THE USE OF MONOLINGUAL ENGLISH AND BILINGUAL ARABIC-ENGLISH DICTIONARIES IN KUWAIT: AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE DICTIONARIES USED AND REFERENCE SKILLS DEPLOYED BY UNIVERSITY STUDENTS OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Hashan Al-Ajmi

2

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds

School of English

October 1992

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

Summary

This is an empirical investigation into the use of dictionaries by students of English and Science at Kuwait University with a particular focus on bilingual dictionaries of Arabic and English. In the introductory chapter we discuss the increasingly important role of vocabulary in EFL methodology and the relevant emphasis on improving existing dictionaries and teaching students how to make effective use of them. In chapter two we focus on bilingual dictionaries and review their status in EFL methodology. Then structural features of this type of dictionary are discussed with special reference to the problems of translation equivalents, sense discriminations, and intended dictionary function. Chapter three is a critical examination of two bilingual dictionaries in Kuwait. AL-MAWRID (English-Arabic) and DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC (Arabic-English) are examined in terms of their users and uses, introductory matter, translation equivalents, sense discriminations, illustrative examples, collocations and idioms, grammatical information, and pronunciation. In the fourth chapter we review previous studies of dictionary users and uses and focus on their findings which bear relevance to our investigation. Chapter five is a description of the research method we follow in our investigation i.e. a questionnaire and two translation tests. In chapter six we present and analyse the findings on specific aspects of dictionary use addressed in the questionnaire. Chapter seven is an analysis of translation errors in relation to the type(s) of dictionary used in the L1-L2 and L2-L1 translation tests. The final chapter summarises the research findings and presents some suggestions with regard to the improvement of existing bilingual dictionaries of English and Arabic and the training of dictionary users.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe my greatest debt to Mr. A.P. Cowie, my supervisor, whose expert advice and critical suggestions have been an invaluable help.

I am also very grateful to my colleagues at Kuwait University, who assisted me in the gathering of data for the present study.

Finally, I would like to express my thanks to my family for their patience and encouragement throughout.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER SEVEN: TRANSLATION TEST RESULTS

CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND AND AIMS

1.1 Introduction:

In recent years, there has been a growing consensus that learners, especially at advanced levels, experience more difficulties with the vocabulary of the foreign language than with its syntax or phonology (cf. Richards 1976; Marton 1977; Meara 1980; Nuttall 1982). Error analysis studies have also confirmed the belief that most errors made by EFL learners are of a lexical nature (cf. Jain 1981; Tomaszczyk 1987; Ard 1982). The complexity of these errors varies according to different linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pedagogical factors. The native language of learners interferes, either negatively or positively, with their L2 performance, influencing their choice of lexical items with a meaning and register appropriate to the spoken or written context (cf. Lado 1957). Yet, some have viewed these errors as a device the learner uses for testing his hypotheses about the nature of the language he is learning (cf. Corder 1981).

The role of vocabulary selection and acquisition was a neglected area in applied linguistic theory for many years (cf. Wilkins 1972; Carter & McCarthy 1988). The lexicon in the structuralist school was assigned a peripheral role after syntax

and phonology; as Bloomfield (1933:274) remarked, "the lexicon is really an appendix of the grammar". The transformationalist approach which emerged in the fifties did not pay enough attention to vocabulary either, as it concerned itself mainly with the syntactic and phonological patterns of sentences. Transformational theorists thought that learners should internalise syntactic rules in order to produce grammatically correct sentences in a creative manner (cf. Chomsky 1965). Research into second-language acquisition has therefore tended to be limited to the role of grammar rather than the vocabulary (cf. Meara 1980). In language teaching methodology, vocabulary has, until comparatively recently, been assigned a secondary role and teachers have concentrated on syntactic structures, although the communicative approach did, in the 1970's, try to redress the balance by basing the foreign language syllabus on a description of learners' lexical as well as syntactic needs in communication (cf. Van Ek 1975; Wilkins 1976; Widdowson 1978). The importance of vocabulary in language teaching methodology was represented by the following statement by Wilkins (1972:111):

> " ... while without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed".

In the late 1980's and early 1990's there has been a more radical shift in favour of vocabulary teaching although, in practice, a good deal is left to the dictionary as a reliable and readily accessible source of information for language learning (cf. Carter 1987; McCarthy 1990).

The earlier lack of enough proper instruction dealing directly with the vocabulary as the main source of difficulty for EFL learners left much to be done by dictionaries as reliable sources of information on the foreign language.

Dictionaries can play a vital role in providing EFL learners with different types of information which a non-native English teacher may not be able to supply in the clear and simple manner of a pedagogically oriented dictionary, which developed mutually with linguistic theory (e.g. OXFORD ADVANCED LEARNER'S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH, LONGMAN DICTIONARY OF CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH, CHAMBERS UNIVERSAL LEARNER'S DICTIONARY, COLLINS COBUILD ENGLISH LANGUAGE DICTIONARY). Unlike native speakers' monolingual dictionaries, these EFL dictionaries provide fuller treatment of syntactic, phonological, and encyclopaedic information for the benefit of the foreign learner (cf. Cowie 1984, 1989a, 1989b; Kirkpatrick 1985).

Yet dictionary use involves complex retrieval operations even for the user wishing to simply understand lexical items in their various senses. Scholfield (1982) described seven steps for successful dictionary use:

1) Locate the word(s) or phrase you do not understand.
2) If the unknown is inflected, remove the inflection to discover the form to look up.
3) Search for the unknown in the alphabetic list.
4) If you cannot find at least one main entry for the unknown, try the following procedures:
   a) If the unknown seems to be a set phrase, idiom, compound word, try looking up each main element.
   b) If the unknown seems to have a suffix, try the entry for the stem.
   c) If the unknown appears to be an irregularly inflected form or spelling variant, scan nearby entries.
   d) If there is an addendum, search it.

5) If there are multiple senses or homographic entries, reduce them by elimination.
6) Understand the definition and integrate it into the context where the unknown was met. This may involve:
   a) Looking up unknown words in the definition itself.
   b) Adjusting for complementation and collocation.
   c) Adjusting for breadth of meaning.
7) If none of the senses entered seems to fit, attempt to infer one that does from the senses you have. If more than one fits seek further contextual clues in the source text to disambiguate (p.188).

It is hard to imagine EFL learners at the initial stages being fully capable of performing these operations of dictionary use. Reports from different parts of the world have reflected doubts about learners' ability to cope successfully with their dictionaries. Tomaszczyk (1979:116) observed that

> "...while advanced learners and speakers seem to know what they can expect of their dictionaries and appear to be getting the most out of them, many beginning and intermediate learners do not know their dictionaries well enough and frequently they have unreasonable and contradictory demands with respect to them".

A contradictory finding was reported by Béjoint (1981:119) who found that even advanced users do not benefit from all types of information in their dictionaries:

> "... it seemed to us that monolingual dictionaries are not used as fully as they should be; their introductions are not commonly referred to and neither are the coding systems for syntactic patterns. Certainly many students are not aware of the riches that their monolingual dictionaries contain".

The question of foreign learners' difficulties in retrieving information from increasingly sophisticated EFL dictionaries has been brought forward by Cowie (1983:136):

> "... the EFL dictionary becomes an increasingly sophisticated reference tool, consciously adapted to specific study needs, but in danger with each innovation of outstripping the often rudimentary reference skills of those it is designed to serve".

Since the seventies, more researchers and lexicographers have been focusing not only on dictionary design but also on the users' needs and expectations (cf. Cowie 1989a; Hartmann 1989b). Identifying and meeting users' needs has become a major concern in lexicographic work. This concern was reflected in the following remark by Ilson (1985:4):

> "Dictionaries have in the past too often been considered simply as systems of information storage. Too little attention has been devoted to the problem of information retrieval. Do people know what is in dictionaries? Can they find it? And if they find it, can they use it?".

The integration of the dictionary as a powerful learning tool in the EFL programme "... has received relatively scant attention from the language teaching profession" (MacFarquhar and Richards 1983). This situation can be changed by deliberate teaching which "... covers the gap which exists between users' attitudes and habits on the one hand and lexicographical understanding and expertise on the other" (Cowie 1983:143). Many

dictionary publishers have tried to close this gap by the introduction of structured guidance and training in the form of workbooks and dictionary guides (e.g. Learning with LDOCE, (Whitcut 1979); Use Your Dictionary, (Underhill 1980); Chambers Universal Learner's Workbook, (Kirkpatrick 1981); An English Pronunciation Companion, (Gimson and Ramsaran 1985); Workbook on Lexicography, (Kipfer 1984). Yet, these have been criticized for being based too often on the information types in the dictionary and not enough on an analysis of the user's needs and reference skills (cf. Hartmann 1987). Also, most of these workbooks do not specify the prospective user beyond that of dictionary purchaser (cf. Stark 1990). More researchers and language teachers have emphasized that students should be taught how to use their dictionaries effectively (cf. Béjoint 1981, 1987; Herbst and Stein 1987; Kipfer 1987; Tickoo 1989; Hartmann 1989a). Some have specified guidelines for EFL learners on how to use monolingual and bilingual dictionaries in writing; i.e. for finding unknown L2 words and handling idioms and particular types of discourse (cf. Béjoint & Moulin 1987).

1.2 **Specifying the problem:**

In Kuwait, problems of dictionary use take on a particular character. An important issue here is that the role of English inside and outside educational institutions in Kuwait is rather limited when compared to countries like Germany, where English

serves as the medium of international business communication, and India, where it is used as a lingua franca to facilitate communication between heterogeneous linguistic communities. In the case of Kuwait, the English language plays a mixture of these roles though in a more limited sense. Companies and businesses with commercial links with industrialised countries often require that their employees attain an advanced level in spoken and written English and provide them with training where English is used as the medium of instruction. English is also used locally to communicate with non-Arab residents especially those from the Indian subcontinent and Southeast Asia. Two daily newspapers are published in English and some radio and television stations broadcast most of their programmes in English.

In spite of the increasing numbers of people learning the language e.g. students, businessmen, travellers, etc., the general aim is still that of developing a basic level of proficiency that enables learners to read rather than write or speak comprehensible English. Some learners, especially businessmen and politicians, would consider a more advanced level in English an essential requirement as their occupations involve travelling to and working in countries where English is the native language (U.K., U.S.A., Canada, etc.) or the language of international communication (Japan, Spain, Germany, etc.). In Kuwait, spoken fluency in English is an important qualification for working in private companies but not in government institutions where the native language is used as the medium of formal written communication.

The local use of English is challenged by those who advocate replacing it with Arabic in formal written communication in private companies and in university departments where English is the medium of instruction (e.g. science, engineering, medicine, etc.). Especially in the latter area, the use of English has been a subject of dispute between those who, motivated by nationalistic sentiment, call for replacing the difficult foreign language with the native tongue of Arab students, and supporters of the use of English as the language of technology, which provides students in their respective fields of study with immediate access to the original publications and scientific theories. The latter group also argue that the existing Arabic Language Academies have not succeeded yet in producing standard technical terminologies in Arabic (cf. Al-Kasimi 1979).

Another relevant issue is the status of dictionary use in the curricula. Although the English language is taught for eight years, students usually leave school having reached a rather poor standard. Dictionary reference skills do not seem to be treated in the school curricula. Only one skill relevant to dictionary use is practised, i.e. familiarisation with the alphabet, but teachers are not told how dictionary use may be taught.

This generally limited role of English means that Kuwaiti learners of English reach university level with little or no background in dictionary use. Their university study involves the use of the English language, and hence they are required to attain a high level of English proficiency in order to read English textbooks or at least understand the specialised

terminology in their different fields of study. Their EFL learning activities are mainly interpretative, and with the exception of English majors, students tend to focus primarily on mastering the necessary specialised vocabulary.

These language needs and study modes entail a heavy reliance on comprehension dictionaries and bilingual English-Arabic ones in particular. Yet, as we will find out later, these bilingual dictionaries do not satisfy their language needs. None of these dictionaries has been updated or improved since the mid-sixties, which means that Kuwaiti students frequently fail to find newly adopted terms. Even recent publications such as the NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY FOR SPEAKERS OF ARABIC and the CONCISE OXFORD ENGLISH-ARABIC DICTIONARY suffer from inadequate lexical coverage. In addition, the inadequate treatment of translation equivalents and the historical ordering of senses are another source of problems for these learners. On the other hand, there is no bilingual Arabic-English dictionary that has been written specifically for the Arabic-speaking learner. Those who wish to write or translate into English have to rely on works designed for western scholars and English-speaking learners of Arabic. EFL monolingual dictionaries are also used especially by the more advanced students. Although this latter type is available on the dictionary market, the heavy demands it places on the less advanced user and the lack of proper instruction in its use make it less popular among Kuwaiti EFL learners than bilingual dictionaries.

1.3 **Aims of the present study:**

Given the increasingly important role of vocabulary acquisition generally and the dominance in the Kuwaiti EFL context of bilingual dictionaries, this study aims at identifying the dictionary needs and habits of learners of English at Kuwait University and the particular problems they face in using their dictionaries.

We shall proceed by examining critically bilingual dictionaries in general, and two Arabic-based ones used as study aids at university level in Kuwait in particular. We shall also investigate the capacity of students to make the best use of dictionaries of various types, determining how both (i.e. students' capacity and their bilingual dictionaries) can be improved, and deciding the part played by deliberate training in dictionary use.

The method followed is first to make a straightforward critical analysis of two popular bilingual dictionaries in the light of published theoretical work on the bilingual dictionary. The issue of dictionary users and uses in Kuwait is then approached via a review of previous studies of dictionary users and uses. We afterwards proceed to the investigation proper; the shortcomings of these two bilingual dictionaries are examined experimentally via L1-L2 and L2-L1 translation tests, and the capacity of the students by the same means and by means of a questionnaire. On the basis of our findings, we then attempt to make certain tentative recommendations with regard to the

information design of bilingual dictionaries aimed specifically at Arab EFL learners, and the training of this group of dictionary users.

What motivates this research is the lack of consciously planned formal instruction on dictionaries, whether monolingual or bilingual, the failure to develop the relevant reference skills, and also the fact that little attention has been given so far to Arab advanced learners of English and their relationship with their dictionaries (cf. Diab 1989). But a major preoccupation has been the dominant role of bilingual dictionaries in the EFL context in Kuwait, and their inadequacies in terms of lexical coverage and information design.

CHAPTER TWO

BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES AND LANGUAGE LEARNING

2.1 Introduction:

In this chapter, we will focus on the type of dictionary that plays the most dominant role in the EFL context in Kuwait, i.e. the bilingual dictionary. We will review the status of this type in English language methodology, and discuss the weaknesses and strengths in its information structure with a particular focus on three crucial information design issues: translation equivalents, sense discriminations, and intended functions of the bilingual dictionary.

2.2 Bilingual dictionaries in EFL learning:

The emphasis on teaching dictionary skills discussed in the previous section has mostly been limited to monolingual dictionaries. Indeed, there are still many language teachers and methodologists who reject the idea of assigning any important role to the bilingual dictionary in the process of foreign language learning. Yorkey (1974) based his objection to bilingual dictionary use in the classroom on two arguments:

> (1) "At the beginning stage of learning, students may assume that a language is just "a bagful of names", and that there exists a word-for-word correspondence between their own language and English. This attitude can result in the many translation howlers that teachers know so well".
> (2) "Students may become overly dependent, and then prolong their reliance on its use. At some point in the study of English - preferably sooner than later - teachers should wean their students away from these word glosses and encourage them to use a specifically prepared English-English dictionary". (p.22).

Yorkey's emphasis that the bilingual dictionary reinforces the assumption that there exists a word-for-word correspondance between languages may not be justified when the bilingual dictionary is addressed to the learner's needs and designed in such a way as to make him aware of the differences between his native language and the foreign language (cf. Snell-Hornby 1987).

Baxter (1980) found that "the use of a bilingual dictionary encourages the tendency to always employ a single lexical item" while the monolingual dictionary "... by demonstrating that definition is always possible, encourages conversational definition" (p.335). Although he criticized the role of bilingual dictionaries in EFL learning, he came to the conclusion that "... students are not encouraged to totally exclude their bilingual dictionaries ... a judicious combination of the two would be the most productive".

The role of bilingual dictionaries in promoting immediate errors has been discussed by Ard (1982) who noticed that

bilingual dictionaries were "... less suited for finding correct words for a particular composition that needs to be as error-free as possible", but he also found bilingual dictionaries to be "... better suited for building up active competence in the English lexicon".

Referring to the negative effects of bilingual dictionary use, Snell-Hornby (1986) stated that "our understanding of a foreign language is distorted if we force it into the concepts of our own language and world view" (p.215). Others thought that EFL learners should decrease their reliance on the bilingual dictionary as they progress to more advanced levels because it "ties us down to a perpetual exercise in translation, inhibits us from free creative expression in the foreign language we are now mastering ... "(Quirk, 1987). Instead they should start using a monolingual dictionary which "... has advantages over a bilingual one because when students keep using a monolingual dictionary, they are trained to think in English and prevented from the habit of mental translation" (Sokeimi 1989).

Tomaszczyk (1983) took a different position and based his defence of bilingual dictionaries on the fact that

> "in the range of FL learning and teaching aids there is a slot that can be usefully filled by bilingual dictionaries. Indeed, it is a need which can hardly be met by any other type of reference material". (p.41).

The usefulness of EFL monolingual dictionaries, according to Tomaszczyk, is limited by their non-specificity with regard to

the learner's linguistic and cultural background and thus they have to be supplemented by bilingual L1-L2 dictionaries. He realised that the inadequate treatment of culture-specific items in monolingual dictionaries could be compensated for by allowing EFL learners to use bilingual dictionaries which require less sophisticated reference skills. He also argued that different contrasts between two languages have to be dealt with in the bilingual dictionary because "some semantic and syntactic properties of words do not become apparent until one has confronted them with their counterparts in another language" (p.45). Other support for bilingual dictionaries comes from English language teaching methodologists (cf. Rivers & Temperley, 1978).

2.2.1 **Staging of bilingual dictionary use:**

As to the stage of language learning where bilingual dictionary use would be most beneficial, language teachers and methodologists adopt different attitudes and approaches.

Al-Kasimi (1977:107-8) divided foreign language learning into three stages; elementary, intermediate, and advanced as follows:

(a) At the elementary stage, a glossary or footnotes are useful in the textbook for they serve as a kind of reference to the student. At this stage, Al-Kasimi does not assign any role to dictionaries.

(b) At the intermediate stage, Al-Kasimi suggests that students should use a good bilingual dictionary to help them in their reading of simplified materials in the foreign language in addition to the use of glossaries in the foreign language-textbooks. Yet, he does not specify the type of this bilingual dictionary; learner's, general, technical, etc. Monolingual dictionaries in the target language, according to Al-Kasimi, cannot be fruitfully employed in this stage because the student does not always understand definitions which use special lexicographical language and conventions, or which include words he/she does not know. Sometimes the student cannot form the proper concept even if he/she understands the meanings of the individual words of a definition.

(c) At the advanced stage, Al-Kasimi proposes that the student should use EFL monolingual dictionaries and add a good native-speaker monolingual dictionary later. He thinks that monolingual dictionaries can help the learner in comprehension only, while for production, whether speaking or writing, the student has to use a bilingual dictionary. It is understandable that it is impractical for the EFL learner to use a monolingual dictionary in speaking as the time and context of a conversation might not allow this use (cf. Whitcut 1986), but the EFL monolingual dictionary, in my view, can provide him/her with real help in writing; definitions and examples can serve as models, and detailed grammatical information along with collocations help the student to avoid many trouble spots. The role of the bilingual dictionary might have been interpreted by Al-Kasimi to

be limited to providing the learner with unknown L2 lexical items needed for production, by means of the L1 entries in the L1-L2 bilingual dictionary.

Snell-Hornby (1987:160-161), who acknowledged that the bilingual learner's dictionary had a part to play in the learning process, called for its integration into a broader concept of language learning. She divided the learning process into three basic stages. As in Al-Kasimi's model, the dictionary plays no part in the first stage, where vocabulary is presented as items in context with an accompanying glossary to encourage awareness of the foreign language as an independent system of communication. Unlike Al-Kasimi, Snell-Hornby does not allow dictionaries to be used in the second stage; a simple grammar may be introduced in simple language with examples implicitly contrasting the L2 grammar with that of the L1. In the third stage when the student has sufficient command of the foreign language system to compare its lexical structure with his/her own, monolingual and bilingual learners' dictionaries and translation exercises are necessary.

The late introduction of bilingual dictionaries in Snell-Hornby's model might have been based on the linguistic background of her students, i.e. German, which has closer links with English than Arabic has in terms of orthography, origin, and cultural context.

Scholfield (1982) was prepared to allow the English-L1 bilingual dictionary to be used from the beginning, but rejected the use of L1-L2 bilingual dictionaries in the

intermediate stage, as was suggested by Al-Kasimi, without conjunction with monolingual dictionaries:

> "While English-Ll BD's can be used with guidance from the beginning of learning English, I have argued that Ll-English BD's can only safely be used at the intermediate and later level in conjunction with good monolingual dictionaries. The single most important mistake in the whole area of dictionaries in relation to ESL/EFL ... is for the learner to get into the habit of using a Ll-English dictionary (of any size) freely as his sole guide for writing/speaking vocabulary items he has little or no grasp of." (p.188)

2.2.2 **Predominance of bilingual dictionaries:**

The predominance of the bilingual dictionary in the EFL classroom is an established fact. Several researchers in different parts of the world have found that EFL learners, especially at the initial stages, rely heavily on this type of dictionary for decoding purposes (cf. Opitz 1979; Bensoussan et al. 1981; Tomaszczyk 1987). Baxter (1980) discovered that Japanese students "... attribute to the bilingual dictionary, in contrast to other reference levels, the greatest degree of importance in their studies of English".

Similarly, in his study of dictionary use by learners of German in South-West England, Hartmann (1983) has found that

> "the use of bilingual dictionaries is so entrenched in and outside of formal language classes - where

> translation activities still reign supreme [that] the idea of 'weaning away' the learner from the translation dictionary seems rather unrealistic".

The assumption that monolingual dictionaries are superior to bilingual ones has not yet been supported by empirical evidence and the part both types of dictionary play in the process of language learning is by no means clear (cf. Béjoint 1987). A combination of both types in the EFL context can be beneficial (cf. Baxter 1980; Moulin 1987; Snell-Hornby 1987; Piotrowski 1989; Stein 1990).

2.3 **Structural features of the bilingual dictionary:**

The discussion of the role of bilingual dictionaries in foreign language learning (section 2.2) shows that it is necessary to highlight the weaknesses of the bilingual dictionary in order to construct working procedures for either eliminating these weaknesses in the design of a new bilingual dictionary or warning learners against these trouble spots and teaching them how to make effective use of the bilingual dictionaries they possess.

Language teachers' objections to bilingual dictionary use in the EFL programme are perhaps based on the structural features inherent in the design of the bilingual dictionary and on the fact that bilingual lexicographers have failed to meet the

precise needs of particular types of users since they work in the shadow of general monolingual dictionaries (cf. Tomaszczyk 1981; Sciarone 1984; Winter 1992).

Unlike monolingual dictionaries which describe one language, bilingual dictionaries are learner-language specific and, therefore, attempt to represent two different linguistic systems, thus the bilingual lexicographer has to find lexical items in L1 with a similar or close meaning to those in L2, and to make sure that the user is able to know which L2 word has the same or the closest meaning to the L1 word in relation to the context. This is a complicated process because of the following three related problems: choice of equivalents, sense discriminations, and intended function of the dictionary.

2.3.1 **Translation equivalents:**

The principle of interlingual equivalence is now being probed and called into question (cf. Snell-Hornby 1984:274). She has identified the principle of elementary approximation as the main defect of bilingual lexicography and has considered equivalence as an illusion because "the type of relationship holding between lexemes of two different languages can vary enormously" (1986:214). This anisomorphism of languages was discussed by Zgusta (1971), who realised that if some plants live or some things exist only in the area where the source language is spoken but not at all in the area of the target language,

there will be no really equivalent lexical units available in the target language. He also found that this situation can occur between any pair of languages. For example, there is nothing similar to the American "drug-store" in Europe and there is no suitable lexical unit in the European languages, either. He observed that distance between the two cultures may cause these cases to be more frequent and thus complicate the task of the bilingual lexicographer.

In his attempt to represent two different linguistic systems, the bilingual lexicographer frequently faces this problem of culture-bound items (such as "drug-store"). Tomaszczyk (1983:43) found that much of the vocabulary is culture-specific and that nil-equivalence exists at this level. Referring to this problem inherent in bilingual lexicography, Snell-Hornby (1984:275) stated that

> "The bilingual dictionary does not satisfactorily treat those lexemes that reflect the perception and evaluation of the speaker and involve culture-specific factors or relationships to personal or socially set norms. Such lexemes are usually distorted by approximate renderings in the form of rough equivalents and require a high degree of 'delicacy' in their analysis".

Tomaszczyk (1984) found that the English equivalents of the culture-bound items in Polish-English dictionaries are of little use to Polish-English speakers, writers and translators and that some of these words create communication problems. These users objected to the sociocultural layer of the bilingual dictionary

entries and found them too specific to British or American life and institutions. For such words, there are no translational, insertible equivalents. The solution proposed by Zgusta (1971, 1984) was to coin a translation equivalent either by borrowing the word from the source language or by creating a new expression for it. The other possible way is to try to find an explanatory equivalent. In some cases, terms are borrowed from another language and given their already available equivalent translations e.g. 'glasnost' "openness" and 'perestroika' "restructuring" from Russian, and 'intifada' "uprising" from Arabic.

Bilingual lexicographers encounter similar difficulties when attempting to treat semantic, syntactic, and phonological differences which exist between any language pair. The following are some examples of these differences:

(a) Differences in grammatical categories: In Japanese, for example, an English adjective would normally be translated as a verb (Wilkins 1976:36). The meaning of the grammatical category 'plural' in Arabic is different from its counterpart in English. Arabic has a three-term number system (singular-dual-plural) whereas English has a two-term number system (singular-plural) (cf. Al-Kasimi 1977:63). Now these differences in number systems would be better treated in grammar books and lessons (cf. Cowie 1984). It would be impossible to represent all dual Arabic noun forms in an Arabic-English dictionary e.g. 'kitaban' "two books". If they are to be included in the dictionary, the situation would be more complicated because they can be either in the subjective

case 'kitaban' or in the objective case 'kitabayn'. Yet, the introductory matter of an L1-L2 dictionary intended for the speakers of the target language can provide a brief description of syntactic irregularities and possibly a list of irregular noun forms in Arabic.

(b) A lexical unit in one language may not even have a corresponding lexical unit in another language. The meaning of that lexical unit might be expressed by a syntactic device in the other language. The Arabic word 'hal' which can be translated as the English interrogative determiner "is" has a lexical equivalent in Persian 'aya', but it does not have one in English. Its meaning corresponds to a meaning conveyed in English by S-V inversion. E.g.:

arrajulu tawil — The man is tall.

hali rrajulu tawil? — Is the man tall? (Al-Kasimi, 1977:64).

(c) In translating pure idioms and proverbs which have no corresponding expression in the target language, the lexicographer is obliged to create explanatory translations. For example, the DIZIONARIO FRANCESE-ITALIANO ITALIANO-FRANCESE (1985) explains rather than translates the French proverb "Qui ne peut galoper, qu'il trotte" with the Italian "Bisogna regolare la propria andatura sulle proprie possibilita" (Marello, 1987).

(d) Phonological differences: The sound system of English contains sounds that do not exist in Arabic (e.g. /p/, /tʃ/, /v/). On the other hand, there are several sounds in Arabic that have no equivalents in English (e.g. /x/, /ħ/, /ʤ̄/, /ʕ/, /ɑ̄/,

/ɬ/, /ɣ/, /ʕ/).

(e) Two related items in two languages sometimes do not cover the same semantic range. The Arabic word 'isba' stands for both "finger" and "toe" (Al-Kasimi 1977:64). Also, the Russian word 'noga' stands for both "leg" and "foot".

Another domain where equivalence does not exist between many languages is that of technical terminology. Although equivalence can be established in this area when concrete objects and new inventions are found in both cultures (cf. Landau 1984; Snell-Hornby 1986) this problem is especially noticeable in the less developed cultures (cf. Al-Kasimi 1979). Bull (1964:530) described five procedures for translating technical terms:
(1) word borrowing, (2) coinage, (3) giving new meaning to existing words, (4) extending the meaning of existing words, and (5) compounding new words from existing elements from the language or from it and some other one.

2.3.2 **Sense discriminations:**

Another problem has to do with the characteristic organisation of entries in bilingual dictionaries. The accumulation of synonyms as possible translations for the entry word in an L1-L2 dictionary causes severe translation difficulties to the dictionary user. For example, Arab users of Arabic-English dictionaries frequently encounter the problem of selecting an appropriate equivalent from a long list of English

synonyms. The accumulation of equivalents in this type of dictionary has been considered by some as one of the deadly sins of lexicography because the user is not given clear information about the semantic conditions under which he may use each of the possible equivalents in the foreign language (cf. Martin 1962; Kromann et al.1984). In an English-Arabic dictionary intended for Arab readers this accumulation is usually permissible because the Arab user is aided by the text and his native tongue.

Sense discrimination was considered by Iannucci (1962:201) as "the crucial problem of bilingual lexicographical methodology". This problem has not yet been successfully solved. As Williams (1960) realised, "there are still other aspects of the problem that need to be considered on the basis of further research ... whether one or another of the devices (i.e. sense discriminations) ... functions more effectively in the source language or in the target language ... whether more people use a dictionary for reading or for writing and whether more people translate from or into their own language" (p.121-4).

Iannucci (1962:202-3) described the following types of sense discriminations:

(1) punctuation: he calls it a negative discrimination - commas separate synonyms and semicolons separate words of more or less different meanings. This discrimination device would be less effective when too many synonyms are included between two semicolons.

(2) definition: some older bilingual dictionaries give long, formal definitions of the type found in monolingual dictionaries

to discriminate between the meanings of a polysemous word. E.g.:

> **Spring**, ... **4.**Primavera, estación del año en la cual comienzan las plantas á brotar y crecer ... (NEW PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY OF THE SPANISH & ENGLISH LANGUAGES, 1953).

But such definitions are unnecessarily long for a bilingual dictionary and extremely wasteful of space. The previous definition, Iannucci added, could be cut down to 'estación del año', or even to 'estación' alone, which could easily serve as a meaning discrimination.

(3) synonyms: synonyms can provide briefer meaning discriminations. Each target word can be accompanied by one of the synonyms of the polysemous entry word. E.g.:

> **prolific** ... a ... (fruitful, fecund) fertile, produttivo ... (productive) generatore, produttore ... (occurring in large numbers) abbondante, copioso ... (STANDARD ITALIAN and ENGLISH DICTIONARY, 1970).

Although this is a powerful device, consistency in its application would be space-consuming, and it seems that few bilingual dictionaries employ it consistently.

(4) illustrative examples: illustrative sentences and phrases are also used for discrimination. E.g.:

> **agreeable** ... adj (a) (pleasing) agradable, person simpático,amable; **he was more ~ this morning** esta mañana se mostró mas simpático. (b)(willing) **if you are ~** si estás de acuerdo, si quieres; **is that ~ to everybody?** ¿estamos de acuerdo todos?; **he was ~ to that** estaba conforme con eso, lo aprobó; **he is ~ to help** está dispuesto a ayudar. (COLLINS SPANISH-ENGLISH ENGLISH-SPANISH DICTIONARY, 1988).

(5) parts of speech: sometimes discrimination is effected by the designation of the part of speech of the polysemous entry word. E.g.:

> **after** adj. siguiente; adv. después; prep. después de;segun; conj. después que o después de que (SPANISH and ENGLISH DICTIONARY, 1962).

It should be noted, though, that in modern bilingual dictionaries, the introduction of parts of speech often means a separation of entries, as in the Collins-Robert French-English English-French Dictionary (1978), where the word 'round' is treated as an adverb, preposition, adjective, noun, and transitive verb in separate entries.

(6) usage labels: labelling by usage (e.g. colloq., fig., etc.) and by fields of knowledge (e.g. architecture, medicine, etc.) may serve as a discrimination. E.g.:

discreto-ta (adj.) discreet, prudent. 2. cautious. 3. ingenious, witty. 4. (math.) discrete (of quantity). 5. (med.) distinct, separate. (NEW COMPREHENSIVE DICTIONARY SPANISH-ENGLISH, ENGLISH-SPANISH, 1966).

(7) context words or phrases: words or phrases which give enough of the context in which the polysemous entry word is used can be a discrimination:

a. The collocating subject or type of subject may discriminate between the meanings of a verb. E.g.:

open up ... vi (a) (flower) sich öffnen, aufgehen; (fig.) (prospects) sich eröffnen, sich ergeben, sich erschließen; (field, new horizons) sich auftun, sich erschließen ... (COLLINS GERMAN-ENGLISH ENGLISH-GERMAN DICTIONARY, 1980).

b. The collocating object or type of object may discriminate between the meanings of a verb. E.g.:

cabecear ... 1.vt ... to nod (a consent, etc.); to head (a boat) downstream; (soccer) to head, butt (a ball); (bookbinding) to provide (a book) with a headband ... (THE NEW APPLETON DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH & PORTUGUESE LANGUAGES, 1964).

c. The noun or type of noun may serve as a context word to discriminate the adjective to which it is applied. E.g.:

> **rotten** ... adj ... estropeado, da; echado a perder (fruit) cariado, da; picado, da (tooth) ...infectado de comalia (sheep), desmenuzable, friable(rocks) (DICTIONARIO MODERNO ESPANOL-INGLES,1976).

d. The adjective or type of adjective may serve as a context word to discriminate the noun. E.g.:

> **detached** ... adj **(a)** (unbiased) opinion unvoreingenommen, distanziert; (unemotional) manner kühl, distanziert... (COLLINS GERMAN-ENGLISH, ENGLISH-GERMAN DICTIONARY, 1991).

Because providing meaning discriminations for every target word would increase the size of the dictionary considerably, Iannucci (1962) suggested coordinating the bilingual dictionary with a monolingual dictionary by a system of number references, thus making the definitions in the monolingual dictionary serve as meaning discriminations for the bilingual one. E.g.:

> **country** ... n ...1. a tract of land; a district; a region 2. rural parts, as opposed to cities or towns; usually with the; 3. one's native land; the land of one's citizenship; 4. the territory of a nation that has a distinct

> existence as to name, language, customs, government, and the like, also the people of such a nation; 5. the people of a region or nation as a whole; the public; ... (THE WINSTON DICTIONARY, 1946).
> English-French: country n 1 région, contrée 2 campagne 3 patrie 4,5 pays, nation.

Another problem in this area is the choice of language in which sense discriminations are presented. Bilingual dictionaries differ in their approaches to this problem and according to Iannucci (1962) there are four trends:

(1) sense discriminations in the target language on both sides of the bilingual dictionary.

(2) Sense discriminations in the source language on both sides of the bilingual dictionary.

(3) Sense discriminations in the same language on both sides of the bilingual dictionary.

(4) Sense discriminations in both languages on both sides of the dictionary.

Since Iannucci believes that sense discriminations are required by the speaker of the source language for native-to-foreign use, he emphasized that they should be in the native language of the user who needs the information (the source language) (1959:198) and also placed before the target language word, because explanatory matter in bilingual dictionaries conventionally refers to what precedes and these sense discriminations refer to different meanings of the entry word rather than of the target word (1962:204). He distinguishes

sense discriminations from translation complements which are provided in the target language and placed after the target word when the sense of the entry word is more restricted than the sense of the target word used to translate it, e.g. Arabic 'xal' "maternal uncle" and 'ʿam' "paternal uncle" (1985:60).

The presence or absence of sense discriminations, according to Iannucci (1985) is determined by the purpose of the bilingual dictionary. The comprehension function never requires sense discrimination and the different equivalents of a polysemous target-language word need never be discriminated because an Arabic speaker, for example, has a context to aid him and has to make a choice among words in his own language. But if the same dictionary is intended for production the English user would need some discriminations so that he can choose the appropriate Arabic translation (cf. Steiner 1984, 1986).

