

## **An Investigation into the Issues of Understanding and Using Collocations among Sudanese EFL English Cultural Centre Students during the academic year 2020-2021**

ELMONTASIRBILLAH RABIE HASSAN BADAWI

Assistant Professor  
Alzaiem Alazhari University, Sudan

### **Abstract**

*This examination targets researching the issues of comprehension and utilizing Collocations that experience Sudanese EFL Students at the English Cultural Center Students.*

*The investigation follows the spellbinding scientific technique and the information was gathered through two instruments, a test for the understudies comprising of collocations and how to assemble, next to a survey for EFL instructors, who work have been showing English for quite a long time. The two information assortment instruments have been confirmed, steered, characterized and broke down altogether through SPSS.*

*The examination closes such a large number of discoveries and gives a few proposals and ideas.*

*The investigation has arrived at the accompanying outcomes: there are quite issues confronting EFL Sudanese college understudies comprehension and utilizing collocations, collocations help improving EFL ECC Students' capability, collocations upgrade understudies' capacity of articulation and give them choices of jargon decision and build up their responsive and profitable abilities. At last, the examination proposed a few suggestions and further investigations in the light of the discoveries.*

**Keywords:** ECC, collocations, EFL, FLL

## INTRODUCTION

Learning collocations is a significant piece of learning the jargon of a language. A few collocations are fixed, or extremely solid, for instance snap a picture, where no word other than take gathers with photograph to give a similar significance. A few collocations are more open, where a few distinct words might be utilized to give a comparable significance, for instance keep to/adhere to the standards. Here are some more instances of collocations.

You should put forth an attempt and study for your tests (NOT de an exertion) Did you sit in front of the TV the previous evening? (NOT glance at TV) This vehicle has an extremely amazing motor. It can do 200 km 60 minutes. (NOT solid motor) There are some old landmarks close by. (NOT old fashioned landmarks)

Some of the time, a couple of words may not be totally off-base, and individuals will comprehend what is implied, yet it may not be the common, typical collocation. On the off chance that somebody says/did a couple of mix-ups they will be seen, however a familiar speaker of English would likely say I committed a couple of errors.

Collocations have been perceived as one of the manners in which that separate local speakers and unknown dialect students. In the event that a non-local speaker needs to help somebody, she/he will say, "Would i be able to help you?" though a local speaker will say, "Would i be able to give you a hand?"(Salkauskiene,2012).

English is loaded with collocations, repetitive blends of words that co-happen more regularly than anticipated by some coincidence. For what reason do we say 'a year ago' and not 'an hour ago'? Also, for what reason do we head off to some place 'via vehicle' or 'via train' yet 'by walking'? The explanation is 'collocation'. " Knowing the importance of a word not just requires knowing its word reference definition; one should likewise know the kind of words with which it is frequently related. Collocations, either fixed or more adaptable, are the consequence of numerous long periods of routine use by familiar speakers of the English" (Prodromou,2004). It is accepted that computerization of collocations assists local speakers with communicating fluidly since it gives 'lumps' of English that are prepared to utilize. Second and unknown dialect students, nonetheless, on account of coming up short on this computerization, may make non-

local blunders while creating expressions. To accomplish local like skill and familiarity, second and unknown dialect students should know that a significant piece of language procurement is the capacity to appreciate and deliver collocations as unanalyzed lumps. The two students and educators of the English acknowledge how muddled the space of collocation is. Lewis (2000) urges instructors to raise understudies' attention to collocations and to start their own activity examination to ensure the progressions they make are helpful for understudies. The reason for this examination is to research the various perspectives in regards to definition and arrangement of collocations, the significance of showing collocation, the primary wellsprings of collocational blunders and to propose a few philosophies and materials for showing collocation in ESL/EFL study halls.

The word collocation is a moderately new expansion to the dictionary of English however characterizing collocation is a test since the term collocation has been a typical worry among etymologists, etymologists and language instructors as of late. In any case, it is beyond the realm of imagination to expect to examine these points of view in this exposition. Subsequently the scientist makes reference to some essential and general perspectives in regards to collocation in this part.

Collocation, begun from the field of dictionary contemplates, it is a term characterized and perceived from multiple points of view (Bahns, 1993). By and large, there were two distinct sides of statements about this term. One of them contended that collocation was identified with significance; the other contended that collocation was not a semantic connection between words.

