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The present study aims to investigate EFL students’ knowledge of lexical collocations (verb+noun) combination. For this purpose, 30 second year master students of English at L’Arbi Ben M’hidi University in Oum Bouaghi, have taken part in this study. Thus, we hypothesize that EFL students do not have a good knowledge of lexical collocations. In order to prove our hypothesis, a Discourse Completion Task (Multiple-Choice Test) has been administered to examine students’ use of collocations. This test consists of 20 sentences; each sentence has four options, and students are asked to select the correct verb to co-occur with the noun in the sentence. The main interest of the analysis is to identify, describe and analyze the correct and incorrect collocational use of lexical collocations (verb + noun) combination. Moreover, the source of collocational errors is analyzed and discussed depending on Liu Analysis of Collocations Errors in EFL Writings. The results of the test have shown that students have knowledge of lexical collocations (verb + noun) combination. On the basis of these findings our hypothesis is rejected.
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Introduction

Language has traditionally been divided into grammar and vocabulary. Vocabulary has long been neglected, but grammar has been studied as a separate module. Grammar has been considered as a language most essential part to be studied and given that value and interest to acquire the language. However, this perspective of superiority has misguided the EFL learners, and made them suffer from many language obstacles. Previously, vocabulary learning was guided to be guessed from extensive reading, and rich context, but this did not make EFL learners use vocabulary in general and lexical collocations in specific accuracy. Thus, this is due to the misuse of word combinations and multi-word units. At that time, a large number of studies have been conducted on vocabulary teaching and learning and new approaches have appeared such as The Lexical Approach of Michael Lewis. The lexical approach has been given a crucial role to vocabulary in the language acquisition.

However, native speakers may have problems in word combinations and word groupings, foreign language learners try also their best to make their language understandable and seem more natural. Producing erroneous utterances for instance, may not be due to the lack of vocabulary needed, but to their ignorance of lexical collocations or even other factors. Accordingly, it is better to teach EFL students how to associate words with their right and accurate collocations and in the appropriate contexts to do not produce combinations that seem “wrong” to native speakers of English.

1. Statement of the Problem

Students of English as a Foreign Language miss the lexis required to express their ideas accurately and fluently in the English language. They produce inappropriate word combinations and non native-like utterances, and this reflects their ignorance of the English collocations. Although they have been taught grammar, they still commit errors. This means that grammar organizes chunks of vocabulary which are considered as a focal point in the language acquisition and proficiency. Collocations as a whole, and lexical collocations as a part are the most important part of vocabulary needed by EFL students as claimed by Hymes (1971) “The knowledge of normal collocations is part of a native speakers’ communicative competence”. Hill
illustrates this problem with the following example in which students say: “his disability will continue until he dies” rather than “he has a permanent disability” as cited in Hill (n.d) (Michael, 2000, p. 50) . So, students should know that words have their own collocational fields.

2. **Aim of the study**

The aim of this study is:

To investigate EFL students’ knowledge of lexical collocations.

**3. Research Questions and Hypothesis**

This study addresses the following questions:

1- Do EFL students know lexical collocations?

2- Do EFL students use lexical collocations incorrectly?

3- What are the sources of collocational errors?

The main hypothesis set for this research is that, EFL students of Oum El Bouaghi University do not have a lexical collocational knowledge.

**4. Research Methodology**

To fulfill the aim of this descriptive study, a discourse completion task will be adopted. It will be used as a data collection tool. A written task will be administered to Second Year Master Degree students in the English Department at L’Arbi Ben M’hidi’ university, Oum El Bouaghi. The Multiple-Choice Test will be distributed to a sample of 30 students that will be randomly selected out of the total population of Second Year Master students; in order to form reliable picture about EFL students’ knowledge of lexical collocations in English Language.

The Multiple-Choice Test consists of 20 sentences with blanks to be filled in by the appropriate verb which will be associated with the appropriate noun in the sentence.
5. Sampling

The sample of the present study consists of 30 Second Year Master Degree Students at the Department of English, L’Arbi Ben M’-hidi University, Oum El Bouaghi. They are chosen randomly out of the total population (124). They are aged between 22 -30 years old.

6. Structure of the Study

The dissertation includes two main chapters. The first chapter will be devoted to the theoretical part which aims at shedding light on the concept of collocations (explaining its origin, definitions, patterns, types and criteria). Then, collocations’ study in comparison to the two close concepts idioms and phrasal verbs, explanation of the notion of collocational knowledge, and a clarification of the two close concepts collocations and colligations. In addition to that, the field of vocabulary teaching is explored in order to draw a relationship between teaching collocations and “communicative competence”, the importance of teaching and learning collocations. So, we will discover the concept of “collocational competence” in foreign language. At the end of the chapter we will study the main reasons behind collocational errors and the most noticeable difficulties of teaching collocations. The Second chapter will be the practical part that aims at analyzing the collected data or results, describing the discourse completion task design, answering the research questions and checking the results as to the truthfulness of the hypothesis, and we will put forward some pedagogical implications.
Chapter One
Collocations
Introduction

The term “collocation” has been defined in many different ways from various linguists, lexicographers and lexicologists. In this chapter, we will firstly try to clarify the notion of collocation by exploring its origin, definitions, patterns, types, and criteria. Secondly, we will study collocations in comparison to idioms and phrasal verbs, collocational knowledge, collocations and colligations. In addition to that, the field of vocabulary language teaching is explored in order to draw a relationship between teaching collocations and “communicative competence” and the importance of learning and teaching collocations. Finally, we will shed light on the main reasons behind collocational errors and the most noticeable difficulties of teaching collocations.
1. The Origin of Collocations

The origin of the term ‘collocation’ refers or goes back to the Latin verb ‘collocare’ which means ‘to arrange’ or ‘to set in order’ (Muller, 2008). This term has appeared with the British Linguist J.R. Firth in his theory “Modes of Meaning” (1957). Firth uses it to describe the co-occurrence of lexical items, and he advocates that words get meaning from their collocates (as cited in Muller, 2008).

Collocation can be separated into parts containing, ‘col’-meaning- ‘together’, ‘with’, ‘loc’-meaning-‘to place or put’, ‘ate’ (a verb suffix), and ‘ion’(a noun suffix). In other words, collocations refer to words that are placed together (Nation, 1990, p.32).

Collocation has their roots in phraseology, according to Howarth (1996) it is a term that becomes generally accepted as the name for the discipline within lexicology that focuses on fixed expressions. This approach studies a set or fixed expressions, or in other words the style in which words and phrases are used in writing or speech. Firth and after him “Neo-Firthians” have been studied the problems that use patterns pose, especially for foreign language learners.

Phraseology can thus be seen to carry on the work of lexicologists and lexicographers like Palmer and Thornbury in the early 20th century; they were presumably the first ones to use the term “collocation” in the context of phraseology (Cowie, 2000)(as cited in Nesselhauf, 2005).

The studies of Firth (1957) in phraseology were about the relationship between lexis and grammar system, instantiation, and systematic variation. J.R. Firth has inspired many linguists which later on called “Neo-Firthians”. Those linguists conduct many studies as John Sinclair “Corpus in Linguistics” (1991), Michael Haliday “Systematic Functional Grammar” (1994) …etc.

Phraseology which has its roots in Russia focuses on the cultural dimension of collocation (Nesselhauf, 2005). Howarth (1996) claims that “The Neo-Firthian lexicologists have been primarily interested, not in classifying types of collocations, but in the phenomenon of ‘collocation’ itself and in what it contributes to linguistic meaning as a whole” (p.30). In contrast to phraseology which is related to phraseological units, lexicology is related to the meaning of individual words. As a result, these word-combinations have become very important in first and second language acquisition.
Firth (1957) defines the term “collocation” as follows “you shall know a word by thcompany it keeps” (p.196). Firth (1957) gives as the example of ‘dark’ that collocates with ‘night’, so one of the meanings of ‘night’ is its collocability with ‘dark’. Thereby, the meaning of the word ‘night’ is clarified through its collocate ‘dark’. Another thing is that, the word that needs clarification here -night- is called the ‘Node’ word, whereas the words that could be combined with it are called ‘Collocates’.

Moreover, collocations in the Semantic Prosody Origin are not similar to collocations in Phraseological Origin since words are not combined just like that with chosen meanings (Lewis, 2000). Sinclair (1991) claims that “many uses of words and phrases show a tendency to occur in a certain semantic environment” (as cited in Lewis, 2000, p.232). For example, the verb “happen” is associated with “unpleasant things” – accident and the like.

Lewis (2000) defines “semantic prosody” as the occurrence of word with a particular set of meaning. He illustrates an example with the word “chilly”; he said that almost anything can be “chilly” as people, food …etc. So, “chilly” as a word can also be associated within the prosody of “time” as morning, night, evening, day; whereas, it does not collocate with minutes or decades (Lewis, 2000).

Finally, the origin of collocations in the Lexical Approach, it is evident that Firth is widely considered as the father of collocations and the developer of both phraseological and lexical approach of collocations. Firth claims (1957) that the meaning of a word is determined by the co-occurring words. Consequently, vocabulary is regarded to be independent and separable from grammar. Words receive their meanings from the words they co-occur with; however, those combinations are so strict in some times, for example, make an omelette but do your homework.