2.3.3 **Intended functions of the bilingual dictionary:**

The structure of entries and the type of information provided in the bilingual dictionary will vary considerably according to the intended users and the functions the dictionary is designed to serve. According to the possible users and uses of the bilingual dictionary, arrangements can be as many as eighteen (Steiner 1986:85). Yet, most existing bilingual dictionaries are in the following forms:

(1) Bilingual dictionaries for comprehension:

This can be an L2-L1 bilingual dictionary for helping the speakers of the target language to understand source-language texts. For example, AL-MAWRID (English-Arabic), which is based on a monolingual English dictionary, provides Arab users with phonological and grammatical information, including irregular inflected forms. The word list in this comprehension dictionary is close to comprehensive (cf. Steiner 1986:88). This type of dictionary can be based, in a much closer way, on a monolingual dictionary of the source language. For example, in the OXFORD ENGELSK-NORSK ORDBOK (1983) which was based on the OXFORD STUDENT'S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH (1978), Norwegian translations appear in place of the original definitions of the monolingual dictionary (Cowie 1989a:681). Another dictionary based on the same concept was the OXFORD STUDENT'S DICTIONARY FOR HEBREW SPEAKERS in which the content of the OXFORD STUDENT'S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH was retained and a gloss was supplied for each sense at the right-hand side of numbered sections to encourage users to understand English by providing help in Hebrew (Reif 1987). Translated versions of OALDCE and LDOCE with largely comprehension functions have also been attempted in China, Japan, and Italy (Tomaszczyk 1983:47). This type of L2-L1 comprehension dictionary might be found in a different form as in the DICTIONNAIRE DE L'ANGLAIS CONTEMPORAIN (1980) where English definitions of the English headwords are replaced by example sentences in both English and French.

The comprehension bilingual dictionary can be used as an

L1-L2 or L2-L1 dictionary, by the source-language speakers to produce written texts in the foreign language and by the target-language speakers to comprehend source-language texts even though entries and equivalents are arranged in such a way to help only one group of users understand and translate texts from the foreign language. For example, the DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC (Arabic-English) (1967) is used by English speakers for whom it has been designed to comprehend Arabic texts. Thus the dictionary dispenses with punctuation, irregularities and other information about English which the English speaker already knows or is expected to check in a monolingual dictionary of English (Steiner 1986:87). Similarly, sense discriminations may not be necessary in this dictionary since the English user is aided by the text and his native language to select the appropriate English equivalent (cf. Iannucci 1985). At the same time, this dictionary is used widely by Arabic speakers for encoding.

(2) Productive dictionary for one group of users:

A good example of this type of bilingual dictionary is Skey's DIZIONARIO INGLESE-ITALIANO ITALIANO-INGLESE (1977) which is aimed at Italian users for decoding in the English-Italian part and encoding in the Italian-English section (cf. Marello 1987; Cowie 1989a). Thus, detailed information about English is provided in the English-Italian section to help the Italian user comprehend English texts while sense discriminations and examples in the Italian-English section are meant for helping him to express himself in speaking or writing English.

(3) Communicative bilingual dictionary:

This is the ideal type of bilingual dictionary which is very difficult to realize in practice (cf. Atkins 1985). Both target-language and source-language speakers are helped in both sections of the dictionary to understand and produce texts in the other language. The COLLINS-ROBERT FRENCH DICTIONARY (1987) attempts to provide information for decoding and encoding for French and English users in both sections of the dictionary. Several authorities have expressed doubts about the likely success of this type of bilingual dictionary (cf. Ščerba 1940; Zgusta 1971; Steiner 1986; Cowie 1989a). Harrell (1962:51-53) stated that "it is clearly impossible to pay equal attention to both X-speakers and Y-speakers in one and the same work ... either X-speaker or Y-speaker must be discriminated against at the expense of the other". Meeting the encoding and decoding needs of both groups of users cannot be achieved without introducing cumbersomeness - pronunciation, for example, would have to be shown for both languages in every entry (Haas 1962:47).

2.4 **Strengths of bilingual dictionaries:**

Despite the seriousness of the weaknesses discussed above, the advantages of using bilingual dictionaries cannot be ignored in the context of EFL learning, where incidentally there is a heavy reliance on this type of dictionary. These advantages

include: direct access to equivalents, orientation towards a specific language pair, immediately insertable equivalents (though not in all cases), scope for an adequate metalanguage, no superfluous material in the form of etymology, lexical definitions, and encyclopaedic information (Kromann et al.1984). Ard (1982) considered bilingual dictionaries to be "... better suited for building up active competence in the English lexicon". Unlike monolingual dictionaries which often face the EFL learner with the problem of circular definitions, bilingual dictionaries, according to Piotrowski (1989), do not require a great effort on the part of the user because they "... point to meaning (via applicability) in a synthetic way: a well chosen equivalent transmits the part of meaning it has in common with the L2 item all at one time, by the powerful mechanism of analogy" (p.78). He considered the L1-L2 bilingual dictionary to be the best solution to the problem of looking up known words in order to go on to unknown words in monolingual ones because the bilingual dictionary "provides the quickest access to the system" (p.79). Yet, he agreed with critics of bilingual dictionaries that "both types of dictionaries are complementary and both have something to offer the users" (p.81).

CHAPTER THREE

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF TWO BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

3.1 Introduction:

The predominance of bilingual dictionaries in EFL learning discussed in the previous chapter applies to a great extent to Kuwait. From my own experience as a student and teacher in the Department of English at Kuwait University, I have noticed that most students (even advanced ones) tend to use general English-Arabic bilingual dictionaries (mainly for decoding activities) and show a reluctance to replace them with monolingual ones. In this chapter, two popular bilingual dictionaries in Kuwait will be assessed in order to see to what extent the information provided in those dictionaries fulfils the compilers' claims in the introductory notes. Also, the assessment will be directed at the structural features to detect weaknesses and strengths that affect the role of the dictionary concerned as a learning tool.

The introductory matter will be examined to see how far the guidance given enables the English language learner to utilise effectively the different types of information in the dictionary. On the basis of the introduction, users and uses will be discussed in relation to the dictionary's intended function. An

analysis of the dictionary's treatment of translation equivalents, sense discriminations, sentence examples, collocations and idioms, grammar, and pronunciation will focus on how this treatment meets the needs of Arab EFL learners. Also, the examination of these features will aim at showing how some aspects of dictionary design can be improved in order to serve a specific group of dictionary users and a specific function.

3.2 **Al-Mawrid (English - Arabic):**

This is the most popular English-Arabic dictionary in the Arab world. Its compiler, Munir Ba'albaki, has relied on his experience as a translator in collecting items from different general and technical Arabic monolingual dictionaries, and from British and American sources in addition to the available general English-Arabic dictionaries e.g. ELIAS' MODERN ENGLISH-ARABIC DICTIONARY (1963). The compiler has also specified nine British and American dictionaries from which headwords, definitions, and structural features were derived. Most of these are general monolingual dictionaries (e.g. WEBSTER'S THIRD NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1961), WEBSTER'S SEVENTH NEW COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY (1965), THE SHORTER OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY (1964), THE AMERICAN COLLEGE DICTIONARY (1965), COLLINS NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY (1964), etc.). The only learner's dictionary in this list was OXFORD ADVANCED LEARNER'S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH (1963).

AL-MAWRID is a general-purpose dictionary which is claimed to include 100,000 items treated in more than 1000 pages. The compiler claims that there was an increasing need for such a dictionary which would meet the requirements of different types of users dissatisfied with the existing bilingual dictionaries of English and Arabic in the Arab world. Several impressions of the dictionary have been published since 1967, but the only changes have been the addition of a few new items, not major improvements in the design itself. This might be due to the type of technology used for printing and also to the political situation in Lebanon where the dictionary originated.

3.2.1 **Users and Uses:**

The author does not indicate a specific group of users for whom the dictionary has been designed although he mentions that he hopes that the dictionary would be welcomed by researchers, teachers, and the general educated public in the Arab world. In spite of the fact that the majority of the users of this dictionary are Arab learners of English, these have not been specifically addressed as a possible category of users. Nevertheless, the implication that the dictionary can satisfy the needs of Arab learners of English is found in the introduction where the compiler states that he decided to write the dictionary because:

> "... of the pressing need for such a dictionary, after the increase in the numbers of learners of English all over the Arab world, and the advancement of modern science which made existing English-Arabic dictionaries incapable of meeting the needs of modern times" (p.5: translated from Arabic).

It does not seem that the compiler had English-speaking or other foreign learners of Arabic in mind. The introduction is written in Arabic only, which suggests that the dictionary is intended only for Arab users. However, the dictionary could be used by some advanced foreign learners of Arabic who were able to operate without help in selecting appropriate equivalents of given headwords.

Since the dictionary has been designed exclusively for Arab users, the function AL-MAWRID would serve is that of comprehension. Indeed, the dictionary is heavily relied upon in the Arab world by translators and university students including those enrolled in courses of a technical nature (cf. Diab 1989). The popularity of this dictionary is perhaps due to its success in satisfying the largely interpretative needs of these users who might regard a dictionary essentially as a tool for understanding another language.

3.2.2 **Guidance in the introduction:**

The author seems to be mainly concerned with describing the organisation of entries, not with helping Arab users with

specific problems of reading or translating. The introduction to the dictionary describes the following principles according to which the information in the dictionary has been organised:

1. Each entry is followed by its part of speech (n., adj., adv.,vt.,vi.,etc.) and a phonetic transcription which is supported by a pronunciation key at the bottom of each page for reference, plus the etymology of the entry word, especially if it was of an Arabic origin. Sometimes, plural forms with transcriptions are added. This information seems to be of little practical value to most dictionary users as it contains specialised jargon with no supporting or clarifying examples.

2. Meanings of polysemous words are ordered according to their grammatical functions with the noun first, followed by the verb, adjective, and adverb. The symbol (§) is used to separate these categories and (x) to separate transitive from intransitive verbs. But this convention can be of significance only to those who have read the introduction.

3. Sense divisions of English headwords are organised according to their historical order. The compiler indicates that this would enable the user to follow the development of lexical items in history. Yet, this method has been criticised for being misleading for users who tend to select the first meaning of a word (cf. Kipfer 1984). Furthermore, several investigations have found little interest in etymology even among native speakers (cf. Quirk 1972; Béjoint 1981; Greenbaum et al. 1984; etc.).

When a meaning is archaic, the lexical item is followed by the abbreviation (ا.ق), (ا.م) for old usage, and (ا.ن) for rarely used words. Yet, the use of these abbreviations is a questionable practice since the decision on whether a word is archaic or rare is based on subjective interpretations rather than on sound scientific judgement. Colloquial words are distinguished by the abbreviation (ع) and when there is a different American colloquial form (عأ) would be used to distinguish it from its British counterpart (عب).

The use of these abbreviations in such a comprehension dictionary might be just a waste of space since they are mostly useful for producing texts rather than interpreting them. However, they will be of value only to those wishing to improve their English vocabulary through reading and translating.

4. Different meanings of a word are ordered by numbers and its subsenses by Arabic alphabetical letters. In this, as the compiler states, the dictionary imitates the system followed in WEBSTER'S THIRD NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1961). This method is standard practice, but it can be improved in AL-MAWRID either by printing these numbers and letters in boldface or by rearranging the structure of long entries so that every meaning or subsense will be in a separate line for ease of recognition.

5. Examples are derived from American and British sources to distinguish some meanings of polysemous words. These examples are claimed by the editor to be useful for those wishing to write in English as well as those looking for a specific meaning of a

word. But this emphasis placed on the value of examples can be questioned on the grounds that this dictionary is basically for comprehension and that texts being read or translated represent contexts for certain meanings of a polysemous word.

6. For technical terms, the compiler has relied on translations of English terms in Arabic sources dealing with biology, botany, art, and also on the publications of the Arabic Academy in Cairo. Items that are not found in those sources have been Arabicised, translated, or blended by the author and followed sometimes by an explanation in addition to a symbol indicating the branch of knowledge to which the technical term in question belongs.

The introduction also includes instructions on how to use the dictionary, but these are limited to explanations of symbols such as (ʃ), (O), (x). Also, a pronunciation key is provided in the introduction along with a table of Arabic and English abbreviations. Some ambiguities in those two tables can cause problems to users. For example, the vowel /a/ is given the example word 'aware' which will confuse the user who does not know which 'a' in the word 'aware' the vowel stands for (see table 1).

In the table of abbreviations, it seems that there is an overlapping between some Arabic and English abbreviations. While abbreviations that stand for nationalities (e.g. Spanish, Turkish, Chinese, German, etc.) and grammatical categories (e.g. adjective, indefinite, preposition, etc.) are given in English, some Arabic abbreviations overlap with the English ones as in the

Table 1: Pronunciation key in AL-MAWRID

مِفتاح اللفظ

إن الفاصلة العليا الغليظة (ʼ) كما في كلمة courtroom [kōrtʼrōōmʼ] تفيد أن المقطع الذي يسبقها يُلفَظ بنبرة مشدّدة.
أما الفاصلة العليا الرقيقة (ʻ) فتفيد أن المقطع الذي يسبقها يُلفَظ بنبرة مخفّفة.

ȧ	at; map	oi	boil; boy
ā	date; mate	o͝o	look; good
ȧ	aware; care	o͞o	boot; cool
ä	car; part	ou	out; found
à	à bas; aperitif	p	paper; crop
b	bad; rib	r	red; try
ch	cheek; beach	s	sea; ass
d	dim; dice	sh	shall; dash
ĕ	egg; end	t	tell; net
ē	ease; me	th	thing; bath
f	fill; cliff	t͟h	this; brother
g	god; big	ŭ	under; love
h	hill; holy	ù	unity; acute
ĭ	in; give	û	urgent; turn
ī	bite; like	v	victory; give
j	jar; edge	w	were; away
k	kill; mark	y	yellow; yet
kh	تُلفظان كما في كلمة *buch* (بوخ) الالمانية.	Y	تُلفظ كما في كلمة *tu* الفرنسية.
l	land ; ball	z	zinc; lazy
m	mile; loom	zh	vision; pleasure
n	no; in	ə	تُلفَظ كما تُلفَظ :
ng	king; sing		الا *a* في كلمة alone
ŏ	bond; lot		والا *e* في كلمة system
ō	bone; old		والا *i* في كلمة easily
ô	orphan; ball		والا *o* في كلمة gallop
œ	تُلفظان كما في كلمة *feu* الفرنسية.		والا *u* في كلمة circus

case of (اسلا) and (Scot.). It is difficult to understand why the compiler uses Arabic abbreviations for branches of knowledge or occupations (e.g. "ق" for Law, "فل" for astronomy, "طخ" for kitchen, etc.) and not for grammatical categories. There does not seem to be any harm in having all abbreviations in Arabic since the dictionary is intended for Arab users only. What is needed is a consistent policy in creating Arabic abbreviations that takes into account the mnemonic element. Arabic abbreviations in AL-MAWRID have been constructed in a way that makes it hard for the users to remember most of them and forces them to constantly refer to the table of abbreviations in the front matter. For example, single-letter abbreviations are given for 'alat' "machinery", 'ilm al-haywan' "biology", 'riyadiyyat' "mathematics", 'zira'a' "agriculture", 'teb' "medicine" (see table 2). This type of abbreviation has no mnemonic value whatsoever and can only result in confusion.

3.2.3 **Translation equivalents:**

The compiler indicates that his policy in selecting the appropriate Arabic equivalents is based on a thorough examination of the English words in British and American monolingual dictionaries in order to determine all possible shades of meaning which, according to the compiler, would result in more accurate Arabic translations. Some technical terms that have not yet been treated in Arabic sources or by Arabic Academies were Arabicised,

Table 2: Abbreviations used in AL-MAWRID

١ . المختصرات العربية

آ	آلات
آث	علم الآثار
أج	علم الأجنة
أح	علم الأحياء
احص	علم الاحصاء
إ	علم الإقتصاد
أر	علم الأرصاد
إس	الإسلام
اسك	اسكتلندية ؛ بلغة اسكتلندية.
إع	علم الاجتماع
ا	استعمال قديم
أ	أحياناً كثيرة
إل	الكترونيات
ا	استعمال مساحة
ا	استعمال بحرية
بح	بحرية
بر	بريطانية ، بلغة الانكليز خاصة .
ب	قانون دولي
ك	علم الكيمياء
كه	علم الكهرباء
كث	الكنيسة الكاثوليكية
كح	كيمياء حيوية
كف	كيمياء فيزيائية
ك	الكنيسة
ل	علم اللغة
لا	علم اللاسلكي
ما	ميثولوجيا ، أساطير
مج	مجمع اللغة العربية بالقاهرة
مس	مسك الدفاتر
مص	مصر
دب	دبلوماسية
ر	رياضيات
ر	راجع
ر	رادار
ر ب	رياضة بدنية
ر	راديو
رس	رسم
ز	زراعة
س	سينما
س	سيارات
ص	صناعة
صح	صحافة
صح	علم الصخور
ص	صوتيات
ص	صيدلة
ض	علم الضوء
ط	علم الطب
ط	طائر
طبع	مطبخ
طب	علم الأمراض
ع	علم المعادن
ع	مغنطيسية
ع	علم المنطق
ع	علم الميكانيكا
ع	ملاحة
مو	موسيقى
ن	علم النبات
تج	تجارة
ن	نصرانيات
ن	علم النفس
هـ	علم الهندسة

٢ . المختصرات الانكليزية

adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
Ar.	Arabic
art.	article
aux.	auxiliary
Brit.	British
cap.	capital
Chin.	Chinese
conj.	conjunction
def.	definite
F.	French
fem.	feminine
G.	German
Gk.	Greek
Hin.	Hindi
i.	intransitive
indef.	indefinite
n.	noun
n. pl.	noun plural
part.	participle
Per.	Persian
Pg.	Portuguese
pl.	plural
prep.	preposition
pres.	present
pron.	pronoun
Russ.	Russian
Scot.	Scottish
sing.	singular
Skt.	Sanskrit
Sp.	Spanish
t.	transitive

translated, derived, or blended by the author. Yet, he does not seem to be following a consistent policy regarding technical terms. Sometimes an Arabicised form would be followed by an abbreviation, but the reader is not told what the word stands for. For example, the word 'austenite' is given the Arabicised equivalent "أوستينيت" followed by (مع) which stands for 'minerals' but no explanatory translation is given to clarify its meaning to the non-specialist who might need to look up the term in this general-purpose dictionary:

austenite (n.) الأوستينيت (مع)

In other places, a classical Arabic equivalent exists but is not widely used. In this case, the dictionary provides a definition but sometimes without a usage label:

autoclave [ô'təklāv] (n.;vt.) (١) المحم ، المعقام: وعاء معدني محكم القفل يستخدم للتعقيم بواسطة البخار المحمي والضغط

The treatment of common words in AL-MAWRID shows an overdependence on English monolingual dictionaries. Providing many synonyms does not seem to be necessary in many places. English senses that have the same Arabic equivalent have been translated into more or less intralingually close Arabic equivalents which many users might not need since they look for one specific meaning. In the following example, numbered divisions are based on the source language i.e., senses 2, 3, and 4 are the same in Arabic but have been translated as different

senses of the headword 'lightness':

lightness [līt'-] (n.) (١) إضاءة، اشراق (٢) خفة في اللون أو الوزن (٣) «أ» خفة، طيش «ب» مرح (٤) رشاقة (٥) رفق، رقة

Lexical items which are specific to Arab culture are treated in the dictionary as in the monolingual dictionaries on which AL-MAWRID was based. For example, the word 'jihad' is given a definition although it is a common word in Arabic. For such a loan word, the Arabic equivalent is semantically the same and thus a definition is not needed:

jihad [jĭhäd'] (Ar.) الجهاد: «أ» حرب مقدسة تشن لنصرة الاسلام «ب» حملة أو حرب في سبيل مبدأ أو عقيدة

For other words borrowed from Arabic, a definition might be necessary to make the Arab user aware that some words of Arabic origin are used in English with different interpretations. For example, the word 'harem' can be interpreted by Arab users to mean 'women'. But a definition would show them that the term in English is applied to a ward in a medieval Arabian palace:

harem [hâr'əm] (n.) الحريم: «أ» جناح النساء في قصر إسلامي قديم. «ب» الزوجات والسراري والخادمات اللواتي يشتمل عليهن هذا الجناح.

Because of the diglossic situation of the Arabic language, translation equivalents are sometimes explained or given the

colloquial form to help those who are not familiar with the classical Arabic term:

regime [rāzhēm;rĭ-] : (١) حمية . «رجيم» (٢) النظام ، طريقة الحكم أو الادارة . «ب» شكل الحكومة.

3.2.4 **Sense discriminations:**

Since the dictionary is intended for comprehension of English texts, sense discriminations are provided in a few places in Arabic or in the form of short English examples or collocations:

just [jŭst] (adj.;adv.) (١) «أ» صحيح ، صائب «ب» دقيق (٢) «أ» منصف ، غير متحيز (a ~man) «ب» مستقيم (to be ~in one's dealings) (~proportions)

Obviously, these examples and collocations, which are of limited value to Arab decoders, are meant to supplement translation equivalents not to help, say, an English-speaking encoder to select an appropriate Arabic sense of the word 'just'.

Another form of sense discrimination in the dictionary is usage labels which are provided in Arabic. Yet, it is doubtful that Arab users of this comprehension dictionary would need such help. After all, the translated context would give the reader or translator some clues as to which Arabic equivalent is the appropriate translation. In the following entry, the specification of the limited use of the word 'knockout' in boxing

is not needed by the Arab user who is aided by the context and his native language and thus will not mistranslate the English word outside a boxing context:

knockout [nŏk'-] (n.) ... الضربة الصارعة أو
الحاسمة (في الملاكمة) (٣) شئ جذاب أو لافت للنظر...

3.2.5 **Illustrative examples:**

The tendency in AL-MAWRID is to provide short illustrative examples. As a comprehension dictionary, the general aim in AL-MAWRID seems to be specifying the use of a word in its different senses.

It is doubtful whether the examples in AL-MAWRID are even useful for writing as the compiler claims in the introduction. These are not provided consistently, but they abound in entries for grammatical and frequently occurring words:

by [bī] (prep.;adv.) (a house ~ (١) بجانب، بقرب
(We came ~ train) (٢) ب، بواسطة (the river) (٣) من
(They went to Japan ~ Siberia) (٤) في طريق
(north ~ east) (٧) نحو ، في إتجاه كذا
(~night) خلال (~force) (٨) ب

However, if the dictionary is to be a useful tool for writers, examples should be used for all types of words with the aim of illustrating their typical context of occurrence as well as showing their various syntactic realisations. In any case, the simple and short examples which this comprehension dictionary

tends to offer might not be of much value to advanced learners in writing.

3.2.6 **Collocations and idioms:**

The provision of collocations in relation to dictionary functions is an important decision in bilingual lexicography. Although this type of information is not essential in a decoding dictionary, it might sometimes be needed by dictionary users translating from the foreign language because they help the translator to locate the appropriate translation whenever contextual clues do not provide enough assistance.

AL-MAWRID, according to its compiler, uses collocations in order to clarify meanings and to illustrate the usage of some words. But it seems that there is no specific policy in presenting collocations as distinct from sentence examples and both are placed between parentheses. Also, collocations in other places are treated as idioms as 'broad daylight' is treated in the entry for the word 'broad':

broad [brod] (adj.;adv.;n.) (١)عريض (٢)فسيح
(the ~ sea) (٣)واسع (~experience) (٤)واضح ، بين
(a ~ hint) (٥)... مطلق العنان ، لايعرف حدًا أو قيدًا
(~mirth)"ب..." بذئ (~jokes) ...
-broadly (adv.) **-broadness** (n.)
~ daylight وضح النهار

True idioms, on the other hand, are always placed at the bottom of the entry without parentheses to distinguish them from

collocations and illustrative examples. The dictionary also contains a separately listed collection of English proverbs and idiomatic expressions with their Arabic equivalents. Yet, there is no reference system employed so that the dictionary user can benefit from the extra information in this collection. Ninety-five pages of the dictionary with 187 idiomatic expressions and proverbs would be of no value unless the dictionary user is told at the point of entry to refer to a certain idiom in that collection for further information.

3.2.7 **Grammatical information:**

Grammatical information in dictionaries is of vital importance especially for those wishing to write in the foreign language. However, the scope of this type of information depends on the function the dictionary is designed to serve. In a comprehension dictionary, such as AL-MAWRID, detailed grammatical information on irregular and unpredictable forms of lexical items might not be needed since the activities for which the dictionary is used such as reading and translation do not require such information (cf. Steiner 1986; Cowie 1989a).

AL-MAWRID presents major categories of nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. Sub-classifications, e.g. countable and non-countable forms of nouns, comparative and superlative forms of adjectives, *etc. might* not be important for decoders who receive enough clues from the context.

The presentation of grammatical information in AL-MAWRID follows the traditional method which lists abbreviated forms of grammatical categories, e.g. 'n' for noun, 'ad' for adverb in parentheses after the headword. This system could be confusing to users when checking an entry for information on grammar in order to understand a lexical item in a specific meaning. In this case, the dictionary user has to read through the whole entry until he finds the required sense. This system could be more helpful if these abbreviations were dispersed to precede their Arabic senses. The symbols (∫) and (x) used to separate different grammatical realisations of a word might not be of any significance to many users who tend not to read the introduction.

The separation of the different grammatical functions of a word within its entry by means of symbols is a rather old-fashioned style. Recently, this has been replaced by allocating subsenses to separate numbered entries as in the OXFORD ADVANCED LEARNER'S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH.

3.2.8 **Pronunciation:**

AL-MAWRID generally offers some assistance to its users with regard to the pronunciation of English headwords. A pronunciation key with example words is provided in the dictionary introduction and at the bottom of every page of the dictionary. Since this type of information is of limited value to the users of this comprehension dictionary, many headwords are

not accompanied with phonetic transcriptions and derivatives are never transcribed in the dictionary. This omission is in line with the chiefly interpretative function of the dictionary and the limited value of phonological information in decoding activities.

However,the pronunciation key at the bottom of each page does not include all diphthongal sounds. For example, the word 'quotient' is transcribed as [kwo'shənt] but there is no example illustrating the pronunciation of the sound /wõ/ in the pronunciation key.

The provision of phonological information in a comprehension dictionary should be based on an understanding of the needs and habits of the users. The decision to provide this type of information has to be, therefore, derived from research into dictionary use which would determine to what extent users of passive dictionaries benefit from this and other types of information.

3.3 DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC:

This is an Arabic-English dictionary with approximately 30,000 entries. The dictionary is based on written Arabic and contains only words and expressions which were found in context during the compiler's wide reading. The major portion was collected between 1940 and 1944 and the German edition of the dictionary which appeared in 1952 was based on 45,000 citations

from different Arabic sources. The compiler states that the dictionary

> "...is based on the form of the language which, throughout the Arab world from Iraq to Morocco - is found in the prose of books, newspapers, periodicals, and letters. This form is also employed in formal public address over the radio and television, and in religious ceremonial."

However, the dictionary does not conform to one variety of Arabic as it has derived its material from Egyptian, Syrian, Lebanese, and Saudi texts, with the main emphasis being placed on written formal norms. According to its author, it treats the material in a purely synchronic fashion, and the origin of older loan words and foreign terms is not indicated because "...the user of a practical dictionary of modern Arabic will not generally be concerned with semitic etymology" (p.X).

3.3.1 **Users and uses:**

Although the compiler does not specify the readership of the dictionary, it is assumed that it is intended for European and American orientalists (cf. El-Badry 1986). Arab learners are also mentioned in the introduction as possible users of the dictionary. The implication that the dictionary is basically for comprehension is found in the following statement

> "The dictionary will be most useful to those working with writings that have appeared since the turn of the century" (p. VII)."

The dictionary is regarded by translators in the Arab World as the best available Arabic-English dictionary for translating into English or writing, in spite of the absence of some features that are essential for the production function (cf. section 3.3.4). The compiler implies in the introduction that users of the dictionary would face some difficulties if they were not accustomed to the system of arranging Arabic entries generally used by Western orientalists.

The anticipated English-speaking or European user of the dictionary is supposed to have attained an advanced level of proficiency in Arabic and knowledge of Arabic grammar and linguistics. This is because the entries are arranged according to their stems and to locate a word one has to determine its stem, an operation which only an advanced learner of Arabic would be able to perform. Even Arab users who have not been instructed in the use of Arabic monolingual dictionaries would find it difficult and time-consuming to use this dictionary.

3.3.2 **Guidance in the introduction:**

The introduction is written in a generally traditional style, the focus being mostly on the description of the arrangement of entries. Instructions on how to use the

dictionary are not supported by full examples and are written in a technical language that would be understood only by specialists or by those accustomed to Arabic linguistic terminology. Terms such as 'elative', 'genitive', 'compound', and 'accusative' are not expected to be understood by the ordinary Arab or foreign user of the dictionary.

Over only two pages, the compiler describes the arrangement of entries and explains the use of symbols and abbreviations. The user is told that Arabic words are arranged according to Arabic roots while foreign words are listed in alphabetical order. It seems that arrangement according to stems is the best way to handle the Arabic vocabulary as the source language in a bilingual dictionary. This is due to the nature of Arabic as a derivational language where a single root can have as many as fifty or more derived forms. Arrangement according to alphabetical order would otherwise increase the size of the dictionary sharply and result in too much cross-referencing.

Some of the symbols used in DOMWA do not seem to be of much value in such a comprehension dictionary. The symbol (○) precedes newly coined technical terms which were repeatedly found in context but whose general acceptance among specialists could not be established with certainty, e.g. 'television'. A foreign or an Arab translator using DOMWA would not be expected to need this information since the translated text would contain clues as to the context in which the term is applied. Another symbol is the small square □ that precedes those dialect words for which the Arabic spelling suggests a

colloquial pronunciation. Clearly, symbols and abbreviations for Arabic dialects are of no value to Arab users and it is doubtful that foreign users would benefit from such information when reading and translating Arabic texts, especially if they were informed about the nationality and the background of an Arab writer. After all, dialect forms are only used in spoken Arabic and if they were written they will be found in newspapers and novels where the country of a certain dialect would be clearly indicated.

The compiler indicates that synonyms and translations have been included in large numbers in order to delineate as accurately as possible the semantic ranges within which a given entry can be used. Synonyms are separated by commas, and semicolons mark the beginning of a definition in a different semantic range while synonyms are not provided. Although this is a problematic feature from the Arab user's standpoint (i.e. for encoding), it is justified with regard to the interpretative function for which the dictionary has been designed. Indeed, the treatment of English synonyms in this dictionary illustrates the fact that it is not a suitable writing tool for the Arab user.

3.3.3 **Translation equivalents:**

For the English equivalents, the author claims that he had to consult a number of reference works in European languages, encyclopaedias, lexicons, glossaries, technical dictionaries, and

specialised literature on diverse subjects in order to ascertain the correct translation of many technical terms.

The author admits that the treatment of items derived from Arabic local dialects may not be satisfactory and recommends that the user should refer to an appropriate dialect dictionary or glossary.

English equivalents are in the form of synonyms when the Arabic entry is common in both languages. But when the entry is a culture-specific word, English equivalents are accompanied by a definition of the Arabic headword as in the entry for 'iwan':

> ايوان ... hall with columns, portico; hall or chamber on the ground floor opening through a high arched entrance onto a courtyard; dais opening onto the main entrance through an arcade (in traditional Arab houses)

This is clearly an advantage for foreign users of the dictionary but not for Arab users who do not need such information. In fact, translation errors can be made by Arab users who tend to select the clearest part of the English equivalents which is in this case the definition and translate accordingly (see chapter 7).

As for Arabic words that have been borrowed from English or French, the English equivalent is provided. So we cannot expect additional information to be added in this passive dictionary to help the Arab user who translates from Arabic into English but is

not sure he fully understands a loan word such as 'باليه' "ballet":

باليه... ballet

3.3.4 **Sense discriminations:**

Since the DOMWA is mainly a comprehension dictionary for English-speaking users, sense discriminations are not consistently provided. Wherever they are necessary, they are offered in the target not the source language, usually in the form of abbreviations such as colloc., Law, etc. The aim seems to be to inform the foreign user of the dictionary about the range of contexts in which the Arabic entry word is used, although Arab users would also benefit from such information.

The general tendency in the dictionary is not to provide sense discriminations because the English-speaking users for whom the dictionary has been designed would be aided by their native language and by the context under translation to select the appropriate English equivalent. The absence of this feature is justified since this is a passive dictionary intended primarily for non-Arab users. This would, however, be a serious obstacle to efficient use of this dictionary by Arab users in writing or translating into English. For example, most Arabic headwords are provided with a list of English synonyms with no sense discriminations as in the following entry:

شديد ... strong, powerful, forceful, vigorous, stern, severe, rigorous, hard, harsh, violent, vehement, intense; bad, evil, ominous, calamitous, difficult (على for s.o.); ...

This would result in inaccurate and awkward translations as the Arab user might frequently select inappropriate English equivalents.

Translation complements, on the other hand, seem to be provided consistently when the Arabic word is more specific than the English word used to translate it:

عيار... standard measure, standard, gauge (of measures and weights); fineness (of silver articles), standard (of gold and silver coins)

3.3.5 **Illustrative examples:**

Full and up-to-date examples are lacking in the dictionary, which is a clear indication that DOMWA is orientated towards the interpretative needs of English-speaking users. Examples are provided not as an aid for writing but to illustrate the possible uses of the headword or its derivatives in modern Arabic writings so that translations of Arabic texts would be more accurate.

The examples provided usually pose difficulties to Arab users. An Arabic idiomatic expression or collocation would be translated into more than one English equivalent leaving the Arab user bewildered as to which English translation is the suitable

one:

عنان... rein; bridle | أطلق له العنان... to give free rein to s.o. or s.th.; جرت الأمور فى أعنتها things took a normal course, developed as scheduled

3.3.6 **Collocations and idioms:**

The author claims in the introduction that a liberal selection of Arabic idiomatic phrases has been added in order to provide the syntactic information to be expected in a dictionary of this size. Yet, the dictionary does not organise examples, collocations, idioms, and compounds in separate forms within the body of the entry for easy recognition. The only device used is the vertical stroke which separates definitions and equivalents of the headword from collocations and idioms:

أمان... security, safety; peace; shelter, protection ... | فى أمان الله (a valedictory phrase) in God's protection! أمان المرور safe-conduct; بكل أمان without danger or risk ...

The dictionary also faces its Arab and foreign users with the problem of locating Arabic collocations, idioms, and compounds. In order to look up the Arabic compound 'ala katibah' "typewriter", the user of the dictionary will have to search under either the entry for 'ala' or the one for the root 'kataba'. In other words, such items are listed either alphabetically or under the entry for one of the constituents of

the idiom or collocation. But no cross-reference system is employed to reduce the frustration of those who have to check different entries for an idiom or collocation.

3.3.7 **Grammatical information:**

Foreign users of the dictionary are given some detailed descriptions in the introduction of the grammatical structures of Arabic entries. The Arabic verb in the perfect of the base stem comes first followed by the verbal nouns in parentheses. Then come the derived stems, indicated by boldface Roman numerals. Nominal forms, verbal nouns, and all passive and active participles follow at the end in separate entries.

Such separation of entries according to grammatical function contributes to the efficiency of look-up operations, but the use of Roman numerals to stand for different verb forms of the stem can be more of a hindrance rather than of a help for many foreign users who would be obliged to refer constantly to the introduction. This information is not needed by Arab users, but it seems that the indication at the point of entry of the forms an Arabic verb takes would be more helpful than using boldface Roman numerals II through X for the corresponding stem forms: fa''ala (II), fa'ala (III), af'ala (IV), tafa''ala (V), tafa'ala (VI), infa'ala (VII), ifta'ala (IX), istaf'ala (X). Thus the arrangement of verb forms within entries follows the grammatical model and unless the dictionary user - whether native or

non-native speaker of Arabic - was accustomed to this method of organisation, the speed and efficiency with which the dictionary is used will be greatly affected.