McIntosh (1961) brought Firth's perspective into additional conversation. He added the thought of reaches, which implied, as Palmer (1976) characterized, that a word may be utilized with an entire arrangement of words that shared some semantic highlights practically speaking. An illustration of a reach was the rundown of things, like metal, iron, and magma, which may be qualified by the descriptive word liquid. As McIntosh would like to think, words have just a specific resilience of similarity. Such information on ranges assists with recognizing the worthy collocations from inadmissible ones. (in the same place). Like McIntosh (1961) and Palmer (1976), Bolinger and Sears (1981) likewise referenced that the reaches and assortment of

collocations are huge. They viewed collocation as "a sort of constant relationship of words" and affirmed that collocations came about because of local speakers' encounters of the articulations, rehashed and again in certain given conditions. In this way, contingent upon the specific circumstance, the collocations, similar to great possibility, high likelihood, and solid probability, may be viewed as adequate, however the collocations like solid possibility, great likelihood, and high probability, inadmissible. In view of Lewis' thought, "collocations are those mixes of words which happen normally with more prominent than irregular recurrence. Collocations co-happen, however not all words which co-happen, are collocations" (Lewis, 1997, p.44). Collocation additionally has been characterized as a routine relationship of words that co-happen with shared hope. At the end of the day, the collocations, as rotten margarine, incredible likelihood and medication junkie are words or expressions which are subjective (Nattinger and DeCarrico, 1992, p.56).

Sinclair (1966), in a volume of papers in memory of Firth, showed an interest in producing lexical sets by the utilization of collocation. For Sinclair, syntax and lexis are two distinct perspectives. Punctuation can be portrayed by structures (syntagms) and frameworks (ideal models), while the subsequent one is lexical things assembling with each other collocations and sets separately. As per Sinclair, collocation alludes to as the co-event of two words, however this co-event isn't demonstrative of two words happening as a little fixed linguistic set. All things being equal, it has two significant highlights. To start with, there might be a few or numerous words between the two applicable things or the two significant things may even happen over sentence limits.

Second, collocation is free of syntactic kinds. At the end of the day, collocation isn't investigated by linguistic designs. The models "he contended unequivocally," "the strength of his contention," "his contention was fortified" show a consistent connection between the two words (Sinclair, 1966, p.42). Then again, be that as it may, a few analysts held various perspectives from the over researchers' conclusions. For instance, McCarthy thought about the idea of collocation as a sort of durable gadget. He guaranteed that collocation alludes to the likelihood that lexical things will co-happen, and is certifiably not a semantic connection between words. (McCarthy, 1991,

p. 65). Such assessment proposes that collocation serves other capacity other than importance in the sentences. Another case was Aghbar's (1990) declaration. He recommended that the idea of collocation isn't raised imaginatively interestingly; truth be told, individuals have a memory of having heard or seen these developments previously and use them accordingly. In addition, Halliday and Hasan (1976 referred to in AL-Zahrani, 1998) characterized collocations from the part of talk. They characterized collocations as "strong impact of sets of words", like fire... light, ruler... crown and hair... brush (AL-Zahrani, 1998, p.19). They suggested that these examples would produce a durable power on the off chance that they happen in a neighboring sentence (ibid). Regarding collocations, nonetheless, there is an overall definition: "collocations are approximately fixed, self-assertive repetitive word blends and the significance of the entire do mirror the importance of the parts. Unadulterated possibility, to submit murder, close consideration, and sharp rivalry share the highlights of this class" (Benson et al., 1986b, p.23). They have likewise classified collocations into two classifications: lexical and syntactic collocations which will be examined in the accompanying.

### **The Categorization of Collocations**

Words can be consolidated from various perspectives to shape significant gatherings if those words are not limited. That is the thing that makes it difficult to explain the idea of collocation. Among these potential blends of words, some are fixed and others are all the more free. To accomplish a more clear comprehension of collocation, it is important to draw a differentiation among collocations, sayings, and different sorts of word mixes (Bahns, 1993; Wang, 2001; Wu, 1996), however these mixes are very like each other, even, one might say, having a place with the class of collocations (ibid). Wood (1981) embraced both semantic and syntactic measures for recognizing collocations from figures of speech, colligations, and free blends. In Wood's perspective, a saying is completely non-compositional and non-beneficial, while a free mix is completely compositional and profitable. "Collocation is the way single word co-happens with another word, colligation is the way single word routinely co-happens with a specific syntactic example; so for instance a few action words ordinarily happen with a specific tense, or a thing may normally seem went before by an

individual pronoun, as opposed to an article, for example, "pass my/your driving test, It's my/your/our duty to..., yet I'll assume the liability for" and so on (Wood, 1981, p.87).

