

# Metaphor and Teaching Collocation to L2 Learners: With the Case of *Rich*\*

Youngju Choi · Sae Il Choi\*\*

(Chosun University · Chonnam National University)

**Choi, Youngju & Choi, Sae Il. 2011. Metaphor and Teaching Collocation to L2 Learners: With the Case of *Rich*. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*. 19(4). 1-19.**

It is currently well accepted that collocation needs to be taught explicitly. Various experimental research shows that it is one of the most recalcitrant areas in learning L2 languages. Students demonstrate difficulties with it even after achieving a high level of second language competence, contrary to the prevalent assumption that it will be naturally acquired when learners have a certain level of grammatical and lexical competence. This paper suggests one method of teaching collocations with the case of the adjective *rich*. It demonstrates how the adjective *rich* extends its meaning and collocates by metaphor, suggesting that teachers' awareness of the cognitive principle of meaning/collocational extension increases students' ability to recognize word combinations in a more flexible way.

**Key Words:** collocation, collocates, cognitive semantics, meaning extension, metaphor, ontological metaphor, container metaphor

## I. Introduction

Over the last few decades, theoretical linguistics has been mainly concerned with how syntactic structures with lexical words generate well-formed sentences.

---

\* This is an extended version of the paper presented at the 2011 Spring Conference of the 21st Century Association of English Language and Literature. I gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments made by the audience there and three reviewers of this journal. This research was supported by the 2011 Chosun University research grant.

\*\* Youngju Choi is the main author and Sae Il Choi is the corresponding author.

The trend has influenced the teaching of English as a second and foreign language. Teachers have believed that students will be able to produce the target language fluently, if they focus on students' grammatical and lexical knowledge. However, even after attaining a high-level of grammatical and lexical competence, students demonstrate difficulties with finding adequate expressions for certain words to go with. The difficulties L2 students face with word combination have been observed through various experiments (Bahns and Eldaw 1993, Lee 2007, Nesselhauf 2003). The findings of the experiments challenge the previous assumption that students can learn collocations automatically when they acquire the knowledge of lexical items and of appropriate structures in which the items can occur. Thus, it has been widely acknowledged that collocations need to be taught explicitly in class (Bahns and Eldaw 1993, Cowie 1992, Farghal and Obiedat 1995, Kim and Yoon 2010, Lewis 1997, Nesselhauf 2003, Ooi and Kim-Seoh 1996).

If collocation needs to be taught in class, which pairs to be chosen is the next issue. Bahns (1993) suggests that we need to pay more attention to incongruent collocations which do not correspond to L1 counterparts. While congruent collocations are easily transferred to L2 production through direct translation, incongruent ones are hard to acquire and thus need special attention.

However, even when teachers focus only on incongruent collocational pairs, they cannot teach all of them in the limited class time. Thus, finding effective ways to teach collocations is the next issue. Raising students' awareness of collocation is said to be the most important factor in learning so that they can find and acquire examples outside the class (Hill 2000, Woolard 2000). In order to increase students' awareness, various exercises for use in class have been proposed as shown in (1) (Beatty 2004, Lewis 1997). The purpose of the exercise is to make students aware of strong word partnerships. For example, after solving the problems of Exercise 2, students will recognize that *heavy traffic* and *strong feeling* are well-accepted pairs but *strong traffic* and *heavy feeling* are not.

(1) a. Exercise 1 : In each of the following, one word does NOT make a strong word partnership with the word in capitals; which is the odd word?

- 1) HIGH season price opinion spirits house time priority
- 2) MAIN point reason effect entrance speed road meal course
- 3) NEW experience job food potatoes baby situation year
- 4) LIGHT green lunch rain entertainment day work traffic

(Lewis 1997: 261)

b. Exercise 2 :

Complete the collocations with *heavy* or *strong*.

- |                  |                  |
|------------------|------------------|
| 1) _____ snow    | 2) _____ smoker  |
| 3) _____ smell   | 4) _____ feeling |
| 5) _____ traffic | 6) _____ taste   |
| 7) _____ opinion | 8) _____ sleeper |

(Beatty 2004: 132)

However, raising awareness through those exercises still has limitations. First, students may become familiar with highly frequent collocations such as *strong smell* and *heavy smoker* but they may not know that *heavy price* is also possible because it is not as frequently used. One experiment by Channell (1981) shows that students are not good at recognizing varieties of right collocations. When the collocational grid (2) was given to students as a classroom test, they made only 24 mistakes in marking wrong collocations, but they failed in marking 111 other right collocations. This indicates that students only accept a limited number of collocational expressions that they are familiar with, largely ignoring other possible combinations.