3.3.8 **Pronunciation:**

Arabic headwords and irregular plural forms are transliterated in the dictionary. This information in such a basically comprehension dictionary is of value to Arab as well as foreign users only when there are homonomous Arabic headwords which have the same form but differ in the way they are pronounced. Providing transliterations for such words would help the user find the needed entry:

اذن idn permission ...

اذن udun, udn ... ear; handle (of a cup)

Transliterations also discriminate between some Arabic nouns and their derived passive forms, as in the following entry:

مؤرخ ... mu'arrik historiographer, historian, chronicler, annalist; -- mu'arrak dated.

Otherwise, the Arab user would not need phonological information on his native language. It is also doubtful whether the foreign user would need this type of information in comprehension and translation tasks.

The aim behind the provision of phonological information in the dictionary is, therefore, to help the foreign user avoid errors caused by ambiguities in Arabic spelling. Arab users are accustomed to the placement of diacritical points on Arabic words to indicate how they should be pronounced, and since this information is absent from the dictionary, they have to resort to transliterations wherever an ambiguity in the Arabic spelling is encountered.

CHAPTER FOUR

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS INTO DICTIONARY USE

4.1 Introduction:

Several studies have been conducted in different parts of the world to investigate the role of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries in language learning. These investigations have employed various data-gathering tools: questionnaires, direct observation, protocols, interviews, etc. (cf. Hartmann, 1987). Yet, most of these studies have been limited to English and German being learned by European students in culturally similar contexts. Other studies, possibly commissioned by publishers, have not been widely released for commercial reasons (cf. Béjoint, 1981).

In this chapter, the focus will be on previous investigations into bilingual dictionary use and to a lesser extent on studies of monolingual dictionary use. Reviewing these studies can reveal some basic differences in the function of bilingual and monolingual dictionaries in the process of foreign language learning. Studies dealing exclusively with native-speaker monolingual dictionary use such as Barnhart (1962), Greenbaum et al. (1984) will be examined in order to establish a basis for comparison of the status of dictionary use

among native and foreign users. Thus four classifications of studies emerge:

a) studies of native-speaker monolingual dictionary use

b) studies of EFL monolingual dictionary use

c) studies of bilingual dictionary use

d) studies of bilingual and EFL monolingual dictionary use

4.2 **Studies of native-speaker monolingual dictionary use:**

Few studies have dealt exclusively with native-speaker monolingual dictionaries. Although this type of dictionary is not used for translation, one should consider the amount and type of information frequently looked up by native speakers of English in order to compare them with EFL learners. Similarities in problematic language areas among both groups might justify similar treatment of linguistic data in EFL or learners' bilingual dictionaries.

4.2.1 **Barnhart (1962):**

This study was aimed at investigating the use of commercial monolingual dictionaries by American college freshmen. In 1955 Barnhart circulated 108 questionnaires in 99 colleges in 27 states reporting on the use of the dictionary by 56,000 students. Teachers were asked to rate six types of information commonly

given in college dictionaries according to their importance to the college freshman. Dictionaries were found to be consulted more frequently for meaning and almost as frequently for spelling. Pronunciation was third, followed by synonym studies and lists, usage notes, and lastly etymologies. Barnhart considered spelling as one of the principal reasons for buying dictionaries. His findings were criticised by Hartmann (1987:13) for being "... based not on direct observation of users , but on indirect reports by their teachers". The study has concerned itself with monolingual dictionaries and focused on what the dictionary contained not on how that information was arranged to suit particular modes of use such as writing or reading. The study did not tell us whether these users consulted their dictionaries for translation tasks.

4.2.2 **Greenbaum et al.(1984):**

This study was conducted to investigate the image of the dictionary among American students and to determine in what respects it differed from its image in the UK. A questionnaire similar to that of Quirk (1973:76-88) was completed during the 1977-78 academic year by 240 undergraduates at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 144 male and 96 female; 83 were freshmen and sophomores, and 157 were juniors and seniors. All were native speakers of American English. 86 were in the humanities , 76 were in the sciences, and 78 were studying mostly Business

Administration and Education. Responses were correlated with the students' field of study and their self-report on the average frequency of dictionary use. 97% of the students owned a dictionary and upperclassmen showed a longer experience in consulting dictionaries. 82 students preferred a particular dictionary and this preference correlated strongly with more use especially among humanities students. The main reasons for dictionary use were meanings, spellings, followed by word games, pronunciation, usage, synonyms, etymology, etc. There was a marked tendency among humanities students to resort to a thesaurus more often than Science students. Etymology attracted little interest when consulting a dictionary (8%), especially among Science students. Only 18% used their dictionaries for pronunciation and few students consulted their dictionaries for information on parts of speech (10%). As to what a dictionary should be like, the majority of the students wanted dictionaries to aim for completeness by including all well-known words, but they were divided on whether the dictionary should contain common phrases and idioms; only 51% were in favour of their inclusion. 72% wanted regional dialect words, and 84% wanted slang words. A majority of 63% were in favour of encyclopaedic entries and a very large majority (89%) wanted information on pronunciation. Style labels were required by 68% and information on usage by 75%.

The researchers concluded that the dictionary has a higher status in the US than in the UK in terms of ownership and frequency of use. They found that the US students used their

dictionaries for etymology and pronunciation less frequently than UK students and were more willing to have well-known and slang words than the UK students.

The study did not tell us about US students' use of bilingual dictionaries, but it provided a comprehensive comparison of the images of dictionaries in the two countries. It can serve as a useful reference for comparison in our study as it might reveal differences in terms of the status of dictionaries and types of information frequently looked for in the Kuwaiti context. For example, the lack of interest in the grammar of English words among English-speaking users explains why the reference needs and consequently the design of a dictionary should vary according to its readership.

4.2.3 **Kipfer (1987):**

Kipfer investigated the acquisition of dictionary skills and their influence on the language needs and abilities of intermediate-level students, in particular tenth-, eleventh-, and twelfth-grade American high-school pupils. She researched the following areas:

1) the relationship between language needs and dictionary skills for intermediate students;

2) the acquisition of dictionary skills and its relationship to needs and attitudes;

3) the influence of dictionary skills on reading and writing

ability at this level.

Her sample included 292 students who answered a preliminary questionnaire intended to reveal the chief uses of dictionaries and students' attitudes to dictionary use. She found that dictionaries were used chiefly for meaning and spelling, and occasionally pronunciation. 72% of the students agreed that people are lazy about looking information up and many claimed to use them only when absolutely necessary and indicated that dictionary use takes more time than they are willing to give. The respondents also claimed the need to spell words correctly to be the main reason for dictionary use when writing and 73% said they used dictionaries to check meanings while writing. 52% of the subjects did not know their dictionary well and none said they had been given information about differences between the major types of dictionaries. The finding that students regarded their dictionaries as unquestionable authorities is of some relevance to the present study since a similar finding was discussed by another study dealing with bilingual dictionaries (cf. Tomaszczyk, 1979). A similar concern is the relationship between dictionary use and language performance.

4.3 **Studies of EFL monolingual dictionary use:**

Only one study has dealt exclusively with the use of EFL monolingual English dictionaries by foreign learners (Béjoint, 1981). The study is reviewed here from a translator's viewpoint

as most subjects showed a marked tendency to use learners' dictionaries for translation.

4.3.1 **Béjoint (1981):**

Béjoint studied the use of English general monolingual dictionaries by French students of English at the University of Lyon. His sample included 122 informants: 63 in their second year, 43 in their third year, and 16 in their fourth year. Most of them were intending to become teachers of English. He devised 21 questions to explore these dictionary users' needs and reference skills. 96% of the sample owned at least one general English monolingual dictionary, and 85% bought their dictionaries on the recommendations of their tutors. As for the preference for a certain dictionary, most students preferred the dictionary they had bought or the one they usually worked with and valued exhaustiveness of coverage. 40% used their dictionaries at least once a week. Meaning was the type of information 87% of the sample looked for most often in their dictionaries followed by syntactic information (53%), synonyms (52%), spelling and pronunciation (25%), language variety (19%), and etymology (5%).

The use of dictionaries for translation by 86% of the subjects of the study made Béjoint conclude that they are used for decoding rather than for encoding, and for written activities (written comprehension 60%, written composition and L1-L2 translation 58%) than for oral activities (oral comprehension 14%

and oral composition 9%). Yet, the absence of information on the use of bilingual dictionaries by the subjects leaves us wondering if the frequency of using learner's dictionaries for translation is higher than that of bilingual ones. Among the kinds of words looked up most often were idioms (68%) and encyclopaedic words (55%). There was an extensive use of examples and quotations (70%) and synonyms (68%) but the figure for the use of pictorial illustrations was rather low (24%). Béjoint observed, regarding the students' reference skills in looking up idiomatic expressions, that they reject the notion of separate main entries for compounds and have a marked tendency to look for nominal compounds in the entry for the headword.

Although this study, as Béjoint admits, was not exhaustive, it could provide us with a number of insights into the dictionary needs of foreign university students of English and their reference skills. The subject major of informants is the same in both studies and also the same is the fact that English is learned in the French and the Kuwaiti contexts as a foreign language, and that both groups show the same tendency to employ dictionaries for decoding rather than encoding. This would enable us to draw some comparisons, in spite of the difference in dictionary types studied, and to see to what extent the different linguistic and cultural backgrounds of EFL learners influence their dictionary needs and reference skills. Also, the comparison would reveal to what extent different types of dictionary are used for translation tasks.

4.4 Studies of bilingual dictionary use:

4.4.1 Bujas (1975):

This study was aimed at assessing the lexical coverage of an English-Croatian medium-sized general-purpose dictionary in order to amend, improve, and update it. The researcher employed 18 undergraduates in the English department at the University of Zagreb. The analysts carefully read, over two and a half years, a total of 34 issues of different publications in American and British English including Newsweek, Time, Reader's Digest, the Economist, the National Geographic, etc. Some analysts looked up those words they expected to be absent from the dictionary, and others looked up every word in the text analysed. The next step was to classify the material collected into one of three basic types of inadequacy:

1) The item underlined is completely absent as a headword from the dictionary.

2) The item underlined is present in the dictionary as a headword, but absent in the particular collocation.

3) The item underlined is present in the dictionary, but its Croatian translation in the dictionary is inadequate.

The final step was to recommend inserting or leaving some items and correcting others. Insertion was recommended because the item was common, topical, typical of British or American society, or required context or descriptive translation. The total number of inadequate items was 6,272 out of which 4,908

(78.3%) had been recommended for insertion.

The study resulted in a workable procedure for improving an existing bilingual dictionary, although it did not yield a generally applicable performance index (cf. Hartmann 1987). In addition, some of the analysts in the study made subjective choices and intuitively recorded only those items that they expected to be absent from the dictionary. Also the study did not indicate whether the category 'common' was based on the frequency of occurrence of items in the publications examined or in other frequency counts. The category 'too technical' can cause many needed items to be put aside without a reliable basis of judgement.

Assessing the lexical coverage of a bilingual dictionary is of direct relevance to the present study as this aspect of dictionary design constitutes an essential criterion in an overall assessment of a particular dictionary. Although the present study is primarily concerned with accessibility and usability, the comprehensiveness of coverage would be treated as an important factor in determining the status of different types of dictionary in the study.

4.4.2 **Ard (1982):**

This study was an investigation of the actual use of bilingual dictionaries by ESL students while composing in English. Ard analysed actual instances of bilingual dictionary

use by these students. He based actual instances of use on a) students' recollections of how they use bilingual dictionaries, b) actual instances of words chosen from bilingual dictionaries by students when writing in class, and c) protocols of students' writing and their simultaneous oral comments about their writing.

The subjects were one Japanese female and one Arab male who were learning at the English Language Institute, University of Michigan. They were asked to write a short composition and to orally describe what they were doing at the same time. Their oral comments were recorded while a TV camera focused on the page they were writing upon, to discover what they were writing while they were talking.

The Japanese female used a bilingual dictionary, while the Arab male did not. Ard found that the lack of a bilingual dictionary did not preclude L1 influence on lexical choice. The Arab student made reference to Arabic when discussing his choices in English, and the Japanese student was influenced by Japanese even in places where she did not consult a dictionary. Ard also noted that the use of bilingual dictionaries involves an excessive expenditure of time. He concluded that 1) The use of bilingual dictionaries frequently leads to errors of certain types, 2) These types are understandable given language differences and the nature of existing bilingual dictionaries, 3) Errors of similar types occur even when bilingual dictionaries are not consulted, and 4) Different difficulties in bilingual dictionary use present themselves for different groups of

speakers.

Although the study employed a useful empirical procedure, the sample (as Ard admits) was not representative for statistical analysis.

4.5 Studies of bilingual and EFL monolingual dictionary use:

4.5.1 Tomaszczyk (1979):

The researcher aimed at examining the ways in which language learners use dictionaries, and their attitudes and expectations towards them. He analysed 449 copies of a questionnaire containing 57 items on language learning history, current language use, use of dictionaries, and evaluation of information they provide. The subjects were 55 foreign students at American colleges, 62 foreign students at Polish universities, 167 Polish students of university foreign language departments, 60 language instructors, 25 translators of belles-lettres, and 80 technical translators. He found that all subjects, no matter how sophisticated they are, use bilingual dictionaries, that more people use L2-L1 dictionaries than L1-L2 ones, and that the extent of dictionary use depends on the nature of the skill practised, on the subjects' level of language proficiency, and on the extent to which the given skill is practised. He also noticed that the main factor which determines the extent of dictionary use was the kind of translating job a person is doing. 74% of the

subjects looked for synonyms, 72% for spelling and idioms, 65% for stress and pronunciation, 45% for swear words and obscenities, 36% for word division and 19% for etymology. As for grammatical information, 70% of students and teachers consulted dictionaries for grammar and function words, and 59% for productive grammar.

Tomaszczyk concluded that learners' dependence on dictionaries decreases as their command of the language increases. There was a paradoxical situation where EFL learners do not choose to utilise monolingual dictionaries especially designed to meet their needs (cf. Tomaszczyk, 1987:140). L1-L2 dictionaries were considered inferior to monolingual dictionaries. The majority of the subjects were satisfied with the treatment in their dictionaries of spelling (72%), function words (70%), stress and pronunciation (65%), and slang and obscenities (45%). The results also showed that many beginning and intermediate learners do not know their dictionaries well as opposed to advanced learners who knew what they can expect of their dictionaries and appeared to be getting the most out of them.

The study addressed the relationship between language proficiency and bilingual dictionary use and examined the status of this type in relation to monolingual dictionaries, which is a main focus in the present study.

4.5.2. **Baxter (1980):**

In this study, Baxter investigated the relation between dictionary use, classroom vocabulary behaviour, and student success in meeting their communicative needs. The dictionary habits and preferences of Japanese university learners of English were analysed by means of a questionnaire which was designed to find answers to the following questions:

1) What are the needs of students?
2) What are their present dictionary habits and preferences?
3) What are the essential differences between a bilingual dictionary and a monolingual English dictionary?
4) What are the essential differences between a monolingual learner's dictionary and one designed for use by native speakers?

The questionnaire included 7 items on different aspects of dictionary use. It was administered in the summer of 1979, to Japanese students at three national four-year universities in Japan. The subjects were 342 students; 62 (18.1%) majoring in English, from faculties of Law and Letters (English and American Literature), and Education. There were 280 students (81.9%) not majoring in English, from faculties of Education, Economics, Agriculture, and Engineering.

The questions were about monolingual English dictionaries, bilingual Japanese-English dictionaries, and bilingual English-Japanese dictionaries. The results indicated that 88.6% of the students bought their bilingual English-Japanese

dictionary in junior high school, and over the next few years, two more bilingual dictionaries were acquired. 97% of these students bought an English-Japanese dictionary. Only if the university major of a student was English, will he or she buy a monolingual dictionary. 44.8% of English majors bought one monolingual English dictionary since they started studying English, while 29.3% bought two. Of non-English majors, 25.4% bought one monolingual dictionary, and 7.8% bought two.

Baxter found that at the university level, an English-Japanese dictionary is used most often. 79% of English majors and 4% of non-English majors reported daily use of their bilingual English-Japanese dictionaries. Japanese-English dictionaries were used less often; 11.3% of English majors and 7% of non-English majors used them weekly.

Monolingual English dictionaries were rarely used by non-English majors (4%) while English majors used them more often (27.4%) but less than bilingual English-Japanese dictionaries. Students were found to attribute to the bilingual dictionary the greatest degree of importance in their studies of English. Bilingual dictionaries were considered by 69.4% of English majors and by 78.2% of non-English majors as the most important type of book they have used (also cf.Tomaszczyk 1979, 1987; Hartmann 1983; Tono 1984; Snell-Hornby 1986; Iqbal 1987; Diab 1989; Nuccorini 1992). Less importance was given to monolingual English dictionaries by 14.5% of English majors and by 6.1% of non-English majors.

When asked about the type of dictionary they preferred, most

students replied that it was a bilingual dictionary because of the ease in finding word meanings. Baxter explained this preference as a result of a background of extensive bilingual dictionary use which caused them to feel that such a dictionary is easier to use, and thus they established definite learning strategies in accordance with bilingual dictionary use and cannot be expected either to want to use a monolingual dictionary, or to be successful in that use. This sustained use of bilingual dictionaries, according to Baxter, makes students unable to operate with conversational definitions when a particular lexical item is not known or not accessible.

Baxter's study shares many of the issues studied in our investigation i.e. dictionary needs and preferences, the use of bilingual dictionaries , and the relationship between students' major and their dictionary behaviour.

4.5.3 **Bensoussan et al. (1982):**

Two separate studies were carried out independently at Haifa and Ben Gurion Universities in Israel in order to investigate the effect of dictionary use in examinations on students' test performance. The researchers tested students of comparable English proficiency who were enrolled in similar courses of English reading comprehension and who had studied English for seven years and also received guidance on how to use a monolingual English dictionary.

At Haifa University, nine reading comprehension tests were administered to 700 first-year students of the advanced reading comprehension EFL course as a final examination. Each student received a text (600-800 words with 20 questions). In the study at Ben Gurion University, nine classes containing 91 students participated. 58% of the students were native speakers of Hebrew, 18% Arabic, and 28% had some other native language. Each student was given the same three texts (500-700 words each) with multiple-choice questions for each text. By random selection of texts for each dictionary, students answered the questions of each of the three texts under different conditions: one text without any dictionary, another text with a monolingual dictionary, and a third using a bilingual dictionary.

The two studies showed a preference for using a bilingual dictionary, but did not indicate any significant correlation between dictionary use and test scores. In both studies, the majority of the students chose to use bilingual dictionaries, and there was some indication that those using bilingual dictionaries were slower and that users of monolingual dictionaries worked faster and scored slightly higher on tests. The researchers also found a gap between the help that teachers thought students would get from dictionaries, and their actual test performance.

A questionnaire was then administered to the students, to their teachers, and to another small group of 13 third-year psychology students who were advanced learners of English. The aim was to understand the underlying attitudes and expectations of dictionary users. Many students expected the dictionary to

help them comprehend a text but were disappointed when the dictionary failed to contain the exact meaning of a word in a particular context. Some students did not use any dictionary during the test because they felt looking up words and deciding on their meanings takes time better spent answering the questions.

Teachers expressed dissatisfaction with their students' ability to use the dictionary systematically or accurately enough for academic reading purposes. They indicated that looking up a word may not always help the student to understand the wider context of a word. The more advanced students used dictionaries less but more selectively than less advanced ones and almost half of them did not expect the dictionary to affect test scores.

The number of subjects and the statistical procedures employed in this study are reliable sources of information. Yet, the small number of texts and questions makes us wonder whether the use of many different types of texts and more questions would have affected the role of the dictionary in reading comprehension examinations.

4.5.4 **Hartmann (1983):**

This was a study of the use of bilingual dictionaries by English-speaking learners and teachers of the German language in schools and colleges in southwest England. Empirical data for this study was obtained by conducting a questionnaire containing

23 sets of questions on issues such as ownership, frequency of use, type of information sought, contexts of dictionary use, etc. The results indicated that 50% of the sample had acquired their first bilingual dictionary within the first two years of learning German. More than 80% had had no guidance on how to use their dictionaries. Most teachers and students consulted their bilingual dictionaries fairly regularly: (35%) at least once a day, (58%) once a week, (5%) once a term, and (12%) never. As for the activities for which dictionaries were consulted, more than 90% indicated translation exercises followed by reading texts (83%), and writing (74%). 19% used the bilingual dictionary for listening and 16% for conversation. Meaning was the most sought after type of information (97%) and grammar (82%), use in context (67%), spelling (68%), synonyms (58%), pronunciation (15%), and etymology (12%). 36% of the subjects experienced dissatisfaction occasionally because they could not find what they were looking for, 29% periodically, and 27% frequently. 76% blamed missing meanings for this dissatisfaction, 61% missing words, and 49% confusing or overlong entries. The majority suggested more examples of usage, others complained about style labels, layout and cross-references. Only 40% reported occasions when a monolingual dictionary was more useful than a bilingual dictionary.

The study draws a rather clear picture of the learning activities for which dictionaries are consulted. Yet, as in most studies of dictionary use, the researcher's data have been obtained indirectly by means of questionnaires only.

4.5.5 **Hatherall (1984):**

Text analysis and check-list questionnaires were employed as the data-gathering tools in this study. 22 subjects were asked to translate into German a text which was part of a newspaper article and were given free choice of dictionaries and other reference works. They were also asked to write on separate forms every word they had looked up. After a one-hour translation task they answered on paper questions about whether they read the section for translation first, the whole text during the hour, the whole text first, or the whole text at the end of the hour. Hatherall observed that the majority of the students do not read the whole text through in advance of translating, but do so after they have begun to translate and perceived difficulties with decoding. He found that the more advanced students use the dictionary more often than the less advanced ones who, according to Hatherall, are perhaps less confident in retrieving the necessary information and thus more reluctant to try. Users of bilingual desk dictionaries made a high number of idiomatic errors in contrast with users of monolingual dictionaries and did not appear to use the dictionary to look up commonly-occurring closed-set items or open-class items. The tendency to translate word-for-word was particularly pronounced amongst less advanced students but excessive amongst all groups.

Detailed numerical information has not been provided in this study (cf. Hartmann, 1987). Yet, this does not disqualify it from being an important source of insights into dictionary users'

habits especially in translation tasks e.g. the effect of prior reading of a text on students' success in a translation test.

4.5.6 **Tono (1984):**

This study was an investigation into the reference skills of 402 Japanese students at Tokyo Gakugei University, of whom 63 were English majors. They were asked to translate English passages from American magazines into Japanese using eight different sets of bilingual dictionaries. Seven different pieces of information were selected to see if the subjects used them properly:

a. grammatical information

b. verb patterns

c. countable vs. uncountable nouns

d. glosses

e. collocations

f. idioms

g. run-ons

Questionnaires were also used to doublecheck the users' reference skills to retrieve different types of information. The subjects were asked to describe the process of information retrieval from their dictionaries.

The study found that these users tend to choose the first definition of an entry. Only when the information in the

dictionary indicated the inappropriateness of the first definition did they move to the next one. The subjects seemed not to read whole entries but would rather stop searching for the required meaning as soon as possible. The study found English majors who are interested in word-related problems make more effective use of syntactic information. Users were also found to dislike the complexity of dictionary design. Illustrative examples were not used by most non-English majors to find appropriate definitions and prevented the subjects from going on to the second definition in many cases. Also, non-English majors relied on translation equivalents rather than syntactic information.

The results of this kind of research has important implications for dictionary design (e.g. the appropriate location of examples within the body of an entry) and the teaching of reference skills (e.g. users should be made aware of the need to scan the whole entry) (cf. Hartmann 1989b).

4.5.7 **Iqbal (1987):**

This PhD dissertation was a comprehensive study of dictionary needs and reference skills of Pakistani advanced learners of English and had the following aims:

1) The assessment of Pakistani advanced learners' reference skills

2) Their language needs on the semantic, syntactic, phonetic,

stylistic, and pragmatic levels and their relative importance in terms of production and comprehension

3) The general difficulties encountered by these learners

4) The most convenient way of making the information readily accessible to them

For these aims a questionnaire comprising 54 items was designed and administered to 700 second-year graduates chosen randomly from all four provinces of Pakistan. They were studying English as a compulsory subject during the year 1983. Iqbal excluded science students on the grounds that their syllabus in the English language was much more limited and orientated towards the sciences. Intermediate students were not included as they form a mixed group coming from both Sciences and Humanities and because they may not reach the prescribed level of advanced language study.

Iqbal found that a very large number of students (92.5%) possess a monolingual dictionary, but he noticed that they were not informed about the fundamental difference between learners' dictionaries and dictionaries aimed at native speakers. The majority (67.7%) bought their dictionaries on their teachers' recommendations but did not receive any advice about the type of dictionary to select.

Students were found to use bilingual dictionaries more frequently. English-Urdu dictionaries were used by 20.7% of the students at least once a week, and Urdu-English were used by 76.1% of the students. The majority considered bilingual dictionaries to be more useful in explaining the meaning of

words.

As for the kinds of activities for which dictionaries were used, 53.3% used their dictionaries for reading, 28.6% for writing, 21.3% for translating from L2 into L1, 17.9% for translating from L1 into L2, 13.3% for speaking, and 8.8% for listening.

The study found that students lacked adequate knowledge about dictionaries and their distinguishing features. Structured interviews with 25 college lecturers showed that only 13 of them recommended learners' dictionaries and that only 10 lecturers knew all the learners' dictionaries. 14 of them were in favour of monolingual dictionaries, 4 in favour of bilingual dictionaries, and 7 viewed both types as suitable.

The study covered a large sample which makes the results much more reliable indicators of certain trends in dictionary using behaviour. Yet, some of the questions especially those concerning the types of activities for which dictionaries were used have been too general and could have been broken down into more specific questions addressing subcategories of activities such as examinations, term papers, etc.

4.5.8 **Moulin (1987):**

This study tried to examine, from a teacher's point of view, a particular type of dictionary-use situation: encoding. Moulin rightly emphasises that one of the reasons why so many learners

never use the dictionary- or use it wrongly for writing tasks is simply that they have not received the right preparation. He recommends that writing should precede dictionary consultation i.e. the learner should first try to express his thoughts by using the words or phrases which come spontaneously to mind. Dictionary consultation is postponed to a later stage when the author re-reads his first draft and examines it critically. The dictionary, therefore, would assist in the process of clarification and correction. Yet, Moulin admits that such help is limited especially when it comes to improving the logical or stylistic coherence of a sentence or paragraph in which learners should be trained.

Translation from the mother tongue, according to Moulin, involves two operations: decoding (i.e. interpreting in the source language and making sure the full meaning of the original text is understood) and encoding (in the target language). Here, he sees the translator's job as the rendering of the richness of the original text without depreciating or possibly overvaluing it. The teacher's art, on the other hand, consists in choosing a source text adapted to his students' proficiency in both decoding and encoding and drawing their attention to the hazards of word-for-word translation.

Moulin finds beginners as well as advanced learners reluctant to write directly in English. They write in their mother tongue instead and then try to translate into English a text which is far above their capacities, assuming that the dictionary's richness will compensate for the indigence of their

written English or conceal their lack of imagination or their reluctance to make the necessary efforts of concentration.

Moulin examines the following situations in which dictionary consultation may help the writer of a text whether translating into or from his mother tongue:

1) Uncertainty over the exact meaning of a word: When a French learner is not quite sure whether a word he knows is correct, he will consult the English-French part of his bilingual dictionary or turn directly to a learner's or standard dictionary. He might also turn to a dictionary of synonyms to be sure that his choice is appropriate and to avoid repetition.

2) Unknown English words: The French writer of English might be stopped by a gap in his vocabulary - an English word he does not know. Here the native-tongue concept would be the ideal starting-point for a word in the French-English part of the bilingual dictionary. The validity of his choice is then checked by examining carefully the examples supplied for the sense in question, by looking up in the English-French part the equivalent he has chosen, and by consulting a monolingual dictionary.

3) Handling idioms: The writer may have to check the idiom's exact make-up by looking up what he considers to be the key word. Then he will verify the meaning of the idiom and make sure it really corresponds to what he wants to say. Then the problem of using the idiom will be solved by using the ODCIE which details its usage.

4) Difficulty with sentences: Moulin suggests that the ideal place to discuss the problem of compound and complex sentences is

a grammar or even a handbook on writing. He realises that there are limitations on dictionary use in translating or writing scientific articles especially when illustrating or explaining rhetorical functions.

5) Difficulties with particular types of discourse: Those who wish to write letters but have no access to bilingual or English monolingual guides to correspondence will probably try to start from the mother tongue experience and find equivalents for traditional salutations and complimentary closes such as: Monsieur, ... J'ai l'honneur de. Provided one knows where to look, it is also possible to find the right formula by consulting a monolingual dictionary. Yet, Moulin insists that grammatical, stylistic, and pragmatic cohesion remain the entire responsibility of the writer.

Moulin concludes that the more original the style and content of the discourse the more difficult is it for the author or translator to use the dictionary profitably. He recommends that linguistic awareness and skill in monolingual dictionary consultation should first be developed in relation to the learning of the mother tongue at primary school level in order to enable the FL teacher to build on a much firmer foundation.

The value of this study lies in its close examination of the use of bilingual and monolingual dictionaries for writing and translating from the student's mother tongue. The emphasis on combined dictionary use in expressive activities is directly relevant to our investigation.

4.5.9 **Tomaszczyk (1987):**

The aim of this study was to examine a number of texts on various topics written in English by non-native speakers of the language for instances of deviation from target language norms in terms of the information provided by dictionaries and thus to see what proportion of the mistakes made might not have occurred if dictionaries had been consulted. Student behaviour in translation classes was observed to see how language problems are typically dealt with.

Tomaszczyk claims that translation is likely to require greater reliance on reference books than any other FL skill and is thus bound to produce more instances of dictionary use and misuse.

He found that a vast majority of errors would not have occurred if dictionaries had been used with skill and they seemed not to have been consulted at all. This finding was confirmed by student behaviour in class.

Among Tomaszczyk's students' strategies in dealing with language problems were: asking somebody for help - a class-mate, another class-mate, the teacher - and only if this does not produce an acceptable result will they consult a dictionary. Bilingual dictionaries were found to be used frequently for lexical items, with OALDOCE or LDOCE being used primarily but rather infrequently for grammar. They rarely questioned the information found and checked it against another source. The main source of mistakes was found to be an unwillingness to consult reference

books rather than a lack of reference skills or inadequate dictionaries.

Tomaszczyk also noticed that for most foreign language learners the content of a message takes precedence over its form. These students seemed to prefer to rely on their competence, even if this involves resorting to avoidance strategies, often at the expense of accuracy.

4.5.10 **Diab:**

This study was an empirical investigation into some aspects of dictionary use among 405 student nurses learning specialised English at the University of Jordan. The researcher used a number of data-gathering instruments which included questionnaires, structured interviews, and dictionary using diaries. He also analysed available syllabuses, study plans, teaching materials, design documents, and test results.

Diab found that dictionaries were assigned a peripheral status in the curricula, and that students at the compulsory stage received just one lesson on dictionary use. The questionnaire returns and interview responses indicated that many of the subjects were reliant on pocket-sized bilingual English-Arabic dictionaries with the frequency of their use gradually increasing as they moved up from one school stage to another.

Dictionaries were found in this study to be used mainly for decoding especially in reading comprehension. Neither monolingual

nor bilingual Arabic-English dictionaries were reported to have been in significant use among students in schools. Monolingual English dictionaries tended to be generally more sophisticated in comparison with the low level of proficiency in English among school pupils.

Diab also found that a lexicographical input was generally lacking in the teaching/learning process, both at the undergraduate and at the post-graduate levels at the University of Jordan, while the majority of students and teachers agreed that training in reference skills, particularly using monolingual dictionaries , was badly needed.

The study found that students employ a number of non-dictionary strategies in handling unfamiliar words. 89% of the subjects regularly attempted to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words from the context. They also glossed in Arabic the vocabulary they looked up in their reading texts, and asked their fellow students and ESP or nursing staff for assistance.

In this study, dictionaries did not appear to have been regularly used in listening comprehension, and advanced students used their dictionaries for listening more than other students. Most of the subjects indicated a need for help in writing and speaking, and agreed that dictionary use is important in such contexts. Although most students needed help in grammar, dictionaries were found to be used for syntactic information by fewer students, and less frequently, in comparison with looking up semantic or phonetic information. Less sought types of information included spelling, illustrations, etymology, and

syllabification.

As for the students' attitudes towards their dictionaries, Diab found that almost half of them thought dictionary use was boring and that 55% agreed that to depend on one dictionary was not enough. While 51% of the students indicated that monolingual dictionaries were more useful than bilingual English-Arabic dictionaries, 74% reported their need for help in using such monolingual dictionaries.

The study offered a detailed picture of dictionary users and how they cope with their dictionaries in specific language-learning activities, but it did not deal with the structural features of the dictionaries concerned in order to show how these can be improved to satisfy a special category of users.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

5.1 Introduction:

In this chapter, the choice of research method will be justified in terms of its suitability and practicality. The discussion of the research design will focus on how to control variables of statistical significance for the present study (e.g. dictionary type, proficiency level, guidance on dictionary use, and grouping of the subjects).

Understanding how and why language learners refer to their dictionaries has been a growing concern among lexicographers and interested researchers, especially since the Bloomington conference (cf. Householder et al 1962). Several studies have been carried out with the aim of identifying dictionary users' needs and/or reference skills (see chapter 4). A comprehensive critical review of these studies has been written by Hartmann (1987, 1989c).

Research into dictionary users and uses is a valuable aid to practising lexicographers and is considered by some as a special aspect of meta-lexicography (cf. Wiegand 1984). Lexicographers who used to base their decisions on their own expectations of what dictionary users needed rather than on reported empirical evidence are now better informed about the

trouble spots in their dictionaries and are thus in a better position to make semantic, syntactic, pragmatic, and phonological information more easily accessible to the dictionary user. Also, the results of investigations into dictionary content help the lexicographers concerned to balance the provision of specific types of information according to their relevance and usefulness and to gain insights into the extent of the lexical coverage needed by their audience.

In addition, research into users' dictionary reference skills provides teachers and foreign language methodologists with insights into their students' problems in retrieving information from reference works. It makes them aware of their responsibility to teach students how to use their dictionaries and to incorporate dictionary use into the FL programme in the form of exercises, etc. (cf. Underhill 1985).

Yet, there remain many gaps in the research into dictionary users and uses and many aspects of the problem have not yet been tackled (cf. Crystal 1986, Hatherall 1984). Very few studies have focused on users' needs in relation to their reference skills. As we have seen earlier, most researchers have been interested in determining what users look for in their dictionaries and their evidence has largely been gained from indirect observation in the form of questionnaires only. This method by itself does not help us discover 'how' users use dictionaries. In addition, the questions themselves encourage certain types of response, whether factual or not (cf. Hatherall 1984). On the other hand, the use of direct observation entails

a small population sample and is time-consuming. Also, it is unlikely that all the information the researcher needs would be obtained by means of cameras, video-recording, etc. (ibid, p. 184). The only study to employ this method was conducted using a very small sample and therefore the evidence was inconclusive (cf. Ard 1982). The unnaturalness of dictionary look-up operations performed under observation is another disadvantage of this research method.

The study of learners' translation errors in relation to dictionary use is an appreciated and informative method for gaining insights into 'how' learners use their dictionaries (cf. Ogasawara 1984; Huang 1985; Maingay et al.1987; Tomaszczyk 1987.) Yet, no study has yet been conducted to examine the effect of the type of dictionary used on the quality and quantity of students' translation errors. One study (cf. Jain 1981) did focus on the relationship between certain types of students' errors made while writing and specific titles of EFL dictionaries although the evidence was extracted from the students' previous written assignments. In the few studies of students' errors made while using dictionaries essential variables such as the level of proficiency, dictionary type and title, and previous training in dictionary use have not been given prominence or have been neglected altogether. These omissions negatively affected the reliability of the cited evidence.

