English Teaching, Vol. 75, No. 3, Autumn 2020, pp. 25-47
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.75.3.202009.25
http://journal.kate.or.kr

A Qualitative Analysis of EFL Learners' Discrimination of Near-Synonyms in a Data-Driven Learning Task

Miso Kim*

Kim, Miso. (2020). A qualitative analysis of EFL learners' discrimination of near-synonyms in a data-driven learning task. *English Teaching, 75*(3), 25-47.

The purpose of this study was to analyze six English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' trajectories of discriminating near-synonyms in a data-driven learning task. Since the learners find it considerably difficult to learn subtle meaning differences of near-synonyms, corpus-based data-driven learning may provide an opportunity for them to tackle their difficulties. The study materials guided the learners to identify the differences between the four pairs of near-synonyms, categorize the concordance lines based on their findings, and generalize the findings. The six participants had notably different trajectories of discriminating near-synonyms. The qualitative analysis of the trajectories showed a tendency that the intermediate learners focused on the meanings and found the correct answer without knowing the core meaning, and the advanced learners moved further to attend to structural differences and sometimes tested their previous knowledge on the concordance data. This study implies the need for careful guidance, collaborative group works, and strategy teaching in data-driven learning tasks.

Key words: near-synonyms, data-driven learning, corpus-based learning, concordance

*Author: Miso Kim, Professor, Center for English as a Lingua Franca, Tamagawa University; 6 Chome-1-1 Tamagawagakuen, Machida, Tokyo 194-8610, Japan; Email: mkim@lab.tamagawa.ac.jp

Received 18 June 2020; Reviewed 28 July 2020; Accepted 9 September 2020

1. INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this study was to analyze the trajectories of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners when discriminating among near-synonyms in corpus-based data-driven learning (DDL) tasks. Although near-synonyms share a core meaning, they differ in nuance and connotation (Inkpen & Hirst, 2006). Discriminating among near-synonyms is challenging for EFL learners, especially where the translated equivalent is the same in their L1. While there is an extensive existing literature on near-synonyms and distinctions (e.g., Hayakawa, 1994; Jung, 2009; Partington, 2004; Xiao & McEnery, 2006), few studies have investigated how students can be helped to use near-synonyms in an appropriate way. Exceptions include studies of Korean EFL learners' use of near-synonyms and semantic prosody by Jung, Sur, and Kim (2007) and Lee (2011). Both report that Korean EFL learners struggle to use near-synonyms appropriately. Against that background, the present study explores the potential of DDL for teaching near-synonyms.

DDL provides ample resources for learners to play the role of researcher—identifying new language-related rules (Johns, 1991, 1994) by exploring concordance data, examining linguistic cues, and drawing conclusions about linguistic items. In the present study, EFL learners used DDL to discover differences between near-synonyms based on concordance lines. To examine learner trajectories, the study addressed the following research questions.

1. How do participants arrive at correct, near-correct, or mistaken answers when they attempt to discriminate near-synonyms by using linguistic cues in concordance lines?
2. How do individuals differ in their use of linguistic evidence to complete the DDL task?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Studies on Near-Synonyms

Word choices reflect the writer's views, attitudes, beliefs, and intentions in choosing a particular word rather than any of the other available options. In making that choice in a given context, the writer considers both the word's core meanings and its connotations, which are not always directly observable (Huston, 2002). In short, both the core and covert meanings of the chosen word convey the writer's intention.

Lexical choice becomes especially difficult in the case of near-synonyms, which share a core meaning but differ slightly. According to Inkpen and Hirst (2006), near-synonyms "are not fully inter-substitutable, but vary in their shades of denotation or connotation, or in

the components of meaning they emphasize; they may also vary in grammatical or collocational constraints" (p. 1). In other words, despite their shared core meaning, each near-synonym has a distinctive meaning that distinguishes it from other words in that category. For example, both *basic* and *fundamental* share the core meaning as *the most essential part of something*. Beyond its core meaning, however, *fundamental* is considered more formal while *basic* has wider application and typically suggests something accepted or standard (Hayakawa, 1994). A corpus search highlights this difference; according to the British National Corpus (BNC) (Davies, 2004), the words *change*, *changes*, *principles*, *principle*, and *importance* typically follow *fundamental*, while *data, rate, principles, training,* and *skills* are the top five collocates for *basic*. Their differing collocates confirm that *fundamental* rather than *basic* is more often used to emphasize deeply grounded principles and the action of change. While this does not preclude the use of phrases such as *basic change*, *fundamental* may more appropriately reflect the writer's intention. In this way, near-synonyms can be seen to have overlapping meanings and are partly interchangeable but non-identical.

As the subtle differences among near-synonyms tend not to be clearly stated, it can be challenging for EFL learners to choose the appropriate word from among several such terms in a given context, especially when their meanings are equivalent in their L1 (Jung, 2009; Morley & Partington, 2009). Existing bilingual dictionaries are not always helpful in such cases, as they emphasize denotation rather than usage (Partington, 1998; Xiao and McEnery, 2006).

To address some of the difficulties faced by EFL learners in this regard, Lee (2011) and Jung, Sur, and Kim (2007) investigated their competence in using semantic prosodies and near-synonyms. Lee (2011) reported that college students lacked knowledge about semantic prosodies, possibly indicating inadequate explanation of this issue in dictionaries and EFL books. Jung, Sur, and Kim (2007) reported that despite an observed positive correlation between English test scores and the ability to make sensitive use of near-synonymous verbs, learners made frequent errors in their use of near-synonyms. These findings confirm that unless special attention is paid to English near-synonyms, learners are likely to know only the core denotational meaning of these terms and not their subtle differences.

The present study explored the application of DDL to a near-synonym discrimination task to determine how learners might be helped to make appropriate use of near-synonyms. Previous cross-linguistic studies of near-synonyms have reported how boundaries drawn between words that share the same core meaning can help EFL learners to understand and fully exploit the connotations of each word. Building on these studies, the present research sought to establish how EFL learners detect these subtle nuances by drawing on the plethora of available linguistic cues in concordance lines, and how they apply their

findings in completing a near-synonym task.

2.2. DDL in Corpus-based Learning Activities

DDL reverses the traditional roles of teachers as deliverers of knowledge and students as receivers. As first proposed by Johns (1991), DDL encourages learners to acquire knowledge by engaging actively in language research and applying their findings within a meaningful context defined by their teacher. This role reversal is facilitated by the use of corpus data in the language classroom to inform learning. Adopting the role of researcher, learners autonomously detect and apply language rules and features by themselves. In this way, DDL offers a new platform for language learning.

Within this model of learning, Johns (1991) outlined a three-step procedure for concordance-based learning research (Identify—Classify—Generalize). Learners first *identify* the distinctive linguistic features of the given items and then *classify* those items on the basis of their findings. Finally, they *generalize* their findings, extending them beyond the given context. Johns (1991) demonstrated the benefits of this procedure for students in terms of how often they moved beyond their current linguistic knowledge and how this approach improved on traditional teacher-centered instruction: "in subsequent discussion it was evident that the class found the student's generalization more useful than the teacher's, not only in relation to the particular problem of *convince vs. persuade*, but as a way of thinking in general about the difference between to-infinitives and that-clauses" (p. 5).