(2) Collocational Grid

	w o m a n	m a n	c h i l d	d o g	b i r d	f l o w e r	w e a t h e r	l a n d s c a p e	v i e w	h o u s e	f u r n i t u r e	b e d	p i c t u r e	d r e s s	p r e s e n t	v o i c e
hand- some		+									+				+	
pretty	+		+	+	+	+		+	+	+		+	+	+		
charm- ing	+		+							+				+		+
lovely	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

(Channell 1981: 120)

Second, the exercises do not lead students to be aware of the importance of contexts in deciding acceptability of word combinations. Some incompatible words are well paired in a certain context. For example, the combination *heavy smell* does not show strong partnership in a regular situation when compared with *strong smell*, but the adjective *heavy* more naturally combines with the noun *smell* where the noun seems to bear some weight as shown in (3).

(3) A heavy smell of cooking hung in the air.

(Corpus of Contemporary American English)

It means that teachers need to pay attention to teaching how to accept and use collocational expressions in a more flexible way. Thus, the following research question is raised related to the methodological problems of teaching collocation.

(4) Research Question:

Can we find a cognitive principle governing the acceptability of collocational expressions for the teachers' **use in** teaching collocations?

In the paper, the cognitive principle, metaphor, will be explored with the example of *rich* and its collocates. How the cognitive mechanism allows marginal collocates of the word to be extended from typical ones will be demonstrated with the example. The more marginal the collocates are, the greater difficulty L2 students may feel because they are not the ones L2 students are frequently exposed to. If students are guided to understand how marginal examples are licensed by a cognitive principle, they can apply the principle to other collocational examples and are able to more flexibly decide their acceptability within a given context.

After clarifying the meaning of collocation and the meaning of conceptual metaphor, we will explore how the adjective *rich* extends its collocates by metaphor, along with its meanings. We also provide implications for language learners and their instructors before concluding the paper.

## 2. Collocation and Metaphor

### 2.1 Collocation

It is not easy to define the concept of collocation because researchers have different ideas about acceptable collocations. Nesselhauf (2003) suggests that a group of words can be arranged from free combinations to idioms in a continuum. Expressions like *drink water/juice/a cup of coffee* are free combinations. The three noun phrases can be freely exchanged as complements of the verb *drink*. On the contrary, the expression *kick the bucket* is a fixed one as an idiom. The complement part *the bucket* or the verb part *kick* cannot be substituted with other synonymous expressions. Between the free combinations and the idioms, collocations lie from looser to more restricted ones. Some collocations are extremely restricted and others are much freer as demonstrated in Carter's (1998) four-type categorizations (unrestricted, semi-restricted, familiar, and restricted). The adjective *rancid* is only compatible with *butter*, as in *rancid butter*. *Rotten eggs* cannot be replaced by *rancid eggs*. Other collocations are relatively free in that their members can be exchanged with other synonymous expressions. As we have seen before, *a lovely child* can be synonymously

replaced by *a charming child*.

While restrictiveness of word combinations is one criterion for defining collocations, frequency can be another criterion. Collocations are defined based on the frequency of occurrence. If a group of words co-occur habitually with some degree of predictability, it can be called a collocation. Carter (1998: 51) defines collocation as "a group of words which occur repeatedly in a language" and Cruse (1986:40) uses the term collocations to refer to "sequences of lexical items which habitually co-occur, but are nonetheless fully transparent in the sense that each lexical constituent is also a semantic constituent". Hill (1999) also notes that a collocation is a habitually co-occurring word sequence. To be considered as a habitually co-occurring sequence, how often does it have to occur? Krishnamurthy et al. (2004) sets a condition: The group of words has to co-occur with a statistically significant frequency to be considered as a collocation. Words have to come together more often than they would by mere chance.

