Chapter One: Introduction

1.0 Overview :

In English language, the term “collocation “has been generally used to refer to a phenomenon in English whereby a lexical item tends to keep company with other words. Thus, “heavy” collocates with “rain”, “fog”, “meal”, “traffic”, “sleep”, “industry” and “smoke”. Besides, using correct collocation will make English sounds more natural, and more like a native speakers’ of English .It has been known as one ways that differentiate native speakers and second language learners.

1.1 The statement of the problem:

The correct use of collocation no doubt will make students speak like native speakers, and wrong use collocation may lead to misunderstanding in both speaking and writing .Therefore, the researcher attempts to investigate the learners use and understanding of collocation.

1.2 The objectives of the study:

The main objective of this study is to explain the learners use and understanding of collocation. Since collocations are largely ignored by the syllabus designers in curriculum at university. Consequently, English language learners need to be aware of the importance of collocation in mastering language. Therefore, there will be a test for fourth year students- Sudan University of science and technology major English language use and understanding of collocation. The objectives of the study can be categorized as follows:

1) Finding ways that enable English learners to use collocations repeatedly in mastering English language.

2) Explain the advantages of understanding collocations in a full and accurate way to help the learners achieve native-like fluency.

1.3 The research questions:

This study attempts to investigate the use and understanding of collocation through addressing the following questions:

1. Do English language learners use collocation?

2.To what extent do English language learners understand collocation?

1.4 Research Hypotheses:

The study attempts to confirm or negate the following hypotheses:

1. Learners use collocation correctly to some extent.

2. Learners understand collocation perfectly.

1.5 The Significance of the Study:

The importance of the study comes from the fact that many learners of English find it difficult to master collocation. Whereas, it is a key in understanding English language .Besides, the second language learners who study collocation deeply their language will turn to be native-like.

1.6 The Methodology of the study:

The method used in this research will be analytical and descriptive.

1.7 The limits of The Study:

The research attempts to shed lights on English learners use and understanding of collocation. And exclusively to the fourth level English language students of Sudan university of science and technology – year 2015.

Chapter two

Literature Review

:Introduction 2.0

Collocation comes from two Latin words, the words cum (with) and the word locus (place), (Singleton 2000) . The main objective of the study is that the research will investigate use and understanding of collocation. To see how Sudan university of science and technology, fourth year students' majoring in English understand and use collocation. As matter of fact, learning collocation is essential for the students to master English language, because it helps learner to speak and write English language in a more natural and accurate way. People will probably understand what you mean if you talk about making a crime or say there is very hard rain this morning, but your language will sound unnatural and might perhaps confused. Besides, learning collocation will also help students to increase the range of their English vocabularies.

2.1 ***What is collocation***?

a) Collocation means a “natural combination of words; it refers to the way English words are closely associated with others”. For example, pay and attention go together, as do commit and crime; blond goes with hair and heavy with rain. (Odell and McCarthy 2008).

b) The phenomenon of words keeping company together is referred to as collocation (Singleton 2000).

c) Our knowledge of language is not only formed by the knowledge of the words themselves, or the relations that hold between them in a sentence (or utterance). It is also formed by the words which tend to occur with some words, but not with different ones. This aspect of language is called ‘collocation’ and it was described as “habitual association of words” (Bolinger and Sears 1981).

c) A collocation is a pair or group of words that are often used together. These combinations sound natural to native speakers, but students of English language have to make a special effort to learn them because they are often difficult to guess. Some combinations just sound “wrong” to native speakers of English language. e.g. the adjective fast collocates with cars, but not with a glance. (Odell and McCarthy 2008).

d) Words which form collocations are repeatedly ‘placed with’ each other; that is to say, they often co-occur within a short distance of each other in speech and in written texts.

e) One way we seem to organize our knowledge of words is simply on the basis of collocation, or frequently occurring together.(Yule 2006).

e) Collocation is not simply a matter of association of ideas, for although milk is white, we should not often say white milk, though the expression white paint is common enough(Palmer 1981). He

also mentions some of collective words which prove the unpredictability of collocation; flock of sheep, herd of cows, school of whales or pride of lions. In addition, he also examines the adjectives abnormal and exceptional to prove that they may have more specific meanings in some collocations. One adjective may replace another without any change of meaning in occurrence with some nouns, such as abnormal/exceptional weather (when temperature is unusually high). But, when it collocates with child (noun), the adjective slightly different meaning; exceptional child suggests that the child is of great ability. While, abnormal child relates to some kind of defect.

2.2 **Why Learning Collocations**?

Learning collocations is a good idea for the following reasons:

a) It gives the most natural way to say something: smoking **is strictly forbidden** is more natural than smoking is **strongly forbidden**.

b) Gives the learner alternative ways of saying something, which may be more colorful/expressive or more precise: instead of repeating, it was ***very*** cold and **very** dark, we can say it was **bitterly** cold **and pi*tch*** dark.

d) Improve one style in writing: instead of saying poverty ***causes crime***, one can say poverty ***breeds crime***; instead of saying a ***big meal*** you can say ***substantial meal***. Learner may not need or want to use these informal conversations, but in writing they can give the text more variety and make it read better.

e) Use the words more accurately, in other words, you will ***make*** (NOT do) fewer ***mistakes***.

2.3 **Grammatical categories of collocation**

Grammatical collocation can be categorized as follows:

a)Verb + noun

- Our lawyer ***drew up a contract*** for us to sign.

- I didn’t want to ***pass up the chance*** of seeing Hong Kong, so I agreed to go on the trip.

- The police officers vest ***can withstand the impact*** of a bullet.

b) Noun + verb

- An ***opportunity arose*** for me to work in China, so I went and spent a year there.

- People feel educational ***standards slipped*** when the government cut finances.

- The ***economy boomed*** in the 1990s.

c) Noun + noun

- There has been ***a spate of attacks/thefts*** in our area recently.

- The minister had to put up with ***a barrage of questions/insults*** from the angry audience.

- She gave me ***a snippet of information*** which is top secret.

d) Adjective + noun

- This is not an ***idle threat***; I will call the police if this happens again.

- He waited in the ***vain hope*** that the minister would meet him.

- The ***simple/plain truth*** is that no one was aware of the problem.

e) Adverb + adjective

- The article provides an ***intensely personal*** account of the writer’s relationship with his sons.

- Joe’s sister was ***a stunningly attractive*** woman.

- They are ***happily married***.

f) Verb + adverb

- The teenager tried to persuade his mother that he was innocent but he ***failed miserably***.

- I didn't like to travel with my brother because he ***drives recklessly***.

- She ***pulled steadily*** on the rope and helped him to safety.

g)More complex collocation

- Mary was looking forward to retiring and ***taking it easy for a while***.

- Its time you ***put the past behind you*** and started focusing on the future.

