Cite as: Gabrielatos, C. (1994). Collocations: Pedagogical implications, and their treatment in pedagogical materials. Unpublished essay, Research Centre for English and Applied Linguistics, University of Cambridge.

University of Cambridge

Research Centre for English and Applied Linguistics

MPhil in English and Applied Linguistics 1993-4

Pedagogical Grammar

Collocations:
Pedagogical implications, and their treatment in pedagogical materials

Constantinos Gabrielatos

22 April 1994

1. The aim and scope of the essay

Treatment of English collocations has only recently begun to find its way in pedagogical materials targeted at the learner of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). This essay will first, draw an outline of the concept of collocation and examine relevant aspects of the way collocational studies are conducted; second, it will look into the (actual and potential) contribution of the findings of collocational studies to EFL instruction and support materials, as well as examine the pedagogical treatment of the collocational properties of lexical items in them *[see also 4 & 5]*.

2. A brief account of the background

Originally, the term 'collocation' was introduced by Firth (1951) as one of the "levels" of meaning. He distinguished "meaning by collocation" from both the "conceptual or idea approach to the meaning of words" and "contextual meaning" (op.cit.: 195-196).

Later, Halliday (1966) and Sinclair (1966) took this idea further and, without abandoning collocation as defining meaning, introduced the notion that patterns of collocation can form the basis for a lexical analysis of language alternative to, and independent of, the grammatical analysis. They regarded the two levels of analysis as being complementary, with neither of the two being subsumed by the other. "Collocation and set, as terms in a lexical description, are analogous to structure and system in a grammatical theory: The difference is that collocation is a relation of *probable* co-occurrence of items, and sets are open-ended" (Malmkjaer, 1991: 302). "We choose items from lexical sets rather as we choose types of grammatical items from grammatical systems or build up grammatical structures" (Carter, 1987: 50). Sinclair (1991: 100) states that evidence from large corpora "suggests that grammatical generalizations do not rest on a rigid foundation, but are the accumulation of the patterns of hundreds of individual words and phrases".

McIntosh (1961: 328) and Mitchell (1971) presented the lexical and grammatical analyses as interdependent: "Collocations are to be studied within grammatical matrices [which] in turn

depend for their recognition on the observation of collocational similarities" (Mitchell, 1971: 65). Sinclair (1991: 109-112) seems to have modified his initial position and to acknowledge the interrelation of the grammatical and lexical levels. He proposes two principles "in order to explain the way in which meaning arises from language text". The grammatical level is represented by the "open-choice principle", which sees "language text as the result of a very large number of complex choices ... the only restraint [being] grammaticalness". The "idiom principle" represents the lexical level and accounts for "the restraints that are not captured by the open-choice model" - "collocation … illustrates the idiom principle" (op.cit.: 115).

Halliday (1966: 151&157) argued that the collocational patterns of lexical items can lead to generalisations at the lexical level. According to him, if certain items belong to the same set, then they can be regarded as "a single lexical item": "*A strong argument, he argued strongly, the strength of his argument and his argument was strengthened* [can all be regarded] as instances of the one and the same syntagmatic relation. What is abstracted is an item *strong*, having the scatter *strong, strongly, strength, strengthened*, which collocates with [the item] *argue* (*argument*)". Sinclair (1966: 412 & 1974: 16) proposed that a lexical item can be defined from its collocational pattern.

3. Collocation: Degrees of idiomaticity

There are three factors determining the categorisation of a lexical combination: the degree of probability that the items will co-occur, the degree of fixity of the combination (i.e. grammatical restrictions), and the degree to which the meaning of the combination can be derived from the meaning of its constituent parts. Since these interacting factors may apply in varying degrees we cannot expect clear cut-off points between categories. What has been proposed is a continuum on which the lexical combinations can be placed. Convenient (but to a great extent arbitrary) end-point and intermediary categories have been proposed as well. Consequently, there are different views not only as to when, for example, a lexical combination ceases to be an idiom and should be regarded as a collocation, but also regarding shadings within

these categories. What makes matters more complicated is the inconsistency with which the terms 'idiom' and 'collocation' (as well as their ‘shadings’) are used by different analysts. One of the reasons for this discrepancy can be regarded as the fact that not all factors are taken into account by all analysts: “most collocationists use only a semantic criterion of whether a combination is fully ‘compositional’ or not” (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992: 177); “the study of lexical collocations ... has tended to concentrate on linear, syntagmatic co-occurrence of items and has not included the syntactic and semantic statements that are often essential” (Carter, 1987: 55). *[For examples see end of section.]*

