

A Corpus Investigation of the Similarities and Differences between *think about* and *think of*

Adam Crafer & Chae Kwan Jung*
(University of Birmingham & KICE)

Crafer, Adam & Jung, Chae Kwan. 2014. A Corpus Investigation of the Similarities and Differences between *think about* and *think of*. *Korean Journal of Linguistics*, 39-2, 337-354. One of the many benefits of using corpora is the ability to investigate the differences between similar words. In this study, the Collins and Birmingham University International Language Database (COBUILD) corpus was used to investigate the differences in meaning and usage between the words *think about* and *think of*. 200 occurrences of each of these words in the corpus were analyzed and any noted tendencies the words displayed were investigated within the corpus. The results of this investigation showed that both words exhibited similarities in their usage of specific tenses, synonyms and between the occurrences, with some differences regarding their interactions with clauses and collocates. However, there were significant differences in the majority of their patterns, adverb usage, noun forms, topics, aspect, semantic prosody and contextual usage. The corpus investigation revealed the words' subtle yet fundamental differences in that *think about* proved to be a deliberate, time-consuming, contemplative, considering and evaluative act of thought whereas *think of* proved to be an equating, conceptualizing, conceiving, considering and evaluative act of thought.
(University of Birmingham & KICE)

Key words: corpus linguistics, corpus investigation, lexico-grammatical analysis, collocates, patterns, syntactic restrictions, semantic restrictions, semantic prosody, Collins and Birmingham University International Language Database

1. Introduction

The study of corpora originated in the 18th century, however, the study of corpora within the field of linguistics was primarily developed during the 20th century through work by linguists such as Harold Palmer and John Firth (Stubbs 2009: 16-17). During this time, modern

* First author: Adam Crafer, Corresponding author: Chae Kwan Jung

technology has been “...the major enabling factor in the growth of corpus linguistics...” (McCarthy and O’Keeffe 2010: 6) and expanded corpora beyond the capabilities of paper-based ones of hundreds or thousands of words to digital ones which can contain hundreds of millions to over a billion words. Through the use of such a digital corpus, it has become possible for corpus studies to investigate how words or phrases are used in various ways (Jung 2013, Jung and Choi 2008, Jung and Wharton 2012, Kim 2012, Kwon and Jung 2012, Lee 2004). For example, previous corpus investigation (CI) on the similarities and differences between words such as *between* and *through* (Kennedy 1991), *big*, *large* and *great* (Biber, Conrad and Reppen 1998) and *high* and *tall* (Taylor 2003) have provided valuable insight for linguists and English language learners alike. In this study, we will explore the lexico-grammatical similarities and differences between *think about* and *think of* as these words and their appropriate usages may present difficulties for English language learners.

2. Literature Review

Corpus investigations (CIs) have led linguists to re-evaluate distinctions between lexis and grammar due to the “interdependence of words” (Moon 2010: 199) and how lexis and grammar “...are intertwined in intricate ways” (Stefanowitsch and Gries 2009: 940). Moon (2010: 199) notes that a “...consistent finding in corpus studies has been the extent to which words occur as parts of phraseologies, whether collocational, structural, or both.” Sinclair (2004: 173) believed that “...if we divide language into these two major categories [lexis and grammar], then we will never be able to get them satisfactorily together again” and that there was no clear distinction between pattern and meaning, nor between lexis and grammar (Hunston 2002: 138).

Greaves and Warren (2010: 218) also note, “all of the corpus evidence confirms Sinclair’s fundamental point that it is not the word that is a unit of meaning, but the co-selection of words which comprise a unit of meaning.” Ellis, Frey and Jalkanen (2009: 90) state that numerous CIs have demonstrated “...how lexis, grammar, grammar and usage are inseparable (Granger and Meunier 2008; Hunston and Francis 2000; Sinclair 1991, 2004)”. CIs are essential for investigating the differences

between words as “[d]istinguishing meanings is a matter of distinguishing between patterns of usage” (Hunston 2002: 47).

