

Keywords

Lexical Collocation Translation, L1 Influence,
Restriction On Collocability, Translations
Of Literary Texts

Anahtar Sözcükler

Action, Verb, Russian, Turkish, Semantic

LEXICAL COLLOCATION ERRORS IN LITERARY TRANSLATION

YAZINSAL METİNLERİN ÇEVİRİSİNDE SÖZCÜKSEL EŞDİZİM HATALARI

• Özgür Şen Bartan

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Kırıkkale Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü,
Mütercim Tercümanlık A.B.D., ozgursen1@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study aims to explore lexical collocation errors in Turkish-English translations of literary texts. To identify, describe and explain the errors (Ellis, 1985), a written corpus of Turkish literary texts and their English translation texts (ETT) was compiled from students of the Department of English Translation and Interpretation. Benson et al.'s (1997) classifications for lexical collocations have been used in order to analyse lexical collocation errors for this study. Also, the most common lexical collocation errors (verb+noun) were examined in terms of restriction on collocability and the L1 influence. The amounts of errors per lexical collocation type in the ETT indicate that the most common type is that of verb + noun, followed by adjective + noun. Moreover, in terms of EFL/ESL learners and translator education, this study suggests that more restrictions of collocation cause poorer collocation production, and L1 influence plays an important role in translators' erroneous collocations. The findings of this study have a number of important implications for future practice of foreign/second language learning and translation education. It's extremely important for foreign language learners to have English-Turkish and Turkish-English bilingual dictionaries of lexical collocations, as searching for the right collocation they spend a lot of time and energy. Also, authentic materials are essential to introduce collocations.

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı Türkçe-İngilizce yazınsal metinlerin çevirisinde sözcüksel eşdizim hatalarını araştırmaktır. Türkçe yazınsal metinlerin İngilizce çevirilerinde yapılan hataları belirlemek, tanımlamak ve açıklamak (Ellis, 1985) için İngilizce Mütercim Tercümanlık Anabilim dalındaki öğrencilerin çevirilerinden oluşan yazılı derlem oluşturulmuştur. Bunun yanı sıra, en sık yapılan sözcüksel eşdizim hataları (eylem+ad) kısıtlı eşdizimlilik ve anadilin etkisi açısından çözümlenmiştir. Çalışmada Benson ve diğerlerinin (1997) sözcüksel eşdizim grupları sözcüksel eşdizimleri çözümlmek amacıyla kullanılmıştır. Her bir sözcüksel eşdizim grubunda yapılan hatalar incelendiğinde, en sık yapılan hatanın eylem+ad grubunda olduğu, ikinci olarak da sıfat+ad grubunda gerçekleştiği belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca çalışmanın çevirmen eğitimi ve İngilizcenin yabancı/ikinci dil olarak eğitimi açısından iki önemli sonucu bulunmaktadır. İlk olarak eşdizim sınırlılığı eşdizim üretimini olumsuz yönde etkilemektedir; ikinci olarak anadilinden yapılan aktarımın Türkçeden İngilizceye sözcüksel eşdizimlerin çevirisi açısından olumsuz yönde etkisi gözlenmiştir. Buna ek olarak yabancı dil öğrencilerinin doğru eşdizimi ararken çok zaman kaybetmeleri nedeniyle İngilizce-Türkçe ve Türkçe-İngilizce ikidilli eşdizim sözlüklerin üretilmesi oldukça önemlidir. Ayrıca özgün araç kullanımının eşdizim öğretiminde çok değerli olduğu öneriler arasında yer almaktadır.

Introduction

Collocation is considered as one of the key components in EFL teaching and learning and studies (Bahns and Eldaw, 1999; Bildircin, 2014; Howart, 1998; Huang, 2001; Liu, 2000; Martelli, 2007; Nesselhauf, 2005; Nişancı, 2014) indicate that learners have problems producing collocations and make collocation errors. Ferris (1999) suggests that some errors, such as problems with verbs, subject-verb agreement, run-ons, fragments, noun endings, articles, pronouns, and possibly spelling, can be considered 'treatable', because they 'occur in a patterned, rule-governed way'. In contrast, errors such as word choice and word order are 'untreatable', in that 'there is no handbook or set of rules students can consult to avoid or fix those types of errors' (1999: 6). Modarresi (2009) who investigates collocation errors of EFL learners in written English has revealed that most of the students' errors in writing come from their lack of collocation knowledge, not their grammatical ability. Besides, Bildircin (2014) explored that the most frequent types of errors among morpho-syntactic errors were errors of collocation, phrase/ clause structure, and omission of determiner respectively. Likewise, Bahns and Eldaw (1999) argued that EFL/ESL learners face relatively greater difficulty with lexical collocations rather than grammatical ones. As Maretti (2007), points out native speakers of a language are usually aware of these limitations on the combinability of items and avoid producing what would be considered strange-sounding combinations.

