Rethinking the Lexical Unit in Spanish as a Foreign Language: A Psycholinguistic, Linguistic and Didactic Framework for Teaching Collocations

Bessma Hamama, Dr. Hind Brigui, Oussama Boukhari
English Department, Faculty of Languages, Letters and Arts, Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra

Abstract:

This article presents a theoretical and methodological synthesis of Marta Higueras García's (2006) monograph *Estudio de las colocaciones léxicas y su enseñanza en español como lengua extranjera*, the author's integrated account of collocations as a privileged type of lexical unit for Spanish as a foreign language. The article first outlines the psycholinguistic foundations of the proposal (cognitivism, the mental lexicon, the principles of idiomaticity and chunking), then the linguistic characterization of collocations (base–collocate structure, semantic compositionality, idiomaticity, restricted co-occurrence), and finally the methodological sequence for teaching them. Particular attention is paid to the author's original distinction between *prototypical* and *non-prototypical* collocations, a distinction that resolves long-standing terminological disputes and has direct pedagogical consequences. The article closes with a discussion of the didactic principles, the materials designed for teacher training, and the empirical validation reported in the book.

Keywords: *collocations; Spanish as a foreign language; lexical competence; mental lexicon; idiomaticity; lexical approach; teaching methodology.*

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

1. Introduction

The teaching of vocabulary in Spanish as a foreign language has traditionally privileged the word as the basic unit of analysis, at the expense of multiword lexical units that native speakers store and retrieve as wholes. Higueras García (2006, p. 7) opens her monograph by noting the "escasez de artículos que apliquen el concepto de colocación a la didáctica del español como lengua extranjera" and justifies her study on the basis of both research need and classroom experience. Her central claim is that collocations constitute a type of lexical unit whose explicit teaching improves retention, precision and fluency, and that ELE pedagogy should incorporate a concept already consolidated in the teaching of English as a foreign language.

The book's structure comprises an introduction, theoretical foundations (psycholinguistic and linguistic), methodological foundations, conclusions, and a bibliography with appendices (Higueras, 2006, p. 5). This article reconstructs the argument in four movements: the psycholinguistic rationale (Section 2), the linguistic definition and taxonomy (Section 3), the methodological proposal (Section 4), and the empirical validation and conclusions (Section 5).

2. Psycholinguistic Foundations

2.1. Cognitivism and the teaching of collocations

Higueras García (2006, p. 11) situates her research within cognitivism, a paradigm that occupies an intermediate position between generative theories centered exclusively on competence and so-called "list grammars." Cognitivism aims to account for real linguistic productions, not the competence of the ideal speaker-hearer, and therefore starts from contextualized productions while granting considerable importance to the idiosyncratic aspects of languages. It is a usage-based approach "que pone énfasis en la lengua real" and that does not exclude idiomatic constructions that generativism considered alien to general rules (Langacker, 1987, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 11). These characteristics are fundamental for the study of collocations because they too are idiosyncratic to each language and can only be studied from performance.

A second postulate is the cognitive nature of language: language is not an autonomous capacity separate from human cognition but interacts with other cognitive systems (Cuenca & Hilferty, 1999, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 11). With respect to acquisition, cognitivism holds that general hypothesis-construction strategies and linguistic data provided by adults are essential, but it does not defend abstract principles exclusive to language; rather, grammar is discovered through general principles of cognition.

Crucially, Higueras García (2006, p. 12) notes that for a long time lexis was neglected because it was thought to lack rules, unlike phonology and grammar. However, recent decades have witnessed growing interest, and it is now accept-

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

ed that "hay también principios estructuradores del léxico." Nation (2001, pp. 398–399, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 12) mentions four: rules of orthography, pronunciation, word formation, and collocations. A further postulate is the need to combine simple structures into complex ones. Castañeda (1997, p. 24, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 12) affirms that "nuestra capacidad de procesamiento es limitada: su máximo aprovechamiento pasa por la automatización de ciertas operaciones." This accounts for the need to recognize and memorize complex lexical units, allowing learners to focus on other linguistic or non-linguistic aspects during communicative exchange.

The consequence is a dynamic characterization of language that blurs the frontiers between linguistic levels—semantics, pragmatics, grammar and lexis—precisely because all aspects of language are symbolic. Cognitive grammar defends the idea that lexis, morphology and syntax form a *continuum* of symbolic units serving to structure conceptual content with expressive purposes (Higueras, 2006, p. 12). Lewis (1993, 1997, 2000, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 12) applied this continuum to foreign language teaching, showing that grammar can be explained from lexis: it is possible to learn chunks holistically and later analyze their component words to learn grammar, as Peters (1983) had proposed.

2.2. Prototypes, fuzzy sets and the mental lexicon

The theory of prototypes shows that cognitive categorization differs from traditional categorization based on binary oppositions (Higueras, 2006, p. 13). The author invokes the notion of fuzzy sets (Moure, 1996, p. 30, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 13) to argue that the boundaries between categories such as "animal" and "plant"—or, for that matter, between collocations and idioms—are not clear-cut. There are no pre-established boxes into which terms must fit; rather, "el único molde será un *continuum* con dos polos caracterizados y una pérdida progresiva de definición de uno a otro extremo" (Higueras, 2006, p. 13). Rosch's (1978) definition of the prototype—the exemplar that is best recognized, most representative and distinctive of a category—grounds the author's later distinction between prototypical and non-prototypical collocations.

With respect to the mental lexicon, Higueras García (2006, p. 15) affirms that words are stored not as in a dictionary but forming networks with relations of different types that expand over time through exposure to input. Aitchison (1987, pp. 74–85, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 15) demonstrated through association experiments that there are structuring principles of lexis, listed by order of frequency: coordination, collocations, superordination, and synonymy. Consequently, teaching collocations aids memorization and retrieval. Since language is full of lexical phrases that speed up conversation and that the speaker has memorized as a whole (Coseriu, 1977; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Wray, 2002; Schmitt, 2004, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 15), their teaching also improves fluency and precision. This implies overcoming the "open choice principle"—the traditional view of language as a system of syntactic rules into which

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

words are inserted—in favor of the principle of idiomaticity (Higueras, 2006, p. 15).

