بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَٰنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قَالُوا۟ سُبْحَٰنَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَآ إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَآ ۖ إِنَّكَ أَنتَ ٱلْعَلِيمُ ٱلْحَكِيمُ

صدق الله العظيم

(سورة البقرة – آيه32)

هيئة التحريـــر

– د. علي سالم جمعة	رئيساً
– د. أنور عمر أبوشينة	عضواً
– د. أحمد مريحيل حربيش	عضواً

المجلة علمية ثقافية محكمة نصف سنوية تصدر عن جامعة المرقب /كلية الآداب الخمس، وتنشر بها البحوث والدراسات الأكاديمية المعنية بالمشكلات والقضايا المجتمعية المعاصرة في مختلف تخصصات العلوم الانسانية.

قواعد ومعايير النشر

-تهتم المجلة بنشر الدراسات والبحوث الأصيلة التي تتسم بوضوح المنهجية ودقة التوثيق في حقول الدراسات المتخصصة في اللغة العربية والانجليزية والدراسات الاسلامية والشعر والأدب والتاريخ والجغرافيا والفلسفة وعلم الاجتماع والتربية وعلم النفس وما يتصل بها من حقول المعرفة.

-ترحب المجلة بنشر التقارير عن المؤتمرات والندوات العلمية المقامة داخل الجامعة على أن لا يزيد عدد الصفحات عن خمس صفحات مطبوعة.

-نشر البحوث والنصوص المحققة والمترجمة ومراجعات الكتب المتعلقة بالعلوم الإنسانية والاجتماعية ونشر البحوث والدراسات العلمية النقدية الهادفة إلى تقدم المعرفة العلمية والإنسانية.

-ترحب المجلة بعروض الكتب على ألا يتجاوز تاريخ إصدارها ثلاثة أعوام ولا يزيد حجم العرض عن صفحتين مطبوعتين وأن يذكر الباحث في عرضه المعلومات التالية (اسم المؤلف كاملاً- عنوان الكتاب- مكان وتاريخ النشر-عدد صفحات الكتاب-اسم الناشر- نبذة مختصرة عن مضمونه- تكتب البيانات السالفة الذكر بلغة الكتاب).

ضوابط عامة للمجلة

ـ يجب أن يتسم البحث بالأسلوب العلمي النزيه الهادف ويحتوى على مقومات ومعايير المنهجية العلمية في اعداد البحوث.

– يُشترط في البحوث المقدمة للمجلة أن تكون أصيلة ولم يسبق أن نشرت أو قدمت للنشر في مجلة أخرى أو أية جهة ناشرة اخرة. وأن يتعهد الباحث بذلك خطيا عند تقديم البحث، وتقديم إقراراً بأنه سيلتزم بكافة الشروط والضوابط المقررة

في المجلة، كما أنه لا يجوز يكون البحث فصلا أو جزءاً من رسالة (ماجستير – دكتوراه) منشورة، أو كتاب منشور .

ـ لغة المجلة هي العربية ويمكن أن تقبل بحوثا بالإنجليزية أو بأية لغة أخرى، بعد موافقة هيئة التحرير .ـ

– تحتفظ هيئة التحرير بحقها في عدم نشر أي بحث وتُعدُّ قراراتها نهائية، وتبلغ الباحث باعتذارها فقط اذا لم يتقرر نشر البحث، ويصبح البحث بعد قبوله حقا محفوظا للمجلة ولا يجوز النقل منه إلا بإشارة إلى المجلة.

–لا يحق للباحث إعادة نشر بحثه في أية مجلة علمية أخرى بعد نشره في مجلة الكلية ، كما لا يحق له طلب استرجاعه سواء قُبِلَ للنشر أم لم يقبل.

–تخضع جميع الدراسات والبحوث والمقالات الواردة إلى المجلة للفحص العلمي، بعرضها على مُحكِّمين مختصين (محكم واحد لكل بحث) تختارهم هيئة التحرير على نحو سري لتقدير مدى صلاحية البحث للنشر، ويمكن ان يرسل الى محكم اخر وذلك حسب تقدير هيئة التحرير .

– يبدي المقيم رأيه في مدى صلاحية البحث للنشر في تقرير مستقل مدعماً بالمبررات على أن لا تتأخر نتائج التقييم عن شهر من تاريخ إرسال البحث إليه، ويرسل قرار المحكمين النهائي للباحث ويكون القرار إما:

* قبول البحث دون تعديلات.

*قبول البحث بعد تعديلات وإعادة عرضه على المحكم.

*رفض البحث.

–تقوم هيئة تحرير المجلة بإخطار الباحثين بآراء المحكمين ومقترحاتهم إذ كان

المقال أو البحث في حال يسمح بالتعديل والتصحيح، وفي حالة وجود تعديلات طلبها المقيم وبعد موافقة الهيئة على قبول البحث للنشر قبولاً مشروطاً بإجراء التعديلات يطلب من الباحث الأخذ بالتعديلات في فترة لا تتجاوز أسبوعين من تاريخ استلامه للبحث، ويقدم تقريراً يبين فيه رده على المحكم، وكيفية الأخذ بالملاحظات والتعديلات المطلوبة.

–ترسل البحوث المقبولة للنشر إلى المدقق اللغوي ومن حق المدقق اللغوي أن يرفض البحث الذي تتجاوز أخطاؤه اللغوية الحد المقبول.

– تنشر البحوث وفق أسبقية وصولها إلى المجلة من المحكم، على أن تكون مستوفية الشروط السالفة الذكر.

–الباحث مسئول بالكامل عن صحة النقل من المراجع المستخدمة كما أن هيئة تحرير المجلة غير مسئولة عن أية سرقة علمية تتم في هذه البحوث.

– ترفق مع البحث السيرة علمية (CV) مختصرة قدر الإمكان تتضمن الاسم الثلاثي للباحث ودرجته العلمية ونخصصه الدقيق، وجامعته وكليته وقسمه، وأهم مؤلفاته، والبريد الالكتروني والهاتف ليسهل الاتصال به.

– يخضع ترتيب البحوث في المجلة لمعايير فنية تراها هيئة التحرير.

–تقدم البحوث الى مكتب المجلة الكائن بمقر الكلية، او ترسل إلى بريد المجلة الإلكتروني.

–اذا تم ارسال البحث عن طريق البريد الالكتروني او صندوق البريد يتم ابلاغ الباحث بوصول بحثه واستلامه.

– يترتب على الباحث، في حالة سحبه لبحثه او إبداء رغبته في عدم متابعة

إجراءات التحكيم والنشر ، دفع الرسوم التي خصصت للمقيمين.

شروط تفصيلية للنشر في المجلة

ـعنوان البحث: يكتب العنوان باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية. ويجب أن يكون العنوان مختصرا قدر الإمكان ويعبر عن هدف البحث بوضوح ويتبع المنهجية العلمية من حيث الإحاطة والاستقصاء وأسلوب البحث العلمي.