The reason why researchers focus on collocation errors emerges from the premise that collocations are sub-category of formulaic language (Wray, 2002) which is seen as one of the main concerns in language processing and language acquisition (Schmitt, 2010). Also, Lewis (2000) suggests that learners need to know not only what is right but also what is wrong. Moreover, Hill (2000) reported that up to 70% of language is made up of fixed expressions, with the number of collocations far outnumbering the number of single-word items. Similarly, Erman and Warren (2000) found that 58.6% of spoken discourse and 52.3% of written discourse consisted of multiword combinations.

However, in EFL instruction there has been increasing evidence that most EFL/ESL textbooks are insufficient in terms of lexical collocation. For instance, Molavi et al. (2014:77) researched the types and frequency of the usage of lexical collocations which were presented in the ELT textbooks series. They concluded that "low number of frequent collocations and low referral to real use of language by native speakers show that ELT textbooks which were examined cannot play an effective role in making collocations part of learner actual competence." It's apparent that most EFL/ESL textbooks are insufficient in terms of lexical collocation learning/instruction or gaining collocational competence (Wray, 1999).

Given that EFL learners have problems producing collocations and EFL textbooks are insufficient in terms of lexical collocation, this study focuses on different types of lexical collocation

errors in literary translations of Turkish learners of English pursuing translation and interpreting programme. For translation learners, choosing the right collocation will make their translations sound much more natural and they need to learn them implicitly and/or explicitly. Noura (2012) emphasizes that a collocation is one of the most important problems in translation. According to Seretan (2013: 87), “lexical collocations are a key issue for Natural Language Processing (NLP) systems since... they do not allow for word-by-word processing”. Also, they are more difficult to handle than other multi-word expressions do (such as idioms), because of their morpho-syntactic flexibility. In addition, Seretan quoted that collocations are considered a key factor in producing more acceptable machine translation output (Heylen et al., 1994, as cited in Seretan, 2013:100).

Dvorkin (1991:19) has mentioned that “collocations are problematic when their meaning is apparent at first glance but their constituent elements cannot be given their translation equivalents”. The translator, in the process of translation, is always looking for the most accurate and natural lexical equivalents between the source and the target language (Newmark, 1988).

Moreover, there are two main views on the concept of collocation: Frequency-based and phraseological approaches (Nesselhauf, 2005; Eren, 2016; Aksu Kurtoğlu, 2016). The frequency-based approach is concerned with the frequency of co- occurrence of lexical items. The main contributors were Firth (1957), Halliday (1966) and Sinclair (1991). Seretan discusses that this linguistic current provides “a purely statistical account of collocation phenomenon and unconcerned with the syntagmatic dimension of the combinations involved” (Seretan, 2013: 90).

On the other hand, researchers conducting the phraseological studies are apparently more involved with phraseology and its application in lexicography and language pedagogy (Benson, 1990; Cowie, 1978). Cowie (1978:132) defines collocation as “co-occurrence of two or more lexical items as realizations of structural elements within a given syntactic pattern”. Cowie (1994) divided word combinations into four groups: Free combinations, restricted collocations, figurative idioms, and pure idioms. Howart (1998:24) “collocational continuum” encompasses “free and restricted collocations”. He illustrates them as *pay heed*, *give someone credit*. Similarly, researchers (Benson, Benson, & Ilson, 1997; Hausmann, 1989) use terms of restricted combinations, unrestricted combinations, and free combinations. According to Denroche (2015: 315), lexical phrases “offer two significant advantages: they extend meaning (because their meaning is more than the sum of their parts) and they make processing easier”.

Also, researchers study on different aspects that affect the collocation production such as lexical (non)congruence of collocation (Jurko, 2010), restriction on collocability (Bonelli, 2000; Granger, 1998; Howart, 1998; Huang, 2001; Martelli, 2007; Nesselhauf, 2005; Nişancı, 2014), the L1 influence (Huang, 2001, Martelli, 2007; Nesselhauf, 2003; Nişancı, 2014; Zughoul& Abdul-Fettah, 2001), semantic transparency of the constituents of a collocation (Martelli, 2007; Nişancı, 2014), and (un)translatability of collocations (Pahlavani et al., 2014).

