from a corpus. Such an approach will demonstrate that "a structure can have different meanings and uses in different contexts" (Frazier, 2003, p. 465).

It is essential for students to learn idioms because they are important characteristics of English language fluency. A study by Simpson and Mendis (2003) revealed a considerable number of idioms that fulfill important functions in academic language. Therefore, they urge teachers to include idioms in the English for academic purposes (EAP) curriculum. Conventional methods of teaching idioms disregard contextual factors, whereas an authentic corpus presents idioms in context so that students can make inferences about their meaning and their real use and function in language.
The studies of Biber et al. (1999) and Kennedy (2003) also indicated that native speakers acquire idiomatic language that English learners need to study within its context to note sociopragmatic features. Corpus-based studies offer more explicit opportunities to analyze specific linguistic features such as idioms, adjectives, and adverbs, so future textbooks can utilize and expose them to students.

A number of applications of corpora in pedagogy are suggested by Hunston (2002). General applications focus on data-driven learning, language teaching methodology, and syllabus design, whereas specific applications refer to ways that corpora can be applied in English for academic purposes (EAP) and language testing, and the way learner corpora are used in classroom settings.

An approach related to language pedagogy is data-driven learning (DDL), developed by Tim Johns and used with international students at the University of Birmingham (Hunston, 2002). DDL engages students with active learning because they examine authentic language through corpora, discover language patterns they are interested in, and store new information in their long-term memory as they deduce knowledge themselves. This approach offers students plenty of opportunities to notice
patterns that teachers did not discuss or books did not address. It is extremely useful for teachers to select or edit the concordance lines their students will use to examine a particular linguistic feature or pattern that is problematic, and use questions to guide them to the desired objective (Hunston, 2002).

It is also important for teachers to bear in mind that in order for students to learn linguistic features or patterns, they need to encounter them more than once. DDL learners work with corpora to retrieve information so students can discover a common pattern among the selected concordance lines. Therefore, DDL activities need to be student-centered so that students are actively involved to achieve learning. In this case, pedagogic corpora are mainly produced and used by the teacher. This approach promotes curiosity, and raises students' consciousness about particular aspects of language (Hunston, 2002).

Corpora may as well be used in syllabus design because they represent what students should learn. Willis in Hunston (2002) suggested that a syllabus can be the actual corpus because it includes all the linguistic features and patterns students should be taught to become competent speakers and writers of English. However, what needs to be taught is constructed based students' prior
knowledge. Useful and grade-level appropriate knowledge
and careful selection of language are two strategies
employed to build an efficient syllabus.

An important issue on which teachers always focus is
the content of an academic course rather than the ways of
teaching it. Corpus linguistics offers information about
salient features of different writing genres that refer to
specific types of writing in English for academic purposes
(EAP) such as academic papers in each discipline (Hunston,
2002). Students have the opportunity to study the
phraseology of grammatical words rather than to learn
individual lexical words. Because phraseology provides
information about the collocates of other words and their
functions, students expand their lexicon of a particular
discipline (Hunston, 2002).

Another specific application of corpora has recently
occurred in language testing. A recent example is the text
selection in the Test of English as a Foreign Language
(TOEFL) examination, which aims to “establish criteria for
the kind of language that should appear in them” (Hunston,
2002, p. 205). Such applications of corpora in language
testing aim to help students learn and be assessed on
authentic, nativelike language.
As linguists and authors have begun to design corpus-based textbooks and other teaching materials, a hypothesis occurred: If these textbooks are mainly based on written-corpus information, it is then less likely for teachers to expect natural spoken output in EFL classrooms. McCarthy and Carter (2001) suggested that EFL textbooks should include spoken language from corpora such as CANCODE, so that learners work on and improve both writing and speaking skills.

Corpora are linked to language teaching because they include the items and processes of language that language users are more likely to encounter, and are thus more worth teaching (Granger, 2003). Teaching materials tend to be constructed to include corpus-based information such as the most frequent functions of prepositions, and collocates of a lexical item. Linguists started producing ESL/EFL dictionaries and textbooks based on corpus research. Even though this new trend is slow, it is promising and encouraging for future language teaching and learning.

In sum, corpora are regarded as an advantageous resource that can be widely used to inform and not to control language pedagogy. Teachers may make use of authentic language rather than invented texts to promote
nativelike fluency. Examples of general applications as well as specific applications in English teaching address the production of teaching materials, dictionaries, and textbooks that promote and reflect real language; the development of language tests; and syllabus design for academic settings.

Limitations of Corpus Linguistics in the English-as-a-Second-Language/English-as-a-Foreign-Language Classroom

Some linguists have argued that corpora are not sufficiently reliable to use in the classroom. Therefore, it is important to examine some of their main arguments.

According to Widdowson (2000), a corpus does not include authentic and contextualized language discourse; rather it offers parts of sentences. Students are not able to understand how those texts were used, by whom, and in what specific contexts, unless edited by teachers before using them as teaching materials.

Another limitation is that teachers may use a corpus uncritically. Language items should not be merely selected to teach because of their frequency in the corpus. Instead, teachers should seek answers in other sources such as introspection and elicitation regarding the salience of specific language features. Hunston (2002) added that teachers should also encourage students to use
language creatively, and not to be constrained to “clichéd utterances” (p. 193).

When corpora include nativelike language only, the language of a non-native speaker of English may be underestimated, because corpora offer details of phraseology and collocations that speakers of other languages may not often use (Hunston, 2002). Thus, teachers’ essential role is to select material that is important and meaningful to the target audience.

A final disadvantage of corpora is that they mostly offer chunks of language to students to learn, without identifying the meaning of those chunks (Hunston, 2002). This can result in students forgetting what they learned because such knowledge was not connected in a meaningful way to their prior knowledge. The aspect of grammar may be also ignored because students only learn lexical chunks. They may not be able to compare the grammar of their L1 and L2, and to draw conclusions concerning similarities and differences of the two languages at a metalinguistic level: talking about the rules of a language.

It is then true that if teachers do not consider factors that address language learners’ needs, they will misuse corpora and will send wrong messages to students regarding language use. Widdowson’s (2000) comment on
contextualized language should be taken into consideration if teachers want students to become fluent and competent language speakers and writers.

Summary

This paper has focused on the emergent area of corpus linguistics. The introduction has presented definitions and an historical overview, the foremost types of corpora, the main functions and benefits of corpora, and the use of corpus linguistics in language pedagogy. Basic research covered a number of case studies that revealed important issues about linguistic features and their diverse functions in language use.

The discussion of corpus-based research offered a number of implications of the application of corpora in language teaching and learning. The purpose of these case studies was to show that teachers and material writers should look at language more closely to provide a wider range of information regarding linguistic features and their different functions in language use. The last section of the paper pointed out some disadvantages that may accrue from the misuse of corpora in classroom environments, to urge teachers to use corpora critically.

Language pedagogy has been influenced from various disciplines, and corpus linguistics is one of them.
However, those who practice it are responsible for obtaining benefits and avoiding misuse. As linguists have suggested, corpora should inform rather than control language pedagogy. Teachers and students should also bear in mind that corpus linguistics is only one way to guide to literacy, and so a combination of all language disciplines addresses and successfully meets more linguistic objectives.

Concordance

Corpus linguistics mainly examines and identifies “what is central and typical in the language” (Sinclair, 1991, p. 17). Therefore, a corpus itself serves no purpose unless processed. Concordance programs (concordancers) are computer-support tools that process corpus information (Hunston, 2002).

Their use as a teaching tool in ESL/EFL classrooms is beneficial and valuable. Students can explore language autonomously and find important information about how language is used, instead of relying in teachers’ intuition.

This paper defines what concordance means, explores the way concordancers function, and explains their purpose in corpus linguistics. It further presents the results of
current research on concordance, and offers a set of pedagogical implications based on the benefits of concordancers.

**Definitions of Concordance**

"Concordancing is a way of processing corpus information" (Hunston, 2002, p. 38). A concordancer is a computer program that functions as a search tool. It is able to conduct a constructive corpus search, identify, and extract 10-15 examples of a selected word ("node word" or "key word") or phrase used in context (Hunston, 2002). Key word in context (KWIC) is known as the "universal format for concordances" (Sinclair, 1991, p. 43).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>to be carried in.</th>
<th>Q: Leather</th>
<th>bag</th>
<th>? What was it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe I put it in my</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>Your office at home?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't recall. What</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>did you put in?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my office and put it in my</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>&quot;They&quot; being who?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brought it in here. What</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>? My black bag that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My black</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>that was eventually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe that</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>? A black bag with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it was in your</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>, it had not been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 1. Key Word In Context Concordance Format

The extracted examples (concordance lines) are parts of sentences that are aligned vertically and ordered alphabetically in some way (see Figure 1). They present
the node word in the middle of the computer screen. The user is able to see the words that appear on the left and right of the node word (Hunston, 2002; Lewis, 2000). As Sinclair concisely put it, "a concordance is a collection of the occurrences of a word-form, each in its own textual environment" (1991, p. 32).

The screen shows single-line examples of the way a word or phrase is used in a language. This is important for the users to maintain visual convenience. According to Sinclair (1991), "the visual convenience is lost if the citation exceeds one line" (p. 33). However, a concordancer can be set to provide complete sentences to meet the needs of a researcher.

Teachers use concordancers as a teaching tool, because it is easier to see which words co-occur with specific target words. Because collocation is important for language learners, concordancing is an easy and fast way to obtain information about the collocates of a word (Hunston, 2002). According to Woolard, concordancing is "an ideal resource for exploring collocation" (2001, p. 42).

Lewis claimed that ESL/EFL students obtain great benefits as they "self-discover probable and appropriate language" (2000, p. 40). Linguists also use it because
concordancers help them analyze lexical collocations and provide frequency information (Biber, Conrad, & Reppen, 1998).

However, the results are efficient only if the selected corpus is efficient (Sinclair, 1991). A researcher or a teacher must carefully select or design a corpus to meet the purpose of its use. If a corpus contains texts with a considerably small number of occurrences of a node word, then the results will not be efficient, and no general conclusions can be inferred.

These programs are relatively inexpensive and user-friendly. As soon as users become acquainted with the functions of a concordancer, they can search any corpus with any concordance program. More information about the way a concordancer functions will be discussed next.

**Concordance Programs and Their Function**

Corpus linguists base their work on the analyses and interpretation of a language. Such analyses are generated by concordance programs, which search a corpus (Hockey, 2001).

Three concordancers for use on the Windows operating system are mainly used nowadays. Two of them, MonoConc® (http://www.athel.com) and WordSmith Tools® (http://www.liv.ac.uk/~ms2928/index.htm), were at first
designed for corpus linguistic purposes. Concordance® (http://www.rjcw.freeserve.co.uk) is a third concordance program, which can be used for both linguistic and literary applications. It was designed to create Web concordances for teaching English literature (Hockey, 2001).

These programs have predefined specifications to identify sets of symbols and classify them as 'words.' Detecting and recognizing all instances of the same set of symbols, the words, allows concordancers to alphabetize them or sort them in some other order. This function offers word lists that are easy for the user to examine. A default list would be ordered according to the way words occur naturally in text. Another type of word list would be ordered alphabetically together with a frequency number (how many times a word occurs in a text) as Figure 2 shows, and percentage frequencies (Hockey, 2001).
A concordancer is able to present the node word used in a sentence or part of it (Hockey, 2001). The list of concordance lines according to an alphabetical order is essential for users, especially for ESL/EFL students (Sinclair, 1991). The concordance lines are displayed on the screen in such way that the words that are on the right of the node word are in alphabetical order. It works the same with the words on the left of the node word. This way a concordance shows together all instances where the node word is followed by or precedes another word (Figures
3 & 4). Students can then notice which words co-occur more frequently with the node word (Hockey, 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaving the white golf ball</th>
<th>bag</th>
<th>and another bluish bag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The white golf ball</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>and that bluish bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besides the little bathroom</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>, how many other items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that assumes the bathroom</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>was a separate piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It wasn’t a big</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>, and it was put with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My black</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>that it was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Words Immediately Before bag Are in Alphabetical Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cats and a</th>
<th>bag</th>
<th>for her and a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your black</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>from its location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a fold-over</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>, garment bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When did the suit</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>get downstairs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>! Golf bag!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t know if my golf</td>
<td>bag</td>
<td>had come back</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Words Immediately After bag Are in Alphabetical Order

Therefore, this possibility allows students to locate and examine the collocates of a node word in different
ways. One way is to set the program to search for all collocates within a fixed number of words to the left or right of the node word. However, if users want to focus on the most important collocates of a node word, they can create a list of common collocates for the program to leave out. Users can then distinguish different meanings of the same word; for example back meaning behind, and back referring to human body (Hockey, 2001).

However, these programs have difficulty distinguishing uppercase from lowercase words. An example Hockey (2001) presented is the word brown as a color and Brown as a last name. He further suggested that such instances should not be distinguished in predefined settings of a concordancer, and that uppercase and lowercase words should be treated equally to obtain accurate results.

Batch concordance programs and interactive text analysis programs function differently. A batch concordance program is more flexible in the sense that it allows the users to determine if they want hyphenated words to be treated as one or two words, for example. On the other hand, an interactive text analysis program requires an already built word index, created by using a special program module. However, a batch concordance is
not able to work on a very large corpus because it is time consuming (Hockey, 2001).

**Corpus-Based Approach**

According to Biber et al. (1998), "one type of language study is language use" (p. 3). During this type of language study, linguists do not try to make judgments on grammatical sentences; they attempt to analyze language to "uncover typical patterns" (p. 3). Researchers seek to find patterns that tend to occur, for example, in written rather than in spoken language, and to analyze the factors, which control unpredictability (Biber et al., 1998).

Such research, however, meets three methodological problems. First, intuition is not a reliable source of analysis. Second, generalization of results should be based on a large amount of spoken and written language. Third, analyses cannot be carried out fast, and several contextual factors are not easy to be controlled, if human-processed (Biber et al., 1998).

Researchers use the corpus-based approach to solve these problems. This approach utilizes concordance programs. A concordancer can work on large amounts of corpora, which include natural language, and can control multiple contextual factors. Moreover, Biber et al. (1998)
claimed that a corpus-based approach not only presents quantitative findings, but also explores patterns of language use in relation to language learning.

Specifically, researchers are able to "identify and analyze complex 'association patterns': the systematic ways in which linguistic features are used in association with other linguistic and non-linguistic features" (Biber et al., 1998, p. 5). Two linguistic associations in which linguists are interested are lexical and grammatical associations. A lexical association refers to collocation: words that co-occur frequently with other words. A grammatical association deals with words, which co-occur frequently with grammatical features in a sentence (Biber et al., 1998).

Corpus-based analyses also investigate non-linguistic associations: the way a linguistic or a grammatical feature is used in different ways "across registers (situations), dialects (social groups), and time periods" (Biber et al., 1998, p. 7). Unfortunately, concordancers are not able to examine "complex grammatical constructions or complex association patterns" (Biber et al., 1998, p. 15). Computer-programming skills are necessary for such deeper investigations. Concordancers, however, investigate word frequencies, word associations, and certain
morphological characteristics, and also can be used to look at the grammatical class of words (Biber et al., 1998, p. 254).

Research on Concordance

Research has found that in order to acquire a linguistic feature, one needs to meet it for at least 7-10 times (Lewis, 2000). Therefore, students observe and examine a linguistic feature that is used in a gathered set of 10-15 concordance lines per search. Furthermore, using a concordance is easier, faster, and provides more accurate information than do dictionaries about the collocates of a word (Woolard, 2001; Gabel, 2001; Lewis, 2000).

Students can use a concordance to observe how words behave within context. One can notice, for example, that words follow different forms in a different surrounding context, and are followed by different words, giving a different meaning each time (Hunston, 2002).

People can use concordances to identify the most frequent meanings or collocates of a word, learn different meanings of synonyms that collocate with different linguistic features, and notice more detailed behavior of individual words (Hunston, 2002). Furthermore, a concordancer allows EFL students to uncover underlying
patterns, which refer to language rules. Such approach is associated with data-driven learning (DDL) (Gabel, 2001; Simpson & Swales, 2001). Students can extract several examples of a particular linguistic feature, and therefore discover language rules. DDL and concordance use are recent promising methods for computer-assisted language learning (CALL) (Sun, 2003).

Sun (2003) claimed that EFL students could gain great benefits from web-concordancing because they “can easily gain exposure to a huge number of authentic and sorted language examples” (p. 603). Sun’s case study included three Taiwanese college students who used a web-based concordancer as a tool for a proofreading activity; they proofread eight sentences, which included different types of grammatical errors. The use of a concordancer helped them identify the errors with supporting evidence. The data was collected by a think-aloud protocol. The students’ thinking about the problem-solving process was recorded to be further analyzed. The research question referred to whether students’ prior knowledge, cognitive skills, and concordancer skills, as well as the teacher’s intervention would influence their learning process and strategies while proofreading (Sun, 2003).
The results showed that students who had prior knowledge on the specific types of errors used the concordancer as a supporting tool. Students who had somewhat encountered such types of errors before used the concordancer to induce and construct knowledge, because they followed efficient problem-solving strategies; they predicted, searched for evidence, analyzed the concordance lines, verified their predictions, and inferred language rules (Sun, 2003).

On the contrary, it seemed rather difficult and confusing for students who had no prior knowledge of the subject matter or limited concordancer skills. They used wrong cues on the concordancer and received irrelevant concordancer outputs. These students required more teacher intervention to continue and overcome such difficulties. Concordancer skills, such as searching for effective strings and retrieving alphabetic lists and sort types, assisted in obtaining more relevant concordancer outputs, which helped students construct meaningful and productive learning.

Thus, as Flowerdew in Sun (2003) claimed, "both learning and concordancer output correspond to students' needs or wants," (p. 611) because students are the ones who initiate learning, and test their hypotheses on
linguistic features and their usage in authentic language. Such experience predicts which students will become proficient and independent language learners. Consequently, researchers have concluded that productive induction can only be achieved if students know how to use concordancing tools, have prior knowledge on particular linguistic features, and use a variety of thinking skills (Sun, 2003; Sun & Wang, 2003).

Gabel (2001) found that when students use concordancers they compare their interlanguage with the target language norms. Such method can lead students to identify misconceptions and mismatches, and thus benefit from the results as they “bridge the gap between their own performance and that of native speakers, and heed the linguistic item in future text productions” (p. 287). This method also encourages future autonomous language learners (Gabel, 2001; Sun, 2003). Moreover, James and Garrett in Gabel (2001) pointed out that students improve their language skills only when they become aware of the mismatch and inconsistencies between the target language and their “own interlanguage system” (p. 271).

In addition to this, Todd in Sun and Wang (2003) conducted a quantitative case study, which reported “a strong correlation between learner’s induction from
self-selected concordances and self-correction" (p. 85). Another longitudinal study by Turnbull and Burston (Sun & Wang, 2003) inferred that language learners experience success with concordancing strategies.