In the paper, the adjective *rich* is selected as a case study based on the definition given above. The first restrictiveness criterion judges *rich* plus noun combinations as collocations because they are neither entirely free combinations nor frozen expressions, and thus lying between the two extremes. The noun phrases following *rich* cannot be exchanged freely. For example, *rich people* and *rich countries* are correct expressions but the nouns *people* and *countries* cannot be substituted by *socks*. *Rich socks* cannot be considered as an appropriate expression. Second, to meet the frequency condition, the top one hundred most frequent collocates of *rich* are selected from the corpus *Corpus of Contemporary American English*.

## 2.2 Metaphor

Metaphor is to understand "one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain" (Kövecses 2002:4). In everyday conversation, it is not very difficult to show how we understand love in terms of journeys, arguments in terms of war, and theories in terms of buildings. In order to understand the concept 'love', 'argument', and 'theory', we use the concept 'journey', 'war', and 'building', respectively, as shown in (5). Metaphor is represented by capital letters and metaphorical linguistic expressions are italicized.

(5) LOVE IS A JOURNEY

Look *how far* we've come.  
We're *at a crossroads*.  
We'll just have to go *our separate ways*.

AN ARGUMENT IS A WAR

Your claims are *indefensible*.  
He *attacks every weak point* in my argument.  
His criticisms were *right on target*.

THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS

Is that the *foundation* for your theory?  
The theory needs more *support*.  
We need to *construct a strong* argument for that. (Kövecses 2002:5)

A conceptual domain we try to understand is called a target domain. A conceptual domain we use to understand another conceptual domain is called a source domain. In the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, *journey* is a source domain and *love* is a target domain. Correspondence between constituent elements in the two domains makes it possible to understand one conceptual domain with another. The constituent elements of the *journey* domain corresponds to those of the *love* domain, as shown in (6).

(6) *Source*: JOURNEY

*Target*: LOVE

the travelers	⇒ the lovers
the vehicle	⇒ the love relationship itself
the journey	⇒ events in the relationship
the distance covered	⇒ the progress made
the obstacle encountered	⇒ the difficulties experienced
decisions about which way to go	⇒ choices about what to do
the destination of the journey	⇒ the goal(s) of the relationship

(Kövecses 2002:7)

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) suggest that there are three different types of

metaphors; structural, ontological, and orientational metaphors. Among the three types, the ontological metaphor is closely related to understanding how *rich* extends its collocates. Thus, the concept of the ontological metaphor and its use will be illustrated with some examples.

The function of the ontological metaphor is to provide an ontological status to abstract concepts. It means that we think of our experience in terms of entities, substances, and containers. For example, events, actions, activities, and states are all considered as containers in some expressions. Examples in (7) show that the event 'race' is a container. Participants, starting and finishing events, and a winner and loser are in the RACE container. Thus the participants in (7), *you* and *he*, can be in or out of the container, *race*.

- (7) a. Are you *in* the race on Sunday?  
 b. He is *out of* the race now. (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 31)

The activity, *washing the window* is also considered as a container. You can put an entity into the activity. In (8a), the event *splashing water all over the floor* is in the washing-the-window container. In (8b), energy is put in the same container.

- (8) a. *In* washing the window, I splashed water all over the floor.  
 b. I *put a lot of energy into* washing the windows.  
 (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 31)

Various states such as *love*, *trouble*, and *depression* are also viewed as containers as in (9). The participants of the state are in and out of the containers *love*, *trouble*, and *depression*.

- (9) a. He is *in* love.  
 b. We are *out of* trouble now.  
 c. He *fell into* depression. (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 32)

Many of the collocates of *rich* are construed as containers which are able to include various and abundant elements. The next section will show how the



CONTAINER metaphor makes it possible for the adjective *rich* to be partnered with various nouns including abstract concepts.

### 3. Metaphor and Collocates of Rich

Collocates of *rich* are not easy to capture with common properties. It collocates not only with people, country, color, land, and resource but also with abstract concepts like *understanding*, *experience*, and *environment*, as shown in (10).

- (10) a. She is a spoiled **rich bitch**.  
 b. Commercialization is proving to be a **rich area** for research.  
 c. Agricultural heritage, warm sun, mild weather, and **rich soil** combine to make Florida a grower's paradise.  
 d. The first qualification for that job is a deep and **rich understanding** of the Constitution and constitutional law.  
 e. In the end, by virtue of my **rich** and unique **experience**, I planned to write a book that would supersede all Bibles.  
 f. Ultimately, a baby who lives in a **rich** learning **environment** will have lots to smile, coo, and babble about.