Firth’s most revolutionary concepts are to perceive lexical relations as syntagmatic rather than paradigmatic ones; in this context, he proposes (1957) that “meaning by collocation” is a lexical meaning at the syntagmatic level not at the paradigmatic level. Halliday (1966) considers collocations as word – combinations that are inflected from grammar boundaries. For instance, ‘he argues strongly’ and ‘the strength of his argument’ are grammatical derivations of the original collocation “strong argument”. Halliday (1966) defined collocation in the lexical approach as a “linear co-occurrence relationship among lexical items which co-occurrence together” (as cited in Brashi, n.d, p.23).
Sinclair (1966) says that the item in which its collocated words are studied is called a “node”, so he distinguishes between three essential items which are node, span and collocate. He asserts that “node” is an item whose total pattern of co-occurrence with other words is under examination, a “collocate” is defined as any one of the items which appears with the node within the specified span, whereas a “span” is the amount of text within which collocation between items is said to occur, neglecting the grammatical structures of which they form a part. Sinclair (1966) shows an interest in generating lexical sets by the use of collocation, grammar, and lexis are two different aspects. Further, he adds that grammar can be described by structures (syntagms) and systems (paradigms), while lexical items collocate with one another collocations and sets regularly.

Michael Lewis coins the term “Lexical Approach” (1993, 1997, 2000) to indicate a theory in which lexis and vocabulary play a major role in language learning. This approach has been emerged as a reaction to the behaviorist tradition which is based on PPP (Presentation, Practice, and Production). This tradition considers learning vocabulary as a key element of learning a foreign language, and vocabulary as a principle part in the communicative competence and language acquisition (Lewis, 2000).

The lexical approach is focused on exposing the learner to a great amount of vocabulary input combined with consciousness-raising (Lewis, 2000). Lewis (2000) claims that within the lexical approach lexis is learnt by learning word combinations, ready-made chunks and prefabs not just individual words. The study of these word combinations should be treated as a whole not as a part. Furthermore, Lewis (2000) argues that language acquisition takes place when the learner is able to analyze the language into lexical “chunks”. Thus, ready-made chunks enable learners to produce native-like language. He adds “but so much of the language of the effective language user is already in prefabricated chunks stored in their mental lexicons just waiting to be recalled for use” (Lewis, 2000, p.15). This indicates that having a collocational knowledge helps you to express your ideas freely and easily, and enables the learner to convey the semantic and pragmatic meanings of words accurately.
2. Approaches to define Collocation

Collocations’ researches have been conducted by two distinctive and overlapping traditions which are “the Statistically Oriented Approach” and “Phraseological Approach”.

2.1 The Statistically Oriented Approach

This approach returns to J.R. Firth, and after that, it has been progressed specifically by Halliday and Sinclair. Many researchers adopt this tradition especially those who are involved in the Computational Analysis of syntagmatic relations and work in the fields of lexicography and pedagogy. (Nesselhauf, 2005). Under this approach there are common definitions which are:

“Collocation is the occurrence of two or more words within a short space of each other in a text”. (Sinclair, 1991, p.170).

“Collocation is considered the co-occurrence of words at a certain distance” (Nesselhauf, 2005, p.3).

“Collocations are, in general, seen as units consisting of co-occurring words within a certain distance of each other, and a distinction is often made between frequently and infrequently co-occurring word” (Barfield and Gyllstad, 2009, p.3).

“The way in which words co-occur in natural text in statistically significant ways” (Lewis, 2000, p.1).

Collocations in this approach are considered as the co-occurrence of lexical and grammatical items, and the distinction that is made regularly between these co-occurrences that happen frequently or infrequently (Nesselhauf, 2005). The co-occurrence of these items happens at a certain distance of each other; this is what is called by Sinclair (1991) the “statistical significance”. This term is explained in the relations of “node”, “span”, and “collocate” (Sinclair, 1991, p.170).

2.2 The Phraseological Approach / Tradition

This approach has been strictly influenced by the Russian Phraseology. From the most influential linguists in this approach is Cowie (Nesselhauf, 2005). In the phraseological approach, the elements of collocations should be syntactically related. According to Hausmann (1984) “Collocations are pre-defined set of syntactic relations: adjective + noun, (subject) noun + verb, noun + noun, adverb + adjective, verb + adverb, verb + (object) noun” (as cited in Nesselhauf, 2005, p.17). There is also a lexical word plus a preposition. Benson et al. (1997) (as cited in Nesselhauf, 2005). Moreover, collocations are studied as a word
combination and approaches collocations from a lexical point of view. This approach can benefit from the co-occurrences of the frequency-based approach.

The following are the most common definitions given to collocation under this approach:

“A collocation is a pair or group of words that are often used together”. (McCarthy & O’Dell, 2005, p.6).

“Collocation is the way words combine in a language to produce natural-sounding speech and writing” (Oxford Collocations Dictionary, 2002 p.vii).

“A collocation, in its simplest definition, consists of two words which are linked together in the memory of native speakers and occur together with some frequency in both written and oral discourse” Aghbar (1990) (as cited in Hsu & Chiu, 2008, p.182).

This approach studies collocations as “word combinations”, their “various degrees of fixedness”, and “collocations typology and its decontextualized classification” (Barfeild & Gyllstad, 2009, p.5).

From all of these definitions, given under each approach, we notice that there is no unique definition to the term “collocation” according to many linguists and researchers. However, in spite of this difference there is a common agreement among all pedagogists that collocations are two or more words combined together continuously. For example, in English we can say “she has a beige car” but not “she has beige hair” or I can say “she has blond hair “but not “she has a blond car” (McCarthy, 1990, p.12). So, “beige car” is called “collocation” since the word “beige” collocates with “car” but not with “hair”; “blond” collocates with “hair” but not with “car”. Thus, if we misuse the words, the speech will not sound natural. Collocations “…give you the most natural way to say something.” (McCarthy & O’Dell, 2005, p.6). There is other examples may include collocations as “deliver a speech” and “make a decision”. This does not mean that all co-occurring words can be considered as collocations since collocations are only one type of word-combinations. For example, we exclude from collocations binomials as “life” and “death”, compound nouns such as “swimming pool” and phrasal verbs like “carry on”. Phrasal Verbs are classified under grammatical collocations.
3. Patterns of Collocations

Patterns of collocations consist of grammatical words which are combined in different ways. Here are the most common patterns of collocations according to Lewis (2000, p.133) and McCarthy & O’Dell (2005, p.12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective + noun</td>
<td>a difficult decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb + noun</td>
<td>submit a report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + noun</td>
<td>radio station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb + adverb</td>
<td>examine thoroughly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb + adjective</td>
<td>extremely inconvenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb + adjective + noun</td>
<td>revise the original plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + verb</td>
<td>the fog closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 Patterns of Collocations (Lewis, 2000, p.133).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective + noun</td>
<td>bright color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + verb</td>
<td>the economy boomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + noun</td>
<td>a sense of pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb + preposition + noun</td>
<td>filled with horror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb + adverb</td>
<td>smiled proudly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb + adjective</td>
<td>happily married</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2 Patterns of Collocations (McCarthy & O’Dell, 2005, p.12).

We notice that Lewis’s patterns are approximately identical to McCarthy & O’Dell (2005) ones. Both of them has in common these following patterns: Adjective +noun, Noun + noun, Verb + adverb, Adverb + adjective. However, there are some differences which are in Lewis’s patterns: Verb + adjective + noun, Verb + noun, and in McCarthy & O’Dell there is: Verb +preposition + noun.

4. Types of Collocations

Collocations have many classifications. Linguists classify collocations differently according to their use, strength …etc.
4.1 Lexical Collocations

Michael Lewis (2000, p.51) classifies Lexical Collocations as the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Collocations</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective + noun</td>
<td>A huge profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun + noun</td>
<td>A pocket calculator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb + adjective + noun</td>
<td>Learn a foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb + adverb</td>
<td>Live dangerously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb + verb</td>
<td>Half understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb + adjective</td>
<td>Completely soaked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3: Lexical Collocations (Lewis, 2000, p. 51).

From the table above (1.3), lexical collocations consist of principal words as Adjective, verb, noun, and adverb, but do not include any grammatical word as prepositions, infinitives or clauses. So, this is why this type is called “lexical”. This type of collocations may be quite difficult to learn and acquire.

4.2 Grammatical Collocations

Benson et al. (1986) classify Grammatical Collocations as the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Collocations</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1 Noun + preposition</td>
<td>Apathy toward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 Noun + to infinitive</td>
<td>He was a fool to do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3 Noun + that clause</td>
<td>He took an oath that he would do hid duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4 Preposition + noun</td>
<td>In advance, at anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5 Adjective + preposition</td>
<td>They are afraid of him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6 Predicate adjective + to infinitive</td>
<td>It was stupid for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7 Adjective + that clause</td>
<td>she was afraid that she would fail the exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.4: Grammatical Collocations Benson et al. (1986a)

Grammatical Collocations as we have noticed include also principal words as noun, verb, adjective, and adverb, but with grammatical items as prepositions, to + infinitive, and that + clause. So, this is why they are called “grammatical”. As a result, we can say that phrasal verbs as “look for”, “sit down” … etc., are considered as grammatical collocations since they include grammatical words as prepositions. Benson et al. (1986) (as cited in
Grammatical collocations are derived from the combinations of one open class word noun, verb, and adjective and one closed class which is a preposition (Lewis, 2000).

4.3 Technical Collocations

Technical Collocations are also considered as Specific Collocations. This type of collocations is quite different from lexical and grammatical collocations since they are used in specific contexts within a specific register. Consequently, technical collocations are used for specific purposes (ESP) to assist learners to acquire a specific language usage and use. In addition to that, technical collocations are “powerful indicators of register” (Partington, 1998, p.20). Also, they are “pre-cooked expressions” which are needed in “many genres of writings”. So, each genre has its specific collocations (Firth, 1957, p.195). Similarly, Sinclair (1966) stresses the relationship between collocation and register. He points out how collocations such as “vigorous depressions” and “dull highlights” are used respectively in Meteorology and photography and seem quite normal. However, they may seem odd in other registers. Firth (1957) also called this kind of collocations “the restricted technical collocations” or “personal collocations” (p.195). Howarth (1996) says that “in most cases the technical sense is a specialization of one of the figurative senses, selected by nouns that are identified with defined register” (p.93). He illustrates these examples: “carry a motion” (politics), “consider a bill or a decision” (law), “hold hights” (sociology) (Howarth, 1996, p.92).

