



**Revue des Sciences humaines  
et sociales, Lettres, Langues et  
Civilisations**

**ISSN  
2958-2814**

**Numéro 003, Juin 2023**

**Université Alassane Ouattara  
UFR Communication Milieu et Société**

***akiri-uao.org***



**ISSN 2958-2814**

Site web: <https://akiri-uao.org/>

E-mail: [revueakiri@gmail.com](mailto:revueakiri@gmail.com)

**Editeur**

UFR Communication, Milieu et Société  
Université Alassane Ouattara, Bouaké (Côte d'Ivoire)



## **INDEXATIONS INTERNATIONALES**

Pour toutes informations sur l'indexation internationale de la revue *AKIRI*, consultez les bases de données ci-dessous :

**auré HAL**  
accès aux données  
de référence de HAL

<https://aurehal.archivesouvertes.fr/journal/read/id/398946>

**Mir@bel**  
“(RE) CUEILLIR  
LES SAVOIRS”

<https://reseau-mirabel.info/revue/15150/Akiri>

## **Equipe Editoriale**

Coordinateur Général : BRINDOUMI Kouamé Atta Jacob

Directeur de publication : MAMADOU Bamba

Rédacteur en chef : KONE Kiyali

Chargé de diffusion et de marketing : KONE Kpassigué Gilbert

Webmaster : KOUAKOU Kouadio Sanguen

## **Comité Scientifique**

SEKOU Bamba, Directeur de recherches, IHAAA, Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny

OUATTARA Tiona, Directeur de recherches, IHAAA, Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny

LATTE Egue Jean-Michel, Professeur titulaire, Université Alassane Ouattara

FAYE Ousseynou, Professeur titulaire, Université Cheick Anta Diop

GOMGNIMBOU Moustapha, Directeur de recherches, CNRST,

ALLOU Kouamé René, Professeur titulaire, Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny

KAMATE Banhouman André, Professeur titulaire, Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny

ASSI-KAUDJHIS Joseph Pierre, Professeur titulaire, Université Alassane Ouattara

SANGARE Abou, Professeur titulaire, Université Peleforo Gbon Coulibaly

SANGARE Souleymane, Professeur titulaire, Université Alassane Ouattara

CAMARA Moritié, Professeur titulaire, Université Alassane Ouattara

COULIBALY Amara, Professeur titulaire, Université Alassane Ouattara

NGAMOUNSIKA Edouard, Professeur titulaire, Université Marien N'gouabi de Brazzaville

KOUASSI Kouakou Siméon, Professeur titulaire, Université de San-Pedro

BATCHANA Essohanam, Professeur titulaire, Université de Lomé

N'SONSSISA Auguste, Professeur titulaire, Université Marien N'gouabi de Brazzaville

DEDOMON Claude, Professeur titulaire, Université Alassane Ouattara

BAMBA Mamadou, Professeur titulaire, Université Alassane Ouattara

NGUE Emmanuel, Maître de conférences, Université de Yaoundé I

N'GUESSAN Mahomed Boubacar, Professeur titulaire, Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny

BA Idrissa, Professeur titulaire, Université Cheick Anta Diop

KAMARA Adama, Maître de conférences, Université Alassane Ouattara

SARR Nissire Mouhamadou, Maître de conférences, Université Cheick Anta Diop

ALLABA Djama Ignace, Maître de conférences, Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny

DIARRASSOUBA Bazoumana, Maître de conférences, Université Alassane Ouattara

TOPPE Eckra Lath, Maître de conférences, Université Alassane Ouattara

M'BRA Kouakou Désiré, Maître de conférences, Université Alassane Ouattara

## Comité de Lecture

BATCHANA Essohanam, Professeur titulaire, Université de Lomé  
 N'SONSSISA Auguste, Professeur titulaire, Marien N'gouabi de Brazzaville  
 CAMARA Moritié, Professeur titulaire, Université Alassane Ouattara  
 FAYE Ousseynou, Professeur titulaire, Université Cheick Anta Diop  
 BA Idrissa, Maître de conférences, Université Cheick Anta Diop  
 BAMBA Mamadou, Professeur titulaire, Université Alassane Ouattara  
 SARR Nissire Mouhamadou, Maître de conférences, Université Cheick Anta Diop  
 GOMGNIMBOU Moustapha, Directeur de recherches,  
 DEDOMON Claude, Professeur titulaire, Université Alassane Ouattara  
 BRINDOUMI Atta Kouamé Jacob, Professeur titulaire, Université Alassane Ouattara  
 DIARRASOUBA Bazoumana, Maître de conférences, Université Alassane Ouattara  
 ALABA Djama Ignace, Maître de conférences, Université Alassane Ouattara  
 DEDE Jean Charles, Maître-Assistant, Université Alassane Ouattara  
 BAMBA Abdoulaye, Maître de conférences, Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny  
 SANOGO Lamine Mamadou, Directeur de recherches, CNRST, Ouagadougou  
 GOMA-THETHET Roval, Maître-Assistant, Université Marien N'gouabi de Brazzaville  
 GBOCHO Roselyne, Maître-Assistante, Université Alassane Ouattara  
 SEKA Jean-Baptiste, Maître-Assistant, Université Lorognon Guédé,  
 BAKAYOKO Mamadou, Maître-Assistant, Université Alassane Ouattara  
 SANOGO Tiantio, Assistante, Institut National Supérieur des Arts et de l'Action Culturelle  
 ETTIEN N'doua Etienne, Assistant, Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny  
 DJIGUE Sidjé Edwige Françoise, Assistante, Université Alassane Ouattara  
 YAO Elisabeth, Assistante, Université Alassane Ouattara

## Contacts

Site web: <https://akiri-uao.org/>

E-mail: [revueakiri@gmail.com](mailto:revueakiri@gmail.com)

Tél. : + 225 0748045267 / 0708399420/ 0707371291

**Indexations internationales :**

**Auré HAL :** <https://aurehal.archivesouvertes.fr/journal/read/id/398946>

**Mir@bel :** <https://reseau-mirabel.info/revue/15150/Akiri>

## PRESENTATION DE LA REVUE AKIRI

Dans un environnement marqué par la croissance, sans cesse, des productions scientifiques, la diffusion et la promotion des acquis de la recherche deviennent un impératif pour les acteurs du monde scientifique. Perçues comme un patrimoine, un héritage à léguer aux générations futures, les productions scientifiques doivent briser les barrières et les frontières afin d'être facilement accessibles à tous.

