

**PÉTER ANTONYI**

## **PHRASAL VERBS: A STUDY AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING METHODS**

**Abstract:** This paper describes a study conducted on the acquisition of phrasal verbs and by the analysis of the data found it seeks to suggest methodological remedies to the numerous kinds of difficulties identified. After discussing the implications for improved teaching efficiency, it also provides a short review of the most influential teaching/practice materials currently in print and examines their treatment of the area with respect to some of the proposed methodological considerations.

### **1 The Study**

*Initial purpose:* This survey is aimed to examine the tendency of students to use phrasal verbs. I consider using phrasal verbs on the part of EFL students as running a risk in the light of the numerous learning problems they impose on the students. Obviously, the likelihood for the students to choose phrasal verbs was naturally quite low as they could freely use language, in which the class of phrasal verbs is only a limited set. Free language use was merely controlled by the context (it was a gap-filling exercise) and the Hungarian translation of the full English text, the latter being an indirect means of encouraging (rarely discouraging) the use of phrasal verbs by deliberate L1 interference imposed on the students.

#### **1.1 Hypothesis**

The study is to demonstrate that, in spite of the factors guiding toward the choice of phrasal verbs, on the whole, students tend to avoid them due to complex learning problems. No doubt that they feel considerably more comfortable and secure choosing simple, mostly latinate, one-part verbs (the usual synonyms for phrasal verbs in textbooks), whose meaning and usage are more evident to them.

The study also meant to point out that avoidance of phrasal verbs is not simply a matter of overall ignorance shown in this field of lexical items. In

fact, it was supposed that relatively good knowledge of phrasal verbs has been given through tuition, but a curious deadlock seems to hinder the switch from passive to active vocabulary. At least one reason for this deadlock could be identified as a general feeling of uncertainty associated with this area.

## 1.2 Subjects

I tested three groups of Hungarian students of English on the use of phrasal verbs. In order to survey a bigger spectrum, I examined two groups of secondary school students and one group of university students. A short description of each group in the chronological order of testing is as follows:

### 1.2.1 Group one

Group one (hereafter G1) numbered *seven secondary school students* of the fourth grade (age: 18). Each holds a certificate of medium level Hungarian State Language Examination in English. This roughly means that they are (upper-) intermediate students of English.

### 1.2.2 Group two

Group two (G2) consisted of *twelve secondary school students* of the third grade (age: 17), only one of them holding a certificate of the language examination mentioned above. Nevertheless, it was an excellent group with some conspicuously sparkling students. Their average level could be determined as intermediate.

### 1.2.3 Group three

Group three (G3) comprised *eighteen first-year university students*. As a matter of fact, English majors are widely presumed to have a good command of English (at least upper-intermediate level). However, this is not always the case because students come to university with considerably varied language backgrounds, ranging from low intermediate to highly advanced level. Basically, an average level, which is quite hard to estimate for a concrete group like this, would probably be upper-intermediate.

## 1.3 Materials and procedures

Basically, I have used a test-sheet that consists of two authentic passages. It was turned to be a gap-filling exercise with the phrasal verbs of interest omitted. The term 'phrasal verb' is used in a broader sense as defined in *Exercises on Phrasal Verbs* by Jennifer Seidl, for, strictly speaking, the

items include some prepositional verbs as well, matching the average language-learner's position who is quite likely to lump these apparently identical categories together, being ignorant of the complicated syntactic background.

The Test Sheet (hereafter TS) contained two different texts, the first one of which being a letter for advice and an answer to it taken from *Bella* magazine, whereas the second one is an extract from *Never Work for a Jerk* by Patricia King, to be precise, I readapted these materials from *Exercises on Phrasal Verbs* by Jennifer Seidl.<sup>15</sup> A kind of balance was struck by using these two extracts since *text one* is a representative of British English while *text two* is of American origin.

TS tested seventeen phrasal verbs also including some phrasal-prepositional verbs (see TS in Appendix A).

In addition to TS, I used an accompanying sheet to test the receptive knowledge (Receptive Test: RT) of phrasal verbs omitted in TS. RT comprised English sentences either to be fully translated into Hungarian or to interpret the underlined phrasal verbs in them (see RT in Appendix C).

