

FREQUENCY AND COLLOCATION OF THE VERBS *REFUSE* AND *REJECT*

Diah Dwi Pratiwi

Universitas Sanata Dharma, Indonesia

correspondence: diahdwipratiwi@gmail.com

DOI: 10.24071/llt.v1i2.3020

received 7 November 2020; accepted 12 December 2020

Abstract

This research aims to study the occurrences frequencies and the collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. By looking at the collocations, it could be seen the context of the verbs occurrences. The objectives of this study are 1) to find out the frequencies of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* in *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA) and 2) to find out the collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. The study was quantitative research and qualitative research. It used corpus study. The data were from COCA 2011 – 2012. The study used the purposive sampling method. The findings of this study showed that the frequency of the verb *refuse* was higher than the verb *reject*. The percentage of *refuse*'s frequency was 57.59%, while the percentage of *reject*'s frequency was 42.41%. The collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* were various. The collocations of the verb *refuse* were nouns, pronouns, and to infinitive forms. The collocations of the verb *reject* were nouns and pronouns. The verbs *refuse* and *reject* shared three similar collocations. They were *money*, *treatment*, *him*, and *her*, which represented a lover or someone who loved. Moreover, this study could support English learning and teaching. English Language Education Study Program students who were teacher candidates would aware of the use of synonymous verbs *refuse* and *reject*. They should clarify that those verbs could not be interchanged to another word.

Keywords: frequency, corpus, token, collocation, *refuse*, *reject*

Introduction

Sometimes it is uncomfortable not to accept someone's request, offer, or invitation. It is because actually he/ she has a good intention and he/ she maybe is someone who has a higher authority than us to be not accepted. In daily conversations, it is found that people can say anything to show that they do not want to do or accept something. In English, there are synonymous verbs which show refusal. Based on *Oxford Thesaurus of English*, the verbs *refuse*, *decline*, *reject*, and *spurn* share the similar meanings. According to *Dictionary of Synonyms and Antonyms*, another synonym of those verbs is *deny*. Although those verbs have identical meanings, they are not used in the similar contexts or situations. Besides, based on Shea (n.d.), sometimes, the use of the synonyms *deny*, *decline*, *refuse*, and *reject* is confusing. He assumes that people can look at the opposite of each verb to distinguish the synonyms. Following, the verbs *refuse* and *reject* are the most similar among the other synonyms. Shea (n.d) adds that the opposite of both verbs is *accept*. He utters

that people have different understanding of use the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. People are confused to decide which verb should be used to communicate.

By looking at lexical semantics and etymology, the meanings of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* will be comprehended. Lexical semantics and etymology will show and explain the differences of both verbs. According to *Oxford Thesaurus of English*, *refuse* and *reject* give the basic meaning to say „no“ to something. *Refuse* is the most neutral word for simply saying „no“ to a request, suggestion, or offer (“Refuse”). *Reject* suggests that what is on offer is felt to be not good enough (“Reject”). Based on *Dictionary of Synonyms and Antonyms*, the synonyms of *reject* are *refuse*, *turn down*, *discard*, *exclude*, and *deny* (“Reject”). Besides, *Online Etymology Dictionary* shows that the verb *refuse* means *reject*, *disregard*, and *avoid* (“Refuse”). The verb *reject* means *to throw*, which indicates not to accept (“Reject”). Based on the lexical semantics and the etymologies, the verbs *refuse* and *reject* can be used in similar and different situations, contexts, and fields. According to Biber, *et al.* (2002), “synonymous words are typically used in very different ways” (p.43). As well, in the similar contexts, those two synonymous words, *refuse* and *reject*, have a meaning, which is not to accept something.

Semantics theory is employed to understand the differences of the use of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. Semantics, that gives explanation about the meaning of language, will show the meaning of *reject* and *refuse* in some contexts in which they occur. According to Finegan (2004), semantics is studied by looking at the language structure meaning especially in words and sentences. From sentences which the verbs *refuse* and *reject* are used, the meaning of the verbs can be studied. In sentences, the verbs will collocate with another word. Based on Nesselhauf (2005), collocates are the words that commonly co-occur with a target word. The words can be in the front or following the target word. Biber, *et al.* (2002) say that “there is strong tendency for each collocate of a word to be associated with a single sense of meaning” (pp.35-36). Palmer (2001) states that “collocation is a part of the meaning of a word” (p.76). He adds that the collocation can determine the meaning of the words. The context of situation contains the meaning, which also can be found in all other levels of analysis.

This study focuses on the verbs *refuse* and *reject* comprehensively. According to Kayaoğlu (2013), the verbs *refuse* and *reject* are listed as close synonyms besides *deny*, *decline*, and *rebuff*. Kayaoğlu (2013) uses the verbs *refuse* and *reject*, which are close synonymous verbs, in a vocabulary test. Moreover, Liu (2011) assumes that people are more aware of the importance of synonymous words, especially in writing. Liu (2011) adds that most synonyms are not exactly substituted to each other based on the collocations. He uses a test which questions the collocations of the synonymous verbs *refuse* and *reject* to determine learners’ proficiency level in using English. The test consists of 20 questions. The test result shows that lower and higher learners are still confused about the use of *refuse* and *reject*.

Besides, it is found that there are some errors in conveying utterances by English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) students. For instance, the student says *refuse ideas*. It is supposed to use the verb *reject* to substitute *refus* in that context. It is because basically, *reject* is used to say that someone does not support *ideas* (“Reject”). In addition, the verbs *refuse* and *reject* are recommended to be investigated using corpus by University of Essex (“Corpus”, 2005). It is interesting to study the

verbs *refuse* and *reject* because both verbs are challenging for English learners, especially beginners; both verbs are used in English competence tests frequently; and both verbs are recommended to be investigated by linguists.

A corpus is used as the data to discover the use of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* in the real life. A corpus which is the collection of written and spoken language that is stored in computers, can be used to present all the contexts in which a word occurs (Biber, *et al.*, 2002). In the corpus, it will be seen the tokens of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. From the tokens, the collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* will be identified. The tokens show the context in which the verbs appear.

The source of the corpus needed will be obtained from *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA). COCA consists of written and spoken language from 1990 to 2012 (Davies, 2009). It is chosen as the data because it contains American English. To comprehend the recent use of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*, the study will use tokens from 2011 to 2012 because the latest tokens in COCA come from those years. It can be seen the use of *refuse* and *reject* in some registers.

This study is useful for English learners and teachers. By studying the synonymous verbs *refuse* and *reject*, ELESP students of Sanata Dharma University will have better understanding of those verbs. The findings from the tokens of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* can deepen the knowledge of lexical meaning. According to Liu (2011), higher and lower learners' understanding of syntactic and lexical collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* are the same. It means that learners in general do not have a good knowledge of the collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* (Liu, 2011).

A corpus shows the collocations which are used to recognize the meaning of the verbs in certain contexts (Hunston, 2002). Thus, the students can put *refuse* and *reject* in the correct context when they use them in producing sentences. As teacher candidates, ELESP students must be aware and emphasize the collocation patterns of synonymous verbs *refuse* and *reject* (Liu, 2011). Teachers introduce a corpus to students as the examples of the use of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. The understanding of synonyms omits incorrect ideas in teaching and learning English.

Moreover, the collocations can develop English fluency. ELESP students are demanded to be fluent in using English. Collocations help language learners to develop fluency (Shin & Nation, 2008). Pawley and Syder suggest that learners need a similar number for native-like fluency (as cited in Shin, 2006). Shin (2006) states that native-like collocations help learners to speak and write seem native-like. By learning collocations, ELESP students are able to remember the lexical patterns because of the frequent use by native speakers. It is effective to improve language fluency and native-like selection in using language (Shin & Nation,

2008). Besides, ELESP students who are prepared to be teachers can operate corpus software which supports teaching and learning English. For instance, by this study, they will be interested to use COCA to see the examples of English use. The corpus-based evidence gives the instances of the use of English as the second language for learning and teaching (Biber, *et al.*, 2002). There are some terms that are mentioned in this study. The researcher gives the definition of the terms to avoid misunderstanding of the topic discussed.

Collocation

Krishnamurthy (2006) defines “*collocation* as the fact that certain lexical items tend to co-occur more frequently in natural language use than syntax and semantics alone would dictate” (“Collocations”). According to Matthew (2007), “*collocation* is a relation within a syntactic unit between individual lexical elements” (p.81). In this study, *collocation* means a word that often be used together and co-occur with the certain word which seems correct and acceptable to people.

Corpus

Corpus (plural *corpora* or *corpuses*) is a large principled collection of natural texts (Schmitt, 2002). Similarly, according to Kennedy (1998), corpus is a body of written text or transcribed speech which can serve as a basis for linguistic analysis and description. In this study, corpus refers to a collection of natural text to be the empirical data for semantics analysis.

COCA

COCA stands for *Corpus of Contemporary American English*. Based on Davies (n.d.), COCA is the largest freely-available corpus of English. It is the only balanced corpus of American English. COCA contains corpora from 1990 – 2012. To know the recent use of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*, the corpora used in this study are taken from 2011 to 2012.

Token

According to McEnery and Hardie (2012), “a token is any instance of particular wordform in a text” (p.50). Similarly, based on Tang (n.d.), token is “the individual forms (words) of a corpus.” In this study, token is any instance of the words *refuse* and *reject* in COCA.

Literature Review

Word Classes

Verb

Verb is a word class which contains words referring to actions (Davies & Elder, 2006). According to Davies and Elder (2006), in English, verbs are used for tense marking. Consider these sentences: (1) John *eats* three apples; (2) Jean *walked* home. Those sentences have the endings, *-s* and *-ed* in the verbs *eat* and *walk*. The endings after the verbs are named *inflections* (Aarts, 1997). Inflections express grammatical properties. According to Aarts (1997), there are two forms of verb: *finite verb*, a verb which takes tense; and *nonfinite verb*, a verb which does not take tense. Based on Davies and Elder (2006), there are three types of verb: intransitive, transitive and ditransitive. Intransitive is a verb which only takes one argument. According to Carstairs-McCarthy (2002), intransitive verbs are verbs which lack such an object. The second type of verb is transitive. Transitive is a verb which takes two arguments (Davies & Elder, 2006).

Bloor and Bloor (2004) say that a verb has many forms. For example, the verb *take* has forms: *takes*, *took*, *am taking*, *are taking*, *is taking*, *was taking*, *were taking*, *has taken*, *has been taken*, *have been taken*, *had been taken*, *will take*, *may take*, and so on.

