The Effect of Lexical Semantic Relations in Vocabulary Learning
A case Study of Secondary School Level in Omdurman Locality

Mozzammil Ahmed Abdallah Mohammed[1], Mahmoud Ali Ahmed[2]

ABSTRACT

This research paper is devoted to investigate the operant effect of lexical semantic relations in vocabulary learning among secondary school students. The researcher has adopted the descriptive analytical method. Data has been collected through a test for a number of **60** secondary school students in Omdurman locality. Findings show that secondary school students are not fully aware of the use of some lexical semantic relations, there is an apparent weakness among secondary school students in inferring antonyms of words, above all there are not enough exercises concerning idioms and collocations. Based on the findings of the study the researcher recommends that the students should be aware of the use of lexical semantic relations as it increases the stock of vocabulary and also sufficient exercises should be given to the students with more concentration on the sense of antonymy as well as the use of idioms and collocations. Finally, suggested studies can cover other areas such as: the role of written and spoken contexts in vocabulary learning, also teachers' attitudes towards the role of lexical semantic relations in vocabulary construction is also suggested.

Key Words:

lexical – hyponymy – taxonomy – meronomy - polysemy

المستخلص :

هذه الورقة البحثية تهدف إلي التحقق من الأثر الفعال للعلاقات الدلالية المعجمية في تعلم المفردات لطلاب المرحلة الثانوية. تبنت الدراسة المنهج الوصفي التحليلي. تم جمع البيانات بإستخدام إختبار لعدد 60 طالبا من طلاب المرحلة الثانوية بمحلية أم درمان. تمثلت أهم النتائج التي توصلت إليها الدراسة في أن طلاب المرحلة الثانوية غير مدركين تماما لإستخدام بعض هذه العلاقات الدلالية كذلك الضعف الواضح في إستنتاج متضادات الكلمات فضلا عن عدم وجود تدريبات كافية تهتم بالعبارات الإصطلاحية والمتلازمات. أوصت الدراسة علي حسب نتائجها بأن الطلاب يجب أن يكونو علي وعي بإستخدام هذه العلاقات لذيادة مخزون المفردات لديهم وكذلك يجب أن يكون هنالك تدريبات علي الكلمات ومتضاداتها بجانب التدريبات علي العبارات الإصطلاحية والمتلازمات. أخيرا يقترح الباحث مواضيع أخرى للدراسة مثل دور السياق المكتوب والمتحدث في تعلم المفردة كذلك ميول وإتجاهات المعلمين نحو دور العلاقات الدلالية في بناء المفردات.

الكلمات المفتاحية:

معجمي – علاقة التضمين – تصنيف الأنواع – علاقة الجزء بالكل – تعدد المعاني

INTRODUCTION:

Learning vocabulary is a very important part of learning a language. The more words you know, the more you will be able to understand what you hear and read and the better you will be able to say what you want to when speaking or writing, so it is very important skill in learning how to read, write, listen and speak therefore without sufficient vocabulary, people cannot communicate and express their feelings in written or in spoken situations hence, the main four skills should be built and developed in terms of vocabulary construction then performance. Kent (2010:1) states that "knowledge of word parts play a role in increasing our vocabularies".

We continue to develop vocabulary in order to change what we have in our minds (what we know) to performance (the use of language) through our lives, so words are powerful and also they open up possibilities and of course that is what we want for all of our students.

Vocabulary knowledge varies greatly from learner to another and this of course according to their abilities, motivation of learning, age, attitudes as well as to the methods and techniques that used in teaching them vocabularies as there are different ways by which vocabulary can be acquired and learned.

From the previous lines we understand that there are different varieties and techniques of vocabulary learning (Vocabulary are acquired with different methods and techniques by different learners), therefore learners should recognize which ones help them in increasing their vocabulary during the process of foreign language learning.

Inside the classroom there are several ways that the teacher might test vocabulary learning of his students; for example: you will be given the words and have to write definitions, use them in an example sentence and then translate into your language. But the question is that: Is translation is the best method of vocabulary learning? Most students prefer words of foreign language to be translated into their own language when teaching as they think it is an easy way to infer meanings but of course it leads to weakness in vocabulary instruction as well as weakness in their use of spoken and written language as a result of lack of vocabulary to be used.