In view of Howarth's model, there are four classifications of word blends:

- (a) Free blends: The importance of a free mix is deciphered from the strict significance of individual components, for example, drink tea.
- (b) Restricted collocations: A confined collocation is more restricted in the choice of compositional components and as a rule has one segment utilized in a specific setting, for example, play out an errand.
- (c) Figurative maxims: A non-literal saying has an allegorical importance in general that can by one way or another reveal to it's exacting understanding, for example, do a U-turn.
- (d) Pure phrases: An unadulterated maxim is a solitary unit whose importance is absolutely eccentric from the significance of it's parts, for example, blow the gaff.

Additionally, Benson et al. (1986b) recognized collocations from different mixes of words like mixtures, maxims, temporary blends (momentary collocations), and free mixes. Coming up next is the outline of the five kinds of word blends, recorded from the most fixed mix to the freest one.

1. Mixtures: The most fixed word blends, are totally frozen, and no varieties at all are conceivable. The occurrences of ostensible mixtures are: floppy circle and fitness test, and an outline of compound action word (or phrasal action word) is get through.

2. Phrases: Idioms allude to generally frozen articulations whose implications don't mirror the implications of their segment parts. The representations of sayings are: to solve two problems at once, to kick the container, to give everything away, etc.

3. Momentary blends: The mixes whose implications are near their segment parts, viewed as more frozen and less factor than collocations. Occurrences of such are: just because, the unavoidable issues facing everyone, to be in a difficult situation, and such.

4. Collocations: They are approximately fixed, subjective intermittent word mixes and the importance of the entire do mirror the significance of the parts. Unadulterated possibility, to submit murder, close consideration, and sharp rivalry share the highlights of this class.

5. Free mixes: Free blends are taken as the most un-firm, all things considered. Their segments are the freest as to being joined with other lexical things.

The average blends of this sort are: to review an undertaking (an occasion, a mishap) and to break down (report, research) a homicide.

Repeating what Benson et al. (1986b) verified, Bahns (1993) additionally conceded that, not the same as phrases, the fundamental qualities of collocations are that their implications mirror the significance of their constituent parts, and that, in examination with free blend, they are utilized regularly, come into view promptly, and are mentally notable. At the end of the day, "there are temporary zones between free mixes and collocations, and among collocations and maxims". (Cruse, 1986, p. 41).

Sinclair (1991) partitioned collocation into two sorts descending collocation and upward collocation. Not the same as Benson et al., Sinclair utilized two terms to characterize collocations. One was the expression "hub," which was utilized to represent the word considered; the different was the expression "assemble," used to address any word happening in the predetermined climate of a hub. In light of Sinclair's case, when A is "hub" and B is "arrange"- collocation of A with a less successive word B, it is called descending collocation, which add to a semantic investigation of a word. The instances of this kind are "advantage over", "scared of", "mentality toward", and so forth Conversely, when B is "hub" and A is "gather," it is called upward collocation. The instances of this kind are "deliberately", "coincidentally", "with alert", and so forth In this sort of collocation, "the words will in general be the components of syntactic casings, or superordinates"(Sinclair,1991,p.116).

Additionally, Lewis (1997) claims that for the most part, collocations can be characterized into four gatherings: solid, powerless, successive, and inconsistent. The qualification among solid and feeble collocations depends on their fixedness and limitation, where as the differentiation among successive and inconsistent ones is based on

their recurrence of co-event in a corpus. The solid collocations, for example, drink lager, drug someone who is addicted, are perceived as firmly connected expressions what capacity like single word. While feeble ones like a decent day or a decent possibility are joined with two regular words, and every one of which may happen with different words? Collocations moreover can be any blend of solid and continuous, solid and rare, powerless and incessant or rare (on the same page).

## **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Jargon learning, particularly collocations are presently a matter of wide-going conversation among instructors, educators and scientist. Collocations generally put unknown dialect students in a hot water in both oral and composed setting. Then again, syllable creators and language educators think that its hard to create viable materials and show them successfully so they consign collocations to have an auxiliary spot in schedule. Likewise unconvincing exploration discoveries in this space of study and absence of clear answers concerning how to educate and learn collocations (Collis, 1987). All things considered, to determine, in any event somewhat, the above-referred to issues, in the current examination the scientist has built up a test comprising of collocations to have a profound knowledge into the issues explored just as a poll for ELT educators at various colleges who have the enough experience about sorting out such issue.

