Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching

Volume 05, Issue 1, (2015) 65-75

www.awer-center.org/gjflt/

Teaching lexical chunks on retention and production of referential and collocational meaning of lexis among the Iranian EFL learners

Manochehr Jaafarigohar *, Department of Post-Graduate Studies, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran.
Mohsen Nazari, Department of Post-Graduate Studies, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran.

Suggested Citation:
Jaafarigohar, M. & Nazari, M. (2015). Teaching lexical chunks on retention and production of referential and collocational meaning of lexis among the Iranian EFL learners. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*. *5*(1), 65-75.

Received 23 January, 2015; revised 12 March, 2015; accepted 07 April, 2015.
Selection and peer review under responsibility of Assoc. Prof Dr. Ali Rahimi, Bangkok University.
©2015 SPROC LTD. Academic World Education & Research Center. All rights reserved.

Abstract

This study focuses on the role of collocations in language teaching. Due to vagueness in definition and categorization, the collocations are being divided into two types: referential collocations meaning being recognizable by just referring to single word companies, and inferential collocations being the types that the meaning cannot be easily discerned by non-native speakers of English. This study compares these two types of collocations and found that learners had more difficulty in producing the collocations while contrary to some studies they also do not recognize the inferential or referential collocations and face difficulty recognizing or producing them.

Keywords: collocation, inferential, referential.

*ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Manochehr Jaafarigohar,** Department of Post-Graduate Studies, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. *E-mail address*: jafarigohar2007@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of the study

The idea of lexical chunking first was introduced by Firth (1952) and later scholars like Halliday (1966) and Sinclair (1991), being inspired by British linguistics of the same school, developed the idea. Later on Lewis (1993, 1997, 2000) focused on lexical approach and boomed the language vocabulary instruction. Nattinger & DeCarrico (1992) also had reported on lexical chunking ending up in the book entitled 'lexical phrases and language teaching'. Moreover, Evert (2004), comments on the theories behind collocation use and how lexical approaches emerged. He states that in structural linguistic tradition (Saussure and Chomsky), no attention was given to collocations and general abstraction about phrases and sentences, whereas, in British linguistics (Firth, Halliday, Sinclair), close attention was casted on lexical chunks and more emphasis on the importance of the context. So the notion is linked to the Firth's contextual theory of meaning which pays attention to social setting as opposed to the idealized speaker of Chomsky and special care toward spoken and textual discourse as opposed to the isolated sentence, mainly stressing the famous quote by Firth that 'You shall know a word by the company it keeps' (1957).

Passed in time, rarely researchers call back lexical chunks and mostly they refer to them as collocations. Founding my paper on the lexical approach of Lewis (1993), and confirming the theoretical background of Firthian school of thought on contextual theory of meaning, I do separate lexical chunks with collocations. Besides, I believe that collocations by definition are part of lexical chunks. Further, in this study I want to introduce another classification of lexical chunks into referential and collocational categories. Referential meaning of lexical chunks refers not to the literal meaning of its linguistic definition as conveying what is in outside world (Crystal, 2005) while I mean if the parts are individually recognizable by the learners, we call the expression involving a referential meaning or as researchers call explicit meaning (Paciorek & Williams, 2013; Paradis, 2004; Dweik & Shakra, 2011). For example if an expression like 'get milk from a cow' being considered as a lexical chunk is easily understood by the learner, we call it a referential meaning; whereas, an expression like 'bury the hatch' may be regarded as a collocational or idiomatic expression. Beside, the collocational meaning may be charged with emotive, connotative, metaphorical sense, and implicit meaning (Dweik & Shakra, 2011). The idea is confirmed by the definition proposed by Stephan Grimly and Kurt – Michael Patrol, (2002), cited in Giang (2010), that "The term collocation refers to combinations of two lexical items each of which makes a distinct semantic contribution" (p.9). therefore, the definition of collocational meaning and pragmatic meaning is not clear-cut (Crystal, 2005; Lyons, 2005) suggesting that collocational/pragmatic definition is a not 'a coherent field of study' (Crystal, 1997).