Facilitated by corpus data, this discovery learning approach is reported to have generally positive effects on language learning (Hong, 2010; Hong & Oh, 2008; Lee & Lee, 2010; Lim & Lee, 2012; Liu & Jiang, 2009). Comparing the traditional grammar-translation method to corpus-based teaching, Hong and Oh (2008) and Lim and Lee (2011) found that the latter was generally more effective for advanced students and was positively accepted. Similarly, Hong (2010) reported that while both teaching methods raised awareness of the targeted grammatical rules, the corpus-based method also improved noticing behavior. Liu and Jiang (2009) also noted several positive effects of the corpus-based approach, including improvements in command of lexicogrammar, understanding of grammatical structure, and discovery learning skills. In similar vein, Lee and Lee (2010) reported that discovery learning increased understanding of collocation. In short, DDL can be said to enhance awareness of grammar and collocation, especially among intermediate and advanced students.

Using DDL in the classroom has some limitations. According to Boulton (2009a, 2009b), these include (a) lack of training and resources for both teachers and students; (b) laboriousness and tediousness of DDL tasks; (c) scarcity of published DDL-style activities; and (d) difficulty in interpreting messy and authentic concordance lines. While DDL can

enhance inductive learning of lexicogrammar, these limitations must be taken into account.

Previous research examining the effects of corpus-based learning in quantitative studies involving large samples found evidence of the effectiveness of corpus-based data. However, little is currently known about how EFL learners explore corpus data, what linguistic cues they find, how they formulate and test their own hypotheses, and how they differ in reaching their conclusions. To bridge this gap, the present study used qualitative methods to investigate the trajectories of a relatively small number of learners using corpus data to discover differences between near-synonyms.

3. THE STUDY

3.1. Participants

All of the six participants had more than ten years of English learning experience. Lower-level students (i.e., TOEIC score lower than 730) were not recruited for this study, as previous findings indicate that they are likely to struggle with corpus data (Kim & Lee, 2012; Lee & Lee, 2010). Participants' profiles are summarized in Table 1. For reasons explained in section 4.2 below, S1 took much longer than other participants to complete the task.

TABLE 1

Participant Profiles

Pseudonym	Major	Gender	Occupation	Residence in an English-speaking country	Time spent on the DDL task
S1	Fashion design	Female	Graduate student	6 months	132 min
S2	Accounting	Male	Undergraduate student	None	80 min
S3	Environmental studies	Male	Graduate student	None	72 min
S4	English education	Male	Graduate student	More than 10 years	74 min
S5	English education	Male	Graduate student	None	74 min
S6	English education	Female	Graduate student	None	75 min

3.2. Study Materials and Procedure

For the purposes of this study, four pairs of near-synonyms were chosen that met two criteria. First, the differences between items had previously been studied. Second, the items were assigned the same meaning in a well-known Korean-English dictionary. This was important because EFL learners have greater difficulty in distinguishing between near-

synonyms with the same L1 translation equivalent. Based on these two criteria, the selected pairs were (1) *demand* and *request* (Hayakawa, 1994); (2) *mend* and *repair* (Hayakawa, 1994; Jung, Sur, & Kim, 2007); (3) *outcome* and *consequence* (Hayakawa, 1994; Xiao & McEnery, 2006); and (4) *happen* and *take place* (Hayakawa, 1994; Partington, 2004). All example sentences and questions were taken from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) (Davies, 2008) or from the studies cited above.

Participants worked through the six major sections of study materials (see Appendix A). The first and second sections prepared them to engage with DDL data. The first section checked participants' existing knowledge of the target items, based on literal translation and a fill-the-blanks activity. The second section was a DDL practice session (in Korean) prior to introduction of the corpus data that asked the participant to distinguish between two Korean near-synonyms in example sentences from Naver Korean Dictionary (n.d.). The remaining four sections followed Johns' (1991) DDL procedure (Identify—Classify—Generalize). The materials included concordance lines and questions related to the four target pairs of near-synonyms. To complete the task, participants were asked to discriminate near-synonyms, so providing data that addressed the two research questions. In the third section (the *identify* stage), participants were asked to distinguish the meanings of near-synonyms by reading Key Word In Context (KWIC) concordance lines (25 lines for each word) before writing their responses in the sheet provided. The concordance lines were then grouped into categories based on the differences identified. In the fourth section (the *classify* stage), participants were given eight lines for each word and were asked to match each line to the meanings they had previously identified. The fifth and sixth sections addressed the *generalization* stage. The fifth section involved a fill-the-blanks activity, with four lines for each pair of near-synonyms, and the final section was a free translation activity (with hints). Because of space limitations, Section 3 in Appendix A includes only concordance lines for the first pair (*demand* versus *request*).

Participants completed the task in open public settings that included cafés, seminar rooms, and classrooms; the procedure was one-to-one and audio-recorded. Table 1 shows how much time each participant spent on the task. Immediately after completion of each section, the researcher asked the participant about their reasoning and linguistic evidence. The researcher intervened only if the participant went off-topic or requested translation help. As the purpose of the study was to trace each participant's thinking trajectory and use of linguistic evidence, questions about line translations were accepted.

3.3. Data Analysis

After collecting the participants' response sheets, the researcher transcribed their answers, reasoning, and verbal explanations of the linguistic evidence. The transcripts did

not include the researchers' explanations of the task or any distractions (e.g., off-task chat). As a first step in the analysis, participants' responses regarding near-synonym discrimination were categorized as correct, near-correct, or mistaken, using previous findings about the target items (Hayakawa, 1994; Jung, Sur, & Kim, 2007; Partington, 2004; Xiao & McEnery, 2006) as categorization criteria. The identified differences are summarized in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2

Differences Between the Four Pairs of Near-Synonyms

Near-synonyms	Sources	Differences
demand versus *request*	Hayakawa (1994)	*Demand* is used by a speaker in authority who insists on being obeyed; *request* is considerably weaker and connotes a courteous statement of desire.
mend versus *repair*	Hayakawa (1994); Jung, Sur, and Kim (2007)	*Mend* usually collocates with words related to clothes, social affairs, and parts of a body; *repair* typically collocates with machines and hard objects. However, both can be used for both physical and mental objects.
outcome versus *consequence*	Hayakawa (1994); Xiao and McEnery (2006)	*Outcome* is a general word for a result and is typically used in a positive sense; *consequence* tends to denote a negative result occurring in some logical order.
happen versus *take place*	Hayakawa (1994); Partington (2004)	The main difference between *happen* and *take place* relates to whether the activity was pre-planned or not. *Happen* is more often used to refer to an unintended event while *take place* commonly refers to a planned activity.

Based on these criteria, participants' answers were categorized as correct, near-correct, or mistaken (see Appendix B). After the researcher had categorized the responses, two PhD students majoring in English education and applied linguistics cross-checked the category scheme. In cases of disagreement, the researcher and two inter-raters shared their opinions; if the disagreement was not resolved, they cast a vote to categorize the response. Correct answers were defined as responses that reflected the difference in core meaning (as discussed above) and any other responses confirmed by the concordance data. Partly correct responses were categorized as near-correct; for example, the response "*demand* refers to the macro-perspective (politics, economy, and the like) while *request* refers to personal and more specific situations" was categorized as near-correct because the use of *demand* and *request* in such contexts relates to their differing core meaning. Incorrect answers were those that did not align with the above criteria and were not supported by concordance lines.