In the last decade, researchers in the social sciences have become more aware that indirect surveying of large populations of subjects would be more informative if supplemented by more

controlled direct observation and experimentation (cf. Hartmann 1989c). Among the studies of dictionary use few have employed both techniques to find out how the needs of dictionary users correlate with their reference skills and recorded performance.

In this chapter, we shall discuss the choice of research method with special reference to its practicality and suitability for providing evidence of dictionary use. The discussion of the design of research method will focus on how to control variables of statistical significance in the study (e.g. dictionary type, proficiency level, dictionary guidance, and grouping of subjects).

5.2 The present study:

This study is conducted from a holistic standpoint, one which views the relationship between the dictionary and the learner as interdependent with the belief that in order to understand the nature of the problems involved in the process of dictionary use, one has to focus on both the dictionary and the learner together. It is necessary to investigate the background of the dictionary user, and his expectations, preferences, and reference skills in order to determine whether these are considered by dictionary compilers, and how far errors are caused by insufficient experience and training. Similarly, the design of the dictionary used will have to be examined via instances of students' translation errors to gain insights into its defective

design features and its inadequate treatment of certain types of lexical items.

With these considerations in mind, we have chosen to employ a questionnaire survey in conjunction with two translation tests (from and into English). This technique should provide us with more concrete information on what EFL learners in a particular linguistic and cultural setting actually do when they use their dictionaries, how dictionaries fail students while translating into and from English, which dictionary type (bilingual, monolingual) is more effective, and how successful is instruction being given in the use of dictionaries. The findings are expected to highlight some aspects of dictionary design that might be improved or modified in order to help students use their dictionaries more effectively.

5.3 **The subjects:**

The subjects of this study were 320 undergraduate students. 80 of them were from the Faculty of Sciences and 240 from the Department of English Language and Literature- Kuwait University. These students attain similar general English language proficiency levels since English is the language of instruction and textbooks in their departments.

Control of the English language proficiency variable has been made by using the criterion 'year of study'. In order to study the effect of English language proficiency on the students'

needs and reference skills only second and fourth-year students were included. They were divided into two groups; low levels (second year) and high levels (fourth year). First-year students were excluded because most students at Kuwait University do not study in English until entering their second year (i.e. after they have completed their general course requirements: Arab-Islamic history, psychology, philosophy, Arabic grammar and literature - all taught in Arabic). At the time of conducting this study, there were no other reliable sources for determining the subjects' proficiency levels (i.e. departmental records, past examination results, TOEFL scores, etc). Most of these were destroyed or plundered shortly before and during the war in the Gulf. It is assumed that, generally, an undergraduate who was taught in English for more than three years would be more advanced and better able to tackle lexical problems than a second-year student who is just beginning to be exposed to more advanced and specialised topics in the foreign language.

The age variable cannot be assigned any statistical significance in this study because there is no considerable difference of age among students of any given year at Kuwait University in general and at the Department of English in particular. Most students are in their early twenties and very few people continue their higher education at a later age. Therefore no attempt was made to divide the subjects according to age difference although this variable might be of statistical significance had there been a wide variety of ages.

The majority of students (about 70%) at Kuwait University

are females and in the Department of English Language and Literature, the percentage is probably higher. This distribution is also represented in the subjects of this study. It is hard to determine the relationship between the gender of the dictionary user and his/her needs and reference skills given a very small number of male students. Yet, it is an established fact that females do better than males in language-related areas of study (cf. Howatt 1984).

Science majors (80 students) were included in the study but were given the questionnaire forms without translation tests. Since very few Science majors own or use Arabic-English dictionaries, it was thought impractical to give them a task (i.e. Arabic-English translation test) that requires the use of this type of dictionary. The aim was to find out how these students differ from English majors in terms of types of information sought, types of dictionary preferred, and attitudes toward dictionary use in general. It is assumed that the nature of study in the Faculty of Sciences and its relevant specialised vocabularies would affect the students' lexical needs both qualitatively and quantitatively.

5.4 **The questionnaire:**

We devised a questionnaire consisting of four sections and fifty items of which some were derived from previous studies into dictionary use (Tomaszczyk 1979; Béjoint 1981; Iqbal 1987) and

based on the aims of the present study (see section 5.2). The first section in the questionnaire (14 questions) had to be completed by all the subjects. It aims at drawing the user profile on the basis of the following general aspects:

a. ownership of dictionaries, their sizes, titles, and numbers (questions 1&2)
b. preferences with regard to type of dictionary, size, and place of dictionary consultation (questions 3, 6, 7, 8)
c. attitudes towards specialised dictionaries, instruction in dictionary use, encyclopaedic and phonological information (questions 5, and 10 to 13)
d. multiple dictionary use (question 4)
e. browsing through a dictionary (question 9)
f. idiom locating (question 14)

The second section of the questionnaire (12 questions) was aimed at only those using English-Arabic dictionaries and questions were written in order to focus on specific aspects of English-Arabic dictionary use. The third section (11 questions) was to be completed by Arabic-English dictionary users only. The last section (13 questions) was aimed at users of EFL monolingual dictionaries. The questions in all three sections were similar except for the last section on monolingual dictionaries where questions on translation equivalents had to be changed into ones on definitions. Also the question on illustrations in Arabic-English dictionaries was omitted because existing

dictionaries of this type do not contain pictures.

These last three sections were designed in order to establish as accurately as possible how different types of dictionary correlate with different needs, levels, and expectations. The following aspects of dictionary use were addressed in those sections:

a. stage of education when a certain type was first used
b. reasons for acquiring dictionaries
c. guidance on dictionary use
d. frequency of dictionary use
e. adequacy of translation equivalents or monolingual definitions
f. types of information often looked up
g. learning activities for which dictionaries are most often used
h. reading the introductory matter
i. adequacy of illustrative example
j. effectiveness of illustrations
k. adequacy of dictionary lexical coverage
l. evaluation of the dictionary used

The division of the questionnaire into different sections according to the types of dictionary under study, i.e. English-Arabic, Arabic-English, and monolingual, is designed to help us make comparisons between these dictionary types and between their respective users. Most previous investigations into dictionary use did not observe such distinctions in their

questionnaire surveys which led to ambiguities and inaccurate results. In addition, terms like 'undecided', 'sometimes', and 'always' etc have been avoided in the questions because the nature of the study and result analysis require factual rendering of the questions. Admittedly, some of the questions such as the one 'occasions of failure to find dictionary entries' make considerable demands on the informant's memory and the accuracy of responses to this and similar questions will therefore be affected. Yet, the large population sample in this study is expected to provide general indicators despite the inaccuracy of some responses.

The metalanguage used in this questionnaire had been minimised in order to make sure that as many students as possible would understand what information they were asked to give. Terms like 'etymology', 'collocations', 'phonetic transcriptions', 'monolingual', and 'comprehensive/desk size' were all explained and/or illustrated in case some low-level students do not interpret the questions where these terms are used.

A list of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries sold on the Kuwaiti market had been written to be distributed along with the questionnaire forms. It is meant to help students answer the first question on the types and titles of dictionaries they have.

5.5 The dictionaries:

Although this study focuses on bilingual lexicography of

English and Arabic from a user's perspective, a monolingual EFL dictionary will be used in the experiment in order to make some comparisons between different types and combinations of dictionaries. Three dictionaries were chosen because of their popularity among the students which is further indicated by their commercial success in the Arab world and Kuwait in particular. These are:

AL-MAWRID (1990) edited by Ba'albaki, Dar El-Ilm Lil-Malayeen, Beirut.

A DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC (1972), edited by M. Cowan, Wiesbaden.

OXFORD ADVANCED LEARNER'S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH (1989), edited by A.P. Cowie, Oxford University Press.

In addition to the critical examination in chapter 3 of the two bilingual dictionaries mentioned above, it would be necessary to examine the adequacy of the design features and information provided in these popular dictionaries by putting them to the test (see section 5.6). Similar studies of dictionary use have suffered from a lack of uniformity with regard to the dictionary used by the test subjects (cf. Atkins et al 1991). In the present study, this problem is solved through the use of specific editions and titles that are also familiar and are used by the majority of the subjects. This entails that the subjects will

have fewer problems accessing the entries as they will be familiar with their arrangement either according to the English alphabetical order (AL-MAWRID and ALD) or according to Arabic verbal stems (DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC). Although the latter type is not used by the majority of students, it is assumed that the subjects of this study are at least familiar with the Arabic arrangement of entries in Arabic monolingual dictionaries which they have been taught to use in secondary school.

5.6 **Translation tests:**

Two translation tests were constructed using two passages of medium length. In each test fifteen items were underlined in the passage and listed separately under it to be given translation equivalents by the subjects using the dictionaries specified (see section 5.7). The aim of the tests was to assess the degree of success of the instructional programme in dictionary use, to examine the effectiveness of the dictionary used by the subjects, and to find out whether a specific combination of dictionaries would yield better translations.

In selecting the passages and the items to be translated, we aimed at designing translation tests that replicate as far as possible the natural use of dictionaries in ordinary translation situations.

5.6.1 **English-Arabic translation test:**

An article from the British magazine 'Scene' was used as a translation passage for this test. The items to be translated were of medium difficulty so as to challenge the students and to ensure that dictionaries would be used for as many items as possible. In addition, in the selection of the test items, we took into consideration some lexicographical problems i.e. the treatment of adverbs, polysemy, abstract nouns, verb transitivity, and culture-bound words. The list of items for translation was as follows:

1. unprecedentedly
2. weathered
3. stretch
4. hot-footing
5. track him down
6. trudged
7. well-meaning
8. locals
9. apologetically
10. secure him
11. stringent requirements
12. punctiliously logged
13. pedometer
14. walkman
15. British Telecom

To avoid multiplicity of translations, the instructions on the test form asked students to write only one Arabic translation for each item. The instructions also required that each of the underlined words in the passage should be translated according to its position in the surrounding context. The possible dictionary use situations for this test were: single use (AL-MAWRID or the ALD) and multiple use (AL-MAWRID and the ALD).

5.6.2 **Arabic-English translation test:**

An Arabic article on environmental issues from the Egyptian newspaper Al-Ahram International was used as a translation passage in which fifteen lexical items were underlined and then listed separately under the passage:

1. مخلفات 'legacy'
2. شعارات 'slogans'
3. تندد 'to criticize'
4. وقاية 'protection'
5. شاق 'arduous'
6. بعيد المنال 'hardly attainable'
7. معدلات 'rates'
8. التغذية 'nutrition'
9. الملوثة 'polluted'
10. المبيدات الحشرية 'insecticides'
11. الملوثات 'pollutants'

12. الزئبق 'mercury'

13. مكونات 'components'

14. مدى 'extent'

15. سمية 'toxicity'

Most of these items were chosen because they were representative of the types of problems frequently encountered by Arabic-English dictionary users (i.e. long synonym lists, Arabic homographs, compounds, technical terminology, etc.). As in the other test, instructions in the subjects' native language asked them to give only one translation for each item. The possible dictionary use situations for this translation test were:

a. single dictionary use (DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC)

b. multiple dictionary use (DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC and AL-MAWRID) or (DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC and the ALD)

The underlined Arabic words in the passage were supposed to be translated according to their use in the context. The passage was selected because its subject matter (pollution) was familiar and did not make excessive demands on their knowledge of the related technical aspects.

5.7 **Procedures:**

We took overall responsibility for distributing the questionnaire forms to the students at the Faculty of Sciences and the Department of English Language and Literature. Instructors at the English Language Unit- Faculty of Sciences had been contacted beforehand to obtain their permission and to agree on convenient dates for conducting the questionnaires.

This prior planning enabled us to locate equal numbers of high and low level Science majors. They were visited in their classrooms and were instructed to complete the questionnaire forms only. Monitoring the informants and answering their questions with regard to the metalanguage of some of the questions proved to be an effective way for reducing the number of invalid questionnaire forms. They were asked to answer the relevant sections according to whether or not they used a specific type of dictionary and to be as factual as possible in their responses.

After similar prior planning, second and fourth-year English majors were visited during their classroom hours and were asked to complete both the questionnaires and the two translation tests. In order to replicate the ordinary use of dictionaries, the students were given no time limit although most of them managed to finish within 45 minutes. To ensure accurate answers with regard to dictionary titles, we distributed a dictionary list along with the questionnaire forms to help those who were not able to remember the exact titles of their dictionaries. As

for the dictionaries they used for the tests, we succeeded in borrowing 40 copies of each dictionary title (AL-MAWRID, OXFORD ADVANCED LEARNER'S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH, and DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC) from a local bookshop for conducting the study.

The different variables to be studied made it necessary to divide the population sample (240 English majors) into six equal groups according to their proficiency levels and the type(s) of dictionary used for the tests. The following divisions were sought:

Group 1

number of subjects: 40

level: low

dictionary used for English-Arabic translation test:

AL-MAWRID

dictionary used for Arabic-English translation test:

DOMWA

Group 2

number of subjects; 40

level: high

dictionary used for English-Arabic translation test:

AL-MAWRID

dictionary used for Arabic-English translation test:

DOMWA

Group 3

number of subjects: 40

level: low

dictionary used for English-Arabic translation test:

AL-MAWRID and ALD

dictionary used for Arabic-English translation test:

DOMWA and AL-MAWRID

Group 4

number of subjects: 40

level: high

dictionary used for English-Arabic translation test:

AL-MAWRID and ALD

dictionary used for Arabic-English translation test:

DOMWA and AL-MAWRID

Group 5

number of subjects: 40

level: low

dictionary used for English-Arabic translation test:

ALD

dictionary used for Arabic-English translation test:

DOMWA and ALD

Group 6

number of subjects: 40

level: high

dictionary used for English-Arabic translation test:

ALD

dictionary used for Arabic-English translation test:

DOMWA and ALD

The subjects were monitored by us and their enquiries about the questionnaire and translation tests were answered: this helped to reduce the number of invalid questionnaire and test forms. Also, the subjects were asked to translate all the translation items and were warned against giving more than one translation for each item. Because of the nature of these translation tests it was impossible to apply language testing statistical techniques for determining test reliability and validity (cf. Harris 1969).

5.8 **Data analysis:**

The analysis of the questionnaire results to be provided in chapter 6, will focus on how the students' dictionary needs differ in relation to their subject of study, proficiency levels in the English language, and types of dictionary they use. To achieve these objectives, the subjects' responses will be regrouped according to dictionary type used, level of English language proficiency, and subject of study.

Tabulation and cross-tabulation of the questionnaire results

will be employed to determine the effect of the above-mentioned variables on students' needs and expectations. For example, tabulated results for the question on the type of dictionary used most often by high levels will be compared with those for low levels in the two groups (English and Science). This tabulation will enable us to detect the effect of proficiency level and subject of study on the student's choice of dictionary.

The two translation tests will be corrected subjectively by us using the criteria 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable'. Translation errors will then be calculated and cross-tabulated with the proficiency levels of those who made them and with the type of dictionary or dictionaries used for translating the item in question. The most important correlation, i.e. between previous instruction on dictionary use and the rate of success in translating a specific item, will be established by checking the questionnaire results to find out how many trained dictionary users committed specific errors.

In the light of students' errors made while using a specific dictionary or combination of dictionaries, we will attempt to analyse the errors in relation to the dictionary's treatment of the translation item to find out to what extent the use of a specific dictionary type causes more errors than the use of another.

CHAPTER SIX

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

6.1 Introduction:

In this chapter, the questionnaire replies will be analysed in order to draw a clear picture of the dictionary situation at Kuwait University, particularly among the students of English language and literature. Such analysis would enable us to identify the factors that influence the degree of EFL learners' success in using their dictionaries. These factors could be arranged into the following categories:

1. The dictionary used - methods adopted in presenting semantic, syntactic, phonological, and pragmatic information and its type.

2. The dictionary user's profile - the level of study, gender, frequency of use, and attitudes toward dictionary use and types.

3. Other factors - the amount of guidance and knowledge of dictionaries the students had from teachers, school textbooks, or other sources.

The combination 'questionnaire-test' is an ideal method for finding out to what extent EFL learners' needs and preferences correlate with their performance on a translation test that requires the use of a specific dictionary type. The effects of single or combined dictionary use on performing the same task would reveal the weaknesses and strengths of the different types and titles used for the tests and would also provide us with some clues as to which dictionary type is more suitable for a particular study mode or type of information.

6.2 **Questionnaire results:**

The total number of valid questionnaire copies was 342 out of which 253 were completed by the students of English and 89 by Science students. In order to have equal numbers of 40 students in each sub-group, 22 copies were discarded randomly (English 13, Science 9). So we ended up with 320 valid replies which were then analysed and tabulated under the following headings:

1. Dictionary ownership -- a. number of dictionaries owned
   b. type(s) of dictionary owned:
   single/multiple ownership

2. Place where dictionaries are usually consulted.
3. Use of more than one dictionary at the same time.
4. Preferred size of dictionary.

5. Use of specialised dictionaries.
6. Type of dictionary used most often.
7. Types of dictionary considered useful for specific activities.
8. Browsing through dictionaries.
9. Attitudes toward the inclusion of encyclopaedic entries.
10. Ability to read phonetic transcription.
11. Trying to find out how words are pronounced.
12. Attitudes toward teaching of dictionary use.
13. Idiom locating.
14. Stage of education at which dictionary use started.
15. Reasons for buying dictionaries.
16. Previous guidance on dictionary use.
17. Frequency of dictionary use.
18. Accuracy of translation equivalents.
19. Types of information looked for most often.
20. Learning activities for which dictionaries are most frequently used.
21. Reading the introductory material.
22. Attitudes toward illustrative sentences.
23. Effectiveness of illustrations.
24. Occasions of failure to find words.
25. Clarity of definitions in monolingual dictionaries.
26. Length of definitions in monolingual dictionaries.
27. Evaluation of dictionaries.

6.2.1 **Dictionary Ownership:**

The students' responses to the question on dictionary ownership were calculated in order to determine the number of those who owned one, two, three or more dictionaries and also to determine how many people owned a specific type, whether singly or in combination with other types of dictionary. To determine the effect of dictionary ownership on the success rate in performing the translation tests, it was essential to know the number of students who owned a bilingual English-Arabic dictionary and/or other types and so on.

6.2.1.1 **Dictionary ownership according to type:**

The majority of students in both groups owned a bilingual English-Arabic dictionary (English 95.4%, Science 97.5%). Next came the monolingual dictionary with 73.3 of English majors and 42.5% of Science majors having one or more. The reliance on monolingual dictionaries seemed to increase sharply among students of English as the students moved to higher levels of English language study. On the other hand, the same group showed a much lower increase in reliance on bilingual English-Arabic dictionaries. This indicates that they become aware at advanced levels that the English-Arabic dictionary does not meet all their lexical needs and start acquiring monolingual ones. The nature of study in the Department of English might be the reason why its

high-level students owned more monolingual dictionaries (91.7%) than did their Science peers (37.5%) as shown in table 3.

As for Arabic-English dictionaries, the results showed a clear contrast between the two groups especially among high-level students. 61.7% of advanced English majors owned an Arabic-English dictionary compared with 12.5% of Science majors at the same level (see table 3). The two groups also differed in the degree of their reliance on this type which increases among English majors from 30.8% of low levels to 61.7% of high levels but decreases from 27.5% for low-level Science students to only 12.5% of high levels. Clearly, the need to translate into English is not a necessary requirement in the School of Sciences and students there can rely on the monolingual dictionary whenever they need to write.

6.2.1.2 **Ownership of a single dictionary type:**

The results were studied to find out whether some students owned only one type of dictionary. Only a few did so and in most cases it was the bilingual English/Arabic dictionary. But this reliance on a single type decreased sharply among the high-level students of English. For example, there were six low-level students of English (5%) who used the monolingual dictionary alone against one high-level student (0.8%). The same decrease is also noticed in the figures for single ownership of bilingual English-Arabic dictionaries. Whereas 30% of low-level English

Table 3: Dictionary users according to type(s) owned

Types of dictionary	English	%	Total	Science	%	Total	no/%
Monolingual dictionary ownership	L=66 H=110	55 91.7	167	L=19 H=15	47.5 37.5	34	English=240 (73.3%) Science=80 (42.5%)
English-Arabic dictionary ownership	L=113 H=116	94.2 96.7	229	L=38 H=40	95 100	78	English=240(95.4%) Science=80 (97.5%)
Arabic-English dictionary ownership	L=37 H=74	30.8 61.7	111	L=11 H=5	27.5 12.5	16	English=240(46.3%) Science=80 (20%)

majors used the English-Arabic type alone, only 3.3% of the high-levels seemed to be satisfied with this type and did not acquire other types (see table 4).

As for Arabic-English dictionaries, none of the students in either group owned this type alone, further evidence that dictionaries are bought to be used mainly for English-Arabic decoding activities.

6.2.1.3 **Ownership of several dictionary types:**

The two groups differed in their ownership of the different combinations of types (i.e. monolingual/English-Arabic, English-Arabic/Arabic-English, monolingual/Arabic-English, and all types). While there was a slight decrease in the number of English majors who owned the combination 'monolingual/English-Arabic' (from 43.2% of low levels to 31.2% of high levels) students of Science seemed to add more dictionaries as they moved to higher levels (from 15% of low levels to 22.5% of high levels).

The dictionary combination 'monolingual/Arabic-English' which implies production of the target language was owned by only one high-level student of English. This indicates that the subjects in general cannot work without recourse to the English-Arabic dictionary but do not, in most cases, use this type exclusively, i.e. without the assistance of other types, especially monolingual ones. This will be confirmed by looking

Table 4 : Ownership of a single dictionary type

Type of dictionary	English	%	Total	Science	%	Total	no/%
Ownership of monoligual dictionaries only	L=6 H=1	5 0.8	7	L=1 H=0	2.5 0.0	1	English=240(2.9%) Science=80 (1.3%)
Ownership of English-Arabic dictionaries only	L=36 H=4	30 3.3	40	L=21 H=20	52.5 50	41	English=240 (16.7%) Science=80 (51.3%)

at the increasing numbers of students who owned all three types of dictionary (see Table 5).

6.2.1.4 **Number of dictionaries owned:**

The fact that students become dissatisfied with bilingual English-Arabic dictionaries and start to add new types is also reflected in the results of the second question on the number of dictionaries owned. While 13 low-level English language students had a single dictionary, only one high-level student in the same group owned a single dictionary, a clear indication that the subjects acquired more dictionaries of the same type or of other types as they reached higher levels, with the majority of English majors having three dictionaries and most Science majors owning one or two dictionaries (see Table 6).

6.2.2 **Place where dictionaries are consulted:**

The majority in both groups preferred to use the dictionary at home (see Table 7). This might be due to the heavy weight of the desk-size dictionaries and to the limited opening hours of college and public libraries. Also, there can be a sociological factor here since most of the subjects were female students who might not be able to do their studying outside their homes, especially if it involves a time-consuming activity such as

Table 5: Ownership of several dictionary types

Types of dictionary	English	%	Total	Science	%	Total	no/%
Ownership of monolingual and E-A dictionaries	L=41 H=38	43.2 31.2	79	L=6 L=9	15 22.5	15	English=240 (32.9%) Science=80 (18.8%)
Ownership of monolingual and A-E dictionaries	L=0 H=1	0.0 0.8	1	L=0 H=0	0.0 0.0	0	English=240 (0.8%) Science=80 (0.0%)
Ownership of E-A & A-E dictionaries	L=16 H=5	13.3 4.2	21	L=0 H=0	0.0 0.0	0	English=240 (8.8%) Science=80 (0.0%)
Ownership of all three types of dictionary	L=19 H=69	15.8 57.5	88	L=11 H=5	27.5 12.5	16	English=240 (36.7%) Science=80 (20%)

Table 6: Number of dictionaries owned

Major	no	Level	One dictionary	Two	Three	Four	Five+
English	240	Low	13	56	35	8	7
		High	1	6	40	24	45
Science	80	Low	13	16	5	4	2
		High	13	10	9	5	2

Table 7: Place where dictionaries are consulted

Place	English	Science
Home	227	70
Library	3	5
College	10	5

translation.

6.2.3 **Use of more than one dictionary at the same time:**

In the English group, there was a clear contrast between low and high-level students in terms of the frequency of using two or more dictionaries or types at the same time for a single translation or writing task. On the other hand, Science students did not show a clear difference in this category probably because their language and translation needs do not change in the same manner as those of English majors (see Table 8).

6.2.4 **Use of specialised dictionaries:**

About half of the high-level students in both groups used specialised dictionaries (see Table 9), but while English majors used the Encyclopedia Brittanica and dictionaries of idioms, pronunciation, and American English, students of Science used technical dictionaries of medicine, chemistry, biology, etc.

6.2.5 **Size of dictionary preferred:**

Most English majors preferred to use the desk-size

Table 8 : Using more than one dictionary at the same time

Level	English	Science
Low	71	30
High	107	26

Table 9 : Use of specialised dictionaries

Level	English	Science
Low	32	13
High	79	18

dictionary although a considerable number of low levels did prefer the pocket size. There was a contrast between low and high-level English majors with regard to the size of dictionary preferred, an indication that as students' vocabulary needs become more sophisticated they resort to more sophisticated sources of information on the English vocabulary i.e., larger dictionaries. Science students, on the other hand, do not experience the same range of vocabulary needs as do English majors and thus do not feel the urgent need to switch to a larger dictionary size (see Table 10).

6.2.6 **Dictionary type preferred:**

When asked about their favourite type of dictionary, the majority of students in both groups chose the bilingual English-Arabic dictionary. Yet, high-level English majors were slightly in favour of the monolingual dictionary, unlike high level students of Science who seemed to continue being in favour of the bilingual dictionary throughout their university years. Again, the nature of a student's university major and the amount of English involved can be a determining factor in students' attitudes toward the different types of dictionary (see Table 11).

Table 10: Size of dictionary preferred

Major	Level	Comprehensive	Desk	Pocket
English	Low	10	64	46
	High	9	94	17
Science	Low	4	12	24
	High	10	12	18

Table 11: Dictionary type preferred

Major	Level	Monolingual	English-Arabic	Arabic-English
English	Low	18	100	2
	High	63	54	3
Science	Low	2	38	0
	High	3	37	0

6.2.7 **Types of dictionary considered useful for specific activities:**

Students in both groups were asked to select from the three types of dictionary (EFL monolingual, English-Arabic, Arabic-English) the one which they thought would be most suitable for each of a list of language learning activities. For reading, the majority of students in both groups found the bilingual English-Arabic dictionary to be the most useful type (English 68.3%, Science 85%). But high-level English majors were divided as 45% chose the EFL monolingual dictionary while 50.8% found the English-Arabic dictionary to be the appropriate type for reading.

For writing, the two groups differed in their views as to the most useful dictionary type. Whereas most English majors' preferences were divided between the EFL monolingual dictionary (37.1%) and the Arabic-English dictionary (37.9%), the majority of Science students chose the English-Arabic type (48.8%) although this type is not a suitable aid for writing in the foreign language.

Most students in both groups thought that the bilingual English-Arabic dictionary is the most useful type for listening (68.3% English, 78.8% Science). But they disagreed on the type of dictionary to be used for speaking. Most English majors (43.3%) preferred the monolingual dictionary while the majority of Science students (62.5%) chose the bilingual English-Arabic dictionary which indicates that students of Science are much less informed about the different types of dictionary and the language

activity for which a particular type would be most useful.

As for meaning, most of the subjects agreed that the English-Arabic dictionary is the most useful type (English 75.8%, Science 78.8%), clear evidence that decoding is the most prevalent mode of dictionary use. Preferring monolingual dictionaries for information on grammar was more prominent among English majors (55.8%) than among Science majors who were almost evenly divided between monolingual dictionaries (45%) and bilingual English-Arabic ones(50%).

Although most high-level English majors chose monolingual dictionaries for phonological information (71.7%), the student population in that group were generally divided between monolingual dictionaries (51.3%) and English-Arabic dictionaries (47.1%) whereas Science students were in the main for the latter type (63.8%). Table 12 illustrates the figures and percentages for each type of dictionary in relation to language activities.

6.2.8 **Browsing through dictionaries:**

Most students were found to be interested in reading a dictionary without looking for anything in particular (English 68.3%, Science 87.5%). Such interest in the dictionary for its own sake rather than as a learning aid should be considered by lexicographers by providing more readable information like examples and encyclopaedic definitions supported by illustrations where possible. These high figures show that dictionaries can

Table 12: Types of dictionary considered useful for specific language activities

Activity		Monolingual		E-A dictionary		A-E dictionary	
		English	Science	English	Science	English	Science
Reading	L	17	1	103	36	0	3
	H	54	8	61	32	5	0
Writing	L	39	8	31	19	50	13
	H	50	14	29	20	41	6
Listening	L	25	9	92	31	3	0
	H	44	8	72	32	4	0
Speaking	L	44	7	50	27	26	6
	H	60	12	19	23	41	5
Meaning	L	23	2	92	36	5	2
	H	28	6	90	34	2	0
Grammar	L	62	20	57	16	1	4
	H	72	16	44	24	4	0
Pronunciation		37	15	80	23	3	2
		86	12	33	28	1	0

play a vital role in enhancing not only the EFL learner's vocabulary but also his or her general knowledge (see Table 13). Publishers have recently begun to recognise this need through the introduction of encyclopaedic dictionaries such as the OXFORD ADVANCED LEARNER'S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH: ENCYCLOPAEDIC EDITION (1992).

6.2.9 **Inclusion of encyclopaedic entries:**

Students of Science were slightly more inclined to have encyclopaedic entries (83.3%) against 74.2% of English majors. This might be due to the nature of Scientific subjects which contain a lot of terms of a technical nature e.g. terms for machinery, chemicals, plants, etc. (see Table 14).

6.2.10 **Interest in phonological information:**

The results show a similar interest among both groups in phonological information. This illustrates that this type of information is badly needed and should be provided as much as possible. Interestingly, high-level English majors used this type of information more often than did other sub-groups (see Table 15).

Table 13: Browsing through dictionaries

Level	English	Science
Low	83 (no=120)	30 (no=40)
High	81 (no=120)	20 (no=40)

Table 14 : Inclusion of encyclopaedic entries

Level	English	Science
Low	94 (no=120)	37 (no=40)
High	84 (no=120)	30 (no=40)

Table 15: Interest in phonological information

Level	English	Science
Low	98 (no=120)	34 (no=40)
High	102 (no=120)	31 (no=31)

6.2.11 **Ability to use phonological information:**

There was a marked difference between the two groups in their ability to read phonological information. While 68.3% of English majors could utilise this type of information only 50% of Science majors were found able to use it although most of them (81.3%) try to read phonetic transcriptions. This is a clear case for the inclusion of at least a basic instructional programme on phonetics in the English curriculum at the School of Sciences (see Table 16).

6.2.12 **Attitudes toward instruction on dictionary use:**

The majority of the subjects (English 91.7%, Science 96.3%) agreed that students should be taught how to utilise the different types of information contained in their dictionaries. Recognition of the need for instruction was approximately the same among low and high-level students (see Table 17).

6.2.13 **Idiom locating (spill the beans):**

Both groups were divided as to the headword under which the idiom is listed. About half of the students of each group chose 'spill' while the rest were divided between 'bean' and 'I don't know'. That corresponds very closely to the fact that about half

Table 16 : Ability to use phonological information

Level	English	Science
Low	64 (no=120)	15 (no=40)
High	101 (no=120)	25 (no=40)

Table 17: Attitudes toward instruction on dictionary use

Level	English	Science
Low	106 (no=120)	40 (no=40)
High	114 (no=120)	37 (no=40)

the subjects in the study owned a monolingual dictionary and, in most cases, the ALD which lists the idiom under the verb 'spill'. It seems that the frequent use of a particular dictionary enables the students to adapt to its method of arranging idioms although this process takes a long period of time (see Table 18).

6.2.14 **Stage of education at which dictionary use started:**

Most students (English 64.2%, Science 53.8%) indicated that they acquired their English-Arabic dictionaries in secondary school. This means that these students reach the university level equipped with a long experience of using this type of dictionary and an accumulated knowledge of its advantages. But they are also aware of its disadvantages and thus can be easily persuaded to add another type.

Most students of English (66.7%) started using their Arabic-English dictionaries at university especially at higher levels when they take Arabic-English translation courses. But it was interesting to find that 20.8% of Arabic-English dictionary owners in the English Department have started using this type at the secondary school level. This suggests an interest among pupils in the expressive use of English from an earlier stage.

The figures show a strong relationship between the student's English proficiency and the use of monolingual dictionaries. Most students in both groups have started using their monolingual dictionaries at university (English 56.3%, Science 73.5%). But a

Table 18: Idiom locating (spill the beans)

	under 'spill'		under 'bean'		I don't know	
	English	Science	English	Science	English	Science
Low	60	24	28	4	32	12
High	63	20	31	14	26	6

considerable number of English majors have already started using this type of dictionary in secondary school which indicates their early interest in the foreign language (see Table 19).

6.2.15 **Reasons for buying dictionaries:**

The majority of the subjects bought their English-Arabic dictionaries following the advice of their instructors (English 46.3%, Science 60.3%) which shows that the teacher's advice plays the major role in the students' buying habits.

The findings show that most English majors who owned Arabic-English dictionaries (52.3%) have received advice from their teachers on buying their dictionaries. Science majors, on the other hand, relied either on their own or other students' advice and only 18.8% were actually advised by their instructors.

Monolingual dictionaries were bought by the majority of English majors who owned them (55.7%) following a teacher's advice. Science majors, on the other hand, seemed to have received a greater amount of advice as 85.3% reported that their instructors recommended this type (see Table 20).

6.2.16 **Guidance on dictionary use:**

About half of the students (English 45.4%, Science 55.1%) have received guidance on the use of their English-Arabic

Table 19: Stage of education at which dictionary use started

		Intermediate		Secondary		University	
Dictionary	Level	English	Science	English	Science	English	Science
E-A	Low	14	7	88	24	14	7
	High	29	17	66	19	21	4
A-E	Low	5	5	9	2	23	4
	High	0	1	14	1	51	3
Monolingual	Low	4	2	19	5	43	12
	High	21	0	33	2	56	13

Table 20: Reasons for buying dictionaries

		Teacher		Student		Price		Other	
Dictionary	Level	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.
E-A	Low	60	26	12	4	1	0	41	8
	High	46	21	17	6	4	2	49	11
A-E	Low	10	1	3	4	3	0	22	6
	High	48	2	6	2	3	0	17	1
Monolingual	Low	42	17	4	0	2	0	20	2
	High	56	12	8	0	2	0	43	3

dictionaries which means that the other half rely on their own efforts when solving translation problems (see Table 21). The high figure for Science students suggests that bilingual dictionaries are valued more by teachers as the best available aids for translation of the mainly technical terminology.

Fewer students have been given guidance by their instructors on the use of their Arabic-English dictionaries (English 36%, Science 56.3%). It seems that even in Arabic-English translation courses not all instructors devote time to teaching their students how to use their dictionaries effectively. Guidance on the use of this type would not only enable students to improve their Arabic-English translation skills but would also make them better writers of English.

Around half of the students who owned monolingual dictionaries have received guidance on the use of this type (English 47.8%, Science 67.7%). Although this is a high percentage when compared with other parts of the world, instruction on dictionary use is not yet treated seriously by instructors and curriculum specialists.

6.2.17 **Frequency of dictionary use:**

The results show that frequency of dictionary use correlates with the improvement in the subjects' English proficiency. High level students in both groups used their dictionaries more frequently. The majority of bilingual English-Arabic and

Table 21: Guidance on dictionary use

Dictionary used	Level	English	Science
E-A	Low	37	15
	High	67	28
A-E	Low	7	7
	High	33	2
Monolingual	Low	25	17
	High	59	6

monolingual dictionary users reported weekly use while Arabic-English dictionaries were consulted less often. Probably because the latter type is used for expressive activities not many students were daily users. Only 11.7% used it daily, 36% weekly, and 45.9% monthly (see Table 22).