ـ يذكر الباحث على الصفحة الأولى من البحث اسمه ودرجته العلمية والجامعة او المؤسسة الأكاديمية التي يعمل بها.

ـأن يكون البحث مصوغاً بإحدى الطريقتين الآتيتين:ـ

1:البحوث الميدانية: يورد الباحث مقدمة يبين فيها طبيعة البحث ومبرراته ومدى الحاجة إليه، ثم يحدد مشكلة البحث، ويجب أن يتضمن البحث الكلمات المفتاحية (مصطلحات البحث)، ثم يعرض طريقة البحث وأدواته، وكيفية تحليل بياناته، ثم يعرض نتائج البحث ومناقشتها والتوصيات المنبثقة عنها، وأخيراً قائمة المراجع.

2:البحوث النظرية التحليلية: يورد الباحث مقدمة يمهد فيها لمشكلة البحث مبيناً فيها أهميته وقيمته في الإضافة إلى العلوم والمعارف وإغنائها بالجديد، ثم يقسم العرض بعد ذلك إلى أقسام على درجة من الاستقلال فيما بينها، بحيث يعرض في كل منها فكرة مستقلة ضمن إطار الموضوع الكلي ترتبط بما سبقها وتمهد لما يليها، ثم يختم الموضوع بخلاصة شاملة له، وأخيراً يثبت قائمة المراجع.

ـيقدم الباحث ثلاث نسخ ورقية من البحث، وعلى وجه واحد من الورقة(A4) واحدة منها يكتب عليها اسم الباحث ودرجته العلمية، والنسخ الأخرى تقدم ويكتب عليها عنوان البحث فقط، ونسخة الكترونية على(Cd) باستخدام البرنامج الحاسوبي(MS Word).

– يجب ألا تقل صفحات البحث عن 20 صفحة ولا تزيد عن30 صفحة بما في ذلك صفحات الرسوم والأشكال والجداول وقائمة المراجع .

–يرفق مع البحث ملخصان (باللغة العربية والانجليزية) في حدود (150) كلمة لكل منهما، وعلى ورقتين منفصلتين بحيث يكتب في أعلى الصفحة عنوان البحث ولا يتجاوز الصفحة الواحدة لكل ملخص.

–يُترك هامش مقداره 3 سم من جهة التجليد بينما تكون الهوامش الأخرى 2.5 سم، المسافة بين الأسطر مسافة ونصف، يكون نوع الخط المستخدم في المتن Times New Roman 12 للغة الانجليزية و مسافة و نصف بخط Simplified Arabic 14 للأبحاث باللغة العربية.

–في حالة وجود جداول وأشكال وصور في البحث يكتب رقم وعنوان الجدول أو الشكل والصورة في الأعلى بحيث يكون موجزاً للمحتوى وتكتب الحواشي في الأسفل بشكل مختصر كما يشترط لتنظيم الجداول اتباع نظام الجداول المعترف به في جهاز الحاسوب ويكون الخط بحجم 12.

–يجب أن ترقم الصفحات ترقيماً متسلسلاً بما في ذلك الجداول والأشكال والصور واللوحات وقائمة المراجع .

طريقة التوثيق:

–يُشار إلى المصادر والمراجع في متن البحث بأرقام متسلسلة توضع بين قوسين إلى الأعلى هكذا: (1)، (2)، (3)، ويكون ثبوتها في أسفل صفحات البحث، وتكون أرقام التوثيق متسلسلة موضوعة بين قوسين في أسفل كل صفحة، فإذا كانت أرقام التوثيق في الصفحة الأولى مثلاً قد انتهت عند الرقم (6) فإن الصفحة التالية ستبدأ بالرقم (1).

-ويكون توثيق المصادر والمراجع على النحو الآتي:

اولا :الكتب المطبوعة: اسم المؤلف ثم لقبه، واسم الكتاب مكتوبا بالبنط الغامق، واسم المحقق أو المترجم، والطبعة، والناشر، ومكان النشر، وسنته، ورقم المجلد – إن تعددت المجلدات– والصفحة. مثال: أبو عثمان عمرو بن بحر الجاحظ، الحيوان. تحقيق وشرح: عبد السلام محمد هارون، ط2، مصطفى البابي الحلبي، القاهرة، 1965م،ج3،ص40. ويشار إلى المصدر عند وروده مرة ثانية على النحو الآتي: الجاحظ، الحيوان، ج، ص.

ثانيا: الكتب المخطوطة: اسم المؤلف ولقبه، واسم الكتاب مكتوبا بالبنط الغامق، واسم المخطوط مكتوبا بالبنط الغامق، ومكان المخطوط، ورقمه، ورقم اللوحة أو الصفحة. مثال: شافع بن علي الكناني، الفضل المأثور من سيرة السلطان الملك المنصور. مخطوط مكتبة البودليان باكسفورد، مجموعة مارش رقم (424)، ورقة 50.

ثالثا: الدوريات: اسم كاتب المقالة، عنوان المقالة موضوعاً بين علامتي تنصيص " "، واسم الدورية مكتوباً بالبنط الغامق، رقم المجلد والعدد والسنة، ورقم الصفحة، مثال: جرار، صلاح: "عناية السيوطي بالتراث الأندلسي– مدخل"، مجلة جامعة القاهرة للبحوث والدراسات، المجلد العاشر، العدد الثاني، سنة 1415ه/ 1995م، ص179.

رابعا: الآيات القرآنية والاحاديث النبوية:– تكتب الآيات القرآنية بين قوسين مزهرين بالخط العثماني﴿ ﴾ مع الإشارة إلى السورة ورقم الآية. وتثبت الأحاديث النبوية بين قوسين مزدوجين « » بعد تخريجها من مظانها.

ملاحظة: لا توافق هيئة التحرير على تكرار نفس الاسم (اسم الباحث) في عددين متتالين وذلك لفتح المجال امام جميع اعضاء هيئة التدريس للنشر.

فهرس المحتويات

Libyan EFL Learners' Use of English Lexical Collocations

Dr. Zainab Ahmed[•]

_____

ABSTRACT

One of the most challenging problems for EFL students is to be able to express themselves not just grammatically but also acceptably and naturally in English in appropriate contexts. The ability to produce acceptable and natural expressions in English is closely related to the EFL students' competence in collocation-which words go together in normal usage.

  In the light of this problem, this study aims at investigating the Libyan EFL learners' use of the English lexical collocations. The theoretical part of this study presents a discussion of lexical collocations in Arabic and English. The practical part is intended to statistically measure the Libyan EFL learners' ability to use English lexical collocations accurately.