Sun & Wang (2003) claimed that there has been little research as to which method, inductive or deductive, best facilitates students’ learning of a grammatical pattern with a concordance program. The research question focused on whether one method is significantly better over the other when students learn collocations.

For this study, two groups were featured: an inductive group and a deductive group. The results favored the inductive group because they performed better than the deductive group when learning collocations with concordance programs in all activities. The conclusions from this study were twofold: first, students should be encouraged to use a concordancer with an inductive method when learning a language, and second, “concordancers create effective discovery learning possibilities for language learning and teaching” (Sun & Wang, 2003, p. 90).

**Pedagogical Implications**

**Benefits of Concordances.** Concordance has proved to be beneficial in the ESL/EFL classroom. Students only need basic training on the way a concordancer functions and
then they usually able to explore and investigate a language with ease and excitement. Students can, for example, examine particular lexes of their interest, such as language used in their academic field.

Using a concordance program is easier to draw students' attention to particular linguistic features that are extracted from natural spoken and written language and are gathered altogether in 10-15 concordance lines. Students have the chance to notice what words come before or after the "search string" in contextualized examples. Using concordance, students have the power to conduct their own research and infer conclusions about language rules. In this way, students are encouraged to improve their language and solving-problem skills (Lewis, 2000).

Traditional grammar books often overwhelm students and do not present natural language. They rather offer invented examples, which may not always comply with the natural target-language norms. Students can thus use concordance to investigate inductively a given linguistic feature, rather than learning multiple language rules, and applying them in invented activities (Lewis, 2000).

Lewis (2000) mentioned four benefits students obtain from concordance use. First, they investigate and discover what proceeds or follows a particular word or phrase.
Second, they notice that language consists of lexical chunks that they can learn and use naturally and accurately. Third, exploring natural language with concordance confirms a learner’s intuition as to whether particular phrases or sentences comply with target-language norms. Fourth, students meet authentic examples of the target language rather than invented ones that may not be accurate.

In addition to this, Savignon and Wang (2003) suggested that EFL students would benefit more if they studied language within context, rather than just stating the language rules. Concordance would help them explore contextualized examples of language, and then draw inferences about language rules.

From Input to Intake. An important advantage of concordance is the chance to come across the collocates of a word. The more naturally occurring language students study, the more likely it is for them to “to run into words and absorb their collocations” (Hoey, 2000, p. 238). Poole in Lewis (2000) claimed that when students use concordance, they learn more subject and object noun collocates.

Students should work on activities using concordance to encounter as much natural language as possible. Only
when they explore contextualized examples will they turn input into intake (Lewis, 2000). For example, memorizing synonyms of phrasal verbs does not help students learn how to use them. However, if students study phrasal verbs that are used in examples extracted from a corpus with the help of concordance, they are more likely to understand their meanings as well as the way(s) they function in language, and therefore store new information in their long-term memory for future use.

As Woolard (2000) argued, students of English for special purposes (ESP) would benefit more if their teachers create a corpus that includes text that meets the student needs. Thus, collocation searches would be more efficient.

Similarly, Lewis (2000) suggested that teachers should edit and modify concordance lines according to the students’ grade level. He further argued it is essential for beginning- and intermediate-level students to study simple concordance lines initially. This should not be the case with advanced learners though, as they should come across more complex language examples (Lewis, 2000). Sun and Wang (2003) added that students should use the inductive approach with easy language patterns, whereas difficult ones should be learnt deductively.
When students use concordances and explore collocations, they come across new words, and thus expand their vocabulary. Hoey (2000) also claimed that “concordancing reinforces or modifies a learner’s mental lexicon” (2000, p. 238). The important issue though is that they meet new vocabulary in contextualized examples of naturally occurring language. Therefore, they are more likely to use a target form more fluently and proficiently.

Concordance in the Classroom. It has been repeatedly pointed out that students benefit from concordance use. Concrete examples of how to use concordance in the ESL/EFL classroom are presented next.

A very simple and effective activity is to collect instances where the same word is used with a different meaning. Students can then distinguish the meanings of the same word according to context (Hockey, 2001). Concordance lines present examples from a corpus, and students investigate them carefully inferring the meaning of each instance.

According to Woolard (2000), students could use concordancing to self-correct their writing. Todd in Sun and Wang (2003) discovered that a learner’s induction from self-selected concordances and self-correction were
strongly correlated. When students self-correct their writing it is more likely to correct their misconceptions, and thus improve their interlanguage system according to the target-language norms (Gabel, 2001; Hill, 2000).

Another activity would be for students to study the collocates of a “search string,” because this is a major issue in ESL/EFL language teaching. Plenty of examples could be extracted from corpora with the use of concordancers (Hill, 2000; Sun & Wang, 2003).

Moreover, teachers can create their own corpus by selecting examples appropriate to their grade-level of natural language to meet student needs. Concordancers can search texts and display word lists, whereby teachers can observe the frequency of specific word-forms they want to teach, and include them in their own bank of texts (Sinclair, 1991).

Teachers can also use concordancers to produce teaching materials. Concordancers can search poems, songs, or stories and present word lists, from which teachers can find linguistic features they want to teach, as Figure 5 shows (Woolard, 2000).
1. She ____ her husband’s oath and went out.
   a. broke b. changed c. put down d. threw away

2. When he spoke, he ____ the prevailing silence.
   a. moved b. damaged c. broke d. violated

3. He _____, forcing him to give into what he wanted.
   a. cut his opponent’s nose b. burst his opponent’s nose
   c. broke his opponent’s nose d. humiliated his opponent

Figure 5. Studying Collocations

Coniam (2004) further suggested that students could analyze their own writing with the use of a concordancer. These analyses allow students to correct their sentence-level writing errors, and teachers to identify on which aspects of language to focus their teaching according to student needs.

Summary

This paper has explored concordance as a powerful teaching and learning tool in the ESL/EFL classroom. Concordance programs are useful when users have efficient concordance skills to investigate language patterns.

Concordancers can only display examples of language; they cannot analyze language. Further analysis should be carried out by researchers and teachers based on their intuition and language knowledge.

A rather limited number of case studies has been conducted on concordance, but the results have proved to
be promising for future language teaching and learning. Therefore, further research should focus on more longitudinal studies, so that conclusions could be more accurate and adhere to external validity and generalizability.

Collocation and Second-Language Acquisition

The purpose of this section is to introduce collocation as one of the most important areas of corpus linguistics. Collocation is considered an essential tool in language teaching, and has proved to be a valuable asset and a long-term investment for life-long language learning.

The sections that follow address definitions of collocation from different perspectives, a brief historical overview of collocation, a report on the current research, a description of the importance of collocation and its relation to language, and a number of pedagogical implications of collocation in English-as-a-foreign/second language (EFL/ESL) classrooms.

Definitions of Collocation and Its Function in Language

One of the benefits of corpus linguistics is that it allows students to study collocation while examining concordance lines. According to Woolard, collocation
“extends and enriches” (2000, p. 29) teaching and learning because students learn how words combine in language. Despite the diversity of definitions on collocation, the common characteristic of all these definitions is the “co-occurrence of words” (Woolard, 2000, p. 29).

Definitions of collocation vary mainly because of the different nature and needs of one’s research (i.e. linguist) or practice (i.e. teacher). To support this inference, Kita and Ogata claimed that “the definition of collocation differs according to the researcher’s interest and standpoint” (1997, p. 230).

Firth, a pioneer linguist, first defined collocation as “the company words keep” (Cardiff University, 2005, p. 2). From a linguistic perspective, collocation is defined in terms of one’s research as “words which are statistically much more likely to [co-occur] than random chance suggests” (Woolard, 2000, p. 29). Teachers prefer a more practical definition that applies to language teaching: “Collocation is the way words combine in a language to produce natural-sounding speech and writing” (Crowther, Dignen, & Lea, 2002, p. vii).

Like collocations, idioms are part of idiomatic language. A distinction between collocations and idioms is that the meaning of an idiom cannot be inferred from the
meanings of its constituents, whereas the meaning of a collocation can (Zughoul & Abdul-Fattah, 2001). For example, the idiom Wake up and smell the coffee does not mean to smell the coffee literally. However, the collocation “Their marriage was formally dissolved last year” means that they had a divorce (Crowther, Dignen, & Lea, 2002, p. 228). This utterance is a collocation because its meaning can be inferred from the meaning of each of its constituents. Lewis (2000), however, added that collocations and idioms are sometimes overlapping terms.

Moreover, Sinclair (1991) mentioned that apart from the idiom-principle, the open-choice principle also needs to be considered to understand the meaning of language in context. He further explained that when “a unit is completed (a word or a phrase or a clause), a large range of choice opens up and the only restraint is grammaticalness” (1991, p. 109). This example proves that collocation expands learners’ mental lexicon, and thus helps them understand words by “knowing the patterns in which [they are] used” (Lewis, 2000, p. 8). Hill also claimed that learners do not really understand the meaning or make use of vocabulary words unless they “know how that
word is used, which means knowing something about its collocational field" (2000, p. 60).

In sum, researchers and teachers look at collocation from a different viewpoint. However, they all perceive collocation as the way words combine to produce naturally occurring language. A discussion about when researchers started to notice the benefits of the use of collocation is presented next.

**Historical Overview**

The idea of collocation was first introduced by Harold Palmer, a language teacher during the 1940s. John Rupert Firth, Michael Halliday, and John Sinclair expanded his work, conducted more research on collocation, and published a selection of articles on collocation and its implications in language teaching during the 1960s (The University of Birmingham, 2005).

However, the influence of audiolingualism on language teaching and learning back in the 1940s is considered to be the reason why research on lexicon is insufficient (Zughoul & Abdul-Fattah, 2001). Teachers and material writers were convinced that phonology and syntax were more important than lexicon. From the 1940s until the 1970s, linguists created word counts—a limited number of vocabulary words—for students to acquire. It was believed
that with only limited vocabulary students could learn the phonology and syntax of English by mastering the sound system of the language and having structural devices automated, according to Fries' theory of second-language acquisition (as cited in Zughoul & Abdul-Fattah, 2001).

It was after the evolution of corpus linguistics that linguists realized that the issues of frequency was misrepresented in the word counts. Initially, Twadell (1983) suggested that the word count should include a few high-frequency words, a large number of medium-frequency words, and a few number of low-frequency words, as Figure 6 shows. This distribution, however, was wrong because linguists noticed that it did not help students develop their communicative skills.
Source: Adapted from Zughoul & Abdul-Fattah (2001). Figure 6. Distribution of Frequency Words in a Word Count According to Twadell

A correct distribution of words in a word count should include a few high-frequency words, a small number of medium-frequency words, and a large number of low frequency words, as Figure 7 shows, according to the study of Kucera and Francis (1967) that was based on the Brown corpus.
As Judd (1978) stated, students often encounter difficulties selecting the correct lexis within a native-speaking environment. Therefore, there is an immediate need for English learners to memorize many prefabricated chunks to achieve language proficiency (Zughoul & Abdul-Fattah, 2001).

**Collocation and Language**

Collocation is an important aspect of second-language acquisition because it helps learners produce fluent and nativelike language. The importance of collocation in language production and its connection with lexicon are two issues that are discussed next.
Importance of Collocation. Non-native speakers (NNS) of English may be aware of a great deal of individual words and their synonyms. However, they often use the wrong word choice when producing sentences in either spoken or written form. Even though the sentences uttered are grammatically correct, the combinations of words are unacceptable in English.

For example, native speakers of Greek may say *I did a cake* instead of *I made a cake* because they know that *do* and *make* are synonyms, so they use them interchangeably. What they clearly do not know is that these two verbs are not used in the same way; *do* co-occurs with different words than *make*. Such combinations of words may convey meaning, but they do not sound nativelike.

Many teachers and researchers found that this failure of NNS to use nativelike combinations of words underlies the fact that educators teach words individually rather than emphasizing the way words combine in English (Zughoul & Abdul-Fattah, 2003). A major difficulty for NNSs is to select words that collocate with other words. Therefore, collocational knowledge is important in second/foreign language learning because it is a key indicator of the learners' language proficiency. Some of the main arguments
favoring the importance of teaching collocations are presented next.

English learners need to study how words are used in English rather than learn the meanings of individual words alone. When students achieve collocational competence, they are more likely to produce acceptable and nativelike utterances (Smadja & McKeown, 1990; Williams, 2000).

Non-native speakers of English do not have the ability to acquire naturally the implicit knowledge of what words to choose, and therefore have difficulty composing correct word combinations. One example is the dilemma a learner encounters to combine the noun tea with either the adjective strong or powerful, which are synonyms and thus options the learner may believe may be used interchangeably. Obviously, powerful tea is a wrong collocation, and thus collocation knowledge is clearly a powerful tool for learners to speak fluent English (Kita & Ogata, 1997).

Kjellemer (1991) added that “‘automation of collocations’ helps native speakers to utter sentences more fluently” (p. 168). Consequently, if English learners learn large lexical chunks of language, and thus have the privilege of such collocational automation, they are more likely to become more proficient speakers and writers of
English. Lewis also claimed that when English learners learn larger lexical chunks, it is easier for them to reproduce natural language in the future (2000).

**Collocation and Lexicon.** According to Hill (2000), language learners should obtain an expanded mental lexicon to become proficient speakers and writers of a second language. She based this proposition on the fact that language input refers to the learners' mental lexicon from which they retrieve and use language in either spoken or written form. In other words, one's mental lexicon and language production are directly connected to one's collocational knowledge.

Likewise, Kita and Ogata (1997) claimed that collocational knowledge signifies “which words co-occur frequently with others and how they combine within a sentence,” (p. 230) and therefore English learners benefit greatly from such knowledge as it is essential for them to generate native-like utterances. As Hill (2000) stated, students often write longer sentences to convey meaning, facing the risk of making grammatical mistakes, because of insufficient collocational competence. If students learn collocations that sound more academic and nativelike, they will not struggle translating utterances from their first
language to produce pragmatically incorrect language, and thus risk being thought of as poor language learners.

Proficient English learners must therefore acquire adequate collocational knowledge to speak more fluent and nativelike English. Teachers can help students learn collocations by focusing their teaching on lexical chunks through which grammatical rules can also be learned. Expansion of learners' lexicon is the key to language proficiency and collocational competence.

Research on Collocation

Limited research has been conducted so far to examine non-native speakers' (NNS) proficiency in collocations. The primary purpose of many studies was to investigate the strategies English learners employed when producing lexical collocations. However, the results showed that English learners performed insufficiently in collocation tests; therefore, collocation is an aspect that had been neglected in language teaching. A number of such studies and their findings are described next.

According to Farghal and Obiedat (1995), Arabic participants failed to answer questionnaires that included collocations related to general topics, such as food, weather, and colors, even though they were English majors. These results emphasized students' lack of preparation in
this area, and also the importance of teaching collocation in the EFL classroom because language proficiency depends largely on learners’ collocational competence.

A study carried out by Liu (2000) examined 34 freshmen Chinese students who were divided in two groups according to their writing-ability level, ranging from lower intermediate to intermediate. The research featured three tasks: “(a) a collocation test, (b) an optimal revision task, and (c) a task-based structured questionnaire regarding their actions and mental processes involved in producing lexical collocations” (p. 481). The research questions addressed the differences of strategy use between good and poor writers in producing correct or incorrect lexical collocations. The results showed that both groups used almost the same types of strategies, but in different frequencies. Retrieval and literal translation were the two top-ranked strategies good and poor writers used. An important issue here is that the good writers performed significantly better (90%) in all three tests compared to the poor writers (79%) in producing acceptable lexical collocations, as Table 2 shows. The most frequent strategy use was retrieval from long-term memory, and poor writers who had never encountered and acquired those collocations before did not
produce them as well as did good writers. This evidence also supports the need for teaching collocations in EFL contexts.

Table 2. A Percentage-Comparison of Good and Poor Writers’ Production of Collocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good Writers</th>
<th>Poor Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Liu (2000).

Williams’s (2000) study also examined NNSs’ collocational knowledge. The 98 participants were mainly Asian students at the University of Hawaii, and their language level ranged from low-intermediate to high-advance. Williams produced three tests, each of which included one type of collocation: (a) verb-object collocation, (b) verb-preposition combination, and (c) figurative-use-of-verb phrase. The results showed that there was a strong correlation between language proficiency and collocational competence, so “lower-level learners [did] seem to have some limited knowledge of collocational relationships” (Williams, 2000, p. 32). Likewise, Zhang (1993) commented that advanced English
learners used a great selection of collocations more accurately than those who were less proficient.

Zughoul and Abdul-Fattah (2001) also examined students’ competence in idioms and collocations. Seventy EFL students who majored in the English department at Yamourk University in Jordan were selected to perform two tasks: (a) select the correct collocation out of four choices in 16 randomly selected idioms and collocations of the verb break, and (b) translate the same idiomatic expressions and collocations from Arabic into English. The results were somewhat disappointing because the students’ overall performance was inadequate. Zughoul and Abdul-Fattah (2001) identified 11 strategies that the participants used when they had trouble translating the idiomatic expressions: Avoidance, literal translation, false collocation, and overgeneralization were their top four communicative strategies. Furthermore, Zughoul and Abdul-Fattah (2003) argued that language learners in general fail to use English correctly in real-life situations because of lexical deficiency. They suggested that more emphasis should be given on direct vocabulary instruction, focusing on lexical prefabricated chunks to help English learners improve their language proficiency.
Kjellemer (1991) further claimed that competent ESL/EFL learners are the ones who produce correct collocations.

In a nutshell, some studies showed that English learners have low collocational competence, and some other studies showed a correlation between language proficiency and collocational competence; good language learners showed adequate collocational competence, whereas that of poor language learners was inadequate. These results show that collocational competence is one indicator of language proficiency.

**Pedagogical Implications of Collocation**

Collocation is what English learners need to learn to achieve the level of language proficiency of native speakers. Therefore, teachers should see collocation from a pedagogical perspective, and adjust their teaching in a way that collocation is integrated naturally, as any other interaction with language.

The use of collocation in teaching brings together what has been taught separately in EFL classrooms so far: vocabulary and grammar. Linguists often refer to lexical versus *grammatical* collocations. Phrasal verbs, such as *interested in*, are considered grammatical collocations. However, teachers often neglect to contextualize them to make "more (collocational) sense," like *interested in*
football (Lewis, 2000, p. 134). Learners find it more useful when they learn collocations in contextualized examples because it helps them comprehend their function more efficiently.

According to Lennon (1996), even advanced English learners have difficulties in speaking and writing, and he concluded that their “knowledge of collocational probabilities and restrictions” should be more emphasized during the classroom instruction and activities (p. 1). It is thus important for teachers to teach collocation consistently like any other aspect of language, such as pronunciation, grammar, stress, and intonation (Hill, 2000). If students encounter a variety of collocations each day of instruction, it is more likely they will expand their mental lexicon, retrieve and use more collocations when speaking and writing, and, as a result, they will achieve higher language proficiency.

