

Philipps-Universität Marburg

Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik – Englische Sprachwissenschaft

SS 2004

10 038 SE Foreign Language Vocabulary

Prof. Dr. Rüdiger Zimmermann

## **Collocations or Free Variation?**

### **Empirical Study**

#### **on the Use of Adverbs in Pre-Verb Position by German ESL Learners**

Dirk Hovy

Hirschberg 9

35037 Marburg

Subjects: DsuL, Spw. Angl., Ling. Eng. MA

Matr.Nr.: 1420461

# Table of Content

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>3. PREVIOUS RESEARCH</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>4. METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>5. RESULTS</b> .....	<b>14</b>
5.1 PARTICIPANTS .....	14
5.2 ADVERBS.....	15
<i>Sentence 1</i> .....	15
<i>Sentence 2</i> .....	16
<i>Sentence 3</i> .....	16
<i>Sentence 4</i> .....	16
<i>Sentence 5</i> .....	16
<i>Sentence 6</i> .....	17
<i>Sentence 7</i> .....	17
<i>Sentence 8</i> .....	17
<i>Sentence 9</i> .....	17
<i>Sentence 10</i> .....	18
<i>Sentence 11</i> .....	18
<i>Sentence 12</i> .....	18
<i>Sentence 13</i> .....	18
<i>Sentence 14</i> .....	19
<i>Sentence 15</i> .....	19
<i>Sentence 16</i> .....	19
<i>Sentence 17</i> .....	19
<i>Sentence 18</i> .....	19
<i>Sentence 19</i> .....	20
<i>Sentence 20</i> .....	20
<i>Sentence 21</i> .....	20
<i>Sentence 22</i> .....	20
<i>Sentence 23</i> .....	21
<i>Sentence 24</i> .....	21
<b>6. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>7. CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>26</b>
7.1 ON COLLOCATIONS .....	26
7.2 GENERAL ASPECTS OF THE WORK .....	27
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>ANTI-PLAGIARISMUS VERSICHERUNG</b> .....	<b>30</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: LIST OF SENTENCES</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: WEBSITE PRINTOUT</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>Questionnaire</b> .....	32
<b>Section 1</b> .....	33
<b>Section 2</b> .....	34
<b>Thank you!</b> .....	37
<b>APPENDIX C: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS' DATA</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: LIST OF INTENSIFIERS GIVEN</b> .....	<b>39</b>

# 1. Introduction

“Learning a language is learning collocations“ (J.F. Hausmann after Busse 1995: 125). This sentence expresses in rather condensed form one of the main points recent research has provided for the field of second language acquisition. Chapter 3 will deal with this in more detail.

As the seminar in the context of which this paper was written was mainly concerned with strategies learners apply in mastering new vocabulary, collocations repeatedly came into focus. This concerns learning a mother tongue (L1) as well as a second language (L2).

However, there is often a gap between what is aimed for and considered as fruitful in research literature on the one hand and what is actually put to use on the other.

This paper is going to take a look at the use of pre-verb adverbs to see if collocations play the role they are assigned in the literature (see chapter 3), and if the proposed strategies are adhered to by German ESL (English as a Second Language) learners. It does not contradict those claims in favour of more collocation teaching. It is simply a sort of state-of-the-art examination of the German learning system. The results should help make a statement about the actual use of these important aspects.

Due to time constraints, the questionnaire used was provided via internet. As this form of presentation has its own advantages and disadvantages, the paper will take a critical look at the outcome of this as well (see chapter 7).

## 2. Research Questions

As mentioned briefly in the previous chapter, collocations are assigned an important role in second language acquisition (for further details see chapter 3). The results of Greenbaum (1970) and Herbst (1996) (see also chapter 3) on the other hand showed that native speakers tended to be much more predictable than ESL learners. The completions made by the former were less varied, mainly owing to collocations and their “certain degree of predictability” (Herbst 1996: 389).

The interest of this paper is now to investigate how much native speakers of German rely on collocations when faced with a completion task.

Generally, the notion **collocation** (from Latin *collocare*: “to place together”) refers to the co-occurrence of two or more lexical items.

In a narrower sense of collocations, a number of semantic relations are assumed to hold between the two items, adding to the predictability. They contribute to the relation in such a way that the reception of one word increases the likelihood of the other one to occur.

We can apply this to the Logogen-theory (after Levelt 1989: 201ff), where every lexical item is represented by a device that collects evidence for its appropriateness. That is called a logogen. Necessarily, all of them are active at the same time. If one logogen has collected enough evidence for its word (i.e. “reaches its threshold” (Levelt 1989: 202)) it “fires” and thus triggers the reception or production of the word it represents.

Applying this to collocations we could state that the activation of one lexical item lowers the threshold of its collocate.

Some collocations work in both ways, i.e. the reception of word A increases the expectation of word B and vice versa. They are thus called **bidirectional**. This is, for example, the case with *to bark* and *dog*.

If the reception of A triggers B but not the other way round, the collocation is called **monodirectional**. This holds true with German *räudiger* and *Hund*. In this case, the lexeme *räudiger* not only triggers but almost demands *Hund*. The more “central” and free word of two (or more) collocates (in the example above *Hund*) is called the **base**, the other ones its **collocates**.

Collocations that allow a high degree of variation are called **open collocations** (for example *to block/barricade/cut off a road/way/street*) others, that allow only a limited range of collocates are called **restricted collocations** (for example *a wooden/artificial leg*).

Although the existence of collocations can be grasped intuitively and proved by the frequency with which they occur in completion tests, it took some time until they could be empirically quantified.

Halliday in 1966 was the first to base his investigations on corpora, i.e. large databases of text in either written or spoken form. The first corpora, however, were too small to yield sound results. Nowadays, with the BNC (British National Corpus), a corpus of 4,124 texts with 100,106,008 words, the basis for such an investigation is a completely different one.

It soon became clear, however, that a simple computer-based analysis of texts was insufficient to detect collocations, no matter how big the corpus. It simply counted the number of occurrences of two given lexemes within a defined range from each other (the so called  *collocational span* ) without paying attention to the sense relations holding between them. If one was to rely on frequency alone, the results would deeply contradict common sense. This would lead to combinations such as  *but he*  being considered as collocations, simply because they occur so frequently together in a corpus, even though the reception of one does not necessarily elicit the other (Bahns 1996: 26).

It is thus necessary to check the results thoroughly on a semantic basis, as Hausmann states (1985: 124 after Bahns 1996: 27): “viele Kollokationen [sind] ‘nicht frequent, aber dennoch verfügbar’“.

This “significance-oriented“ approach (Bahns 1996: 26) was first advocated by Hausmann, who proposed to see collocations as “Halbfertigprodukte der Sprache” (Hausmann 1984: 398 after Bahns 1996: 24).

Typical collocations tend to possess some  *predictability*  and a  *mutual expectancy* . Collocations thus form a lexical unit which can be distinguished from idioms in that they are still variable and that their meaning is deductible from the meaning of their components<sup>1</sup>. From free combinations they can be distinguished in that their co-occurrence is not arbitrary but to some extent predictable<sup>2</sup>.

Concluding the thoughts presented above, collocations can be seen as restricted syntagmatic combinations of two or more lexical items between which certain semantic relations exist. These create a mutual expectancy and increase the other’s likelihood to occurring (cf. Bahns 1996: 28f).

This definition will be the basis for the use of the notion  *collocation*  in the following paper (for a plea in favour of this narrow view of collocations see also Herbst 1996).

