# A Study of Collocation in English and Japanese Noun-Verb Combinations

Taeko Koya

*Waseda University*

## Introduction

Some collocation research by contrastive analysis between L1 and L2 has been conducted. Biskup (1992) carried out a comparative study of advanced Polish and German students of English in order to discover the main causes of collocational errors and confirm the influence of L1 on production of L2 collocations. Bahns and Eldaw (1993) examined the data from their subjects in order to investigate German advanced EFL students' productive knowledge of English collocations including the ability to paraphrase them, a noun and a verb combination, in a translation and cloze test. Caroli (1998) pursued her research in order to clarify the relation between learners' general vocabulary knowledge and their collocational knowledge and examine how the role of transfer develops and changes at different stages of L2 learning. All of these researchers have based their research on the assumption that collocation teaching and learners' development of their collocation competence are necessary and important in order to achieve the globalized standards of Englishes.

However, very little empirical research on collocation has been conducted in Japan. Therefore, there is no consensus on how to teach

and learn collocations at different stages of English proficiency for Japanese learners of English or how to present collocations in English textbooks for them. Judging from this state of collocation study in Japan, it would be useful to conduct a survey on collocation acquisition by Japanese learners of English to consider effective ways to develop their knowledge of collocations in acquiring world standard English. Accordingly, this paper is aimed at examining an aspect of productive and receptive collocation acquisition at different stages of language learning by focusing on verb + noun combinations.

## Research design
### Research questions

In order to conduct a survey on collocations, three specific research questions were raised as follows:

### Research Question 1:

What developments occur in learners' productive and receptive knowledge of collocations and in their vocabulary size at different stages of language learning? (How are collocational knowledge and general vocabulary knowledge related to one another in the same individual? Will the learners' knowledge of collocation expand at the same rate as their knowledge of vocabulary in general?)

### Research Question 2:

How are the receptive and the productive knowledge of collocation acquired in different types of collocations at different stages of language learning? Is the different extent of the acquisition related to L1 features in selecting possible collocations for an L2 given node at different stages of L2 learning?

### Research Question 3:

How necessary is knowledge of collocations to successful English communication ability for Japanese learners of English? (In view of the creative potential of language, is it not usually possible to paraphrase one's way around the tricky terrain of collocations?)

Subjects

The subjects were 93 first-year university students in Japan. All of them had received classroom instruction in EFL for a period of at least six years. The first language of all the students was Japanese.

Materials

Test A:  The Vocabulary Levels Test

Test A (Appendix 1), which was designed by Nation (1990), was used for assessing the subjects' written receptive vocabulary level. This test is made up of five frequency levels: 2,000 words, 3,000 words, 5,000 words, the university word level (above 5,000 words) and 10,000 words. The format of the test was word-definition matching. By this test, the 93 subjects were divided into three groups as given in table one.

Table 1.  Three Groups of Subjects

| Categorization | Explanation of each group | N of subjects |
|---|---|---|
| 1000 word level group | students whose score is less than 12 at 2000 level test | 30 |
| 2000 word level group | students whose score is less than 12 at 3000 level test | 30 |
| 3000 word level group | students whose score is less than 12 at 5000 level test | 33 |

Test B: The Productive Collocation Test

Test B was the productive test (Appendix 2), whose purpose was to examine learners' productive knowledge of collocations. The twenty-six target collocations were all verb + noun combinations among the lexical collocations and selected and checked from some textbooks used at upper-secondary schools, the BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations (Benson et al., 1987), Cobuild English Collocations on CD-ROM and three native speakers of English. The twenty-six collocations were divided into two groups: thirteen collocations which had a Japanese equivalent and thirteen collocations which did not have a direct translation from English into Japanese. These are selected target collocations:

Table 2.  The Selected Collocations (a) with a Japanese equivalent
and (b) without Japanese equivalent

| (a) 13 collocations with a Japanese equivalent | (b)13 collocations without Japanese equivalent |
| --- | --- |
| Break the law | Make every effort |
| Break one's promise | Eat soup |
| Lose heart | Do harm |
| Take a vacation | Keep one's promise |
| Win a contest | Make a speech |
| Do one's homework | Set a good example |
| Pass the exam | Take a walk |
| Pay tax | Take a medicine |
| Make money | Keep a diary |
| Do business | Make mistakes |
| Open one's eyes | Make some progress |
| Save the life | Make a copy |
| Play cards | Make no difference |

For the translation task, twenty-six Japanese sentences, which include selected collocations, were constructed using vocabulary from the 700 words, which are listed up as basic words for lower secondary school students according to the Ministry of Education in Japan. It was felt that the test would be suitable for students at all levels. Students were asked to translate them into English phrases.