Firstly, one of the aspects that affect the collocation production is (non)congruence of collocation. Jurko (2010) studies on lexical (non)congruence of collocation and mentions that high frequency lexical collocations should be listed and instructed, yet the L1 into L2 translation equivalent is important, i.e. the L2 collocation shouldn't be parallel to that in L1. The frequency of occurrence can be a decisive factor in discriminating synonymous collocations (Jurko, 2010). Nation (2006:449) points out that L2 word combinations which are not parallel to the combinations in L1 deserve special attention and have to be learned, which complies with the underlying methodology of approaching L2 vocabulary. The frequency of co-occurrence will not always cause useful results, to illustrate: The Turkish collocation *zamanı olmak* is parallel to that of English equivalent *to have time*, and the collocations have high frequency in their corpora (COCA=FREQ:5635; TNC =FREQ:1566.02) yet, Jurko (2010) claims that the pair of collocations is of little contrastive pedagogical value as the L1 into L2 translation equivalent is completely predictable.

Another factor that influences the collocation production is restriction on collocability. In brief, most findings of the restrictedness studies (Bonelli, 2000; Granger, 1998; Howart, 1998; Nesselhauf, 2005) claims that higher degree of restriction facilitates collocation production, in contrast, others (Huang, 2001, Martelli, 2007; Nişancı, 2014) suggest that higher degree of restriction causes poorer collocation production.

Lastly, researchers (Huang, 2001, Martelli, 2007; Nesselhauf, 2003; Nişancı, 2014; Zughoul& Abdul-Fettah, 2001) have shown an increased interest in the L1 influence. The researchers (Zughoul&Abdul-Fettah, 2001) conclude that even at advanced levels, learners face difficulty in producing collocations due to "direct translation from native language (NL) to target language (TL)". Also, Huang (2001) and Nesselhauf (2003), emphasize that L1 transfer has an effect on collocational errors.

Firth (1957:168) has stated that "you shall know a word by the company it keeps" and defined collocation as "part of the meaning of a word" (as cited in Carter, 1998).Carter (1998:51) has described collocation as "a group of words which occur repeatedly in a language" and these patterns of co-occurrence can be either grammatical or lexical. Also, Hoey (2005) has the following definition for collocation:

Collocation is a psychological association between words which is evidenced by their occurrence together in a corpora more frequently than is rational in terms of random distribution (2005: 3-5).

According to Seretan (2013), lexical collocations are typical combinations of words, such as *heavy rain*, *close collaboration*, or *to meet a deadline*. Also, Hausmann (1989) suggests the following list of syntactic patterns characterising collocations: adjective-noun, noun-verb, verb-noun (object), verb-adverb, adjective-adverb, noun-preposition-noun.

Benson et al. (1997: xx) state that “collocations fall into two major groups: grammatical collocations and lexical collocations. Grammatical collocations consist of a noun, an adjective, or a verb plus a preposition or a grammatical structure such as an infinitive or a clause or preposition plus noun. Lexical collocations consist of various combinations of nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. Benson et al. (1997) distinguish several structural types of lexical collocations:

1. verb+noun (inflict a wound),
2. adjective+noun (a crushing defeat),
3. noun+verb (storms rage),
4. noun+noun (a world capital),
5. adverb+adjective (deeply absorbed),
6. verb+adverb (appreciate sincerely).

This study aims to explore different types of lexical collocation errors of Turkish L2 learners of English in literary translation and their frequencies were investigated adopting the structural types of lexical collocation described by Benson et al. (1997). Also, the most common lexical collocation errors (verb+noun) was examined in terms of restriction on collocability and the L1 influence. Recent developments in the field of phraseology and lexicography have led to a renewed interest in collocation teaching, yet the researcher was not able to find bilingual lists of Turkish and English lexical collocations; also there is no bilingual (Turkish – English) collocation dictionary to encourage L2 learners and translators to use the right collocations. The present study may shed light to the issues on Turkish learners’ performance in English collocations and explore the characteristics of the most common errors made by Turkish learners of English.

2. Method

2.1. Participants and Translation Task

The participants of this study were 4th Year students of English Translation and Interpretation Department. A written parallel corpus of Turkish literary texts (TLT) and their English translation texts (ETT) was compiled. 10 students took the course called Translation of Specialty Texts (Literary Translation) and translated Turkish literary texts from *The Dervish Gate* (Bab-ı Esrar) by Ahmet Ümit to English. Ahmet Ümit’s *The Dervish Gate* is a detective story (408 pages in Turkish, 2012) and it is one of the greatest masterpieces of the author. Ümit, whose “more than 60 novels have been translated into more than 20 languages, including Spanish, English, Russian, Chinese, German, Arabic and others, is known as one of the most successful contemporary writers”. Ümit is especially well-known for his mastery of the mystery genre as reflected in many of his bestselling novels and short story volumes (ahmetumit.com).

