

French dictionary users and word frequency

ABSTRACT: The first part of this paper is devoted to the policies that French dictionaries have for entering multi-word expressions. The front matter and the practice of four French dictionaries are compared with the results of an experiment where native speakers of French were asked to indicate their preference in looking up frequent collocations and idiomatic phrases. The second part gives an account of a new experiment with native speakers of French. The aim of this experiment was to examine to what extent differences in the frequency of the words composing an expression influence the search strategies of French dictionary users.

In a paper about the comprehension of written texts by learners of foreign languages, Scholfield (1982) gives some advice as to how to benefit maximally from the information that dictionaries provide. One of the difficulties he mentions concerns the case where an unknown element is part of a multi-word expression. He recommends that one look, whenever necessary, under each of the component words, commenting that: "Probably many dictionary users give up too soon if they can't find an unknown item, though there is more than one way a dictionary might enter many items, and several hypotheses can be followed up" (Scholfield 1982, 187).

This statement may provoke two remarks. First, it is noticeable that Scholfield, like any other author in this field, is unable to give better advice than just to search at all places to find the explanation or the translation of a given phrase. Second, the prudent use of the word 'probably' underlines the fact that next to nothing is known about how dictionary users, foreign language users or others, go about finding their way in these valuable sources of information.

In this article I would like to discuss both points. I will give a concrete example of how French dictionaries enter a series of more or less fixed collocations, and I will briefly comment on the policies that have been outlined. Subsequently, I will report on an experiment where French dictionary users were asked to indicate where they would look up a number of phrases.

1. Multi-word expressions in French dictionaries

In order to get an idea of the guidelines that may have served to determine the place where multi-word expressions are entered, I have consulted the front matter of four French dictionaries: PETIT ROBERT (1986, PR), LEXIS (1975), HACHETTE (1987) and ROBERT & COLLINS (1987, R&C). Nothing was said about this subject in LEXIS or HACHETTE.

As to the PR, after having explained that the lexicographer has many difficult choices to make on this point, the compilers (page X) state that combinations like *pomme de terre*, *chemin de fer* and *point de vue* will be treated as entries on their own, but that other expressions, like *excès de pouvoir*, *à l'exception de* and *comme il faut*, will be entered under *excès*, *exception* and *falloir*, respectively. It is not entirely clear what makes the two groups of examples so different as to be treated in different ways. According to the PR, the examples of both groups are sufficiently lexicalized to be called "real words", but those of the second group are considered to be "less important" and are, therefore, to be found in the microstructure of the most important word. Because of shared intuitions about the "importance" of lexicalized word combinations, this policy may not be too big a hindrance for native speakers of French. For learners of that language, however, it will certainly lack coherence.

In a "Note sur les groupes de mots" (page XV) the PR makes a distinction between "a sequence of words which is frequent but *modifiable* (example or citation)" on the one hand and "a sequence of words which is *inviolable* (phrase, idiom, gallicism, proverb)" on the other, without there being a sharp line between the two. "For greater convenience of the reader" it is stated that "mostly" items belonging to the latter category will be entered under the most important element: *faire fête* under *fête*, *feu de joie* and *coup de feu* under *feu*. Moreover, asterisks will be used in cases where an expression could be entered at several places.

In the introduction to the R&C (page XIV) the category of compounds and set phrases is "taken to cover not only solid and hyphenated compounds (eg. *camion-citerne*, *arrière-pensée*, *body-building*), but also attributive uses of English nouns (eg. *boat train*, *freedom fighter*), and other collocations which function in a similar way (eg. *grand ensemble*, *modèle déposé*, *air traffic control*, *ear nose and throat specialist*). All of the above are normally treated in the compound section of the entry in alphabetical order." On the next page (XV) it is specified that "Compounds are placed under the first element, 'grand ensemble' under *grand*, 'pont d'envol' under *pont*, ... Where for practical reasons an exception has been made to this rule a cross-reference alerts the user. ... Set phrases and idiomatic expressions are also placed under the first element or the first word in the phrase which remains constant despite minor variations in the phrase itself." This clear policy is based on formal criteria, which may be helpful in a dictionary which was devised for native speakers of French as well as for native speakers of English.