4.4 Academic Collocations

They are called Academic or General Collocations. This type of collocations could be used in both General English and ESP. Collocations that are used in General English are especially “common core collocations” which are used frequently and hence common. “The lexical resources that signal academic values are also of interest for their collocational behavior, which is largely related to discipline–specific content and rhetorical conventions. Attempt to compile lists of academic collocations to improve EAP vocabulary learning.”


4.5 Strong Collocations

We say a collocation is “strong” when its words are “very closely associated” with each other (ECUA, n.d). For example, the adjective “mitigating” almost always collocates
with “circumstances” or “factors”; it rarely collocates with any other word. Although she was guilty,
the jury felt there were mitigating circumstances (factors or circumstances that lessen the blame) (ECUA, n.d). Strong collocations are fixed collocations that cannot change in any way. Strong collocations refer to the degree of words’ association.

4.6 Weak Collocations

We say a collocation is “weak” when its words are “made up “ of words that collocate with a “wide range of other words” (ECUA, n.d). For instance, you can say you are in “broad agreement” with someone ( generally in agreement with them). However, “broad” can also be used with a number of other words : a broad avenue , a broad smile , broad shoulders , a broad accent , (a strong accent), a broad hint (a strong hint) and so on . Weak collocations are words that collocate with a broad range of different nouns. This type of collocations is “more predictable” and easy to the majority of students (ECUA, n.d).

4.7 Open Collocations

Open collocations are also “free collocations” that their constituents have a “free combination” with other words, and their elements used “literally” e.g., “fill the sink” (Fischer, 1998, p.44). According to Cowie &Howarth (1996, p.81) we call a collocation “an open” collocation when one or both parts has/have a “figurative meaning” such as “white man” referring to “skin color”. Open collocations are as described by Carter (1996) “open to partnership with a wide range of items” (as cited in Partington, 1998, p.26). In open collocations, we find many lexical items which are adjectives and nouns.

4.8 Restricted Collocations

They are called restricted collocations or “fixed collocations, semi-idiom, pseudo-idiom, phraseologism, and phraseme” (Fischer,1998 ,p.44). In this type, Cowie (1966) says that some “substitutions” are “possible” but there are other “arbitrary limitations” on them .E.g., “perform a task” (as cited in Nesselhauf, 2005, p.14). “At least one element has a non-literal meaning and at least one element is used in its literal sense; the whole combination is transparent” Cowie (1996) (As cited in Nesselhauf, 2005, p.14). Cowie and Howarth (1996, p.83) claim that this type of collocations is “idiosyncractic” and “arbitrary”. They also say that a collocation is restricted if its parts “keep their literal meaning”, for instance, “vested interest”. Fischer (1998, p.44) says that one element of the restricted collocation “is not used in its original, literal meaning”. He adds
(1998) that “both restricted and open collocations resemble each other in that their elements may be combined with others” (p.44). Moreover, their literal elements can either be replaced by pronouns or are totally missing.

“The restricted collocation resembles the idiom in so far as its figuratively used elements cannot (or only to a very limited extent) be combined with other elements (e.g., jog one’s memory). Each restricted collocation carries the potential of an idiom” (Fisher, 1998, p.44).

Hill (2000) distinguishes four categories, defined in terms of collocational strength:
- Unique collocations for example “foot the bill”, “shrug one’s shoulders”.
  The two collocations are unique because the verb “shrug” and “foot” are not used with any other nouns.
- Strong collocations for example “rancid butter”, “trenchant criticism”. These are not unique because there are other things that can be trenchant or rancid, but these collocations are very few
- Medium-strength collocations for example “holds a conversation”, “make a mistake”.
  According to Hill this type of collocations neither strong nor weak.
- Weak collocations for example “red car”, “big house”; the adjectives “big” and “red” could be combined with many nouns. (as cited in Arabski & Wojtaszek, 2010, p.128).

5. Criteria of Collocations

Typical criteria for collocations: non-compositionality, non-substitutability, non-modifiability. “Collocations usually cannot be translated into other languages word by word” (Bowles, 2007, p.8). “A phrase can be a collocation even if it is not consecutive” e.g., Nock the door. (Bowles, 2007, p.8).

5.1 Non-Compositionality

Bowles claims that a phrase is “compositional if the meaning can be predicted from the meaning of the parts” (2007, p.8) e.g., new companies. He says also that a phrase is “non-compositional if the meaning cannot be predicted from the meaning of the parts” (2007, p.8) e.g., hot dog. This means that we are not able to get the right meaning of the sentence even if we understand the meaning of the individual words. Bowles adds that “Collocations are not necessarily fully compositional in that there is usually an element of meaning added to the combination” (2007, p.8) e.g., strong tea. “Idioms are the most extremes example of non-compositionality” (Bowles, 2007, p.8) e.g., to hear it through the grapevine.
5.2 Non-Substitutability

“It means that we cannot substitute near-synonyms for the components of a collocation”. for example, “we cannot say yellow wine instead of white wine even though yellow is a good description of the color of white wine as white is (it is a kind of yellowish white)” (Bowles, 2007, p.8). This means that we cannot substitute the words which a collocation made up by their synonyms.

5.3 Non-Modifiability

“Many collocations cannot be freely modified with additional lexical material or through grammatical transformations” (Bowles, 2007, p.8) e.g., white wine, but not whiter wine, mother in law but not mother in laws. This means that it is impossible to modify words of a collocation by supplying extra words.

6. Collocations in Comparison to the two close concepts Idioms and Phrasal Verbs

Here are definitions of the three different concepts which are as follow:

“Collocations are frequently recurring two-to-three word syntagmatic units which can include both lexical and grammatical words e.g., verb + noun (pay tribute), adjective + noun (hot price), preposition + noun (on guard), and adjective + preposition (immune to)”.


“Collocation is a pair or group of words that are often used together” (McCarthy & O’Dell, 2005, p.6).

“An idiom is an ensemble of two or more words which are subject to semantic and syntactic restrictions. Its meaning cannot be deduced from the meaning of its constituents. It forms a semantic entity. Thus, it may be substituted by a synonym.” (Fischer, 1998, p.44). An idiom is an expression in which all the words do not have their literal meanings, their sense is rather figurative or metaphoric. As a result, it is difficult to understand its meaning. McCarthy and O’Dell (2005) defined idioms as “groups of words in a fixed order that have a meaning that cannot be guessed by knowing the meaning of the individual words e.g., pass the buck” (p.6).

Phrasal verbs according to Hart (2009) are either “separable” as “took my choose off” or “non-separable” as “He ran into a tree”. Phrasal verbs are phrases in which verbs are joined to particles, for instance, “stand up”. We can understand phrasal verbs from their individual words.
Phrasal verbs are verbs that consist of a verb and a particle. Particles are small words which we already know as prepositions or adverbs (McCarthy & O’Dell, 2004, p.6). The most common particles are: about, (a) round, at, away, back, down, for, in, into, off, on, out, over, through, to, up. To understand the meaning of phrasal verbs you should understand the phrasal verbs as a whole word not in parts (McCarthy& O’Dell, 2004, p.6).

From the above definitions, we notice that phrasal verbs and idioms definitions include words that go together as collocations. So, collocations are phrasal verbs and sometimes “idiomatic expressions” as Hill(1997) says “…in a sense, all collocations are idiomatic and all phrasal verbs and idioms are collocations or contain collocations”(as cited in Lewis,2000, p.51).

Most EFL learners are more familiar with idioms and phrasal verbs more than collocations; this is why it is more beneficial to orient their attention to learn types of collocations which are represented by Michael Lewis (2000), and McCarthy and O’Dell (2005).

7. Collocational Competence

Michael Lewis (2000) says that “we are familiar with the concept of communicative competence, but we need to add the concept of collocational competence to our thinking.” (p.49)

It is evident that the communicative and linguistic competence are two known competences, but unfortunately the collocational competence still new and vague to the majority of EFL learners. So, what is a collocational competence? Henriksen (n.d) sees that collocational knowledge as a part of communicative competence. He says that “the mastery of formulaic sequences-including collocations-is a central aspect of communicative competence, which enables the speaker to process language both fluently and idiomatically to fulfill basic communicative and social needs”(as cited in Bardel, Lindquist , and Laufer , 2013,p.6-7).

Many studies have indicated that collocational competence is not acquired at the first time students learn the language, but at a late stage of the learning process, and they do not master this competence very well in the most usual cases (Bardel , Lindquist ,and Laufer ,2013).Hill (2000) says that “Any analysis of students’ speech or writing shows a lack of this collocational competence” (p.49).This means that students do not have an adequate collocational competence .Students make grammatical mistakes when they express their
ideas in long erroneous sentences, and this refers to the ignorance of collocations, so the unavailability of collocational knowledge and competence (Hill, 2000). Thus, collocational competence is the knowledge of which collocations are normal in which context. This means that collocational competence is part of a native speakers’ communicative competence (Hymes, 1971). As a result, this competence permits you to express precisely and concisely what you want to say or write in a fluent and accurate language.

8. Collocations and the Communicative Competence

The use of collocational knowledge indicates the native speaker/writer’s communicative competence since the native speaker is able enough to decide which collocation is quite normal in any context. Moreover, “Collocational normality is dependent on genre, register, and style i.e., what is normal in one kind of text may be quite unusual in another” (Partington, 1998, p.17-18). However, the use of an unusual collocation by a native speaker may purpose at bizarre effect.

From other perspective of communicative competence, the father of this concept, Noam Chomsky (1999) makes a distinction between what the speaker of a language knows in implicitly about the language which is called “competence” and what he does with the language which is called “performance”.