Corpora will be used, however, to check the frequency of acknowledged collocations and to quantify the results achieved by the completion tests.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is not the case with idioms: the meaning of a phrase such as  *get on like a house on fire*  can not be achieved by simple addition of the meaning of the words it consists of. To understand idioms, the speaker has to have the knowledge of their meaning as a whole.

<sup>2</sup> A free combination like  *a nice house*  might be frequent as well, but one of these lexemes does not increase the likelihood for the other occurring.

Based on the results of Greenbaum (1970) it is assumed that the collocability between certain verbs and intensifiers is higher than between others. That is, some combinations occur more frequently than others, and these combinations are to some extent predictable, according to the view on collocations presented above.

In contrast to Greenbaum's test, which left the verb to be filled in (for more details see chapter 3), the one used in this study left open the place of the adverb, based on the consideration that a speaker is normally quite sure about the predicate of a sentence, but rather free in the (optional) choice of an intensifying adverb.<sup>3</sup>

Therefore, a bidirectional relation between the verb and its adverb has to be assumed, i.e. that the verb triggers the use of a certain range of adverbs as well as vice versa.

According to this, the verbs collected in Greenbaum (1970) should elicit most of the intensifiers given there.

In line with Herbst (1996) and Bahns (1997) it will be hypothesized that average German ESL (English as a Second Language) learners tend to produce a wide range of rather open collocations and that more restricted ones will be used only if the collocate itself is rather rare but occurs in a combination that is quite frequent (an example could be the German lexeme *eingefleischter* that almost exclusively occurs together with the base *Junggeselle*).

### 3. Previous Research

The main source this paper is based on is the work by Greenbaum (1970) "Some Verb-Intensifier Collocations in English: an experimental Approach". He thoroughly distinguishes between adverbs of various kinds and intensifiers (cf. Greenbaum 1970: 23ff). *Verb-intensifiers* are called those "adverbs that

---

<sup>3</sup> In line with Levelt's Speaking Model (cf. deBot 1992) it is assumed that a speaker first produces a macroplan of what he is going to say, i.e. he formulates the goal of the utterance nonverbally. The lexical items are considered afterwards according to the language the speaker is using and the means it provides to express the content of the utterance. The predicate is here considered of vital importance for the macroplan, while adverbs are to be seen as language specific possibilities to add to the meaning.

may be positioned before the verb” and that have “some heightening effect on the force of the verb” (Greenbaum 1970: 23).

In his study he used completion tests that consisted of the subject of a sentence followed by an intensifier (*entirely, utterly, much, completely, certainly, really, badly, very much* and *greatly*), but left open the predicate. Greenbaum relied on 366 participants of different educational levels, but all of them students at colleges or universities.

The participants were asked to write down and complete the sentences after they had heard and repeated them. Between the sentences the informants were given several grammatical tasks to distract them and to thus avoid serial effects.

He presented the test in two different orders to check whether this had any effect on the elicited answers. Some minor differences were found which showed that the ordering of the sentences contributed slightly to the choice of completions, even when separated by distractions (as a consequence, this paper used a randomized order of the sentences for each participant. See also chapter 4).

A subset of four of the nine intensifiers used (*entirely, utterly, much* and *completely*) was given twice, the second time with a different subject. Greenbaum found out that the subject influenced the choice of the verb. He points out, though, that it is still difficult to decide what has more influence on this choice, namely the subject or the intensifier, as many changes lead only to a different ranking of the same verbs. Only few changes elicited completely new ones.

In his terminology, all verbs occurring in more than 10% of the cases are called *principal collocations*, the other ones *occasional collocations*. Any answers that did not seem to be predictable were called *aberrant* (which could be called free combinations alternatively).

A semantic evaluation of the given answers was conducted to check whether certain semantic categories were preferred and how this interacted with the intensifiers.

He conducted some compliance tests as well to check the acceptability of a collocation and its syntactic constraints. As these tests were reported only

briefly and have no major impact on the quantitative results, they will not be dealt with here.

He concludes:

“Statements [...] will be different in kind. For some intensifiers [...] the collocational range can be defined semantically. For others, there appears to be a collocational range of verbs that are semantically homogeneous, but [...] some verbs that are apparently in the same semantic group are unacceptable as collocates.[...] In such a case, [...] we must also list exceptions [...]. [F]or some intensifiers [...], all we can do is specify the individual verbs with which they may collocate.” (Greenbaum 1970: 83).

Herbst (1996) repeated some of Greenbaum’s tests with both native speakers of English and German ESL speakers. He states that the results of the German students showed a great variety of different answers and not much correspondence with the findings of Greenbaum, whereas the results for his English students corresponded more or less with the ones from Greenbaum. His results are rather scanty though, and it could not be inferred where he presents them more fully.

Collocations are assumed to play an important role in the acquisition of a language and are highly present in the recent literature on L2 acquisition.

On the one hand, a hearer needs to know the range of possible collocates of a word to be able to process information faster when hearing a sentence (the attention can be focused on the collocates, which are predictable and thus only few. Mental processing is thus faster). The same is true for production (speaking and writing): a speaker has to know what words usually collocate to produce understandable and idiomatic<sup>4</sup> sentences (cf. Nation 1990: 31f; Gass/Selinker 1994: 272).

On the other hand, the knowledge of collocations helps to minimize the learning burden as vocabulary is learnt more easily in a context with associations than as isolated items (cf. Nation 1990: 36ff).

The role of collocations in second language teaching is dealt with in detail in Bahns 1997. His view is more focused on the use of collocations in teaching (thus concentrating on teaching methods and collocation dictionaries), but he includes some general remarks on collocations as well. However, what he

---

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion of the ambiguous use of the lexeme *idiomatic* see also Bahns 1997: 62ff.



reports about the collocation knowledge of advanced learners brings all the theories down to earth: The active competence of even advanced learners of English is rather poor, as exemplified by several works from German and Polish researchers (Bahns 1997: 68ff).

On the one hand this is due to the fact that several collocations seem to be completely unknown, on the other hand due to the learners' tendency to apply collocations from their L1 verbatim to L2 (Bahns 1997: 70), for example *\*to prove courage* from G. *Mut beweisen* instead of *to exhibit/display courage* (Bahns 1997: 67). This phenomenon is known as negative transfer ( cf. Gass/Selinker 1994: 53ff; Larsen-Freeman/Long 1991: 52ff).

The planning and design of questionnaires and processing of the data is dealt with in Dörnyei 2003. Of special interest in this case was the chapter about queries conducted via mail. Many of the statements made there can be applied to the use of the internet as a medium as well (Dörnyei 2003: 77ff).

## 4. Methodology

Sentence	Verbs (lemma)
The man certainly	be (23%), know (15%)
The child really	be (30%), love (10%)
I badly	need (65%), want (28%)
Your friend very much	like (29%), want (18%)
They all greatly	admire(44%), enjoy (20%)
I entirely	agree (82%)
They all utterly	hate (10%)
We all much	admire (29%), enjoy (21%), appreciate (10%)
My friend completely	forget (32%), ignore (14%)
My friend entirely	agree (56%)
His father utterly	despise (10%), hate (10%)
Some people much	prefer (56%), admire (17%), enjoy (11%)
I completely	forget (50%)

Table 1 (after Greenbaum 1970: 36. Intonation markers omitted)

To investigate the questions posed in chapter 2, a questionnaire was devised. Due to the view on collocations explained above, a completion test was chosen. The mutual expectancy and predictability of collocations was assumed to be sufficient to elicit only a limited number of possible answers. These could be

quantified and compared to findings of other investigations (due to the assumed bidirectionality) as well as to research conducted on the BNC.