Noun

Aarts (1997) says that nouns are words that represent people, animals, things, or places. Nouns identify *Peter, bird, car, student, New York*, etc. The description given by nouns is called a *notional definition*, because it presents a characterization, in term of concept of meaning (Aarts, 1997). Based on Bloor and Bloor (2004), there are three subdivisions of noun: pronoun, proper noun, and common noun. There are three subclasses of pronouns: personal pronouns, possessive pronouns, and the so-called wh-pronouns.

There is also *Noun Phrase*. According to Azar and Hagen (2009), a noun phrase can be used as a subject or an object. Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan (1999) state that “a noun phrase consists of a noun as a head, either alone or accompanied by determiners (which specify the reference of the noun) and modifiers (which describe or classify the entity denoted by the head noun)” (p.122). The examples of noun phrase are *a house, his bristly short hair, the little girl next door*. Moreover, the head of a noun phrase can be followed by complements, which is *that*-clauses or infinitive clauses (Biber, *et al.*, 1999). The meaning of the noun is completed by complements.

Adjective

Based on Bloor and Bloor (2004), the first function of adjective is to modify nouns, for example, *a pretty boy*. The other function of adjective is to be a head of a group that is the complement of a copular verb (be, seem, become), for example: *the shop is big*. Aarts (1997) states there are some adjectives (adj) that can change (improve) nouns, for examples in: *the red shoes, a patient girl*. The adjectives give more description about the nouns. Adjectives can be formed by adding suffixes *-ful, -less, and -ive* and prefix *-un* in some words (nouns, verbs) (Aarts, 1997).

Adverb

Many adverbs are identified from the form which has been related to another form. According to Bloor and Bloor (2004), numerous adverbs are formed from adjectives by adding the morphological feature *-ly*, for examples, *bravely* (the adjective *brave* + *-ly*) and *suddenly* (the adjective *sudden* + *-ly*). Aarts (1997) adds that there are other morphological features of adverb endings: *-ward* (*afterward*), *-wise* (*clockwise*), *-ways* (*sideways*). Besides, there are many common words which are adverbs, such as *soon, away, tomorrow, next*. Based on Aarts (1997), there are seven adverb subclasses. The first one is adverb of manner which indicates how (e.g. *quickly, beautifully, slowly*). The second subclass is adverb of time. It indicates when (e.g. *now, tomorrow, then*). The third one is adverb of place which indicates where (e.g. *here, there*). The forth subclass is adverb of frequency (e.g. *seldom, often, always*). The fifth one is adverb of directional (e.g. *upwards, sideways, forwards*). The sixth subclass is adverb of degree (e.g. *extremely, more*). The last subclass is adverb of sentence (e.g. *however, perhaps*).

Preposition

Prepositions precede a noun phrase (Finegan, 2004), as in *at the ballroom, on Friday, under the sky*. Finegan (2004) adds that prepositions show a semantic relationship between other units.

Determiner

Determiners specify more exactly the meaning of the nouns they precede (Aarts, 1997). According to Finegan (2004), determiners have some subclasses. The first subclass is definite and indefinite articles (*the, a, an*). The second one is demonstrative (e.g. *this, those*), the third subclass is possessive (e.g. *my, your, his*). The fourth one is interrogative (e.g. *which, what, whose*). The examples of the use of determiners: *the doll, an apple, those knives*. Determiners precede noun phrase such as *my long hair, which big box, these red apples*.

Conjunction

Aarts (1997) says that conjunctions have a linking function. Conjunctions connect words in a sentence and/ or sentences. There are two types of conjunctions. The first one is linking or coordinating conjunctions or coordinators, such as *and, but, or, for, so, then* (Bloor & Bloor, 2004). Co-ordinators join expressions which have the same category, for example, *look and feel, bread or cake*. The second conjunction is binding or subordinating conjunctions or subordinators, such as *that, whenever, while, because*. Subordinators link clauses to another, as in *She said that she would come, He felt regretful while he met her*. In this study, the verbs *refuse* and *reject* are taken to be examined.

Meaning Aspects

Semantics is the study of languages structure meaning in words and sentences (Finegan, 2004). Based on Leech (1981), there are seven types of meaning. The first type is conceptual/ denotative/ cognitive meaning. Leech (1981) says that the meaning is the main factor in linguistic communication. It can be seen to be integral to the essential functioning of language, in a way that other types of meaning are not. Lyons (1996) adds that denotative meaning/ referential is what the meaning refers to (or denotes), or stands for. The examples of it are *cat* means either the general class of cats or the basic property which they all share.

Referential meaning is stated as one of linguistic meanings besides social meaning and affective meaning (Finegan, 2004). Finegan (2004) says that "referential meaning of *Scott's dog* refers to particular domesticated canine belonging to Scott" (p.182). Finegan (2004) adds that "the particular animal can be said to be the referential meaning of the linguistic expression *Scott's dog*" (p.182). The second type is connotative meaning. It is the communicative value that an expression has by virtue of what it *refers to*, over and above its purely conceptual content (Leech, 1981). The notion „reference“ overlaps with conceptual meaning. The third one is social meaning. It deals with the situation in which an utterance occurs (Leech, 1981). Social meaning is that the language expresses about social circumstances of its use. The fourth type is affective meaning. Based on Leech (1981), that meaning is often explicitly conveyed through the conceptual or connotative content of the words used. The fifth type is reflected meaning. It is the meaning which arises in cases of multiple conceptual meaning, when one sense of a word forms part of our response to another sense

(Leech, 1981). The sixth one is collocative meaning. Leech (1981) says that it consists of the associations a word acquires on account of the meanings of words which tend to occur in its environment. The seventh type is thematic meaning is a

communication when the speaker or writer organizes the message, in terms of ordering, focus, and emphasis (Leech, 1981).

In this study, the researcher is going to use the theory of denotative meaning and collocative meaning to answer the research questions. O'Grady, Archibald, Aronoff, & Rees-Miller (2010) state that semantics approach attempts to equate the meaning of a word or a phrase with the entities to which it refers – its denotation or referents. Denotative meaning or referents explains the meanings and the definitions of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. Moreover, collocative meaning helps in the analysis of the verbs when they collocate with other words.

The Etymologies of Refuse and Reject

Online Etymology Dictionary shares the definitions of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. Both verbs come from 1200 – 1500 AD. Based on Old French, the word *refuse* is from the word *refuser* which means reject, disregard, avoid. The verb *refuse* also comes from Vulgar Latin, *refusare* which is formed from the past participle stem of Latin, *refundere*. *Refundere* itself means pour back, give back. According to Old French, *reject* is from the word *rejecer*. In Latin, *reject* comes from the word *reiectus* that means „throw away, cast away, vomit“. From the origin words, *refuse* and *reject* indicate similar meanings, not to accept something.

The Definitions of Refuse and Reject

In this study, the definitions of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* are given by two dictionaries. The first dictionary is *Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online Version* and the second one is *Macquarie Dictionary* also online version. Each dictionary shares some definitions of each verb.

Based on *Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online Version*, the word *refuse* has two functions, as a noun (which is pronounced /'ref.ju:s/) and a verb (which is pronounced /rɪ'fju:z/). The verb *refuse* has two categories of definition. It is as a transitive verb and an intransitive verb. The transitive verb of *refuse* carries four meanings. The first one is “to express oneself as unwilling accept, e.g. *refuse a gift, refuse a promotion*” (“Refuse”). The second definition is “to show or express unwillingness to do or comply with or deny, for example *refused to answer the question, they refused admittance to the game*” (“Refuse”). The third definition is “give up, renounce (obsolete), as in *deny thy father and refuse thy name – Shakespeare*” (“Refuse”). The fourth definition is “to decline to jump or leap over (of a horse)” (“Refuse”). The intransitive verb *refuse* means “to withhold acceptance, compliance, or permission” (“Refuse”).

Based on *Merriam-Webster Dictionary Online Version*, the word *reject* has two functions, as a noun (which is pronounced /'ri:.dʒekt/) and a verb (which is pronounced /rɪ'dʒekt/). The dictionary gives seven definitions of the transitive verb *reject*. The first definition is “to refuse to accept, consider, submit, take for some purpose, or use, for example *rejected the suggestion, reject a manuscript*”

(“Reject”). The second definition is “to refuse to hear, receive, or admit (rebuff, repel) as in *parents who reject their children*” (“Reject”). The third definition is “to refuse as lover or spouse” (“Reject”). The fourth definition is “to cast off (obsolete)” (“Reject”). The fifth definition is “throw back, repulse” (“Reject”).

Next, the sixth definition of *reject* is “to spew out (“Reject”).” The seventh definition is “to subject to immunological rejection” (“Reject”). Besides, there is another

dictionary used to obtain the definitions of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. According to *Macquarie Dictionary*, the verbs *refuse* and *reject* share seven definitions of each verb.

Macquarie Dictionary is considered as the standard reference of Australian English (Macquarie Dictionary, n.d.). It is first published in 1981 and has been online since 2003. *The Macquarie Dictionary and Thesaurus Online* gives annual updates of new words and references of thesauruses. It means that the dictionary is more excellent in giving definitions and references since it is always updated. This study employs the last edition of *Macquarie Dictionary*, the Sixth Edition which published in October 2013. The features of the dictionary are gained to find the most update definitions of the verbs.

Synonymy

“Synonymy is the lexical relation of sameness of meanings either among lexical items or among sentences or propositions, although the latter is also called paraphrase” (“Synonymy”). Based on Lyons (1996), “synonymous are expressions with the same meaning” (p.60). Synonyms are words which have the same meanings, but actually synonyms are not identical in meaning. *Logical synonymy* can be substituted in some contexts without changing the truth conditions of its proposition (“Synonymy”). It is also called *sense synonymous* or just *synonyms*. According to Finegan (2004), “two words are said to be synonymous if they mean the same thing” (p.192). Finegan (2004) gives examples of synonyms, the terms are *movie*, *film*, *flick*, and *motion picture*. People can use the terms *movie*, *film*, and *flick* to define the term *motion picture*. The terms *film*, *flick*, and *motion picture* also can describe the term *movie*. Finegan (2004) states that we can say the term *A* is synonymous with the term *B* if every referent of the term *A* is a referent of the term *B* and vice versa. The terms are synonymous if we state that we are taking only linguistic meaning (Finegan, 2004).