Chomsky’s perspective of competence and performance in generative grammar was oriented to represent knowledge of only grammar; this is why it has been criticized by many linguists such as Hymes, Russell, … etc. “A very large part of the criticism leveled against Chomsky concerns the inadequacy of his attempts to explain language in terms of the narrow notions of the linguistic competence of an ideal hearer-speaker in a homogeneous society.” (Paulston, 1992, p.38).

Hymes (1971) wrote a whole book entitled “Communicative Competence”, and Russell (1981) wrote also a book entitled “Communicative Competence in a Minority Group”. These criticisms are because of the total neglection of “the Sociocultural Dimension” which may influence the language description.

In communicative competence Hymes (1971) adds that collocations can be located within a general model of language use via repeated exposure, use and feedback. The collocations used in successful communication (social interaction) are internalized by language users. Furthermore, communicative competence stresses on the native speakers’ capacities to deliver and
comprehend utterances and sentences which are suitable to the context in which they occur; what he really requires in order to communicate appropriately and effectively in socially separate and different scenarios and contexts (Crystal, 1985).

The communicative competence was the first step to the Communicative Approach.

“A communicative approach opens up a wider perspective on language. In particular, it makes us consider language not only in terms of its structures (grammar and vocabulary), but also in terms of the communicative functions that performs. In other words, we begin to look not only at language forms, but also at what people do with these forms when they want to communicate with each other”.

(Littlewood, 1981, p. 223)

9. Collocations and Colligations

Collocations and Colligations are two terms that seem similar but in fact the two are distinguishable. Collocations are made up of two or more words which are joined together. However, colligations refer to the co-occurrence of word forms with grammatical phenomena as complement or with an indefinite article. Firth defined colligations as “the relation between a node word and grammatical categories such as a preposition or a Wh clause which co-occur frequently with it, or expressed differently” (as cited in Lindquist, 2009, p.88). An example of colligation, “deny that they”, “deny the existence”. The similarity between collocations and colligations is that colligations are the co-occurring of grammatical categories and collocations also consist of grammatical categories (grammatical collocations). Lewis (2000) says that another word exists far from collocations and semantic prosody is colligations or what he defined as “the grammatical company a word keeps and the positions it refers” (p. 234).

10. Importance of Learning and Teaching Collocations

This importance is summarized as the following:
- Learning collocations allow you to have a creative, beautiful and successful language acquisition and learning. Peters and Wray (1999) (as cited in nesselhauf, 2005).
- Collocations make you produce a fluent and accurate language (spoken or written) since psychololinguistics’ proof claim that the human brain “is much equipped for memorizing than for processing”. So, the availability of collocations will reduce the brains processing effort and makes your language fluent. Aitchison et al. (1987) (as cited in Nesselhauf,2005).
- Collocations’ use facilitates and supports students’ comprehension of the whole meaning

- Phraseological units allow you to be a native-like speaker. Wray et al. (1999) (as cited in Nesselhauf, 2005).

According to McCarthy and O’Dell (2005, p.9) learning collocations is quite important since they can:
- “Give you the most natural way to say something: smoking is strictly forbidden is more natural than smoking is strongly forbidden”.
- “Give you 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 pitch dark”.
- “Improve your style in formal writing: instead of saying poverty causes crime, you can say poverty breeds crime”.

According to Lewis (2000) collocations are essential for learners to expand the proficiency of vocabulary in both spoken and written language. He adds that learning chunks of words helps learners develop their communicative competencies better than learning words in isolations.

Collocations have different functions one from those is noted in Oxford Collocations Dictionary (2002, p.9) “Language that is collocationally rich is more precise . The precise meaning in any context is determined by the context, by the words that surround and combine with the core word, by collocations”. As a result, collocations make language more precise and concise, rich and appealing.

11. Vocabulary Language Teaching

It is crystal clear that native speakers store in their brains a great deal of vocabulary, but EFL students suffer from vocabulary deficiency (Lewis, 2000). So, how vocabulary has been taught through language teaching, and how collocations as an integral part of vocabulary teaching were developed?

Many strategies and methods have been applied and vocabulary has been taught through these various methods (Schmitt, 2000). Firstly, in GTM (grammar translation method), vocabulary has been presented via “bilingual lists” for the purpose of making students capable enough to interpret pieces of writings. Thus, lexis was a means of presenting a grammar point (Zimmerman, 1997).
Secondly, in the Direct Method, vocabulary has been taught implicitly via “classroom interaction” i.e., through asked questions and received answers. Concrete objects (items) were presented in pictures, but abstract concepts were taught via group of ideas (Zimmerman, 1997).

Thirdly, in the Situational Approach, vocabulary was considered as a means to practice “the sentence patterns”, and was illustrated via lists in “substitution tables” (Zimmerman, 1997).

Furthermore, within the Communicative Competence of Hymes (1971) and his perspective of language teaching, vocabulary still present via communication, and cultural elements i.e., social interaction (Zimmerman, 1997).

Next, in the 1980s, a new tradition has appeared at the purpose of “natural oral communication”. This approach’s main concern is stressing “comprehensible meaning”. Vocabulary was considered as a focal point in second language acquisition and reading was considered as a strategy to enrich linguistic repertoire (Zimmerman, 1997).

At the end, Richards and Rodgers (2001) point out that the Lexical Approach is “…divided from the belief that the building blocks of language learning and communication are not grammar, functions, notions, or some other units of planning and teaching but lexis, that is, words and word combinations”( p.132). In addition to that, Schmitt (2000; p.14) views that “vocabulary and grammar as partners in synergy with no discrete boundary, sometimes referred to as lexicogrammar”. So, lexis is a crucial part in foreign language teaching and the lexical approach confirms that. Thus, vocabulary is quite valuable knowledge that deserved to be learnt since it is a central part in second language learning process. Lexis facilitates second language proficiency (written and oral), communicative competence and text comprehension.

This knowledge is more significant and crucial to second language teachers more than EFL learners. Researchers consider vocabulary at the forefront of contemporary Applied Linguistics research. Vocabulary has a huge use and contribution in Discourse, Phonology, and Grammar. In language teaching, it is the interest of researchers, teachers and graduate EFL learners (Schmitt, 2000).

Language teaching method has been focused on the dichotomy of grammar and vocabulary i.e., students have a control over the grammar structure and learn lists of lexis to understand and build up an appropriate and accurate language. Learners used to learn a lot of vocabulary to tend to express their ideas; however, they were struggling to use appropriately grammatical
rules that they have learned. This weakness in using grammar in erroneous way was since of the lack of chunks or what is “ready-made” in their linguistic repertoire. Collocations do not just give names to things, but also convey pragmatic element, evoke situations, they “enable you to talk about things” and “do things” although they are merely one or two words. So, this gives collocations a great importance that “they are not simple words that go to gether” (Lewis, 2000).

David Wilkins (n.d) observes that “without grammar little can be conveyed; without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed” (as cited in Lewis, 2000, p.8). One of the most problematic issues that face learners is acquiring an adequate amount of lexis and most of our lexis contains phraseological units which are highly important (Lewis, 2000). As a result, we say that EFL students’ lack and deficiency on such kind of lexis refer to the total neglect of vocabulary teaching through decades and the unavailability of such kind of lexis in the students’ mental lexicon.

12. Causes of Collocational Errors

The recent studies show that there are several reasons and factors that affect EFL students’ production of accurate and fluent language. Linguists and researchers reveal these factors of collocational errors which are as follow: analogy, overgeneralization, paraphrase, interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, and shortage of collocational knowledge (as cited in Liu, 1999b). Liu (1999b) has conducted a research in a try to reveal the most noticeable difficulties that EFL learners face in second language production. These difficulties are as follow:

- Lack of collocational knowledge, i.e., students do not know which word will co-occur with another word, but they just know their meanings.
- Direct translations, i.e., some students translate depending on the first language influence and interference, e.g., “learn knowledge instead of gain knowledge”
- Ignorance of some grammatical restrictions, e.g., “few knowledge instead of little knowledge”
- “Lack of knowledge of collocational properties”, i.e., the majority of students ignore the “potential collocational properties” of lexis they already recognize, e.g., adjective ‘good’ collocates with the word ‘boy’, ‘a good boy’ and the other use of this adjective is with the word ‘knowledge’, ‘a good knowledge’ (Farrokh, 2012).
In addition to what is already said, there are other difficulties that really face EFL students such as language transfer, synonym strategy, repetition and overgeneralization…etc. (Swan, 1997).

13. Difficulties of Teaching Collocations

It is evident that the total neglect of vocabulary teaching is the main reason behind these difficulties since collocations still vague and unknown to the majority of EFL students. According to Engberg (2007) “some authors think we have to encounter a collocation up to seven times to actually remember it … I believe that non-native speakers have to use collocations also in the encoding process in order to remember them and be able to retrieve them later”(p.242).

Although collocational knowledge is quite necessary, it also poses considerable problems and difficulties, even for the advanced learners (Nesselhauf, 2005). Similarly, Hill(2000, p.49) says “Any analysis of students’ speech or writing shows a lack of …collocational competence”.

There was a wide agreement about teaching collocations by linguists as Bahns (1997), Cowie (1988), McCarthy (1990), and Nation (2001) (as cited in Nesselhauf, 2005). Even though, collocations have been received wide and high attention in language teaching in few years ago ; teachers, students, and the hole teaching process (language teaching materials and syllabi) still have a wide deficiency in this type of vocabulary to be taught and learnt accurately (Nesselhauf,2005). In this context, Bartch (2004) claims that collocation is totally and widely neglected phenomenon in language teaching since of the diversity of many structures that look like collocations as colligation, idioms, phrasal verbs, other Multi-word combinations, and the dichotomy of grammar and vocabulary.