Test C: The Receptive Collocation Test

    Test C was the receptive collocation test (Appendix 3), which had the aim of measuring the subjects' receptive knowledge of collocations. The selected collocations were identical to those used in the productive test. The test format was multiple-choice and twenty-six sentences were prepared, in which the missing main node was to be provided by the subjects. There were three choices in each question and all of the distracters were synonymous words from a dictionary of English synonyms and antonyms and checked with BBI to make sure they are not a collocational combination. The students

were asked to choose the answer which they thought was right from the three choices.

Procedure

Ninety-three subjects took these three kinds of tests during a regular class. The vocabulary levels test and the productive collocation test lasted for forty minutes and the receptive collocation test for twenty minutes. The students were not basically allowed to use any dictionaries to check the meaning of words. Moreover, they were not informed about the true purpose of the three tests, but were simply told that their vocabulary proficiency would be tested. After finishing all the tests, the answer sheets were distributed to students, because it was felt that they should know their results from an instructive perspective.

Scoring Procedure

The data from the three kinds of tests were marked according to two scoring criteria: one applied to the Vocabulary Levels Test (Test A) and the Receptive Collocation Test (Test C) and the other to the Productive collocation test (Test B). In the Vocabulary Levels Test and the Receptive Collocation Test, the items were simply scored as correct or incorrect, because both Test A and Test C had a multiple-choice format.

On the other hand, the Productive Collocation Test (Test B) was a translation task so a variety of answers was expected. Twenty-six sentences including twenty-six collocations were rated with the following marks;

0 = incorrect answers

1 = correct answers, which include expected collocations in the sentences

2 = correct answers which did not include expected collocations in the sentences, but which were regarded as acceptable ones

3 = blank

4 = incorrect answers, which are affected by L1

The answers given by the subjects were checked with the BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations (1997) and then evaluated by native speakers of English.

Data Analysis and Results

The data gathered from the subjects' completion of the three kinds of tests were submitted to statistical analysis. The SPSS was used in order to analyze all the data. The results will be shown following order of the research questions.

3.1  *Research Question 1:  Knowledge of collocations vs general vocabulary knowledge*

Research Question 1 examined whether learners' collocational knowledge develops at the same pace as their general vocabulary knowledge at the three different vocabulary level groups. In order to answer this question, mean scores for the Productive Collocation Test (Test B) and the Receptive Collocation Test (Test C) were calculated by means of ANOVA and they were compared at learners' three different vocabulary level groups. Table 3 and Table 4 give the results of the statistical analysis. As shown in Table 3, the mean scores at level groups 1000, 2000 and 3000 are 6.700, 11.733 and 14.181 respectively, showing that there is a significant difference in variation between groups considering the P-value (p<0.0001).

Table 1.  ANOVA Analysis: Development of Productive Collocational Knowledge

| One-Way Analysis of Variance (Test B) | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Analysis of Variance | | | | |
| Source | DF | SS | MS | F | P |
| Factor | 2 | 904.881 | 452.44 | 42,106 | |
| p<0.0001 | | | | | |
| Error | 90 | 967.076 | 10.745 | | |
| Total | 92 | 1871.957 | | | |

| Level | N | Mean | StDev |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prod. 1000 | 30 | 6.700 | 2.465 |
| Prod. 2000 | 30 | 11.733 | 3.767 |
| Prod. 3000 | 33 | 14.181 | 3.297 |

Table 2.  ANOVA Analysis: Development of Receptive Collocational Knowledge

One-Way Analysis of Variance (Test C)

Analysis of Variance

| Source | DF | SS | MS | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor | 2 | 490.887 | 245.44 | 26.363 | p<0.0001 |
| Error | 90 | 837.909 | 9.31 | | |
| Total | 92 | 1328.796 | | | |

| Level | N | Mean | StDev |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prod. 1000 | 30 | 15.566 | 2.996 |
| Prod. 2000 | 30 | 18.300 | 3.397 |
| Prod. 3000 | 33 | 21.151 | 2.595 |

A similar conclusion can be drawn from Table 4, where the mean scores at level groups 1000, 2000 and 3000 are 15.566, 18.300 and 21.151 respectively (p<0.0001). Judging from the results mentioned, it can be said that there was evidence of a slight and steady improvement in both production and reception.