6.2.18 **Accuracy of translation equivalents:**

Both groups reported their satisfaction with Arabic translations in their bilingual English-Arabic dictionaries. Whereas the majority of low and high-level students of English thought the Arabic translations in their bilingual dictionaries were accurate, only high-level users of Arabic-English dictionaries were satisfied with the English translations in their dictionaries. This can be explained by the fact that as students use their dictionaries over a long period of time, they become accustomed to their conventions of design and can use them to their benefit and thus report more satisfaction than lower levels who are still struggling with the lists of synonyms and the traditional Arabic arrangement of word stems (see Table 23).

6.2.19 **Types of information looked for most often:**

Among English-Arabic dictionary users, meaning was found to be the type of information most frequently sought by both groups

Table 22: Frequency of dictionary use

Dictionary	Level	Daily		Weekly		Monthly		Yearly	
		Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.
E-A	Low	33	24	72	12	9	3	0	0
	High	37	14	54	18	24	8	1	1
A-E	Low	2	0	13	7	19	2	3	2
	High	11	2	27	2	32	1	5	0
Monolingual	Low	12	7	41	9	12	3	1	0
	High	43	0	46	7	20	6	1	2

Table 23: Accuracy of translation equivalents

Dictionary used	Level	English	Science
E-A	Low	89 (no=113)	28 (no=38)
	High	101 (no=116)	32 (no=40)
A-E	Low	16 (no=37)	8 (no=11)
	High	51 (no=74)	4 (no=5)

(English 97.4%, Science 98.7%). Spelling was second on the list (English 32.3%, Science 21.8%). These figures show that this type is used mainly for decoding purposes. This is further confirmed by the low figures for grammar, pronunciation, and collocations (see Table 24).

The majority in both groups looked for meanings of words most often in their Arabic-English dictionaries (English 98.2%, Science 100%). This indicates that this type of dictionary is basically used for translation into English rather than writing since fewer students were interested in grammar, spelling, pronunciation, and collocations. Obviously, there is a lack of understanding of what is important for encoding i.e. grammar and collocations (see Table 24).

In monolingual dictionaries, meaning was also the type of information sought by most users (English 92.6%, Science 94.1%). Yet the results also show a greater interest among monolingual dictionary users in grammar, spelling, and collocations which are associated with the productive use of the foreign language among these students.

6.2.20 **Learning activities for which dictionaries are frequently used:**

Bilingual English-Arabic dictionaries were used by both groups mainly for translation from English (English 91.7%, Science 87.2%). But the interesting finding was that 17.5% of

Table 24 : Type of information looked for most often

Dictionary	Level	Meaning		Grammar		Spelling		Pronunciation		Etymology		Collocations	
		Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.
E-A	Low	109	38	2	1	35	12	8	1	0	3	8	4
	High	114	39	5	2	39	5	21	1	2	2	20	2
A-E	Low	36	11	2	0	8	4	2	0	0	3	6	0
	High	73	5	3	0	7	1	4	0	0	0	12	2
Monolingual	Low	63	18	22	4	27	9	13	3	1	1	28	5
	High	100	14	28	2	54	4	18	3	7	0	33	4

English majors used this type for writing possibly in combination with Arabic-English or monolingual dictionaries. Fewer students used it for listening, speaking, and Arabic-English translation (see Table 25).

As expected, most students used their Arabic-English dictionaries for encoding purposes, and translation into English was the activity for which the dictionary was mainly used (English 86.5%, Science 87.5%). Next was writing in English with only 28.8% of English majors and 25% of Science ones. These low figures for writing further indicate that students are more involved in decoding activities such as translation and reading rather than encoding ones like writing and speaking. For the latter only 10.8% of English majors used their Arabic-English dictionaries (see Table 25).

Monolingual dictionaries were found to be used by most students for writing (English 68.8%, Science 47.1%) and about half the students of English used their monolingual dictionaries for English-Arabic translation (52.3%) against 73.5% of Science majors which confirms that clarity of definitions in monolingual dictionaries encourage more students to use them for this type of activity. The two groups also differed in the use of this type for speaking (English 23.3%, Science 14.7%).

6.2.21 **Reading the introductory matter :**

About half the students in each group had not read the

Table 25: Learning activities for which dictionaries are frequently used

Dictionary	Level	E-A Translation Eng.	E-A Translation Sci.	A-E Translation Eng.	A-E Translation Sci.	Writing Eng.	Writing Sci.	Speaking Eng.	Speaking Sci.	Listening Eng.	Listening Sci.
E-A	Low	104	29	8	10	11	9	5	4	2	4
	High	106	39	12	4	19	5	4	3	12	1
A-E	Low	1	2	30	9	11	3	5	2	2	2
	High	5	1	66	5	21	1	7	1	0	0
Monolingual	Low	40	12	6	0	43	8	17	3	5	3
	High	52	13	13	0	78	8	24	2	10	0

introduction to their English-Arabic dictionaries (English 39.7%, Science 51.3%). The specialised Arabic terminology employed in the prefaces of existing English-Arabic dictionaries might be responsible for that (see Table 26).

A lower number of Arabic-English dictionary users in the English Department have read the introductory matter in their dictionaries (27%). There is an obvious need here to encourage learners from an early stage to refer to the introductory notes to acquaint themselves with the arrangement of Arabic headwords and the division of English synonyms.

Less than half of the students in both groups (English 35.8%, Science 41.2%) have actually read the introduction to their monolingual dictionaries in spite of the clarity and valuable information it contains. These percentages are close to those in question 47 on the guidance on dictionary use which leads one to conclude that reading the introduction of the monolingual dictionary should be incorporated into lessons on its use.

6.2.22 **Attitudes toward illustrative sentences:**

There is general agreement that existing English-Arabic dictionaries do not provide enough examples. However, high-level students of English were less eager to see more illustrative sentences in their English-Arabic dictionaries (see Table 27).

The majority of English majors thought their Arabic-English

Table 26 : Reading the introductory matter

Dictionary used	Level	English	Science
E-A	Low	46 (no=113)	24 (no=38)
	High	45 (no=116)	16 (no=40)
A-E	Low	13 (no=37)	8 (no=11)
	High	17 (no=74)	2 (no=5)
Monolingual	Low	18 (no=66)	11 (no=19)
	High	47 (no=110)	3 (no=15)

dictionaries should include more examples (65.8%). This dissatisfaction might be due to their writing and creative translation needs which put a greater emphasis on the provision of example sentences (see Table 27).

Although monolingual EFL dictionaries do provide plenty of illustrative sentences most students thought that there should be more (English 59.1%, Science 61.8%). This might be explained by the fact that most students use this type for writing where they rely to a large extent on illustrative examples in order to use words in their appropriate contexts.

6.2.23 **Effectiveness of illustrations:**

A large majority in both groups appreciated the use of illustrations in their English-Arabic dictionaries (English 90.8%, Science 87.2%). This shows that illustrations should be provided more liberally in bilingual dictionaries. Yet, there was relatively weaker support for pictures among users of monolingual dictionaries (English 78.4%, Science 79.4%) which can be due to the types of words they look for and the power of definitions and verbal explanations (see Table 28).

6.2.24 **Occasions of failure to find words:**

About half of the students in both groups reported failure

Table 27 : Attitudes toward illustrative examples

Dictionary used	Level	English	Science
E-A	Low	89 (no=113)	32 (no=38)
	High	68 (no=116)	33 (no=40)
A-E	Low	34 (no=37)	7 (no=11)
	High	39 (no=74)	4 (no=5)
Monolingual	Low	29 (no=66)	10 (no=19)
	High	75 (no=110)	12 (no=15)

Table 28 : Effectiveness of illustrations

Dictionary used	Level	English	Science
E-A	Low	101 (no=113)	35 (no=38)
	High	107 (no=116)	26 (no=40)
Monolingual	Low	46 (no=66)	14 (no=19)
	High	92 (no=110)	13 (no=15)

to find some lexical items in their English-Arabic dictionaries (English 55.9%, Science 64.1%). The higher figure for Science majors indicates that they experience more problems when looking up technical terms in a general bilingual dictionary. This is also confirmed by the relatively high number of Science students who failed to find words in their Arabic-English dictionaries. But this can also be due to the students being unable to locate what they are looking for as a result of lack of guidance from their instructors.

Fewer EFL monolingual dictionary users reported similar problems with the lexical coverage in their dictionaries (35.8%). But monolingual dictionaries do not seem to provide an adequate number of technical terms since a majority of 61.8% of Science majors failed to find what they were looking for (see Table 29).

6.2.25 **Evaluation of dictionaries:**

Although the majority of students chose the category 'good' to describe their English-Arabic dictionaries, English majors' evaluation of their dictionaries showed a dissatisfaction that seemed to grow over the years of university study. This is shown in the decreasing numbers of students who viewed their English-Arabic dictionaries as excellent works of reference. For example only 23% of low levels and 19% of high levels considered their dictionaries excellent (see Table 30).

Arabic-English dictionaries were described either as good or

Table 29: Occasions of failure to find words

Dictionary used	Level	English	Science
E-A	Low	71 (no=113)	24 (no=38
	High	57 (no=116)	26 (no=40)
A-E	Low	17 (no=37)	6 (no=11)
	High	55 (no=74)	4 (no=5)
Monolingual	Low	14 (no=66)	11 (no=19)
	High	49 (no=110)	10 (no=15)

Table 30: Evaluation of dictionaries

		Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Dictionary	Level	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.	Eng.	Sci.
E-A	Low	26	15	70	21	16	0	1	2
	High	22	11	66	26	22	3	5	0
A-E	Low	7	4	10	7	14	0	6	0
	High	3	0	39	4	25	1	7	0
Monolingual	Low	32	6	33	10	0	2	1	1
	High	52	6	54	6	3	3	1	0

average by most of their users especially high-level students. A contrast between high and low levels is detected in their evaluation of their dictionaries. Whereas 18.9% of low-level English majors described their Arabic-English dictionaries as excellent, only 4.1% of high levels shared a similar view.

For monolingual dictionaries, most responses in each group of those using this type were divided between the categories 'good' and 'excellent'. This, in addition to the considerable numbers of users, indicates that monolingual dictionaries, especially the EFL type, enjoy a high status among Kuwaiti advanced learners of English.

6.2.26 **Clarity of definitions in monolingual dictionaries:**

There has been general satisfaction among students in both groups with regard to the clarity of definitions in their monolingual dictionaries (English 86.9%, Science 55.9%). The lower figure for Science students leads one to assume that their lower proficiency level in the foreign language was the main reason why many of them encountered difficulties in understanding definitions in their monolingual dictionaries, especially lower level ones (see Table 31).

6.2.27 **Length of definitions in monolingual dictionaries:**

English majors were found to be more satisfied with the

Table 31 : Clarity of monolingual definitions

Level	English	Science
Low	60 (no=66)	13 (no=19)
High	93 (no=110)	6 (no=15)

length of definitions in their monolingual dictionaries (64.2%) and higher levels seemed to have less difficulty in this area. On the other hand, most Science majors (76.5%) thought that definitions were too long and the distribution of positive responses to this question was almost equal for low and high levels of Science. Again the English language proficiency of these students seems to affect their ability to use their monolingual dictionaries and their attitudes toward their layout (see Table 32).

Table 32 : Length of monolingual definitions

Level	English	Science
Low	24 (no=66)	14 (no=19)
High	39 (no=110)	12 (no=15)

CHAPTER SEVEN

TRANSLATION TEST RESULTS

7.1 Introduction:

In this chapter, the two translation tests will be analysed in order to determine the effect of choice of dictionary types, proficiency levels, and previous training in dictionary use on the students' performance. Each translation item will be examined against its treatment in the dictionary used by a specific group of students. This is expected to detect the possible sources of students' translation errors and the reference strategies they employ.

7.2 English-Arabic translation test:

The aim of this test was to examine the way students of English cope with translation problems while using a specific type, or combination of types, of dictionary (AL-MAWRID alone, ALD alone, or both).

In general, the combined use of AL-MAWRID and the ALD proved to be the most profitable look-up strategy. Yet, success was also dependent upon the dictionaries' treatment of the translation item and for several items it seemed that the students benefited

more from the EFL dictionary than from the bilingual one while the opposite was true for others.

Some of the translation errors committed were apparently due to the student's inadequate reference skills and L2 proficiency level rather than to the dictionary itself. But this should not detract us from the fact that there are still many inadequacies in bilingual and in EFL monolingual dictionaries such as the treatment of adverbs, illustrative examples representing all grammatical realisations of double transitive verbs, etc.

7.2.1 **'Unprecedentedly':**

Out of 80 students who translated this adverb using AL-MAWRID only half managed to give the correct translation 'بشكل لم يسبق له مثيل'. The more proficient high levels were relatively more successful as 27 of them (67.5%) were correct against 13 low level students (32.5%). AL-MAWRID does not list this adverb: only the adjective 'unprecedented' is listed:

(AL-MAWRID)

unprecedented [ŭnprĕs' -] (adj.) لم يسبق إلى مثله

Most of the incorrect translations were imitations of the Arabic equivalents in the dictionary, thus many used the adjective 'jadeed' "new"to translate the adverb 'unprecedentedly' (App.IV,no.1). Others used the other synonym 'lam yusbaq ila

mithlih' "never having been done before" as shown in the dictionary without changing it into an Arabic adverb by the addition of 'bi shakl' or 'bi tareeka'. Yet, other students attempted their own translations which were not semantically identical with 'unprecedentedly'. Among these were the translation 'li awwal marra' " for the first time" and 'ala ghayr almu'tad' "unusually". These were considered acceptable translations since they reflect the student's understanding of the context in which the word under translation appeared.

Using the ALD also resulted in comparatively similar figures for incorrect translations of 'unprecedentedly'. Again, high levels did relatively better than lower levels, (62.5%) against (37.5%) gave correct responses. It seems that the non-inclusion of the adverb is responsible for most of the students' errors. The majority of them looked under 'unprecedented' and translated in most cases the first definition 'bila sabigh' "without precedent" or 'lam yahduth min qabl' "never having happened before" as they appear in the entry for 'unprecedented':

(ALD)

> **unprecedented** /ʌn'presidentid/ adj without precedent; never having happened, been done or been known before; unprecedented levels of unemployment O a situation unprecedented in the history of the school.

The combined use of AL-MAWRID and the ALD by the last two groups of English majors did not result in any significant change in the number of correct translations. Clearly, the absence of the adverb 'unprecedentedly' from both dictionaries must be

responsible for the high number of incorrect translations, and one can therefore argue that adverbs should be listed and translated or explained in order to provide the EFL learner with direct access to the meaning of the adverb under translation.

Dictionaries used	level	translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	27	67.5
	high	13	32.5
ALD	low	25	62.5
	high	15	37.5
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	23	57.5
	high	10	25

7.2.2 **'Weathered':**

Few students were able to translate this item correctly using AL-MAWRID alone. Less than half of low and high levels wrote correct translations. Most of the correct ones were imitations of the dictionary's treatment of this item. 'Weathered' is given a single-word translation 'mujaw'wa' followed by an explanation. Most errors were committed as a result of the students' tendency to use all the paraphrase without extracting the part relevant to the context. Other students chose the other sense of the word which belonged to a different context (architecture) in spite of the abbreviation

(عم) which indicates the specialised use of the word (App.IV, no.2).

(AL-MAWRID)

weathered [wĕth'ərd] (adj.) (١) مجوى: «١» معالج أومغير اللون أو التركيب أو الشكل بالتعريض للعوامل الجوية (٢) عمال أو محدر « منعا لتجمع المياه » (عم)

The number of correct and incorrect translations were almost the same when the ALD was used. Although the examples (Teak weathers to a greyish colour O Rocks weathered by wind and water) are provided at the verb entry for 'weather' few students were able to relate the verb meaning to the adjective form 'weathered' in the text and translate it accordingly. But even those translations were often paraphrases rather than single-word equivalents. Many students left this item untranslated probably because they searched for the adjective form 'weathered' only.

(ALD)

weather[2] /weðə(r)/ v 1 [Tn] dry or season (wood) by leaving it in the open air. 2 [I,Tn] (cause sth to) change shape or colour because of the action of sun, rain, wind, etc.: Teak weathers ...

The combined use of AL-MAWRID and the ALD did not seem to improve the situation. Twenty-one low levels (52.5%) and nineteen high levels (47.5%) gave correct translations. Although the absence of examples in AL-MAWRID is compensated by the ALD, the non-inclusion of the adjective 'weathered' in the ALD could have led some students to rely on AL-MAWRID's treatment of this item. Also, the students' unfamiliarity with or reluctance to

learn the abbreviations used in AL-MAWRID was responsible for some of the errors.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	22	55
	high	22	55
ALD	low	24	60
	high	21	52.5
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	19	47.5
	high	21	52.5

7.2.3 'Stretch':

Users of AL-MAWRID did not seem to be getting enough help in translating this item. The majority of errors were made because the students picked the first sense of the entry and translated 'stretch' as a verb 'yumad'did' "to stretch" (App.IV,n.3). Others seemed to have relied upon the irrelevant example (took a ~ over the country side) and translated the word as a noun 'nuzha ala al-qadamayn' "a walk". Few students saw a connection between the context of 'coast' in the passage and the example (a ~ of meadow) in AL-MAWRID and selected the correct translation 'imtidad'.

Users of the ALD, especially high-level students, were more successful with this item (75%) against (42.5%) of low levels.

The significant difference between the two groups might be due to the length of the entry for 'stretch' in the dictionary and/or to the inability of low-level students to distinguish the verb from the noun entry for this item. Yet, the higher success rate in finding the correct translation can certainly be attributed to the relevant example sentences in the ALD (a beautiful stretch of countryside O a long stretch of open road).

(ALD)

> **stretch** n **1** [C usu sing] act of stretching or state of being stretched ... 3 [C](**a**) ~ (**of sth**) continuous expanse or extent (of sth) a beautiful stretch of countryside O a long stretch of open road ...

The use of the two dictionaries together resulted in less errors than the use of a bilingual dictionary alone. Yet, the figures were slightly lower than the use of the ALD alone, probably because more students relied on the bilingual dictionary's treatment of this item.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	26	65
	high	26	65
ALD	low	23	57.5
	high	10	25
Mawrid + ALD	low	26	65
	high	18	45

7.2.4 'Hot-footing (it)':

Most students who used AL-MAWRID alone (low levels 67.5%, high levels 55%) made errors translating this verb. They wrongly selected the first adverb equivalent of 'hotfoot' "bi'ajalah" and translated accordingly (App.IV,no.4). Again, this is evidence of poor grammatical knowledge. The absence of examples also seemed to have contributed to this high number of translation errors. The second sense of the word in AL-MAWRID is the correct one and although the user is informed that 'hot-foot' as a verb is followed by 'it', few students seemed to have used this information and related it to the verb 'hot-footing' in the passage.

(AL-MAWRID)

hotfoot [hŏt'fo͝ot] (adv.;vi.;t.;n.) بعجلة، بغير ابطاء

The use of the ALD showed a decrease in the number of translation errors (low levels 47.5%, high levels 45%). The provision of the example (We hotfooted it down to the beach) corresponds closely to the context under translation. Also, separating the grammatical labels 'adv.' and 'v.' instead of cramming them after the headword proved to be a useful design feature for locating the required meaning and understanding the division of the entry.

(ALD)

> **hotfoot** adv in great haste; quickly and eagerly: The children came running hotfoot when they heard tea was ready. --v (idm)'**hotfoot it**(inf) walk or run hurriedly and eagerly: We hotfooted it down to the beach.

The combined use of AL-MAWRID and ALD resulted in lower numbers of translation errors (low levels 32.5%, high levels 35%). It is probably because of the closely similar size and content of the two entries in both dictionaries that the students perceived one entry as a translation of the equivalent entry in the other dictionary and were thus more able to get closer to the appropriate meaning.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	27	67.5
	high	22	55
ALD	low	19	47.5
	high	18	45
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	13	32.5
	high	14	35

7.2.5 **'Track him down':**

Using AL-MAWRID, low level students committed more errors (35%) than did high levels (25%). It is true that most students did not select the first noun meaning 'athar' "track", probably

because the pronoun 'him' after the verb 'track' made it clear that the verb meaning of the word was the appropriate choice. Yet many of the students who found this sense in Al-Mawrid did not add the Arabic equivalent of 'him' to the end of 'yata'aqab' "to follow or pursue". Most of the incorrect translations were influenced by the example in the entry for 'track' (to ~ a desert) and thus the erroneous translation 'yajtaz' "to cross" was given by several subjects (App.IV, no.5).

(AL-MAWRID)

track [trăk](n.;vt.;i.) (١) أثر (أقدام أو دولاب أو مركب) "ب" مجاز، طريق، درب. "ج" حلبة للسباق ... (٦) يقتفي الأثر، يتعقب ...

The use of the ALD resulted in a considerably lower number of translation errors (low levels 20%, high levels 7.5%). This is probably because this phrasal verb in bold print was easy to find and the examples that followed confirmed the student's search. The mention of 'sb/sth' also confirmed that this was the appropriate meaning for the phrasal verb 'track him down' in the passage.

(ALD)

▷**track** v 1 [Tn, Tn.pr] ~ **sb/sth** (**to sth**) follow the tracks of sb/sth: track a satellite, missile, etc. using radar O The police tracked the terrorists to their hideout ... 3 (phr v) **track sb/sth down** find sb/sth by searching: track down an animal (to its lair) O I finally tracked down the reference in a dictionary of quotations ...

The combination 'AL-MAWRID & ALD' resulted in a low number of errors among both low and high level students who used it. Yet these students' apparent awareness of the grammatical category of 'track him down' did not prevent them from using semantically irrelevant translations, particularly from the bilingual dictionary, such as 'yamshi' "to walk" or 'yuraqib' "to monitor".

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	14	35
	high	10	25
ALD	low	8	20
	high	3	7.5
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	8	20
	high	9	22.5

7.2.6 **'Trudged':**

Although this item was supposed to be an easy one for translation a considerable number of students (low levels 30%, high levels 42.5%) still could not give a correct or acceptable translation of the verb 'trudge' using AL-MAWRID which lists the word as follows:

(AL-MAWRID)

trudge [trŭj] (vi.;t.;n.) (١) يمشي بجهد / بتجتاز (٢) مشى طويل بجهد.

In order to select the contextually appropriate translation the student has to decide whether 'trudge' is an intransitive verb, a transitive verb, or a noun in the given passage. Obviously, most of those who made errors either did not pay enough attention to the function of the word in the context as they were instructed by us, or they did not distinguish between the two equivalents of the verb 'trudge' in its transitive and intransitive uses (App.IV, no.6).

Users of the ALD committed an approximately similar number of errors for this item (low levels 37.5%, high levels 32.5%). The possible verb patterns listed after the phonetic transcription of 'trudge' combined with the examples represent an additional help for the learner, but not all the subjects used or were able to use such information. Some of the errors were possibly caused by the students' misinterpretation of the definition of the verb 'trudge' in the ALD. They focused on the adjective 'tired' in the definition as a synonym of 'trudged' and gave the incorrect translation 'mut'ab' "tired".

(ALD)

> **trudge** /trʌdʒ/ v [I, Ipr, Ip, In/pr] walk slowly or with difficulty because one is tired, on a long journey, etc: trudging (along) through the deep snow ◇ He trudged 20 miles...

Fewer students among users of the dictionary combination

'AL-MAWRID & ALD' made translation errors (lower levels 22.5%, higher levels 32.5%). It seems that the ALD helped the students to focus on the intransitive form of the verb in AL-MAWRID which translates into the definition and the relevant examples in the ALD.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	12	30
	high	17	42.5
ALD	low	15	37.5
	high	13	32.5
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	9	22.5
	high	13	32.5

7.2.7 'Well-meaning':

Most of the users of AL-MAWRID succeeded in giving a correct or acceptable translation of this item. Only 15% of low levels and 32.5% of high levels gave incorrect translations. This discrepancy in the figures for the two levels might be due to the stronger tendency among low-level students to select the first sense in a dictionary entry (which happened to be the correct one in the case of 'well-meaning'). Some of the errors were made because the student thought that this word was a verb and translated it as 'ya'ni hasanan' "to have a good meaning" without

using the grammatical information given after the headword (App. IV,no.7).

(AL-MAWRID)

well-meaning [wĕl'mēnĭng](adj.) (١)حسن النية
(٢) صادر عن حسن نية .

On the other hand, the use of the ALD alone has resulted in about half of its users being unable to come up with a correct or acceptable translation (low levels 50%, high levels 45%). Probably the absence of examples is responsible, but the definition itself seemed to have caused some translation errors which were direct translations of the phrase 'acting with good intentions' "yumathiloon binawaya hasanah" with some students translating 'acting' into its theatrical sense.

(ALD)

well-'meaning adj acting with good intentions (but often not having the desired effect).

The use of both dictionaries caused a sharp drop in the number of errors (low levels 10%, high levels 15%). It seems that the definition in the ALD became easier to understand when compared with its Arabic translation in AL-MAWRID and thus acted as a sense discrimination for distinguishing between 'hasan al niyyah' "good intentioned" and 'sadir an husn niyyah' "done with good intentions".

Dictionaries used	Levels	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	6	15
	high	13	32.5
ALD	low	20	50
	high	18	45
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	4	10
	high	6	15

7.2.8 **'Locals':**

AL-MAWRID does not list the meaning of 'local' in the list of senses in its noun form as a person who inhabits a particular place or district. The closest is the adjective 'mahalli' which was used by most students although it is not a proper translation. This and the absence of relevant examples seemed to have led some students to randomly select one of the other senses of the word 'local' (train, organisation, newspaper report) as they are given in the entry (App.IV, no.8).

(AL-MAWRID)

local [lō'kəl](adj.;n.) (١) موضعي (٢) محلي (٣) متوقف
في جميع المحطات (a ـه train) . . . نبأ محلي (في صحيفة) . . .

There were relatively more translation errors in the students' performance using the ALD. Again, with an apparently heavy reliance on the bilingual dictionary, most students translated the word as an adjective rather than as a noun, which

comes as the second entry after that of the adjective 'local'. Those translations were not totally incorrect since the Arabic translation 'mahalli' can be interpreted as a noun as well as an adjective. Although this is a relatively easy item, the number of correct translations does not reflect that fact and other factors such as the length of the definition and the difficulty of the word 'inhabitant' and 'suspicious' in the noun entry might have affected the students' success in translating this item.

(ALD)

> ▷**local** n **1** (usu pl) inhabitant of a particular place or district: The locals tend to be suspicious of strangers O **2** (Brit infml) public house, esp near one's home: pop into the local for a pint ...

The combined use of both dictionaries did not seem to have a significant effect on the number of errors (low levels 52.5%, high levels 22.5%). Most low-level students' translation errors were similar to those committed by users of AL-MAWRID alone which indicates that they could not access the relevant part of the noun entry for the word 'local' in the ALD.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	15	37.5
	high	7	17.5
ALD	low	18	45
	high	7	17.5

AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	21	52.5
	high	9	22.5

7.2.9 **'Apologetically':**

AL-MAWRID lists the adjective 'apologetic;-al' but not the adverb, which resulted in most of the translation errors being imitations of the adjective equivalents (low levels 75%, high levels 30%) (App.IV,no.9). The correct responses were obviously based on the students' interpretation of the text and their ability to use their L1 grammatical knowledge in order to change the Arabic adjective into an adverb or adverbial such as 'bi tareeqah difa'iya', 'mubari'ran', 'mudafi'an', etc.).

(AL-MAWRID)

apologetic;--al (adj.) (١) دفاعي (من طريق الكلام او الكتابة) (٢) اعتذاري، تبريري.

The number and distribution of errors did not change drastically when the ALD was used (low levels 60%, high levels 40%). This is partly caused by the lack of explanation of the adverb 'apologetically' and by the use of the word 'regret' in the definition for the adjective 'apologetic' which must have led many students to give the translation 'nadim' "regretful".

(ALD)

apologetic /əpɒlə'dʒatik/ adj~(**about/for sth**)

feeling or expressing regret; making an apology: an apologetic letter, voice O He was deeply apologetic about his late arrival.
▷**apologetically** /-kli/ adv.

The use of both dictionaries resulted in a relatively lower number of translation errors especially for low levels (37.5%). The examples in ALD probably made more students focus on the second Arabic equivalent (i.e. the sense of apologising or justifying) in AL-MAWRID. Also, the mention of the adverb as a separate sub-entry in the ALD could have helped them to be aware of the difference between the two words.

Dictionaries used	Levels	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	30	75
	high	12	30
ALD	low	24	60
	high	16	40
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	15	37.5
	high	17	42.5

7.2.10 **'Secure him':**

This item was answered incorrectly by 82.5% of low levels and 47.5% of high levels who used AL-MAWRID. Most low levels were not aware that 'secure' in this context was a ditransitive verb which takes two objects (him, entry). In addition, AL-MAWRID

does not inform the user that this verb can take two objects. Therefore, translations like 'yahmeehi','yasoonahu','yuharriruhu min al-khatar' "protect him from danger" were given. Closer translations 'yadmanuhu' and 'yu'amminuhu' "ensure him" also reflected the students' unawareness of the double transitivity of 'secure' in the given context (App.IV, no.10).

(AL-MAWRID)

secure [sĭkyo͝or'] (adj.;vt.) (was ~ واثق (١)
.of victory) ..ب.. مطمئن (٢) آمن: ١٠.. متحرر من الخطر
(a ~ retreat) ..ب.. موقع في النفس شعورًا بالأمن
(٣) مأمون (a ~ investment) (٤) محكم، متين (٥) أكيد،
مضمون (victory was ~) ...

An approximately similar high number of translation errors was committed by those who used the ALD (low levels 62.5%, high levels 40%). Errors here were due to the students' apparent difficulty with ditransitive verbs. Also, while the ALD does inform the user that 'secure' is a double transitive verb that takes two objects, the illustrative examples do not clarify the relevant code (Dn.n).

(ALD)

▷**secure** v 1 [Tn] fix (sth) firmly ... 3 [Tn, Dn.n, Dn.pr] ~ **sth** (**for sb/sth**) (fml) obtain sth, sometimes with difficulty: We'll need to secure a bank loan. O They've secured government backing (for the project).

No significant change could be noticed in the number and

distribution of errors made using both AL-MAWRID and the ALD for this item. Yet, these errors were closer both quantitatively and qualitatively to those made by the ALD users (low levels 65%, high levels 40%) which could imply that most students looked for help in the ALD for this grammatically problematic item.

Dictionaries used	Levels	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	33	82.5
	high	19	47.5
ALD	low	25	62.5
	high	16	40
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	26	65
	high	16	40

7.2.11.1 **'Stringent':**

This item is part of the collocation 'stringent requirements', which proved to be a relatively easy translation item. Yet, by examining the nature of errors made in translating the adjective 'stringent', one could detect the influence of the dictionary's treatment on a student's performance. 35% of low levels and 32.5% of high levels made errors using AL-MAWRID and most of these errors were committed by selecting the incorrect Arabic synonym. The two example sentences provided in the dictionary could have confused the students when making their

choices. (~laws) and (~necessity) seem to have led the students to associate 'requirements' with either 'laws' or 'necessity' although 'requirements' in the given context is semantically closer to 'laws' (App.IV, no.11).

(AL-MAWRID)

stringent [-'jənt] (adj.) (١) ضيق ، شديد ، متشدد صارم (~laws) ... ملح ، ماس (~necessity)

Using the ALD, high-level students made fewer errors (17.5%) than did low levels (30%), which indicates that language proficiency plus experience in dictionary use sometimes affect a student's success rate in translation. The ALD provides more help by listing between parentheses some of the possible collocates (of a law, rule, etc.) to illustrate the semantic range of this restricted collocation. Yet, most of errors made here were not caused by selecting the wrong sense but by the student's inability to find an appropriate translation in L1.

(ALD)

stringent /'strindʒənt/ adj. 1 (of a law, rule, etc.) that must be obeyed; strict or severe: a stringent ban on smoking. 2 (of financial conditions) difficult because there is not enough money:a stringent economic climate.

It seems that the combined use of the two dictionaries helped many students to limit the choice of possible equivalents since the ALD further clarifies the collocability of'stringent' with 'law' and 'rule', which have many semantic features

applicable to 'requirements'.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	14	35
	high	13	32.5
ALD	low	18	45
	high	17	17.5
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	15	37.5
	high	11	27.5

7.2.11.2 **'Requirements':**

This highly frequent item was translated successfully by most subjects especially advanced ones using AL-MAWRID (low levels 35%, high levels 15%). Yet, the use of the dictionary seems to have promoted the error of using the noun 'hajah' "need" which happens to be the first sense listed in AL-MAWRID (App.IV, no.12).

(AL-MAWRID)

requirement [rĭkwīr'mənt] (n.) (١) حاجة ، مطلب
(٢) متطلب ، شرط أساسي.

The use of the ALD resulted in fewer translation errors (low levels 30%, high levels 7.5%). This could be due to the clarifying effect of the example sentences after the definition. Again, most erroneous translations were made by interpreting

'requirements' as 'hajat' probably because of the use of 'needed' in the definitions and also the presentation of 'requirements' in the sense of 'need' or 'necessity' in some of the example sentences.

(ALD)

> **requirement** n (esp pl) 1 thing depended on or needed: our immediate requirement is extra staff. O Stock surplus to requirements, ie more than is needed O Our latest model should meet your requirements exactly, ie be just what you want. 2 thing ordered or demanded: Not all foreign visitors satisfy/fulfil legal entry requirements.

Because the examples and definitions in the ALD did not contain the range of collocating adjectives, the combined use of both dictionaries did not result in a significantly different number of translation errors for this item (low levels 35%, high levels 12.5%).

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	14	35
	high	6	15
ALD	low	12	30
	high	3	7.5
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	14	35
	high	5	12.5

7.2.12.1 **'Punctiliously':**

More than half of those who used AL-MAWRID made errors (low levels 62.5%, high levels 55%) because they translated this item as an adjective. The absence of the adverb from the dictionary list is most probably responsible for this failure on the part of the student to recognize the difference in meaning and function of 'punctilious' and 'punctiliously' in the given context (App.IV,no.13).

(AL-MAWRID)

punctilious [pungktil'iəs] (adj.) (١) دقيق في اتباع (الأوامر) (٢) حريص على الشكليات.

More students committed translation errors using the ALD alone (low levels 82.5%, high levels 65%). It seems that the majority of the students expected to find all the information they needed to copy and since the derivative 'punctiliously' is not explained they wrongly expected to find the needed translation at the headword for the adjective 'punctilious'. It is obvious that the lack of skill in deriving the adverbial meaning from an adjective entry should be compensated for not only by listing all the derivatives but also by explaining and illustrating them, space allowing, in separate entries not as run-ons.

(ALD)

punctilious /pʌŋk'tiliəs/ adj (fml) very careful to carry out one's duties, etc. correctly; very attentive to details of behaviour or ceremony: a punctilious attention to detail O a punctilious observance of the formalities. ▷ **punctiliously** adv. **punctiliousness** n [U].

The figures for translation errors were still high in the performance of those who used AL-MAWRID and the ALD simultaneously for this item (low levels 72.5%, high levels 50%). Obviously, the absence of explanations of the adverb must have contributed to this high number of errors.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	25	62.5
	high	22	55
ALD	low	33	82.5
	high	26	65
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	29	72.5
	high	20	50

7.2.12.2 **'Logged':**

The majority of users of AL-MAWRID alone committed translation errors here (low levels 75%, high levels 67.5%). These errors were made as a result of the student's failure either in locating the appropriate sense or in writing the passive Arabic verb equivalent of 'logged'. In addition, the dictionary does not illustrate the meanings of the verb 'log', and the explanation at the verb entry of 'log' makes reference to the logbook of a ship or plane but does not leave the door open for other possible contexts (App.IV, no.14).

(AL-MAWRID)

log [lôg;lŏg] (n; vt;i)... ... يدون تفاصيل الرحلة في سجل الباخرة أو الطائرة (٨) يجتاز مسافة معينة أو يبلغ سرعة معينة يسجلها اللوك .

When the ALD was used for translating this item 65% of low levels made errors compared with only 35% of high levels, who seemed to have benefited from their higher English proficiency and experience in using monolingual dictionaries. Yet, the number of errors might have been lower had the dictionary treated the passive form of the verb 'log'.