Lahuerta and Pujol (1996) and Baralo (1997, 2001) described these relations, and Gómez Molina (2004a, p. 495, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 16) insists that associative experiments show the basic relation types people employ: coordination (*cuchara–cuchillo–tenedor*), syntagmatic combinations (*azul turquesa/marino/eléctrico*; *carta personal/certificada/urgente/de negocios*), hierarchical relations (*infusión–té*), and pairs with evident opposites. Teachers should therefore present and practice words and lexical units through techniques and contexts that allow relating them to one another, as they appear to be stored in the mental lexicon. Baralo (2001, p. 37, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 16) synthesizes this in two aspects: sources providing comprehensible input subject to Krashen's *i + 1* rule, and activities favoring strategies of association of lexical pieces through morphological, semantic, lexical, discursive and pragmatic networks.

2.3. What it means to know a word, and the problem of forgetting

Higueras García (2006, p. 17) argues that learning a word involves much more than understanding its meaning: it is a process that restructures prior knowledge. Each time a new lexical entry is learned, operations differentiate it from known entries and associate it with those already mastered. The example of *caliente/frío/templado* illustrates how incorporating a new element changes the whole structure of the semantic field. The collocational meaning is one of the elements integrating our knowledge of a word (Nation, 1990, 2001): drawing attention to the possibility or impossibility of combining certain words helps learners relate units correctly in their lexicon, improves long-term retention and avoids transfer errors. For example, we cannot say we know the word *hablar* if we do not know that Spanish says *hablar una lengua extranjera*, *hablar en público*, *hablar claro*, *hablar de negocios*, *hablar por teléfono*, but not *hablar la verdad (Hill, 2000, p. 61, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 17).

The author then addresses forgetting, "uno de los aspectos que más dificulta la adquisición del léxico" (Higueras, 2006, p. 18). Since learning lexis is a process of accumulating and relating a high number of lexical pieces rather than merely relabeling objects, and since forgetting seems to affect lexis more than grammar or phonology, the aim is to move lexical information from short-term to long-term memory. Schmitt (2000, p. 130, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 18) proposes relating new units to known ones—creating networks of meanings—to create an anchor in memory. Thornbury (2002, p. 24, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 18) adds techniques to overcome forgetting: repeating activities, using mnemonic rules, encountering words again in other contexts, spacing reviews, providing opportunities for use, and promoting deep cognitive processing; affective depth also appears to influence memorization. Gairns and Redman (1986, p. 94, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 18) suggest reviews at the end of the session,

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

the next day, a week later, and after one and three months. Teachers can help by raising learners' awareness of the need to review individually and periodically outside class, and by planning lexical teaching cyclically (Higueras, 2006, p. 19).

2.4. Bases of the methodological proposal: communicative approach and lexical approach

Higueras García (2006, pp. 19–20) grounds her proposal in principles and techniques from communicative language teaching: starting from learners' concrete needs, explicit teaching of strategies so that learners take responsibility for their learning, respect for different learning styles, contextualized teaching of lexis, attention to all communicative activities, incorporation of a ludic component, and relating lexical content to other components of communicative competence. The most important influence concerns the purpose of lexical learning: it is not an end in itself but is subordinated to improving the learner's communicative competence.

From the lexical approach (Lewis, 1993, 1997, 2000), the author takes four principles (Higueras, 2006, p. 22): (a) the primacy of lexis over grammar; (b) attention by teachers and learners to the recognition and memorization of lexical segments or chunks to improve fluency and precision and to allow both the principle of idiomaticity and the open choice principle to operate; (c) the importance of the syntagmatic or horizontal organization of words—co-text and context—and hence of collocations; and (d) emphasis on incidental learning. The author stresses that the lexical approach does not break with the communicative approach but develops it (Higueras, 2006, p. 22).

Regarding explicit versus incidental learning, Higueras García (2006, p. 20) argues that both direct and indirect learning are necessary and complementary. Explicit learning guarantees acquisition but requires great time investment and would make it impossible to learn all the words needed; incidental learning arises from exposure to oral and written input during communicative use, making time doubly beneficial, but it is slower, gradual and less systematic. For collocations, there is no agreement among authors on the convenience of explicit teaching; for the author, both are needed.

3. Linguistic Characterization of Collocations

3.1. Antecedents and definitions

The introduction of the term *colocación* into Spanish linguistics is attributed to Seco, to denote what he later called "contorno" in lexicographic definition, although Coseriu's "solidaridades léxicas" had already been sketched in his works on semantic theory (Higueras, 2006, p. 22). The English term *collocation* derives from J. R. Firth (1957, p. 196), for whom it meant "the distribution of common words"; Firth never defined it precisely but introduced *collocability*

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

and *collocational* (Higueras, 2006, p. 23). The term began to stabilize in Spanish from 1992 with works by Írsula (1992), Aguilar-Amat (1993a), Alonso Ramos (1993), Corpas (1996), Castillo (1998), Luque and Manjón (1998), Koike (2001), Bosque (2001b), Penadés (2001) and Higueras (2004a) (Higueras, 2006, p. 23).

Hausmann (1989, p. 1010, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 24) distinguished the base—the word that determines with which words it can combine—from the collocate—the determined element. The base is semantically autonomous; the collocate is not. For example, the adjective *solo* ('without milk') needs the co-occurrence of *café* to mean what it means, which is why the collocation is usually described in the entry of the base in works such as the DICE (Alonso Ramos, 2002b; Sanromán, 2003; Muñiz, 2004), but not in *Redes*, which could be considered a dictionary of collocates (Bosque, 2001a; Higueras, 2005). Koike (2001, p. 63, as cited in Higueras, 2006, pp. 24–25) adds the concept of entorno (environment), obligatory or facultative, and distinguishes radio colocacional (the set of collocates combinable with a base) from campo colocacional (synonymous words with similar collocational potential). Bosque (2001b, p. 31) identifies three elements: base, collocate, and the semantic relation between them.

3.2. Statistical and semantic approaches

Corpas (2001, p. 49, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 25) distinguishes two basic approaches: the statistical, which identifies collocation with combination and understands it as the mere significant co-occurrence of lexical units in discourse (Sinclair's neo-Firthian tradition), and the semantic, which starts from combinations but applies additional criteria, considering that there is semantic determination between the base and its collocate. The semantic current, stemming from Hausmann, has had enormous influence on lexicography. Collocations present internal semantic links of various types—specialization, delexicalization, metaphorization of collocates—and reflect a typical and real relation holding in the world, offering semantic precision (Higueras, 2006, p. 25). Mel'čuk's (1981) lexical functions, within Meaning–Text Theory, have attempted to account for these internal semantic links, as studied by Alonso Ramos (1993) and Írsula Peña (1994).