(Corpus of Contemporary American English)

When it is collocated with people, its meaning is 'wealthy'. As a possessor of wealth, an individual or a group of people is a good partner of *rich*. The property 'possessor of wealth' is found in institutions such as *country* and *family*, too. However, the property is not found in color, land, resource, and other abstract concepts. Those words are not related to financial abundance. Instead, they are related to abundance of other elements. The next section illustrates that those collocational partners that are not relevant to 'wealth' are licensed by the container metaphor.

#### 3.1 *Rich* and Its Collocational Extension

The prototypical collocates of *rich* are individuals and institutions which can

possess wealth, as shown in (11). The meaning of *rich* here is purely related to financial abundance.

- (11) a. He is a spoiled little **rich boy**.  
b. I see some of my friends I grew up with from **rich families**. Their parents spoiled them, and they never made them work.  
c. Even before the financial crisis, women's financial power in both **rich and poor countries** was increasing.

(Corpus of Contemporary American English)

The prototypical meaning 'abundance of financial wealth' is extended to 'abundance of resource' when *rich* is used with natural resources. Natural resources can abundantly possess what is beneficial to a recipient. Rich soil means fertile soil which includes a lot of nutrients and moisture for crops to grow on. Water can include a lot of nutrients for fish to grow in. Seeds can have abundant dietary fiber which is good for human beings. In that sense, natural resources which abundantly include good elements can be easily partnered with *rich*.

- (12) a. I took a deep breath, and the damp musk of vegetation and **rich soil** filled my nostrils.  
b. The **water is rich in nutrients** which attract whales, huge shoals of fish, and seals.  
c. The tiny white **seeds** are amazingly **rich in dietary fiber**.

(Corpus of Contemporary American English)

The meaning of *rich* is extended from individuals and institutions possessing abundant wealth to natural resources having abundant beneficial elements. The metaphor NATURAL ITEMS ARE CONTAINERS is used here. Examples in (13) demonstrate that ocean and water are usually understood as containers in daily expressions. The container *ocean* includes fishes in it and the container *water* holds minerals in it.

- (13) a. Various kinds of fishes live in the ocean.  
 b. Tap water includes minerals.

Sense related words can easily be collocated with *rich*. Taste, flavor, texture, color, look, shade, sound, and tone are good candidates. When *rich* is combined with those words, it means an abundance of the elements which is pleasing to human senses. For example, *rich red* means that various shades of red are mixed together and united in a harmonious way. *Rich cheese flavor* means that the taste of cheese is strong enough to please human taste.

- (14) a. It's overly tangy but has a deep, **rich cheese flavor** that pairs well with sweet cherries.  
 b. This raspberry cheesecake ice cream gets its detectably **rich taste and texture** from an infusion of fluffy cream cheese.  
 c. I also love deep blues, **rich reds**, and dark pinks and yellows.  
 d. Look for shampoos that keep the **shade rich** and bright.  
 e. Jacob stays fresh with striking separates in vibrant hues and **rich textures**.  
 f. Multifaceted color, a **rich tone** with shimmer, adds elegance.  
 g. The hardwood floor has a **rich polished look**, which contrasts with the unfinished concrete walls.

(Corpus of Contemporary American English)

The same container metaphor is also used in examples of (14): SENSE-RELATED ITEMS ARE CONTAINERS. They contain their ingredients. In daily expressions, the same metaphor is also found for the sense-related items. In (15a), smell is treated as a container of various smelling elements. In (15b), voice is also regarded as a container which includes different types of sounds. Tone as a substance of voice can also be turned into a container as in (15c).

- (15) a. I can distinguish paprika in the smell of the sauce.  
 b. Can you notice dark tone in his voice?  
 c. Her anxiety was apparent in the tone of her voice.

*Tradition, past, and history* are considered to be containers involving lots of events. Then the events in the containers are viewed as entities or substances. If those are partnered with *rich*, a lot of events are meant to be included in those containers as shown in (16).