Ainsi, s'inscrivant dans la dynamique du temps et de l'espace, la revue « *AKIRI* » se présente comme un outil de promotion et de diffusion des résultats des recherches des enseignants-chercheurs et chercheurs des universités et de centres de recherches de Côte d'Ivoire et d'ailleurs. Ce faisant, elle permettra aux enseignants-chercheurs et chercheurs de s'ouvrir davantage sur le monde extérieur à travers la diffusion de leurs productions intellectuelles et scientifiques.

*AKIRI* est une revue à parution trimestrielle de l'Unité de Formation et de Recherches (UFR) : Communication, Milieu et Société (CMS) de l'Université Alassane Ouattara. Elle publie les articles dans le domaine des Sciences humaines et sociales, Lettres, Langues et Civilisations. Sans toutefois être fermée, cette revue privilégie les contributions originales et pertinentes. Les textes doivent tenir compte de l'évolution des disciplines couvertes et respecter la ligne éditoriale de la revue. Ils doivent en outre être originaux et n'avoir pas fait l'objet d'une acceptation pour publication dans une autre revue à comité de lecture.

## **PROTOCOLE DE REDACTION DE LA REVUE AKIRI**

La revue **AKIRI** n'accepte que des articles inédits et originaux dans diverses langues notamment en allemand, en anglais, en espagnol et en Français. Le manuscrit est remis à deux instructeurs, choisis en fonction de leurs compétences dans la discipline. Le secrétariat de la rédaction communique aux auteurs les observations formulées par le comité de lecture ainsi qu'une copie du rapport, si cela est nécessaire. Dans le cas où la publication de l'article est acceptée avec révisions, l'auteur dispose alors d'un délai raisonnable pour remettre la version définitive de son texte au secrétariat de la revue

### **Structure générale de l'article :**

Le projet d'article doit être envoyé sous la forme d'un document Word, police Times New Roman, taille 12 et interligne 1,5 pour le corps de texte (sauf les notes de bas de page qui ont la taille 10 et les citations en retrait de 2 cm à gauche et à droite qui sont présentées en taille 11 avec interligne 1 ou simple). Le texte doit être justifié et ne doit pas excéder 18 pages. Le manuscrit doit comporter une introduction, un développement articulé, une conclusion et une bibliographie.

### **Présentation de l'article :**

- Le titre de l'article (15 mots maximum) doit être clair et concis. De taille 14 pts gras, il doit être centré.
- Juste après le titre, l'auteur doit mentionner son identité (Prénom et NOM en gras et en taille 12), ses adresses (institution, e-mail, pays et téléphones en italique et en taille 11)
- Le résumé (200 mots au maximum) présenté en taille 10 pts ne doit pas être une reproduction de la conclusion du manuscrit. Il est donné à la fois en français et en anglais (abstract). Les mots-clés (05 au maximum, taille 10pts) sont donnés en français et en anglais (key words)
- Le texte doit être subdivisé selon le système décimal et ne doit pas dépasser 3 niveaux exemples : (1. - 1.1. - 1.2. ; 2. - 2.1. -2.2. - 2.3. - 3. - 3.1. - 3.2. etc.)
- Les références des citations sont intégrées au texte comme suit : (L'initial du prénom suivi d'un point, nom de l'auteur avec l'initiale en majuscule, année de publication suivie de deux points, page à laquelle l'information a été prise). Ex : (A. Kouadio, 2000 : 15).
- La pagination en chiffre arabe apparaît en haut de page et centrée.
- Les citations courtes de 3 lignes au plus sont mises en guillemet français («...»), mais sans italique.

**N.B.** : Les caractères majuscules doivent être accentués. Exemple : État, À partir de ...

### **Références bibliographiques**

Ne sont utilisées dans la bibliographie que les références des documents cités. Les références bibliographiques sont présentées par ordre alphabétique des noms d'auteur. Les divers éléments d'une référence bibliographique sont présentés comme suit : NOM et Prénom (s) de l'auteur, Année de publication, zone titre, lieu de publication, zone éditeur, pages (p.) occupées par l'article dans la revue ou l'ouvrage collectif.

Dans la zone titre, le titre d'un article est présenté entre guillemets et celui d'un ouvrage, d'un mémoire ou d'une thèse, d'un rapport, d'une presse écrite est présenté en italique. Dans la zone éditeur, on indique la maison d'édition (pour un ouvrage), le Nom et le numéro/volume de la

revue (pour un article). Au cas où un ouvrage est une traduction et/ou une réédition, il faut préciser après le titre le nom du traducteur et/ou l'édition (ex : 2<sup>nde</sup> éd.).

Les références des sources d'archives, des sources orales et les notes explicatives sont numérotées en série continue et présentées en bas de page.