2.4 **Collocatinal range**

Collocation range is defined by (palmer 1996, p.79) a "word may be used with a whole set of words that have the same semantic features in common". Whereas, (Singleton 2000,p.49) definition is the term "used to refer to different patterns of combinability". Even the most casual reflection on the way in which we put words together in the languages we know will lead us to an awareness of the fact that some words enter into a great number and variety of lexical partnerships, whereas other words are, as it were, a great deal more 'choosy' about the combinations they become involved with. At the many-partnered end the scale is, for example, the English word *nice. The list of items with which this word frequently co-occurs seems to be almost endless; the following is a tiny example of the vast array of nice collocations:*

Nice body, nice day, nice food, nice house, nice idea, nice job, nice manners, nice move, nice neighborhood, nice person, nice time and nice weather. At the end of the scale the addled, which

in its literal sense of *rotten* collocates only with egg(s), and which in its metaphorical sense of *muddled* collocates only with words such as *brain* and *mind .thus, nice would be said to have a very wide collocational range, whereas, addled would be said to have restricted collocational range.*

2.5 Strong Collocations

A strong collocation is "one in which the words are very closely a associated with each other"(O dell and Mc McCarthy 2008,p.8) For example, the adjective mitigating almost always collocates with circumstances or factors; it rarely collocates with any other word.

**Although she was found guilty, the juries there were mitigating circumstances*.

**Inclement weather was expected*.

**She has auburn hair*.

**I felt deliriously happy*.

**The chairperson adjourned the meeting*.

2-6 Fixed Collocations

Fixed collocations are "collocations so strong that they cannot be changed in anyway" (Odell and Mc McCarthy 2008,p.8) for example, I was walking to and fro(meaning I was walking in one direction and then in opposite direction, a repeated number of time).no other words can replace to and fro in this collocation. It is completely fixed. The meaning of some fixed collocation cannot be guessed from the individual words. (Singleton 2000,p.49) defined the term by a "particular grouping of words may recur so

frequently in a language that it comes to be seen as fixed expression". Some examples of fixed expressions in English are:

*Seeing is believing

*The other side of the coin

Obviously, some fixed expressions are more fixed than others. Thus, in "seeing is believing", it might just be possible to insert adverb before is (e.g. seeing really is believing), but otherwise expression has to be used as it is. In other cases changes in the syntax and in the actual components of the expression can be made the force of expression being undermined. Thus, the other side of the coin can be manipulated in various ways while still maintaining its essential identity.

*Moving on to the cost of the project, here we see the negative side of the coin.

*Of the French economy it has been remarked that this is a coin that has two very different sides.

*As for present political situation, well, which side of the coin shall begin with?

2-7 **Why Teach Collocations**?

Teaching collocation is very significant to the second language learners at different levels. Perhaps the most recognizable benefit is that learners will sound more native like. "Collocation knowledge allows us to say and write things like a native speaker" (Nation 2008,p.117).

A great deal of second language learner will considered the following sentence grammatically accurate, but in reality is not. For example, Biochemists are making research into the causes of AIDs. This sentence is grammatically accurate in tense, aspect, subject and verb agreement, but English speakers of English language would not use the verb make, but would use do instead.

Because of the incorrect verb usage, the reader or listener would know native speakers did not produce the sentence. Word choice mistakes also interfere with comprehension. We are able to understand quickly spoken language because we do not focus on the individual words but on chunks of language that we often predict. Written texts with collocation errors are difficult to read, and additional processing time to understand the intended meaning. Spoken language with collocation errors can hamper comprehension even further as speakers do not have the luxury time to review what they have heard.

Another benefit concerns low-level speakers. (Nation, 2008, p.118) stated that “learning multiword units allows beginners to make productive use of the language without having to know a lot of the vocabulary or grammar”. The idea of productive use is one of the strongest reasons to focus on collocations as opposed to individual words. While Nation is referring to complete phrases (e.g. where is the bathroom?) it is reasonable to assume that learning word combinations, especially verb+noun collocations, low –level students will have an easier time expressing themselves. Students who study lists of individual words are often unable to use them productively in conversations or written texts.

It has been suggested that studying collocations can help students to learn grammar. By learning chunks of language containing certain grammatical structures, the learner will be better able to acquire that grammatical pattern.

It has argued that a strict focus on grammar instruction has led to many of the word combination errors mentioned earlier. This problem occurs because learning grammar is often seen as a simple substitution exercise in which different word types can be placed into the correct slot. A better approach may be to teach appropriate word combinations from a lexical perspective and students come to their own conclusions about the syntax of a language.

Furthermore, collocation study allows students to use language they already know. (Woolard 2000,p.31) emphasized that "Learning more vocabulary is not just learning new words, it is often learning familiar words in new combinations".

2-8 **Efficient Language Acquisition Requires Collocation Knowledge.**

It is generally accepted that language is "acquired faster and more efficiently when learned in 'chunks', such as set phrases or routines"(Ellis 2001,p.67).

There is substantial psycholinguistic evidence which supports this. Based on Schmitt's belief, "lexical phrases in reflect the way the mind tend to 'chunk' language in order to make it easier to process" (Schmitt 2000,P.78).

Aitchison(1987) states that there are powerful and long-lasting links between words in mind . In first language acquisition "young children acquire language in chunks even it is claimed for producing collocational constructions, they could not have learned from their parents" (Pinker 2007,p.55).Gleason(1982) states that, working on second language acquisition indicates that the second language learners begin not so much generative systems as with chunks, prefabricated routines, or unopened packages . in a comparative study of first language and second language English speakers, Conklin and Schmitt (2008) found that what they term 'formulaic sequences, were read more quickly than non-formulaic sequences by both groups of participants, supporting the assertion that such chunks have a processing advantage over creatively generated language' . All of the above evidence appears to support the view that collocations are organized in the mind in some way to enable more way efficient language processing, for both language reception and language production.

2.9 **The Difficulty of Collocation Learning**

Studies show that an educated native speaker of English knows about 20000 word families (Goulden et al.1990). However, the size of their mental lexicon- stored as prefabricated multi-word chunks – is larger than was first thought (Lewis 1997). High-frequency words make up about 80% of the words in running text, and the first 2000 cover almost 90% of what we say and write (Nation 1997). It is those hundreds of millions of expressions, idioms and collocation that make up the language of everyday use.

The single most formidable task the learner faces is mastering a sufficiently large lexicon to achieve native-like fluency. Levis (1997) states that to make the situation more challengable, all lexical items, expression or collocations, are arbitrary: they are conventionalized language that simply has been used for years. Very few of them were consciously learnt by native speakers. Learners, especially EFL students, do not have constant language exposure, as native speakers do. As a primary language source, they rely heavily on course books from which many features of natural language have been removed.

Wary (2000) states that gaining full command of a new language requires learners to become sensitive to the native speakers' preference for certain sequences of the words over others that might appear just possible. From bizarre idiom, through the customary collocation, to the terms of phrases that have not other apparent linguistic merit than that ' we just say it that way', subtleties of a language may floor even the proficient non-native, not so much because of a non-alignment between inter language and target language forms, as because the learners lacks necessary sensitivity and experience that will lead him or her unerringly away from all the grammatical ways of expressing a particular idea except the most idiomatic. Learners have a tendency to translate word for word, and think of words that are definitional equivalents in the first and the second language.

Teachers who speak learners' first language understand why they often make collocation errors like strong smoker instead of heavy smoker, powerful tea, instead of strong tea, and big rain instead of heavy rain.

Collocation is a notoriously challenging aspect of English productivity use even from advanced learners (Bishop 2004). Collocation learning has been peripheral in the class, especially in EFL teaching. Teachers are under pressure from curricula that are traditionally grammar focused and exams that are used to evaluate their teaching performance.

They have to decide how best to use the limited class time. For teachers whose mother tongue is not the target language, grammar and individual words are relatively easy to teach and assess. Learners tend to believe that single words are units of meaning and, without adequate guidance, have no means of distinguishing useful collocations from the mass of possibilities. Consequently, they fail to notice collocations and even to understand their existence and importance (Bishop 2004).