Woods (1981, in Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992: 177-178) suggests the following continuum (from most to least predictable/fixed): *idioms - collocations - colligations - free combinations.* At the one end of this cline, idioms seem to be definable both from their semantic characteristics and the fixity of their constituents. They are seen to function semantically as a single unit, and to be more or less “non-productive” (see also Mitchell, 1971: 53&57), that is, they tend not to allow for substitution of their elements, nor for grammatical or syntactic alterations. An extreme case is the one of *true idioms*, which are described as “completely frozen”. At the other end, free combinations are “really compositional and productive”. Collocations are presented as “roughly predictable ... yet restricted to certain specified items”. Colligations are “generalisable classes of collocations, for which at least one construct is specified by category rather than as a distinct lexical item”.

ODCIE2 (: xii-xiii) *[see appendix B]* presents a continuum from "idiom" to "non-idiom" and distinguishes between "pure idioms" (totally fixed) and "figurative idioms" (allowing for some variation). Collocations (non-idioms) are divided between "restricted" (or "semi-idioms"), which “allow a degree of lexical variation”, and in which one element “has a figurative sense not found outside that limited context”, whereas the other appears “in a familiar, literal sense”; and "open", in which elements are “freely combinable” and are used “in a common literal sense”. Cowie (1978: 134) adds a sub-category to the one of "open collocations", which he

terms “established collocations”. These are “more familiar, or established in use than others”. ODCIE1 (: ix-x), in its discussion of idiomaticity regarding collocations of the type ‘*verb+particle and/or preposition’*, offers three tests of idiomaticity: “particle deletion” or “verb replacement” should affect the meaning of an idiomatic construction; idiomatic combinations should also be able to be converted into nouns. Since not all combinations will either pass or fail all three tests, this approach is consistent with the gradience of idiomaticity which ODCIE1 advocates.

Aisenstadt (1979: 71-73) makes a discrete distinction between "idioms" (“one semantic unit”), "restricted collocations" (combinations whose constituents are “used in one of their regular, non-idiomatic meanings, following certain structural patterns, and restricted in their commutability not only by grammatic and semantic valency ... but also by usage”), and "free word-combinations" (whose “commutability restrictions are conditioned by usage”).

Cruse (1986: 37-41) uses mostly semantic criteria and distinguishes between "idioms" (“lexically complex” units, constituting a “single minimal semantic constituent”) and "collocations" (“sequences of lexical items which habitually co-occur”, each lexical item being a “semantic constituent”). He also introduces "bound collocations" (expressions “whose constituents do not like to be separated”) as a “transitional area bordering on idiom”.

Kjellmer (1994: xiv&xxxiii) defines collocations as “such recurring sequences of items as are grammatically well formed”. "Collocation" is used as an inclusive term, and "idiom" is presented as a “subcategory of the class of collocations”, and is defined as “a collocation whose meaning cannot be deduced from the combined meanings of its constituents”. Furthermore, Kjellmer (1984: 163-171) introduces the concept of “collocational distinctiveness”: collocations are assigned their place along a continuum ranging from “lexicalised collocations” to “new syntactic combinations” according to how high they score when measured against the following six factors: "absolute frequency of occurrence", "relative frequency of occurrence", "length of sequence", "distribution of sequence over texts", "distribution of sequence over text categories", and "structure of sequence".

Jones & Sinclair (1974: 42-44) also regard idioms as a subclass of collocations, an idiom showing “limitations on word order or grammatical form and function”. They use the test of position-dependency, and state that “position-dependent” collocations are “statistically significant at a single span position but not in total”.