Absolutely, the meaning of the vocabulary not always can be known by translation method or by separating the words individually but the meaning of language is often seen from the relations of the word with other words. We do not communicate using individual words, we communicate in phrases and sentences. When you learn a new word, look at its place in the sentence and look at the words that typically appear with it, so lexemes contribute meanings to the utterances in which they co-occur, and what meanings they contribute depend on what other lexemes they are associated with in these utterances.

2. Statement of the Problem:

During the period of teaching the researcher observed that the students tend to know the meaning of unfamiliar items found in their spine series but they do a lot of mistakes because of the ambiguity of these items even through the context of the sentence.

The EFL learners have specified problems in how to know the meanings of these vocabularies correctly, so this research tries to provide and present the technique of lexical semantic relations as a suitable method of vocabulary learning which can be used by secondary school students beside that the researcher tries to find solutions to the problem of vocabulary learning made by the secondary school students.

3. Literature Review:

The process of learning any skill is considered as no sense if the learner doesn't pay attention about the meaning of what he/she heard or read, so when practicing any of the main four skills (reading, writing, listening or speaking) we concentrate on the meaning of the vocabulary, therefore any attempt to recognize the nature of language must try to describe and explain the ways in which linguistic expressions have meanings.

Nick (2010:3) states that "it is easy to agree that meaning is the heart of language. Meaning, we might say is what language is for: to have a language without meaning would be like lungs without air. Only when sequences of sounds or letters have (or are judged capable of having) a meaning do they qualify as language: infants' babbling and bird song for example use the same medium as human language – sound – but since they don't and cannot express meaning (except perhaps to the infants and the birds) we don't consider them as examples of language in the full sense of the word".

Many factors affects our knowledge of meanings and assist us to know what that word means. For example inside the classroom knowing the meaning of the word through the context of the sentence requires many steps such as reading the entire sentence, identify words you understand, look for illustrative examples and thinking logically if the context clue is not clear, therefore the learner can recognize the meaning of that item through looking to words surrounding it and guessing what does it indicate for.

Particularly, in secondary school level students always involve with the problem of lack of vocabulary if they were asked to discuss a certain topic in groups or even if they were ordered to write a composition, so that sentence context is an important factor that helps us to guess meanings of words in sentences.

(Dolores: 2007) states that "when languages is studied in use, context always come first, directing the process of meaning construction from the very beginning, therefore; when words are used they always come in specific contexts and the influence exerted by those contexts for the meaning of word to know the exact meaning of that word as the interpretations of a word may vary quite a lot from context to context".

Not only contexts affects meanings but also relationships between words can be reflected and discussed through various ways and methods, therefore sentence context is considered as one type of these methods. For example, linguists shed lights on explaining the meaning of unfamiliar words through the technique of lexical semantic relations (sense relations) because it also has a relation to the word and other surrounding words.

Yule (1985:104) opposes that "Not only can words be treated as containers of meaning or as a fulfilling roles in events, they can also have relationships with each other. In everyday talk, we often explain the meanings of words in terms of their relationships" therefore, it is agreed that we can find out the meaning of a particular word in term of its link or association with other words. If someone heard the word 'doctor', other words such as nurse, patient, hospital and drug comes to his mind. This event is similar to the flow of electricity which turns on some lights simultaneously; therefore the recognition of these words becomes easier" while Murphy (2003:1) assumes that " semantic relations and lexicon explores the many paradigmatic semantic relations between words such as synonymy, antonymy and hyponymy and their relevance to the mental organization of our vocabulary".

Saeed (1997:63) assumes that "there are numbers of different types of lexical relations. A particular lexeme may be simultaneously in a number of these relations, so that it may be more accurate to think of the lexicon as a **network** rather than listing of words in a published dictionary"

Hence the researcher aims to investigate the use of these lexical relations inside secondary school classrooms as a technique that promote vocabulary learning among secondary school students.

