



NWSA-Humanities
ISSN: 1306-3111/1308-7320
NWSA ID: 2015.10.1.4C0192

Status : Original Study
Received: October 2014
Accepted: January 2015

E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy

**Fatma Has
Elçin Esmer**

Mersin University, Mersin-Turkey
elciny@yahoo.com; ftmcelik33@hotmail.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.12739/NWSA.2015.10.1.4C0192>

SEMANTIC PROSODIC ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH TEXTS PRODUCED BY TURKISH STUDENTS

ABSTRACT

This study aims to reveal the use of semantic prosodic words which are decided before *happen, cause, bring about, create, effect, provide* by some researchers and two new phrases *because of* and *thanks to* in 606 paragraphs by the students of Mersin University ELT Department. The other aims are to find out whether SP types of words have any differences in terms of gender, grade, group and text types, and decide text coherence and cohesion. A special corpus is designed. With Antconc 3.3, all of target words are analyzed with naked eye as Xiao and McEnergy (2006) did, and how frequent each type of SP is used in percentages as Stubbs (1995) did. The study shows if there is more than one equivalent of a word in another language; the knowledge of SP may help choosing the best one. Also, appropriate semantic prosodic use may help to produce coherent and cohesive texts.

Keywords: Semantic Prosody, Collocation, Text Coherence, Text Cohesion, Learner Corpus

TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLER TARAFINDAN ÜRETİLEN İNGİLİZCE METİNLERİN ANLAMSAL BÜRÜN GÖRÜNÜMLERİNİN ÇÖZÜMLENMESİ

ÖZET

Çalışmanın amacı alanyazında daha önce yapılan çalışmalarda anlamsal bürün görünümleri ispatlanmış *happen, cause, bring about, create, effect, provide*, ve bunlara ek olarak *because of* ve *thanks to* gibi iki yeni yapının 2012- 2013 akademik yılında Mersin Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği bölümü öğrencileri tarafından yazılan 606 İngilizce metnindeki anlamsal bürün görünümlerinin nasıllığını sorgulamaktır. Çalışmanın diğer amaçları cinsiyet, sınıf, grup ve metin türü değişkenlerine göre anlamsal bürün kullanımının ve bununla metin bağdaşıklık-tutarlılık oranının betimlenmesidir. Katılımcılar konulara göre neden-etki, anlatı ve düşünce paragrafı türlerinde metinler üretmiş ve metinler bilgisayar ortamına aktarılarak çalışma için özel bir derlem oluşturulmuştur. AntConc 3.3 yazılımı yardımıyla tüm eşdizimler Xiao ve McEnergy'nin (2006) yaptığı gibi manuel incelenmiştir. Ardından anlamsal bürün sınıflaması Stubbs (1995)'in çalışmasında yaptığı gibi yüzdelerle belirtilmiştir. Çalışma diğer dilde birden fazla anlamı olan kelimelerin doğru ifadelerle kullanımında bürün bilgisinin yararlı olabileceğini göstermiştir. Ayrıca bulgular uygun anlamsal bürün kullanımının metin içi bağdaşıklığı ve tutarlılığı artıracak yönündedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Anlamsal Bürün, Eşdizim, Metin Bağdaşıklığı, Metin Tutarlılığı, Öğrenci Derlemi



1. INTRODUCTION (GİRİŞ)

When one thinks about learning a foreign language, it is necessary to have enough proficiency in four basic skills which are reading, writing, listening and speaking. But one thing ignored about a language is its vocabulary (Nation & Carter, 1989). "Vocabulary, which is the basic material of the language, is, of course, of crucial importance in expressing ideas and thoughts when communicating" says Xia (2010). Also, Wu (2009) sees vocabulary as a tool of thought, self-expression, translation and communication. In 1976, Wilkins states that one can express few things without grammar, but without vocabulary s/ he can describe nothing (cited in Xia, 2010; Wu, 2009). At that point, Wu (2009) gives a good example: "Without the acquisition of vocabulary, that is equal to that a capable housewife feels it difficult to cook porridge without rice". (p. 131)

Vocabulary acquisition is the largest and most important task facing the language learner (Swan & Walter, 1984 cited in Shejbalova, 2006), and ability to communicate in a foreign language necessitates more than solely its grammar and semantic knowledge (Sadeghi & Panahifar, 2013). According to Öztürk (2006), words are labels for concepts, and teaching word meaning is essentially teaching context for given words (Antonacci & O'Caalghan, 2012). Thinking vocabulary is more than a list of words (Hackman, 2008), Carter (1998) and McKay (1980 cited in Zhang, 2010a) state that knowing a word mainly involves knowing how to use the word syntactically, semantically and pragmatically. Richards (1976) and Nation (2001 cited in McCarten, 2007) gives a list of different things learners need to know about a word before one can say that s/ he has learned it. This list includes the meaning(s) of the word, its spoken and written forms, what "word parts" it has (e.g., any prefix, suffix, and "root" form), its grammatical behavior (e.g., its word class, typical grammatical patterns it occurs in), its frequency, connotations and collocations (p. 18).