So this study aims at improving the Iranian students' ability in retention and production of the lexical chunks including the referential and collocational meaning. Besides, it aims at finding the differences between the idiomatic, metaphorical, collocational meaning with those of literal, denotative and referential meaning. The two levels of retention and production are also compared.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Goudarzi and Moini (2012), stress that collocations for Iranian students are one of the most difficult aspect of language learning and communication. Most books compiled or written by Iranian authors lack lexical chunking, here after I refer to as collocations, and the books by the ministry of education are not an exception (Akbari, 1995; Zarei, 2002; Koosha & Jafarpour, 2006; Pirmoradian & Tabatabei, 2012). So learners face major difficulties in producing lexical phrases especially the preposition ones (Ahranjani & Shadi, 2012). Based on my 15 years of experience in iranian high schools teaching the English course, grades 9, 10 and 11 provide a word list at the end of each lesson without its context, not embedded in chunks, so that making them dull and boring. Similarly, Nofal (2012) admits that [lexical chunks] collocations in particular are not

appropriately touched or handled in the Arabic curriculum. Besides, most of English and Arabic dictionaries do not handle this issue. Both English and Arabic dictionaries deal with idioms but not with collocations. Moreover, reading proficiency may get improved by teaching lexical chunks (Lin, 2009).

Based on the literature on lexical approach, it has been proven that learning vocabulary through chunks has long-term retention (Lewis, 1993, 1997, 2000). It can also lower the burden of memorization and expand the learners' vocabulary repertoire (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Moon, 1997).

Therefore, the writer of this paper believes that by providing chunks and collocations for each single word, the learners will improve their word knowledge. Moreover, since Lewis (1997) has stated that 'the pragmatic meaning in EFL context needs not to be dealt with, as they may not need it' (p. 208), further adding that 'the pragmatic meaning is socially determined and bears little relation to the meanings of the individual words' (p. 62); his statement can be a field of research for further studies. This study does not deal with the pragmatic aspect of collocational competence as it is not applicable in a foreign language context extracted from computerized, web-based online courses.

In addition, the researcher believes that for a foreign language learner the definition of collocational and referentional one is not the same as for the native speaker. For a foreign language learner of English it may make less sense to change the 'zero tolerance' to 'no tolerance' or ' to take appropriate measures', and 'secure their construction sites' to get/give/ appropriate measures', and 'save/keep/ their construction sites (Chan, 2008) respectively as they may have not been exposed to the appropriate lexical chunks. To the native speaker the collocational meaning as well as its referential one happens naturalistically, whereas it may be regarded as a hurdle to the non-native speaker (Koosha & Jafarpour, 2006). To non-native speaker, 'take an exam' may sound as difficult as 'fall out with somebody' since both need being exposed to their chunks. A word of caution needs to be mentioned here that collocational and colligational meaning may not be easily separated as they were previously (Moon, 2001). This issue will be further elaborated in the review of the related literature. Besides, raising the questions of the research, I do not use the term 'vocabulary' and instead based on justifications by Lewis (1993, 2000) I prefer 'lexis'.

1.3. Research questions

1- Does the teaching of lexical chunks improve the Iranian EFL learners' retention and production of referential and collocational meaning of lexis?

2. Is there a correlation between the teaching of lexical chunks and the Iranian EFL learners' production and retention of referential and collocational meaning of lexis (in the experimental group)?

2. Literature review

This study challenges the collocational meaning of lexical chunks, introducing a new terminology which may trigger some semanticians' feeling—positively or negatively. Lewis (1993, 1997) previously looked at lexical chunks from two angles: two kinds of lexical item, Collocations and Fixed and Semi-fixed Expressions. He emphasized that they are pedagogically are important as, together with individual words, they form complementary parts of the mental lexicon. He distinguishes between words and expressions, calling the words and collocations convey referential meaning, while expressions convey pragmatic meaning. The former are concerned with the speaker/writer's content, and the latter with the speaker/writer's intentions. This idea is objected later by Crystal (1997, 2005), Moon (2001), believing that pragmatics is culture-bound and speaker-specific and generally context-specific —making the idea difficult to be measureable.

Lewis divides lexical chunks into four groups of a) polywords or extension of words, which is composed of more than one word, for example: as soon as, on the one hand, talk about, after all, grow up, b) Collocation: refers to pairs of words that frequently co-occur with each other, examples can be knife and fork, bread and butter verb+noun: play the basketball, shake hands, catch a cold, c) Institutionalized utterances: Chunks that are called whole units and conventionalized in the language, for instance, accepting: I"d be delighted to offering: can I give you a hand supposing: If I were you… and finally d) Sentence frames and heads: serve as the framework builder of the whole sentences, like 'It is suggested that…, The fact is…, My point is that… composition frames: This paper concentrates on…, firstly, secondly…, finally'

Lewis (1993) points out that among the four basic types, the first two categories are concerned mainly with referential meaning, and the latter two with pragmatic meaning.