Another difficulty that teachers and learners face is that there is few resources for checking which collocation is correct by looking it up. Many non-native teachers still use out-of-date dictionaries rather than modern ones with many thousands of corpus-based examples. Few course books address collocations, explicitly and most teachers are forced to rely on intuition (Conzett 2000).

2.10 **The needs of Collocational Competence for Language Learners.**

It has been widely argued that a collocational competence is important for language production and reception enabling language learners:

1) To make idiomatic choices come across as native like.

2) To process language fluently under real-time condition.

3) To establish ‘islands of reliability’ (Dechert 1983) which enable the user to channel cognitive energy into more creative production.

4) To disambiguate meaning of polysemous words, e.g. the verb commit in the following collocation contexts:

Commit a crime, commit self, commit to memory.

5) To understand connotational meaning, e.g. the fact that the verb cause is often associated with negative connotations as in cause incident.

It has also been pointed out that formulaic sequences(FSs)fulfils basic communicative and social needs(Wray 2002), since many collocations are primarily referential units and therefore, do not have the same sciocultural function as many of the pragmatic phrases discussed by Nattinger and De Carrieo (1992), this may have an impact on the silency of occurrence of many collocations, as well as second language learners motivation to acquire collocations compared to the move pragmatically oriented formulaic sequence. However, as argued by Warren(2005) collocation should be viewed as multi-word lexical items with

form-meaning pairings which are associated with specific situations or phenomena and thus can be seen as lexical items that fulfill important communicative functions.

2.11 **Learners' Problems with Collocations**

Foreign/ second language learners' problems and errors in producing collocation have been emphasized particularly by researchers, Hussein (1990) and Bahns and Eldaw (1993). Similar to the findings of the earlier studies, large-scale studies conducted to seek the use of collocation by second language learner have also documented the difficulty non-native speakers face. (Granger 1998 and Nesselhauf 2003) found that non-native language learners use fewer collocations than their native speaker counterparts do. Therefore, learners have difficulty in producing and using collocations. The main reason for this, as Wu and Witten (2010) asserted, is the disproportionate emphasis on grammar and neglect of the vocabulary and collocation teaching. They maintained grammar is the traditional focus on EFL curriculum since it is relatively easy to teach and assess whereas identifying a set of useful collocation is challenging and demanding task particularly for non-native teachers of foreign language.

Another reason for collocational errors a committed learner has been attributed (Taylor 1997) to negative transfer from first language. Foreign language learners are generally unfamiliar with the structure of particular collocations, and they tend to use generic terms instead of specific ones. The collocations differ from language to language which is a concern of cross-language collocational differences.

2.12 **The acquisition of collocations**

Collocational development in second language vocabulary has not been investigated yet in terms of systematic patterns of acquisition, even though there has been evidence for the

existence of such sequences in the fields of syntax and morphology and phonology, and also evidence that vocabulary acquisition may also follow patterns of development.

There is no doubt that collocations are important part of second language lexical development. It has been shown that collocational errors make up a high percentage of all errors committed by second language learners Matron (1977), and linguists have acknowledged the importance of focusing on the relations that hold between items in the lexical system in order to describe vocabulary development . It has also been suggested that collocation provide most of the “initial lexical units”, and thus their study is of great importance both for the early stages of language acquisition and for the following years of vocabulary development (Greenbaum 1974, p.89).

The need for research in collocations has long been identified (Levenston 1979), but it is only in recent years that empirical investigations have been conducted. “One reason for this lack of interest could be shortage of suitable research instruments designed especially for testing hypotheses about lexical acquisition processes” (Blum 1978, p.2).

The links between the acquisition and use of collocations and writing proficiency were reported by Ghadessy (1989).According to (Ghadessy1989,p.114) “the use of function words indicates a more advanced use of the collocations, grammatical patterns and cohesive devices on the part of the older students” Ghadessy’s study demonstrates that the examination of the collocations second language learners’ use can be useful in an investigation of what happens during the second language learners’ development towards a full linguistic communicative competence.

A developmental process in the acquisition of collocations is also suggested by zhang (1993) in his study of the use of collocations in the writings of native and non-native speakers of English. One of the results of the study is that poor non-native writers and

good native writers use more grammatical collocations and fewer lexical collocations.

Even though zhang did not compare the acquisition of English collocations by second language learners from different proficiency levels, he assumes that the results of his study indicate a certain development in the acquisition of collocations by second language learners: at the lower levels of English proficiency learners use more grammatical collocations and fewer lexical collocations; when learners are at intermediate level they produce a greater variety of collocations but they still rely greatly on the prefabricated routines they have acquired at early stages, and therefore use more lexical collocations than grammatical ones; finally, when learners have reached an advanced level of proficiency, they better knowledge of grammatical collocations, which they are now able to break down into parts and use to create new ones, thus resulting in a heavier use of grammatical collocations. However, a development continuum like the one described by zhang would require empirical evidence from second language learners at different acquisition stages.

Aghbar and Tang (1991) devised an instrument to measure the acquisition of collocations. The principle proposed scoring scheme is based on the “assumption that the acquisition and use of collocations evolves along continuum from the least semantic approximation to the full mastery collocations that are idiomatic and appropriate, both semantically and register” (Aghbar and Tang 1991,p.2). The scoring instrument was used to test mastery of verb-noun collocations by 205 university level ESL students.

The collocations were collected using a blank filling test, and they were scored in terms of their idiomaticity (idiomatic/ non-idiomatic), semanticity (semantic/ marginally semantic/ not semantic), and register (proper register/ not proper register). Results showed that the use of common verbs such as ‘take’, ‘get’, ‘find’, were relatively easy for the low proficiency in

collocations. It was also concluded that open-choice tests are more reflective of the students' choice of collocations in their own natural communication, and that low proficiency students are much more likely to choose an appropriate answer in a multiple choice test.

The acquisition of lexical collocations or "conventional syntagms" in foreign language learning was also investigated by Matron (1977). Result showed that recurrent exposure to conventional syntagms did not lead to their remembering and recall by the learners. This could be due to the fact that conventional syntagms are easily decodable and thus they do not cause any difficulty in the process of the recognition. Simple word or more idiomatic expressions gave a stronger impact on the learners' conscious mind as the learner makes an effort to learn them, and thus they have a better chance of being remembered.

Matron suggests that the "intensive study of vocabulary and conscious effort in memorizing and rehearsing of a great number of conventional syntagms is the most effective way to learn how to handle target lexical collocations" (Matron 1977, p.55).

More recent studies have also underscored the effects of practice in second language acquisition (Hird 1993). The above studies showed that an investigation of how collocations are acquired will be of potential benefit for illuminating some of the processes that contribute to second language vocabulary development and for second language teaching.

2.13 **Approaches to the Study of Collocations**

Since the 1960's there have been three main approaches to the study of collocations, focusing on different aspects of the phenomenon of collocation. These approaches are referred to as: the lexical composition approach, the semantic approach, and the structural approach. The lexical composition approach characterizes collocation as a different level of lexical meaning. The semantic approach attempts to predicts the collocates of lexical units by reference to their semantic features. The structural approach examines collocations using grammatical patterns. Each of these approaches are described in more details in the following:

2.13-0 **The Lexical Composition Approach**

The lexical composition approach in the study of collocations is based on the assumption that words receive their meaning from the words they co-occur with. Among those who perceived collocations as a lexical phenomenon independent of grammar is Firth, who is also believed to be the father of the term collocation.