Teaching collocations should have the same “kind of status” in the teaching methodology as other aspects of language such as pronunciation, intonation, stress, and grammar. It must have the same value of other aspects of language acquisition. Thus, teaching lexis in general and collocations in particular is quite necessary to second language acquisition.

Advanced learners are those who have a huge amount of vocabulary in their mental lexicon. They are students who never stop challenging the language difficulties and themselves (Lewis, 2000). Advanced learners do not know just words as book, family, holiday…etc. As intermediate
learners do, but they also know their collocations as a coffee –table book, the nuclear family, a busman’s holiday …etc. In contrast to advanced learners, intermediate learners just know words without their collocates, and this will be as a waste of time or inefficient. So, the main concern of vocabulary teaching is increase students collocational competence with the words which they are already familiar with. McCarthy (1990) claims that “knowledge of collocation is based on years of experiences of masses of data, statements about collocations”(p.15). Consequently, it is difficult to achieve a real collocational use, and this affects the process of teaching collocations. This means that EFL teachers cannot provide an adequate and sufficient collocational knowledge to their learners. In this context, McCarthy (1990) says that “even very advanced learners often make inappropriate or unacceptable collocations” (p.13). So, the major reason behind this is the fact that EFL learners are not native speakers and do not live inside English speaking countries; no real and potential competence exists. Thus, EFL teachers are not capable, proficient and not prepared enough to teach such kind of vocabulary. In some cases, they avoid using or dealing with collocations (McCarthy, 1990). Also, from the other difficulties is the fact that EFL students do not use dictionaries of collocations; Hill and Lewis (1997) state that EFL teachers can rely on collocation dictionaries such as the LTP dictionary of selected collocations (1997) or the Oxford Collocation Dictionary (2009). Since EFL teachers need dictionary to find a word definition and to get its precise meaning; both of teachers and students rely on bilingual dictionaries which provide translations of words. Another problem is that; although, the existence of some types of exercises which deal with collocations like matching exercises, and completion exercises the teaching curriculum does not stress collocational competence and use (Lewis, 2000).

To conclude, we can say that despite the fact that linguists’ methodologies are “to learn large numbers of collocations by heart as if they are single lexemes” as Palmer state or “to learn a language involves learning many multi-word expressions” as Firthians and Sinclairrians assert, collocations’ teaching process still ignored and neglected.
Conclusion

Collocation is a widespread phenomenon in second language acquisition and its knowledge and mastery equal a proficient language (oral and written). This is why EFL learners’ should have this kind of knowledge since it has crucial role in being a native like speaker of English language.
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Introduction

This study attempts to diagnose and investigate Second Year Master Degree students’ knowledge of collocations at l’Arbi Ben M’hidi University, Oum El Bouaghi. This study describes the choice of the method used to fulfill the prescribed aim and identifies population and sampling. Moreover, it explores the analysis procedures as well as the description of the analysis and the interpretation of the findings.

2.1 Research Design and Methodology

2.1.1 Population and Sampling

The target population of this study is Second Year Master Degree students at L’Arbi Ben M’hidi University, Oum El Bouaghi, for the academic year 2015-2016. We have chosen Second Year Master Degree students since they are supposed to have a minimum knowledge in English. The population consists of 124 students. Since it is somehow difficult to deal with the whole population (we have taken just the fifth 1/5), we have chosen a sample of 30 students as participants in this study. The participants are chosen randomly from the total population.

2.1.2 Choice of the Method

In this descriptive study, the most suitable tool is Discourse Completion Task. We have used this research tool in order to get relevant and precise data about the use of lexical collocations (verb + noun) combination by the subjects who are aged between 22 to 30 years participating in this study. Our Multiple-choice Test consist of 20 sentences; each sentence has 4(four) options and the student is asked to tick the correct verb to co-occur with the noun above in the sentence.

2.1.3 Analytical Procedure

In this study, we have used Dictionary of selected Collocations (1997) and Oxford Collocations Dictionary (2009). Our analysis’ main interest is to identify correct and incorrect use of lexical collocations. The incorrect use of collocations is analyzed via depending on Liu (1999 a, 1999 b) Analysis of collocations errors in EFL writings. Then, we interpreted the
obtained results and answered the research questions and checked the results as to the truthfullness of the hypothesis; at the end we put forward some practical implications.

2.2 Description of the Test

In this descriptive study, our tool is Multiple-Choice Test. Every student is asked to answer 20 sentences in this Test; each sentence has four options. The options are different verbs to be selected to co-occur with the correct noun in the sentence. This Test represents a receptive knowledge via the proposed options. The participants in this study are 30 students. They have spent 30 minutes. Students do not get tired during answering the Test. The test is taken place at TEFL course with Dr. Marrouch. The tester was me.

2.3 Analysis and Interpretations

In this chapter, we will present the analysis that is made for each combination at the level of the single sentence in the form of tables. These tables contain the frequency of correct and incorrect use of collocations, the percentage of each frequency, and the total for both. So, each table is followed by a qualitative analysis and interpretation of the main source of the collocation error and the reason behind the correct use. Furthermore, it is quite necessary to mention that the explanation of the source of the errors is resulted from our ideas and guess. Since it is the only possible explanation, but rather the most likely one because sometimes it is quite difficult to understand why a given learner has committed the questionable error.
Sentence 1 “A pact”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly Rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A pact</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a pact”

From the table above, collocational use of “a pact” is the combination “had a pact” made by 14 participants (46.66%).

The incorrect collocational use of “a pact” is the remaining combinations “performed gave and had a pact” by 11 participants (36.67%). There are 5 participants who did not answer (16.67%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination N+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A pact</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hade</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a pact”
From the table above, we notice that 14 participants (46.66%) have rendered the combination “made a pact” correctly.

The wrong (incorrect) combinations are as follow:

“performed a pact” has just one participant (3.33%).

“gave a pact” has 7 participants (23.33%).

“had a pact” has 3 participants (10%).

In this combination, students have committed three types of lexical collocation errors which are: “performed a pact”, “gave a pact”, and “had a pact”. In the first combination “performed a pact” students use the verb “performed” incorrectly with the noun “a pact”. The two words cannot be combined together because the word “a pact” can co-occur only with a specific verb which is “made”. The collocation error “performed a pact” explains well that the source of the error is overgeneralization or overuse of semantic properties of the verb “performed”, i.e, students use this technique when the items (as perform) did not carry any obvious contrast to them.

The two other wrong combinations “gave a pact” and “have a pact” also cannot be combined with “a pact” and the source of the error is the lack of collocational competence and overgeneralization; students did not recognize which word co-occur with, but they just know their basic meanings. Thus, they are not competent in such combination.

Also, students used overgeneralization when they do not have any misunderstanding with the verb, so they use it instead of the correct one as the combination “had a pact” or “gave a pact” instead of “made a pact”
Sentence 2 “The promise”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The promise</td>
<td>Ruining</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breaking</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demeaning</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrupting</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “the promise”

Table (2.3) indicates that the correct use of “the promise” is the combination “breaking the promise” by 24 participants (80%). The incorrect use of “the promise” are the combinations “ruining the promise”, “demeaning the promise” and “corrupting the promise” by 6 participants (20%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The promise</td>
<td>Ruining</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breaking</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demeaning</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrupting</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “the promise”

Table (2.4) shows that the correct combination of “the promise” is “breaking promise”
by 24 participants (80%). We notice that approximately the whole sample rendered this combination correctly since they are more familiar with it. This combination is quite frequent. Just six (06) participants (20%) who rendered this combination incorrectly.

**Sentence 3 “A horse”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A horse</td>
<td>Riding</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driving</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traveling</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cruising</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.5 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a horse”**

From the table above, the correct collocational use of “a horse” is the combination “riding a horse” by 30 participants (100%). As we notice that there is no incorrect collocational use of “a horse”. All students know the correct combination which is “riding a horse”. This means that students are more familiar with this combination through grammar exercises and readings.
Table 2.6 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a sword”

Table (2.6) illustrates, the correct use of “a sword” is the combination “drawn a sword” by 8 participants (26.67%). The incorrect collocational uses of “a sword” are as follow:

“Hauled a sword”, “dragged a sword”, and “towed a sword” by 16 participants (53.33%).

Table 2.7 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a sword“

**Haul:** to carry sth, to pull or draw sth heavy.

**Drag:** to pull along a surface or through a medium; sometimes with difficulty.
**Tow:** to pull sth behind one using a line or chain; to haul.

From table (2.7), the correct combination is “drawn a sword” by 8 students (26.67%). The incorrect combinations of “a sword” are as follow:

“Hauled a sword” by 5 students (16.66%).

“Dragged a sword” by 9 students (30%).

“Towed a sword” by 2 students (6.66%).

In this combination of collocation, students have committed three types of lexical collocation errors, which are:

“Hauled a sword”, “dragged a sword”, and “towed a sword “.

The three verbs are used incorrectly with the noun “a sword” since the three verbs cannot be combined together with this noun. The word “a sword” can co-occur only with a specific verb which is “drawn”. The collocation errors in these three combinations explain well that the source of the errors resulted from the use if synonym. This refers to the fact that learners know the synonyms but fail to know the collocability (the correct one) of the word.

**Sentence 5 “Orders”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nº of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nº of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders</td>
<td>Give 23</td>
<td>76,67</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make /</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tell /</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Say /</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 23</td>
<td>76,67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “orders”
Table (2.8) asserts, the correct collocational use of “orders” is the combination: “Give orders” by 23 participants (76.67%).

The incorrect collocational uses of “orders” are the following combinations:

“Tell orders”; “say orders” and “make orders” by 7 participants making up of (23.33%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.9 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “orders”

The table (2.9) shows that the correct combination is “give orders” by 23 students (76.67%).

The incorrect combinations are:

“make orders” by 4 participants (13.33%).