To give an idea of how the practice of the four dictionaries compares to what native speakers of French do when they are asked to indicate where they would look up set phrases, I present in table 1 some twenty expressions where at least 75% of the subjects (N = 144) of a former study (Bogaards 1990) chose one particular item. This table should be read as follows:

- Each expression contains two target words, which are printed in italics.
- Under 1 and 2 the percentages of choice for the first or the second word of each expression are given; in most cases the percentages do not add up to 100 because of other choices made by the subjects or because of voids.
- In the next columns a 1 or a 2 indicates that, in the dictionary concerned, the expression is to be found with an explanation or a translation under the first or the second word; an asterisk stands for a cross-reference; not all expressions figure in all the dictionaries consulted.

Table 1. Some selected expressions in four French dictionaries.

	1	2	PR	LEXIS	HACH.	R&C
Noun + Noun						
1. <i>pile ou face</i>	84	9	1	1/2	1	1
2. <i>le droit d'aïnesse</i>	20	77	2	2	1/2	1/*
3. <i>un enfant de choeur</i>	17	80	1/*	1/2	1/2	1/*
4. <i>un mutilé de guerre</i>	93	4	1/2	1	1	1
5. <i>la caque sent toujours le hareng</i>	80	14	1/*	–	1	1
6. <i>un rameau d'olivier</i>	77	20	2	2	–	1/*
Noun + Adjective						
7. <i>c'est clair comme le jour</i>	77	16	1/2	1/2	1/2	1
8. <i>au petit jour</i>	12	86	1/2	2	1	–
9. <i>un frère utérin</i>	13	85	1/2	1/2	1/2	–
10. <i>à une heure indue</i>	14	85	1/2	1/*	2	1/*
11. <i>jaune comme un coing</i>	19	81	2	1/2	–	1
12. <i>avoir une petite santé</i>	2	97	2	1	2	1
13. <i>aux petits oignons</i>	1	97	2	2	2	2
Noun + Verb						
14. <i>jeter l'opprobre sur qn.</i>	3	95	2	–	–	2
15. <i>chercher noise à qn.</i>	4	95	2	2	2	1/2
16. <i>vivre dans l'aisance</i>	11	87	2	–	2	2
17. <i>nager dans l'opulence</i>	15	83	1/2	–	1/2	1
18. <i>se fouler le pied</i>	96	3	1/2	–	1	1
19. <i>se dévisser la tête</i>	88	12	–	1	–	1
20. <i>flanquer qn. à la porte</i>	89	9	1/2	1	2	1
21. <i>fouler aux pieds</i>	93	6	1/*	1	1	1

As can be seen, the dictionaries score differently as to the number of times the expressions are treated at the places where the users tend to look them up: PR 16 times, LEXIS 13 times, HACHETTE 15 times, and R&C 12 times. It should be added, however, that the better score of PR is at the cost of much room: on 8 occasions the phrase is treated at two places. This contrasts with 5 occasions in LEXIS and in HACHETTE and only one in R&C. The latter dictionary, which has outlined a clear formal policy, seems to be the most economical; it has to be admitted, however, that the better score is obtained because in three cases the dictionary transgresses its own rules by placing items under the second element, even without giving cross-references (items 13, 14 and 16). The PR, which has chosen an intuitive semantic point of view, apparently has the most difficulty in making clear choices.

The number of times dictionaries treat items at the wrong place, that is to say in an entry where less than 25% of the users will look them up (without there being a cross-reference to guide the user), is rather limited: 1 time for PR, 2 times for LEXIS and HACHETTE, 3 times for R&C. Clearly, the compilers of the dictionaries have the same sort of intuitions as their users. And these seem to be so strong as to make them forget even an explicit policy. Taking into account the number of times items are entered at the right place only and subtracting the number of times items are entered at the wrong place, it is possible to calculate an "optimal score" for each dictionary. This is .35 for PR (16 – 8 "doubles" – 1

"wrong place" = 7 on a total of 20 items), .38 for LEXIS (13 - 5 - 2 = 6 on 16 items), .47 for HACHETTE (15 - 5 - 2 = 8 on 17 items) and .53 for R&C (12 - 1 - 1 = 10 on 19 items).