Degrees of Synonymy

According to Cruse (2000), there are three degrees of synonymy: absolute synonymy, propositional synonymy, and near-synonymy. Absolute synonymy refers to a complete identity of meaning (Cruse, 2000). Two words are said absolute synonymy if they contain these three conditions: all their meanings are identical; they are synonymous in all contexts; they are semantically equivalent on all meanings, descriptive and non-descriptive (Lyon, 1996). Absolute synonymy is also called *full synonymy*. Full synonymy is logical synonyms in all senses (“Synonymy”). This type of synonyms is rare, usually it is found in words with a rather narrow range of senses. Cruse (2000) adds that “absolute synonyms can be defined as items which are equinormal in all contexts” (p.157). The examples of it are the species names, *gorse* and *furze*. Those words refer to a plant which grows yellow flowers. Secondly, there is propositional synonymy. It is defined as “if two lexical items are propositional synonyms, they can be substituted in any expression with truth-conditional properties without effect on those properties” (Cruse, 2000, p.158). The examples of propositional synonymy are the words *fiddle* and *violin*. Besides, there is *near-synonymy* or *partial synonymy* or *plesionymy*. Lyons (1996) says that “expressions that are more or less similar, but not identical in meaning is called near-synonymy” (p.60). Near synonyms can be substitutable in specific contexts, not in all contexts (“Synonymy”). The examples of nearsynonymy are the nouns *mist* and *fog*.

Thesaurus

To find synonyms of a word, people can look at thesauruses. “Thesaurus carry out three meanings which are (1) „special word list“ or „lexicon“, (2) „semantic dictionary“ or „nomenclator“, and (3) „terminological database“ or „index“” (“Thesauruses”). Having looked at the definitions, it means that thesauruses help to explain and express ideas of words which have several definitions. *Oxford Thesaurus of English* writes that the verb *refuse* has multiple synonyms which are *decline*, *turn down*, *say no to*, *reject*, *spurn*, *scorn*, and etc. (“Refuse”). As it has been mentioned, *reject* is one of the synonyms of *refuse*. People can choose any form of words to express certain meanings. There must be a reason why they prefer use the certain word over the others. “People assume that the word they have chosen is more appropriate to the context than other ones that they do not choose” (“Synonymy”). Since the verbs *refuse* and *reject* have similar meanings, people may substitute the use of those verbs. After studying the verbs *refuse* and *reject*, the researcher will know how far those two verbs synonymous.

Corpus Linguistics

A corpus consists of collections of texts specifically for linguistic analysis stored structurally (Kennedy, 1998). A corpus can be used to discover problems or questions about all the aspects of linguistics. Schmitt (2002) says that corpora are collected from natural occurring sources rather than from surveys and questionnaires. According to McEnery and Wilson (2001), a corpus offers more up-to-date info about language. Corpora give more complete and exact definitions because there are many examples from daily life use. There are written and spoken corpora as sources for studies. Spoken corpora are composed by recording first and then transcribing speech. Based on Hunston (2002), “linguists have always used the word *corpus* to describe a collection of naturally occurring example of language, consisting of anything from a few sentences to a set of written texts or tape recordings, which have been collected for linguistics study” (p.2). In the recent time, the collections of those texts are stored in computers and accessed electronically. Biber, *et al.* (2002) state that there are four characteristics of a corpus-based study of language: (1) it is empirical, analyzing the real patterns of language use in natural texts; (2) it employs a great number and principled collection of natural texts, or „corpus“, as the basic data for analysis; (3) it makes wide use of computers for analysis, using automatic and interactive techniques; (4) it can be quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques.

A corpus which is acquired by computers really helps researchers to explore the use of language in real life and eases to sort and analyze words. Nowadays, a corpus-based study facilitates linguistics researchers to explore language use in actual life. Based on Schmitt (2002), a corpus has a main contribution to investigate patterns of the use of language, so it is empirical and reliable. By using a corpus-based study, researchers can find how language varies in different situations, for example in formal and informal conversations, or in spoken and written language.

Besides, researchers take a corpus as an important data for describing language use that shows how lexis, grammar, and semantics interact accurately (Davies & Elder, 2006). In addition, researchers are able to find out how knowledge of language actually works in a certain real-life context. Hunston (2002) states that a corpus can show frequencies, phraseologies, and collocations. It means that a corpus-based study allows

researchers to see what collocation patterns co-occur. Additionally, a corpus which shows collocations of words can indicate the relevant senses of words from word lists.

Moreover, a corpus-based study has several benefits to comprehend more about language. The evidences from corpora help researchers and learners to develop dictionaries, handbooks, and teaching materials (Biber, *et al.*, 2002). Corpora show the accuracy of the use of language for language learners of all levels. Corpus linguistics as the base theory is used to conduct this study. From a corpus, the researcher will see the occurrences of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. Furthermore, the corpus shows the collocations of each verb, which will be examined in this study.

The Main Data Source: Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)

Corpora which are stored in computers help researchers to sort data easier. Schmitt (2002) says that the feature of modern-day corpora is created accessible to researcher, for free of charge. The computer technology stores a large number of corpora from variety of sources (Biber, *et al.*, 2002). Hunston (2002) adds that computers maintain and process large amounts of information, the electronic corpora which are used to study aspects of language. Biber, *et al.* (2002) state that corpora are written in complete texts, so they will be not limited to sentencelength excerpts to be analyzed. There are corpora that are available online on *corpus.byu.edu*. That website, which consists of billions words, is created by Mark Davies, a Professor of Linguistics at Brigham Young University, USA. It consists of corpora from three languages, English, Spanish, and Portuguese.

There are seven English corpora: *Global Web-Based English (GloWbE)*, *Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)*, *Corpus of Historical American English (COHA)*, *TIME Magazine Corpus*, *Corpus of American Soap Operas*, *British National Corpus (BYU-BNC)*, and *Strathy Corpus (Canada)*. The corpora are built to find out how native speakers actually speak and write, look at language variation and change, design authentic language teaching materials and resources, and find the frequency of words, phrases, and collocates (Davies, n.d.). Davies (n.d.) says that there are more than 100.000 people each month who use this site for teaching, learning, and personal interest.

The website also provides the publication of corpus study by researchers all around the world. In early 2008, COCA was released online (Davies, 2009). COCA is the first large and diverse corpus of American English. It has 450 million words from 1990 to 2012, balanced between spoken (20%), fictions (20%), popular magazines (20%), newspapers (20%), and academic journals (20%). Davies (2009) adds that the composition of the texts can compare data diachronically across the corpus. The changes in the language will be shown by looking at the equivalent of text compositions which consist of spoken and written from year to year. The spoken texts are almost entirely the transcription of unscripted conversation from television and radio programs (Davies, 2009). The spoken corpora are accurate although they are completely spontaneous.

Frequency

Hunston (2002) defines a frequency list as “a list of all the types in a corpus together with the number of occurrences of each type” (p.67). The list has some kinds of section which present frequency order, alphabetical order, and the first occurrence of the type in the corpus. By investigating the frequency of words, it will be known the most

common and uncommon words in English (Biber, *et al.*, 2002). In the online corpus, including COCA, it gives an automatic list of words. COCA shows the number of occurrences frequency of certain words. Hunston (2002) says that “the words in a corpus can be arranged in order of their frequency in that corpus” (p.3). Biber, *et al.* (2002) explain that the frequency lists of all of the words in a corpus can be produced by COCA.

They add that each form of a word will appear in the list, for example the words *deal*, *deals*, *dealing*, and *dealt*. Researchers may discuss the frequency of all the words or just one word. “The term „lemma“ is used to mean the base form of a word, disregarding grammatical changes such as tense and plurality” (Biber, *et al.*, 2002, p.29). The frequency of each word is compared to another word through some sections or registers. COCA has the sections to limit the frequency findings such as spoken, fiction, magazine, newspapers, academic, and based on the year 1990 to 2012. Hunston (2002) says that the list of frequency of the words is useful for identifying possible differences between corpora. Biber, *et al.* (2002) also verify that “one use of frequency lists is to compare the frequency of a target word to other words” (p.29).

To determine the occurrences of a word which contains two lexical categories, such as *deal*, the researchers must look at the forms in the context, determine the grammatical category, and keep count (Biber, *et al.*, 2002). It facilitates to study the corpora of each word in details.

The Role of Collocation

Collocation required a quantitative basis, giving actual numbers of cooccurrences in some texts (“Collocations”). Stubbs (2003) suggests that all lexical items have collocations. Leech, Cruickshank, and Ivanic (2001) state that “collocations are not part of grammar, but they make use of grammar, and part of what it means to use English naturally” (p.104).

Types of Collocation

Based on Hunston (2002), “collocation is tendency of words to be biased in the way they co-occur” (p.68). Hunston (2002) gives the example of collocation: *children toys*. The word *toys* collocates with the word *children* because those two words are frequently co-occur comparing to the other words, such as *women* or *men*. The collocation is said to be motivated since there is a rational explanation that the word *toys* belong to *children* rather than to *women* or *men*. Another example of collocation is *high mountain*. The word *high* collocates with the word *mountain*, not to the words *man* or *tree*, if it is compared. The word *high* commonly co-occurs with the word *mountain*. Lyons (1996) says about the *collocational range*, which means the set of contexts in which it can occur. The collocational range of an expression is completely determined by its meaning. Thus, synonyms must be essential having the same collocational range. Take for instance, the adjectives *large* and *big*.

There are some contexts that *large* cannot be substituted for *big*. It can be considered from these sentences: (1) *He is making a big mistake*; (2) *He is making a large mistake*. Besides, there is unmotivated collocation. Unmotivated collocation has no logical explanation for clarifying the form of collocation (Hunston, 2002). The examples of unmotivated collocation are *strong tea* and *powerful car*. Biber, *et al.* (2002) add that “in some cases, the observed patterns seem completely obvious once we see them, while in other cases they can be quite unexpected” (p.25). Nesselhauf (2005)

defines collocation as “the co-occurrence of words at a certain distance” (p.11). The frequent (or more frequent than could be expected if words combined randomly in a language) co-occurrences make the distance on the collocations (Nesselhauf, 2005).

Sinclair describes collocation as “the occurrence of two or more words within a short space of each other in the text” (as cited in Nesselhauf, 2005, p.12). He adds that the „short space“ refers to a distance of around four words to the left and right of the target word explored. The target word is called *node* by Sinclair (as cited in Nesselhauf, 2005, p.12). The example for the node *refuse* is in this sentence, *Your mother says that you refuse all their invitations*. The words *your, mother, says, that, you, all, their, invitations* are counted to form collocations with the node *refuse*. Those words are called *collocates*.

As cited in Nesselhauf (2005), Sinclair terms *collocation* as *significant collocation*. It senses as “co-occurrence of words such that they co-occur more often than their representative frequencies and the length of text in which they appear would predict” (p.12). Take a look at the phrase *the wedding*, the words *the* and *wedding* would not be a significant collocation. The word *the* often occurs in every kind of text. The words *dog* and *barked* are more considered as a significant collocation. The word *barked* is likely to be found near the word *dog*. Phoocharoensil (2010) gives an example that the noun *pride* has a strong tendency to co-occur with the adjective *immense*, as in *immense pride*, rather than the adjective *colossal*, as in *colossal immense*. The adjectives *immense* and *colossal* are considered having a close meaning. In that context, *immense* is selected because *immense pride* sounds common for English native speakers rather than *colossal pride*.