“Tell orders” by 2 participants (6.66%).

“Say orders” by just one participant (3.33%).

As we notice from the results shown in the table above that the main source of errors in these three incorrect combinations, which are “tell, say and make orders”, is the lack of collocational concept i.e., students really know the basic meaning of the word but unfortunately do not know the accurate collocability of that word. Thus, they do not know which verb will co-occur with it correctly. Students were unable to answer correctly since they had limited knowledge of collocations the core of vocabulary.
They do not store adequate lexical collocations in their linguistic repertoire. Thus, there is no mastery of lexical collocations.

**Sentence 6 “Secrets”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secret</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reveal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46,67</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announce</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46,67</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.10 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “Secrets”**

The table (2.10) shows that the correct combination of “secrets” is “reveal secrets” by 14 participants (46.67%). The incorrect collocational use of “secrets” are the combinations “give/ say, and announce secrets” by 16 participants (53.33%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secrets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reveal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46,67</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announce</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46,67</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.11 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “secrets”**

From the table (2.11) we notice that correct collocational use of “secrets” is the combination “reveal secrets” by 14 participants (46.67%).
The incorrect collocational uses of “secrets” are:

“Give secrets” by 4 participants (13.33%).

“Say secrets” by 9 participants (30%).

“Announce secrets” by 3 participants (10%).

In this combination, students committed three types of lexical collocation errors, which are mentioned above. In the two combinations “say and announce secrets”, students use these two verbs incorrectly with the noun “secrets”. The two verbs cannot be combined together because the word “secrets” can co-occur only with a specific verb, which is “reveal”. The collocation error is resulted from the use of synonyms since the students use the synonym of a give word when s/he does not find the exact word to express her/ his idea. Depending on their misconceptions about synonyms, students produced unacceptable collocations because they combined synonymous words with the same collocates such as “say” and “announce” with “secrets”. The use of “give” instead of “reveal” indicates the overgeneralization of the semantic property of the verb “give” but in fact this do not work. Students’ collocational errors due to overgeneralization are the result of their inability to correctly combine English words.

Sentence 7 “A deal”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A deal</strong></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>4 13,33</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.12 The Correct and Incorrect Collocation Use of “a deal”**
Table (2.12) demonstrates that the correct combination of “a deal” is “complete a deal” by 4 participants (13.33%). The incorrect collocational uses of “a deal” is: “fix/have and make a deal” by 26 participants (86.67%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A deal</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fix</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.13 The Correct and Incorrect Collocaional Use of “a deal”

The table (2.13) demonstrates that the correct combination is “complete a deal” by 4 participants (13.33%).

The wrong or incorrect collocational uses are as follow:

“Fix a deal” by 4 participants (13.33%).

“Have a deal” by 7 participants (23.33%).

“Make a deal” by 15 participants (50%).

The main source of the errors in here is the lack of collocational concept since students do not know the words’ collocability. Lack of collocational knowledge is a major source of students’ collocational errors. Since grammar was studied as a separate module but vocabulary learning and teaching is guessed from rich contexts and extensive readings teachers should know that grammatical rules may be useless if students do not poses patterns of lexical co-occurrence.
Table 2.14 The Correct and Incorrect Collocation Use of “a mistake”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66,67</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66,67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.15 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a mistake”

The table (2.15) indicates that the correct combination is “made a mistake” by 20 participants (66.67%). The incorrect combinations are as follow:

“Performed a mistake” by 3 participants (10%).

“Did a mistake” by 7 participants (23.33%).

In this combination, students have committed two types of lexical collocation errors, which are mentioned above. In the first combination “did a mistake” students use
verb and auxiliary “did” incorrectly with the noun “a mistake”, the two words cannot be combined together because the word “a mistake” can be co-occurring only with a specific verb which is “made”. The collocation error explains well that the source of the error resulted from false concept hypothesized. This means that students have misconceptions about the verbs such as make, do and take. They think that these verbs are de-lexicalized verbs. So, they could be substituted by each other easily as “did a mistake” instead of “make a mistake”.

In the second combination “performed a mistake”, the source of the error is overgeneralization of the semantic properties and this is a result of lack of collocational concept. Since students understand the basic meaning of the word but do not recognize its correct use with other words, so they are not competent to produce correct collocations.

Sentence 9 “A crime”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93,33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93,33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.16 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a crime”

The table (2.16) indicates that the correct combination is “committed a crime” by 28 students (93.33%) . The incorrect combinations are committed by 2 students (6.66%).
Table 2.17 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a crime”

From the table above, the correct combination is “committed a crime” by 28 participants (93.33%). This means that this combination is known by students and they are more familiar with it. This is why they answer correctly (all of them). This may be due to watching a lot of movies and not necessarily acquired from classroom or extensive readings. The incorrect combinations are “did a crime” by one student (3.33%), and “made a crime” by also just one participant (3.33%).

Sentence 10 “An effect”

Table 2.18 the correct and incorrect collocation use of “an effect”

From the table above, the correct combination is “make an effect” by 26 students (86.67%). The incorrect collocational uses of “an effect” are the rest combinations by 4 students (13.33%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An effect</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employ</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>make</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87,67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.19** the correct and incorrect collocational use of “an effect”

The table (2.19) states that the correct combination is “make an effect” by 26 participants (87.66%).

As we notice that, the majority of students rendered this combination correct. So, this interprets that students are familiar with this combination. They acquired this combination from extensive readings or classroom tasks. The incorrect combination is “use a effect” by 4 participants (13.33%).

**Sentence 11 “The law”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The law</td>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violating</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disregarding</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disrespecting</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36,67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.20** The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “the law”

From the table above, the correct combination is “violating the law” by 11 students (36.67%). The incorrect collocations are “ignoring/disregarding, and disrespecting the law” by 19 students (63,33% ).
The table (2.21) shows that the correct combination is “violating the law” by 11 participants (36.67%).

The incorrect combinations are as follow:

“Ignoring the law” by 5 participants (16.66%).

“Disregarding the law” by 3 participants (10%).

“Disrespecting the law” by 11 participants (36.66%).

**Violate:** to break, disregard, disagree or not act according to.

**Disregard:** to ignore; misregard.

The source of error in the combination “disregarding the law” is the use of synonym; students use “disregarding” instead of “violating” since it is synonym. It refers to the fact that learners did know the synonyms, but fail to know the correct co-occurrence. This is taken as a straightforward application of the open choice principle. Students were not aware that the meaning of a collocation is different from the meaning of its core word i.e., there is no absolute synonym. These mis-collocations confirm that students were unfamiliar with lexical collocations and did not know how to get rid of the factors operating to hinder producing acceptable collocations. The source of errors in both “ignoring the law” and “disrespecting the law” are overgeneralization of semantic properties and lack of collocational concept.

### Table 2.21 The Correct and Incorrect Collocation Use of “the law”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The law</strong></td>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violating</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disregarding</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disrespecting</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36,67</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sentence 12 “An example”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An example</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87,67</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86,67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.22 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “an example”

From the table above, the correct combination is “give an example” by 26 participants (87.67%). The incorrect combination is “supply an example” by 4 participants (13.33%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An example</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87,67</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87,67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.23 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “an example”

The table (2.23) shows that the correct combination is “give an example” by 26 participants (87.66%). As we have noticed, the majority of students know this combination since it is more used by teachers inside the classroom and through exercises. The incorrect combination is “supply an example” by 4 participants (13.33%).
Sentence 13 “A goal”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nº of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nº of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96,67</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96,67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.24 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a goal”

From the table above, the correct combination is “achieve a goal” by 29 participants (96.67%). There is just one participant who rendered this combination incorrectly (3.33%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nº of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nº of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96,67</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96,67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.25 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “an example”

The table (2.25) shows that the correct combination is “achieve a goal” by 29 students (96.67%). As we have noticed, the majority of students know this combination since it is quite frequent in study and life in general. They have acquired it from their academic environment. The incorrect collocation is “get a goal” by one participant (3.33%).
Sentence 14 “Rage”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rage</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>/ 10</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covered</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevented</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ceased</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.26 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “rage”

From the table above, the correct combination is “suppressed her rage” by 3 participants (10%). The incorrect collocational uses of “rage” are the rest combinations by 22 participants (73.33%). Students who do not answer are 5 participants (16.67%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rage</td>
<td>Suppressed</td>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covered</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevented</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ceased</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.27 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “rage”

The table (2.27) shows that the correct combination is “suppressed her rage” by 3 participants (10%). The incorrect combinations are as follow:

“Covered her rage” by 15 participants (50%).

“Prevented her rage” by 6 participants (20%).

“Ceased her rage” by one participants (3.33%).
The students who do not answer are five (16.67%).

The source of error of the combinations “covered and ceased her rage” is due to overgeneralization of semantic properties and lack of collocational concept. Students do not know the words’ collocability. Lack of collocational knowledge is a major source of students’ collocational errors. Since grammar was studied as a separate module but vocabulary learning and teaching is guessed from rich contexts and extensive readings, teachers should know that grammatical rules may be useless if students do not pose patterns of lexical co-occurrences. The source or error of “prevented her rage” is due to the use of synonyms. And, as we notice that, there are students who do not even know how to answer so they have not answer at all. It refers to the fact that learners did know the synonyms, but fail to know the correct co-occurrences. This is taken as a straightforward application of the open choice principle. Students were not aware that the meaning of a collocation is different from the meaning of its core word i.e., there is no absolute synonym. These mis-collocations confirm that students were unfamiliar with lexical collocations and did not know how to get rid of the factors operating to hinder producing acceptable collocations.

**Sentence 15 “A favour”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A favour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarding</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.28 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a favour”*

From table above, the correct combination of “a favour” is “doing a favour” by 21 participants (70%). The incorrect combinations are the rest by 9 participants (30%).
The table (2.29) indicates that the correct combination is “doing a favor” by 21 participants (21%).