González Rey (2002, pp. 157–164, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 25) divides into three the stages of consolidation of the concept in general language: the broad conception of English combinatorics, the lexicographic perspective, and the didactic perspective. Mitchell (1971, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 26) affirmed that collocation is not a combination of words but of lexemes. Ettinger (1982, pp. 249–258, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 27) distinguishes collocations from fixed combinations of lexemes according to the degree of interchangeability. Benson et al. (1986, pp. 252–253, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 27) define collocations as "fixed, identifiable, non-idiomatic phrases and constructions," distinguishing eight types of grammatical collocations and seven of lexical col-

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

locations. Benson (1989b, p. 3, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 27) insists on arbitrariness: collocations should be defined not just as "recurrent word combinations" but as "arbitrary recurrent word combinations."

Hausmann (1989, p. 1013, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 28) captures the idiosyncratic nature of collocations:

"C'est que l'idiosyncrasie de la collocation ne se relève définitivement que dans l'optique d'une autre langue qui combine, pour exprimer le même fait, des mots différents."

That is, the idiosyncrasy of a collocation is definitively revealed only from the perspective of another language that combines different words to express the same fact. This is precisely what justifies its study in foreign language teaching: the same word may combine in other languages through other lexemes (compare *to be cold* vs. *tener frío*) or even through a single word (*pass an exam* vs. *aprobar*), so ignorance of collocations produces multiple encoding errors through L1 transfer (Higueras, 2006, p. 39).

3.3. Corpus-based and syntactic criteria

Sinclair (1991, p. 115, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 43) applies the frequency criterion and introduces the distinction between node (the word being studied) and collocate (any word appearing in its specific environment), and between downward collocations (the node is a higher-frequency word; the collocate provides semantic analysis) and upward collocations (a statistically poor pattern; the words tend to be grammatical-frame elements or superordinates). Koike (2001, p. 27, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 30) considers that one can speak of collocation when the co-occurrence percentage of two lexical units exceeds 20%, and introduces the notion of *collocational span* (distance between collocates).

Corpas (1996, pp. 66–76, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 43) classifies collocations by grammatical category and syntactic relation, distinguishing six types: (a) noun (subject) + verb (*correr un rumor*, *estallar una guerra*); (b) verb + noun (object), with three subgroups—shared collocate with bases of the same semantic field (*desempeñar un cargo/papel/función*), very limited combinatorial pattern (*conciliar el sueño*, not *atraer el sueño), and delexicalized verb + deverbal noun (*tomar una decisión*, *dar comienzo*); (c) adjective + noun (*fuente fidedigna*, *error garrafal*), with three subgroups according to the extension of the adjective; (d) noun + preposition + noun (*rebanada de pan*); (e) verb + adverb (*negarse rotundamente*); and (f) adverb + adjective (*profundamente dormido*) (Higueras, 2006, pp. 43–45).

Koike (2001, p. 76, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 30) offers "la propuesta más completa y rigurosa," defining collocations as "un vínculo léxico-semántico condicionado por la sintaxis," with three formal characteristics—frequent co-

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

occurrence, combinatorial restrictions imposed by traditional usage, and formal compositionality with certain flexibilities—and three semantic ones—link between two lexemes, typicality of the relation (*tocar la guitarra*, *rasguear la guitarra*, but not *comprar una guitarra*), and semantic precision (Higueras, 2006, pp. 30–31). Bosque (2001b, as cited in Higueras, 2006, pp. 31–32) inverts the direction of selection, affirming that it is the predicate (collocate) that selects its arguments (bases), as *Redes* systematically documents; he recommends caution with the frequency criterion and with the criterion of preference, since many preferred combinations are manifestations of *loci communes*.

Muñiz (2002, p. 266, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 33) characterizes collocations as units of discursive synthesis, formally and semantically regular, in which verb–noun cases involve oriented lexical selection (the noun chooses a determined verb to express the process). Zuluaga (2002, p. 111, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 33) defines them by opposition: "Las llamadas colocaciones no son ni unidades fraseológicas ni construcciones libres"; they seem free because of their grammatical regularity and semantic transparency, but are not, due to the fixation of their lexical components; they seem phraseological units because of the arbitrary fixation of their components, but are not, due to their grammatical regularity and semantic compositionality.

3.4. The author's conceptual proposal

Higueras García (2006, p. 39) formulates her own definition from the perspective of foreign language teaching:

"Desde la óptica de la enseñanza del léxico como lengua extranjera, entendemos que las colocaciones (como entablar conversación, saldar una deuda, conceder un crédito, fruncir el ceño, armar jaleo, despejar una duda) son un tipo de unidad léxica [Lewis, 1993; Higueras, 1997a] –son una unidad psicológica para los hablantes de una lengua [Benson et al., 1986]–, formadas por dos lexemas [Mitchell, 1971] que coocurren con frecuencia, y que expresan una relación típica entre sus componentes [Koike, 2001]. Son parcialmente composicionales, porque la base mantiene su sentido, pero el colocativo adopta un sentido especial que sólo posee en presencia del otro elemento [Corpas, 1996; Castillo Carballo, 1998; Koike, 2001]. Ilustran preferencias de combinación y restricciones impuestas por el uso, a nivel de la norma [Corpas, 1996, p. 76; Zuluaga, 2002, p. 106], en unos casos debido al conocimiento del mundo y en otros por razones idiosincrásicas de cada lengua."

She explicitly opts not for the broadest possible conception that would encompass all frequent combinations worth teaching, but for a definition faithful to linguistic contributions, reserving the term combinaciones sintagmáticas or colocaciones no prototípicas for those frequent, stable combinations that help learners combine words on the syntagmatic axis when speaking about a given topic (e.g., domestic tasks: *lavar la ropa*, *hacer la compra*, *lavar los platos*, *lim-*

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

piar la casa) but that depart from the prototype by not fulfilling typicality, showing less cohesion and lower frequency (Higueras, 2006, pp. 39–40).

3.5. Collocations and the CEFR competencies

Higueras García (2006, pp. 40–41) relates collocations to the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (Council of Europe, 2002). The semantic regime is one of the elements of lexical competence and a type of semantic relation integrating semantic competence. Within general competencies, many collocations are understood and produced thanks to world knowledge (declarative knowledge), while others are idiosyncratic and relate to the capacity to learn (reflection on the language system). Within communicative linguistic competencies, collocations manifest lexical, semantic (synonymy: *liquidar/saldar/resolver las diferencias*; *dar/emitir una opinión*; antonymy: *abrir la sesión* ± *cerrar la sesión*; *cumplir las normas* ± *violar las normas*) and sociolinguistic dimensions (diatopic, diastratic and diaphasic variation: *quitarse los zapatos* in Spain vs. *sacarse los zapatos* in Chile; *encender la luz* vs. *prender la luz*) (Koike, 2001, pp. 191–202, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 41).