2. Strategies in French dictionary search

As has been suggested by earlier research (Bogaards 1990 and in press) and as can also be seen in the items which figure in table 1, the strategies that French dictionary users employ when looking up multi-word expressions are not simply a matter of the order in which elements are contained in a phrase. Word frequency seems to play an important role. It is this variable that explains as a first factor why in *fouler aux pieds* 93% of the subjects choose *fouler*, whereas in *lever le pied* the first element is chosen by about 55% only: *fouler* is a rather infrequent word and *lever*, just like *pied*, belongs to the 1,000 most frequent words of French. In the latter case the percentages of choice circle around chance level. The same tendency can be observed in *jeter l'opprobre sur quelqu'un* and *accabler quelqu'un d'opprobre*, where the very frequent verb *jeter* gets only 3% of the choices, while the infrequent verb *accabler* gets 30%; the very infrequent noun *opprobre* gets 95% in the first case and 69% in the second. As was concluded earlier (Bogaards 1990, 101), frequency is not the only factor in the strategies of French dictionary users: grammatical structure also plays a significant role.

As frequency seems to be the most important factor, however, what is important to know next is at what level of frequency this factor makes itself felt in dictionary search strategies; or, in other words, what is the minimal distance that words should have in a rank order of diminishing frequencies to influence the looking-up behaviour of French dictionary users?

In a first attempt to establish this distance (Bogaards in press), I have presented lists of fixed expressions to several groups of native speakers of French. The expressions had a more or less idiomatic character like *veiller au grain* (to keep an open eye for trouble) or *un retour de bâton* (a kickback). The subjects were asked to underline in each expression the word under which they would look for the explanation of the whole expression in a monolingual dictionary. The words making up the expressions were chosen at distances of less than 1,000 items, 1,000 to 2,000 items, and more than 2,000 items in the rank order of Juilland & al. 1970. An analysis of variance showed weak but highly significant effects for difference of frequency and for word class as well as a significant interaction between these two factors.

To make sure that frequency was really the explaining factor, the same subjects were presented two weeks later with a set of word pairs. They were asked to indicate which word of each pair was the more frequent one. This time the words were chosen at distances of about 50, 100, 150, 200, 300, 400 and 900 places in the rank order of Juilland & al. 1970. Unfortunately, the expectations about the sensitivity for frequency differences proved to be too optimistic: at distances below 1,000 for native speakers of French there seems to be no systematic influence on the part of this factor.

The provisional conclusion may be that frequency is a relevant factor in the search strategies of French dictionary users, but that the distance between words has to exceed 1,000 items in a frequency rank ordering. Some parts of the results of that experiment may be interpreted as indicating that a distance of some 2,000 items could be a more

reliable criterion. In the first place, the lists of expressions contained four items which were variants of expressions used in earlier experiments. The original expressions were combinations of very frequent and very infrequent words (e.g. *chercher noise à quelqu'un* 'to try to pick a quarrel with someone'); in the variants the very infrequent words were replaced with frequent ones, or the reverse (e.g. *chercher des histoires à quelqu'un* 'to try to make trouble to someone'). The changes in the percentages of choice suggest that 2,000 words constitutes the lower limit for frequency sensitivity. In the second place, a closer inspection of the data of the first part of the experiment as a whole suggests that, from a distance of 2,000 onwards, frequency has a more or less systematic influence on the choice of 'headwords' of multi-word expressions.