- (16) a. North Carolinians, in particular, seem to have a **rich tradition** of making snow cream.  
 b. Constructed in 1905, the place came with a **rich past**.  
 c. This unlikely scene just after dawn actually has a **rich history**.  
 (Corpus of Contemporary American English)

The nouns *detail, variety* and *diversity* strongly denote having various elements in themselves. Their compatibility with *rich* is very well expected.

- (17) a. Each question is open-ended to allow respondents to explain their experiences in **rich detail** and to offer interpretations.  
 b. The museum has a **rich collection** of ravishing papiers dolls by Picasso.  
 c. Kids can learn about engineering and the **rich variety** of jobs that engineers do.  
 d. No single collection of articles can capture the full range of issues affecting the **rich diversity** of African societies.

The metaphor ABSTRACT CONCEPT IS A CONTAINER explains how *rich* can be used with the collocational extension of *rich* in (18). Though it is not easy to define what type of abstract concept is compatible with *rich* and what is not, if a container includes many things that have a positive influence, it can be called *rich*. In this case, not only abundance but also positivity are relevant factors in deciding whether a noun is possibly collocated with *rich* or not.

- (18) a. Working with Andre is always a **rich experience**.  
 b. For a **rich discussion** on the effects of foreign funding on Russian civic organization, see Sarah L.  
 c. We discover and then share the **rich satisfactions** of story.

- d. Student prediction and postdiction of test scores in college courses has **rich literature**.
- e. Teachers provide students with a **rich learning opportunity**.
- f. Hightower's adage is a **rich** and important **observation**.

(Corpus of Contemporary American English)

The following results are from the corpus (COCA) which provides the top one hundred most frequent items that immediately follow the adjective *rich*. We subcategorize the items from A to G based on their semantic relatedness. The results reveal that the prototypical collocates of *rich* are *people* and *men* who are easily related to possession of financial properties. The second ranked is *countries*. Other collocates are metaphorically extended from the prototypical ones in a chain relationship: Things that possess abundance of wealth licenses things containing abundance of beneficial things, things containing abundance of beneficial things licenses things having abundance of positive things, and, finally, things having abundance of positive things licenses positivity of the abstract concepts

(19) Frequency of Collocates (among total 5706 collocates)

- A. people 734; man/men 669; guy(s) 163; kid(s) 188; woman/women 109; boy 35; ones 34; folk(s) 85; person 66; friends 47; parents 25; Americans 23; girl(s) 98; lady 22; merchant 17; bitch 17; individuals 21; uncle 21; star 24
- B. country/countries 338; nation(s) 108; family/families 95; world 49
- C. soil(s) 118; field(s) 40; earth 30; area 25; land 18; farmland 19
- D. color(s) 153; flavor 72; texture 48; food(s) 78; chocolate 68; voice 35; smell 30; sound 26; cream 24; green 22; scent 19; diet 18; baritone 22 ; taste 21; textures 21; fabric 18; dessert 20; oil 24; material 26; sauce 23; mix 31; mixture 21; gold 17
- E. history 225; tradition(s) 107; legacy 34; culture 36; past 19; life 56; heritage 71
- F. variety 92; diversity 71; collection 37; detail 37
- G. array 45; resource(s) 71; experience 38; environment 34; literature 33; understanding 18; description 17; data 27; source(s) 215; information 24

### 3.2 *Rich* and Its Collocational Acceptability

The CONTAINER metaphor is also important in deciding the collocational acceptability of *rich*. The adjective *rich* is incompatible with some noun phrases in regular situations but it becomes compatible when it is in a context where the noun phrases can be construed as containers. In case of *rain*, *heavy rain* is a frequently occurring phrase. On the contrary, *rich rain* is not often heard of. As shown in (20b), *rich rain* sounds unnatural.

- (20) a. The **heavy rain** caused rivers to overflow.  
 b. #The **rich rain** caused rivers to overflow. (Kim 2010:6)

However, *rich rain* in (21) sounds plausible due to the context where the rain is interpreted as having a lot of beneficial factors that save the crops. In (20b), it is hard to imagine that there are any beneficial elements of rain when the rain caused rivers to overflow. However, when a context given makes it possible for *rain* to contain an abundance of positive things, the seemingly impossible combination is allowed. We can imagine that the abundant nutrients and moisture in the rain saved the crops. The metaphor RAIN IS A CONTAINER is temporarily made possible in that setting.