- Pour les sources orales, réaliser un tableau dont les colonnes comportent un numéro d'ordre, nom et prénoms des informateurs, la date et le lieu de l'entretien, la qualité et la profession des informateurs, son âge ou sa date de naissance et les principaux thèmes abordés au cours des entretiens. Dans ce tableau, les noms des informateurs sont présentés en ordre alphabétique
- Pour les sources d'archives, il faut mentionner en toutes lettres, à la première occurrence, le lieu de conservation des documents suivi de l'abréviation entre parenthèses, la série et l'année. C'est l'abréviation qui est utilisée dans les occurrences suivantes :  
Ex. : Abidjan, Archives nationales de Côte d'Ivoire (A.N.C.I), 1EE28, 1899.
- Pour les ouvrages, on note le NOM et le prénom de l'auteur suivis de l'année de publication, du titre de l'ouvrage en italique, du lieu de publication, du nom de la société d'édition et du nombre de page.  
Ex : LATTE Egue Jean-Michel, 2018, *L'histoire des Odzukru, peuple du sud de la Côte d'Ivoire, des origines au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 252 p.
- Pour les périodiques, le NOM et le(s) prénom(s) de l'auteur sont suivis de l'année de la publication, du titre de l'article entre guillemets, du nom du périodique en italique, du numéro du volume, du numéro du périodique dans le volume et des pages.  
Ex : BAMBAM Mamadou, 2022, « Les Dafing dans l'évolution économique et socio-culturelle de Bouaké, 1878-1939 », *NZASSA*, N°8, p.361-372.

**NB** : Les articles sont la propriété de la revue.



## SOMMAIRE

### SCIENCES HUMAINES ET SOCIALES

#### Géographie

1. **Diffusion des Technologies de l'Information et de la Communication (TIC) et problématique de l'accès à l'internet mobile dans le département de Korhogo**  
KONE Kapiéfolo Julien ..... 1-16
2. **Impact des déchets ménagers et miniers sur l'environnement et sur la sante de la population de la sous-préfecture de M'bengue (Côte d'Ivoire)**  
KONE Kagbagnan, KONE Kapiéfolo Julien & COULIBALY Moussa ..... 17-35
3. **Étude géographique des parcs autos dans la ville de Bouaké (Côte d'Ivoire)**  
Firmain Kouakou N'GUESSAN..... 36-46
4. **Les activités artisanales et leurs conséquences sur l'environnement : une étude de cas à Yopougon nord-est (Abidjan-Côte d'Ivoire)**  
KOUADIO Konan Célestin, KONAN Amani Fulgence & BAMBA Mamadou ..... 47-60
5. **Health risk linked to the use of pesticides in The sub-prefecture of bazra-natis (ivory coast)**  
TAPE Bi Sehi Antoine.....61-78
6. **La situation de la sédentarisation des pasteurs peuls en Côte d'Ivoire : cas du département de Ferkessédougou**  
YOMAN N'Goh Koffi Michael ..... 79-98
7. **La réserve de Lamto (Côte d'Ivoire) : une aire protégée en proie à des activités anthropiques illicites**  
Ahou Suzanne N'GORAN & N'Guessan Simon ANDON..... 99-114
8. **Etalement urbain et développement des friches dans la ville de Bondoukou**  
KONAN Kouakou Attien Jean-Michel & KOSSONOU Yaoua Phoébé..... 115-131

#### Histoire

9. **L'agriculture au Songhay et dans les sociétés littorales ouest-africaines aux XV<sup>e</sup>-XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles**  
Amon Guy Serge ATCHIE..... 132-147
10. **Les mécanismes de gestion des conflits dans la société traditionnelle yaouré (XVIII<sup>e</sup>-XX<sup>e</sup> siècles)**  
N'Founoum Parfait Sidoine KOUAME..... 148-160
11. **Jeunes et partis politiques en Côte d'Ivoire : entre prise de conscience et instrumentalisation (1990-2020)**  
Hyacinthe Digbeugby BLEY ..... 161-177

<b>12. Les artisans de l'avènement d'Ibn Yasin au Sahara occidental</b>	
Issouf OUATTARA.....	178-189
<b>13. Tombouctou dans la rébellion du Balama es-sadeq : un activisme contestataire au Songhoy (XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle)</b>	
Jean Charles DÉDÉ.....	190-206
<b>14. Patrimoine culturel ivoirien dans la consolidation de l'identité nationale 1893-2018</b>	
OUATTARA Brahim.....	207-222
<b>Sociologie et anthropologie</b>	
<b>15. Gouvernance communale et gestion du personnel des mairies : cas de la mairie de Cocody</b>	
KOUADJO Koffi Stéphane.....	223-237
<b>Droit</b>	
<b>16. Droits de la femme en Côte d'Ivoire : de l'égalité des sexes en réalisation</b>	
Samuelle Bernice EBA.....	238-257
<b>COMMUNICATION, SCIENCE DU LANGAGE, ARTS</b>	
<b>Sciences du langage et de la communication</b>	
<b>17. Impacts communicationnels des ellipses dans les réseaux sociaux sur les résultats scolaires en Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
N'golo Koné SIONGO & Monvaly Badara TOURE.....	258-279
<b>18. Les représentations sociales de la maternité des adolescentes au Burkina Faso</b>	
Aïcha Tamboura-Diawara .....	280-293
<b>19. Incommunication et taux de divortialité élevé en Côte d'Ivoire : une incidence sociale</b>	
Antoine KOUAKOU & Kan Samuel KOUAKOU.....	294-309
<b>20. Financement non public des industries culturelles et créatives en Côte d'Ivoire : états et enjeux</b>	
Renaud-Guy Ahioua MOULARET .....	310-327
<b>LANGUES, LETTRES, CIVILISATIONS</b>	
<b>Anglais</b>	
<b>21. English lexical collocations: a challenge for Malian EFL learners</b>	
Sekou SISSOKO.....	328-345
<b>Lettres Modernes</b>	
<b>22. L'épicurisme dans Sylves de Jean-Joseph Rabearivelod'Alain Mabanckou</b>	
Gohi Jonas TA BI.....	346-360