3.2  *Research Question 2:*

*Productive vs receptive knowledge of collocations in different types of collocations at different stages of L2 learning*

Research Question 2 is to determine how the learners' reception and production of collocational knowledge are acquired at different stages of L2 learning and whether the difference of the acquisition is related to the influence of L1 features for selection of collocations. Two steps were taken in order to find the answer to this research question. The first step was to calculate the mean of the productive collocational knowledge and the receptive collocational knowledge in two types of collocations at three groups with descriptive statistics

tests and a posthoc test. Table 5 shows that all the means of the productive and receptive knowledge of collocations in two different types of collocations are statistically significant, except two means: the mean of productive collocational knowledge in level 2000 voc group and level 3000 voc group in equivalent collocations in Japanese and the mean of receptive collocational knowledge of level 1000 voc group and level 2000 voc group in no equivalent collocations in Japanese. Therefore, it can be said that more receptive and productive knowledge of the collocations  is slightly and steadily acquired, as learners' vocabulary becomes richer.

Table 3.  Descriptive Statistics, ANOVA and Posthoc Test (Tukey):
Mean in productive and receptive knowledge of collocation which
has direct and no-direct translation in Japanese

| Descriptive Statistics, ANOVA and Posthoc Test | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Level | N | Mean | StDev |
| 1000pro (1-) | 30 | 5.83 | 2.17 |
| 2000pro (1-) | 30 | 8.67 | 1.99 |
| 3000pro (1-) | 33 | 9.36 | 1.56 |
| (ANOVA:  DF=2,  SS=215.530,  MS=107.765,  F=29.527 P=.000) | | | |
| Posthoc test | | | |
| 1000 vs 2000, 1000 vs 3000   significant | | | |
| 2000 vs 3000  not significant | | | |
| Level | N | Mean | StDev |
| 1000pro (14-) | 30 | .90 | 1.18 |
| 2000pro (14-) | 30 | 3.07 | 2.43 |
| 3000pro (14-) | 33 | 4.85 | 2.74 |
| (ANOVA:  DF=2,  SS=245.191,  MS=122.595,  F=24.694 P=.000) | | | |
| Posthoc test | | | |

```
1000 vs 2000, 1000 vs 3000   2000 vs 3000  significant


Level            N            Mean          StDev
1000rec (1-)     30           8.30          1.82
2000rec (1-)     30           10.33         1.77
3000rec (1-)     33           11.48         1.32

(ANOVA:  DF=2,  SS=162.103,  MS= 81.05,  F=28.809
P=.000)

Posthoc test
1000 vs 2000, 1000 vs 3000   2000 vs 3000  significant


Level            N            Mean          StDev
1000rec (14-)    30           7.30           1.56
2000rec (14-)    30           7.96          1.97
3000rec (14-)    33           9.66          1.86

(ANOVA:  DF=2,  SS=94.690,  MS= 47.35,  F=13.719
P=.000)

Posthoc test
1000 vs 3000, 2000 vs 3000   significant
1000 vs 2000  not significant
```

In the next step, the mean of incorrect answers which showed transfer from L1 in productive collocations, that is, in question 14-26 in the productive collocation test, was calculated and the posthoc test was conducted to answer the question: Is the different extent of the acquisition related to L1 features in selecting possible collocations for an L2 given node at different stages of L2 learning? As shown in Table 6, there were significant differences in the incorrect-transfer answers in the 1000 voc group and 3000 voc group. It means that there is a slight possibility that learners who have broader knowledge of collocation are affected by L1 in producing collocational sentences.