Lewis (1993) regards lexis as the basis of language rather than grammar or vocabulary. Different from vocabulary which is understood as a stock of individual words with fixed meanings, lexis includes not only the single words but also the frequently used word combinations that we store in our mental lexicon. The fundamental principle of the lexical approach is "language consists of grammaticalized lexis, not lexicalized grammar" (Lewis 1993). It implies that lexis is the core or heart of language while grammar plays a subservient role. In other words, lexical chunks offer far more language generative power than grammatical structures. Lews believes that "the lexical approach concentrates on developing learners' proficiency through lexical chunks". As a result, teachers should focus on fixed or semi-fixed expressions that occur frequently in the language rather than originally created sentences. Farrokh and Mahmoodzadeh, (2012), summarized the difference between the lexical chunks and collocations stating that "the native-speakers have a lexicon that consists of prefabricated chunks and that they use these chunks in order to comprehend and produce language". They add that collocations being the largest part of these chunks. Hence, learning collocations is also important for an L2/LF learner in order to achieve native-like, fluency.

Based on Benson et al's (1997) definition of collocation "In English, as in other languages, there are many fixed, identifiable, non-idiomatic phrases and constructions. Such groups of words are called recurrent combinations, fixed combinations, or collocations". Collocations fall into two major groups: grammatical collocations and lexical collocations (p. 11834).

Lewis states that students need to improve their collocational competence in order to succeed. So they need training to know which words go-together (2000).

Yousefi, Pustchi and Salehipour (2012), believe that collocational patterns are the cornerstone of every language, recognizable by native speakers, strived to be acquired by second language learners; sometimes this inability leads to collocational errors and consequently the breakdown of comprehension, since the equivalent lexical items don`t always convey the same sense in two languages for reasons like cultural differences in the vocabulary of every language.

Further they quate that, communication, listening comprehension, and reading speed, and that teaching collocations enables learners to be aware of language chunks used by native speakers in speech and writing. It has been affirmed that heightening learners' awareness of collocations is a very efficient way of increasing their communicative power Channell (1981), fulfilling the referential or representational function of language that focuses on conveying a fact or context Sadoughvanini (2012).

Collocations are defined as a familiar grouping of words, especially words that habitually appear together and hence convey meaning by association (Firth, 1963; Robins, 1964; Nofal, 2012; Nordquist, 2013). Further collocational range refers to the accompaniment of a word determined by a word's level of specificity and number of meanings (Nordquist, 2013) or as Baker (1992) states—sense. There is also the contrasting term colligation; both terms, collocation and colligation were first used by British linguist John Rupert Firth (1890-1960), who defined colligation as the interrelation of grammatical categories in syntactical structure and collocation in semantic one. McEnery (2006) et. al, add that according to Firth (1968:181),

previously colligation refered to the relations between words at the grammatical level, i.e. the relationship between the words and sentences. But nowadays the term colligation is being used to refer not only to significant co-occurrence of a word with grammatical classes or categories (e.g. Hoey, 1997; Stubbs, 2001c:112) but also to significant co-occurrence of a word with grammatical words (e.g. Krishnamurthy, 2000). The patterning with grammatical words, of course, can be observed and computed even using a raw corpus. However, Moon (2001) doubts the individualization of collocation versus colligation believing that the dichotomy is blurred and lexical and grammatical collocations are double-functioned.

To Benson et al. (1986) collocation are fixed phrases stored in the mind, whereas for Halliday and Hasan (1976), a cohesive force determines word combination in the mind of the speaker. Again care should be taken that the intended speaker does not sound to be the non-native one [researcher's own comment]. However, Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) consider collocations "as high frequency word combinations" making no distinction between idioms, metaphors, etc. proposing an extended definition.

So as mentioned by Benson and other, it seems that chunks are predictibale. On this issue, Kuo (2009) states native speakers of English have a sense of collocational competence to predict the word companies; it is hard for foreign language learners to foresee the accompaniment of words. Besides, Evert (2004) suggests that predictability may be equated with compositionality conveying similar meanings; he reiterates that idioms are the most extreme cases of non-compositionality. He finally sums up that most collocations exhibit milder forms of non-compositionality. Word combinations that are considered as collocations range from compound nouns (black box), over semantically opaque idiomatic expressions (kick the bucket), to fully compositional combinations that are only lexically restricted (handsome man vs. beautiful woman).