  The statistics shows a low level of performance on the Libyan EFL learners' part. It is also concluded that the learners employ literal transfer from their mother tongue, substitution, and generalization as communicative strategies to overcome their deficiency in using the English lexical collocations accurately.

KEYWORDS:
 Collocation, idioms, free combination, fixed expressions, EFL/ ESL
language learners

_____

[•] Al-Jabal Al- Gharbi University, Faculty of Education / Yefren / Libya

----

Introduction

Collocations are considered as one of the features that differentiate native speakers from non-native speakers of English. Lewis (1997) states that native speakers carry hundreds of thousands, possibly millions, of lexical chunks in their heads, ready to draw upon, in order to produce fluent, accurate and meaningful language. In other words, native speakers intuitively know which words frequently combine and which do not. As claimed by Williams (2000), "automation of collocation" helps native speakers fluently express themselves since it provides "chunks" that are ready to use. Second language learners, however, lacking this automation of collocation, may make non-native errors when producing utterances.

The lack of collocational competence often leads learners to "create longer utterances, because they do not know the collocations which express precisely what they want to say" (Lewis, 2000). As claimed by McCarthy and O'Dell, (2005: 6) collocations" ... give you the most natural way to say something: smoking is strictly forbidden is more natural than

smoking is strongly forbidden"

Hence, collocations as a specific area within lexis are of particular importance and recognized

as one of the challenges that EFL learners encounter in their journey of English language learning. Different researchers in ESL/ EFL have found that L2 learners from different

proficiency levels face difficulties in combining words together, resulting in texts that are not native-like. Wardell (1991) points out that one peculiarity of the English of second language learners is the failure of these learners to

produce collocations in the proper order. In Lewis'

(2000: 8) words:

> "the single most important task facing language learners is acquiring a sufficiently large vocabulary. We now recognise that much of our 'vocabulary' consists of prefabricated chunks of different kinds. The single most important chunk is collocation. Self-evidently, then, teaching collocation should be a top priority in every language course."

One reason for this may be due to the fact that unlike native speakers, L2 learners seem to focus on learning individual words and gradually building up bigger units, so it becomes particularly hard for them to establish strong associations between pairs of words forming collocations (Schmitt 2010; Wray, 2002). As a result, L2 learners tend to resort to a creative mechanism to combine isolated words, rather than store, retrieve and produce ready-made collocations.

Consequently, second language learners need to be aware that an essential requirement for the overall mastery of L2 is the ability to comprehend and produce collocations as unanalyzed chunks in order to achieve native-like competence and fluency, i.e. in order to speak a language the way its native speakers do (Brashi, 2009). Thus, collocations require to be given more focus because they help learners not only to understand lexis but also to communicate ideas more effectively in writing and speaking.

Collocation is one of the most difficult problems for EFL Libyan students. Not many of them are aware of the existence of collocations due to dominance of the grammar-translation approach which has played a key

role in the teaching of English in Libya for decades. Willis (1990) considers that, at present, the knowledge of language that teachers offer learners is heavily loaded towards grammar, and teachers need to pay more attention to lexical elements in classrooms as, if teachers emphasize grammar too much, the students are less likely to be able to create a significant and native-like output in language terms.

Given these considerations, it is the focus of the present study to examine the knowledge of English lexical collocations of EFL Libyan learners.

Rationale and purpose of the study

The importance of collocations and the difficulties they pose to EFL/ESL learners have been understood by various second language acquisition researchers (Bahns and Eldaw, 1993; Bahns, 1993; Channell, 1981; Lewis, 1993; Willis, 1990). These researchers agree that learners' knowledge of lexical collocations is an essential requirement for the overall mastery of their second language. Yet, despite the important role that collocations have in language acquisition, relatively few studies have been conducted to investigate the English lexical collocation knowledge of EFL Arabic-speaking learners (e.g., Al- Zahrani, 1998; Farghal and Obiedant, 1995; Hussein, 1990; Zughoul and Abdul-Fattah, 2003; and Shehata, 2008). Suffice to say, and to the knowledge of the researcher, to date no studies have been conducted in order to investigate the knowledge of English lexical collocations of EFL Libyan students who are English majors.

In addition to what has been said about the importance of collocation in language learning, the present study has been motivated by the

observation that, even at intermediate to advanced stages, Libyan learners of English have considerable difficulties in using English. In other words, they often remain stuck at a certain level of language competence, even though the majority of them are familiar with the basic, and most common, grammatical structures of English language. This inefficiency seems to be due, to some extent, to the lack of collocational knowledge among Libyan EFL students.

Many factors contribute to this problem, including the unawareness of Libyan learners 0f the importance of collocations in language learning, the teaching methods used, the inadequate emphasis given to collocational patterns in the content of the syllabus and the type of instructions they receive. As a result, students graduate from schools with a very low ability to communicate or to express themselves properly in English in real life situations.

Therefore, there is a need to investigate the English lexical collocation knowledge of Libyan Arab EFL University students and know what problems they encounter when using English lexical collocations.

Theoretical background

The literature shows that knowledge of collocations is an important and necessary one for the successful learning of language in general and vocabulary learning in particular. Hill (1999) contends that 'collocation is the key to fluency' both in written and oral language. In addition, Hill (ibid.) claims that learning words in chunks improves pronunciation and intonation, and speeds up reading through the chunking of phrases. Previous research also shows that unfamiliarity with collocations often leads to serious problems in language production.

Definition of collocation

The term 'collocation' was first used in the 18th century (Carter & McCarthy 1988:32) but as a formed concept it was firmly grounded only in the 20th century. Collocation as a linguistic phenomenon was studied in association with lexical semantics by Greek Stoic philosophers as early as 2,300 years ago (Robins, 1967:21 cited in Gitsaki, 1991). Robins (1967) states that Greek Stoic philosophers rejected the equation of "one word, one meaning" and put forward an important aspect of the semantic structure of language. They believed that "word meanings do not exist in isolation, and they may differ according to the collocation in which they are used" (Robins, 1967:21). This view of word collocations has continued to be central to the study of language at the present time. The majority of linguists have come to recognize the fact that certain fixed expressions, among which collocations are, are stored in the memory of native speakers of a language as whole chunks and are used, as such. in their written and oral production.

Idioms/Collocation/Free Combination

It is obvious that there is significant disagreement and a lack of clarity in the definition of collocations among different linguists. What additionally makes the issue unclear is the fact that sometimes collocations are categorized as idioms, since it is often thought that no clear distinction can be made between a collocation and an idiom (e.g.Wallace, 1979; Sinclair, 1991). For instance, Smith (1947, cited in Brashi, 2005) considers collocations as idiomatic expressions, in which two words are habitually combined together for the sake of emphasis. For example, far and away

(emphatic), over and over (emphatic repetition), part and parcel (emphasis by alliteration), fair and square (emphasis by rhyme), heads or tails (emphasis by the contrast of two words), now and then (emphasis by inclusive phrases). Similarly, Wallace (1979) does not seem to differentiate between collocations, proverbs and idioms. He perceives collocations (e.g., to be honest with) and proverbs (e.g., don '(count your chickens before they are hatched) as subcategories of idioms.