Table 4.  Descriptive Statistics, ANOVA and Posthoc Test (Tukey):
Influence of L1 on incorrect answers

| Descriptive Statistics, ANOVA and Posthoc Test | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Level | N | Mean | StDev |
| 1000pro (14-) | 30 | 2.20 | 1.32 |
| 2000pro (14-) | 30 | 3.03 | 1.47 |
| 3000pro (14-) | 33 | 3.18 | 1.58 |
| (ANOVA:  DF=2,  SS=17.217,  MS=8.61,  F=3.861   P=0.02) | | | |
| Posthoc test | | | |
| 1000 vs 3000   significant | | | |
| 1000 vs 2000, 2000 vs 3000  not significant | | | |

Actually it was hypothesized that lower level students would tend to resort extensively to their L1, so this result is opposite to my expectations, and the results of some previous research. Therefore, the number of blanks in the Productive Collocation Test was checked by calculating means of blanks in three different groups (Table 7). In the results, there was a significant difference of the number of blanks between 1000 voc group and 2000 voc group, and between 1000 voc group and 3000 voc group. Judging from the results of these two statistical data: comparison of the means in incorrect-transfer answers and blanks in the Productive Collocation Test, the lower level students do not rely on L1, but they refrain from giving any answer to almost all the questions which have no direct translation from Japanese. On the contrary, 3000 voc level students rely on Japanese more than 1000 level students, because they give up producing sentences much less than 1000 voc students.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics, ANOVA and Posthoc Test (Tukey):
Missing answers

| Descriptive Statistics, ANOVA and Posthoc Test | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Level | N | Mean | StDev |
| 1000pro (14-) | 30 | 11.26 | 5.39 |

```
2000pro (14-)    30          6.80          4.15
3000pro (14-)    33          4.36          3.59

(ANOVA:  DF=2,  SS=763.525,  MS=381.76,  F=18.896
P<0.0001)

Posthoc test
1000 vs 2000, 1000 vs 3000   significant
2000 vs 3000  not significant
```

### 3.3  Research Question 3: Collocation vs other acceptable combinations

Research Question 3 has a close relation to Research Question 2 and is to investigate how necessary a knowledge of collocations is to a successful English communication ability for Japanese learners of English and whether it is not usually possible to paraphrase one's way around the tricky terrain of collocations at different stages of L2 learning. In order to do this, the mean scores of the number of acceptable combinations in the Productive Collocation Test were obtained for the three different groups.

Table 6.  Descriptive Statistics, ANOVA and Posthoc Test (Tukey): Other alternatives

```
Descriptive Statistics, ANOVA and Posthoc Test

Level           N       Mean        StDev
1000pro         30      0.53        0.66
2000pro         30      1.26        1.06
3000pro         33      1.90        1.28

(ANOVA:  DF=2,  SS=29.746,  MS=14.87,  F=13.115    P<0.0001)

Posthoc test
1000 vs 2000, 1000 vs 3000,  2000 vs 3000   significant
```

According to Table 8, mean scores in the three voc level groups are very low, although there are significant differences

between the learners' groups considering the posthoc test (p<0.0001). Therefore, it can be said that it is very difficult for any level of students to paraphrase or describe answers with synonymous words when they do not know the target collocations. Moreover, they prefer refraining from giving any answer to make some mistakes. It can be said that they are reluctant to take risks.

3.4  Summary

The results analyzed by means of SPSS can be summarized for each question as follows:

*Research Question 1:*

*What developments occur in learners' productive and receptive knowledge of collocations and in their vocabulary size at different stages of language learning? (How are collocational knowledge and general vocabulary knowledge related to one another in the same individual? Will the learners' knowledge of collocation expand at the same rate as their knowledge of vocabulary in general?)*

As predicted in Research Question 1, it can be said that the more vocabulary knowledge learners have the more collocational knowledge in both production and reception will be acquired. In other words, there is a close correlation between learners' general vocabulary knowledge and their collocational knowledge.

*Research Question 2:*

*How are the receptive and the productive knowledge of collocation acquired in different types of collocations at different stages of language learning? Is the different extent of the acquisition related to L1 features in selecting possible collocations for an L2 given node at different stages of L2 learning?*

It seems that more receptive and productive knowledge of collocations which had both direct and non-direct translation in Japanese are slowly and steadily acquired, as learners' vocabulary becomes richer, although caution must be exercised in drawing

conclusions from these results, because of two exceptions. Considering the influence from L1 transfer, higher level students tended to resort to L1 in selecting possible collocations for an L2 given node, which is opposite to my expectation and some previous research. This result seems to be affected by another result that lower level students much more easily give up producing sentences whenever they do not know some words or verb+noun combinations

*Research Question 3:*
*How necessary is knowledge of collocations to successful English communication ability for Japanese learners of English? (In view of the creative potential of language, is it not usually possible to paraphrase one's way around the tricky terrain of collocations?)*

On the whole, it seems to be very difficult for any level of students to paraphrase or describe answers with synonymous words when they do not know the target collocations. Moreover, they prefer refraining from giving any answer to make mistakes. It can be said that they are reluctant to take risks.