As for the actual experiment, all groups, that is, G1, G2, G3 were tested on TS. An essential point to be made here is that none of the groups were told what sort of vocabulary items to concentrate on and each gap could be filled with any number of words of their own choice. However, I did not intend this to be a cloze test, that is, I did not mean to test students' ability to use textual cohesion. In order to put my subjects in a situation where they are surely aware of what they want to express and the focus of interest is rather the choice of language they make, I needed to present them with the Hungarian translation of the texts (see Appendix B).

Each group was given approximately 50 minutes, 35 minutes of which could be devoted to the gap-filling test (TS) leaving the remaining 15 minutes for the passive test (RT) to work on.

#### 1.4 Evaluation and points for analysis

In evaluating TS, I adopted the following system of signs:

- OP – original phrasal verb (the same as in the original text);
- DP – different but appropriate phrasal verb;
- NOP – non-phrasal verb, but correct completion;
- WP – wrong phrasal verb, inappropriate use or non-existent combination;
- W – wrong (non-phrasal verb) completion;

---

<sup>15</sup> Seidl 1990 p. 59, 81

NIL – no answer is given.

The evaluation of RT was not classified further than correct and incorrect answers. The use of DPs in most cases is just as excellent as that of OPs, so it is probably merely accidental that the original texts selected OP and not DP. (Although there are some cases where OP is more suitable, a DP must undoubtedly be acceptable.)

The frequency of NOPs tells a lot about avoidance and ignorance of phrasal verbs, although the translations do not always encourage OP or DP completion. This is inevitable because some phrasal verbs do not translate well into Hungarian 'phrasal verbs'. Wherever I could, I retained analogous structures in the Hungarian translation of TS to help positive L1 interference function although these did not always suggest obvious translation equivalents but rather hinted at the kind of structure to be favoured.

The occurrence of WPs is almost the most interesting area of the analysis since it gives an opportunity to see how Hungarian students of English are apt to guess at certain combinations, largely controlled by L1 interference, that is, using the structural and lexical analogies rooted in their mother tongue when communicating in the target language (L2). It is also an area of immense significance for it is likely to give clues about the potential utilization of positive L1 interference (positive transfer) and about possible ways to develop L2 (target language) intuition.

### 1.5 Receptive Test (RT)

I do not intend to discuss the different kinds of errors found in RT since their purpose was simply testing the receptive knowledge of the phrasal verbs. One might even argue that no errors should be in a test like this because somebody either knows the phrasal verbs in question or not. Actually, I am well aware that this test does not exclude guessing since the phrasal verbs are contextualized and thus, it has come to test the informants' ability to recognize these phrasal verbs.

However, I would rather have *recognition* (receptive knowledge) and the tendency for *production* of phrasal verbs juxtaposed than drafting an unfair list of phrasal verbs out of context and ask about equivalents, when most of them may acquire several (occasionally idiomatic) meanings depending on the context they are used in. Another device to keep successful guessing to a minimum would have been the use of 'atypical' sentences that make clear the particular meaning of the phrasal verb in question but do not allow for

success from sheer guessing. This balance, however, is extremely difficult to strike and there is considerable danger of sentences failing to specify even the desirable meaning and therefore they could well be unfit to detect even receptive knowledge sufficiently. Anyway, guessing, as in natural language use, was allowed to function and created L1 interference errors like 'kitalál'(= *make up*, devise) for *find out* and free association from the sentence like the one with *bottle up* rendered as 'Sokat iszik' ('S/he drinks too much').

Nevertheless, even guessing could not prevent markedly difficult (and unfamiliar) phrasal verbs from being highlighted. For instance, 'get *carried away*' proved to be the trickiest and caused a lot of headache in RT, too.

### 1.6 Results

To show the capacity of the group tested in terms of receptive knowledge and the distribution of answers in the gap-filling exercise the following tables are to be studied:

**Table I.**

	OP	DP	NOP	WP	W	NIL	PT corr.
G	2.8%	6.5%	50.9%	11.1%	21.5%	7.1%	79%

**All tests show that students avoid using phrasal verbs although they know (or recognize) relatively large number of them.** Let us reinforce this finding by a quotation from one of the sources:<sup>16</sup>

Since the phrasal verb structure is a peculiarity of the Germanic languages, it should be the case that the avoidance phenomenon noted in this paper is found generally with regard to learners of English who are native speakers of non-Germanic languages other than Hebrew. The theory advanced here would indeed receive strong support should similar studies done with speakers of other non-Germanic languages confirm our findings.

