

The Islamic University of Gaza.
Deanery of Post graduate Studies
Faculty of Education.
Department of Curriculum &
Methodology.



The Role of Mother Tongue in Reception and Production of Collocations by English Majors at the Palestinian Universities.

Prepared by:

Ahmed Abd-Alwahab Miqdad

Supervised by

Dr. Awad Sulaiman Keshta

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Education in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Master Degree of Education

2012

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to:

The sake of Allah, my Creator and my Master,

My great teacher and messenger, Mohammed (May Allah bless
and grant him), who taught us the purpose of life,

My homeland Palestine, the warmest womb;

The great martyrs and prisoners, the symbol of sacrifice;

The Islamic University; my second magnificent home;

My great parents, who never stop giving of themselves in countless
ways,

My dearest wife, who leads me through the valley of darkness
with light of hope and support,

My beloved brothers and sisters; particularly my dearest brother,
Yousef, who stands by me when things look bleak,

My beloved kids: Dana, and Kareem, whom I can't force myself
to stop loving. To all my family, the symbol of love and giving,

My friends who encourage and support me,

All the people in my life who touch my heart,

I dedicate this research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the Name of Allah, the Most Merciful, the Most Compassionate all praise be to Allah, the Lord of the worlds; and prayers and peace be upon Mohamed His servant and messenger.

First and foremost, I must acknowledge my limitless thanks to Allah, the Ever-Magnificent; the Ever-Thankful, for His help and bless. I am totally sure that this work would have never become truth, without His guidance.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to our university for giving us an opportunity to complete this work.

I am grateful to some people, who worked hard with me from the beginning till the completion of the present research particularly my supervisor Dr. Awad Keshta, who has been always generous during all phases of the research, and I highly appreciate the efforts expended by Dr. Mohammed Atia Abdelraheem, Dr. Jaber Abu-Shaweesh, Dr. Ahmed Al-Nakhala, Dr. Sha'ban Al-Omary, Mr. Mazen Abu-Nada.

I would like to take this opportunity to say warm thanks to all my beloved friends, who have been so supportive along the way of doing my thesis.

I also would like to express my wholehearted thanks to my family for their generous support they provided me throughout my entire life and particularly through the process of pursuing the master degree. Because of their unconditional love and prayers, I have the chance to complete this thesis.

I owe profound gratitude to my wife, Amal, whose constant encouragement, limitless giving and great sacrifice, helped me accomplish my degree.

I am very appreciative to my colleagues at Islamic, Al-Aqsa and Al-Azhar Universities, who participated in this study. I am also grateful to the instructors at the Palestinian Universities who let me implement my study on their classes like Dr. Wael AL-Howaity, Asa'd Abu-Sharekh, Haider Eid, and Shawki Ghanam. Without their support, this study would not have been possible.

Last but not least, deepest thanks go to all people who took part in making this thesis real.

Abstract

The Role of Mother Tongue in Reception and Production of Collocations by Palestinian English Majors.

The study aimed to investigate the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations by Palestinian English majors at the Palestinian universities.

To achieve this aim, the researcher adopted the descriptive analytical approach. The sample of the study consisted of (280) participants: in which (104) male and (176) female .

The researcher used three instruments to achieve the aim of the study. The first instrument was the receptive test which consisted of (30) items and the second instrument was the productive test which also consisted of (30) items. The third instrument was the written interview which was designed to measure the participants' level of exposure to language.

The collected data were analyzed and treated statistically through the use of (SPSS) by using T- test, One Way ANOVA. And Scheffe Post test was also used to identify the direction of the differences. The findings indicated that there were statistically significant differences between congruent and non-congruent collocations in favor of the congruent collocations and this indicated that the mother tongue played a significant role in reception and production of collocations. The findings showed that there were statistically significant differences in reception and production of collocations in favor of the receptive knowledge. Moreover, there were statistically significant differences

between reception and production of collocations due to gender and university in favor of female Participants and the Islamic university of Gaza.

In the light of those findings, the study recommended the necessity of shedding more light on the Non-congruent collocations because of their difficulty in the acquisition and the adjective-noun collocations must be treated in different ways to make the student receive and produce them easily. The focus should be more on the productive knowledge because the participants met more difficulty in producing collocations than receiving them. It was also suggested that further researches should be conducted in using other lexical categories of collocations and other researches must be conducted in more ESL environments and finally, researches should be particularly conducted in the productive knowledge of collocations.

ملخص الدراسة

دور اللغة الأم (اللغة العربية) في اكتساب و إنتاج المتلازمات اللفظية لدى متخصصي اللغة الانجليزية.

لقد هدفت الدراسة إلى التعرف على دور اللغة الأم (اللغة العربية) في اكتساب وإنتاج المتلازمات اللفظية لدى متخصصي اللغة الانجليزية بالجامعات الفلسطينية. ولتحقيق هدف الدراسة، تبنى الباحث المنهج الوصفي التحليلي. وقد تكونت عينة الدراسة من (٢٨٠) طالبا وطالبة. وقد شملت العينة (١٠٤) من الذكور و (١٧٦) من الإناث من مختلف الجامعات المدرجة ضمن الدراسة (الإسلامية والأزهر والأقصى). وقد استخدم الباحث ثلاث أدوات لتحقيق هدف الدراسة فكانت الأداة الأولى اختبار اكتساب مكون من ٣٠ فقرة اختيار من متعدد والثانية اختبار إنتاج مكون أيضا من ٣٠ فقرة إكمال والأداة الأخيرة عبارة عن أسئلة مقابلة مكتوبة مكونة من ١١ فقرة لقياس مستوى التعرض للغة الانجليزية.

لقد تم إدخال ومعالجة البيانات إحصائيا باستخدام برنامج (المجموعة الاحصائية للعلوم الاجتماعية) وذلك باستخدام (اختبار ت) واختبار تحليل التباين الأحادي واختبار شيفيه البعدي لمعرفة اتجاه الفروق.

وقد أشارت النتائج إلى أنه توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين المتلازمات اللفظية التي لها ترجمة حرفية باللغة العربية والمتلازمات التي ليس لها ترجمة حرفية باللغة العربية وكانت الفروق لصالح المتلازمات التي لها ترجمة حرفية باللغة العربية وهذا يشير إلى وجود دور هام للغة الأم في اكتساب وإنتاج المتلازمات اللفظية ولقد أشارت النتائج إلى وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين اكتساب وإنتاج المتلازمات اللفظية لصالح الاكتساب. كما ان النتائج أشارت إلى وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين تصنيفات المتلازمات اللفظية (فعل - اسم) و(صفة- اسم) لصالح (فعل - اسم). كما وأوضحت النتائج أن هناك فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين اكتساب وإنتاج المتلازمات اللفظية تعزى لمتغير الجنس وكانت الفروق لصالح الإناث

ولمتغير الجامعة وكانت الفروق لصالح الجامعة الإسلامية كما وانه لا توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية تعزى للمعدل التراكمي .

وأوصى الباحث في ضوء تلك النتائج بإجراء دراسات تلقي الضوء على المتلازمات اللفظية التي ليس لها مقابل باللغة العربية، وكذلك دراسات تركز على تصنيف (صفة- اسم) نظرا لصعوبتها في الاكتساب والإنتاج وأيضا إجراء دراسات على تصنيفات أخرى للمتلازمات اللفظية، وأخيرا إجراء دراسات تتعلق بالمعرفة الإنتاجية للمتلازمات اللفظية نظرا لصعوبتها مقارنة بالمعرفة الاكتسابية.

Table of Contents

| No. | Contents | Page |
|------|---|------|
| 1- | Dedication | I |
| 2- | Acknowledgements | II |
| 3- | Abstract in English | IV |
| 4- | Abstract in Arabic | VI |
| 5- | Table of Contents | VIII |
| 6- | List of Tables | XIII |
| 7- | List of Appendices | XV |
| 8- | List of Abbreviations | XVI |
| | Chapter I Study Background | |
| 1.1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 | Need for the study | 7 |
| 1.3 | Statement of the problem | 9 |
| 1.4 | Research questions | 9 |
| 1.5 | Hypotheses of the study | 10 |
| 1.6 | Purpose of the study | 11 |
| 1.7 | Significance of the study | 11 |
| 1.8 | The operational definition of terms | 12 |
| 1.9 | Limitations to the study | 13 |
| 1.10 | Summary | 13 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| | Chapter II Literature Review | |
| -A- | Part one: Theoretical Framework | 14 |
| 2.1.1 | Introduction | 14 |
| 2.1.2 | The notion of collocations | 14 |
| 2.1.3 | Definitions of collocations | 16 |
| 2.1.4 | Characteristics of collocations | 19 |
| 2.1.5 | Classifications of collocations | 21 |
| 2.1.6 | Collocations and other combination words | 27 |
| 2.1.7 | The importance of teaching collocations | 30 |
| 2.1.8 | Contrastive analysis hypothesis | 34 |
| 2.1.9 | Types of errors | 36 |
| 2.1.10 | Approaches to error analysis | 38 |
| 2.1.11 | Methodological implications for teaching collocations | 40 |
| 2.1.12 | Learners' problems in collocations | 41 |
| 2.1.13 | Collocations and second language acquisition | 45 |
| 2.1.14 | Summary | 49 |
| -B- | Part two: previous studies | 50 |
| 2.2.1 | Introduction | 50 |
| 2.2.2 | Studies that dealt with Arabic-speaking learners | 50 |
| 2.2.3 | Commentary | 54 |
| 2.2.4 | Studies that dealt with ESL / EFL learners | 54 |
| 2.2.5 | Commentary | 58 |
| 2.2.6 | Studies that dealt with English collocation errors | 58 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.2.7 | Commentary | 62 |
| 2.2.8 | Commentary on all domains of the previous studies | 63 |
| | Chapter III Methodology | |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 64 |
| 3.2 | Type of research methodology | 64 |
| 3.3 | The population | 65 |
| 3.4 | The sample | 65 |
| 3.5 | Instrumentation | 67 |
| 3.6 | The pilot study | 67 |
| 3.7 | Receptive test | 67 |
| 3.7.1 | Validity of the receptive test | 68 |
| 3.7.2 | Reliability of the receptive test | 70 |
| 3.7.3 | Difficulty coefficient | 72 |
| 3.7.4 | Discrimination coefficient | 73 |
| 3.8 | Productive test | 75 |
| 3.8.1 | Validity of the productive test | 75 |
| 3.8.2 | Reliability of the productive test | 77 |
| 3.8.3 | Difficulty coefficient | 78 |
| 3.8.4 | Discrimination coefficient | 80 |
| 3.9 | Written interview | 81 |
| 3.9.1 | Validity of the written interview | 82 |
| 3.9.2 | Reliability of the written interview | 83 |
| 3.10 | Statistical analysis procedures | 84 |
| 3.11 | Summary | 85 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| | Chapter IV Results: Analysis of Data | |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 86 |
| 4.2 | Question 1 analysis | 86 |
| 4.3 | Question 2 analysis | 88 |
| 4.4 | Question 3 analysis | 90 |
| 4.5 | Question 4 analysis | 91 |
| 4.6 | Question 5 analysis | 92 |
| 4.7 | Question 6 analysis | 94 |
| 4.8 | Question 7 analysis | 98 |
| 4.9 | Summary | 99 |
| | Chapter V Findings, Discussion, Implication, Conclusion and Recommendations. | |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 100 |
| 5.2 | Discussion | 100 |
| 5.3 | Interpretation of the first question | 101 |
| 5.4 | Interpretation of the second question | 102 |
| 5.5 | Interpretation of the third question | 103 |
| 5.6 | Interpretation of the fourth question | 104 |
| 5.7 | Interpretation of the fifth question | 104 |
| 5.8 | Interpretation of the sixth question | 105 |
| 5.9 | Interpretation of the seventh question | 106 |
| 5.10 | General Discussion | 106 |

| | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|-----|
| 5.11 | Recommendations of the study | 107 |
| 5.12 | Conclusion | 109 |
| 5.13 | Recommendations for further studies | 111 |
| References | | 113 |
| Appendices | | 129 |

List of Tables

| No. | Subject | Page |
|------|--|------|
| 2.1 | Lexical Collocations Adopted from Benson et al. (1986a). | 24 |
| 2.2 | Grammatical Collocations Adopted from Benson et al. (1986a). | 25 |
| 3.1 | The distribution of the population according to university. | 65 |
| 3.2 | The distribution of the sample according to gender. | 66 |
| 3.3 | The distribution of the sample according to the university. | 66 |
| 3.4 | The distribution of the sample according to the participants' grade point average. | 66 |
| 3.5 | The number of each domain after modification. | 69 |
| 3.6 | The internal consistency of the receptive test | 69 |
| 3.7 | The correlation of the test domains with the test as a whole. | 70 |
| 3.8 | (KR20) and Split half coefficients of the test domains. | 71 |
| 3.9 | Difficulty coefficient for each item of the test. | 72 |
| 3.10 | The discrimination coefficient for each item of the test. | 74 |
| 3.11 | The number of each domain of the productive test after modification. | 75 |
| 3.12 | The internal consistency of the productive test. | 76 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 3.13 | The correlation of the test domains with the test as a whole. | 77 |
| 3.14 | (KR20) and Split half coefficients of the productive test domains. | 78 |
| 3.15 | Difficulty coefficient for each item of the productive test. | 79 |
| 3.16 | Discrimination coefficient for each item of the productive test. | 80 |
| 3.17 | Pearson correlation to each item of interview items. | 83 |
| 3.18 | Reliability coefficient of all items of the written interview. | 83 |
| 3.19 | Correlation between two parts (even X odd) and modification by Guttman. | 84 |
| 4.1 | T.test Paired Samples results of differences between the congruent and non-congruent collocation groups for all of the sub domain and total score of the domains. | 87 |
| 4.2 | T.test Paired Samples results of differences between verb-noun collocations and adjective-noun collocations for all of the sub domains and total score of the domains. | 88 |
| 4.3 | T.test Paired Samples results of differences between the productive and receptive tests for all of the sub domain and the total score of the domains. | 90 |
| 4.4 | T.Test for independent samples with gender variables. | 91 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 4.5 | One Way ANOVA results of the receptive and productive tests with the participants' grade point average. | 93 |
| 4.6 | One Way ANOVA results of the receptive and productive tests with the differences between universities. | 94 |
| 4.7 | Scheffe post test Matrix to know the direction of differences between universities in the Productive test. | 95 |
| 4.8 | Scheffe post test Matrix to know the direction of differences between universities in the receptive test. | 96 |
| 4.9 | Scheffe post test Matrix to know the direction of differences between universities in both "Productive and Receptive tests". | 96 |
| 4.10 | Pearson correlation between the participants' proficiency in collocations and their exposure to English language. | 98 |

List of Appendices

| No. | Appendices | Page |
|-----|---|------|
| A- | The Names of the Referee Panel. | 129 |
| B- | The Final Receptive and Productive Tests. | 130 |
| C- | The Final Written Interview. | 137 |
| D- | The Authorization Letter Addressed to AL-Azhar University. | 140 |
| E- | The Authorization Letter Addressed to AL-Aqsa University. | 141 |
| F- | A collected Group of Verb-noun Collocations from Previous Studies. | 142 |
| G- | A collected Group of Adjective-noun Collocations from Previous Studies. | 144 |

List of Abbreviations

| No. | Abbreviations | Full Form |
|-----|---------------|---|
| 1- | SLA | Second Language Acquisition |
| 2- | L1 | First Language |
| 3- | L2 | Second Language |
| 4- | ESL | English as a Second Language |
| 5- | EFL | English as a Foreign Language |
| 6- | IUG | Islamic University of Gaza |
| 7- | GPA | Grade Point Average |
| 8- | SPSS | Statistical Package for the Social Sciences |

Chapter I

Study Background

Chapter One

Study Background

1.1. Introduction:

Language is one of the great signs of the Almighty Allah Who says in the Holly Quran, "*And from His signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the diversity of your languages and your colors, surely in that are signs for those who possess knowledge*" (Surat ArRum, 22).

English language has become a widespread international language since early 1980s because of its worldwide political and business importance. English is the formal means of communication in several different parts of the world from North America to East Asia, and it is the language of modern technology and internet. Teaching English, as a result, has become a global industry. Consequently, companies and publishing houses have been working hard to enrich the field of English language teaching through printing and producing teaching aids to facilitate learning. Different types of dictionaries have been published, and all latest technologies have been dedicated to help learners master language with minimum effort and within the shortest time. For example, the smart board has made teaching much easier, and language labs help students master listening and speaking (Herzallah, 2011)

Therefore, English teachers try to make their students master all skills of English language such as reading, writing, listening, and speaking. There are other skills, in addition, English learners have to be proficient in grammar and vocabulary, which are necessary to let the

student master the language and be able to communicate actively with others. It is obvious that vocabulary plays a significant role in the students' ability to speak the language and master the language skills better.

Many researchers emphasized that the mother tongue has an influence on the acquisition of the second language or even the learners follow the first language system to learn the second language and this may cause different problems and errors during the process of learning the language. The learning of vocabulary is crucial to convey the message as Wilkins (1972,p.111) states that “While without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed” . This argument has been supported by many researchers in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) who have emphasized the significance of vocabulary and agreed that vocabulary is equally, if not more, important than language structure in language acquisition. This is why it was recommended to pay attention to the teaching of vocabulary in the same way as the teaching of grammar (Krashen, 1988). For example, McCarthy (1990) summarizes the importance of vocabulary teaching for second language (L2) learners in the following statement:

No matter how well the student learns grammar, no matter how successfully the sounds of L2 are mastered, without words to express a wide range of meanings; communication in an L2 just cannot happen in any meaningful way (p. viii).

The knowledge of L2 collocations is, to a considerable extent, related to the knowledge of L2 vocabulary. As collocational use of language involves knowledge of words and the company they keep, it is reasonable to assume that the more L2 vocabulary a learner has acquired, the more collocations he is likely to know or use. If learners do not know ‘moustache’, their knowledge of ‘thin moustache’ would virtually be non-existent. Similarly, if learners do not have good knowledge of a wider range of collocates, they are bound to rely heavily on a small number of simple items such as ‘fat’ and ‘very’ in collocational use, producing language which is monotonous and repetitive. In some cases, learners may know all the words in the collocation e.g. ‘deep’ and ‘scar’ but they may not have knowledge of the collocation ‘deep scar’ and are not able to use it in production. To achieve competence in L2 collocational use, learners need to develop a wider vocabulary and knowledge of collocations.

In addition, collocations are indispensable for second language (L2) learners, especially at an advanced level. This is due to the fact that collocational knowledge is an essential part in both speech and writing (Bahns & Eldaw, 1993). To gain overall language proficiency, learners need to gain collocational competence (Fayez-Hussein, 1990). According to Kjellemer (1992), the more accurately language learners are able to use collocations, the fewer pauses and hesitations they make during long chunks of discourse. This is only one of many reasons why it is necessary for language learners to master collocations. By doing so, their speech sounds more natural, and is more easily understood by native speakers. Also, language learners are able to express their ideas in

more varied ways when they learn collocations (Lennon, 1986). Furthermore, Benson and Ilson (1997) state that language learners must acquire how words collocate with each other to be able to produce language with native-like accuracy and fluency in both oral and written forms.

Thus, their vocabulary and overall language proficiency level increases as their collocational knowledge increases. Therefore, many researchers like (Lewis, 2001; McCarthy, 1984) claim that collocational knowledge is the essence of language knowledge. Based on the aforementioned argument, the importance of collocations has recently been emphasized by researchers in the field of SLA.

Lexicographers show interest in collocations. Due to the importance of collocations that are widely spread in native speakers' speech, lexicographers bear in mind that collocations need to be well explained to L2 learners, to whom they create a hazard. For example, Verstraten (1992) states that "Fixed phrases must be thoroughly explained in the learner's dictionary in order to enable the student quickly to enter them into his/her own mental lexicon" (p. 38). Thus, lexicographers like Benson (1985), and Cowie (1981) support the importance of having specialized dictionaries for collocations. Therefore, the last three decades have witnessed the appearance of specialized collocation dictionaries, such as Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (Hornby, 1974).

