INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF FIELD EDUCATION

The Traces of Interference in the Use of Collocations

Semin KAZAZOĞLU[1]

Yıldız Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Education
ORCID: 0000-0002-0207-720X

ABSTRACT	ARTICLE INFO

Contrastive linguistics is a field of linguistics where applied linguistics is reflected in foreign language learning. It aims to compare a mother tongue and a foreign language, to identify the differences and contrasts between them, and thus to provide effective foreign language teaching methods. When resetting the parameter, language learners transfer linguistic features to two different systems. Accordingly, while some features of the foreign language can be transferred to the mother tongue, it is also possible for the mother tongue to affect the target language. This phenomenon is called *transfer*. Transfer has both positive and negative sides. The negative side is called *interference* and the positive side is called *equivalence*. Positive transfer facilitates learning while negative transfer complicates it. This study aimed to analyze the L1 transfer in collocational errors made by Turkish students learning English as a foreign language. In this sense, the errors made by the participants are grouped under three headings: a) errors involving word order; b) prepositional errors; and c) errors involving incorrect word choice. The findings showed that L1 transfer was observed in all tasks, regardless of students' level. However, wrong word choice error is the most recorded error types among students at all levels. In addition, students with low proficiency level, make more interference errors than students with higher proficiency levels. Overall, regardless of their proficiency level, all participants make interlingual lexical and grammatical errors in foreign language writing, including incorrect word choice.

[1] Corresponding author: *Dr.Öğr.Üyesi Semin KAZAZOĞLU*
Title Title
semink@yildiz.edu.tr
0555 555 55 55
0212 212 12 12

Dil Aktarımının Eşdizimlilik Kullanımındaki İzleri

Semin KAZAZOĞLU [1]
Yıldız Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Education
ORCID: 0000-0002-0207-720X

ÖZET	**MAKALE BİLGİSİ**

Karşıtsal dilbilim, uygulamalı dilbilimin yabancı dil öğrenimine yansıyan bir dilbilim alanıdır. Bir anadiliyle bir yabancı dili karşılaştırarak bunlar arasındaki ayrılıkları, karşıtlıkları belirleyerek ve böylece etkin yabancı dil öğretim yöntemleri oluşturulmasını sağlama amacı güder. Parametreyi yeniden oluştururken, dil öğrenenler dilsel özellikleri iki farklı sisteme aktarırlar. Buna göre, yabancı dilin bazı özellikleri ana dile aktarılabilirken, anadilin öğrenilen dili etkilemesi de mümkündür. Bu duruma *aktarım* denir. Transferin hem olumlu hem de olumsuz tarafları vardır. Olumsuz tarafına girişim, olumlu tarafına *eş değerlik* denir. Olumlu aktarım öğrenmeyi kolaylaştırırken olumsuz aktarım zorlaştırır. Bu çalışma, İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin yazılı anlatımda yaptıkları eşdizimsel hatalarda anadil aktarımını analiz etmeyi amaçlamıştır. Bu bağlamda, katılımcıların yaptığı hatalar üç başlık altında toplanmıştır: a) kelime sırası içeren hatalar; b) edat içeren hatalar; ve c) yanlış sözcük seçimi içeren hatalar. Bulgular, öğrencilerin seviyesinden bağımsız olarak tümünde anadil aktarımı gözlemlendiğini göstermiştir. Ancak yanlış kelime seçimi hatası tüm seviyelerdeki öğrencilerde en çok kaydedilen hata türleri arasında yer almaktadır. Ayrıca, düşük yeterlik düzeyindeki öğrenciler, daha yüksek yeterlik düzeyine sahip öğrencilere göre daha fazla aktarım hatası yapmaktadır. Genel olarak, yeterlilik düzeyi ne olursa olsun, tüm katılımcılar yabancı dilde yazmada yanlış kelime seçimi içeren dillerarası sözcüksel ve dilbilgisel hatalar yapmaktadırlar.