---

<sup>16</sup> Dagut and Laufer 1985 p. 78

**Another important observation is that they tend to be largely controlled by their native language not only to comprehend but to create phrasal verbs in the target language.**

**Table II. (three classifications)**

	<b>Correct</b>	<b>Incorrect</b>	<b>PhV</b>	<b>Non-PhV</b>	<b>Corr. PhV</b>	<b>Incorr. /Non-PhV</b>
<b>G</b>	<b>60.1%</b>	<b>39.9%</b>	<b>28.2%</b>	<b>71.8%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>90.7%</b>

This demonstrates that a relatively high level of correct performance in general and a good knowledge of phrasal verbs do not necessarily correlate.

## **2 Implications**

As the study has pointed out students clearly tend to avoid using phrasal verbs and feel much more at ease with choosing NOP solutions. The vast influence that L1 interference exerts on the acquisition of phrasal verbs should not be proven any further. In addition, L2 intuition is another important component to direct the production of phrasal verbs mostly, when guesses are made by recalling vague memories of certain combinations (sometimes they are non-existent) that are supposed to convey the desired meaning.

Guessing of some kind was generally the main source in 'creating' phrasal verbs. This study, by principle, cannot determine whether a correct phrasal verb was the result of guessing or not, so it must fall back on WPs to analyse the way guessing works. Studying WPs, however, a simple question arises: which part of the phrasal verb is remembered more successfully in general? The verb or the particle? The present study has evidence both for and against either case, but as it is not the immediate objective of this paper and transfer has the most subtle influence on shaping phrasal verbs, this question needs considerable research to be fairly answered or there might not even be a general answer. Nevertheless, avoidance of phrasal verbs by EFL students and their tremendous frequency in target language use (English) evidently challenges the traditional teaching methods regarding this field of vocabulary.

The traditional methods tended to imply that the verbs randomly select particles and hence, there is no system at all. The most decisive argument against this implicit hypothesis is that people utilize their knowledge of other combinations and inevitably use some sort of analogies when they create

new phrasal verbs. This primarily takes place in slang, science and technical areas. These analogies are often made in a way that the particle remains the same (e.g. *hold on*, *hang on* → *wait on* – recent American version). Moreover, if someone is told to *bog off* (go away), s/he will surely manage to understand it properly, without having the faintest idea of what 'bog' means, since the particle bears the main communicative function. There are, of course, counterexamples, in which the particle adds little to the communicative value. In the examples *dream on*, *go on*, *cry on* etc. it seems to be the verb that carries more weight of meaning and the particle only adds the semantic component of continuity. Surprisingly, this very component makes the particle become the more significant part in the synonyms of 'wait' (see earlier examples) since in that case continuity is the most important semantic feature. A most remarkable example from Hungarian is that with yes/no questions an optional way to answer 'yes' to the question is simply repeating the particle; this obviously confirms its communicative priority over the main verb. Let us go back to a previous example to demonstrate this:

(1) Péter elvitte a levelet?

'Peter away-took the letter?'

Did Peter take away the letter?

Answer: Igen ('yes') or El ('away').

## 2.1 Richard Side's theory

The 'meaning' of the particle, then, might be arrived at by discovering the connections between the environments it occurs in.

Let us take a classification of this kind for *up* after Side:<sup>17</sup>

*Up*, being one of the most commonly used particles, is also one of the most complex. Its areas of meaning can be defined as follows:

**1** General definition: *in an upward direction. Increasing, growing, improving, (or preventing from doing the opposite of these)*. The first part of this definition may be viewed as more literal, the second part as a more metaphorical extension. Examples would include the following:

---

<sup>17</sup> Side 1990 p. 149-150

*Blow up* a balloon  
I was born and *brought up* here  
*Cheer up*!

(...)

Business is *looking up* (= improving)

(...)

**2** General definition: *stopping/completion of act; finality*. Examples would include the following:

We *ended up* in a field  
We must *settle up* (= pay the bill)  
*Shut up*!

(...)

They *beat him up*

(...)