According to *Oxford Collocations Dictionary* (2002,p.vii), collocations run through the whole of English language and no piece of

natural spoken or written English is totally free of collocations. For learners of English, choosing the right collocations make their speech and writing sound much more natural, more native speaker-like, and quite precise. For example, it is normal to say *strong wind* but *heavy rain*. On the other hand, it would not be normal to say **heavy wind* or **strong rain*. Students who talk about **strong rain*, for example, may make themselves understood, but possibly not without provoking a smile, an embarrassment or a correction. To native-speakers, these combinations are highly predictable; to learners of English, they pose some sorts of difficulties and require a greater degree of competence to be used accurately and productively.

Though the role that collocation plays in language acquisition is an important topic, very few rigorous studies can be found that address this issue. One thing for certain is that Hatch and Brown (1995) found that L2 learners learn or acquire those phrases or chunks language as a unit rather than as individual words of a phrase. Compared to L1 users, who acquired their phrases or chunk language and developed the competence to reconstruct the language with phrases from exposure to the environment, L2 learners seemed to have the same ability to resort to the same strategies as L1 learners to learn chunk language (Schmitt 2000). Consequently, it is possible for L2 learners to reach native-speaker like competence if the learners are capable of using the idioms fluently (Ellis 1997).

The importance of collocations for the development of L2 vocabulary and communicative competence has been underscored by a

number of linguists and language teachers, who recommend the teaching and learning of collocations in the L2 classroom. Collocation has been considered as a separate level of vocabulary acquisition. Bolinger (1976,p.8) argues that we learn and memorise words in chunks and that most of our "manipulative grasp of words is by way of collocations".

Among the early advocates for the importance of collocations in L2 learning and their inclusion in L2 teaching is Brown (1974), who suggests that an increase of the students' knowledge of collocation will result in an improvement of their oral and listening comprehension and their reading speed. In an effort to make the advanced students achieve a better feel of what is acceptable and what is appropriate.

The combination of lexical items as a source of difficulty in vocabulary acquisition has been noted by researchers like Korosadowicz-Struzynska (1980,p.111), who claims that the learner's mastery of these troublesome combinations, rather than her/his knowledge of single words, should be an indication of her/his progress. Korosadowicz-Struzynska reports that students face intralingual and interlingual problems in the use of collocations, and even advanced students who have considerable fluency of expression in a foreign language make collocational errors.

The teaching and learning of collocations for production reasons is regarded as essential by Korosadowicz-Struzynska, who also describes certain steps that should be followed in order to promote the teaching of collocations from the initial stages of foreign language learning. These include selection of the most essential words on the

basis of usefulness and frequency of occurrence, selection of the most frequent collocations of these words, presentation of these collocations in the most typical contexts, and contrasting any of the selected collocations with the equivalent native-language collocations that could cause interference problems for the learners.

The English major students in the Palestinian universities have different problems using English as native-like specially, practicing the spoken English and being as native speakers. Such problems may be related to the lack of vocabulary in the students' lexicon or the shortage of engaging the students in different English environments. Therefore, the researcher is going to investigate the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations by Palestinian English majors . The researcher depended on several related studies that dealt with this topic to set up the present study on them. These studies are Alsakran (2011), Rabeh (2010), Shehata (2008), Moussa (2006), Bazzaz et al. (2011), Lesniewiska et al. (2007), Darvishi (2011), and El Mahdi (2009).

1.2. Need for the study:

Much has been said about the acquisition of collocations by English as a foreign language (EFL) learners, who come from various cultural backgrounds in various countries (AL-Sakran, 2011; Bahns & Eldaw 1993; Bazzaz et. al. 2011; Biskup, 1992; Channell, 1981; Ghadessy, 1989; Shehata, 2008; Willis, 1990). However, few studies have explored the collocational knowledge of Arabic-speaking learners of English in an EFL environment (Fayez-Hussein, 1990; Farghal &

Obiedant, 1995; Al- Zahrani, 1998). Like other EFL learners, Arab learners of English have difficulties with the acquisition of English collocations (Al- Zahrani, 1998). Researchers attribute the poor collocational knowledge of L1 Arabic learners of English to various factors, e.g., their unfamiliarity with English collocation structures, and negative transfer from Arabic (Hussein, 1990). Since most Arabic-speaking learners in EFL classrooms have fewer opportunities to encounter collocations in their daily input, it is hypothesized that they commonly resort to their L1 whenever they lack English collocational knowledge (Hussein, 1990; Al- Zahrani, 1998). Moreover, they typically find it difficult to encounter collocations in EFL settings, since they are more accustomed to learning individual words that form collocations, but they are less frequently exposed to those words in the form of collocations (Farghal & Obiedant, 1995). Further, as a learner and a teacher of English in an EFL environment in Palestine, an Arab country, I have noticed that collocations do not receive much attention from teachers in the classroom. In this context, the focus is restricted to drills or repetition of individual words, in particular verbs. Consequently, students graduate from universities with a very low ability to communicate or express themselves effectively in English using collocations. Finally, previous studies that have analyzed learners' production of English collocations have been insufficient since they have relied on a small range of instruments, such as translation tests (Nesselhauf, 2003). Further collocation research and discussions are certainly needed to explore both the reception and production of collocations. This study will investigate the reception and production of

collocations, in addition, to the role of mother tongue in these two skills (reception and production of collocations).

1.3. Statement of the problem:

The learners of English language face different obstacles in learning English such as the interference of the first language in learning collocations which is the topic of this study. So, the problem of this study can be stated in the following main question:

What is the role of mother tongue in reception and production of English collocations by Palestinian English majors at the Palestinian universities?

1.4. Research questions:

The following sub-questions came up to answer the main question:

- 1- Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations?
- 2- Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' performance on verb-noun collocations and adjective-noun collocations?
- 3- Are there significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations?
- 4- Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to gender?
- 5- Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to GPA?

- 6- Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to university?
- 7- Is there a correlation at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between participants' proficiency in recognizing and producing collocations and their level of exposure to the English language?

1.5. Hypotheses of the study:

- 1- There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations.
- 2- There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' performance in verb-noun collocations and adjective-noun collocations.
- 3- There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations.
- 4- There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to gender.
- 5- There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to GPA.
- 6- There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to university.

- 7- There is no correlation at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between participants' proficiency in recognizing and producing collocations and their exposure to the English language.

1.6. Purpose of the study:

The study aims to:

- 1- Investigate the role of the mother tongue on the reception and production of English collocations.
- 2- Examine the difference in the receptive and productive knowledge of collocations between the male and female students.
- 3- Explore the relationship between the participants' collocational proficiency and their exposure to English language.
- 4- Find out if there are statistically significant differences between participants' receptive knowledge of collocations and their productive knowledge of collocations.
- 5- Explore the differences in the receptive and productive knowledge of collocations based on the participant's grand point average, and university.
- 6- Investigate the participants' performance in verb-noun and adjective-noun collocations.

1.7. Significance of the study:

This study was significant for the following:

- 1- According to the knowledge of the researcher it is the first study in Palestine that examines the role of the mother tongue (Arabic) in the reception and production of English collocations.

- 2- This study includes a wide range of participants since it will be conducted on three Palestinian universities
- 3- It is hoped that it will help the teaching staff at English language programs to know the strength and weakness areas of their students' collocational knowledge later on.
- 4- It will add new information to the knowledge regarding whether the mother tongue affects positively or negatively the reception and production of English collocations by Arab learners.
- 5- This study will suggest more researches about the field of the study concerning other types of collocations.
- 6- It will show the teachers a holistic picture of their students' level of the collocational knowledge.
- 7- It will draw the learners' attention to the important role of collocations in learning English language and communicative skills.
- 8- It will encourage the curriculum designers to provide the students with authentic materials of different types of collocations.

1.8. The operational definition of terms:

- 1- The mother tongue: The researcher defines it as the participants' mother tongue and here it is Arabic language.
- 2- Collocations: the researcher adopts the definition of (Cruse, 1986, p.40) "Sequences of lexical items, which habitually co-occur, but which are nonetheless fully transparent in the sense that each lexical constituent is also a semantic constituent".
- 3- Congruent collocations: They refer to the collocations that have literal translation equivalent in the participants' L1. (The researcher's definition)

- 4- Non-congruent collocations: the researcher states that they refer to the collocations that don't have literal equivalents in the participants' L1.
- 5- Exposure to language: it refers to all kinds of contact with the target language either inside or outside the formal environment, including reading, writing, listening or speaking. (The researcher's definition).

1.9. Limitations of the study:

- 1- The study targets a limited number of university students in the second semester of the academic year (2011-2012).
- 2- It deals with junior and senior students at the Palestinian universities (Islamic university of Gaza, AL-azhar and AL-aqsa universities).
- 3- The study uses verb-noun and adjective- noun collocations.
- 4- It examines a limited number of collocations.

1.10. Summary:

This chapter was an introduction to this study. It began talking about the language and the importance of learning languages especially English language. In addition, it talked about the important role that vocabulary plays in learning the language particularly collocations because of their significant role in making the learners native-like. Moreover, this chapter mentioned that the study has seven questions with seven hypotheses to achieve the aim of the study. This chapter also illustrated the purpose, the significance, the definition of terms, and at the end the limitations of the study and the summary of the chapter.

Chapter II

Literature Review

Chapter Two

Literature Review

A. Part one: Theoretical Framework.

2.1.1. Introduction:

The following chapter is going to illustrate the theoretical framework of English collocations in different topics such as the notion of collocations, definitions of collocations, collocations and other combination words, characteristics of collocations, classifications of collocations, the importance of teaching collocations, types of errors in collocations, approaches to error analysis, methodological implications to teach collocations, learners' problems in collocations and collocations and Second Language Acquisition.

2.1.2. The Notion of Collocation:

Collocation originated from the field of lexicon studies as a term defined and understood in many different ways (Bahns, 1993). Generally, there are two different sides of assertions about this term. One of them argued that collocation is related to meaning; the other argues that collocation is not a semantic relation between words. The two assertions are discussed in this section.

On the one hand, for the assertion that collocation is concerning meaning, J. R. Firth has been regarded as the one responsible for bringing the term into existence in the field of lexicon study (Carter & McCarthy, 1988; Hill, 2000). In Firth's view, the meaning of a word

should be known by the company it keeps (Hill, 2000). In other words, collocation is about the meaning of a word and about its relationship with other words (Hill, 2000). Such a notion about collocation is often applied to the subsequent research related to collocation.

McIntosh (1961) took Firth's viewpoint into further discussion. He adds the notion of ranges, which meant, as Palmer (1976) defines, that a word might be used with a whole set of words that had some semantic features in common. An example of a range was the list of nouns, such as *metal, iron, and lava*, which might be qualified by the adjective molten. In McIntosh's opinion, words have only a certain tolerance of compatibility. Such knowledge of ranges help to distinguish the acceptable collocations from unacceptable ones.

Similar to McIntosh (1961) and Palmer (1976), Bolinger and Sears (1981) also mention that the ranges and variety of collocations were enormous. They regard collocation as a kind of habitual association of words and assert that collocations result from native speakers' experiences of the expressions repeated again and again in certain given circumstances. Therefore, depending on the context, the collocations, like *good chance, high probability*, and *strong likelihood*, might be considered acceptable, but the collocations like **strong chance, *good probability*, and **high likelihood*, unacceptable.

Sinclair (1966), in a volume of papers in memory of J. R. Firth, showed an interest in generating lexical sets by the use of collocation. For Sinclair, grammar and lexis are two different aspects. Grammar could be described by structures and systems, while lexis is about lexical items collocating with one another-collocations and sets respectively. According to Sinclair, collocation is referred to as the co-

occurrence of two words, but this co-occurrence is not indicative of two words occurring as a small fixed grammatical set. Instead, it has two important features. First, there might be several or many words between the two relevant items or the two relevant items might even occur over sentence boundaries. Second, collocation is independent of grammatical types. In other words, collocation is not analyzed by grammatical structures. The examples “he argued strongly,” “the strength of his argument,” “his argument was strengthened” (Carter & McCarthy, 1988, p. 35) to illustrate a constant relationship between the two words.

On the other hand, however, some researchers hold cohesion in views from the above scholars' opinions. For example, McCarthy (1991) argues that the notion of collocation is made use of as a kind of cohesive devices. He claims that "collocation refers to the probability that lexical items will co-occur, and is not a semantic relation between words." (p. 65). Such opinion suggests that collocation serves other function besides meaning in sentences. Another instance was Aghbar's (1990) proclamation. He proposed that the notion of collocation was not raised creatively for the first time; in fact, people had a memory of having heard or seen these constructions before and used them as such. The above two examples gave a broader definition of collocation.

2.1.3. Definitions of Collocations:

Most linguists offer a similar view on the concept of collocation, all containing a focus on the co-occurrence of words. The term *collocation* has its origin from the Latin verb *collocare* which means *to set in order/to arrange* (Martynska,2004). The researcher selected many definitions to make the idea of collocations more clearer and at the end ,

the researcher will give the adopted definition adopted throughout the study.

Firth (1957) defines collocation *as an abstraction at the syntagmatic level*. For example, one of the meanings of *night* is its collocability with *dark*, and of *dark*, of course, collocates *night*.

Sinclair (1991) defines collocation as a regular combination between items, in such a way that they co-occur more often than their respective frequencies.

Celce (cited in Martynska, 2004) defines collocations as a co-occurrence of lexical items in combination, which can differ in frequency or acceptability. Items which collocate frequently with each other are called *habitual*, e.g. *tell a story*, whereas those which cannot co-occur are called *unacceptable*, e.g.* *powerful tea* instead of *strong tea*.

Baker (1992) defines collocations as a tendency of certain words to co-occur regularly in a given language.

Likewise, Lewis (1994) defines collocation as a subcategory of multi-word items, made up of individual words which usually co-occur.

In addition, Hill (2000) explains that a collocation is predictable combinations of the content words e.g. *foot the bill* and *weather forecast*, etc.

Woolard (2000) defines collocation as “the co-occurrence of words which are statistically much more likely to appear together than random chance suggests” (p.29).

Moreover, Nation (2001) identifies that the term *collocation* is used to refer to a group of words that come together, either because they commonly occur together like *take a chance*, or because the meaning of the group is not obvious from the meaning of the parts, as with *by the way* or *to take someone in* (p.317).

According to *Oxford Collocations Dictionary* (2002), collocation is a means of combining words in a language to produce natural-sounding speech and writing. Incorrect combinations such as *heavy wind* or *strong rain* do not sound natural in English.

In addition, Benson and Ilson state that:

"Collocations are arbitrary and non-predictable. Non-native speakers cannot cope with them; they must have a guide. They have no way of knowing that one says in English *make an estimate*, (but not *make an estimation*), *commit treason* (but not *commit treachery*). In English one says *commit fraud* and *perpetrate fraud*. However, only the collocation *commit suicide* is possible; one does not say *perpetrate suicide*. One says *bake a cake*, but *make pancakes* (not *bake pancakes*) (p.258)

Lastly, (Cruse, 1986, p.40) defines collocations as “Sequences of lexical items, which habitually co-occur, but which are nonetheless fully transparent in the sense that each lexical constituent is also a semantic constituent” This definition clarifies the idea of collocation in which it mentions the sequences and the co-occurrences of the lexical items that work together not as a separate items in spite of the specific meaning of each item. The researcher adopts this definition as an operational one to achieve the aim of the study.

To sum up, all of the previous definitions of collocation share the same concept. Collocation is a co-occurrence of words or words that usually keep company with one another.

2.1.4. Characteristics of Collocations:

Some scholars illustrate the characteristics of collocations in different ways but they also met in some central characteristics that collocations share. The researcher displays some of these classifications as follows:

Boonyasaquan (2005, pp.11-13) summarizes the characteristics of collocations as the following:

- 1- Collocations are frequent co-occurrences of items between which no word can be added. For example, in *knife and fork*, it is very unusual to add a word to this collocation like, * *knife, spoon and fork*.
- 2- Collocations consist of components that cannot be replaced by a synonym or word of similar meaning. For example:

1. *John makes a cake*; but not
2. **John makes a pancake*.
- 3- Collocations are binomials that cannot be reversed. The order of the parts of a collocation is more or less fixed, for example, *bread and butter*, not **butter and bread*.
- 4- Some collocations are predictable; for example, if a person hears a collocation *apply...* and *shrug...* s/he automatically expects that *for* and *shoulder* will follow respectively.

Beekman and Callow (cited in Baker, 1992) indicate that the two main factors influencing the collocation range of an item are the following:

- 1- A level of specificity:** this means “the more general a word is, the broader its collocational range; the more specific it is and the more restricted its collocational range” (p.50). For example, the verb *bury* is likely to have much broader collocational range than any of its hyponyms, such as *inter* or *entomb*. Only people can be *interred*, but you can *bury people, a treasure, your head, face, feeling and memories* (p.50).
- 2- The number of senses an item has:** this means most words have several senses and they tend to attract a different set of collocates for each sense (Baker,1992). For example, in its sense of *manage*, the verb *run* collocates with words like *company, institution, and business*. Meanwhile, its sense of *operate or provide* collocates with words like *service* and *course* (Baker, 1992, p.50).

To recap, collocations usually have specific characteristics. Their frequent co-occurrences are observed and their collocates cannot be changed or explained.

2.1.5. Classifications of Collocations:

Many linguists have given different classifications of collocations with different concepts and proper names. In spite of that, these classifications of collocations were classified into similar ways. For example, Mahmoud (2005) points out that there are two types of collocation: open and restricted collocations.

- 1- Open collocations:** refer to nodes that can cluster with a wide range of other words e.g. *a red car, a small car, an expensive car*, etc.
- 2- Restricted collocations:** refer to clusters that are fixed or like idioms e.g. *kick the bucket, rain cats and dogs*, etc.

Likewise, Huang (2001) focuses only on lexical collocations and adopts Howarth's (1998) categorization as the following:

- 1- Free combinations:** This category of collocation refers to a combination of words of which meaning is from the literal meaning of each element, for example, *blow a trumpet* and *blow a whistle*.
- 2- Restricted collocations:** This category is used in a more specific context and the number of collocates is few, for example *blow a fuse*.
- 3- Figurative idioms:** This category refers to a metaphorical meaning as a whole that can somehow be derived from its literal interpretation e.g. *blow your own trumpet*.

- 4- Pure idioms:** This category has a unitary meaning that is totally unpredictable from the meaning of its components e.g. *blow the gaff*, meaning to reveal a secret.

Similarly, Hill (2000) categorizes collocations as the following:

- 1- Unique collocations:** These refer to collocations which are fixed and cannot be replaced by any other words, such as *to foot the bill*, *to foot the invoice*, or *to foot the coffee* is obviously wrong.
- 2- Strong collocations:** These collocations are strong or very strong but not unique. Usually, strong collocations have few other possible collocates. For example, *moved to tears* or *reduced to tears*.
- 3- Weak collocations:** This kind of collocation consists of a number of word co-occurrences and can be easily guessed, such as *a white shirt*, *a red shirt*, *a green shirt*, *a long shirt*, *a small shirt*, etc.
- 4- Medium- strength collocations:** These collocations are of the same meaning as suggested by Lewis (2000). They can sometimes be weak collocations such as *to hold a conversation* and *to make a mistake*. Normally learners already know each individual word such as *to hold* and *a conversation* but they are able to use as a single item or as a collocation.

Meanwhile, Lewis (2000) classifies collocations as the following:

- 1- Strong collocations:** These refer to collocations that have a very limited number of collocates. Most collocates are fixed, for example, *rancid butter* or *rancid oil*.

3- Weak collocations: These refer to collocations that have a wide variety of collocates; for example, many things can be *long or short*, *cheap or expensive*, *good or bad*.

4- Medium-strength collocations: These are words that always go together more frequently than weak collocations. Some examples are *hold a meeting*, *carry out a study*.

Sinclair (1991) divides collocation into two categories as the following:

1- The upward collocations: This category consists of words which habitually collocate with other words more frequently used in English than they are themselves and most of them are prepositions, adverbs, conjunctions and pronouns. For example, the word “*back*” normally combines with *at*, *down*, *from*, *into*, *on*. “*back*” is used with another word, more than standing alone.

2- The downward collocations: are words which combine with other words less frequently than standing by themselves and give a semantic analysis of a word. For instance, *arrive* and *bring* are less frequently combined with other words than *back*.

In addition, Benson, and Ilson (1986) divide collocations into two major categories: grammatical and lexical collocations. Grammatical collocations consist of content words: a noun, an adjective or a verb plus a preposition or *infinitive*.