Collocation according to Firth(1957) is a mode of meaning. Just as a light of mixed wave-lengths disperses into a spectrum, "the lexical meaning of any given word is achieved by multiple statements of meaning at different levels", e.g. the orthographic level, phonological level, grammatical level and collocational level (Firth 1957, P.192).

For example, the meaning of the 'peer' is described by Firth in the following way: at the orthographic level the group of letters 'peer' is distinguished from the group of 'pier'. Next the pronunciation is stated , then at the grammatical level we state whether 'peer' is a noun or a verb, and by making such statements at the grammatical level we make explicit a further component of meaning. Also, formal and etymological meaning may be added, together with social indications of usage . Finally, at the

collocational level, one of the meanings of the word ‘peer’ is its collocation with ‘school’, as in ‘school peers’. Firth highlights the “general rule” that every word entering a new context is a new word.

Firth also distinguishes contextual meaning from meaning by collocation, and attempts a classification of collocation into “general or usual collocations and more restricted technical or personal collocation”, though unfortunately without any further elaboration (Firth 1957, p.195).

Halliday and Sinclair (1966) took Firth theory one step forward and stressed the importance of lexical collocations, i.e. collocations that consist of lexical items, in an integrated lexical theory. The so called Neo-Firthians attempted the study of lexis as a distinct linguistic level. Sinclair saw grammar and and lexis as two “interpenetrating way” of looking at language form (Sinclair 1966, p.411), and Halliday(1966) argued that lexical theory is complementary to, but not part of, grammatical theory .

Grammar organizes language as a system of choices and whatever patterns and/or items fail to “resolve themselves into systems” are tested at the end of each grammatical description (Sinclair 1966,p.411).’ Lexis’ , on the hand, devoted to the study and description of individual lexical items and their collocational tendencies that cannot be dealt with by grammar, since they are not a matter of choice(one rather than another) but likeliness of occurrence, i.e. “there are virtually no impossible collocations, but some are more likely than others” (Sinclair 1966,p.411). E.g. the collocation, ‘this lemon is sweet’ would considered as unusual except in the context of somebody exclaiming over a child’s painting of still life .

The Neo-Firthians also introduced a new set of linguistic terms related to the study of collocations. They used the term Node to refer to a lexical item whose collocations are being studied, Span to refer to the number of lexical items on either side of the Node

that are considered to be relevant to the node, and Collocates to refer to those items that are in the environment defined by the Span . for example, when we study the collocational patterns of ‘tea’ . ‘tea’ is node, if we decide to have a span of 3, that means we study the 3 lexical items that occur before and after ‘tea’, all the lexical item that are within the span of the word ‘tea’ are considered to be its collocates.

To the extent to which words are specified by their collocational environment, similarities of their collocational restrictions enable linguist to group lexical items into “lexical sets”, i.e. sets of words with similar collocational restrictions. For example, the word ‘bright’, ‘shine’, and ‘light’ are members of the same lexical set because they are frequent collocates of the word ‘moon’ (Halliday 1966). Along the same lines, the lexical items ‘bright’, ‘hot’, ‘shine’, ‘light’, ‘lie’, and ‘come out’ are all member of the same lexical set because they all collocate item ‘sun’ (Halliday 1966). The criterion for a lexical item to enter a lexical set is its syntagmatic relation to a specified lexical item (i.e. its collocation with the specific word) rather than its paradigmatic relation to that lexical item. For example, lexical items like ‘strong’, and ‘powerful’ are considered member of the same lexical set because they collocate with the lexical item ‘argument’, e.g. ‘strong argument’ and powerful argument’.

As far as other collocates are concerned, e.g. ‘car’, and ‘tea’ the lexical items ‘strong’ and ‘powerful’ will enter different lexical sets, i.e. ‘strong’ will be a member of lexical set defined by ‘tea’, and ‘powerful’ will be a member a lexical set defined by ‘car’(Halliday 1966). Halliday is also interested in the collocational patterns that lexical items enter. For example, a ‘strong argument’ presents the same collocational pattern as ‘the strength of his argument’ and ‘he argued strongly’. Since ‘strong’, ‘strength’ and ‘strongly’ are parts of the same collocational pattern, they are considered as word-forms of the same lexical item . Halliday also points out that lexical items need not have

any formal relationship to one another in order to collocate. For example, ‘strong and ‘argument’ could be in different sentences ‘I wasn’t convinced of his argument. He had some strong points but they could all be met’.

What Halliday refers to as ‘collocational pattern’ McIntosh calls ‘collocational range’ in order to distinguish it from its grammatical equivalent, i.e. “pattern which has to do with the structure of the sentences produced while ‘collocational range’, has to do with the specific collocations we produce in a series of particular instances” (McIntosh 1961,p.33).

A theory of the lexical meaning similar to the one outlined by Firth and the neo-firthians is suggested by (Antony 1975). Even though Antony was not involved directly in the study of collocation, his proposed theory treats the lexical word as an empty form capable of bonds to different kinds of meaning . Each lexical word becomes a discourse word when it is used in ordinary discourse, and the particular meaning which is in focus is called its lexical meaning. For example, the lexical word ‘pitch’ can mean many things, i.e. it is capable of bonds to different kinds of meaning (a throwing action, a tar-like distance, something musical, etc).

the moment ‘pitch’ is used communicatively in a group of other words and become a discourse word, then a small portion of its repertory of meanings is in focus and this becomes its lexical meaning, e.g. in the sentence ‘pitch ball to me ‘, ‘pitch’ receives the meaning of ‘a throwing action’. Antony also remarks that a word that occurs in one grammatical construction differ in lexical meaning from the same word in another construction. For example, the use of ‘mother’ as a verb has different referential meaning from the use of ‘mother’ as a ‘noun’.

Collocation has also been identified by (Halliday and Hasan1976,p.286) as a form of lexical cohesion, and it has been defined as the ‘bee…..honey’ and ‘king……crown’ which depends

not so much on any systematic relationships on their tendency to share the same lexical environment, to occur in collocation with one another . However, ‘collocational cohesion’, as it is used by Halliday and Hasan, is simple, a ‘cover term’ for textual cohesion, a kind of “semantic interlace that provides texts with their texture- their non-structured cohesion or lexical form” (Addison 1983,p.3), and the “specific kinds of co-occurrence which are available and complex” to be dealt with by a “general semantic description of the English language”(Halliday and Hasan 1976,p.288).

Halliday and Hasan’s definition of collocation serves the task of textual analysis, but it is restricted in lexical predictable collocational chains that extend beyond boundaries of a sentence. Furthermore, it does not pay attention to idiosyncratic and predictable co-occurrence of words that are semantically and or environmentally, a physical sense, associated to each other ,e.g. there is nothing obvious in the meaning of ‘tea’ that explains why it collocates with ‘strong’ but not with ‘powerful’.

The main problem with lexical analysis has been identified as “the circularity of definition of the basic unit of description the lexical item” (Sinclair 1966, p.412). That is, every item is described in terms of its environment which in its turn is defined in terms of the item. For example, one of the meanings of ‘night’ is its collocatability i.e. ability to collocate) with ‘dark’, and of ‘dark’ its collocation with night. The above realization makes lexical statements look weaker and less precise than grammatical ones, which are based on a well-defined and explicit framework.