Based on the result of Greenbaum (see table 1), the 24 principal collocations were chosen<sup>5</sup>. The verbs were then inserted into the sentences Greenbaum had used. Where necessary, an object was inserted (especially with transitive verbs like *to admire* or copula verbs like *to be*). Otherwise, the structure of Greenbaum was kept, except that the slot of the adverb was left blank (For a list of the resulting 24 sentences see Appendix A).

It was decided to use the internet to publish the questionnaire, as it provided several possibilities:

1. A wider range of participants than possible with a standard test could be reached in short time
2. Independence from time and space constraints. It was not necessary to get the participants together at a certain place and time
3. the data could be inserted directly into a database, which facilitated the handling of it and provided numerous possibilities for sorting and ordering it.

For a more detailed critical discussion of advantages and disadvantages of the chosen form of data collection see chapter 7.

61 persons were asked via e-mail if they were willing to participate. They were given the internet-address of the questionnaire and were asked to fill it in.

The website consisted of three parts: a short welcome page and the two sections of the questionnaire.

On the welcome page, the participants were thanked for their contribution and given a short overview of what was to follow. They also received instructions on how they were supposed to fill in the questionnaire. They were also told about the way confidential data would be handled.

---

<sup>5</sup> As stated above in chapter 2, the frequency of a collocation is not assumed to be the crucial factor for its relevance or collocational status as such. However, to obtain comparable results, this paper relied on the most frequent ones (whose collocational status was undoubted), as less frequent ones would be less likely to be chosen by German ESL learners

In section I of the questionnaire they were asked to provide some data concerning themselves. This featured:

- *Name*. This data was only included to avoid doubled entries (which can occur if the form was sent twice due to a server-problem). It was, however, deleted from the database before any evaluation took place to ensure anonymity.
- *Age*. Though this feature was asked, it could not be included in the evaluation as it was not stored for some participants due to an error in the design of the database. Due to time pressure it was impossible to recollect this data. Though this is a shortcoming for statistical reasons, it does not have a major impact on the subject as such.
- *Sex*. Included for statistical reasons. A different use of the lexical items in question by the different genders was not expected and not part of the investigations.
- *Native language*. As the test was passed on by some of the participants to persons that were unknown to the author this statement was required, as the paper was only concerned with the strategies of German ESL learners.
- *Approximate number of years for which they had been learning English at an institution*. This included school as well as university or Volkshochschulkurse.
- *Stay in an English-speaking country*. The participants could chose from no stay at all (coded as 0) up to a stay of more than 1 year (coded 6) on a seven point scale.
- *Estimation of proficiency*. The participants were asked to rate their own proficiency. They could choose from six degrees ranging between near-native (6) to poor (1) proficiency.
- *Frequency of usage*. The scale included four steps, ranging from almost daily (coded 4) to less than once a month (coded 1).

To facilitate the comparison of the participants and to mark persons with a exceptionally high or low proficiency<sup>6</sup>, an algorithm was designed which

---

<sup>6</sup> A circumstance that had to be taken into account when looking at the results was that people with a very high proficiency cannot be counted as representative for the majority of ESL learners. It could be interesting, however, to compare their answering strategies to the ones of

featured the last four statements. The different answers were internally given numbers to facilitate a calculation.

The four statements were weighted differently, as they are assumed to have different influence on the proficiency of a learner.<sup>7</sup>

The stay in an English-speaking country was rated highest and thus multiplied by 4, the length of acquisition by 3, the frequency of use by 2 and the self-rated proficiency was simply added, as it should ideally only sum up what could be calculated from the three other values.

Finally, the average of these four values was calculated. It will be referred to further on as Overall Speaker Proficiency (OSP).

$$\text{OSP} = ( (\text{stay} * 4) + (\text{years of acquisition} * 3) + (\text{frequency of use} * 2) + \text{self-rating} ) / 4$$

As Greenbaum had proved that the ordering of the sentences had an effect on the chosen completions, the section II presented the 24 sentences in a randomized order to avoid those effects. Each participant thus received one of 620,448,401,733,239,439,360,000 possibilities ( $24 * 23 * \dots * 2$ ).

To further minimize unwanted serial effects, the participants were given a mathematical task after each sentence. This was designed to avoid the consistent usage of only one adverb all the time.

The Layout and web-based forms were written in HTML, the handling of the data and the database was done in PHP.

For a printout of the website see Appendix B

The data was then saved into a MySQL database in two different tables where the first one contained all the participant-specific information while the second one listed the given answers. An index number referenced back to the table of participants, so that each answer could be matched with the data of the person who had given it.

---

participants with a poor or average proficiency. As briefly mentioned in chapter 2, it was hypothesized that very proficient learners would use a wider set of intensifiers.

<sup>7</sup> It is a common fact and stated by many learners of a second language that they are unable to communicate when being in the country whose language they have already been learning though having had lessons for some time. Hence a stay abroad was ranked slightly higher than the overall number of years a learner had spent on acquiring the language in institutions.

The data was finally filtered: the names were deleted to ensure anonymity. The list of adverbs given was checked for obvious spelling mistakes (for example *realy* instead of *really* or *absolutly* instead of *absolutely*) which were corrected. Unclear entries were marked with a ‘ ? ’ and not included in the further evaluation.

As the website did not provide tools to sort and present the data, two short pages were programmed to handle the data in a presentable form and to retrieve all the information needed. This featured sorting algorithms as well as a consistent and user friendly layout.

See Appendices C and D for those lists.

The evaluation concentrated only on those adverbs that occurred twice or more in the sample. This was done to reduce the amount of work to a manageable size for the scale of this paper and to make general statements about the frequency of use. It does not tell anything about the significance of the collocation. No differentiation will be made between intensifiers and adverbs, however. If the collocations are strong enough, intensifiers are assumed to result anyway.

If an intensifier that was given by Greenbaum did not occur or occurred only once, it was treated separately.

Finally, the achieved results were compared to the BNC. As it would go far beyond the scope of a work like this to compare all the results obtained, only two adverbs of each item were chosen (one from Greenbaum's test and the most frequent one achieved here). According to Greenbaum's definition of intensifiers (see chapter 3), only adverbs in pre-verb position were evaluated. The search was conducted on the whole BNC (spoken and written texts), as both sorts are assumed to influence the formation of collocations in the speaker.

Using the collocation function of the BNC, first the adverb in question was searched. Then, the collocations (including lemma information) within a range of four (i.e. four items to either side of the adverb) were calculated.

From the resulting list of verb collocations, the selected span could be further reduced to +1 to +3 (i.e. the first, second and third item to the right of the adverb)<sup>8</sup>, as only verbs following the adverb were of interest here. A randomized subsection of 100 entries was chosen and checked individually. Entries that did not fit the intended search (for example adverbs modifying a preceding verb joined with the verb in question by *and*<sup>9</sup>) were excluded. The error quote achieved this way was used on the total number of collocations given by the BNC to achieve a corrected value. If there were less than 100 collocations for one lemma, all were checked individually and the number of “wrong” entries was counted as total.

To make it possible to compare the two adverbs (one from Greenbaum, one from this test), the collocability of the verb with each of it was computed. The number of collocations with one adverb was divided by the total number of the verb’s lemma and multiplied with 100. This number showed in how many percent of its occurrences the verb is preceded by the respective adverb.

$$\frac{\text{TOTAL}_{\text{COLL}}}{\text{TOTAL}_{\text{VERB}}} * 100 = \text{likelihood of the verb to collocate (in \%)}$$

The two adverbs can thus be compared ignoring their respective frequency.