Accordingly, all the previous points of view regards to lexical semantic relations show that we can examine the sense relations between words and also show that it has an important role in the process of vocabulary learning. Various types of Lexical semantic relations will be discussed below in this chapter.

Hyponymy:

There are group of words that refer to the class itself (involve us in **inclusion**) to show that a particular term is included in another. Palmer (1976:85) states that "there are words that refer to the class itself. Hyponymy involves us in the notion of inclusion in the sense that *tulip* and *rose* are included in *flower* and *lion* and *elephant* in *mammal*, similarly, *scarlet* is included in

179

SUST Journal of Linguistic and Literary Studies (2019)   **Vol.20.No. 4 December (2019)**
ISSN (text): 1858 -828x   **e -ISSN (online): 1858-8565**

red. Inclusion is thus a matter of membership. The 'upper' term is the **superdinate** and the 'lower' term is the **hyponym"**.

According to Murphy (2006:446) "hyponymy is generally defined as a relation of inclusion whose converse is hyperonymy" while Yule (1985:105) states that "when the meaning of one form is included in the meaning of another, the relationship is described as **hyponymy**. Examples are the pairs: animal/dog, dog/poodle, vegetable/carrot, flower/rose, and tree/banyan. The concept of 'inclusion' involved in this relationship is the idea that if an object is a *rose*, then it is necessarily a *flower*, so the meaning of flower is included in the meaning of rose, Or *rose* is a hyponym of *flower.*

In addition to the last two points of view about hyponymy, Hyponymy is the semantic relation that plays the most important role in our conscious thinking about what words mean. Nida (1964:15) also provides examples for this meaning of 'inclusion' by showing that " the meaning of *scarlet* is said to be included in the meaning of *red;* the meaning of *tulip* is included in the meaning of *flower* and so on.

For that, when words are grouped together in language teaching, the meanin of a particular word can be known through hyponymy relation and the meaning could be explained in terms of saying (X is a kind of Y), (Y has an X) or even by putting vocabularies in a hierarchy.

Synonymy:

When two words have the same meaning, we call them synonyms and also such words are called synonymous or they are synonyms of one another.

Yule (1985:104) mentions that "two or more words with very closely related meaning are called synonyms. They can often though not always be substituted for each other in sentences. In the appropriate circumstances we can say: what was his *answer* Or what was his *reply*? with much the same meaning". Other common examples of synonyms are the pairs*: almost/nearly, big/large, broad/wide, buy/purchase, cab/taxi, car/automobile, coach/sofa and freedom/liberty.*

Synonym: exact synonyms are very rare" whereas Aitchison (1978:87) assumes that "lexical items can be regarded as synonyms if they can be interchanged without altering the meaning of an utterance". Examples:

- He *snapped* the twig in half.
- He *broke* the twig in half.

By studying interchangeable items a linguist can build up a picture of those with similar meaning. Usually, a lexical item only partially overlaps another and the two are synonymous only in certain contexts. To return to the words *snap* and *break*; (he *snapped* his finger) doesn't mean the same as (he *broke* his fingers) and although (he *broke* the record for the 100 meter sprint) is an acceptable sentence more than (he *snapped* the record for the 100 meter sprint). (ibid)

Geeraerts (2010:84) clarifies that "if synonymy is defined as relationship between words in context, two items are synonymous if they may be substituted for each other in a given context".

Also O' Grady (1987:269) thinks that "it is easy to think of contexts in which both words in each pair have essentially the same meaning (I spend my holiday/vacation in the Swiss Alps), there are also contexts in which their meaning diverge at least slightly. For example, Christmas and Spring Bank Holiday are holidays, but they are not necessarily parts of one vacation".

Antonymy:

Words which are opposites in meaning are called **antonyms.** So, it is also very useful to identify relationships of antonymy or (opposition). Palmer (1976:94) explains that "the term

antonymy is used for oppositeness of meaning; words that are opposite are antonyms. Antonymy is often thought of as the opposite of synonymy, but the status of the two is very different".

(1963:460) suggests that "" antonymy or 'oppositeness' of meaning, has long been recognized as one of the most semantic relations. However it has been the subject of a good deal of confusion, partly because it has generally been regarded as complementary to synonymy and partly most semanticists have failed to give sufficient attention to different kinds of oppositeness".