Moreover, Conzett (2000) called attention to the way English learners use vocabulary incorrectly in writing courses. Giving insufficient answers to students, such as We do not use the word this way in English, will confuse them more. However, if students learn collocations they will probably say poisonous snake instead of toxic snake because they know that poisonous and snake tend to
co-occur (Conzett, 2000, p. 73). Therefore, teaching collocations is the key for successful use of words. However, teachers should direct students to learn collocations selectively. This selection should reflect the content of curriculum, and students' grade level. To explain this further, Conzett suggested discouraging learners from "recording" weak collocations such as nice dress or "strong, inappropriate" collocations such as reduced to penury (2000, p. 74). Similarly, Swan in Conzett (2000) emphasized the necessity to prioritize the type and amount of vocabulary that teachers will select, incorporate, and recycle during instruction. Only when teachers guide students to pay attention to collocations, will they meet the pedagogic objectives.

Because teachers teach according to the syllabi and materials, a major change should take place in their contents (Hill, 2000). Lexis as the emphasis in language teaching bridges the gap between grammar and vocabulary. Such transformation is valuable to English learners because language is more comprehensible and natural to them.

Moreover, four other factors should be considered when revising the content of language: (a) frequency, (b) suitability, (c) level, and (d) type of course.
Teachers should select collocations according to their "frequency of occurrence in spoken and written text" (Hill, 2000, p. 65). Types of collocations that do not address English learners' needs, and thus are not suitable for NNSs, should be excluded. Another factor that should be considered when selecting collocations is the type of register and genre. It is obvious that a course of general English should include little or no medical English language because it does not fall in the interests or immediate needs of the students (Hill, 2000).

Hill claimed that student output is the main focal point in language teaching. Therefore, teachers should emphasize, revise, and increase the "quantity, type, and quality" of language input (Hill, 2000, p. 66). The role of teachers must focus on providing students with opportunities to notice interesting language features. A corner library, interesting and useful articles on the walls, and Internet access support a language-rich environment, in which students have numerous opportunities to encounter and notice new linguistic patterns (Hill, 2000).

A substantial matter to discuss here is the number of collocations that English learners should learn. Teachers should vary the teaching strategies according to students'
grade level and language-ability. Elementary students need to learn more individual words with a few collocations, so they can use them efficiently. Intermediate students need to increase their vocabulary accompanied with more collocations. Gradually, students develop and enhance their collocational knowledge and competence constructing on their mental lexicon (Hill, 2000). By the time they are intermediate- and advanced-level students, they read a more wide range of books, and become “autonomous learners” (Hill, 2000, p. 67) because they pick-up lexical chunks, and by now they have in mind that learning individual words is of no value.

Teachers should focus on modeling ways and strategies to record lexis, so that students can improve their skills at performing it themselves. Additionally, teaching difficult vocabulary may be of insignificant or no use to students. So, what is more important is to teach vocabulary they are more familiar with to expand their mental lexicon and, consequently, their collocational competence (Hill, 2000).

Another suggestion by Hill (2000) is that non-native teachers should consider collocation when translating to students in their native language. Language is more
meaningful and useful this way, and students will have no difficulties with translations that make no logical sense.

Lastly, Hill (2000) claimed that teachers should not correct collocation mistakes, but rather collocation errors, those that are so profound that they impair meaning. The language model of collocation should follow the language model of grammar; not all grammatical errors are corrected. Teachers should decide what collocational errors to correct according to students' grade-level and learning-ability.

McAlpine and Myles (2003) agreed that English learners often use unknown vocabulary inappropriately because they just look up the definition in a translational dictionary. They further recommended a dictionary that provides examples of collocations, rather than offering a definition alone, because this type of dictionary is extremely helpful for English learners to produce authentic language. Fuentes further claimed that creating "specialized dictionaries, that reflect knowledge fields and concepts" (2001, p. 106) would provide even more assistance for students of English for specific academic purposes (ESP/EAP).

According to Nesselhauf and Tschichold (2002), lexical collocations are more essential for EFL learners
to focus on than are phrasal verbs and idioms because collocations, unlike phrasal verbs and idioms, are more frequently used and they cannot be replaced by other expressions. For example, if learners are not aware of the phrasal-verb use *He didn’t turn up* they can alternatively say *He didn’t come*. On the other hand, if they do not know the collocation *make a mistake*, they produce unacceptable utterances such as *He did a mistake*.

Researchers also claimed that idiomatic expressions and phrasal verbs "are more easily noticed (because less easily understood)," and, unlike collocations, they have been taught widely in EFL courses for a long time (Nesselhauf & Tschichold, 2002, p. 253). For these reasons, Nesselhauf and Tschichold (2002) compared seven commercially available computer programs that enhance learners' vocabulary to investigate whether these programs include activities on collocations. Unfortunately, their findings revealed that Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) in general has overlooked collocations. They further suggested that designers of such programs should demonstrate "better specification of the proficiency level the program aims at (and/or a division into different levels of difficulty)," incorporate "consistent context-embedding of the items learned," offer more
flexible feedback "(at least so that alternative correct answers are not rejected)," include a more extensive variety of exercises, and insert some "sections that teach besides sections that test" (Nesselhauf & Tschichold, 2002, p. 271).

Continuing with the benefits of CALL in language teaching, Shei and Pain (2000) located incorrect collocations produced by NNSs using a learner corpus, and compared them to correct nativelike collocations extracted from the British National corpus in their empirical study. They then created a computer-system design that implemented a corpus-based collocation tutor. According to their model, the system detects unacceptable collocations that students write, and displays examples of concordance lines extracted from a reference corpus to provide learners with correct collocations of specific words (Shei & Pain, 2000). If, for example, a student writes make action, the system will automatically show concordance lines that suggest take action as the correct collocation. This type of aid is fundamentally essential for improving English learners' collocational competence.

This section offered a number of practical suggestions of ways to implement collocation in language teaching. Teachers need to shift their focus on lexical
chunks, and offer students more opportunities to encounter as many collocations as possible according to their grade level. CALL would also be able to help students to acquire collocational knowledge by exploiting comparable corpora to locate similar and more meaningful collocations in both native and target languages.

**Summary**

This paper has focused on a very important area of corpus linguistics: collocation. Research has revealed the importance of collocation to language teaching and the development of learners' mental lexicon. The potential implications of collocation in language teaching are enormous because it bridges the gap between vocabulary and grammar; it helps students acquire a large amount of idiomatic language; and it predicts language fluency and proficiency because of one’s expanded lexicon.

Students learn and use a second language sufficiently, when they become collocationally competent; that is, when they produce acceptable language in English. Therefore, teachers are urged to exploit collocation as a valuable teaching tool to meet all pedagogical objectives in ESL/EFL contexts.
The Lexical Approach

Two approaches—in some ways, opposites—that teachers have used in language pedagogy are the structural approach and the communicative approach. The structural approach focuses on “general, abstract [grammar] rules of psychological processing, based on underlying phonological and syntactic representations of competence that operate... independently of any context” (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992, p. xiv). On the other hand, the communicative approach focuses on English learners’ ability to use language appropriately.

Each approach relies heavily on different aspects of language and neglects other important aspects. According to Widdowson (1989), “The structural approach accounts for one aspect of competence by concentrating on analysis but does so at the expense of access, whereas the communicative approach concentrates on access to the relative neglect of analysis” (p. 132). An approach that combines and relies equally on both structural competence and communicative competence is therefore necessary.

Recent studies in language acquisition have pointed out that it is necessary to focus on the process of language development as far as social interaction is concerned (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992). Placing the
emphasis on the process rather than the outcome—language production—is crucial for linguists to discover language patterns that are useful for language teaching and learning. According to Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992), language acquisition has one common pattern: “learners pass through a stage in which they use a large number of unanalyzed chunks of language in certain predictable social contexts” (p. xv).

Many researchers emphasized the fundamental role of these lexical chunks—often called prefabricated chunks or formulaic speech—in language pedagogy (Carter & McCarthy, 1988; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Lewis, 1993, 1997; Moudraia, 2001). English learners first acquire lexical chunks that they use in social contexts (i.e. I-wanna-go). Then they analyze them in smaller patterns (i.e. wanna-go to want-to-go), which they later analyze in individual words (i.e. I, want, to, go). This process helps them discover the grammar rules of language and produce creative speech and writing. Because that approach uses the lexical phrase as its basic unit, it is called lexical approach, and it offers what the communicative approach has failed to achieve.

This paper aims to present the functions and benefits of the lexical approach in ESL/EFL contexts. Specifically,
the following sections address the definition, function, and role of the lexical phrase in language acquisition and language pedagogy, types of lexical phrases and their structural differences, research on formulaic speech, two types of lexical syllabi, and a number of implications of the lexical approach in language pedagogy. It is hoped that this section will offer valuable information regarding the lexical approach that emphasizes appropriate language use as well as analysis of grammar rules, so language teachers can help learners become competent English speakers and writers.

**Definition, Function, and Role of the Lexical Phrase**

Linguists now have the concept that lexical phrases—lexico-grammatical units—are valuable in language pedagogy. A definition of lexical phrases and a description of their function in language are essential to obtain a more comprehensive insight into their value in ESL/EFL contexts—how they interact with the components of grammar and pragmatics and their role in language acquisition.

According to Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992), lexical phrases are described as "'chunks' of language of varying length that occur more frequently and have more
idiomatically determined meaning than language that is put together each time, as well as associated discourse functions" (p. 1). These phrases may be short (i.e. a ____ ago) or longer (i.e. the _____er X, the _____er Y) and they function as frames in which there are slots potentially containing various fillers—a year ago expressing time, the longer you wait, the sleepier you get expressing relationships among ideas, etc. (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992). More detail regarding the types of lexical phrases will be presented below.

Lexical Phrases, Pragmatics and Competence. Widdowson (1989) clearly stated that learners’ knowledge of a language refers not only to (a) knowledge of grammar rules that will help produce an unlimited number of utterances, but also to (b) knowledge of rules of use—pragmatic rules—that control the appropriateness of these utterances according to specific social interactions. These rules are part of both grammatical competence and pragmatic competence, and not performance (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992). An example presented by Nattinger & DeCarrico (1992) is when children of early age say I-want-to-go as if this pattern were a single unit. This pattern refers to children’s grammatical competence because the utterance I-want-to-go is contained in their lexicons as a
prefabricated chunk. It is also used in a specific social interaction associated with the function of request (Figure 8).

Children gradually acquire chunks that have similar syntactic patterning, such as *I-want-to-walk*, *I-want-my-doll*, *I-want-milk*, and then they isolate the pattern *I-want*, analyze it, and generalize it "into regular syntactic rules" as Figure 9 shows (Nattinger, 1988; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992, p. 12).

Therefore, children not only retrieve language from their lexicons that is grammatically correct, but also select such language that adheres to the limits of variability—limits of adaptability—of lexical phrases.
This interrelationship of the pragmatic component and the lexicon and syntax is shown in Figure 10. The solid arrows indicate the process of grammatical competence, whereas the broken arrows indicate the process of pragmatic competence. For example, when learners request something from their parents, they may choose the lexical phrase *I-want-to*, whereas if the request involves a teacher, this particular lexical phrase is not accepted within the limits of adaptability; *I-would-like-to* would fall in the limits of adaptability in contrast to *I-want-to*.

**Lexical Phrases and Their Role In Language Acquisition.** Research showed that lexical phrases appear not only in an adult's language but also in that of a child. This fact convinced many linguists that the notion
of these prefabricated chunks being "distinct from, and somewhat peripheral to, the main body of language" was a fallacy (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992, p. 24).

As mentioned earlier, children use prefabricated language and treat it as an unanalyzed unit in appropriate situations. According to Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992), children first acquire prefabricated language, then they "learn to segment [the] previously unanalyzed units and ... attach meanings to the segmented pieces" (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992, p. 27).

Even though there is not adequate research that determines "the amount of prefabricated speech in adult acquisition" (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992, p. 27), linguists believe that adults probably go through the same
stages as do children. To support this view, Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) claimed that people are exposed to predictable language every day, so it is very likely they encounter prefabricated speech. Another claim was that because the learners' second-language linguistic systems may not be sufficient yet to produce utterances from scratch, they usually store and easily retrieve large lexical items—lexical phrases—to convey meaning in social interactions (Pawley & Syder, 1983; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992).

In sum, lexical phrases are prefabricated chunks of language associated with discourse functions that support appropriate language use. Learners encounter, store, and retrieve such lexical items in their social interactions. These chunks are initially learned as unanalyzed items, which later help learners deduce grammatical patterns, structures and rules.

**Lexical Items: Words, Collocations, and Institutionalized Expressions**

“Lexical items [...] are socially sanctioned independent units” (Lewis, 1993, p. 90). Some of them are individual words, whereas others combine more than one word—multi-word units or formulaic language. Collocations and institutionalized expressions are the two main groups
of multi-word units. Linguists have begun to place emphasis on multi-word units because research has revealed that a great deal of native speakers' (NSs') language is formulaic; multi-word units are stored so that they can be retrieved for social interaction in specific situations rather than being produced from scratch (Cowie, 1988; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Lewis, 1993). Individual words, collocations, and institutionalized expressions will be discussed next for comparison purposes, with emphasis placed on the latter group.

The individual word is the most basic and familiar lexical item (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992). Linguists claimed that words are separated in two groups: (a) words with zero or low information content such as so, from, and (b) words with high information content such as chair, and museum. Collocations are another type of lexical item that falls into the group of multi-word items. Like individual words, collocations are also associated with content and are message-oriented.

Unlike individual words and collocations, institutionalized expressions are pragmatic in character (Lewis, 1993). These expressions are divided into two categories: (a) fully fixed expressions, and (b) "semi-fixed 'frames' with 'slots' which may be filled
in a limited number of ways” (Lewis, 1997, p. 9). Some examples of fixed expressions are just a moment, please, not yet, and of course not. According to Lewis (1997), these fixed expressions comprise a large amount of the language people use. Specifically, “modern analyses of real data suggest that we are much less original in using language than we like to believe” (Lewis, 1997, p. 11) exactly because much of the language we use contains prefabricated chunks.

More attention, however, should be given to semi-fixed expressions because they cover a greater number of institutionalized expressions than fully fixed expressions, which are rarer and shorter. Some examples of semi-fixed expressions are “Could you pass _____, please?, What was really surprising/interesting/annoying was _____” (Lewis, 1997, p. 11). The following narrative offers interesting examples of institutionalized expressions that support the concept of looking at language lexically:

There are broadly speaking two views of ______. The more traditional, usually associated with _____ and his/her colleagues, suggests that _____, while the more progressive view, associated with ____ suggests ____. In this paper I wish to suggest a third position, which
while containing elements of the view proposed by ____ also takes account for recent developments in ____ which have produced evidence to suggest ____. (Lewis, 1997, p. 11)

This example is an opening paragraph of an academic paper containing slots that can be filled with a range of lexical items appropriate to the subject matter. This example supports the lexical approach to language because it contradicts with "the traditional distinction between 'fixed' vocabulary and 'generative' grammar" (Lewis, 1997, p. 11), and suggests that language allows users to produce utterances that contain a spectrum of grammaticalised lexis and not lexicalized grammar.

In summary, institutionalized expressions and collocations form the two main groups of lexical items. Because institutionalized expressions are pragmatic in character, and therefore address appropriate language use, they should be given more attention in ESL/EFL classrooms. Their role in language is even more important because they cover a large amount of language use that learners encounter.

Research on Formulaic Speech

Unfortunately, there has been inadequate research regarding the implementation of the lexical approach and a
lexical syllabus where lexis is the central part of language teaching in ESL/EFL contexts. The research that is available to support the lexical approach addresses the matter of formulaic speech in first- and second-language acquisition. Relevant studies and their results are presented next.

As Hill (2000) claimed, second-language learning is similar to first-language learning. He further explained that children learning their native language first learn, store, and retrieve prefabricated language at the early stages of language production. These prefabricated chunks are analyzed further, and the grammatical system is learned deductively within language use. He then claimed that second-language learning follows the same path as first-language learning: first, learners acquire lexical phrases as unanalyzed items; second, they retrieve them in social interactions; third, they analyze them, according to other similar patterns, to infer the grammatical structures in which they function.

A study on second-language acquisition was conducted by Kazuko (1992) that focused on the way children move from formulaic to creative speech. Her sample consisted of two Japanese-speaking children, aged four and eight. They were observed for two years while learning English as a
second language in New York. The results showed that the process of learning English was similar to the process suggested by many linguists (Carter & McCarthy, 1988; Lewis, 1993, 1997; Moudraia, 2001; Nattiger & DeCarrico, 1992). The children memorized and imitated routines of speech—unanalyzed items—that "evolved into patterns, then eventually into creative speech" (Kazuko, 1992, p. 1). According to Ellis (1985), children tend to memorize and imitate formulaic speech because "it reduces the learning burden while maximizing communicative ability" (p. 168).

Formulaic speech and prefabricated chunks enhance not only English as a second language but also French as a second language. The longitudinal study of Myles, Hooper, and Mitchell (1998) focused on 16 children learning beginning-level French for two years. The results revealed that most of the students who learned and produced initially prefabricated chunks broke down those chunks and used them to produce new utterances. The researchers further claimed that such prefabricated language enhanced the children's communicative skills and accelerated production even in the early stages. Therefore, it was concluded that grammar is learned within language use along with a vast amount of lexis necessary for
second-language learners to produce nativelike language in speech and writing.

Research on first- and second-language learning, even limited in scope, showed that prefabricated language enhanced communication and language production in the early stages, and that later it was further analyzed to search out the grammatical structures lying beneath language. For these reasons, linguists and researchers proposed a new type of syllabus, different from the traditional grammar-based syllabus, to be implemented in ESL/EFL classrooms: a lexical syllabus.

**Syllabi and the Lexical Approach**

As mentioned earlier, a lexical syllabus must emphasize the central role of lexis. A mere word list is not a syllabus. Two proposals for implementing lexis in syllabi and their criticisms are discussed next.

**The COBUILD Project.** A lexical syllabus of English for general purposes should focus on three basic guidelines: (a) "the commonest word forms in the language," (b) "their central patterns of usage," and (c) "the combinations they typically form" (Sinclair & Renouf, 1988, p. 148). The COBUILD project was based on the COBUILD corpus that included spoken and written typical, nativelike language.
Computer-based studies—corpus linguistics—offered valuable insights regarding language teaching and learning. Founded by Sinclair at the University of Birmingham, the COBUILD project “is an ambitious lexicographic research program which is designed initially to lead to publication of a monolingual foreign learner’s dictionary of English” (Carter & McCarthy, 1988, p. 58). This dictionary differed from any other contemporarily published dictionaries because it included the 700 most frequent English words that account for approximately 70% of English text, which English learners need in the early stages of EFL/ESL courses and “are the commonest and most basic meanings in English” (Willis, 1990, p. 46). Then these 700 words were examined using a concordancer to locate the most common grammatical structures in which these words are used, and to seek other words with which they co-occur in contextualized examples of authentic language (Thornbury, 1998).