According to Ahmadian, Yazdani and Darabi (2011) "In the last few years, much research has been focused on some specific uses of collocations". Some corpus linguists such as Sinclair (1991), Stubbs (1995) and Hoey (2003 cited in Ahmadian et al., 2011) provide some instances about near synonyms having different collocational behaviors in different connotations; for instance, cause death but bring about happiness, which they call this relation as Semantic Prosody (SP).

SP is an aura of meaning with which a word or phrase is imbued by its collocates, which means that collocates frequently occurring in the vicinity of a word or phrase will have 'shaped' that word's semantic aura in the mind or expectations of the native speaker (Milojković, 2013).

The notion of SP in this study can be defined as Louw did in 1993 since he states the main functions of SP clearly. As to Louw (1993 cited in Stewart, 2010), "Semantic prosody refers to a form of meaning which is established through the proximity of consistent series of collocates" adding the main function of these collocations is to express the hidden attitude of its speaker or writer. Then, in 1995, Stubbs (cited in Guo et al., 2010) states that there are three kinds of SP, and this classification is chosen because it is the most widely used one in many studies (Berber Sardinha, 2000; Wei, 2002;



Stefanowitsch, 2003; Tsui, 2004; Wang & Wang, 2005 cited in Ahmadian et al., 2011; Xiao & McEnery, 2006; Huntson, 2007; Sadeghi, 2009; Zhang, 2010b; Louw & Chateau, 2010; Yang, 2011, Ebeling, 2013 etc.). If a node word has collocations with negative semantic characteristics, it has negative SP. If the word has positive collocations, it has positive SP, and finally if a node word attracts both positive and negative collocations, then it has neutral or mixed SP. When deciding SP, it is important for a word to co-occur typically with other words, as in frequency-based approach, in addition to belong to a particular semantic set (Huntson & Francis, 2000 cited in Stefanowitsch, 2003). So, co-occurrence and semantic environment of collocations in a pragmatic framework are two important factors for SP (Carmen, Cubillo, Belles-Furtuno & Gea-Valor, 2010).

SP has the power to create a bridge between reader and writer or listener and speaker by adding extra meanings to a text or speech (Berber Sardinha, 2000). In order to avoid inadequacies, the language learner should have enough knowledge about SPs in target language, so that one can realize whether the chosen collocations are suitable connotationally (Louw, 2008). "Native speakers' unconscious knowledge of collocations is essential component of their idiomatic and fluent use" says Stubbs (2001 cited in Gyllstad, 2002). Also the difference between native speakers and L2 learners can be attributed to collocation knowledge (Shei & Pan, 2000). Moreover, Nation (2000) suggests that the improvement in collocation competence will help language learners gain native-like fluency, and for L2 learners and teachers, a big challenge in learning a word lies in mastering its pragmatic function (Zhang, 2008), which is related to its SP (Partington, 1998; Sinclair, 1999 cited in Sadeghi, 2009). Common inappropriate word choice is because of neglecting semantic prosodic features of the words (Wei, 2006 cited in Zhang, 2009; Xiao & McEnery, 2006).

Parallel with the aims of the study, the following research questions form the basis of the study:

- How is the semantic prosodic appearance of the words analyzed within the scope of this study in English written texts produced by the students majoring in Mersin University ELT Department?
- What type of semantic prosodic appearance do the target words in English and Turkish written texts produced by the students majoring Mersin ELT exhibit in terms of different variables?
 - What type of semantic prosodic appearance do the target words in English written texts produced by the students majoring Mersin ELT exhibit in terms of gender?
 - What type of semantic prosodic appearance do the target words in English written texts produced by the students majoring Mersin ELT exhibit in terms of grade?
 - What type of semantic prosodic appearance do the target words in English written texts produced by the students majoring Mersin ELT exhibit in terms of group?
 - What type of semantic prosodic appearance do the target words in English written texts produced by the students majoring Mersin ELT exhibit in terms of text type?
- Do the students produce cohesive and coherent texts by using the semantic prosodic features of the target words effectively?



2. RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE (ÇALIŞMANIN ÖNEMİ)

Language is a tool for communication (Parikh, 2001; Semin, 1998). In order to have native like fluency, not only collocation knowledge but also the knowledge of SP is crucial. Possible results of this study can indicate how Turkish students use SP, and how they provide a coherent and cohesive text if there are some deficiencies in the knowledge of semantic prosodic words. Moreover, the findings of this study can light the way for language instructors and teachers about teaching vocabulary items not on their own but with the collocations they are used within a semantic framework, that is, with their semantic prosodies.