Another point of view mentioned by O' Grady (1985:269) is that "antonyms are words or phrases that are opposites with respect to some component of their meaning".

Learners should realize that as two or more words can have the same meaning (synonyms), they also can be antonyms (each one is the opposite of the other).Yule (1989:104) states that "the forms with opposite meanings are called antonyms. Some common examples are the pairs:

Alive/ dead
Big/ small
Fast/ slow
Happy/ sad
Hot/ cold
Long/ short
Male/ female

Polysemy:

Polysemy is concerned with the way words often have a number of different meanings. Yule (1985:107) suggests that "when we encounter two or more words with the same form and related meanings, we have what is technically known as *polysemy*. Polysemy can be defined as one form (written or spoken) having multiple meanings that are related by extension. Examples are the word *head*, used to refer to the object on the top of your body, on top of a glass, person at the top of a company or department and many other things; other examples of polysemy are: *foot* (of person, of bed, of mountain) or *run* (person does, water does, colors do)".

Mc Mcarthy (2002:14) also provides some examples showing the meaning of polysemy when he assumes that "look at these sentences and think about how you would translate the words into your own language:

A)
1. It is only *fair* that we would share the housework.
2. The Frankfurt Book *Fair* is more important even for most publishers.
3. Our caravan gives us shelter through *fair* weather or foul.
4. I have got *fair* eyelashes and my eyes look awful without mascara.
5. His marks in final exam were *fair* to disappointing.

B)
1. The firefighters managed to save the children from the burning third – floor *flat*.
2. The countryside round there is terribly *flat* and boring.
3. To join the Fitness Club you must pay a *flat* fee of 500 dollars.
4. The tune in B *flat* minor.
5. He erected the shed in five minutes *flat*.

You probably need a different word to translate *fair* and *flat* in each sentence".

Homonymy:

With reference to the sense of polysemy, (1995:4) assumes that "when a given word is thought to have more than one meaning, in other words, when it comprises two or more possible readings, it is classified as lexically ambiguous. This ambiguity type is usually divided into two main categories, namely **homonymy** and **polysemy**. The former can be defines as the phenomenon where a word has several meanings, these meanings being unrelated. The latter in contrast is applied to words with two or more related meanings (as what it was discussed).

181

SUST Journal of Linguistic and Literary Studies (2019)   **Vol.20.No. 4 December (2019)**
ISSN (text): 1858 -828x   **e -ISSN (online): 1858-8565**

Yule (1985:106) mentions that "when two or more different written forms have the same pronunciation, they are described as **homophones**. Common examples are bare/bear, meat/meet, flour/flower, pale/pail, right/write, sew/so and to/too and two. We use the term homonyms when one form (written or spoken) has two or more unrelated meanings as in these examples:

- Bank (of a river) – bank (financial institution)
- Bat (flying creature) - bat (used in sport)
- Mole (on skin) - mole (small animal)
- Pupil (at school) - pupil (in the eye)
- Race (contest of speed) - race (ethnic group)

The temptation is to think that the two types of *bank* must be related in meaning. They aren't. *Homonyms* are words that have separates histories and meanings, but have accidently come to have exactly the same form.

Meronomy:

Another lexical relation helps in learning vocabulary raise students' stock of vocabulary is the **meronymy** and as Saeed (1997:70) explains it "it is term used to describe a part – whole relationship between lexical items". When learning, students have to know frames like X is a part of Y.

Riemer (2010:140) opposes that "meronymy is the relation of part to whole: *hand* is a meronym of *arm*, *seed* is ameronym of *fruit*, *blade* is a meronym of *knife*, conversely, *arm* is the holonym of *hand*, *fruit* is the holonym of *seed*, etc.".