Nevertheless, Crystal (2005) differentiates between collocation and association reiterating that the go-togetherness of words may have nothing to do with ideas. We say in English green with jealousy (not blue or red), though there is nothing literally 'green' about 'jealousy.

Firth (1967) emphasizes on the habitual or customary nature of collocations, by proving the appropriate and inappropriate collocational phrases below.

Adverb + Adjective	*completely satisfied*	*downright satisfied*
Adjective + Noun	*excruciating pain*	*excruciating joy*
Noun + Noun	*a surge of anger*	*a rush of anger*
Noun + Verb	*lions roar*	*lions shout*
Verb + Noun	*commit suicide*	*undertake suicide*
Verb + expression	*burst into tears*	*blow up in tears*
with Preposition	*wave frenetically*	*wave feverishly*
Verb + Adverb	*completely satisfied*	*downright satisfied*

Supporting the collocational versus referential meaning of lexica chunks proposed here, o Heine, Claudi & Hunnemeyer (2001), suggested that the opposition between grammatical and lexical meanings of a lexeme is often identified with the *concrete – abstract* opposition. The simplest abstraction is making an object non-referential. In terms of logic, the intentional content of the concept decreases while its extensional content increases.

In this study the pragmatic is not dealt with since according to Crystal (2005), it is not a coherent field of study which refers to the study of factors governing our choices of language - such as our social awareness, our culture and our sense of etiquette.

Lyons (1995) draws a distinction between 'descriptive' (or 'propositional') and 'non-descriptive' (or 'non-propositional') meaning. Focusing on the above-word-boundary, Lyons, implicitly compares collocational with referential meaning.

Nofal (2012) states that many linguists have addressed collocations in English. They have come up with similar definitions and categories, but they may differ in their focus. He argues about two types of collocations: the first type refers to situational meaning of words concerned as in "white coffee", "black coffee", "white race" and "white wine" where these colors are not used with reference to their referents. The other type refers to the referential meaning of words as in "dark night" where one meaning of "night" is its collectability with "dark" and vice versa. The Nofal's classification may be regarded as another support point for collocational and referential division proposed by the researcher.

As far as difficulties in collocational use are concerned, Iranian learners of English are by no means an exception. Any analysis of students' speech or writing indicates a deficiency in this regard. Despite having sufficient lexical or grammatical knowledge, most Iranian EFL learners seem to experience serious problems with the production of collocational patterns. Such erroneous expressions as *strong rain, to take birthday, heavy tea, to begin a family, hard question,* just to name a few, are not due to poor mastery of grammar or lexis. These problems, as Koosha and Jafarpour (2006) have pointed out, stem largely from lack of appropriate collocatioal knowledge among Iranian EFL learners, the inadequate emphasis given to collocational patterns in their textbooks and the type of instructions they receive. Moreover, such multi-word expressions have not usually been the focus of teaching. The fact is that research professionals in our country and most of the research studies carried out to date (Akbari, 1995; Zarei, 2002; Koosha & Jafarpour, 2006) have investigated the use of collocations in the learners' written product with only a few touching on their oral performance.

Based on their study with 200 participants, Koosha and Jafarpour concluded that the majority of Iranian EFL learners had good knowledge of English grammar and vocabulary; however, they seemed to have serious problems with the production of collocational patterns, especially collocations of prepositions.

3. Methodology

3.1. Subjects

The subjects of the study were 66 boys of high school students aged 16-18 in Tehran. The subjects are divided into two groups of experimental and control, 33 in each. They were chosen from among 8 classes of grade one, two of the classes were homogenous. The learners were all taught by the same teacher.

3.2. Design

The study keeps and experimental design with control-experimental group and conducting pre-post tests, so following a quasi-experimental design. Besides, a t-test and correlational analysis is carried out.

3.3. Materials

There is a multiple choice of 50 items test on vocabulary, 20 related to collocational meaning and 30 to referential meaning, piloted and validated for the intended audience. The test is based on students' book one of high school. Besides, the learners are required to produce the English equivalents of the Farsi given chunks to be assessed on their production ability. Therefore, the vocabulary of the four lessons of book one by the ministry of education is taught and evaluated. Moreover, applying SPSS, the reported reliability was 0.90.