## 5. Results

### 5.1 Participants

The group of participants consisted of 23 persons, all of them native speakers of German. The distribution of the sexes was quite even (12 female / 11 male). As can be inferred from the general statistics (see table 2), the group was otherwise rather mixed.

	<b>Learned for X years</b>	<b>Stay abroad</b>	<b>Proficiency</b>	<b>Usage</b>	<b>OSP</b>
<b>Average:</b>	9.65	2.74	4.17	2.74	11.72
<b>RMS:</b>	2.96	1.86	0.98	1.25	5.65
<b>Minimum:</b>	6.00	0	1	0	7.00
<b>Maximum:</b>	20.00	6	6	4	34.50

<sup>8</sup> Pre-tests had shown that this span yielded sufficient results as relevant items were next to zero when the span was greater.

<sup>9</sup> For example *He had been cut **badly** and **needed** aid*. The items searched for are in bold type.

## Table 2 (participants' statistics)

The average time participants had learned the English language was a bit longer than nine and a half years, which is roughly the time spent on English in the German Gymnasium. However, the actual range was rather wide, between 6 and 20 years, though this maximum is an exception, as can be inferred from the RMS (root mean square).

The average participant had spent approximately two months abroad (for the decoding of the keys see chapter 4). Here, two items exceeded the standard range.

The self rating of the proficiency was rather unified (see RMS). Most of the participants rated their proficiency as "good", the extremes (*near native*: 6 and *poor*: 1) were chosen only once each. The average frequency of use was almost once a week.

The computed OSP values showed great variance. The average value is not representative here, as there is a gap between the maximum value and the nearest on below of 16.5 points. If we exclude this exceptional high value, we gain an average of 10.68.

However, this is still a rather high value, indicating a high proficiency of the average speaker. For the complete list, see Appendix C.

Some participants showed particularly interesting strategies: one of them (ID 14) used *really* in 21 of the 24 cases, except for sentence 17, 21 and 24 (*nearly*, *rather* and *almost*, respectively). The OSP was well below average, but this was mainly due to a low value in the stay abroad column.

Only one person (ID 24) never used *really*. She used *completely* instead (7 times: 29.2%).

## 5.2 Adverbs

### SENTENCE 1

Sentence: The man \_\_\_ knew it.

Greenbaum's sentence: The man certainly KNOW (15%)

valid answers: 22

Most frequent intensifiers: 5 *hardly* (22.7%), 2 *exactly*, 2 *never*, 2 *really*, 2 *surely* (each 9.1%)

It is interesting to observe that the intensifier Greenbaum originally used is not even mentioned once. *hardly* is not particularly an intensifier, as there is no

heightening effect to the verb. One participant even completed the sentence with an NP, namely *in the rain*.

#### SENTENCE 2

Sentence: The man \_\_\_ was a genius.

Greenbaum's sentence: The man certainly BE (23%)

valid answers: 21

Most frequent 7 *really* (33.3%), 3 *definitely*, 3 *truly* (each 14.3%)  
intensifiers:

Again, no one used *certainly*, but this time a relative clause was inserted, namely *he saw*.

#### SENTENCE 3

Sentence: The child \_\_\_ was clever.

Greenbaum's sentence: The child really BE (30%)

valid answers: 18

Most frequent 5 *really* (27.8%), 2 *clearly*, 2 *obviously* (each  
intensifiers: 11.1%)

The result matches the one from Greenbaum. However, *really* was one of the most frequent intensifiers (19.7% of all valid answers).

#### SENTENCE 4

Sentence: The child \_\_\_ loved ice-cream.

Greenbaum's sentence: The child really LOVE (10%)

valid answers: 23

Most frequent 6 *really* (26.1%), 2 *deeply*, 2 *definitely*, 2 *madly*  
intensifiers: (each 8.7%)

Again, the verb triggered the intensifier also given by Greenbaum, but again it is *really*.

#### SENTENCE 5

Sentence: I \_\_\_ need a friend.

Greenbaum's sentence: I badly NEED (65%)

valid answers: 23

Most frequent 7 *really* (30.4%), 4 *desperately* (17.4%), 2 *dearly*,  
intensifiers: 2 *never* (each 8.7%)



Again, *really* was chosen most frequently, the intended collocation *badly* did not occur even once. However, *desperately* is semantically very similar. The choice of time adverbs (*never*) is interesting. They do not intensify the verb, but negate its meaning.

#### SENTENCE 6

Sentence: I \_\_\_ want it.

Greenbaum's sentence: I badly WANT (28%)

valid answers: 21

Most frequent 10 *really* (47.6%), 4 *definitely* (19%)

intensifiers:

*badly* and the quite similar *urgently* occur once each (4.8%).

#### SENTENCE 7

Sentence: Your friend \_\_\_ liked the show.

Greenbaum's sentence: Your friend very much LIKE (29%)

valid answers: 23

Most frequent 8 *really* (34.8%), 2 *definitely*, 2 *hardly*, 2

intensifiers: *obviously* (each 8.7%)

*hardly* and *nevertheless* (once: 4.3%) are in a way qualifying adverbs with a slight negative connotation, asking for an explanation in a separate sentence. *very much* does not occur.

#### SENTENCE 8

Sentence: Your friend \_\_\_ wanted to get there.

Greenbaum's sentence: Your friend very much WANT (18%)

valid answers: 23

Most frequent 5 *really* (21.7%), 2 *dearly*, 2 *desperately*, 2 *never*,

intensifiers: 2 *urgently* (each 8.7%)

*very much* does not occur.

#### SENTENCE 9

Sentence: They all \_\_\_ admire her.

Greenbaum's sentence: They all greatly ADMIRE (44%)

valid answers: 21

Most frequent 3 *deeply*, 3 *really* (each 14.3%), 2 *greatly*, 2 *truly*

intensifiers: (each 9.5%)

#### SENTENCE 10

Sentence: They all \_\_\_ enjoyed it.

Greenbaum's sentence: They all greatly ENJOY (20%)

valid answers: 23

Most frequent 7 *really* (30.4%), 3 *happily* (13%)

intensifiers:

*greatly* occurs only once (4.3%).

#### SENTENCE 11

Sentence: I \_\_\_ agree!

Greenbaum's sentence: I entirely AGREE (82%)

valid answers: 20

Most frequent 5 *absolutely*, 5 *totally* (each 25%)

intensifiers:

Though *entirely* does not occur, the given answers are semantically quite similar, denoting unconditional agreement. This holds also true for *completely*, *definitely*, *fully* and *genuinely* (each once: 5%). This amounts to 14 items of this kind (70%).

#### SENTENCE 12

Sentence: They all \_\_\_ hate it.

Greenbaum's sentence: They all utterly HATE (10%)

valid answers: 23

Most frequent 7 *really* (30.4%), 2 *deeply* (8.7%)

intensifiers:

*utterly* was not given, but *completely* and *profoundly* (each of them once: 4.3%).

#### SENTENCE 13

Sentence: We all \_\_\_ admired this.

Greenbaum's sentence: We all much ADMIRE (29%)

valid answers: 23

Most frequent 4 *really* (17.4%), 2 *deeply*, 2 *definitely*, 2 *truly*

intensifiers: (each 8.7%)

*much* does not occur.

**SENTENCE 14**

Sentence: We all \_\_\_ enjoyed the evening.

Greenbaum's sentence: We all much ENJOY (21%)

valid answers: 23

Most frequent 8 *really* (34.8%), 4 *absolutely* (17.4%)

intensifiers:

*much* does not occur.