**3** General definition: *for a purpose*. This definition is Alexander's (1988: 339)<sup>18</sup> I must confess I don't like it much as, instinctively, it doesn't seem to fit into the general idea of *up*. However, I cannot think of any alternative of these examples:

*Start a car up*  
*Measure sb up* (for a dress)  
*Learn sth up* (for a test)  
*Call up* your mother (= phone her)

With *up* there are also a number of awkward examples which can only be categorized, if at all, with difficulty. While some people may be happy with *draw up* (a document), *bring up* (a topic for discussion), or *act up* (= behave badly), other

---

<sup>18</sup> Side's reference: Alexander, L.G. 1988. Longman English Grammar. London: Longman

examples such as *turn up* (= arrive), *look sth up* (in a dictionary), *follow up* (= investigate), and *own up* (= confess) seem like square pegs in round holes. At least we can say that such examples form only a small minority.

This theory suggests that learning phrasal verbs would be much more effective if they were grouped according to the particle rather than the verb (e.g. for *up*: *eat up*, *drink up*, *finish up*...). Perhaps a more sophisticated grouping would form various sub-groups to match different meanings of the same particle, as derived in the quotation. However, I must admit that I have no experience about the real efficiency of this method.

## 2.2 Teaching aspect

*Contextualization* is a keyword at presenting any kind of vocabulary, since it proves to be beneficial in many ways. On the one hand, it sets guessing to operate – a basic strategy we pursue in everyday language use (mostly in understanding) and also an excellent device of personalization. On the other hand, it carries information on structural features (e.g. word order, separability) and pragmatic (e. g. register) properties of a given combination, so it is a good way to fix the meaning in the minds of the students more effectively. To sum it up, its purpose is:<sup>19</sup>

To supply groups of words that regularly accompany particular phrasal verbs and that should be learnt in company with them. These groups of words help to limit and define the meaning of a verb.

### 2.2.1 The three Ps

Practically, after a contextualized *presentation*, the teacher can make the students guess what the approximate meaning of a given phrasal verb is. This should always precede the drilling stage to avoid mechanical drilling in favour of meaningful drills. The *practice* stage may consist of choral drilling followed by group drilling, finally getting to drilling in pairs. Here the teacher might want to employ different sort of substitution drills that make the meaning even clearer by providing additional contexts. As for a possible *production* stage we might imagine a groupwork activity in which the students contrive situations employing the given phrasal verb to be acted out

---

<sup>19</sup> Mortimer 1972 p. iii (intro.)

before the class. This is to enhance creative use and to prompt personalization – an idiosyncratic approach to what is to be learnt.

### 2.2.2 Switch from receptive to active knowledge

To trigger off a better recall 'path' in the students we should help them learn to systematize the new items ready for memorization. Adding new phrasal verbs to lists is strongly recommended. This can be done either according to the particle or with respect to their relation to L1, that is, whether they are *identical*, *similar*, or *different* as compared to their approximate counterparts in L1.<sup>20</sup> Also – as with any kind of vocabulary – it is advisable to form semantic fields (lists as *walk*, *stagger*, *tread* etc.) in which the organising principle is one prominent semantic component that all the items share. It is also advisable to present phrasal verbs according to specific situations, circumstances, activities, professions etc. they are used in (e.g. travel, motoring, telephoning, banking etc.). In my opinion, however, out of the first two ways, the second type of listing will benefit the students more in the long run since they can always fall back on their L1 knowledge in remembering a combination. The 'hazy' meanings of the particle may prove to be helpful only for rather highly advanced students, who presumably have a command of the language good enough to enable them not only to tell one meaning from another, but to work out the right placement for a newly-learnt phrasal verb. Whether it will help them to recall a combination better or not is another question but – as my experience shows – it surely will with the kind of listing Irujo proposed.

### 2.2.3 Making use of positive interference

Another important task is to exhaust L1 interference, which has been demonstrated to be of immense importance in the acquisition of phrasal verbs. Not only is the comprehension of phrasal verbs controlled largely by transfer but their production is often carried out by using L1 patterns. To make use of the latter, lists should be compiled selecting *identical*, *similar* and *different* phrasal verbs, as mentioned before – although originally devised for use with idioms – the idea can be extended to phrasal verbs since a great many of them are idiomatic. We can manage to draft these lists by comparing a phrasal verb to the corresponding construction in the native language, in the case of Hungarian verbs with prefixes. To illustrate this, example lists for Hungarian have been given in Appendix D. Now, I would argue with Irujo at this point for I do not think that these lists might be used at the presentation stage since this would lead to memorization of isolated

---

<sup>20</sup> Irujo 1986 p. 297-300

lexical items. However, no doubt that they can be put to use successfully when it comes to systematization (arrangement) of items already presented. It is perhaps a good idea to make the students judge which list a certain phrasal verb belongs to hoping that it would guide them so as to achieve an intuition on transferability eventually.