## **QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY**

This investigation brings up numerous significant issues to be answered these inquiries are:

1. To what degree are Sudanese EFL English Cultural Center Students mindful of comprehension and utilizing collocations?
2. To what degree are Sudanese EFL English Cultural Center Students have issues managing collocations?
3. What is the thought behind the troubles that they experience .



## **HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY**

H1 somewhat Sudanese EFL English Cultural Center Students don't know about comprehension and utilizing collocations.

H2 somewhat Sudanese EFL English Cultural Center Students have issues managing collocations.

H3 there are numerous purposes for the challenges of comprehension and utilizing collocations.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The study follows the descriptive analytical method. This section describes the methods used for data collection. It particularly presents the target subject, study instruments and procedures for data collection. Then it goes further to present tools, reliability and validity. It also illustrates the steps used in the study and concludes with a summary. In order to collect the data the study uses both a test for the students and a questionnaire (for EFL teachers) to examine a random sample of the English cultural Centre Students.

### **Population of the study**

The population of this study consists of students of the English Cultural Center at all levels as well as English language teachers from different Sudanese universities at Khartoum locality. Subject's data which this study used to analyze were collected from 200 students from both genders males and females of the English Cultural Centre Khartoum locality.

### **The Sample of the study:**

The total number of students included in the test was 100 students. The experiment sample amounts to 200 students in the first level who are randomly chosen to undergo a test investigating the problems of understanding and using collocations. Students were classified as pre-intermediate EFL learners.

### **Instrument for Data Analysis**

In this study, two types of tools are used to gather the required data and information from the subject of this study. These two tools are: a

test for the students and a questionnaire for teachers to enhance the overall outcomes. Both the test and the questionnaire processed through the statistical package of Social Sciences (SPSS) to conclude to the findings.

### **What is meant by a collocation?**

A collocation is a pair or group of words that are often used together. These combinations sound natural to native speakers, but students of English have to make a special effort to learn them because they are often difficult to guess. Some combinations just sound ‘wrong to native speakers of English. For example, the adjective fast collocates with cars, but not with a glance. English Collocations in Use (Michael McCarthy Felicity O'Dell).

### **Reasons behind the difficulties of understanding and using collocations**

There are several reasons behind the problems of understanding and using collocations, these problems have been pointed out through many studies and by many researchers. researchers discovered that the difficulties and errors resulted from analogy, overgeneralization, paraphrase, interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, and shortage of collocational knowledge (Bahns & Eldaw, 1993; Channel, 1981; Ellis, 1985; Farghal & Obiedat, 1995; Liu, 1999a, 1999b, 2000b). For instance, Bahns and Eldaw (1993) proclaimed that many EFL students' collocation errors were caused by their L1 interference. 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 the strategies such as synonym, paraphrasing, avoidance, and transfer. In addition, a series of studies conducted by Liu (1999a, 1999b, 2000b) revealed that the same strategies were used by EFL students 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 have been 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 (e.g. \*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 (e.g. \*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, six sources of errors were found. Among them, a small number of errors resulted from word coinage and approximation belonged to communication strategies, while the majority of the errors were attributable to negative interlingual transfer. 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 does 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 the verbs such as make, do, and take. Some students might think that these words were de-lexicalized verbs, thus they could be substituted for one another freely. For instance, students had used "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 had used the collocation "\*am used to take," which was a combination of "am used to something" and "used to take."

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

6. Word coinage and approximation: Word coinage was a type of paraphrase employed to make up a new word in order to communicate the desired concept. The instance of the collocational errors resulted from word coinage was "to \*see sun-up" (instead of "to see the sunrise"). On the other hand, approximation was another type of paraphrase. It was the use of an incorrect vocabulary item or structure, which shares enough semantic features in common with the desired item to satisfy the speakers. For example, the word middle in "\*middle exam" was used to mean mid-term in "midterm exam." Furthermore, in another study on students' strategy used in producing lexical collocations, Liu (2000) mentioned seven types of strategies that EFL students might use in their writing, inclusive of observable actions and unobservable mental process. The followings are the seven types of strategies.

1. Retrieval: It means the students' ability to recall collocations from their memory. Without understanding the notion that language does not consist of words but of chunks, many students have no intention to store collocations in their memory. Consequently, they often fail in searching for the proper collocations they need when they communicate in either speaking or writing.

2. Literal translation: Students tend to transfer the thought word-for-word from L1 to L2 when not succeeding in finding stored collocations. They take the strategy of literal translation to produce either acceptable or unacceptable collocations.