Meanwhile, lexical collocations could be made up of nouns, adjectives, verbs, or adverbs, like *warmest regards*, *file an affidavit*, *strictly accurate*, etc. There were seven types of lexical collocations, labeled from L1 to L7, whose structures and examples are given in Table (2.1).

Table (2.1)

Table (2.1) Lexical Collocations Adopted from Benson et al. (1986a).

| Type | Structures | Examples |
|------|---|--|
| L1 | verb (donating creation or activation) + noun (pronoun or prep. phrase) | compose music; make an impression; draw up a will |
| L2 | verb (meaning eradication or nullification)+ noun | revoke a license; demolish a house |
| L3 | adjective + noun | strong tea; a rough estimate |
| L4 | Noun + verb | bees buzz; bombs explode |
| L5 | Noun1 of noun2 | a pack of dogs; a herd of buffalo |
| L6 | adjective + adverb adverb + adjective | sound asleep; hopelessly addicted |
| L7 | verb + adverb | anchor firmly; argue heatedly |

On the other hand, a grammatical collocation is made up of a dominant word, such as a noun, an adjective, or a verb, and a preposition or a grammatical structure like an infinitive or a clause. Benson et al. (1986a) further categorizes the grammatical collocations into eight small groups, marked as G1 to G8, among which, G8

collocations contain nineteen English verb patterns as listed in Table (2.2).

Table (2.2)

Table (2.2) Grammatical Collocations Adopted from Benson et al. (1986a).

| Type | Structure | Examples |
|------|--------------------------------|--|
| G1 | noun + preposition | apathy toward |
| G2 | noun + to inf. | He was a fool to do it. |
| G3 | noun + that clause | He took an oath that he would do his duty. |
| G4 | preposition + noun | in advance; at anchor |
| G5 | adjective + preposition | They are afraid of him. |
| G6 | predicate adjective +to inf. | It was stupid for them to go. |
| G7 | adjective + that clause | She was afraid that she would fail the exam. |
| G8 | Svo to o (or) svoo | He sent a book to his brother. He sent his brother a book. |
| | Svo for o (or) svoo | She bought a shirt for her husband. She bought her husband a shirt. |
| | sv prep. o (or) svo prep. O | He came by train. We invited them to the meeting. |
| | sv to inf. | They began to speak. |
| | sv inf. | He had better go. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Svv-ing | They enjoy watching television. |
| | Svo to inf. | She asks me to come. |
| | Svo inf. | She heard them leave. |
| | svov-ing | I caught them stealing apples. |
| | sv possessive v-ing | Please excuse my waking you so early. |
| | sv(o) that-clause | They admitted that they were wrong. |
| | Svo to be c | We consider her to be very capable. |
| | Svoc | She dyed her hair red. |
| | Svoo | We bet her ten pounds. |
| | sv(o)a | He carried himself well. |
| | sv(o) wh-word | He wants what I want. |
| | s(it) vo to inf. (or) s(it) vo that-clause | It surprised me to learn of her decision. It surprised me that our offer was Rejected |
| | svc (adjective or noun) | She was enthusiastic (a good girl). |
| | svc (adjective) | The flowers smell nice. |

In this study, the researcher classifies collocations into two types to serve the purpose of the study which is the role of the mother tongue in reception and production of collocations by Palestinian English majors. The classification of collocation is as follows:

- 1- **Congruent collocations:** These refer to collocations that have literal translation or equivalent in Arabic such as (adjective +noun) like *political parties, last chance, and fine arts* or (verb+noun) like *lose weight, play a role and tell the truth.*
- 2- **Non-congruent collocations:** These refer to collocations that have no literal translation or equivalent in Arabic such as (adjective+noun) like *broken English, heart attack and fast food* or (verb+noun) like *pay attention, catch fire and give birth.*

In conclusion, these are various ways of classifying collocations. However, the frequent classifications found are firstly lexical and grammatical collocations and secondly, unique, strong, and weak collocations. All of these classifications express the same idea but in different ways as seen in the previous classifications.

2.1.6. Collocation and Other Combination of Words:

Words can be combined in numerous ways to form meaningful thought groups if those words are not restricted. That is what makes it hard to clarify the notion of collocation. Among these possible combinations of words, some are fixed and others are more loose. In order to attain a clearer understanding of collocation, it is necessary to draw a distinction among collocations, idioms, and other kinds of word

combinations (Bahns, 1993; Wang, 2001), though these combinations are quite similar to one another, even, in a sense, belonging to the category of collocations. Wood (1981) adopts both semantic and syntactic criteria for distinguishing collocations from idioms, colligations, and free combinations. In Wood's point of view, an idiom is fully non-compositional and non-productive, while a free combination is fully compositional and productive. However, Wood's interpretation about collocation and colligation are still rather vague. On the other hand, a collocation, as Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) suggests, with its meaning in a restricted sense, is less frozen than an idiom, and a colligation is compositional and permits only limited lexical variation.

Lewis (2000,p137) has far more explanation to differentiate collocation from colligation. Collocation is the way one word co-occurs with another word, colligation is the way one word regularly co-occurs with a particular (grammar) pattern, so, for example some verbs typically occur with a particular tense, or a noun might typically appear preceded by a personal pronoun, rather than an article (**pass my/your driving test, It's my/your/our responsibility to..., but I'll take the responsibility for...**).

Besides, Benson, Benson, and Ilson (1986b) and Benson (1989) distinguish collocations from other combinations of words-compounds, idioms, transitional combinations (transitional collocations), and free combinations. The following are the summaries of the five types of word combinations, which are listed from the most fixed combination to the freest one proposed by Benson (1989) and Benson et al. (1986b).

1- Compounds: The most fixed word combinations are completely

frozen, and no variations at all are possible. The instances of nominal compounds are like *floppy disk* and *aptitude test*, and an illustration of compound verb (or phrasal verb) is *break through*.

- 2- **Idioms:** These refer to relatively frozen expressions whose meanings do not reflect the meanings of their component parts. The illustrations of idioms are *to kill two birds with one stone*, *to kick the bucket*, *to spill the beans*, and so on.
- 3- **Transitional combinations:** (transitional collocations), whose meanings are close to their component parts, are regarded as more frozen and less variable than collocations. Instances of such are *for old time's sake*, *the facts of life*, *to be in a tight spot*, and the like.
- 4- **Collocations:** are loosely fixed, arbitrary recurrent word combinations and the meaning of the whole reflects the meaning of the parts. *Pure chance*, *to commit murder*, *close attention*, and *keen competition* shares the features of this category.
- 5- **Free combinations:** are taken as the least cohesive of all combinations. Their components are the freest in regard to being combined with other lexical items. The typical combinations of this sort are *to recall an adventure (an event, an accident)* and *to analyze (report, investigate) a murder*.

Echoing what Benson et al. (1986b) attest, Bahns (1993) also admits that, different from idioms, the main characteristics of collocations are that their meanings reflect the meaning of their constituent parts, and that, in comparison with free combination, they are used frequently, spring to mind readily, and are psychologically salient. In other words, there are "transitional areas" (Cruse, 1986, p. 41)

between free combinations and collocations, and between collocations and idioms.

2.1.7. The Importance of Collocation in Language Teaching:

English collocation is important from the pedagogical point of view. According to Cowie (1992), English collocation is important in receptive as well as productive language competence. A similar assertion is made by Carter and McCarthy (1988). In their opinion, English collocations are useful not only for English comprehension but for English production. They claim that by memorizing collocational groups, students would have the idea about certain lexical restrictions. The most important according to Carter and McCarthy (1988), is "collocations teach students expectations about which sorts of language can follow from what has preceded. Students will not have to go about reconstructing the language each time they want to say something but instead can use these collocations as pre-packaged building blocks" (p. 75).

Moreover, according to Woolard (2000), "collocation has emerged as an important category of lexical patterning and it is fast becoming an established unit of description in language teaching courses and materials" (p. 28). Liu (2000a) also states that the more often English collocations students are taught, the more correctly students can make use of collocations.

Such asserations are supported by Lin (2002). When investigating the effects of collocation instruction on students' English vocabulary

developments, Lin (2002) found that students made progress in productive collocation competence after receiving collocation instruction. Furthermore, laying more emphasis on the significance of English collocation in detail, Hill (2000) mentions that there are nine reasons to teach English collocations. The nine reasons are summarized as follows:

1- The lexicon is not arbitrary: The lexicon is not randomly produced.

In other words, language is not spoken or written as if language were one huge substitution table with vocabulary items which merely fill slots in grammatical structures.

2- The patterns of collocation are predictable: To a certain extent vocabulary choice is predictable. Here are some examples given by Hill (2000). When a speaker thinks of drinking, he may use a common verb such as *have*. The listener's expectations predict a large number of possibilities: *tea, coffee, milk, mineral water, orange juice*, even *tequila sunrise*, but there would be no expectations of *engine oil, shampoo, sulphuric acid*. The latter liquids are drunk by accident, but linguistically they are not 'probable' in the way that the former are. Another example is the verb *enhance*. The choice of its objects is limited to a relatively small number of nouns or noun patterns, e.g. *his reputation, the standing of the company*. If the verb is *do*, the choice is far greater, but still limited, for example, *his best, the honourable thing*, but *not a mistake* (p. 53). Thus, the use of collocations can be predicted. Such a feature can help learners learn English more easily in the classroom. In a similar way, the patterns of collocations can also do a big favor in learning.

- 3- The size of the phrasal mental lexicon is large:** The field of predictability of collocation is enormous. It is usually two-word or more-than-two-word collocations that constitute major proportion of the whole naturally-occurring text, spoken or written. Rather surprisingly, it is possible "that up to 70% of everything we say, hear, read or write is to be found in some form of fixed expression." (Hill, 2000, p. 53)
- 4- The role of memory is important:** Collocations are recognized because they have been met before and imprinted in the memory. They can be retrieved from the mental lexicon just as a telephone number or address is pulled from memory.
- 5- Collocation makes English fluent:** Collocation is helpful for language users to think more quickly and to communicate more efficiently. Native speakers can only speak at the speed they did because they are calling on a vast repertoire of ready-made language, immediately available from their mental lexicons. Similarly, they can listen at the speed of speech and read quickly because they are constantly recognizing multi-word units rather than processing everything word by word. One of the main reasons the learner finds listening or reading difficult is not because of density of new words, but because of the density of unrecognized collocations.
- The main difference between native and non-native speakers is that the former has met far more English so that they can recognize and produce these ready-made chunks at a much faster rate.
- 6- Complex ideas are related more to lexicon than to grammar:** Simple language is ideal for the expression of simple ideas, while

complex ideas are difficult to express in complex language and even more difficult to express in simple language.

Sometimes, the complexity does not necessarily result from convoluted grammar, but usually from lexical-complex noun phrases, which are frequently made of several supposedly “easy” words. Not until students have to have a memory of these noun phrases are they aware of the meanings of the phrases. The more students are exposed to good quality input and the more awareness they develop of lexical nature of language, the more they will recognize and will eventually produce long chunks themselves.

- 7- Collocation makes thinking easier:** Since ideas can be named quickly by means of using collocations, the ideas can be manipulated without taking efforts to focus on the form of words. Thus, people who are good at using collocations can convey their ideas more fluently and faster.
- 8- Collocation makes pronunciation integral:** At times, speakers will not pronounce every word clearly in free speaking because the focus is on meaning. As mentioned above, collocations are stored in chunks in memory and they will flow quickly; as a result, the sounds of each word may not be produced clearly. Therefore, if the listeners happen to know the collocations, they will understand the message easily.
- 9- Recognizing chunks is essential for acquisition:** Students understand the texts that teachers read aloud in class if they can hear the text correctly chunked. From time to time, students find the unseen reading difficult to understand because they do not recognize the chunks. They read every word as if it is separate from every other

word; as a result, during silent reading students may be chunking totally wrongly. Moreover, mis-chunking matters in comprehension. Correctly understood and stored, lexical items should be available for immediate use. If students do not identify the items correctly, they cannot store items correctly in their mental lexicon. Incorrectly chunked, the input would either not be stored at all or would be wrongly stored. In either case, it cannot be available for retrieval and use.

2.1.8. Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis:

CAH was made when the structural linguistics and the behavioural psychology were dominant in the sixties. It originated from Lado's *Linguistics across Culture* (1957). He made one of the strongest claims of CAH in the preface "The plan of the book rests on the assumption that we can predict and describe the patterns that will cause the difficulty in learning, and those that will not cause difficulty, by comparing systematically the language and the culture to be learned with the native language and the culture of the students" (1957,p. vii).

The linguistic model of CAH is structuralism which was expounded by Bloomfield (1933), elaborated by Fries (1945) and Lado (1957). Structuralism assumes that there is a finite structure of a given language that can be documented and compared with another language. Esser (1980,p.181) suggests that contrastive analysis belongs to applied linguistics in that the analysis may yield practical instructional materials.

Behavioral psychology associated with Skinner was the basis

of CAH. Any kind of learning is viewed as habit formation and learning takes place by reinforcement. These are concerned with Skinner's Stimulus-Response Theory. Associationism and S-R theory are the two psychological bases of CAH. (James, 1985).

CAH is also founded on the assumption that L2 learners will tend to transfer the formal features of their L1 to their L2 utterances. As Lado (1957,p.2) claims, "individuals tend to transfer the forms, meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture". This notion of " transfer" means carrying over the habits of his mother tongue into the second language. (Corder, 1971,p.158).

Ellis (1965) also suggests that the psychological foundation of CAH is transfer theory, substituting the first language for the prior learning and second languages for the subsequent learning.

Procedure of CAH:

Whitman (1970,p. 191) breaks the contrastive analysis down to a set of component procedures, the four procedure are:

- 1- Taking the two languages, L1 and L2, and writing formal descriptions of them.
- 2- Picking forms from the descriptions for contrast.
- 3- Making a contrast of the forms chosen.
- 4- Making a prediction of difficulty through the contrast.

To describe the prediction stage, Stockwell et al. (1965) propose " a hierarchy of difficulty" based on the notions of transfer (positive, negative, zero) and of optional and obligatory choices of certain phonemes in the two languages in contrast. When the structures of the given two languages are similar, positive transfer will occur while with those that are different, a negative transfer will take place. Where there is no relation between those structures of the two languages, zero transfer will occur.

Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis:

- 1- Learning is habit of formation.
- 2- L1 causes most errors in L2.
- 3- Compare and contrast L1 and L2.
- 4- Bigger differences mean more errors.
- 5- Learn differences, not similarities.
- 6- Difficulty is concerned by differences.

2.1.9. Types of Errors in collocations:

There are different ways of categorizing errors. First, they can be divided into two main categories (Corder, 1967,pp.19-27 and Richards, 1971, pp.172- 181):

1. Interlingual Negative Transfer/ Interference Errors:

Those errors are caused by the influence of the native language in areas that languages differ markedly. Those errors are interpreted as a manifestation of the learner's hypothesis that the new language is just like the native language.

2. Intralingual Errors:

Those errors arise from properties of the target language itself. Unlike interference errors, intralingual errors arise from properties of the target language.

Second, according to Corder (1973, p.277), errors fall into four main categories: *omission* of some required element; *addition* of some unnecessary or incorrect element; *selection* of an incorrect element; and *misordering* of elements. The details are as following:

- 1- Omission:** Certain linguistic forms may be omitted by learners because of the forms complexity in production. For example, there are a number of fixed expressions or idioms in English characterized by omission of certain syntactic elements. For example, *Beg your pardon? Long time no see. Had a nice day?*
- 2- Addition:** Learners not only omit elements which they regard as redundant but they also add redundant elements. At the lexical level, learners may add an unnecessary word. For example, *I stayed there during five years ago* , instead of *I stayed there for five years.*
- 3- Selection:** Sometimes, learners make errors due to the wrong selection of vocabulary item. For instance, learners sometimes

select words which do not entirely convey their intended meanings. *A robin* may simply be referred to as *a bird*.

4- Ordering: At the lexical level learners may reverse elements of a compound word. *Car key* may become *key car*, which may be regarded as a car carrying keys or the most important car in a caravan.

Third, errors can be *diagnostic* and *prognostic*. *Diagnostic errors* indicate the learners' state of the language at a given point during the learning process. *Prognostic errors* inform course organizers to reorient language learning materials on the basis of the learners' current problems (Corder, 1967, pp.19-27).

Fourth, error types can be formed in other classifications. These classifications receive different terminologies other than *error types*. Such terminologies include: *types and causes* (Richards, 1971, pp.172-181), and Vrbinc, 2005), *strategies* (Zughoul and Abdul-Fattah, 2003) and *factors* (Mohideen, 1996).

2.1.10. Approaches to Error Analysis:

The growing interest of investigating error types led apparently to the rise of error analysis. Error analysis can be defined as an examination of those errors made by learners in both spoken and written medium (Mohideen, 1996). It is worth noting that error analysis gives a picture of the type of difficulty learners are experiencing (Norrish, 1994,p. 80). Richards (1984,p. 1) justifies the importance of error analysis as it functions as input to theoretical discussion. In the phase of evaluation, error analysis offers appropriate feedback to the design of remedial curricula by giving

the designers the opportunity to identify the errors and prepare the suitable remedial materials. Similarly, Mohideen (1996) indicates that error analysis is useful in ESL/EFL because it reveals the problematic areas to language teachers, syllabus designers and textbook writers. In this regard, due to the fact that foreign language learners lack the automation of collocations which may result in errors that hinder their learning English, the analysis of collocation errors is strongly believed to be adopted in this study as an effective way to help English language students overcome difficulties.

Various approaches to error analysis are formed basically for investigating errors. Corder (1971,pp.158-171) identifies a representative model for error analysis. His model can be summarized as followed. The initial step requires the **selection** of a corpus of language followed by an **identification** of errors. The errors are then **classified**. The next step, after giving a grammatical analysis of each error, it is demanded to give an **explanation** of different types of errors. Gass and Selinker (1994,p. 67) add additional two steps: analyzing **sources** of error, and **offering remedy** for errors.

In another attempt for analyzing errors, Norrish (1994,p. 81) states that there are fundamentally two main approaches to error analysis. The first one is to set up categories of errors, based on a set of preconceptions about the learners' most common problems. This approach has an advantage of being easier and quicker to carry out because errors are indicated on a list of categories. However, the

drawback of this approach is that the issue is prejudged, since errors can be sorted out only in terms of predetermined error types. The second approach is to group the errors as they are collected in particular areas. Such approach has the advantage of allowing the errors themselves to determine the categories chosen. By a process of sorting and re-sorting errors, the categories will eventually define themselves.

2.1.11. Methodological implications to teaching collocations:

In the lexical approach, Lewis (1993, p. 35) points out his methodological implications to teach collocations as the following:

- 1- Early emphasis on receptive skills, especially listening, is important. De-contextualized vocabulary learning is a fully legitimate strategy.
- 2- The role of grammar as a receptive skill must be recognized.
- 3- The importance of contrast in language awareness must be recognized.
- 4- Teachers should employ extensive, comprehensive language for receptive purposes.
- 5- Extensive writing should be held as long as possible.
- 6- Nonlinear recording formats, such as collocation tables, word trees, are central to the lexical approach.
- 7- Teachers' correction should be the natural response to student error.
- 8- Teachers should always react primarily to the content of student language.
- 9- Pedagogical chunking should be a frequent classroom activity. This will help in the teaching of collocation because the students will be

familiar with using more than one words together as a collocation instead of using them individually.

2.1.12. Learners' Problems in Collocation:

There has been a great concern among researchers about the reasons why EFL students frequently make collocational errors in their writings and the researchers discovered that the causes of collocational errors resulted from analogy, overgeneralization, paraphrase, the L1 interference, interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, and shortage of collocational knowledge (Bahns & Eldaw, 1993; Channel, 1981; Ellis, 1985). For instance, Bahns and Eldaw (1993) proclaim that many EFL students' collocation errors are caused by their L1 interference. A similar conclusion was made by Farghal and Obiedat (1995). They noted that the students who did not know a specific collocation tended to resort to such strategies as synonym, paraphrasing, avoidance, and transfer.