One of the good points of the lexical composition approach is that it drew attention to lexis and uncovered the insufficiency of grammatical analysis to for the ‘patterns’ a word enter in, in Hallidayan sense, and the collocatory idiosyncrasies of lexical items. The Neo-Firthians argue that grammar alone cannot describe what the lexical item is, therefore the lexical “must be

identified within lexis, on the basis of collocation” (Halliday and Strevens 1964, p.35).

Sinclair and Halliday do not underestimate the importance of the grammatical analysis; they rather highlight the significance of being able to to make valid statements about lexis that do not disregard but complement grammar. However, the Neo-Firthians admit that they do not know “how far collocation patterns are dependent on the structural relations into which the item enter” (Halliday 1966, p.159), and therefore it is essential to examine collocational patterns into their grammatical environments. In other words, the advocates of the lexical composition approach recommend that collocational patterns are best described and analyzed through lexical analysis, but they do admit that help from grammar is still needed.

2.13.1 **The Semantic Approach**

Collocation as a linguistic phenomenon a associated with lexical semantics was described as early as 2300 years ago . (Robins 1967,p.21) rejected the equation of “one word, one meaning” and shed light on an important aspect of the semantic structure of the language: “words meaning do not exist in isolation, but they may differ according to the collocation in which they are used” In parallel to the lexical composition approach, where linguists recognized lexis as a level of analysis of language separate from grammar, in the semantic approach linguists attempted to investigate collocations on the basis of semantic framework, also separate from grammar.

The Neo-Firthians a approach to the study of collocations was found inadequate by semanticists because “it sort lexical items into sets according to their collocations, but it does not explain why they are lexical items that collocate only with certain other lexical items.In the lexical composition approach collocations and sets are studied as if the combinatorial processes of language were arbitrary” (Lehrer 1974, p.176).

Firth’s theory of meaning was found to be insufficient for the study of collocation (Lyons 1966). Lyons claims that Firth’s definition of ‘meaning’ as “complex of contextual relations” is puzzling, and he criticizes the apparent lack of principles by means of which “lexical groups by association” can be established and lexical sets can be defined(Lyons 1966,p.289-297).

Overall, Lyons proposes an abandonment of Firth’s theory of meaning, in which the statement of meaning by collocation was introduced, because it does not coincide with well-established theories of meaning and language description and furthermore there are other “more important meaning relations” which must be accounted for in a theory of meaning(Lyons 1966,P.295).

Even though Lyons seems to agree that ‘collocations’ restricted to “syntagms (or collocations) composed of a noun and a verb or a noun and an adjective”(Lyons 1977, p.261) are worthy of study by the semanticist, he does not believe that a separate collocational level has to be established. Lyons also proposes that collocations should be studied only as part of the synchronic and diachronic analysis of language, or the study of the collocations Lyons proposes the notion of ‘lexical field’ founded upon “the relations of sense holding between pairs of syntagmatically connected lexemes” (Lyons 1977,p.261).

He then proceeds to describe the principles of a strong version of field-theory as if the vocabulary of a language was a closed set of lexemes with each lexeme being a member of no more than one field. However, the vocabulary of a language is an open system, and lexemes do belong to different fields due to their different meanings. Therefore, the study of vocabulary in a theory of lexical fields based on syntagmatic relations presents problems. These problems led Lyons to suggest that descriptive semantics can get along without syntagmatic relations(Lyons 1977). Thus, Lyons description to deal with the ‘more important’ paradigmatic

relations of sense in his study of semantics, setting aside the study of syntagmatic relation altogether.

Even though Lyons (1977) provided only a criticism of the firthian theory of meaning, there have been other semanticists who tried to put together a theory of lexical meaning based on the semantic properties of lexical units. This approach is the semantic approach to the study of collocations. According to semantic approach, the lexical item is received as a combination of the semantic properties of item. It is the semantic property of a lexical item that determine its collocates. Just as the Neo-firthians tried to establish a semantic theory that is different from, but complementary to, grammar.(Katz and Fodor 1963,p.170) describe a semantic theory that would “organize, systematize, and generalize facts about meaning”. They state that semantic theory of a language would “take over the explanation of the speaker’s ability to produce and understand new sentences at the point where grammar leaves off”(Katz and Fodor 1963,p.172).

They accept that one component of a semantic theory of a language is a dictionary of that language, and they proceed to describe the semantic markers for a new lexical entries of a model dictionary of English. According to the semantic proposed by Katz and Fodor, each entry for a lexical item in the dictionary must contain a selection restriction, i.e. . . . a condition for that particular lexical item to combine with others. For example, the lexical item ‘sleep’ would require a subject with feature {animate}, and the item ‘break’ would require as object something that is a {physical object} and {Rigid}.

Due the fact that under the semantic approach to the study of collocations each lexical item will be defined by semantic markers based on its meaning or meanings, Lehrer(1974) argues that the semantic approach is more likely to explain why certain words can be found together. In his explanation of syntagmatic meaning relations between lexical units, (Cruce 1986,p.279) describes

collocational restrictions as “co-occurrence restrictions that arbitrarily established” . For example, ‘kick the bucket’ can only be used with human beings, although its propositional meaning is simply ‘die’ and not ‘die in a characteristically human way’. Similarly, ‘blond’ refer to hair, but describing a hairy animal or a fur coat as ‘blond’ would be unacceptable.

Cruce also distinguishes three kinds of collocational restrictions: systematic, semi-systematic and idiosyncratic, according to whether, and if so to what degree, the semantic properties of a lexical item set up an expectation of a certain collocant. Lexical units that belong to the category of systematic collocational restrictions are ‘grill and toast’. Both verbs denote the same process from the point of view of the agent, but different patients: normally we ‘grill’ food that is raw, while we ‘toast’ food that already cooked.

Semi-systematic are those collocational restrictions that still behave as presuppositions of the lexical item in question, but there can be certain exceptions to the general tendency . For example, ‘customers’ obtain something material in exchange for money, while a ‘client’ receives a less tangible professional or technical service. So, butchers, bakers, and grocers have ‘customers’, solicitors and architects have ‘clients’.

However, banks seem to have ‘customers’ rather than ‘clients’ (Cruce 1986). finally for “lexical items that present idiosyncratic collocational restrictions, their coolocational ranges can only be described by enumerating all their acceptable collocates” (Cruce 1986,p.281). For example, one can ‘pay attention/ a visit’ but not ‘pay a greeting or welcome’. Idiosyncratic collocational preferences, such as ‘flawless performance’ but not ‘unblemished performance’, do not give rise to presuppositions, according to the semantic approach, and Cruce wonder whether “idiosyncratic restrictions are a matter of semantics at all” (Cruce 1986,p.282). A close study of what collocational restrictions can deliver to the

sentence they are used in is totally justified, since they are not ‘logically’ necessary.

For example, ‘die’ and ‘pass a way’ have the same meaning, but ‘pass a way’ refers to human beings, so the use of ‘pass a way’ in the sentence ‘my grandfather passed away’ add semantic cohesion to it; if it is used to describe the death of a pet animal then it anthropomorphizes the animal, (Cruce 1986). To the difficulty of syntagmatic relations, Cruce (1980) like most lexical semanticists, finds that paradigmatic sense relations are “a richer vein to mine than relations of the syntagmatic variety” (Cruce 1986, p.86).