This study is significant in two ways. First one is that in the present study, a specialized corpus composed of three types of paragraphs by Turkish students majoring in Mersin University ELT Department is used to analyze SPs of the words. Secondly, this study of SP is supposed to be unique, since it has not been come across such a study looks for semantic prosodic words in English texts of Turkish students although much effort is made to find one. Finally, this study is thought to be the first important step of a tall SP ladder in Turkey. There is much to add on it. Researchers, curriculum developers or instructors in Turkey realizing the importance of the knowledge of SP can take this study further and so the implications of such studies may be great for the students growing within Turkish educational curriculum.

3. METHOD (YÖNTEM)

3.1. The Participants of the Study (Çalışmanın Katılımcıları)

The participants of this study are freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior students of English Language Teaching Department at Mersin University during 2012-2013 academic year, both in day and night classes. The participants' proficiency level in English language is assumed to be intermediate (independent user, B1 and B2) and advanced (proficient user, C1 and C2) based on proficiency levels in Common European Framework (CEF) (İrgin, 2011). All students are supposed to have the Turkish L1. The participants have written three paragraphs. There are different participant numbers for each type of paragraph as in Table 1.

Table 1. The Numbers of participants for each type of texts
(Tablo 1. Her metin türü için katılımcı sayıları)

	Cause-Effect		Narrative		Opinion	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Freshman / Day	32	18	26	15	23	12
Freshman / Night	25	14	25	14	21	10
Sophomore / Day	14	6	14	4	15	5
Sophomore / Night	18	8	21	5	19	5
Junior / Day	11	3	23	5	21	4
Junior / Night	6	6	11	6	8	6
Senior / Day	15	11	14	11	11	6
Senior / Night	7	6	19	9	11	7
TOTAL	128	72	153	69	129	55
	606	200	222	184		



3.2. The Tool of Data Collection (Veri Toplama Aracı)

Data has been collected through three different types of texts: cause- effect, narrative, and opinion which are mostly used paragraph types in ELT. Erkuş (2009) states that the reasonable period between each kind of measurement is ten days - two weeks. While choosing the topics, it was important to make all learners, from freshmen to senior, produce something about them, so the subjects of the paragraphs have been chosen carefully. In the first term of 2012- 2013 academic year, the participants are asked to write a narrative text in English firstly whose topic is 'If I could go back in time, ...'. Secondly, two weeks later, they write a cause- effect paragraph about the effects of social sites on people's lives. Finally, after a break for two weeks again, the participants write an opinion paragraph about the question 'Does age matter in relations?'

3.3. Data Analysis (Veri Analizi)

Semantic prosodic appearances of six words analyzed in this study have been decided before as *happen* - negative SP, *cause-negative* SP, *bring about*- positive SP, *provide*- positive SP, *effect-neutral* SP, *create*- neutral SP. The target words are extracted from 606 paragraphs written in English using AntConc 3.3 Corpus software. "AntConc is a freeware, multiplatform tool for carrying out corpus linguistics research and data-driven learning" states Anthony (2011). Semantic prosodic appearance for each word are identified, and then each instance for each category is counted and presented as a percentage of the total amount of instances as Xiao and McEnery did (2006), and Nelson (2006). Following the steps of in the research by Xiao and McEnery (2006), with the aim of revealing how native speakers of English use *because of* and *thanks to*, Brigham Young University British National Corpus (BYU-BNC) is retrieved as a reference. BNC is one of the largest corpora with approximately 100 million of words in length 90 % of which consists of written and 10 % consists of spoken British English (Meyer, 2004; Sahillioglu, Sahinkayasi and Sahinkayasi, 2012). Finally, for text coherence and cohesion, the frequencies about the appropriate semantic prosodic use are calculated and then, percentages about each target word use in texts are presented.

4. THE FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS (BULGULAR VE TARTIŞMALAR)

The findings of overall semantic prosodic appearance of the target words in English cause- effect, narrative and opinion texts written by students in Mersin University ELT Department in 2012- 2013 academic year are presented in Table 2.

In Table 2, highlighted lines show the target words that reveal some kind of different uses. The target words in the other lines are used as in previous studies (Berber Sardinha, 2000; Wei, 2002; Xiao & McEnery, 2006; Huntson, 2007; Sadeghi, 2009 etc.). First target word *happen*, which occurs eight times in 606 English texts, is used with neutral SP in the present study. However, Sinclair (1991 cited in Ahmadian et al., 2011), Stefanowitsch (2003), Pan and Feng (2003 cited in Zhang, 2010b), Bednarek (2008), Yu and Cai (2009) state that the word *happen* has negative SP. When *happen* is thought to be equivalent of Turkish *ol-mak*, which is a light verb, and has various uses in



Turkish, Turkish ESL learners may not realize the difference between two languages and use some equivalents of *ol* such as *be*, *become*, *happen* etc. (Redhouse Turkish- English Dictionary, 2012) in the place of one another if they do not have the knowledge of SP.