#### 2.2.4 Developing intuition in L2

This is an ability which could be called L2 intuition and – to describe it simply – by this I understand the learner's potential to decide whether something 'sounds right' in L2. To put it more formally, it is the ability to suspect that an utterance is not only grammatical but it also suits the overall concept structure of the target language, that is, it would not strike a native speaker as though grammatical but indisputably outlandish language use. This ability, naturally, presupposes an advanced user since this kind of 'hang' for the language may solely be built on knowledge of analogies. A speaker can take advantage of L2 intuition especially with phrasal verbs, both at the comprehension and the 'creation' of unknown items, if we bear in mind that new combinations do not randomly come to existence but by the instinctive and unconscious application of the same analogies by natives. To develop L2 intuition we might consider going on to exercises on nominalized and adjectival forms either after having presented the phrasal verbs from which they are derived or for more advanced students it can be 'off hands' exercises without ensuring that the phrasal verbs used have already been introduced.

#### 2.2.5 Teaching idiomatic combinations

As for idiomatic combinations, this is the area most crucially demanding a traditional teaching approach (if any in particular) to be revised, or methodological negligence to be lifted since along with definitely poorer knowledge of these phrasal verbs, an additional uncertainty as to appropriacy (pragmatic properties) can be found. Perhaps this uncertainty accounts for a higher rate of avoidance with idiomatic phrasal verbs stated by the quotation:<sup>21</sup>

... the result is always the same: the majority of learners will prefer the one-word verb and avoid using the semantically equivalent phrasal verb. This avoidance is most evident with *figurative* phrasal verbs-where it is much more frequent than in the case of *literal* or *completive* phrasal verbs.

---

<sup>21</sup> Dagut and Laufer 1985 p. 77

Plenty of games, puzzles and fun activities could be used here, including making up humorous situations or jokes that display a misunderstanding stemming from the difference between the idiomatic and the literal meaning of a certain combination. In order to pursue the same objective, exercises as matching cartoons and captions, drawing/acting out literal or idiomatic meanings etc. could be adopted. The most extraordinary thing about these activities is that they *personalize* the acquisition of these items and by doing so, they undoubtedly make it much more effective.

### 2.3 A short review of some (exercise) books

Finally, a word is given to some (mostly recent) books on phrasal verbs with the view of the new approach in mind. The oldest of them, *Phrasal Verbs in conversation* by Colin Mortimer, lists phrasal verbs in the old fashion (according to verbs) but contextualizes them perfectly:<sup>22</sup>

Each conversation attempts to present a dramatic and developing situation with economy of words, and with some attention to compelling rhythmical and stylistic patterning. The situations are fairly adult and are based particularly on the workings of human nature—a powerful source of motivation in language learning that has often been left untapped in language teaching materials.

*English Idioms* by Jennifer Seidl and W. McMordie has a single chapter on phrasal verbs in the form of a dictionary (according to verbs), but it classifies them in semantic fields like business, motoring, telephoning etc. in other sections of the book which is a commendable example.

One of the accompanying exercise books of the latter, *Exercises on Phrasal Verbs* by Jennifer Seidl uses authentic material and contains plenty of witty jokes, cartoons and puzzles, but occasionally it falls into the trap of presentation out of context. However, its most remarkable merits are that it concentrates on nominalized forms,<sup>23</sup> too, and lists similar pairs of phrasal verbs with different meanings.

*Test your Phrasal Verbs* by Jake Allsop combines the traditional and the new approach to the area in that it presents phrasal verbs both according to

---

<sup>22</sup> Mortimer 1972 p. iii (intro.)

<sup>23</sup> Seidl 1990 p. 33

the main verb and the particle. It maintains a considerably high level of contextualization throughout. In addition, it deals with nominalized and adjectival derivatives and provides some excellent exercises for more advanced students as well e.g. headline-correction tasks prove to be a real challenge that also unleashes L2 intuition ('guessing') strategies and in so doing they are extremely useful from a methodological angle. On the whole, this book turns learning phrasal verbs into sheer fun by including exercises of great variety.

As a final word, we can say that the field of English phrasal verbs definitely deserves further research and will undoubtedly continue to be a fascinating challenge both for scholars and language learners wishing to master their actual linguistic skills.