Each participant translated 10 pages (each consisting of approximately 3500 words). The participants were instructed to understand major difficulties of literary translation (LT), translation models and strategies for LT, to translate literary texts during the course. They had shared translation sessions before translating on their own, which were guided by the instructor.

2.2. Data Collection and Analysis

The data for the study was collected from a written parallel corpus of Turkish literary texts (TLT) and their English translation texts (ETT) manually. Students' literary translations were built into a learner corpus. ETT was totally consists of 28.357 words; however, 11.738 words were selected randomly to analyse lexical collocation errors of 10 participants. Richard and Schmidt (2002) defined error analysis (EA) 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. According to Ellis (1985), EA requires the following procedure: defining a corpus of language; identifying errors in the corpus, description of the errors; explaining the errors.

The erroneous lexical collocations from the corpus (ETT) were identified, classified manually with the distinction of Benson et al. (1997) and explained. Based on Benson et al.'s (1997: ix) distinction between grammatical collocations and lexical collocations, the study focused on the lexical collocations and translation errors. Collocations examined in this study included verb+noun, adjective+noun, noun+verb, noun+noun, adverb+adjective, verb+adverb

Furthermore, the most common lexical collocation errors were analysed in terms of (un) restriction on collocation and the L1 influence.

The most common lexical collocation error was verb+noun collocation and they were categorised as "Restricted" or "Unrestricted". Nesselhauf (2005) defines the first group as "collocations with verbs that permit only a very limited number of nouns", and the second group 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).

The accuracy of lexical collocation errors which were consulted during the analysis is based on the following sources: The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English (BBI; Benson et al., 1997); Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English (OCDSE); Turkish National Corpus (TNC) (Aksan, 2012); Collocation Dictionary of Turkey Turkish (CDTT; Özkan, 2010); Corpus of Contemporary American (COCA; (Davies, 2008).

The researcher was not able to find bilingual lists of Turkish and English lexical collocations; also there is no Turkish - English collocation dictionary.

3. Findings

This study aims to explore lexical collocation errors in Turkish-English translations of literary texts.

Totally, the largest number of collocations of all is that of verb + noun (51), followed by adjective + noun (33) (see Table 1). It's essential to mention that even if participants sometimes produce a lexical collocation error more than once, it was estimated as only one.

Table 1: The Frequency of Errors of Lexical Collocation Types

	Lexical collocations	N	%
1	verb+noun	51	36.1%
2	Adj.+noun	33	23.4%
3	noun+verb	26	1.4%
4	noun+noun	5	0.3%
5	adv+adj	8	0.5%
6	verb+adv	18	12.7%
	Total	141	100%

Table 2 demonstrates some sample lexical collocation errors that the participants made:

Table 2: Different Types of Lexical Collocations and Sample Lexical Collocation Translation Errors

Lexical collocations	L1-Turkish literary texts (TLT)	L2 Sample Errors of English translation texts (ETT)	Possible solutions
verb+noun	Kanıtları ortadan kaldırmak	abolish the evidence	destroy the evidence
Adj.+noun	Saçlarını arkasına topuz yapmış bir kadın	a woman who made a bun behind her hair	a woman who made a bun at the back of the head
noun+verb	Öfkem gerginliğim kayboldu.	My anger and tension got lost.	My anger and stress has faded away/ subsided.
noun+noun	tek damla kan	single gob blood	A drop of blood
adv+adj	Kuşkuya yer bırakmayacak kadar açık olarak işittim.	I heard the voice undoubtedly clear.	I heard the voice absolutely/quite clear.
verb+adv	Kapıyı tamamen açtım.	I entirely opened the door.	I opened the door wide.

Table 3 shows the results of errors in collocations which are restricted. In 51 verb+noun erroneous lexical collocations which participants translated, 42 of them were categorised as restricted and nine (9) of them were put in the group of unrestricted. In brief, 82% of the verb+noun erroneous lexical collocations were restricted.

Table 3: Errors of Verb+noun Lexical Collocations in terms of (Un)Restrictedness

	Restricted	Unrestricted	Total
N	42	9	51
%	82%	18%	100%

Table 4 demonstrates the influence of L1 in the performance of verb+noun lexical collocations. It can be seen that 24 (47%) out of 51 collocation errors were regarded as due to L1 influence. Also, Table 5 (see Appendix) illustrates some verb+noun lexical collocation errors with L1 influence.

