

A Corpus-based Analysis of Korean EFL Learner's Use of Amplifier Collocations*

Soyoung Lee
(Inha University)

Lee, Soyoung. (2006). A corpus-based analysis of Korean EFL learners' use of amplifier collocations. *English Teaching*, 61(1), 3-17.

This study examines how intensifying adverbs tend to collocate with adjectives in a Korean EFL learners' corpus. In particular, it analyzes the use of amplifiers, which are used to enhance the meaning of their focus, in a corpus of Korean university students' writing by adopting a contrastive interlanguage analysis approach. It compares the use of *-ly* amplifier collocations in the Korean EFL corpus to that of a native English speakers' corpus. The result of the study shows that Korean learners use fewer amplifiers in their writing than the native speakers in terms of both the type and token counts, indicating Korean learners make use of a limited number of high-frequency amplifying adverbs due to their small repertoire of *-ly* amplifiers. It further reveals that the learners have difficulties in distinguishing between target language registers, which results in the mixed use of spoken-mode forms with written-mode forms. Based on these results, methodological and pedagogical implications were discussed. Suggestions were made for adopting corpus-based approach not only in locating and understanding learners' language difficulties but also in the teaching of L2 as a good way of restructuring learners' collocational competence.

I. INTRODUCTION

The use of linguistic corpora in the field of applied linguistics has expanded rapidly over the last few decades because of revolutionary developments in the new technology of electronic storage and analysis. The increasing use of native English corpora in the design of syllabi and materials for English language teaching (ELT) is one of the extensive uses of linguistic corpora (Conrad, 1999; Gavioli & Aston, 2001). Underlying the wide use is the belief that better descriptions of authentic native English would yield better syllabi and materials for ELT. Until very recently, however, the compilation and pedagogical

* This study was supported by Korea Research Foundation Grant (KRF-2004-003-B00254).

application of computer learner corpora had been rarely made. It was not until the early 1990s that the huge theoretical and practical potential of computer learner corpora was recognized and corpus-based L2 analysis was adopted as a new methodological approach (Flowerdew, 2003; Granger, 1998a; Hunston, 2002; Eun-Ju Lee, 2004). Several computer learner corpora have been created, including the best known International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE). The compilation of computer learner corpora makes it possible to identify in what respects learners differ from each other and from the language of native speakers, for which a comparable corpus of native speaker speech and writing is required.

The increasing availability of computer corpora coupled with a search tool like a concordancer empowers today's researchers to explore and describe the complex nature of language. One of the emerging aspects of language in this line of corpus-based research is so-called collocation, which is typically defined as "words which are statistically much more likely to appear together than random chance suggests." (Woolard, 2001, p. 29). Although a number of studies have taken account of the phenomenon of collocation since the term of collocation was adopted by Palmer in 1933 (Palmer, 1933; Pawley & Syder, 1983; Peters, 1983), collocation is becoming an important category of and an established unit of description in language in recent years. This recognition even leads to the coinage of a new term of "collocational competence" (Hill, 2001, p. 49). However, "until relatively recently, the true complexity of collocations was largely hidden, and L2 professionals had no way of understanding their nature and the extent of their use." (Kennedy, 2003, p. 468). Thus, the nature and extent of collocations need to be systematically investigated by using vast amounts of electronic texts and increasingly sophisticated software for the analysis of corpora.

Pursuing the line of corpus-based research on collocations, the present study attempts to explore how amplifying adverbs, one aspect of the complex phenomenon of collocations, collocate with adjectives in a Korean EFL learners' corpus. More specifically, the study compares the Korean EFL learners' corpus with a corpus of essays written by native English undergraduates, concentrating on the overall frequency of *-ly* amplifiers, the overuse and underuse of *-ly* amplifiers, and the associations between *-ly* amplifiers and their modified adjectives in the corpora.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The following sections will briefly present an overview of the current computer learner corpus research in which various linguistic features were examined, and then review corpus-based research on amplifier collocation, focusing on the contradictory findings on learners' use of amplifying adverbs in modifying adjectives.