3. Approximate translation: Approximate translation is a process of paraphrasing the thought from L1 to L2. Sometimes students rely on their intuition to create collocations of their own and choose approximate translation as another strategy other than literal translation.

4. Use of de-lexicalized verbs: Students are inclined to use de-lexicalized words (e.g. do, take, make, and keep) carelessly and substitute one for another casually in their writing. Owing to linguistic deficiencies, intermediate EFL students often consider de-lexicalized verbs as words that have little or no meaning outside the context of particular use

5. Use of synonyms: It is the using of synonyms that students solve L2 lexical problems when they encounter the collocations that they are not able to bring out. Nevertheless, more often, they produce erroneous collocations as a result of the insufficient collocational information of the synonyms they use.

6. Appeal to authority: When students are unable to find the right collocation to use, they would like to ask a native speaker or consult a dictionary for the answer. However, if their problems would be solved depended on what kind of dictionary they usually used and whether they could find the answer in a dictionary.

7. Appeal for assistance: Learners have a tendency to depend on others for guidance and instruction. Chances are that most of the time the poor writers are the ones seek advice from.

Regarding the negative effect of L1, the results of the study conducted by Koosha and Jafarpour (2006) also confirmed the influence of L1 on acquiring collocation of prepositions by Iranian EFL adult learners. Furthermore, Namvar et al.'s research also analyzed the collocations in the Iranian postgraduate students' writings and found that negative transfer is a common phenomenon among Iranian language learners. In other words, first language influence appears to have a strong effect on the learners' production of collocational errors.

### **The Importance of Collocations in EFL Classrooms**

According to Benson et al.(1985),collocations are arbitrary and unpredictable” and that makes it difficult for non-native speaker to cope with them. Despite the arbitrary nature of collocations, it is recommended by many other researchers that teachers should motivate their students to learn collocations.

According to Cowie (1992), English collocation is important in receptive as well as productive language competence. Similar assertion was made by Carter and McCarthy (1988). In their opinion, English collocations are useful not only for English comprehension but for English production. They claimed that by memorizing collocational groups, students would have the idea about certain lexical restrictions. Most importantly, "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" (Carter & McCarthy,1988, p. 75). Moreover, it can be said that "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" (Woolard, 2000, p.28). Liu (2000a) also stated that the more often students are taught English collocations, the more correctly students can make use of collocations. Such declaration was supported by Lin (2002), while investigating the effects of collocation instruction on students' English vocabulary developments. Lin (2002) found that students made progress in producing collocations after receiving collocation instruction. Here a review of three of the most common arguments stressing the importance of developing collocational knowledge of language learners is presented.

#### **1. Language Knowledge Requires Collocational Knowledge**

Collocations are everywhere. “Collocations are found in up to 70% of everything we say, hear, read, or write” (Hill, 2000,p.53). Collocation highlights the strong patterning that exists in language and shows that a word-by-word approach cannot satisfactorily account for meaning in a text. Nation writes that the strongest position is that language knowledge is collocational knowledge because the stored sequences of

words are the bases of learning, knowledge and use (Nation, 2001,p. 321).

## **2. Efficient Language Acquisition Requires Collocational Knowledge**

It is generally accepted that language is acquired faster and more efficiently when learned in ‘chunks’, such as set phrases or routines (Ellis, 2001, p.67). There is a substantial psycholinguistic evidence which supports this. Based on Schmitt's belief, “lexical phrases in language reflect the way the mind tends to ‘chunk’ language in order to make it easier to process”(Schmitt,2000,p.78). Aitchison states there are powerful and long-lasting links between words in the mind (Aitchison, 1987, p.79). In first language acquisition young children acquire language in chunks even it is claimed for producing collocational constructions, they could not have learned from their parents (Pinker, 2007, p.55). Gleason states that ‘working on the second language acquisition indicates that the second language learners begin not so much with generative systems as with chunks, prefabricated routines, or unopened packages’(Gleason, 1982, p.355). In a comparative study of L1 and L2 English speakers, Conklin and Schmitt (2008) found that what they term ‘formulaic sequences’ were read more quickly than non-formulaic sequences by both groups of participants, supporting the assertion that such chunks ‘have a processing advantage over creatively generated language’ (Conklin & Schmitt,2008, p.72).

All of the above evidences appear to support the view that collocations are organized in the mind in some way to enable more efficient language processing, for both language reception and language production.