3.6. Taxonomies

The book reviews the principal taxonomies in chronological order (Higueras, 2006, pp. 41–49). Cowie (1981) classifies by degree of restriction: free combinations, restricted collocations, stable collocations, and a fuzzy boundary with idioms. Benson et al. (1986, p. 9) distinguish grammatical collocations (noun, adjective or verb followed by a preposition, infinitive or subordinate clause: *escasez de*, *hablar de*, *fiel a*) from lexical collocations (verb + noun, noun + adjective, noun + verb, verb + adverb, etc.); Koike (2001, p. 14) notes that both types can co-occur in the same sequence (*caer en la trampa*). Nation (2001, pp. 328 ff.) proposes a *continuum* articulated through ten scales: frequency of co-occurrence, adjacency, grammatical structuring, grammatical uniqueness, grammatical fossilization, collocational specialization, lexical fossilization, semantic opacity, uniqueness of meaning, and—implicitly—the degree of institutionalization.

Koike (2001, as cited in Higueras, 2006, pp. 46–47) distinguishes collocations of simple lexical units (six types: noun + verb with three subtypes, noun + adjective with attributive and predicative subtypes, noun + *de* + noun, verb + adverb, adverb + adjective/participle, verb + adjective) from complex collocations (verb + nominal idiom, verbal idiom + noun, noun + adjectival idiom, verb + adverbial idiom, adjective + adverbial idiom), summarized in the book's Figure 3 (Higueras, 2006, p. 47). Wotjak (1998b, p. 260, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 46) distinguishes lexicalized from lexicalizing collocations. Higueras herself (1997a, pp. 38–39, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 46) classifies by origin of restrictions: those determined by world knowledge (*talar un árbol*, *el perro ladra*, *la rana croa*) and those determined by the language itself. Bosque (2001b, as

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 46) distinguishes designative restrictions (deducible from world knowledge: subjects of *volar*: *pájaros, aviones, cometas, globos*) from denotative ones (not deducible without knowledge of the idiom: subjects of *estribar*: *cuestiones, asuntos, problemas, dificultades*), and criticizes purely formal classifications.

3.7. Collocations versus other multiword lexical units

The author applies fuzzy-set theory to the boundaries between lexical units (Higueras, 2006, p. 50) and proposes a taxonomy of palabras and unidades pluriverbales, the latter comprising five types: *combinaciones sintagmáticas* (non-prototypical collocations), *colocaciones* (prototypical), *compuestos sintagmáticos*, *expresiones idiomáticas*, and *expresiones institucionalizadas* (Higueras, 2006, pp. 52–53). She rejects *unidad fraseológica* as hypernym because it cannot comfortably accommodate non-prototypical collocations, and prefers *unidad pluriverbal lexicalizada y habitualizada* (Ettinger, 1982; Higueras, 1997a, p. 36).

Table 1. *Prototypical vs. non-prototypical collocations: defining features*

Feature	Prototypical collocations	Non-prototypical collocations (syntagmatic combinations)	Free combinations
1. Lexical restriction	Yes	Partial	No
2. Directionality (one lexeme selects the other)	Yes	Weak	No
3. Typicality of the relation	Yes	No	No
4. Arbitrary fixation in the norm	Yes	Weak	No
5. Syntactic regularity	Yes	Yes	Yes
6. Semantic transparency	Yes	Yes	Yes
7. Institutionalization (community membership)	Yes	Partial	No
8. Frequency of co-occurrence	High	Variable	Variable
Example	*reservar una mesa*	*hacer la compra*	*comprar un libro*

Note. Adapted from Higueras García (2006, pp. 53–54, Figure 5). The author assigns features 1–8 to prototypical collocations, features 4–8 (with lower intensity) to non-prototypical ones, and only features 5–6 to free combinations.

Table 2. *Main linguistic classifications of collocations reviewed in the monograph*

Author(s)	Criterion	Types distinguished	Example(s)
Cowie (1981)	Degree of restriction	Free, restricted, stable, fuzzy boundary with idioms	*provocar una pelea*; *conciliar el sueño*; *levantar una calumnia*
Benson et al. (1986)	Grammatical vs. Lexical	8 grammatical + 7 lexical types	*escasez de*; *hablar de*; *fiel a*; *sentar las bases*
Hausmann (1989)	Base–collocate structure	6 syntactic patterns (N+Adj, N+V, V+N,	*épithète*; *objet*

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

		V+Adv, Adj+Adv, N+Prep+N)	
Sinclair (1991)	Frequency; node–collocate	Downward vs. upward collocations	Node + collocate
Corpas (1996)	Grammatical category and syntactic relation	6 types (N+V, V+N with 3 subtypes, Adj+N with 3 subtypes, N+Prep+N, V+Adv, Adj+Adv)	*correr un rumor*; *desempeñar un cargo*; *fuente fidedigna*; *rebanada de pan*; *negarse rotundamente*; *profundamente dormido*
Wotjak (1998b)	Degree of lexicalization	Lexicalized vs. lexicalizing collocations	*entablar una conversación*; *implementar nuevos datos*
Koike (2001)	Simple vs. complex units	6 simple + 5 complex types	*contraer matrimonio*; *dar el santo y seña*; *una salud de hierro*
Nation (2001)	Ten-scale continuum	Frequency, adjacency, grammatical structuring, uniqueness, fossilization, specialization, opacity, etc.	*anno domini*; *a bird's eye view*
Bosque (2001b)	Origin of restriction	Designative vs. denotative restrictions	Subjects of *volar* vs. subjects of *estribar*
Higueras (1997a)	Origin of restriction	World knowledge vs. language-determined	*la rana croa*; *talar un árbol*

Note. Compiled from Higueras García (2006, pp. 41–49).

Table 3. *Collocations vs. other multiword units: differential features*

Feature	Compounds	Collocations	Locutions	Other idioms	Institutionalized expressions
Written separation of elements	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Single accentual unit	Yes (second constituent)	No	No	No	Yes
Fixed order	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Morphological invariability	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes
Substitution of components	No	Yes (synonyms)	No	No	Partial
Semantic compositionality	Yes	Yes (partial)	No	No	No
Denotative/referential function	Yes	No	No	No	No
Grammatical category equivalence	Noun, adjective, verb	Syntagm	Various	Various	Enunciation
Idiomaticity	Variable	No	Yes	Yes	Pragmatic

Note. Adapted from Higueras García (2006, pp. 66–69, Figures 6–7). The author concludes that collocations and idioms "no pueden llegar a confundirse" (p. 63), given the compositionality, categorial non-equivalence, and constituent autonomy of the former.