The Benefits of Learning Collocations

There are two main benefits of learning collocations especially for language teachers and learners. Shin and Nation (2008) state that collocations facilitate learner’s language use to develop fluency and native-like selection. According to Kaci and Zimmermann (n.d.), native-like selection is “the ability of native speakers routinely to convey their meaning by an expression that is not only grammatical but also native-like” (p.1). Pawley and Syder suggest that L2 learners need a similar number for native-like fluency (as cited in Shin & Nation, 2008). Native-like fluency is “a speaker’s ability to produce fluent stretches of spontaneous connected discourse” (Kaci & Zimmermann, n.d., p.1). Pawley and Syder argue that “there are hundreds of thousands of „lexicalized sentence stems“ that adult native speakers have at their disposal” (as cited in Shin & Nation, 2008, p.340). Thus, “the chunked expressions help language learners to reduce cognitive effort, to save time, and to have language available for immediate use” (Shin & Nation, 2008, p.340). Shin and Nation (2008) assume that learning collocations is very effective to develop learners’ language fluency and native-like selection of language use. Collocations will ease the language learners to remember lexical patterns since frequent collocations have bigger chances of being used, especially by native speakers. Shin and Nation (2008) also assume that “the most frequent collocations will usually be the most useful” (p.340). In this study, the collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* will be investigated. Those verbs which are synonymous may have different collocational range. By exploring the collocations of *refuse* and *reject*, it will be known the similar collocations which can determine the contexts of those synonyms.

Previous Corpus Studies

There are some corpus studies which help the researcher to understand and explore the study deeper. One of the studies has been conducted by Liu (2011). In his study, Liu (2011) uses COCA and BNC to investigate the collocations of *refuse* and *reject*. Liu (2001) gives a test to Taiwanese learners which questions the collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. The result of the test shows that lower and higher learners are still confused about the use of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. In conclusion, the understanding of syntactic and lexical collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* of learners in general is the same.

The second study is conducted by Kayaoğlu (2013). Kayaoğlu (2013) uses COCA to conduct his study. He examines the feasibility of using a corpus to help students differentiate between close synonyms which have similar meanings but cannot be substituted one for another (Kayaoğlu, 2013). He employs t-test analysis to find the results of the study. He lists *reject* as the close synonym of *refuse* besides *deny*, *decline*, and *rebuff*. Kayaoğlu (2013) gives a vocabularies test about close synonyms for English learners. His study shows that the use of a corpus for deciding on close synonyms proved to be very effective. It is because there is a statistically significant different result between the pre-test and the posttest.

In the researcher's batch, there are four other researchers who conduct corpus study. The first researcher is Samodra (2014). She examines the modal *shall* in two registers. The second researcher is Krismaheryanti (2014). She studies collocation patterns of the words *pupil* and *student* which convey their meanings. The third researcher is Duanaya (2014, in process), who investigates the syntactic patterns of the synonymous conjunctions, *since* and *because*. The last researcher is Riski (2014, in process), who studies the collocations of the verbs *suggest* and *advice*. Having same basic idea, the researcher shares the references and knowledge through doing the study.

Method

Research Method

The research methods of this study were quantitative research and qualitative research. Quantitative research would be employed to answer the first research problem. According to Biber, *et al.* (2002), quantitative research was important to compare synonymous words. This study would know the frequencies of synonymous verbs *refuse* and *reject* in a corpus. Thus, this study employed descriptive statistics to analyze the data. Xiao (n.d.) said that "frequencies are a type of descriptive statistics" (p.8). He added that "descriptive statistics were used to describe a dataset" (p.8). Based on Tebbs (2006), "statistics is the development and application of methods to the collection, analysis, and interpretation of observed information (data) from planned investigation" (p.1).

Besides, another research method of this study was qualitative research. Ary, Jacobs, and Sorensen (2010) stated that by using qualitative research, the researcher looks for the understanding of a phenomenon by emphasizing on the entire picture. It did not need to break the entire idea into some variables. According to Lichtman (2013), in qualitative research, the researcher played an 38 important role. The researcher collected and gathered the data and the information through his or her eyes and ears. The goal of qualitative research was a full and depth understanding of a picture (Ary, *et al.*, 2010). Hunston (2002) said that corpus software would show the number of

frequency without doing calculation. The purpose of qualitative research was to “understand and interpret social interactions” (Lichtman, 2013, p.15).

Furthermore, the qualitative research would assist the researcher to dig the collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* deeper which could occur in the similar contexts. The explanation of the verbs discussed was qualitative. This study used corpus study since this study would find out the frequencies and the collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* from a corpus. Corpus study would facilitate the questions about the frequencies of the occurrences of the words (Hunston, 2002). Stubbs (2001) stated that corpus study assisted in studying language in which observational data from a corpus were used as the main evidence for the uses and the meaning of words and phrases. A corpus would show the occurrences of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. Next, corpus study helped to explore the collocations of the synonymous verbs *refuse* and *reject*. According to Schmitt (2002), corpus study contributed to investigate patterns of the use of language. The researcher considered that corpus study could be the best method to answer the research problems of this study.

Research Setting

The study was conducted in Yogyakarta from February 2014 until July 2014. This study needed the tokens of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* from COCA as the data. The corpus is obtained from a website, corpus.byu.edu/coca/. Because the corpus stored in a computer, it meant that the researcher could conduct the study virtually. She needed a good internet network to look for the data on COCA. Thus, the researcher could conduct the study in any given time and place.

Data Source

The data source of this study were the tokens of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* from COCA. COCA had 450 million words from time period 1990 until 2012. “It is the only large and balanced corpus of American English” (Davies, n.d.). The data given from COCA showed the collocations of the verbs. To analyze the collocations deeper, the researcher chose 100 tokens for each verb. Those 100 tokens would represent the context in which the verb occurred. Therefore, to conduct this study, the role of COCA was really helpful since it was easy to use and access. Besides, according to Biber, *et al.* (2002), COCA gave the data which was reliable because of the excellent store in computers.

Instruments and Data Gathering Technique

The instruments of this study were the researcher and tokens of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. The researcher was the instrument of this study because the researcher who was going to conduct the study. The second instrument for conducting this study was the tokens of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* from COCA. The researcher would see the occurrences of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* in different registers, which could indicate the meaning and the context they were used.

Data Analysis Technique

In qualitative research, the first stage in analyzing data was organizing to ease the data retrieved (Ary, *et al.*, 2010). The researcher selected *purposive samples*, which was sufficient to provide minimum insight and understanding of what the researcher was

studying (Ary, *et al.*, 2010). Ary, *et al.*(2010) said that purposive samples had to be relevant to the topic of the study. To do the sampling, the researcher used her experience and knowledge, specially which was related to this study. Thus, the tokens used had to represent all meanings of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. Moreover, the collocations of the verbs would present the meanings and contexts they took place. The analysis would be conducted based on the definitions on the dictionaries and the related references mentioned in Chapter II.

Research Procedure

There were six steps to conduct this study. Ary, *et al.* (2010) gave the steps to conduct qualitative study. The first step was specifying the phenomenon to be investigated. The second step was selecting the source from which the observations were to be made. The researcher chose COCA as the source of the data in this study. Next, the researcher would copy the tables of the tokens because the tokens could not be downloaded. After doing it, the third step was classifying the data (Ary, *et al.*, 2010). The data were classified into two: the data of the tokens of the verb *refuse* and the data of the tokens of the verb *reject*. Then, it was selected 100 tokens for each verb to be digged more in the next step. The researcher highlighted the occurrences of the synonymous verbs and their collcoations in every token. After that, the forth step was analyzing the data (Ary, *et al.*, 2010). Then, the fifth step was drawing conclusions (Ary, *et al.*, 2010).

Findings and Discussion

The Frequencies of the Verbs Refuse and Reject

To conduct this study, the data needed were taken from COCA. The tokens of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* were from 2011 to 2012. It would be a discussion about the comparison of the frequencies of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. It would be seen which one of the verbs that was used the most. The words *refuse* and *reject* in COCA were not classified into the word classes. Thus, in the lists of each word, *refuse* and *reject* could occur as a noun and as a verb. This was the table of the occurrences frequencies of *refuse* and *reject* in COCA 2011 – 2012.

Table 4.1 The Frequencies of *Refuse* and *Reject* in COCA 2011 – 2012

Word	Frequency		Total
	2011	2012	
<i>refuse</i>	288	146	434
<i>reject</i>	217	93	310

Table 4.1 above showed that *refuse* had more number of occurrences than *reject* from 2011 to 2012. *Refuse* occurred 288 times in 2011 and 146 times in 2012. In the total, *refuse* occurred 434 times. *Reject* appeared 217 times in 2011 and 93 times in 2012. The total occurrences of *reject* were 310. In result, *refuse* had a higher number of the frequency rather than *reject*. It indicated that *refuse* was commonly used more than *reject*.

The Frequency of the Verb Refuse

The occurrences of *refuse* in COCA from 2011 to 2012 were not only as a verb. There were 16 tokens from COCA 2011 which showed *refuse* as a noun which meant “something (such as paper or food waste) that has been thrown away” (“Refuse”). Take for instance in the tokens below.

- (3) events, today 119 souls have come to watch the Dotsons sell off the abandoned refuse of shattered lives. # " Here are the rules, folks, " says (COCA: USA Today)
- (4) pausing briefly to collect \$50 from a resident planning to take 20 loads of refuse to the town dump. " I'm not supposed to have to leave my (COCA: NY Times)
- (5) and go right back into the nest. Finally, midden workers toil over the refuse pile and over the pebbles that the ants bring back to cover the mound. (COCA: Natural Hist)

This case also happened in the tokens of *refuse* in COCA 2012. After examining the tokens, it was found that there were 11 tokens which used *refuse* as a noun. The tokens below were the examples which indicated the use of the noun *refuse*.

- (6) has command. They came in at night unseen, buried themselves amid wreckage and refuse, two rifles, two cones of fire, and a long wait for a (COCA: Alpha)
- (7) vampire's remains just lying there, trickling into the gutter with all the other refuse of the city. On the other hand, I couldn't do anything to (COCA: Wicked City Zephyr)
- (8) debris, and dirt, so, in this overflow of passions, all the refuse of men's souls was washed up and brought to the surface; this added (COCA: Iowa Rev)

As explained above, in year 2012, *refuse* as a verb was used only 135 times after it was reduced from *refuse* as a noun in 11 tokens. Consequently, to find out how many the verb *refuse*, the frequency of *refuse* in COCA 2011 to 2012 was reduced by the tokens of the noun *refuse*. The noun *refuse* occurred 27 times in two years. As a result, in COCA 2011 to 2012, the verb *refuse* occurred 407 times.