---

[1] Sorumlu yazar iletişim bilgileri:
Dr.Öğr.Üyesi Semin KAZAZOĞLU
semink@yildiz.edu.tr
0555 555 55 55
0212 212 12 12

Introduction

Defined as "items that occur physically together or have stronger chances of being mentioned together" (Sinclair, 1991, p. 170), collocations have been one of the aspects of the language that almost every learner have difficulty acquiring, producing, or mastering. Not only learners of the target language but also researchers in the field of applied linguistics find it a challenging issue (Schmitt, 2010). Since collocations are considered as culture-related or language-related, Alqaed (2017), when it comes to translating or uttering collocations, ESL and EFL learners face problems finding a suitable equivalent of the collocations, which leads to the incidents of L1 interference on L2 production. Lexical collocations of typical combinations of words, such as *heavy rain*, or *to meet a deadline*, might be different in other languages, therefore the direct translations might not always be possible for collocations, or they would cause mistranslation and misunderstanding in communication. To acquire vocabulary successfully, learners need to learn not only several useful words and their meanings but also to be able to use possible and likely word combinations, which are referred to as collocations (Phoocharoensil, 2012). Therefore, challenging though it may be, collocations are crucial when developing language proficiency, since they are one of the key points in a language. There have been different views on the framework of syntactic patterns characterizing collocations. For instance, Hausmann (1989), suggested collocational patterns as: a) adjective-noun, b) noun-verb, c) verb-noun (object), d) verb-adverb, e) adjective-adverb, f) noun-preposition-noun. On the other hand, Benson (1997) states that collocations fall into two major groups: grammatical collocations and lexical collocations. Grammatical collocations consist of a noun, an adjective, or a verb + a preposition or a grammatical structure, such as an infinitive or a clause or preposition + noun while lexical collocations consist of various combinations of nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs. Moreover, Benson et al. (1997) distinguished several structural types of lexical collocations: 1. Verb + noun (inflict a wound) 4. Noun + noun (a world capital)2. Adjective + noun (a crushing defeat) 5. Adverb + adjective (deeply absorbed)3. Noun + verb (storms rage) 6. Verb + adverb (appreciate sincerely). Based on Benson et al. (1997) distinction between grammatical and lexical collocations the present study aims to examine Turkish EFL learners' written productions in terms of their use of grammatical and lexical collocations. By analyzing their collocational errors, this study seeks the use of L1 (first language) transfer on students' use of collocations in L2 (second language) English.

Literature Review

The issue of crosslinguistic influence has always been the topic of interest in the studies of SLA, especially where English is taught as a foreign language, such as in Turkey. The fact that in the literature there are several studies on the cross-linguistic influence of L1 on L2 production conducted in Turkey (e.g., Aksu Kurtoğlu, 2016; Bartan, 2019; Gök, 2020; Kazazoğlu, 2020; Cangır & Durrant, 2021; Öksüz et al., 2021) demonstrates that Turkish learners make L1 interference-based errors; and that there is a need for studies, focusing on this field. According to Nunan (2001), the reason why EFL learners make cross-linguistic errors is that when the rules governing the two languages are different, the errors appear due to the interference between two languages. In line with this hypothesis, it can be concluded that the proximity of languages is a determining issue in L1 interference. When we consider Turkish, which is an agglutinating language, it is quite different from English (Öksüz, 2019). Therefore, when

Turkish learners apply the word order in Turkish into the English language, many interference errors appear (Kazazoğlu, 2020). In the literature, there have been studies in the interference errors in terms of different aspects, such as L2 writing (Kazazoğlu, 2020; Elkılıç, 2012); listening (Luft Baker et al., 2021); pragmatics (Antoni & Rylova, 2021); and collocations (Alqaed, 2017; Modaressi, 2009; Nesselhauf, 2003; Phoocharoensil, 2013; Wolter & Gyllstad, 2011; Zughoul & Abdul-Fettah, 2001). The fact that L1 interference on L2 collocations has been studied in the context of EFL indicates that learners of the target language have difficulty in the use of collocations and make errors when using collocations. Therefore, there is a need to conduct studies focusing on error analysis of Turkish EFL learners' collocations.

There are two main hypotheses proposing how we learn and retrieve collocations in our brain, and the present study is shaped by these hypotheses, one being *Lexical Priming* (Hoey, 2005); and the other, *Network Model of Language* (Fortescue, 2014). Coined by Hoey's (2005) *Lexical Priming* hypothesis suggests that the psycholinguistic mechanism of priming could be used to explain how language users learn and produce collocations successfully. This hypothesis suggests that a language user's recognition of a word is facilitated (or inhibited) by the words they have recently encountered. Specifically, words are recognized more rapidly if they occur after the words to which they are related in some way. For instance, the doctor is recognized more quickly if it is encountered after nurse than it would be if encountered after a less closely related word. In this case, from the perspective of the Lexical Priming Hypothesis, the word nurse is said to prime the target word doctor. Moreover, Kootstra and Muysken (2017) assert that cross-linguistic priming is the influence of recent experience with language on current processing of language. For example, when language users have just heard a sentence with a specific syntactic structure, they tend to re-use that syntactic structure in subsequent utterances. Secondly, in the hypothesis of Network Model of Language, Fortescue (2014), expands the understanding of how our brain uses collocations. He states that when a language user hears or produces a lexical item (e.g., heavy) immediately followed by another lexical item (e.g., rain), a strong link is formed between them. Our brain tends to make connections and networks between words that are formulaic and uses them together.