Table 4: The Verb+noun Lexical Collocation Errors with L1 Influence

	verb+noun	verb+noun with L1 influence
N	51	24
%		47%

4. Conclusion and Discussion

The present study was designed to determine and examine the lexical collocation errors in Turkish-English translations of literary texts. A written parallel corpus of Turkish literary texts (TLT) and their English translation texts (ETT) was compiled to analyse and reveal the frequency of the errors manually; moreover, the most common lexical collocation errors (verb+noun) was examined in terms of restriction on collocability and the L1 influence.

Firstly, manually analysing the data, a total of 141 erroneous lexical collocations were listed in the ETT consisting 11.738 words, and 51 (36%) of them were categorised as verb+noun collocation errors as being the most frequent. The present findings seem to be consistent with other researchers (Bonelli, 2000; Liu, 2000; Nesselhauf, 2005; Nişancı, 2014) who found that learners of second/foreign language fail to use verb+ noun collocations and the most challenging for L2 learners was verb+noun collocations.

Secondly, this study concludes that translation students whose L1 is Turkish and who translate Turkish to English literary texts have difficulty in translating more restricted lexical collocations. Totally 42 (82%) collocation errors out of 51 verb+noun collocation errors were classified as restricted. As stated in the introduction part, literature has emerged that offers contradictory findings about restriction, in that, unlike Huang (2001), Martelli (2007), and Nişancı

(2014) who found that higher degree of restriction causes poorer collocation production, Bonelli (2000), Granger(1998), Howart (1998),and Nesselhauf (2005) reported that higher degree of restriction facilitates collocation production. Nişancı (2014) studied “the factors influencing Turkish learners’ production of English collocations”. The study found that students had slightly poorer performance in collocations with more restricted collocations.

It is difficult to explain the contradictory results, yet these differences can be explained in part by the unpredictability of L2 collocations. Jurko (2010) states that the L1 into L2 translation equivalent is important, the pair of collocations is of little contrastive pedagogical value as the L1 into L2 translation equivalent is completely predictable. In other words, when the L2 collocation is parallel to that in L1, relatively, it is assumed to be easier to predict the L2 translation equivalent of lexical collocation, however, when it is not parallel to that in L1, accordingly, the L2 translation can be unpredictable. Therefore, the unpredictability of L2 collocations for foreign language learners and translators may be one of the reasons that explain inconsistent results. For instance, for Turkish learners of English, it may be difficult to predict what collocates with *evidence* (in sentence 1). Therefore, L2 collocations which are not parallel to the combinations in L1 may deserve special attention.

(1) *Source text: Kanıtları ortadan kaldırdın.*

(2) *Target text: You abolished the evidence.*

(3) *Possible solution: You destroyed/disposed of the evidence.*

In consequence of revealing the problematic collocations, a contrastive analysis is essential and bilingual lists of lexical collocation errors should be prepared to find out the frequency of different types of lexical collocation errors that are specific to Turkish learners of English as a foreign language.

Another possible explanation for the contradictory results is that different languages, different levels of language learners and different genres may influence them. Researchers state that collocations are pervasive in all text genres and domains (Kjellmer, 1987; Mel’čuk, 1998), yet, the frequency of (un)restrictedness of collocation errors in literary translation may be different from, for instance, translations of technical texts. As it has been mentioned earlier, Erman and Warren (2000) found that 58.6% of spoken discourse and 52.3% of written discourse consisted of multiword combinations. However, Turkish learners generally don’t have opportunity to expose natural spoken English even in advanced levels. For instance, Uçkun and Onat (2008:149) examined an English course book which was promoted by the Ministry of Education. They concluded that “the contents of the texts and tasks ignore elements of the target culture and do not carry the features of authentic language use”. According to Denroche (2015:316), “one of

the difference between learners and mother tongue speakers is that learners rely more on free combinations while native speakers make more use of chunks, and that the process of becoming proficient is linked to the ability to learn lexical phrases..." With regard to the researches on lexical phrases, Denroche (2015:316) states that "our choices (as native speakers) are far more restricted rather than free combinations".

Besides, it is not clear that EFL textbooks support lexical collocation learning/instruction. Vassiljev, Skopinskaja and Liiv (2015:307) studied on course books of ELT and the research has shown that "lexical collocations are neglected rather than central in these textbooks, and their selection in terms of frequency and usefulness value is quite random."