## English lexical collocations: a challenge for Malian EFL learners

**Sekou SISSOKO**

*Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako (Mali)*

*Email: [sissokosekou703@gmail.com](mailto:sissokosekou703@gmail.com)*

### **Abstract**

The teaching of English as a foreign language (TEFL) is still dominated by the use of grammar translation method while little or no attention is given to English lexical collocations. Though, Malian EFL learners have enormous difficulty in recognizing and producing English lexical collocations. We conducted a contrastive study between Bamanankan, English and French on the level of their collocations in 2022 at the Université des Langues et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako. The aim was to examine the receptive and productive collocation knowledge of Malian EFL learners. 150 participants took part in the study and six types of lexical collocations were used: verb+ noun, noun+ verb, noun+ noun, adjective+ noun, verb +adverb, adverb+ adjective. Data were collected through a multiple choice test, a translation task and a questionnaire and analyzed by SPSS software. The results revealed that learners' receptive collocation knowledge is higher in Bamanankan with 85% than English as a foreign language with 38%. Their receptive collocation knowledge in English is also higher than their productive collocation knowledge with 38% to 30% respectively. We concluded that the more EFL learners are exposed to collocation the better their collocation knowledge.

**Keywords:** Malian EFL learners, collocations, Bamanankan, English, ULSHB.

## **Collocations lexicales anglaises : un défi pour les apprenants EFL maliens**

### **Résumé**

L'enseignement de l'Anglais comme langue étrangère (ALE) est encore dominé par l'utilisation de la méthode traductionnelle en mettant peu ou non d'attention sur les collocations lexicales. Cependant, les apprenants maliens ALE ont d'énormes difficultés à reconnaître et à produire des collocations lexicales anglaises. Nous avons mené une étude contrastive entre l'Anglais, Bamanankan et Français au niveau de leurs collocations en 2022 à l'ULSHB. L'objectif était d'examiner les connaissances réceptives et productives des apprenants en matière de collocations. Nous avons échantillonné 150 apprenants et six modèles de collocations ont été utilisés : verbe + nom, nom + verbe, nom + nom, adjectif + nom, verbe + adverbe, adverbe + adjectif. Un test à choix multiple, une tâche de traduction et un questionnaire ont été utilisés ainsi que le logiciel SPSS pour l'analyse. Les résultats ont révélé que la connaissance des collocations réceptives des apprenants est plus élevée en Bamanankan (85 %) qu'en Anglais (38 %). Leur connaissance réceptive des collocations en Anglais est également plus élevée que leur connaissance productive, avec respectivement 38% et 30%. Nous avons conclu que plus les apprenants sont exposés aux collocations, meilleure est leur connaissance des collocations.

**Mots-clés :** Apprenants maliens ALE, collocations, Bamanankan, Anglais, ULSHB.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Introduction and Background

It has been widely argued over the last decade that learning a language involves learning its collocations (Hausmann, 1995: 125). In other words, the core of learning a language relies on the process of word combination that native speakers of that language intuitively know. Nation (2001) also thinks that: “all fluent and appropriate language use requires collocational knowledge”.

Demir (2017: 76) stated: “There is nearly no way of using a language without referring to collocations because they are intricately interwoven with the language itself. That is why; you absolutely have a high chance of encountering collocations whether you are a reader, speaker, or writer.”

These authors show that collocations are the bedrocks in language learning and teaching. That means speaking, reading and writing eloquently in a language requires the mastery of the collocations of this language. Lewis’ viewpoint (2000: 8) goes to the same lines as those of Hausmann and McCarthy. He stated:

The single most important task facing language learners is acquiring a sufficiently large vocabulary. We now recognize 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.

In other words, language learning is based on vocabulary and a great number of vocabulary is collocation. Reason why the teaching of collocation should be in the front line in language course. 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.

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 and Underwood, 2004; 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. Therefore, collocation is a convoluted issue requiring a huge amount of attention. Fox (1998) indicated that the fundamental trouble regarding an academic writing with full of odd expressions is of collocations but nothing else.

Over the last five decades many attempts have been made to define collocations, but up to date, studies on collocations have been insufficient in defining the concept of collocation in a more rigorous way (Cowie 1989: 1). The term collocation has been defined and used differently by researchers for different purposes. The definition of collocation adopted in this study is from Van Roey who defines collocation as: “The linguistic phenomenon whereby a given vocabulary item prefers the company of another rather than its “synonyms” because of constraints which are not on the level of syntax or conceptual meaning but on that of usage”. (1990:46).

From this definition, we notice that the word combination is not done freely. It requires some constraints which are not based on grammar but rather on the usage.

## **1.2. Problem statement**

Collocation is one of the most difficult problems for Malian EFL students at Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako (ULSHB). Not many of them are even aware of the existence of collocations due to the dominance of the grammar-translation approach which has played a key role in the teaching of English in Mali for decades. In this teaching approach, a particular attention is placed on the mastery of grammar rules but how lexemes are combined by native speakers is not taken into account. Such attitude does not permit learners to be exposed to collocations. Given these considerations, the focus of the present study is to examine the receptive and productive collocation knowledge of English lexical collocations in multilingual context at the university of languages and human sciences of Bamako. The descriptive qualitative method was used and the data were collected through a multiple choice test, a translation task and a questionnaire. The SPSS software version 21.0 was used for data analysis.

### **1.3. Purpose and objectives**

The overarching goal of this study is to examine the receptive collocation knowledge (RCK) and productive collocation knowledge (PCK) of Malian EFL learners at ULSHB. An important objective of this study is to gain better understanding of Malian EFL learners' ability to recognize Bamanankan lexical collocations and contrast them to that of English lexical collocations. It also permits to measure the amount of English lexical collocations Malian EFL learners can produce through a translation task. The study describes the underlying difficulty arising from these two categories of collocation knowledge in Malian EFL learners.