Sinclair (1991) also gives a very general definition of a collocation: "A collocation is the occurrence of two or more words within a short space of each other in a text" (1991: 170). He suggests, as a measure of proximity, a maximum of four words intervening in between standing together. Certainly, this defmition suggests that all occurrences of two or more words, including idioms, are considered to be collocations. Again, this dissipates the technical usefulness of the notion of collocation to the point where almost any fixed forms of expression can act as such.

Bollinger, on the other hand, does not think that it is necessary to make a differentiation of the three word combinations and says that "it is of course, a matter of terminology whether collocations should be classed separately from idioms or as a major sub-class" (1976: 5).

However, there are other linguists who draw a clear line between collocations, idioms and free combinations (Aisenstadt, 1981; Benson Benson & Ilson, 1997; Carter, 1982; Cowan, 1989; Cowie and Howarth, 1996). Among the most reliable criteria are ' 'fixedness" including restrictions on both syntactic and lexical variability, "semantic

transparency" or "semantic compositionality" and "frequency" of co-occurrence

Classification of Collocations

Various classifications of collocations can be made through investigations of different criteria which can form a basis for the classifications. In his study of collocation, Firth (1957) includes not only usual collocations but also unusual collocations. This classification seems to be based on the frequency of co-occurrence since usual collocations are more frequent and can be utilized in various fields while unusual collocations are more restricted technical or personal collocations.

Sinclair (1991, 115) uses the same criterion as he makes a distinction between casual collocations and significant collocations. According to him, a collocation is said to be 'significant' if the probability of co-occurrence is in a higher degree than that which he calls 'casual' collocations. The words dog and bark would very likely constitute a significant collocation since bark is expected to be found near the word dog. Sinclair is inclined to exclude those items that are very frequent in all kinds of texts - noticeably grammatical words - which are participating members of significant collocations. Perhaps this inclination is based on his commitment to a view that lexis is a separate and independent level of grammar.

Later on in his studies Sinclair slightly changes his attitude and forms an integrated approach by which both lexical and grammatical aspects of collocations are taken into consideration. As a result, he divides collocations into two categories: upward and downward collocations in which upward collocations include prepositions, adverbs, conjunctions, and pronouns that collocate with words more frequently used than

themselves. For example, Sinclair notes that the word back collocates with at. down. from, into. on and then, all of which are more frequent words than back. Downward collocations, on the other hand, include verbs and nouns that collocate with words less frequently used than they are. Again, Sinclair uses the example of the word back giving arrive, bring and climbed as examples of less frequently occurring words that collocate with back. He makes a sharp distinctions between these two categories claiming that the elements of upward collocations (mostly prepositions, adverbs, conjunctions, pronouns) tend to form grammatical frames while the elements of the downward collocations (mostly nouns and verbs), by contrast, give a semantic analysis of a word.

> There appears to be a systematic difference between upward and downward collocation. Upward collocation, of course, is the weaker pattern in statistical terms, and the words tend to be elements of grammatical frames, or superordinates. Downward collocation by contrast gives us a semantic analysis of a word. (Sinclair 1991:116)

Carter (1987) divides collocations into four categories, depending on how restricted they are: 'unrestricted', which collocate freely with a number of lexical items, e.g. take a lookJa holiday/a rest/a letter/take time/take notice/a walk: 'semi-restricted', in which the number of adequate substitutes which can replace the elements of collocation is more limited, e.g. harbour doubt/grudgesluncertainty/suspicion. The other two categories include 'familiar' collocations whose elements collocate on a regular basis, e.g. unrequited love, lukewarm reception and 'restricted' collocations which are fixed and inflexible, e.g. dead drunk, pretty sure.

Lewis (2000, 63) lays down the criterion of "collocational strength" to classify collocations. His classification is pedagogically motivated. For him collocations are of four types: "unique collocations", "strong collocations", "medium strength collocations" and "weak collocations". In a unique collocation like foot the bill one cannot imagine footing the invoice or footing the coffee. This shows the uniqueness of foot in the collocation. Similarly, one shrugs our shoulders but not other parts of one's anatomy. Examples of strong collocations are trenchant criticism or rancid butter. Although this does not mean that other things cannot be trenchant or rancid, the collocational bond is too strong. In Lewis' view the medium strength collocations are of prime importance in expanding learners' mental lexicons. Make a mistake and significantly different are examples of medium strong collocations. A white shirt and red wine represent weak collocations. Although many things can be white or red there is something more predictable and so more collocations about these examples.

Review of literature:

A number of researchers have attempted to categorize L2 learners' problems with acquiring collocational competence (Halliday and Hasan 1976, Korosadowicz-Struzynska, 1980; Bahans, 1993; Farghal & Obiedate, 1995, Gitsak, 1999; Biskup, 1992; Granger, 1998; Gitsaki, 1999; Bahns & Eldaw, 2000; Zughoul and Hussein, 2001; Nesselhauf, 2003; Mahumed, 2005).

Korosadowicz-Struzynska (1980) reports that students face interlingual and intralingual problems in the use of collocations and even advanced students who have considerable fluency of expression in a foreign

language make collocational errors. As a consequence, Korosadowicz-Struzynska considers the teaching and learning of collocations for production reasons is essential for EFL learners and describes certain steps that should be followed in order to promote the teaching of collocations from the initial stages of foreign language learning.

Halliday (1961) called collocation "the most problematic part of lexical cohesion" (p. 288). Collocations are very often language-specific and, therefore, will cause frequent language (production) mistakes and communication breakdown. That is, they may present a problem to the EFL/ESL learner when the native language meaning equivalent uses different collocations. Palmer (1979) also stressed that collocations and phrases are problematic for both native speakers and learners of English. There is, in fact, evidence that even native speakers

have difficulty collocating certain words in increasingly formal written contexts

Interlingual problems (i.e. transfer from the mother tongue) are considered as one of the common factors which cause problems for EFLIESL learners. Mahmoud (2000) points out that the availability of a native language to foreign language learners brings about a difference between the mother tongue and other tongues in the sense that the native language is an additional source of linguistic knowledge. Littlewood (1984:26) illustrates that learners use their previous mother tongue experience as a means of organizing the second or foreign language data and to make sense of such a new experience. This means that learners do not have to discover everything from zero. In other words, their L 1 collocational knowledge may represent their assumption that there is a

one-to-one correspondence between L 1 and L2 collocational choices.