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

4. Methodological Proposal

4.1. Why teach collocations?

Higueras García (2006, pp. 72–76) marshals several arguments. First, the collocational aspect is essential in the acquisition process because ignorance of combinatorial restrictions separates non-natives from native productions, precisely because collocations are fixed in the norm (Cowie, 1992; Castillo Carballo, 2001). Castillo Carballo goes so far as to affirm that collocations can be more complicated than locutions themselves, since the latter can be replaced by a free combination expressing the same meaning, whereas this operation is not possible with collocations given their semantic precision. Second, collocations are necessary to know the meaning of some words: Nation (1990) affirms that vocabulary is enriched with a new word only when there is clear awareness of the lexical units with which it co-occurs; Lewis (1993, p. 82) distinguishes referential, connotational, differential, contextual, collocational, pragmatic, factual, modal, negotiated, and discursive meanings. Third, collocations are difficult to translate word for word and often undergo metaphorization (Corpas, 1996, p. 83; Koike, 2001). Fourth, they improve comprehension and production of specific text types (e.g., *chubascos ocasionales*, *nubosidad variable* in meteorology). Fifth, it is more efficient to learn the whole and break it into parts than to learn the parts and have to learn the whole as an extra arbitrary item (Lewis, 1997, pp. 33–34). Sixth, teaching collocations enables qualitative learning: Channel's (1981, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 74) experiment with *check, examine, inspect, scrutinize, scan* showed that learners made few errors but ignored some fourteen possible collocations. Seventh, collocations evoke a whole situation concisely (*chequeo rutinario*, *dispersar la multitud*) (Morgan Lewis, 2000, p. 15). Eighth, the lexicon is not arbitrary and lexical choice is often predictable, which improves comprehension (Hill, 2000, p. 53). Ninth, *chunking* improves processing capacity: Miller's (1956) seven-bit limit is overcome by recoding bits into chunks, and segmentation into blocks affects all levels of language from letters to collocations (Nation, 2001, p. 319). Tenth, a quantitative argument: up to 70% of what we hear, say, read or write forms part, to a greater or lesser extent, of a fixed expression (Hill, 2000, p. 62), so a vast lexicon is not enough—collocational competence is required. Eleventh, collocations are semantically transparent and therefore pass unnoticed unless the teacher demonstrates that lack of collocational competence causes most errors (Biskup, 1992, p. 87; Woolard, 2000, p. 29). Twelfth, given their arbitrariness, collocations can be learned autonomously; the teacher's role is limited to teaching the concept, teaching how to recognize them, and teaching how to memorize them (Woolard, 2000, p. 35). Finally, there is abundant L1 transfer in collocation production (Corpas, 1992, p. 184), and frequent collocations are stored as a single unit, as the work of Towell, Hawkins and Bazergui (1996, as cited in Nation, 2001, p. 335) demonstrates.

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

4.2. Which collocations to teach?

The author warns that it would be useless and even counterproductive to teach every collocation appearing in class (Hill, 2000, pp. 63–64); it is probably sufficient to focus on a few and insist that learners investigate the rest autonomously (Higueras, 2006, p. 76). Luque and Manjón (1998, p. 20) highlight the importance of frequent, usual and culturally generalized collocations over literary ones. Lewis (1997, p. 23) proposes the rule: "the more meaning a word carries, the rarer it is and the fewer strong collocates it has; the converse—less meaning, more common and more collocates—is also true." The author shares Lewis's view that neither unique collocations (*foot the bill*) nor strong ones (*moved to tears*) nor weak ones (*cheap skirt*) are the main target; teachers should focus on those of medium strength or cohesion, usually formed by words known to the learner but whose combinability is unknown (*cometer un error*, *tomar una decisión*, *mantener una conversación*, *llevar un negocio*) (Higueras, 2006, p. 77). Where possible, it is better to focus on those that differ between L1 and L2, as Bahns's (1993, p. 56) contrastive study confirms. Finally, it is profitable to focus on thematic areas of interest to learners and on specific purposes (e.g., *anestesia epidural*, *parto vaginal*, *hacer una cesárea*, *romper aguas* for expectant mothers; *aprobar una ley*, *dictar sentencia*, *interponer un recurso* for lawyers) (Higueras, 2006, p. 77). The experts Hill, Lewis and Lewis (2000, p. 116) suggest focusing on general nouns with little meaning and on delexicalized verbs.

4.3. Sources: dictionaries and concordancers

Higueras García (2006, pp. 78–87) reviews lexicographic sources. Monolingual dictionaries allow some collocations to be inferred from examples, contorno or definition (Penadés, 2001, p. 62), though not always systematically; the DEA (Seco, Andrés & Ramos, 1999) treats collocations in the collocate's entry without clearly separating semantic and syntactic information (Alonso Ramos, 2002a, p. 70), and the DIPLELE (2005) does not resolve many encoding doubts (Alonso Ramos, 2006). Bilingual dictionaries are "una fuente inagotable de colocaciones" and can teach translation of lexical units, blocks or segments better than a monolingual dictionary—e.g., the Collins English Dictionary (1990) entry for *lengua*: *dar a la* ~ (chatter, talk too much), *sacar la* ~ (to poke one's tongue out at sb.), *se le trabó la* ~ (he began to stammer), ~ *de tierra* (spit of land), ~ *franca* (lingua franca), ~ *madre* (parent language), ~ *materna* (mother language), ~ *moderna (modern language)*, ~ *muerta* (dead language), ~ *viva* (living language) (Higueras, 2006, pp. 79–80, Figure 8).

Among combinatory dictionaries, the author discusses the DEC (Mel'čuk et al., 1984), the BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English (Benson et al., 1986, 1997), the Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English (2001), the DICE (Alonso Ramos, 2004), Koike's (2001) entry model, and Redes (Bosque, 2004). The DICE, based on lexical functions, converts some 3,000 bases into

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

lemmas and adopts a codifying orientation: the speaker first chooses semantically what to talk about (*cariño*), then chooses a lexical function ('begin to feel'), then chooses the collocate (*coger/tomar/cobrar cariño*) (Sanromán, 2003, p. 20, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 83). Redes, by contrast, converts collocates into lemmas and is 'onomasiological', describing the extension of predicates (Higueras, 2006, pp. 85–86). The author also highlights corpus concordancers as tools for autonomous learning: Woolard's (2000, pp. 36–42) example of a learner's *big possibility*, corrected to *strong/remote/real/obvious possibility* after corpus consultation, illustrates their value (Higueras, 2006, p. 87).