The COBUILD corpus has sent positive messages for the design and implementation of lexical syllabi for English learners, such as frequency counts that included the most common words for English for specific purposes (ESP) courses, and lexically authentic materials and collocation dictionaries for general English courses, to name a few.
(Carter & McCarthy, 1988). Despite the potential contribution of such lexical syllabi in language teaching and learning, the COBUILD project failed to spread and develop because, according to Thornsbury (1998), many teachers and publishers thought this change from a grammar-based syllabus to a lexical-based syllabus was sudden, radical, and dysfunctional. Supporters of the lexical approach, however, have not given up; they continue to work on similar projects to convince educators that the lexical approach enhances English language learning.

Lexical Approach Rather than Lexical Syllabus. Lewis (1993) based his work on the lexical approach somewhat differently than Willis' in the COBUILD project, whose syllabus was word-based. Lewis argued that he did not propose a lexical syllabus but a lexical approach instead.

His approach emphasized the power of storing and retrieving word-patterns, collocations, and institutionalized expressions in social interactions. He argued against the traditional structure-based syllabus and placed emphasis on lexical phrases as vital in language learning. Furthermore, he replaced the traditional presentation-practice-production (P-P-P) methodology with the observation-hypothesize-experiment
(O-H-E) methodology supporting the view that learning is enhanced when English learners observe linguistic patterns, and so it is more likely that they may produce fluent language.

Lewis' proposal was criticized because he was "more concerned about improving the fluency of the learner's output than increasing the complexity of the learner's developing language system" (Thornbury, 1998, p. 10) through further analyses of these prefabricated chunks into grammatical structures. Language teachers expressed another criticism of Lewis' lexical approach. They were concerned whether the principles Lewis proposed in an approach—rather than in a syllabus with comprehensible pedagogical implications—could be operationalized in ESL/EFL classrooms without problems.

Because Lewis (1993) suggested learners must be exposed to a vast amount of lexis even at the very early stages of ESL/EFL courses, an obvious concern regarding the learner's memory arose concerns. Moreover, Lewis' approach did not address the "selection-and grading question" (Thornbury, 1998, p. 11) regarding the type of input—lexical phrases that should be taught. Although Lewis' lexical approach provided useful insights, it was
scarcely implemented because it does not support a specific syllabus (Thornsbury, 1998).

Despite the differences between Willis' (1990) and Lewis' (1993) viewpoint on the design of a lexical syllabus, their main ideas remain similar; lexical phrases should be placed in the center of such syllabus. More emphasis should be given to the way they function and combine with other words in language.

**Pedagogical Implications of the Lexical Approach**

Linguists and teachers have realized that traditional syllabi and methodologies do not have satisfactory results in ESL/EFL classrooms. There is an immediate need for change, mainly on behalf of teachers. Lewis (1993) suggested a number of methodological implications for the lexical approach.

Many teachers have focused their teaching on productive skills—writing and speaking—and have somewhat neglected reading and listening. However, it is necessary to place emphasis on receptive skills in the early stages of language learning because the language the learner produces comes from the language listened to or read (Lewis, 1993). Language is selected, stored, and retrieved when necessary and appropriate. English learners thus should spend more time reading and listening to authentic
language from a variety of sources such as teachers, books, tapes, and videos. On the same lines, teachers should use teaching talking time wisely by choosing comprehensible language—spoken language—used in social interactions.

According to Lewis (1993), “de-contextualized vocabulary learning is a fully legitimate strategy” (p. 194). Beginning-level English learners should study and learn a large amount of vocabulary that is de-contextualized—high information content words—to maximize their communicative skills, which, despite their grammatical inaccuracy, will improve as soon as they discover the grammatical patterns of lexical chunks later on. Moreover, learning grammar deductively is meaningful for learners. It contributes to the learning process more than implementing the present-practice-produce model through which grammatical rules that are more likely to be forgotten.

It is also important for teachers to recognize that English should be compared with learners’ native language (L1) for purpose of language awareness (Lewis, 1993). The more learners compare and contrast English with their L1, the more accurate their interlanguage becomes. Teachers should offer learners many opportunities to encounter
language that shares similarities between English and their L1 so they will notice similar linguistic patterns. They should further encounter differences between English and their L1 to locate and correct their errors. In this way, their interlanguage process moves faster toward English learning (Figure 11).
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Source: Adapted from Gass & Selinker (2001). Figure 11. Interlanguage Process when First Language and Second Language are Compared

Another methodological implication suggested by Lewis (1993) is the delay of extensive writing, especially where English is a foreign language. Writing is a preoccupation for EFL learners—especially in the early stages of learning—because their mental lexicon and their ability to construct grammatically correct utterances are rather poor. Students should encounter and learn a large amount of lexical phrases and then produce language in spoken or
written form. Writing requires knowledge of rich content—a broad mental lexicon.

Collocation tables, mind-maps, and word-trees are examples of non-linear recording that are valuable for teaching and learning that emphasizes the way words function and combine in language (Table 3). These lexical phrases may be further analyzed to deduce grammatical rules according to other similar linguistic patterns.

Table 3. Collocation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a letter</th>
<th>of</th>
<th>complaint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resignation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>..............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>..............</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Reformulating students’ errors is yet another way to improve their interlanguage and provide them with comprehensible input. This response to student errors is a way to show them that “their oral contributions are valued” (Lewis, 1993, p. 195). Lewis (1993) further argued that teachers should emphasize primarily the correction of communicative errors rather than structured errors. However, it must be clear that correcting grammar errors should not be completely overlooked. It should occur
wisely according to the students’ writing-ability level so they do not get overwhelmed and build negative attitudes toward English.

The lexical approach has many potentials in language learning. However, teachers often realize its value only when they consider these implications and implement them in their teaching. Even without a lexical syllabus, if lexical phrases have a central role in a language course, the implications produce great results in language teaching and learning.

Summary

Research on language acquisition has spawned a new approach that facilitates both structural and lexical knowledge. The lexical approach places emphasis on teaching prefabricated language that is later analyzed further to deduct grammatical rules of English. The role of lexical phrases in language is vital because most of the language second-language learners encounter consists of prefabricated chunks that are stored and retrieved in social interactions.

Unfortunately, limited empirical research on the lexical approach to language has been conducted. Some research on first- and second-language acquisition favors the lexical approach and recognizes its benefits in
language learning. However, teachers and materials writers are reluctant to use an approach that seems completely different from the contemporary structural approach. Further research may help convince them.

Lastly, this paper has provided a number of methodological implications of the lexical approach. When teachers employ this approach little by little, they may gradually realize that the lexical phrase is the backbone of language, and that emphasis should be placed primarily on lexis, and then grammar.

Second-Language Vocabulary Acquisition

Even though vocabulary is one of the most important components in learning a second/foreign language, it has received limited attention in second language (L2) acquisition research (Meara, 1984; Gass, 1988). However, researchers have studied L2 vocabulary acquisition and have taken a variety of factors into account. The purpose of this section is to address issues regarding the importance of vocabulary in language, the breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge, the approaches to L2 vocabulary acquisition, and the current research on L2 vocabulary acquisition and its pedagogical implications.
The Importance of Vocabulary

According to Knight (1994), many L2 teachers and students consider vocabulary their priority in language courses. Vocabulary plays an important—perhaps the most important—role in L2 learning. Some of the main arguments that favor vocabulary acquisition are presented next.

Second-language vocabulary acquisition helps learners in reading comprehension as well. According to sociolinguists, words comprise the central elements in the social communication system (Harley, 1995). For example, the more the expanded lexicon one has, the more successful it is likely to be to use strategies to infer the meanings of unknown words without considering the grammar of L2 (Macaro, 2003). It is important to point out here the reciprocal relation between vocabulary and reading: the more English learners read, the more words they learn; and the more words they know, the easier reading becomes.

It is also noteworthy to mention that English learners’ errors in L2 are mainly lexical errors (Gass & Selinker, 2001). Therefore, both English learners and their teachers consider vocabulary essential for communication and language proficiency. Gass, Madden, Preston, and Selinker (1988) further claimed that lexical errors are more likely to interfere with communication
because the speaker may have chosen the wrong lexical item, which leads to misunderstanding between speakers. This often happens with English learners who misspell a word in the target language (i.e. they write *adapt* instead of *adopt* or say *breath* instead of *breadth* because they are acoustically somewhat similar) or use lexical items in inappropriate situations.

In sum, L2 vocabulary acquisition is considered a top priority for English learners to become proficient English speakers and writers. It is central to their oral and reading comprehension, speech production, and communication with others.

Aspects of Vocabulary Knowledge

Linguists have often addressed two aspects of vocabulary knowledge to explain what it means to know a word: breadth and depth. Further discussion on the two dimensions of vocabulary knowledge follows.

**Breadth of Vocabulary Knowledge.** One’s cumulative amount of vocabulary is considered vocabulary breadth. In other words, breadth is the sheer number of words one knows to communicate in a second/foreign language. According to Macaro (2003), not everybody’s breadth of vocabulary knowledge is the same because of the different purposes of language use. For example, a doctor has a
broader vocabulary in medicine than a chef has, and the reverse would be true for a chef in the domain of cooking.

An individual’s own breadth of vocabulary also differs between the vocabulary used in receptive skills, reading and listening, versus the vocabulary used in productive skills, speaking and writing. Laufer (1989) claimed that one needs to know at least 95 percent of the words in a text to comprehend it. Macaro (2003) further suggested that one needs less vocabulary for the productive skills than for the receptive skills. His argument was based on the fact that people can use non-linguistic features when they speak to convey meaning such as gestures and facial expressions. However, written discourse requires that one have broad vocabulary knowledge to convey meaning and reduce misunderstanding.

Depth of Vocabulary Knowledge. Knowing a word does not merely mean knowing its meaning. Many linguists have offered explanation of what it means to say that one knows a word. It is a misconception to claim that an English learner knows or does not know a word. Laufer and Paribakht (1998) also argued that vocabulary cannot be considered as mere passive/receptive (when an English learner recognizes a word when it is heard or seen) or active/productive (when one writes or says a word). This
oversimplified distinction is not valid, according to many researchers who claim that L2 vocabulary acquisition is instead an incremental process (Nation, 1990; Paribakht & Wesche, 1993; Schmitt, 1998).

Table 4 offers two types of vocabulary knowledge criteria according to Nation (1990), and Paribakht and Wesche (1993). The criteria of Paribakht and Wesche are scaled, that is English learners follow specific stages during the process of learning a word. However, Macaro (2003) found this ranking somewhat questionable. He argued that if an English learner uses a word appropriately, it does not necessarily mean that he or she knows all its synonyms, according to their fourth criterion (Macaro, 2003). On the other hand, Nation’s criteria are not scaled, that is, they do not follow a particular order. Instead, Nation’s criteria imply that one needs to have a particular kind of knowledge to comprehend and use a word in appropriate situations.
Table 4. Vocabulary-Knowledge Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The word is not familiar at all</td>
<td>Learner knows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The word is familiar but the meaning is not known</td>
<td>1. spoken form of a word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learner gives correct synonym or translation</td>
<td>2. written form of a word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learner uses word with semantic appropriateness in a sentence</td>
<td>3. grammatical behavior of a word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Learner uses word with semantic appropriateness and</td>
<td>4. collocational behavior of a word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammatical accuracy in a sentence</td>
<td>5. frequency of a word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. stylistic appropriateness of a word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. concept meanings of a word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. associations word has with other related words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For example, one should recognize a word when it is heard (spoken form) or seen (written form); one should know that the verb go should be followed by the word to if destination would be important to mention (grammatical pattern); one should know that strong collocates with wind and not engine (collocation); and the like (Nation, 1990).

Another division of an English learner's vocabulary knowledge was proposed by researchers to measure the increase of vocabulary: (a) passive vocabulary, (b) controlled-active vocabulary, and (c) free-active vocabulary (Laufer, 1998). According to this distinction, passive vocabulary means that a learner comprehends the basic meaning of the word. Controlled-active vocabulary means that the learner produces a word when prompted by a
specific task (i.e. cloze activity). Lastly, free-active vocabulary means that a learner can produce a word without a specific prompt (i.e. in a free essay).

Succinctly, breadth and depth of vocabulary are two dimensions of vocabulary knowledge. Breadth of vocabulary consists of all the words a learner knows, whereas depth of vocabulary addresses knowledge of meaning of a word, which refers to its form, meaning, and use. Furthermore, researchers have suggested that vocabulary knowledge is more of an incremental process rather than a simple passive-active distinction.

**Incidental and Explicit Vocabulary Learning**

Linguists and researchers have proposed different approaches to vocabulary learning. These approaches are found on the explicit-implicit continuum (Nation, 1990). Implicit vocabulary learning is also known as incidental vocabulary learning. These two approaches have been given great attention—especially the incidental approach to vocabulary (Gass & Selinker, 2001).

The explicit approach suggests that English learners should focus directly on the vocabulary words to be learned such as through the use of word lists, vocabulary games, vocabulary-building exercises, and the like. On the other hand, incidental vocabulary learning occurs when
leaners are focused on meaning comprehension rather than learning the words themselves (Gass & Selinker, 2001; Nation, 1990; Paribakht & Wesche, 1999; Schmitt, 2000). According to Nation, when English learners read a passage and the number of unknown words is limited, incidental vocabulary learning occurs. This situation is what Krashen (1985) called the input theory of language learning in which learners are interested in comprehending what they read. This interest triggers their need to understand the unknown words, and if context is adequate to provide enough information, English learners are likely to learn these unknown words.

Even though some researchers support the two extremes—explicit or incidental approach—others claim that both approaches should be employed in ESL/EFL classrooms according to the students’ age and ability level (Nation, 1990; Schmitt, 2000). Further discussion about the research on explicit and incidental vocabulary learning and their findings is presented next.

Research in Second-Language Vocabulary Acquisition

Vocabulary acquisition has been the center of interest of many researchers who examined explicit and incidental vocabulary approaches. Much research has also focused on studies that examined what English learners do
when they encounter unknown words; specifically, strategies that learners use to infer meanings. Other studies have explored how the quantity of L2 vocabulary develops over time. Further discussion on these issues is presented next.

An issue that has troubled many researchers is whether English learners learn words better—that is, the right depth of meaning is achieved—from context while reading than by explicit methods. Knight’s 1994 study examined and compared two conditions: (a) students learning vocabulary when exposed to them in context; and (b) students learning vocabulary when not exposed to them in context. The sample included 105 college sophomore Spanish learners who were divided in two groups: (a) high-verbal-ability students, and (b) low-verbal-ability students.

The participants were first asked to give a definition of 12 unknown words that they read in a text earlier. The results of this test were then compared to the results of another test where the participants were asked to define unknown words that were out of context. Knight found that all participants learned more new words when exposed to them in context than when they were not exposed to the context. The high-verbal-ability group
learned more words from context and performed better in 
supplying their own definition than the low-verbal-ability 
group. Therefore, it is concluded that students in this 
study learned words better when they read them in context.

A similar study was conducted by Prince (1996) who 
examined the implicit and incidental approaches to 
vocabulary learning. He used 48 university-level English 
learners who were divided into two groups: weaker versus 
more advanced students. One group was asked to learn 
unknown English words in context; the other through 
translation. Both groups took the same test: they were 
asked to recall words that half of them were in a context 
condition—incidental knowledge—and half were in a 
translation condition—explicit knowledge. The results 
favored the explicit approach to vocabulary learning 
because both groups recalled words in the translation 
condition better than words in the context condition. 
Moreover, the stronger group performed better in the 
context condition than did the weaker group.

Prince (1996) argued that low-verbal-ability students 
may not benefit from this method because the amount of 
unknown vocabulary is large, and hence context does not 
help them learn new words. On the contrary, English 
learners may make incorrect guesses that lead to failure
in comprehension and communication. It was then proposed that students may learn vocabulary better if explicit and incidental approaches are combined rather than used separately, as the following study suggests.

Knight (1994) also investigated the combination of explicit and incidental vocabulary learning compared to just the incidental approach to vocabulary learning. She used the same sample and ability groups as in the earlier study (Knight, 1994). All participants were able to read a text on the computer but only some had access to a computerized dictionary. The findings revealed that English learners who had the context as well as the dictionary learned the most words. The group who had access to the dictionary performed better in giving a definition to unknown words than the group who had only the context condition. An important finding to discuss here is that the high-level-ability group not only used the dictionary more than the low-level-ability group, but they also used it unnecessarily because they had already managed to infer the unknown words from context.

Concisely, research has proved that approaches to vocabulary learning vary depending on the students' grade and ability level. High-ability-level English learners benefit from learning vocabulary from context, as opposed
to low-ability-level English learners who prefer explicit learning. Thus, a combination of both approaches results in more successful vocabulary learning, even though for high-ability-level English learners explicit vocabulary learning is not necessary in some occasions as it may consume valuable time. Some questions arising now would be as follows: How do second-language learners infer meanings when they encounter unknown words in context? What strategies do they use? The studies presented next answer these and other relevant questions.

A case study conducted by Chern (1993) addressed the following questions: (a) What strategies do Chinese learners of English use to guess unknown words? and (b) Do these Chinese who are at various proficiency levels differ in their use of strategies in guessing unknown words? Twenty Chinese English learners (4 undergraduate students and 16 graduate students) participated in Chern’s study. They were asked to read a passage and give a summary in a think-aloud process. The passage employed in this study included 12 underlined nonsense-difficult-words which the participants had to infer their meaning and part of speech during the think-aloud process. The following contextual word-solving strategies were expected to be employed in this study: (a) sentence-bound cues, (b) forward cues, and
(c) backward cues (see Table 5). The results showed that high-proficiency English learners used all three strategies, whereas those with low proficiency largely ignored the use of forward cues. Hence, forward and backward strategies played an important role in determining ESL/EFL reading proficiency. However, Chern (1993) claimed that further research should employ different passages to replicate and expand the results of this study.

Table 5. Contextual Word-Solving Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence-bound cues</td>
<td>The meaning is obvious within the sentence the word is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward cues</td>
<td>Learner reads sentences that follow the word to infer its meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward cues</td>
<td>Learner reads sentences that precede the word to infer its meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Chern (1993).

A similar study (Haynes & Baker, 1993) examined the English learners’ ability to infer the meaning of unknown words from lexical familiarization—contextual aid intentionally provided by the author—in English text. This study comprised three groups: (a) 25 Chinese freshman students, (b) 29 Chinese senior students, and (c) 9
American undergraduate students. The purpose of this study was threefold: "(a) to compare the word-learning success of L2 college readers with that of comparable American readers; (b) to compare the effects of strategic and linguistic skill on learning new vocabulary from reading; and (c) to better understand the process of concept learning from reading by looking closely at an important type of guessing-from-context task, learning from lexical familiarization in written text" (Haynes & Baker, 1993, p. 131).