In addition, a series of studies conducted by Liu (1999a, 1999b) revealed the strategies that EFL students might use in producing collocations, either acceptable or unacceptable, in their writings. To begin with, in the study of Chinese college freshmen's collocational competence, Liu (1999b) found that the EFL students had difficulties in producing acceptable collocation. He further concluded that the causes of producing unacceptable English collocations were mostly attributed to the lack of the concept of collocation and interlingual transfer. The results of the study are summarized as follows:

- 1- Lack of collocational concept:** Some students only understood the basic meaning of the word but did not know which word it would go with. Thus, they were not competent to produce any collocation.
- 2- Direct translation:** Some students remembered only the Chinese translation of the word. Therefore, they relied on direct translation to produce collocations (for example, **learn knowledge* instead of *gain knowledge* or *absorb knowledge*).
- 3- Ignorance of rule restrictions:** Some students did not know that some collocational restrictions were based wholly on the meaning of the word and range; others did not take grammar into consideration. As a result, they produced grammatically unacceptable collocations (for example, **few knowledge* instead of *little knowledge*).
- 4- Lack of knowledge of collocational properties:** Many students did not understand the potential collocational properties of the words they knew. Take the word *good* for example. It could be assumed that most students knew the collocation *a good boy*, but few students generated the collocation *a good knowledge*.

Moreover, in Liu's (1999a) another analysis of collocational errors in EFL writings, with fourteen types of lexical and grammatical collocational errors studied in the students' compositions and examination papers, there were six sources of errors found. Among them, a small number of errors resulting from word coinage and approximation belonged to communication strategies, while the majority of the errors attributable to negative interlingual transfer and four kinds of intralingual transfer, overgeneralization, ignorance of rule

restrictions, false concepts hypothesized, and the use of synonyms-- belonged to cognitive strategies.

The strategies concluded in Liu's (1999a) study were further accounted for as follows:

- 1- Negative interlingual transfer:** Some collocational errors were caused by direct translation. Although phrases, like "*listen his advice" and "*wait your phone call," are understandable when they were translated back into Chinese, they were not acceptable English collocations. Being intransitive verbs, listen and wait could not be directly followed by a noun. The rule did not exist in Chinese, however.
- 2- Ignorance of rule restrictions:** Analogy and failure to observe the restrictions of existing structures were at times the reasons why students produced unacceptable collocations. For example, "to **make Joyce surprise*" was a false analogy of the construction verb + object + infinitive (e.g. "*make Joyce surprised*").
- 3- False concept hypothesized:** Students had misconceptions about such verbs as make, *do*, and *take*. Some students maybe thought that these words were de-lexicalized verbs, thus they could be substituted for one another freely. For instance, students would use "**do plans*" instead of "*make plans*."
- 4- Overgeneralization:** Students used overgeneralization 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. For example, instead of using "am used to taking," students would use the collocation "*am used to take," which was a combination of "am used to something" and "used to take."

- 5- Use of synonyms:** Students might use "*receive other people's opinion" instead of "accept other people's opinions." It was taken as a straightforward application of the open choice principle.

In addition, Deveci (2004) points out related problems of collocations such as the following:

- 1- Learners may have intralingual problems.** For example, instead of *doing homework*, they might incorrectly use *making homework*.
- 2- Learners may make negative transfer from their mother tongue language.** For example, some Palestinian learners tend to say *close the light* instead of *turn off the light*.
- 3- Learners may look for general rules for collocations that do not work for all collocations.** For example, they might overgeneralize rules of collocations, for example, the use of prepositions in phrasal verbs. They could think that *put off your coat* is the opposite of *put on your coat*.
- 4- When learners learn words through definitions, their chances of using appropriate collocations or remembering the words decrease.** In other words, students use words just to memorize and they do not use such words in context.

- 5- Learners may fail to make sense of an idiom.** To illustrate, some English idioms such as *raining cats and dogs* does not make sense to the Palestinian learners of English because this idiom does not exist in their culture.
- 6- When students read texts, they may not recognize collocations as meaningful phrases, which would inhibit their understanding of the text.**

To recap, ESL/EFL learners do have problems in producing correct collocations due to several sources. The most prominent sources are the negative interlingual transfer, overgeneralization, direct translation, and lack of knowledge of collocations.

2.1.13. Collocations in Second Language Acquisition:

Collocational development in L2 vocabulary acquisition has not been investigated yet in terms of systematic patterns of acquisition, even though there has been evidence for the existence of such sequences in the fields of syntax and morphology and phonology, and also evidence that vocabulary acquisition may also follow patterns of development.

There is no doubt that collocations are an important part of L2 lexical development. It has been shown that collocational errors make up a high percentage of all errors made by L2 learners (Marton 1977; Arabski 1979), and linguists have acknowledged the importance of focusing on the relations that hold between items in the lexical system in order to describe vocabulary development (Meara 1992). It has also

been suggested that collocations provide most of the "initial lexical units", and thus their study is of great importance both for the early stages of language acquisition and for the following years of vocabulary development (Greenbaum 1974,p.89).

The need for research in collocations has long been identified, but it is only in recent years that empirical investigations have been conducted. One reason for this lack of interest could be the shortage of suitable research instruments designed specifically for testing hypotheses about lexical acquisition processes (Levenston & Blum 1978,p.2). The recent research on collocations has taken a number of forms. Links between the acquisition and use of collocations and writing proficiency were reported by Ghadessy (1989). According to Ghadessy, the use of function words indicates a more advanced use of collocations, grammatical patterns and cohesive devices on the part of the older students (Ghadessy 1989,p.114). Ghadessy's study demonstrates that the examination of the collocations L2 learners use can be useful in an investigation of what happens during the L2 learners' development towards a full linguistic communicative competence.

A developmental process in the acquisition of collocations is also suggested by Zhang (1993) in his study of the use of collocations in the writings of native and non-native speakers of English. One of the results of the study is that poor non-native writers and good native writers use more grammatical collocations and fewer lexical collocations. Even though Zhang did not compare the acquisition of English collocations by L2 learners from different proficiency levels, he assumes that the results of his study indicate a certain development in the acquisition of collocations by L2 learners: at the lower levels of English proficiency

learners use more grammatical collocations and fewer lexical collocations; when learners are at intermediate levels they produce a greater variety of collocations but they still rely greatly on the prefabricated routines they have acquired at early stages, and therefore use more lexical collocations than grammatical ones; finally, when learners have reached an advanced level of proficiency, they have a better knowledge of grammatical collocations, which they are now able to break down into parts and use to create new ones, thus resulting in a heavier use of grammatical collocations.

The acquisition of lexical collocations by advanced learners of English from two different L1 backgrounds, Polish and German, was investigated by Biskup (1992). Subjects were asked to supply the English translation equivalents of lexical collocations in Polish and German respectively. German learners were more prone to use descriptive answers and try alternative ways of rendering the meaning of unfamiliar collocations, while the Polish students would use a collocation only if they were sure it was the correct one. This result is explained in the light of the different emphasis on EFL in Poland and Germany. The Polish educational system insists on accuracy, so the Polish learners would refrain from giving any answer at all unless they were certain that it was the correct one. On the other hand, the Germans pay more attention to communication and fluency and thus the German learners tried to use alternative ways of expressing the meaning of collocations whose English equivalents they did not know (Biskup 1992,p.88). in Biskup's study does not treat the acquisition of collocations from a linguistical perspective. The study suggests that in order to make the vocabulary acquisition more valid, you have to take

into consideration some factors like the focus of instruction and the use of new and valuable teaching approaches.

Though the role that collocation plays in language acquisition is an important topic, very few systematic studies can be found that address this issue. One thing for certain is that Hatch and Brown (1995) found that L2 learners learn or acquire those phrases or chunk language as a unit rather than as individual words of a phrase. Compared to L1 users, who acquired their phrases or chunk language and developed the competence to reconstruct the language with phrases from exposure to the environment, L2 learners seemed to have the same ability to resort to the same strategies as L1 learners to learn chunk language (Schmitt 2000). Consequently, it is possible for L2 learners to reach native-speaker like competence if the learners are capable of using the idioms fluently (Ellis 1997).

Krashen and Terrell (1983), (cited in Lewis 2000) have introduced the distinction between language acquisition, which is unconscious, and language learning, which is conscious. They claimed that only language which is unconsciously acquired, is later available for spontaneous use. Partly agreeing with Krashen's idea, Lewis (2000) argues that, in the lexical approach, conscious learning does facilitate language learning. He states that, to some extent, focusing learners' attention: "explicitly on some aspect of the linguistic form of the input is helpful in accelerating the acquisition processes (p.160)." In other words, although input is important, intake is what is really helpful to the learners, and the turning point of input to intake starts with the ability to notice the difference and similarity. Therefore, Lewis (2000) urges teachers to help learners to notice the kinds of chunks they met in text and the kinds of

prefabricated chunks that are the prerequisite of fluency. It is suggested to have students notice the nature of the language in the materials, or "the chunks of language" (p.162). However, the limitation of this is that it would be difficult for the teachers to know whether the students are ready for the new concepts and to be aware of the precise degree of sensitivity to the language of students. Moreover, it is not easy for students to notice the language itself in a short period of time. Therefore, teachers need to spend a lot of time discussing the importance of this skill, consistently drawing the students' attention to collocations. As pointed out by Lewis (1993), students with low English proficiency would usually fail before they even reach the point of having a sense of the target language.

2.1.14. Summary:

This part of this chapter discussed some topics covering collocations from different dimensions. It started talking about the notion of collocations, definitions of collocations, collocations and other combination words, characteristics of collocations, classifications of collocations, the importance of teaching collocations, methodological implications to teach collocations, learners' problems in collocations. Finally, it discussed collocations and Second Language Acquisition.

Previous studies

B. Part Two: Previous Studies:

2.2.1. Introduction:

The studies in this section divided into three main domains which are:

1. Studies that dealt with Arabic-speaking Learners.
2. Studies that dealt with ESL or EFL Learners.
3. Studies that dealt with English Collocation Errors.

2.2.2. Studies that dealt with Arabic-speaking Learners:

Alsakran's study (2011). It examined the productive and receptive knowledge of lexical and grammatical collocations among advanced Arabic-speaking learners of English and it also investigated whether the language environment (ESL or EFL) has an influence on the acquisition of collocations, In addition, it explored if there were significant differences between the participants' performance on three types of collocations. Sixty-eight participants were divided into thirty eight Saudi students at the Institute of Public Administration in Riyadh, and 30 Arab students in the Intensive English Program at Colorado State University. To collect the data, the researcher used three gap filling tests to measure the productive collocational knowledge. The receptive collocational knowledge was measured by an appropriate judgment test. The results revealed that the participants' learning environment has a strong effect on the acquisition of L2 collocations. Moreover, there were significant differences between the participants' productive and receptive knowledge of collocations. In addition, the results revealed that there was a statically significant difference between the three types of collocations. As a general result, the Arabic-speaking learners of English had poor knowledge of English collocations.

Rabeh's study (2010). The purpose of this study was to get some insights about the students' awareness of collocations and it explored the different problems which the students may face when translating different types of collocations. This study tried to examine and evaluate the participants' awareness by examining their translation of English collocations into Arabic, and vice versa. The researcher used a test which was divided into two parts. The first part was used to test the

participants' collocational knowledge and the second was the translation of collocations from English to Arabic and vice versa. The participants were chosen randomly and they were 30 students of Master students of English in the English department, Montouri University, Constantine. The results revealed that there were two main causes of students' errors in translating collocations which were the students adopted literal translation as the main translation method. Secondly, the students did not give enough importance to collocations belonging to another culture and language.

Shehata' study (2008) investigated the role of L1 on the use of English collocations by Advanced Arabic-speaking learners of English and how an L1 (Arabic) influenced production and reception of collocations. It also explored whether the learning environment (EFL vs. ESL) and the amount of exposure to language had an influence on the acquisition of collocations. The sample of the study consisted of ninety seven participants and they were divided into thirty five Arabic-speaking learners at a university in the United States and sixty two undergraduate students from an English department in a university in Egypt. The study followed the descriptive research to accomplish its aims. The researcher used two productive tests and one receptive test that contained the two types of collocations. In addition, the researcher used vocabulary recognition test to examine the participants' familiarity with the meaning of individual components of collocations. The findings revealed the following:

1. The learners' L1 and their learning environment had a strong influence on the acquisition of L2 collocations.

2. There was a moderate positive correlation between the learners' knowledge of collocations and their amount of exposure to the language.
3. The learners' receptive knowledge of collocations was better than their productive knowledge of collocations.

Moussa' study (2006) aimed to investigate the students' awareness of the phenomenon of restricted collocations and to know whether the students operate at the open choice principle or at the idiom principle by examining the participants' translation of Arabic lexical collocations into English. In addition to that, this study tried to determine the role of the participants' first language (Arabic) and the first foreign language (French) on their production of English restricted collocations. The sample of the study consisted of eighty second year translation students. In order to achieve these aims, the researcher used a three part test : Translation task, a filling gap task, and a filling gap task using (**to do or to make**). The researcher used the descriptive research to achieve the study. The results showed that the participants are unaware of the phenomenon of restricted collocations. Another result revealed that negative transfer was equal in the participants' first language (Arabic) and their first foreign language (French).

Zughoul et al.'s study (2003) This study determined the extent to which university English language majors can use English collocations properly. To collect the data, the researchers used a two-form translation test of sixteen Arabic collocations which was made up for both graduate

and undergraduate students of English. The participants' of the study were thirty-eight graduates and thirty two in the third academic level (undergraduates) from the department of English at Yarmouk University, Jordan. The study followed the descriptive analytical research to achieve the aims. The findings proved the researchers' hypothesis that Arab learners of English at all levels face difficulty with English collocations.

2.2.3. Commentary on the previous section of the studies:

All of the studies in this domain dealt with Arabic speaking learners. Most of the previous studies met nearly at the same points such as: First, L1 has a significant influence in the reception and production of English collocations. Second, learning environments (EFL or ESL) play a great role in the acquisition of collocations. Third, Arabic speaking learners are better in the receptive knowledge rather than the productive knowledge and generally, they are poor in the knowledge of collocations. Fourth, the participants respond differently on the different types of collocations which means that some types of collocations are much more difficult than others. Finally, all of the previous studies showed that the participants' performance in the receptive test was much better than the productive one. These findings indicated that the researcher predicted that the mother tongue would play a significant role in the present study according to the previous studies.

2.2.4. Studies that dealt with ESL or EFL Learners:

Bazzaz et al.'s study (2011). This study aimed at investigating the possible relationship between knowledge of collocations and the use of verb-noun collocations in writing stories and it examined the correlation between knowledge of verb-noun collocations and their use in written essays. The descriptive research was used in the study to achieve its aims. The participants of the study were twenty seven Ph.D. Iranian students in a Malaysian university. To achieve the aim of the study, the researchers used t-test to measure the participants' collocational knowledge. Moreover, the researchers used the number of collocations used in the essays written by the participants to measure the use of collocations. In order to achieve this aim, the participants wrote six different stories in six weeks based on a writing task designed to illicit verb-noun collocations.

The results showed that there was a strong positive relationship between knowledge of collocations and the use of verb-noun collocations in writing stories.

Yamashita et al.'s study (2010). The researchers stated that this study investigated first language influence on the acquisition of second language collocations by comparing the performance on a phrase-acceptability judgment task among native speakers of English, Japanese use English as a foreign language, and Japanese use English as second language learners. The researchers used the test materials which included congruent collocations and incongruent collocations.

The results showed that EFL made more errors and reacted more slowly with incongruent collocations than congruent ones. However, ESL users do generally better than EFL learners in lower rate of errors and faster

speed. This means that the first language does not affect the learning of the second language. In addition to that, the results also concluded that:

- 1- The L1 congruency and L2 exposure affected the acquisition of L2 collocations.
- 2- It was difficult to acquire incongruent collocations even with a considerable amount of exposure to L2.
- 3- L2 collocations were processed independently of L1.

Hsu et al.'s study (2008). This study tried to explore the knowledge and use of English collocations and their relation to the speaking proficiency of Taiwanese EFL university learners. The sample of the study consisted of fifty six junior English majors at the National university of Science and Technology in Southern Taiwan. To implement the study, the researchers used three tests to collect the data. The first test was a lexical collocation test, the second, English speaking test, and the third, phone pass spoken English test. The results of the study showed that there was a significant correlation between Taiwanese EFL learners' knowledge of lexical collocations and their speaking proficiency. However, there was no significant correlation between the participants' use of lexical collocations and their speaking proficiency. In addition to that, the results revealed that there was no statically significant correlation between the participants' knowledge and use of lexical collocations. To conclude, this study indicated that lexical collocations knowledge was a significant indicator of speaking proficiency.

Lesniewska et al.'s study (2007) investigated to what extent the nature of cross-linguistic influenced both L1 and L2 phraseological competence of advanced Polish learners of English. The sample of the study consisted of ninety one Polish advanced learners of English and their age is between (20 – 22). To achieve the aims of the study, the researchers used two acceptability tests. The collocations used in the tests could be classified according to two criteria: firstly, they were either typical or unusual collocations. Secondly, collocations were either with congruence or equivalent with their first language (Polish) or without congruence with their first language.

The results of the study were at the opposite of the fact that first language may affect the acquisition of L2 collocations. Therefore, the findings showed that there was no obvious pattern of cross-linguistic influence emerging from the data. This study seems to indicate that the advanced learners learn the L2 independently from their L1.

Koizumi's study (2005) examined the relationships between productive vocabulary knowledge and speaking performance which included fluency, syntactic complexity and lexical complexity. The researcher chose a random sample of Japanese learners of English at the novice level. In order to implement the study, two tests were used. The first test was to measure the productive vocabulary test which was divided into two sections: the size section and the depth section which included three subsections: the derivation, antonym and collocation subsection. The second test was the speaking test.

The findings showed that there was a moderate or strong tendency in some tasks for Japanese learners of English at the novice level who

have longer and deeper productive vocabulary knowledge. Moreover, the size of productive vocabulary knowledge was related more to accuracy in a task or at least one aspect of depth was related to one element of fluency when Japanese learners of English at the novice level produce monologic description and comparison without pre-task planning time.

2.2.5. Commentary on the previous section of the studies:

The researcher concluded that these studies were divided into two parts, two of these studies showed that the learners of English learn second language collocations independently of the L1 such Yamashita et al.'s (2010) and Lesniweska et al.'s (2007). The other studies showed that the congruency of collocations in the L1 plays a significant role in the acquisition of collocations. This means that the participants do much better in the congruent collocations than the non-congruent collocations. So this indicated that the first language plays a great role in the reception and production of collocations. At the end, most of the studies agreed that the knowledge of collocations has a positive role in the production of language like writing and speaking skills.

2.2.6. Studies that dealt with English Collocation Errors:

Darvishi's study (2011) investigated the collocational errors in EFL college learners' writing. Sixty eight sophomores at Hamdan University participated in the study. To collect the data, the researcher used thirty-eight assignments and thirty-eight in-class practices which were collected and analyzed for collocational errors. The researcher

intended to identify a list of the ungrammatical and lexical errors through the BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations, and the British National Corpus were used to analyze the participants' assignments to discover the collocation errors. In addition to that, a questionnaire was developed by the researcher to explore the participants' perceptions of difficulty in collocations.

The results showed that the participants' errors made in writing samples were different from the collocational error types mentioned in the questionnaire. Moreover, the major source of collocational errors was the ignorance of rule restrictions and the participants made the errors because of the interference of their mother tongue, lack of collocational knowledge, intralingual transfer, paraphrase, and their shortage of the collocational concept.

Laufer, et al.'s study (2011). This study investigated the use of English verb-noun collocations in the writing of native speakers of Hebrew at three proficiency levels. To achieve the aim of the study, the researchers compiled a learner corpus that consisted of about 300,000 words of argumentative and descriptive essays. The researchers made a concordance in the learner corpus and the researchers took 220 most frequent nouns in the LOCNESS corpus. The researchers concluded to make two types of comparisons:

- 1- Learners were compared with native speakers on the frequency of collocation use.
- 2- Learners were compared with other learners of different second language proficiencies on the frequency and correctness of collocations.

The results showed learners at all three proficiencies produced fewer collocations than native speakers. The number of collocations increased at the advanced level, the errors occurred were related to interlingual transfer and continued to persist even at advanced levels of proficiency.