1. Computer Learner Corpus Research

With roots in corpus linguistics and second language acquisition, computer learner corpus research uses the main principles and methods of corpus linguistics. A number of researchers have created computer learner corpora, which contain the spoken and written texts of individuals learning a language as a second or foreign language stored in computer-readable form (Granger, 1998a; Eun-Ju Lee, 2004; Meyer, 2002; Tono, 2002). These corpora can give information about the difference between learners and between learners and native speakers, and allow us to gain better insights into authentic learner language.

One of the larger corpora in the area of computer learner corpus research is the ICLE, which contains more than three million words in length (Granger, 2002). It comprises 500-word nontechnical argumentative essays produced by learners of English as a foreign language who are studying English at undergraduate level. Other learner corpora include the Longman's Learner Corpus, which comprises ten million written words produced by learners of English with different levels of proficiency, the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Learner Corpus (Flowerdew, 2002), which is made up of the English of Chinese learners, and the Japanese EFL Learners' Corpus (Tono, 2002).

The development of computer learner corpora lends itself to what Granger terms 'Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis (CIA),' which involves two major types of comparison—comparison of native language and learner language, and comparison of different learner languages (Granger, 1998a). The creation of computer learner corpora and the new CIA approach led to a number of studies, in which various linguistic features such as vocabulary frequency (De Cook, 1998; Ringbom, 1998), adverbial connectors (Altenberg & Tapper, 1998; Eun-Ju Lee, 2004), complement clauses (Biber & Reppen, 1998), adjective intensification (Lorenz, 1998, 1999), and direct questions (Virtanen, 1998) were investigated.

Most of these studies are quantitative in nature. For example, Ringbom (1998) analyzes learner lexis in terms of high-frequency words and reveals that the most frequent lexical words in the corpora of learner English accounts for a greater proportion of the total text than in the corpus of native speaker English. In other words, the learner corpora show a great use of a smaller range of vocabulary items. In their study of the use of adverbial connectors in the section of the International Corpus of Learner English containing the writing of Swedish students learning English, Altenberg and Tapper (1998) find that the Swedish speakers underuse connectives such as *however*, *though* and *yet*. They note that the underuse reflects a tendency among the Swedish learners to avoid formal connectors and replace them by less formal ones such as *but*. From this finding, they draw pedagogical conclusion that the Swedish learners need to be exposed "to a greater range of registers and

to a more extensive training in expository writing.” (Altenberg & Tapper, 1998, p. 92). Along the same line of research, Eun-Ju Lee (2004) shows EFL learners’ underuse of some conjunctive adverbials such as *thus*, *indeed*, and *hence*, and tendency to employ a small set of conjunctive adverbials, which leads to the repeated use of the same word in the text. Using a corpus of Hong Kong learners’ writing to explore the use of hedging devices, Flowerdew (2000) notes that due to the underuse of hedging devices learners’ writing is too direct.

2. Corpus-based Research on Amplifier Collocations

Speakers and writers have a variety of degree adverbs to choose from in modifying adjectives. To date, the framework proposed by Quirk, Svartvik, Leech, and Greenbaum (1985) is considered to be the most comprehensive in categorizing degree adverbs as modifiers (Kennedy, 2003). The framework consists of two scalar intensifier categories, that is, amplifiers and downtoners.¹ While amplifiers such as *completely*, *absolutely*, *highly*, and *very* are used to amplify adjectival qualities, downtoners such as *nearly*, *fairly*, *slightly*, and *hardly* are used to have a lowering, mitigating effect on the meaning or sense of an adjective (Lorenz, 1998, 1999).

The use of intensifiers has been explored with a corpus-based approach (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan, 1999; Granger, 1998b; Kennedy, 2003; Lorenz, 1998, 1999; Paradis, 1997). For example, Kennedy (2003) investigates amplifier collocations in the British National Corpus, 100-million-word collection of spoken and written texts. Analyzing 24 adverbs of degree and the adjectives that they modify with the use of a statistical measure of the strength of two collocated words, he shows that the amplifiers tend to occur with words that share certain grammatical or semantic characteristics. Kennedy’s result is contrasted by Biber et al.’s suggestion that “in many cases, there is little semantic difference between the degree adverbs. Thus, the adverbs could be exchanged in the following pair of sentences with little or no change of meaning: *That’s completely different. It’s totally different*” (Biber et al., 1999, p. 54).