After the responses had been categorized, participants' trajectories in arriving at correct, near-correct, and mistaken answers were analyzed. Regarding the first research question, the analysis focused on their use of linguistic cues in concordance lines. To address the

second research question, the analysis compared each participant's trajectory in terms of the evidence they used to identify synonyms.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Correct, Near-Correct, and Mistaken Answers

This section addresses the first research question: "How do participants arrive at correct, near-correct, or mistaken answers when they attempt to discriminate near-synonyms by using linguistic cues in concordance lines?" This section summarizes the results involving correct answers before moving on to near-correct and mistaken answers. A full list of correct, near-correct, and mistaken answers can be found in Appendix B. Because of space limitations, this section reports only selected examples of the participants' responses in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Examples of Correct, Near-Correct, and Mistaken Answers

Category	Answers
Correct answers	1. *Repair* refers to fixing machines and physical objects. (S1, S2, S3) 2. Coincidences or unexpected events follow *happen*; pre-planned activities follow *take place*. (S4, S6)
Near-correct answers	3. *Happen* is used when time and place are vague; *take place* is used when time and place are explicit. (S2, S3) 4. *Repair* refers only to physical objects; *mend* can refer to both physical and mental objects. (S4, S6)
Mistaken answers	5. *Outcome* presupposes input; *consequence* does not. (S2) 6. The cause of an *outcome* is attributable to someone, but a *consequence* has an external cause. (S2) 7. *Wh-words* frequently follow *demand*. (S5) 8. *Mend* means to tidy oneself up. (S6)

As a first observation, the participants drew correct conclusions based on different linguistic cues. For instance, S1, S2, and S3 used different linguistic cues to arrive at the first answer in Table 3. S1 identified the difference between *mend* and *repair* by contrasting collocates (e.g., "living-related" things like fences and walls versus physical objects like bicycles) as in Excerpt 1 below. S2 looked at the physicality of the objects of *repair*, which included bicycles, military equipment, and women, all of which have a physical form. S3 examined the objects of *mend* and *repair* in Excerpt 1 to see whether they had fixed forms. According to S2, *repair* refers to fixing hard things (e.g., machines) while *mend* refers to fixing soft things whose form is more fluid (e.g., clothes). During the

categorization stage, S1 and S3 did not include the human body or people as objects of *repair*, but S2 included them all, saying that all are tangible. At the generalization stage, both S2 and S3 included shoes as objects of *repair*, saying "Well it's ambiguous, but I'll write *repair*." According to BNC (Davies, 2004) and COCA (Davies, 2008), the word *shoes* collocates with both *repair* and *mend*, but strictly speaking, *mend* is the correct answer. As shown, the participants' thinking trajectories and use of linguistic evidence differed slightly even though they all arrived at the correct answer.

Excerpt 1. S1, S2, and S3 explain *mend* versus *repair*

S1: *Mend* is for... living-related things, such as fences, walls, and grounds […] Looking at this (collocates), fence, fences […] they are used for living. In contrast, *repair* fixes […] physical objects, like bicycle, as in this line.

S2: Repair fixes […] physical objects. Bicycles, military equipment […] Woman? Well, it's because it (the line) was from a fiction genre. Anyway, a woman is also a physical object.

S3: *Repair* is […] mostly for machines, looking at the lines, here, machines or things […] *mend* fixes soft things, such as clothes. […] things that don't have fixed forms, like this, which can be stretched, soft things.

In another example, S4 and S6 arrived by differing means at the difference between *happen* and *take place* (second answer in Table 3). S4 began by formulating a hypothesis and then used linguistic cues in the concordance lines to confirm it. In contrast, S6 first examined the linguistic cues before arriving at a conclusion. As illustrated in Excerpt 2, S4 began by hypothesizing that *happen* refers to accidents while *take place* refers to predictable events. He then tested his ambiguous understanding of the differences from the concordance data, examining the objects of *happen* and *take place* to confirm his hypothesis. Unlike S4, S6 first read through the concordance lines and noted the events. Excerpt 2 shows that S6 identified the difference by looking at the collocates of *take place*. Both participants successfully categorized the concordance lines and generalized their findings correctly. However, while both arrived at the correct conclusion, S4's approach was top-down and S6's was bottom-up.

Excerpt 2. S4 and S6 explain *happen* versus *take place*

S4: The sentence *What happened?* makes sense, but *What took place?* is awkward. Thus, *happen* refers to accidental events and connotes surprise. However, *take place* literally has *place*, and a predictable place and time follow *take place*.

S6: *Happen* is used when the event occurs frequently or in the future, so it is

> used if the event happens accidentally. *Take place* collocates with *activity, story, movements,* and *performances*, so I feel that pre-planned events follow *take place*.

The participants arrived at near-correct answers (a) when they failed to examine enough linguistic cues or (b) when they ignored counter-evidence. The former case is exemplified by S2 and S3, who concluded that the time and place of events following *happen* were vague while the opposite was true of *take place* (third answer in Table 3). This answer is near-correct because the vagueness of events relates to the core meaning—that is, whether they are pre-planned. S2 successfully identified the core meaning, but S3 did not. At the beginning of the study, S2 did not know the meaning of *take place* and asked the researcher for the Korean counterpart. He first noticed that *place* in *take place* might be a clue and further explored the differences by looking at the collocates of each expression. He established that the time and place of events following *happen* were vague while the opposite was true of *take place* (i.e., a near-correct answer). He also established that *happen* could be used when events were unplanned, as indicated by the high frequency of the question *What happened?* In contrast, *take place* was seen to refer to more specific events such as trends or human sacrifices. Although he did not know the meaning of *take place*, he discovered this near-correct answer (i.e., vagueness of the event) before successfully identifying the core difference between these two near-synonyms (i.e., pre-plannedness). Like S2, S3 saw that *place* in *take place* might be a linguistic cue: "When it comes to *take place*, the phrase itself has *place*. Contrary to *happen*, *take place* has a noun (place) in it. So the usage is limited. It's so easy." He felt that the events following *take place* had to be specific because of the presence of the word *place*. On that basis, he drew the near-correct conclusion that *happen* refers to vague events while *take place* refers to events that are more concrete. However, S3 also concluded that *take place* relates to space while *happen* relates to time. In categorizing and generalizing this finding, he failed to notice that his conclusion was incorrect.

S4 and S6 ignored counter-evidence in the concordance lines. Both wrote that *repair* is used for physical objects while *mend* is used for both physical and mental objects (fourth answer in Table 3). In fact, both words can be used in both contexts, and the concordance line showed both. In Excerpt 3, S4 noted that *repair* also collocates with mental objects such as relationships and social security. Despite this counter-evidence, he failed to revise his conclusion and moved on. S6 also chose to ignore counter-evidence; in Excerpt 3, she noted that *relationship* was the object of *repair* but still adhered to her original finding. These two cases confirm that, even if learners notice new linguistic cues, they may choose to ignore them and so produce a near-correct answer, as their background knowledge may prevent them from learning a new word (Toro, Pons, Bion, & Sebastián-Gallés, 2011).

Excerpt 3. S4 and S6 neglect the counter-evidence

S4: I originally thought that *repair* is for something like machines while *mend* is for relationships and the like, but the concordance lines look very similar. The meaning difference is smaller than I think. Can I move on?

S6: Although the word *relationship* was used with *repair*, in a general sense, *repair* is for broken physical objects.

Finally, the participants drew mistaken conclusions when they (a) used inappropriate linguistic cues or (b) misinterpreted concordance lines. The former is illustrated by S2 in Excerpt 4 (fifth and sixth answers in Table 3). He understood that *out* in *outcome* is a linguistic cue and concluded that *outcome* refers to the results of someone's action, as in the relationship between *input* and *output*. In relation to *consequence*, he concluded that this refers to results caused by external factors because one concordance line included "economic consequence."