Miyakoshi's study (2009). The study examined ESL learners' use of verb-noun collocations such as *take notes, place an order, cut corners, and make a discovery* and the effects of instructions which direct learners' attention to input and to restrictions of combinations. The sample consisted of sixty Japanese students (thirty intermediate and thirty advanced). The participants passed fill-in-the blank tests; in addition the participants studied collocations at home using paper-based exercises provided after the pre-test. After two weeks, the participants came back to take the second fill-in-the-blank test which was considered as a post-test. The findings revealed that there are significant influences of various factors such as overall frequency, literal versus abstract meaning, and the existence of L1 equivalent. The explicit instruction improved the participants' collocational competence in the target language.

The results showed that there were eleven error types specified as the following:

1. Misuse of verbs.
2. Inappropriate paraphrase.
3. Interference of the native language (Japanese).
4. Blending two collocations with similar meaning.
5. Mistakes by using morphological synonymy
6. Use of words other than verbs.

7. Inserting unnecessary articles, particles, and prepositions between verbs and nouns.
8. Mistakes in distinguishing intransitive and transitive verbs.
9. Creating collocations from compound nouns.
10. Misunderstanding actor-patient relations of verbs.
11. Phonological errors.

There are some errors like paraphrases, and the interference of the native language which worked as strong indicators of the difficulty of collocations for the learners.

El-Mahdi's study (2009). This study tried to investigate the problem facing English language majors in collocational knowledge and it investigated the relationships between the collocational competence and English language proficiency. The study included eighty male and female students chosen by the simple random sample from the English language department in the faculty of education in Sana'a University 2007-2008. The study used the descriptive analytical approach to achieve the aim of the study. The researcher designed the collocations test and the proficiency test. In order to analyze the data, the SPSS was used and showed the following findings:

1. The fourth level students still made errors in collocations.
2. There was a significant relation between the participants' collocational competence and English language proficiency.

At the end, the study mentioned some pedagogical implementations such as: raising the awareness of the students of the important role of collocations in increasing the language proficiency.

El Mashharawi's study (2008). This study was conducted to identify and analyze collocation errors made by English and journalism majors at Islamic university of Gaza. The participants of the study consisted of 245 Palestinian female and male English and journalism majors and all of the participants were in the second semester of the academic year (2007). The study followed the descriptive analytical research to achieve the aims of the study. The researcher constructed a diagnostic test which contained two main parts. In order to analyze the data, the researcher used SPSS and the results of the study were as the following:

1. The English language and Journalism majors at the IUG made errors.
2. The results indicated that English and journalism majors had limited collocational knowledge.
3. The journalism majors' collocation errors were higher than those made by the English language majors.
4. The female students have higher level of collocation competence than the male students.

2.2.7. Commentary on the previous section of the studies:

The researcher included the domain of collocation errors studies to conclude and investigate the source of the collocation errors. These errors let the researcher predict whether the mother tongue influenced the results of such studies or not. The researcher found that all of the studies agreed that the major source of errors related to the interference of the participants' mother tongue. In addition, some of the studies showed that the literal translation affected the responses of the

participants. The researcher concluded that there was a relation between the participants' collocational knowledge and their language proficiency. In other words, the proficiency of language increased by the knowledge of collocations and vice versa. This indicates that the number of collocations increased at the advanced level of the learners.

2.2.8. Commentary on All sections of the Previous Studies:

The researcher tried to collect the related studies update and deal with the same topic of the present study. These studies were divided into three main domains which are studies dealing with Arabic speaking learners, studies dealing with EFL or ESL, and studies dealing with collocation errors. All of these domains have their purpose during the present study. The majority of the studies showed that the mother tongue played a significant role in the reception and production of English collocations. This important role was asserted during the third domain in which the studies indicated the main source of collocation errors was the interference of the mother tongue. In addition, the literal translation of collocations was a clear cause behind making errors. The studies showed that the learning environments play a great role in the acquisition of English collocations and the knowledge of collocations certainly affects language proficiency. Generally, the previous studies indicated that the Arabic-speaking learners are poor in the knowledge of collocations and this may affect language proficiency.

Chapter III

Methodology

Chapter Three

Methodology

3.1. Introduction:

In an attempt to explore the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations by Palestinian English majors, the researcher has developed three instruments to achieve the purpose of the study. The first instrument is a receptive test, the second is a productive test, and the third is a written interview. In addition, the researcher has chosen an appropriate sample from the population to know the validity and reliability of the tools. Moreover, this chapter includes type of research methodology, the population of the study, the sample of study, instrumentation, and research procedure.

3.2. Type of research methodology:

The descriptive analytical approach is used in such an investigation that describes and analyzes the data. The researcher used the descriptive analytical method to carry out the study. Brown and Rodgers (2002,p.117) define the descriptive research as "A research that describes a group of characteristics or behaviors in numerical terms". They maintain that "the descriptive statistics are used to analyze descriptive research data, usually in terms of central tendency and dispersion.

3.3. The population:

The population of the study consisted of all Palestinian English majors (juniors and seniors) at the Palestinian universities during the second term of the academic year (2011-2012). The population of this study was (1150) English major students. These numbers are according to the data provided to the researcher by the universities:

Table (3.1)

Table (3.1) shows the distribution of the population according to university:

| University | Number | Percentage |
|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| IUG | 471 | 41% |
| AL-Azhar | 326 | 28.3% |
| AL-Aqsa | 353 | 30.7% |
| Total | 1150 | 100% |

3.4. The sample of the study:

The sample of the study was a stratified convenient sample. It consisted of (280) students which was divided into (104) male students with a percentage (37.14%) and (176) female students with a percentage (62.86%). The percentage of the sample represents (24.3%) of the population. The following tables show the distribution of the sample according to gender, university, and grade point average.

Table (3.2)

Table (3.2) shows the distribution of the sample according to gender:

| Classification | Number | Percentage |
|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Male | 104 | 37.14% |
| Female | 176 | 62.86% |
| Total | 280 | 100% |

Table (3.3)

Table (3.3) shows the distribution of the sample according to the university:

| University | Number | Percent |
|-------------------|---------------|----------------|
| IUG | 85 | 30.36% |
| AL-Azhar | 107 | 38.21% |
| AL-Aqsa | 88 | 31.43% |
| Total | 280 | 100% |

Table (3.4)

Table (3.4) shows the distribution of the sample according to the participants' grade point average:

| GPA | Number | Percentage |
|------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Good | 76 | 27.14% |
| Very Good | 168 | 60.00% |
| Excellent | 36 | 12.86% |
| Total | 280 | 100% |

3.5. Instrumentation:

In order to achieve the purpose of the study, the researcher developed three instruments to collect the data . These instruments were developed after reading the literature and the previous studies related to the topic of the study.

3.6. The pilot study:

To examine appropriateness of the tests' items as well as the validity and reliability, the tests were administered on a random sample of 35 students: 15 male students and 20 female students from the Palestinians universities that were intended in the present study which are AL-Azhar university, AL-Aqsa university, and The Islamic University of Gaza. The results were recorded and statistically analyzed. The necessary revision and recommendations were made in the light of the statistic results. The researcher used the following equation to determine the test time:

Test time = $\frac{\text{the time needed for the 1st student} + \text{the time needed for the last student}}{2}$

2

After applying the equation, the researcher found that the time needed for the test to be applied is 45 minutes.

3.7. The Receptive Test:

After revising the previous studies, the researcher built the receptive test to achieve an aspect of the study which is the participants' ability to recognize the collocations and to know if there is a role to the mother tongue in reception of these collocations. This test consisted of

(30) items which were classified in two aspects (verb-noun collocations) and (adjective-noun collocations). Each aspects of these was also divided into two parts (congruent collocations) and (non-congruent collocations). Each part of the test consisted of (15) items. These items were divided into (8) congruent items and (7) non-congruent items.

3.7.1. Validity of the receptive test:

A valid test measures what it is designed to measure (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2010). The researcher used the referee validity to ensure the test is valid.

3.7.1.1. The referee validity:

The test was refereed by a panel of referees (see appendix A). Most of the referees were university professors and one of them was a school teacher. The referees were asked to check the clarity and relevance of the test items. Some of the test items were added to increase the number of the items and some of the items were modified according to the referees' comments. Table (3.5) shows the number of each domain after modification.

Table (3.5)

Table (3.5) shows the number of each domain after modification.

| Instruments | Domains | Number of items |
|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| Receptive test | Congruent collocations | 16 |
| | Non-congruent collocations | 14 |
| Productive test | Congruent collocations | 16 |
| | Non-congruent collocations | 14 |
| Total | | 60 |

3.7.1.2. Internal consistency validity:

To compute the internal consistency of the test items, the researcher used Pearson correlation coefficient. Pearson Correlation computed the correlation of the following: the items with their domains, the items with total test and the domains with test as a whole. Table (3.6) describes the internal consistency of the receptive test.

Table (3.6)

The internal consistency of the items and domains.

| Item | Correlation with domain | Correlation with domain | | Correlation with domain | | Correlation with domain | |
|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------|--------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|
| | Congruent verb-noun | Non-congruent verb-noun | | Congruent adjective-noun | | Non-congruent adjective-noun | |
| 1 | **0.696 | 9 | *0.369 | 1 | **0.624 | 9 | **0.473 |
| 2 | **0.678 | 10 | **0.568 | 2 | **0.501 | 10 | **0.412 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|----|---------|---|---------|----|---------|
| 3 | **0.540 | 11 | **0.694 | 3 | **0.510 | 11 | **0.516 |
| 4 | **0.706 | 12 | **0.564 | 4 | **0.666 | 12 | **0.647 |
| 5 | **0.724 | 13 | **0.753 | 5 | **0.718 | 13 | **0.458 |
| 6 | **0.644 | 14 | **0.684 | 6 | **0.481 | 14 | *0.379 |
| 7 | **0.594 | 15 | *0.376 | 7 | **0.485 | 15 | **0.441 |
| 8 | **0.402 | | | 8 | **0.530 | | |

***r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.361**

****r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.463**

In addition, the researcher computed the correlation of the test domains with the test as a whole. Table (3.7) describes the results.

Table (3.7)

Correlation of the test domains and the total degree of test.

| Domain | Correlation with total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Congruent verb-noun | **0.763 |
| Non-congruent verb-noun | **0.620 |
| Congruent adjective-noun | **0.673 |
| Non-congruent adjective-noun | **0.482 |

Table (3.9) clarifies that all the correlations are significant at 0.05 or 0.01 levels. This means the test has internal consistency validity.

3.7.2. The reliability of the receptive test:

Mackey and Gass (2005,p.128) define reliability as "instrument consistency". That is, if a student gets a high mark in a certain subject test, it would be expected that he would also receive a high mark if he

took the same test. The following steps were taken to measure the test reliability.

1- Kuder-Richardson (K-R20): (K-R20) depends on calculating the percentages of correct answers to the test items, and also on the variance of every item.

2- Split Half Method: It depends on splitting the test into two parts, and calculating the correlation between the parts, then making a correction for the correlation coefficient by Spearman – Brown Prophecy Formula. (Abu Hattab & Sadeq, 1980,p. 14) .Table (3.8) describes (KR20) and Split half coefficients for the test domains.

Table (3.8)
(KR20) and Split half coefficients of the test domains

| Test Domains | (KR20) | Split half coefficients of the test domains |
|-------------------------------------|--------|---|
| Congruent verb-noun | 0.732 | 0.704 |
| Non-congruent verb-noun | 0.609 | 0.587 |
| Congruent adjective-noun | 0.665 | 0.817 |
| Non-congruent adjective-noun | 0.717 | 0.645 |

The results showed that the reliability coefficients are acceptable. This means the test is reliable and valid to apply.

3.7.3. Difficulty Coefficient:

Difficulty coefficient is measured by finding out the percentage of the wrong answers of each item (Abu Nahia,1994,p.308).

The coefficient of difficulty of each item was calculated according to the following formula:

$$\text{Difficulty Coefficient} = \frac{\text{No. of wrong answers}}{\text{the total students who answered the test}}$$

Table (3.9) shows the difficulty coefficient for each item of the test:

Table (3.9)

Difficulty coefficient for each items of the test

| No. | Difficulty coefficient | No. | Difficulty coefficient |
|-----|------------------------|-----|------------------------|
| 1 | 0.59 | 1 | 0.59 |
| 2 | 0.68 | 2 | 0.64 |
| 3 | 0.59 | 3 | 0.50 |
| 4 | 0.68 | 4 | 0.59 |
| 5 | 0.64 | 5 | 0.55 |
| 6 | 0.45 | 6 | 0.59 |
| 7 | 0.68 | 7 | 0.59 |
| 8 | 0.64 | 8 | 0.45 |
| 9 | 0.64 | 9 | 0.36 |
| 10 | 0.50 | 10 | 0.68 |
| 11 | 0.68 | 11 | 0.64 |
| 12 | 0.59 | 12 | 0.64 |

| No. | Difficulty coefficient | No. | Difficulty coefficient |
|-----|------------------------|-----|------------------------|
| 13 | 0.55 | 13 | 0.32 |
| 14 | 0.68 | 14 | 0.36 |
| 15 | 0.64 | 15 | 0.68 |

Table (3.9) shows that the difficulty coefficient wobble is between (0.32 – 0.68) with total average (0.58) which means the test items are acceptable and the acceptable level of difficulty is (0.30)or above.

3.7.4. Discrimination Coefficient:

The discrimination coefficient was calculated according to the following formula: (Abu Nahia, 1994,p.311).

$$\text{Discrimination Coefficient} = \frac{\text{No. of the students who have the correct answer from the high achievers}}{\text{No. of high achievers}} - \frac{\text{No. of the students who have the correct answer from the low achievers}}{\text{No. of low achievers}}$$

Table (3.10) shows the discrimination coefficient for each item of the receptive test:

Table (3.10)

Discrimination coefficient for each items of the test

| No. | Discrimination coefficient | No. | Discrimination coefficient |
|--|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------|
| 1 | 0.45 | 1 | 0.45 |
| 2 | 0.64 | 2 | 0.55 |
| 3 | 0.45 | 3 | 0.45 |
| 4 | 0.45 | 4 | 0.27 |
| 5 | 0.55 | 5 | 0.55 |
| 6 | 0.36 | 6 | 0.27 |
| 7 | 0.45 | 7 | 0.45 |
| 8 | 0.55 | 8 | 0.55 |
| 9 | 0.36 | 9 | 0.55 |
| 10 | 0.45 | 10 | 0.64 |
| 11 | 0.64 | 11 | 0.55 |
| 12 | 0.64 | 12 | 0.36 |
| 13 | 0.55 | 13 | 0.45 |
| 14 | 0.64 | 14 | 0.55 |
| 15 | 0.55 | 15 | 0.64 |
| Total Discrimination coefficient | 0.50 | | |

The previous Table (3.10) shows that the discrimination coefficient is between (0.27 – 0.64) and the total average (0.50) which means the test items are acceptable from (0.30) Or over.

3.8. The productive test:

The test was built to investigate the second aspect of the study which is the productive aspect. This exam also consisted of (15) items. The exam contained two types of collocation like the previous test which are (verb-noun collocations) and (adjective-noun collocations). Those items were divided into part one which contained congruent collocations and the second contained non-congruent collocations.

3.8.1. The referee validity:

The test was refereed by a panel of referees (see appendix A). Most of the referees were university professors and one of them was a school teacher. The referees were asked to check the clarity and relevance of the test items. Some of the test items were added to increase the number of the items and some of the items were modified according to the referees' comments. Table (3.11) shows the number of each domain after modification.

Table (3.11)

The number of each domain after modification.

| Instruments | Domains | Number of items |
|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| Receptive test | Congruent collocations | 16 |
| | Non-congruent collocations | 14 |
| Productive test | Congruent collocations | 16 |
| | Non-congruent collocations | 14 |
| Total | | 60 |

3.8.2. Internal consistency validity:

To compute the internal consistency of the test items, the researcher used Pearson correlation coefficient. To measure such validity, Pearson correlation computed the correlation of the following: items with their domains, the items with the total test and domains with the test as a whole. Table (3.12) describes the internal consistency of the test.

Table (3.12)

The internal consistency of the test domains.

| Item | Correlation with domain | Correlation with domain | | Correlation with domain | | Correlation with domain | |
|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------|--------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|
| | Congruent verb-noun | Non-congruent verb-noun | | Congruent adjective-noun | | Non-congruent Adjective-noun | |
| 1 | **0.653 | 9 | **0.883 | 1 | **0.697 | 9 | *0.343 |
| 2 | **0.744 | 10 | **0.804 | 2 | **0.581 | 10 | **0.582 |
| 3 | *0.345 | 11 | **0.914 | 3 | **0.494 | 11 | *0.317 |
| 4 | **0.636 | 12 | *0.364 | 4 | **0.775 | 12 | *0.390 |
| 5 | **0.516 | 13 | **0.846 | 5 | **0.466 | 13 | **0.498 |
| 6 | *0.349 | 14 | *0.336 | 6 | **0.579 | 14 | **0.498 |
| 7 | *0.321 | 15 | *0.234 | 7 | **0.400 | 15 | **0.414 |
| 8 | *0.314 | | | 8 | **0.290 | | |

***r table value at df (38) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.304**

****r table value at df (38) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.393**

In addition, the researcher computed the correlation of the test domains with the test as a whole. Table (3.13) describes the results.

Table (3.13)

Pearson correlation of the test domains and the total degree of test.

| Domain | Correlation with total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Congruent verb-noun | **0.492 |
| Non-congruent verb-noun | **0.557 |
| Congruent adjective-noun | **0.755 |
| Non-congruent adjective-noun | **0.652 |

***r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.304**

****r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.393**

The above table (3.13) proves that all the correlations are significant at 0.05 or 0.01 levels. This means the test has internal consistency validity.

3.8.2. The reliability of the test:

Mackey and Gass (2005,p.128) define reliability as "instrument consistency". That is, if a student gets a high mark in a certain subject test, it would be expected that he would also receive a high mark if he took the same test. The following steps were taken to ensure the reliability of the productive test.

1- Kuder-Richardson (K-R20): (K-R20) depends on calculating the percentages of correct answers to the test items, and also on the variance of every item.

2- Split Half Method: It depends on splitting the test into two parts, and calculating the correlation between the parts, then making a

correction for the correlation coefficient by Spearman – Brown Prophecy Formula. (Abu Hattab & Sadeq, 1980,p. 14).Table (3.14) describes (KR20) and Split half coefficients for the test domains.

Table (3.14)
(KR20) and Split half coefficients of the test domains

| Test Domains | (KR20) | Split half coefficients of the test domains |
|------------------------------|--------|---|
| Congruent verb-noun | 0.323 | 0.552 |
| Non-congruent verb-noun | 0.714 | 0.706 |
| Congruent adjective-noun | 0.590 | 0.638 |
| Non-congruent adjective-noun | 0.572 | 0.624 |

According to the previous table (3.14), the results showed that the reliability coefficients are acceptable. This means the test is reliable and valid to apply in order to achieve the aim of the study.

3.8.3. Difficulty Coefficient:

Difficulty coefficient is measured by finding out the percentage of the wrong answers of each item (Abu Nahia,1994,p.308).

The coefficient of difficulty of each item was calculated according to the following formula:

$$\text{Difficulty Coefficient} = \frac{\text{No. of wrong answers}}{\text{the total student who answered the test}}$$

Table (3.15) shows the difficulty coefficient for each items of the test:

Table (3.15)
Difficulty coefficient for each items of the test

| No. | Difficulty coefficient | No. | Difficulty coefficient |
|------------------------------|------------------------|-----|------------------------|
| 1 | 0.73 | 1 | 0.59 |
| 2 | 0.59 | 2 | 0.64 |
| 3 | 0.64 | 3 | 0.59 |
| 4 | 0.50 | 4 | 0.68 |
| 5 | 0.64 | 5 | 0.59 |
| 6 | 0.59 | 6 | 0.59 |
| 7 | 0.68 | 7 | 0.41 |
| 8 | 0.59 | 8 | 0.68 |
| 9 | 0.68 | 9 | 0.64 |
| 10 | 0.68 | 10 | 0.68 |
| 11 | 0.50 | 11 | 0.32 |
| 12 | 0.68 | 12 | 0.41 |
| 13 | 0.68 | 13 | 0.68 |
| 14 | 0.55 | 14 | 0.64 |
| 15 | 0.64 | 15 | 0.64 |
| Total difficulty coefficient | 0.60 | | |

The previous Table (3.15) shows that the difficulty coefficient is between (0.32 – 0.68) with the total average (0.60) which means the test

items are acceptable or in the normal limit of difficulties according to the assessment and the evaluation specialists.