While the two studies cited above offer corpus-based evidence on the nature of amplifier

¹ Several classifications of intensification have been suggested (Bolinger, 1972; Johansson, 1993; Quirk et al., 1985). Quirk et al.’s system is most noted, which groups intensifiers into six functional categories as follows:

- Amplifiers: Maximizers: *fully, completely, entirely, absolutely, totally, perfectly, utterly*
- Boosters: *really, particularly, clearly, highly, extremely, deeply, greatly, severely*
- Downtoners: Compromisers: *apparently, comparatively, fairly, generally, probably*
- Approximators: *largely, mainly, nearly, partly, virtually*
- Diminishers: *modestly, possibly, slightly*
- Minimizers: *barely, hardly, seemingly, supposedly*

collocations and thereby suggest some implications for L2 teaching, they have a limitation of not paying attention to learner corpora which give a valuable insight into L2 learners' use of intensifiers. In this respect, the following two studies are noteworthy, in which the use of intensifying adverbs in L2 learners' argumentative writing is investigated. Comparing the ICLE subcorpus of French-speaking students of English to a corpus of essays by native English undergraduates by conducting token and type analyses, Granger (1998b) finds a general underuse of amplifiers in the learner corpus, both in the number of tokens and types. The small number of amplifier types in learners' writing confirms the learners' deficiency of various amplifiers at their disposal. In other words, it reflects the learners' lack of vocabulary. The small number of amplifier tokens implies that learners' writing is less hyperbolic than that of native speakers.

By contrast, in an investigation aimed at contrasting how native and nonnative writers scale an adjectival quality in a more comprehensive way in which downtoners as well as amplifiers are examined with larger corpora than Granger's (1998b), Lorenz (1998) finds that German learners of English use far more intensifiers than the native speakers of English. While a total of 1,339 intensifiers are shown in the nonnative speakers' corpus, the native English corpus has a total of 949. From the finding of the frequency pattern, he suggests that German learners of English may have a tendency to overuse particular modifiers and hyperbole. He also speculates that "adjective intensifier counts correlate with linguistic maturity and nativelike argumentative writing" (Lorenz, 1998, p. 55).

Granger's and Lorenz's research, both of which adopt the aforementioned CIA approach, has led to some inconclusive, contradictory stylistic findings and implications. Thus, further studies are required to gauge whether L2 learners have a tendency to overuse or underuse amplifiers in modifying adjectives. In an attempt to validate accurate generalizations about amplifier collocations, the present study will investigate the similarities and differences between learners' and native speakers' use of amplifiers. More specifically, the study will examine the following research questions.

1. What is the overall frequency in the analysis of amplifiers in learners' and native speakers' corpora?
2. Which amplifiers are most and least frequently used?

III. METHOD

1. Corpora

The present study used two sets of corpora, the Korean EFL corpus (KC) and the native

speaker of English corpus (NC) containing argumentative essays. The KC was compiled by collecting the written samples from Korean university students who were taking two undergraduate level English courses. At the time of data collection, the students were requested to write about a non-technical argumentative English essay in a word processing program format as an assignment and upload the typed essays to their class websites. The KC contains of 336 essays totaling about 123,696 words, each essay having an average length of about 368 words. A sample of the KC is presented in the Appendix.

For the native speaker data, a subcorpus of the Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays (LOCNESS) was used, which is a collection of essays of a type similar to those in the ICLE, written by undergraduate students in Britain and the US. The LOCNESS consists of three major subcorpora, which are 60,209 British students' essays, 95,695 British university students' essays, and 168,400 American university students' essays (LOCNESS, 2004). The subcorpus of American university students' essays, in particular, American argumentative essays, was used in the present study. The NC is made up of samples of 176 essays with a total of 149,574 words. Each sample of the NC has an average length of about 850 words. A sample of the NC is also presented in the Appendix.