Thirdly, it's interesting to note that 24 (47%) out of 51 verb+noun collocation errors were regarded due to the L1 influence. Prior studies concerning the L1 influence concerning lexical collocations (Huang, 2001, Martelli, 2007; Nesselhauf, 2003; Zughoul & Abdul-Fettah, 2001) have noted that L1 transfer has an effect on collocational errors. Bildircin (2014: vi) also concluded that "first language interference was the major source particularly in the beginning of the year, which gradually loses its effect...". However, Zughoul and Abdul-Fettah (2001) conclude that even at advanced levels, learners face difficulty in producing collocations due to "direct translation from native language (NL) to target language (TL)". As Seretan (2013:100) points out "the transfer of collocations is relatively more complex" and "many of them cannot in fact be translated literally". Nonetheless, Pahlavani et al.(2014) reported that literal translation was the most frequently (35.73%) used strategy by translators while translating collocations. This study confirms that the L1 influence is associated with partly literal translation.

Nevertheless, more research on this topic needs to be undertaken before the association between L1 interference and the above-mentioned factors are more clearly understood. It is possible to observe L1 interference on not only lexical level but also on structural level (Kurtul, 2012). A further study with more focus on L1 interference is therefore suggested, for instance, investigating its association with literal translation and unpredictability. In addition, it would be interesting to assess the effects of using authentic texts other than textbooks concerning collocation instruction. Moreover, the results of this research support the idea that restricted collocations are more challenging for EFL/ESL learners and translators and they need to learn them implicitly and/or explicitly. It is recommended that further research be undertaken in exploring the effect of teaching unpredictable, restricted lexical collocations.

5. Suggestions

The study has gone some way towards enhancing our understanding of the issues and the nature of the problems of translating collocation. The findings of this study have a number of important implications for future practice.

1. For the reason that EFL/ESL textbooks are not sufficient to teach/introduce lexical collocations, instruction should evolve learners other primary sources of foreign language teaching. Apart from EFL/ESL textbooks, input outside of the classroom is also invaluable. As Richards (2015) mentions the classroom is no longer a learner's primary source of interaction in the internet age so far. Authentic materials are essential to introduce collocations.

2. It's recommended that collocations are needed to be translated into collocations. It's extremely important for foreign language learners to have English-Turkish and Turkish-English bilingual dictionaries of lexical collocations, as searching for the right collocation they spend a lot of time and energy. Through these bilingual dictionaries, they may have the chance to reach invaluable input. Many researchers prepared bilingual collocation dictionaries such as A Dictionary of English Collocations (English-Chinese) (Wang, 1988), Russian-English Dictionary of Verbal Collocations (Benson & Benson, 1993), The Kenkyusha Dictionary of English Collocations (Shigeziroo., 1995). Özkan (2010) states that "when the studies are considered about the vocabulary of Turkey Turkish, general purpose lexicon works, and particular purpose lexicons for special aim works are insufficient and limited". Therefore, it is claimed that "collocation dictionary is one of the main products of lexicology" (Özkan, 2010: 65).

3. Also, bilingual lists of collocations with reference to specialized fields, for instance, scientific texts, technical texts or/and literary texts etc. can be produced. Jurko (2010) benefits from bilingual lists of Slovene and English collocations resulting from BA theses of students. Also, more emphasis is needed to be given on restricted collocations which can be challenging for Turkish EFL/ESL learners and translators.

4. As a consequence of the absence of bilingual collocation dictionary which consists of both English and Turkish collocations, translators may have some obstacles. In order to solve the expected problems, some solutions could be useful for them. They can use monolingual collocation dictionaries such as: The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English (BBI); Collins COBUILD Collocations; The LTP Dictionary of Selected Collocations (LTP); Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English (OCDSE); Turkish National Corpus (TNC); Collocation Dictionary of Turkey Turkish (CDTT). Also, there are apps for mobile phones (Oxford Collocations Dictionary), it's easy to download and use it to search for what collocates with what.