## **3. Fluent Language Use Requires Collocational Knowledge**

A third reason cited supporting the teaching of collocation is that fluent and appropriate language use requires collocational knowledge. According to Pawley and Syder:

“Memorized clauses and clause-sequences form a high proportion of the fluent stretches of speech heard in everyday conversation ... Speakers show a high degree of fluency when describing familiar experiences or activities in familiar phrases ...We believe that

memorized sentences and phrases are the normal building blocks of fluent spoken discourse". (Pawley & Syder, 1983, p.208).

There have been several studies which support this position. Towell, Hawkins and Bazergui (1996) in a study of learners of French as a second language found that increased fluency resulted from learners storing memorized sequences. Sung (2003), in a study of international students in the USA, found a significant correlation between the knowledge of lexical collocations and the subjects' speaking proficiency as did Hsu and Chiu (2008) in a study of Taiwanese EFL learners. The three positions summarized stressing the importance of teaching collocation in ESL/EFL classrooms. Accepting that collocation should be taught to ESL/EFL learners, we need to consider how this might best be done.

## **Analysis and Discussion**

### **Students' Test**

The test of idioms and collocations was given more emphasis because the students were the major target of the study and the investigation of their knowledge, problems of understanding and using idiomatic expressions and collocations were the vocal objectives of the present study. The researcher adapted for this purpose, a 50 item test in which 25 items on idiomatic expressions and 25 items on collocations.

The test was widely selected to assess the student's knowledge of idiomatic expressions and collocation. The questions were meant to cover the different levels of English idioms and collocations such as lexical, semantic and syntactic levels. Some of the tests' questions try to trace the impact of the students' native idiomatic expressions on their understanding of the English idiomatic expressions. Contextual clues were given with some idiomatic expressions while, some idiomatic expressions provided without contextual clues in order to test student's knowledge of idiomatic expressions.

### **Cranach's alpha method: -**

Where reliability was calculated using Cranach's alpha equation shown below:



$$\text{Reliability coefficient} = \frac{n}{N-1} * \frac{1 - \text{Total variations questions}}{\text{variation college grades}}$$

Cranach alpha coefficient = (0.77), a reliability coefficient is high and it indicates the stability of the scale and the validity of the study.

Validity coefficient is the square of the islands so reliability coefficient is (0.88), and this shows that there is a high sincerity of the scale and that the benefit of the study.

### **The questionnaire:**

The aim of the questionnaire used in this research was to find out about the teachers' views regarding teaching and learning of idiomatic expressions and collocations, and it is also relevant directly to the questions and hypothesis of the study. It was administered to a total sample of 40 ELT teachers at the English Cultural Centre.. It consisted of two parts the first part contained personal information about the participant. The second part contained 15 statements related to teachers' views about idiomatic expressions and collocations, problems of understanding and using them,

The scale used in the questionnaire was five-point Likert scale to show the expected responses from participants, five codes were given to the statement as follows:

- 1=Strongly Agree,
- 2=Agree,
- 3=Neutral,
- 4=Disagree
- 5=Strongly Disagree

The table below illustrates chi-square test results for respondents' answers about the statements

NO	Statements	Chi-square value	df	Sig	Median	Interpretation
1-	Idioms are important for EFL learners in communication context.	41.000	3	0.000	5.00	strongly agree
2-	Grammatical and syntactical restrictions of idioms may affect the degree of idiomaticity of lexical items.	31.400	3	0.000	4.00	agree
3-	Using idiomatic expressions helps EFL learners to achieve the expected level of proficiency in English language.	36.500	4	0.000	5.00	strongly agree

Elmontasirbillah Rabie Hassan Badawi– **An Investigation into the Issues of Understanding and Using Collocations among Sudanese EFL English Cultural Centre Students during the academic year 2020-2021**

4-	EFL students are not aware of using contextual pragmatic clues to understand idioms whose meaning can't be inferred from the individual word meaning.	12.600	3	0.000	4.00	agree
5-	Idioms knowledge has crucial role in EFL students' level of proficiency in receptive and productive skills.	38.250	4	0.000	5.00	strongly agree
6-	Idioms are difficult to understand because of the lack of the cultural background behind the idiom.	45.200	3	0.000	5.00	strongly agree
7-	Using and understanding idioms are difficult for EFL learners at university level.	34.250	4	0.000	4.00	agree
8-	Idioms are difficult because they are not well taught in classes.	34.250	4	0.000	4.00	agree
9-	Collocations play an important role in the process of language learning and teaching.	10.400	2	0.000	4.50	agree
10-	Collocations help improving EFL learners' fluency.	23.800	3	0.000	4.00	agree
11-	Having knowledge about collocations is very important for EFL learners.	19.800	3	0.000	4.50	strongly agree
12-	EFL learners' L1 may affect students' use of appropriate collocation.	13.050	2	0.000	4.00	agree
13-	Only teachers who have a clear understanding of different kinds of collocation can help learners understand and use collocations.	15.600	2	0.000	4.00	agree
14-	EFL learners should be equipped with skills that enable them to develop their collocation knowledge independently.	23.000	3	0.000	4.00	agree
15-	Collocations are effective in improving EFL students' multi-cultural competence.	10.850	2	0.000	5.00	strongly agree