Excerpt 4. S2's mistaken answer

S2: *Consequence* is like, the result might have come from someone's past actions, but it is, like, the result came from external factors. Here, "economic consequence"—I didn't adjust for the economy. But *outcome* is not so; it's not from external factors. […] *Outcome* is related to income. It is related to someone who inputs something, but *consequence* is not related to that.

S5 and S6 produced mistaken answers by misinterpreting concordance lines. S5 concluded that wh- words follow *demand* (seventh answer in Table 3): "*Demand* is used with wh-words, as you see here. But they do not appear in *request*." However, the concordance line included several sentences, and the wh- word was not in the same sentence as *demand*. He noticed his mistake but did not correct his original finding. S6 also produced an incorrect answer as a result of misinterpretation (eighth answer in Table 3). According to her logic, "wearing her glasses and bent over the torn underwear she was mending (the concordance line) […] I feel like she is tidying herself up. So I thought that *mend* is also used in that context." Looking at the full sentence, the object of *mend* was *the torn underwear* rather than *she*. *Mend* in this context referred to fixing the torn underwear rather than to tidying oneself up. Because of this misunderstanding, S6 formed the premature conclusion that *mend* can be used to refer to tidying oneself up.

4.2. Individual Differences in DDL

This section reports findings related to the second research question: "How do individuals differ in their use of linguistic evidence to complete the DDL task?" All of the participants arrived at their findings in different ways; the two main reasons for these individual differences were (a) participants' attention to different aspects of language and (b) their individual problem-solving styles. The instruction was to "find differences between the pair of near-synonyms, such as meaning differences, structural differences, or grammatical differences." In relation to (a), S3 attended exclusively to differences in meaning while S5 focused on structural or grammatical differences in 9 out of 12 answers. Although the researcher explicitly asked S5 to address differences in meaning, he did not change his focus. While S3 and S5 tended to focus on one aspect of the near-synonym pairs, S2 approached the task more flexibly; for example, in exploring the difference between *demand* and *request*, she focused on broad context and structural tendency. However, in the case of *mend* versus *repair*, she shifted her focus to individual word meanings.

When looking at differences in meaning, the participants focused on different aspects of meaning. For example, in exploring the difference between *outcome* and *consequence*, S2 focused on who or what was responsible for the result while S3 sought to determine whether the result was quantifiable. In other words, S2 attended to who produced the result while S3 focused on the result itself. This difference of focus produced different answers. According to S2, "*Outcome* shows a result attributable to someone, and the reason of *consequence* might come from outside." For S3, on the other hand, "*Outcome* refers to quantifiable results, and *consequence* doesn't."

Second, differences in problem-solving style influenced how the participants reached their conclusions. For example, as an intermediate-level participant who had lived in an English-speaking country for six months or so, S1 did not know the meanings of 6 of the 15 words in the first task section. In contrast, S4 had lived in an English-speaking country for more than 10 years and answered everything correctly in the first section. This proficiency gap might seem to suggest that S4 gained more from DDL, but this was not the case. In fact, while S1 was much more willing to revise her conclusions and spent more time on the task, S4 adhered to his original hypotheses. S1 took more than 70 minutes to complete Section 3 and returned to it three times to modify or add findings even after proceeding to the next sections. As she spent more time on the task, she found more evidence or counter-evidence and was the only participant to return to her original finding in this way. As a result, she spent 132 minutes on the DDL task. Excerpt 5 is one example of S1's iterative modification process.

Excerpt 5. S1 iteratively modifies her answer

S1: Ah… I got it. Can I go back and modify it?

Researcher (R): Of course you can.

S1: How do you say it… Wait a minute. So… translation, please.

R: (Looking at a concordance line, "nobody was repairing her") Nobody has soothed her, although she was emotionally broken.

S1: Then, so, it (*mend*) repairs personal relationships, but this (*repair*) fixed a person him/herself. This line (my body has begun to repair) also seems to mean the body fixed him/herself. I felt like that.

R: Then are you going to modify the previous finding? You said *repair* is not used for relationships?

S1: Yes. As for the same person, *mend* means the relationship between people but *repair* fixes the person him/herself.

As the only participant who moved back and forth to revise her original findings, S1 demonstrated her ability to distinguish near-synonyms appropriately by correctly answering all eight questions in Section 6. In contrast, S4's trajectory was quite different. He already had some vague ideas about the differences between the two pairs of near-synonyms. Although he tested the ideas during the DDL task and found counter-evidence, he nevertheless regressed to his original idea. Excerpt 6 is one example of S4's process.

Excerpt 6. S4 reverts to his original idea

S4: Well… I originally thought that their meanings (*mend* and *repair*) are different. But the more I look at it, the more I feel there is no difference […] Can I just write that there is no difference?

R: Yes.

S4: I originally thought that *repair* is for something like machines, and *mend* is for relationships and the like, but the concordance lines look very similar. The meaning difference is smaller than I think. Can I move on?

[15 minutes later]

S4: Can I go back to the previous section and write my feeling about them, because there is nothing? It's just my feeling. *Repair* is for physical things, *mend* is something like… something. […] *mend* can be applied for mental and abstract things, and *repair* is for physical objects. But… see. (concordance lines) *mend fences and walls*…

This excerpt shows that the concordance lines did not support S4's original assumptions about the difference between the two words, but he adhered to his original idea and

neglected counter-evidence (*mend fences and walls*). He ignored the concordance lines and wrote his original idea on the answer sheet. His answers in Sections 5 and 6 show that he failed to notice that *clothes* collocate more with *mend* than *repair*, and he answered incorrectly in both sections. In summary, while S4 used the concordance lines to test his hypothesis and ignored the counter-evidence, S1 based her conclusions on the concordance lines.

5. DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

These six cases of DDL-based near-synonym discrimination raise several important issues. First of all, it is clear that identical linguistic evidence can lead to completely different findings, depending on the learner's reasoning process. For example, both S2 and S3 derived a near-correct answer from the same linguistic evidence (the noun *place* in *take place*). However, by collecting further linguistic evidence that included collocations, S2 was able to establish that *happen* refers to unplanned activities while *take place* refers to activities that are planned. In contrast, S3 focused exclusively on the word *place* in *take place* and wrongly concluded that *happen* relates to time while *take place* relates to space. These cases show that on noticing the same linguistic cue, some learners seek further corroborating evidence while others stop collecting new evidence and reach a premature conclusion. In short, the same linguistic evidence may be differently interpreted, and reliance on one item of evidence may lead to an incorrect conclusion. For that reason, DDL tasks should encourage learners to examine multiple items of evidence or to cross-check their findings.

Second, the study demonstrates that near-correct or mistaken answers may be a consequence of inappropriate or insufficient linguistic cues, neglect of counter-evidence, or misinterpretation of concordance lines. Some linguistic cues need to be substantiated by other cues, as for example in the findings regarding *place* in *take place* (S2, S3). Some linguistic cues may be misleading; for example, *out* in *outcome* is not an antonym of *input*, but S2 reached an inaccurate conclusion by interpreting it in this way. In some cases, participants noted several instances of counter-evidence but were reluctant to revise their previous answers (e.g., S4, S6). Misinterpretation of concordance lines also led to mistaken responses (S5, S6). These cases demonstrate the need for careful guidance regarding which linguistic cues to use, how many cues to use, how to validate conflicting cues, and how to interpret concordance lines.