The definition of meronymy as based on the 'part of' relation isn't without problems. Typically, meronymy is taken to be transitive. If **A** is a meronym of **B** and **B** is a meronym of **C**, then it seems to be necessarily true that **A** is also a part of **C**. The use of 'part of' in English is often consistent with transitivity of meronymic relation. Thus sequences of embedded parts and wholes, such as (seed, fruit, plant) yield

perfectly natural- sounding sentences highlighting the part of relation:

- A seed is a part of fruit.
- A fruit is a part of plant.
- A seed is a part of plant.

Taxonomy:

Cruse (2000:150) states that "taxonomy is a sub- type of hyponymy". In his other book (1995:137) he says "A useful diagnostic frame of taxonomy is: An X is a kind/ type of Y".

The following pairs of taxonomy shows Cruse's opinion about the sense more clearly:

X	*Y*	
Poodle:	dog	A

A poodle is a type of dog.

Orchid:	flower	An

orchid is a type of flower.

Banana:	fruit	A

banana is a type of fruit.

From Cruse's point of view and the given examples, it is clear that taxonomy can be used in learning vocabulary instead of hyponymy or vice versa.

Idioms:

Idioms are group of words established by usage as having a meaning deducible from those of the individual words. Cruse (1986:37) clarifies that "it has long been recognized that, expressions such as to pull someone's leg, to have a bee in one's bonnet, to kick the bucket, to cook someone's goose, to be off one's rocker, round the bend, up the creek, etc. are semantically peculiar. They are usually described as 'idioms'. A traditional definition is that "an idiom is an expression whose meaning cannot be inferred from the meaning of its parts".

Palmer (1976:79) says that "we cannot predict for any given language, whether a particular meaning will be expressed by a single word or by a sequence of words. Thus English PUNCH and KICK have to be translated into French with *donner un coup de* and *donner un coup depied*. In these French examples, we clearly have instances of collocations that involve some

association of ideas, and the meaning of entire expression can be predicted from the meaning of the individual words" therefore, the meaning of idiom will be opaque if an idiom is taken word by word. (the meaning of idiom is not related to the meaning of individual words).

Collocations:

Despite of the different definitions of the term collocation, we find the simplest one is that 'two or more words that often go together'. Yule (1985:108) says that "we know which words tend to occur with other words. If you asked a thousand of people what they think of when you say *hammer*, more than half will say *nail.* If you say *table*, they will mostly say *chair*, and *butter* elicits *bread* and *salt* elicits *pepper*. One way we seem to organize our knowledge of words is simply on the basis of **collocations**, or frequently occurring together".

Firth (1951:124) cited in Palmer (1976:75) thinks that "you shall know a word by the company it keeps" whereas Nesselhauf (2003:11) assumes that "a collocation is considered the co-occurrence words at a certain distance, and a distinction is usually made between co- occurrences that are frequent (or more precisely more frequent

than could be expected if words combined randomly in a language) and those that are not".

4. The Method of the Research:

The researcher used the descriptive analytical method to conduct the study. A test was used as methods of data collection. The population of the study were a number of 60 secondary school students and the procedures were as follow:

The researcher used pre and posttest method to collect his data and gave this tool more focusing because the students are the major target of the study, so the test was selected to evaluate the actual students' use of lexical semantic relations when learning vocabulary.

The test was constructed to obtain data from secondary school students (first, second and third levels) in two of Omdurman secondary schools. All the students are aged between (15 to 19) years old and all of them taught English as a foreign language.

The test contains different types of questions such as: completion, tick the right answer, fill in gaps and draw a circle round the best alternative answer. Listening questions are also included in the test to assess their abilities in homophones.

5. Data Analysis:

Pretest and Posttest Analysis (Success and Failure):

Table 1

Category	No.	Success	Success %	Failure	Failure%
Pretest	60	18	30.0%	42	70.0%
Posttest	60	51	85.0%	9	15.0%

Table 2

Student	Pre	Post	Diff.	Student	Pre	Post	Diff.
1	21	23	2	31	11	22	11
2	9	18	9	32	13	29	16
3	11	25	14	33	13	22	9
4	15	16	1	34	13	21	8
5	11	30	19	35	9	24	15
6	13	17	4	36	17	22	5
7	12	18	6	37	13	16	3