- (21) The **rich rain** saved the dying crops.

Similarly, *rich day* is acceptable when an appropriate context is provided, though *full day* is normally used in most of the cases. *Rich* is compatible with a long period of time, as in *rich life*, *rich past*, and *rich history*. A short period is not seen as a container which can include a lot of event elements. Thus, *rich* is not compatible with *day* as shown in (22). Even if the person does a lot of work in a day, a single day is too small a container to hold a variety of events. However, the container itself can be full regardless of size. Thus, *full day* is an easily acceptable combination, while *rich day* is not.

- (22) a. I had come home after a full day of work. My clothes smell like wet garbage.  
 b. #I had come home after a **rich day** of work. My clothes smell like wet garbage.

However, the same container can be regarded as flexible in its size, depending on the events we experience. In (19), *rich* is more easily combined with *day* than in (18b) because the setting implies that the siblings experienced a lot of events and emotional changes. This makes the size of the container bigger than usual.

- (23) The reunion between lost siblings made for a **rich day**, filled with tears of joy.

On the same token, *impact* is interpreted as a one time blow. It is not easily construed to be a container having a variety of elements. Thus, it is not a good candidate for a partner of *rich*. Rather, it is more easily combined with *strong* as in *strong impact* because a one-time blow is more concerned with the strength of the blow.

- (24) a. strong impact  
b. #rich impact

However, if we create a situation where a strong positive result is expected due to the impact, *impact* can go well with *rich*, as in (25).

- (25) Her talk made a **rich impact** on think-inside-the-box researchers.

On the other hand, there is a case where a normally acceptable pair is not allowed in a certain situation. While *rich smell* is allowed in a regular situation, as in (26), the same expression is not allowed in a certain context, as shown in (27). The negative smell from a garbage dump is not compatible with *rich* since the adjective has a very strong positive connotation.

- (26) The rich smell of broiled lobsters spread to the hall.  
(27) a. Pungent smell rises from the garbage dump.  
b. # Rich smell rises from the garbage dump.

The observation of *rich* and its partners demonstrates that contexts change the acceptability of their combinations. Unacceptable pairs sometimes sound natural

in certain contexts while regularly accepted pairs sound awkward in other contexts. That a certain pair is judged as acceptable or unacceptable is not a fixed concept but rather a flexible one which changes depending on the context. The more naturally noun phrases are interpreted as containers, the more acceptable the collocation becomes. Again, the CONTAINER metaphor explains what is to be accepted or rejected as a collocation.

#### 4. Pedagogical Implication

Collocation has not been taught explicitly in Korean classrooms. Korean students may be surprised when they realize that the adjective *rich* can be collocated with a variety of nouns since they only have been exposed, at best, implicitly to the prototypical collocates of *rich* throughout reading materials. Exercises asking compatible and incompatible pairs are one way to make students aware of various collocational expressions. However, while those exercises may help students acquire frequent pairs easily, they cannot turn students' attention to many other possible pairs. Moreover, they cannot help students realize that the judgement of collocational correctness changes depending on contexts. Even when a pair is considered as an incorrect combination in isolation, it can sound natural if an appropriate context is provided.

In overcoming the problems, a new method for teaching collocation is suggested in the paper with the example *rich*. How the adjective *rich* extends its collocates through metaphor has been illustrated in order to suggest that the metaphorical extension of words has to be explained to students when collocations are taught. It must be explained to students how the prototypical meaning and collocates are metaphorically extended to the marginal examples. Thus, teachers' understanding of metaphor in linguistic expressions is important. If teachers introduce the principle in class with one or two examples, they do not have to teach all the instances one by one. When students learn how to understand the relationship between collocations of *rich*, they can apply the semantic principle to other collocational pairs.



## 5. Conclusion

Collocational competence is a key factor in acquiring fluency in L2 language production. Even after mastering grammar and having lexical knowledge, students still have problems with collocations. In the paper, in order to suggest a way to help students understand how collocates of one word are metaphorically interrelated to each other, the adjective *rich* has been explored.

How the adjective *rich* extends its collocates is closely related to how it extends its meaning. One of the ontological metaphors, the CONTAINER metaphor, is adopted in the meaning extension of *rich*. Its prototypical meaning 'abundance in wealth' is extended to 'abundance in beneficial things', to 'abundance', and to 'positivity'.