These considerations have been used as a starting point in the formulation of a hypothesis for a new experiment, which was a replication of the one described above, but with other frequency distances: it was expected that native speakers of French, when asked to indicate where they would look up more or less fixed phrases, would tend to choose the less frequent elements provided that the distance between the component elements of each phrase be at least 2,000 items in a frequency rank order. A questionnaire containing two parts was presented to a group of French students in order to verify this hypothesis.

2.1 Material

For the first part of the questionnaire, words were chosen between 750 and 1250 (1,000), and between 1750 and 2250 (2,000) in the 'usage' rank ordering of Juillard & al 1970; these words were then combined to form current collocations with words which are at various distances from 1,000 to 4,000 items in that list as well as with some words which are too infrequent to be included in the list. In most cases the first element of an item is the most frequent one, but in order to break the possible monotony of this type of item, four items presented the elements in the reverse order. All items were of the form 'Noun + de + Noun', except for three items which, for the same reason of breaking the monotony, were of the form 'Verb + Noun'. The items were presented in sentences where all words were provided with subscript numbers. The total number of sentences was 36 (see Appendix).

The second part of the questionnaire contained six words which were paired with three or four words at distances of about 1,000, 2,000, 3,000 and 4,000 words in the Juillard list. Only nouns were used and the words of a pair had to have about the same degree of concreteness/abstractness. The order of frequent and infrequent words was randomized over pairs. The total number of pairs was 21 (see Appendix).

2.2 Subjects and procedure

The subjects were 62 students of the highest classes of a 'lycée' in Lille (France). For different reasons only 52 questionnaires could be used for analysis: 16 males and 36 females, with a mean age of 17 years, all native speakers of French.

For each sentence of the first part of the questionnaire the subjects were asked to note the number of the word where they would look up the expression as a whole in case they had to check its exact meaning in a monolingual dictionary. In the second part, they had to underline the most frequent element of each pair of words. The two parts of the questionnaire were given in one session.

Table 2. Results of test 1 (N = 52)

(The numbers of the choices are in real figures. The numbers in brackets are the numbers of the items in the questionnaire.)

distance 1,000 - 1,500 (mean .59**, s.d. .19)			
1. défaut	/construction (14)	24	17
2. tapis	/bombes (33)	26	25
3. pomme	/pin (25)	22	30
4. peau	/âne (1)	23	25
5. huile	/coude (9)	33	18*
6. économies	/échelle (23)	22	28
7. pots	/vin (7)	39	6** R
8. mandat	/arrêt (16)	46	4** R
distance 1,500 - 2,000 (mean .55 n.s., s.d. .24)			
9. gare	/marchandises (13)	28	19
10. parc	/attractions (4)	14	34**
11. sensation	/malaise (17)	27	25
12. pierre	/taille (27)	20	26
13. marchand	/canons (32)	14	38**
14. groupement	/achat (35)	25	19
distance 2,000 - 2,500 (mean .49 n.s., s.d. .23)			
15. faim	/loup (18)	33	19
16. salon	/thé (12)	35	8**
17. conflit	/compétence (5)	19	32
18. odeur	/sainteté (22)	17	35*
19. centre	/accueil (2)	15	33*
20. bâton	/maréchal (30)	18	33 R
distance 2,500 - 3,000 (mean .68**, s.d. .25)			
21. crise	/foie (28)	26	26
22. marchand	/soupe (36)	22	27
23. pierre	/autel (21)	6	43**
24. certificat	/origine (29)	38	9** R
distance 3,000 - 4,000 (mean .65**, s.d. .29)			
25. viande	/boucherie (26)	13	38**
26. bruit	/enfer (11)	17	33*
27. voie	/accès (20)	24	24
28. agent	/maîtrise (3)	17	34*
distance 4,000 > (mean .63**, s.d. .27)			
29. sang	/poulet (19)	27	23
30. bateau	/plaisance (10)	17	35*
31. gare	/triage (24)	13	37**
32. sac	/couchage (34)	24	25
33. pot	/échappement (6)	13	35*
34. sauver	/meubles (8)	29	18
35. romper	/attente (15)	28	19
36. vendre	/mèche (31)	14	36**

* = $p < .05$ (2-tailed) ** = $p < .01$ (id.)