### **1.4. Research questions**

The study is framed by two research questions constructed to examine how Malian EFL learners master English lexical collocation both in reception and production and to figure out the difference between their receptive and productive collocation knowledge.

- 1- To what extent do Malian EFL students have knowledge of English and Bamanankan lexical collocation reception?
- 2- Is there a statistically significant difference between the participants' production and reception skills relating to lexical collocations in English?

### **1.5. Significance of the study**

This study highlights the extent to which Malian EFL learners have knowledge of lexical collocations in Bamanankan (L1) and English (a foreign language) by contrasting their receptive collocation knowledge in the two languages and measuring their productive collocation knowledge in English. It also permits to draw learners' attention about the importance of collocations in translation task by demonstrating that words are not always combined freely in a discourse.

The focus of most studies in collocations has been mainly on only a limited number of lexical collocation types such as verb+ noun and adjective +noun to measure both the reception and production of the participants' knowledge of collocations. Therefore, the present study attempts to fill this gap in the existing research by investigating a variety of collocation types (verb + noun, noun+ verb, noun+ adjective, noun + noun, verb+ adverb, and adjective+ adverb). Roughly speaking, the present study attempts to add to the existing research by exploring the receptive and productive collocation knowledge in Malian EFL learners at ULSHB.



The second instrument was the translation task composed of 26 French sentences with selected lexical collocations. Knowing that translation is a demanding activity, the researcher tried to keep the French sentence unambiguous and as simple as possible both semantically and structurally, hoping that the students would not feel linguistic pressure and thus focus more on how to render the problematic part in each sentence. Consequently, the participants were asked to translate only the phrases in bold from French into English where the target lexical collocation had to be supplied. The remaining parts of the sentences were translated from French into English to make sure that the questions would not lead participants to give answers involving aspects of grammar, e.g. tenses, preposition, articles and words such as determinates other than collocations. For example, in the following sentence, students were only asked to translate the phrase in bold (target collocation).

- Il est **formellement interdit** de fumer ici.
- It is.....to smoke here.

The aim of this test was to assess the participants' production knowledge of collocations and to elicit any influence of French on their lexical collocation performance.

The third instrument was a self-report questionnaire. The main purpose of the questionnaire was to help create a complete picture of the participants' awareness of the existence of collocation as well as to examine whether students had ever been in any English speaking country that may permit them to be aware of the word combination process used by native speakers. The questionnaire contained 3 items and was translated by the researcher into French for fear that some students would not understand the questions if they were given in English and thus could not give proper answers.

### **2.3. Data analysis procedures**

Student's multiple and translation outputs were first manually retrieved and categorized into independent and dependent variables. Independent variables included: Verb+ Noun, Noun+ verb, Adverb+ Verb, Noun+ Noun, Adjective + Noun, and Adverb+ Adjective and dependent variables were composed of correct, incorrect and lack of vocabulary (LOV) that means participants were asked in translation task not to let a sentence blank. So, if they don't know the answer they had to write "I don't know" which was categorized as lack of vocabulary or LOV. In the next stage, the qualitative data was quantified to measure the frequency rate by using SPSS software version 21.0.



Finally, the resulting translation categories were analyzed, and interpreted in the light of the questions guiding the study.

### 3. Results and their interpretation

The first question of this study was to determine the extent to which Malian EFL learners can recognize English lexical collocations properly and contrast it to their performance of collocation reception in their native language (Bamanankan).

To answer the first question, the percentage of correct and incorrect answers of the participants in each test was calculated. Table 1 and 2 show the results, presented as the number and percentage of correct and incorrect answers of the participants in receptive and productive tests respectively.

**Table 1: Number and percentage of correct and incorrect answer of receptive test.**

	Receptive test (Multiple choice questions)			
Number	150 participants			
	English (60 items)		Bamanankan (50 items)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Correct answers	3,443	38.25%	6,378	85.04%
Incorrect answers	5,557	61.75%	1,122	14.96%
Total	9,000		7,500	

**Table 2: Number and percentage of correct and incorrect answer of productive test.**

	Productive test (Translate from French to English) = 26 items                      Score: 3,900	
Number	150 participants	
	Frequency	Percentage
Correct answer	1,163	29.83%
Incorrect answer	2,737	70.17%

Data analysis reveals that the Malian EFL students intuitively used the correct combination in their native language than they did in a foreign language like English with 85.04% of the total correct combination in Bamanankan to only 38.25% in English (see table1). This overall level of performance of the subjects in the target lexical collocations is lower than would be expected considering the fact that the subjects have been learning English for more than six years.

The results in the productive test (the translation task) were even lower where only 29.83% of the subjects' total attempts were correct (see table 2). Based on these results, we notice that students' performance in the use of collocation is higher in their native language than in a foreign language (English).

The second research question investigated the statistical difference between the performance of participants in their receptive and productive lexical collocation knowledge in English. 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. Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, the minimum and the maximum percentage of correct scores of the whole group to obtain a picture of the general distribution of the data.

**Table 3: Descriptive statistics of the percentage of correct score of the two tests**

Type of test	Total number of students	Min	Max	Means	Standard Deviation
English receptive test	150	32	43	37	45.61
English productive test	150	23	37	31	60.39

Table 3 shows that the average of the performance of the students in English receptive task was higher than their average performance in English productive task with a mean score of 37 to 31 respectively. In a one-sample t-test this difference in correct scores between the two tests is statistically significant ( $t=402,347$ ,  $df=149$ ,  $Sig= 0,000$ ). The mean score in test one (the English receptive test) is 37 and the mean score of English reproductive test is 31. The t-test assesses whether the difference in the mean scores is statistically significantly different from zero;  $p\text{-value} = 0.000$  is less than 0.05 which indicates that the difference in mean scores is statistically significantly different from zero. Therefore, one can conclude that there is a difference in mean score between the two tests. Table 4 below shows the distribution of scores in the two tests.