3.4. Procedure

1. First a multiple choice test of lexical chunks is prepared, validated and piloted for the post test.
2. The learners in the two classes are pre-tested with the same test prepared in advance.
3. The learners' instruction starts. The vocabularies for the lessons are taught with applying chunks and collocation examples. The instruction took 45 days.
4. The experimental groups received chunking examples of vocabulary while the word list was supplied for the control group and they were asked to memorize the word list presented to them.
5. The groups were post tested, both through multiple choice test as a recognition aspect and written English-Farsi equivalent exam.
6. The data was analyzed through applying SPSS and the findings were reported.

4. Data collection and analysis

The data was analyzed through SPSS, applying independent t-test as well as paired one. First, two groups of students were randomly chosen from among 8 classes of grade nine in high school. All the eight classes were pre-tested to find the targeted control and the experimental groups. So the two groups of students were compared to ensure of no initial differences in their scores. Hence the pre-test is analyzed to show the learners' homogeneity.

Group Statistics

Table 1. pre-test group statistics

		N	Mean	S. D
Groups	Experimental	33	12.69	6.78
	Control	33	12.96	6.36

As the mean and the standard deviation in table 1 show, the two groups signify to be homogenous. To ascertain the claim, the given data was t-tested independently through the following table (2). As being indicated, the t-observed (0.16) is much less than the t-critical (1.67) for 66 subjects, whether directional or non-directional. So we can confer that the difference between the two groups was not significant at the pre-test stage.

Table 2. Pre-test analysis independent samples test

F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
0.00	0.95	-0.16	64	0.86	-0.27	1.62

Now to answer the questions of the study raised in the introductory section of this paper, further analysis of the data was required. Answering question one which stated that if the teaching of lexical chunks improve the Iranian EFL learners' retention and production of referential and collocational meaning of lexis, the subjects' results in the experimental and the control group were compared using independent t-test.

Table 3. Post-test total score statistics

	Groups	N	Mean	S.D	SEM
Total score	Experimental	33	32.75	7.62	1.32
	Control	32	24.81	9.18	1.62

By a glance at the descriptive data in table 3, some inferences might be made about the mean differences between the two groups. However, to make statistically cocksure, the data is rallied on into the following table.

Table 4. Post-test total independent t-test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
Post-test						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Std. Error Difference
Total	.98	.32	3.80	63	.00	2.09

The above table illustrates that the t-observed is higher than the t-critical and the two groups are significantly different. It implies that teaching through chunks was meaningfully significant for the experimental group whereas the control group did not receive any chunking practices.

So the above tables confirm that the teaching of chunks improved the learners' performance. Further analysis shows if the production and recognition abilities of the learners have improved compared to the control group. Table five shows the mean and standard deviation, but again more precise analysis is required to spot the differences.

Table 5. Post-test total Recognition and production statistics

Post-test Recognition	Groups	N	Mean	S.D	SEM
Recognition Referential Chunks	Experimental	33	10.81	2.78	.48
	Control	32	8.65	3.01	.53
Recognition Collocational Chunks	Experimental	33	10.00	2.89	.50
	Control	32	8.28	2.86	.50
Production Referential Chunks	Experimental	33	6.96	2.02	.35
	Control	32	4.62	2.45	.43
Production Collocational Chunks	Experimental	33	5.00	2.66	.46
	Control	32	3.25	2.59	.45
Total Production	Experimental	33	11.66	3.96	.69
	Control	32	7.46	4.61	.81

Table 6. Post-test total Recognition and production t-test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	SEM
Recognition Referential Chunks	0.60	0.44	3.00	63	0.00	0.71
Recognition Collocational Chunks	0.06	0.79	2.40	63	0.01	0.71
Total Recognition	0.20	0.65	2.92	63	0.00	1.31
Production Referential Chunks	1.88	0.17	4.20	63	0.00	0.55
Production Collocational Chunks	0.15	0.69	2.68	63	0.00	0.65
Total Production	0.50	0.48	3.93	63	0.00	1.06

As shown in table six above, in all cases of recognizing and producing the referential as well as the collocational chunks the experimental group's results surpassed that of the control group.