R = elements in reversed frequency order

2.3 Results

The results of the first test are presented in table 2. The numbers of choices are reported in two columns, for the first and the second element respectively. For each distance a mean has been calculated by noting a 0 when the frequent element was chosen and a 1 when the infrequent element was chosen. In the first group (distance 1,000 – 1,500) the mean differs significantly from a purely random choice; this is mainly due to the two items which are in reverse order of frequency. For the first three groups (distance 1,000 – 2,500), difference in frequency appears to exert little influence: the number of items demonstrating some sort of preference for the frequent element almost equals the number of items where subjects tend to choose the less frequent element. From distance 2,500 upwards, there is a strong tendency to choose the infrequent element: of a total of 13 items, 8 items show a (highly) significant preference for the infrequent element. The means for these groups are all highly significant.

Table 3 presents the results of the second test. For each pair the number of choices for the more frequent and the less frequent word is given. As can be seen, for the six pairs with a distance of about 1,000 words, the choices for only one demonstrate a clear preference for the less frequent element. At distances 2,000 and 3,000 this tendency is clear from all pairs. At distance 4,000, however, only one of the three pairs shows a significant preference for the infrequent element.

On the whole, the results of the two tests can be taken to support the hypothesis, albeit that those of the first test may suggest that a distance of 2,500 items might be the lower limit for words in phrases. The correlation between the scores on the two tests is a highly significant .95, which may be taken as an indication that frequency is indeed involved in the choices made by native speakers of French in this type of test.

2.4 Discussion

Some items of the first part of the questionnaire have not produced the expected results; this is notably the case with *salon de thé* (16, 'tea-room') and *huile de coude* (5, 'elbow grease'), where the differences of choice are (highly) significant in the wrong direction. It is not clear how these striking exceptions could be explained. For item 5, one could think of its idiomatic character; this suggestion is supported by items like 15, 20 and 29, but is contradicted by items like 6, 13, 18, 22 and 26, where expressions with a more or less strong idiomatic character behave as expected. As was concluded earlier (Bogaards 1990, 83), idiomaticity does not seem to play an independent role in the search strategies of French dictionary users.

Items 7, 8 and 24 of table 2 show a convergence of two tendencies in these search strategies: the tendency to choose the least frequent element and that of choosing the syntactically independent element. In these items the first element is not only the least frequent one, but it is also the head of the construction. The numbers of students preferring these elements are among the highest mentioned. This is not the case, however, with item 20.

Items 34, 35 and 36, which contain a verb and a noun, call for some comment. The three verbs are from the same frequency range (about 1,000); the three nouns are at distances of about 1,000, 2,000 and 3,000 items respectively. Whereas in the first and the

Table 3. Results of test 2 (N = 52)

(The numbers of the choices are in real figures. The numbers in brackets are the "usage" rank order numbers of Juilland et al. 1970)

peau (996)	parc (1997) 23/29	queue (2995) 16/35*	astre (3993) 10/42**	tranche (4987) 34/18*
gare (1107)	restaurant (2088) 39/12**	tribune (3117) 1/51**	caveau (4106) 3/48**	talon (5078) 10/42**
agent (1047)	gardien (2025) 25/24	héritier (3049) 13/39**	fournisseur (4021) 16/35*	mouchard (5096) 22/29
conflit (2181)	injustice (3165) 19/33	bienveillance (4160) 0/52**	soumission (5073) 5/47**	
parc (1997)	tronc (2999) 15/37**	racine (3977) 9/43**	touffe (4984) 6/45**	
sac (1913)	paire (2909) 20/32	corbeille (3904) 7/45**	cousin (4901) 17/35*	

* = $p < .05$ (2-tailed) ** = $p < .01$ (id.)

second phrase the syntactic tendency seems to overrule the tendency based on frequency, in the last case the frequency difference becomes too strong to be neglected.