Benson, Benson & Ilson (1986: 252-254) identify five groups of “lexical combinations”: "free combinations" (“their components are the freest in regard to combining with other lexical items”), "idioms" (“relatively frozen expressions whose meanings do not reflect the meanings of their component parts”), "collocations", or “fixed”/“recurrent” combinations (“loosely fixed combinations” between free combinations and idioms), "transitional collocations" (“between idiom and collocation ... more ‘frozen’ than ordinary collocations ... [they] seem to have a meaning close to that suggested by their component parts”), and "compounds" ("lexical elements of more than one word").

Some examples of inconsistencies

1. What Benson, Benson & Ilson (1986), Woods and Aisenstadt (1979), term as free combinations are termed as open collocations by ODCIE2. Benson, Benson & Ilson (1986) and Cruse (1986) use almost identical definitions for what they term "compounds" and "idioms" respectively.

2. Aisenstadt (1979), Cruse (1986) and ODCIE2 regard collocations as non-idioms. Benson, Benson & Ilson (1986) and Woods & McLeod (1990) see collocations and idioms as shading into each other. DEC, Jones & Sinclair (1974), and Nattinger & DeCarrico (1992: 20&181) present idioms as a subgroup within collocations.

3. Nattinger & DeCarrico (1992: 178) offer *`kick the bucket'* as an example of collocation. On the other hand, ODCIE2 (: xii) and Cruse (1986: 37) offer the same example as a typical idiom (ODCIE2 terms it a pure idiom).

4. Collocation and meaning

Collocationists regard collocability as one determinant of meaning, or, according to extreme views (Mitchell, 1971: 42), the only determinant of meaning. Furthermore, the discussion on degrees of idiomaticity *[see 3]* often resorted to the concept of 'meaning'. In this section we will discuss the mutual influence of meaning and collocability.

Cruse (1986: 37) makes a relevant point in his discussion of idioms. He criticises the "traditional" definition ("an idiom is an expression whose meaning cannot be inferred from the meanings of its parts" *[my underline]*) for "circularity". His objection stems from his interpretation of the underlined part as "the meanings its parts have when they are not parts of idioms". He argues that "to apply the definition, we must already be in a position to distinguish idiomatic from non-idiomatic expressions". This point can be modified to apply to the case of 'meaning through collocation'. The argument that the collocational patterns of a lexical item define its meaning can be reversed. That is, it can be equally argued that it is the particular meaning(s) of an item which determine its collocational range. Lyons (1977: 613) makes a similar point and argues (op.cit.: 265) that "we must not go from one extreme of saying that the collocations of a lexeme are determined by its meaning or meanings … to the other extreme of defining the meaning of a lexeme to be no more than the set of its collocations".

Lying between the two extremes are a number of more moderate views. The less favourable to collocability as defining meaning is the one of Leech (1981: 17), who advocates that "only when explanation in terms of other categories of meaning does not apply do we need to invoke the special category of collocative meaning: on the other levels generalizations can be made, while collocative meaning is simply an idiosyncratic property of individual words". Nearer to the other extreme, Mackintosh (1961: 330) and Nattinger & DeCarrico (1992: 181-182) argue that not only does the collocational range of a lexical item contribute to its meaning, but also that its collocates "share meaning to a great extent" (loc.cit).

Sinclair (1991: 115-116) argues that the relative frequency of node and collocate

determines whether the collocational relation will contribute to the meaning of the node. According to him, of interest are only the collocations which a node contracts with less frequent collocates ("downward collocation"), which give "a semantic analysis of a word".

Nattinger & DeCarrico (1992: 20) see an inverse relation between predictability of the collocates of a certain node and the meaning this node derives through the collocational relation. Their view is that a fixed "mutual expectancy ... results in loss of meaning because of elimination of an element of choice".

5. Collocational evidence: Corpora

The study of collocation has been linked from early on to the analysis of (large) corpora (e.g. Halliday, 1966: 159), and has argued against reliance on intuition. Therefore, it seems reasonable to expect pedagogical materials to be informed by the findings of such analyses. We shall, then, briefly examine those aspects of the methods by which collocational relations are extracted from corpora which have potential implications for pedagogical materials.