**SENTENCE 15**

Sentence: We all \_\_\_ appreciate that.

Greenbaum's sentence: We all much APPRECIATE (10%)

valid answers: 23

Most frequent 5 *really* (21.7%), 2 *deeply*, 2 *greatly*, 2 *never* (each

intensifiers: 8.7%)

Again, *much* does not occur.

**SENTENCE 16**

Sentence: My friend \_\_\_ forgot that.

Greenbaum's sentence: My friend completely FORGET (32%)

valid answers: 22

Most frequent 5 *nearly* (22.7%), 4 *unfortunately* (18.2%), 2

intensifiers: *almost*, 2 *always* (each 9.1%)

*completely* does not occur. It is interesting to observe that there are some adverbs (8 after all: 36.4%) which simply state that something actually has been forgotten, whereas two (*nearly*, *almost*: together 31.8%) express that this was prevented. The others express regret about the fact that something was forgotten, one (*never*) even denied it.

**SENTENCE 17**

Sentence: My friend \_\_\_ ignored them.

Greenbaum's sentence: My friend completely IGNORE (14%)

valid answers: 21

Most frequent 3 *completely* (14.3%), 2 *almost*, 2 *nearly*, 2 *simply*

intensifiers: (each 9.5%)

**SENTENCE 18**

Sentence: My friend \_\_\_ agreed.

Greenbaum's sentence: My friend entirely AGREE (56%)  
valid answers: 23  
Most frequent intensifiers: 3 *totally* (13%), 2 *always*, 2 *completely* 2 *happily*,  
2 *kindly* (each 8.7%)  
*entirely* does not occur.

**SENTENCE 19**

Sentence: His father \_\_\_ despised him.  
Greenbaum's sentence: His father utterly DESPISE (10%)  
valid answers: 23  
Most frequent intensifiers: 4 *really* (17.4%), 2 *desperately*, 2 *nearly* (each  
8.7%)  
*utterly* does not occur

**SENTENCE 20**

Sentence: His father \_\_\_ hated that.  
Greenbaum's sentence: His father utterly HATE (10%)  
valid answers: 22  
Most frequent intensifiers: 4 *deeply* (18.2%), 3 *absolutely*, 3 *really* (each  
13.6%), 2 *obviously* (9.1%)  
*utterly* does not occur.

**SENTENCE 21**

Sentence: Some people \_\_\_ prefer that.  
Greenbaum's sentence: Some people much PREFER (56%)  
valid answers: 21  
Most frequent intensifiers: 3 *rather* (14.3%), 2 *always*, 2 *hopefully*, 2  
*surprisingly* (each 9.5%)  
*much* does not occur.

**SENTENCE 22**

Sentence: Some people \_\_\_ admire this.  
Greenbaum's sentence: Some people much ADMIRE (17%)  
valid answers: 21  
Most frequent intensifiers: 3 *definitely*, 3 *really* (each 14.3%), 2 *truly* (9.5%)  
*much* does not occur.

**SENTENCE 23**

Sentence: Some people \_\_\_ enjoy it.  
 Greenbaum's sentence: Some people much ENJOY (11%)  
 valid answers: 22  
 Most frequent 4 *hardly*, 4 *really* (each 18.2%)  
 intensifiers:  
*much* does not occur.

**SENTENCE 24**

Sentence: I \_\_\_ forgot that!  
 Greenbaum's sentence: I completely FORGET (50%)  
 valid answers: 22  
 Most frequent 4 *nearly* (18.2%), 3 *almost*, 3 *completely*, 3  
 intensifiers: *unfortunately* (each 13.6%), 2 *totally* (9.1%)

Adverbs	total	average use/person	% of valid answers
really	104	4.52	19.73
definitely	21	0.91	3.98
absolutely	21	0.91	3.98
deeply	18	0.78	3.42
(nearly)	15	0.65	2.85
truly	15	0.65	2.85
(hardly)	14	0.61	2.66
(never)	13	0.57	2.47
completely	11	0.48	2.09
totally	11	0.48	2.09

**Table 3 (most frequent adverbs in the study)**

The quantitative check against the BNC yielded interesting results. It featured, though, only the two most frequent adverbs of each sentence listed above (cf. table 4).

Some adverb verb combinations occurred twice, they are marked in the last column of table 4, giving the corresponding entry.

Where the results of the questionnaire matched Greenbaum's, only one row is given (3, 4 and 17). Where there are two rows for one sentence, the first one denotes the collocation from Greenbaum, the second one the combination achieved in this test.

<b>S</b>	<b>intensifier</b>	<b>verb</b>	<b>collocations</b>	<b>collocability</b>	<b>double</b>
1	certainly	KNOW	156	0,09	
1	hardly	KNOW	224	0,13	
2	certainly	BE	2222	0,07	
2	really	BE	3458	0,11	3
3	really	BE	3458	0,11	2
4	really	LOVE	175	1,23	
5	badly	NEED	190	0,29	
5	really	NEED	784	1,20	
6	badly	WANT	56	0,06	
6	really	WANT	1507	1,72	8
7	very much	LIKE	76	0,19	
7	really	LIKE	538	1,33	
8	very much	WANT	30	0,03	
8	really	WANT	1507	1,72	6
9	greatly	ADMIRE	52	2,51	
9	deeply	ADMIRE	3	0,14	
10	greatly	ENJOY	43	0,30	
10	really	ENJOY	310	2,18	14
11	entirely	AGREE	78	0,34	18
11	absolutely	AGREE	5	0,02	
12	utterly	HATE	0	0,00	
12	really	HATE	72	1,53	
13	much	ADMIRE	92	4,44	22
13	really	ADMIRE	12	0,58	
14	much	ENJOY	58	0,41	23
14	really	ENJOY	310	2,18	10
15	much	APPRECIATE	119	2,73	
15	really	APPRECIATE	66	1,52	
16	completely	FORGET	84	0,71	24
16	nearly	FORGET	24	0,20	24
17	completely	IGNORE	68	0,96	
18	entirely	AGREE	78	0,34	11
18	totally	AGREE	20	0,09	
19	utterly	DESPISE	0	0,00	
19	really	DESPISE	1	0,16	
20	utterly	HATE	0	0,00	
20	deeply	HATE	1	0,02	
21	much	PREFER	112	1,69	
21	rather	PREFER	7	0,11	

22	much	ADMIRE	92	4,44	13
22	definitely	ADMIRE	0	0,00	
23	much	ENJOY	58	0,41	14
23	hardly	ENJOY	2	0,01	
24	completely	FORGET	84	0,71	16
24	nearly	FORGET	24	0,20	16

**Table 4 (BNC results)**

Though the BNC proved to be very useful, its results have to be examined carefully. For some collocations, the frequency was 0 (*utterly* HATE), though it was listed as a significant collocation twice by Greenbaum.

## 6. Discussion of Results

All the results have to be used critically and carefully, as the sample size was rather small. Normally, a sample size of about 30 people is recommended for L2 research (Dörnyei 2003: 74). Thus, though the results showed a wide variance of proficiency, it is better to attribute them no general significance. They are rather tendencies.

When comparing the results, it has to be observed that there are two factors that hinder a direct comparison: a) the results of Greenbaum come from native speakers of English, while the ones presented here are from ESL learners (the results from Herbst 1996 are too scarce to be a sound basis of comparison). If there are judgements made about the idiomatic quality of some combinations, they rely mostly on the quantitative results from the BNC<sup>10</sup>.

b) The results from Greenbaum aimed at the verb, while in the questionnaire used here the adverb was left open.