(ALD)

▷**log** v (-gg-) [Tn] 1 enter (facts in a log-book. 2 achieve (a certain speed, distance, number of hours worked, etc.) as recorded in a log-book or similar record: The pilot had logged over 200 hours in the air ...

The number of errors committed when using the two dictionaries were closer to the ones for AL-MAWRID which means that most students relied on the bilingual dictionary after they realised that the ALD did not add any additional help for translating this item.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	30	75
	high	27	67.5
ALD	low	26	65
	high	14	35

AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	31	77.5
	high	20	50

7.2.13 **'Pedometer':**

The majority of students gave the correct translation for this item using AL-MAWRID, ALD, or both. This concrete object is described in both dictionaries: in AL-MAWRID by means of a translation equivalent 'addad al-khota' "step counter" plus an explanatory equivalent 'miqyas masafat al-sayr' "measuring device for walking distance", and in the ALD by means of a definition which specifies the function the pedometer performs. The few errors made here seem to be the result of failing to locate the word in the dictionary.

(AL-MAWRID)

pedometer [pĕdŏm'ə-] (n.) عداد الخطى ، مقياس مسافة السير.

(ALD)

pedometer /pi'dɒmitə(r)/ n instrument that measures the distance a person walks by recording the number of steps taken ...

Dictionaries used	Levels	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	9	22.5
	high	7	17.5
ALD	low	8	20
	high	6	15

AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	9	22.5
	high	5	12.5

7.2.14 **'Walkman':**

Most low-level students using AL-MAWRID which does not list this item failed to give a correct translation (85%) compared with 47.5% of high-levels who seemed to have encountered this word before. However, the correct responses were far from homogeneous as some translations were transliterations 'wokman' or paraphrases describing the function, size,and use of this object in the student's own words (App.IV, no.15).

Users of the ALD, on the other hand, made far fewer errors (low levels 22.5%, high levels 17.5%) and most of these errors seemed to have been caused by the student's failure to locate the word which is listed as a sub-entry under the verb 'walk' and not as a separate headword like 'walkie-talkie'.

(ALD)

> **Walkman** n (pl s) (propr) small cassette player with earphones that can be worn by sb walking about.

Dictionaries used	Levels	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	29	72.5
	high	19	47.5
ALD	low	9	27.5
	high	7	17.5

AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	10	25
	high	6	15

7.2.15 **'British Telecom':**

In order to give a correct translation for this item, the student has to have some knowledge about British culture and life as 'British Telecom' is a term used to refer to one of Britain's institutions specialising in telephone and other communication services.

The absence of this item from both dictionaries apparently led some high-level students to check the meaning of the second part of the phrase under 'telecommunication' and the resulting translations were more or less based on the student's interpretation of the context in which the item is used. Although the number of errors was relatively low, the inclusion of culture-specific terms referring to well-known institutions and companies is a desirable feature since these terms can occur in nonspecialised contexts. Also, the inclusion of such items in bilingual dictionaries would help standardise translations of the names of this and similar institutions. Examining the students translations of 'British Telecom' shows that while some students interpreted the term as referring to a company, others thought it was a ministry or authority (App.IV, no.16).

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
AL-MAWRID	low	17	42.5
	high	12	30
ALD	low	18	45
	high	10	25
AL-MAWRID + ALD	low	17	42.5
	high	11	27.5

7.3 **Arabic-English translation test:**

The analysis of students' translation errors made while translating from Arabic into English is a valuable aid in understanding the nature of problems involved in the use of the different types and combinations of dictionaries.

The main problem with the use of the Arabic-English dictionary under examination was the long uncommented synonym lists which remained problematic even in combined use especially with abstract terms that are synonymous. Furthermore, some of the translation errors showed that the absence of diacritical points from Arabic homographs is a serious defect in the design of this dictionary.

Combined use with the EFL monolingual dictionary (ALD) proved to be the most profitable strategy since the user can filter the synonym list by looking up the words where they are properly defined and illustrated in the EFL dictionary.

Yet, much attention needs to be focused on the students'

ability to use this L1-L2 dictionary. Strong correlations were found between the lack of guidance and the student's failure to use the dictionary properly. Students with a background in dictionary training were better able to avoid the problematic spots in the design features of this L1-L2 dictionary and follow specific strategies to solve word problems when enough help is not provided by the dictionary.

7.3.1 'مخلفات' "legacy"

(Pollution is the worst ~ of industrial civilization ...)

Using the Arabic-English dictionary (DOMWA) for this item did not seem to have helped the students give the correct translation of 'legacy'. A very high number of low levels (90%) made errors compared with 77.5% of high levels. The dictionary lists the equivalents of the Arabic plural given in the passage, yet most students selected the last translation equivalent 'leftovers' probably because it was the one they were confident to have understood (App.V, no.1). Others chose 'heritage', the first translation in the dictionary entry for the Arabic plural. The latter group seem to have been aware that this English noun can translate an Arabic plural but failed to select the semantically appropriate translation which happens to be the second one.

(DOMWA)

مخلف mukallaf left, left behind; leftover; pl. heritage, legacy, estate; scraps, leftovers

The use of AL-MAWRID with the Arabic-English dictionary (DOMWA) resulted in a similar number of errors (low levels 90%, high levels 80%). AL-MAWRID does help the student to see that 'scraps' and 'leftovers' are used in contexts of food or paper, but the lexical treatment of 'heritage' , 'legacy', and 'estate' does not specify a context other than possessions or funds and does not help the user distinguish between these three nouns. Most subjects in this group made the error of selecting the first equivalent 'heritage'.

(AL-MAWRID)

heritage [hĕr'ətĭj] (n.) (١) إرث، ميراث، تركة (٢) تراث

legacy [lĕg'əsĭ] (n.) (١) ميراث بوصية (٢) تراث

estate [ĕs tāt'] (n.) (٤) ... أ.. ملكية، ممتلكات، وبخاصة ما يملكه المرء من أرض وأطيان ...

The entries for 'leftovers' and 'scraps' in the ALD clarify the use and context of these synonyms and thus help the students to focus on the other English equivalents of the plural 'mukhallafat' in DOMWA. The definition of 'estate' rules out this word as belonging to contexts of land and funds. Yet, the definitions of 'heritage' and 'legacy' do not distinguish clearly the subtle difference in meaning. Although students in this group made fewer translation errors, the figures were still relatively high (low levels 80%, high levels 67.5%). The use of difficult words in the definitions such as 'predecessors', 'Renaissance', and 'folklore' could be responsible for the students' failure to understand the meaning and the use of the

two synonyms.

(ALD)

heritage /'heritidʒ/ n [C usu sing] 1 things such as works of art, cultural achievements, and folklore that have been passed on from earlier generations: our literary heritage ...

legacy /'legəsi/ n 1 money or property left to sb in a will. 2 (fig) thing passed to sb by predecessors or from earlier events, etc: the cultural legacy of the Renaissance ...

estate /i'steit/ n [C] area of land, especially in the country, with one owner:He owns a large estate in Scotland ...

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	36	90
	high	31	77.5
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	36	90
	high	32	80
DOMWA + ALD	low	32	80
	high	27	67.5

7.3.2 'شعارات' "slogans"

(Conferences and organisations launch~)

About half the users of DOMWA failed to give the correct translation (low levels 52.5%, high levels 42.5%). The majority of errors were made because the students selected the first word in the synonym list 'password'. Other students seemed to have

read the whole list and preferred to choose the easiest and most frequent equivalent 'symbol'. Few students avoided the words 'catchword' and 'catchphrase' probably because of the abbreviation (pol.) that follows. The ability to select the appropriate equivalent 'slogan' is therefore dependent on the students' English proficiency, and this explains the difference between the figures for low and high levels (App.V, no.2).

(DOMWA)

> شعار ... password, watchword; slogan; catchword, catchphrase (pol.); motto, device; coat of arms; symbol; distinguishing mark; emblem, badge ...

The combined use of AL-MAWRID and DOMWA resulted in a relatively higher number of errors (low levels 57.5%, high levels 50%). But most of those who made errors seem not to have used AL-MAWRID to check the meanings of all the synonyms given in DOMWA. After finding that 'password' is not contextually acceptable, most of them chose the word 'watchword' which is translated as the headword in DOMWA and thought that it was an acceptable translation. Others seemed to have checked the other synonyms in AL-MAWRID but found little help since 'watchword', 'slogan', 'motto', 'symbol', and 'emblem' are all given the same translation. Only 'coat of arms', 'badge', and 'device' are explained and their contexts of use are indicated. As a result, the rest of the incorrect translations were mostly given as 'symbol', followed by 'motto' and 'emblem'.

(AL-MAWRID)

password [păs'-] (n.) كلمة المرور ، كلمة السر

watchword [wŏch'-] (n.) (١) كلمة السر (٢) شعار

slogan [slō'gən] (n.) (١) نداء الحرب ، صرخة الحرب (٢) شعار

motto [mŏt'ō] (It.) pl. -es also -s شعار

device [dĭvīs'] (n.) ... (٣) ... (١) رسم أو صورة (للزخرفة) وبخاصة على شعار للنبالة الخ .. ب .. شعار

coat of arms (n.) شعار النبالة

symbol [sĭm'bəl] (n.; vi.; t.) (١) رمز (٢) يرمز

emblem [ĕm'bləm] (n.; vt.) (١) شعار (٢) رمز (٣) رمز ..

badge [băj] (n.; vt.) (١) شارة (تحمل دلالة على الانتساب إلى حرفة أو مدرسة ...

The students who used the ALD with DOMWA performed better than the other two groups although translation errors were still high in number (low levels 42.5%, high levels 32.5%). Some students selected the first equivalent 'password' probably because they could not locate it in the ALD where it is listed as a sub-entry under the noun 'pass'. Others seemed to have been confused by the entry for 'watchword' which is cross-referenced to 'password'. The dictionary defines and illustrates 'watchword' but at the same time lists the synonyms 'slogan' and 'catchphrase' after the definition of 'watchword'. This might have led some students to select one of the three equivalents or focus on 'slogan' alone since DOMWA indicates to the user that 'catchword' and 'catchphrase' are restricted to politics. Entries for other synonyms in the ALD refer the user to one another giving the student similar definitions and examples and

the more synonyms he looks up, the more confused he gets. Yet, the use of the ALD rules out 'device', 'coat of arms', 'symbol', 'emblem', and 'badge'.

(ALD)

> **'password** (also **watchword**) n secret word or phrase used by sb to indicate to sb else (eg a sentry) that he is a friend rather than an enemy: give the password.
>
> **watchword** /wɒtʃwɜ:d/ n. 1 word or phrase that expresses briefly the principles of a party or group; slogan or catchphrase: Our watchword is:"Evolution, not revolution" ...
>
> **slogan** /ˈsləʊgən/ n word or phrase that is easy to remember, used as a motto eg. by a political party, or in advertising: political slogans O "power to the people" is their slogan.
>
> **motto** /ˈmɒtəʊ/ n (pl **es**) 1 short sentence or phrase chosen or used as a guide or rule of behaviour or as an expression of the aims or ideals of a family,a country, an institution, etc.: My motto is: 'live each day as it comes.' O ...

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	21	52.5
	high	17	42.5
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	23	57.5
	high	20	50
DOMWA + ALD	low	17	42.5
	high	13	32.5

7.3.3 ' تنديد ' "to criticise"

(~ pollution and its harmful effects)

More than half of the students using DOMWA alone committed translation errors (low levels 62.5%, high levels 50%). Some of them (31 students) looked under the noun instead of the verb entry and selected the first equivalent 'criticism'. Out of those students, only four (12.9%) were taught how to use their Arabic-English dictionaries, an indication that guidance correlates with successful dictionary use. Others seem to have read the verb entry and were divided in their selection between 'to expose' and 'to criticise'. This shows a failure on the part of the student to associate the dictionary equivalent with its grammatical and semantic position in the given context. Yet, the lack of sense discriminations and the incomplete list of equivalents make the dictionary's treatment of this item equally responsible for this high number of errors (App.V, no.3).

(DOMWA)

فند ... to run away, flee ... II to expose, show up, compromise (ب s.o.): to criticize (s.o. or s.th.), find fault (ب with)

تنديد ... criticism; revilement, abuse, disparagement, defamation

The group of students using AL-MAWRID with DOMWA did comparatively better (low levels 57.5%, high levels 45%). The dictionary rules out the transitive verbs 'show up' and 'compromise' but not 'criticise' and 'find fault with'. The

latter verb was used by many students but there were also those who used the noun 'criticism' to translate the Arabic verb in the passage probably because it was the first equivalent in the entry.

(AL-MAWRID)

expose [ĕkspōz'] (vt.) يعرض ل ... (٢) يهجر ... (٣) يكشف عن ، يعرض للبيع (في محل تجاري) (٤) ١- يفشي (سرّاً) ب- يفضح جريمة.

show [shō] (vt.;i.;n.) ... (١) يفضح (٢) يبدو بوضوح

compromise [kŏm'prəmīz'] (n.;vt.;t.) (١) يفضح (٢) يبدو بوضوح (٣) يصل. يحضر (٣) يسوي (نزاعاً ...

criticize [-'əsīz'] (vi.;t.) ينتقد ، ينقد

find ... (vt.;i.;n.)... to find fault (with) يعيب، ينتقد ، يعترض على.

Users of the ALD with DOMWA performed almost the same as those who used DOMWA alone (low levels 60%, high levels 55%). This could be due to the length of the entries in the ALD or to the students themselves not being able to decide which English verb would be the correct translation since the Arabic verb can have different interpretations in the text. Yet, a careful reading of the entries for the English verb equivalents would rule out 'expose', 'show up', and 'compromise', while showing that the entries for 'criticise' and 'find fault with' make them possible translations. Only the more advanced students relied on their higher proficiency and gave the correct translation 'criticise':

(ALD)

expose /ik'spəʊz/ v **1** [Tn, Tn.pr] (**a**) uncover or make (sth) visible; display ... **2** [Tn] (**a**) make known (sth secret); reveal: expose a plot, project, plan, etc. ...

... **show sb up** (infml) make sb feel embarrassed by behaving badly in his company: He showed me up by falling asleep at the concert.

▷ **compromise** v ... **2** [Tn] bring (sth/sb/oneself) into danger or under suspicion by foolish behaviour: He has irretrievably compromised himself by accepting money from them 0 ...

criticize, -ise /'kritisaiz/ v **1** [I,Tn,Tn.pr, Tsg] ~ **sb/sth** (**for sth**) point out the faults of sb/sth: Stop criticising (my work)! ... **2** [Tn] form and express a judgement on (a work of art, literature, etc.)

... **find fault** (**with sb/sth**) look for and discover mistakes (in sb/sth); complain (about sb/sth) I have no fault to find with your work ...

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	25	62.5
	high	20	50
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	23	57.5
	high	18	45
DOMWA + ALD	low	24	60
	high	22	55

7.3.4 ' وقاية' "protection":

(Is there a strategy for the ~ against pollution)

Few students made errors translating this item while using DOMWA alone (low levels 35%, high levels 22.5%). These errors were caused in most cases by the student's failure to select the appropriate translation 'protection' though it comes as the first equivalent in the synonym list. Other students mistakenly translated the homograph ' وقاية ' which is given the translation 'protective covering' because they obviously did not read the sense discriminating transliteration [waqqaya] which helps the user distinguish it from the other homograph [wiqaya] for 'protection' (App.V, no.4).

(DOMWA)

وقاية	wiqaya	protection; prevention; precaution; obviation, averting;... antiaircraft protection; health protection;...
وقاية	waqqaya	protective covering

Using AL-MAWRID with DOMWA resulted in a relatively higher number of translation errors (low levels 37.5%, high levels 27.5%. It seems that examining the meaning of less familiar English words in the synonym list has led some students to make errors as they found that most of the English equivalents in DOMWA are treated circularly in AL-MAWRID i.e. given the same translation ' وقاية'. Yet, the use of AL-MAWRID seemed to have helped the students to avoid the error of using the homograph

meaning 'protective covering' although only the adjective element of the compound is listed.

(AL-MAWRID)

protection [prətĕk'shən] (n.) (١) حماية (٢) وقاية

prevention [prĭvĕn'shən] (n.) (١) منع، اعاقة (٢) وقاية

precaution [prĭkô'shən] (n.) (١) حيطة ، احتراس، حذر
(٢) وقاية ، تدبير وقائى

obviation [ŏbvĭā'shən] (n.) تحاش ، تفاد ، تجنب

avert [əvûrt'] (vt.) (١) يحول بصره عن (٢) يتجنب ، يتفادى

The lowest number of errors was associated with the use of the ALD with DOMWA (low levels 30%, high levels 22.5%). The use of the dictionary certainly helped the students reduce the number of possible translations from the synonym list in DOMWA. The definitions and example sentences explained and put these words in their contexts of use except for the word 'prevention' which was selected by some students as they associated the idiomatic entry "prevention is better than cure" with the identical Arabic saying ' الوقاية خير من العلاج ' which contains the headword 'wiqaya' "prevention".

(ALD)

protection /prə'tekʃn/ n 1 ~(for sb) (against sth) (a) [U] protecting or being protected: appeal for protection from the police ...

prevention /pri'venʃn/ n 1 [U] (action of) preventing: the prevention of crime O the prevention of cruelty to animals. 2 (idm) **prevention is better than cure** (saying) ...

precaution /pri'kɔ:ʃn/ n ~ (**against sth**) thing done in advance to avoid danger, prevent problems, etc.: take an umbrella just as a precaution ...

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	14	35
	high	9	22.5
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	15	37.5
	high	11	27.5
DOMWA + ALD	low	12	30
	high	9	22.5

7.3.5 'شاق' **"arduous/tedious":**

(The path is ~)

The lack of information on the collocability options for the list of synonyms in DOMWA seems to have led many students to select at random and make errors (low levels 82.5%, high levels 77.5%). Most errors were made by selecting the first word on the list, 'troublesome' (App.V, no.5).

(DOMWA)

شاق ... troublesome, toilsome, wearisome, cumbersome, tiresome, tedious, fatiguing, arduous, onerous, difficult, hard

The use of AL-MAWRID together with DOMWA seems to have

helped some students reduce their lexical options and consequently their translation errors (low levels 70%, high levels 70%). The Arabic translations for 'wearisome', 'cumbersome', 'tiresome', and 'fatiguing' seem to have been ruled out by more students since they did not include the adjective ' شاق '. For the rest of the synonym list, most erroneous translations focused on 'troublesome' probably because it was the only adjective they were confident about. Yet, the entry for 'arduous' was the only one that clarified the collocability of its headword by means of the example (an ~ path) and this could have contributed to the higher number of correct translations.

(AL-MAWRID)

troublesome [trŭb'əlsəm] (adj.) مزعج، عسير، شاق

toilsome [toil'-] (adj.) شاق، متعب، منهك

wearisome [wĭr'ĭsəm] (adj.) (١) مرهق، متعب
(٢) مضجر، ممل

cumbersome [kŭm'-] (adj.) (١) ثقيل، مرهق، مزعج

tiresome [tīr'səm] (adj.) متعب، مضجر، مبرم، ممل

tedious [tēd'ĭəs] (adj.) مضجر، ممل

fatigue [fətēg'] (adj.) ... يتعب، يرهق

arduous [är'jŏŏəs] (adj.) (an ~ task) مرهق، شاق
(an ~ effort) (٢) جهيد
(an ~ winter) (٣) شديد التجدر
(an ~ path) (٤) قاس صعب المرتقى

onerous [ŏn'ərəs] (adj.) مرهق، شاق

No great difference in the number of translation errors could be noticed for the combined use of the ALD and DOMWA when

compared with the performance of the previous group (low levels 70%, high levels 65%). The selection of the correct equivalent here has been a matter of chance since the correct translation 'arduous' was shown in the ALD to collocate with the nouns 'task' and 'work' only. Yet, other synonyms in DOMWA were defined and their collocabilities exemplified in the ALD to limit the choice of possible translations to 'wearisome', 'onerous', in addition to 'arduous'. Here the students also showed the tendency to select the familiar 'troublesome' probably as a result of their uncertainty about the other synonyms.

(ALD)

> **'troublesome** /-səm/ adj giving trouble; causing annoyance, pain, etc: a troublesome child, problem, headache O My cough is rather troublesome today.
>
> **wearisome** /wiərisəm/ adj causing one to feel tired or bored: wearisome complaints, duties, tasks.
>
> **cumbersome** /ˈkʌmbəsəm/ adj 1 heavy and difficult to carry, wear, etc: a cumbersome parcel, overcoat. 2 slow and inefficient: the university's cumbersome administrative procedures.
>
> **tiresome** /ˈtaiəsəm/ adj troublesome, tedious or annoying: Selling your house can be a tiresome business.
>
> **tedious** /ti:diəs/ adj tiresome because of being long slow or dull; boring: The work is tedious ...
>
> ▷**fatigue** v [Tn] make (sb) very tired: feeling fatigued O fatiguing work
>
> **arduous** /ˈɑ:djʊəs;US -dʒʊ-/ adj needing much effort or energy; laborious: an arduous task O The work is arduous ...

onerous /ɒnərəs/ adj (fml) needing effort; burdensome: onerous duties ◊ This is the most onerous task I have ever undertaken.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	33	82.5
	high	31	77.5
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	28	70
	high	28	70
DOMWA + ALD	low	28	70
	high	26	65

7.3.6 ' بعيد المنال ' **"hardly attainable":**

(What is hoped for is ~)

All three groups performed almost the same translating this item with high-level students being more successful in locating this collocation in DOMWA than were low-level students. This collocation comprises the adjective 'ba'id' "far" and the noun 'almanal' "reach" and to locate it in DOMWA the user has to begin the search under the verbal stem 'ba'uda' to find the adjective 'ba'id' "far" where a number of collocations are listed including the one under translation. Yet, the dictionary does not list the noun element 'manal' "reach" . This seems to have led some students into errors as they tried their own incorrect translations after failing to locate the needed collocation and not attempting to search under the verbal stem of the adjective

element (App.V, no.6).

The use of AL-MAWRID or the ALD did not result in any significant change in the number of translation errors. This is so because the collocation is not listed at the entry for 'hardly' or 'attainable' in either dictionary.

(DOMWA)

بعيد المنال... hardly attainable, hard to get at

(AL-MAWRID)

attainable [ta'n b l] (adj.) ممكن احرازه أو تحقيقه

(ALD)

▷**attainable** adj that can be attained: These objectives are certainly attainable.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	19	27.5
	high	8	20
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	12	30
	high	9	22.5
DOMWA + ALD	low	11	27.5
	high	10	25

7.3.7 'معدلات' "rates":

(Pollution ~)

The students using DOMWA were divided as to whether

'average' or 'rate' should be used with 'pollution'. The use of the former, which we considered an error, was committed by about half the students in this group (low levels 52.5%, high levels 40%). The use of 'average' to translate the Arabic 'mu'addalat' in the passage is possibly due to the university students' familiarity with this term and also because it comes as the first translation equivalent in the dictionary entry (App.V, no.7). Those who selected 'rate' were helped by the dictionary which lists a number of examples showing some of the words that co-occur with this word (inflation, growth, mortality, exchange) and the correct translation 'pollution rates' can thus be reached by analogy.

(DOMWA)

معدل ... average; average amount or sum ; rate | معدل السرعة average speed; معدل الصرف rate of exchange معدل التضخم inflation rate; معدل النمو growth rate; معدل الوفيات mortality rate ...

The use of AL-MAWRID and DOMWA by the second group did not result in any significant difference in the number of errors (low levels 57.5%, high levels 37.5%). The treatment of the terms 'average' and 'rate' in AL-MAWRID does not indicate clearly the possible contexts of use so that students could associate the context with the appropriate sense.

(AL-MAWRID)

average [av' rij] (n.;adj.;vi.;t.) (١) المعدل المتوسط
(the age of the boys in our class is متوسط

fourteen) ...

rate [rāt] (n.;vt.;i.) (١) سعر، قيمة (٢) معدل، نسبة

Users of the combination DOMWA and ALD made fewer errors than other groups (low levels 45%, high levels 27.5 %). The ALD distinguishes between 'average' and 'rate' and for the latter a list of collocating nouns is given as an example (the annual birth/marriage/death rate). As with the former two groups, users of this dictionary combination seemed to have obtained the correct translation by analogy, yet the definition and illustration of the other option 'average' as a term used with concrete objects in mathematical contexts seem to have contributed to the rather higher number of correct translations of this item.

(ALD)

average /ˈæv(ə)ridʒ/ n 1 [C] result of adding several amounts together and dividing the total by the number of amounts: The average of 4, 5, and 9 is 6. 2 [U] standard or level regarded as usual: These marks are well above/below average ...

rate /reit/ n 1 standard of reckoning obtained by expressing the quantity or amount of one thing in relation to another ... the annual birth/marriage/death rate ...

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	21	52.5
	high	16	40

DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	23	57.5
	high	15	37.5
DOMWA + ALD	low	18	45
	high	11	27.5

7.3.8 'التغذية' **"nutrition":**

(Science of~)

The long list of synonyms in DOMWA resulted in a considerable number of translation errors (low levels 65%, high levels 55%). The students seem to have selected at random from the synonym list in which only 'charging' was distinguished by means of the translation complement (e.g. of an electric battery). It is likely that those who already knew the technical term for the science or study of human diet gave the correct translation 'nutrition' (App.V, no.8).

(DOMWA)

تغذية ... feeding (also tech.), nourishment, alimentation, nutrition, provisioning, supply, input, charging (e.g. of an electric battery).

The use of AL-MAWRID with DOMWA made some students aware that some of these synonyms are not used in a technical sense to describe the study of human diet and thus reduced the number of translation errors (low levels 60%, high levels 50%). The dictionary helps the user rule out the words 'feeding',

'provisioning', 'supply', and 'input'. Yet, the entry for 'nutrition' does not inform the user that this is a technical term for the study of food.

(AL-MAWRID)

feed [fēd] (vt.;i.;n.) ... تلقيم أو تغذية (آلة أو فرن)

nourishment [nûr'ĭshmənt] (n.) (١) غذاء، قوت (٢) تغذية اقاتة (٣) إغتذاء

alimentation (n.) (١) تغذية، اقاتة (٢) تغذ، اقتيات

nutrition [nūtrĭsh'ən] (n.) (١) تغذية (٢) اغتذاء (٣) غذاء

provision [-vĭzh'ən] (n.;vt.) ... مؤن ... يزود بالمؤن

supply [səplī] (vt.;i.;n.) ... (٦) مؤونة، ذخيرة

input [ĭn'pŏŏt] (n.) (١) الزاد: ... مقدار الطاقة التي تزود بها آلة ما.

The lowest number of translation errors is associated with the use of the ALD together with DOMWA (low levels 50%, high levels 42.5%). This is probably because more of the English equivalents in DOMWA are defined and illustrated in the ALD which enables the student to make his selection on the basis of a better understanding of the words and their contexts of use. Using the ALD to 'filter' the synonym list leaves 'nutrition' as the only possible translation, but errors were made probably because some students could not locate 'feeding' and 'alimentation' as separate headwords and assumed that they were nevertheless appropriate ones.

(ALD)

feed /fi:d/ v ... give food to (a person or an animal) ...

nourishment n [U] food: obtain nourishment from the soil.

nutrition /nju:'triʃn/ n [U] ... 2 the study of human diet: a number of books on nutrition.

▷**supply** n ... 2 [C often pl.] thing that is supplied ...: the water-supply O arms, food, fuel supplies ...

input /input/ n ~(**into/to sth**) 1 (a) [U] action of putting sth in ... an input of energy (to a system) O electrical input...

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	26	65
	high	22	55
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	24	60
	high	20	50
DOMWA + ALD	low	20	50
	high	17	42.5

7.3.9 ' الملوثة ' **"polluted":**

(~food and drinks)

The adequate treatment of this item in DOMWA and the students' apparent familiarity with the verb 'pollute' and its inflected or derived forms explains the rather lower number of translation errors (low levels 32.5%, high levels 20%). The word

'polluted' is followed by its collocates (air, water) which correspond closely to the translation passage. Most errors were made by selecting the first undifferentiated synonym 'stained' (App.V, no.9).

(DOMWA)

ملوث ... stained, blotted, tarnished, soiled, sullied, unclean; polluted (air, water) ...

Users of AL-MAWRID with DOMWA were able to rule out some but not all of the other synonyms and thus made fewer errors (low levels 22.5%, high levels 17.5%). If consulted, AL-MAWRID will show that the synonyms (stained, blotted, sullied, unclean) do not translate the Arabic term in the context, but 'tarnished', 'soiled', and 'polluted' are left as possible translations.

(AL-MAWRID)

stained [stānd] (adj.) (١) ملطخ، مبقع (٢) مصبغ، ملون

blot [blŏt] (n.;vy.;i.) (١-أ) لطخة - ب- بقعة حبر

tarnish [tär'nĭsh] (vt.;i.;n.) ... يتلطخ، يتلوث

sully [sŭl'ĭ] (vt.;i.;n.) (١) يلطخ X (٢) يتلطخ (٣) لطخة

unclean [ŭnklēn] (adj.) (١) غير طاهر ... (٢) نجس، قذر

pollute [-lōōt] (vt.) (١) يدنس (شيئاً مقدساً) (٢) يلوث (الماء).

The third group using the ALD with DOMWA did not do as well as the previous one (low levels 30%, high levels 17.5%). This is obviously because of the length of entries for some of the synonyms like 'stained'. Yet, the dictionary does clarify the

meaning and context of use for the other synonyms.

(ALD)

blot /blɒt/ v (**-tt-**) **1** [Tn] make a blot or blots on (paper); stain (with ink): an exercise book blotted with ink ...

tarnish /tɑ:niʃ/ v **1** [I,Tn] (cause sth to) lose its brightness by being exposed to air damp: mirrors that have tarnished with age ...

▷**soil** v [I,Tn] (fml) (cause sth to) become dirty: This material soils easily. O a basket for soiled sheets...

sully /sʌli/ v (pt,pp **sullied**) [Tn] ... make (sth) dirty; stain; ruin or destroy (sb's reputation, etc.)...

unclean /ʌnkli:n/ adj (**a**) (of food) that cannot be eaten ... (**b**) lacking spiritual purity; unchaste: unclean minds, hearts, thoughts.

pollute /pə'lu:t/ v [Tn, Tn.pr] **sth** (**with sth**) **1** make sth dirty or impure, esp by adding harmful or unpleasant substances: rivers polluted with chemical waste from factories O polluted water ...

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	13	32.5
	high	8	20
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	9	22.5
	high	7	17.5
DOMWA + ALD	low	12	30
	high	7	17.5

7.3.10 'المبيدات الحشرية' "insecticides":

Most errors were made because some students searched under the adjective element of this Arabic compound and gave the incorrect translations 'insectile' or 'insectival' (low levels 30%, high levels 32.5%). Others found the appropriate entry but were confused by its organisation; some selected the phrase 'means of extermination' which appears before the Arabic run-on term for 'insecticides' while others thought 'antibiotics' translates the Arabic term on the previous line (App.V, no.10). This is obviously a result of the student's unfamiliarity with the design of the Arabic-English dictionary where two languages are written and read in two different directions, which sometimes can be a source of confusion and errors. That raises the question of whether Arabic multi-word subentries and run-ons should be listed at the beginning of separate lines.

(DOMWA)

حشري... insectile, insectival...

مبيد ... destructive, annihilative;
مبيدات means of extermination|
مبيدات حشرية insecticides;
مبيدات حيوية antibiotics (bio.,med.)

The use of AL-MAWRID seems to have helped some students check their choices from DOMWA and thus reduced the likelihood of committing translation errors (low levels 27.5%, high levels 22.5%). The main type of error made by this group was the use of

'means of extermination' which is not listed under either 'mean' or 'extermination' in AL-MAWRID.

(AL-MAWRID)

insectile [ĭnsĕk'tĭl] (adj) حشرى أوشبيه بالحشرة

destructive [dĭstrŭk'-] (adj) (١) مهلك، متلف ألخ
(small children are ~) (٢) مولع بالتحطيم
.(~ criticism) (٣) هدام، غير بناء

insecticide [-'təsīd'] (n.)... مبيدة الحشرات، مادة...

antibiotic (adj.,n.) (كالبنسلين) مضاد الجراثيم

Translation errors made when the ALD was used in conjunction with DOMWA were similar in their nature and quantity to the ones made by the previous group of students (low levels 27.5%, high levels 20%). The use of very low frequency words in DOMWA (annihilative, insectival, insectile, means of extermination) caused most of the errors since these words are not listed in the ALD, which nevertheless makes the user aware of the meanings of other difficult or confusing terms in DOMWA (destructive, antibiotics).

(ALD)

destructive /di'strʌktiv/ adj (a) causing destruction or serious damage: the destructive force of the storm ...

▷**insecticide** /in'sekti'said/ n [C,U]substance used for killing insects (eg DDT): (attrib.) an insecticide spray, powder, etc ...

antibiotic /æntibai'ɒtik/ n, adj (substance, eg pencillin) that can destroy or prevent the growth of bacteria.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	12	30
	high	13	32.5
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	11	27.5
	high	9	22.5
DOMWA + ALD	low	11	27.5
	high	8	20

7.3.11 'الملوثات' "pollutants":

(Industrial ~)

105 out of 240 students made errors by referring to the other Arabic homograph 'ملوث' "polluted" and selecting at random from the synonym list. There were only sixteen trained users who committed this type of error (15.2%). This shows that guidance in the use of this type of dictionary is a crucial factor in the students' successful performance in L1-L2 translation.

Since DOMWA does not list this item the majority of students made errors (low levels 90%, high levels 80%). Those who gave the correct translation 'pollutant' did so probably because they had encountered this word recently. Some students who made errors thought that changing the verb 'pollute' into the noun 'polluter' would be the right solution (App.V, no.11).

The second group using AL-MAWRID and DOMWA performed rather better (low levels 72.5%, high levels 67.5%). It seems that some students have employed their reference skills in searching around

the verb 'pollute' in AL-MAWRID in the hope that one of its derivatives would be the translation equivalent of the Arabic term which is also a derivative. The same look-up strategy seems to have been followed by the third group using the ALD in combination with DOMWA.

(AL-MAWRID)

pollutant;polluter [pəlōōt'-](n.) (١) المدنس، الملوث
pollute [-lōōt'] (vt.) (١) يدنس (شيئاً مقدساً) (٢) يلوث (الماء)
pollution [pəlōō'shən] (n.) (١) تدنيس، تلويث ...

(ALD)

pollute /pə'lu:t/ v [Tn, Tn.pr] ~ **sth** (**with sth**)
1 make sth dirty or impure ...
▷ **pollutant** /-ənt/ n substance that pollutes, eg exhaust fumes from motor vehicles; releasing pollutants into the atmosphere.
pollution /pə'lu:ʃn/ n [U] (**a**) polluting or being polluted: the pollution of our beaches with oil ...

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	36	90
	high	32	80
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	29	72.5
	high	27	67.5
DOMWA + ALD	low	31	77.5
	high	28	70

7.3.12 ' الزئبق ' "mercury":

The students' failure to select the appropriate English equivalent for the context resulted in some errors (low levels 30%, high levels 25%). The users of DOMWA are not informed by the dictionary that 'mercury' is used in more formal contexts such as the article under translation (App.V, no.12).

(DOMWA)

زئبق ...quicksilver, mercury

When AL-MAWRID and the ALD were used with DOMWA by the other groups, similar numbers of translation errors were made. Again, the failure of the dictionary in specifying different contexts of the use of the two synonyms seems to be the main factor.