We will, mainly, compare relevant procedures followed in the preparation of two analyses of English collocations: *Frequency Analysis of English Vocabulary and Grammar, Volume 2* (FAEVG2; Johansson & Hofland, 1989), based on the LOB Corpus, and *A Dictionary of English Collocations* (DEC; Kjellmer, 1994), based on the Brown Corpus. There will also be references to procedures of studies cited elsewhere.

***Nodes*:** Both treat word-forms as nodes. Nevertheless, FAEVG2 also offers lemmata for the verbs (only), under which the collocations of their different forms are listed, and treats verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbial particles in separate sections. Sinclair (1991: 7-8) supports the treatment of word-forms as "unique lexical unit[s]". He argues that "forms should only be conflated into lemmas when their environments show a certain amount and type of similarity", but adds (op.cit.: 41) that "lemmatization ... is actually a matter of subjective judgement by the researcher". *[See also 'Restrictions'.]*

***Span*:** In both, only combinations of adjacent items have been included, thus running the risk of failing to reveal discontinuous collocational patterns. DEC (: xix-xx) claims that its procedure of extraction is such that only very infrequent discontinuous combinations have not been included. Sinclair (1991: 105-106 & 121) proposes a span of 4-5 words on either side of the node, but adds that certain findings suggest that wider spans can yield useful insights into collocational patterns. Of the same mind are also Nattinger & DeCarrico (1992: 22).

***Restrictions*:** In DEC the frequency threshold for inclusion is simple recurrence of a form in the corpus (no lemmatisation has been carried out). FAEVG2 sets the minimum frequency for verbs and adjectives at 10 occurrences *of a single form*. But, in the case of verbs, if one form passes that threshold, then *all the occurrences of other forms* of the same verb (=lemma) are included as well, regardless of their individual frequencies. Collocations with nouns and adverbial particles as nodes were extracted from the (already compiled) lists of collocations of verbs/adjectives and verbs (respectively). As far as grammar is concerned, both apply (different sets of) restrictions, which ensure the grammaticality of the collocations. A further restriction FAEVG2 places is that, in order to be included, a node has to appear in more than one text in the corpus. As a combined result of decisions regarding the span and grammatical restrictions, collocations over sentence boundaries (or even, in the case of FAEVG2, across any punctuation mark) are placed outside the scope of the two dictionaries. Sinclair (1991: 117) describes a procedure in which collocation patterns were extracted with "no account ... of syntax, punctuation, change of speaker, or anything other than the word-forms themselves".

***Collocates*:** FAEVG2 concentrates only on the right-side collocates of verbs and adjectives, and the left-side collocates of nouns. DEC offers collocates on either side of the node. In both books collocates can be either words or phrases.

***Meaning*:** Both list collocations of nodes regardless of their meaning. Neither gives any indication regarding the degree of idiomaticity of the collocations listed.

***Genre*:** No information is given on the distribution of collocational patterns among the different

genres that make up the two corpora. Sinclair (1991: 17) argues that in order not to distort the homogeneity of a corpus, specialised materials should be "either kept out or stored separately as an ancillary corpus".

Undoubtedly, collocational information derived from the analysis of corpora is of primary importance to the writing of EFL pedagogical materials of any kind. On the other hand, the different approaches to the treatment and analysis of the raw data that corpora provide, the different compositions in terms of genres, together with the limitations of corpora sizes and computational techniques (matters which leave room for subjective decisions) suggest that "we must not, at present, be too rigidly guided by occurrence and frequency statistics ... [and] must use the evidence with care" (Sinclair, 1991: 44-45).

6. Collocations and the EFL learner

"In all kinds of texts collocations are essential, indispensable elements ... with which our utterances are very largely made" (Kjellmer, 1987: 140). "Even very advanced learners often make inappropriate or unacceptable collocations" (McCarthy, 1990: 13). The above quotes make two points relevant to the EFL learner. First, that collocational relations are an important part of the language to be mastered. Second, that it is an area which 'resists' tuition and, therefore, requires special, systematic attention. Apart from the unpredictability and low generalisability of collocations, another factor that poses difficulties for learners is that "in many cases, one language will use a syntagm where another language employs a single lexeme" (Lyons, 1977: 262).