The Frequency of the Verb Reject

The occurrences of *reject* in COCA from 2011 to 2012 were not only as a verb. As well as *refuse* occurrences, the word *reject* also had a role as a noun. There were six tokens of the noun *reject* in COCA 2011. Three tokens below were the examples which indicated that *reject* took a part as a noun which meant “something that is not good enough for some purpose/ something that cannot be used or accepted” (“Reject”).

- (13) with disabilities recognized to have APE needs must receive APE services (i.e., zero reject and zero fail, Sherrill, 1998; USDE, 1996). Thus, (COCA: Teaching Exceptional)

- (14) in an alpha level of .936; thus demonstrating homogeneity of variance by failing the reject the null hypothesis and allowing us to proceed with analysis using one-way ANOVA. # (COCA: Education)
- (15) in an alpha level of .360; thus demonstrating homogeneity of variance by failing the reject the null hypothesis and allowing us to proceed with analysis using one-way ANOVA. # (COCA: Education)

Moreover, there were other two tokens of the noun *reject*. The definition of the noun *reject* was “a person who is not accepted or liked by other people” (“Reject”). The tokens below presented that intention.

- (16) up to new people. FAUX BREAK-DANCE What it looks like: He's a reject from America's Best Dance Crew. What it means: Yes, he's (COCA: Cosmopolitan)
- (17) " Bubba " Ball. From the sidelines, Gingrich lashes out like the reject who can't stand the letter-jacket handsome. " What we need is a president (COCA: Newsweek)

The noun *reject* also occurred in COCA 2012. By examining the tokens, there were five examples which used *reject* as a noun. These were three tokens of the noun *reject* which had a sense that “something that is not good enough for some purpose” (“Reject”).

- (18) continues to sport his snaggle-toothed smile -- a collection of bright white Chiclets from the reject bin, all of them chipped and unmatched, widely set. " PAGE 80 (COCA: Esquire) "
- (19) of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; 2006): zero reject, nondiscriminatory evaluation, individualized and appropriate education, least restrictive environment, procedural due (COCA: Teaching Exceptional)
- (20) in their neighborhood schools (Smith, 2000). The IDEA principle of zero reject applies in this case: special education services must be available wherever there are students (COCA: Teaching Exceptional)

The discussion showed that the word *reject* could be a verb and a noun. By investigating the role of the word *reject*, the verb *reject* occurred 299 times. That number was the result after reducing the frequency of *reject* in COCA 2011 to 2012 (310) from the frequency of the noun *reject* (11).

After examining the occurrences of *refuse* and *reject* deeper, it was found that not all those words in COCA 2012 to 2011 referred to a verb. By looking at each token, the words *refuse* and *reject* were also used as a noun. In this study, one of the aims was to find out the occurrence frequency of each word as a verb. The table below presented the occurrences frequencies of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*.

Table 4.2 The Frequencies of the Verbs *Refuse* and *Reject* in COCA 2011 – 2012

Verb	Frequency		Total	Percentage
	2011	2012		
<i>refuse</i>	271	135	406	57.59%
<i>reject</i>	211	88	299	42.41%
		Total	705	100%

From Table 4.2, it was shown that the verb *refuse* had a higher number than *reject*. In total, the verb *refuse* occurred 406 times and the verb *reject* occurred 299 times. In calculation, the verb *refuse* had 107 more tokens than the verb *reject*. The occurrence percentage of the verb *refuse* was 57.59% and the verb *reject* was 42.41%. The ratio of those two verbs occurrences was 15.18%. The number of ratio percentage given was not really considerable since it was not 50% or nearly 50%, which was a half of 100%. This finding was compared to BNC. BNC was a well-known corpus of British English. The tables below showed the frequencies of *refuse* and *reject* in BNC.

Table 4.3 The Frequencies of *Refuse* and *Reject* in BNC

Verb	Frequency	Percentage
<i>refuse</i>	106	62.35%
<i>reject</i>	64	37.65%
Total	170	100%

Table 4.4 The Frequencies of the Lemmas *Refuse* and *Reject* in BNC

Verb	Frequency	Percentage
<i>refuse</i>	22	59.45%
<i>reject</i>	15	40.54%
Total	37	100%

Based on Table 4.3, *refuse* and *reject* had different occurrences frequency. Based on Leech, Rayson, & Wilson (2001), the verb *refuse* which was in four forms (lemma, past participle, present participle, continuous) occurred 106 times (62.35%). Compared to the verb *reject*, it (in the same forms like *refuse*) occurred 64 times (37.65%) (Leech, *et al.*, 2001). *Refuse* had more 42 occurrences rather than *reject*. Table 4.4 presented the frequencies of the lemmas *refuse* and *reject*. According to Table 4.4, the lemma *refuse* occurred 22 times and the lemma *reject* occurred 15 times (Leech, *et al.*, 2001). The percentage of the lemma *refuse* was 59.45% and the lemma *reject* was 40.54%. It meant that *refuse* was used more than *reject* although the ratio was not really significant (18.91%). The result in BNC showed that the verb *refuse* was used more than the verb *reject*. The findings showed that the verb *refuse* was commonly used rather than the verb *reject* to express denial. There were some dictionaries which did not list *reject*. *Longman Dictionary of Common Errors* did not have the verb *reject* in the list. The explanation of the verb *reject* was in the verb *refuse* section. In that dictionary, the use of *reject* was compared to *refuse*. In *Dictionary of Word Origins*, *reject* was not found in the list of words. In addition, there was an explanation of *refuse*. In *Google*, the occurrences frequency of *refuse* was higher than *reject*, which the words *refuse* and *reject* could be a verb and a noun. The word *refuse* occurred about 170.000.000 times in 0.19 second, while the word

reject occurred about 93.200.000 times in 0.20 second. As a result, the percentage of the word *refuse* in *Google* was 64.59% and the percentage of the word *reject* was 35.41%. The results showed that the word *refuse* (as a verb and a noun) had a higher occurrence than the word *reject* (as a verb and a noun) From the discussion, it could be concluded that the verb *refuse* had a higher frequency than *reject*. As stated by Biber, *et al.* (2002), it would be known the most common words by investigating the frequency of words. The verb *refuse* was commonly used to express denial rather than the verb *reject*.

The Collocations of the Verbs Refuse and Reject

The tokens in COCA gave the clear use of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* in their own utterances. There were 100 tokens from each verb to be investigated. Each verb had some meanings that would be explained one by one according to the certain meaning. As *refuse* and *reject* were transitive and intransitive verbs, the study of collocation was adjusted to each kind of verb. The transitive verbs focused on the right collocations. Biber, *et al.* (2002) wrote that the researchers could investigate the right collocation of a certain word. They added that to find some contexts of the word meaning, it could be looked at the right collocations only.

It had explained about the definitions of the transitive verbs *refuse* and *reject* in Chapter II. *Refuse* and *reject* were followed by words which intended to express something that was being refused or rejected. To give a clear description, here were the tokens of the transitive forms of *refuse* and *reject*.

- (18) There were ladies who would travel miles in order to have a handsome young werewolf refuse to sell them a hat. # He looked up to see Madame Lefoux. (COCA: Timeless)
- (19) too dangerous for vampires and humans alike. Which explained why Aileen thought I would refuse to set foot in any establishment that served the brew. # But the truth (COCA: Wicked City Zephyr)
- (20) a dry lab? Dr-PATEL: No, not at all. We reject -- we reject products as well. HANSEN: (Voiceover) In this email he blamed us for misleading him (COCA: NBC_Dateline)

Based on the examples, there were two different forms of the collocations. As it was seen, the left collocations of each example were subjects (*a handsome young werewolf, I, we*) and could be followed by a modal (*would*). The right collocation could be in the form of *to infinitive (to reject)* and another word such as a noun (*products*). The examples showed that *refuse* and *reject* wanted to make clear the things which were not accepted by the subjects. Besides, the right collocations gave the context meaning of each verb used.

The verbs *refuse* and *reject* had similar and different collocations based on the sentences they occurred. The collocations could show the certain meanings of the verbs. Each verb had several specific meanings which made the differences in the use of them. A corpus could show the examples of the use of words in some contexts they occurred (Biber, *et al.*, 2002). From the contexts, it could be identified the different meaning associated with a word (Biber, *et al.*, 2002). Thus, by investigating the tokens of *refuse* and *reject*, it would be known the context where *refuse* and *reject* occurred.

After exploring the occurrences of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* in COCA 2011 – 2012, it was found that there were numerous collocations of each verb. There were left collocations and right collocations which could describe the meanings of the verbs. Furthermore, it would be seen the similar collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*.

Refuse

1. Refuse as a Transitive Verb

As a transitive verb, *refuse* collocated with other words which explained the meaning of its occurrences. For the transitive verb *refuse*, the study only focused on the right collocation. It was because the right word clarified the things which were being denied. There were 75 tokens which contained *refuse* as a transitive verb. This table below showed the collocations of *refuse* as a transitive verb.

Table 4.5 The Collocations of Transitive Verb *Refuse*

No	Type of Collocation	Total
1	noun	31
2	to infinitive	44
	Total	75

Table 4.5 showed that there were two types of right collocation which occurred after a transitive verb *refuse*. The first type of collocation was a noun, which had 31 occurrences after *refuse*. There were various kinds of noun which collocated with *refuse* such as *challenge, proposals, invitations, help, treatment, procedures, fare, and insurance*. Those collocations were found in some registers. As it was known, COCA made tokens from several kinds of sources such as from spoken, magazines, newspapers, and fictions (Davies, 2009). From Table 4.5, the right collocation of *refuse* could be in the form of *to infinitive*. As stated by Azar and Hagen (2009), the verb *refuse* was one of common verbs which were followed by infinitives. The occurrences of that form were in 44 tokens. The infinitives which followed *refuse* to were various, e.g. *to excuse, to meet, to share, to give, to commit, to trade, to play*.