Observable in table six, all the differences in the two groups are significant—all t-observed are higher than the t-critical and significance is above 0.05 percent. Therefore, it can be wrapped up that the chunking helps students' recognition and production ability compared to their control group counterpart.

To reply question two and trace where exactly the experimental group's performance was highlighted, a paired t-test was carried out, besides the correlation between the scores was calculated. It was the place where we can make conclusions on the significance of chunking practices.

Table 7. Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	SD	SEM
Pair 1	Recognition Referential	10.81	33	2.78	0.48
	Recognition Collocational	10.00	33	2.89	0.50
Pair 2	Production Referential	10.27	33	3.58	0.62
	Production Collocational	8.33	33	3.94	0.68
Pair 3	Recognition Referential	10.81	33	2.78	0.48
	Production Collocational	8.33	33	3.94	0.68
Pair 4	Recognition Referential	10.81	33	2.78	0.48
	Production Referential	10.27	33	3.58	0.62
Pair 5	Recognition Collocational	10.00	33	2.89	0.50
	Production Collocational	8.33	33	3.94	0.68

Table 8. Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Recognition Referential & Recognition Collocational	33	0.60	0.00
Pair 2	Production Referential & Production Collocational	33	0.45	0.00
Pair 3	Recognition Referential & Production Collocational	33	0.28	0.10
Pair 4	Recognition Referential & Production Referential	33	0.12	0.50
Pair 5	Recognition Collocational & Production Collocational	33	0.18	0.30

Tables seven and eight above indicate that pair 5 as recognition and production of collocational chunks reveal very low correlation meaning that although learners are better at recognizing the collocational chunks they need more practice on producing them. Besides, the same issue happens for pair 4 as recognizing and producing referential chunks show significantly very low correlation. It also signifies that in referential chunking which seem to be easier to learn, there sounds to be more to study.

6. Conclusion

In this study the role and effect of chunking on students' performance was investigated. It was found that the experimental group outperformed the control group's performance on chunking ability. However, students were able to recognize but not produce the chunks. It means that more practice is needed on producing chunks than just helping them to recognize. In addition, contrary to many who believe that students have more problems on collocational chunks, it was found that learners faced more difficulty producing the referential chunks than the collocational one. For example when learners taught that 'get down to the lesson' means 'pay attention'; they mostly answered and produced the required response. Whereas seemingly simple expressions like, 'it is *getting late*' '*this* is Reza (on the phone)' and 'I can't *hear* you' the learners were not so successful in producing such expressions. It can be somehow inferred that the learners focused on collocational expressions more than the referential ones; however, in

producing the referential chunks they may receive more prominence and attention. Moreover, the findings suggest that learners need to focus on chunking in speaking and writing exercises. Teachers also need to make students aware of simple referential chunks which seem to be easy but are difficult when produced.

Reference

Ahranjani, A. K., & Shadi, M. (2012). Input enhancement and EFL learners'collocation acquisition. *Interantional Journal of Academic Research, 4*(1), 96-101.

Akbari, R. (1995). *The role of language-specific collocations on the written production of intermediate Iranian students learning English as a foreign language.* Unpublished MA thesis*,* Tarbiat Modarres University, Tehran, Iran.

Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Kentucky: Routledge.

Benson, M., Benson, E. & Ilson, R. (eds.). (1997). *The BBI dictionary of English word combinations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chan, S. (2008). Buildings Department Warns of High Winds. *The New York Times*, June 16,

Crystal, D. (2005). *How language works*. New York: Overlook Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). In, M. A. Locher & S. L. Graham. (2010). (Ed.). *Interpersonal pragmatics*. New York: Walter de Gruyter Publication.

Dweik, S. B. & Shakra, A. M. (2011). Problems in translating collocations in religious texts from Arabic into English. *The Linguistics Journal*. 5, (1), 5-41.

Ellis, N. C. (1997). Vocabulary acquisition: Word structure, collocation, grammar, and meaning. In M. McCarthy & N. Schmidt (Eds.) (1997), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 122-139). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Evert, S. (2004). *The statistics of word cooccurrences word pairs and collocations*. Unpublished Ph.D thesis. Von der Philosophisch-Historischen Fakultät der Universität Stuttgart zur Erlangung der Würde eines Doktors der Philosophie (Dr. phil.) genehmigte Abhandlung

Farrokh, P. & Mahmoodzadeh, K. (2012). Iranian learners' knowledge of English grammatical collocations of gerund. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, *2*(11), 11834-11844.