Finally, DDL may help students to identify differences among near-synonyms, even if they do not know a word's correct meaning or their proficiency level is low. While it is commonly believed that DDL tasks are likely to prove challenging for inexperienced

learners (Boulton, 2009a, 2009b), the present findings show that this approach can be effective for intermediate-level learners. For example, S1 and S2 were unfamiliar with several words at the beginning of the experiment but ultimately succeeded in drawing reasonable conclusions about subtle or nuanced differences as well as superficial meanings and successfully categorized and generalized their findings beyond the given concordance line. In addition, the cases of S1 and S4 show how differences in problem-solving style enable lower-proficiency learners to benefit from DDL by taking the time to examine diverse linguistic cues and iteratively revising their findings.

The limitations of this study include the small sample size (six adult participants with at least intermediate English proficiency) and the limited number of DDL sessions (single one-to-one DDL sessions averaging about 90 minutes duration). For these reasons, the study findings should be interpreted with caution in cases involving younger or lower-proficiency students, or when tasks are completed in a classroom setting, where one teacher is responsible for a group of students for a longer period.

The present results indicate that DDL tasks may assist vocabulary learning, especially when the boundaries between synonyms are unclear. When researching differences in meaning, grammar, or structure, concordance lines provide rich linguistic cues. The following provisions can help to implement DDL tasks more easily and effectively. First, careful guidance and assistance from an instructor or from other learners is likely to produce more refined answers. Specifically, the participants' trajectories suggest that performance was likely to improve if they received guidance, noticed more counter-evidence, took account of other linguistic evidence, and double-checked their findings. In the classroom, guided assistance is likely to help students to notice relevant linguistic cues, to accurately interpret concordance lines, and to draw clear conclusions based on concordance data.

A second implication of these findings is that group work is important for DDL. As participants attended to different aspects of the same concordance data, collaborative activities among peers would facilitate the assembly and cross-checking of different findings and items of evidence. For example, while S1, S2, and S3 tended to focus on meanings, S4, S5, and S6 looked beyond the semantic level to structural and grammatical differences. In addition, while S1, S2, and S3 carefully investigated the linguistic evidence, S4 and S6 tended to reach hasty conclusions, ignoring any counter-evidence. By working together, learners who differ in proficiency and style are likely to detect more linguistic evidence at the levels of meaning, structure, and grammar and to validate their findings from multiple perspectives.

Finally, it seems useful to teach learners about strategies for reading concordance data before attempting a DDL task. For example, as all of these participants needed time to familiarize themselves with the KWIC lines and struggled to interpret them, it would be useful to advise learners to read five lines at a time, attending to three words close to the

node word and referring to overall frequency lists.

6. CONCLUSION

For near-synonyms in L2, especially those sharing the same L1 counterpart, it is challenging for L2 learners to draw appropriate meaning boundaries. To address this issue, the present study employed a corpus-based task based on the three steps of DDL (Identify—Classify—Generalize). In examining concordance data, the six participants all differed in trajectory and problem-solving style. The study confirms the need for further research on the application of DDL from different perspectives. As the focus here was on vocabulary, it would be useful for future qualitative studies to explore grammar-level and other relevant tasks. Investigation of interactions during a group DDL task is also likely to yield new ideas for the practical application of DDL in the classroom.

Applicable levels: Tertiary

REFERENCES

Boulton, A. (2009a). Data-driven learning: Reasonable fears and rational reassurance. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 35*(1), 81-106.

Boulton, A. (2009b). Testing the limits of data-driven learning: Language proficiency and training. *ReCALL, 21*(1), 37-54.

Davies, M. (2004). *British National Corpus (From Oxford University Press)*. Retrieved on September 6, 2020, from https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/

Davies, M. (2008). *The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA): One billion words, 1990-2019*. Retrieved on September 6, 2020, from https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/

Hayakawa, S. I. (Ed.). (1994). *Choose the right word: A contemporary guide to selecting the precise word for every situation* (2nd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Hong, S. C. (2010). EFL learners' consciousness-raising through a corpus-based approach. *English Teaching, 65*(1), 57-86.

Hong, S.-Y., & Oh, S.-Y. (2008). The effects of corpus-based learning of vocabulary and grammar on Korean high-school students. *English Language Teaching, 20*(1), 261-283.

Huston, S. (2002). *Corpora in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inkpen, D. Z., & Hirst, G. (2006). Building and using a lexical knowledge-base of near-synonym differences. *Computational Linguistics, 32*(2), 223-262.

Johns, T. (1991). Should you be persuaded: Two samples of data-driven learning materials. *English Language Research Journal, 4*, 1-16.

Johns, T. (1994). From printout to handout: Grammar and vocabulary teaching in the context of data-driven learning. In T. Odlin (ed.), *Perspectives on pedagogical grammar* (pp. 293-313). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jung, Y. (2009). A corpus-based study on the use of adverb synonyms 'Entirely, Totally, and Wholly'. *Linguistic Research, 26*(2), 85-101.

Jung, Y.-C., Sur, R.-I., & Kim, E. (2007). A corpus-based study of Korean college students' collocation ability of English synonymous verbs. *The New Korean Journal of English Language and Literature, 49*(2), 175-194.

Kim, M., & Lee, J.-H. (2012). An exploratory study on the role of attention in corpus-based English learning. *English Language and Linguistics, 12*(3), 403-423.

Lee, H. J., & Lee, E.-J. (2010). The effects of corpus-based vocabulary tasks on high school students' English vocabulary learning and attitude. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 16*(4), 239-265.

Lee, S. (2011). Semantic prosody in bilingual dictionaries and EFL learners' sentence writings. *English Teaching, 66*(2), 253-272.

Lim, S. Y., & Lee, E.-J. (2012). The effects of the corpus-based grammar tasks on high school students' English grammar learning and attitude. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, 12*(2), 303-325.

Liu, D., & Jiang, P. (2009). Using a corpus-based lexicogrammatical approach to grammar instruction in EFL and ESL contexts. *The Modern Language Journal, 93*, 61-78.

Morley, J., & Partington, A. (2009). A few frequently asked questions about semantic—or evaluative—prosody. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 14*(2), 139-158.

Naver Korean Dictionary. (n.d.) Retrieved on September 15, 2020, from https://ko.dict.naver.com/#/search?range=all&query=%EA%B0%91%EC%A0%88%20%EA%B3%B1%EC%A0%88

Partington, A. (1998). *Patterns and meanings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Partington, A. (2004). "Utterly content in each other's company": Semantic prosody and semantic preference. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 9*(1), 131-156.

Toro, J. M., Pons, F., Bion, R. A. H., Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2011). The contribution of language-specific knowledge in the selection of statistically-coherent word candidates. *Journal of Memory and Language, 64*, 171-180.

Xiao, R., & McEnery, T. (2006). Collocation, semantic prosody, and near synonymy: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(1), 103-129.

APPENDIX A

Study Materials

Section 1. Preliminary Check

Q1) 다음 단어들의 뜻은 무엇입니까? 한글로 편하게 적어 주세요.

1	demand	
2	good	
3	happen	
4	consequence	
5	request	
6	take place	
7	mend	
8	job	
9	confidence	
10	outcome	
11	repair	
12	event	
13	meeting	
14	trust	
15	profession	

Q2) 다음 문장에 알맞은 단어는 위의 단어들 중 무엇입니까?

(1) The guy came to _____ the washing machine.
그 남자는 세탁기를 **고치러** 왔다.

(2) They _____ed that their sons be assigned classes with other black students.
그들은 그들의 아들이 다른 흑인들과 같은 반에 배치되기를 **요구했다.**

(3) These kinds of events are going to _____.
그런 종류의 사건이 **일어날** 예정입니다.

(4) They will seek to _____ divisions caused by the war.
그들은 전쟁으로 야기된 분리를 **고치려고** 할 것이다.