Thereby, as Mahmoud (2005) argues, 'the influence of the mother tongue and the pervasiveness of interlingual transfer is indisputable, especially in learning situations where the students' exposure to the foreign language is confmed to a few hours per week of formal classroom instruction'. Hence, insufficient exposure to the target language could make it be filtered through the native language at all linguistic levels and could give rise to different errors (Rivers, 1983). This language transfer becomes a learning strategy that most foreign language learners fall back on (Odlin, 1989 and Mahmoud, 2002).

Research by Bahans (1993), Bahans & Eldaw (1993), Farghal & Obiedant (1995) indicate that learners lacking collocational knowledge rely heavily on LI as the only source and thus do better in those collocations that have L I equivalents than those do not.

Nesselhauf (2003) provides support for the previously mentioned studies in stating that L 1 influence, in her study of collocations used by German EFL learners, is considerable, resulting in several L2 errors. She also confirms the significance of native language impact on L2 collocation learning, suggesting that since L l-L2 collocational incompatibility is a

major source of errors in learner language, English teachers should concentrate on such non-congruent collocations in the two languages in order to prevent learners from committing such transfer errors.

Another probable reason for the difficulty with collocations, as Shokouhi

(2010) argues, is that learners acquire L2 words individually or in isolation, without adequate attention to the relations that words have with one other. In other words, ignorance of restriction rules in word choice. For instance, as Shokouhi (2010) mentions, although many EFL learners appear to know the meanings of big, heavy and smoker, they produced strings like hi~ smoker instead of heavy smoker.

In this regard, Elyildirm (1997) finds evidence, from an examination of the KWIC (key words in context), that students have reasonable knowledge about the key lexis, but are not familiar with the naturally occurring environment in which the word usually occurs. As a result, learners produce many wrong utterances such as:

- This butter is sour.   (rancid)
- My tea is very powerful (strong)
- Flocks of cows   (sheep)
- The enemy used a fatal weapon (lethal)
- Herd of sheep   (cows)

According to Shokouhi (2010), such problems arise partly because of the arbitrary and unpredictable nature of collocations. Moreover, McCarthy et al. (2010) point out that a register could be another way in which learners might create untypical collocations because of their knowledge of single words within a register. For example, Taiwo (2004) gives some examples such as borrow a loan instead of lake out a loan and type the keyboard instead of use the keyboard.

Given all this information, we can say that it is not single words that are

always

difficult for EFL/ESL learners, but multi-word units such as collocations. Therefore,

common combinations of words should be taught, not just the individual words.

Methodology

Research question:

This study attempts to answer the following research question:

1- To what extent do Libyan students majoring in English have knowledge of English lexical collocation?

2- Is there a significant statistical difference between the participants' production and

reception skills relating to lexical collocations in English?

3- What is the effect of Libyan EFL learners' LI on their proficiency in producing lexical collocations in English?

4- Is there a significant statistical difference between participants' proficiency in producing

and recognizing lexical collocations in English and their amount of exposure to the

English language?

5- Are all kinds of lexical collocations equally difficult for Libyan students?

The aim of the study is to examine some EFL learners' knowledge of six

types of English

Collocations (verb+ noun, noun +verb, adjective+ noun, adverb+ verb, adjective+ adverb, noun+ noun)   in terms of their capability to produce some examples of these specific types of collocation correctly.

Participants in the study

This study was conducted at the English Language Department, Al-Jabal Al-Gharbi

University, libya. The participants in this study were senior undergraduate students majoring in English. These students were in their fourth year of study (final year). The participation in this study was voluntary. A total of 245 second and third-year students participated in the present study: 60 students participated in the pilot testing, and 185 participants took the test in the subsequent main test administration. The participants were English major university students randomly drawn from four Faculties of Humanities at AI-Jabal AI-Gharbi University in Libya (it is one of the large universities in Libya located in the North West of the country)

The participants have studied English. on average, for eight years at the rate of four hours per week in preparatory schools, twelve hours per week in secondary schools and eighteen hours per week in the university. Their level of proficiency is intermediate, and they are all speakers of Arabic as their L 1 language and both sexes are represented although the number of females was more than the number of males

Data collection instruments

This study used three data collection instruments. The instruments designed and

used to collect the data of the present study were a a 'multiple-choice test

of English collocations' (Test 1) translation test (test 2) and A self-reporting questionnaire see. In designing the 'blank-filling test of English collocations' for the present study, the researcher used examples from the BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations (Benson et aI., 1997) and the Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English which both provided typical examples of collocations. Moreover, English Collocation in A Use (McCarthy and O'Dell, 2005) and Natural English Collocations Vocabulary Work Book (Marks and Wooder, 2007) were also used as main sources because they offered useful examples used in the real world. In addition, there are some targeted collocations which were adopted from the previous studies which conducted in this area (e.g., Hussien, 1990, and Shokouhi, 2010).

By means of the two tests and the questionnaire. the researcher attempted to explore the participants' lexical collocation knowledge and the relationship between their collocation knowledge and the amount of their exposure to English. The first instrument was a multiple-choice test which was used to assess the participants' performance in lexical collocation knowledge and, in particular. had the aim of measuring the participants' receptive knowledge of lexical collocation. Owing to the limited time available for conducting the survey, both the pilot test and the main test in the study were administered in the multiple-choice format to investigate the participants' receptive knowledge of collocation. The sentences were carefully screened before being chosen as the test items. This test included sixty targeted collocations where one of the constituents of the collocation in question was left out. Three choices were provided to the students, one being the correct response and the other two serving as distracters. For example. in the following sentence, students were asked to choose the

right collocate to complete the following sentence: The jacket is the right size but its colour does not .... me.

a. match; b. suit; c. fit

> For the translation task, the aim of this test was to assess the participants' production knowledge of lexical collocations and to elicit any influence of the participants' LI on their lexical collocation performance. The selected sentences included only the six patterns of lexical collocations mentioned above. The 35 different sentences of the translation task were given to three

The third instrument was a self- reporting questionnaire and was designed partly along the lines followed Shehata (2008). The main aim of the questionnaire was to help create a complete picture of the participants' profile, and to elicit some information about the participants' learning background, as well as to examining whether students had had exposure to learn English from any source other than that of the classroom. The questionnaire items were specifically focused and used Likert because these are highly appreciated by methodologists. The questionnaire contained 10 items and was translated by the researcher into Arabic (the participants' mother tongue see Appendix 5) for fear that some students would not understand the questions if they were given in English and thus could not give proper answers.