**Table 4: Distribution of scores in the two tests**

	Test Value = 0				
	t	df	Sig.	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
Total correct English receptive test	99.348	149	0.000	37	36.26
Total correct English productive test	63.550	149	0.000	31	30.36

In overall, the results revealed that Malian EFL learners had good knowledge of collocations in their native language than the foreign language (English) and good performance in reception than production of English collocation. These differences can be accounted for the high degree of exposition to Bamanankan than to English. Moreover, the socio-political factors such as the strikes of teachers and students, the political turmoil can also be influential in the poor performance of

students. These factors have resulted in the intermittent school closes. Thus, the students' exposure to English collocations has been drastically reduced.

#### **4. Discussion**

##### **4.1. Discussion of the first research question related to the general collocation competence of Malian EFL learners in English and Bamanankan**

The investigation of the general lexical collocation knowledge of Malian EFL learners in both Bamanankan and English is the first aspect of the current study. To conduct this investigation, the researcher has used a multiple choice collocation test in English and Bamanankan and a translation task (from French to English) to test the participants' general lexical collocation competence in reception and production. A cursory look at the quantitative results presented in section 3 indicates that the Malian EFL learners' receptive collocation knowledge (RCK) in English was lower than would be expected. As indicated in tables 1 and 2 in section 3, only 38.25% of the total attempts of all the subjects on the receptive test (multiple-choice test in English) were correct. Our findings are parallel with those of Nguyen and Webb (2017) who found that their learners, despite having had seven years of English instruction and the fact that they were adult English majors, had poor RCK, with less than 50% correct answers. Howarth (1998) found out 25% of correct answer of non-native speakers. Zenab (2012) also pointed out that Libyan EFL learners had an insufficient RCK with 47% of correct answers. This is slightly different from ours which is 38% of correct combinations. Yet, the findings of Begagic (2014:54) are higher than ours with 78.87% of correct answers in the receptive test.

The results on the productive test (translation task) were even lower and only 29.83 % of the subjects' answers were correct. This is quite disappointing since our learners have been studying English for at least seven years and they are studying English as a main subject in the English language department of ULSHB. Our result is lower than that of Zenab in Libya with 41% of correct answer in the translation task. However, our result is also higher than that of Begagic in Bosnia (2014:46) with 14.37% of correct answers in productive test. Begagic's study concerned three types of collocations: verb + noun, adjective + noun and verb + adverb with 40 participants in first and fourth year of university study whereas our study included six types of collocation with 150 participants in first, second and third year of university study. In contrast, our participants did well in their native language (L1) with 85% of the total attempts of all the subjects on the receptive

test (multiple-choice test in Bamanankan). This may be accounted for by the fact that learners are exposed to Bamanankan collocations from early infancy which led them to the mastery of collocations in their L1 without any academic knowledge in this language. As Long (2015, p. 311) argues that child L1 learners not only are exposed to collocations more frequently than L2 learners, but also more intensively, with shorter time intervals between re-encounters with items. This may be the reason why collocations are more salient and memorable for L1 learners. Moreover, Per Snoder (2019) stated that “L1 users under normal circumstances receive abundant input of the language from early infancy, which leads to mastery of the linguistic system, including the ways words are naturally combined in the native-speaking communities. This occurs without conscious or deliberate effort”. Overall, the findings 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), Zaghoul and Abdul Fathah (2003), Mahmoud (2005), and EI-Masharawi (2008) which reported low levels of collocational knowledge of EFL learners. For instance, Bahns and Eldaw (1993) and Begagic (2014) found out 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.

An explanation for the low level of English lexical collocational knowledge of Malian EFL students could be attributed to the following factors. It is the researcher’s belief that the interaction between all the factors discussed below was the ultimate reason for the weak results obtained in this study: lack of awareness; grammar translation method and teaching material discrepancy, and socio-political turmoil. Students’ insufficient awareness is assumed to restrict their knowledge of lexical collocations. Malian EFL students seem to be not autonomous learners. They just depend on and take in what the teacher gives to them. In other words, they depend heavily on the grammar rules of word combination and do not pay attention to how native English speakers make their word combinations (collocation). Yet, despite their lack of academic knowledge of collocation, Malian EFL students know that some words accept to be accompanied by one word rather than its synonyms, not because of syntax or semantic rule but that of the usage. Reason why, they did well in Bamanankan lexical collocations with 85% of the correct answers than in English with 38%.

One other probable reason for their relatively low achievement may be the traditional method of teaching which is still dominant in Malian classrooms. Malian EFL teachers seem to

overemphasize the grammar in both teaching and testing at expense of the lexicon. They do not pay attention to teaching of collocations, and to make the matter worse, they do not encourage their students even to use a dictionary of English collocations. As a result, Malian EFL students learn English words individually or in isolation, without attention given to the relations that words have with one other. For example, the verb “to say” is known by all of them and they also know the word “prayer”. However, none of our participants found out the combination “to say the prayer”. Latiwish (2003) explained that learning English as a foreign language is viewed as a matter of mastering grammatical rules and vocabulary, and many English language curricula and accompanying course books are designed to promote this by memorization. This viewpoint of Latiwish (2003) illustrates vividly what we said above.

The socio-political turmoil can also influence the performance of students because the school programs cannot be fully executed. As the matter of fact, the amount of students’ exposure to English collocations was lower. From 2019 up to 2022, the research period, Malian schools have undergone intermittent closes because of the teachers and students’ strikes. Some of these strikes have lasted many months. In addition, during this research period, Mali has also known two military coups leading to political turmoil. Such a political situation is not also favorable for the learning process in general. Moreover, the adopted language learning materials in Malian universities seem to have much influence on the issue of the students’ low knowledge of English lexical collocation. It goes without saying, that the L2 learners, particularly in formal learning situations, are often exposed to text of rather restricted lexical content and very simplified structure.