2.13.2 **The Structural Approach**:

The structural approach consists of those linguists and researchers who suggest that collocation is influenced by structure, and collocations occur in patterns. Therefore, the structural approach recommends that the study of collocations should include grammar.

The neo-firthian’s view of separating lexical analysis from grammatical analysis was criticized by Mitchell (1971) who argues for the “oneness of grammar, lexis and meaning” (Mitchell 1971, P.43). the interdependence of grammar and lexicon is evident from the fact that “lexical particularities” derive their

meaning not only from contextual extension of a lexical kind but also from generalized grammatical patterns in which they appear(Mitchell 1971,p.480).

For the study of collocations, Mitchell proposes that “collocations {which are ‘of root’ rather than ‘of words’} are to be studied within grammatical matrices” (Mitchell 1971,p.65).In a group of word forms like ‘drinks’, ‘drinker’ and ‘drinking’ Mitchell abstracts the common elements of each word form and labels that as ‘root’, e.g. / drink, and the associations of different roots, e.g. / drink and / heave, as ‘collocations’, e.g. ‘heavy drinker’, ‘drink heavily’ (Mitchell 1971). Mitchell refers to “collocation ‘heavy drinker’ as an exemplification of the colligation ‘adjective+agentive noun” (Mitchell 1966, p.33).

The relationship between ‘collocation’ and ‘colligation’ is one of generality: ‘collocations’ are their particular members (Mitchell 1971). Mitchell’s view that collocations are of roots rather than of words does not hold for every combination of roots. For example, ‘faint praise’ is an acceptable English collocation, but not all combinations of the two roots / faint- and /praise-, produce acceptable collocations: ‘she was damned by faint praise’ is acceptable, but ‘he praised her faintly’ is not.

The influence of grammar on collocation was also discussed by Greenbaum (1970) who pointed out that certain instances of collocation require syntactic information. For example, ‘much collocates with ‘prefer’ when it is in a pre-verb position as in ‘I much prefer a dry wine’, but it does not collocate ‘prefer’ in post-subject position as in ‘I prefer a dry wine much’ (Greenbaum 1974).

Greenbaum suggests collocability of words (i.e. their potential co-occurrence with their other lexical items) should be ‘tied’ to syntax, and realizes that there are certain lexical items that can

occur only in certain syntactic relationships, e.g. ‘his sincerity frightens us, but not ‘we frighten his sincerity’ (Greenbaum 1974)

Without reference to syntax, the notion of collocability becomes vacuous. Virtually any two items can co-occur at a given arbitrary distance. For example, ‘sincerity’ can collocate with ‘frighten’, but the acceptability of the combinations they produce can only be judged via syntax.

2.13.3 **Summary of the Three approaches**:

The three approaches to the study of collocations focus on different aspects of the phenomenon of collocation. The lexical composition approach regard lexical analysis as independent from grammar and considers lexis an autonomous entity, choosing its own collocates which can be enumerated and classified in lexical sets. The semantic approach tries to find semantic features based on the meaning of lexical units that would enable the prediction of their collocates. The structural approach tries to establish patterns of collocations that include grammatical and lexical words alike.

The semantic and the lexical composition approaches are restricted to the study a small number of collocations (usually ‘verb noun’ and adjective noun’ collocations); they include grammatical words from their scope, and eventually they achieved only limited results.The structural approach, on the other hand, examines patterns of collocations, includes grammatical words in the study of collocations.

Chapter Three

Research Methodology

3.0 **Introduction**

This chapter describes the methodology used in this research. It includes the introduction of the chapter, research method, the research subject (respondent), research tool (instrument), the procedure, validity and reliability.

3.1 **Research method**

The researcher adopted the descriptive and analytical methods to conduct this study.

3.2 **Research subjects (respondents)**

The subjects of the study are 40 students fourth year majoring in English at Sudan University of Science and Technology-College of Languages. For the purpose of this study the participants have been chosen randomly.

3.3 **Research Tool (instrument**)

Data used in this study was collected by examining 40 students who study English as a foreign language at Sudan University of Science and Technology. In this study the researcher has used one instrument of data collection which was test. It was designed for English language learners at university level. In particular for those who are in specialized English as foreign language. The test was divided into two parts. Part one consists of ten items. They were designed to measure learners' awareness of the use of collocations. On other side of the coin, part two consists of ten items. They were designed to see the learners understanding of collocations.

3.4 **Procedures**

The researcher distributed the test to respondents in order to get their response; it was given to them hand by hand in the classroom. It was distributed and collected in a period of an hour.

As it has been mentioned earlier in section (3-2) the researcher has used the random sample of 40 respondents. The data collected from these 40 subjects will be statistically analyzed and discussed in chapter four.

3.5 **Validity**

To check the validity in this research, the test has been prepared and passed to a juries consisting of two Ph D. holders at the college of language department of linguistics. The result of the evaluation and judgment of the test stated that it was valid for learners' use and understanding of collocations.

3.6 **Reliability**

Reliability is defined as the consistency in performance results, and is intended to measure the ability to get the same results if re-use the same tool a second time. The following table illustrates the consistency of using Cronbach's alpha coefficient calculation. Besides, the test was distributed to the subjects to be answered in order to prove whether the collected data will achieve the purpose of the research.

Stability study axes coefficient :-

Parts	**Cronbach's Alpha**
Part one	0.66
Part two	0.42
Total	**0.76**

From the table above, the research finds that the stability of the test axes coefficients ranged between values (0.66 and 0.42), where is the consistency of these transactions are high. As can be seen that the overall reliability coefficient of the test has reached (0.76). It is a very high stability coefficient.

Chapter four

Data Analysis and Discussion

4.0 **Introduction**

In this chapter the researcher analyzes the data collected through the test. It consists of twenty questions. These questions were divided into two parts. Each part includes ten questions, which are presented in the form of graphs and tables to be discussed below.

4.1 **Data Analysis and Discussion**

4.1.1 **English language learners use collocations correctly to some extent**.

The First question: My sister e-mailed me this wonderful video…….of her new baby.

Table (4-1)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	37	92.5%
wrong	3	7.5%
Total	40	100.0%

In the first question (37) respondents out of (40) have got the right answer that constitute (92.5%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (3) respondents have the wrong answer. This means that the respondents have used the collocation correctly.

Figure (4-1)

The second question: I want a mobile phone that will let me…….my e-mails when I am away from home.

Table (4-2)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	34	85.0%
wrong	6	15.0%
Total	40	100.0%

In the second question (34) respondents answered correctly. It means (85.0%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (6) have got the wrong answer. This an indication that respondents have succeeded the question.

Figure (4-2)

The Third question: I took on too much…….last month and couldn’t finish it all.

Table (4-3)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	29	72.5%
wrong	11	27.5%
Total	40	100.0%

In the third question (29) respondents have got the right answer that make (72.5%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (11) have got the wrong answer. As shown in the figures above the respondents succeeded the question.

Figure (4-3)

The Fourth question: At the peak of her…….she was managing to a sales force of 200 people.

Table (4-4)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	22	56.0%
wrong	18	44.0%
Total	40	100.0%

In the fourth question (22) respondents out of (40) have got the right answer that constitute (56.0%) of the total number of the

respondents. While, (18) have the wrong answers. It means that the respondents have passed the question.

Figure (4-4)

The fifth question: I'm going to apply for a……in a supermarket.