Table 2. SPs of the target words
(Tablo 2. Hedef kelimelerin anlamsal bürün görünümleri)

Target word	F	SP	SP in This Study
happen	8	Negative	Neutral
cause	31	Negative	Negative
bring about	-	Positive	-
provide	7	Positive	Positive
effect	54	Neutral	Neutral
create	10	Neutral	Neutral
because of	82	Negative	Negative
thanks to	61	Positive	Positive

Cause is the one of most commonly used words in SP studies, and it has negative SP in the studies of Stubbs (1995 cited in Walker, 2011), Stefanowitsch (2003), Pan and Feng (2003 cited in Zhang, 2010b), Huntson (2007), Bednarek (2008), Louw and Chateau (2010), Guo et al. (2010). Also, in cross- linguistic studies, Wei (2002) finds out the negative semantic prosodic use of *cause* in JDEST corpus.

Bring about is synonym of the verb *cause*. Some researchers (Louw, 2008; Louw & Chateau, 2010) think that the knowledge of SP is useful for learning the appropriate usage of synonyms, and look for *bring about* in English texts. While *cause* is used with negative collocations, *bring about* is used with positive ones. But unfortunately there is no occurrence of that phrasal verb in the students' English texts which shows the ignorance of phrasal verbs in vocabulary lessons.

Provide is the third target word of this study, which is proved to have positive SP in Bublitz (1998 cited in Bednarek, 2008), Pan and Feng (2003 cited in Zhang, 2010b), Yu and Cai (2009), and Louw and Chateau (2010)'s studies. Parallel with those studies, in this study, seven occurrences of *provide* is used with positive semantic prosodic appearance. *Effect* is found out to have neutral SP in Stubbs (1995 cited in Bednarek, 2008), and Louw and Chateau's study in 2010. In the present study, it is revealed that in forty-one occurrences, *effect* is used with negative, positive and neutral collocations, which shows it has neutral SP. Another word, *create* is stated to have neutral SP in English (Stubbs, 1995 cited in Bednarek, 2008; Louw & Chateau, 2010). In this study, the participants use this verb with neutral collocations in ten concordance lines totally.

Two new words taken the uses of Turkish equivalents (Eker, 2005) are added in this study, *because of* and *thanks to*. As Yang (2011) did, BYU-BNC is examined first. It is seen that native speakers of English use *because of* in negative contexts, that is with negative SP, and *thanks to* with positive SP as in Eker's (2005) statements. In the present study, *because of*, is used with negative SP in 82 occurrences. Moreover, *thanks to* is used with positive SP in 61 concordance lines.

The results in terms of four variables; gender, grade, group and text type are discussed one by one in Table 3.



Table 3. The use of SP in terms of variables
 (Tablo 3. Değişkenler açısından anlamsal bürün görünümü kullanımı)

Target Word	Genders	Grades	Groups	Text Types
happen	Female-Neutral	Sophomores & Juniors-Neutral	All-Neutral	Narrative-Neutral
provide	Female-Positive	All-Negative	All-Negative	Cause-effect & Opinion Negative
cause	Both- Negative	Freshmen, Sophomores & Juniors-Positive	Day-Positive	Cause- effect-Positive
effect	Both- Neutral	All-Neutral	All-Neutral	Cause-effect & Narrative-Neutral Opinion (Once)-Positive
create	Both- Neutral	All-Neutral	All-Neutral	All-Neutral
because of	Both- Negative	All-Negative	All-Negative	All-Negative
thanks to	Both- Positive	All-Positive	All-Positive	All-Positive

The highlighted lines in Table 3 show the different semantic prosodic uses by females and males; freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors; day and night groups; and finally narrative, cause-effect and opinion text types. At that stage, since no studies examining the use of semantic prosodic words in terms of those variables have been come across after many searches, the findings of those research questions cannot be compared with the previous ones.

Firstly, the target words *happen* and *provide* are used only by female participants. Eight occurrences of *happen* are used neutrally in female participants' text. On the other hand, seven occurrences of *provide* are used positively by female participants. *Create* is used with neutral semantic prosodic appearance in English texts by females and males. Also, *cause* is used with negative semantic prosodic appearance by two genders. Moreover, in the present study, *effect* is used with positive, negative and neutral collocations in English texts of female and male participants. *Because of* is used with negative collocations in English texts by two genders appropriately. Also, *thanks to* is used positively in English texts by two genders appropriately as in Eker (2005).