Such distinctions are realized through the analysis of concordance lines which identify the meanings and phraseologies of selected words (Hunston 2002). However, as “[c]oncordance lines present information; they do not interpret it” (Hunston 2002: 65), this CI requires a clear method of interpreting and organizing the data. To investigate the selected words in this study, the lexico-grammatical profile of O’Keeffe, McCarthy and Carter (2007: 14-15) was selected to form the basis of the CI (see Table 1).

Table 1. Lexico-grammatical profile
(adapted from O’Keeffe et al. 2007: 14-15)

Number	Feature	Question
1	Collocates	Which word(s) occur most frequently and with statistical significance in the word’s environment?
2	Patterns	Does the word form part of any recurring patterns?
3	Syntactic Restrictions	Are there syntactic patterns which restrict the word? What are its typical clause-positions (initial/medial/final)? Are there any tense/aspect restrictions?
4	Semantic Restrictions	Are there semantic restrictions?
5	Semantic Prosody	What is the word’s semantic prosody?
6	Other relevant or recurring features	Are there any differences between corpora? What synonyms are possible for the selected words?

2.1 Collocates

Firth (1957: 11 in Stubbs 2009: 15) was one of the earliest linguists to recognize the significance of collocates in Corpus Linguistics, stating “You shall know a word by the company it keeps.” Though some

collocates, “the co-occurrence of words” (Sinclair 2004: 174), are sometimes simple for a native speaker to intuit (*play a game; commit a crime*), others are less obvious (*wax wroth; pontificate on*). Electronic corpora alleviate this difficulty by instantaneously searching for a specific word’s strongest collocates, typically through its MI-score, which “...measures the amount of non-randomness present when two words co-occur” (Hunston 2002: 71).

2.2 Patterns

Patterns, also dubbed ‘phrases’, ‘lexical phrases’, ‘lexical bundles’, ‘routine formulae’, ‘prefabricated routines’, ‘sentence stems’, ‘formulae’, ‘formulaic language’ (Hunston 2002) while Greaves and Warren (2010) use ‘multi-word units’ in their study. The investigation of these lexical units is significant to corpus linguistics as phraseology is dubbed “the area of intersection between grammar and lexicon” (Allen 1975: xxxii in Stubbs 2009: 19). The ‘intertwined’ nature of lexis and grammar discussed previously requires that a CI includes investigating the words’ presence in preconstructed or semi-preconstructed forms.

2.3 Syntactic Restrictions

Words co-occur with other words as collocates however words can also co-occur with specific grammatical choices, which Sinclair (2004) defines as ‘colligation’. These grammatical choices are part of the words’ syntactic restrictions, which are realized in their specific tense, passive, adjectival or clause usages. The study of colligation has long been a part of corpus research. For example, Hoey (2009: 45) notes how “...warned of and threatened of are primed for most speakers to colligate with the passive or adjectival use”. Hunston (2010: 163) also notes how “clause[s] beginning with *when* indicates a situation contrasting with the present one” (e.g. *Christmas was simpler...*).

2.4 Semantic Restrictions

Semantic restrictions dictate which semantic fields a word is limited to (e.g. *blonde* cannot be used with cars, animals) or what combinations

are possible or impossible with intensifiers/amplifiers/adverbs, for example, **very abroad*, **far abroad* (O’Keefe et al. 2007).

2.5 Semantic Prosody

Hunston (2002: 142) suggests that “[semantic prosody] accounts for ‘connotation’: the sense that a word carries a meaning in addition to its ‘real’ meaning.” It is the “...general tendency of certain words to co-occur with either negative or positive expressions” (Ellis et al. 2009: 90) or with “tentativeness/indirectness/face saving” (McCarthy 1998: 22). Using corpora to define semantic prosody is essential because such “...subtlety of usage is difficult to intuit, and is observable only when a lot of evidence is seen together so that the pattern emerges” (Hunston 2002: 12).