183

SUST Journal of Linguistic and Literary Studies (2019)   **Vol.20.No. 4 December (2019)**
ISSN (text): 1858 -828x   **e -ISSN (online): 1858-8565**

8	17	19	2	38	9	22	13
9	9	13	4	39	5	19	14
10	15	30	15	40	11	18	7
11	16	15	-1	41	11	30	19
12	24	13	-11	42	13	20	7
13	14	15	1	43	20	22	2
14	7	18	11	44	13	18	5
15	9	20	11	45	16	18	2
16	12	19	7	46	18	20	2
17	24	16	-8	47	14	21	7
18	17	14	-3	48	11	28	17
19	18	30	12	49	14	25	11
20	10	15	5	50	11	12	1
21	19	14	-5	51	10	13	3
22	15	13	-2	52	22	21	-1
23	15	17	2	53	13	21	8
24	12	30	18	54	5	22	17
25	11	15	4	55	6	18	12
26	12	19	7	56	6	19	13
27	14	30	16	57	8	27	19
28	12	24	12	58	11	21	10
29	17	15	-2	59	9	25	16
30	13	19	6	60	16	15	-1
				Mean	11.42	19.7	7.1

Hypotheses:

The 'null hypothesis' might be:

H_0: There is no difference in mean pre- and post-marks

And an 'alternative hypothesis' might be:

H_1: There is a difference in mean pre- and post-marks

Table 3: Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair1	PRE	13.43	60	5.033	0.650
	POST	20.18	60	5.740	0.650

Table 4: Paired Samples Correlations

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 PRE&POST	60	-0.05	0.707

Table 5: Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the difference				
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Deviation Error	Lower	Upper	T	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
Pair 1 PRE-POST	-6.75	7.322	0.945	- 8.64	- 4.86	- 7.141	59	0.00

From table 5 we observe the t statistic, t = -7.141, and p = 0.000, i.e. a very small probability of this result occurring by chance, under the null hypothesis of no difference.

The null hypothesis is rejected, since p < 0.05 (in fact p = 0.000).

There is strong evidence (t = -7.141, p = 0.000) that the teaching intervention improves marks. In this data set, it improved marks, on average, by approximately 6 points. Of course, if we were to take other samples of marks, we could get a 'mean paired difference' in marks different from 6.75. This is why it is important to look at the 95% Confidence Interval (95% CI).

If we were to do this experiment 100 times, 95 times the true value for the difference would lie in the 95% confidence interval. In our case, the 95% CI is from -8.64 to -4.86. This confirms that, although the difference in marks is statistically significant, it is actually relatively small. You would need to consider if this difference in marks is practically important, not just statistically significant.

According to the analysis of the pretest, it is clear that only 38% of the students succeeded in passing the test. A number of 18 students scored more than 50% from the total percentage whereas a number of 42 students which represents 70% failed in answering half or more than half of the test questions. This clarify that students they lack of awareness of lexical semantics use and this was very clear in their responds to the relations of hierarchy beside antonyms, idioms and collocations.

Posttest scored showed that 85% of the number of the students respond correctly while only a number of 9 students which represents only 15% failed in answering the many of the questions of these relations.

Post-test scores were high when compared to pretest scores (Table 1) and post-test results showed 55.0% had become higher performers where none of them scored more than twenty-four in pre-test; moderate performers were raised to 85.0% (post-test) from 30.0% (pre-test) with an improvement of 55.0%; and none of them were below average performers following post-test. This suggests that the students were attentive to the intervention and so were able to understand the key objective of the lecture.

Summary of all answers

Category	Number	Percentage
Pass	1220	68.5%
Fail	560	31.5%
Total	1780	100%

6. Results and Discussions:

A prospective study was conducted to see if a pretest, given immediately before teaching, improved performance in a subsequent post-test. The study was also used to assess the educational value of a structured teaching method. Results revealed that majority of the students (85.0%) felt that pretests helped them to improve their focus toward didactic lecture and for better performance. The possible reason could be realization of their loopholes and lacuna following pretest. Thus, administering pretests before lecture would increase the attentiveness, curiosity, eagerness to listen to the lecture among the students. 85.0% of the students felt that pretest helped in acquiring new learning as well as important points which were unknown previously. These perceptions of better performance after the pretest were confirmed to be true by post-test scores was significantly higher ($P \leq 0.05$). In addition to that, the total of test's items was 1780 items. A number of 1220 participants which represents 68.5% responded correctly to the test items whereas 560 students which represents 31.5 failed in answering correctly.