There have been many studies conducted to analyze how EFL learners acquire collocations. Psycholinguistic studies have demonstrated that second language collocations are processed faster when they are congruent with collocations in the first language; that is, where the usual second language collocation is a word-for-word translation of collocation in the first language (Wolter & Gyllstad, 2011). For example, in a study, where the collocation use of Turkish learners were investigated, Cangır & Durrant (2021) found that direct translations from Turkish to English were easier to be produced and retrieved by learners, such as *soğuk savaş* = cold war; *çıplak göz= naked eye*; or *acı son= bitter end*. Also, they asserted that those word combinations were processed faster when they were presented in the L1–L2 direction and when they were congruent between the two investigated languages. However, it is not always possible to translate collocations directly because they are mostly culture-related or language-related (Alqaed, 2017). This fact makes a crosslinguistic influence on L2 collocations a case for all foreign language learners regardless of the proficiency level. For example, Zughoul and Abdul-Fettah (2001), conclude that even at advanced levels, learners face difficulty in producing collocations. Thus, the investigation of EFL error analysis in collocations has been a point of discussion for decades now, especially in Turkey.

One of the reasons why collocations are difficult for Turkish learners is that, according to Öksüz (2019), by nature of Turkish as an agglutinating language, with rich morphology, its structure affects collocational processing in L1 Turkish and the same factors affect the processing of collocations in English and Turkish. After analyzing Turkish learner errors in L2 English Bartan

(2019) indicates that the most common lexical collocation error was verb+noun collocation and they were categorized as "restricted" or "unrestricted". Nesselhauf (2005), defines the former as collocations with verbs that permit only a very limited number of nouns, and the latter as collocations with verbs that permit a larger number of nouns but where some arbitrary restriction holds. When the noun collocates with 1-3 verbs, it is regarded as "restricted"; when it collocates with more than three verbs, it's considered as "unrestricted" (Nişancı, 2014).

Research Questions:

Research questions in this study are threefold:

1) Do collocational errors in L2 English that users make stem from their L1 Turkish linguistic resources?
2) Is there a correlation between the number of collocational errors participants make and their proficiency level
3) Does the type of writing task (e.g., freewriting/ translating) affect participants' L1 interference-based collocational errors?

Methodology

Research Design

This study follows a qualitative study design, in which verbal and written responses of the participants were collected through an open-ended questionnaire, read through multiple times, analyzed, and L1 influenced collocational errors were identified by the researcher. Based on the collocation patterns of Benson et al. (1997) this study analyzes Turkish EFL learners' written productions of L1 interference in their L2 English. Besides, the analysis of errors followed Corder's (1967) taxonomy model. However, semantic and mechanical errors have been excluded just to concentrate on collocational errors.

Participants

The participants of this study are 8 university students from different departments and academic years to ensure variety among the participants. The criteria for participation included having active status as a university student and having at least an A2 proficiency level. The latter criterion was included due to concerns that beginners might not perform the tasks that they are asked to do. Demographic information of the participants is found in the following tables.

Table 1. Overview of Demographic Information

Item	Total

Male		4 (50%)
Female		4 (50%)
Academic Year		
Freshman		3 (37,5%)
Sophomore		2 (25%)
Junior		2 (25%)
Senior		1 (12,5%)

Table 2. Complete Demographic Information

Participants	Gender	Academic Major	Academic Year	Proficiency Level
P1	Female	Forensic Sciences	2nd year	A2
P2	Female	Political Science and Public Administration	3rd year	B2
P3	Male	English Language Teaching	2nd year	C1
P4	Male	Physics	3rd year	B2
P5	Male	German Translation and Interpretation	1st year	C1
P6	Male	German Translation and Interpretation	1st year	C2
P7	Female	Medicine	1st year	B2
P8	Female	English Language Teaching	4th year	C1