The investigation of a word’s semantic prosody has been a substantial benefit of using CIs as demonstrated in numerous studies: Carter and McCarthy (1999 in Adolphs and Lin 2011: 602) note the *get-passive* holds a “...consistently negative semantic prosody...(e.g. *get arrested*, *get sued*”); Sinclair (2004: 175) notes that *efforts to [do something]* is used “...when someone appears to be very unlikely to succeed, to be heading for failure, or already unsuccessful ... the speaker/writer’s prejudgement of the efforts, that they are heading for failure”; Hoey (2009:39) notes *dry up* predisposes users to see it “...as something negative that happens” (e.g. money, patience).

2.6 Other Relevant or Recurring Features

Any significant tendencies regarding the selected words’ realization in specific corpora and the similarities and differences between the selected words’ synonyms and specific meanings were also investigated and compared.

3. Method

3.1 Corpus

For this CI, we selected the Collins and Birmingham University

International Language Database (COBUILD) corpus which is one of the largest reference corpora in the world. COBUILD contains over 450 million words in 20 separate sub-corpus, including corpora solely consisting of spoken English (e.g. *brspok*, *usspok*), newspapers (e.g. *guard*, *indy*, *times*), radio (e.g. *bbc*, *npr*), as well as sources of Australian (*oznews*) and Canadian (*strathy*) English. All 20 sub-corpora of COBUILD were selected for this CI.

3.2 Procedure

For this CI, the selected words were *think about* and *think of* (written as *THINK+about* and *THINK+of* henceforth) in which all forms of their lemmas were investigated. The method used in the investigation was based on Sinclair's (1999 in Hunston 2002: 42) and Hunston's (2002) approach of 'hypothesis testing'. A sampling of 200 random lines was selected for each word and the data of both left and right sides were analyzed based on the aforementioned lexico-grammatical profile of O'Keefe et al. (2007). Any lexico-grammatical tendencies observed in the CI were compared to the COBUILD data for reaffirmation.

Spans of 0:4 and 0:2 were initially attempted, however, due to the high frequency of *THINK* in COBUILD (626,439 total occurrences) and *THINK*'s 6th and 18th most frequent collocates being *of* and *about* respectively, numerous results were false positives (e.g. *I think one of the issues with this is...*). Due to this issue, a span of 0:0 was chosen for the CI except where noted.

4. Findings

4.1 Collocates

THINK+about collocated strongly with words like *piagetian* and *cristalena* whereas *THINK+of* collocated strongly with *sharona* and *frouncy*. This was to be expected as the strength of the MI-score tends to reveal uncommon but strong patterns. Table 2 below compares the collocates of more common words than the above for *THINK+about* and *THINK+of*.

Table 2. *THINK+about* and *THINK+of* most common words

<i>THINK+about</i>	MI-score	<i>THINK+of</i>	MI-score
<i>quitting</i>	4.74	<i>euphorically</i>	7.29
<i>remortgaging</i>	4.57	<i>counterarguments</i>	6.61
<i>awhile</i>	4.56	<i>cringes</i>	6.50
<i>overthrowing</i>	4.47	<i>offhand</i>	6.32
<i>rationally</i>	4.34	<i>shudder</i>	5.74
<i>shiver</i>	4.27	<i>salivating</i>	5.71
<i>mobilizing</i>	4.14	<i>remortgaging</i>	5.45

The most significant difference between the words and their most common collocates is that the strongest collocates of *THINK+of* describe feelings (e.g. *euphorically*, *cringes*, *shudder*, *salivating*) whereas the strongest collocates of *THINK+about* describe possible, future action (e.g. *quitting*, *remortgaging*, *overthrowing*, *mobilizing*). However these tendencies are not wholly restricted evident in the co-occurrence of the planned action of *remortgaging* for *THINK+of* and the co-occurrence of describing the feeling of the process *shiver* for *THINK+about*.