As can be inferred from the statistics of the participants, the group mainly consisted of rather proficient speakers of English who tend to use it quite regularly (approximately once a month). Similarly to the few findings of Herbst (1996), the range of answers was very wide. Even the ten most frequent adverbs together amounted to a sum of less than 45% of all valid answers. All of them but one occurred in less than 4% of the valid answers.

---

<sup>10</sup> The risks of such a quantitative approach have been discussed more fully in chapter 2 above.

Only *really* was used exceptionally often. This might be due to a tendency to use a very common adverb fit for most contexts, but could also result from the fact that there was not enough time and distraction between the sentences. However, the difference to the next intensifier is astounding (cf. table 3).

When looking at the individual sentences one sees that none of the given adverbs amounts to more than 47.6% of the given answers, most of them not even 30%. This might be due to the low number of participants, but it suggests that the predictability of collocations is far beyond chance level for German ESL learners.

In 17 of 24 cases, the given verb did not trigger the expected intensifier (according to the sentences from Greenbaum) at all. This might be the case for several reasons:

1. the collocation is monodirectional: the predicate does not trigger the intensifier, only vice versa. This could only be checked if the test was repeated under this aspect with native speakers of English as well.
2. the collocation is genuinely bidirectional, but not for L2 learners. It can be assumed that they know the collocation only in one order, namely that the intensifier comes first and thus triggers the verb. The collocational ties in their mental lexicon then do not seem to be strong enough to reverse this order. This is contradicted, however, by the observation that *really* was chosen by the participants in slots before BE, though many found this awkward, due to its markedness. In these cases they were able to reverse the well-known order and produce a collocation similar to the “native” ones. However, in these cases the intensifier *really* was concerned, which is the most frequent one. It could be hypothesized that German learners rely on it in every case they are unfamiliar or in doubt with.
3. L2 learners of English have no collocation at all reserved for the verb in question. This is more in line with the findings of Herbst (1996). He states that the German students used a far greater variety of answers and sometimes differed up to 55% from the answers given by Greenbaum’s participants. It, too would explain the exceptional high use of the unspecific *really*.



After all, the results were even more varied than Greenbaum's. As roughly sketched in the previous chapter, some verbs seemed to evoke intensifiers of a certain semantic group (for example in sentences 11 and 18: AGREE), others resulted in so many different answers that it is difficult to state anything about their collocability, especially with a sample size that small (for example sentences 9, 13 and 22: ADMIRE). A third group seemed to collocate rather with qualifying adverbs than with intensifiers (sentence 1: KNOW and *hardly* or sentences 16 and 24: FORGET and *nearly*)

The hypothesis formulated in chapter 2 was more or less fulfilled. German ESL learners do indeed rely on a rather unspecified set of intensifiers with open collocations, especially *really*. This adverb yields a higher collocability rate than any other adverb, thus the mostly higher collocability results for the ESL speakers. Careful examination shows, however, that their choice had a lower collocability rate than the native one when other adverbs were chosen, except for sentence 1, where it turned out that *hardly* indeed occurs more frequently with KNOW than *certainly*. It is no intensifier, though.

Summing up, the intensive use of *really* might have several implications:

- 1.) The high number of different verbs and the unspecific semantic meaning of these ADV + V combinations make it doubtful that these are real collocations. There is some evidence that suggest a free combination.
- 2.) If it were collocations, there is some data that suggests that the relation is monodirectional: It is doubtful that all the verbs that elicited *really* should in their turn be chosen by ESL learners if the test followed Greenbaum's construction. A valid answer, however, could only be given if such a test was carried out with German ESL learners.
- 3.) If it were collocations, yet unspecific ones, the plea of Bahns (1997) for more teaching of collocations would be strengthened even more because no bidirectionality has been established.

All the conclusions drawn above can be summed up as such: a systematic use of collocations in speech production and word storage by German ESL users is rather doubtful.

## 7. Conclusion

### 7.1 On collocations

Many participants reported afterwards that they were faced with great difficulty to complete the sentences. “The first thing I thought of was *really*, but I didn’t want to write it all the time” was a sentence encountered quite often.

The results showed that many relied on this adverb nevertheless, and to a significant amount (19.7% of all valid answers).

As already stated more fully above, it can be only concluded that the collocational knowledge of German ESL learners is not as recent literature would like to have it. They seem to rely on combinations that are either rather unspecific or even free combinations.

The works by Bahns do suggest a more focused use of collocations in foreign language teaching and the findings of this paper can only supply this plea.

It has to be said, though, that this concerns only “idiomatic” use of collocations in English. The reception and production is not handicapped or hindered, as the BNC results showed, but they suggest some degree of “un-Englishness” (Marton after Bahns 1997: 65).

To ensure a more systematic use, collocations would have to be taught in such a way that a bidirectional link (where possible) is properly established. The results here suggest that this is not done so far.

There were many aspects of this paper that could only be mentioned in passing but deserved further investigation. First of all, it would seem advisable to repeat the tests on a wider basis (using at least 50 participants), especially in combination with a “reverse order” test where the verbs are left blank to be filled in.

The reversed order test would also make it possible to make some judgements about the directionality of collocations in L2 usage, which might prove useful when considering this problem for teaching.

A more thorough look on the differentiation between collocations and free combinations might be interesting as well.

## **7.2 General aspects of the work**

It was interesting to see how German ESL learners behaved when faced with the problem and to see that it was often far from the ideal depicted in recent literature.

However, many occasions arose where the task threatened to go beyond the scope of this paper and a more detailed evaluation had to be skipped for the sake of clarity. This adds to the impression of a rough sketch and leaves room for further investigations (as depicted briefly above). If this was to be done, some aspects should be considered:

Dörnyei (2003: 63ff) recommends to pre-check a questionnaire to see where misunderstandings or other problems may occur. Due to time pressure and the low rate of possible participants this was not possible. The corrections had thus to be made “on the fly”, as the first participants thankfully pointed out where they had problems (which could be solved, though).

According to Dörnyei the response rate of a survey conducted by mail is “often well below 30%”(Dörnyei 2003: 77). The mail had been sent to 61 people initially, a number of 23 responses equals thus a response rate of 37.7%. The use of the internet as a medium for the questionnaire was thus quite satisfactory (although the response rate might be due to the personal connection of the participants to the researcher). A large number of participants can be reached this way quite easily. Statistically important factors (for example age, sex or educational background) can thus be adhered to sufficiently.

Some things, however, have to be taken into account if a similar work should be done again:

The use of a database deserves thorough planning to avoid unwanted drawbacks or even the loss of data. Otherwise it proved to be rather helpful, as the collected answers could be transferred directly into a form that provided various possibilities to cope with the data.

The reliance on algorithms and programs facilitates the handling of the data further, irrespective of its size (2000 entries can be dealt with as easily as 20). It might even be more economic for larger amounts of data. This, too, needs exact planning and pre-checks to avoid irreparable deterioration or even loss of the data.

As there is no way to ask the researcher himself (except via e-mail, a feature that should be obligatory), the introduction should be precise and clear.

However, the medium does not provide a high degree of control over the way the questionnaire is filled in. Neither can the participant be controlled while taking part, nor can the number or distribution of persons be controlled, as the internet provides too many possibilities to spread the information.

The test has thus to be thoroughly designed and tested to counteract any misunderstandings or even deceptive actions. Checking routines might be applied for example, to make sure that all the required fields have been filled in.

The following proposals concerning concrete improvement for future tasks were raised during the course of the investigation:

To make sure that the mathematical tasks are really filled in, a checking routine could be applied that prevents the user from proceeding to the next sentence before the correct answer is filled in. This means, however, that the test appears to be longer, a factor that might be counterproductive.