2. Procedure

Collocations associated with amplifying adverbs ending in *-ly*, whose examples are below, are the focus of the present study.

- One can visualize how *extremely* important this issue is.
- It encourages students to question *widely* accepted beliefs like evolution and ...

Since a comprehensive and finite list of amplifiers ending in *-ly* does not exist (Lorenz, 1999), the study took an open-ended method of investigation, in which all adverbs ending in *-ly* were treated as potential amplifiers following Lorenz's methodological approach. These adverbs could be retrieved by an '*ly' wildcard search.

With the use of WordSmith 4.0 (Scott, 2001), a concordancer program, all the words ending in *-ly*, were automatically retrieved from the KC and NC corpora. The target data were, then, manually sorted. This process of the manual selection allowed to eliminate some lexical items such as *assembly*, *reply*, *family*, *monopoly*, or *friendly*, which an '*ly' wildcard search incidentally displayed in the concordances.

As a first step, the number of types and tokens of amplifiers in the two corpora was compared in order to see the difference in the use of amplifiers between the KC and the NC. Then, individual amplifiers were examined to look at whether Korean learners' use of amplifiers was a general phenomenon or due to underuse/overuse of particular amplifiers.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study first looks at the result from the comparison of the number of types and tokens of amplifying adverbs between the KC and NC. Then, it identifies the overuse and underuse of *-ly* amplifiers among the corpora by examining individual amplifiers.

1. Overall Frequencies of *-ly* Amplifier Instances

Table 1 shows the frequencies of the types and tokens of the amplifiers used in the KC and NC. Since the two corpora differ in size (123,696 words for KC and 149,574 words for NC), the number of tokens per 10,000 words is also provided.

TABLE 1
Frequencies of *-ly* Amplifiers in the Corpora

	KC	NC
Tokens	132	171
Tokens/10,000 words	10.67	11.43
Types	29	39

The frequency in the token analysis of the KC indicates that Korean learners use fewer amplifiers in their writing than the native speakers (10.67 vs. 11.43). The result is analogous to Granger's (1998b) study, in which a statistically very significant underuse of amplifiers in the nonnative speakers' corpus was reported. It is also in line with some corpus-based L2 studies on connector use which reported learners' underuse of connectors in their writing (Altenberg & Tapper, 1998; Wikborg & Bjork, 1989). The result, however, differs from Lorenz's (1998) findings that learners massively overuse adjective intensification in general and that the higher a population's command of English, the less it depends on the use of amplifiers in modifying adjectives. The fact may contribute to yield such a different result that while the learner corpus used in Lorenz's study consisted of advanced German learners' writing the corpus of the present study was compiled from the samples written by Korean learners whose information on English proficiency was not obtained. Considering the postulation made by Granger (2002) that amplifier collocations used by the learners are quite congruent and results from their L1 transfer, cross-linguistic approach is expected to reveal further information on learners' use of amplifier collocations.

The low frequency in the type analysis of the KC indicates that Korean learners tend to make use of a limited number of versatile, high-frequency amplifying adverbs such as *really*, which will be discussed in more detail in the following section. Their tendency to

use certain amplifiers as general-purpose items can be also confirmed by their use of the amplifier *very*, which will be also examined in the following section.

Overall, the analysis in terms of the frequencies of *-ly* amplifiers confirms that the vocabulary of nonnative speakers is smaller than that of native speakers of a comparable educational level. The limited vocabulary may give an impression of learners' language as either dull or contextually unnecessary (Ringbom, 1998). In the next section, a more detailed examination and discussion will be made on Korean learners' use of *-ly* amplifiers in comparison with native speakers'.

2. Overuse and Underuse of *-ly* Amplifiers

As seen in Table 1, lower frequencies in the type and token instances of *-ly* amplifiers in the KC were found out. The next step was to look at whether the underuse was general or due to underuse/overuse of particular amplifiers by examining 'individual' amplifiers. The examination of the individual *-ly* amplifiers witnesses overuse and underuse of some amplifiers.