Secondly, the highlighted lines in Table 3 show the different semantic prosodic uses by four grades. Since no studies examining the use of semantic prosodic words by different grades of participants have been come across in the literature, the findings of this research question cannot be compared with the previous ones. *Happen* is used only eight times in English texts, and by sophomores and juniors. Both grades use it as neutral SP. *Provide* is used positively by freshmen, sophomores and juniors. The texts written by seniors do not include the word *provide* so they cannot be added to the comparison. Moreover, *create* is used similarly in the English texts in present study by all four grades of students. All students from four grades use *cause* as negative SP. Also, *effect* is a neutral semantic prosodic word in the



texts of all grades. *Because of* is used negatively as it is accepted by all grades. *Thanks to* is used as positive semantic prosodic words in English texts of four grades of students as in Eker (2005).

Thirdly, the highlighted lines in Table 3 show the different semantic prosodic uses by two groups. *Provide* is used positively only by day group students. The texts written by the students in night group do not include the word *provide* so they cannot be added to the comparison. Then, *create* is used neutrally in the present study by two groups of students. Students in both day and night groups use *happen* as neutral SP. Also, all students from two groups use *cause* as negative SP. Moreover, *effect* is a neutral semantic prosodic word in the texts of day and night groups. *Because of* is used negatively and *thanks to* positively by both groups.

The highlighted lines in Table 3 show the different semantic prosodic uses in three types of texts. Since no studies examining the use of semantic prosodic words in cause-effect, narrative and opinion texts have been come across in the literature; the findings of this research question cannot be compared with the previous ones. *Happen* is used eight times in English narrative texts as neutral semantic prosodic word. There are no occurrences in cause-effect and opinion paragraph types to compare the results. Moreover, in cause-effect and opinion texts, participants use *cause* as negative SP. Unfortunately, this verb is not used in narrative texts. *Provide* is used seven times with positive SP just in cause-effect paragraphs of English. Furthermore, *effect* is a neutral semantic prosodic word in cause-effect and narrative text types. On the other hand, it is used once in an opinion paragraph with positive SP.

Finally, the appropriate use of semantic prosody helps language learners to create coherent and cohesive texts since the hidden attitude will be transferred to the reader or listener thanks to SP (Zhang, 2009; Partington, 1998 cited in Zethsen, 2006). The target words *cause*, *provide*, *effect*, *create*, *because of*, *thanks to* are all used with expected SPs. So language learners build coherent and cohesive texts which is a semantic unit parts linked together (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) with the help of correct SP use. Only *happen* is used inappropriately in the texts of participants. *Happen* has negative SP whereas in this study it is used with neutral SP. So when this verb is used especially with a positive collocation, a coherent and cohesive text cannot be produced since correct messages and attitudes cannot be transferred to the readers or listeners (Eker, 2005). This result may be because of the ignorance of SP in vocabulary teaching (Xiao & McEnery, 2006). ESL / EFL learners use dictionaries as an important reference for unknown words (Yang, 2011). When a learner looks up the verb *olmak* in a dictionary such as Redhouse Turkish- English Dictionary (2012), the equivalents are be, become, happen, exist, etc. So s / he chooses one of them randomly, then coherent and cohesive texts cannot be created since the learner does not see the words in context when s / he looks them up in dictionaries. If SPs are presented in dictionaries, then learners can choose one of the near synonyms that is appropriate for his / her negative or positive attitude (Yang, 2011).

To sum, when all these findings are taken into consideration, it is seen that there are some kinds of problems in English vocabulary



teaching (Nation & Carter, 1989). So it can be suggested that teachers should present vocabulary items not on their own but also in context with their collocations at the same time (Gabrielatos, 1994). This will be useful especially when there are more than one equivalents of a word in one of the languages. So ESL / EFL learners can gain unconscious knowledge of collocations and SP as native speakers do (Stubbs, 2001 cited in Gyllstad, 2002). Also these findings are important for applied linguistics which is seen as a problem-solving discipline, concerned broadly with language education and language problems (McDonough, 2002).

5. CONCLUSION (SONUÇ)

Vocabulary knowledge is at the core of any language teaching (Wu, 2009). Also Lewis (1992) holds the idea that vocabulary acquisition is the main task of second language acquisition and the language skills as listening, speaking, reading, writing and translating all cannot go without vocabulary (Xia, 2010). Carter (1992 cited in Xia, 2010) and Nation (2001) state that knowing a word includes some aspects, and one of them is collocations. Huntson (2002) says vocabulary teaching needs to take account of semantic prosody (cited in Zhang, 2009) which is a special use of collocations.

Semantic prosody is a concept which has been a focus of interest among corpus linguists over the last 15- 20 years (Stewart, 2010). Yu and Cai (2009) state that SP is a kind of semantic overflow, a special kind of selection restriction, in which the node words have to keep a semantic harmony with collocations. According to Xiao and McEnery (2006), inappropriate word choice arising from ignorance of semantic prosody is common among ESL / EFL learners since L2 learners and teachers have a big challenge in mastering a word's pragmatic function (Zhang, 2009), which is related to its semantic prosody (Partington, 1998; Sinclair, 1996 cited in Zhang, 2009). Moreover, Tsui (2005 cited in Zhang, 2009) states that for ESL teachers, one challenge in vocabulary instruction concerns the semantic prosodies of words. However, SP is the determiner of the meaning of the whole lexical item, expresses the function of it and shows how the rest of the item will be interpreted (Carmen et al., 2010). Moreover, the knowledge of SP can also provide insight into the teaching of vocabulary, especially near synonyms (Zhang, 2010b).