Firth, J. R. (1968). *Selected papers of J.R. Firth, 1952-59.* Edited by F. R. Palmer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Firth, J. R. (1968). A synopsis of linguistic theory. In Palmer, F.R. (ed.) *Selected Papers of J.R. Firth 1952-59* (168-205). London: Longmans.

Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers in linguistics (1934-1951).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goudarzi, Z., & Moini, M. R. (2012). The effect of input enhancement of collocations in reading on collocation learning and retention of EFL learners. *International Education Studies, 5*(3), 247-258.

Grimly, S. Patrol, K.M. (2002). In H.T. Giang. (2010). *A study on the pragmatic features of collocation used in advertising hair care products in English and Vietnamese*. Unpublished MA thesis. Ministry of Education and Training: University of Danang. Received from: *tailieuso.udn.vn/bitstream/TTHL_125/1379/2/Summary.pdf*

Halliday, M. (1966). Lexis as a linguistic level. In C. E. Bazell et al. (Eds.), *In Memory of J. R. Firth*. 148-162.

Heine, B., Claudi, U & Hünnemeyer, F. (2001). *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. UAS: University of Chicago Press.

Honey, J. (1997). *Language is power: The story of standard English and its enemies*. Faber & Faber.

Koosha, M., & Jafarpour, A. (2006). Datadriven learning and teaching collocation of prepositions: The case of Iranian EFL adult learners. *Asian EFL Journal*, *8*, 192-209.

Kranz, D. (1997). 'Review of Michael Lewis' book 'Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice', Hove UK: Language Teaching Publications', in: *TESL-EJ*, *3*(1).

Kuo, C. L. (2009). An analysis of the use of collocation by intermediate EFL college students in Taiwan. *Arecls, 6,* 141-155.

Lewis, M. (2000).*Teaching collocation: Further development in lexical approach.* England: The Language Teaching Publication, LTP.

Lewis, M. (Ed.), (2000). *There is nothing as practical as a good theory. In teaching collocations: Further developments in the lexical approach*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (1997).*Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*. United Kingdom: Heinle.

Lewis, M. (1993).*The lexical approach.* England: The Language Teaching Publication, LTP.

Lin, Y. (2009). Enhancing EFL learners' English reading proficiency through collocation instruction. *English Teaching & Learning, 33*(1), 37-71.

Lyons, J. (1995). *Linguistic semantics: An introduction*. Cambridge: CUP.

McEnery, T., Xiao, R. & Tono, Y. (2006). *Corpus-based language studies: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

Moon, R. (2001). *Vocabulary connections: Multi-word items in English. I**n* Schmitt and McCarthy J. Options for vocabulary learning through communication tasks**.** *ELT Journal, 55*(1).

Nattinger, J. R., & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.

Nofal, K. H. (2012). Collocations in English and Arabic: A comparative study. *English Language and Literature Studies*; 2, (3), p.80.

Nordquist, N. (2013). *Collocation*. Received from: http://grammar.about.com/od/c/g/collocationterm.htm.

Paciorek, A. & Williams, J. (2013). Semantic implicit learning in language. *CogSci Proceedings*. Received from: http://mindmodeling.org/cogsci2013/index.html.

Paradis, M. (2004). *A Nero-linguistic theory of bilingualism*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pirmoradian, M. & Tabatabei, O. (2012). The enhancement of lexical collocation learning through concordanceing: A case of Iranian EFL learners. *MJAL* 4: 4.

Robins, R. (1964). *General linguistics*: *An introductory survey*. Longman. Sadeghi, K. & Panahifar, F. (2013). A corpus-based analysis of collocational errors in the Iranian EFL learners' oral production. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS), 4*(4), 53-78.

Sadoughvanini, S.H. (2012). The relationship between use of collocations and expressiveness: Fulfilling the referential function of language. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies 1*(2), 28-37.

Sinclair, J. M. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stubbs, M. (2001). *Words and phrases: Corpus studies of lexical semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Yousefi, O. M. & Pustch, S., & Salehipour, S. (2012). The effect of pre-teaching vocabulary and collocations on the writing development of advanced students. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies, 2*(5). May 2012, 86- 103. Received from:www.academians.org

Zarei, A. (2002). *Patterns of Iranian advanced learners problems with English collocations.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Isfahan, Iran.