The transitive verb *refuse* had several meanings according to *Merriam- Webster Dictionary* and *Macquarie Dictionary*. After examining the tokens, the researcher found that the definitions given by the dictionaries were used in the real life by the people. However, not all the definitions gave many examples presented in the corpus. For the definition “to renounce (obsolete)” (“Refuse”), the researcher found one token only. Next, there was no token which shared the meaning “decline to leap over a fence (horse)” (“Refuse”). To answer the research problems, the explanation given was according to the meanings of the verb occurrences in the tokens. By investigating the tokens, the transitive verb *refuse* occurred in four meanings. The study investigated those four meanings which could indicate the context of *refuse*.

a. The First Meaning of Refuse

The first definition of *refuse* was “to decline to accept something offered” (“Refuse”). From COCA, the researcher found the examples of that meaning. Based on that meaning, it was found that *refuse* collocated with other words which were shown in the some contexts. The researcher had picked 25 tokens of 407 which presented that meaning. All of the right collocations for this meaning were *nouns*, which presented things offered that was denied. There were a lot of offered things which were refused. Having looked at the right collocations, the verb *refuse* was used in many contexts.

Here, the researcher would explain some of the collocations. Firstly, it was found that there were three occurrences of the noun *treatment* as the right collocations of *refuse*. The occurrences of *treatment* were on the tokens below.

- (21) that may not be the best practices, or even quackery. The option to refuse a given treatment is still offered. In my 37 years in medical practice I (COCA: Christ Century)
- (22) to court. Even though the court decided that the parents had the right to refuse treatment, the hospital refused to remove the ventilator. Instead, they slowly weaned (COCA: Social Work)
- (23) it, the U.S. Supreme Court held that a competent person has the right to refuse medical treatment even if the lack of treatment will lead to their death (Colby (COCA: Social Work).

The use of *refuse* in the examples above showed a denial to offered *treatment*. According to those three examples, people had a right to decide whether they would accept or refuse the treatment. The collocation of *refuse* + *treatment* related to medical field. Secondly, the noun *help* appeared twice in the tokens of *refuse*. The tokens were in magazine and academic registers. Here were the tokens which carried *help*.

- (24) Shopping Tips # In-store # Ask to unpack and pitch the tent yourself (politely refuse help from sales clerks). Is it quick to lay out and erect? (COCA: Backpacker)
- (25) 66521244 ADULTS # ROUGH SLEEPING # A group of women who sleep rough in London refuse help, seeing homelessness as their choice. They do not take drugs or abuse (COCA: Community Care).

The tokens above presented the collocations of *refuse help*. The verb *refuse* was used to decline *help* which was offered by other people. *Help*, which was a good act, could be refused by the people who seemed to need it.

Next, *refuse* occurred with the noun *proposals* as the right collocation. The occurrence of it was in fiction register. This token below had its occurrence.

- (26) lining up the Eligibles is beyond me. " # " Sheer determination. You refuse the proposals one by one, and honestly, Evie, Papa isn't as (COCA: Lady Maggies Secret)

Based on the example, Evie did not want to have the proposals which were offered to her. There was more than one proposal which were declined by her. In that context, *proposal* was being a wonderful thing which was offered by men who asked a woman to marry.

To stretch the use of *refuse* that carried the meaning discussed in this section, next, *refuse* collocated with the noun *money*. The token of it was in fiction register. Here was one of the tokens in which *money* occurred.

- (27) favorite restaurant, an Italian place in Santa Monica where the ardent and merry owners refuse to take his money and ask only permission to take his photo, to have (COCA: Southern Rev)

From that example above, a man would like to give money to the ardent and merry owners. They did not want to accept the money given by him. *Money*, which was considered as a valuable thing, was denied although it might be in a big number. Those collocations showed that there were things offered which were declined. From the collocations, it was clear that anything could be denied. *Refuse* was used to “say no when someone wants you to accept something” (“Refuse”). The verb *refuse* was used in the daily life and in many contexts.

b. The Second Meaning of Refuse

The second meaning of *refuse* was “to decline to give/ deny a request demand, etc.” (“Refuse”). That meaning referred to “not allow someone to have something (“Refuse”)” which sensed as a “request” or “demand.” By investigating, that meaning was found in some tokens. The researcher had picked 25 tokens to understand the use of *refuse* in this meaning deeper. The right collocations of *refuse* were mostly *to infinitive* forms which were 19, and the others were nouns. From 25 tokens, there were 7 *to let* forms, 4 *to give* forms, and 4 *to allow* forms. The other collocations were *to excuse*, *to meet*, *to share*, and *to have vaccinated*. *To infinitive* form was followed by a noun which described something that was declined or a verb which expressed “something could not to do.” The tokens below presented *to infinitive* forms that indicated “deny a request or demand” (“Refuse”).

- (28) shape. # As Denver Restaurant Week gets underway, we found five chefs who refuse to let the demands of their jobs interfere # with their physical and mental fitness (COCA: Denver)
- (29), for example, they publicly exaggerate the resulting civilian deaths. Meanwhile, they refuse to give the United States permission to conduct commando raids in Pakistan, swearing that (COCA: Foreign Affairs)
- (30) just liberals who oppose spending cuts. Conservative members of Congress from farm states refuse to allow major cuts in farm subsidies, an antiquated program born back in the (COCA: USA Today)

The first and the second tokens ((28) and (29)) described that someone declined *to let* and *to give* somethings which were considered as a “request” and a “demand.” The following words of those two tokens were *demands* (as in (28)) and *permission* (as in (29)), which were nouns. It clearly described that the tokens presented the use

of *refuse*, “to deny request and demand.” The following words of the collocations clearly referred to the meaning discussed. The next example showed that *refuse to allow* was followed by a verb which explained the thing which was demanded by the people. Other tokens obviously showed that the words *request* and *demand* were the collocations of *refuse*. The tokens below showed that intention.

- (31) mermaid this year. " # I almost laugh, knowing that Dad would never refuse Sam's request. # But Tm too upset to laugh. # Sam goes (COCA: Storyworks)
- (32) a local farmer to supply eggs for thebakery, he'd been unable to refuse Mrs. Becroft's request. "Theyneed our help, " he'd told (COCA: Storyworks)
- (33)are now trained upon your remaining ships. You are hardly in a position to refuse our demands. Relations between the Hegemony and your Syndicate are of no concern to (COCA: Analog)

The examples showed the meaning of *refuse* as “refuse to give something that someone needs or have asked for” (“Refuse”). The words *request* (as in (31)), *request* (as in (32)), and *demands* (as in (33)), which followed *refuse*, clearly showed the meaning discussed. The collocations of this meaning were directly the words *demand* and *request*. Thus, it strengthened the explanation of the second meaning of *refuse*.

c. The Third Meaning of Refuse

The third meaning of *refuse* was “will not to do something” (“Refuse”). There were 24 tokens of this meaning which had been investigated. The tokens showed that *refuse* collocated with other words to support the meaning. The right collocations of *refuse* were in the form of *to infinitive*. The collocations of 24 tokens were various. Every token had different collocations such as *to metamorphose*, *to remember*, *to contemplate*, *to sit down*, *to pray*, *to trade*, and *to play*. The verb *refuse* could collocate with other verbs (in the form of *to infinitive*) to convey a determination not to do something. The tokens below presented *refuse* which were used in the different registers.

- (34) Proving he was more than just a highly paid mercenary, Curtin would not only refuse to commit what amounted to perjury, but he also offered in each case to (COCA: Kill Switch)
- (35) the most robust surge in filmmaking since the 1960s. France, Italy and Germany refuse to be ignored. # And then there is Greece. Your hazy recollections of (COCA: NY Times)
- (36) 's sunny but in this heart of mine the world is gloomy, the sun refuse to shine. I've done the best that I could do all for you (COCA: NPR_Fresh Air)

Those tokens appeared in the different registers. The first token (34) occurred in a fiction book, the second one (35) appeared in news, and the last one was in spoken. The subject who did the refusal could be various in those tokens (*Curtin*, *France*, *Italy and Germany*, *the sun*). Those tokens used *refuse* and then were followed by a verb which described an act which was denied to do.

d. The Forth Meaning of Refuse

The forth definition of *refuse* was “to renounce” (“Refuse”) which was used to say formally or publicly. From 407 tokens, the researcher only found one token which referred to this meaning. The token below showed that meaning.

- (38) national borders. " Nothing will stop us, " Hlne promises. " We refuse to have Louis Renault remembered as a collaborator for eternity. It's our duty (COCA: Town Country)

The verb *refuse* collocated with *to have*, and was followed by *remembered*. The context of that example was announcing publicly. As *Macquarie Dictionary* said about this meaning, the context of *refuse* here was used on the past time, which was not used anymore at the recent time. That token occurred in magazine register entitled „*Town Country*“.As it was seen, *refuse* which referred to the meaning discussed was still used in the year 2012.

2. As an Intransitive Verb

Besides, based on the definition in the dictionaries which had been mentioned in Chapter II, *refuse* was also an intransitive verb. Here, the study needed to investigate the left collocations since intransitive verbs lacked objects (Carstairs-McCarthy, 2002). By looking at the left collocations, it would be obtained the meaning of the verb *refuse*. The last meaning of *refuse* which was discussed in this study was “to decline acceptance, consent, or compliance” (“Refuse”). It implied that there was no right collocation of *refuse* which indicated its“ context.

The researcher had examined the tokens of this intransitive verb. Unfortunately, not all tokens could show the objects which were being refused. From 25 tokens, there were 18 tokens which presented the objects or actions refused. Mostly, the left collocations of these 18 tokens were the word *offer*, which occurred in 7 tokens. The other collocations were the words *option*, *wine*, *weapons*, *date*, *abortion*, *deals*, and *cuts*. Those words signified to something offered and agreement. There were *to infinitive* forms as the left collocations which were *to press* and *to cut*. Those two collocations indicated a determination not to do something. Seven other tokens did not show the certain object or action. The tokens below showed the intransitive verb *refuse* which presented something or action refused.

- (39) If it is still technically optional, it's an option you can't refuse. # In a recent debate, moderator John King invoked Romney's father George (COCA: Town Country)
- (40) federal funding is " coercive " by luring states into an offer they can't refuse. They say it also will pull others into Medicaid who already qualify but have (COCA: USA Today)
- (41) against her dark skirt like a starry sky, there was simply no way to refuse. # It had worked once. It had to work again. # " (COCA: Paradise Dogs)

The examples above proved that *refuse* was an intransitive verb. *Refuse* had no object and ended with a full stop. The first and second tokens ((39) and (40)) showed that the left collocations of *refuse* could indicate the meanings, which were refusing

an option (as in (39)) and refusing an offer (as in (40)). However, in the third token (41), it could not certainly indicate the object or the action which was refused.

From the finding, *refuse* was used in many contexts and fields. The collocations of *refuse* were various. Additionally, *refuse* can be followed by *to infinitive* to indicate the meaning. It might be the reason that *refuse* was common used rather than other synonyms which referred to decline to do something.