The participants were asked to read a passage, write a free recall of the passage, reread the passage to underline words that made comprehension difficult, and then give a definition for each word. After this part ended, the participants were asked to reread the passage and review the definitions they wrote. The first part of the procedure measured incidental learning from context, whereas the second part measured attended learning from context because the participants had the opportunity to "maximize their word learning by rereading and by seeking further clues in the text" (Haynes & Baker, 1993, p. 137).

The results showed that American students were significantly more successful than Chinese students in both incidental and attended word learning methods.
However, an important point was that the Chinese seniors performed significantly better than the Chinese freshmen in both incidental and attended word learning. This phenomenon occurred mainly because the senior students had broader vocabulary knowledge than the freshmen did. Thus, prior knowledge helped them infer meanings of unknown words successfully. A conclusion from this study was that learners’ stronger English vocabulary knowledge helps them use lexical familiarization more efficiently.

The study of Huckin and Bloch (1993) also examined strategies English learners use to infer word meanings in context. The research questions addressed two matters: (a) What strategies do English learners use when they encounter unknown words while reading in academic situations? and (b) How does context help these learners deal with unknown vocabulary? The study was qualitative and employed a think-aloud protocol for the data collection. Three Chinese graduate students participated in this study whose English proficiency was intermediate, according to the Michigan Test of Language Ability (MTLA). All subjects were asked to read a passage relevant to their graduate courses, and write a translation of the passage while thinking aloud. The protocols were
tape-recorded, transcribed, and translated into English by a Chinese speaker.

The results showed that the participants made 25 successful guesses out of 44 words, and mainly used context clues (23 out of 25 guesses) of three types: "(a) local linguistic constituents (e.g., syntactic or semantic collocations), (b) global text representations (including text schemata and 'permanent memory,' that is the translation up to that point), and (c) world knowledge" (Huckin & Bloch, 1993, p. 161). The small number of participants in this study is one of its limitations because the findings could not be generalized. However, the researchers believe these answers are consistent and coherent enough to be used as hypotheses for further research.

Similarly, Parry's case study (1997) involved two EFL freshman students (a Greek Cypriot and a Korean) to examine how they deal with unknown vocabulary of a particular academic field (introductory anthropology). Both were at the same level of English proficiency according to the Michigan Vocabulary Test. The participants were asked to prepare a list of difficult words they encountered while reading their anthropology textbook, and guess the meaning of these words. After six
weeks, the participants prepared another list of unknown vocabulary based on another anthropology text while thinking aloud. Two paragraphs were then prepared based on these think-aloud protocols which the participants were asked to translate into their first language (L1) as a pre-test.

At the end of the term, the participants took a test based on their own lists of unknown words. The list was composed of every fifth word on each one’s list. The participants were first asked to write down the meanings of isolated words, and then the meanings of those words used in context. The use of L1 took place throughout the test and think-alouds were translated into English and transcribed by proficient English speakers whose L1 was Greek or Korean, respectively. The results showed that the Greek Cypriot performed much better than the Korean at the pre-test. However, the results were reversed after the post-test: The Korean student performed better than the Greek Cypriot. The results were interesting because when comparing their lists, the Greek Cypriot student was expected to have a wider vocabulary than the Korean student.

The researcher discovered that differences regarding their vocabulary learning underlie the different use of
strategies. The Greek Cypriot student defined each word by using it in context and did not spent much time on it—a holistic approach to vocabulary—whereas the Korean student spent a considerable amount of time on each word and gave a single-word definition using the dictionary—analytic approach to vocabulary. The researcher concluded that both approaches are necessary to vocabulary acquisition but in different occasions.

Studies have revealed that contextual clues play an important role in word learning because English learners rely heavily on context to guess the meaning of unknown vocabulary, and they make use of a variety of strategies, such as forward cues, backward cues, and lexical familiarization. However, even though the findings of case studies cannot be generalized because of their small number of participants, such information offers insights for further research and theory development.

Laufer (1998) claimed that limited research focused on how the L2 vocabulary increases over period. Therefore, she decided to compare two groups of Hebrew-speaking English learners in Israel: a class of 17-year-olds and a class of 16-year-olds. The measurements were according to their gains in passive vocabulary, controlled-active vocabulary, and free-active vocabulary. The results
revealed that passive and controlled-active vocabulary increased significantly over the course of the year, as opposed to free-active vocabulary. However, Laufer's study was not longitudinal. Therefore, the results could not be generalized.

Commenting on Laufer's (1998) study, Laufer and Paribakht (1998) argued that only two levels of proficiency were taken into account and that the participants were only examined in an EFL environment where target language input was limited. Hence, a study by Laufer and Paribakht (1998) involved university-age students who studied in ESL (103 English learners in Canada) and EFL (79 English learners in Israel) contexts. Three instruments were used to test the three dimensions of the participants' vocabulary knowledge: (a) the vocabulary levels test to measure their passive vocabulary size, (b) the productive version of the vocabulary levels test to measure the controlled-active vocabulary size, and (c) the lexical frequency profile to measure their free-active vocabulary size. The results were as follows: (a) English learners' passive vocabulary was larger than their controlled-active vocabulary; (b) The controlled-active vocabulary was delayed and did not grow at the same rate as the passive vocabulary in either ESL
or EFL environment; and (c) The free-active vocabulary developed more slowly than did the passive vocabulary.

The results of studies that examined the development of the three dimensions of vocabulary knowledge confirmed that ELLs’ passive vocabulary is larger and develops faster than their controlled- and free-active vocabulary does.

In sum, many issues with regards to L2 vocabulary acquisition have been investigated, such as the comparison of explicit and incidental vocabulary learning methods, strategies English learners use to infer word-meanings from context, and the development of L2 vocabulary over time. Findings of these studies offer important information to language teachers and materials designers. Several pedagogical implications of L2 vocabulary acquisition are offered next.

Pedagogical Implications of Second Language-Vocabulary Acquisition

It is important for teachers to take into account the findings of current research when dealing with L2 vocabulary acquisition. Another factor to take into consideration is the difference in vocabulary according to the learners’ grade- and ability level.
According to Laufer (2003), language teachers should use explicit methods with beginning-level English learners because their vocabulary knowledge is low—if non-existent—as they just begin to learn a new language. Therefore, context cues would not help them learn any words because their comprehension is limited. Word lists, at least in the beginning-level courses, are thus required so that second-language learners begin to learn words in the target language (Laufer, 2003). Extensive use of dictionaries is also greatly beneficial for English learners at the early stages of L2 vocabulary acquisition.

As English-learners’ age and ability level increase, incidental vocabulary-learning methods should be used in ESL/EFL classrooms. Teachers should use texts that offer contextual aid to help English learners infer word meanings from context rather than depending on a dictionary. However, given the fact that most ESL/EFL classrooms consist of mixed-ability-level students, low-ability-level students “should not be barred from using dictionaries and not told to just try and guess from text” (Macaro, 2003) because such conditions may undermine interest in learning. On the other hand, high-verbal-ability students should be discouraged from
extended and unnecessary use of dictionary if they can manage to infer the meaning from context successfully.

Moreover, English learners would learn vocabulary more easily if teachers provided an L1 or L2 gloss in the margins of the page (Nation, 2001; Macaro, 2003). This way, students can focus on selective words that may help them in reading comprehension without disrupting the flow of the reading—especially for the beginning- and intermediate-level English learners.

As Nation (1990) claimed, “because of the large number of low-frequency words and because of their infrequent occurrence and narrow range” (p. 159) teachers should teach English learners strategies to help them deal with unknown words rather than explicitly teach the new vocabulary. Table 6 shows 13 strategies that English learners can use at the age of seven and above (Schmitt, 1997). However, not all strategies are equally successful at all levels of language learning.
Table 6. Second-Language Vocabulary Acquisition Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Applicable Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word lists</td>
<td>Beginning/Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash cards</td>
<td>Beginning/Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect word with synonyms and antonyms</td>
<td>Beginning/Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask teacher to use new word in sentence</td>
<td>High intermediate/low university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze part of speech</td>
<td>High intermediate/low university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of speech (remembering)</td>
<td>High intermediate/low university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze affixes and roots</td>
<td>High intermediate/low university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guess from textual context</td>
<td>High intermediate/low university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use scales for gradable adjectives</td>
<td>High university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect word with personal experience</td>
<td>High university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affixes and roots (remembering)</td>
<td>High university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use semantic maps</td>
<td>High university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate words with its coordinates</td>
<td>High university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use physical action when studying</td>
<td>High university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Schmitt & McCarthy (1997).

It may benefit beginning- and intermediate-level English learners to use strategies 1-3. Strategies 4-8 may be more helpful to high-intermediate and low-university level learners of English. Finally, strategies 9-14 may be achieved better by high-university-level students who
study in English-speaking countries. This strategy classification according to learners' grade level is not a firm recipe for language teachers to apply in their classrooms. These are just suggestions that may help English learners improve their lexical knowledge and promote their cognitive skills. Language teachers should consider factors (i.e. text readability, and learners' first language and personal experiences) other than their grade level before deciding to encourage them to use any strategy.

Summary

This section has focused on issues of L2 vocabulary acquisition. English learners' vocabulary knowledge has been given emphasis during the last 20 years because of its great importance in comprehension of the world and communication with others. Breadth and depth are the two dimensions of vocabulary knowledge. Breadth refers to all the words a second-language learner knows. However, it has been pointed out that knowing a word goes beyond a mere meaning of the word. Thus, depth of vocabulary knowledge addresses issues such as the form, the meaning, and the use of a word.

Two extreme approaches to vocabulary learning have also been discussed: explicit and incidental vocabulary
learning. Research has showed that second-language learners learn words better when both approaches are combined in language courses, and that teachers should teach students strategies to help them expand their mental lexicon throughout their education. Language teachers should also bear in mind the learners’ grade and ability level when a strategy is introduced in order not to undermine their interest in learning the target language. Early stages of language learning require the employment of more explicit methods such as word lists, whereas learners at advanced stages need to make more use of contextual aids. It is time second-language teachers and learners realize the importance of lexical knowledge in language learning; an expanded vocabulary knowledge is the key to achieving English proficiency.
CHAPTER THREE

THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Purpose of the Model

Corpus linguistics, concordance, collocation, the lexical approach, and second-language vocabulary acquisition are the focal concepts discussed in Chapter Two. It was emphasized in the literature review that expansion of second-language vocabulary acquisition is the main concern of language teachers and English learners. To this end, the lexical approach promotes language learning with its main emphasis on lexis rather than grammar, as opposed to traditional approaches. Because corpus linguistics is based on a lexical approach to foreign-language pedagogy, research has revealed that the use of concordance programs to assist in processing corpus information, collecting a number of occurrences of a word-form within its textual environments, helps students learn collocations, the way words combine in natural-occurring language.

The relationships among the five key concepts comprise a theoretical model that can be applied in ESL/EFL contexts to teach English learners. The theoretical model presented in this chapter is designed to
be employed in introductory English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) university-level courses in which EFL students are expected to be proficient in their native languages, and have rather broad vocabulary knowledge and grammatical competence.

A Proposed Theoretical Model

Figure 12 illustrates the relations among the lexical approach, second-language vocabulary acquisition, corpus linguistics research, concordance, and collocation. It is expected that this model will help university-level EFL students become proficient in all four language skills—listening, reading, writing, and speaking.

Teaching Centered on the Lexical Approach

In contrast to structural approaches to language teaching, in which sentence-level grammar is foundational, the lexical approach emphasizes lexis while not neglecting grammar. More detail about teaching both aspects of language is discussed as follows.

Teaching Vocabulary. Many EFL students have received a traditional education in English where grammar is the focal issue, and lexis is secondary. The lexical approach focuses on second-language vocabulary learning by emphasizing lexical phrases in contrast to individual
Second-language vocabulary acquisition
The lexical approach
Corpus linguistics research
Concordance and collocation used as pedagogy in discrete teaching events

Figure 12. Theoretical Model: The Instantiation of Corpus Linguistics Research in Language Teaching Focused on the Lexical Approach

words. Acquiring a considerable academic vocabulary and learning how these words combine in nativelike contexts is what university-level EFL students need to achieve to attain educational success.
Teaching Grammar. An important issue here is that grammar is not taught explicitly through rules and structures; rather, it is incidentally learned through language use with a vocabulary focus. English learners are exposed to language through listening and reading wherein they encounter a number of similar linguistic patterns. This condition allows students to notice these patterns by means of comprehensible input, and use these patterns in the future through speaking and writing.

Research Informing the Lexical Approach

Corpus Linguistics. The lexical approach was one of the areas that received attention in corpus linguistics research. Corpora have been used in the lexical approach, which gathers a large amount of academic language (i.e. lectures, conferences, student-professor conversations, and other) for purposes of contextual analysis. English learners, in turn, process corpus information using a concordancer to examine collocations.

Concordance and Collocation. Two central elements in corpus linguistics that inform the lexical approach are concordance and collocation. Processing corpus information helps English learners locate and notice specific linguistic patterns, whether lexical or grammatical. Specifically, a concordancer searches a corpus and
provides contextualized instances of keyword use. The words with which the keyword co-occurs are called its collocations. In other words, concordancing is a process through which students learn collocations and achieve language proficiency in academic settings.

Summary

According to many researchers, second-language vocabulary acquisition is the central component of language learning and can be achieved through the lexical approach. Corpus linguistics research has partly focused on the lexical approach, employing concordance programs to process corpus information. The results of concordancing offer important information about language use by featuring lexical and grammatical collocations.

The theoretical model suggests that the instantiation of corpus linguistics research in language teaching focused on the lexical approach is beneficial to EFL university-level students because they have the opportunity to learn contextualized vocabulary from the authentic examples of language use that corpora provide. These examples offer ample linguistic patterns for English learners to locate, acquire, and use in academic contexts. Thus, the theoretical model explains the connection
between the general body of corpus linguistics research and the specific instantiation of concordance and collocation use in second-language teaching.
CHAPTER FOUR
CURRICULUM DESIGN

Introduction

The curriculum unit featured in the Appendix is structured based on the literature review in Chapter Two and the theoretical model in Chapter Three. This unit is designed for college-level English-as-a-foreign-language students who will practice and improve their presentation skills—listening and speaking—while encountering a variety of speaking genres (i.e. narrative speech, expository speech, persuasive speech, etc.). Students will benefit from this unit plan because they will develop language skills and strategies useful for their current education and future career. The theoretical approach is embodied in the lessons as students use the lexical approach based on corpus linguistics to prepare the text for their speaking exercises.

Sequence and Content of the Unit Plan

The curriculum presents five lesson plans, each of which examines a type of speaking genre. The learning-strategy objective of each lesson plan entails the use of one concept as discussed in Chapter Two, although more keywords can be applied (see Table 7).
Table 7. Interrelationship between Keywords and Lesson Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Lesson A</th>
<th>Lesson B</th>
<th>Lesson C</th>
<th>Lesson D</th>
<th>Lesson E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corpus linguistics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordance</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lexical approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-language vocabulary acquisition</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All lesson plans have three objectives: (a) the content objective, (b) the learning-strategy objective, and (c) the language objective. The content objective aims to help students comprehend the subject matter of the lesson; the learning-strategy objective helps students recognize and use a strategy for learning purposes; and the language objective helps students practice their listening, reading, speaking, and writing skills. The timeframe for each lesson plan is two hours. All lesson plans feature focus sheets, work sheets (i.e. listening-cloze activities), and assessment sheets that evaluate their individual or group presentations.
The listening-cloze activities are usually used as focus sheets also. Work sheets are used to teach content comprehension and learning-strategy activities. Assessment sheets involve language activities (presentations). Students need to listen to a story (each story explains a speaking genre). Then students have to complete the necessary worksheets individually, with partners, or in groups. Finally, a rubric is used to assess student’s final presentation performance—whether they applied what they learned.

In Lesson A, the content objective is to listen to how introductions of oral presentations are constructed. The students encounter some vocabulary chunks more than once, and they do a listening-cloze activity about successful introductions. The learning-strategy objective is to work on new collocations with compound nouns and verbs and prepositions. The students use a web concordancer or a collocation dictionary to gather examples of lexical items with regard to the way they are used in language. Finally, the purpose of the language objective is for students to use new vocabulary chunks, compound nouns, and verbs and prepositions in various activities (i.e. role-play activity where they create a brief introduction on a particular topic). Their last
performance is evaluated with a rubric that examines whether collocations or other expressions were used.

In Lesson B, the content objective is to listen to and identify a persuasive speech and do a cloze activity. Then, the students learn how to use a web concordancer—the learning-strategy objective—to collect some examples of a word and its various meanings. Finally, the language objective is to conduct a persuasive speech that is evaluated with a rubric.

Lesson C is about debating; the students listen to and identify a debate, and learn how it should be constructed while doing a listening-cloze activity. Then, the students learn how to find new collocations and examine the way they are used in language using corpora and collocation dictionaries. The phrases to be examined are extracted from the text of the listening cloze so that students notice their contextual environment in a debate. After the students are familiar with several collocations, they are encouraged to perform a mini-debate to practice their language skills. It is important that the students use the expressions in appropriate situations while debating in order to convey meaning and comprehension. This strategy is evaluated during the final formal debate.
Lesson D aims to help students perform a narrative speech. The students find information about narrative speeches while reading a text and listening to a story (content objective). This lesson is based on a lexical approach; the students study new lexical phrases in a text, examine the way they are used in language, and discover their meaning (learning-strategy objective). Finally, the assessment determines whether the students performed a successful debate using new collocations and other expressions appropriately.

In Lesson E, the students read and listen to expository speech as a content objective. The purpose of this lesson is for students to notice, study, and learn new lexical items. To this end, the learning-strategy objective is to use corpora to find how lexical phrases are used in language, and to use them while performing an expository speech, upon which they are evaluated with a rubric.

This unit plan is designed to encourage and help EFL students pass their fear of speaking in public, and help them use language appropriately. The purpose for the use of corpora and the study of collocation is to offer students accurate examples of authentic language. It is hoped that these lessons will help students begin feeling
confident about speaking English, and employ strategies of the lexical approach in their learning. Moreover, this unit plan presents the value of implementing a lexical approach in EFL teaching emphasizing what contemporary language research has discovered: the lexical phrase is the most important language unit.
CHAPTER FIVE
UNIT PLAN ASSESSMENT

Purpose of Assessment

Assessment is necessary at all levels of education because it helps both teachers and students: teachers use assessment to examine whether the objectives of the lesson have been met, students are assessed to receive feedback on their performance, and both teachers and students use assessment to determine students' level of performance or knowledge on a particular subject matter (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2002). In the unit plans in the Appendix, the worksheets help students practice new knowledge or strategies and the assessment sheets and rubrics evaluate and assign a formal score to each student's performance on a specific task.

Both formative assessment and summative assessment are involved in this lesson plan. Both assessments are performance-based—that is, students are evaluated according to their performance on particular tasks. More detail on the types of assessment is discussed next.