Data collection:

The study used an online Google-Forms-based open-ended questionnaire to collect data from the participants. It was utilized in this study because of its convenience for gathering information from the participants, with less time, effort, and cost. In the questionnaire, the participants were asked to provide demographic information; then they were asked to respond to two different written tasks. The first task involved free writing where students were asked to answer the question: "How does it feel to be back to school after the online education process?". The participants were asked to complete the questionnaire and submit their written responses, which were to be analyzed by the researcher. They were instructed to answer as openly and clearly as possible within the 100 words limit. In the second task, they were asked to translate an excerpt from the novel, *Lord of the Flies*, written by William Golding. To ensure the reliability of the findings, the researcher was present at the time of the data collection process to ensure that each participant translated on their own, and did not use a translator app or seek for help. Some participants with low proficiency had difficulty in translating the excerpt and therefore, could not translate the whole piece. As a result, they were asked to do their best and

translate as much as they could; that is why one student's translation task has missing parts. The following excerpt was the translation task that participants were asked to complete:

Table 3. Translation Task to be Translated from Turkish to English

> …
> *Jack sabırsızlanıp yeniden konuştu:*
> *"Canı istediği kadar yedi mi herkes?"*
> *Mala sahip olmanın gururundan gelen bir uyarma vardı Jack'in sesinde. Çocuklar iş işten geçmeden önce daha hızla yediler. Yemeği hemen bırakmayacaklarını anlayan Jack, tahtı olan kütüğün üstünden kalktı. Ralph bir yandan yerken bir yandan da ateşe bakıyordu. Akşam olmuştu. Huzurlu bir güzellikle değil, şiddet tehditleriyle dolu bir akşam.*
> *Jack konuştu:*
> *"Bana su verin."*
> *Sanki iktidar, bilekleriyle dirsekleri arasındaki kabaran kaslarına yerleşmişti; sanki otorite, küçük bir maymun gibi omzuna tünemiş, kulağının dibinde geveze geveze konuşuyordu.*
> *"Oturun hepiniz."*
> …

Table 4. Original Version of the Excerpt in English

> *…*
> *Jack spoke again, impatiently:*
> *"Has everybody eaten as much as they want?"*
> *His tone conveyed a warning, given out of the pride of ownership, and the boys ate faster while there was still time. Seeing there was no immediate likelihood of a pause, Jack rose from the log that was his throne. Ralph watched the fire as he ate. Evening was come, not with calm beauty but with the threat of violence.*
> *Jack spoke:*
> *"Give me a drink."*
> *Power lay in the brown swell of his forearms: authority sat on his shoulder and chattered in his ear like an ape. "All sit down." (Lord of the flies, by William Golding)*
> …

Data Analysis:

Since the data collection was composed of written data, the researcher used the qualitative data analysis method. The researcher read through the participants' responses several times to identify errors, seek common points, observe similarities, and patterns in their written products in terms of collocational errors. Thus, the analysis of the responses acts as error analysis (EA), which was defined by Richard and Schmidt (2010) as a technique for identifying, classifying, and systematically interpreting the unacceptable forms of a language in the production data of

someone learning either a second or a foreign language. Based on this definition, in this study, the researcher followed the following steps to analyze the data: first, she identified errors that learners made when writing a short text and translating an excerpt to seek L1 influence, and then classified these errors under headings, such as errors involving L1 word order; errors involving prepositions; errors involving wrong word choice and after that, she interpreted these errors in terms of what the intended meaning is and what the possible solution is to fix these errors. Please see Table 5 below for the types of collocation errors that were analyzed in this study:

Table 5. Types of L1 Cross-linguistic Influence on L2 Collocational Errors

Types of Errors	L1 Turkish utterance	L2 English Sample Errors	Possible Solutions
Errors involving L1 word order	*Tekrar konuştu*	*Again spoke*	*Spoke again*
	Ortak sorun	*Common problem*	*Problem in common*
	Oturun hepiniz	*Sit down all.*	*All sit down.*
	Fiziksel olarak orada olmak	*Physically being there*	*Being there physically*
	Sosyal açıdan kısıtlayıcıydı	*It was restricting socially wise.*	*It was socially restricting.*
	Üniversiteye başlamak	*I just started to university*	*/ start university*
	...ile dolu bir akşam	*Evening full with...*	*Evening filled with.../ full of...*
Errors involving prepositions	*Bu durumdan mutluyum.*	*I'm happy this situation*	*I'm happy with this situation.*
	Öğretmeni dinlemek	*Listening the teacher*	*Listening to the teacher*
	"Açısından" (Konfor açısından iyi.)	*It is good about comfort*	*It is good in terms of comfort.*
	Yemeği bırakmak	1. *Give up the food* 2. *Quit eating* 3. *Break the meal*	*Stop eating, pause*
	İş işten geçmeden önce	1. *Before work goes to work* 2. *Before work was done*	*Before it is too late*
	Emeklerimin meyvesini almak.	*Harvest the fruits of my efforts*	*Reap the fruits of my labors/ hard work pays off*
Errors involving wrong word choice	*Zorlanmak*	*Felt difficulty*	*Have difficulty*
	Yüzyüze eğitimde kalmalıyız	*We should stay face-to-face education.*	*We should carry out education face-to-face.*
	Ateşe bakıyordu	*He was looking at the fire.*	*He was watching the fire.*
	Akşam olur	*The evening was arrived.*	*Evening comes.*

Findings

The findings were presented concerning the research questions below.

RQ 1) Do collocational errors in L2 English that users make, stem from their L1 Turkish linguistic resources?

After analyzing participants' written responses to an open-ended question as well as a translation task, it was found that the majority of the errors that users make stem from their L1, Turkish. Especially, the word order of Turkish has an interfering effect on L2 written production. For example, "*sit down all*" and "*all sit down*" can be used interchangeably. However, when the participants were asked to translate "*Oturun hepiniz*" they were tended to use the verb before the subject, and the majority of the participants (N=6) translated the sentence as *"sit down all"* because of the Turkish word order. Another example of the word order is, in

Turkish excerpt when participants were asked to translate "*tekrar konuştu*" one of the participants translated it as "*again spoke*" which is wrong although it is correct in Turkish syntax, adverbs are placed before verbs in English. Another cross-linguistic influence is discovered in collocations with prepositions. Accordingly, some participants were found to be relying on their L1 linguistic resources. For example, "*üniversiteye başlamak*" was uttered as "*started to university*", which indicates that the Turkish suffix "*-ye*" (as in '*üniversiteye*') was transferred to L2 English by over- and misusing "to" (as in '*to university*). Another example of this issue is in the case of "*…ile dolu*", meaning "*full of*" in English. The conjunction "*ile*" can be directly translated in English as "*with*". Therefore, a participant translated this collocation as "*full with…*" which indicates a wrong preposition choice because of the L1 influence.

Furthermore, some participants made collocation errors due to the direct translation of the words in English. For instance, although the word "*iş*" in Turkish means "*work*" in English, the phrase "*iş işten geçmeden önce*" means "*before it is too late*" in English. When this phrase is directly translated word-by-word, it is no doubt that mistranslation may occur. Some participants translated this phrase, by translating the word "*iş*" as "*work*", and P2 replied to this translation task as "*before work goes to work*"; and P4 wrote as "*before work was done*" which would not convey the meaning of the correct translated version of "before it is too late".

When we consider the collocational errors of the participants, we can see that Turkish EFL learners rely on their L1 Turkish linguistic backgrounds and therefore collocational errors can be categorized as interlingual errors.

RQ 2) Is there a correlation between the number of collocational errors participants make, and their proficiency level?

I answer this question, we need to consider each of the collocational error category and analyze if students with higher or lower proficiency make these errors. The table below demonstrates the analysis of higher and lower proficiency learners' errors. The proficiency level of participants in this study is indicated as A2, B2, C1, and C2. Therefore, A2 and B2 are categorized as lower proficiency, while C1 and C2 are categorized as higher proficiency.

Table 6. Higher vs. Lower Proficiency Learners' Collocation Errors

Lexical collocations	Higher Proficiency (C1 & C2)		Lower Proficiency (A2 & B2)	
	Participants	Number of times that the errors occurred	Participants	Number of times that the errors occurred
Errors involving L1 word order	P5	1	P1	3
	P6	1	P2	1
	P8	1	P4	1
			P7	1
Errors involving prepositions	-	-	P1	1
			P2	1
			P4	1

			P7	2
Errors	P3	4	P2	5
involving	P5	2	P4	5
wrong word	P6	1	P7	2
choice	P8	2		

As it is clear from the table, participants with lower proficiency made far more L1-based collocational errors than higher proficiency participants. The fact that the learner with the lowest proficiency level (P1 with A2 proficiency) was the one with the most errors and the learner with the highest proficiency level (P6 with C2 proficiency) was the one who made least errors.