Collocations and idioms are of the greatest importance to the language learner; one of the things that distinguishes an advanced learner's language from that of a native speaker (Zeneth, 2006). Nation (2001) and Gass and Selinker (2008) state that second language use can be accounted for by the storage of chunks of language in long-term memory seeing the collocational knowledge as the essence of language knowledge.

Vocabulary teaching gains importance with those views about collocations. But who will do it? Of course, language teachers. Influenced by grammar-translation method and concept, the teachers tend to offer the translation equivalent of a new word in vocabulary instruction as word lists (Zhang, 2009). However, language learners' goal is to be able to communicate in target language rather than mastery of its structures in Communicative Language Teaching which is a world-wide accepted approach for language teaching (Richards &



Rodgers, 2001). While communicating in target language, in order to convey true messages to the receiver, it is important to use words appropriately in context (Eker, 2005). In Richards' (1976) and Nation's (2001 cited in McCarten, 2007) list of different things learners need to know about a word, emphasis is made on collocations of that word. That means teaching lexis, that is word combinations, is important in language learning, and teachers are the ones who will do this. Teachers should realize the fact that meaning is not so much centred in individual lexemes as it is the product of extended lexical units (Zethsen, 2006), and they should put on more emphasis on teaching collocations and lexis instead of teaching separate words without context (Zhang, 2010a).

Furthermore, vocabulary, including SP, should be taught in a context providing clues from which the learner can recall meaning and usage (Zhang, 2009). If SP is ignored in vocabulary courses, then inappropriate uses of words will be common during language production process (Zhang, 2009) which will cause coherence and cohesion problems arises from wrong semantic relations between sentences within a text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). But if it is taught consciously in contexts by language teachers, language learners can take a step further towards native like fluency, and produce coherent and cohesive texts (Zhang, 2010b). The knowledge of SP will be beneficial especially while teaching near synonyms such as cause and bring about, day by day and day after day, which are the structures students can have difficulty in using appropriately without the knowledge of SP (Xiao & McEnery, 2006).

Also SP has another importance for dictionary compiling. As Zhang (2010a) states in dictionaries, near synonyms have similar meanings in one language although in fact, they usually differ in their collocation behaviors and semantic prosodies. Language learners use dictionaries as a first reference when they do not know a word in a text. If dictionaries provide adequate information with semantic prosodic appearances of words, then ESL / EFL learners will reach appropriate use of words in context (Yu & Cai, 2009).

Finally, in a publication of Ministry of National Education of Turkey (2008), the qualities of English language teachers are defined in totally twenty- six items with three performance indicator for each one. The roles of language teachers are given in details about how to teach four basic skills of language, listening, speaking, reading and writing. But there is nothing about how to teach vocabulary or what the teachers' roles are in vocabulary teaching process which is ignored by Ministry of National Education also. Moreover, when course document of Mersin University ELT Department is looked through, it is seen that there is no vocabulary course to teach pre-service teachers the importance of SP or even collocations. If pre-service teachers do not learn the importance of the knowledge of lexis, chunks, collocations, SP etc. then how can one expect them to teach those to their students? If we want our students to be proficient not only in receptive skills, listening and reading, but also in productive skills, speaking and writing, firstly curriculum specialists and English language teachers should be aware of the fact that having lexical knowledge and SP as its special use is the key for gaining fluency in four basic skills of a foreign language (Sadeghi, 2009).



This study is thought to be the only one in Turkey which looks for semantic prosodic appearances of some words both in English texts. So it has many limitations. Firstly, in this study although the number of data has been tried to be increased by collecting different types of paragraphs, it is limited to only students majoring in Mersin University ELT Department. Another limitation of the study is that there are some other words in English SPs of which are discussed in previous studies. Also each suffix added to a word, that may be plural s, ed, ing, etc., or voice structures of verbs are different variables for each word. But they are ignored in this study. Finally, this study has a corpus compiled of written texts only. However, McCarten (2007) advises to examine the words both in written and spoken data added to the corpus.