Thus, the results of this study accord with the voices calling for teaching lexical collocation such as McCarthy (1990), Lewis (1993), and Hill (2000). For instance, McCarthy (1990) mentioned that the learners from early stage need to focus on the acquisition of collocations to enrich their vocabulary and to help them produce natural sounding sentences. Lewis (1993) also points out that raising awareness of collocation can be incorporated into the teaching and learning process to expand the learners’ mental lexicon proficiency. Thus, it seems reasonable to claim that the knowledge of lexical collocation is central in building up students’ confidence, therefore, collocations should be emphasized in second foreign language classrooms to enhance effective language learning.

Interestingly, this study corroborates with the research of Hussein (1990) and the results of Mahmoud (2005) and Zenab (2012) by confirming the low collocational level of Arabic-speaking university students majoring in English in EFL contexts. While 51.9% of the collocations the participants used in Hussein's study and 64% in Mahmoud's study were wrong, in our study 71% of the collocations produced by the EFL participants (in the translation task) and 62% (in the multiple-choice test) were erroneous against only 15% of erroneous collocations in their native language. The difference in percentages between the results of the three studies are probably due to the differences in the nature of the tasks used. Hussein used only a multiple choice task, Mahmoud used a writing task and in our study, we used two type of tests, the multiple-choice test and the translation task. One more reason for this difference may be related to the selection of the used items. Although the number of incorrect collocations was lower in Hussein's (1990) study than Mahmoud's (2005) study and the current study, Hussein's study was the only study of the three that did not describe how the test items were selected. However, all the aforementioned studies agreed with previous research on the poor collocational knowledge of EFL learners majoring in English.

#### **4.2. Discussion of the results of the second question of the study related to the differences between the participants' receptive and productive knowledge of English lexical collocations**

The issue of the differences between the participants' receptive collocation knowledge and their productive collocation knowledge is the second aspect in the current study. The second research question addressed in this study asked whether there was a significant difference between Malian EFL learners in regards to their receptive and productive knowledge of English lexical collocations. As mentioned above, the researcher used two instruments in order to achieve the objective of this question. A multiple choice test was the main instrument to assess the participants' receptive collocation knowledge and the translation task was used to examine their productive collocation knowledge. Six types of English lexical collocations were tested (verb + noun, noun + verb, noun + noun, adjective + noun, verb + adverb, adverb + adjective). One point which is worth noting here is that the use of translation task as a technique to measure the foreign language learners' productive knowledge has drawbacks, on being that it is not very productive, because translating single words is a rather artificial task at some remove from the reality of communicative language use. But it still considered a technique which can yield insights (Milton, 2009). Literature has various

definitions of receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. For example, Laufer et al. (2004) describe receptive knowledge as retrieval of the word form and productive knowledge as retrieval of the word meaning. Also, in his study, Webb (2008) defines receptive vocabulary knowledge as the ability to recognize the form of a word and to define or find a synonym for it, while productive vocabulary knowledge is the ability to recall the form and meaning of a foreign language word. The common characteristics of these definitions on receptive vocabulary knowledge is the ability to recognize the form and retrieve the meaning in listening and reading. Whereas productive vocabulary knowledge defined as the ability to retrieve and produce the appropriate spoken or written form of a word in the target language to express a meaning by speaking or writing (Nation, 1990). In this study, the receptive task required learners to look at the target English words and choose the right collocation while the productive task presented the target words in L2 (French) and required learners to recall the English words.

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% of the correct answers. A t-test of these two means confirmed that there is a slight difference between them ( $t=99.348$ ,  $df=149$ ,  $Sig= 0.000$ ). 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 and only one type of collocations shows contrary evidences. Such a finding 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 Mirna (2014), Nation (2000), Taeko (2005), 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, Mirna (2014) 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.

Based on the results obtained, the researchers have attributed the differences between the participants' receptive and productive knowledge to the following possible explanations. The format of the receptive test and the productive test might play a role in the results gained with regard to the differences between the participants' receptive and productive knowledge of the target lexical collocations. Milton (2009) claimed that "it seems reasonable to assume that the listener or reader of a text can often call on variety of contextual and other information to reach meaning. However, in production, when the learner is under pressure of time for communication, these clues will be missing and the learner will have to rely on the fewer words they have accessible in memory (p.117)". In other words, whilst it was easy for students to select the correct answer from a limited number of choices in the multiple-choice test (receptive test), it seems to be difficult for them to produce the target lexical collocation according to the sentences provided. For instance, Zenab (2012) found that Libyan EFL learners were able to recognize the lexical item "absolutely delicious" in the receptive test and failed to produce the same lexical collocation in the productive test. In our study, learners were also able to recognize the collocation "shrug his shoulder" but failed to find it out in the translation task.

Another reason may be traced to the challenging task of the translation process that inevitably involves two languages and two cultural traditions and strong linguistic background. As Gueye (2015) claims that Learning a foreign language represents a significant challenge because of the adjustments it requires from the learner at the psychological, linguistic, cultural and neurolinguistic levels.

In short, Malian EFL learners will need to develop larger receptive collocation knowledge in order to develop their productive knowledge of lexical collocations that can lead to effective communication in writing and speech.



## 5. Conclusion

Although it is widely acknowledged that collocations play an important role in second or foreign language learning. However, there are scanty studies about them in Malian multilingual context. This study aimed to examine the English lexical collocation knowledge of Malian EFL learners, both receptively and productively.

Generally, statistical analysis showed that the level of Malian EFL learners' receptive collocation knowledge was relatively low in English but very high in Bamanankan (their native language). It also showed that learners' receptive collocation knowledge in English was better than their productive collocation knowledge. This poor performance of Malian EFL learners both receptively and productively can be accounted for many reason such as lack of collocation awareness, grammar translation method, poor curricula in collocations and the recent social and political turmoil in Mali. According to all aforementioned suggestions, it can be stated that more effort should be made towards collocation awareness for teachers and students through exercises and class discussions about collocations.