(AL-MAWRID)

mercury [mûr'kyəri] (n.) ... زئبق (٢) ...

quicksilver [kwĭk'-] (n.,adj.) (١) زئبق (٢) زئبقي

(ALD)

mercury /mɜ:kjʊri/ n [U] (also **quicksilver**) chemical element, a heavy silver-coloured metal usu found in liquid form, used in thermometers and barometers ...

quicksilver /'kwiksilvə(r)/ n [U] = MERCURY: like quicksilver; i.e. very quick(ly)

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	12	30
	high	10	25
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	12	30
	high	11	27.5
DOMWA + ALD	low	13	32.5
	high	11	27.5

7.3.13 'مكونات' **"components/ingredients"**

(~of a meal)

The majority of the students using DOMWA alone made translation errors (low levels 75%, high levels 52.5%). In addition to the long list of undifferentiated synonyms, the run-on 'mukawwanat' within the entry for the homograph 'mukawwan' caused many of the students' errors. Obviously, the absence of diacritical points from the headwords in this Arabic-English dictionary causes many Arabic-speaking users to confuse the entries for homographs, in this case 'mukawwin' and 'mukawwan' which are both written as 'مكون' (App.V, no.13). Yet, if read, the English transliterations could have made these students aware of the grammatical and semantic differences between the two words in order to focus on the one relevant to the context under translation. The analysis of this error in relation to the number of trained dictionary users showed that there is a strong relationship between guidance on the use of Arabic-English

dictionaries and the success in locating the appropriate entry. 80 students made this type of error. Of these, only eleven were trained users (13.75%).

(DOMWA)

مكون mukawwin creator; ___ (pl. -at) component; formative, constituent (also gram.); factor, element

مكون mukawwan made, created: consisting composed, made up (من of), formed (من by); pl. مكونات structures, formations

Using AL-MAWRID with DOMWA by the second group resulted in fewer translation errors (low levels 67.5%, high levels 57.5%). By checking the meanings of 'structures' and 'formations', AL-MAWRID users realised that neither of these translates the Arabic word in the passage. This might have made some students turn their attention to the entry for the other homograph to look up the synonyms 'component', 'formative', 'constituent', 'factor', and 'element'. The dictionary's treatment of these words rules out 'factor' and 'element' only while the rest of the synonym list are given the same translation equivalent.

(AL-MAWRID)

structure [-'chər] (n.;vt.) (١) بناء، تشييد. ب- مبنى (٢) بنية، تركيب (٣) ينشيء، ينظم ...

formation [fôrmā'-] (n.) (١) أ- تشكيل، تكوين.. ب- تشكل، تكون (٢) شكل، بنية.

component [kəmpō'-] (n.;adj.) (١) عنصر أو جزء اساسى (٢) مركب، مكون (~parts)

formative [fôr'mətĭv] (adj.;n.) (١) مشكل، مكون

constituent [kənstĭch'ōōənt] (adj.;n.) (~parts) (١)مقوم، مشكل وحدة أو كلاً تامًا

factor [făk'tər] (n.;vt.) (١) وسيط تجارى بالعمولة. وكيل تجارى (٢) عامل.

element [ĕl'əmənt] (n.) (١) العنصر: «١» احد العناصر الاربعة (الهواء والماء والنار والتراب)

The use of the ALD with DOMWA did not seem to have a noticeable effect on the students' performance (low levels 70%, high levels 50%). That might be due to the close semantic properties of the synonyms listed in DOMWA which make it difficult for an EFL learner to decide. The ALD does not show that 'component' can be used in a context of food as in the given passage.

(ALD)

component /kəm'pəunənt/ n any of the parts of which sth is made: the components of an engine, a camera, etc. O a factory supplying components for the car industry ...

formative /'fɔ:mətiv/ adj [attrib] having an importat and lasting influence on the development of sb's character: a child's formative years ...

▷**constituent** n 1 member of a constituency. 2 component part: the constituents of the mixture ...

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	30	75
	high	21	52.5
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	27	67.5
	high	23	57.5

DOMWA + ALD	low	28	70
	high	20	50

7.3.14 **' هدى ' "extent/degree":**

(~of toxicity)

The users of DOMWA had to select from a list of twenty-one undifferentiated synonyms which resulted in a high number of translation errors (low levels 82.5%, high levels 60%). Most of the students in this group selected from the English equivalents nearest to the Arabic headword (extension, expanse, stretch). Only the proficient students were able to find the correct translation either from their own vocabulary knowledge or from the dictionary (App.V, no.14).

(DOMWA)

> هدى ... extension, expanse, stretch, spread, compass, range, scope, space, latitude, reach; distance, interval, interspace; extent, degree, measure, scale, proportion; utmost point, extreme, limit; space of time, duration, period ...

The use of AL-MAWRID with DOMWA did not result in a significantly lower number of errors among the second group (low levels 77.5%, high levels 57.5%). This is probably because many of the English synonyms were given the same Arabic translation equivalent in AL-MAWRID. The same applies to the use of the ALD

where some of these synonyms are explained and illustrated without differentiation.

(AL-MAWRID)

extension [ĭkstĕn'shən] (n.) ... مدى ، نطاق

stretch [strĕch] (vt.;i.;n.;adj.) نطاق-ب- عرض، مدى

spread [sprĕd] (vt.;i.;n.;adj.) ... عرض، مدى

range [rānj] (n.;vt.;i.)... ... (٣) مدى

scope [skōp] (n.) ... (٣)مدى ،مدى الفهم أوالنظر الخ.

(ALD)

extension /i'kstenʃn/ n **1** [U] process or action of extending ...

▷**stretch** n ... 3 [C] (**a**) ~**(of sth)** continuous expanse or extent (of sth): a beautiful stretch of countryside ...

▷**spread** n **1** (usu sing) (**a**) extent, width or expanse of sth ... (**b**) extent of space or time; stretch ...

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	33	82.5
	high	24	60
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	31	77.5
	high	23	57.5
DOMWA + ALD	low	30	75
	high	24	60

7.3.15 ' سمية' **"toxicity":**

(~of pollutants)

Most students failed to translate this item because it was not listed in DOMWA (low levels 95%, high levels 97.5%). Many students thought the closest Arabic headword ' تسمم' would have similar English translations and thus selected 'poisoning' and 'toxication'. Others looked under the Arabic adjective ' سام' and translated the item as 'poisonous', 'toxic', 'toxicant'. or 'venemous' (App.V, no.15).

(DOMWA)

تسمم ... poisoning, toxication...

سام ... poisonous; toxic, toxicant; venomous

Although DOMWA does not list the Arabic item, fewer students made translation errors using AL-MAWRID (low levels 75%, high levels 70%). It seems that some students checked the entries for 'toxic', 'toxicant' 'toxication' and the surrounding derivatives in AL-MAWRID to find the correct translation 'toxicity' which is translated in the dictionary as the word in the translation passage. Those who used the ALD with DOMWA seem to have followed the same strategy as they committed a lower number of errors than those who used DOMWA alone (low levels 80%, high levels 75%).

(AL-MAWRID)

toxic (adj) [tŏk'sĭk] سمي (١)، سام (٢)

toxic- or **toxico-**
toxicant [tŏk'səkənt] (adj.,n.)
toxicity [toksis'əti] (n.)

مادئة معناها : سم
(١) سام (٢) سم
السمية

(ALD)

toxic /'tɒksik/ adj poisonous: toxic drugs o the toxic effects of alcohol.

▷**toxicity** n [U] quality or degree of being toxic: the comparative toxicity of different insecticides.

Dictionaries used	Level	Translation errors	%
DOMWA	low	38	95
	high	39	97.5
DOMWA + AL-MAWRID	low	30	75
	high	28	70
DOMWA + ALD	low	32	80
	high	30	75

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

8.1 Introduction:

In this empirical project, we have attempted to investigate the dictionary situation in Kuwait with special focus on bilingual dictionaries of English and Arabic and how well these meet the different FL linguistic needs of advanced learners of English at Kuwait University. We examined the two most popular bilingual dictionaries in the Arab World, i.e. AL-MAWRID (English-Arabic) and DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC (Arabic-English) in order to determine to what extent the various types of dictionary information, e.g. translation equivalents, guidance in the introduction, sense discriminations, illustrative examples, collocations and idioms, grammatical and phonological information are suitable for the users and uses of the dictionaries examined.

Also, we conducted two translation tests from and into English using three dictionary titles; AL-MAWRID, DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC, and the OXFORD ADVANCED LEARNER'S DICTIONARY OF CURRENT ENGLISH. The aim was to seek confirmation of our earlier critical analysis, to discover how successfully students retrieved the required information, and to find out whether single or combined dictionary use is the most fruitful

look-up situation.

This chapter summarises all the main conclusions we can draw from the questionnaire and test results. It also presents suggestions for some design improvements in bilingual dictionaries of Arabic and English.

8.2 **Summary of findings:**

The analysis of the results of the questionnaire and translation tests has revealed some significant facts regarding the dictionary behaviour of advanced EFL learners at Kuwait University, and has indicated a number of inadequacies in the information design of their bilingual dictionaries. The following are the findings in summary:

1. We found that general-purpose English-Arabic dictionaries play the dominant role at the advanced EFL level in Kuwait, in terms of ownership, frequency of use, preference, etc. Yet, the reliance on this type seemed to decrease as students moved to higher levels. The heavy reliance on this type was enhanced by the dominant study modes which require their use, i.e. reading, listening, and translating from English. The main source of structural problems in the English-Arabic dictionary examined was the fact that it was written in the shadow of monolingual English dictionaries, without identifying the precise needs of the Arab user (cf. Tomaszczyk 1981; Sciarone 1984; Winter 1992).

2. Bilingual Arabic-English dictionaries were found unsuitable for Arab writers and translators since they were designed to serve the English-speaking user wishing to read Arabic texts. The critical analysis (chapter 3) and the discussion of the Arabic-English translation test results (chapter 7) have further confirmed this fact.

3. Monolingual EFL dictionaries were found less popular among beginners than among advanced learners (cf. Bareggi 1989), and were found useful in translation only when combined with a bilingual dictionary. More importance was assigned to this type by the students as an effective writing aid and they were rated highly as reliable sources of information on the grammar of English words. Also as in the study reported by Béjoint (1981), this type was considered satisfactory and useful.

4. In looking up a word, students showed a tendency to select the first meaning or sense, but they seemed to benefit from illustrative examples in determining the appropriate meaning of a polysemous headword. Indeed, illustrative examples were highly appreciated by the majority of the students who felt that their dictionaries, bilingual and monolingual, did not provide enough of this type of information.

5. Since dictionaries were used predominantly for comprehension, most students indicated that they refer to their dictionaries primarily for meaning and less often for spelling, collocations, and grammar.

6. As for instruction in dictionary use, the majority of the students stressed the need for such instruction although about

half of them had already received some kind of guidance on how to use their dictionaries. This is a clear indication of the inadequacy of the amount of dictionary-related instruction currently given to Kuwaiti advanced EFL learners. It is significant that this instruction has not yet gained any formal recognition by being included in syllabuses or curricula. Yet despite this, we found that those with some background in dictionary training were better translators (see chapter 7), indicating some relationship between instruction in dictionary use and successful dictionary use.

8.3 The need for better bilingual dictionaries:

In spite of their dominance in the EFL context in Kuwait, bilingual L2-L1 and L1-L2 dictionaries are often used with unsatisfactory results. This dissatisfaction, according to Tomaszczyk (1981:285-6), stems from three factors:

1. In practice, general bilingual lexicography still depends to a considerable extent on developments in monolingual lexicography.
2. The failure to identify the precise needs of particular kinds of bilingual user.
3. The failure to identify the mode of use for which the bilingual dictionary has been designed.

There is, therefore, an urgent need to revise the notions underlying the compilation of bilingual dictionaries of Arabic and English. First, existing bilingual dictionaries in the Arab World will have to be updated to reflect the recent innovations in lexicographical information design especially in EFL monolingual dictionaries. Second, compilers of these bilingual dictionaries will have to balance the types and quantities of dictionary information against the needs and the most widely practised language skills as determined by investigations into Arab dictionary users and uses and by error-analysis studies (cf. Kharma et al.1989). Finally, Arab bilingual lexicographers should consider co-operation with English native speakers during the compilation process, as advocated by Ogasawara (1984:256):

> "The specific language/culture-bound versions of the foreign-language learners' dictionaries could best be prepared through close collaboration between native-speaker lexicographers and qualified competent non-native foreign-language teachers and scholars who have extensive knowledge of the linguistic/cultural trouble spots of the learners, and who are familiar with the contrasts between the two languages and cultures."

In section 8.3.1 we will focus on possible areas of improvement in English-Arabic dictionaries, while in section 8.3.2 we will attempt to determine how the information structure in an Arabic-English dictionary should be presented in order to help the Arab learner in production.

8.3.1 **English-Arabic dictionaries:**

The introductory matter of a bilingual English-Arabic dictionary addressed to the Arab advanced learner should contain a brief description of the regional and national varieties of English, and its present status as an international language. It should also explain the purpose of the dictionary and specify the English proficiency level of the prospective user (cf. Magay 1984), and define explicitly its conventions (cf. Osselton 1979; Stein 1979,1984,1985; Ilson 1984). An easy-to-remember Arabic list of abbreviations and warning symbols should be provided along with a description of the arrangement of entries and translation equivalents. Also, a practical guide should explain and illustrate the appropriate use of the dictionary e.g.:

- looking up simple words, derivatives and compounds, irregular verbs, plurals, and adjectives.
- looking up a specific sense of a polysemous word.
- looking up idioms, phrasal verbs, and antonyms (cf. LDOCE2; OALDCE4).

The introductory matter should include a pronunciation key which adopts the modified IPA system in transcription (cf. Gimson 1973, 1978, 1981; Lewis 1978; Magay 1979; Wells 1985). A detailed guide to the arrangement of grammatical information should illustrate points of grammar provided in the dictionary such as word-formation rules (cf. Swanson 1962). This guide should pay more attention to parts of speech, irregular verbs, affixes, noun classes. Example sentences should be used in the introduction to

clarify and illustrate grammatical points such as complementation of nouns, verbs, and adjectives. Style and field labels e.g. informal, formal, British slang, etc. and subject labels e.g. law, art, computing, etc. should all be presented in the native language of the Arab user. The latter labels can only be useful when the subject is too specialised or cannot be deduced from the Arabic translation.

The word-list of the English-Arabic dictionary should be comprehensive with regard to the lexical needs of advanced Arab learners and their university textbooks. Inflections would have to be shown especially for irregular verbs with cross-references at the dummy entries referring the user to the full entries for irregular verbs, plurals, or adjectives. Affixes have to be entered as separate entries with appropriate translations and examples because of their value in comprehension and building up a student's vocabulary (cf. Stein 1985; Nattinger 1988). The inclusion of technical terms should be based on their frequency of occurrence in the mass media and the daily language of native speakers (cf. Kharma 1984). Derivatives should also be translated since they are necessary for both comprehension and production by EFL learners (cf. Moulin 1979; Cowie 1983a; 1989a; Stein 1984; Folomkina 1986). In the present study, we found that many students experience difficulties in translating English derivatives, apparently because of the current policy of listing them without their Arabic translations. Idioms have to be distinguished from the rest of the entry by means of bold print and a consistent policy should be followed in placing the idiom

under the important constituent. In translating idioms, the bilingual lexicographer should look for a corresponding Arabic idiom or near equivalent that shares the same stylistic and socio-cultural functions (cf. Kachru 1987). As for collocations, these have to be translated and provided generously in areas where learners have difficulties distinguishing different senses of a polysemous word. Indeed, the provision of collocations in entries of polysemous words helped our students select the appropriate sense in the L2-L1 bilingual dictionary (see chapter 7). In labelling entry words , we should focus on those labels that help the language learner distinguish clearly between different social styles of English (cf. Hartmann 1981; Delbridge 1987). This information will help the Arab learner find translations with similar or close stylistic values. Labels like sport, chemistry, or medicine are probably less important since the appropriate context is usually deducible from the translation equivalent or explanation (cf. Kirkpatrick 1985).

The transcription of entry words should adopt the widely used IPA system because of its simplicity and close correspondence to the English spelling system. It would be preferable to base the pronunciation on one national type and one accent i.e. RP, the choice of this accent being determined by geographical and cultural factors as well as by the tradition of English teaching in the Arab World where British textbooks are in wide circulation (cf. Gimson 1981).

Translation equivalents in an English-Arabic dictionary should be precise and free of archaisms. They should be written

in the modern standard variety of Arabic, which is understood throughout the Arab World. The diglossic situation of the language (cf. Ferguson 1959, 1972; Abboud 1971) requires that some translations especially those for technical terms be presented in a variety of Arabic common among all Arabic speakers along with an explanatory equivalent. Translations of items peculiar to the British, American, or Australian cultures should reflect in depth the cultural implications of these items (cf. Gleason 1962; Swanson 1962; Nguyen 1980, 1981; Snell-Hornby 1987).

Grammatical information has to be provided in the form of part-of-speech labels in order to help the user locate a specific homograph.

Picture illustrations should be systematically provided, especially for culturally unfamiliar items. Group pictures also have to be given with cross-references in order to treat economically features of some lexical fields e.g. verbs of motion, kinship networks, etc. (cf. Ilson 1987; Cowie 1989c).

The back matter of the English-Arabic dictionary should provide extra-linguistic information such as currencies used in English-speaking countries, weights and measures, place names, common female and male names, famous buildings, mythological names, famous titles, works of art, maps, military ranks, spelling table, and malapropisms (also cf. Steiner 1984; Berkov 1990).

8.3.2 **Arabic-English dictionaries:**

The results of the study showed that there is a great need for a bilingual Arabic-English dictionary written specifically for Arab writers. Our envisaged dictionary would provide in its introductory matter information relating to the purpose of the dictionary and its prospective users. Since it is a productive dictionary it would inform the Arab user about the irregularities in the English spelling system, verbs, nouns, and adjectives and their complementation. It would also introduce the user to the arrangement of entries, the abbreviations and labels used in the dictionary and give a pronunciation key with example words in the introduction, the language of explanation being Arabic.

The word list should be minimized in order to give exhaustive treatment of essential items (cf. Cowie 1983b, 1989a; Tomaszczyk 1981, 1983). Arabic headwords, sub-entries, compounds, and run-ons have to be presented in boldface letters for easy recognition. Raised dots (as in LODCE and OALDCE) should be used in English translations to show the Arab writer where an English word can be cut at the end of a line. Arabic entry words should be in standard modern Arabic because the Arab writer will use this high variety of his language as the starting point in dictionary look-up operations and in predominantly formal contexts, i.e. translating Arabic written texts and writing term papers, compositions, etc. The arrangement of Arabic entries should follow the traditional model employed in classical monolingual dictionaries of Arabic because students have already

received some instruction in the use of these mother-tongue dictionaries at secondary school. Thus, the entries should list the verb stem followed by the derived Arabic forms (i.e. adjectives, nouns, adverbs, etc.), but when the Arabic entry word has no verbal stem as in borrowings and technical terms (e.g. 'باليه' "ballet") it will have to be listed alphabetically and a proper cross-reference should be placed where the untrained user is likely to search, informing him/her that the word should be looked up alphabetically. Where there are homographs it would be necessary to use diacritical points to distinguish, for example, an Arabic noun from an adjective (see chapters 3 and 7). Other phonological and syntactic information on Arabic is not needed. Yet, English equivalents and examples will have to be transcribed and stress shifts indicated. Collocations, especially restricted ones should be given (cf. Cowie 1978; Aisenstadt 1979; Benson 1985) and illustrative examples should be provided generously in this L1-L2 dictionary because of their great value in encoding (cf. Fries 1958; Folomkina 1986; Creamer 1987; Drysdale 1987; Marello 1987; Cowie 1989a). These should perform the following functions (Cowie 1978:129):

1. Indicating the syntactic distribution of words in their various senses.
2. Throwing light on the meaning of words, especially where this cannot be satisfactorily explained in any other way.
3. Encouraging the learner to compose sentences which are lexically, as well as syntactically, new.

In the treatment of culture-bound items, the focus should be on helping the Arab user express properly these concepts in English. Translations of the names of Arab institutions, authorities, and organisations have to be standardised in this type of dictionary (cf. Wesseloh 1981; Tomaszczyk 1984). Group pictures of Arab artefacts, animals, architecture, and plants peculiar to the Arab World along with transcribed English translations would be a welcome feature in an Arabic-English dictionary. As an aid for writers, the dictionary should also provide a list of standard English transliterations of common Arab proper names often given different spellings by Arab writers (cf. Stirling 1964).

8.4 **The need for structured instruction in dictionary use:**

The results of our study have shown that instruction in dictionary use is an essential factor contributing to effective use of such works and to overall success in vocabulary development. Structured instruction was badly needed by the subjects of the study (see chapter 6). Several English language specialists and lexicographers have called for teaching EFL learners how to use their dictionaries effectively (cf. Marckwardt 1973; Cowie 1978; Ard 1982; Mathews 1982; Rossner 1985; Underhill 1985; Crystal 1986; Hartmann 1986; Whitcut 1986; Summers 1988; Battenburg 1989). English language teaching methodologists in the Arab world and Kuwait in particular would

need to recognise the importance of the dictionary as an essential learning aid and accord it its proper place in EFL syllabuses and curricula.

We have found that many English majors at Kuwait University lacked even some basic dictionary skills such as locating the appropriate sense or part of speech. Their problems with Arabic-English dictionary use were particularly severe and thus require special attention. At least this category of students can be trained by integrating the use of their L2-L1, L1-L2, and EFL dictionaries into the academic programme. This might be achieved by encouraging the students to utilise the wealth of information in their dictionaries through exercises relevant to different linguistics courses. In a traditional grammar class, for example, the students may be asked to use their dictionaries to check different grammatical sub-classes of nouns, adjectives, adverbs, etc., and derive from their dictionaries examples for each grammatical point. Illustrative sentences will be of great value in such exercises. Also, in their study of English morphology, students may be referred to their dictionaries to provide examples for compounding, word-formation processes, inflections, and derivation. In composition and translation classes, students can be encouraged to use their Arabic-English dictionaries in tandem with EFL monolingual ones after informing them about the weaknesses and strengths of the different types of dictionary in their possession.

8.5 **Suggestions for future studies:**

Research into dictionaries and their users is never exhausted. Especially bilingual lexicography is in obvious need for more feedback from contrastive studies, error analysis, and research into the role of sense discrimination devices. A fruitful area of investigation would be examining empirically the effectiveness of some specific types of dictionary information like illustrative sentences, picture illustrations, or grammatical labels to discover if the absence of such information would affect dictionary users' success in retrieving information from their dictionaries. Observational research methods such as video-recording can be employed to determine certain patterns of dictionary look-up operations.

Finally, there is an obvious need for studies of bilingual dictionary use in different parts of the world. Such studies can provide lexicographers and language teaching methodologists with valuable feedback for improving their materials.

Name:
University number:
Year:
Major:
Native language:

1. Which of the following types of dictionary do you have?
   a. monolingual (English-English)
      title:
      size (pocket or large):

   b. bilingual (English-Arabic)
      title:
      size:

   c. bilingual (Arabic-English)
      title:
      size:

2. How many dictionaries do you have?

3. Where do you consult the dictionary most often?
   a. at home
   b. at college
   c. in the library

4. Do you sometimes use more than one dictionary at the same time?
   a. yes
   b. no

5. Do you sometimes use specialised dictionaries (E.g. of idioms, the Encyclopedia Britannica, etc.)?
   a. yes
   b. no

6. What size of dictionary do you prefer?
   a. comprehensive (more than one volume)
   b. desk (one large volume)
   c. pocket (small size)

7. Which type of dictionary do you use most often?
   a. monolingual (English-English) size:
   b. bilingual (English-Arabic) size:
   c. bilingual (Arabic-English) size:

8. Underline the type of dictionary which you think is most useful for the following
   a. reading monolingual/English-Arab/Arab-English

b. writing monolingual/English-Arab/Arab-English
c. listening monolingual/English-Arab/Arab-English
d. speaking monolingual/English-Arab/Arab-English
e. meaning monolingual/English-Arab/Arab-English
f. grammar monolingual/English-Arab/Arab-English
g. pronunciation monolingual/English-Arab/Arab-English

9. Do you sometimes read your dictionary without looking for anything in particular?
   a. yes
   b. no

10. Do you think a dictionary should include encyclopedic entries (e.g. information about people, countries, etc.)?
    a. yes
    b. no

11. Do you try to find out how a word is pronounced when you look it up in your dictionary?
    a. yes
    b. no

12. Can you read phonetic transcriptions to find out how words are pronounced (e.g. [frəˈtɜ:rnətɪ] for 'fraternity'?
    a. yes
    b. no

13. Do you think students should be taught how to use a dictionary?
    a. yes
    b. no

14. Under which headword would you look up the idiom 'spill the beans'?
    a. under the word 'spill'
    b. under the word 'bean'
    c. I don't know

---

* If you use a bilingual English-Arabic dictionary (such as Al-Mawrid) answer questions 15-26.

15. At what stage of your education did you start using your English-Arabic dictionary?
    a. intermediate school
    b. secondary school
    c. university

16. Why did you buy/acquire your English-Arabic dictionary?
    a. recommended by teacher
    b. recommended by another student
    c. its low price
    d. other:

17. Did your school/university instructor give you any guidance on the use of English-Arabic dictionaries?
    a. yes
    b. no

18. How often do you use your English-Arabic dictionary?
    a. daily
    b. weekly
    c. monthly
    d. yearly
    e. never

19. How do you find Arabic translations in your English-Arabic dictionary?
    a. accurate
    b. inaccurate

20. Which type(s) of information do you look for most often in your English-Arabic dictionary?
    a. meaning
    b. grammar
    c. spelling
    d. pronunciation
    e. etymology (history of words; French, Italian, etc.)
    f. collocations (e.g. 'responsible for' or 'responsible of')

21. For which learning activity do you most often use your English-Arabic dictionary?
    a. translation from English
    b. translation from Arabic
    c. writing
    d. listening
    e. speaking

22. Have you read the introduction to your English-Arabic dictionary?
    a. yes
    b. no

23. Do you think more examples should be given in your English-Arabic dictionary?
    a. yes
    b. no

24. Do pictures in your English-Arabic dictionary help you understand the meaning of a certain word?
    a. yes
    b. no

25. Do you remember any occasion on which you failed to find what you were looking for in your English-Arabic dictionary?
    a. yes
    b. no

26. How would you evaluate your English-Arabic dictionary?
    a. excellent
    b. good
    c. average
    d. poor

---

* If you use a bilingual <u>Arabic-English</u> dictionary (such

as Hans Wehr's Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic) answer questions 27-37.

27. At what stage of your education did you start using your Arabic-English dictionary?
    a. intermediate school
    b. secondary school
    c. university

28. Why did you buy/acquire your Arabic-English dictionary?
    a. recommended by teacher
    b. recommended by another student
    c. its low price
    d. other:

29. Did your school/university instructor give you any guidance on the use of Arabic-English dictionaries?
    a. yes
    b. no

30. How often do you use an Arabic-English dictionary?
    a. daily
    b. weekly
    c. monthly
    d. yearly
    e. never

31. How do you find English translations in your Arabic-English dictionary?
    a. accurate
    b. inaccurate

32. Which type(s) of information do you look for most often in your Arabic-English dictionary?
    a. meaning
    b. grammar
    c. spelling
    d. pronunciation
    e. etymology (history of words e.g. French, Italian..)
    f. collocations (e.g. 'responsible for' or 'responsible of')

33. For which learning activity do you most often use your Arabic-English dictionary?
    a. translation from Arabic
    b. translation from English
    c. writing
    d. listening
    e. speaking

34. Have you read the introduction to your Arabic-English dictionary?
    a. yes
    b. no

35. Do you remember any occasion on which you failed to find what you were looking for in your Arabic-English dictionary?
    a. yes
    b. no

36. Do you think more examples should be given in your Arabic-English dictionary?
    a. yes
    b. no

37. How would you evaluate your Arabic-English dictionary?
    a. excellent
    b. good
    c. average
    d. poor

---

* If you use a monolingual English-English dictionary (such as Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary) answer the following questions.

38. At what stage of your education did you start using your monolingual dictionary?
    a. intermediate school
    b. secondary school
    c. university

39. Why did you buy/acquire a monolingual dictionary?
    a. recommended by teacher
    b. recommended by another student
    c. its low price
    d. other:

40. How often do you use your monolingual dictionary?
    a. daily
    b. weekly
    c. monthly
    d. yearly
    e. never

41. Do you find definitions in your monolinguial dictionary clear enough?
    a. yes
    b. no

42. Do you find definitions in your monolingual dictionary too long?
    a. yes
    b. no

43. Did your school/university instructor give you any guidance on the use of monolingual dictionaries?
    a. yes
    b. no

44. Which type(s) of information do you look for most often in your monolingual dictionary?
    a. meaning
    b. grammar
    c. spelling
    d. pronunciation
    e. etymology (history of words, e.g. French, Italian..)
    f. collocations (e.g. 'responsible for' or 'responsible of'

45. For which learning activity do you most often use your monolingual dictionary?
    a. translation from English
    b. translation from Arabic
    c. writing
    d. listening
    e. speaking

46. Have you read the introduction to your monolingual dictionary?
    a. yes
    b. no

47. Do pictures in your monolingual dictionary help you understand the meaning of a certain word?
    a. yes
    b. no

48. Do you remember any occasion on which you failed to find what you were looking for in your monolingual dictionary?

49. Do you think more examples should be given in your monolingual dictionary?
    a. yes
    b. no

50. How would you evaluate your monolingual dictionary?
    a. excellent
    b. good
    c. average
    d. poor

Dictionary List

1. Bilingual dictionaries:

- Al-Manar, English-Arabic Dictionary (Ed. Karmi).
- Al-Mawrid, English-Arabic Dictionary (Ed. Ba'albaki).
- Al-Mufid, English-Arabic Learner's Dictionary (Ed. Nasr & Al-Khatib).
- Arabic-English Dictionary (Ed. Wortabet & Porter).
- Arabic-English, English-Arabic Dictionary (Ed. Wortabet & Porter).
- Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, Arabic-English (Ed. Hans Wehr).
- Longman First Learning English-Arabic Dictionary
- Oxford English-Arabic Reader's Dictionary

2. Monolingual dictionaries (English only):

- Chamber's Universal Learner's Dictionary (Ed. Kirkpatrick).
- Collins English Learner's Dictionary (Ed. Carver).
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (Ed. Procter).
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (Ed. Cowie).
- Oxford Student's Dictionary of Current English (Ed. Hornby).
- Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (Ed. Woolf).

English-Arabic Translation

Instructions: Use your dictionary (or dictionaries) to translate the underlined words as they appear in the following passage.

Quarter to ten on a Saturday morning in January and I was there, almost unprecedentedly early for my appointment. Boots just a bit too new, borrowed jacket satisfactorily weathered. I sat on Fishbourne station, mentally and physically prepared to accompany 19-year-old Mark Duncan along a nine mile stretch of the Sussex coast.

When the planned rendezvous did not happen, getting to meet Mark developed into a mini initiative test all of its own. Only four hours later, after hot-footing it inland to our final destination and enlisting the help of an impromptu local reconnaissance patrol who kindly placed their time, telephone, binoculars and an unofficial taxi service at my disposal, did I eventually manage to track him down as he trudged along country lanes towards the coastal path at Bosham.

Advice from well-meaning locals can be misleading. 'They say it'll only take you three quarters of an hour and it turns out to be two and three quarters', he said apologetically.

Each day will involve a stage of up to 30 miles or more and should secure him an entry in the Guinness Book of Records. The stringent requirements of the Guinness Book of Records demand that all details are punctiliously logged and also that he carries a pedometer.

Mark's only 'luxury' is the walkman in his top pocket, though to conserve the batteries he uses only the radio, not cassettes. For his nightly progress reports home, he uses public telephone boxes, which despite British Telecom's best efforts don't seem to guarantee him a 90 per cent reliability rate.

Scene, March 1989, no.152, p.7.

Words and phrases to be translated:

1) unprecendently
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged
7) well-meaning
8) locals
9) apologetically
10) secure him
11) stringent requirements
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

ترجم الكلمات التى تحتها خط الى اللغة الانجليزية مستخدما المعجم العربى - الانجليزى وأى معجم آخر

يعد التلوث كارثة العصر وأسوأ مخلفات الحضارة والتكنولوجيا لذا تنعقد باسمه مؤتمرات ومنظمات لتطلق الشعارات تندد به وتؤكد خطورته وتطالب التوصيات بحماية البيئة والصحة العامة وانقاذ البشرية من أهواله.

ترى هل هناك سبل للوقاية منه ، وكيف تواجهه الأسرة العادية ؟

تؤكد الحقائق والدراسات أن الطريق طويل وشاق والأمل بعيد المنال . . والى أن تحدث المعجزة وتنخفض معدلات التلوث . . . هل هناك سبيل يمكن أن تسلكه الأسرة لمقاومة هذه السموم المنتشرة فى الهواء والغذاء واحيانا فى الماء . . . . ؟

الاجابة على هذا السؤال عند الدكتور مصطفى عبد الرزاق نوفل استاذ علوم وتكنولوجيا التغذية بجامعة الأزهر والذى تناول فى دراساته ما يحدثه الغذاء من تداخلات داخل الجسم تقاوم السموم المختلفة التى تنقلها الأغذية والمشروبات الملوثة ويحملها الهواء الملوث مثل سموم المبيدات الحشرية والسموم الفطرية والملوثات الصناعية كالرصاص والزئبق والنحاس .

ويقول الدكتور نوفل أن هناك تداخلات غذائية تقلل بل تمنع أحيانا من ظهور الخطورة الصحية لهذه السموم وتصبح مكونات الوجبه الغذائية ذات تأثير كبير على مدى سمية مواد التلوث التى تدخل الجسم.

صحيفة الأهرام الدولية ، ٦ سبتمبر ١٩٩١
السنة ١١٦ ، العدد ٣٨٢٥٨ . ص ٥

١ - مخلفات
٢ - الشعارات
٣ - تندد
٤ - للوقاية
٥ - شاق
٦ - بعيد المنال
٧ - معدلات
٨ - التغذية
٩ - الملوّثة
١٠ - المبيدات الحشرية
١١ - الملوثات
١٢ - الزئبق
١٣ - مكونات
١٤ - مدى
١٥ - سمية

Appendix IV: Typical errors (English-Arabic translation).

No.1

1) unprecendently
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged
7) well-meaning
8) locals
9) apologetically
10) secure him
11) stringent requirements
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

No.2

1) unprecendently
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged
7) well-meaning
8) locals
9) apologetically
10) secure him
11) stringent requirements
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

No.3

1) unprecendently
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged
7) well-meaning
8) locals
9) apologetically
10) secure him
11) stringent requirements
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

No.4

1) unprecendently
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged
7) well-meaning
8) locals
9) apologetically
10) secure him
11) stringent requirements
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

No.5

1) unprecendently بشكل جديد
2) weathered قُوِيَ
3) stretch مَدَّ
4) hot-footing بِاستِعجال
5) track him down يَختار
6) trudged مَشَى بِجُهد
7) well-meaning حسن النية
8) locals محليات
9) apologetically وفاءً
10) secure him تأمينه
11) stringent requirements متطلبات صارمة
12) punctiliously logged دقة متناهية
13) pedometer مقياس مسافة السير
14) walkman الماشي
15) British Telecom المؤسسة البريطانية

No.6

1) unprecendently
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged
7) well-meaning
8) locals
9) apologetically
10) secure him
11) stringent requirements
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

No.7

1) unprecendently
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged
7) well-meaning
8) locals
9) apologetically
10) secure him
11) stringent requirements
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

No.8

1) unprecendently
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged
7) well-meaning
8) locals
9) apologetically
10) secure him
11) stringent requirements
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

No.9

1) unprecendentiy
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged
7) well-meaning
8) locals
9) apologetically
10) secure him
11) stringent requirements
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

No.10

1) unprecendently =
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged =
7) well-meaning =
8) locals =
9) apologetically =
10) secure him =
11) stringent requirements =
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer =
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

No.11

1) unprecendently =
2) weathered =
3) stretch =
4) hot-footing =
5) track him down =
6) trudged =
7) well-meaning =
8) locals =
9) apologetically =
10) secure him =
11) stringent requirements =
12) punctiliously logged =
13) pedometer =
14) walkman =
15) British Telecom =

No.12

1) unprecendently
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged
7) well-meaning
8) locals
9) apologetically
10) secure him
11) stringent requirements
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

No.13

1) unprecendently — جديد
2) weathered — معالج
3) stretch — تمدد
4) hot-footing — مستعجل
5) track him down — يتتبع
6) trudged — يمشي بجهد
7) well-meaning — حسن النية
8) locals — محلي
9) apologetically — دفاعي
10) secure him — يؤمنه
11) stringent requirements — شديد
12) punctiliously logged — دقيقة - حريص
13) pedometer — عداد
14) walkman
15) British Telecom — بث بريطاني

No.14

1) unprecendently — ① غير سبق مثيل
2) weathered — ② متأثر من الجو
3) stretch — ③ طول - امتداد
4) hot-footing — ④ تعجيل
5) track him down — ⑤ اقتفاء أثره
6) trudged — ⑥ مجهد - يمشي بتثاقل
7) well-meaning — ⑦ ذوي نية حسنة
8) locals — ⑧ المحليين
9) apologetically — ⑨ باعتذار
10) secure him — ⑩ يأمنه له
11) stringent requirements — ⑪ المتطلبات الضرورية بالشدة
12) punctiliously logged — ⑫ تسجل بدقة
13) pedometer — ⑬ مقياس المشي
14) walkman — ⑭ راديو
15) British Telecom — ⑮ الاتصالات البريطانية

No.15

1) unprecendently — لم يسبق
2) weathered — متعرض للعوامل الجوية
3) stretch — امتداد
4) hot-footing — بسرعة
5) track him down — تتبعه
6) trudged — مشى مجهدا
7) well-meaning — حسن النية
8) locals — سكان المنطقة
9) apologetically — اعتذاري
10) secure him — يأمنه
11) stringent requirements — متطلبات شديدة
12) punctiliously logged — سجل بدقة
13) pedometer — مقياس المشي
14) walkman — الووكمان
15) British Telecom

No.16

1) unprecendently
2) weathered
3) stretch
4) hot-footing
5) track him down
6) trudged
7) well-meaning
8) locals
9) apologetically
10) secure him
11) stringent requirements
12) punctiliously logged
13) pedometer
14) walkman
15) British Telecom

Appendix V: Typical errors (Arabic-English translation).