References

- Aksan, Y. Aksan, M., Koltuksuz, A., Sezer, T., Mersinli, Ü., Demirhan, U. U., Yılmaz, H., Atasoy, G., Öz, S., Yıldız, Y., ve Kurtoğlu, Ö. (2012). Construction of the Turkish National Corpus (TNC). In Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2012). İstanbul. Türkiye. Available online at <http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2012/papers.html>
- Aksu Kurtoğlu, 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.
- Bahns, J., & Eldaw, M. (1999). "Should we teach EFL students collocations? *System*, 21, 101–114.
- Benson, M. (1997). Collocations and General-purpose Dictionaries, *International Journal of Lexicography*, 3 (1), 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/3.1.23>
- Benson, M., Benson, E. & Ilson, R. F. (1997). The BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations. Rev. ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Available online at [http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/z.bbi1\(2nd\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/z.bbi1(2nd)).
- Benson, M. & Benson, E. (1993). Russian-English Dictionary of Verbal Collocations Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bıldırçın, Y. U. (2014). A corpus-based analysis of the morpho-syntactic errors in the written productions of Turkish learners of English as a foreign language: Mersin University sample, Doctoral Thesis, Mersin Üniversitesi, Turkey.
- Bonelli, E. T. (2000). Corpus Classroom Currency. *DarbairDienos*, 205-243.
- CDTT (2011). Collocation Dictionary of Turkey Turkish, National Research Project, Mersin University, Available online at <http://turkcederlem.mersin.edu.tr/esdizim/>
- Cowie, A. P. (1978). The place of illustrative material and collocations in the design of a learner's dictionary. In: Strevens, P. (ed.) Honour of A.S. Hornby, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 127–139.
- Davies, M. (2008). The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA): 520 million words, 1990-present. Available online at <https://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>.
- Denroche, C. (2015). Metonymy and Language: A New Theory of Linguistic Processing, Routledge, New York
- Ellis, R. (1985). Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eren, N. T. (2016). Eşdizimlerin saptanmasına ve betimlenmesine yönelik kuram ve yaklaşımlar", Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 13 (33), p. 28-47.
- Erman, B. & Warren, B. (2000). The idiom principle and the open choice principle. *Text* 20(1),

29–62.

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8 (1), 1–10.

Firth, J. R. (1957). *The Techniques of Semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Granger, S. (1998). Prefabricated Patterns in Advanced EFL Writing: Collocations and Formulae. In *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 145-160.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1966). Lexis as a linguistic level. In C. E. Bazell, J. C. Caford, M. A. K. Halliday, & R. H. Robinso (Eds.), *In memory of J. R. Firth*, London: Longman, 148-162.

Hausmann, F.J. (1989). Le dictionnaire de collocations. In: Hausmann, F., Reichmann, O., Wiegand, H., Zgusta, L. (eds.) *Wörterbücher: in internationalen Handbüchern zur Lexicographie*. Dictionaries, Dictionnaires, deGruyter, Berlin, 1010–1019.

Hill, J. (2000) Revising priorities: from grammatical failure to collocational success. In Lewis, M. (ed.) *Teaching Collocation: Further Developments in the Lexical Approach*. London: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Hoey, M. (2005). *Lexical Priming: A New Theory of Words and Language*. Routledge.

Howart, P. (1998). Phraseology and Second Language Proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 24-44.

Huang, L-S. (2001). Knowledge of English collocations: An analysis of Taiwanese EFL learners. In *Texas papers in foreign language education: Selected proceedings from the Texas foreign language education conference 2001*, 6(1), 113-129. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 465 288).

Jurko, P. (2010). Slovene-English contrastive phraseology: Lexical collocations. *ELOPE*, 7 (2), 57-73. DOI 10.4312/elope.7.2.57-73.

Kjellmer, G. (1987). Aspects of English collocations. In: Meijs, W. (ed.) *Corpus Linguistics and Beyond*, Rodopi, Amsterdam, 133–140.

Kurtul, K. (2012). An inquiry into connectives and their use in written discourse. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 8 (1), 110-131.

Lewis, M. (2000). Learning in the lexical approach. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach* Hove, UK: Language Teaching Publications, 155-185.

Liu, C. P. (2000). An Empirical Study of Collocation Teaching. *The Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China*, Taipei: Crane, 165-178.

Martelli, A. (2007). *Lexical Collocations in Learner English: A Corpus-Based Approach*. Edizioni dell'Orso.

Mel'čuk, I. (1998). "Collocations and Lexical Functions" (Ed. A.P. Cowie) *Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications*, Oxford University Press, 23-54.

Modarresi, G. (2009). Collocational errors of Iranian EFL learners in written English. *TELL*, (3) 1,135154. Retrieved September 1, 2017 from <http://www.parsgig.com/f/AkUov>.

Molavi, A., Koosha, M., & Hosseini, H. (2014). A comparative corpus-based analysis of lexical collocations used in EFL textbooks. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 7(1), 66-81. doi:10.5294/laclil.2014.7.1.4 eISSN 2322-9721.

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

Nesselhauf, N. (2005). *Collocations in a Learner Corpus*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Nişancı, S. (2014). Factors influencing Turkish EFL learners' collocation production, Yeditepe University, Unpublished Master of Arts : 31

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. London: Prentice Hall.