The most important findings are that: secondary school students aren't aware of the use of the use of some lexical semantic relations to promote their vocabulary learning and this was shown according to the results obtained by the students from the test and despite of the partly rejection of the second hypothesis which insured that most students know relations between words and their meanings but lack of exercises led to their insufficient awareness of the use of some of them. In addition to that there was an apparent weakness in the sense of antonymy and most of the students didn't react in vocabulary learning through oppositeness in a positive way despite of the sentence context. So, they need more practicing and enough exercises in antonyms.

7. Conclusion:

This study investigates the role of lexical semantic relations in the process of vocabulary learning in secondary level. Based on the findings of the present study and with reference to the main hypotheses it can be concluded that: the first hypothesis that states "secondary school students are aware to some extent of learning kinds of vocabulary which requires lexical semantic relations". The results obtained after the analysis of the post test showed that, students did well in the majority of these relations so that their scores were very high in the parts of hyponymy, meronomy, taxonomy, synonymy, antonomy (to some extent) beside the acceptable answers in idioms and collocations and of course this confirms the authenticity of this hypothesis.

As for the second hypothesis which says 'words can be learned and understood from their relations to other words'. High scores obtained by the students in most of these relations confirmed that this hypothesis is true and although most students failed in answering questions related to the part of polysemy but this doesn't affect the authenticity of this hypothesis for it seems that the majority of the students thought these words have only one meaning (for each one) and they didn't take sentence context into consideration.

8. Recommendations:

In the lights of findings of the study, it is appropriate to make the following recommendations for both learners and teachers:

5. Secondary school students should be aware of the use of lexical semantic relations especially for those who suffer from lack of vocabularies as it increases the stock of vocabulary and also teachers should take these relations into consideration when teaching.

6. Enough exercises in the sense of antonomy should be given to the students and in different varieties when asking the question, for example: cross the odd word, draw a circle, find word/s from the passage that are the opposites of these words because the results of the

7. test showed that most of the students didn't use antonyms properly as well as students' awareness of polysemous words should be raised.

8. There should be listening exercises which make students use different forms of words that having the same sound but they written differently (homophones).

9. Suggestions for Further Studies:

The current study shows the important effect of lexical semantic relations in vocabulary learning, but further studies are needed on teachers' attitudes towards the use of lexical semantic relations in teaching new words.

As shown in the test results analysis, multi meanings of a word is quite problematic for secondary school students, therefore the role of written and spoken contexts in vocabulary learning is also suggested beside difficulties that face students when using synonyms and antonyms.

10. References:

Aithcison J. (1978). Linguistics. U.K Milton Park. Abingdon.

Cruse A. (2002). Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.

Cruse D. (1986). Lexical Semantics. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Geeraerts D. (2010). Theories of Lexical Semantics. Inc. New York. Oxford University Press

Hurford R, Heasly B and Smith M. (2007). Semantics a course book. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Lyons J. (1963). Structural Semantics. Oxford. Blackwell.

Lyons J. (1995). Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction. Cambridge. England. Cambridge University Press.

Mc. Carthy. M, O' Dell. (2002). English Collocations in Use. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Murphy M. (2003). Semantic Relations and Lexicon: Antonymy, Synonymy and other Paradigms. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Nida, Eugence A. (1964). Componential Analysis of Meaning: Approaches to Semantics. New York. Mouton Publishers.

O'Grady W, Bobrovolsky M. (1987). Cotemporary Linguistics. Francis Katamba. Harlaw. United Kingdom.

Palmer F. (1976). Semantics. U.S.A Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Riemer N. (2010). Introducing Semantics. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Saeed J. (1997). Semantics. Oxford. Main Street, Malden Graisington.

Yule G. (1985). The Study of Language. Cambridge. Cambridge Universi