Tables 2 and 3 display the frequency scores for the top ten amplifiers, as they occurred in the KC and NC. In terms of figures and ranks order, the two tables yield some interesting trends.

First, the most frequent amplifier in the KC, which is *really*, comprises about 47% of the total number of *-ly* amplifiers in the KC. Korean learners' heavy use of *really* sharply contrasts with native speakers' use of it, which only takes up 3.5% of the total use of their *-ly* amplifiers. Learners combined *really* with a wide variety of words, which resulted in 43 collocates. It suggests that *really* is used as an all-round amplifier. The learners' overuse of *really* may well be that they have a direct translation equivalent which is very frequent in Korean, but this observation would seem to warrant further investigation

TABLE 2
Top Ten KC Amplifiers

Rank Order	Amplifiers	Tokens	Tokens/10,000 words	%(Tokens/132)
1	really	63	5.09	47.43
2	extremely	10	0.81	7.58
3	absolutely	8	0.65	6.06
4	highly	7	0.57	5.30
5	completely	4	0.32	3.03
5	deeply	4	0.32	3.03
5	fully	4	0.32	3.03
8	especially	3	0.25	2.27
8	greatly	3	0.25	2.27
8	seriously	3	0.25	2.27

Note: amplifiers used in NC are bold-faced.

TABLE 3
Top Ten NC Amplifiers

Rank Order	Amplifiers	Tokens	Tokens/10,000 words	%(Tokens/171)
1	highly	20	1.34	11.70
2	extremely	19	1.27	11.11
3	easily	12	0.80	7.02
4	clearly	10	0.67	5.85
5	greatly	9	0.60	5.26
6	widely	8	0.53	4.68
7	completely	7	0.47	4.09
7	readily	7	0.47	4.09
9	really	6	0.40	3.51
9	simply	6	0.40	3.51

Note: amplifiers used in KC are bold-faced.

In terms of target language registers, the learners' higher use of *really* indicates that learners' writing more resembles native English speech than writing. As Stenström (1986) pointed out, "*Really* occurred with a density of .31 per 1,000 words in LOB² and 3.17 per 1,000 words in LLC[London-Lund Corpus of Spoken English], a considerable difference, which immediately indicates that *really* is a characteristic feature of conversation." (p. 152). The learners' overuse of *really* also means that they fail to realize that *really* is a more typical feature in informal conversation and distinguish between target language registers. It, thus, suggests the need for teaching the learners not to mix spoken-mode forms with written-mode forms in order to make their formal writing more competent.

In terms of frequency, other types of amplifiers in the KC are comparatively rare; Compared to *really*, the percentages in overall occurrence are much lower for the other nine amplifiers. This may be due to the learners' repeated use of a small set of amplifiers, which was witnessed in the overuse of *really*. Learners' general preference for frequent, all-round amplifiers can be also seen in the case of *very*, which was not part of the present investigation but was analyzed independently. The analysis of the learners' use of *very* shows a significant overuse, as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Frequencies of -ly Amplifiers and very in the Corpora

	KC	NC
-ly amplifiers	132	171
-ly amplifiers/10,000 words	10.67	11.43
<i>very</i>	238	175
<i>very</i> /10,000 words	19.24	11.70

² LOB was compiled by researchers in Lancaster, Oslo and Bergen. It consists of one million words of British English texts from 1961.

Very occurs twenty times in every 10,000 words in Korean learners' written texts. The frequency of *very* is almost twice as many as that of the total *-ly* amplifiers found in the KC. This result could be explained in two ways. First, as Lorenz (1999) asserted, native speakers are more likely to find out more complex means of adjective intensification than nonnative speakers who seem to lean towards well-established amplifiers. As seen in Table 4, native speakers' use of *very* occurs less frequently than Korean learners'. Second, Korean learners' general underuse of *-ly* amplifiers is compensated for by their overuse of *very*. In other words, learners' use of limited expressions that they believe they know well results in a small repertoire of *-ly* amplifiers in the KC corpus (Milton, 1998).