Having said that, two pertinent questions arise: What kinds of collocational information do learners need? In what ways can such information facilitate learners? Since the two questions are interrelated, any attempts at answering one are bound to take the other into account.

***Decoding/Encoding*:** The collocational relations of a lexical item contribute to its meaning. It is reasonable to expect that relevant information will facilitate comprehension. The learner can be

more successful in inferring meaning from context (Nattinger, 1987: 70), or in understanding the "subtle layers of meaning" hinted by "untypical collocations" (McCarthy, 1990: 14). Nevertheless, it seems that it is in production of language that knowledge of collocational habits is most important. Following are some clues leading to this assumption. In most discussions of collocation it is the native speakers' ability to *produce* (not understand) acceptable and novel collocations which is stressed (e.g. Lyons, 1977: 265). In order to test the acceptability of a sample of the collocations due to be included in ODCIE2, Mackin (1978: 152-154) asked native-speaker informants to provide the missing word(s) in collocations contained in phrases (clarly a task which clearly simulated production rather than comprehension). The meaning of a collocation situated around the middle of the 'idiomaticity continuum' can be inferred even when the learner does not understand all the words involved (e.g. by using clues from the context and co-text). On the other hand, mere knowledge of (some of) the meanings of the words is unlikely to lead to spontaneous production of an acceptable collocation (e.g. 'white coffee'). Both decoding and encoding are facilitated by the clarification of synonymous (Carter, 1987: 53-54) and polysemous (Benson, 1990: 27) items through their different collocational behaviour.

***Constraints/Generalisability*:** Information regarding frequent or "established" collocations (Cowie, 1978: 134) of a node is essential, but not adequate. Learners also need information regarding any grammatical constraints (e.g. whether passivisation or change of word order is possible). They also need to know whether they can generalise from the collocation patterns of one form to all the forms of a lemma, or whether some forms enter into different collocations.

***Genre*:** Researching the relation between collocation types and genres in the Brown Corpus, Kjellmer (1987: 140) found that "long collocations" (i.e. "somewhat fossilized" collocations of 5 words or more) are three times more frequent in "informative/formal" than in "imaginative/ informal" genres. Since collocation is "text sensitive" (Hoey, 1991: 22) pedagogical material aimed at the learner of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) should take that into account. Collocational relations deemed not statistically significant in the analysis of a corpus consisting of

a diversity of genres may prove quite frequent in the analysis of large samples of one specific genre.

***Dictionary entries*:** Since learners are more likely to look up a collocation for encoding purposes, decisions concerning in which entry (of the component items) the collocation is listed are of great importance to the user.

7. Collocations: Pedagogical material

The EFL pedagogical materials to be examined fall into three broad categories: grammars, dictionaries and course-books. In the discussion we will adopt the categorisation of collocations in "grammatical" (*G*) and "lexical" (*L*) as presented in BBI (: ix-xxx).

[For a key to the typology of BBI see Appendix A; for a key to the acronyms see Appendix B.]

***Dictionaries*:**

Entries: ODCIE2 (: xiii-xiv) excludes "open collocations" but includes what Cowie (1978: 134) termed "established collocations". The three dictionaries of phrasal verbs include both *verb+preposition* and *verb+particle* combinations. LDPV also includes *verb+adjective* and *verb+pronoun* if they have "a different meaning when used together". From the general learner's dictionaries, only LLA includes collocations as entries (usually of the types *D, P* and *L3*, but also phrases combining different collocation patterns, some of which do not fit in BBI's categorisation).