No.1

١ - مخلفات	left overs
٢ - الشعارات	slogans
٣ - تنتد	criticizing
٤ - للوقاية	prevent it
٥ - شاق	difficult
٦ - بعيد المنال	far sighted
٧ - معدلات	rates
٨ - التغذية	nourishment

٩ - الملوّثة	polluted , ~~unclean~~
١٠ - المبيدات الحشرية	insechicides
١١ - الملوثات	pollutants
١٢ - الزئبق	mercury
١٣ - مكونات	components
١٤ - مدى	degree ~~extract~~
١٥ - سمية	toxication ~~toxin~~

No.2

١ - مخلفات	wastes
٢ - الشعارات	slogans
٣ - تنتد	criticize
٤ - للوقاية	prevention
٥ - شاق	difficulty
٦ - بعيد المنال	hardly attainable
٧ - معدلات	rates
٨ - التغذية	feeding

٩ - الملوّثة	polluted
١٠ - المبيدات الحشرية	insechicide
١١ - الملوثات	pollutants
١٢ - الزئبق	mercury
١٣ - مكونات	structures
١٤ - مدى	extent
١٥ - سمية	poisonous

No.3

١ - مخلفات	heritage
٢ - الشعارات	Slogans
٣ - تنتد	Criticism
٤ - للوقاية	protection
٥ - شاق	troublesome
٦ - بعيد المنال	hardly attainable
٧ - معدلات	averages
٨ - التغذية	alimentation

٩ - الملوّثة	polluted
١٠ - المبيدات الحشرية	insecticide
١١ - الملوثات	~~pollutants~~
١٢ - الزئبق	mercury
١٣ - مكونات	structures
١٤ - مدى	extension
١٥ - سمية	poisonous

No. 4

١ ـ مخلفات	left over
٢ ـ الشعارات	emblem catch words
٣ ـ تندد	disparage
٤ ـ للوقاية	protective covering
٦ ـ شاق	wearsome
٦ ـ بعيد المنال	hard to get ~~had~~ at
٧ ـ معدلات	average
٨ ـ التغذية	feeding
٩ ـ الملوّثة	unclean
١٠ ـ المبيدات الحشرية	insecticide~~dust~~
١١ ـ الملوثات	tarnished
١٢ ـ الزئبق	mercury
١٣ ـ مكونات	Componant
١٤ ـ مدى	Stretch
١٥ ـ سمية	toxicity

No. 5

١ ـ مخلفات	left behind.
٢ ـ الشعارات	emblem
٣ ـ تندد	Criticism
٤ ـ للوقاية	Protection
٥ ـ شاق	troublesome
٦ ـ بعيد المنال	far away offering
٧ ـ معدلات	average
٨ ـ التغذية	feeding
٩ ـ الملوّثة	Polluted
١٠ ـ المبيدات الحشرية	insechicides
١١ ـ الملوثات	blotted
١٢ ـ الزئبق	mercury
١٣ ـ مكونات	Consisting
١٤ ـ مدى	range
١٥ ـ سمية	poison

No. 6

١ ـ مخلفات	heritage
٢ ـ الشعارات	
٣ ـ تندد	defamation
٤ ـ للوقاية	to protect against it
٥ ـ شاق	hard
٦ ـ بعيد المنال	far handing over
٧ ـ معدلات	averages
٨ ـ التغذية	feeding
٩ ـ الملوّثة	~~pollution~~
١٠ ـ المبيدات الحشرية	hasarig insecticides
١١ ـ الملوثات	the poll~~ution~~
١٢ ـ الزئبق	mercury
١٣ ـ مكونات	contains
١٤ ـ مدى	Scope
١٥ ـ سمية	poisonous

No.7

١ ـ مخلفات	heritage
٢ ـ الشعارات	slogans
٣ ـ تندد	criticism
٤ ـ للوقاية	protection
٥ ـ شاق	troublesome
٦ ـ بعيد المنال	hard to get at
٧ ـ معدلات	averages
٨ ـ التغذية	feeding

٩ ـ الملوّثة	
١٠ ـ المبيدات الحشرية	destructive insecticides
١١ ـ الملوثات	polluted
١٢ ـ الزئبق	quicksilver
١٣ ـ مكونات	components
١٤ ـ مدى	expanse
١٥ ـ سمية	

No.8

١ ـ مخلفات	heritage
٢ ـ الشعارات	slogans
٣ ـ تندد	to criticize
٤ ـ للوقاية	to protect
٥ ـ شاق	onerous - difficult
٦ ـ بعيد المنال	hard to get at difficult to reach
٧ ـ معدلات	averages
٨ ـ التغذية	Feedings

٩ ـ الملوّثة	blotted
١٠ ـ المبيدات الحشرية	insecticides
١١ ـ الملوثات	blottes
١٢ ـ الزئبق	mercury
١٣ ـ مكونات	structures
١٤ ـ مدى	long distance
١٥ ـ سمية	poison

No.9

١ ـ مخلفات	
٢ ـ الشعارات	
٣ ـ تندد	
٤ ـ للوقاية	
٥ ـ شاق	
٦ ـ بعيد المنال	
٧ ـ معدلات	
٨ ـ التغذية	

٩ ـ الملوّثة	
١٠ ـ المبيدات الحشرية	
١١ ـ الملوثات	
١٢ ـ الزئبق	
١٣ ـ مكونات	
١٤ ـ مدى	
١٥ ـ سمية	

No.10

١ ـ مخلفات	Leftovers
٢ ـ الشعارات	mottos
٣ ـ تنمر	criticizing ~~criticism~~
٤ ـ للوقاية	protection
٥ ـ شاق	tiresome
٦ ـ بعيد المنال	hardly attainable
٧ ـ معدلات	averages
٨ ـ التغذية	nutrition
٩ ـ الملوثة	polluted
١٠ ـ المبيدات الحشرية	antibiotics
١١ ـ الملوثات	pollutive
١٢ ـ الزئبق	& mercury
١٣ ـ مكونات	structures
١٤ ـ مدى	degree
١٥ ـ سمية	poisonous

No.11

١ ـ مخلفات	wastes
٢ ـ الشعارات	slogans
٣ ـ تنمر	~~oppose~~ / criticize
٤ ـ للوقاية	~~protection~~ prevention
٥ ـ شاق	~~difficult~~ / hard
٦ ـ بعيد المنال	difficult to reach/~~unattainable~~
٧ ـ معدلات	≠ rates
٨ ـ التغذية	nutrition ~~nourishment~~
٩ ـ الملوثة	polluted
١٠ ـ المبيدات الحشرية	insecticides
١١ ـ الملوثات	~~polluting~~ (objects)/ ~~pollutors~~
١٢ ـ الزئبق	mercury
١٣ ـ مكونات	~~consists~~ ≠ components
١٤ ـ مدى	the extent
١٥ ـ سمية	toxic / ~~poisoning~~

No.12

١ ـ مخلفات	leftovers
٢ ـ الشعارات	slogans
٣ ـ تنمر	criticize
٤ ـ للوقاية	protection
٥ ـ شاق	difficult
٦ ـ بعيد المنال	hard to reach
٧ ـ معدلات	rates
٨ ـ التغذية	nutrition
٩ ـ الملوثة	polluted
١٠ ـ المبيدات الحشرية	insecticides
١١ ـ الملوثات	waste
١٢ ـ الزئبق	quicksilver
١٣ ـ مكونات	structures
١٤ ـ مدى	how
١٥ ـ سمية	poisonous

No.13

١ - مخلفات stained

٢ - الشعارات motto

٣ - تتدد show up

٤ - للوقاية to protect

٥ - شاق toilsome

٦ - بعيد المنال hardly attainable

٧ - معدلات averag

٨ - التغذية alimentation

٩ - الملوّثة

١٠ - المبيدات الحشرية poison

١١ - الملوثات

١٢ - الزئبق mercury

١٣ - مكونات creatorej

١٤ - مدى expanse

١٥ - سمية

No.14

- مخلفات lieritage

- الشعارات slogan - password catchword

- تتدد revilement

- للوقاية prevention

- شاق toilsome - troublesome

- بعيد المنال hardly attainable

- معدلات averages

- التغذية feeding - nutrition

٩ - الملوّثة polluted

١٠ - المبيدات الحشرية insecticides

١١ - الملوثات pollution

١٢ - الزئبق quicksilver - Mercury

١٣ - مكونات formations - structures

١٤ - مدى extension

١٥ - سمية poisonans

No.15

١ - مخلفات left over

٢ - الشعارات emblems

٣ - تتدد revile

٤ - للوقاية protection

٥ - شاق toilsome

٦ - بعيد المنال not simple to grasp

٧ - معدلات rates

٨ - التغذية nourishment

٩ - الملوّثة polluted

١٠ - المبيدات الحشرية D.D.T

١١ - الملوثات

١٢ - الزئبق quicksilver

١٣ - مكونات components

١٤ - مدى degree

١٥ - سمية poisoning

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Dictionaries:

Atkins, B.T., (ed.) (1978), Collins-Robert French Dictionary, 1st edition, London and Glasgow: Collins.

Ba'albaki, M., (ed.) (1967-91), Al-Mawrid: A Modern English-Arabic Dictionary, Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lil-Malayeen (25th ed., 1991).

Boch, R., (ed.) (1985), Dizionario Francese-Italiano Italiano-Francese, 2nd edition, Bologna: Zanichelli.

Collin, P.H. et al., (eds.) (1987), A New English Dictionary for Speakers of Arabic, Toronto: Kernerman Publishing Inc.

Cowie, A.P., (ed.) (1989), Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cowie, A.P. et al (eds.) (1975/83) Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crowther, J., (ed.) (1992), Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary: Encyclopaedic Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doniach, N.S., (ed.) (1982), Concise Oxford English-Arabic Dictionary of Current Usage, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dubois, F., (ed.) (1980), Dictionnaire de L'Anglais Contemporain, Paris: Larousse.

Garcia-Pelayo, (ed.) (1976), Dictionario Moderno Español-Ingles, Paris: Larousse.

Hornby, A.S. et al (eds.)(1948-1974), Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, London: Oxford University Press.

Hornby, A.S. with Reif, J.A., (eds.) (1985), Oxford Student's Dictionary for Hebrew Students, Kernerman, Jerusalem.

Hornby, A.S. with Ruse, C.A., (eds.) (1978), Oxford Student's Dictionary of Current English, 1st edition, Oxford: OUP.

Hornby, A.S. and Svenkerud, H., (eds.) (1983), Oxford Engelsk-Norsk Ordbok, Oslo: J.W. Capelens.

Houaiss, A. & Avery, C., (eds.) (1964), The New Appleton Dictionary of the English & Portugese Languages, New York: Appleton Century-Crofts.

Kirkpatrick, E.M., (ed.) (1980), Chamber's Universal Learners' Dictionary, Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers.

Macchi, V., (ed.) (1970), Standard Italian and English Dictionary, Milan: Sansoni.

New Comprehensive Dictionary Spanish-English, English-Spanish, (1966), Madrid: Benedetto, Ubaldo.

Procter, P., (ed.) (1978), Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1st edition, London: Longman.

Williams, E., (ed.) (1962), Spanish and English Dictionary, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sinclair, J., (ed.) (1987), Collins COBUILD English Dictionary, London and Glasgow: Collins.

Skey, M., (ed.) (1977), Dizionario Inglese-Italiano Italiano-Inglese, Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale.

Smith, C., (ed.) (1988), Collins Spanish-English & English-Spanish Dictioary, London and Glasgow: Collins.

Summers, D., (ed.) (1987), Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 2nd edition, Harlow: Longman.

Terrell, P., (ed.) (1980), Collins German-English English-German

Dictionary, London and Glasgow: Collins.

Terrell, P., (ed.) (1991), Collins German-English English-German Dictionary, 2nd edition , London and New York: Harper Collins.

Velazquez de la Cadena, M. A., (d.) (1953), New Pronouncing Dictionary of the Spanish & English Languages, Chicago: Wilcox & Follett.

Wehr, H., (ed.) (1966-85), A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

The Winston Dictionary (1946), College edition, Philadelphia: John C. Winston.

2. **Other references:**

Abboud, P.F., (1971), 'Spoken Arabic', in: Sebeok, T., (ed.) Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol.6, The Hague: Mouton, pp.439-466.

Aisenstadt, E., (1979), 'Collocability restrictions in dictionaries', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), Dictionaries and their Users, Exeter Linguistic Studies, Vol.4, Exeter: Exeter University Press, pp.71-4.

Al-Kasimi, A.M., (1977), Linguistics and Bilingual Dictionaries, Leiden: Brill.

Al-Kasimi, A.M., (1979), Problems of technical terminology in Arabic lexicography', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), Dictionaries and their Users, Exeter Linguistic Studies, Vol.4, Exeter: Exeter University Press, pp.111-118.

Al-Kasimi, A.M., (1983), 'The interlingual/translation dictionary', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), Lexicography: Principles and Practice, London: Academic Press, pp. 153-162.

Ard, J., (1982), 'The use of bilingual dictionaries by ESL students while writing', ITL 58, pp.1-17.

Atkins, B., (1985), 'Monolingual and bilingual learners' dictionaries: a comparison', in: R. Ilson (ed.), Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning, ELT documents 120, Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp.15-24.

Atkins, B.T., and Knowles, F., (1991), 'Interim report on the EURALEX/AILA research project into dictionary use', Paper presented at the Oxford-Waterloo Conference, St. Catherine's College, September 1991, pp.381-392.

Bareggi, C., (1989), 'Gli studenti e il dizionario: un'inchiesta presso gli studenti di inglese del corso di laurea in Lingue e Letterature Straniere Moderne della Facolta di Lettere di Torino' (Students and the dictionary: An inquiry among students of English following a degree course in modern foreign languages at the University of Turin), in: M.T. Prat Zagrebelsky (ed.) Dal Dizionario ai Dizionari, Turin: Tirrenia Stampatori, pp.155-190.

Barnhart, C., (1967), 'Problems in editing commercial monolingual dictionaries', in: F.W. Householder and S. Saporta, (eds.), Problems in Lexicography, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, p.161-181.

Battenburg, J., (1989), 'A study of English monolingual learner's dictionaries and their users', Ph.D., Purdue University.

Baxter, J., (1980), 'The dictionary and vocabulary behavior: a single word or a handful?', TESOL Quarterly, Vol.14, No.3, pp.325-336.

Béjoint, H., (1981), 'The foreign student's use of monolingual English dictionaries: a study of language needs and reference skills', Applied Linguistics, Vol.2, No.3, pp.207-222.

Béjoint, H., and Moulin, A., (1987), 'The place of the dictionary in an EFL programme', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.97-114.

Benson, M., (1985), 'Collocations and idioms', in: R. Ilson (ed.), Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning, ELT documents 120, Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp.61-68.

Bensoussan, M., Sim, D. & Weiss, R., (1981), 'The effect of dictionary usage on test performance compared with student and teacher attitudes and expectations', in: B. Sigurd & J. Svartvik

(eds.), AILA 81 Proceedings 1, Lund: Lund University Press, pp.216-217.

Berkov, V.P., (1990), 'A modern bilingual dictionary - results and prospects', in: T. Magay and J. Zigány (eds.) BudaLEX '88 Proceedings,Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, pp.

Bloomfield, L., (1933), Language, New York: Holt, Rinehart.

Bujas, Z., (1975), 'Testing the performance of a bilingual dictionary on topical current texts', Studia Romanica, 39, pp.193-204.

Bull, W. E., (1964), 'The use of vernacular languages in education', [Review of The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education (Monograph on Fundamental Education, No.8) Paris: UNESCO 1953], in Language in Culture and Society, ed. by Dell Hymes (New York: Harper & Row), pp.527-533.

Carter, R., (1987), Vocabulary: Applied Linguistic Perspectives, Aspects of English, London: Allen & Unwin.

Carter, R. and McCarthy, M., (eds.) (1988), Vocabulary and Language Teaching, London: Longman.

Chomsky, N., (1965), Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Corder, S., (1981), 'The significance of learners' errors', in: J.C.R. Richards (ed.), Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition, London: Longman, pp.19-27.

Cowie, A.P., (1978), 'The place of illustrative material and collocations in the design of a learner's dictionary', in: P. Strevens (ed.), In Honour of A.S. Hornby, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.127-139.

Cowie, A.P., (1979) 'The treatment of polysemy in the design of a learner's dictionary', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.) Dictionaries and their Users, Exeter Linguistic Studies, Vol.4, Exeter: Exeter University Press, pp.82-88.

Cowie, A.P., (1981), 'The treatment of collocations and idioms in

learners' dictionaries', Applied Linguistics, Vol.2, No.3, pp.223-235.

Cowie, A.P., (1983), 'The pedagogical/learner's dictionary: English dictionaries for the foreign learner', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), Lexicography: Principles and Practice, London: Academic Press, pp.135-144.

Cowie, A.P., (1984), 'EFL dictionaries: past achievements and present needs', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.155-164.

Cowie, A.P., (1987), 'Syntax, the dictionary and the learner's communicative needs', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.183-192.

Cowie, A.P., (1989a), 'Language as words: lexicography', in: N.E. Collinge (ed.), An Encyclopaedia of Language, London and New York, pp.671-700.

Cowie, A.P., (1989b), 'Information on syntactic constructions in the general monolingual dictionary', in: F. Hausmann et al (eds.), An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography, pp.588-592.

Cowie, A.P., (1989c), 'Learners' dictionaries - recent advances and developments', in: M. Tickoo (ed.), Learners' Dictionaries: State of the Art, SEAMEO Language Centre, Singapore, pp.42-50.

Creamer, T., (1987), 'Beyond the definition: some problems with examples in recent Chinese-English and English-Chinese bilingual dictionaries', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.238-245.

Crystal, D., (1986), 'The ideal dictionary, lexicographer, and user', in: R. Ilson (ed.), Lexicography: An Emerging International Profession, Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.72-81.

Delbridge, A., (1987), 'Cultural, situational and modal labels in dictionaries of English', in: R. Steele and T. Threadgold (eds.), Language Topics: Essays in Honour of Michael Halliday, Vol.2, John Benjamin Publishing Co., pp.65-69.

Diab, T., (1989), 'The role of dictionaries in E.S.P., with special reference to student nurses at the University of Jordan', Ph.D., University of Exeter.

Drysdale, P.D., (1987), 'The role of examples in a learner's dictionary', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.213-223.

El-Badry, N., (1986), 'The development of the bilingual English-Arabic dictionary from the middle of the nineteenth century to the present', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), The History of Lexicography, Exeter: Exeter University Press.

Ferguson, C., (1959), 'Diglossia', Word, 15, pp.325-340.

Ferguson, C., (1972), 'Diglossia', in: A. Cashdan et al (eds.), Language in Education: A Source Book, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp.38-45.

Folomkina, S.K., (1986), 'Some linguistic and pedagogical aspects of the foreign learner's dictionary', in: M.G. Murphy (ed.), Proceedings of the 4th Joint Anglo-Soviet Seminar on English Studies, London: British Council.

Fries, C., (1958), 'Preparation of teaching materials, practical grammars, and dictionaries, especially for foreign languages', in: E. Sivertsen (ed.), Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists, Oslo: Oslo University Press, pp.738-751.

Gimson, A.C., (1973), 'Phonology and the lexicographer', in: R. McDavid and A. Duckert (eds.), Lexicography in English, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol.211, pp.115-121.

Gimson, A.C., (1978), 'Towards an international pronunciation of English', in: P. Strevens (ed.), In Honour of A.S. Hornby, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.45-53.

Gimson, A.C., (1981), 'Pronunciation in EFL dictionaries', Applied Linguistics, Vol.2, No.3, pp.250-262.

Gimson, A.C., and Ramsaran, S.M., (1985), An English Pronunciation Companion, Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Gleason, H., (1962), 'The relation of lexicon and grammar', in: F.W. Householder and S. Saporta (eds.), Problems in Lexicography, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp.85-102.

Greenbaum, S., Meyer, C., and Taylor, J.,(1984), 'The image of the dictionary for American college students', Dictionaries, (Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America),No.6, pp.31-52.

Haas, M.R., (1962), 'What belongs in the bilingual dictionary?', in: F.W. Householder and S. Saporta (eds.), Problems in Lexicography, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, pp. 45-50.

Harrell, R.S., (1962) 'Some notes on bilingual lexicography', in: F.W. Householder and S. Saporta (eds.), Problems in Lexicography, Bloomington,Indiana: Indiana University Press, pp. 51-61.

Harris, D., (1969), Testing English as a Second Language, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Hartmann, R.R.K., (1981), 'Style values: linguistic approaches and lexicographical practice', Applied Linguistics, Vol.2, No.3, pp.263-273.

Hartmann, R.R.K., (1983), 'The bilingual learner's dictionary and its uses', Multilingua, Vol.2, No.4, pp. 195-201.

Hartmann, R.R.K., (1986), 'The training and professional development of lexicographers in the UK', in: R. Ilson (ed.), Lexicography: An Emerging International Profession, Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.89-92.

Hartmann, R.R.K., (1987), 'Four perspectives on dictionary use: a critical review of research methods', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 11-28.

Hartmann, R.R.K., (1989a), 'The dictionary as an aid to foreign-language teaching', in: F. Hausmann et al (eds.), An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography, pp. 181-189.

Hartmann, R.R.K., (1989b), 'Sociology of the dictionary user:

hypotheses and empirical studies', in: F. Hausmann et al (eds.), An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography, pp.102-110.

Hatherall, G., (1984), 'Studying dictionary use: some findings and proposals', in R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 183-189.

Herbst, T., and Stein, G., (1987), 'Dictionary using skills: a plea for a new orientation in language teaching', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 115-127.

Householder, F.W., and Saporta, S., (1962), Problems in Lexicography, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Howatt, A.P.R., (1984), A History of English Language Teaching, Oxford University Press.

Huang, G.F., (1985), 'The productive use of EFL dictionaries', RELC Journal, Vol.16, No.2, pp.54-71.

Iannucci, J., (1959), 'Explanatory matter in bilingual dictionaries', Babel, vol.5, pp.195-199.

Iannucci, J., (1962), 'Meaning discriminaion in bilingual dictionaries', in F.W. Householder and S. Saporta (eds.) Problems in Lexicography, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp.201-216.

Iannucci, J., (1985), 'Sense discrimination and translation complements in bilingual dictionaries', Dictionaries (Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America), 7, pp.59-65.

Ilson, R., (1984), 'The communicative significance of some lexicographic conventions', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.80-86.

Ilson, R., (1985), 'Introduction', in: R. Ilson, (ed.), Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning, ELT documents 120, London: Pergamon Press, pp.1-6.

Ilson, R., (1987), 'Illustration in dictionaries', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen:

Niemeyer, pp.193-212.

Iqbal, Z., (1987), 'Aspects of the learner's dictionary with special reference to advanced Pakistani learners of English', Ph.D., University of Aston in Birmingham.

Jain, M.P., (1981), 'On meaning in the foreign learner's dictionary', Applied Linguistics, Vol.2, No.3, pp.274-286.

Kachru, Y., (1987), 'Toward a bilingual dictionary of idioms: Hindi-English', in: R. Steele and T. Threadgold (eds.), Language Topics: Essays in Honour of Michael Halliday, Vol.1, John Benjamin Publishing Co., pp.367-378.

Kharma, N., (1984), 'Contextualization and the bilingual learner's dictionary', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kharma, N. and Hajjaj, A., (1989), Errors in English among Arabic Speakers: Analysis and Remedy, London: Longman.

Kipfer, B., (1984a), 'Methods of ordering senses within entries', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.101-108.

Kipfer, B., (1984b), Workbook on Lexicography: A Course for Dictionary Users, Exeter Linguistic Studies, Vol.8, Exeter: Exeter University Press.

Kipfer, B., (1987), 'Dictionaries and the intermediate student: communicative needs and the development of user reference skills', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, p.44-54.

Kirkpatrick, E.M., (1981), Chambers Universal Learners' Workbook, Edinburgh: Chambers.

Kirkpatrick, B., (1985), 'A lexicographical dilemma: monolingual dictionaries for the native speaker and for the learner', in: R. Ilson (ed.), Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning, ELT documents, Oxford: Pergamon press, pp. 7-13.

Kromann, H., et al., (1984), ' "Active" and "passive" bilingual

dictionaries: the Ščerba concept reconsidered', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.207-215.

Lado, R., (1957), Linguistics Across Cultures, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Landau, S., (1984), Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography, New York: Scribners.

Lewis, W., (1978), 'New directions in pronunciation transcriptions', in: P. Strevens (ed.), In Honour of A.S. Hornby, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.183-189.

MacFarquhar, P.D., & Richards, J.C., (1983), 'On dictionaries and definitions', RELC Journal, Vol.14, No.1, pp.111-124.

Magay, T., (1979), 'Problems of indicating pronunciation in bilingual dictionaries with English as the source language', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), Dictionaries and their Users, Exeter Linguistic Studies, Vol.4, Exeter: Exeter University Press, pp.98-103.

Maingay, S., and Rundell, M., (1987), 'Anticipating learners' errors - implications for dictionary writers', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.128-135.

Marckwardt, A.H., (1973), 'The dictionary as an English teaching resource', TESOL Quarterly, Vol.7, No.4, pp.369-379.

Marello, C., (1987), 'Examples in contemporary Italian bilingual dictionaries', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.224-237.

Martin, S., (1962), 'Selection and presentation of ready equivalents in a translation dictionary', in: F.W. Householder and S. Saporta (eds.), Problems in Lexicography, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp.153-159.

Marton, W., (1977), 'Foreign language vocabulary learning as problem number one of language teaching at the advanced level', The Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, Vol.2, No.1, pp.33-57.

McCarthy, M., (1990), Vocabulary, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meara, P.M., (1980), 'Vocabulary acquisition: a neglected aspect of language learning', Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts, Vol.13, No.4, pp.221-246.

Moulin, A., (1979), 'Dictionaries - general, technical, specialist, etc. - and how they often leave (foreign) advanced learners in the lurch', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), Dictionaries and their Users, Exeter Linguistic Studies, Vol.4, Exeter: Exeter University Press, pp.76-81.

Nation, P., and Coady, J., (1988), 'Vocabulary and reading', in: R. Carter and M. McCarthy (eds.), Vocabulary and Language Teaching, London: Longman, pp.97-108.

Nattinger, J., (1988), 'Some current trends in vocabulary teaching', in: R. Carter and M. McCarthy (eds.), Vocabulary and Language Teaching, London: Longman, pp.62-82.

Nguyen, D., (1980), 'Bicultural information in a bilingual dictionary', in: L. Zgusta (ed.) Theory and Method in Lexicography: Western and Nonwestern Perspectives, Columbia, S.C.: Hornbeam Press, pp.57-68.

Nguyen, D., (1981), 'Teaching culture through bilingual dictionaries', Dictionaries, (Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America), 3, pp.57-68.

Nuccorini, S., (1992), 'Monitoring dictionary use', in: H. Tommola et al (eds.) Euralex '92 Proceedings, Tampere: Tampereen Yliopisto, pp.89-102.

Nuttall, C., (1982), Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language, Oxford: Heinemann.

Ogasawara, L., (1984), 'Problems in improving Japanese-English learners' dictionaries', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.253-257.

Opitz, K., (1979), 'Technical dictionaries: testing the requirements of the professional user', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), Dictionaries and their Users, Exeter Linguistic Studies, Vol.4, Exeter: Exeter Uiversity Press, pp.89-95.

Osselton, N., (1979), 'Some problems of obsolescence in bilingual dictionaries', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), Dictionaries and their Users, Exeter Linguistic Studies, Vol.4, Exeter: Exeter University Press, 120-126.

Piotrowski, T., (1989), 'Monolingual and bilingual dictionaries: fundamental differences', in: M. Tickoo (ed.), Learners' Dictionaries: State of the Art, SEAMEO Language Centre, Singapore, p.72-83.

Quirk, R., (1973), 'The social impact of dictionaries in the U.K.', in: R.I. McDavid and A.R. Duckert (eds.) Lexicography in English, pp.76-88.

Quirk, R., (1987), 'Preface', LDOCE, F7.

Reif, J.C., (1987), 'The development of a dictionary concept: an English learner's dictionary and an exotic alphabet', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.146-150.

Richards, J.C. (1976), 'The role of vocabulary teaching', TESOL Quarterly, Vol.10, No.1, pp.77-89.

Rivers, W., and Temperley, M., (1978), A Practial Guide to the Teaching of English, New York: Oxford Universiy Press.

Rossner, R., (1985), 'The learner as lexicographer: using dictionaries in second language learning', in: R. Ilson (ed.), Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning, ELT documents 120, Oxford: Pergamon Press, 95-102.

Ščerba, L.V., (1940), 'Opy obscej teorii leksikografii', Lekskograficeskij sbornik, 3, pp.89-117.

Scholfield, P.J., (1982), 'Using the English dictionary for comprehension', TESOL Quarterly, Vol.16, No.2, pp.185-194.

Sciarone, A., (1984), 'The organization of the bilingual dictionary', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.413-419.

Snell-Hornby, M., (1984), 'The bilingual dictionary - help or

hindrance?', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, pp.274-281.

Snell-Hornby, M., (1986), 'The bilingual dictionary - victim of its own tradition?', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), The History of Lexicography, Exeter: Exeter University Press, pp.207-218.

Snell-Hornby, M., (1987), 'Towards a learner's bilingual dictionary', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.159-170.

Sokeimi (1989), 'How to use your dictionary', in: M. Tickoo (ed.),Learners' Dictionaries: State of the Art, SEAMEO Language Centre, Singapore, pp.204-212.

Stark, M., (1990), Dictionary Workbooks: A Critical Evaluation of Dictionary Workbooks for the Foreign Language Learner, Exeter Linguistic Studies, vol.16, Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Stein, G., (1979), 'The best of British and American lexicography', Dictionaries (Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America), 1, pp.1-23.

Stein, G., (1984), 'Towards a theory of lexicography: Principles and/vs practice in modern English', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (d.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.124-130.

Stein, G., (1985), 'Word formation in modern English dictionaries', in: R. Ilson (ed.), Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning, ELT documents 120, Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp.35-44.

Stein, G., (1990), 'From the bilingual to the monolingual dictionary', in: T. Magay and J. Zigány (eds.) BudaLEX '88 Proceedings, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, pp.401-407.

Steiner R.J., (1984), 'Guidelines for reviewers of bilingual dictionaries', Dictionaries (Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America), 6, pp. 16-181.

Steiner R.J., (1986), 'How many languages should a "bilingual" dictionary offer', Lexicographica, 2, pp.85-92.

Stirling, W., (1964), 'Observations on the transliteration of Arabic names into the Roman alphabet', in: D. Abercrombie et al (eds.), In Honour of Daniel Jones, London: Longman, pp.437-444.

Summers, D., (1988), 'The role of dictionaries in language learning', in: R. Carter and M. McCarthy (eds.), Vocabulary and Language Teaching, London: Longman, pp.111-125.

Swanson, D., (1962), 'The selection of entries for a bilingual dictionary', in: F.W. Householder and S. Saporta (eds.), Problems in Lexicography, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, p.63-77.

Tickoo, M., (1989), 'Which dictionary and why? Exploring some options', in: M. Tickoo (ed.), Learners' Dictionaries: State of the Art, SEAMEO Language Centre, Singapore, pp.184-203.

Tomaszczyk, J., (1979), 'Dictionaries: users and uses', Glottodidactica, Vol.12, pp.103-119.

Tomaszczyk, J., (1981), 'Issues and developments in bilingual pedagogical lexicography', Applied Linguistics, Vol.2, No.3, pp.287-296.

Tomaszczyk, J., (1983), 'The case for bilingual dictionaries for foreign language learners', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), Lexicography: Principles and Practice, London: Academic Press, pp.41-51.

Tomaszczyk, J., (1984), 'The culture-bound element in bilingual dictionaries', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.289-297.

Tomaszczyk, J., (1987), 'FL learners' communication failure: implicatons for pedagogical lexicography', in: A.P. Cowie (ed.), The Dictionary and the Language Learner, Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp.136-145.

Tono, Y., (1984), 'On the dictionary user's reference skills', Bachelor of Education, Tokyo Gakugei University.

Tono, Y., (1987), 'Which word do you look up? A study of dictionary reference skills', Master of Education, Tokyo Gakugei University.

Underhill, A., (1980), Use Your Dictionary, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Underhill, A., (1985), 'Working with the monolingual learner's dictionary', in: R. Ilson (ed.), Dictionaries, Lexicography, and Language Learning, ELT documents 120, Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp.103-114.

Van Ek, J.A., (1977), The Threshold Level for Modern Language Learning in Schools, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, London: Longman.

Wesseloh, J., (1981), 'Standardisation principles for the translation of names of authorities, organisations and institutions', in: B. Sigurd and J. Svartvik (eds.), AILA 81 Proceedings, Lund: Lund University Press, pp.320-321.

Wells, J., (1985), 'English pronunciation and its dictionary presentation', in: R. Ilson (ed.), Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning, ELT documents 120, Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp.45-51.

Whitcut, J., (1979), Learning with LDOCE, London: Longman.

Whitcut, J., (1985), 'Usage notes in dictionaries: the needs of the learner and the native speaker', in: R. Ilson (ed.), Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning, ELT documents 120, Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp.75-80.

Whitcut, J., (1986), 'The training of dictionary users', in: R. Ilson (ed.), Lexicography. An Emerging International Profession, Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.111-122.

Widdowson, H., (1978), Teaching Language as Communication, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiegand, H., (1984), 'On the structure of a general theory of lexicography', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, Exeter: Exeter University Press, pp.13-28.

Wilkins, D., (1972), Linguistics in Language Teaching, London: Billing & Sons Ltd.

Wilkins, D., (1976), Notional Syllabuses, London: Oxford University Press.

Winter, C., (1992), 'Bilingual dictionaries: between language and speech', in: P.J.L. Armand and H. Béjoint (eds.), Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics, London: Macmillan, pp.41-51.

Yorkey, R., (1974), 'Which desk dictionary is best?', English Teaching Forum, Vol.12, No.4, pp.16-33.

Zgusta, L., (1971), Manual of Lexicography, The Hague: Mouton.

Zgusta, L., (1984), 'Translation equivalence and the bilingual dictionary', in: R.R.K. Hartmann (ed.), LEXeter '83 Proceedings, pp.147-154.