While amplifiers such as *really* and *very* were overused in the KC, amplifiers used in both KC and NC such as *extremely*, *highly*, *completely*, and *greatly*, vary significantly in their distribution. Table 5 presents the frequencies of commonly used five amplifiers in the KC and NC.

TABLE 5
Frequencies of *-ly* Amplifiers Used in Both KC and NC

Amplifiers	KC		NC	
	Tokens	%(Tokens/132)	Tokens	%(Tokens/171)
<i>really</i>	63	47.43	6	3.51
<i>extremely</i>	10	7.58	19	11.11
<i>highly</i>	7	5.30	20	11.70
<i>completely</i>	4	3.03	7	4.09
<i>greatly</i>	3	2.27	9	5.26

Of the commonly used amplifiers except *really*, which was separately examined in the above, the most marked difference in use between the two corpora was manifested in the amplifier of *highly* (KC 5.30%, NC 11.70%). Korean learners' underuse of *highly* is analogous to Granger's (1998b) study, in which a statistically significant difference was demonstrated in French learners' underuse of *highly* (NNS 11 instances, NS 31 instances). With regards to the finding, Granger (1998b) speculates that interlingual transfer plays a role in the underuse of *highly*; The French equivalent of *highly* is not much frequent in French. In the case of Korean learners, however, their preference for *very* as an all-round option and more exposure to spoken English in which *really* is more prominent seems to be a more explanation for the lower use of *highly*. Further corpus investigation would be necessary to confirm the conjecture.

The next amplifiers underused by Korean learners are *extremely*, *greatly*, and *completely* in their rank order of use. One interesting phenomenon to note is that four out of the five amplifiers common to both KC and NC are in the category of boosters. While boosters

such as *really*, *highly*, *extremely*, and *greatly* express a high degree, maximizers such as *completely* expresses the highest degree (Granger, 1998b). This suggests that both native speakers and Korean learners may prefer to signify less than maximal intensity in their writing, which deserves further studies.

To sum up, the results of the study show that Korean learners tend to use a smaller number of amplifiers with a limited number of different types than the native speakers. Further, the study demonstrates the learners' overuse of all-round amplifiers such as *really* and *very*, which results in comparative underuse of other amplifiers such as *highly*. The learners' tendency to employ a few high-frequency amplifiers may cause their writing to become less competent. This suggests that the learners may have difficulties in distinguishing target language registers and acquiring subtle stylistic sensitivity.

V. CONCLUSION

The present study attempts to reveal how computerized corpus-based analysis using learner corpora can throw light on a better appreciation of the nature and scope of learners' difficulties in mastering an L2 through analyzing the use of *-ly* amplifier collocations in a Korean learners' corpus. The results of the study show that some discrepancy exists between the Korean learners' corpus and the native speakers' corpus in the use of *-ly* amplifier collocations. The Korean learners' difficulties in using amplifier collocations may be due to their incomplete knowledge of and lack of experience in collocational relationships, which should be mastered in order to become a fluent user of English. Due to the limited amount of data from Korean learners' writing samples, however, the findings of the study should be corroborated in further studies.

This study has both methodological and pedagogical implications. Methodologically speaking, computer learner corpora prove to be a useful tool to yield meaningful data for investigating EFL learners' language difficulties and thereby providing ways to improve their learning. Although the computer learner corpus in the study is designed to compare itself with native speakers', computer learner corpora can be developed as graded corpora. They allow for the comparison between more and less mature writers and thus afford more specific information such as what Lorenz called "developmental tendencies" or "stylistic significance" (Lorenz, p. 218). Besides the written learner corpora used in the study, spoken learner corpora can be compiled. It is true that while there has been remarkable growth of research in the area of written learner corpora, research on spoken learner corpora is rare; compiling and transcribing spoken discourse is time-consuming and difficult (Leech, 1997). More interest in the compilation of and research on spoken corpora is needed to provide a better understanding of the nature and scope of spoken language.

Computer learner corpora can be also compiled by gathering data from different L2 learners with various L1 backgrounds. They allow for investigations of the different variables affecting learners' output in a more thorough way than natural language use data do (Granger, 1998a).