3.8.4. Discrimination Coefficient:

The discrimination coefficient was calculated according to the following formula: (Abu Nahia, 1994,p.311).

$$\text{Discrimination Coefficient} = \frac{\text{No. of the students who have the correct answer from the high achievers}}{\text{No. of high achievers students}} - \frac{\text{No. of the students who have the correct answer from the low achievers}}{\text{No. of low achievers students}}$$

Table (3.16) shows the discrimination coefficient for each item of the test:

Table (3.16)
Discrimination coefficient for each items of the test

| No. | Discrimination coefficient | No. | Discrimination coefficient |
|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------|
| 1 | 0.55 | 1 | 0.45 |
| 2 | 0.64 | 2 | 0.36 |
| 3 | 0.36 | 3 | 0.64 |
| 4 | 0.64 | 4 | 0.45 |
| 5 | 0.55 | 5 | 0.64 |
| 6 | 0.64 | 6 | 0.45 |

| | | | |
|--|------|----|------|
| 7 | 0.45 | 7 | 0.64 |
| 8 | 0.64 | 8 | 0.64 |
| 9 | 0.45 | 9 | 0.36 |
| 10 | 0.45 | 10 | 0.45 |
| 11 | 0.64 | 11 | 0.45 |
| 12 | 0.64 | 12 | 0.64 |
| 13 | 0.45 | 13 | 0.64 |
| 14 | 0.36 | 14 | 0.55 |
| 15 | 0.55 | 15 | 0.55 |
| Total Discrimination coefficient | 0.53 | | |

Table (3.16) shows that the discrimination coefficient wobbles between (0.36 – 0.64) with total average (0.53). That means the test items are acceptable and discriminating according to the assessment and the evaluation specialists.

3.9. The Written Interview:

The researcher designed this instrument as a written interview which consisted of (11) questions and the interview was directed to the participants and it also was attached with the two exams to measure the participants' exposure to English language to help the researcher find the correlation between the participants' proficiency in reception and production of collocations and their exposure to language.

3.9.1 The validity of the interview:

The following steps were taken to ensure the validity and reliability of the written interview in order to apply it in the study.

3.9.1.1. The referee validity:

The written interview was also introduced to a panel of referees, who are professors at different Palestinian universities and an expert teacher (see appendix A). All of them agreed on the items of the interview and considered it as a valid instrument to measure the purpose which it was built. The items of the interview were modified according to their recommendations.

3.9.1.2. The internal consistency validity:

Al Agha (1996,p. 121) states that the internal consistency validity indicates the correlation of the score of each item with the total average of the test . It also indicates the correlation of the average of each scope with the total average. This validity was calculated by using Pearson Formula.

According to the table (3.17), the coefficient correlation of each item within its scope is significant at levels (0.01) and (0.05). According to the following tables , it can be concluded that the written interview is highly consistent and valid as a tool for the study.

Table (3.17)

Pearson correlation of each item of interview items.

| No. | Pearson Correlation |
|-----|---------------------|
| 1 | **0.461 |
| 2 | *0.384 |
| 3 | *0.355 |
| 4 | *0.345 |
| 5 | **0.614 |
| 6 | **0.533 |
| 7 | **0.661 |
| 8 | **0.525 |
| 9 | *0.347 |
| 10 | *0.389 |
| 11 | *0.382 |

*r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.304

**r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.393

3.9.2. Reliability of the written interview:

The instrument is reliable when it gives the same results if it is reapplied in the same conditions The reliability of the test was measured by Alpha Cronbach and the Spilt- half techniques.

Table (3.18)

Reliability coefficient of all items of the written interview

| Alpha Cronbach Technique | | |
|--------------------------|-------|-------------|
| Scope | Total | Correlation |
| Total | 11 | 0.606 |

From table (3.18), the results show that the written interview has a good reliability because the reliability coefficient is (0.606).

3.9.2.1. By using Split half:

Correlation between two parts (even X odd) and modification by Spearman Brown:

Table (3.19)

| SPILT –HALF TECHNIQUE | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|--------|-------|
| WRITTEN INTERVIEW | TOTAL | BEFORE | AFTER |
| Total | 11 | 0.565 | 0.722 |

From table (3.19), the results show that the written interview has a good reliability.

From tables (3.18) and (3.19) , the tool is proved to be reliable .

Alpha Cronbach coefficient is (0.606) and the Spilt- half coefficient is (0.568) that indicates the tool passed to be applied in the study.

3.10. Statistical analysis procedures:

The responses to the instruments were collected, computed, and analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The significance level used was 0.05. The following statistical techniques were used:

- 1- **Spearman Correlation:** to determine the internal consistency validity of the tests items and the evaluation criteria of the test.
- 2- **Alpha Cronbach Technique:** to measure the reliability of the tests items.

- 3- **T- test** of paired samples.
- 4- **Split-half technique:** to test the reliability of the test items.
- 5- **Sheffe' Post Test:** to identify the direction of the differences.
- 6- **One Way ANOVA:** was used to measure the statistical differences in means between the universities.

3.11. Summary :

The researcher discussed in this chapter the research type, the population, the sample, the designing of the instruments, the validity and reliability of the tests, and the statistical treatments used in the study.

Chapter IV

Results and Discussion

Chapter Four

Analysis of Data

4.1. Introduction:

The study aimed at investigating the role of the mother tongue in reception and production of collocations by Palestinian English majors. This chapter presents the results of the study according to the data collected through the instruments of the study. In addition, this chapter also introduces the analysis of the results as the following.

4.2. The first question inquired the following:

Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations?

To answer this question, the researcher tested the following null hypothesis:

There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations?

The researcher used t.test Paired Samples to show the differences between the congruent and non-congruent collocations. The following table (4.1) shows that:

Table (4.1)

T.test Paired Samples results of differences between the congruent and non-congruent collocation groups for all of the sub domain and total score of the domains

| scope | GROUP | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | t | Sig. value | sig. level |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----|--------|----------------|--------|------------|--------------|
| Productive test | Congruent | 280 | 6.718 | 3.132 | 4.674 | 0.000 | sig. at 0.01 |
| | Non-congruent | 280 | 5.979 | 2.918 | | | |
| Receptive test | Congruent | 280 | 10.932 | 2.555 | 26.425 | 0.000 | sig. at 0.01 |
| | Non-congruent | 280 | 6.246 | 2.445 | | | |
| Total | All Congruent | 280 | 17.650 | 4.771 | 21.799 | 0.000 | sig. at 0.01 |
| | All Non-congruent | 280 | 12.225 | 4.561 | | | |

“t” table value at (279) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 1.96

“t” table value at (279) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 2.58

The previous table (4.1), clarifies that (T) computed value is larger than (T) table value in all domains and the total. In other words, computed (T) is 16.016 which is larger than (T) table at (0.5) is 1.96 and

(0.01) is 2.58. This means that there are statistically significant differences between congruent and non-congruent collocations in favor of the congruent collocations. This proved that the mother tongue played a significant role in reception and production of congruent collocations. The role of mother tongue was positive with the reception and production of collocations because the participants used the literal translation to answer the tests. They used the literal translation with congruent and non-congruent collocations. this means that the first language interferes positively with congruent collocations , meanwhile it does not help with the non-congruent ones.

4.3. The second question inquired the following:

Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' performance on verb-noun collocations and adjective-noun collocations?

To answer this question, the researcher tested the following null hypothesis:

There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' performance on verb-noun collocations and adjective-noun collocations.

The researcher used t.test Paired Samples. The following table (4.2) shows that:

Table (4.2)

T.test Paired Samples results of differences between verb-noun collocations and adjective-noun collocations for all of the sub domains and total score of the domains.

| Scope | GROUP | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | T | Sig. value | sig. level |
|-----------------|-----------|-----|--------|----------------|--------|------------|--------------|
| Productive test | Verb-noun | 280 | 7.143 | 2.895 | 9.703 | 0.000 | sig. at 0.01 |
| | Adj-noun | 280 | 5.554 | 3.193 | | | |
| Receptive test | Verb-noun | 280 | 9.650 | 2.777 | 12.665 | 0.000 | sig. at 0.01 |
| | Adj-noun | 280 | 7.529 | 2.079 | | | |
| Total | Verb-noun | 280 | 16.793 | 4.917 | 15.974 | 0.000 | sig. at 0.01 |
| | Adj-noun | 280 | 13.082 | 4.274 | | | |

“t” table value at (279) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 1.96

“t” table value at (279) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 2.58

The previous table (4.2) clarifies that (T) computed value is larger than (T) table value in all domains and the total. This indicates that there are statistically significant differences between the reception and production of verb-noun and adjective-noun collocations in favor of the verb-noun collocations. The Mean of the verb-noun collocations is 16.793 and Mean of adjective-nouns collocations is 13.082. (T) computed is significant at 0.01. This statistical analysis proves that there

are significant differences between the two types of collocations in favor of the verb-noun collocations. This means that the verb-noun collocations are easier than adjective-noun collocations in reception and production of collocations.

4.4. The third question inquired the following:

Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' receptive and productive knowledge of collocations?

To answer this question, the researcher tested the following null hypothesis:

There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' receptive and productive knowledge of collocations.

To answer this question the researcher used t.test Paired Samples the following table (4.3) shows that:

Table (4.3)

T.test Paired Samples results of differences between the productive and receptive tests for all of the sub domain and total score of the domains:

| Scope | GROUP | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | T | Sig. value | sig. level |
|-------|------------|-----|--------|----------------|--------|------------|--------------|
| Tool | Productive | 280 | 12.696 | 5.445 | 16.016 | 0.000 | sig. at 0.01 |
| | Receptive | 280 | 17.179 | 4.026 | | | |

“t” table value at (279) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 1.96

“t” table value at (279) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 2.58

The previous table (4.3) shows that (T) computed value is larger than (T) table value in all domains and the total. To illustrate, (T) computed is 16.016 and mean of the productive test is 12.696 and the receptive test is 17.179. This means that there are statistically significant differences between receptive and productive tests in all sub domains and the total score of each domain in favor of the receptive test, which means the students do better in the receptive test which clarifies that the students in the process of receiving language than producing it. In addition to that, the results indicate that the students need more practice and read much more to be able to produce these collocations.

4.5. The fourth question inquired the following:

Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to gender?

To answer this question, the researcher tested the following hypothesis:

There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to gender.

The researcher used t. test for independent samples. Table (4.4) shows this:

Table (4.4)

Table (4.4) shows the differences between males and females

| Scope | SEX | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | T | Sig. value | sig. level |
|--------------|------------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Productive | male | 104 | 11.442 | 5.353 | 3.005 | 0.003 | sig. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--------|-----|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| test | female | 176 | 13.438 | 5.377 | | | at 0.01 |
| Receptive test | male | 104 | 16.308 | 3.791 | 2.817 | 0.005 | sig. at 0.01 |
| | female | 176 | 17.693 | 4.083 | | | |
| Total | male | 104 | 27.750 | 7.963 | 3.331 | 0.001 | sig. at 0.01 |
| | female | 176 | 31.131 | 8.347 | | | |

“t” table value at df (278) and sig. level (0.05) = 1.96

“t” table value at df (278) and sig. level (0.05) = 2.58

The previous table (4.4) illustrates that (T) computed value is larger than (T) table value in all domains and the total. On the other hand, t computed is statistically significant in all tests. Means of gender in the productive and receptive tests are as the following: The mean of male is 27.750 and the female is 31.131 and (T) computed is statistically significant 3.331. This indicates that there are statistically significant differences due to gender (male and female) in favor of the female students in reception and production of collocations. The results prove that the female students are more receptive and productive of English collocations. As a result, the male students have to receive more and more collocations to be able to produce them.

4.6. The fifth question inquired the following:

Are there statistically significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants’ reception and production of collocations due to GPA?

To answer this question, the researcher tested the following null hypothesis:

There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to GPA.

The researcher used One Way ANOVA to measure the statistical differences between the groups. Table (4.5) shows this:

Table (4.5)

One Way ANOVA results of the receptive and productive tests with the participants' grade point average.

| Scope | Source of variance | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Sig. level |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|------------|
| Productive test | Between Groups | 167.353 | 2 | 83.676 | 2.860 | 0.059 | not sig |
| | Within Groups | 8103.844 | 277 | 29.256 | | | |
| | Total | 8271.196 | 279 | | | | |
| Receptive test | Between Groups | 37.529 | 2 | 18.765 | 1.159 | 0.315 | not sig |
| | Within Groups | 4485.542 | 277 | 16.193 | | | |
| | Total | 4523.071 | 279 | | | | |
| Total | Between Gs | 292.486 | 2 | 146.243 | 2.112 | 0.123 | not sig |
| | Within Gs. | 19178.139 | 277 | 69.235 | | | |
| | Total | 19470.625 | 279 | | | | |

“F” table value at (2, 279) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 3.04

“F” table value at (2, 279) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 4.71

The previous table (4.5) shows that (F) computed value is less than (F) table value in all domains and the total. (F) computed is 2.112 which is less than (F) table at the different levels of significance is 3.04 and

4.71. This makes the results more clear to indicate that there are no statistically significant differences in reception and production of collocations related to the participants' grade point average. The researcher attributes these results to the limited number of collocations used in the tests and the exam itself does not cover all types of collocations.

4.7. The sixth question inquired the following:

Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to university?

To answer this question, the researcher tested the following null hypothesis:

There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to university.

The researcher used One Way ANOVA to measure the statistical differences between the receptive and productive tests. table (4.6) shows that.

Table (4.6)

One Way ANOVA results of the receptive and productive tests with the differences between universities.

| Scope | Source of variance | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig | Sig. level |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------|--------------|
| Productive test | Between Groups | 556.004 | 2 | 278.002 | 9.981 | 0.000 | sig. at 0.01 |
| | Within Groups | 7715.193 | 277 | 27.853 | | | |
| | Total | 8271.196 | 279 | | | | |
| Receptive | Between | 349.452 | 2 | 174.726 | 11.596 | 0.000 | sig. at |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------------|-----------|-----|---------|--------|-------|--------------|
| test | Groups | | | | | | 0.01 |
| | Within Groups | 4173.619 | 277 | 15.067 | | | |
| | Total | 4523.071 | 279 | | | | |
| Total | Between Groups | 1643.595 | 2 | 821.798 | 12.769 | 0.000 | sig. at 0.01 |
| | Within Groups | 17827.030 | 277 | 64.358 | | | |
| | Total | 19470.625 | 279 | | | | |

“F” table value at (2, 279) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 3.04

“F” table value at (2, 279) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 4.71

The previous table (4.6) shows that (F) computed value is larger than (F) table value in all domains and the total. (F) computed is 12.769 and (F) table is at all significance levels 3.04 and 4.71. The mean between groups is 821.798 and within groups 64.358. This indicates that there are statistically significant differences related to the university variable. In order to know the direction of differences the researcher used Scheffe post test Matrix for knowing the direction of differences between universities in the Productive test. The following table (4.7) shows that.

Table (4.7)

Scheffe post test Matrix to know the direction of differences between universities in the productive test.

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Universities | IUG 14.494 | AL-Azhar 12.738 | AL-Aqsa 10.909 |
| IUG 14.494 | 0 | | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------|---|
| AL-Azhar 12.738 | 1.756 | 0 | |
| AL-Aqsa 10.909 | *3.585 | 1.829 | 0 |

***sig. at (0.05)**

The previous table shows that there are statistically significant differences between Islamic University of Gaza and AL-Aqsa University in the productive test in favor of The Islamic University of Gaza in the productive test. The results also illustrate that there are no statistically significant differences between the other universities in the same test.

Table (4.8)

Scheffe post test Matrix to know the direction of differences between universities in the receptive test.

| Universities | IUG 18.871 | AL-Azhar 16.430 | AL-Aqsa 16.455 |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| IUG 18.871 | 0 | | |
| AL-Azhar 16.430 | *2.441 | 0 | |
| AL-Aqsa 16.455 | *2.416 | 0.025 | 0 |

• **sig. at (0.05)**

The previous table (4.8) shows that there are statistically significant differences between The Islamic University of Gaza and AL-Azhar University in the receptive test in favor of The Islamic University of Gaza. And there are statistically significant differences between Islamic

University of Gaza and AL-Aqsa University in the receptive test in favor of The Islamic University.

Table (4.9)

Scheffe post test Matrix to know the direction of differences between universities in both "Productive and Receptive tests".

| Universities | IUG 33.365 | Al-Azhar 29.168 | AL-Aqsa 27.364 |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| IUG 33.365 | 0 | | |
| AL-Azhar 29.168 | *4.196 | 0 | |
| AL-Aqsa 27.364 | *6.001 | 1.805 | 0 |

***sig. at (0.05)**

The previous table (4.9) shows that there are statistically significant differences between Islamic University of Gaza and AL-Azhar University in the receptive and productive in favor of The Islamic University of Gaza. And there are statistically significant differences between The Islamic University of Gaza and AL-Aqsa University in the receptive and productive tests in favor of The Islamic University. In addition to that, there are statistically significant differences in reception and production of collocations between AL-Aqsa and AL-Azhar universities in favour of AL-Azhar university.

4.8. The seventh question inquired the following:

Is there a correlation at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between participants' proficiency in recognizing and producing collocations and their exposure to the English language?

To answer this question, the researcher tested the following null hypothesis:

There is no correlation at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between participants' proficiency in recognizing and producing collocations and their exposure to the English language.

The researcher used Pearson correlation and table (4.10) shows Pearson correlation between the participants' proficiency in collocations and their exposure to English language.

Table (4.10)

Pearson correlation between the participants' proficiency in collocations and their exposure to English language.

| | Level of exposure to language | Sig. |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| Productive test | 0.223 | sig. at 0.01 |
| Receptive test | 0.132 | sig. at 0.05 |
| Total | 0.196 | sig. at 0.01 |

"r" table value at df (278) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.148

"r" table value at df (278) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.113

The previous table (4.10) shows there is a correlation between the participants' proficiency in the productive test and their level of exposure to English language. In addition, there is also a correlation between the participants' proficiency in the receptive test and their level of exposure to language. Finally, the results show that, there is a correlation between the participants' proficiency in collocations and their exposure to English language.

Summary:

The researcher in this chapter clarified and described the results after the treatment of the data by using SPSS. The researcher described the data in the tables to answer the seven questions of the study statistically.

Chapter V

Findings,

Discussion, Recommendations of the study,

Conclusion,

Recommendations for Further Studies.

Chapter Five

Findings, Discussion, Implications for pedagogy, conclusion, and recommendations for further studies.

5.1. Introduction:

This study consists of five chapters aiming at investigating the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations by Palestinian English majors. In accordance with the literature reviewed and discussed earlier in the study, in addition to the practical and statistical investigation of the study, this chapter aimed at discussing the results of the study and providing recommendations for further researches.

5.2. Discussion:

The main goal of this study was to investigate the role of mother tongue in reception and production of English collocations by Palestinian English majors. To achieve this goal, the researcher constructed two tests, the first was a receptive test and the second was a productive test. Each of these tests consisted of two parts: verb-noun collocations and adjective-noun collocations. Each of these parts was divided into two domains: congruent and non-congruent collocations. Each of the receptive and productive tests consisted of 30 items. The researcher selected an appropriate sample consisting of 280 participants. Accordingly, the findings revealed the following results:

5.3. Interpretation of the first question:

The researcher investigated the first question which examined if there were statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations by Palestinian English majors. The results indicated that (T) computed value, 16.016, was larger than (T) table value, 1.96,. This meant that there were statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations by Palestinian English majors because the results showed that the mean of congruent collocations which have literal translation in Arabic was, 17.179, and Mean of non-congruent collocations which have no literal translation in Arabic was, 12.696,. This means that there are statistically significant differences in the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations by Palestinian English majors in favor of the congruent collocations. This result indicates that many of the students used the literal translation in answering the congruent and the non-congruent collocations of the tests. The literal translation was prominent and dominant in most of the tests' items and this indicates that the participants used their mother tongue in answering the tests and this makes the congruent collocations get a higher score than the non-congruent collocations because the congruent ones cope with the participants' literal translation and they are available in the participants' mother tongue. Regarding the non-congruent collocations, the participants got a low score because this type of collocations does not cope with their literal translation and they are not available in their mother tongue. To sum up, the participants over generalized the literal

translation on the most of items of the tests and this means that the mother tongue facilitated the learning of congruent collocations not the non-congruent ones because they need special treatment. To conclude, the mother tongue (Arabic) played a great and significant role in recognizing and producing English collocations as the results above proved.