Moreover, excluding 100 tokens which had been discussed above, *refuse* seemed to be used to convey another meaning besides its own definitions. The dictionaries listed that meaning as the definition of *reject*, which was “to refuse as lover or spouse, not love” (“Reject”). In this discussion, there were two tokens of *refuse* which carried that meaning. The tokens of *refuse* below showed that intention.

(42) asked the Cutters. Sam had never asked her for anything. How could she refuse him this? Pros: working on an engine that really needed her. She (COCA: Undertow)

(43) moon about Tom's return. He sent this e-mail, and I couldn't refuse him, even though I'm the shyest person on earth. I trust Tom (COCA: Harpers Bazaar)

The collocations of *refuse* from those tokens above were *him*. Those tokens ((42) and (43)) occurred in fiction and magazine registers. In this context meaning, the definition of *reject* was used by *refuse* (as in *refuse him*) might be because *refuse* and *reject* were near-synonymy words. As a result, people used *refuse* to utter that someone did not accept someone else's love, which should be use *reject* to say that.

Reject

The verb *reject* shared several specific meanings according to the dictionaries mentioned in Chapter II. COCA had the occurrences of *reject* in the specific meanings. There were 100 tokens of the verb *reject* which would be discussed deeper in this section. As well as *refuse* tokens, the tokens of *reject* were taken by considering the intention of the utterances.

Since *reject* was a transitive verb, the analysis would be on the right collocations only. The right collocations would explain the context meanings of *reject*. Table 4.6 below presented the right collocations of *reject*.

Table 4.6 The Right Collocations of the Verb *Reject*

No	Type of Collocation	Total
1	noun	84
2	pronoun	16
TOTAL		100

After exploring 100 tokens, the verb *reject* collocated with two word classes: noun and pronoun. The collocations were 84 nouns and 16 pronouns. Those nouns and pronouns were various. Actually, those 84 nouns also contained the noun phrases. When investigating the noun phrases, the researcher listed them into noun by looking at their heads. The complements of the head were completed the meaning of the noun (Biber, *et al.*, 2002). Thus, only the heads of the noun phrases which were considered in the collocation analysis.

There were 7 definitions appeared among 100 tokens. However, 5 definitions only occurred in 1 – 10 tokens. Two definitions occurred in a lot of tokens. The explanation of the collocations would be based on the definitions.

1. The First Meaning of Reject

To start the discussion, the first meaning of *reject* was “to refuse to have, take, recognize, etc.” (“Reject”). Carrying this meaning, *reject* had collocations which occurred in some certain contexts. In COCA, there were many *reject* occurrences in this meaning. By investigating the tokens of *reject*, there were 50 tokens which contained the meaning discussed. The collocations of *reject* were the nouns, such as *idea*, *bill*, *tax*, *money*, *proposal*, *treatment*, *argument*, *teaching*, *beliefs*, *agreement* and *offer*. From 50 tokens, there were some nouns which appeared more than 2 times, which were *agreement* (3 times), *bill* (4 times), *tax* and *taxes* (the plural form of *tax*) (4 times), and *idea* and *ideas* (the plural form of *idea*) (12 times). The occurrences of *idea* and *ideas* were the highest among other collocations. Here were the examples of the *idea*’s and *ideas*’ occurrences which were in the different registers: the first token (44) was in news, the second token was in fiction, and the third token (46) was in academic.

- (44) but the President sat on our set, talking to you, saying I categorically reject the idea that this is a tax. I think you’ll appear on the (COCA: ABC_This Week)
- (45) it themselves. # Or had they? Maybe they'd fabricated some reason to reject the idea. Half of my joy balloons popped at that thought, but I (COCA: Analog)
- (46) treatment of enemy combatants captured in unconventional conflicts, both wings of the Tea Party reject liberal internationalist ideas and will continue to do so. The U.S. Senate, in (COCA: Foreign Affairs)

According to the examples, *idea* and *ideas* were being something which was not considered by the subjects. Basically, *reject* was used to say that you did not support an idea (“Reject”). Therefore, it was reasonable if the occurrences of *idea*/*ideas* were high.

Next, this study would like to discuss *money* as a collocation of *reject*. The noun *money* occurred twice in the tokens. The appearances of *money* were in the tokens below.

- (47) of which \$10,000 came from his own pocket. As part of his pledge to reject special-interest money, Roemer has said he will not take PAC donations and will limit (COCA: CS Monitor)
- (48) we care? COKIE-ROBERTS-1-A# (Off-camera) Well, I should just say that they did then reject that money and sent internal e-mails basically saying this is totally unacceptable. We have (COCA: ABC_This Week)

The examples occurred in the different registers. The first example occurred in news and the second one was in spoken. The noun *money* was also the right

collocation of *refuse* in fiction register. The collocation of *reject/ refuse + money* could be in the different registers but in the similar context.

In this meaning, the verb *reject* also collocated with the noun *treatment*. The occurrence of that collocation was only one. The token below presented its occurrence.

- (49) options available? # Patient preferences may conflict with the prevailing evidence or they may reject a treatment because they do not understand the risks or benefits correctly. Some of (COCA: Practice Nurse)

The example above occurred in academic register about medical matter. *Treatment* was being the thing that was refused to take by the patients. This noun also appeared as the right collocation of *refuse*. Both *refuse* and *reject* collocated with *treatment* in the medical environment. Thus, the context meaning of the use of those both verbs were similar. Another collocation of *reject* was the noun *proposal*. *Proposal* occurred twice in the tokens. Here were the tokens which contained *proposal*.

- (50) a panel appointed by the governor and lawmakers, also will have the power to reject or accept the proposal. # Gov. Jerry Brown has pushed for some type (COCA: San Fran Chron)
- (51) in place. # In Oklahoma, for example, the EPA is likely to reject a proposal, state officials say, after the state determined it wasn't cost-effective (COCA: Assoc Press)

Those two tokens ((50) and (51)) appeared in news registers. The *proposal* which were refused referred to “something (such as plan or suggestion) that is presented to a person or group of people to consider” (“Proposal”). Principally, *reject* was used to say that someone did not support proposals (plan or suggestion) (“Reject”). The verb *refuse* had *proposal* as its collocation too. However, *proposal* which occurred in *refuse* meant “the act of asking someone to marry you” (“Proposal”). Although *reject* and *refuse* had the collocation *proposal*, that noun shared different definitions. Thus, the context meanings were absolutely different.

2. The Second Meaning of Reject

The second meaning of *reject* was “refuse to grant (demand)” (“Reject”). By investigating COCA, there were some objects which were considered to be not granted. It was found 9 collocations of *reject* which held this meaning. The collocations were *request* and *requests* (the plural form of *request*) (4 times), *demand* and *demands* (the plural form of *demand*) (2 times), *appeal*, *plea*, and *orders*. The examples of those occurrences were presented below.

- (52) the paperwork (some of it in English) in order definitively and legally to reject any further demands for maintenance from her or her heirs. This must be possible (COCA: New Statesman)
- (53) Lawyers for Mr. Rumsfeld and the other military officials, urged the high court to reject the appeal. # " Petitioners seek to provide enemy combatants fighting against the United (COCA: CS Monitor)

- (54) from Summit and WorldCat to avoid ILL requests, they decided it was simpler to reject the few incoming loan requests when they were made. # Using PCC Vendor Neutral (COCA: Library Resources)

The tokens above proved that *reject* was used to decline a need asked. The words *demand* (as in (52)) and *appeal* (as in (53)), as the collocations of *reject*, sensed something which were strong needed. Those words had the same idea as the word *requests* (as in (54)). Followed by the occurrence of *requests* (as in (54)), that noun also occurred in the token of *refuse* as its collocation. However, *request* which followed *refuse* was less formal which referred to “something (such as a song) that a person asks for” (“Request”), as had explained in the previous section. The noun *request* which occurred once in the token of *refuse* was in fiction register. Thus, *request* as *reject*’s collocation was likely to be “an act of politely or formally asking for something, the state of being sought after” (“Request”). These tokens below showed other occurrences of *request* as *reject*’s collocation.

- (55) has thrown out her files and cut off her company email, gotten employees to reject her requests for information on the company's finances and activities, fired the company (COCA: Assoc Press)
- (56) in particular Pacific Gas and Electric Co. TURN often urges the commission to reject PG&E's requests for rate hikes, usually without success. # Sandoval's expertise (COCA: San Fran Chron)
- (57) a two-week- long protest at the White House, hoping to persuade the administration to reject the permit request. About 1,000 people were arrested. A few days into the (COCA: PBS_News Hour).

Those tokens above appeared in some registers. The tokens ((55) and (56)) occurred in news register, and the next token (57) was in spoken register, specifically in a news program. Although *request* appeared as the collocations of *reject* and *refuse*, the context of each verb’s collocation seemed to be different. In addition, in this meaning, *reject* referred “to use official powers to formally refuse request” (“Reject”). Thus, the collocation of *request* in *reject* was more formal rather than in *refuse*.

3. The Third Meaning of *Reject*

The third definition of *reject* was “to refuse to accept (a person)” (“Reject”). Having this meaning, there were 31 tokens which took place in some contexts and all registers. The collocations of *reject* in this meaning were 15 nouns and 16 pronouns. The nouns were *candidate*, *someone*, *children*, *kids*, *person*, and also proper nouns such as *Jesus*, *Nari*, *Perry*, *Bin Laden*, and *Mitt Romney*. The pronouns were *you*, *him*, *them*, *me*, *her*, and *us*. The tokens below showed the use of a pronoun, a proper noun, and a noun as *reject*’s collocations.

- (58) difficult. The painters either modify the use of these familiar images or reject them completely, often evolving a style of complete abstraction. The film repeats (COCA: Framework)

- (59) have no ability to sin nor moral conscience, do not have an ability to reject Jesus, " therefore they get a free pass to heaven (USA Today, (COCA: Christ Century)
- (60). # That makes long-term joblessness a problem that feeds on itself. When employers reject someone who has been out of work awhile, it only adds to the time (COCA: Atlanta)

Those three examples were in the different registers. The first token (58) was in fiction; the second token (59) was in magazine; and the third token (60) was in news. The use of *reject* which collocated with *them*, *Jesus*, and *someone* obviously gave examples of the meaning.

4. The Forth Meaning of *Reject*

The forth meaning of *reject* was "to throw away, discard, or refuse as useless or unsatisfactory" ("Reject"). After exploring, it was found two tokens which contained this meaning. These tokens below presented the meaning discussed.