Table (4-5)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	31	77.5%
wrong	9	22.5%
Total	40	100.0%

In the fifth question (31) respondents have got the right answers that make (77.5%) of the total number of the respondents. Meanwhile, (9) have the wrong answers. That makes (22.5%). It is clear that the respondents who have got right answers more than the ones who have got wrong answers.

Figure (4-5)

The sixth question: I hope you will always tell me…….

Table (4-6)

Statement	Frequency	Percent

right	36	90.0%
wrong	4	10.0%
Total	40	100.0%

From the table above (36) respondents have answered correctly. They obtained (90.0%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (4) have got wrong answers. The respondents succeeded the question brilliantly.

Figure (4-6)

The Seventh question: I wish you had never raised……

Table (4-7)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	15	37.5%
wrong	25	62.5%
Total	40	100.0%

In the seventh question (15) respondents out of (40) have got the right answers that constitute (37.5%) of the total number of the respondents. Meanwhile, (25) have wrong answers. It is clear that the respondents have failed this question miserably.

Figure (4-7)

The eighth question: When I gave my students a lot of homework, they always complain……

Table (4-8)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	6	15.0%
wrong	34	85.0%
Total	40	100.0%

From the table above just (6) respondents gave the right answer that makes (15.0%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (34) have the wrong answers. The respondents have failed the question spectacularly.

Figure (4-8)

The ninth question: It doesn’t sound quite natural to address your fellow students so……

Table (4-9)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	11	27.5%
wrong	29	72.5%

Total	40	100.0%

In the ninth question (11) respondents out of (40) have got the right answers that constitute ((27.5%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (29) respondents have got the wrong answers. They have failed this question as well.

Figure (4-9)

The tenth question: ‘I love you’, he whispered to her…….

Table (4-10)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	28	70.0%
wrong	12	30.0%
Total	40	100.0%

According to the table above (28) respondents gave the answers. That makes (70.0%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (12) respondents have got the wrong answers. They succeeded the question pretty well.

Figure (4-10)

4.1.2 Table analysis of part one

Part one(A)	Mean	Test Value	Std. Deviation	value of. (T)	Sig	Level	%
The First question	1.93	1.5	0.267	10.077	0.00	High	96.5%
The second question	1.85	1.5	0.362	6.121	0.00	High	92.5%
The Third question	1.73	1.5	0.452	3.147	0.00	High	86.5%
The Fourth question	1.55	1.5	0.504	1.628	0.41	High	77.5%
The fifth question	1.78	1.5	0.423	4.113	0.00	High	89.0%
The sixth question	1.90	1.5	0.304	8.327	0.00	High	95.0%
The Seventh question	1.38	1.5	0.490	-1.612	0.11	Average	69.0%
The eighth question	1.15	1.5	0.362	-6.121	0.00	Average	57.5%
The ninth question	1.28	1.5	0.452	-3.147	0.00	Average	64.0%
The tenth question	1.70	1.5	0.464	2.726	0.01	High	85.0%
Total	16.23	15	1.86	4.16	0.00	High	81.1%

The result of the test part one as shown in the table above, explains that the average subjects response was (16.23), which was high average by comparing it to Test Value (15). Besides, the Value of (T) is mounted to (4.16) v (0.00) a sig of statistical significant when the indicator value of 5%. Therefore, the result of analysis shows that (81.1%) of the respondents answered the test correctly. Which indicates that the subjects get high marks (level) in the test. The conclusion of the research part one – hypothesis 'English learners use collocations correctly to some extent' is rejected by the researcher.

4.1.3 **English language learners understand collocation correctly**

The First question: It's time for breakfast, would you go to the café and bring me fast…….

Table (1-4)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	16	40.0%
wrong	24	60.0%
Total	40	100.0%

From above table (16) respondents out of (40) have got the right answer that constitute (40.0%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (24) have got the wrong answers. The respondents have totally failed to pass the question.

Figure (4-1)

The second question: Mona is suffering from vomiting, the doctor gave her tablets to the……

Table (4-2)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	10	25.0%
wrong	30	75.0%
Total	40	100.0%

In the second question (10) respondents gave the right answers that makes (25.0%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (30) have got the wrong answers. The respondents failed dismally in this question.

Figure (4-2)

The Third question: The students didn’t go to school yesterday because there were……rain

Table (4-3)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	24	60.0%

wrong	16	40.0%
Total	40	100.0%

In third question (24) respondents have answered correctly. That constitute (60.0%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (16) gave the wrong answers. It means the respondents have succeeded the question.

Figure (4-3)

The Fourth question: She……..ill and was taken to hospital

Table (4-4)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	7	17.5%
wrong	33	82.5%
Total	40	100.0%

In the fourth question (7) respondents gave the right answers that constitute (17.5%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (33) got the wrong answers. That means the respondents have failed miserably the question.

Figure (4-4)

The fifth question: I was……..crazy

Table (4-5)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	0	0.0%
wrong	0	0.0%
Total	0	0.0%

In the fifth question (0) respondents out of (40) have got the right answer that constitute (0.0%) of the total number of the respondents. Simply no one gets a single right answer. The respondents have totally failed the question.

The sixth question: The police is collecting evidence against the offender who has committed the……..

Table (4-6)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	36	90.0%
wrong	4	10.0%
Total	40	100.0%

In the sixth question (36) respondents gave the right answers. That makes (90.0%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (4) respondents gave the wrong answers. The respondents have largely succeeded this question.

Figure (4-6)

The Seventh question: Do you find it easy to……friend?

Table (4-7)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	9	22.5%
wrong	31	77.5%
Total	40	100.0%

In this question (9) have got the right answers. That constitute (22.5%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (31) have got the wrong answers. The respondents have totally failed the question.

Figure (4-7)

The eighth question: As my father……..old, he spent less time working.

Table (4-8)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	17	42.5%
wrong	23	57.5%
Total	40	100.0%

In the eighth question (17) respondents gave the right answers. That makes (42.5%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (23) have got the wrong answers. This indication that the respondents have miserably failed the question.

Figure (4-8)

The ninth question: Ahmed……in love with Mona.

Table (4-9)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	25	62.5%
wrong	15	37.5%
Total	40	100.0%

In the ninth question (25) respondents out of (40) have got the right answers that constitute (62.5%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (15) have got the wrong answers. That means the respondents have passed the question.

Figure (4-9)

The tenth question: Do you make excuses if someone ask you to…….a big favor for them.

Table (4-10)

Statement	Frequency	Percent
right	31	77.5%
wrong	9	22.5%
Total	40	100.0%

In the tenth question (31) respondents gave the right answers. That makes (77.5%) of the total number of the respondents. While, (9) have got the wrong answers. The respondents have succeeded the question brilliantly.