Collocational information: BBI excludes "compound verbs" (i.e. *verb+particle*), which it treats as entries (: xxi), "free lexical combinations" (: xxiv) *[see 3.]*, and "predictable free" *L2* combinations (: xxvi). On the other hand, it includes "important fixed phrases" (: xxix). From the dictionaries of phrasal verbs, only ODCIE1 lists collocates directly. The general learner's dictionaries (i.e. CCELD, LLA, OALD) as well as ODBE offer some collocations directly (usually the most idiomatic ones), but mainly through examples. ODCIE2 and LLA tackle collocational information both 'within' and 'of' the headphrase. Constraints regarding the actual

forms of the lemma which enter into the collocation provided are given through either codified information, or the treatment of the collocation itself as a headphrase, or the examples. ODCIE2 uses a combination of all three.

***Grammars*:** As expected they only tackle grammatical collocations, mainly of the *G(8)* type. All three contrast *E* and *G*, that is, they choose a number of verbs entering into collocations of both types and exemplify the resulting difference in meaning. Type *D* is also covered by all three, but, whereas EGU and OPG distinguish between *D* and *verb+particle* (which they term 'phrasal verbs'), EGU presents both types as phrasal verbs. EGU also contrasts the meanings of different combinations of *D* (e.g. *look for* vs *look after*) as well as *G5* vs *G6* (e.g. *afraid to* vs *afraid of*). Interestingly enough, these (typical) EFL grammars not only offer certain colligations *[see 3.]*, they also assume the role of a dictionary at some point.

***Course-books*:** WWW tackles types *L1, G5* and *verb+noun* (but not of the *L1* or *L2* type). MTW tackles *L3* and *verb+noun* types, and makes a distinction between *D* and *verb+particle* ("prepositional" vs "phrasal" verbs) (: 8). The aim of both WWW & MTW seems to be the facilitation of the learners' encoding abilities. TWYN presents mainly *L3* and *verb+noun* collocations. It uses "collocation grids' not in order to offer a comprehensive list of collocations, but to delimit the meaning(s) of the items treated as nodes, or to clarify semantic differences between synonymous items and/or items belonging to the same semantic field (e.g. see p. 12-13). The specialised course-books (BO and EIBF) only present *L3* collocations. *[See also 'Points of interest]*.

Points of interest

1. The main difference between ODBE and the non-specialised dictionaries is that it treats as entries what the others present as collocations. For example ODBE contains *above par*, *below par*, *at par* as headphrases and provides collocations of the type *rise above par*; BBI offers *par* as a headword and offers *above/below/at par* as collocations (it does not offer *rise above par*). This is also the case with the specialised course-books. It is made more obvious

by the fact that EIBF provides a list of abbreviations of lexical combinations, which are treated as collocations in non-specialised dictionaries (e.g. *book value* is a collocation of *value* in BBI, but a single lexical item for EIBF and ODBE).

2. The specialised course-books present and offer exercises in combinations that are considered 'free' by BBI. Nevertheless, if we consider the constraints and specificity of context, these combinations become both restricted and more frequent.

3. The inconsistency regarding terminology and place on the 'continuum of idiomaticity' is reflected in the pedagogical materials. For example, *in the vicinity* is presented as an idiom (OALD), expression (LLA), and collocation (BBI).

4. Since not all dictionaries are informed by evidence from a corpus, or are based on different corpora, the collocates offered are quite diverse at times. For example, for the entry *income* LLA offers three collocations, of which none is given by BBI (which gives 14), and only one is given by ODBE (which offers 5). As regards types, LLA offers *L3* and *G1*, BBI *L1, L3* & *G4*, and ODBE only *L3*.

5. General learner's dictionaries seem to have a dual approach to meaning. In some cases they first define the 'meaning' of the entry and then go on to present collocations; in other cases they offer the collocation as a (sub-)headphrase and define the meaning of the entry through it. For example, in the entry *occasion* of OALD, sense *(1)* is first defined before collocations are given, but sense *(2)* is presented as a combination (*occasion (for sth)*).