Data Collection Procedures

Firstly, the researcher contacted the Head of the English Department at Yefren Faculty of Arts, where the researcher was working as a staff member, and obtained approval to conduct the pilot study and a part of the main study. The researcher met some of the faculty members and

discussed the study with them in detail as well as discussing the necessary steps to be taken to conduct the research. Then the researcher visited other three Faculties at the same university and introduced herself as a doctoral student at Bangor University in the United Kingdom who was conducting research to fulfill the requirements of a Doctoral degree in the field of linguistics and language teaching. After obtaining permission from professors in the four Faculties of Arts at AL-Jabal AI-Gharbi University, the collocation test, the translation task and the questionnaire were administered at the most convenient time for these professors' classes In terms of administration and timing, each subject was allowed sufficient time to work individually on the test items. It took about 60 minutes for all the subjects to be finished in the multiple-choice test and 50 minutes to complete the translation task with a 15 minutes' break between the administration of the collocation test and the translation task. So fatigue was probably not a major factor in the subjects' scores. Both tests were administered in the same classroom and students were separated as much as possible to reduce any cheating to a minimum. Examinee names and other personal information were not evident at the scoring time. Once students finished taking the multiple-choice test, the researcher instructed them to leave the test materials behind on the desk and to take a 15 minutes' break before taking the second test (the translation task). After they left the room, the researcher collected the test materials and stored them by numbers. Next, all the students were given enough time to ftnish the translation task and after they had finished, the researcher collected the answering sheets and added them the previous test materials.

With regard to the questionnaire, the final version included 10 items and it was administered in the same   environment   and   circumstances

associated with the administration of both the collocation test and translation task. The administration of the questionnaire did not take a long time because all its items were clear as a consequence of running the pilot study. However, a few questions were raised by some students regarding how questions should be answered and the meaning of vocabulary. Since the items of the questionnaire did not gather information relating to any sensitive issues, the researcher asked the participants to write their names down. The participants were told to give accurate information and were reassured that confidentiality would be maintained. To make sure that the participants understood all the questions, the researcher went over each of them with the students giving any necessary explanation and translation in the students' mother tongue .In many cases, using L 1 language saves time and conftrms understanding. Once all the students had finished answering the questionnaire, all the questionnaires were collected after the class and coded for further analysis.

Results and discussion

This section will discuss the participants' response to the 'multiple-choice test of English collocations', and to the translation task of English collocation,

As earlier mentioned, the first purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which Libyan university English language majors can use English lexical collocations properly. To gain data about the informants' ability in English lexical collocations, two tests of lexical collocations were administered based on the six patterns of Benson et al. (1986). A multiple-choice test, consisting of 60 items, was intended to elicit the learners' receptive competence in recognizing correct English lexical collocations. Test two was a translation task consisting of 28 items and was intended to

explore the learners' production proficiency in this linguistic phenomenon. Both tasks were viewed as complementary indicators of the learners' overall competence in English lexical collocations.

To answer the first question, the percentage of correct answers of the participants in each test was calculated. Table 1 shows the results, presented as the number and percentage of correct answers of the participants in each test.

	Receptive test (MCQ) =60		Productive test (Translation task)=28	
Number	185		185	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Correct answers	5225	47%	2175	41%
Incorrect answers	5875	53%	3005	58%
Total	11100		5180	

Table 1 Number and percentage of correct answers of the participants an each test

A cursory look at the quantitative results presented in table 1 gives an indicator that the EFL Libyan learners' knowledge of English lexical collocation was lower than would be expected. As indicated in table 1 in, only 47% of the total attempts of all the subjects on the recognition task (multiple-choice test) were correct. The results on the production translation task were even lower and only 41 % of the subjects' answers were correct. This is quite disappointing since these learners have been studying English for at least eight years and they are majoring in an English language department.

Overall, the fmdings obtained from the first research question of this study

are in line with other studies such as Bahns and Eldaw (1993), Farghl and Obiedat (1995), Hussein (1998), Howarth (1998), Bonk (2000), Cooper (2000), Zaghoul and Abdul Fathah (2003), Mohmoud (2005), and EI-Masharawi (2008) which reported low levels of collocational knowledge of EFL learners. For instance, Bahns and Eldaw (1993) state that learners' knowledge of collocation does not develop in parallel with their knowledge of vocabulary and this may be in part due to the fact that learners do not therefore, pay any attention to learning them

The second research question investigated the difference between the performance of participants in their receptive and productive lexical collocation knowledge. A t-test was used to examine whether there was a significant statistical difference between the participants' receptive and productive knowledge of English lexical collocations. From the results obtained, there was a slight difference between the mean scores of the multiple-choice test and the translation task. Although collocational mismatches were frequent in the participants' answer, both productively and receptively, and neither of them reached 50%, a t-test of these two means confirmed that there is a slight difference between them (t=4.281, df=184, p < 0.001). In the light of these results, it is plausible to suggest that lexical collocations types are more difficult at the productive than at the receptive level.

Such a fmding was expected because evidence shows receptive knowledge typically precedes productive mastery. There is a general assumption that a learner's receptive vocabulary knowledge will be different from his/her productive vocabulary knowledge. The number of words that a learner can recognize in the context of speech or writing is likely to be different from the number of words the same learners can call

in mind and use. However, Melka (1997:85-89) points out that boundary between receptive and productive knowledge are fuzzy according to adverse linguistic and pragmatic factors. He argues that receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge is a continuum and it reflects the notion that one has to perceive a word before he/she produces it. In general, the findings of this study are in congruence with many other research findings such as Melka (1997), Caroli (1998), Nation (2000), Wang (200 I), Taeko (2005), Shehatta (2008), Brashi (2009) and Alsakran (2011) which confirmed the common sense views that receptive knowledge of collocations was generally larger than the productive one and it comes before the productive knowledge at all stages of language learning, For instance, Caroli (1998) and Koya (2005) indicated that the participants in their studies were able to judge the correctness and incorrectness of the given collocations on the receptive test, but they encountered difficulties in producing the correct collocation on the productive test.

The influence of the Ll on the participants' knowledge of English lexical collocations was one of the main dimensions under investigation in the current study. To address this question the data were collected from a translation task comprising 28 items based on six patterns of lexical collocation (verb+ noun, noun+ verb, noun+ noun, adjective + noun, verb+ adverb, adverb +adjective). After the data were collected and recorded, approximately 3005 incorrect responses were extracted from the learners' productive test. The Table below (2) shows that interlingual errors are the most common types of errors made by Libyan EFL students. They constituted 67% of the total number of errors, whereas intralingual errors constituted only 33%.

Possible source of collocation errors	Number of errors	Percentage
Interlingal (negative transfer)	2010	67%
Intralingual (over-generalization, the use of improper synonyms, ignorance of rule restrictions, simplification, etc.)	995	33 %

Table 2: The distribution of collocation errors among Libyan EFL learners in test 2 (the translation task).