## References

- Allsop, J *Test your Phrasal Verbs*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1990.
- Dagut, M and B Laufer 'Avoidance of Phrasal Verbs-A Case for Contrastive Analysis', *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 7/1, 1985. p. 73–79.
- Irujo, S 'Don't Put Your Leg in Your Mouth: Transfer in the Acquisition of Idioms in a Second Language.', *TESOL QUARTERLY*. 20/2, 1986. p. 287–303.
- Mortimer, C *Phrasal verbs in conversation*. Harlow, Longman Group Limited, 1972.
- Seidl, J *Exercises on phrasal verbs*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Seidl, J and W McMordie *English Idioms*. (Fifth Edition) Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Side, R 'Phrasal verbs: sorting them out.', *English Language Teaching Journal*. 44/2, 1990. p. 144–152.

## Appendices

### Appendix A

Fill in the blanks as you like with the help of the translation you are given! You can use any number of words for each slot! However, please do not cut out the fixed text!

## TEXT I

### LETTER:

I have done something very silly and I don't know what to do. The other day, I had lunch in a café I often use, but when it came to paying the bill, I discovered that I had forgotten my purse. I was too embarrassed to say anything, so I just \_\_\_\_\_(1) without paying. Now I haven't got the nerve to go back, in case I'm arrested. I'm terrified that it will all \_\_\_\_\_(2) and I will \_\_\_\_\_(3) in court and lose my job.

### ANSWER:

You were very silly to \_\_\_\_\_(4) like that. Whyever didn't you just explain you would pay later? They might have asked you for some identification and your name and address, but that's all. Now you have laid yourself open to the charge of 'making off without payment' contrary to section three of the Theft Act 1968. This is committed where a person \_\_\_\_\_(5) without paying intending never to pay. You would do well to go back to the café, explain what happened, apologize and \_\_\_\_\_(6) . If you feel that you can't do that, at least send the money by post with a covering letter.

## TEXT II

If you're having problems with a difficult boss, first of all you need to talk to her. She may not know you are having trouble. By \_\_\_\_\_(7) such a meeting while \_\_\_\_\_(8) your feelings, you could \_\_\_\_\_(9) as an irrational person when you finally confront her. No one, least of all management, wants to listen to hysterical complaints. Before you speak with your supervisor, prepare your approach. Make sure your requests are valid. For example, if you want a bigger office, \_\_\_\_\_(10) whether one is actually available. Are your expectations realistic? Try to anticipate any objections your boss may \_\_\_\_\_(11). Think positive. \_\_\_\_\_(12) the meeting in your mind and anticipate how your boss will react. Plan how you'll \_\_\_\_\_(13) negative responses, so you can maintain a positive attitude overall. Be very specific about what you want. For example, 'better communication' is not a clear objective. Neither is merely wanting a raise. If you ask for a raise and your boss says yes, you may \_\_\_\_\_(14) with \$1.50 more a week. A little background is probably necessary to frame your problem, but don't get \_\_\_\_\_(15) with long-winded speeches. Use all the communication skills you have to get the best response from your boss.

Use the most straightforward methods you can in \_\_\_\_\_(16) your boss. Come out of the meeting with a plan of action. Set a date for another conference, and make these meetings seem like business as usual. If you call a meeting only when something \_\_\_\_\_(17) , you will be seen as a complainer.

**Appendix B**  
**(Hungarian translation of TS)**

**ELSŐ SZÖVEG**

**LEVÉL:**

Valami nagy hülyeséget csináltam, és nem tudom, mitévő legyek. Valamelyik nap ebédeltem egy kávéházban, ahová gyakran járok, és mikor fizetésre került a sor, rájöttem, hogy nincs nálam a pénztárcám. Túlzottan zavarban voltam, hogy magyarázkodjak, Így egyszerűen ellógtam fizetés nélkül. Mostmár nincs bátorságom visszamenni, mert még letartóztatnak. Nagyon félek, hogy minden ki fog derülni és a bíróságon találom magam, és elveszítem az állásomat.

**VÁLASZ:**

Tényleg nagy butaság volt így kerekelt oldania. Miért nem magyarázta meg egyszerűen, hogy később fog fizetni. Biztosan elkérték volna a papírjait, a nevét és a címét, de semmi több. Így az 1968-as, vagyon elleni bűncselekményekkel foglalkozó törvény harmadik cikkelyébe ütköző, „fizetés nélkül való távozás” vádjával illethető. Ezt az ember akkor követi el, ha fizetés nélkül távozik, és soha nem is áll szándékában fizetni. Okosan tenné, ha visszamenne a kávéházba, elmagyarázná, mi történt, elnézést kérne, és fizetne. Hogyha úgy érzi, hogy ezt nem képes megtenni, legalább küldje el a pénzt postán, egy levél kíséretében.