4.2 Patterns

4.2.1 Pattern 1: *THINK+of+[]+as*

A unique feature of *THINK+of* was its usage in the above pattern which occurred frequently in the CI with a ratio of 7:50. The specific patterns of usage are shown in Table 3 below:

Table 3. *THINK+of+[]+as* patterns

Specific pattern	CI
<i>THINK+of+[pronoun]+as</i>	10
<i>THINK+of+[noun]+as</i>	8
<i>THINK+of+[person]+as</i>	7
<i>THINK+of+[that]+as</i>	2

The specific meaning of this usage and pattern typically denoted equating a specific object with another (e.g. *as a brother*), generalizing

a wider topic (e.g. *cats, people, men*) or reconsidering an abstract topic (e.g. *death, life, work*) in a different manner, possibly by simplifying it or explaining it. This pattern appeared 8,179 times for *THINK+of* in COBUILD compared to a mere 677 times for *THINK+about* and is a significant difference between the words.

4.2.2 Pattern 2: *even+THINK+about* and *even+THINK+of*

In the CI, both words used the above pattern to an almost equal degree of frequency and with no noticeable differences in meaning. Both words also used the structure with a negative (e.g. *not, n't*) or the pattern *before+[person]+can/could* prior to it, the former accounting for 75% of *even+THINK+about/of* pattern usage in COBUILD. Table 4 below shows the specific usages in COBUILD and the CI:

Table 4. *even+THINK* patterns

Pattern	CI <i>THINK+ about</i>	COBUILD <i>D THINK+ about</i>	CI <i>THINK+ of</i>	COBUILD <i>D THINK+ of</i>
<i>even</i>	9	808	11	472
<i>[negative]+even</i>	7	306	8	137
<i>before+[person]+can/could +even</i>	2	28	2	12

The usage of the above pattern for *THINK+of* compared to *THINK+about* in the CI was 40-60% lower than it was in COBUILD. This difference reinforces the necessity of comparing CI data with COBUILD data before forming deductions about selected words as the limited data acquired from the hypothesis sampling was misrepresentative in regards to this pattern.

4.3 Syntactic Restrictions

4.3.1 Clauses

Both words featured as part of a clause with 18 occurrences of *THINK+about* (e.g. *when you think about what we've achieved*) and 24

occurrences of *THINK+of* (e.g. *just what I thought of him*) in the CI. There were also 9 occurrences each in which the words preceded a clause in object position. The CI contained usage 14 occurrences of *THINK+about+[wh-clause]* compared to 0 for *THINK+of+[wh-clause]*, however, this pattern was not as unique as the CI originally indicated as the COBUILD data in Table 5 below shows:

Table 5. *THINK+about* and *THINK+of* with wh-clauses

<i>wh-clause</i>	<i>THINK+about</i>	<i>THINK+of</i>
<i>+what+[clause]</i>	1,689	585
<i>+how+[clause]</i>	897	317
<i>+when+[clause]</i>	160	142
<i>+why+[clause]</i>	92	19
<i>+who+[clause]</i>	77	49

Though there was a tendency for this usage to occur more frequently with *THINK+about* (notably with *what*, *how* and *why*), *THINK+of* was not restricted from its usage.

4.3.2 Future Tense

There were 2 occurrences of *THINK+about* in the Future Tense ('will' or 'BE going to') and 3 for *THINK+of* in the CI. This low result was reaffirmed in COBUILD: 326 and 302 occurrences of 'will' and 51 and 28 occurrences of 'BE going to' for *THINK+about* and *THINK+of* respectively. Instead, the words depicted the Future Tense by frequently occurring in the Present Continuous to indicate a future action (e.g. *...is thinking about what's going to happen; ...the original, which I'm thinking of having framed*).

4.3.3 Passive

The Passive was rare in the CI with 2 occurrences for *THINK+about* and 1 for *THINK+of*, however, COBUILD revealed 941 usages of *BE+thought+of* and 77 usages of *BE+thought+about*. This significant difference between the words was due to the unique *THINK+of+[noun/person/pronoun/that]+as* pattern which accounted for

over 75% of *THINK+of* usages in the Passive.