Noura, M. (2012). Translation of good in the history of Tom Jones, aFoundling. *International Journal of English Linguistics* (2) 3 Retrieved September 1, 2017 from: <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijel/article/view/17643>

OCDSE (2003). *Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English*. Oxford University Press.

Özkan, B. (2010). Collocation dictionary of adjectives in Turkish teaching method and practice. *E-International Journal of Educational Research* 1 (2),51-65. Retrieved October 1, 2017 from:<http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/ijer/article/view/1073000055>

Pahlavani, S. D., Bateni, B. & Hosseini, H. S. (2014).Translatability and Untranslatability of Collocations in Ernest Hemingway's Novels, *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences* (3) 4, 1195-1206. Retrieved August 10, 2017 from: www.european-science.com

Richards, J.C., and Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. (3rd ed.). United Kingdom: Pearson Education Limited.

Richards, J. (2015). "Tools Learning Beyond the classroom", Retrieved September 12, 2017 from: www.cambridge.org/elt/blog/2015/10/08/language-learning-beyond-classroom/

Seretan, V. (2013). A Multilingual Integrated Framework for Processing Lexical Collocations, A. Przepi'orkowski et al. (Eds.): *Computational Linguistics*, SCI 458, 87–108, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-34399-5 5 Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.

- Shigeziroo, I. (1995). *The Kenkyusha Dictionary of English Collocations*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. Palgrave Press
- TNC (2017) Turkish National Corpus, www.tnc.org.tr
- Uçkun, B. & Onat, Z. (2008). Yabancı Dil Kitaplarında Özgün Metin ve Özgün Görev Kullanımının Önemi: Bir Kitap İncelemesi. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 7(1),149-164.
- Ümit, A. (2012). *Bab-ı Esrar*, İstanbul: Everest Yayınları,
- Vassiljev, L., Skopinskaja, L. & Liiv, S. (2015). The treatment of lexical collocations in EFL course books in the Estonian Secondary School context. *Estonian Papers in Applied Linguistics* (11), doi:10.5128/ERYa11.18. Retrieved July 1, 2017 from: <http://arhiiv.rakenduslingvistika.ee/ajakirjad/index.php/aastaraamat/article/view/337>
- Wang, W. (1988). *A Dictionary of English Collocations (English-Chinese)*, Nanjiang.
- Wray, A. (1999). Formulaic language in learners and native speakers. *Language Teaching*, 32 (4), 213-231.
- Wray, A. (2002). Formulaic language in computer-supported communication: Theory Meets reality. *Language Awareness* 11(2), 114-131.
- 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. Retrieved September 1, 2017 from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED479650.pdf>

APPENDIX

Table 5: Some of the Verb+noun Lexical Collocation Errors with L1 Influence

	L1-Turkish literary texts (TLT)	L2 Sample Errors of English translation texts (ETT)	Possible solutions/ Intended	Explanations
1	Kanıtları ortadan kaldırmak	abolish the evidence	destroy the evidence	In Turkish “ortadan kaldırmak” is used for both “to put an end to both a system or practice”, and “to end the existence of something”.
2	Dizlerimin üstünde duran bilgisayarım.	laptop lying on my knees	laptop lying on my lap	In Turkish it is called “knee top” not lap
3	Bilgisayarı kapattım .	shut my laptop	turn off/ shut down-off my laptop	In Turkish it is called “close/shut”.
4	Alnıma bir öpücük kondurmuştu.	kissed me from my forehead	kissed my forehead	The word “from” is used for the suffix –a which is used as dative case.
5	Dudaklarından öperdi onu	kissed him on his lips	kissed his lips	The word “from” is used for the suffix –dan which is used as ablative case.
6	Televizyonu açtığımda	I opened television	turn on the TV	In Turkish there is not a verb for TV, “close/open” is used to turn on and off the TV.
7	Televizyonu kapattı	... close television...	turn off the TV	
	İçeri girebilir miyiz?	Can we enter the inside ?	Can we enter?	As “içeri” means “inside” in Turkish, it’s a literal translation.
8	Yanlış bir iş yapmamıştım.	I hadn’t done wrong thing .	I haven’t done anything wrong.	The pronoun “anything” is not negative in Turkish, that’s why “thing” is used instead of “anything”,.
9	Yere düşmüşüm.	I fell into place .	I fell down on the ground .	The word “into” is used for the suffix –e (yere) which is used as dative case in Turkish.
10	Herkes görüşünü açıklamış.	Everyone explained his opinion.	Everyone expressed their opinion/ opinions.	In Turkish, people “explain” their opinions instead of “expressing”.