(5) This rapid jump in price is also an unintended _____ of the current policy.
이 급격한 가격의 상승은 현재 정책의 의도되지 않은 **결과**입니다.

(6) They _____ed the surrender of Harris and three other men.
그들은 Harris와 다른 3명의 항복을 **요구했다.**

(7) We, the family, are hopeful for a positive _____.
우리 가족은 긍정적인 **결과**를 바랍니다.

(8) Alarmingly, accidents _____ at brand new pipelines, said Barenboim.
걱정스럽게도, 새로운 파이프라인에 사고가 **일어나고 있다**고 Barenboim이 말했습니다.

Section 2. Warm-up activity

Q1) 다음은 '갑절'과 '곱절'의 예문들을 모아 놓은 것입니다.
다음 예문을 참고하여 '갑절' 과 '곱절' 의 차이를 찾아 주세요.

<갑절>

그의 몸무게는 나보다 **갑절**이나 무겁다.
이곳 집값은 다른 곳의 **갑절**이다.
연휴를 앞둔 토요일이라 서울을 빠져나가기가 **갑절**로 힘들다.
올해 생산량은 지난해보다 **갑절**이나 늘었다.
그 상점은 도매보다 가격을 **갑절**로 비싸게 부른다.

<곱절>

그 상점은 도매보다 가격을 **곱절**로 비싸게 부른다.
생산량이 작년보다 세 **곱절**이나 늘었다.
영농 방식을 이처럼 개선하면 소득이 몇 **곱절** 높아지게 됩니다.
내 나라, 내 백성이 백 **곱절**은 소중하오!
불안스러운 기색을 감추려는 듯 술잔을 비워 내는 속도도 선우 중위보다는 **곱절**이나 더 빨랐다.

Q2) '갑절' 과 '곱절' 의 차이는 무엇이라고 생각하십니까?

Q3) 다음의 빈 칸에는 '갑절' 과 '곱절' 중 무엇이 더 잘 어울릴까요?

- 올해 강원도 내의 해수욕장을 찾은 피서객 수는 지난해의 _____이다.
- 어떤 문제에 부닥치면 나는 미리 남보다 시간을 서너 _____ 투자할 각오를 한다.

Section 3. Concordance lines

명사 동사 형용사 대명사 부사 전치사 고유명사
FIC 소설 MAG 잡지 ACAD 학문적 글 SPOK 대화체 NEWS 뉴스

'demand'

FIC	the china made for an emperor in the twelfth century who	demanded	the glaze be the color of the sky after rain . He
FIC	" Why do you march on my people ? " Edmund	demanded	. " Why did your people attack the citizens of Safe Harbor
MAG	and abusive . If he was demanding of me , he	demanded	that much more from himself . " CURIOSITY " Curiosity is an
FIC	looked up angrily . " Wer sind Sie ? " he	demanded	. Beethoven looked like an unmade bed himself . A shaggy mane
FIC	" Do you know where the girl is ? " Lucien	demanded	, cutting into his musings . # " No , I do
ACAD	. The process was essentially introspective , reflective , and	demanding	in terms of documentation and many cycles of reviewing the data
MAG	prone to get carried away with transforming love-promoting and	demanding	all manner of accomplishments from their children , seeking
MAG	ordinances ; by creating Atlanta 's 25% set-aside programs , and	demanding	that blacks receive a fair share of the $700 million Atlanta
SPOK	American to buy -- they have to buy a product ,	demanding	you buy something . PERINO: So , this is the most amount
MAG	while she was on duty , apparently because they had been	demanding	and troublesome . # Borderlines appear to be very capricious
MAG	. If only he could find the staff to meet the	demand	. # Hoffman figured he needed to at least double the Hoffman
ACAD	when rapid social change creates uncertainty and magnifies the	demand	for secure , stable , unquestioned group identities . They
ACAD	of GDP . But that was after four years of pent-up	demand	followed by unprecedented optimism . By contrast , consumers
MAG	in languages , computer technology and business and created a	demand	for teachers in these areas . 2 . Master technology . Make
NEWS	Barney , worries that the new jobs mean there is strong	demand	for workers , and that will spur wage inflation . Meanwhile ,
MAG	airport 's fast-food restaurants was $7 an hour . # The	demands	of the job also affect performance . Screening duties require
ACAD	and , therefore , doing less to satisfy other more immediate	demands	. Economic growth , in short , in itself imposes opportunity
ACAD	do so in such a subordinate manner -- especially when the	demands	would damage existing group economic benefits and social
FIC	unholy alliance of bureaucratic Ottawa and Indian elites . " The	demands	of Indian organizations , " writes Allard , " provided
NEWS	promising career opportunities ? Increasingly , our economic	demands	on other nations threaten fragile experiments in political
SPOK	From videotape) Democracy is not a free ride . It	demands	more of each of us than any other arrangement . There can
NEWS	state before the Communists came to power . Ethnic Germans	Demand	Justice # " Our action is not political , " said Geza
MAG	" Mars face " angle to the public , which would	demand	action from its elected officials . But Squyres considers such
MAG	competition ; and expanding health care costs that threaten to	demand	a disproportionate amount of the nation 's resources , yet do not
MAG	it to him , Phil Gramm would be the first to	demand	answers . # ILLUSTRATION # PHOTO (COLOR) : PHIL GRAMM

"request"

SPOK	. Anything less is to dishonor them . " And they	requested	that their names be taken off as directors . Mr-STOUT : Correct
FIC	have it in a week or so . And I also	requested	the record of actions dismissed . I 'll bet , sight unseen
MAG	. That 's how complicated the industry has become . We	requested	an aisle seat for you when you wanted a window seat .
NEWS	Saudi involvement were jolted today when a U.S. official , who	requested	anonymity , was asked whether Saudi Arabia and the small Persian
MAG	began teaching gay studies at Amherst College in 1985 , she	requested	that heterosexual students not reveal their sexual identity
ACAD	many athletes reported positive experiences when	requesting	accommodations which accounted for over half (52.0%) of the
NEWS	King and other judges are bracing for an onslaught of parents	requesting	court orders for higher child support payments . " I would guess
SPOK	is an environmental engineering PhD student at LSU . At our	request	, he 's also testing the water for various chemicals . Results
NEWS	. The machines came down from Quilish . At Newmont 's	request	, the ministry withdrew its permit , too . # What remains
NEWS	to speak to the Legislature , at the Governor 's personal	request	. She clenched her notes so tightly in the back of the
FIC	followed was an order rather than a recommendation or an info	request	. " Roger that , " Tomo replied , twisting the valves
ACAD	is implemented on the SCM . # In operation , a	request	for the SHA-1 engine may come either from the CPU via the
FIC	feast . " Sure , " he 'd replied to their	request	without hesitation . If they were coming to his ceremony , he
ACAD	but hardly surprised when the managing committee tabled their	request	for the purchase of a small tractor better suited to small
SPOK	November , 1996 , he is , at the company 's	request	, removed from the Rezulin evaluation . Dr. JOHN GIRIGIAM : I
ACAD	imposed by an order approved by the judge , at the	request	of the police authority or the agency of the Ministerio Publico .
FIC	in an upcoming made-for-TV movie . Henry has been bombarded with	requests	for interviews , but she will talk only to those who have
MAG	that share pirated files with debilitating numbers of download	requests	. # However , defending themselves to the end , downloaders
NEWS	. Daly responded calmly and went on past the moderator 's	requests	to wrap it up . People in the audience started yelling for
NEWS	. The union chief briskly ticks off accounts of workers whose	requests	were squelched by autocratic postmasters or whose grievances
NEWS	guidelines remain ambiguous as companies try to respond to	requests	for rules without incurring liability . Consider the challenge
MAG	level in the TMS and , when it 's low ,	requests	that a new batch be delivered . After a while a pattern
ACAD	American interests so well . We , therefore , respectfully	request	that you maintain support for a vibrant , forwardlooking
FIC	The inn-keeper marks it , showing surprise at Shestan 's #	request	. # # ALI # # You have my word ! Come
FIC	and dumplings . I knowed many a person said they 'd	request	that on their deathbed , but I do n't know any that

Section 4. Grouping concordance lines together

Q1) Section 3에서 찾아낸 단어들 간의 차이점은 무엇이라고 생각합니까?