4.4 Semantic Restrictions

4.4.1 Numbers and Time

When the object was a number or a time, there seemed to be a unique feature of *THINK+about* which would denote a sense of approximation or guessing (e.g. *I think about 45 responses*). However, upon closer examination, this deduction was erroneous as it appeared to be separate from *THINK+about*. For example, *He also bought about 15% of the Union Bank* does not depict a unique structure *buy+about*; it is simply the verb *buy* combined with the adverb *about* being used in an approximation function. This usage of *THINK+about+[number/time]* is a combination of the verb *THINK* and the adverb *about* used as an approximation and is separate from the multi-word verb selected for this CI.

4.4.2 Adverbs

COBUILD contained approximately 2,500 occurrences of *THINK+[adverb]+about* and approximately 1,700 of the pattern *THINK+[adverb]+of*. Table 6 below shows the most frequent collocates listed in descending order of collocational frequency:

Table 6. *THINK+[adverb]+about* and *THINK+[adverb]+of*

Rank	<i>THINK+[adverb]+about</i>	<i>THINK+[adverb]+of</i>
1	<i>twice</i>	<i>much</i>
2	<i>seriously</i>	<i>only</i>
3	<i>carefully</i>	<i>better</i>
4	<i>again</i>	<i>more</i>
5	<i>more</i>	<i>highly</i>
6	<i>much</i>	<i>instead</i>
7	<i>hard</i>	<i>well</i>
8	<i>differently</i>	<i>less</i>
9	<i>critically</i>	<i>again</i>
10	<i>deeply</i>	<i>particularly</i>
11	<i>only</i>	<i>not</i>

12	<i>clearly</i>	<i>now</i>
13	<i>harder</i>	<i>seriously</i>
14	<i>positively</i>	<i>badly</i>
15	<i>now</i>	<i>enough</i>
16	<i>creatively</i>	<i>too</i>
17	<i>aloud</i>	<i>here</i>
18	<i>just</i>	<i>especially</i>
19	<i>not</i>	<i>immediately</i>
20	<i>intelligently</i>	<i>longingly</i>
21	<i>too</i>	<i>ahead</i>
22	<i>less</i>	<i>also</i>
23	<i>ahead</i>	<i>fondly</i>

Upon examination, it appeared that the usage of adverbs for *THINK+of* and *THINK+about* typically followed different functions: *THINK+[adverb]+of* frequently denoted an opinion, typically of a person, idea or place (e.g. *much*, *better*, *badly*, *longingly* etc.) whereas *THINK+[adverb]+about* was about the manner of thinking or contemplation (e.g. *seriously*, *carefully*, *differently*, *critically*, *deeply*, *rationally*) or alternatively contrasted the thought to another time or thought (e.g. *again*, *more*, *much*, *now*, *less*, *ahead*).

In addition, *THINK+about* contained 2 unique adverb usages compared to *THINK+of*. For example, *THINK+twice+about* depicted a hesitation or reconsideration of an action taking place, sometimes a dangerous or negative action whereas *THINK+aloud+about* specifically voiced one's current thought or what one was at the time contemplating.

There was little overlap between *THINK+about* and *THINK+of* regarding less common adverbs (e.g. *longingly*, *fondly*, *creatively*), which indicated the uniqueness of these adverbial collocations. However, the adverbs that did overlap (e.g. *more*, *much*, *now*) were typically used for different purposes: *THINK+much+of* was frequently used to denote an opinion of somebody or something (56% in the negative) whereas *THINK+much+about* typically used to describe the length of time dedicated to a thought. These tendencies were repeated with the words' usages of adverbs *more* and *now*.

4.5 Semantic Prosody

4.5.1 Time, Aspect and Deliberation

Frequently, the context of *THINK+about* indicated that the act required significant effort and time when compared to *THINK+of*. Due to this, *THINK+about* showed a greater tendency to co-occur with another deliberate action (typically *sit*) or in a manner related to a time word (e.g. *start, stop, moment, while*). This greater tendency for *THINK+about* to denote an occurring action is partially reaffirmed upon examination of the words in gerund verb form: 57 occurrences for *thinking+about* and 33 for *thinking+of* in the CI whereas COBUILD held 9,016 occurrences for *thinking+about* and 6,344 for *thinking+of*. Though not entirely dissimilar, this could strengthen the connotive basis of *THINK+about* typically referring to a time based occurrence more frequently than *THINK+of* does. Overall, it appeared that *THINK+about* typically depicted a more deliberate and time-consuming act than *THINK+of* did.