Pedagogically speaking, learners' heavy use of a limited number of amplifying adverbs such as *really* and *very* found in the study indicates their small repertoire of *-ly* amplifiers, which should be expanded to achieve fluency. As the analysis of amplifier collocations in Kennedy's (2003) study illustrates, the complexity of what has to be learned regarding amplifier collocations has emerged through corpus analysis. Thus, language teachers should ensure that learners get frequent opportunities for experiencing a vast collection of units of language in use and internalizing prefabricated word groups. One of the promising ways of providing such opportunities is to employ so-called data-driven learning approach (Johns, 1991). In the approach, "language learners is also, essentially, a research worker whose learning needs to be driven by access to linguistics data—hence the term data-driven learning (DDL) to describe the approach." (p. 2). Unfortunately, despite the enthusiasm for data-driven learning approach or hands-on concordancing, attempts to test how concordancing facilitates learning have been rarely made. Thus, more research will be necessary in the future to identify a specific learning effect that attributed to the use of concordance software by learners.

Another way for language teachers to develop learners' collocational competence is to devise an "implicit curriculum" (Kennedy, 2003, p. 482) that maximizes the opportunities for learners to get enough exposure to language in use. Unlike an "explicit curriculum" (Kennedy, 2003, p. 482) that lists the explicit knowledge that learners need to know, the implicit curriculum includes experience of using routinized combinations of words in speech and writing. According to Kennedy, the implicit curriculum can be effectively developed by encouraging learners' autonomous reading. In addition to delivering the explicit instruction that may work well for very high-frequency linguistic items, thus, language teachers need to be aware of the importance of implicit knowledge that learners unconsciously acquire. They also need to impose a hidden curriculum on learners by using extensive reading, which allows for much more amount of experiences that result in learners' building implicit knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Altenberg, B., & Tapper, M. (1998). The use of adverbial connectors in advanced Swedish learners' written English. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on computer* (pp. 80-93). London: Longman.

- Biber, D., & Reppen, R. (1998). Comparing native and learner perspectives on English grammar: A study of complement clauses. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on computer* (pp. 145-158). London: Longman.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Bolinger, D. L. (1972). *Degree words*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Conrad, S. (1999). The importance of corpus-based research for language teachers. *System*, 27, 1-18.
- De Cock, S. (1998). A recurrent word combination approach to the study of formulae in the speech of native and non-native speakers of English. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 3, 59-80.
- Flowerdew, J. (2000). Investigating referential and pragmatic errors in a learner corpus. In L. Burnard & T. McEnery (Eds.), *Rethinking language pedagogy from a corpus perspective* (pp. 145-154). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Flowerdew, J. (2002). Corpus-based analysis in EAP. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 95-114). New York: Longman.
- Flowerdew, J. (2003). A combined corpus and systemic-functional analysis of the problem-solution pattern in a student and professional corpus of technical writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(3), 489-512.
- Gavioli, L., & Aston, G. (2001). Enriching reality: Language corpora in language pedagogy. *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 238-246.
- Granger, S. (1998a). *Learner English on computer*. London: Longman.
- Granger, S. (1998b). Prefabricated patterns in advanced EFL writing: Collocations and lexical phrases. In A. Cowie (Ed.), *Phraseology* (pp. 145-160). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Granger, S. (2002). A bird-eye view of computer learner corpus research. In S. Granger, J. Hung, & S. Petch-Tyson (Eds.), *Computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 3-33). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hill, J. (2001). Revising priorities: From grammatical failure to collocational success. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach* (pp. 47-69). London: Language Teaching Publications.
- Huston, S. (2002). *Corpora in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johansson, S. (1993). 'Sweetly oblivious': Some aspects of adverb-adjective combinations in present-day English. In M. Hoey (Ed.), *Data, description, discourse* (pp. 39-49). London: HarperCollins.
- Johns, T. (1991). Should you be persuaded: Two examples of data-driven learning. In T. Johns & P. King (Eds.), *Classroom concordancing* (pp. 1-13). Brimingham: ELR.
- Lee, Eun-Ju. (2004). A corpus-based analysis of the Korean EFL learners' use of