A further research can be done with a larger corpus for both English and especially Turkish. Also, there are two equivalents of cause in Turkish: *neden olmak* and *sebepe olmak*. A further study can be done in order to examine those two near synonyms in Turkish. In order to see whether there are different words apart from *because of* and *thanks to*, SPs of which are included in Turkish grammar books, and they can be looked for in Turkish texts of participants with a concrete support from Turkish literature, and the findings of such a study can be compared with the data in two- million- word METU Turkish Corpus and 50- million- word Turkish National Corpus in order to reach a generalizable result in Turkish language. Moreover, the uses of words with different suffixes, different uses as verb or noun, and also verbs in active or passive voice sentences can be handled as different variables in further studies. Furthermore, a further study can be done with English language teachers working for Ministry of National Education of Turkey and their awareness about SP can be examined. Finally, spoken data can be included in as a further study.

REFERENCES (KAYNAKLAR)

1. Ahmadian, M., Yazdani, H., and Darabi, A., (2011). Assessing English learners' knowledge of semantic prosody through a corpus-driven design of semantic prosody test. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*. doi:10.5539/elt.v4n4p288.
2. Anthony, L., (2011). *AntConc* (Windows, Macintosh OS X, and Linux) Readme Text. Retrieved from http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/software/README_AntConc3.2.4.pdf in May 2014.
3. Antonacci, P.A. and O'Caalghan, C.M., (2012). *Promoting literacy development*. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/40627_4.pdf
4. Bednarek, M., (2008). Semantic preference and semantic prosody re-examined. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 4(2), pp: 119- 139. doi: 10.1515/CLLT.2008.006
5. Berber Sardinha, T., (2000). Semantic prosodies in English and Portuguese: A contrastive study. *Cuadernos de Filología Inglesa*, 9(1), pp:93-109.
6. Carmen, M., Cubillo, C., Belles-Furtuno, B., and Gea-Valor, L.M., (2010). *Corpus-based approaches to English language teaching*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.



7. Ebeling, S.E., (2013). Semantic prosody in a cross- linguistic perspective. *Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English 13: Corpus Linguistics and Variation in English: Focus on Non-Native Englishes*. Retrieved from <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/13/ebeling/> on 30.05.2013
8. Eker, S., (2005). *Çağdaş Türk Dili*. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları.
9. Erkuş, A., (2009). *Davranış bilimleri için bilimsel araştırma süreci*. Ankara / İstanbul: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
10. Gabrielatos, C., (1994). *Collocations: Pedagogical implications, and their treatment in pedagogical materials*. Unpublished essay. Research Center for English and Applied Linguistics, University of Cambridge. Retrieved from <http://www.gabrielatos.com/Collocation.pdf>
11. Gass, S.M., and Selinker, L., (2008). *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. NewYork: Routledge.
12. Guo, X., et al., (2010). Acquisition of conscious and unconscious knowledge of semantic prosody. *Elseiver, Consciousness and Cognition*, 20. doi:10.1016/j.concog.2010.06.015.
13. Gyllstad, H., (2007). *Testing English collocations: Developing receptive tests for use with advanced Swedish learners*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Lund University, Sweden.
14. Halliday, M.A.K., and Hasan, R., (1976). *Cohesion in English*. UK: Pearson Education Limited.
15. Hunston, S., (2007). Semantic prosody revisited. *Words, grammar, text: Revisiting the work of John Sinclair*. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 12,pp: 249- 268.
16. İrgin, P., (2011). *Listening strategies used by Turkish students learning English as a foreign language: The development of listening strategy inventory*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Mersin University, Mersin.
17. Louw, B., (2008). Contextual prosodic theory: bringing semantic prosodies to life. *Texte Janvier*, 8(1),pp: 1-58. Retrieved from http://www.revue-texte.net/docannexe/file/124/louw_prosodie.pdf
18. Louw, B., and Chateau, C., (2010). Semantic prosody for the 21st century: Are prosodies smoothed in academic contexts? A contextual prosodic theoretical perspective. *JADT 2010: 10th International Conference of Statistical Analysis of Textual Data*.
19. McCarten, J., (2007). *Teaching vocabulary. Lessons from the corpus, Lessons for the classroom*. NewYork: Cambridge University Press.
20. McDonough, S., (2002). *Applied Linguistics in Language Education*. London: Arnold Publishers.
21. Meyer, C.F., (2004). *English corpus linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
22. Milojković, M., (2013). Is corpus stylistics bent on self-improvement? The role of reference corpora 20 years after the advent of semantic prosody. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 42(1), pp:59-78. doi: 10.1515/jls-2013-0002.