Under the category of errors involving word order, all lower proficiency learners (N=4) made errors, while 3 out of 4 higher proficiency level learners made this kind of errors. As for errors involving prepositions, learners with higher proficiency level none, while all lower proficiency students made. Finally, all the proficiency level students recorded some errors involving wrong word choice.

All in all, it can be concluded that learners with lower proficiency level make more errors than those who have higher proficiency level. However, regardless of the proficiency level, all participants make cross-linguistic errors involving wrong word choice in their L2 writing productions.

RQ 3) Does the type of writing task (e.g., free writing/ translating) affect participants' collocational errors?

It was found that the type of writing task does not affect the number of errors that participants make. The participants who make errors in free writing task also make errors in the translation task. Therefore, the findings of this study indicate that there is no relationship between the writing task and the number of L1-based errors.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study has some potential limitations that may cause drawbacks. A future study with a larger size of participants would yield more generalizable results in Turkish context. Furthermore, the tasks can be revised and more collocation-provoking texts can be used to acquire more data to be analyzed.

Significance of the Study

There is a growing body of literature that recognizes L1 interference in the production of L2 because the cross-linguistic influence on L2 production has been a popular topic of interest in the field of ELT for a long time. This study was intended to contribute to this growing area of research by analyzing collocational errors of Turkish EFL students to trace L1 cross-linguistic

influence in different writing tasks. Since Turkish is an understudied language in terms of collocational use, this study contributes to the literature, and therefore it is highly significant.

Result and Discussion

The study concluded that errors that EFL learners make stem from the L1 interference. Accordingly, when writing in the target language, learners tend to use Turkish word order, and this causes L1 interference in their writings. In terms of collocations with prepositions, lower-proficiency level students make more errors, sometimes they overuse or lack prepositions because of the Turkish translation. Also, regardless of their proficiency level, participants tend to use wrong words, which are mostly direct translations and cause errors in their production. In a similar vein, Zughoul and Abdul-Fettah (2001) lay out that learners struggle to produce collocations even at advanced levels. Overall, it is concluded that every language learner makes L1 interlingual errors in their written products. However, learners with lower proficiency are more prone to make collocational errors than proficient ones. The findings of the study may shed light on the possible causes of several collocation errors made by Turkish EFL learners. Besides, the case studies based on collocation errors can be beneficial in exploring different approaches to teaching and learning languages. Accordingly, further studies should be carried out to observe the effects of teaching collocations to learners of EFL on developing L2 writing and speaking skills.

References

Aksu, K. Ö. (2016). A theoretical view to collocations with an argument of integrant approach in teaching level, *Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi, MEUDED, 13* (1), 39-70.

Alqaed, M. A. (2017). Perceptions on L2 lexical collocation translation with a focus on English-Arabic. *Journal of Education and Practice, 8* (6), 128-133.

Artoni, D., & Rylova, A. (2021). L1 interference in interlanguage pragmatics. Annali Di Ca' Foscari. *Serie Occidentale, 55*(55). https://doi.org/10.30687/AnnOc/2499-1562/2021/09/014

Bartan, Ö. Ş. (2019). Lexical collocation errors in literary translation. *Dil Dergisi, (170)*, 73-88.

Cangır, H., & Durrant, P. (2021). Cross-linguistic collocational networks in the L1 Turkish–L2 English mental lexicon. *Lingua, 258*, 103057.

Corder, S. (1967). Error analysis: The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5* (4), 161-169.

Fortescue, M. (2014). A network model of lexical organization in the bilingual brain. In: 4th UK Cognitive Linguistics Conference, 117-135.

Hoey, M. (2005). *Lexical priming: A new theory of words and language*. Routledge.

Huang, L. S. (2001). *Knowledge of English collocations: an analysis of Taiwanese EFL learners*. In: Luke, C., Rubrecht, R. (Eds.), Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education.

James M. A. (2012). Cross-Linguistic influence and transfer of learning. In: Seel N.M. (eds) Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning. Springer, Boston, MA. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_702

Kazazoğlu, S. (2020). The impact of L1 ınterference on foreign language writing: A contrastive error analysis. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 16* (3), 1177-1188.