**Conclusion**

**Further discussion based on the results**

There are three main interesting points arising from the research which aimed at examining aspects of productive and receptive collocation acquisition at different stages of language learning by focusing on verb + noun combinations.

1.  There are no significant differences of the statistical means of productive collocational knowledge in the 2000 voc level group and 3000 voc level group in equivalent collocations in Japanese.

This finding resulted from Research Question 2 and was one of the two exceptions showing significant differences in the statistical data analysis. This can be explained by Kellerman (1979) transferability hypothesis from the L1 in making L2 collocability predictions, especially a U-shaped type of transfer behavior. According to Kellerman, at an early stage of vocabulary development learners

mostly resort to L1 features in selecting possible English collocates. They later confide in developmental target-language features before finally returning to the correct target features. Based on this hypothesis it is probably thought that 2000 and 3000 voc level learners are on the way to acquiring the correct target-language features. In other words, they rely on both developmental target-language features and L1 features, as learners acquire more vocabulary. Especially, 3000 voc level students show that they are acquiring the correct target-language features and they are also influenced by positive and negative transfer from Japanese. It can be said that the more vocabulary they acquire, the more they may be able to rely on only the correct target-language features.

2.   There are no significant differences of the statistical means of receptive collocational knowledge in 1000 voc level group and 2000 voc level group in no-equivalent collocations in Japanese

This finding resulted from Research Question 2 and was the other expectation showing no significant differences in the statistical data analysis. This reflects EFL teaching strategy in Japan, judging from my own learning/teaching experience. Collocations are little focused on in English textbooks and by English teachers, and they are always taught implicitly and incidentally in textbooks. However, Schmitt (2000) claims that both explicit and incidental learning is necessary, especially certain important words make excellent targets for explicit attention, for example, the most frequent words in a language and technical vocabulary. Nation (1995) also argues that we should consider vocabulary teaching in terms of cost/benefits, with the value of learning such words well worth the time required to teach them explicitly; on the other hand, infrequent words in general English are probably best left to incidental learning. Based on these two researchers, some collocations which are used frequently should be taught explicitly. However, on the contrary, it cannot be said that 1000 and 2000 voc level learners can select possible collocations for an L2 given node and their collocations are firmly acquired. There is

a great possibility that 3000 voc level learners needed to learn target collocations explicitly to pass entrance university examination, generally speaking.

3.  Japanese learners of English are not risk-takers

This is based on two findings:

(1) Lower level students much more easily refrain from producing sentences whenever they do not know some words or verb+noun combinations

(2) On the whole, it looks very difficult for any students at any level to paraphrase or describe answers with synonymous words when they do not know the target collocations.

This can be compared to Biskup (1992). He conducted a comparative study of advanced Polish and German students of English. One of his findings was that the qualitative and quantitative results had something to do with different teaching polices in Poland and Germany. The Polish learners tend to avoid using collocations whose usage they were not convinced of, because the Polish teaching of English focused on accuracy. On the other hand, German learners tried to use alternative ways: paraphrasing and using definitions, because they were used to taking English classes which were aimed at fluency of English communication. Comparing his findings with this study, it can be said that Japanese learners of English tend to be reluctant to give any answers or use any alternative ways of explanation in contrast to Polish and German learners of English.

## **Pedagogical Implications**

Considering all the results and further discussion based on them, three pedagogical suggestions can be proposed:

(1) The Japanese teaching of English should focus on fluency.

(2) Word combinations should explicitly be taught in classes.

(3) English teachers should encourage students to give as many kinds of expressions as possible, not accept only one fixed expression.

Useful collocations which are used frequently should be acquired. However, students should be able to paraphrase or use definitions to

successfully communicate in English with them, when they do not know restricted combinations. To have them do so, accuracy should be changed to fluency in teaching English in Japan, and teachers should display many varieties of acceptable expressions to students explicitly.

## Further Research

The present research on collocations into Japanese learners of English was limited so that questions remain to be answered. There are two main questions which should be clarified in further research.