1	demand	1. 2. 3.
	request	1. 2. 3.
2	mend	1. 2. 3.
	repair	1. 2. 3.
3	outcome	1. 2. 3.
	consequence	1. 2. 3.
4	happen	1. 2. 3.
	take place	1. 2. 3.

Q2) 다음 예문들은 Section 3에 있는 예문 중 일부입니다. Q1에서 찾은 차이점의 번호를 다음 예문들의 왼쪽에 적어서 분류해 보세요.

1) demand vs request

	and abusive. If he was demanding of me, he **demanded** that much more from himself. " CURIOSITY " Curiosity is an
	American to buy -- they have to buy a product, **demanding** you buy something.
	"Why do you march on my people?" Edmund **demanded**. "Why did your people attack the citizens of Safe Harbor
	If only he could find the staff to meet the **demand**. #Hoffman figured he needed to at least double the Hoffman
	in languages, computer technology and business and created a **demand** for teachers in these areas. 2. Master technology
	promising career opportunities? Increasingly, our economic **demands** on other nations threaten fragile experiments in
	"Mars face" angle to the public, which would **demand** action from its elected officials. But Squyres considers such
	it to him, Phil Gramm would be the first to **demand** answers. #ILLUSTRATION # PHOTO (COLOR) : PHIL GRAMM

	Anything less is to dishonor them. And they **requested** that their names be taken off as directors. Mr-STOUT: Correct
	That's how complicated the industry has become. We **requested** an aisle seat for you when you wanted a window seat
	to speak to the Legislature, at the Governor's personal **request**. She clenched her notes so tightly in the back of the
	feast. "Sure," he'd replied to their **request** without hesitation. If they were coming to his ceremony , he
	that share pirated files with debilitating numbers of download **requests**. However, defending themselves to the end
	guidelines remain ambiguous as companies try to respond to **requests** for rules without incurring liability. Consider the
	American interests so well. We, therefore, respectfully **request** that you maintain support for a vibrant, forwardlooking
	Saudi involvement were jolted today when a U.S. official, who **requested** anonymity, was asked whether Saudi Arabia and

2) mend vs repair

	times a year. At the croft on Papa Westray he **mended** walls and fences, even built new outbuildings. He had five
	was her guitar now , she'd had the broken string **mended**. Saying, "It was his own choice. When one
	wearing her glasses and bent over the torn underwear she was **mending**." Your mother's working too hard, " Dad muttered
	called me , and I think our relationship is on the **mend**." Even Wilson admits that getting on with her life wo
	have Jamal Mashburn healthy again and David Wesley on the **mend** from his injuries. The Hornets are a lame-duck team
	academic achievement, whereas chatting and socializing with **mends**, playing games, and the use of Internet Cafs
	first months in office, de la Rua has tried to **mend** relations not only with the international Jewish community
	we can cook food, make candles, start seeds, **mend** the chicken fence, plant the garden or put it to bed

	I remembered Charles in the damp workshop where he **repaired** bicycles for the neighborhood children. He was a mole in
	soap, paper, light bulbs, gasoline, parts for **repairing** military equipment and municipal water pumps , and medicines
	Lady of the Tears is falling to bits and nobody's **repairing** her. It seems she's worth more demolished than standing .
	chemical and electrical processes, was damaged beyond **repair**. But there was life enough in the quijote to gasp
	direct hit. It's one of the few places where **repairs** were finished in time for the first day. (on-camera)
	to a lower altitude, when my body has begun to **repair** itself-then I look at the notes I made during my hours of
	windows in his social studies class because parts needed to **repair** windows that old were too hard to come by .
	watch though, she warns . A laptop was sent for **repair** because a student spilled jello into the keyboard. Leaving the

3) outcome vs consequence

	the world of the no less contemptible insect; but the **outcome** of his legend turns on his redemption through speech
	the war on terror and Hezbollah's bloody history, this **outcome** may not be entirely satisfying.' -- but it is the only
	transitional agreement without any understanding on the final **outcome**. The reason why is quite obvious: Both the
	falls or gets by him. it's probably a different **outcome** to the game. He got away with one there .. "
	Jenkins (2005) tracked the educational and labor market **outcomes** of Washington States basic skills students and found that
	college practitioners examined inequities in students' **outcomes** in developmental education courses. The ways in which
	a whole, contributes to an improvement in intended **outcomes**. An example of research that begins to address these issues
	In other words, the preference for immediate positive **outcomes** becomes dominant, and this may serve the purpose of

	their child 's physical education program. The **consequence** of this lack of information was evident in the marginal position
	achievements. The cost and effort of space travel are a **consequence** of space's being supremely hostile to life. You might
	decrease in difficulty is due to external pressures with little **consequence** given to educational excellence (Altbach , Kelly ,
	the 10% fee for dealing in their territory or suffer the **consequences**. Some gang members, however, are given the option of
	would " have lasting energy security and negative economic **consequences**" for the country. It said "responsible drilling"
	Environmental resources are common property, and the **consequences** of their use are a social problem (Mosler , 1993)
	strikingly with a more infamous example that had fatal **consequences** in England in 1170. When King Henry II said of
	carelessly approaching any bear in the wild can have fatal **consequences**. Because of the precautions that Aumiller and his

4) happen vs take place

	south of town. An accident. "What **happened**?" " I think the operator twisted an ankle or
	mental state, yes. I believe that is exactly what **happened** to her. MANKIEWICZ: That tape doesn't make her sound like
	way of life for him. A lot of good things **happen** to him because he's in shape. "IS MARRIAGE IN
	without having taken the potion. Narr 1: This **happens** more frequently, and then all the time. It was harder
	and dredge it through the ice, you can see what **happens**. I've spread the germs on to the cup and
	health, his life," Riley said. "Whatever **happens** in the future from a basketball standpoint, I don't know
	changing today, and again, I don't see that **happening** in the science world. It's still a very slow and
	her head. "I don't believe that's what **happened**. I don't think you do, either. There was

	other .. But don't forget the development that has **taken place** since then. We did the new measure only after the United
	to Eaccae . (EDITOR 'S NOTE . This story **takes place** about ten years before "Duel for a Dracowolf November 1998
	so to speak, that the events of the book **take place** near a big anti-war demonstration because McEwan uses Henry to
	SARAH-MASTER : This is where the study will be **taking place**. TRACY-SMITH: Some new research out of UCLA shows that
	The social changes that have **taken place** in Algeria since its independence as represented by the spread
	that the background on which all of these trends are **taking place** is the nation. And if the emergence of a self-confident
	Japan . I 'm deeply sorry about the accident that **took place**. Mr. PHILLIPS : Well, who knows whether that took place
	in which resident alcohol consumption behaviors **take place**, a section of the interview investigated various

Section 5. Fill-in-the-blanks activity

Q1) Section 3과 4를 참고하여 다음의 빈 칸에 알맞은 단어를 고르세요. 두 개의 단어가 모두 가능할 수도 있습니다.