**The results of table (4.67) above were interpreted as follows:**

1. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Idioms are important for EFL learners in communication context was (41.000) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
2. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Grammatical and syntactical restrictions of idioms may affect the degree of idiomaticity of lexical items was (31.400) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.

3. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Using idiomatic expressions helps EFL learners to achieve the expected level of proficiency in English language was (36.500) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
4. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement EFL students are not aware of using contextual pragmatic clues to understand idioms whose meaning can't be inferred from the individual word meaning was (12.600) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
5. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Idioms knowledge has crucial role in EFL students' level of proficiency in receptive and productive skills was (38.250) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
6. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Idioms are difficult to understand because of the lack of the cultural background behind the idiom was (45.200) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
7. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Using and understanding idioms are difficult for EFL learners at university level was (34.250) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
8. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Idioms are difficult because they are not well taught in classes was (34.250) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than

- the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
9. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Collocations play an important role in the process of language learning and teaching was (10.400) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
  10. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Collocations help improving EFL learners' fluency was (23.800) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
  11. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Having knowledge about collocations is very important for EFL learners was (19.800) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
  12. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement EFL learners' L1 may affect students' use of appropriate collocation was (13.050) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
  13. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Only teachers who have a clear understanding of different kinds of collocation can help learners understand and use collocations was (15.600) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.
  14. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement EFL learners should be equipped with skills that enable them to develop their collocation knowledge independently was (23.000) with P-value (0.000) which is lower

than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.

15. The value of chi – square calculated to signify the differences between the numbers of individuals of the study for the statement Collocations are effective in improving EFL students’ multi-cultural competence was (10.850) with P-value (0.000) which is lower than the level of significant value (5%) These refer to the existence of differences statistically.

## **CONCLUSION**

### **Findings:**

From the primary and secondary sources of the study the researcher concludes to the following:

1. Many students are not aware of using collocations.
2. Students have serious problems regarding understanding and using collocations.
3. Collocations can play a vital role in improving students’ communicative skills.

### **Recommendations**

The researcher recommends the following:

1. Teachers should use different techniques for teaching collocations.
2. Language vocabulary specifically idiomatic expressions should be given good care when teaching English.
3. Necessity of concentrating on the importance of collocations and developing students’ abilities to be able to collocate.

## **PRELIMINARY BIBLIOGRAPHY**

1. Aghbar, A. A. (1990). Fixed Expressions in Written Texts: Implications for Assessing Writing Sophistication. (pp.33-44). Paper presented at a Meeting of the English Association of Pennsylvania State System Universities.
2. Aitchison, J. (1987). *Words in the Mind*. Oxford: Blackwell.
3. Al-Zahrani, M. S. (1998). Knowledge of English lexical collocations among male Saudi college students majoring in English at a Saudi university. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.