4.4. Review of experimental studies

The book reviews the scarce experimental literature (Higueras, 2006, pp. 87–92). Dechert and Lennon (1989, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 87) detected serious collocational errors in advanced learners' written compositions, attributed to the primacy of grammar teaching and the neglect of direct instruction in combinability. Farghal and Obiedat (1985) reached similar conclusions. Bahns (1993) found more L1 interference in Polish learners (46%) than in German learners (21%) of English. Bahns and Eldaw (1993, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 89) concluded that collocational competence does not expand at the same rate as other lexical knowledge, that learners do not grant it much importance, that they can sometimes translate but not produce collocations, and that the collocations to teach are those not susceptible to paraphrase, since these are the ones that hinder communication. Corpas (1994, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 89) confirmed that English natives recognize collocations faster than other word combinations, supporting their storage as units. Lennon (1996) found a very high percentage of collocational errors in oral productions and demonstrated L1 interference. Granger (1998) showed that learners apply the open choice principle while natives apply the principle of idiomaticity. Bogaards (2001, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 90) showed that it is easier to learn a new meaning of known words than words with unknown form and meaning. Bonci (2002) found that grammatical collocations improve from one level to another but lexical ones do not, and that even advanced learners have difficulties. Nesselhauf (2003) found that most errors occurred precisely in collocations and advocated explicit teaching and L1–L2 contrasts. Nesselhauf and Tschichold (2002, as cited in Higueras, 2006, p. 91) reviewed seven vocabulary-learning software programs and found that the collocational aspect had not been taken into account at all. Kasuya (2000) concluded that collocations are absent as explicit content from Spanish manuals, and Conceição (2001) demonstrated that focusing on collocations improved reading comprehension and summary writing.

The author cautions that these experiments do not explain the criteria used to select the collocations tested, and that they measure collocational competence without offering a didactic proposal (Higueras, 2006, p. 92). Her own work aims to fill that gap.

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

4.5. Didactic sequence and principles

Following Woodward (2001, pp. 104–112), the author adopts a four-phase sequence (Higueras, 2006, pp. 93–94): (1) exposure to language (any input format serves, but learners at all levels need input for non-planned learning); (2) perception of form and meaning (making learners aware of the concept of collocation and teaching them to discover collocations, attending to spelling, pronunciation and meaning); (3) memory or mental storage (planning varied practice: grouping, ordering, repeating, consulting reference works, matching, odd-one-out, crosswords, gap-filling, composition writing); and (4) use and improvement (evaluation of whether form, meaning and use have been perceived and learned: tests, text reconstruction, essays, talks, reading comprehension, rewriting, out-of-class research, reflection on one's own errors). These phases correspond to cognitive psychology's input-processing theories: VanPatten (1996) holds that learners first process input for meaning and only then for form; Schmidt (1990) emphasizes *noticing*, since only perceived input can become intake.

Table 4. *Five principles for teaching collocations*

Principle	Content	Practical implication
1. Combine explicit and implicit teaching	Teach the concept explicitly and design awareness and controlled-practice activities, alongside abundant input exposure	Awareness tasks, matching, gap-filling, odd-one-out, extensive reading
2. Select by semantic field or language function	Work in semantic fields or by communicative function, rather than by verb or text	More realistic practice and better consolidation
3. Start from learners' needs	Ensure domains, texts and activities concern learners' interests	Collocations needed in daily life
4. Respect learning styles in memorization	Accept any activity that helps memorize and review	Structural exercises, cards, games, bingo
5. Integrate lexis with all communicative activities	Work collocations in oral and written comprehension, expression and interaction	Not only in written expression

Note. Compiled from Higueras García (2006, pp. 95–97).

4.6. Materials for teacher training and for the classroom

The book describes a CD-ROM-based self-training material organized in three modules, with self-assessment at the end of each (Higueras, 2006, pp. 97–108). Module 1 reflects on the limitations of the word as a unit of analysis and on the teaching of lexical units; Module 2 addresses the concept of collocation, its characteristics and the distinction between lexical and grammatical collocations; Module 3 reflects on didactic implications and teaching techniques (Higueras, 2006, p. 99, Figure 15). The material was validated with 27 teachers in the Master's program in ELE (Español como Lengua Extranjera) at Universidad Antonio de Nebrija; the results confirmed that learners understood the concept of lexical unit and collocation and acquired techniques to incorporate them into

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

their teaching (Higueras, 2006, pp. 104–108). The author also designed a complementary example for the manual *Planet@ ELE 3* (Cerrolaza, Cerrolaza & Llovet, 2000), grouping 18 collocations by communicative function for job offers and application letters (Higueras, 2006, pp. 109–111, Figure 16):

Table 5. *Collocations selected for the job-search didactic unit*

Example	Type	Function
Demanda de empleo	S + *de* + S	Used when seeking employment
Oferta de empleo	S + *de* + S	Used when seeking employment
Aspirar a un puesto (de trabajo)	V + S	Used when writing the CV
Presentar/mandar/adjuntar el C.V.	V + S	Used when writing the CV
Datos personales	S + Adj.	Describe job requirements
Datos académicos	S + Adj.	Describe job requirements
Experiencia laboral	S + Adj.	Describe job requirements
Disponibilidad inmediata	S + Adj.	Describe what the job offers
Buena presencia	Adj. + S	Describe what the job offers
Dominio del idioma	S + *de* + S	Describe what the job offers
Titulación universitaria	S + Adj.	Describe what the job offers
Amplia experiencia	Adj. + S	Describe what the job offers
Sueldo elevado	S + Adj.	Describe what the job offers
Formación continua	S + Adj.	Describe what the job offers
Posibilidades de promoción	S + *de* + S	Describe what the job offers
Incorporación inmediata	S + Adj.	Describe what the job offers
Contrato temporal	S + Adj.	Describe what the job offers
Contrato indefinido	S + Adj.	Describe what the job offers

Note. Adapted from Higueras García (2006, p. 111, Figure 16).