One is related to the mental lexicon. The retrieval of an item from the mental lexicon may be viewed as a process of putting together semantic, syntactic and phonological features to activate a fully functioning lexical item. The question is whether an L2 mental lexicon functions in the same way. Moreover, how acquired words or word combinations are stocked by the learners at different stages of L2 learning is also an important question.

The qualitative examination for correct answers and errors of each target collocation at different stages of L2 learning is another issue. According to Research Question 2, two exceptions were found: the statistical means of productive collocational knowledge in the 2000 voc group and the 3000 voc group in equivalent collocations in Japanese, and the means of the receptive collocational knowledge of the 1000 voc group and the 2000 voc group in no-equivalent collocations in Japanese. However, the qualitative examination was not carried out for each target collocation: whether specific collocations could be differentiated and produced or not at different vocabulary level groups of students? This examination may be able to lead  to an answer to the question: which collocation could be acquired more easily?

**References**

Bahns, J. and Eldaw, M.
  1993   Should we teach EFL students collocations? *System*. 21/1: 101-
          114.
Bahns, J.
  1993   Lexical collocations: A contrastive view. *ELT Journal*. 47/1: 56-
          63.
Benson, M., Benson, E. and Ilson, R.
  1997   *The BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations*. Amsterdam:
          John Benjamins.
Berendt, E. A. and Takefuta, Y.
  1999   *Eigo Kihon Goi no Tsukaikata Jiten*. Tokyo: Goken.
Biskup, D.
  1992   L1 influence on learner's renderings of English collocations: A
          Polish/German empirical study. In Arnaud and Béjoint (eds.).
          *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*. Macmillan. 85-93.
Caroli, M. T.
  1998   Relating collocations to foreign language learning. Unpublished
          MA thesis. University of Reading. Department of Linguistic
          Science.
Kellerman, E.
  1979   'Transfer and non-transfer: where are we now?' *Studies in
          Second Language Acquisition 2*: 37-57.
Kellerman, E. and Jorden, P.
  1977   Towards a characterisation of the strategy of transfer in second
          language learning, *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, *2*, No. 1,
          pp.58-145.
Kjellmer, G.
  1994   *Dictionary of English Collocations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Mackin, R.
  1978   On collocations: Words shall be known by the company they
          keep. In Strevens (ed.). *In honour of A. S. Hornby*. 149-165.
Nation, P.

1990   *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary.* New York and London: Newbury House Publishers.

Schmitt, N.

2000   *Vocabulary in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## Appendix1. Test A: Vocabulary levels test (2000 and 3000)

# A Vocabulary Levels Test

This is a vocabulary test. You must choose the right word to go with each meaning.
Write the number of that word next to its meaning.

```
eg)
 1 business
 2 clock        6  part of a house
 3 horse
 4 pencil       3  animal with four legs
 5 shoe
 6 wall         4  something used for writing
```

**The 2,000-word level**

```
 1 original
 2 private      ____ complete
 3 royal
 4 slow         ____ first
 5 sorry
 6 total        ____ not public
```

```
 1 apply
 2 elect        ____ choose by voting
 3 jump
 4 manufacture  ____ become like water
 5 melt
 6 threaten     ____ make
```

```
 1 blame
 2 hide         ____ keep away from sight
 3 hit
 4 invite       ____ have a bad effect on something
 5 pour
 6 spoil        ____ ask
```

```
 1 accident
 2 choice       ____ having a high opinion of yourself
 3 debt
 4 fortune      ____ something you must pay
 5 pride
 6 roar         ____ loud, deep sound
```

```
 1 basket
 2 crop         ____ money paid regularly for doing a job
 3 flesh
 4 salary       ____ heat
 5 temperature
 6 thread       ____ meat
```

```
 1 birth
 2 dust         ____ being born
 3 operation
 4 row          ____ game
 5 sport
 6 victory      ____ winning
```