4. Bahns, J. (1993). Lexical collocations: A contrastive view. *ELT Journal*, 47(1), 56-63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/47.1.56>
5. Bahns, J., & Eldaw, M. (1993). Should we teach EFL students collocation? *System*, 21(1), 104-114. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(93\)90010-E](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(93)90010-E)
6. Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1986a). *The BBI combinatorial dictionary of English: A guide to word combinations*. (pp.i-v). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
7. Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1986b). *Lexicographic description of English*. (p.24). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
8. Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1985). The structure of the collocational dictionary. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 2, 1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ijl/2.1.1>
9. Bolinger, D., & Sears, D. A. (1981). *Aspects of language*. (pp.87-88). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
10. Carter, R. (1998). *Vocabulary: Applied Linguistics Perspectives*. London: Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203270110>
11. Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1988). *Vocabulary and language teaching*. (pp.68-75). New York: Longman.
12. Channell, J. (1981). 'Applying semantic theory to vocabulary teaching'. *ELT Journal*, 2, 115-122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/XXXV.2.115>
13. Conklin, K., & Schmitt, N. (2008). 'Formulaic Sequences: Are They Processed More Quickly than Nonformulaic Language by Native and Nonnative Speakers?'. *Applied Linguistics*, 29/1, 72-89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm022>
14. Cowie, A. (1992). Multiword lexical units and communicative language teaching. Inp. Arnaud & H. Bejoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and applied linguistics*. (pp. 216-331). London: Macmillan Academic and Professional LTD.
15. Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
16. Ellis, N.C. (2001). *Memory for language*. In Robinson, P. (ed.). (2001). *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
17. Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. (p.47). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
18. Farghal, M., & Obiedat, H. (1995). Collocations: A neglected variable in EFL. *IRAL*, 33(4), 315-333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral.1995.33.4.315>
19. Fox, M. (1998). *Teaching collocations: Further developments in the lexical approach*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.
20. Gleason, J.B. (1982). 'Converging evidence for linguistic theory from the study of aphasia and child language'. In Obler, L.K. and Menn, L. (1982). *Exceptional Language and Linguistics*. New York: Academic Press.
21. Hill, J. (2000). Revising priorities: From grammatical failure to collocational success. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation: further developments in the lexical approach*. (pp. 49-60). London: Language Teaching Publications.
22. Howarth, P. (1993). A phraseological approach to academic writing. In G. Blue (Ed.), *Language learning and success: studying through English*. (pp. 58-69). London: Macmillan.
23. Hsu, J.T., & Chiu, C. (2008) 'Lexical Collocations and their Relation to Speaking Proficiency' <http://www.wordcollocations.com/tech.html.pdf>

24. Hsueh, S.C. (2008). *A study on the relationship between collocations and English writing*. <http://www.grammaticalcollocation/ppb/3j.net.pdf>.
25. Khanchobani, A. (2012). Input enhancement and EFL learners' collocation acquisition. *International journal of Academic research*, 4(1), 96-101. <http://www.researchgate.net>.
26. Koosha, M., & Jafarpour, A.A.(2006). Data-driven Learning and Teaching collocation of prepositions: The Case of Iranian EFL Adult Learners. *Asian EFL Journal*,8/8, 23-32.
27. Lewis, M. (1997). *Implementing the lexical approach*. (pp.34-44). England: Language Teaching Publication.
28. Lewis, M. (2000). *Language in the lexical approach*. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation: further developments in the lexical approach*. (pp. 133-134). London: Language Teaching Publications.
29. Lin, Y. P. (2002). The effects of collocation instruction on English vocabulary developments of senior high students in Taiwan. (pp.87-90). A Master's Thesis Submitted to English Department of kaohsiung. University.<http://www.techingcollocation.ednknu.html.pdf>.
30. 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.
31. 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, 81-99.
32. Liu, C. P. (2000). A study of strategy use in producing lexical collocations. *Selected papers from the tenth International Symposium on English Teaching*. (pp. 481-492).Taipei: Crane.
33. Namvar, F., Mohd Nor, N.F., & Ibrahim, N. (2012).Analysis of collocations in the Iranian postgraduate students' writings. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*,18(1), 11 – 22. <http://www.ukm.my/mbp/3/>.
34. Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
35. Nattinger, J. R., & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrase and language teaching*. Oxford:Oxford University Press.
36. Nesselhauf, N. (2005). *Collocations in a Learner Corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
37. Pawley, A., & Syder, F.H. (1983). 'Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Native like selection and native like fluency'. In Richards, J.C. and Schmidt, R.W. (eds.). (1983). *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.
38. Pinker, S. (2007). *The Stuff of Thought*. London: Penguin.
39. Prodromou, L. (2003). Collocation. Retrieved March 16th, 2005, from the Language Study section of the Macmillan Essential Dictionary Webzine, published by Macmillan Publishers, <http://www.macmillandictionary.com/med-magazine/May2004/19-Language-Study-Collocation-UK.htm>.
40. Rezvani, E. (2011).The effect of output requirement on the acquisition of grammatical collocations by Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(3), 674-682. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.3>

41. Salkauskiene, D. (2002). Review of the book *Teaching Collocation: Further Developments in the Lexical Approach*, [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Communication and Education: Language Magazine*, 4,7.
42. Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
43. Shin, D., & Nation, P. (2008). 'Beyond single words: the most frequent collocations in spoken English'. *ELT Journal*, 62, 339-348. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm091>
44. Sinclair, J. M. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford University Press.
45. Sinclair, J.M. (1966) 'Beginning the study of lexis'. In Bazell, C.E., Catford, J.C., 51. Halliday, M.A.K. and Robins, R.H. (eds.) (1966). *In Memory of J.R.Firth*. London: Longman.