The incorrect combinations are as follow:

“Presented a favour” by one participants (3.33%).

“Giving a favour” by 7 participants (23.33%).

“Awarding a favour” by one participant (3.33%).

The source of error in the first combinations “presenting a favor” is negative transfer “L1 interference” which is in Arabic Language "يقدم خدمة". Students may be subconsciously restore these lexical chunks of Arabic Language in their minds.

Mis-collocations is due to the fact that students’ attention was never directed towards English lexical collocations when students failed to say what they wanted in English so they express themselves in Arabic. The source of error of the other two combinations “give and awarding favor” is overgeneralization.
Sentence 16 “A civil war”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A civil war</td>
<td>Pursue</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53,34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.30 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a civil war”

From table above, the correct combinations are “make a civil war” and “wage a civil war”. The first correct combination by 4 participants (13.33%), and the second one by 12 participants, (40%). The incorrect combinations are the rest combinations by 13 participants (43.33%). There is just one participant who does not answer (3.33%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A civil war</td>
<td>Pursue</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53,34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.31 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a civil war”

The table (2.31) indicates that the two correct combinations are “make and wage a civil war” by 16 participants (53.34%).

The incorrect combinations are:

“Pursue a civil war” by 7 participants (2.33%).

“Practice a civil war” by 6 participants (20%).

51
There is just one participant who does not answer (3.33%).

The source of the error of “pursue a civil war” is overgeneralization and lack of collocational concept. The source of the error of “practice a civil war” is the use of synonym.

**Pursue:** to follow with harmful intent, to try to harm, to persecute, torment.

**Wage:** to conduct or carry out (a war other on test).

The majority of students (16) answer correctly (53.34%) since they are familiar with this combination through watching movies.

**Sentence 17 “A caution”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nº of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nº of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A caution</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perform</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.32 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a caution”**

From the table above, the correct combination is “exercise a caution” by 4 students (13.33%). The incorrect combinations are the rest combinations by 25 participants (83.33%). There is just one participant who does not answer (3.33%).
Combination V+N | Correctly rendered collocation | Incorrectly rendered collocation | No answer
| Nº of students | % | Nº of students | % | Nº of students | % |
| Practice | / | / | 9 | 30 | / | / |
| Exercise | 4 | 13,33 | / | / | / | / |
| Perform | / | / | 7 | 23,33 | / | / |
| Act | / | / | 9 | 30 | / | / |
| Total | 4 | 13,34 | 25 | 83,33 | / | / |

**Table 2.33 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a caution”**

The table (2.33) indicates that the correct combination is “exercise a caution” by 4 students (13.34%).

The incorrect combinations are as follow:

“Practice a caution” by 9 students (30%).

“Perform a caution” by 7 students (23.33%).

“Act a caution” by 9 students (30%).

There is just one student who does not answer (3.33%).

The source of error in the three combinations is the use of synonyms.

**Sentence 18 “A decision”**

Combination V+N | Correctly rendered collocation | Incorrectly rendered collocation | No answer
| Nº of students | % | Nº of students | % | Nº of students | % |
| Mad | 24 | 80 | / | / | / | / |
| Gave | / | / | / | / | / | / |
| Supplied | / | / | / | / | / | / |
| Provided | / | / | / | / | / | / |
| Total | 24 | 80 | 6 | 20 | / | / |

**Table 2.34 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a decision”**
From the table above, the correct combination is “made a decision” by 24 participants (80%). The incorrect combinations are “gave / supplied and provided a decision” by 6 participants (20%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplied</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.35 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational use of “a decision”

The table (2.35) shows that the correct combination is “made a decision” by 24 students (80%).

The incorrect combinations are as follow:

“Gave a decision” by 2 students (6.66%).

“Supplied a decision” by one student (3.33%).

“Provided a decision” by 3 students (19.99%).

The source of the error in the combination “gave a decision” is overgeneralization. The source of the error in the two combinations “supplied and provided a decision” is the use of synonyms.

The majority of students (24) are familiar with the combination “made a decision” and rendered it correctly (80%) since they know it from an academic environment.
Sentence 19 “A law”

The Table 2.36 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a law”

From the table above, the correct collocational use of “a law” is the combination “passed a law” by 7 students (23.33%). The incorrect collocational uses of “a law” are the rest combinations by 22 participants (73.33%). There is only one participant who does not answer (3.33%).

Table 2.37 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “a law”

Table (2.37) shows that the correct combination is “passed a law” by 7 participants (23.33%). The incorrect combinations are as the following:

“launched a law” by 5 participants (16.66%).

“formed a law” by 6 participants (20%).
“created a law” by 11 participants (36.66%).

The source of the error in the three combinations “launched a law”, “formed a law”, and “created a law” is overgeneralization of the semantic properties of the three verbs. And, this is resulted from lack of collocational concept.

**Sentence 20 “The Company”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The company</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govern</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26,67</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26,67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.38 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “the company”**

From the table above, the correct combination of “the company” is “run the company” by 8 participants (26.67%). The incorrect combinations are the rest combinations by 22 participants (73.33%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination V+N</th>
<th>Correctly rendered collocation</th>
<th>Incorrectly rendered collocation</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N° of students</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N° of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The company</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govern</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26,67</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26,67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.39 The Correct and Incorrect Collocational Use of “the company”**
The table (2.39) indicates that the correct combination is “run the company” by 8 participants (26.67%).

The incorrect combinations are as the following:

“control the company” by 8 participants (26.67%).

“govern the company” by 12 participants (40%).

“rule the company” by 2 participants (6.66%).

The source of the error in the combination “control the company” is the use of synonyms.

The source of the error in the two combinations “govern the company” and “rule the company” is due to the overgeneralization of the semantic properties of the two verbs “govern” and “rule”.
Conclusion

This Chapter shed light on the practical part of our research: we illustrate research design and methodology including population and setting, and explanation of choice of the method. Moreover, we explain the analytical procedure via the analysis and techniques of data analysis. At the end, we identify, describe and analyze the obtained data and results which reject our hypothesis which is EFL students of Oum El Bouaghi do not have a lexical collocational knowledge, and the summary of the findings and comments.
2.4 Summary of the Findings and Comments

This study was conducted using both qualitative and quantitative methods. In analyzing mis-collocations, that were treated from a qualitative perspective and at the same time their frequency, accuracy and inaccuracy were calculated quantitatively.

The participants in the present study are 30 Algerian male and female Second Master Degree English students who are aged between 22 to 30 years at l’Arbi Ben M’hidi University, Oum El Bouaghi. English is their Foreign Language and Arabic is their mother tongue.

The Collocation Test seeks to investigate the participants’ knowledge of lexical collocations (verb +noun combination). We have 30 subjects who are asked to answer 20 sentences.

The scores reveal that students’ incorrect answers are 241 (40.16%) incorrect answers, sentences without answers are 19 (3.16%) sentences, and students’ correct answers are 340 (56.66%) from the total number of sentences which are 600 sentences. We have 30 subjects who are asked to answer 20 sentences. As we notice that the majority of participants answered correctly 340 (56.66%).

Thus, the results show that Second Year Master students at l’Arbi Ben M’hidi University, Oum El Bouaghi have knowledge of Lexical Collocations (verb +noun) combination, and automatically their English language level will be raised and advanced. Although the fact that lexical collocations (verb +noun) combination is considered difficult for learners to produce and memorize, EFL students at l’Arbi Ben M’hidi University, Oum El Bouaghi have knowledge in this type of collocations and use them correctly. Many researchers have proved the difficulty of learning this type, and this is through the learners’ results. Firstly, Hill (1997) lists lexical collocations (verb +noun) combination in the Dictionary of Selected Collocation as one of the difficult and problematic type that is probable to be learned by EFL/ESL students. Secondly, Darvishi (2011) has found in his research that lexical collocations (verb+ noun) combination is the only type that has the highest frequency of errors in learners’ answers. Furthermore, Chen (2002) has found that lexical collocations (verb+ noun) combination is the most frequent lexical collocational error type. Finally, Liu (1999b) has obtained results that lexical collocation (verb+noun) combination is the most noticeable type of errors in learners’ writings.
Students have consumed only 30 minutes in answering the Test, and they do not get
tired. Despite the fact that students’ knowledge of the meaning of both elements of a
collocation, they did not always succeed in correct matching, so they have committed
collocational errors. Concerning the source of errors, the obtained results indicate that
students commit lexical collocational error type due to many reasons which are
developmental errors of Liu (1999a, 1999b) Analysis of Collocational Errors in EFL
Writings. The source of errors is due to:

Firstly, Lack of Collocational Concept this means that students do not know which word
will co-occur with another word, but they just know their basic meanings. In other words,
the fact that students face problems concerning word combinations and word groupings is
due to mainly their ignorance of collocations. This problem is what Lewis (2000) calls
“mis-collocations” or wrong association of words.

Secondly, Direct Translation i.e some students translate depending on the first language
influence and negative transfer of their mother tongue as “presenting a favour”
"تقدم خدمة". This in our Test has committed only by one participant (3.33%).

Thirdly, Synonym Strategy that refers to the fact that learners know the synonym but fail
to know the correct collocability. Students also use synonym of a given word when they do
not find the exact word to express their idea. “It is the using of synonyms that students
solve L2 lexical problems when they encounter the collocations that they are not able to
bring out” Liu ( as cited in Farrokh, 2012, p.64).

Moreover, False Concept Hypothesized i.e., the student may have misconception about
the acceptable verbs which are “do, make, and take” since they consider them as de-
lexicalized verbs. They think that these verbs have the same meaning and the same
function, so they replace the acceptable collocation, within unacceptable one in order to
convey the meaning. This interprets “linguistic deficiencies”, and “EFL students often
consider de-lexicalized verbs as words that have little or no meaning outside the context of
particular use” Liu ( as cited in Farrokh, 2012 , p.64). For that reason, they believe that
these verbs can replace each other freely as in our Test 7 students (23.33%) answered by
the incorrect combination “did a mistake” instead of “make a mistake”.