As to results as a whole and especially the items for which no acceptable explanation is available, it is in order to make some remarks about the frequency data which were used in this experiment. The rank order established by Juilland et al. was based on written material collected in the period between 1920 and 1940; it may be expected, therefore, that it does not fit in very well with the intuitions about frequencies of modern speakers of French, which are mainly based on spoken material. Although the language does not seem to have changed so drastically as to make Juilland's data useless, there are two facts which suggest that his material might be less than adequate. In the first place, a group of 30 Dutch university students of French proved to have better scores for the second part of the questionnaire than the native speakers. As the contact these students have with the French language is based to a much greater extent on written texts (and for a good deal on historical literary texts), this may be interpreted as a confirmation of the view put forward above. The second confirmation comes from the word *mouchard* in the second questionnaire: it is the only word at a distance of more than 2,000 items where

there is no significant preference for the less frequent element. This is, without doubt, due to the fact that the word is far more frequent in the spoken school language of the students than in the written language in general.

3. Conclusion

In this paper I have sought to present an overview of the way French dictionaries treat multi-word expressions and of one aspect of the search strategies employed by French dictionary users. Although many questions remain about these strategies, as well as about the practical implications of the findings I have presented, some basis for a better defined policy may well become available if more research of this type is done. The results may lead to a less space-consuming practice and to more user-friendly dictionaries.

Bibliography

Dictionaries

- ATKINS, B.T., DUVAL, A., MILNE, R.C. (1987): Robert-Collins Dictionnaire français - anglais, anglais - français. Dictionnaires Le Robert, Paris.
- DUBOIS, J. et al. (1975): Lexis. Dictionnaire de la langue française. Larousse, Paris.
- GATARD, M. (1987): Dictionnaire du français. Hachette, Paris.
- REY, A., REY-DEBOVE, J. (1986): Le Petit Robert. Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française. Dictionnaires Le Robert, Paris.

Studies

- BOGAARDS, P. (1990): "Où cherche-t-on dans le dictionnaire?". In: *International Journal of Lexicography* 3, 79-102.
- BOGAARDS, P. (in press): "Word frequency in the search strategies of French dictionary users". In: *Lexicographica*.
- JUILLAND, A., et al. (1970): *Frequency Dictionary of French Words*. Mouton, The Hague.
- SCHOLFIELD, P. (1982): "Using the English dictionary for comprehension". In: *Tesol Quarterly* 16, 185-194.

Appendix

QUESTIONNAIRE

Ce questionnaire comporte deux parties:

- A. une liste de phrases françaises
- B. un certain nombre de couples de mots français

A. Le français connaît bien des expressions du type 'l'âge de raison' ou 'un retour de bâton'. Si vous voulez vérifier le sens exact de ces expressions dans un dictionnaire français, il vous faut décider si vous allez chercher sous le premier mot ou sous le second.

Ce qu'on vous demande c'est d'indiquer *sous quel mot* vous chercheriez *en premier lieu* l'explication des expressions qui figurent dans les phrases ci-dessous. Est-ce que vous voudriez bien *noter le numéro* du mot dans la case après chacune des phrases de la liste?