- (61) a dry lab? Dr-PATEL: No, not at all. We reject -- we reject products as well.
HANSEN: (Voiceover) In this email he blamed us for misleading him
(COCA: NBC_Dateline)
- (62) speaker, the child will be able to perceive smaller acoustic differences between productions and reject some productions as produced badly, whereas such sounds would be acceptable for a low-acuity (COCA: J Speech Language)

Based on those tokens, the collocation of *reject* was *products* and *productions*, which described something discarded. *Products* and *productions* were "thrown away because the quality was not good enough" (Reject"). The tokens were in spoken and academic registers.

5. The Fifth Meaning of *Reject*

The fifth meaning of *reject* was "to cast out or off" ("Reject"). In this definition, it was found 4 tokens which held this meaning. The collocations of *reject* were *oil*, *plant*, *addresses*, and *words*. The tokens below presented the collocations of *reject* in this meaning.

- (63) vines, grading them for root length and even spacing. # " I would reject this plant, " she said, holding one Friulano sapling, " because it (COCA: San Fran Chron)
- (64) adept at finding substitutes, but it still took his brain time to recognize and reject the S words that came to mind automatically. # " Mr. Grant, of (COCA: Win Her Heart).

The examples above were in the different registers. The first token (63) was in news register and the second one (64) was in fiction register. The two other tokens occurred in news and academic registers. Those tokens described that the subjects did not want some things which irritated them. Consequently, they threw out those things.

6. The Sixth Meaning of *Reject*

The sixth definition of *reject* was “(of an organism) to not accept (a graft or transplant)” (“Reject”). From 100 tokens, there was only one token which held this definition. This token below showed that intention.

(65) Drugs the remainder of his or her life so is or her body does not reject the transplanted organ. Besides the expense involved, the drugs reduce the effectiveness of (COCA: Tech Engineer Teacher)

The token obviously showed the meaning discussed. The token showed the collocation of *reject* was *organ*, from a noun phrase *the transplanted organ*. Moreover, this meaning occurred in the medical environment.

7. The Seventh Meaning of *Reject*

The seventh definition of *reject* was “to refuse as lover or spouse, not love” (“Reject”). After exploring the tokens of *reject*, there were 3 tokens which bore this definition. The collocations of *reject* were *her* (twice) and *love*. Here were the tokens of that definition.

(66) feels superior to him... and for a moment he wants to hate her... reject her... but to his surprise she suddenly looks more sensual and beautiful than he (COCA: Framework)

(67) from me. She turns away each time I kiss her. She continues to reject my love towards her. I truly long to serve Jesus, but I became (COCA: NBC_Dateline)

Those tokens occurred in the different registers. The token (66) occurred in fiction and the next token (67) occurred in spoken. Those tokens clearly described someone who was not accepted in love with another else. This context also occurred in *refuse*. *Refuse* collocated with *him*, while *reject* collocated with *her*, which both *him* and *her* indicated to someone who loved.

The findings showed that *reject* was used in many contexts and situations. *Reject* collocated with various nouns and pronouns which formed the meanings of its use. Comparing to *refuse*, it had another form of collocation, *to infinitive*. *Reject* did not have *to infinitive* form as its collocation.

Based on the discussion, the collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* were various. The collocations of *refuse* were nouns and to infinitive forms. The new finding showed that the verb *refuse* was also used to deny a lover, which presented by the words *him*. Thus, pronoun was also the collocation of the verb *refuse*. The collocations of the verb *reject* were nouns and pronouns.

There were five similar collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject*. The words which were the collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* were *money*, *treatment*, *proposal*, *request*, and *him* and *her*, which represented someone who loved. However, not all those collocations had the similar contexts in use. The words *proposal* and *request* had different definitions when they were used as the collocations of *refuse* and *reject*. Thus, the similar collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* which

occurred in the similar contexts were *money*, *treatment*, *him*, and *her*. People could use both verbs *refuse* and *reject* to express that they did not accept *money*, a *treatment* in the medical field, and, someone who loved, which represented by the words *him* and *her*.

Conclusion

This study examined the frequencies and the collocations of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* in COCA. COCA 2011 and 2012 were taken as the data to discover the research problems. After examining and discussing the data, this study found the answers of the research problems.

The first research problem was the frequencies of the verbs *refuse* and *reject* in COCA from 2011 to 2012. Based on the occurrences in COCA, the frequency of the verb *refuse* was higher than the verb *reject*. The verb *refuse* occurred 406 times, while the verb *reject* occurred 299 times from 705 tokens. In the percentage, the occurrence frequency of *refuse* was 57.59% and the occurrence frequency of *reject* was 42.41%. The ratio of *refuse* and *reject* occurrences was 15.18%. That number of ratio percentage was not really significant. As a result, *refuse* was used more than *reject* to convey denial, as the basic sense of those synonymous verbs. The second research problem of this study was the collocations of verbs *refuse* and *reject*. The verbs *refuse* and *reject* had various collocations. The collocations of the verb *refuse* were nouns, pronouns, and to infinitive forms. The collocations of verb *reject* were nouns and pronouns. The verbs *refuse* and *reject* had three similar collocations. Based on the finding, the first collocation was *money*. The second collocation was *treatment*. The third collocation was *him* and *her*, which represented someone who loved. Thus, the verbs *refuse* and *reject* could be used to deny money, a treatment in the medical field, and a lover or someone who loved.

References

- Aarts, B. (1997). *English syntax and argumentation*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Allan, K. (2009). *Concise encyclopedia of semantics*. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). California: Wadsworth.
- Ayto, J. (1990). *Dictionary of word origins*. New York: Arcade Publishing Inc.
- Azar, B. S. & Hagen, S. A. (2009). *Understanding and using English grammar* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (2002). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Bloor, T. & Bloor, M. (2004). *The functional analysis of English* (2nd ed.). London: Hodder Education.
- Cartstairs-McCarthy, A. (2002). *An introduction to English morphology – words and their structures*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in a language - an introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Davies, A. & Elder, C. (Eds.). (2006). *The handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Davies, M. (2009). The 385+ million words of corpus of contemporary American English (1990 – 2008+). *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 14(2), 159-190.
- Davies, M. (2011-). *COCA – corpus of contemporary American English*. Retrieved April 11, 2014, from <http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>
- Evans, B. & Evans, C. (1957). *A dictionary of contemporary American usage*. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Finegan, E. (2004). *Language: Its structure and use* (4th ed.). Boston: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Google. *Refuse*. Retrieved September 1, 2014, from https://www.google.co.id/search?q=refuse&oq=refuse&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i59j69i60l2.973j0j7&sourceid=chrome&es_sm=93&ie=UTF-8
- Google. *Reject*. Retrieved September 1, 2014, from https://www.google.co.id/search?q=reject&oq=reject&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i59.39935j0j9&sourceid=chrome&es_sm=93&ie=UTF-8
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Teubert, W. (2004). *Lexicography and corpus linguistics: An introduction*. New York: Continuum.
- Harper, D. (2014). *Online etymology dictionary*. Retrieved March 24, 2014, from <http://www.etymonline.com>
- Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaci, L. & Zimmermann, L. (n.d.). *Native-like fluency and native-like selection*. Retrieved August 4, 2014, from http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/lili/personen/plennon/lillp1/lil+llp_handout_25.05.09.pdf
- Kayaoğlu, M. N. (2013). The use of corpus for close synonyms. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 9(1), 128-144.
- Kennedy, G. D. (1998). *An introduction to corpus linguistics*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Krismaheryanti, M. Y. (2014). *The corpus-based study on contextual preferences and collocation patterns of the words pupil and student*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University.
- Leech, G. (1981). *Semantics: The study of meaning* (2nd ed.). New York: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Leech, G., Cruickshank, B., & Ivancic, R. (2001). *An a-z of English grammar and usage*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Leech, G., Rayson, P., & Wilson, A. (2001). *Word frequencies in written and spoken English*. Harlow: Pearson Education
- Litchman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide* (3rd ed.). London: SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Liu, C. P. (2011). *A study of Taiwanese University students' production of collocations of English synonyms*. Taipei: Chinese Culture University.
- Lyons, J. (1996). *Linguistic semantics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macquarie dictionary*. Retrieved June 6, 2014, from <https://www.macquariedictionary.com.au/>
- Manser, M. (1998). *Dictionary of synonyms and anonyms*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Ltd.

- Matthew, P. H. (2007). *The concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McEnery, T. & Wilson, A. (2001). *Corpus linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McEnery, T. & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus linguistics: Method, theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Merriam-Webster online: *Dictionary and thesaurus*. Retrieved June 6, 2014, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/>
- Nesselhauf, N. (2005). *Corpus linguistics: Method, theory, and practice*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing.
- O'Dell, F. & McCarthy, M. (2008). *English collocation in use: Advanced*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Grady, W., Archibald, J., Aronoff, M., & Rees-Miller, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Contemporary linguistics: An introduction* (6th ed.). New York: Bedford/ St. Martin's.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Semantics* (2nd ed). New York: Press Syndicate of University of Cambridge.
- Phoochaorensil, S. (2010). A corpus-based study of English synonyms. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 3(10), 227-245.
- Samodra, M. C. (2014). *The use of modal verb shall in contemporary American English*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University.
- Schmitt, N. (2002). *An introduction to applied linguistics*. London: Arnold Publishers.
- Shea, M. (n.d.). *Ask about English*. Retrieved April 11, 2014, from [http:// www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/learningenglish/radio/specials/1837_aae/page19.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/learningenglish/radio/specials/1837_aae/page19.shtml)
- Shin, D. (2006). *A collocation inventory for beginners*. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Shin, D. & Nation, P. (2008). Beyond single words: The most frequent collocations in spoken English. *ELT Journal*, 62(4), 339-348.
- Stubbs, M. (2001). *Words and phrases: Corpus studies of lexical semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Tang, W. M. (n.d.). *Glossary of basic corpus linguistics terms*. Retrieved October 25, 2014, from <http://wmtang.org/corpus-linguistics/glossary-of-corpus-linguistic-terms/>
- Tebbs, J. M. (2006). *Stat 101 – Introduction to descriptive statistics*. The University of South Carolina.
- Turton, N. D. & Heaton, J. B. (1996). *Longman dictionary of common errors*. Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- University of Essex. (2005). *Corpora – An intro for the ELT student or applied linguist at Essex*. Retrieved September 11, 2014, from <http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~scholp/corpintro.htm>
- Waite, M. (2009). *Oxford thesaurus of English*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary. (2001). San Diego: Thunder Bay Press.
- Xiao, R. (n.d.). *Corpus linguistics: The basics*. Retrieved October 25, 2014, from [http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/corpus/ZJU/presentations/session %201.ppt](http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/corpus/ZJU/presentations/session%201.ppt).