It also has been shown that there is no rigid boundary concept in the acceptability of collocational expressions. If a context provides a plausible setting, expressions that were unacceptable in isolation are readily accepted. On the other hand, even if a collocational expression is an acceptable one in isolation, if the context is not compatible with the properties of the collocational expression, the pair may be rejected. Thus, exposure to a limited set of collocational expressions does not allow non-native speakers to freely use many possible combinations in L2. Their use of word combination tends to be limited to well-known pairs. However, if students understand how an adjective and a noun pair is accepted based on metaphor, they can earn more knowledge on collocations than when they are trained to find correct and incorrect collocational pairs through exercises.

## References

- Bahns, J. (1993). Lexical collocations: a contrastive view. *ELT Journal*, 47(1), 56-63.
- Bahns, J., & Eldaw, M. (1993). Should we teach EFL students collocations? *System*, 21(1), 101-114.
- Beatty, K. (2004). *Read and think: A reading strategies course*. Hong Kong: Pearson

Longman Asia ELT.

- Carter, R. (1998). *Vocabulary: Applied linguistic perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Channell, J. (1981). Applying semantic theory to vocabulary teaching. *ELT Journal*, 35(2), 115-122.
- Cowie, A. P. (1992). Multiword lexical units and communicative language teaching. In P. J. L. Arnaud and H. Béjoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and applied linguistics* (pp. 1 – 12). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Farghal, M., & Obiedat, H. (1995). Collocations: A neglected variable in EFL. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in language teaching (IRAL)*, 33(4), 315-331.
- Granger, S. (1998). Prefabricated patterns in advanced EFL writing: Collocations and formulae. In A. P. Cowie (Ed.), *Phraseology. theory, analysis, and applications* (pp. 145-160). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hill, J. (1999). Collocational competence. *English Teaching Professional*, 11, 3-7.
- Hill, J. (2000). Revising priorities; from grammatical failure to collocational success. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach* (pp. 47-69). LTP.
- Howarth, P. (1998). Phraseology and second language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 24-44.
- Kim, H., & Yoon, H. (2008). Effects of predictability in L1 on the use of L2 verb-noun collocations. *English Teaching*, 63(2), 237-259.
- Kim, H., & Yoon, H. (2010). Effects of explicit and implicit collocation instruction on learners' acquisition of receptive and productive collocational knowledge. *Yengyeungmwunhak yenku*, 52(1), 129-149.
- Kim, M.-R. (2010). *Are you RICH?* Unpublished manuscript.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Krishnamurthy, R., Sinclair, J., Jones, S., & Daley, R. (2004). *English collocation studies: The OSTI report*. London: Continuum.
- Lee, J.-K. (2007). Use of common verb phrases in describing everyday activities by advanced Korean-speaking learners of English. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 13(2), 109-127.
- Lewis, M. (1997). Pedagogical implications of the lexical approach. In J. Coady &

- T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy* (pp. 255-270). Cambridge University Press.
- Nesselhauf, N. (2003). The use of collocations by advanced learners of English and some implications for teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 24.(2), 223-242.
- Ooi, D., & Kim-Seoh, J. L. (1996). Vocabulary teaching: Looking behind the word. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 52-58.
- Sadeghi, K. (2009). Collocational differences between L1 and L2: Implications for EFL learners and teachers. *TESL Canada Journal*, 26(2), 100-121.
- Weinert, R. (1995). The role of formulaic language in second language acquisition: A review. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 180-205.
- Woolard, G. (2000). Collocation- encouraging learner independence. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach* (pp. 28-46). London: Heinle, Cengage Learning.
- Corpus of contemporary American English* from <http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>

Youngju Choi

Department. of English Language and Literature

Chosun University

375, Sesek-dong, Dong-gu

Gwangju 501-759 , Korea

Phone: +82-62-230-6540

Email: ychoi1@chosun.ac.kr

Sae Il Choi

Department of English Education

Chonnam National University

77, Yongbong-lo Buk-gu

Gwangju 500-757, Korea

Phone: 82-62-530-5114

Received on 10 August, 2011

Revised version received on 13 December, 2011

Accepted on 13 December, 2011