Formative Assessment

The purpose of the formative assessment is to evaluate students' performance on each task of the lesson.
Teachers observe students as they complete worksheets, and as they are working with partners or in groups. To ensure that students are on task and they participate in all activities, teachers circulate around the class, check for appropriate college-level strategies, and give feedback. During formative assessment, teachers have the opportunity to monitor students' progress and locate any weaknesses that require feedback.

During Lesson B, for example, students are asked to use a web concordancer to find the collocates of particular words or phrases. After the teacher models how to perform a concordance search, the students practice concordance searching on their own. During practice, the teacher circulates around the class to check if students use appropriate strategies to find these collocates. If students do well, the teacher gives positive feedback to praise students' efforts. A feedback to correct the way students work occurs only when the teacher notices that students follow a wrong process to find the collocates of a word. During formative assessment, students do not receive any score on their work sheets.

**Summative Assessment**

All final assessments in this unit plan are summative; students are evaluated based on their overall
comprehension of the lesson. The score each student receives is based on a rubric that is divided in sections, each with a separately scorable category such as delivery, design and content, and language use. Each section of a rubric has points; the total score of a student's performance is the cumulative number of all points received. Thus, summative assessment evaluates the outcome of student's learning.

Peer Assessment

Another type of assessment used in this unit plan is peer assessment. Students have the opportunity to work with partners to evaluate their speech according to a rubric provided by the teacher. Peer assessment aims to encourage students to be responsible for one another's progress and offer feedback to one another to help peers succeed in their performance. All lessons incorporate formative, summative, and peer assessment.

It is important for teachers to use assessment to gain information about students' learning, strengths, and weaknesses. Assessment also helps teachers give efficient feedback so that students correct errors and improve their production and comprehension of English.
Conclusion

This project has offered information about how corpus linguistics can be applied in college-level English-as-a-second-language (EFL) pedagogy following a lexical approach. It is hoped that this project will offer potential contribution to EFL teaching. The lexical approach to language has offered valuable information of the way vocabulary and grammar can be taught as two interconnected units of language. Language teachers managed to combine the teaching of language skills rather than teaching them separately; it is then time to combine vocabulary and grammar teaching with emphasis on large lexical chunks: collocations. The objective of corpus linguistics researchers is to encourage EFL teachers to look at language from a lexical perspective and use its implications in EFL classrooms.
APPENDIX

INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT—EXPLOITING CORPUS LINGUISTICS IN A LEXICAL APPROACH TO IMPROVE THE PRESENTATION SKILLS OF COLLEGE-LEVEL STUDENTS
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Brief Description of the Unit Plan

The instructional unit is composed of five lesson plans, which help students to improve their presentation skills. Each lesson plan emphasizes at least one key concept from Chapter Two. All lesson plans are designed for college-level English-as-a-foreign-language students within a time-frame of two hours.

In Lesson Plan A, students learn how to compose successful introductions; in Lesson Plan B, students learn how to produce a persuasive speech; in Lesson Plan C, students encounter situations of debate and they practice debate skills; in Lesson Plan D, students learn how to build a narrative speech; and finally, in Lesson Plan E, students learn how to construct an expository speech.
Lesson Plan A
What is an Introduction?

Level: Lower Advanced

Performance Objectives: The students will be able to do the following:

- Listen to how introductions are constructed (Content objective)
- Work on new collocations with compound nouns and verbs and prepositions (Learning-strategy objective)
- Use new vocabulary chunks, compound nouns, and verbs and prepositions in various activities (Language objective)


Warm-up Activity: The teacher greets the class and distributes Worksheet A-1. The students will listen to some sentences and fill in the blanks with the appropriate vocabulary chunk. The students share the answers out loud in the class.

Task Chain 1: Listening to How Introductions Are Constructed
1. The teacher distributes Worksheet A-2.
2. The students listen to the same vocabulary chunks, and other collocations, in a passage read by the teacher, and fill in the gaps. The passage gives information about the way an introduction is constructed to be interesting, what should be included and excluded, etc.
3. The students check their answers with a partner.
4. The teacher then distributes Assessment Sheet A-1 for homework.
5. The students read the complete passage (Focus Sheet A-1), and answer comprehension questions.

Task Chain 2: Working on New Collocations with Compound Nouns and Verbs and Prepositions
1. The teacher distributes Worksheet A-3. The students work in three groups. Each group is
assigned to work on a part of the passage, as it is divided in Focus Sheet A-1.

2. Each group underlines all the verbs and circles any prepositions that follow them.

3. Students then use collocation dictionaries to find other prepositions that may follow these verbs, write them on a poster board, and use them in a sentence.

4. The poster boards are pinned on the wall so all students can read the examples.

5. Each group shares their results aloud.


7. The students use a web concordancer to discover compound nouns, and write them down.

8. Finally, the students share their answers aloud.

Task Chain 3: Using New Vocabulary Chunks, Compound Nouns, and Verbs and Prepositions in Various Activities

1. The teacher distributes Worksheet A-5.

2. The students use a web concordancer or a collocation dictionary to find the meanings of some expressions.

3. The teacher checks their answers with their partner.


5. The students fill in the blanks of a passage using the expressions of Worksheet A-5.


7. The students have only five minutes to come up with a one-minute role-play introduction for one topic.

8. The teacher uses Rubric A to assess the students’ performance on the role-play activity.

Assessment:

Formative: The teacher circulates around the class to check if all students participate in individual, pair, or group activities. The teacher checks for grade-level-appropriate listening and speaking strategies during class share out.

Focus Sheet A-1
What is an Introduction?

An introduction is a way to get the audience to listen to your speech. Just like the beginning of a book, if the first few sentences you utter are not interesting, your audience will turn off.

A good introduction should consist of two things: First of all, you need to prepare the audience for what you will say by offering them background, showing why your topic is important and establishing your credibility by explaining your credentials to speak on the topic. Additional types of information at this point might include handout material, brochures, pictures, or a "PowerPoint" presentation on a computer system, which will be used to help illustrate your upcoming speech.

Second of all, you have to get your audience interested. Right before the body of your speech, you might want to ask the audience a question, show them an overhead, or tell them a joke or an anecdote, depending on the group you are talking to. But no matter what, you need an attention getter.

A joke is one way to break the ice. Make sure the joke is linked to the topic, and don’t make fun of anyone, ever.

You are bound to insult one member of the audience who will just plain stop listening. Make sure your audience will understand your joke, so keep it simple, and smile! There is nothing worse than a joke that doesn’t work: “Did you hear the one about the stupid blonde who...” is bound to get you in trouble with someone in the audience, and your presentation will fall flat.

An anecdote might also get your speech off the ground. You could start your speech with: “When I was a kid, my father always told me, Sue, if you want to get something done, do it yourself. Well, I am not going to show you why Dad was wrong, and why allocating work is essential to the workplace.”

Asking a question of the audience can also get them going. There are many kinds of questions. You could ask for a show of hands; you could ask a rhetorical question, for example, “How many people want to earn more money?” or you could ask a shocking question: “How many people here have ever thought about the day they will die?” You could ask a real question, too, and expect an answer: “How many
production workers here have ever received a Research Grant?" Something like this is bound to capture your audience’s attention.

Finally, you could use a famous quotation as an introduction, but keep your quotations short. Do not recite an entire page, or you will put your audience to sleep and defeat your purpose! You should quote a famous person, and preferably a quotation that everyone knows. For example: (speaking to a group of hopefuls) T. S. Eliot once asked a group of hopefuls: “How many people out there want to be writers?” When half the audience raised their hands, he then said, "Well, why aren’t you at home writing?” And stepped off the stage. Good advice—but I promise you I’ll stay and give you something more down to earth.”

Keep your introduction short! Of course, the shorter the speech, the shorter the introduction should be, so a five minute speech should have an introduction that is no longer than one minute.

Worksheet A-1
Introduction to New Vocabulary Chunks

Listen to the sentences read by the professor and fill in the blanks with the appropriate vocabulary chunk.

1. Overheads are often ______________ points in a speech.

2. Lung cancer is ______________ smoking.

3. My father told me to ____________ smoking, or he would halt my allowance.

4. When he tried to ____________ with a joke, it just ____________.

5. I couldn’t get my speech ________________.

6. I often use ____________ in my speeches because they get the audience involved.

7. Good speeches ____________ an introduction, a body, and a conclusion.

8. Make sure you ____________ during a speech, so people will trust what you say.

9. To help the audience realize you’ll be showing them an overhead, you could say: "______________________
I’d like to show you some statistics. Could someone get the lights?"

10. ______________ can sometimes be distracting during your speech, because people sometimes read it rather than listen to you!

Worksheet A-2

What is an Introduction?

An introduction is a way to get the audience to listen to your speech. Just like the beginning of a book, if the first few sentences you utter are not interesting, your audience will ________.

A good introduction should ______ two things: First of all, you need to prepare the audience for what you will say by offering them background, showing why your topic is important, ______ by explaining your credentials ______ the topic.

_______ of information ______ might include ______, on a

__________ you have to get your audience interested ______ the body of your speech, you might want to ask the audience a question, show them an overhead, or tell them a joke or an anecdote, ______ the group you are ________.

But no matter what, you need an ________.

A joke is one way _______. Make sure the joke is _______ the topic, and _______ anyone, ever. you are _______ insult one member of the audience who will _______ listening. Make sure your audience will understand your joke,

__________ a joke that doesn’t work:

"__________ the stupid blonde who..." is bound to get you in trouble with someone in the audience, and your presentation will ________.

An anecdote might also get your speech _______. You could start your speech with:

“When I was a kid, my father always told me, Sue, if you want to get something done, ________. Well, I am not going to show you why dad was wrong, and why allocating work is essential to the ________.”

__________ can also _________. There are many kinds of questions. You could ask for ________; you could ask _______ for example, “How many people want to earn more money?” or you could ask a shocking question:

"__________ here have ever ________ the day they will die? You could ask a real question, too, and expect an answer: “How many ________ here have ever received a ________ _______ is bound to ________.”
Finally, you could use a famous quotation as an introduction, but ___________. Do NOT recite an entire page, or you will __________________! You should quote a famous person, and preferably a quotation that everyone knows. For example: (______________ a group of writers) T.S. Eliot once asked: "________________________ want to be writers?" When half the audience ____________, he then said, "Well, why aren't you at home writing?" And __________ the stage. Good advice—but I promise you I'll stay and give you something ____________. Keep your introduction short! Of course, __________ the speech, __________ the introduction should be, so a five minute speech should have an introduction that is no longer than one minute.

Worksheet A-3
Verbs and Prepositions

Underline all the verbs in your section. Circle any preposition that is next to a verb. Do you think you could use any other preposition with this verb? When? You can use a dictionary to find such possibilities. Example: Speak ON a topic, speak WITH someone, speak TO an audience. Make sure the other students can see the difference: in other words, write as much information in your sentence as you feel necessary to explain the meaning. On the poster board provided, write the new verb-preposition phrase collocations and pin them on the wall for the rest of the class to see.

Worksheet A-4
Compound Nouns

Look through the box for two nouns together (compound nouns). Can you think of any other combinations using either noun?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worksheet A-5
Expressions

Find out the meaning of the following expressions. You could ask a native speaker, look the phrase up in the computer, use a collocation dictionary, use a web concordancer, or use a synonym finder or a thesaurus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Meaning of Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consist of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do it yourself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break the ice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make fun of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A show of Hands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something more down to earth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defeat the purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At your expense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture the audience’s attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you heard the one about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worksheet A-6
One-Minute Role Play

You have five minutes to plan a one-minute role play on one of the following topics. Try to use the collocations you have learned today (i.e. vocabulary chunks, expressions, compound nouns, etc).

1. Make a role play in which a father is asking a child what s/he wants to be when s/he grows up. The child wants to be the ruler of an island. (Something more down to earth).

2. Pretend you are a stand-up comedian. Tell at least one other joke before you use this phrase: "Did you hear the one about...?"

3. Pretend you are running a meeting on how many people would like the bus fares reduced ("Can I have a show of hands?").

Assessment Sheet A-1
Comprehension Questions

1. What is one of the first things you have to do to convince the audience that you are qualified to speak on a topic? (5 points)

2. What is something you might give to the audience to get their attention? (5 points)

3. What is a phrase you might use to signal a joke is coming? (5 points)

4. Why is humor a good device to interest the audience in your speech? (5 points)

5. What is the danger of using humor, if the joke does not fit the topic? (5 points)

6. What kind of questions might you use to involve the audience? (5 points)

7. What is one way to poll the audience for their opinion? (5 points)

Total: ____/35

Assessment Sheet A-2
Fill in the Blanks

Which of the expressions in Worksheet A-5 do you think would be most appropriate to fill in the blanks? (5 points each)

____________________ you start your introduction, you could __________________ by telling a joke. For instance, you might start, “____________________ the man who __________ a store...” But make sure you do not __________ any member of the audience-s/he won’t appreciate it. You might also poll the audience by asking a question and then asking for a __________.

Total: ___/30

Rubric A-1  
One-Minute Role Play

Student’s Name: ___________________ Date: ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Student’s voice is loud and clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Student used expressions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Student used compound words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Student used verb-preposition phrases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Student made good use of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Student’s introduction was rich.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Student’s introduction was interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Grammatical performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___ /40
Lesson Plan B
Persuasive Speech

Level: College

Performance Objectives: The students will be able to do the following:

- Listen to and identify a persuasive speech (Content objective)
- Use a web concordancer (Learning-strategy objective)
- Recognize fallacies and conduct a persuasive speech (Language objective)

Materials: Focus Sheet B-1, Worksheet B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, and B-5, Assessment Sheet B-1, B-2, and B-3, Rubric B-1, B-2, cassette player, web concordancer, Internet access.

Warm-up Activity: The teacher greets the class and distributes Worksheet B-1. The students discover the class’s opinion on one of the controversial topics provided on Worksheet B-1. Then, each student shares the results and the most interesting comment.

Task Chain 1: Listening to and Identifying a Persuasive Speech
1. The teacher distributes Worksheet B-2.
2. The students listen to a passage read by the teacher, and fill in the gaps. The passage gives information about what a persuasive speech is, what the person giving the speech should do or not, and so forth.
3. The students check their answers with a partner.

Task Chain 2: Using a Web Concordancer
1. Worksheet B-3 is distributed and the students are asked to underline the word “wonder” in all sentences.
2. The students do the fill-in-the-blanks exercise and they check the answers with their partners.
3. The teacher points out that “wonder” is a keyword that is used in sentences and that it carries a different meaning depending on its context—phrases in bold.
4. The teacher demonstrates the example of “wonder” using a web concordancer to gather more sentences.
5. The teacher distributes Worksheet B-4.
6. In groups of four, the students choose one of the three words/phrases provided in the worksheet and they use a web concordancer to gather several instances of them in context.
7. The students share the results with the class.

Task Chain 3: Recognizing Fallacies and Conducting a Persuasive Speech
1. The teacher distributes Worksheet B-5.
2. The students read what a fallacy is and they encounter several types of fallacies.
3. Then, they use a search engine to discover the meaning of each fallacy on the Internet, keep notes, and share the results with the class.
4. The teacher scores the students’ comprehension on fallacies with Assessment Sheet B-1.
5. The teacher then distributes Assessment Sheet B-2.
6. The students create a five-minute silly persuasive speech based on a false statement.
7. They are assessed with Rubric B-1.
8. The teacher distributes Focus Sheet B-1.
9. The students read and receive information about false statistics that some people use in their persuasive speeches.

Final Assessment: The Major Persuasive Speech
1. The teacher distributes Assessment Sheet B-3.
2. Each student conduct a 15-minute persuasive speech on any appropriate topic.
3. The teacher scores each student’s performance with Rubric B-2.

Assessment:
Formative: The teacher circulates around the class to check if all students participate in individual, pair, or group activities. The teacher checks for college-level-appropriate listening and speaking strategies during class share out.
Summative: The teacher checks the students’ Work Sheet B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, and B-5, and scores Assessment Sheet B-1, B-2, and B-3 (Assessment Sheet B-2 and B-3 are scored based on Rubrics B-1 and B-2, respectively).
Focus Sheet B-1
Lies, Damned Lies, and Statistics

Please study the statistics below. Do you think they are accurate? Why/Why not? Ask yourself the following questions before you give them "the green light":

1. What might be the sources for this number?
2. How could one go about producing this number (in an unethical way?)
3. Who produced the number, and what interests might they have?
4. How else might they have proven or disproven their claim?
5. How might the desired conclusion affect this statistic?
6. What statistics have the opponents of this conclusion come up with?

- "Every year since 1950, the number of American children gunned down has doubled."
- "In an experiment performed on 40 members Tanomami tribe of Brazil, over a period of one year, scientists were able to prove that the tribe was the most violent of any tribe in the world."
- "By studying XXX and XYY children we have successfully proven that for biological reasons, girls actually prefer doll toys, and boys actually prefer gun toys."
- "Our Nobel-Prize-winning economist supports the statistics compiled by scientist Milton Friedman in his best-seller The Bell Curve, which proves that because Orientals get higher scores on IQ tests, they are also most likely more intelligent than Caucasians."
- "Our minister has shown, through a survey done in his ministry, that 95% of all Canadians believe in God."
- "Nine out of ten doctors prefer Bayer Aspirin® over any other pain killer."
- "Our representative has told us in a speech that it is not necessary to reduce the number of cars. It's been shown that trees produce more carbon monoxide than cars."
- "The U.S. has refused to sign the ban on land mines. A general was quoted as saying, 'We have to protect our American troops overseas. That is our first priority.'"
- "The scientist tried to prove that one gender was biologically inferior in intelligence by measuring each gender's brain size. He filled skulls with marbles. He
discovered that one gender's brain cavity held sometimes as many as five marbles more than the other.”

Re-evaluate the statistics using these “Faulty Statistic” guidelines. Also, please vote on which statistic you think won the “worst statistic ever compiled” award.

Premise Based on the Conclusion
Often, statistic gatherers are trying to prove a particular thing. They will manipulate the experiment (consciously or subconsciously) to fit the conclusion they are aiming for.

Too Small a Sample
Often, statistic gatherers will ask too few a number of people or study too small a sample of people, or study only one group to get the statistics they are hoping for.

Biased Sample
Some statistic gatherers will only survey the group whom they know will agree with the “facts” as they wish to prove them.

Manufactured Sample
Some groups will actually PAY a group of experts to follow their product or conclusion. This is not to say that the experts consciously agree with whomever is paying them, but if you knew you would only get on TV and get paid if you said you preferred Pepsi to Coke, what would you say?

Inappropriate sample
Some scientists will use an inappropriate group (i.e. rats or fish) when trying to prove something about human beings. Sometimes this is necessary, but it does not follow that their statistics are reliable proof.

Skewed Facts
A person can create statistics that are incorrect simply by confusing words or mixing up facts that deal with another issue.

Appeal to Authority
Some people will quote an authority’s figures, even if really this person is not an authority in this particular field.
False Assumption
Some people will quote one statistic when if really does not apply to the issue at hand. For instance, to state that Americans have had no casualties in the war in Afghanistan so far because the three people who died, did so as the result of accidents, is assuming that a "casualty" is only some who was shot by the enemy.

