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Data-Driven Learning (DDL), originated from Johns (1990), in which learners approach linguistic data and induce patterns, has shown to be effective in collocation learning. Nevertheless, for the L1 incongruent collocation, the type of collocation that learners have the highest level of difficulty with. most studies focused on learners’ problematic production rather than investigating effective ways to alleviate the problem. Moreover, although researchers have advocated the “eclectic approach” (Chan & Liou, 2005, p. 248), which combines inductive learning with deductive learning via coordination of different resources, including dictionaries and corpus concordance, studies have not examined how the learning effects of combining two approaches differ from each approach respectively. Lastly, whether or not it is needed to provide L1 translation in teaching L1 incongruent collocations has been a contradictory issue. While most scholars suggested the provision of L1 translation in L1 incongruent collocation learning, some scholars argue for the need to help learners build connections between individual words in L2 directly. The current research intends to bridge the gap through comparing the learning outcomes of 15 L1 congruent and 15 L1 incongruent adjective+noun collocations among three Freshman English classes receiving different instructional treatment. The first class, TDL1 (traditional, deductive, L1 translation), are provided L1 translation of the 30 target collocations and conventional matching exercises. The second class, DDLO (data-driven learning only) is required to consult Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) to find the adjective of the target adjective+noun collocation. The third class, DDL1 (data-driven learning plus L1 translation), the combination group, will be asked to consult COCA to find the adjective of the target adjective-noun collocation with the provision of L1 translation of the 30 target collocations. Participants’ evaluation toward different approaches of learning and how their evaluation is related to their learning outcome will be investigated. Data is obtained through (1) learners’ performances: pretest, post-test and delayed post-test and (2) learners’ attitude toward the instruction: questionnaires from 90 students and interviews from 10 students out of each class. A mixed-method approach including quantitative statistics and qualitative analysis based on grounded theory is used to evaluate learners’ performance, attitude and corpus use. Preliminary results show that for L1 congruent collocations, the DDL1 group performs the best followed by the DDLO group. The performance of the inductive TDL1 is the worst. Yet, for L1 incongruent collocations, the DDL1 group still performs the best, but the performance of the DDLO group is the worst and TDL1 is in between the two. It is indicated that while the combination of DDL and L1 translation brings the most learning gains to both L1 congruent and L1 incongruent collocations, the DDL and L1 translation combination varies in its effect in two types of collocations. For L1 congruent collocations, DDL is more effective than the provision of L1 translation; but for L1 incongruent collocations, L1 translation is more important than the provision of DDL.