The classroom sequence for this unit follows Woodward's four phases and includes activities such as identifying collocations in a job application letter, selecting key words and completing an associogram, matching letter parts with formulaic expressions, intensifying *Tengo una experiencia como profesor de español*, and translating collocations into other languages (Higueras, 2006, pp. 140–141, Annex III). The appendices document the collocations found by trainee teachers in the letter (Figure 30: *entrevista personal*, *ampliar esta información*, *proceso de selección*, *participar en el proceso*, *desempeñar una función*, *clases particulares*, *Filología Hispánica*, *domino el inglés*, *reúno las condiciones*, *impartir clases*, *presente año*, *responder a un anuncio*, *en espera de sus noticias*) and the non-prototypical combinations (Figure 31: *cerrará su filial*, *tener tres años de experiencia*, *ser licenciado*, *tener 27 años*, *profesor de español*), as well as the correct and incorrect collocations found in a journalistic text (Figures 32–33: grammatical collocations *dedicarse a*, *molestarse en*, *quedar con*, *cumplir con*; lexical collocations *llegar tarde*, *guardar las formas*, *caer en el error*, *ser de fiar*, *programar una reunión*, *reunión informal*, *acto oficial*, *respetar el turno de palabra*, etc.) (Higueras, 2006, pp. 141–142, Annexes IV–V).

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

5. Discussion and Conclusions

Higueras García's (2006) monograph makes three contributions to ELE didactics, as she herself states (p. 8): a definition of collocation that is comprehensible and profitable for teachers, a methodological proposal (didactic sequence and principles), and two practical applications (a CD-ROM for teacher training and a complementary example for a printed manual). The theoretical contribution that most clearly distinguishes her proposal is the distinction between prototypical and non-prototypical collocations, grounded in prototype theory and fuzzy-set logic. This distinction dissolves the terminological stalemate between statistical and semantic approaches: it acknowledges that many frequent, transparent, stable combinations (*hacer la compra*, *estar cansado*) fall short of the prototype (they lack typicality and strong lexical restriction) yet are pedagogically indispensable, and it gives them a place in the taxonomy without conflating them with free combinations or idioms.

The psycholinguistic argument is equally consequential: if the mental lexicon is a network in which collocations are among the most frequent associative relations (Aitchison, 1987), then teaching collocations exploits the storage format of lexical knowledge and enhances retention, fluency and precision. The principle of idiomaticity, complemented by chunking and the recoding of bits into chunks (Miller, 1956; Nation, 2001), provides a cognitively plausible rationale for replacing the word with the lexical unit as the basic unit of lexical teaching.

The methodological proposal is deliberately eclectic: it combines explicit teaching of the concept and controlled practice with abundant input exposure, organizes selection by semantic field or communicative function, and integrates lexis with all communicative activities. The empirical validation reported—though not a controlled experiment in the strict sense, as the author acknowledges (Higueras, 2006, p. 8)—suggests that six hours of instruction suffice for trainee teachers to distinguish collocations from other lexical units and to design teaching activities, and that the CD-ROM format favors reflection, participation and autonomy, especially for non-native teachers.

The limitations are candidly recognized: the absence of a *stricto sensu* experimental study, the reliance on trainee teachers rather than learners, and the technical difficulties some participants experienced with the CD-ROM (Higueras, 2006, pp. 107–108). These limitations point to future research: classroom-based quasi-experimental studies comparing explicit and incidental conditions, longitudinal designs tracking the retention of prototypical and non-prototypical collocations, and the development of corpus-based and AI-assisted resources that make collocational information available at the point of need.

In sum, the book offers a theoretically grounded, terminologically precise and pedagogically operational framework for treating collocations as a privileged lexical unit in ELE. Its central insight—that collocational competence is not pe-

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

ripheral but constitutive of knowing a word, and that its development requires both explicit attention and massive exposure—remains a robust guide for curriculum design, materials development and teacher education in Spanish as a foreign language.

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

References

Alonso Ramos, M. (1993). *Las funciones léxicas en el modelo lexicográfico de I. Mel'čuk* [Doctoral dissertation]. UNED.

Alonso Ramos, M. (2002a). Colocaciones y contorno de la definición lexicográfica. *Lingüística española actual, XXIV*, 63–96.

Alonso Ramos, M. (2002b). Presentación del Diccionario de colocaciones y marcadores del español: estructura y objetivos. In *IV Congreso de Lingüística General* (pp. 47–61). Universidad de Cádiz.

Alonso Ramos, M. (2004). *DICE: Diccionario de colocaciones del español*. [In preparation].

Alonso Ramos, M. (2006). Un vacío en la enseñanza del léxico del español como lengua extranjera: las colocaciones léxicas. In A. Braasch & C. Povlsen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth EURALEX International Congress* (Vol. II, pp. 551–561). CST.

Aguilar-Amat Castillo, A. (1993a). En torno a la combinatoria del léxico: los conceptos de colocación e idiomatismo. In C. Martín Vide (Ed.), *Actas del XI Congreso de Lenguajes Formales* (pp. 267–272). PPU.

Aitchison, J. (1987). *Words in the mind: An introduction to the mental lexicon. Basil Blackwell.*

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.

Baralo Ottonello, M. (1997). La organización del lexicón en la lengua extranjera. *Revista de Filología Románica, 14*(1), 59–71.

Baralo Ottonello, M. (2001). El lexicón no nativo y las reglas de la gramática. In S. Pastor Cestero & V. Salazar García (Eds.), *Tendencias y líneas de investigación en adquisición de segundas lenguas* (pp. 23–38). Universidad de Alicante.

Benson, M. (1989b). The structure of the collocational dictionary. *International Journal of Lexicography, 2*(1), 1–14.

Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1986). *The BBI combinatory dictionary of English: A guide to word combinations*. John Benjamins.

Biskup, D. (1992). L1 influence on learners' renderings of English collocations. In P. Arnaud & H. Béjoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and applied linguistics* (pp. 85–93). Macmillan.

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

Bogaards, P. (2001). Lexical units and the learning of foreign language vocabulary. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 23*, 321–343.

Bonci, A. (2002). Collocation restrictions in Italian as a second language: A case control study. *Tuttitalia, 26*, 3–14.

Bosque, I. (2001a). Bases para un diccionario de restricciones léxicas. *Moenia, 7*, 11–52.

Bosque, I. (2001b). Sobre el concepto de "colocación" y sus límites. *Lingüística española actual, XXIII*(1), 9–40.

Bosque, I. (2004). *Redes: Diccionario combinatorio del español contemporáneo*. SM.

Castillo Carballo, M. A. (1998). El término colocación en la lingüística actual. *Lingüística española actual, XX*(1), 41–54.

Castillo Carballo, M. A. (2001). Colocaciones léxicas y variación lingüística: implicaciones didácticas. *Lingüística española actual, XXIII*(1), 108–133.