- conjunctive adverbials. *English Teaching*, 59(4), 283-301.
- Leech, G. (1997). Teaching and language corpora: A convergence. In A. Wichmann, S. Fligelstone, T. McEnery, & G. Knowles (Eds.), *Teaching and language corpora* (pp. 1-23). London: Longman.
- LOCNESS. (2004). *Louvain corpus of native English essays*. Retrieved September, 9, 2004 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.fltr.ucl.ac.be/FLTR/GERM/ETAN/CECL/Cecl-Projects/Icle/LOCNESS1.htm>.
- Lorenz, G. (1998). Overstatement in advanced learners' writing: Stylish aspects of adjective intensification. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on computer* (pp. 53-66). London: Longman.
- Lorenz, G. (1999). *Adjective intensification—learners versus native speakers: A corpus study of argumentative writing*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Meyer, C. (2002). *English corpus linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milton, J. (1998). Exploring L1 and interlanguage corpora in the design of an electronic language learning and production environment. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on computer* (pp. 186-198). London: Longman.
- Palmer, H. E. (1933). *Second interim report on English collocations*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Paradis, C. (1997). *Degree modifiers of adjectives in spoken British English*. Lund, Sweden: Lund University Press.
- Pawley, A., & Syder, F. H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 191-226). London: Longman.
- Peters, A. (1983). *The units of language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R., Svartvik, J., Leech, G., & Greenbaum, S. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. New York: Longman.
- Ringbom, H. (1998). Vocabulary frequencies in advanced learner English: A cross-linguistic approach. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on computer* (pp. 41-52). London: Longman.
- Sott, M. (2001). Comparing corpora and identifying key words, collocations, and frequency distributions through the WordSmith Tools suite of computer programs. In M. Ghadessy, A. Henry, & R. L. Roseberry (Eds.), *Small corpus studies and ELT: Theory and practice* (pp. 47-70). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Stenström, A. (1986). What does really really do? Strategies in speech and writing. In G. Tottie & I. Bäcklund (Eds.), *English in speech and writing. A symposium*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wilksell.
- Tono, Y. (2002). *The role of learner corpora in SLA Research and foreign language learning: The multiple comparison approach*. unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University.

- Virtanan, T. (1998). Direct questions in argumentative student writing. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on computer* (pp. 94-106). London: Longman.
- Wikborg, E., & Bjork, L. (1989). *Coherence in text: An empirical study with pedagogical sequences for composition teaching*. Uppsala, Sweden: Hallgren and Fallgren.
- Woolard, G. (2001). Collocation—encouraging learner independence. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach* (pp. 28-46). London: Language Teaching Publications.

APPENDIX

KC Sample Writing

I think the death penalty can never deter people who are thinking of committing a murder. Moreover, the death penalty is not necessary at all. First of all, most murderers don't realize that the death penalty can end them, as smokers don't realize that they can be lung cancer patients and are not exceptions. When one kills another person, he or she has little reason. Even if the murder is perfectly planned in advance, he or she cannot commit a murder without impulses or emotions because the man is a creature of impulse. Therefore, hardly do the murderers think about the possible death penalty at the very time of committing murders...

NC sample writing

The highest sentence that can be enforced by the American Judicial system is that of death. Capital punishment has been carried out on criminals for quite some time, but never without a strong opposition. Many people view capital punishment as a heinous act that is morally incorrect. The fact still remains that in our current society, the majority of Americans support capital punishment. For every American that sees capital punishment as a senseless and unnecessary act of violence, there are several who believe that this sentence is the ultimate act of justice....

Applicable levels: higher education

Key words: learner corpora, contrastive interlanguage analysis, amplifier collocation

Soyoung Lee
Dept. of English Education
Inha University
253 Younghyun-dong Nam-gu
Incheon, 402-751, Korea
Tel: (032) 860-7856
Fax: (032) 865-3857
Email: soyoung@inha.ac.kr

Received in November, 2005

Reviewed in December, 2005

Revised version received in February, 2006