**The 3,000-word level**

```
 1 administration
 2 angel        ____ managing business
 3 front
 4 herd         ____ spirit who serves God
 5 mate
 6 pond         ____ group of animals
```

```
 1 bench
 2 charity      ____ part of a country
 3 fort
 4 jar          ____ help to the poor
 5 mirror
 6 province     ____ long seat
```

```
 1 coach
 2 darling      ____ a thin, flat piece cut from something
 3 echo
 4 interior     ____ person who is loved very much
 5 opera
 6 slice        ____ sound reflected back to you
```

```
 1 marble
 2 palm         ____ inner surface of your hand
 3 ridge
 4 scheme       ____ excited feeling
 5 statue
 6 thrill       ____ plan
```

```
 1 discharge
 2 encounter    ____ use pictures or examples to show the meaning
 3 illustrate
 4 knit         ____ meet
 5 prevail
 6 toss         ____ throw up into air
```

```
 1 annual
 2 blank        ____ happening once a year
 3 brilliant
 4 concealed    ____ certain
 5 definite
 6 savage       ____ wild
```

### Appendix 2. Test B: Productive Test

## Vocabulary test
Translate the following 26 Japanese into English. (In fact, the exam sheet in which 26 Japanese sentences are written were delivered to the students.)

1 .  If you break the law, you will be arrested.
2 .  He breaks his promise to give the book back to me within a week.
3 .  He seems to lose heart.
4 .  She took a vacation to go to Italy.
5 .  She won a speech contest last year.
6 .  I was doing my homework in the library.
7 .  Kate passed the entrance examination for the university.
8 .  Paying taxes is our duty.
9 .  How much money did you make?
10.  Why do you do business with that firm?
11.  Open your eyes!
12.  Save the children around the world.
13.  Do you want to play cards?
14.  We shall make every effort to hasten the delivery of the goods.
15.  I want to eat onion soup.
16.  Bad books do great harm.
17.  She keeps her promise that she would visit us every week.
18.  Could you make a three-minute speech?
19.  You should set a good example to others.
20.  Shall we take a walk?
21.  How often should I take a medicine?
22.  She makes it a rule to keep a diary every day.
23.  I made several mistakes in the test.
24.  Some progress has been made toward a solution.
25.  I asked my secretary to make ten-sheet copy.
26.  It makes no difference to me whether it is large or small.

## Appendix 3. Test C. Receptive Collocation Test

# Vocabulary Test

Choose the best choice among A, B, and C.

> e.g.) I ( A ) like quitting my job from time to time.
> 　　　　　A. feel　　　　　　B. want　　　　　　C. love

1)    If you (    ) the law, you will be arrested.
      A. damage        B. break          C. destroy
2)    He (    ) his promise to give the book back to me within a week.
      A. damage        B. break          C. destroy
3)    He seems to (    ) heart.
      A. lose          B. eliminate      C. miss
4)    She (    ) a vacation to go to Italy.
      A. win           B. catch          C. take
5)    She (    ) a speech contest last year.
      A. win           B. overcome       C. prevail
6)    I was (    ) my homework in the library.
      A. study         B. learn          C. do
7)    Kate (    ) the entrance examination for the university.
      A. pass          B. make           C. hit
8)    (    ) taxes is our duty.
      A. sweep         B. move           C. pay
9)    How much money did you (    )?
      A. cause         B. make           C. produce
10)   Why do you (    ) business with that firm?
      A. do            B. act            C. go
11)   (    ) your eyes!
      A. open          B. undo           C. unwrap
12)   (    ) the children around the world.
      A. Shelter       B. Save           C. Free
13)   Do you want to (    ) cards?
      A. play          B. amuse          C. perform
14)   We shall (    ) every effort to hasten the delivery of the goods.
      A. make          B. do             C. get
15)   I want to (    ) onion soup.
      A. eat           B. drink          C. feed
16)   Bad books (    ) great harm.
      A. do            B. be             C. exist
17)   She (    ) her promise that she would visit us every week.
      A. protect       B. keep           C. guard
18)   Could you (    ) a three-minute speech?
      A. make          B. get            C. do
19)   You should (    ) a good example to others.
      A. set           B. display        C. show
20)   Shall we (    ) a walk?
      A. take          B. get            C. do
21)   How often should I (    ) this medicine?
      A. drink         B. take           E. eat
22)   She makes it a rule to (    ) a diary every day.
      A. record        B. keep           C. write
23)   I (    ) several mistakes in the test.
      A. make          B. do   145       C. put
24)   Some progress has been (    ) toward a solution.
      A. make          B. do             C. put
25)   I asked my secretary to (    ) ten-sheet copy.
      A. make          B. do             C. get
26)   It (    ) no difference to me whether it is large or small
      A. make          B. exist          C. do

Class (　　　　　) No. (　　　　　) Name (　　　　　　　　　　　　　　)