Based on these results, it was concluded that first language interference in the production of lexical collocation was rather great. The researcher, who is a native speaker of Arabic, arrived at the above conclusions in consultation with one educated Arabic scholar. From the literature, it is plausible to say that deviations resulting from interlingual transfer have been recorded at all linguistic levels,(e.g Gass and Selinker, 1983, Bahns & Eldaw, 1993; Bahns, 1993; Farghal & Obiedat, 1995; Huang, 2001, Zughoul & Abdul-Fattah, 2001, 2003; Nesselhauf, Mohamed, 2005; Shehata 2008; Brashi 2009).

To examine the fourth question that explored whether the participants' self-reported amount of exposure to the English language was linked to the participants' performance on both receptive and productive collocation tests, the Kruskal-Wallis test was used to test for a significant difference in mean percentage of correct answers between the groups. The results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in scores according to how much time respondents spent listening to English radio programmes, English songs, English television, browsing English websites, reading English books and chatting online in English. Those who spent longer engaging in these activities tended to achieve higher scores in the

tests. However, there were very few respondents in the higher categories for the most of the variables. This fmding of this study support Bahns and Sibiles's (1992) and Shehata's (2008) findings in which that the amount of exposure to practical opportunities, real life experience and situations related to the English language can positively help in the acquisition of L2 collocations.

The current study also explores the differences between participants' receptive and productive scores on six patterns of English lexical collocations: adjective + noun, verb + noun, noun+ noun, noun + verb, adverb + adjective, and verb+ adverb. The purpose was to identify which collocation type is most problematic to acquire. To answer this question, repeated measures ANOVA was used to test whether there was a statistically significant within subjects' difference in the mean percentage scores in each lexical collocation pattern. The results from the within subjects ANOV A shows that the difference in average scores is statistically significant for both tests (test 1 F=12.697, p<0.00I and test 2: F=4.965, p=0.00I), i.e. students find some types of lexical collocations more difficult than others in both tests. In test one (the multiple choice test), the verb+ noun collocations has the highest mean score, followed closely by the verb+ adverb collocations. The adverb +adjective collocations were noticeably lower in their mean scores than that of the other types. In test two (translation task), the highest scores was for noun+ verb collocations whereas the adjective + noun followed by the noun + noun collocations patterns had the lowest score compared with the patterns of other target collocations. The results of this study are in agreement with a number of previous studies (Bahans & Eldaw, 1993; Howarth, 1998; Nesselhauf, 2003; Li, 2005; Huang,2007, Hsu & Chiu, 2008) in that they all highlighted the learners' problem with the productive of collocations. But the types

which cause problem for learners in this study slightly differ from those of other studies. For instance, in Zarei's (2010) study, the noun + verb type of lexical collocation was the most difficult type for upper-intermediate Iranian learners of English, whereas this study suggests that the 'adjective noun' and the' adverb+ adjective' types of collocation were the most problematic ones for Libyan EFL learners in productive and receptive levels respectively.

Pedagogical implications

The present study suggests a number of pedagogical implications with regard

to collocations. These can be applied as a generic framework or model for teaching

collocations to EFL/ESL learners. Recommendations are outlined

in a form of a proposed pedagogical framework in order to tackle the issue of collocation problems encountered by Libyan EFL learners and encourage collocations build up. The recommendations that will be mentioned in this section consist of two overlapping parts related to: (1) the concerns of English language teachers, and (2) the learning materials designers.

1- Recommendations for English language teachers

One of the teachers' responsibilities is to provide learners with effective opportunities that will enable them to learn more vocabulary items and retain them for a longer time. According to Schmitt (2010) 'after textbooks, the teacher is probably the next best resource in the classroom for introducing new vocabulary and providing important information on its meaning and use'. Accordingly, based on the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 2, the following practicalities are necessary in

teaching and learning lexical collocations for both EFL teachers and learners (some ideas based on suggestions of Taiwo, 2004; Tang, 2004 and EL-Masharwi, 2008).

*Raising Students' Collocation Awareness

Raising students' awareness of collocations would involve explicitly directing learners' attention to these phrasal elements. Siyanova and Schmitt (2009) claims that the only way to develop good collocation intuition in our learners is to institute a fundamental change in our teaching pedagogies, moving from a focus on individual words towards a focus on phrasal elements. The following could be useful guidelines for stimulating the students' awareness of collocational knowledge and usage.

1- Teachers should introduce words in chunks, and draw their students' attention to the fact that words act less as individual units and more as part of lexical phrases in interconnected discourse (Schmitt 2000:78).

2- Teachers should encourage their students to be involved in an extensive reading of different genres, and not to be restricted only to the course books.

3- As indicated by Hsueh (2002) learners should be encouraged to develop good habits of checking collocation usage by consulting collocation dictionaries, and take notes systematically.

*Promoting students' autonomous constant practice of collocations and tackling their collocational errors

A further equally important and closely related implication is that for raismg learners' awareness and promoting their constant autonomous

practice of collocation, teachers should check students' knowledge of collocation, track their progress, and tackle their errors in order to reinforce their collocational competence. Here are some suggestions that might help teachers to improve learning quality

1- In order to promote learners constant autonomous practice of collocation, Teachers should encourage their learners to make effective use of the internet by frequently surfing websites and browse some topics related to politics. education, and daily life situations. or any topic of their choice, finding pen-friends on the Internet, taking part in competitions. chat-clubs.

2- In order to help learners achieve native-like competence and fluency. learners should also be encouraged to access the native speaker corpora as a way to compare their L2 with the

native speakers' L I. In this regard, web-concordances are very useful, as they contain a huge source of authentic materials which can provide learners with multiple exposures to new items and collocations.

3- In order to enhance learners' collocation competence effectively, and in the longer term, learners should be encouraged to keep a vocabulary note book and write down a number of collocational expression noticed inside or outside the classroom.

4- In order to move learners forward and promote students' understanding of collocations, teachers should provide consistent and frequent formative and corrective feedback on their learners' mis-collocations. In other words, providing feedback is essential to the assessment process, and to the improvement of students learning as it allows teachers to collect the

evidence they need to immediately address their students' learning needs.

Suggestions for learning materials designers (Developing appropriate

L2 material on collocations)

According to Channell (1981), most students' errors resulted from a lack of emphasis on vocabulary in syllabi. It is not surprising that most syllabi taught in

Libyan schools and universities are organized to cover more grammar than vocabulary. which does not help students develop their collocational competence. The following are some suggestions to be taken into consideration on designing the language learning materials.

1- Teachers and curriculum designers at Departments of English language at Libyan universities should give more attention to the significance of collocations, and work together to implement EFL syllabi in a way that allow collocations to be a part of a balanced course at each level of teaching English as a foreign language in Libyan schools, institutions and universities.

2- Language learning materials should be reconstructed to include a variety of collocations, and build more practice activities on collocations into relevant EFL course books at all proficiency according to learners' needs and interests.

3- The language teaching materials should be reconstructed in the way that offcrs explicit instructions on the way that teaching and learning should target language collocations. In other words, such materials should provide teachers with teaching ideas that help them implement the suitable techniques to further enhance their learners' lexical collocation knowledge.