5.4. Interpretation of the second question:

The researcher investigated the second question which examined if there were statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' performance in verb-noun collocations and adjective-noun collocations. The results indicated that (T) computed value, 15.974, was larger than (T) table value, 1.96,. This meant that there were statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' performance in verb-noun collocations and adjective noun collocations in favor of the verb-noun collocations. The researcher inquired the results that the acquisition of the verb-noun collocations is much easier than adjective-noun collocations. In addition to that, the researcher attributes this result that the verb-noun collocations take place more frequently than the adjective-noun collocations. This referred that the students encounter verb-noun collocations in the learning of language more than the adjective-noun collocations. Moreover, the participants are more familiar with the verb-noun collocations rather than the adjective-noun ones. Moreover, the researcher attributed this result to the fact that the acquiring of verb-noun collocations is much easier than the acquiring of adjective-noun ones. Finally, verb-noun collocations are more frequent than the adjective-noun collocations in using English

language and in the students' vocabulary lists. This result looks like the studies of AL-Sakran (2011) and Shehata (2008).

5.5. Interpretation of the third question:

The researcher investigated the third question which examined if there were statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production knowledge of collocations. The results indicated that (T) computed value, 16.016, was larger than (T) table value, 1.96,. This meant that there were statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' receptive and productive knowledge of collocations in favor of the receptive knowledge. These results indicated that the reception was much easier than production of knowledge because the receptive knowledge is considered the base that the students start from. In addition to that, reception is the first stage of learning language then production comes after. So the students have to receive the knowledge then produce it. Moreover, these results indicated that most of the students are still in the reception stage and they need to be encountered with more and more materials in collocations to be able to produce them easily. On the other hand, production is the second step of learning the language, so it is much more difficult for the learners to practice the collocational knowledge productively because the students do not have much practice and also they do not have the environment in order to encourage them produce such knowledge. In addition, the researcher attributes this result that there is no available productive environment to the learners to practice their productive skills and the teaching of collocations in EFL classrooms is often neglected. Moreover, the foreign language teachers

focused on giving students synonyms rather than providing them with the appropriate collocations to be used in certain contexts. Finally, it is known that the receptive knowledge typically precedes the productive mastery.

5.6. Interpretation of the fourth question:

The researcher investigated the fourth question which examined if there were significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to gender. The results indicated that (T) computed value, 3.331, was larger than (T) table value, 1.96,. This meant that there were statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to gender in favor of the female students. These results attribute that the female students are more interested in learning language and specially collocations to improve their language and become native-like. In addition, the female students may read and listen much more than males, therefore, they are much better than the male ones. Moreover, the researcher indicated that the female students are more competitive than the male students and they attended English lectures regularly. Finally, all the reasons above may inquire the previous result that there are statistically significant differences in reception of production of collocations between male and female participants in favour of the female ones.

5.7. Interpretation of the fifth question:

The researcher investigated the fifth question which examined if there were significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants'

reception and production of collocations due to GPA. The results indicate that (F) computed value,2.112, was larger than (F) table value,3.04,. This meant that there were no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to GPA. The researcher attributes such results that all of the participants are from nearly the same academic level and the grade point average does not affect their receptive and production of collocations. In addition, the researcher attributed this result that all the participants face the same difficulty in answering the non-congruent collocations because these collocations do not need the literal translation to be answered, therefore, the non-congruent collocations are much more difficult than the congruent ones because it needs literal translation and this makes congruent collocations much easier than the non-congruent ones. Finally, the researcher attributes such results that the tests used in this study use a limited number of collocations, in addition to that the collocations which was used verb-noun and adjective-noun collocations just not other types of English collocations. So, all these reasons affected the result of this question.

5.8. Interpretation of the sixth question:

The researcher investigated the sixth question which examined if there were significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to university. The results showed that (F) computed value,12.769, was larger than (F) table value,3.04,. This meant that there were statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the participants' reception and production of collocations due to universities in favor of The Islamic

University of Gaza. The researcher attributed this result to the fact that English courses are different from university to university and the teachers themselves may do their best in teaching language and making the students more active in the process of learning. Moreover, the methods and techniques used in teaching the students and the way the lecturers follow in teaching the language. In addition to that, the facilities used by the students like labs., books, and internet. Finally, the system of the university in attending the lectures also may have affected the results of the previous question and make the differences significant in favor of the Islamic university of Gaza.

5.9. Interpretation of the seventh question:

The researcher investigated the seventh question which examined if there was a correlation at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between participants' proficiency in producing and recognizing collocations and their amount of exposure to the English language. The results clarified that, there was a correlation between the participants' proficiency in the two tests of English collocations and their exposure to English language. The researcher attributes such results that, when the learners are exposed to language, they will be better in the language skills.

5.10. General Discussion:

This study aimed to investigate the role of mother tongue in reception and production of collocations by Palestinian English majors at the Palestinian universities. To achieve this aim, the researcher built three instruments to collect the data. The results showed that there were statistically significant differences between the congruent and non-

congruent collocations in favor of the congruent collocations and this proved that there was a significant role to the mother tongue in reception and production of collocations. The results also indicated that there were statistically significant differences between verb-noun collocations and adjective-noun collocations in favor of verb-noun collocations. In addition to that there were statistically significant differences between the receptive and productive knowledge of collocations in favor of the receptive knowledge. Moreover, the results showed that there were statistically significant differences in the reception and production of collocations due to gender in favor of female students and university variable in favor of the Islamic university of Gaza. On the other hand, the results clarified that there were no statistically significant differences in reception and production of collocations due to the participants' grade point average. Finally, the results indicated that there was a correlation between the participants' proficiency in receiving and producing collocations and their exposure to English language.

5.11. Recommendations of the study:

According to the results of the present study, many recommendations for teaching collocations in general can be suggested. These implications can be applied as a general framework or a model for teaching all collocation categories. The implications of the study are the following:

- 1- It is clear that the mother tongue plays a significant role in the acquisition of collocations, it may be most effective to use authentic materials in teaching collocations at the higher levels of proficiency

in universities. Authenticity gives EFL learners the chance to be exposed to natural language, which in turn helps them improve their language proficiency (Benally, 1994).

- 2- In light of the difficulty of the production in collocations, learners are in need of more practice producing collocations. Also, they should receive as much collocation input as possible. According to Krashen (1988), the more word input language learners perceive, the more productive of them they become, which can be true in the acquisition of collocations as well. Consequently, it is assumed that the more the receptive knowledge of collocations is increased, the more advanced the productive knowledge of collocations will be. Therefore, different kinds of activities can be used to improve learners' receptive and productive skills. For example, students can tell or retell or write stories they have heard that contain collocations, and they can present plays, dialogues with collocations in them. Also, to increase comprehension and recognition of collocations, teachers can use activities that provide learners with skills in guessing meaning from context like showing a paragraph from which a collocation has been deleted; students can supply a word or phrase which better fits the context.
- 3- Non-congruent collocations should receive more attention in language teaching without neglecting congruent collocations as some researchers suggested (Bahns, 1993), and (Shehata, 2008) which can be a source of trouble as the results of the present study showed.
- 4- Selecting and teaching collocations should be done with reference to L1 where learners become aware of the L1-L2 differences and similarities. It is useless, for example, to teach Arabic-speaking

learners the English collocation *false teeth* without drawing their attention to the fact that **artificial teeth* (the equivalent to *asnan senaeia*) is not possible in English.

- 5- In teaching collocations, more attention should be given to teaching adjective-noun collocations, which the results showed to be more difficult, if not a challenge, to the participants, where the focus should be on the adjective that causes the greatest difficulties.
- 6- Adding a bilingual glossary of collocations to textbooks is recommended to keep learners aware of the similarities and differences between the first and second language.

5.12. Conclusion:

Collocations play a crucial role in native speakers' lexical knowledge in general. Therefore, collocational knowledge has an impact on many aspects of language processing, comprehension and use. They are communicatively more useful to L2 learners than idioms, since they are less frozen and more transparent. However, previous collocation research has reflected L2 learners' poor performance in producing and recognizing English collocations. Therefore, the aim of this study was to identify the role of the mother tongue (Arabic) in reception and production of English collocations among English majors at the Palestinian universities.

Generally, the results highlighted the important role that learners' first language plays in the reception and production of L2 collocations. The study's results revealed that there was a positive role of the mother tongue in reception and production of collocations because the results showed that the participants' responses on the congruent collocations

were better than the non-congruent ones because of using the literal translation in answering the tests' items. This means that the role of the mother tongue was obvious and dominant through the participants' using of the literal translation. So the role of the mother tongue was a facilitator in reception and production of the congruent collocations but the mother tongue was inhibitant with the non-congruent collocations because literal translation does not work with this type of collocations. In addition, the amount of exposure to the language is shown to have a moderate positive correlation with learners' collocational knowledge. On the other hand, although adjective-noun collocations were assumed by previous research to be less difficult than verb-noun collocations, the results of the present study indicated that the participants have found them more difficult than verb-noun collocations. This implies that adjective-noun collocations need to be taught explicitly to language learners and used in more authentic contexts to be better acquired by language learners. Like previous research, the present study provides evidence that participants' receptive knowledge of collocations is broader than their productive knowledge of collocations.

Moreover, the results showed that the Islamic University of Gaza was better than AL-azhar and AL-aqsa universities in the reception and production of collocations.

Finally, based on the study results and findings, suggestions were given regarding measures that should be taken into account when teaching collocations.

Overall, collocations are important in language learning, but they represent a source of trouble for language learners. Therefore, they need more attention and practice to be well acquired.

5.13. Recommendations for Further studies:

The present study on the acquisition of collocations by advanced Arabic-speaking learners of English is an empirical one that sheds light on the problems they have with two lexical collocation categories: verb-noun and adjective-noun collocations. The study has clarified some aspects of collocation acquisition by a specific group of English language learners. That is why further research is recommended to be done in the following areas:

- 1- Research should be done on other lexical and grammatical collocations to further examine the mechanism of learners' acquisition of collocations. The current research has only examined verb-noun and adjective-noun collocations, which are the most frequent lexical collocations in the previous research. However, learners make errors with other categories as well. Therefore, more empirical research on other types of collocations needs to be conducted to get a comprehensive standpoint on collocation acquisition by Arab learners of English at different proficiency levels.
- 2- It would be valuable to replicate the current study using one proficiency test.
- 3- More research in the ESL environment is still needed in order to compare its results with the researches in the EFL environment and meet the differences between them to make the role of the mother tongue in the acquisition of collocations more obvious.
- 4- It is hoped that the insights presented in this study may inspire more research into learners' collocational productive performance, which

is of crucial importance to L2 learners' overall language performance and which is shown to be problematic for the participants.

- 5- More researches are needed to investigate different ways in teaching especially non-congruent collocations.
- 6- Doing more researches exploring the role of the academic level in the development of the collocation knowledge.

References:

The Holy Quran. *AL-rRoum* (22).

Aghbar, A. A. (1990). Fixed Expressions in Written Texts: Implications for Assessing Writing Sophistication. Paper presented at A Meeting of The English Association of Pennsylvania State System Universities.

AL-Sakran, R. (2011). The Production and Receptive Knowledge of Collocations by Advanced Arabic-Speaking ESL\EFL Learners. *Unpublished Master Thesis*. Colorado State University. USA.

AL-Zahrani, S. (1998). Knowledge of English Lexical Collocations Among Male Saudi College Students Majoring English at Saudi University. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*, Indiana university of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.

Arabiski, J. (1979). Errors as Indicators of The Development of Interlanguage. University slaski Katowice. In Arnaud, p. and H. Bejoint (eds) (1992, *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*. Hampshire: Macmillan academic and professional.

Bahns, J. (1993). Lexical Collocations: A Contrastive View. *ELT Journal* 47(1), (pp.56-63).

Bahns, J., & Eldaw, M. (1993). Should We Teach EFL Students Collocation? *System*, 21(1), (pp.104-114).

Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words*. London: Routledge.

Bazzaz, F. Samad, A. (2011). The Use of Verb Noun Collocations in Writing Stories among Iranian EFL Learners. *English Language*

- Teaching*. Canadian Center of Science and Education. Vol.4, No.3. (pp.158-163).
- Benally, H. J. (1994). Navajo Philosophy of Learning and Pedagogy. *Journal of Navajo Education*, 12, (pp.23-31).
- Benson, M. (1985). Collocations and Idioms. In R. Ilson (Eds.), *Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning (ELT Documents 120)*, (pp.61-68).
- Benson, M. (1989). The Structure of The Collocational Dictionary. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 2, (pp.1-14).
- Benson, M., Benson, E. & Ilson, R. (1986a). *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English: A guide to Word Combinations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Benson, M., Benson, E. & Ilson, R. (1986b). *Lexicographic Description of English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1997). *The BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Biskup, D. (1992). L1 Influence on Learners' Renderings of English Collocations: A Polish/German Empirical Study. In P. J. L. Arnaud and H. Béjoint (eds.). *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*, (pp.85–93). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York:Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Blum, S. and Levenston, E. (1978). Universal of lexical Simplification. *Language Learning*. 28,(2).
- Bolinger, D., & Sears, D. A. (1981). *Aspects of Language (3rd ed.)*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

- Boonyasaquan, S. (2005). An Analysis of Collocational Violations in Translation. *Journal of Humanities*, 27, (pp.79-91). Bangkok: Srinakarinwirot University.
- Brown, D. (1974). Advanced Vocabulary Teaching: The Problem of Collocation. *RELC Journal*, 5(2), (pp.1–11).
- Brown, J. and Rodgers, T. (2002). *Doing Second Language Research*. Oxford University Press.
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1988). *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Channell, J. (1981). Applying Semantic Theory to Vocabulary Teaching. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 35, (pp.115–122).
- Cohen, L.; Manion, L.; Morrison, K. (2010). *Research Methods in Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Corder, S. (1967). "The Significance of Learners' Errors". In Richards, J. (ed.) (1984). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. (pp.19-27). London: Longman.
- Corder, S. (1971). Idiosyncratic errors and Error Analysis. In Richards, J. (ed.)(1974). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. (pp.158-171). London: Longman.
- Corder, S. (1973). *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Education.
- Corder, S.P. (1971) .Idiosyncratic Dialects and Error Analysis. *IRAL*.vol. 9
- Cowie, A. (1992). *Multiword Lexical Units and Communicative Language Teaching*. In P. Arnaud & H. Bejoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 216-331). London: Macmillan Academic and Professional LTD.

- Cowie, P. (1981). The Treatment of Collocations and Idioms in Learners' Dictionaries. *Applied Linguistics*, 2, (pp.223-235).
- Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Darvishi, S. (2011). The Investigation of Collocational Errors in University Students' Writing Majoring in English. 2011 International Conference on Education. Research and Innovation. Vol. 18. Singapore.
- Deveci, T. (2004). Why and How to Teach Collocations. *English Teaching Forum Online*. Retrieved March 3, 2011 from www.exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol42/no2/p16.
- Durrant, Ph. (2008). High Frequency Collocations and Second Language Learning. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*. University of Nottingham. England.
- EL- Mashharawi, A. (2008). Collocation Errors Made By English and Journalism Majors at The Islamic University of Gaza. *Unpublished Master Thesis*. The Islamic university of Gaza. Palestine.
- Ellis, C. (1965). *The Transfer of Learning*. New York: MacMillan.
- Ellis, N.C., 1997. Vocabulary Acquisition: Word Structure, Collocation, Word-class, and Meaning. *In: Schmitt, N. and M. McCarthy, eds. Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy*. CUP, (pp.122-139).
- EL-Mahdi, Kh. (2009). Problems Facing English Language Majors and Relation with Their Exposure to Language. Unpublished Master Thesis. Sana'a Univesity, Yemen.

- Esser, J. (1980). CA at The crossroads of Linguistics and Foreign Language Teaching. *IRAL*, vol.13, 3.
- Farghal, M., & Obiedat, H. (1995). Collocations: A Neglected Variable in EFL. *IRAL*, 33(4), (pp.315-333).
- Firth, J. (1957). Modes of Meaning. In J. Firth (Ed.), *Papers in Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fries, C. (1945). Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language. Ann Arbor , University of Michigan Press.
- Gass, S. and Selinker, L. (1994). *Second Language Acquisition*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ghadessy, M. (1998). The Use of Vocabulary and Collocations in The Writing of Primary School Students in Singapore. In P. N. a. R. Carter (Ed.), *Vocabulary Acquisition* (pp. 110-117): *AILA Review*, No.6.
- Greenbaum, S. (1974). Some Verb-intensifier Collocations in American and British English. *American Speech*, 49, (pp.79-89).
- Gyllstad, H. (2007). Testing English Collocations: Developing Receptive Tests for Use with Advanced Swedish Learners. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*. Lund University.
- Herzallah, A. (2011). Professional Development Obstacles Facing Primary English Language Teachers in Northern Gaza. *Unpublished Master Thesis*. Islamic University of Gaza. Palestine.
- Hill, J. (2000). *Revising Priorities: From Grammatical Failure to Collocational Success*. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching Collocation: Further Developments in The Lexical Approach* (pp. 49-50). London: Language Teaching Publications.

- Hornby, A. S. & Wehmeier, S. (1974). *The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Howarth, P. (1998). Phraseology and Second Language Proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 19 (1), (pp.24-44).
- Hsu, J. and Chiu, C.(2008). Lexical Collocations and their Relation to Speaking Proficiency of College EFL Learners in Taiwan. *The Asian EFL Journal*. The EFL Professional's Writing Forum. Vol.10, No.1. (pp. 181-204).
- Huang, L. (2001). *Knowledge of English Collocations: An Analysis of Taiwanese EFL Learners*. Retrieved January 9, 2011, from www.utexas.edu/students/flesa/tpfle/contents7.doc
- Hussien, F. (1990). Collocations: The Missing Link in Vocabulary Acquisition Amongst EFL Learners. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 26 (26), (pp.123-136).
- James, C. (1985). *Contrastive Analysis*. Singapore: longman Singapore Publishers.
- Kjellmer, G. (1992). Old as he was: A note on Concessiveness and Causality. *English Studies*, 7, (pp.337-350).
- Koizumi, R. (2005). Relationships Between Productive Vocabulary Knowledge and Speaking Performance of Japanese Learners of English at The Novice Level. *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*. The University of Tsukuba. Japan.
- Krashen, S. (1988). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics Across Cultures*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

- Laufer, B. and Tina, W. (2011). Verb-noun Collocations in Second Language writing: A Corpus Analysis of Learners' English. Available November, 13, 2011 from: www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/recordDetails.jsp?EJ928537.
- Lennon, P. (1996). Getting 'easy' Verbs Wrong at The Advanced Level. *IRAL*, 34(1), (pp.23–36).
- Lesniewska, J. and Witalisz, E. (2007). Cross-linguistic Influence and Acceptability Judgment of L2 and L1 Collocations: A study of Advanced Polish Learners of English. *EUROSLA Yearbook*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 7(1),(pp.27-48).
- Lewis, M. (1994). *The Lexical Approach: The State of ELT And A Way Forward*, Language Teaching Publications.
- Lewis, M. (2000). *Teaching Collocation: Further Development in the Lexical Approach*. Hove, Brighton: Language Teaching Publications.
- Lewis, M., (1993). *The Lexical Approach: The State of ELT and a Way Forward*. Language Teaching Publications.
- Lin, Y. P. (2002). The Effects of Collocation Instruction on English Vocabulary Developments of Senior High Students in Taiwan. *Unpublished Master Thesis*. National Kaohsiung Normal University.
- Liu C. P. (2000a). An Empirical Study of Collocation Teaching. Proceedings of *The Seventeenth Conference on English Teaching and Learning in The Republic of China* (pp. 165-178). Taipei: Crane.