6. Course-books have the advantage of being able to present collocations through context. An interesting issue arising from that fact is the one of selection. To a great extent, the course-book can be considered to be the learners' 'corpus', and the same care should be shown in the selection of 'authentic texts' as for the texts to be included in a corpus (see also Sinclair, 1991: 15-18). This is more so in the case of 'constructed' texts for lower-level students. That the constructed texts should reflect (all other things being equal) the collocational behaviour of 'real' language may seem self-evident, but the task of simulating the collocational habits of different genres is not facilitated by evidence from non-specialised corpora. A principled categorisation of genres and the analysis of large samples will yield more helpful evidence.

APPENDIX A: A typology of collocations

[From Benson, M., Benson, E. & Ilson, R. (1986)]

Grammatical Collocations

G1 = noun + preposition
G2 = noun + to-inf
G3 = noun + that-clause
G4 = preposition + noun
G5 = adjective + preposition/prepositional phrase
G6 = predicate adjective + to-inf
G7 = adjective + that-clause
G8= verb patterns (distinguished by a single capital letter)
A = verbs allowing dative movement transformation
B = transitive verbs not allowing dative movement transformation
C = transitive verbs + *for* (allowing dative movement transformation)
D = verb + preposition
E = verb + to-inf.
F = verb + inf (without *to*)
G = verb + verb-ing
H = tr. verb + object+to-inf.
I = tr. verb + object+inf. (without *to*)
J = verb + verb-ing
K = verb + possessive+gerund
L = verb + that-clause
M = tr, verb + direct object+adjective/past participle/noun/pronoun
O = tr. verb + two objects (not normally used in a prepositional phrase with *to* or *for*)
P = verb + (obligatory) adverbial (but not a particle)
Q = verb + interrogative word
R = *it* + tr. verb + to-inf/that-clause
S = intr. verb + predicate noun/adjective

Lexical collocations

L1 = verb (meaning *creation, activation*) + noun/pronoun/prepositional phrase
L2 = verb (meaning *eradiction, nullification*) + noun
L3 = adjective + noun
L4 = noun + verb (the verb names an action characteristic of the person or thing designated by it)
L5 = noun + noun (usually noun + of + noun)
L6 = adverb + adjective
L7 = verb + adverb (not adverbial particle)

APPENDIX B: References to pedagogical materials

Dictionaries

BBI = *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English* (1986), John Benjamins Publishing Company
CCELD = *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary* (1987), Harper Collins
LDPV = *Longman dictionary of Phrasal Verbs* (1983), Longman
LLA = *Longman Language Activator* (1993), Longman
OALD = *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (1989) (4th ed.), Oxford University Press
ODBE = *Oxford dictionary of Business English* (1993), Oxford University Press
ODCIE1 = *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English, Vol. 1 - Phrasal Verbs* (1975), Oxford University Press
ODCIE2 = *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English, Vol. 2 - English Idioms* (1983), Oxford University Press

Grammars

EGU = **Murphy, R.** (1994) *English Grammar in Use*, Cambridge University Press
OPG = **Eastwood, J.** (1992) *Oxford Practice Grammar*, Oxford University Press
UEG = **Woods, E. & McLeod, N.** (1990) *Using English Grammar*, Prentice Hall

Course-books

BO = **Hollett, V.** (1991) *Business Objectives*, Oxford University Press
EIBF = **Corbett, J.** (1990) *English for International Banking and Finance*, Cambridge University Press
MTW = **Harmer, J. & Rossner, R.** (1992) *More than words,* Longman
TWYN = **Rudska, B., Channell, J., Putseys, Y., Ostyn, P.** (1981) *The Words You Need*, Macmillan
WWW = **Redman, S.** (1991) *A Way With Words - Book 3*, Cambridge University Press

References

Aisenstadt, E. (1979) "Collocability Restrictions in Dictionaries", in Hartmann, R. R. K. (ed.) *Dictionaries and their Users*, Exeter Linguistic Studies.

Benson, M. (1989) "The Structure of the Collocational Dictionary", in *International Journal of Lexicography*, Vol. 2 No. 1, Oxford University Press.

Benson, M., Benson, E. & Ilson, R. (1986) *Lexicographic Description of English* (Studies in Language Companion Series, No 14), John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Benson, M., Benson, E. & Ilson, R. (1986) *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English*, John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Carter, R. (1987) *Vocabulary: Applied Linguistic Perspectives*, Routledge.

Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary (1987), Harper Collins.

Corbett, J. (1990) *English for International Banking and Finance*, Cambridge University Press.

Courtney, R. (1983) *Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs*, Longman.

Cowie, A. P. (1978) "The place of illustrative material and collocations in the design of a learner's dictionary", in Strevens, P. (ed.) *In Honour of A. S. Hornby*, Oxford University Press.

Cowie, A. P. & Mackin, R. (1975) *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English*, *Vol. 1 - Phrasal Verbs*, Oxford University Press.

Cowie, A. P., Mackin, R. & McCaig, I. R. (1983) *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English,Vol. 2 - English Idioms*, Oxford University Press.

Cruse, D. A. (1986) *Lexical Semantics*, Cambridge University Press.

Eastwood, J. (1992) *Oxford Practice Grammar*, Oxford University Press.

Firth, J. R. (1951) "Modes of Meaning", in Firth, J. R. (ed.) (1957) *Papers in Linguistics*, Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1966) "Lexis as a Linguistic Level", in Bazell, C. E., Catford, J. C., Halliday, M. A. K. & Robins, R. H. *In Memory of F. R. Firth*, Longman.

Harmer, J. & Rossner, R. (1992) *More than Words,* Longman.

Hoey, M. (1991) *Patterns of Lexis in Text*, Oxford University Press.

Hollett, V. (1991) *Business Objectives*, Oxford University Press.

Johansson, S. & Hofland, K. (1989) *Frequency Analysis of English Vocabulary and Grammar, Vol. 2*, Clarendon Press.

Jones, S. & Sinclair, J. McH. (1974) "A Study in Computational Linguistics", in *Cahiers de Lexicologie*, No24.

Kjellmer, G. (1984) "Some Thoughts on Collocational Distinctiveness", in Aarts, J. & Meijs, W. *Corpus Linguistics*, Rodopi.

Kjellmer, G. (1987) "Aspects of English Collocations", in Meijs, W. (ed.) *Corpus Linguistics and Beyond*, Rodopi.

Kjellmer, G. (1994) *A Dictionary of English Collocations*, Clarendon Press.

Leech, G. (1981) *Semantics*, Penguin Books.

Longman Language Activator (1993), Longman.

Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics*, Cambridge University Press.

Mackin, R. (1978) "On Collocations: 'words shall be known by the company they keep'", in Strevens, P. (ed.) *In Honour of A. S. Hornby*, Oxford University Press.

Malkmjaer, K. (ed.) (1991) *The Linguistics Encyclopaedia*, Routledge.

McCarthy, M. (1990) *Vocabulary*, Oxford University Press.

McIntosh, A. (1961) "Patterns and Ranges", in *Language*, Vol. 37 No. 3.

Mitchell, T. F. (1971) "Linguistic 'goings on'. Collocations and other lexical matters arising on the syntagmatic record", in *Archivum Linguisticum*, Vol. II.

Murphy, R. (1994) *English Grammar in Use*, Cambridge University Press.

Nattinger, J. R. (1988) "Some current trends in vocabulary teaching", in Carter, R. & McCarthy, M. (eds.) *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*, Longman.

Nattinger, J. R. & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992) *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*, Oxford University Press.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (1989) (4th ed.), Oxford University Press.

Oxford Dictionary of Business English (1993), Oxford University Press.

Redman, S. (1991) *A Way With Words - Book 3*, Cambridge University Press.

Rudska, B., Channell, J., Putseys, Y. & Ostyn, P. (1981) *The Words You Need*, Macmillan.

Sinclair, J. McH. (1966) "Beginning the Study of Lexis", in Bazell, C. E., Catford, J. C., Halliday, M. A. K. & Robins, R. H. *In Memory of F. R. Firth*, Longman.

Sinclair, J. McH. (1991) *Corpus Corcondance Collocation*, Oxford University Press.

Woods, E. & McLeod, N. (1990) *Using English Grammar*, Prentice Hall.