Conclusion

Generally, the results of this study were consistent with the previous studies, and support claims that L2 learners have inadequate knowledge of producing and recognizing English lexical collocations (e.g., Bahns and Eldaw,1993; Farghl and Obiedat, 1995; Hussein 1998; Howarth, 1998a; Bonk 2000, Zaghoul and Abdul-Fathah, 2003; Mohmoud 2005, Mashharawi, 2008, and Abu Naba'h, 2011) . The results also highlighted the important role that learners' first language plays in the acquisition of L2 collocations, and therefore, were again in line with the claim that interference is the prime cause of L2 learners' errors (e.g Bahns and Eldaw, 1993; Bahns, 1993; Farghal & Obiedat, 1995; Huang, 2001, Zughoul &

Abdul-Fattah, 2001, 2003; Nesselhauf, Mohamed, 2005; EI.Masharwi 2008; Brashi 2009). The study'S results also confirmed the common sense view that receptive knowledge of

\ collocations was generally larger than the productive one and it absorbed before the productive knowledge at all stages of language learning(e.g., Nation 2000; Waring, 2002, Taeko 2005; Shehatta 2008; Brashi, 2009 and Alsakran 2011).

In summary, the results showed that collocations present a source of difficulty for English language learners. Therefore, collocations need more attention from L2 curriculum designers and teachers.

List of References

Aisenstadt, E. (1981). Restricted collocations in English lexicology and lexicography.
ITL: Review ofApplied Linguistics, 53, 53-61.

AI-Zahrani, M.S. (1998). Knowledge of English lexical collocations among male Saudi college students majoring in English at a Saudi university. Unpublished doctoral
thesis, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania

Bahns, J. (1993). Lexical Collocations: A Contrastive View. ELT Journal, Vol. 47, No: 56-63.

Bahns, J.& Eldaw, M. (1993). Should we teach EFL students collocations?System,21 (I), 101-114

Benson, M. Benson, E. &Ilson, R. (1997).The BBI dictionary ofEnglish wordcombinations (2nd edition). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Bolinger, D. (1976). "Meaning and Memory", in: Forum Linguisticuml, 1-14.

Brashi, A. (2005). Arabic collocations: Implications for translation. Unpublished doctoral thesis, UniversityofWestem Sydney, Sydney

Brashi, A. (2009). Collocability as a prohlem in 1,2 production. Rejleclioll Oil FII,I!,/i,/i
1.(/l1gu{/ge Tet/chil1g. 8(1). 21-34.

Carter, R. (1992). Vocabulary: Applied linguistic perspectives. London, England: Routledge.

Carter, R.& T. McCarthy.(1988). Vocabulary and language teaching. New York: Longman

Channell, J. (1981).Applying semantic theory to vocabulary teaching. EL T Journal 35 (2), 115-122.

Cowan, L. (1989). Towards a definition of collocation. Unpublished Master thesis, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Cowie, A.P. & Howarth, P.(1995). Phraseological competence and written proficiency. In Blue,G.M. &Mitchell, R. (Eds.), Language

andeducation British studies in applied linguistics 11 (pp. 80-93).Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

EI-Masharawi, A. (2008).Collocation Errors Made by English and Journalism

Majors at the Islamic University of Gaza. Unpublished dissertation. The Islamic University of Gaza.

Elyildirm, S. (1997). The acquisition of collocation by Turkish EFL learners. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Reading, Reading, United Kingdom

Firth, J.R. (1957). Papers in Linguistics 1934-1951. London. Oxford University

Farghal, M.& Obiedant, H. (1995). Collocations: a neglected variable in EFL. IRAL. 33(4),315-331.109

Gitsaki, C. (1991). Second language lexical acquisition: A study of the development of collocational knowledge. San Francisco: International Scholars Publications.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1967).Categories of the theory of grammar .In Kress, G. R. (Ed.), Halliday: System and Function in Language (pp. 52-72). Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hill, J. (1999). Collocational Competence. English Teaching Professional. Issue II, April 1999

Hussein, R. F. (1990). Collocations: The missing link in vocabulary acquisition amongst EFL learners.Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics, 26(26), 123-136.

Korosadowitz-Struzynska, M. (1980). Word collocations in FL vocabulary instruction.

StudiaAnglicaPosnaniensia. 12. 109-120.

Lewis, M. (1993). The Lexical Approach. Language Teaching Publications.

Littlewood, W. (1984). Foreign and Second Language Learning.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

McCarthy, M. & O'Dell, F. (2005).English Collocations in Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Nesselhauf, N. (2003). The use of collocations by advanced learners of English and some implications for teaching. Applied Linguistics, 24(2), 223-242.

Palmer, F. R. (1976). Semantics: A new outline. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robins, R.H.(1967). A short history of linguistics. London: Longman

Shehata, A. (2008). Ll Influence on the Reception and Production of Collocations by advanced ESLIEFL Arabic Learners of English. unpublished dissertation. The College ofArts and Sciences of Ohio University, Ohio

Schmitt. D. (2010). Are learners getting the knowledge they need? Assessmcnt procedure. International Re,iew of Applied Linguistics: 119-20: 27-47.

Shokouhi, H., & Mirsalari, GH. (2010). Collocational Knowledge versus General Linguistic Knowledge among Iranian EFL Learners. Teaching English as a Second or foreign language. [Online] Available: http://tesl-ej.org/pdf7ej52/a7.pdf(September 16,2010) The Electronic Journalfor English as a Second Language. Volume (13), 4

Sinclair, J. M. (1991). Corpus, concordance, collocation . Oxford: Oxford University Press

Siyanova, A. & Schmitt, N. (2008).L2 Learner Production and Processing of Collocation: A Multi-study Perspective. The Canadian Modern Language ReviewlLa Revue Canadienne des LanguesVivantes, 64, 3 (March), 429-458

Wallace M.J. (1979). What is an idiom? An applied linguistic approach, in:

Hartmann R.R.K, (ed.), Dictionaries and their users, Exeter Linguistic Studies 4, Exeter, University of Exeter 63-70.

Wray, A. (2002). Formulaic Language and the Lexicon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wardell, D. (1991). Collocations: Teaching word pairs in EFLc1asses. English Teaching Forum, 29(2), 35-37

Williams, J. (2000). Leaming without awareness. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27, 269-304.

Willis, D.(1990). The lexical syllabus. Collins COBUILD: Harper Collins Publishersum, 29(2),35-37

Zarei, A. (2003). Patterns ofIranian advanced learners problems with English collocations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University ofIsfahan, Iran

Zughoul, M. R.& Abdul-Fattah, H. (2003).Translational collocational strategies of Arab learners of English: A study in lexical semantics. Babel, 49 (1), 59-81