1. Il₁ a₂ enfin₃ obtenu₄ sa₅ peau₆ d'₇âne₈.
2. Adressez₁-vous₂ au₃ centre₄ d'₅accueil₆.
3. Il₁ est₂ devenu₃ agent₄ de₅ maîtrise₆.
4. Nous₁ allons₂ visiter₃ ce₄ parc₅ d'₆attractions₇.
5. Il₁ est₂ question₃ d'₄un₅ conflit₆ de₇ compétence₈.
6. Il y a₁ un₂ trou₃ dans₄ le₅ pot₆ d'₇échappement₈.
7. Ils₁ ont₂ accepté₃ des₄ pots₅ de₆ vin₇.
8. Il₁ s'₂agit₃ maintenant₄ de₅ sauver₆ les₇ meubles₈.
9. Ce₁ garçon₂ manque₃ d'₄huile₅ de₆ coude₇.
10. Nous₁ avons₂ acheté₃ un₄ bateau₅ de₆ plaisance₇.
11. Les₁ enfants₂ ont₃ fait₄ un₅ bruit₆ d'₇enfer₈.
12. Il y avait₁ un₂ salon₃ de₄ thé₅ juste₆ à₇ côté₈.
13. On₁ s'₂est₃ retrouvé₄ dans₅ une₆ gare₇ de₈ marchandises₉.
14. C'₁était₂ probablement₃ un₄ défaut₅ de₆ construction₇.
15. Malheureusement₁, ce₂ garçon₃ a₄ trompé₅ l'₆attente₇.
16. Les₁ gendarmes₂ lui₃ ont₄ montré₅ le₆ mandat₇ d'₈arrêt₉.
17. Elle₁ a₂ eu₃ une₄ sensation₅ de₆ malaise₇.
18. Il₁ avait₂ une₃ faim₄ de₅ loup₆.
19. Ils₁ ont₂ vraiment₃ du₄ sang₅ de₆ poulet₇.
20. La₁ voie₂ d'₃accès₄ est₅ assez₆ difficile₇.
21. Ils₁ ont₂ admiré₃ cette₄ pierre₅ d'₆autel₇.
22. Elle₁ est₂ morte₃ en₄ odeur₅ de₆ sainteté₇.
23. Cela₁ permettra₂ de₃ réaliser₄ des₅ économies₆ d'₇échelle₈.
24. Le₁ wagon₂ était₃ resté₄ dans₅ une₆ gare₇ de₈ triage₉.
25. Les₁ enfants₂ ont₃ apporté₄ une₅ pomme₆ de₇ pin₈.
26. C'₁est₂ de₃ la₄ viande₅ de₆ boucherie₇.
27. Il y a₁ des₂ murs₃ en₄ pierre₅ de₆ taille₇.
28. Il₁ a₂ encore₃ fait₄ une₅ crise₆ de₇ foie₈.
29. Ces₁ articles₂ sont₃ munis₄ d'₅un₆ certificat₇ d'₈origine₉.
30. Il₁ a₂ maintenant₃ son₄ bâton₅ de₆ maréchal₇.
31. Tu₁ ne₂ vas₃ pas₄ vendre₅ la₆ mèche₇, j'₈espère₉.

32. Son₁ père₂ étai_t₃ marchand₄ de₅ canons₆.
 33. Les₁ avions₂ ont₃ lancé₄ un₅ tapis₆ de₇ bombes₈.
 34. J'₁avais₂ oublié₃ mon₄ sac₅ de₆ couchage₇.
 35. Ils₁ sont₂ membres₃ d'₄un₅ groupement₆ d'₇achat₈.
 36. Ce₁ n'₂est₃ qu'₄un₅ marchand₆ de₇ soupe₈.

B. Dans l'emploi de la langue, nous n'utilisons pas tous les mots avec la même fréquence: certains mots reviennent très souvent (tout, faire, etc.), d'autres sont plus ou moins rares (rameau, brider, etc.).

Ci-dessous on vous présente chaque fois deux mots et on vous demande d'indiquer lequel de ces mots est, selon vous, le plus fréquent, c'est-à-dire lequel de ces mots vous employez, entendez ou lisez le plus souvent. Veuillez *soulligner le mot le plus fréquent* de chaque couple.

peau	- queue	tribune	- gare	gare	- caveau
conflit	- injustice	paire	- sac	peau	- tranche
gardien	- agent	peau	- parc	agent	- fournisseur
soumission	- conflit	coussin	- sac	gare	- restaurant
parc	- touffe	agent	- héritier	conflit	- bienveillance
sac	- corbeille	parc	- tronc	astre	- peau
racine	- parc	talon	- gare	mouchard	- agent

Veillez indiquer enfin

votre sexe: m. / f.

votre âge: ans

votre langue maternelle: français/autre, à savoir

Merci beaucoup