Crazy Statistics
These are statistics that "sound" good, but when you think about them for a while, you realize that they are impossible!

VOTE NOW!

Worst Statistic Ever Compiled: ________________________________

Worksheet B-1
Opinion Poll

You will find out the opinions of three members of the class on five of these controversial topics. Ask each individual what s/he thinks of the statement, and why? The possible answers are "yes, - because...", "no, - because...", or "it depends, because..." After you write down your notes, you will share the results of your survey, and the most interesting comment.

1. I.Q. tests are a true judge of intelligence.
2. Women should be paid for housework.
3. Only women should have the right to decide on abortion issues.
4. There is too much violence on television, and it causes violence in real life.
5. Pornography and hate literature should be censored.
6. People who smoke should have to pay for their own hospital bills.
7. Euthanasia should be legalized.
8. Boxing should be made illegal.
9. There is nothing wrong with children working if the parents need the money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worksheet B-2
What Is a Persuasive Speech?

In a good persuasive speech, you state your opinion, usually on a controversial topic, and try to convince your audience _______ that you are right _______ that they should agree with you. Perhaps this means that you have _______ by using _______ or _______. If you try this, perhaps you will sway some people to your opinion, but in the end you will probably be caught. So I will try to teach you how to make a speech that is logical and that avoids these _______.

But _______ if your speech is expository or persuasive? If your speech gives information without really giving a controversial opinion that someone could strongly agree or disagree with, then it is probably an expository speech. _______ you are making a speech about Stalin, and you describe his life, his childhood, _______ etc. That would be an expository speech.

But let’s say instead that your thesis statement is “Stalin was one of the greatest leaders of the 20th century.” Then you have just made a persuasive thesis statement. _______ does my thesis just give information or does it give an opinion about the information?

Look at these examples of speech topics. _______ which ones are expository, which are narrative and which ones are persuasive topics?

DON’T _______ ALL THE WORDS OF YOUR SPEECH. That is a fatal mistake. So many speakers with written-out manuscripts are _______ --they gave their speech while they were writing it. Instead, WRITE DOWN IDEAS ON CUE CARDS AND THEN CREATE THE WORDS AS YOU SPEAK. What you want to do is write down one or two words to help you _______ and the statistics you are using to _______ and then you want to improvise, using these little “reminders.”

Making a speech _______ turns it into a conversation with the audience. You can _______, and see how they are reacting to your words, so you can change the parts which might offend, or add more controversial statements if _______ agreeing with you. A speech is always a _______ communication. And remember, the audience WANTS to hear your speech. That’s why they are there. So there is no need to be embarrassed or uncomfortable UNLESS you are not really prepared! So make sure you are ready,
with strong information to ______________ and make sure you know the opposite opinions so you can ___________ during ____________.

Length of speech: This speech should be at least 15 minutes long. At the end, I want to be convinced! Make sure you include an introduction, a body with good strong points, quotations, statistics, and logical proof for your opinion.

Choose from the words below:

• but also
• can you tell
• counter them
• fallacies
• fallacious traps
• his rise to power
• how can you tell
• In other words, ask yourself
• just plain dull
• look them in the eye
• look to be
• not only
• on the spot
• question period
• remember the points you want to get across
• swayed the audience by using false statistics
• two-way
• up your argument
• write out

Worksheet B-3
Words of “Wonder”

What do the following expressions mean?

1. I wonder who’s going tonight?
2. No wonder so many people skipped class!
3. It’s one of the wonders of the world.
4. Is it any wonder that nobody called her?
5. Wonder what Gladys asked me?
6. It’s just another seven day wonder.
7. Do you think it’ll happen? I wonder...

Which of these bolded expressions would fit best in the blanks below?

- The Hanging Gardens of Babylon was once one of the ________________.
- ________________ why she said that about me?
- I wouldn’t bother learning to dance West Coast Swing—it’s just a ________________ if you ask me.
- ________________ he quit the class—he got an F on the last test!
- ________________ that the bullies were expelled from the school? Serves them right, if you ask me.

Gossip: You are to have a conversation in which you gossip about a famous star couple—whomever you like: Nicole Kidman and Tom Cruise/Meg Ryan and Dennis Quaid/Prince Charles and Camilla Parker-Bowles, etc. Nothing you say has to be true! When you gossip, see how many times you can use one of these question and statement expressions with “wonder.”

Example:
Louise: I wonder why Tom and Nicole got a divorce.

Jane: They say he was cheating on her! No wonder she asked for so much money in alimony!

Worksheet B-4
"Plain," "Back-Up," and "Look+Someone"

You will be working with a team. Using a web concordancer
(http://www.hti.umich.edu/cgi/m/micase/micase-idx?type=rev ise), your team is in charge of one of the three phrases or words above. Type your phrase or word in the corpora box and see the different ways this word can be used. Choose your favorites. You will share with the class the meanings, and examples, of your word or phrase. The choices are “plain,” “back-up,” and “look+someone.”

Example: In the search box type the word ‘look’ and the word ‘someone’ in the context-word box by clicking the option ‘to the right’. The concordance lines will have examples of sentences that include the word ‘look’ and the word ‘someone’ on its right.

You look at someone...

Write the results below.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Worksheet B-5

Fallacies

A fallacy is an illogical argument, used to win an argument. Sometimes fallacies, such as Appeal to Emotion, are designed to make us feel rather than think, and are often more effective than a good, cogent argument. This is not to say that feeling is less important than thinking—but many times we are tricked into believing something because of sad music or pitiful pictures shown in the background, say, even though what is being argued for has nothing to do with the sounds or the images. A good example of this was one religious cult’s use of the slogan “END WORLD HUNGER” when actually, the donations given were to end the hunger of the cult—they were used exclusively by the cult, in other words. Therefore, it is important to recognize fallacies to avoid using them and to avoid being tricked by them.

To understand what a fallacy is, you have to understand what an argument is. An argument has one or more premises (ideas) and a conclusion. The premises may be true or false; the conclusion may be true or false. It is important not to be tricked into believing false premises or conclusions.

Example:
Premise #1: There is hunger in the world.
Premise #2: Money will help to fight this hunger.
Conclusion: Give me money.

Use a search engine to find other definitions of your fallacy. Example: Go to http://www.yahoo.com. In the box next to “search” type your fallacy—“appeal to authority” for instance—in quotation marks. You can add, “fallacy” as well. Or write “appeal to authority” AND “fallacy” with the “AND” in upper-case letters without quotation marks. There are many sites on the internet to explain fallacies! Back in class, go around the room, tell five classmates the definition, and give an example. You will also be finding out what these fallacies are, so keep good notes.

Choices:
1. Ad Hominem
2. Appeal to Authority
3. Appeal to Belief
4. Appeal to Flattery
5. Appeal to Emotion
6. Appeal to Tradition
7. Bandwagon
8. Begging the Question
9. Confusing Cause and Effect
10. False Dilemma
11. Genetic Fallacy
12. Personal Attack
13. Poisoning the Well
14. Post Hoc
15. Questionable Cause
16. Red Herring
17. Relativist Fallacy
18. Slippery Slope
19. Straw Man
20. Two Wrongs Make a Right

Assessment Sheet B-1
Recognizing Fallacies

Look at the quotations below. Can you and your partner figure out which fallacy from Worksheet B-5 best describes the quotation? There may be more than one right answer, but one answer is the best. (2 points each).

1. The American people are the greatest in the world, and they agree with me.

2. I believe that only feminists and men haters would support a bill asking for affirmative action for women.

3. You know, in the good old days, things were a lot better. People worked harder for their money, and they didn’t have unions to wreck everything.

4. Everybody supports my bill, so I hope you will, too!

5. We know that God exists because the Bible, written by God Himself, says so.

6. We can’t allow poor people to go on welfare, because soon everyone will want to go on, they’ll be no one left to work, and how can we afford anything after that? The whole economy will turn into a mess.

7. I now allow my opponent, who knows nothing about our program, to speak.

8. First, they ask us for a little tax cut. Next year, they’ll ask for a handout. The whole situation is ridiculous.

9. Sure, the killer just murdered 100 people, but his childhood was a mess. It’s society’s fault that he did it, so society should be punished, not him.

10. Stop asking me to quit smoking. My father smoked until he was ninety, and he never got sick. Maybe smoking kills some people, but I have good genes.

11. It says here that women who are depressed get sick twice as much as those who don’t. So depression must cause illness. If we stay happy, we won’t get sick!
12. I will have to buy that aspirin product! My favorite actor, who plays a doctor in my favorite show, recommends it, and he should know!

Write your answers here:

1. __________________________________________

2. __________________________________________

3. __________________________________________

4. __________________________________________

5. __________________________________________

6. __________________________________________

7. __________________________________________

8. __________________________________________

9. __________________________________________

10. _________________________________________

11. _________________________________________

12. _________________________________________

Total: ___/24

Assessment Sheet B-2
Silly Persuasive Speech

You will be assigned a thesis statement that is obviously not true. Your job is to create a five-minute persuasive speech, with time for questions, on this thesis. Don’t worry; you can use all the fallacies you want for this speech. Basically, you have to make something up—something convincing. Please, take the speech seriously. It must have an introduction, a body and a conclusion, just like the real persuasive speech.

Possibilities for the silly speech:

1. The official language of Brazil is Spanish.
2. Two plus two equals forty.
3. The dinosaur did not go extinct.
4. I am really an English Canadian.
5. The electric light bulb was invented by Alexander Graham Bell.
7. Austria and Australia are in the same continent.
8. The Amazon is the smallest river in the world.
9. The capital city of Canada is Toronto.
10. Pizza was invented in Africa.
11. Albert Einstein was no genius.
12. The world is flat.

Write your notes here:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Assessment Sheet B-3
The Major Persuasive Speech

Choose any topic you wish to speak on, as long as it is persuasive, has a good strong introduction, body and conclusion, and uses statistics to prove your case. Be careful to list the source of your statistic. Be careful, too, not to just pick any source. It should be a respected and trustworthy source, like the New York Times, not the Bull-Hickey Journal of Slosh Spuzzim. Your speech should be 15-20 minutes long.

Total: ___/100

Rubric B-1
Silly Persuasive Speech

Name of Student: ___________________________ Date: __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic: _______________</th>
<th>Score/Critique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintained eye contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoke loudly and clearly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Looked comfortable and at ease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was able to convince</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did not use notes in a distracting way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pronunciation was clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used linking and reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoke fluently, without too much hesitation or repetition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoke loudly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vocabulary choices were reasonably accurate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Talk had an introduction, body and conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed topic with examples, reasons and details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used convincing points well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elicited questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did not expect too much from audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did not exaggerate fossilized errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used correct tenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formed questions correctly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric B-2  
The Major Persuasive Speech

Name of Student: __________________________ Date: ______

Others in Group: ______________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic:</th>
<th>Length: _____</th>
<th>Score/Critique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>____/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delivery
- Rapport
- Support Material
- Use of notes

Design and Content
- Introduction
- Body
- Conclusion
- Statistics

Language
- Word choice
- Grammar
- Pronunciation

Fallacies
- (- 2 points each)  

TOTAL  

Lesson Plan C
Debating

Level: College

Performance Objectives: The students will be able to do the following:

- Listen to and identify a debate (Content)
- Find collocations, antonyms, and synonyms (Learning-strategy objective)
- Use new collocations in a debate (Language objective)

Materials: Worksheet C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, and C-5, Rubric C-1, C-2, and C-3, cassette player, web concordancer, and collocation dictionary.

Warm-up Activity: The teacher greets the class and distributes Worksheet C-1. The students read several controversial statements that people use when debating. In pairs, the students select and discuss three topics. The partners must disagree and use controversial statements.

Task Chain 1: Listening to and Identify a Debate
1. The teacher distributes Worksheet C-2.
2. The students listen to a passage read by the teacher, and fill in the gaps. The passage gives information about what a debate is, what should each side do or not, and so forth.
3. The students check their answers with a partner.
4. The teacher then distributes Worksheet C-3.
5. The students have a mini-debate in pairs.

Task Chain 2: Finding Collocations, Antonyms, and Synonyms
1. The teacher distributes Worksheet C-4.
2. Each student works individually to find synonyms and antonyms for specific words or phrases, and find collocations using collocation dictionaries or web concordancers.
3. Then in pairs, the students check, add or correct their answers.
4. Finally, the students share their answers aloud.
Task Chain 3: Using New Collocations in a Formal Debate

1. The teacher distributes Worksheet C-5.
2. The students are divided in groups of four.
3. Each group is further divided in two groups (pro-side and con-side). Each side is responsible to gather information from a website regarding debating, and present a formal debate in class next time.
4. The students are assessed on their grammatical performance and content of the debate (Rubric C-1 and C-2).

Assessment:
Formative: The teacher circulates around the class to check if all students participate in individual, pair, or group activities. The teacher checks for grade-level-appropriate listening and speaking strategies during class share out.
Summative: The teacher checks the students’ Work Sheet C-1, C-2, C-3, and C-4, and score Rubric C-1.
Worksheet C-1
Controversial Statements

Below is a list of some controversial statements. With a partner, think of two more you could add to the list. Then please choose your three favorite topics and discuss your opinion with your partner. Your partner should disagree with whatever you say!
Some polite ways to disagree:

I hear what you’re saying, but I’m not sure I agree.
I beg to differ.
You’re right in a lot of ways, but have you thought about this?
That’s one way to think about it... However, I believe that sometimes we have to do something different.
Not to play the Devil’s Advocate, but I think exactly the opposite.
Well, my opinion is slightly different. I think we shouldn’t have gone that route.
Are you sure about that? I read this article that says something different.
On the other hand, if people did it that way, it might get done faster.
You’ve made some good points, here, but I’ll have to disagree.
We’d better agree to disagree.
I’ve read something different: The Prime Minister was quoted in the paper today saying he would lower taxes.
I’m not sure that’s true...
Sorry, but I have to disagree with you there. I think it’s wrong to cut social assistance.
(add two more below)
Topics (please add three more!)

1. Men should always earn more money than women, especially married men.
2. Women shouldn’t serve in the military.
3. Children should always obey their parents.
4. Cigarettes and alcohol should be de-legalized.
5. Everyone should work a four-day week.
6. Love is more important than money.
7. You should never lie to anyone.

A debate is ___________________, in that the speakers only prepare the first part, the ARGUMENT that they are presenting to the audience. The debaters are _______ two teams: the ___________, who will present matter agreeing with the opening statement of the debate, and the ____________, who will present matter disagreeing with the opening statement.

Debates can be very important, like the debates you can ___________ during an ______________ which may help decide who the next Prime Minister of Canada will be. Formal debates are also used ______________ in high schools and universities, to teach students how to think critically, logically and quickly.

To be a good debater, you have ___________ against ________and _____________ the other side might present. In other words, if you yell and scream at the other team, or say things like "You are so wrong!" You will not win the debate.

The debate is a competitive game. You will be ___________ a panel of your ____________, so your job is to convince this panel that you have the better argument. The _______ do not have to ___________ your side-their job is to judge your argument for fallacies and for logical progression in your presentation. You want to convince them that your side’s arguments are the best, not that your viewpoint is the best. To be able to do this, your side must do extremely thorough research on the topic, be prepared to present your side clearly, ___________ the other side’s case by predicting what their arguments will be ____________, and be ready to ___________. ____________ you ____________ your side is not important-___________ in formal school debates, the participants are often assigned to be ____________-to ____________ the side they disagree with. It is essential, however, that you know the main arguments for your side.

The debate for our class will have some aspects, which are ____________, and some which are ____________, the formal university debate. For instance, our debate is timed, but we will not use a timer with a ____________. Instead, your teacher will ____________ with a wristwatch.

The first part of our debate will be the statement of the TOPIC. One of the PRO side should ____________ the
TOPIC, in sentence form. Example: "This is a debate on whether or not women should be paid for housework. We are the pro-side, Mary, and John, and the con-side is Bill and Susan."

The pro side then has 5 minutes to present the pro arguments, the con side, who presents the con arguments. DO HERE ON WHAT THE OTHER SIDE HAS PRESENTED! Present only the arguments that you have prepared.

The second part of the debate, after time to prepare, is the . This is the most important, and most difficult part of the debate. The con-side has five minutes to disprove and invalidate the pro side’s arguments. This is why each side must what they THINK the other side will present, so they can be ready with arguments and statistics with which to the other side’s statements. After the con-side is finished, the pro side ONLY makes rebuttal on the arguments the con side presented .

Again, the rebuttal must be logical—your team needs to show to the judges why the other side’s arguments do not work. You want to take the other side’s argument, , and show why it doesn’t make sense. Be careful not to criticize the individuals on the other side: "She is wrong because she is stupid and the argument she made is stupid, too." if that is the best argument , you will lose the debate.

The third part of the debate is

The pro side starts by asking one question to the con side, who has to prepare an answer, and then two minutes to answer it. The con-side then asks their question, another question from the pro-side, and one more question from the con side. , the formal part of the debate is over, and has probably taken approximately 45 minutes. Since this is a practice debate, the teacher will give you in the timing, but normally formal debates are very strict in keeping to the timing. The audience and the judges now have as much time as they wish to ask questions of both sides.

In our debate, the judges and the audience are the same people. You will be deciding which side wins, and also on their performance. The judges will be on your debate: 1) the information you have presented; 2) the way you argued and
how organized, informed and logical you were; 3) how well you presented (voice, nervous habits, ____________, etc.) Your teacher will give you a separate mark on your grammar and your pronunciation.

GOOD LUCK WITH THE DEBATE and MAY THE BEST SIDE WIN!

Choose from the list below:

- a little bit of leeway
- a little time
- adjudicating on three aspects of
- agree with
- agree with
- At this point
- beforehand
- body language
- buzzer
- CON side
- debate on
- devil’s advocates
- different from
- different from a formal speech
- divided into
- election campaign
- fallacies
- followed by
- followed by
- I assure you
- in fact
- in other words
- in the first place
- judged by
- judges
- judging your peers
- keep track of the time
- know in advance
- NOT MAKE ANY COMMENT
- PRO side
- question period
• quite frequently in
• rebut
• rebutal
• refute
• report on
• similar to
• skewed statistics
• tear apart
• to be on your best guard
• watch on TV
• whether or not
• you can come up with

Worksheet C-3
Mini Debate

With your partner, you are going to design a small mini-debate, using your two nouns. One of you will be the pro-side and one the con-side. The pro-side is responsible for introducing the topic and both the speakers.

The topic will be: "A _______ is more important than a _______." Then the pro-side has three minutes to make arguments for his/her side. The con-side has three minutes to make arguments for his/her side, followed by two minutes each for rebuttal. One question each. Then the class may ask questions.

The main difference between this and a real debate is the number of participants and the length. Although the topic may seem silly, please take it seriously. And, of course, there is no need for research.