4.5.2 Any

This connotive meaning of *THINK+about* being a deliberate act is seemingly reaffirmed when the words' interactions with *any* and its variants (e.g. *anyone, anybody, anymore, anything, anytime, anyway, anywhere*). There were 1,514 occurrences of *THINK+of+any[variants]* in COBUILD compared to 197 occurrences for *THINK+about+any[variants]*. It appears that the connotive nature of *THINK+about* being a deliberate and time-consuming act conflicted with the indefinite meaning of *any* which caused infrequent combinations. Frequently the usage of *THINK+of +any[variants]* was in conjunction with *can't, cannot* and *couldn't* to emphasize or exasperate the individual's inability to do the action (e.g. *I cannot think of anyone I have known for thirty years*) and was a significant difference between the words' usages and semantic prosodies.

4.5.3 Mood

THINK+of displayed a more frequent tendency to co-occur with modal verbs (e.g. *can, could, would*), however, *THINK+about* displayed a more frequent tendency to co-occur with modal verbs of obligation (e.g.

should, have+to, need+to) when compared to *THINK+of*.

When comparing the usage of the modal verbs of obligation, it became apparent that *THINK+about* contained a partially negative connotive meaning. The usage of the word is not itself negative, however, it appeared that the act of thinking about was something people had a tendency to neglect or not wish to do so as they were frequently reminded, reprimanded or admonished regarding the act (e.g. *you need to sit down and think about it*) or had to force themselves to do the action (e.g. *They had to think about what clothes they would take*). This semantic prosody feature was not apparent in usages of *THINK+of* and is a significant difference between the words' connotive meanings.

4.6 Other Relevant or Recurring Features

4.6.1 Sub-corpora

In COBUILD, *THINK+about* occurred 32,371 times whereas *THINK+of* occurred 46,826 times indicating that in the corpus *THINK+of* is the more common word. Table 7 below shows in which five corpora the words occurred most frequently:

Table 7. Frequencies in sub-corpus

<i>THINK+about</i>			<i>THINK+of</i>		
The 5 most frequent sub-corpus	Occurrences	Average per million	The 5 most frequent sub-corpus	Occurrences	Average per million
<i>brbooks</i>	8844	203.9	<i>usspok</i>	889	439.3
<i>brspok</i>	4088	203.6	<i>brspok</i>	3735	186.0
<i>usbooks</i>	6041	186.2	<i>usbooks</i>	4336	133.7
<i>usspok</i>	353	174.5	<i>npr</i>	2149	96.7
<i>strathly</i>	2025	127.2	<i>brbooks</i>	4023	92.8

The words share corpora similarities as they occurred most frequently in four of the same corpora (though *brbooks* and *usspok* are halved and doubled for *THINK+about* and *THINK+of* respectively). Regarding the differences between spoken and written corpora for British and US

sources, *THINK+of* was more frequent in written corpora whereas *THINK+about* was more frequent in spoken corpora. The comparative increase of the *npr* corpus (public radio) in *THINK+about* supports this finding of a possible difference between the presence of the words in spoken and written corpora however given their high frequency in both types of corpora, this appears to be more of a tendency for the words rather than a restriction.