Cerrolaza, M., Cerrolaza, Ó., & Llovet, B. (2000). *Planet@ E/LE 3*. Edelsa.

Consejo de Europa. (2002). *Marco común europeo de referencia para las lenguas: aprendizaje, enseñanza, evaluación*. Anaya–Instituto Cervantes–MECD.

Corpas Pastor, G. (1994). Almacenamiento de estructuras léxicas en nativos ingleses. In L. Mora (Ed.), *Investigaciones filológicas anglo-norteamericanas* (pp. 69–73). Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha.

Corpas Pastor, G. (1996). *Manual de fraseología española*. Gredos.

Corpas Pastor, G. (2001). Apuntes para el estudio de la colocación. *Lingüística española actual, XXIII*(1), 41–56.

Cowie, A. P. (1981). The treatment of collocations and idioms in learners' dictionaries. *Applied Linguistics, 2*(3), 223–235.

Cuenca, M. J., & Hilferty, J. (1999). *Introducción a la lingüística cognitiva*. Ariel.

Ettinger, S. (1982). Formación de palabras y fraseología en la lexicografía. In G. Haensch et al. (Eds.), *La lexicografía: de la lingüística teórica a la lexicografía práctica*. Gredos.

Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers in linguistics 1934–1951*. Oxford University Press.

Gairns, R., & Redman, S. (1986). *Working with words*. Cambridge University Press.

Gómez Molina, J. R. (2004a). La subcompetencia léxico-semántica. In J. Sánchez Lobato & I. Santos (Eds.), *Vademécum para la formación de profesores* (pp. 491–510). SGEL.

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

González Rey, M. I. (2002). Contribución a una reflexión sobre las colocaciones. In A. Veiga et al. (Eds.), *Léxico y gramática* (pp. 155–171). Tris Tram.

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). Clarendon Press.

Hausmann, F. J. (1989). Le dictionnaire de collocations. In F. J. Hausmann et al. (Eds.), *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires* (Vol. 1, pp. 1010–1019). Walter de Gruyter.

Higueras García, M. (1997a). Las unidades léxicas y la enseñanza del léxico a extranjeros. *REALE, 8*, 35–49.

Higueras García, M. (2004a). *La enseñanza-aprendizaje de las colocaciones en el desarrollo de la competencia léxica en el español como lengua extranjera* [Doctoral dissertation]. Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Higueras García, M. (2005). Necesidad de un diccionario de colocaciones para aprendientes de LE. In M. A. Castillo et al. (Eds.), *Las gramáticas y los diccionarios en la enseñanza del español como segunda lengua* (pp. 480–490). Universidad de Sevilla.

Higueras García, M. (2006). *Estudio de las colocaciones léxicas y su enseñanza en español como lengua extranjera* (Colección Monografías No. 9). Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, CIDE. ISBN 84-369-4308-2.

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). Language Teaching Publications.

Hill, J., Lewis, M., & Lewis, M. (2000). Classroom strategies, activities and exercises. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach* (pp. 88–126). Language Teaching Publications.

Írsula Peña, J. (1992). Colocaciones sustantivo-verbo. In G. Wotjak (Ed.), *Estudios de lexicografía y metalexicografía del español actual* (pp. 159–167). Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Koike, K. (2001). *Colocaciones léxicas en el español actual: estudio formal y léxico-semántico*. Universidad de Alcalá & Universidad de Takushoku.

Lahuerta Galán, J., & Pujol Vila, M. (1996). El lexicón mental y la enseñanza de vocabulario. In C. Segoviano (Ed.), *La enseñanza del léxico español como lengua extranjera* (pp. 117–129). Iberoamericana.

Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar*. Stanford University Press.

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

Lennon, P. (1996). Getting "easy" verbs wrong at the advanced level. *IRAL, XXXIV*(1), 23–36.

Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and the way forward*. Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (1997). *Implementing the lexical approach*. Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (2000). *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach*. Language Teaching Publications.

Luque, J. de D., & Manjón, F. J. (1998). Colocaciones léxicas: cuestión lingüística o estilística. In J. de D. Luque Durán & F. J. Manjón (Eds.), *Teoría y práctica de la lexicografía* (pp. 15–24). Universidad de Granada.

Mel'čuk, I. (1981). Meaning-text models: A recent trend in Soviet linguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 10*, 27–62.

Mel'čuk, I., et al. (1984). *DEC: Dictionnaire explicatif et combinatoire du français contemporain*. Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Miller, G. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review, 63*, 81–97.

Mitchell, T. F. (1971). Linguistic "going on": Collocations and other lexical matters arising on the syntagmatic record. *Archivum Linguisticum, 2*, 35–69.

Moreno Pereiro, S., & Buyse, K. (2003). Colocaciones léxicas: pistas y trampas. *Mosaico, 10*, 10–17.

Moure, T. (1996). *La alternativa no-discreta en lingüística: una perspectiva histórica y metodológica*. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.

Muñiz Álvarez, E. M. (2002). Las colocaciones como combinaciones léxicas libres. In A. Veiga et al. (Eds.), *Léxico y gramática* (pp. 261–271). Tris Tram.

Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. Newbury House.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.

Nattinger, J. R., & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford 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.

Nesselhauf, N., & Tschichold, C. (2002). Collocations in CALL: An investigation of vocabulary-building software for EFL. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 15*(3), 251–279.

Penadés Martínez, I. (2001). ¿Colocaciones o locuciones verbales? *Lingüística española actual, XXIII*(1), 57–88.

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution

Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorization* (pp. 27–48). Erlbaum.

Sanromán Villas, B. (2003). *Semántica, sintaxis y combinatoria léxica de los nombres de emoción en español* [Doctoral dissertation]. Universidad de Helsinki.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 17–46.

Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Schmitt, N. (Ed.). (2004). *Formulaic sequences*. John Benjamins.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford University Press.

Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to teach vocabulary*. Longman.

VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction in second language acquisition*. Ablex.

Woodward, T. (2001). *Planificación de clases y cursos*. Cambridge University Press.

Woolard, G. (2000). Collocation: Encouraging learning independence. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach* (pp. 28–46). Language Teaching Publications.

Wotjak, G. (Ed.). (1998b). *Estudios de fraseología y fraseografía del español actual*. Iberoamericana.

Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge University Press.

Zuluaga, A. (2002). Los “enlaces frecuentes” de María Moliner: observaciones sobre las llamadas colocaciones. *Lingüística española actual, XXIV*, Madrid, Arco Libros, 97–114.

© Authors. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) non-commercial reuse with attribution