23. Ministry of National Education. (2008). İngilizce öğretmeni özel alan yeterlikleri. Retrieved from otmg.meb.gov.tr/alaningilizce.html in December, 2011.
24. Nation, I.S.P., (2001). Learning Vocabulary in Another Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
25. Nation, P., and Carter, R., (1989). Vocabulary acquisition. Association Internationale de Linguistique Applique (AILA) Review. Retrieved from <http://www.aila.info/download/publications/review/AILA06.pdf#page=10> in March, 2014
26. Nelson, M., (2006). Semantic associations in business English: A corpus-based analysis. Elseiver, English for Specific Purposes, 25, pp: 217- 234. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2005.02.008
27. Öztürk, M., (2006). Vocabulary teaching. Ankara Üniversitesi Dil Dergisi, 133, pp: 20-28. doi: 10.1501/Dilder_0000000060
28. Parikh, P., (2001). The Use of Language. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information (CSLI) Publications.
29. Redhouse English- Turkish, Turkish English Dictionary. (2012). İstanbul: SEV Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık Eğitim Ticaret A. Ş.
30. Richards, J.C., and Rodgers, T.S., (2001). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. NewYork: Cambridge University Press.
31. Sadeghi, K., (2009). Collocational differences between L1 and L2: Implications for EFL learners and teachers. TESL Canada Journal, 26(2), pp: 100- 124.
32. Sadeghi, K., and Panahifar, F., (2013). A corpus- based analysis of collocational errors in the Iranian EFL learners' oral production. The Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 69(4), pp: 53- 78.
33. Sahillioglu, F., Sahinkayasi, Y., and Sahinkayasi, H., (2012). Effectiveness of two corpus tools on Turkish students' learning English Grammar. e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy NWSA- Education Sciences, Volume:7, Number:1, 1C0488, pp: 230-240. Retrieved from http://www.newwsa.com/download/gecici_makale_dosyalari/NWSA-5762-2656-5.pdf
34. Semin, G.R., (1998). Cognition, language and communication. In Fussell, S. R., & Kreuz, R. J. (Eds.). Social and Cognitive Psychological Approaches to Interpersonal Communication. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Retrieved from <http://www.cratylus.org/people/uploadedFiles/1118485714114-9752.pdf> in February, 2014.
35. Shei, C.C., and Pain, H., (2000). An ESL writer's collocation aid. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 13(2), pp: 167-182.
36. Shejbalova, D., (2006). Methods and approaches in vocabulary teaching and their influence on students' acquisition. Unpublished final work. Masaryk University, Czech Republic. Retrieved from http://is.muni.cz/th/104917/pedf_b_a2/bakalarska_prace.pdf
37. Sinclair, J.M., (1991). Corpus, concordance, collocation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
38. Stefanowitsch, A., (2003). Semantic prosody. Corpus Linguistics. Retrieved from <http://www.db->



- thueringen.de/servlets/DerivateServlet/Derivate-10791/corp_sempros.pdf in May, 2012.
39. Stewart, D., (2010). *Semantic prosody: A critical evaluation*. New York: Routledge Publishing.
 40. Stubbs, M., (1995). *Collocations and Semantic Profiles: On the Cause of the Trouble with Quantitative Studies*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
 41. Tsui, A.B.M., (2004). What teachers have always wanted to know - and how corpora can help. In Sinclair, J. M. (Ed.). *How to use corpora in language teaching* (p. 39- 61). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
 42. Xia, J., (2010). *Communicative language teaching in vocabulary teaching and learning in a Swedish comprehensive class*. D-essay in English Didactics.
 43. Xiao, R.Z., and Mcenery, T., (2006). *Collocation, semantic prosody, and near synonymy: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. *Applied Linguistics* 27(1), pp: 103-129. doi:10.1093/applin/ami045
 44. Walker, C., (2011). How a corpus-based study of the factors which influence collocation can help in the teaching of business English. *Elseiver, English for Specific Purposes*, 30, pp: 101-112. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2010.12.003.
 45. Wei, N., (2002). Research methods in the studies of semantic prosody. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 34(4), pp: 300-307.
 46. Wei, N., (2002). Research methods in the studies of semantic prosody. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 34(4), pp: 300-307.
 47. Wu, Y., (2009). The application of CLT in college English vocabulary teaching. *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 4(3), pp: 128-131.
 48. Yang, S., (2011). Corpus-based English near synonym distinction in learner autonomy mode. *Psychology Research*, 02, pp: 52-55. doi: 10. 5503/J. PR. 2011.02.012
 49. Yu, P., and Cai, J., (2009). *Semantic prosody: a new perspective on lexicography*. *US- China Foreign Language*, 7(1), pp: 20-25.
 50. Zethsen, K.K., (2006). *Semantic prosody: Creating awareness about a versatile tool*. *Tidsskrift for Sprogforskning*, 4(1-2), pp. 275- 294.
 51. Zhang, C., (2010a). An overview of corpus-based studies of semantic prosody. *Asian Social Science*, 6(6), pp: 190- 194.
 52. Zhang, C., (2010b). A comparative corpus-based study of semantic prosody. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(4), pp: 451-456. doi: 10.4304/jltr.1.4.451-456.
 53. Zhang, W., (2009). *Perspectives: Semantic prosody and ESL/ EFL vocabulary pedagogy*. *TESL Canada Journal*, 26(2), pp: 1-12.