Finally, Overgeneralization this means that students use this strategy when “the items
did not carry any obvious contrast to them. It was the creation of one deviant structure in
place of two regular structures on the basis of students’ experience of the target language”
Liu (as cited in Farrokh, 2012, p. 64). The most noticeable source of lexical collocational error in our Test is both lack of collocational concept and overgeneralization. Thus, learners when they overgeneralise or use synonyms they might not be familiar with the many uses and senses of the most highly frequent words in terms of differing contexts. Students do not know what lexical collocation means in English when they commit errors. Also, they did not recognize that there is a Dictionary of Collocation. Translation, for example students pass courses related to the translation of Idioms and Phrasal Verbs, but no course is dedicated to collocations. Furthermore, EFL students use incorrect collocations is due to the fact that teachers do not pay enough attention to collocation teaching, and to a large extent, to the inadequate emphasis given to collocation knowledge in their books, and the instructions they receive. To conclude, collocations have never been a part of teaching in Algeria.
Research Limitations

The present study is focused on students’ knowledge of lexical collocations (verb + noun) combination, and our hypothesis is rejected since 2nd Year Master Degree students of Oum El Bouaghi have knowledge in this type of collocations. This study is oriented to investigate only a specific type and combination, and the Multiple-Choice Test represents a receptive knowledge of lexical collocations. Thus, we cannot generalize the obtained results from only one type and combination, and say that EFL students have a collocational knowledge since there are other types of collocations and numerous combinations in each type. Moreover, the obtained results may change if the Test will be “filling the gaps” without any options since it represents a productive knowledge. So, productive knowledge may reveal students’ lack and deficiency in this type of vocabulary.
**Pedagogical Implications**

On the aim of what has been found and after we conducted the whole research, we recommend at:

- Positive feedback is a useful tool to overcome misuse of collocations and raise learners’ awareness and collocational knowledge and concept. Thus, their communicative competence may be raised automatically.

- Practicing activities, tasks and exercises on collocations as in McCarthy and O’Dell (2005) “English Collocations in Use” and a helpful tool to revise the correct combinations is via using Oxford Collocations Dictionary (2002).

- EFL students are urged to use Collocations’ Dictionaries to enrich their vocabulary and linguistic repertoire.

- It is preferable to include teaching collocations in the syllabus of TEFL especially in the productive skills (oral and writing modules).

- Implementing vocabulary learning teaching approach via teaching vocabulary as a separate module. Consequently, EFL students’ will expose to various types of vocabulary as collocations, idioms, colligations and phrasal verbs. As The Lexical Approach of Lewis (1993, 1997, 2000) in which he emphasizes the importance of vocabulary acquisition.

- Technical Collocations should be included even in ESP courses.

- Including textbooks and materials of collocations in the teaching syllabus.

- Rising EFL students’ awareness of collocations as suggested by Hill (2000). He says that teachers are responsible to raise students’ consciousness of collocations and help them to increase their knowledge about collocations through highlighting collocations in teaching context via making them aware enough to them.
General Conclusion

After the total neglection of the importance of teaching and learning vocabulary, many researchers have stressed the worthy study of lexical collocations for vocabulary learning during the past three decades. Paul Nation’s (1990) Teaching and Learning Vocabulary appeared at the beginning of the decade and proved influential in its inclusive review of research on vocabulary while providing pedagogical guidance through interpreting the research in terms of classroom applications. John Sinclair’s (1991) book, Corpus, Concordance, Collocation and Subsequent Concordance studies have revealed new understandings of how English works leading to new descriptions of the language. During this time, Michael Lewis began describing an approach to language teaching; the Lexical Approach which moved vocabulary to the forefront of language teaching in two books; The Lexical Approach (Lewis, 1993), and Implementing the Lexical Approach (Lewis, 1997) this book continues the development of this approach by focusing on a key element in the approach, collocations. This study attempts to investigate EFL students’ knowledge of collocations (verb + noun) combination. It was undertaken to answer the following questions: Do EFL learners know lexical collocations? Do EFL learners use lexical collocations incorrectly? What are the sources of collocational errors? Thus, the main hypothesis set for this study is EFL students of Oum El Bouaghi do not have a lexical collocational knowledge. To reach the aim of this study, a descriptive study was conducted via depending on Multiple-Choice Test. The sample has been chosen randomly. Then, a collocation Test was used to explore students’ collocational knowledge. The results obtained gave a clear view about the students’ knowledge of lexical collocations (verb + noun) combination by the rejection of the hypothesis. However, this does not cover the students’ collocational errors that are committed. These errors have various sources of misuse which are (1) lack of collocational concept, (2) the use of synonyms, (3) overgeneralization, (4) false concept hypothesized, (5) direct translation, and negative transfer of the first language. These sources influence their L2 acquisition. Furthermore, the results allowed us to check how students of English seemed to treat each word combination separately. Also, they failed to identify its correct collocates. Overgeneralization and lack of collocational concept are the most frequent collocational errors that are committed by EFL students, and which are concluded from the results obtained.
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Appendices
Multiple-Choice Test of English Collocations

Choose the verb that collocate with the noun (in italics) in the following sentences

1-The couple … a pact not to talk about each other.
   A. performed       B. gave       C. made       D. had

2-They are… the promise they made before the election.
   A. ruining         B. breaking    C. demeaning   D. corrupting

3-The last time I went anywhere near Peckham Rye, I believe I saw a girl …a horse.
   A. riding          B. driving    C. traveling   D. cruising

4-Lord John had … his sword and touched his spurs to his horse’s flanks.
   A. hauled          B. dragged    C. towed       D. drawn

5-He doesn’t like to tell people what to do or …orders.
   A. give            B. make       C. tell        D. say

6-In other words, if a woman asks you to… your secrets, she may really be asking you to tell her that you have no secrets.
   A. give            B. say        C. reveal      D. announce

7- Hong Kong government is under pressure from liberals who fear that Britain will again …a deal with china.
   A. complete        B. fix         C. have        D. make

8- Now, looking back on it, I don’t know how we could have … a mistake.
   A. presented       B. made       C. did         D. performed

9- In his mind, Robertson had … a crime which was unforgivable.
   A. committed       B. made       C. did         D. performed

10- … an effort to keep in touch with your friends, even if it’s just a quick phone cal
A. use  B. exercise  C. employ  D. make

11- Mr. Bush said the embassy must stay open and stressed that President Saddam was … the law by attempting to force its closure.
   A. ignoring  B. violating  C. disregarding  D. disrespecting

12- I can … an example.
   A. supply  B. offer  C. give  D. issue

13- New-Zealand’s central bank looks well on track to … its goal of reducing inflation to 0-2% by the end of 1993.
   A. get  B. obtain  C. acquire  D. achieve

14- She … her rage and humiliation that night, driving him home at the end of the evening.
   A. suppressed  B. covered  C. prevented  D. ceased

15- She said she thought she was … a favour
   A. presenting  B. giving  C. doing  D. awarding

16- The Kurds cannot … a civil war on the streets of Baghdad.
   A. pursue  B. wage  C. make  D. practise

17- Until then you will have to … caution in all your financial dealings
   A. practise  B. exercise  C. perform  D. act

18- He wanted to think it out himself, and he didn’t want to talk about it until he … his decision.

19- The Supreme Soviet … a law on May 20th.
   A. launched  B. formed  C. created  D. passed

20- Because if they agree with you, it would be very hard for me to … the company
   A. control  B. govern  C. run  D. rule

( Brashi, n.d, p.32)
The Correction of the Test

1- C. made
2- B. breaking
3- A. riding
4- D. drawn
5- A. give
6- C. reveal
7- A. complete
8- B. made
9- A. committed
10- D. make
11- B. violating
12- C. offer
13- D. achieve
14- A. suppressed
15- C. doing
16- B. wage C. make
17- B. exercise
18- A. made
19- D. passed
20- C. run
**Résumé**

تُهدف هذه الدراسة إلى اختبار مدى معرفة طلبة السنة الثانية ماستر لغة إنجليزية، بجامعة العربي بن مهدي، أم البوادي للمتلازمات اللغوية المعجمية تركيبة (فاعل+اسم) وتحديد ووصف وتحليل أخطاء هذه المتلازمات اللغوية المعجمية التي يرتكبها الطلبة. كما سيتم أيضًا مناقشة مصادر هذه الأخطاء من خلال التحليل. لدراسة فرضيتنا اتبنا منهجية واسعة وافقنا ذلك من خلال اعتماد "اختبار لعلا متلازمات بالفاعل المناسب للاسم" في أعلى الجملة. كل طالب مطالب بملام فراغات الجمل والتي يبلغ عددها 20 جملة. كل جملة مرفقة بأربعة خيارات. عينتنا لهاته الدراسة تتكون من 30 طالب من مجتمع الطلبة (124). اعتمدنا منهج "ليو" (1999a, 1999b) من أجل تحليل الأخطاء ومعرفة مصدر الخطأ. ومن أجل تحديد أخطاء المتلازمات اللغوية المعجمية تركيبة (فاعل+اسم) اعتمدنا قاموس LTP للمتلازمات اللغوية المختارة (1997) وقاموس أكسفورد للمتلازمات اللغوية لغة الإنجليزية (2009) للتصحيح. بناءاً على اختيار مدى معرفة الطلبة للمتلازمات اللغوية المعجمية فرضيتنا رفضت وذلك بناء على معرفة بالمتلازمات اللغوية المعجمية تركيبة (فاعل+اسم) ويستخدمونها بطريقة صحية.