Figure (4-10)

4.1.4 Table analysis of part two

Part two (B)	Mean	Test	Std. Deviatio	value of.	Sig	Level	%

		Value	n	(T)			
The First question	1.40	1.5	0.496	-1.275	0.21	Weak	68.0%
The second question	1.25	1.5	0.439	-3.606	0.00	Weak	62.5%
The Third question	1.60	1.5	0.496	1.275	0.21	Average	78.0%
The Fourth question	1.18	1.5	0.385	-5.342	0.00	Weak	59.0%
The fifth question	.	-	.	-	-	-	-
The sixth question	1.90	1.5	0.304	8.327	0.00	High	95.0%
The Seventh question	1.23	1.5	0.423	-4.113	0.00		61.5%
The eighth question	1.43	1.5	0.501	-.947	0.34	Average	71.5%
The ninth question	1.63	1.5	0.490	1.612	0.01	High	81.5%
The tenth question	1.78	1.5	0.423	4.113	0.00	High	89.0%
Total	**13.4**	**13.5**	**1.58**	**-6.26**	**0.00**	**Average**	**65.7%**

The analysis of the test as shown in the table above, demonstrates that average subjects response was (13.4) which was medium when comparing it to Test Value (13.5). Furthermore, Value of (T) is mounted to (-6.26) v 0.00 sig of statistical significant. Besides, the result of analysis clarifies that the

answers of the respondents to the test was (65.7%). Therefore, the result of data analysis and discussion of research hypothesis ‘English learners understand collocations perfectly’ is rejected by the researcher.

Chapter Five

Conclusion, Recommendations and Suggestions for Further studies

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a brief summary of the whole study. It also provides the findings of the study which is achieved mainly from the test. Besides, it includes the recommendations of the study, which will play an essential role in the process of English language learners use and understanding of collocations. In addition there are suggestions for further research.

5.1 Summary

This study aims at investigating English language learners use and understanding of collocations. The study was limited to Sudan University of Science and Technology – College of Languages – fourth year students majoring English language.

5.2 Findings of the Study

This study has been conducted with the purpose of investigating English language learners use and understanding of collocations. At the end of the study the researcher has come up with the following findings:

1. The majority of the fourth year students of Sudan University of Science and Technology have got high marks at the test in part one ‘learners use and understanding of collocations’
2. In part two ‘learners understanding of collocations’ the students have got low marks.
3. Teaching collocations can help students to speak and write English in more natural and accurate way.
4. Learning collocations will also help learners to increase their range of English vocabulary.
5. Learning collocations will enable learners to specify which ones are appropriate.

5.3 Recommendations

In the light of the results of the study, the researcher has suggested some recommendations which should be taken into consideration by syllabus designers, teachers and learners.

1. Collocations should be taught at different levels of education system.
2. The syllabus and text selection should concentrate on use and understanding of collocations. Because it helps teachers know the reception (knowledge) and production (performance) of their students.

5.4 Suggestions for further Studies

Collocation is a very important aspect of language. Learners should concentrate on studying collocation, because that makes their language sounds natural and a native like. Therefore, the following topics are suggested by the researcher for further studies:

1. Investigating learners' proficiency of grammatical categories of collocation.
2. Investigating learners' collocation competence.

References

- Crystal, D. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*.

Available at: www.amazon.com/Cambridge- Encyclopedia- Language- David- Crystal/dp/0521559677

{Accessed: 15 May 2015}.

-Farrock,P.2012. Journal of studies in education.

Raising Awareness of Collocation in ESL/EFL Classrooms [online] 62

Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jse.v2i3.1615pdf

[Accessed: 13 May 2015]

-Granddol, D. et al. 1994. *Describing Language*. 2nd ed. Buckingham: Ballmoor.

Hatch, E and Cheryl, B. 1990. *Vocabulary, Semantics, and Language Education*.

Available at: https://www.goodreads.com/work/editions/1633415

{Accessed: 2 June 2015}.

-Lyons, J. 1968. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*.

Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/412090

{Accessed: 8 June 2015}.

-Lyons, J. 1981. *Language and Linguistics*.

Available at: www-langtoninfo.co.uk/web_content/9780521297752

{Accessed at: 25 April 2015}

-Nofal,Kh.2012. English Language and Literature Studies.

Collocations in English and Arabic: A comparative Study [online] 76

Available at: http//dx.doi.org/10.5539/ells.v2n3p75pdf

[Accessed: 27 April 2015]

-Newmark,P. 1982. *Approaches to Translation*. 1st ed. London: Pergamon.

-O'Dell and Mc McCarthy. 2008. *Advanced English Collocations in Use*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Edinburgh.

-Palmer, F. 1996. *Semantics*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Edinburgh.

-Singleton,D.2000. Language and the Lexicon an Introduction. 1st ed. London: Member of the Hodder Headline Group.

-Sinclair, I. 1991*. Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*.

Available at: http: books. Google.com/books

{Accessed: 2 July 2015}

-Taylor, I. 1976. *Introduction to Psycholinguistics*.

Available at: www.amazon.com/introduction-psycholoinguistics-Insup-Taylor/dp/0030129818

{Accessed: 22 April 2015}

-Vlavatskaya,M.2014. International Journal of Language and Linguistics.

Combinatory linguistics: Area of Theoretical and Applied Language Study [online] 169

Available at: http://www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/j/Ijll)pdf

[Accessed: 7 May 2015]

-Yule, G. 2006. The Study of Language. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Edinburgh.

Appendix (A)

Questions

Sudan University of Science and Technology

Post graduate Studies

Linguistics Department

<u>Test on the Use and Understanding of Collocations</u>

**University:……..……..……
…….**

**Level:……..……
…….**

Marks: 100
Times: an hour

A) Complete each sentence using the following words:

access, softly, bitterly, job, the subject, career, the truth, work, politely, dip.

1. My sister e-mailed me this wonderful video……of her new baby.

2. I want a mobile phone that will let me ……..my e-mails when I am away from home.

3. I took on too much... ……last month and couldn't finish it all.

4. At the peak of her …….....she was managing to a sales force of 200 people.

8**.** When my students a lot of homework, they always complain…….

9. It doesn’t sound quite natural to address your fellow students so…….

10. ‘I love you’, he whispered to her…….

B) Fill in the gaps with the appropriate collocations

1. It’s time for breakfast, would you go to the café and bring me fast……

2. Mona is suffering from vomiting, the doctor gave her tablets to ease the ……

3. The students didn’t go to school yesterday because there were ……rain.

4. She ……ill and was taken to hospital.

5. I was ……crazy.

6. The police is collecting evidence against the offender who has committed the……

7. Do you find it easy to……friends?

8. As my father……older, he spent less time working.

9. Ahmed……in love with Mona.

10. Do you make excuses if someone ask you to …… a big favor for them.

Appendix (B)

Answers

A) **Complete each sentence using the following words**:

Access, softly, bitterly, job, the subject, career, the truth, work, politely, clip.

1. My sister e-mailed me this wonderful video **clip** of her new baby.

2. I want a mobile phone that will let me **access** my e-mails when I am away from home.

3. I took on too much **work** last month and couldn't finish it all.

4. At the peak of her **career** she was managing to a sales force of 200 people.

5. I'm going to apply for **job** in a supermarket.

6. I hope you will always tell me **the truth**

7. I wish you had never raised **the subject**

8. When I give my students a lot of homework, they always complain **bitterly**

9. It doesn't sound quite natural to address your fellow students so **politely**

10. 'I love you', he whispered to her **softly**

B) **Fill in gaps with the appropriate collocation**

3. The students didn’t go to school yesterday because there were **heavy** rain.

4. She **get/ became /fell** ill and was taken to hospital.

5. I was **getting** crazy.

6. The police is collecting evidence against the offender who has committed the **crime.**

7. Do you find it easy to **make** friends?

8. As my father **get/ grew/ became** older, he spent less time working.

9. Ahmed **falls** in love with Mona.

10. Do you make excuses if someone asks you to **do** a big favor for them?