The lack of age information should certainly be avoided.

The frequency of usage should discriminate between active (spoken) and passive (reading) usage.

All in all, the results of this paper, however scant they may be, show nevertheless that the use of collocations in ESL learning deserves further concentrated research.

## References

- BAHNS, JENS (1996): *Kollokationen als lexikographisches Problem: Eine Analyse allgemeiner und spezieller Lernerwörterbücher des Englischen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- BAHNS, JENS (1997): *Kollokationen und Wortschatzarbeit im Englischunterricht*. Tübingen: Narr.
- BUSSE, ULRICH (1995): *Kollokationen*. In: Ahrens, Rüdiger et al (ed.): *Handbuch Englisch als Fremdsprache*. Berlin: Schmidt. p. 123-128.
- DE BOT, KEES (1992): *A Bilingual Production Model: Levelt's 'Speaking' Model Adapted*. *Applied Linguistics* 13/1, p. 1 - 24.
- DÖRNYEI, ZOLTÁN (2003): *Questionnaires in Second Language Research. Construction, Administration and Processing*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- GASS, SUSAN M.; SELINKER, LARRY (1994): *Second Language Acquisition. An Introductory Course*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- HERBST, THOMAS (1996): *What are Collocations: Sandy Beaches or False Teeth?* *English Studies* 77/4, p. 379 – 393.
- GREENBAUM, SIDNEY (1970): *Some Verb-Intensifier Collocations in English: an experimental Approach*. The Hague: Mouton.
- LARSEN-FREEMAN, DIANE; LONG, MICHAEL (1991): *An Introduction to SLA Research*. London: Routledge.
- LEVELT, WILLEM J. M. (1989): *Speaking. From intention to Articulation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- NATION, PAUL I. S.(1990): *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary*. New York: Newbury House.
- LEHMANN, HANS MARTIN; HOFFMANN, SEBASTIAN; SCHNEIDER, PETER. "BNC World Edition". *British National Corpus Online Resource*. <<http://www.ub.uni-marburg.de/cgi-bin/bnc/BNCquery.pl?urlTest=yes>>. (5 and 6 august 2004).

## **Anti-Plagiarismus Versicherung**

Ich versichere hiermit, dass ich die vorliegende Arbeit selbständig verfasst, ganz oder in Teilen noch nicht als Prüfungsleistung vorgelegt und keine anderen als die angegebenen Hilfsmittel benutzt habe. Sämtliche Stellen der Arbeit, die benutzten Werken im Wortlaut oder dem Sinn nach entnommen sind, habe ich durch Quellenangaben kenntlich gemacht. Dies gilt auch für Zeichnungen, Skizzen, bildliche Darstellungen und dergleichen, sowie für Quellen aus dem Internet.

**Marburg, den**

.....  
**( Datum )**

.....  
**( Unterschrift )**

Anmerkung: Bei Zuwiderhandlung gilt das Seminar (PS, SE etc.) als nicht bestanden – keine Scheinvergabe.

## Appendix A: List of sentences

- (1) The man \_\_\_ knew it.
- (2) The man \_\_\_ was a genius.
- (3) The child \_\_\_ was clever.
- (4) The child \_\_\_ loved ice-cream.
- (5) I \_\_\_ need a friend.
- (6) I \_\_\_ want it.
- (7) Your friend \_\_\_ liked the show.
- (8) Your friend \_\_\_ wanted to get there.
- (9) They all \_\_\_ admire her.
- (10) They all \_\_\_ enjoyed it.
- (11) I \_\_\_ agree!
- (12) They all \_\_\_ hate it.
- (13) We all \_\_\_ admired this.
- (14) We all \_\_\_ enjoyed the evening.
- (15) We all \_\_\_ appreciate that.
- (16) My friend \_\_\_ forgot that.
- (17) My friend \_\_\_ ignored them.
- (18) My friend \_\_\_ agreed.
- (19) His father \_\_\_ despised him.
- (20) His father \_\_\_ hated that.
- (21) Some people \_\_\_ prefer that.
- (22) Some people \_\_\_ admire this.
- (23) Some people \_\_\_ enjoy it.
- (24) I \_\_\_ forgot that!

## Appendix B: Website printout

### Questionnaire

First of all, let me thank you for participating in this questionnaire!

It will not cost you a lot of time (approximately 5-10 minutes) to fill it in. Just write down the first thing that comes to your mind and that feels right...

Please do not use any dictionaries or thesauruses but rely on your intuition. For the interest of this study **there is no wrong or right...**

In the first section, you will be asked to provide some information about your proficiency of English. You are also asked to fill in your name.

This personal data, however, will **not be stored permanently!** It is only needed to check that there are no doubled entries (maybe due to the fact that you had to redo the site after crash). Your name will be deleted **directly after this check** and even **before any evaluation takes place!** It is thus practically anonymous.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me via e-mail ([PALMEKOPP@GMX.DE](mailto:PALMEKOPP@GMX.DE)).

Thanks again for your help, kind regards,

Dirk Hovy

Proceed to section 1

---

**DIRK HOVY**  
Philipps-Universität Marburg  
Fachbereich 09 - Institut für Anglistik



## Section 1

Please fill in your name and some information about your proficiency of English.  
Personal data will be deleted before the evaluation starts...

**First name:**

**Last name:**

**Age:**

**Sex:**

female      male

**Native language:**

German      other

**How long have you  
been learning  
English (at school  
and other  
institutions like  
university, VHS,  
etc.)?**

approximately  years

**Have you ever been  
to an English-  
speaking country?**

no  
up to 2 weeks  
up to 1 month  
up to 3 months  
up to six months  
up to 1 year  
more than 1 year

**How do you  
estimate your  
knowledge of  
English?**

near-native  
very good  
good  
average  
below average  
poor

**How often do you  
use English?**

almost daily  
once a week  
once a month  
even less

Proceed to section 2

## Section 2

In the following, you will be given 24 short sentences where you are asked to fill in the blanks. The part missing is always an adverb. Please fill in the blanks and solve the mathematical tasks in the given order ...

*Example:*

He  loved her.

1. His father  despised him.

$$17 + 19 = \text{$$

2. The child  loved ice-cream.

$$64 - 22 = \text{$$

3. Your friend  wanted to get there.

$$12 + 11 = \text{$$

4. I  need a friend.

$$10 + 12 = \text{$$

5. The man  knew it.

$$23 + 12 = \text{$$

6. Your friend  liked the show.

$$35 + 1 = \text{$$

7. Some people  admire this.

$$10 + 3 = \text{$$

8. My friend  forgot that.

$16 + 5 = \text{}$

9. I  want it.

$9 + 46 = \text{}$

10. Some people  prefer that.

$99 - 22 = \text{}$

11. We all  admired this.

$20 + 9 = \text{}$

12. My friend  ignored them.

$57 - 35 = \text{}$

13. We all  appreciate that.

$40 + 19 = \text{}$

14. My friend  agreed.

$3 + 11 = \text{}$

15. The child  was clever.

$18 + 18 = \text{}$

16. They all  enjoyed it.

$8 + 24 = \text{}$

17. They all  hate it.

$5 + 17 = \boxed{\phantom{00}}$

18. His father  hated that.

$82 - 10 = \boxed{\phantom{00}}$

19. I  forgot that!

$63 - 33 = \boxed{\phantom{00}}$

20. The man  was a genius.

$68 - 26 = \boxed{\phantom{00}}$

21. Some people  enjoy it.

$11 + 15 = \boxed{\phantom{00}}$

22. I  agree!

$12 + 6 = \boxed{\phantom{00}}$

23. We all  enjoyed the evening.

$77 - 49 = \boxed{\phantom{00}}$

24. They all  admire her.

$17 + 15 = \boxed{\phantom{00}}$

## Thank you!

Thank you for participating in this questionnaire! It has been a great help to me.  
Kind regards,