Kootstra, G., & Muysken, P. (2017). Cross-linguistic priming in bilinguals: Multidisciplinary perspectives on language processing, acquisition, and change. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 20* (2), 215-218. doi:10.1017/S1366728916001127

Luft Baker, D., McCoach, B. D., Ware, S., Coyne, M. D., & Rattan, S. M. (2021). Effects of Spanish vocabulary knowledge on the English word knowledge and listening comprehension of bilingual students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism, 1* (15). https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1908219

Modarresi, G. (2009). Collocational errors of Iranian EFL learners in written English. *TELL, 1* (3),135-154.

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

Nişancı, S. (2014). *Factors influencing Turkish EFL learners' collocation production*, Yeditepe University, Unpublished Master of Arts.

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Öksüz, D., Brezina, V., & Rebuschat, P. (2021). Collocational processing in L1 and L2: The effects of word frequency, collocational frequency, and association. *Language Learning, 71* (1), 55-98.

Phoocharoensil, S. (2013). Cross-linguistic influence: Its impact on L2 English collocation production. *English Language Teaching, 6* (1), 1.

Richards, J., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics*. Pearson Education Limited, Longman.

Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. Palgrave Press.

Wolter, B. & Gyllstad, H. (2011). Collocational links in the L2 mental lexicon and the influence of L1 intralexical knowledge. *Applied Linguistics, 32* (4), 430--449.

Zughoul, M. & Abdul-Fettah, H. (2001). Collocational competence of Arabic speaking learners of English: A study in Lexical semantics. *Journal of the College of Arts, 1-19*, 9. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED479650.pdf.

Appendix

Raw Data: Written Survey Responses:

Participants	Gender	Academic Major	Academic Year	Proficiency level	Q1. How does it feel to be back at school after the online education process

P1	Female	Forensic Sciences	2nd year	Overall: A2 • Reading, listening, speaking: A2 • Writing: A1	I think online education is not productive. I can't understand some lessons even face to face so online is more difficult for me, for my friends and the other students. it's our common problem. I'm happy this situation. face to face so useful for education. I hope it continues like this.
P2	Female	Political Science and Public Administration	3rd year	Overall: B2 • Reading: C1 • Writing, listening: B2 • Speaking: B1	Unlike the classic face-to-face education that has been going on for many years, the transition to online education was an unexpected move for us. But we got used to online education very quickly and we thought that it was comfortable. I sometimes miss online education in terms of convenience. Although it is good about comfort, I always prefer face-to-face education because of that socializing and having a lively education life. That's why we should stay face-to-face education!
P3	Male	ELT	2nd year	Overall:C1 • Reading, Writing, listening, speaking: C1	It feels great to be back with our friends and teachers. Although online education has some advantages, it was quiet restricting especially socially wise. Now that it is face-to-face, I feel much better about my learning process and eventually academic scores.
P4	Male	Physics	3rd year	Overall: B2 • Reading, Listening: B2 • Writing, Speaking: B1	During online education, I felt difficulty following the lessons and listening the teacher. In face-to-face education it is a lot easier and more effective for my learning. I feel more motivated to learn and I hope I can harvest the fruits of my efforts.
P5	Male	Translation and Interpretation on German Language	1st year	Overall: C1 • Reading, writing, listening: C2 • Speaking: C1	The online education made me feel miserable and lonely in general. At some point i've felt that i've no friends at all. Getting back at the campus with my new friends was a joyful experience. Nowadays i'm getting used to curriculum and the department as well.
P6	Male	German Translation and Interpretation	1st year	Overall: C2 • Reading, listening: C2 • Writing, speaking: C1	It feels so good that I cannot type it in words. It was very frustrating last year. I really think that I could've done better in my exams if it had not been online.

46

						e v l ' A l l '
P7	Female	Medicine	1st year	Overall: B2 • Reading, listening: C1 • Writing, speaking: B2	I just started to university so i don't really know what was it like before pandemic but we're still taking online classes time to time and it doesnt bother me at all. I prefer online classes. Because physically being there requires more effort.	J ' l g i l v l ' l a l '
P8	Female	ELT	4th year	C1 • Reading, writing, listening, speaking: C1	It actually feels great to be honest, but I expected that we would have more classes face to face, but still it is better than last year that's for sure.	J l T C u l f t l C A l l T