You will be assessed on your grammar and your pronunciation. You will not be judged on debating style, because this is to help you learn the debating style. (30 points)

You may write your arguments below to help you during your debate.

____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________

Worksheet C-4
Antonyms, Synonyms, and Collocations

Work with a partner. Can you think of any antonyms (opposite words or phrases) or synonyms (similar words or phrases) to go with the phrases below? You can find some antonyms and synonyms in the text, as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word or Phrase</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Antonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the first place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little bit of leeway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tear apart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep track of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewed statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beforehand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be one one’s guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you match up the words in the columns to form a collocation? Often, there will be more than one right answer... You may use collocation dictionaries or a web concordancer (http://sara.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/lookup.html, http://www.edict.com.hk/concordance/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>come up</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>a second speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divided</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>an idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on guard</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judged</td>
<td>against</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>followed</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>your peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on</td>
<td>go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an enemy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Write the results below:

Worksheet C-5
A Formal Debate

Please look at the following site:

http://www.britishdebate.com

Your group is in charge of the following:
• You need to find out the history of debating, and why people debate.
• You need to find out the rules of debating; how debates are organized; how they are judged.
• You also need to find a topic to debate. It does not have to be in this web-site, but it does have to be a sentence. Two of the people in your group will be the “pro” side, and two will be the “con” side.
• After you know all the information above, and have a topic to debate, you have the rest of the period to "surf" this topic for statistics, facts, authorities, arguments, etc. for your side. Decide who will talk about what, etc.
• Be prepared to present the debate next time in class.
• Your group will be assessed on two rubrics (the teacher's rubric and the peer-group's rubric).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic of Debate: ________________________________</th>
<th>Score/Critique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Argument had an introduction, body and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed topic with examples, reasons and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avoided fallacies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rebutted only against the main argument of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the other side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asked a good question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pronunciation was clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used linking and reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoke fluently, without too much hesitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or repetition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-corrected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vocabulary choices (collocations) were</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasonably accurate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**                                      **/50**

Rubric C-2
A Formal Debate

Names in Group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro-Side</th>
<th>Con-Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each team is responsible for giving points to the pro-side and the con-side. Your points, and my score sheet, will determine the winner of the debate and the score of the student. You have 30 points per team.

You should consider the following (3 points each):

- Which speaker managed to convince me of his/her side?
- Which speaker rebutted the most logically and convincingly?
- Which speaker isolated the main points of the argument as completely as possible?
- How well did s/he present his/her case?
- Did s/he use statistics, overheads, power-point or other visual aids to add to the case?
- Did s/he seem well-organized?
- Did s/he seem nervous, unsure? Did s/he obviously memorize anything? Did s/he insult the opposition or simply say "you're wrong" as a rebuttal?
- Did s/he bring new material not mentioned in either argument in the rebuttal?
- Were the questions challenging?
Use the table below to score each side:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Pro-Side</th>
<th>Con-Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arguments presented:</td>
<td>_____ /10</td>
<td>_____ /10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuttal points:</td>
<td>_____ /10</td>
<td>_____ /10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question/Answer period:</td>
<td>_____ /10</td>
<td>_____ /10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>_____ /30</td>
<td>_____ /30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesson Plan D
Narrative Speech

Level: College

Performance Objectives: The students will be able to do
the following:

• Read and listen about narrative speeches
  (Content objective)
• Study new lexical phrases (Learning-strategy
  objective)
• Conduct a narrative speech (Language objective)

Materials: Focus Sheet D-1, and D-2, Worksheet D-1, D-2,
D-3, and D-4, Assessment Sheet D-1, and Rubric
D-1, cassette player, web concordancer, collocation dictionaries.

Warm-up Activity: The teacher greets the class and asks
the students to share with the class what they know
about narrative speeches.

Task Chain 1: Reading and Listening about Narrative
Speeches
1. The teacher distributes Focus Sheet D-1.
2. The students read about and identify a narrative
speech, and they encounter some examples of
narrative-speech topics.
3. Then the teacher distributes Worksheet D-1.
4. The students practice in conducting a narrative
speech to prepare them for their final narrative
speech.
5. The teacher distributes Worksheet D-2.
6. The students listen to a passage read by the
teacher, and fill in the gaps. The passage gives
information about the "Dos" and "Don'ts" of
narrative speech.
7. The students check their answers with a partner.

Task Chain 2: Studying New Lexical Phrases
1. The teacher distributes Focus Sheet D-2.
2. The students read an example of narrative
speech.
3. The passage contains lexical phrases that help
students with their narrative speech.
4. Then they work on Worksheet D-3 and check their
answers with a partner.
5. The teacher distributes Worksheet D-4 for homework.
6. The answers are shared with the class next time.

Task Chain 3: Conducting a Narrative Speech
1. The teacher distributes Assessment Sheet D-1.
2. Each student conducts a four-minute narrative speech on any topic.
3. The teacher scores each student’s performance with Rubric D-1.

Assessment:
Formative: The teacher circulates around the class to check if all students participate in individual or pair activities. The teacher checks for college-level-appropriate listening and speaking strategies during class share out.
Summative: The teacher checks the students’ Work Sheet D-1, D-2, D-3, and D-4, and scores Assessment Sheet D-1 based on Rubric D-1.
Focus Sheet D-1
What is Narrative Speech?

A narrative speech tells a story, usually a story about your own life, although it could be the life of a famous person as well. The speech should be very casual and is more like reciting a short story than a list of facts. Narrative speeches have a beginning that interests the audience, a middle, that gives the story, and an ending that will make the audience remember the story later, fondly.

Examples of topics:

1. The day I fell into the river
2. Abraham Lincoln’s finest hour
3. My child’s biggest wish

Focus Sheet D-2
Example of a Narrative Speech

Read the example and some lexical phrases below to help you with your narrative speech planning!

This happened when I was just a kid. I had a big crush on my brother, and I asked my mother if I could marry him. She said no. When I asked why not, she said, someday I would understand.

Unfortunately, for me, there was this other girl that also was crazy about my brother. She was an older woman—six years old, and he was only five—robbing the cradle. Well, one day, she came right up to him and gave him a big kiss, right in front of me. I was seeing red, let me tell you! So, I walked right up to her and smacked her with my lunch pail. Unfortunately again for me, this girl’s mother was the fifth grade teacher. She came right up to me and I turned beet red, then went white as a sheet. "Did you hit my daughter?" she asked. I hemmed and hawed, "Nnn...ooo, no, no, no..." "I think you did," she said. "So tonight, I am calling the police, and they are coming to get you and they’ll throw you in the slammer!" Well, I was scared half to death. I stood there, bawling my eyes out. And my brother walked me home and said, "Don’t worry, Louise, when the police come, I’ll protect you." And he spent the whole night, awake, guarding the door!

My brother the gentleman, that teacher the creep!

Worksheet D-1
This is Your Life

(Preparation for the Narrative Speech)

Tell one person in your class a story about topic #1. After you both have finished, move on and tell a new person a story about topic #2. Keep going until you have told five stories and heard five stories. When you are finished, choose the story you enjoyed telling the best. That will be your narrative speech to the class.

1. Describe an interesting event in your childhood.

2. What was your first kiss or first romantic crush?

3. Do you have any funny stories about learning English?

4. What was one of the scariest things that ever happened to you?

5. What was your most embarrassing moment?

## Worksheet D-2
### Speech Dos and Don’ts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dos</th>
<th>Don’ts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>______________ you are telling a story, you want to __________ where you are going with it. Make sure you have _______________. Know __________ your speech is __________ and practice by timing it in front of a mirror. Make sure you have a __________” in your introduction. Make sure you include __________-don’t be stiff! Keep good __________ with the entire audience. Be positive, smile. Keep __________.</td>
<td>DON’T memorize the speech! Use __________ instead. A speech is a ______________ with an audience. DON’T use __________ or bad words. Avoid too __________. DON’T apologize, ever, ever, ever, for anything. DON’T write the speech down. DON’T look __________ or at no one. DON’T __________, verbally or physically. (example: avoid saying “uh, ya know, right, er, and avoid __________ playing with a pen, __________, or shifting your weight __________.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choose from the following list:

- a beginning, middle and end
- and forth
- at only one person
- be
- casual
- contact
- cue cards
- even though
- eye
- formal conversation
- gestures
- good posture
- grabber
- hem and haw
- how long
- jingling change
- language
- make sure
- pacing back
- slang
- supposed
- to
- to and fro

Worksheet D-3
How Well Do You Know This?

1. Match the synonym phrases below with the words in bold in the story (Focus Sheet D-2). Can you think of any other synonym phrases that mean the same thing?

Example: slammer/prison/Big House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words/Phrases</th>
<th>From Story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 was infatuated with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 in love with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 a May-December romance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pretty upset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 blushed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 turned pale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 coming to pick you up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 weeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 stammered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In the story, how is the word “right” used? What does it mean in these phrases?

He came right up to me.
She stood right in front of me.
He turned right.
He always thinks he’s right.
His politics are right of centre.
She came right over to tell me the gossip.
She came right away without even putting on a coat.
He plays right wing in a minor hockey team.
Politically, he’s very right wing.

3. Can you fill in the blanks with the right phrase from the list below?

My brother plays ________ with the Vancouver Canucks.
Politically, he’s a bit ____________________, but not overly so. One day, I called him to go to a peace rally.
and he had no trouble with that, so maybe he’s more _________. The problem is, he always thinks he’s ________ about everything, even when he’s wrong. For instance, one day he wanted to take me home, and I said “_________ here,” but instead he turned left. He drove __________ a dog that was crossing the road! A woman started to shout at us. She came _________ to our car, and stood __________ of us and started crying. So we felt pretty bad, but what can you do!

Choices

Turn right
right over
right up
right in front
right of centre
right wing
right
right wing

Worksheet D-4
Colors

In the story, colors are often used as idioms to describe an emotion or a personality. For instance: I saw red. I turned beet red. I went white as a sheet. You will be assigned a color. You are in charge of finding as many idioms as you can for this color using a web concordance, a collocation dictionary, or asking native speakers. In class, please tell as many people as you can about your idioms, while finding out as well their idiom-color discoveries.

Colors
red
black
green
pink
yellow
purple
blue
white
brown

Write the results below.

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

Assessment Sheet D-1
The Formal Narrative Speech

You will conduct a four-minute narrative speech on the topic you selected from Worksheet D-1 with which you feel more comfortable narrating. Your overall performance will be assessed based on a rubric (30 points).

You may write your notes here:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

# Rubric D-1

**Silly Persuasive Speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Student: __________________________</th>
<th>Date: __________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic:</strong> ______________________________</td>
<td><strong>Score/Critique</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Talk had a beginning, middle, and end</td>
<td>_____/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed topic with new lexical phrases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Story was interesting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Story described memorable events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintained eye contact</td>
<td>_____/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoke loudly and clearly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Looked comfortable and at ease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was able to convince</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did not use notes in a distracting way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pronunciation was clear</td>
<td>_____/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used linking and reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoke fluently, without too much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hesitation or repetition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoke loudly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vocabulary choices were reasonably</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accurate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>_____/30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesson Plan E
Expository Speech

Level: College

Performance Objectives: The students will be able to do the following:
- Read and listen about expository speech (Content objective)
- Use corpora to find how lexical phrases are used in language (Learning-strategy objective)
- Conduct an expository speech (Language objective)

Materials: Focus Sheet E-1, Worksheet E-1, E-2, and E-3, Assessment Sheet E-1, and Rubric E-1, cassette-player, web concordancer, Internet access.

Warm-up Activity: The teacher greets the class and distributes Focus Sheet E-1. The students read about expository speech and look at some topic examples. Then, the teacher distributes Worksheet E-1 and explain the instructions.

Task Chain 1: Reading about and Listening to Persuasive Speech
1. The teacher distributes Worksheet E-2.
2. The students listen to a passage read by the teacher, and fill in the gaps. The passage gives information about what an expository speech is, what the person giving the speech should do or not, etc.
3. The students check their answers with a partner.

Task Chain 2: Using Corpora to Examine How Lexical Phrases Are Used in Language
1. The teacher distributes Worksheet E-3.
2. In pairs, the students search various corpora using a web concordancer to gather instances where collocation noun and verb forms with the preposition “off” occur in language.
3. The students share the results with the class.

Task Chain 3: Conducting an Expository Speech
1. The teacher distributes Assessment Sheet E-1.
2. The students create a 10-minute expository speech on a topic the teacher provides.
3. They are assessed with Rubric E-1.

Assessment:

Formative: The teacher circulates around the class to check if all students participate in individual, pair, or group activities. The teacher checks for college-level-appropriate listening and speaking strategies during class share out.

Summative: The teacher checks the students' Work Sheet E-1, E-2, and E-3, and scores Assessment Sheet E-1 based on Rubric E-1.
Focus Sheet E-1

What is An Expository Speech?

Sometimes an expository speech is called an "informative" speech. There are many examples of this kind of speech. You are not giving your opinion, but you may be talking to a group of people about some aspect in your country, or about how to do something, like bake a cake, or about a particular custom, or about some fact in history. You are telling a group of people about something you find interesting. Most of what you will be covering will be "facts" that are generally accepted to be true by those familiar with the topic. However, you cannot presume that your audience knows anything about your topic, so you will want to provide a solid background and include definitions of important terms so that your listeners will be able to understand what you are talking about.

Topic examples:

1. How to knit a sweater
2. My country’s superstitions
3. Traveling to Brazil

Worksheet E-1
Expository Speech Practice: The Expert Speech

The expert speech is not exactly a speech; it is a panel, where you will answer the questions of a small group of students. Four students will be presenting an expert speech, to four separate groups, each day. You will be doing your expert speech twice, first to one group, then—after a session of peer grammar correction, from the mistakes the teacher has written on the board—to another group. In other words, the speakers rotate clockwise to the next group of question askers.

The expert speech works as follows:

1. Choose something you know a lot about. Maybe it’s a sport, or your city, or your job, or a hobby.
2. You look at the group and simply say, “I am an expert in __________ (skiing, Venice, stamp collecting).”
3. You are NOT allowed to say anything else! The group you are speaking to must then ask you questions on your topic. (How do you ski, aren’t you scared? Why do you like Venice?)
4. You continue to answer the questions until the teacher stops the group and focuses your attention to the mistakes s/he has heard while each group was speaking. Don’t worry! Your name will not be on your mistakes, and the best way to learn a language is to speak and MAKE mistakes! Everyone in the class will correct the mistakes together. If no one knows what the mistake is, then the teacher will explain.
5. You then move on to the next group, say “I am an expert in __________” and nothing else, and let your new group ask you questions.

Worksheet E-2

The Form of a Formal Expository Speech

The expository speech has ______________: Introduction, body, conclusion. The thesis statement, as in an essay, is usually the last sentence in the introduction. It should __________ your speech, like _____________.

While an expository speech does not ask you to express an opinion, you still need to be a personality in your speech and let the listeners see ______________. Ask yourself: if I were in the audience, and didn’t know anything about the topic, what would I want to learn? What would interest me the most?

Introduction.

I have written an entire lesson plan on the introduction, because it is one of the things that will __________ your speech. If you do not interest the audience ________ in what you are saying, they will soon ________ and start to think of other things. So make sure you capture the audience’s attention by telling a joke, asking a ___________, or using a quotation. You should also let the audience know the main points of the body of the speech. For instance: "I will be telling you about three kinds of __________ in Brazil: Impolite gestures, flirting gestures, and frustration gestures. First, Impolite gestures…"  

Body

The body is really the speech itself, where you present ______________________. ________________ a separate part of the speech, as you warned the audience in the introduction, and remind them again when you reach each new part of the speech. Keep each cue ___________________. Be sure to include __________ quotation or visual or statistic in your speech. It will make you sound like an expert.

Conclusion

The conclusion should be used to _______________ of the ___________ of your speech. You should repeat your points, and then give a little ending, which again can be a joke, an anecdote or a question. You want to leave your ____________________. You want them to remember your speech! Don’t forget, a movie can be great, but if the ending is disappointing it is soon forgotten! So leave them with __________________.
Choose from the following list:

- a preview of coming attractions
- at least
- audience with a good taste in their mouths
- Divide each point into
- everything you intended to say on the subject
- highlight
- in the same order as in your introduction
- major points
- make or break
- provocative question
- remind the audience
- right away
- something to remember you by
- three main parts
- turn off
- your interest in the topic

Worksheet E-3
Searching Corpora

Look at the second sentence in the section "Introduction" (Worksheet E-2): "They will soon turn off and start to think of other things." What does turn off mean in this context? Can it mean anything else? Can it be used as a noun?

Please work with a partner. You will be in charge of looking up eight of the expressions below. You will use corpora (http://www.edict.com.hk/concordance/WWWConcappE.htm) to find out all the ways these expressions can be used. Can it only be used as a verb or a noun? How many meanings can it have? You will be in charge of telling the class all the possible meanings of this phrase. Use a separate sheet of paper to write down the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nod off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jump off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoot off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take off</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Sheet E-1
The Formal Expository Speech

Your speech should be at least ten minutes long. Make sure you have some kind of visual for this speech. It could be an overhead, a power-point presentation, a photograph, a drawing. You will be describing some aspect of your country to the rest of the class.

Please do NOT memorize the speech! I will take off points for every part of the speech that seems memorized. Use cue cards instead. Make sure you include an introduction, a good strong outlined body, and a conclusion. Also, make sure you do not tell a long story of your life! This is an expository speech, not a narrative speech. You are talking about a custom of your country, not of yourself. (But certainly you can highlight your speech with examples of things that have happened to you.)

You should choose one of the following topics:

1. Taste in my country. (You can choose any aspect of taste-art/clothing/styles of architecture/materialism-consumerism/fads, etc.)

2. Restaurants in my country (again, you can choose to say anything you like-styles of restaurants/a popular and different eating habit, etc.)

3. Food in my country (a popular dish and how to prepare it/some unusual dish/tropical fruit, etc.)

4. Dating in my country (etiquette, arranged marriage, asking the opposite sex out, dates from Hell, etc.)

Total: ___/30

# Rubric E-1

## The Formal Expository Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Student: __________________________</th>
<th>Date: ________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Topic:</strong> ________________________________</th>
<th><strong>Score/Critique</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Talk had an introduction, body, and conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed topic with examples, reasons and details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used quotations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elicited questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used visuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>____/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Delivery**                               |                     |
| • Maintained eye contact                    |                     |
| • Spoke loudly and clearly                  |                     |
| • Looked comfortable and at ease            |                     |
| • Avoided tics                              |                     |
| • Did not use notes in a distracting way    |                     |
|                                            | ____/10             |

| **Communication**                          |                     |
| • Pronunciation was clear                   |                     |
| • Used linking and reduction                |                     |
| • Spoke fluently, without too much hesitation or repetition |                     |
| • Self-corrected                            |                     |
| • Vocabulary choices were reasonably accurate |                   |
|                                            | ____/10             |

| **TOTAL**                                  | ____/30             |
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