## References

- ALSAKRAN A. Rayed, 2011, *The productive and receptive knowledge of collocations by advanced Arabic-speaking ESL/EFL learners*. unpublished Masters dissertation, Colorado State University.
- BAHNS, Jens & ELDAW, Moira, 1993, *Should we teach EFL students collocations?* *System*, 21 (I), 101-114
- BEGAGIC Mirna, 2014, *English language students' productive and receptive knowledge of collocations*. *Explorations in English Language and Linguistics (ExELL)*, pp: 46-67
- BENSON Morton, BENSON Evelyn & ILSON Robert, 1986, *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary Of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.1. D. (Eds.), *A focus on language test development: expanding the language proficiency*
- BONK J. William, 2000, *Testing ESL learners' knowledge of collocations*. *ELT Journal*, 35, 115-122.
- BRASHI Abbas, 2009, *Collocability as a problem in L2 production*. *Reflection on English Language Teaching* 8(1). 21-

DEMIR Cüneyt, 2017, *Lexical Collocations in English: A Comparative Study of Native and Non-native Scholars of English*. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(1), 75-87.

EI-MASHHARAWI Aya Khaled, 2008, *Collocation Errors Made by English and Journalism Majors at the Islamic University of Gaza*. Unpublished dissertation. The Islamic University of Gaza.

FARGHAL Mohammed & OBEIDAT Husain, 1995, *Collocations: a neglected variable in EFL*. *IRAL*. 33(4), 315-331.109

FILLMORE J Charles, 1979, On fluency. In Fillmore, C., Kempler, D.& Wang, W. S. Y. (eds) p.193.

FOX Michael, 1998, *Teaching collocations: Further developments in the lexical approach*. Hove:

GUEYE Mamadou, 2015, *Some Reflections on the Relationships between Bilingualism, Intelligence Quotient (IQ) and Error Making in Teaching of English as a Foreign Language in Mali*. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 6, No. 1, p.85-90

HAUSMANN Franz Josef, 1989, “*Le dictionnaire de collocations*.” In Franz J.Hausmann, Herbert E. Wiegand, & Ladislav Zgusta (Eds.), *Wörterbücher, Dictionaries, Dictionnaires*. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie (pp. 1010–1019). Berlin:de Gruyter.

HILL Jimmie, 2000, *Revising priorities: from grammatical failure to collocational success*. In Lewis, M. (Ed.), *Teaching collocation* (pp. 28-46). Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

HOWARTH Peter, 1998, *Phraseology and second language proficiency*. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 24-44.

HUSSEIN Riyad Fayez, 1998, *Collocations: The missing link in vocabulary acquisition amongst EFL learners*. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 26(26), 123-136.

KOYA Taeko, 2005, *The acquisition of basic collocations by Japanese learners of English*. (Doctoral dissertation. Waseda University. 2005). Retrieved from <http://www.dspace.wul.waseda.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/nl206515285/31H0nbun-4160>. Pdf

Language Teaching Publications

LATIWISH Mohamed, 2003, *Teachers' training strategies*. Benghazi: University of Garyounis Press.

LAUFER Batia, ELDER Cathie, HILL Kathryn & CONGDON Peter, 2004, Size and strength: do we need both to measure vocabulary knowledge? *Language testing*, 21 (2), p.202-206.

LEWIS Michael, 1993, *The Lexical Approach*. Language Teaching Publications.

LEWIS Michael, 2000, *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach*. London: Language Teaching Publications p. 248.

LONG Mike, 2015, *Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons p. 311.

MAHMOUD Abdulmoneim, 2005, *Collocation errors made by Arab learners of English*. *Asian EFL Journal*, 6 (2), 117 -126 Matters.

MCCARTHY Michael, 1990, *Vocabulary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MCCARTHY Michael. & O'DELL Felicity, 2005, *English Collocations in Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

MELKA J Francine Teichroew, 1997, *Receptive versus productive aspects of vocabulary*. In Schmitt, N. & McCarthy, M. (eds.) *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition, and pedagogy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, p.84-102.

MILTON James, 2009, *Measuring second language vocabulary acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual

NATION Paul I. S. P., 1990, *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. New York and London: Newbury House Publishers natively like fluency. In Richards, I. C. & Schmidt, R. W. (Eds.), *Language and communication*

NGUYEN Huynh Trang & WEBB Stuart, 2017, *Examining second language receptive knowledge of collocation and factors that affect learning*. *Language Teaching Research*, 21(3), p.298-320.

PAWLEY, Andrew & SYDER Frances, 1983, *Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Natively like selection and native like fluency* in Richards J.C and Schmidt, R.W (eds.). (1983). *Language and communication*. London: Longman.

SCHMITT Norbert & UNDERWOOD Geoffrey. 2004, *Exploring the processing of formulaic sequences through a self-paced reading task*. In Schmitt, N. (Ed.), *Formulaic Sequences*, p.171-189, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins

SNODER Per, 2019, *L2 Instruction and Collocation Learning - Classroom intervention research on input processing with L1 Swedish adolescent learners of English- A doctoral thesis*, Stockholm University

WEBB Stuart ,2008, *Receptive and productive vocabulary sizes of L2 learners*. *Studies in Second language acquisition*, 30(1), p.79-95.

ZINAB A. Ahmed, 2012, *English lexical collocation knowledge of Libyan University students*, doctoral thesis, Bangor University

ZUGHOUL, Muhammad Raji & ABDUL-Fattah Hussein ,2003, *Translational collocational strategies of Arab learners of English: A study in lexical semantics*. *Babel*, 49 (1), 59-81.