**MÁSODIK SZÖVEG**

Ha problémáid akadnak a főnököddel, először is beszélned kell vele. Lehet, hogy nem is tudja, mi bajod van. Azáltal, hogy halogatod az ilyen beszélgetést, miközben az indulataidat elfojtod, könnyen hülyének nézhetnek, mikor végül összeütközésbe kerülsz vele. Senki sem szeret hisztériás panaszkodást hallgatni, legkevésbé a főnökök. Mielőtt beszélsz a feletteseddel, készíts tervet. Győződj meg arról, hogy a kéréseid teljesíthetők. Például, ha nagyobb irodát akarsz, nézz utána, hogy egyáltalán rendelkezésre áll-e ilyen. Reálisak az elvárásaid? Próbáld elképzelni minden

ellenvetést, amellyel a főnököd előhozakodhat. Gondolkodj pozitív módon! Képzetben játszd le a beszélgetést, és próbáld megsejteni a főnököd reakcióit. Tervezd meg, mit fogsz lépni a negatív válaszokra, hogy végéig tudd tartani a pozitív hozzáállást. Konkrétan mondd meg, mit akarsz. Például a „jobb párbeszéd” kialakítása nem tekinthető konkrét célnak. Az sem, hogy pusztán fizetésemelést akarsz. Ha fizetésemelést kérsz, és a főnököd igent mond, lehet, hogy heti \$1.50 emeléssel kell beéred. Egy kis bevezetésre szükség van, hogy előadd a problémádat, de ne ragadd meg magad hosszú szónoklatokra. Vesd latba az összes kommunikációs képességedet, hogy a legkedvezőbb választ csald ki a főnöködből. A legcélravezetőbb módszereket válaszd, amikor a főnököddel tárgyalasz. Beszélj meg vele egy másik találkozóval, és tégy úgy, mintha mi sem lenne természetesebb, minthogy időnként tárgyaltok. Ha csak akkor beszélsz vele, ha valami nincs rendben, elégedetlenkedőnek fognak tartani.

## Appendix C

Give the meanings of the underlined phrases or translate the following sentences!

- (1) My car always *breaks down* when I'm about to set off for a journey so I usually take a train.
- (2) I'm not really used to *dealing with* kids.
- (3) John was *carried away* with hatred for his mother-in-law.
- (4) Let's *wind up* the meeting, it's getting late.
- (5) We had *gone over* the play several times before we performed it.
- (6) He kept *bringing up* unimportant matters, which annoyed me.
- (7) I couldn't *find out* more about the murderer.
- (8) If you continue to behave like this, you would *come across* as an idiot.
- (9) Don't *bottle up* your anger because it's bad for your health!
- (10) By the time the police arrived, the thief had *made off*.
- (11) If you don't slow down, you'll *end up* in hospital.
- (12) Finally all the illegal business of the company *came out* and the case was taken to court.
- (13) He never *pays up* in time so I've decided not to give him credit anymore.
- (14) George *slipped out* unnoticed, taking a silver spoon with him.
- (15) The meeting has been *put off* till tomorrow.

## Appendix D

**Some 'identical' phrasal verbs (+ transfer):** *catch out, hold up, give up, pick up, count on, cut in, go into, go on, go through, grow up, call back, pile up, look up to, move out, think over, help out, keep up, see through sth, settle down, speed up, slow down, stand by, wake up, write down, answer back, bring sth up, calm down, deal with, turn off etc.*

**Some similar phrasal verbs [(p)='particle' is identical, (v)=verb is identical]:** *take on (v), talk into (v), try on (v), back out (v), break down (p), change down (v), crop up (p), cut out (p), turn out (p), work out (p), come off (v), bring sb up (p), finish off (v), find out (p), make off (p), take sb in (p), get up (p), dress up (v) etc.*

**Some different phrasal verbs:** *carry on, catch up with, stamp out, call off, call on, turn up, turn in, put up with, turn down, drop by, drop off, fall through, see sb through, own up, make up, fall behind, strike up, etc.*