- Liu, C. P. (1999a). An Analysis of Collocational Errors in EFL Writings. The proceeding of *The Eighth International Symposium on English Teaching* (pp. 483-494). Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Liu, C. P. (1999b). A Study of Chinese Culture University Freshmen's Collocational Competence: "Knowledge" as an example. *Hwa Kang Journal of English Language & Literature*, 5, (pp.81-99).
- Mackay, A. and Gass, S. (2005). *Second Lannguage Research: Methodology and Design*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher, London.
- Mahmoud, A. (2005). Collocation Errors Made by Arab Learners of English. *Asian EFL Journal*, 6(2), (pp.117 -126).
- Marton, Waldemar. (1977). Foreign Vocabulary Learning as Problem No. 1 of Language Teaching at The Advanced Level. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin 2*: (pp.33–57).
- Martynska, M. (2004). Do English Language Learners Know Collocations? *Investigations Linguisticae*, Poznan:11(1), (pp.1-12).
- McCarthy, M. (1984). A New Look at Vocabulary in EFL. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), (pp.12-22).
- McCarthy, M. (1990). *Vocabulary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- McIntosh, A. (1961). Patterns and Ranges. *Language*, 37, (pp.325-37).
- Meara, P. (1992). EFL Vocabulary Tests. *Centre for Applied Language Studies*: University of Wales, Swansea.

- Miyakoshi, T. (2009). Investigating ESL Learners' Lexical Collocations. The Acquisition of Verb+ Noun Collocations By Japanese Learners of English. *Unpublished Dissertation*. The University of Hawai'i.
- Mohideen, H. (1996). "Contributory Factors to Students' Errors with Special Reference to Errors in Written English". *The English Teacher*, 25/4. Available December 10, 2011 from: www.melta.org.my/ET/1996/main4.html
- Moussa, S. (2006). The Students' Production of Restricted Collocations in Arabic-English Translation. *Unpublished Master Thesis*. Mentouri university. Constantine.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nattinger, J. R. & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical Phrase and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nesselhauf, N. (2003). The Use of Collocations by Advanced Learners of English and Some Implications for Teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(2), (pp.223-242).
- Norrish, J. (1994). *Language Learners and their Errors*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Oxford Collocations : Dictionary for Students of English* (2002). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Palmer, F. R. (1976). *Semantics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rabeh, F. (2010). Problems in Translating Collocations. *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*. Montouri University. Constantine.

- Richards, J. (1971). "A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis". In Richards, J. (ed.) (1984). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman. (pp.172-181).
- Richards, J. and Sampson, P. (1984). "The Study of Learner English". In Richards, J. (ed.) (1984). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman. (pp.6-17).
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shehata, A. (2008). L1 Influence on the Perceptive and Production of Collocations by Advanced ESL/EFL of English. *Unpublished Master Thesis*. Ohio University. USA.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus Concordance Collocation*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. M. (1996). *Beginning The Study of Lexis*. In C.E. Bazell, J. C. Catford, M. A. K. Halliday, & R. H. Robbins (Eds.), *In Memoey of J. R. Firth*. London: Longman. (pp. 410-430).
- Stockwell, R. et. al. (1965). *The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Verstraten, L. (1992). Fixed Phrases in Monolingual Learners' Dictionaries. In Arnaud, P. and Bejoint, H. (eds.), *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*. London: Macmillan.
- Vrbinc, M. (2005). Native Speakers of Slovene and Their Translation of Collocations from Slovene into English: A Slovene-English Empirical Study. Available March 12, 2012 from: www.unierfurt.de/eestudies/eese/artic25/marj2/8_2005

- Wang, C. S. (2001). A Study of The English Collocational Competence of English Majors in Taiwan. *Unpublished Master Thesis*. Fu Jen Catholic University.
- Wei, Y. (1999, March). Teaching Collocations for Productive Vocabulary Development. Paper presented at *The Annual Meeting of The Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Language*. New York.
- Wei, Y. (1999, March). Teaching Collocations for Productive Vocabulary Development. Paper presented at *the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Language*. New York.
- Whitman, R. (1970). Contrastive Analysis: Problems and Procedures. *Language Learning*, vol.20.
- Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics in Language Teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Willis, J. D. (1990). *The Lexical Syllabus*. London: Collins.
- Wood, M. (1981). A Definition of Idiom. Manchester, England: *Center for Computational Linguistics*, University of Manchester. Reprinted by the Indiana University Linguistics Club, 1986.
- Woolard, G. (2000). Collocation- encourages Learner Independence. In M. Lewis (Ed.) *Teaching Collocation: Further Development in The Lexical Approach* (pp.28-46). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yamashita, J. and Jiang, N. (2010). L1 Influence on The Acquisition of L2 Collocations. Japanese ESL Users and EFL Learners Acquiring English Collocations. *TESOL Quarterly*. Teachers of

English to Speakers of Others Language, Inc.(TESOL). Vol.44,
No.4. (pp.647-668).

Zaghoul, M. and Abdul-Fattah, H. (2003). Translational Collocational
Strategies of Arab Learners of English: A Study in Lexical
Semantics. Available November 10, 2011 from:
www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=ED479746

Zhang, X. (1993). English Collocations and Their Effect on The Writing
of Native and Non-native College Freshmen. *Unpublished Master
Thesis*. Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.

المراجع العربية:

أبو حطب، فؤاد و صادق، امال (١٩٨٤). *علم النفس التربوي*، ط٢. مكتبة الانجلو المصرية،
القاهرة.

أبو ناهيه، صلاح (١٩٩٤). *القياس التربوي*، ط١. مكتبة الانجلو المصرية، القاهرة.


الأغا، احسان (١٩٩٦). *البحث التربوي، عناصره، مناهجه، وادواته*. الجامعة الاسلامية، غزة.

APPENDICES:

APPENDIX A: The Names of the Referee Panel:

| No. | Names | Position |
|-----|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1- | Dr. Jaber Abu-Shaweesh | AL-Quds Open University. |
| 2- | Dr. Mohammed Ateya Abdul Rahim | AL-Aqsa University. |
| 3- | Dr. Ahmed AL-Nakhala | AL-Quds Open University. |
| 4- | Dr. Sha'ban AL-Omary | Islamic University of Gaza. |
| 5- | Mr. Mazen Abu-Nada | Teacher at UNRWA. |

APPENDIX B: The Final Productive and Receptive Tests:

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>The Islamic University-Gaza Postgraduate Studies Faculty of Education Department of Curriculum and Teaching Methods</p> |  |
|--|---|

The researcher has prepared these exams to collect the needed data to serve the study which is entitled as:

"The Role of Mother Tongue in Reception and Production of Collocations by English Majors at the Palestinian Universities".

These exams consist of:

- 1- Part one: personal information.
- 2- Part two: a productive test.
- 3- Part three: a receptive test.
- 4- Part four: a written interview.

You are invited to participate in answering the questions included and the researcher will be thankful and grateful to you.

I would like to pay your attention that your responses are to be used for the research purposes only, and they will remain confidential.

Researcher,

Ahmed Abd-alwahab Miqdad

Ahmednoor_85@hotmail.com, 0599445428

Part one: Personal information:

- 1- **Gender:** a) male b)female
- 2- **University:** a) IUG b) Al azhar c) Al aqsa
- 3- **Grade point average:**%

Part two: Productive test

A) Complete the following sentences with an appropriate **verb**:

| No. | Sentences |
|-----|--|
| 1- | It is true that we..... weight when we burn off more than we eat. |
| 2- | Parents can..... a role in preventing childhood obesity. |
| 3- | Do not lie, just..... the truth . |
| 4- | It usually..... time to change laws. |
| 5- | Could you..... an eye on my bags, while I go to the toilet? |
| 6- | She usually.....a lot of her time reading. |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 7- | This book describes ten ways to..... advantage of the web. |
| 8- | Governments should the necessary actions to stop global warming. |
| 9- | The students have to..... attention to their teacher. |
| 10- | The lantern was knocked over and the barn..... fire . |
| 11- | Tom's wife..... birth to a son yesterday. |
| 12- | The robbery..... place at about 3:00 am yesterday. |
| 13- | Last July, Mike..... the mistake of going to work on a strike day. |
| 14- | Do you think there is a chance that John will..... his mind ? |
| 15- | It will you good to get out of the house very often. |

B) Complete the following with an appropriate **adjective**:

| No. | Sentences |
|-----|--|
| 1- | The most dominant..... parties in the US are the Democrats and the Republicans. |
| 2- | Today is your chance to submit your final paper. |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 3- | The term "..... arts " is used to refer to the visual arts such as painting and architecture. |
| 4- | Palestinians are trying to gain the opinion on their issue. |
| 5- | China hopes to grow its class to more than half of its total population by 2020. |
| 6- | The majority of people die of age all over the world. |
| 7- | Although no executions took place, the state reestablished punishment in 1982. |
| 8- | Everyone knows that a little lie is sometimes necessary in a time of solving social problems. |
| 9- | After the death of his son, John had a..... attack . |
| 10- | McDonalds is the largest..... food advertiser in the US. |
| 11- | This tourist speaks..... English . I cannot understand him well. |
| 12- | My dad stopped smoking, although he was a..... smoker . |
| 13- | Coca cola mainly produces..... drinks rather than juices or water. |
| 14- | The 1930s and 1940s are considered the age of Hollywood. |
| 15- | If you do not take the cut , it is four miles further. |

Part three: Receptive test

Choose the correct collocation:

| No. | Collocations |
|-----|--|
| 1- | a) have a decision b) take a decision c) get a decision |
| 2- | a) make suicide b) get suicide c) commit suicide |
| 3- | a) cease fire b) stop fire c) save fire |
| 4- | a) make a play b) do a play c) perform a play |
| 5- | a) destroy money b) waste money c) cancel money |
| 6- | a) do a language b) talk a language c) speak a language |
| 7- | a) solve a problem b) answer a problem c) do a problem |
| 8- | a) save a secret b) keep a secret c) hide a secret |
| 9- | a) pay a speech b) give a speech c) talk a speech |
| 10- | a) have cold b) get cold c) catch cold |
| 11- | a) run business b) make business c) do business |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 12- | a)do homework b) make homework c) perform homework |
| 13- | a) get meetings b) make meetings c) hold meetings |
| 14- | a) make a visit b) pay a visit c) take a visit |
| 15- | a)strike divorce b) get divorce c) make divorce |

| No. | Collocations |
|-----|---|
| 1- | a) strong wind b) heavy wind c) speedy wind |
| 2- | a) executive punishment b) capital punishment c) killing punishment |
| 3- | a)cash cheque b) money cheque c) currency cheque |
| 4- | a) brightening age b) silver age c) golden age |
| 5- | a) seen illusion b)visional illusion c) optical illusion |
| 6- | a) yellow lie b) white lie c) red lie |
| 7- | a)clinical death b) bed death c)sleep death |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 8- | a) hard pain b) sever pain c) sharp pain |
| 9- | a) bad visibility b) poor visibility c) little visibility |
| 10- | a)wide awake b) good awake c) comprehensive awake |
| 11- | a)burning ambition b)destroying ambition c) vanishing ambition |
| 12- | a) heavy coffee b) strong coffee c) dark coffee |
| 13- | a) wet blood b) cold blood c) hot blood |
| 14- | a) strong drinker b) heavy drinker c) much drinker |
| 15- | a)thin excuse b)silly excuse c) bad excuse |

APPENDIX C: The Final Draft of the Written Interview:

Part four: Written interview

You are invited to respond to the following questions appropriately .

Tick the most suitable choice to you:

| | |
|----|---|
| 1- | How much time do you spend watching programs in English such as TV News a day? <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Less than one hour <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3 hours <input type="checkbox"/> more than 4 hours |
| 2- | How much time do you spend surfing English websites a day? <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Less than one hour <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3 hours <input type="checkbox"/> more than 4 hours |
| 3- | How much time do you spend listening to English programs on the radio a day? <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Less than one hour <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3 hours <input type="checkbox"/> more than 4 hours |
| 4- | How much time do you spend going out with native English speaking friends a day? <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Less than one hour <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3 hours <input type="checkbox"/> more than 4 hours |

| | |
|----|--|
| 5- | <p>How much time do you spend listening to English rhyme or songs?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>None <input type="checkbox"/>Less than one hour <input type="checkbox"/>1-3 hours <input type="checkbox"/> more than 4 hours</p> |
| 6- | <p>How much time do you spend watching English movies a day?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>None <input type="checkbox"/>Less than one hour <input type="checkbox"/>1-3 hours <input type="checkbox"/> more than 4 hours</p> |
| 7- | <p>How much time do you spend reading English books a day?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>None <input type="checkbox"/>Less than one hour <input type="checkbox"/>1-3 hours <input type="checkbox"/> more than 4 hours</p> |
| 8- | <p>How much time do you spend chatting with English friends online a day?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>None <input type="checkbox"/>Less than one hour <input type="checkbox"/>1-3 hours <input type="checkbox"/> more than 4 hours</p> |
| 9- | <p>How much time do you spend speaking with native English speakers a day?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>None <input type="checkbox"/>Less than one hour <input type="checkbox"/>1-3 hours <input type="checkbox"/> more than 4 hours</p> |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 10 | <p>How much time do you spend attending English lectures a day?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>None <input type="checkbox"/>Less than one hour <input type="checkbox"/>1-3 hours <input type="checkbox"/> more than 4 hours</p> |
| 11- | <p>How much time do you spend writing short stories, poems or reports?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>None <input type="checkbox"/>Less than one hour <input type="checkbox"/>1-3 hours <input type="checkbox"/> more than 4 hours</p> |

APPENDIX E: The Authorization Letter Addressed to AL-Azhar University

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



الجامعة الإسلامية - غزة
The Islamic University - Gaza

هاتف داخلي: 1150

عمادة الدراسات العليا

الرقم... ج.م.ع. / 35 / 2012

التاريخ... 2012/03/25

الأخ الأستاذ الدكتور/ نائب الرئيس للشئون الأكاديمية
جامعة الأزهر - غزة

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته،

تسهيل مهمة طالب ماجستير

تهديكم عمادة الدراسات العليا بالجامعة الإسلامية بغزة أعطر تحياتها، وترجو من سيادتكم التكرم بتسهيل مهمة الطالب/ أحمد عبد الوهاب يوسف مقداد، برقم جامعي 120100439 المسجل في برنامج الماجستير بكلية التربية تخصص مناهج وطرق تدريس، وذلك بهدف تطبيق أدوات دراسته والحصول على المعلومات التي تساعد في إعدادها والمعنونة بـ

The Role of the Mother Tongue on the Production and Reception of Collocations by English Majors at the Palestinian Universities

شاكرين لكم حسن تعاونكم،

عميد الدراسات العليا

أ.د. فؤاد علي العاجز



مع بلوائف
أ.د. ع. م. م.
٢٠١٢/٤/١



مركز عميد الدراسات العليا
مركز عميد طلبة الدراسات
مركز عميد كلية التربية
التكرم بالعلم والعمل التسهيلي
٢٠١٢/٤/١

أ.ع. أحمد عبد
صورة إلى:-
تسهيل مهمة الطالب
اللف.
١-4-2012

APPENDIX F : The Authorization Letter Addressed to AL-Aqsa University.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



الجامعة الإسلامية - غزة
The Islamic University - Gaza

هاتف داخلي: 1150

عمادة الدراسات العليا

الرقم: ...ج من ع/35/..... Ref

التاريخ: 2012/03/25 Date

الأخ الأستاذ الدكتور/ نائب الرئيس للشئون الأكاديمية حفظه الله،
جامعة الأقصى - غزة

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته،

تسهيل مهمة طالب ماجستير

تهديكم عمادة الدراسات العليا بالجامعة الإسلامية بغزة أعطر تحياتها، وترجو من سيادتكم التكرم بتسهيل مهمة الطالب/ أحمد عبد الوهاب يوسف مقداد، برقم جامعي 120100439 المسجل في برنامج الماجستير بكلية التربية تخصص **مناهج وطرق تدريس**، وذلك بهدف تطبيق أدوات دراسته والحصول على المعلومات التي تساعده في إعدادها والمعنونة بـ

The Role of the Mother Tongue on the Production and Reception of Collocations by English Majors at the Palestinian Universities

شاكزين لكم حسن تعاونكم،

عميد الدراسات العليا

أ.د. فؤاد علي العاجز



استاذ الدكتور/ عميد كلية الدراسات العليا
أ.د. فؤاد علي العاجز
عميد الدراسات العليا
جامعة الأقصى - غزة

APPENDIX G: COLLOCATIONS SELECTION:

The following table shows verb-noun collocations extracted from the previous studies

achieve goal/administer a test/admit defeat/ adopt policy/advise action/break deadlock/bring end/ cancel order/Catch cold/make a mistake/catch train/catch fish/catch fire/ catch mail/ close door/do job/do work/do research/make an excuse/ hold a discussion/explode a myth/ express opinion/commit a murder/take a break/ shake hand/take time/take turn/take vacation/take risk/take walk/take place/bring peace/ catch breath/catch eye/catch fire/catch glimpse/cut cost/cut price/cut rate/cut tax/ carry weight/change mind/do job/draw attention/draw conclusion/ face problem/find way/find place/find job/follow path/follow example/ get call/get ride/get message/get answer/get job/turn attention/give advice/give answer/give chance/give example/give information/ give speech/give way/ keep eye/keep distance/lose sight/lose money/lose weight/shed light/show talent/receive treatment/receive message/receive support/make difference/make decision/make friend/make face/make sense/make use/ make visit/make call/ make appointment/make wall/make progress/make success/make conversation/make contact/make love/make name/make joke/make reservation/make check/make effort/make point/make law/make call/meet standard/meet requirement/meet need/pay visit/play role/play part/put end/put money/put pressure/raise money/run country/set example/set fire/set record/set standard/solve problem/stand chance/stand trail/take account/take action/take

advantage/take part/take look/take job/take test/take trip/take
pick/take holiday/take bus/take boat/take care/take turn/ take
picture/take vacation/take time/take walk/take year/take chance/take
control/take place/take hand/take walk/take step/take seat/take
pride/take pleasure/tell difference/set fire/set example/put
pressure/express anger/make judgment/make list/make room/make
rule/make profit/make payment/make success/make statement/make
sacrifice/make copy/make advance/make movie/make choice/make
claim/ run business/run race/run riot/spend time/pass exam/have
sex/have trouble/have effect/ use force/open door/hold hand/tell
truth/raise question/hold meeting/give reason/fight war/send
message/answer questions/tell story/send letter/see reason/set
precedent/improve image/break oath/break heart/break law/break
silence/break code/harm brain/give birth/wear makeup/cast
doubt/mock raid/boost moral/take route/forge signature/shrug
shoulder/renovate house/arouse interest/acquire knowledge/relieve
pressure/compose music/set alarm/reject appeal/keep
competition/make proposal/pay attention/propose action/draw
distinction/reach conclusion/draw comparison/commit suicide/make
impression/inflict wound/express concern/light fire/cash
cheque/clear table/resist temptation/emit pollutants/satisfy
need/withdraw money/make impression/keep diary.

APPENDIX H: COLLOCATIONS SELECTION:

The following table provides adjective-noun collocations extracted from the previous studies:

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| Absolute poverty/ | acute shortage/addled | egg/addled |
| brain/agricultural implements/artificial limbs/bake | screech/barren | |
| argument/barren land/best regards/best wishes/big | mistake/black | |
| horse/black eye/bleak prospect/bilateral talks/bright | color/broken | |
| English/burning ambition/capital punishment/classical | music/close | |
| friends/close interest/dark horse/dense | traffic/desperate | |
| attempt/disappointing results/drafting | committee/extenuating | |
| circumstances/false teeth/fast food/final results/fine | arts/fine | |
| weather/flimsy excuse/frozen food/full time/golden | age/hardened | |
| criminal/harmful effect/harsh measurements/heavy | buyer/heavy | |
| drinker/heavy rain/heavy traffic/high ambition/high | tide/high | |
| winds/ill effect/immediate family/important | device/last | |
| chance/lasting peace/light drizzle/low tide/middle | class/missing | |
| link/mutual cooperation/negative effect/old | age/political | |
| party/preliminary results/prevaling silence/profound | effect/public | |
| opinion/quick glance/red tape/religious instructions/residential | | |
| area/rising generation/rough estimate/ | rough sea/second | |
| thoughts/sharp pain/short cut/soft drinks/sterner | sex/stifling | |
| atmosphere/strong coffee/Subsidential meal/thin | excuse/torrential | |
| rain/wet paint/white coal/white current/white horse/white | lie/ | |