< demand vs request >

1. I _____ed the bandleader to play her favorite tune.
2. In so doing, society _____s greater accountability from the coach.
3. There will be plenty of customer _____, even in an economic environment.
4. Farrell didn't respond to the _____ for interviews.

<mend vs repair>

5. Anne asked John if he would _____ the coat himself.
6. It's possible new sign that the economy is on the _____.
7. US President Barack Obama was calling for Argentina to _____ its relationship with the IMF.
8. A woman might choose to _____ zippers or shoes or watches..

<outcome vs consequence>

9. The rise in lung cancers was a(n) _____ of widespread smoking.
10. For a music student the successful _____ is a performance.
11. Willing to tolerate the degree of inflation that was inevitable _____ of full employment.
12. Encouraging patients to participate in treatment decisions leads to better _____s.

<happen vs take place>

13. But a purchase could _____ at any time.
14. The hearing is scheduled to _____ tomorrow morning at eleven.
15. The application process _____ at a staffing office.
16. It _____ to snow that day.

Section 6. Free translation activity

Q1) 다음의 문장을 영어로 번역해 보세요.

1. 그 스폰서는 우리가 그의 법안을 수용하기를 거듭 요구했다.
(The sponsor / take up the bill / repeatedly)

2. 그 비행기 꼬리는 그 제조사에 의해 고쳐졌다.
(The tail of the airplane / the manufacturer)

3. 이라크에서 철수하는 데 대한 결과를 이해하는 것은 모든 미국인들에게 중요하다.
(Pulling out of Iraq / every American / understand)

4. 그러나 교육 이사회는 그 정보를 요구하지 않았다.
(The board of education / the information)

5. 그들은 대부분 TV를 보거나, 신발을 고치거나, 저녁을 먹고 있었다.
(Most of them)

6. 나는 내 가족에 무슨 일이 일어날지 두려웠다.
(would / to my family / be afraid of)

7. 그는 그 결과에 대해 매우 극적으로 기뻐했고, 나도 또한 그랬다.
(extremely / about / as was I)

8. 이 예비선거들은 9/11 기념일 하루 전인 격양된 분위기에서 일어나고 있다.
(These primary elections / 9.11 anniversary / the charged atmosphere / the day before)

연구에 참여해주셔서 진심으로 감사드립니다. "0"

다음은 연구의 분석에 필요 한 정보들입니다. 모든 정보는 익명을 보장하고, 연구 외의 목적으로는 절대로 사용되지 않으니 자연스럽게 답변해 주시길 부탁 드립니다.

1. 귀하의 성별은 무엇입니까?

2. 귀하의 전공은 무엇입니까?

3. TOEIC 공인영어성적이 있으시다면 이 중 어느 정도에 해당합니까?
① 470 - 725 ② 730 - 855 ③ 860 990

만약 TOEIC 시험이 아닐 경우, 대략의 점수를 기입해 주십시오. ( )

4. 자신의 영어실력이 어느 정도라고 생각하십니까? 생각하시는 부분에 체크해 주세요.

(낮음) 1 2 3 4 5 (높음)

APPENDIX B

The Participants' Correct, Near-Correct, and Mistaken Answers

TABLE 1

Correct, Near-Correct, and Mistaken Answers of *Demand* Versus *Request*

Correct answers
1. *Demand* is for referring to quantifiable customer needs but *request* cannot be used in the same way. (S3)
2. *Demand* is stronger than *request*. (S4, S6)
3. *Demand* is both transitive and intransitive but *request* is transitive. (S5)
4. Possessive pronouns frequently precede *request*. (S5)
Near-correct Answers
1. *Demand* refers to the macro-perspective (politics, economy, and the like) while *request* refers to personal and more specific situations. (S1)
Mistaken Answers
1. *Demand* is a noun in "*demand for* + *object*," whereas *request* is used as a phrasal verb in "*request for*." (S4)
2. *Demand* is for listing something, and *request* is for linking things. (S1)
3. *Demand* presupposes that the receiver is not present. *Request* does not. (S2)
4. Wh-words frequently follow *demand*. (S5)
5. *Request* + *that* + *clause* is more frequent than *demand* + *that* + *clause*. (S5)

TABLE 2

Correct, Near-Correct, and Mistaken Answers of *Mend* Versus *Repair*

Correct Answers
1. *Mend* is used in the phrase *on the mend* frequently. (S1, S2)
2. *Repair* refers to fixing machines and physical objects. (S1, S2, S3)
3. The objects of *mend* are soft things (e.g., clothes). (S1, S3)
4. *Mend* is used for fixing personal relationships. (S1)
5. *Mend* is for fixing everyday objects (e.g., fences and walls), whereas *repair* is frequently used for fixing machines. (S1, S5)
Near-correct Answers
1. *Repair* fixes a person's emotion or body. (S1)
2. *Repair* refers only to physical objects; *mend* can be used for both physical and mental objects. (S2, S4, S6)
3. The plural form of *repair* is more frequent than that of *mend*. (S4)
4. *Repair* is used to fix broken things, whereas *mend* is for minor flaws. (S6)
Mistaken Answers
1. *Repair* is exclusively used for fixing physical objects. (S2)
2. Many articles appear before *mend*. (S5)
3. *Mend* means to tidy oneself up. (S6)

TABLE 3

Correct, Near-Correct, and Mistaken Answers of *Outcome* Versus *Consequence*

Correct answers
1. *Outcome* is frequently used when interpreting statistical results. (S1)
2. *Outcome* is less negative than *consequence*, and *consequence* is for negative situations due to some reason. (S1)
3. *Consequence* is used to refer to a predictable and complicated result, but the referents of *outcome* are often unpredictable. (S4)
4. The meaning of *consequence* is stronger than that of *outcome*. (S5)
Near-correct Answers
1. Adjectives before *outcome* have less stronger meanings than adjectives before *consequence*. (S5, S6)
2. *Outcome* includes speculative events. The referents of *outcome* may not have already happened. (S6)
3. *Outcome* is used in academic settings more frequently than *consequence* is. (S3)
Mistaken Answers
1. *Consequence* is frequently used in spoken settings. (S3)
2. *Outcome* presupposes input; *consequence* does not. (S2)
3. The cause of an *outcome* is attributable to someone, but the cause of *consequence* is external. (S2)
4. *Outcome* is for quantifiable results, but *consequence* is not. (S3)
5. Generally, adjectives precede *outcome* and nouns precede *consequence*. (S1)

TABLE 4

Correct, Near-Correct, and Mistaken Answers of *Happen* Versus *Take Place*

Correct Answers
1. The objects of *happen* are unexpected, but those of *take place* are logically predictable. (S2)
2. Coincidences or unexpected events follow *happen*; pre-planned activities follow *take place*. (S4, S6)
3. *What* comes before *happen* frequently. (S5)
4. Spatial prepositions frequently follow *take place*. (S5)
5. The form *happen to* refers to an activity that is experienced by someone. (S5)
Near-correct Answers
1. *Happen* is used when the time and place is vague, and *take place* is used when time and place are explicit. (S2, S3)
2. Sentences that use *happen* have simpler structures than sentences that use *take place*. (S1)
Mistaken Answers
1. Grammatical devices (e.g., modal verbs, present perfect, and wh-words) frequently precede *happen*, whereas adverbs and nouns precede *take place*. (S1)
2. *Happen* is related to time and *take place* is related to space. (S3)
3. *Take place* is used in present progressive forms more frequently than *happen* is. (S5)