Dirk Hovy

---

**DIRK HOVY**  
Philipps-Universität Marburg  
Fachbereich 09 - Institut für Anglistik

## Appendix C: List of Participants' Data

Nr	ID	Sex	Language	Learned for X years	Stay abroad	Proficiency	Usage	OSP
1	9	male	German	9.00	2	4	2	9.75
2	6	female	German	11.00	3	4	3	12.25
3	7	male	German	8.00	2	5	4	9.25
4	8	male	German	7.00	2	4	3	8.25
5	12	female	German	8.00	0	4	0	7.00
6	13	female	German	12.00	5	5	4	15.25
7	14	male	German	9.00	1	5	4	9.00
8	15	female	German	8.00	3	5	2	10.25
9	16	male	German	9.00	2	4	4	9.75
10	17	male	German	10.00	3	4	4	11.50
11	18	male	German	7.00	1	3	1	7.00
12	19	female	German	9.00	5	4	3	12.75
13	20	female	German	13.00	6	5	3	17.00
14	21	female	German	8.00	1	3	1	7.75
15	22	male	German	10.00	3	4	4	11.50
16	23	male	German	8.00	2	4	3	9.00
17	24	female	German	9.00	1	4	4	8.75
18	25	female	German	9.00	5	5	2	13.00
19	26	female	German	12.00	1	4	3	11.00
20	28	male	German	6.00	4	4	1	9.50
21	29	male	German	13.00	5	5	3	16.00
22	31	female	German	20.00	6	6	4	34.50
23	32	female	German	7.00	0	1	1	9.50
<b>Average:</b>								
	-	-		9.65	2.74	4.17	2.74	11.72
<b>RMS:</b>								
	-	-		2.96	1.86	0.98	1.25	5.65
<b>Minimum:</b>								
	-	-		6.00	0	1	0	7.00
<b>Maximum:</b>								
	-	-		20.00	6	6	4	34.50

## Appendix D: List of Intensifiers given

ID	itf1	itf2	itf3	itf4	itf5	itf6	itf7	itf8	itf9	itf10	itf11	itf12
6	exactly	really	really	merely	really	really	hardly	dearly	greatly	greatly	hardly	extremely
7	hardly	barely		madly	desperately		hardly	badly		gladly	?do	slightly
8	eventually	really	surprisingly	madly	really	badly	really	finally	honestly	really	finally	really
9	in the rain	probably	?for sure	blindly	never	really	honestly	urgently	wildly	merrily	do	inflammibly
12	never	ever	frequently	daily	sometimes	?previously	always	lonely	always	proudly	proudly	normally
13	already	really	really	really	desperately	really	really	never	absolutely	really	absolutely	really
14	really	really	really	really	really	really	really	really	really	really	really	really
15	hardly	really	really	absolutely	really	really	really	really	deeply	really	absolutely	deeply
16	suddenly	really	?however	really	desperately	definitely	obviously	never	truly	immediately	absolutely	definitely
17	surely	definitely	clearly	really	strongly	urgently	almost	rapidly	deeply	clearly	?friendly	deeply
18	never	likely	never	really	absolutely	necessarily	really	yesterday	warmly	rather	totally	often
19	perfectly	really	obviously	apparently	really	really	extremely	dearly	obviously	hopefully	definitely	really
20	hardly			definitely	never	often	really	really	really	happily	totally	seemingly
21	correctly	?he saw	luckily	really	often	really	luckily	quickly	really	happily	absolutely	terribly
22	hardly	indeed	obviously	obviously	honestly	really	obviously	desperately	?lovefully	happily	happily	desperately
23	always	never	always	childishly	desperately	just	nevertheless	desperately	stupidly	really	absolutely	intensively
24	hardly	definitely		deeply	dearly	definitely	completely	surely	surely	completely	completely	completely
25	instantly	truly	genuinely	generally	dearly	honestly	surprisedly	instantly	instantly	similarly	genuinely	truly
26	exactly	definitely	simply	extremely	really	really	definitely	really	helplessly	really	totally	really
28	really	truly	really	pleasantly	actually	really	really	really	truly	truly	totally	sincerely
29	hopefully	obviously	clearly	deeply	immediately	definitely	definitely	obviously	deeply	intensively	totally	really
31	surely	truly	certainly	definitely	definitely	definitely	really	urgently	greatly	really	fully	profoundly
32	happily	apparently	already	certainly	really	extremely	clearly	confessedly	faithfully	certainly	certainly	really

ID	iff13	iff14	iff15	iff16	iff17	iff18	iff19	iff20	iff21	iff22	iff23	iff24
6	really	extremely	greatly	nearly	completely	kindly	nearly	just	greatly	really	hardly	completely
7	silently	really	really	obviously	almost	sometimes	desperately	usually	always			almost
8	really	truly	deeply	promptly	unconsciously	deeply	obviously	obviously	unfortunately	truly	luckily	unfortunately
9	together	really	promptly	nearly	strictly	friendly	often	unexpectedly?	?also	do	still	?typigly
12	sometimes	lonely	never	stupidly	?thousand times	happily	strongly	?longly	never	strongly	everytime	really
13	certainly	really	generally	absolutely	always	always	really	absolutely	generally	certainly	hardly	completely
14	really	really	really	really	nearly	really	really	really	rather	really	really	almost
15	really	honestly	rather	almost	almost	honestly	really	deeply	rather	deeply	extremely	honestly
16	profoundly	eventually	really	always	?meanwhile	always	thoroughly	?formerly	rather	truly	hardly	regularly
17	deeply	nearly	truly	unfortunately	nearly	constantly	nearly	deeply	hopefully	hopefully	dearly	nearly
18	actually	absolutely	never	never	absolutely	totally	sometimes	absolutely	?admirely	mostly	sometimes	unfortunately
19	definitely	really	mostly	always	mostly	hopefully	mostly	extremely	likely	definitely	kindly	always
20	deeply	seriously	deeply	nearly	completely	generously	always	quietly	hopefully	strangely	hardly	nearly
21	heavily	really	heavenly	unfortunately	simply	totally	desperately	really	always	voluntarily	badly	nearly
22	immediately	hardly	luckily	nearly	coldly	fearfully	finally	obviously	hardly	unfortunately	cheerfully	unfortunately
23	absolutely	definitely	absolutely	almost	?knowingly	happily	clearly	definitely	unwillingly	childishly	never	almost
24	strongly	absolutely	definitely	surely	completely	completely	absolutely	deeply	surprisingly	definitely	heavily	completely
25	continuously	really	really	instantly	commonly	simultaneously	willingly	generally	similarly	definitely	nearly	immediately
26	totally	really	simply	simply	totally	completely	really	absolutely	surprisingly	blindly	really	totally
28	truly	absolutely	actually	nearly	really	totally	actually	sincerely	really	really	really	nearly
29	definitely	absolutely	really	unfortunately	kindly	kindly	deeply	deeply	probably	dearly	really	totally
31	truly	hugely	greatly	unfortunately	simply	gladly	truly	really	certainly	greatly	truly	absolutely
32	entirely	gradually	soon	quickly	entirely	certainly	collaterally	fundamentally	incidentally	grudgingly	unfortunately	quickly