4.6.2 Synonyms

The CI revealed that *THINK+about* and *THINK+of* are largely polysemous, evident in the context of their usages as Tables 8 and 9 below show respectively:

Table 8. *THINK+about* possible synonyms

Usage	Possible synonym
<i>say pretty please and we'll think about it</i>	Consider; Deliberate on; Ponder; Mull over
<i>He thought about...</i>	Contemplate (non-negative); Deliberate on; Ponder; Mull over
<i>I have to think about my own race</i>	Consider; Focus on
<i>What got me thinking about it...</i>	Cause a thought - Deliberate on; Ponder; Mull over
<i>I had time to think about Franco and me</i>	(Re-)evaluate; consider; Deliberate on; Ponder; Mull over
<i>Hint: Think about the chain of infection</i>	Consider; Deliberate on
<i>It gives him something to think about and he enjoys it</i>	Consider; Deliberate on; Ponder; Mull over; Contemplate (non-negative); Evaluate

Table 9. *THINK+of* possible synonyms

Usage	Possible synonym
<i>Now, think of a common first name</i>	Come up with; Consider
<i>I thought of an idea</i>	Come up with

<i>I'll think of something</i>	Conceive of; Come up with
<i>I think of it as...</i>	Equate something to something else; Perceive
<i>it becomes clear what people think of you</i>	Evaluate; Feel about; Perceive
<i>Whatever you think of the theory,</i>	Evaluate; Feel about
<i>Think of it this way</i>	Consider; Equate something to something else; Evaluate

Though *THINK+about* and *THINK+of* show certain similarities in their synonyms, *evaluate* and *consider* for example, differences between their synonyms were fairly apparent with *equate*, *conceive of*, *perceive* and *come up with* being rather unique to *THINK+of* and *contemplate* (with non-negative semantic prosody), *deliberate on*, *ponder*, *mull over* and *(re-)evaluate* being somewhat unique synonyms for *THINK+about*.

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate the similarities and differences between *THINK+about* and *THINK+of* by using COBUILD. The lexico-grammatical profile established a number of similarities and differences between these words. They both exhibited similarities in their usages with specific tenses, certain synonyms and between corpora. Although not completely dissimilar, there were some differences between their interactions with clauses and larger differences between their interactions with collocates. The majority of their patterns, their specific adverb usages, their topics such as *THINK+of+[person]* and *THINK+about+[time]*, the lengths of the acts, their semantic prosodies and certain specific meanings were some of the most significant differences encountered for *THINK+about* and *THINK+of* in this CI.

Each of these similarities and differences reaffirm the differences and meanings between *THINK+about* and *THINK+of* established throughout this study; that of a deliberate, time-consuming, contemplative and evaluative act of thought for *THINK+about* and that of an equating or conceptualizing, conceiving, considering and evaluative act of thought for *THINK+of*. These subtle yet significant differences between their meanings and usages are what ultimately established the lexico-grammatical similarities and differences between *THINK+about*

and *THINK+of* encountered in this study.

This vast array of lexico-grammatical information regarding the words' similarities and differences would have been impossible to establish without the usage of a corpus and it is for this reason, and many others like it, that we believe Corpus Linguistics and CIs are such an integral and essential part of modern linguistic study today.

References

- Adolphs, S., & Lin, P. 2011. "Corpus Linguistics," In J. Simpson (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, 597-610. London: Routledge.
- Allen, S. 1975. *Nusvensk frekvensordbok*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Biber, B., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. 1998. *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, R. & McCarthy, M. 1999. The English Get-passive in Spoken Discourse : Description and Implications for an Interpersonal Grammar. *English Language and Linguistics*, 3-1, 41-58.
- Ellis, N., Frey, E., & Jalkanen, I. 2009. "The Psycholinguistic Reality of Collocation and Semantic Prosody (1): Lexical Access," In U. Romer and R. Schulze, (eds.), *Exploring the Lexis: Grammar Interface*, 89-114. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Firth, J. R. 1957. *A Synopsis of Linguistic Theory: 1930-1955*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Granger, S., & Meunier, F. 2008. *Phraseology: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Greaves, C., & Warren, M. 2010. "What Can a Corpus Tell Us about Multi-word Units?," In M. McCarthy and A. O'Keeffe (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*, 212-226. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hunston, S. 2002. *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunston, S. 2010. "How Can a Corpus Be Used to Explore Patterns?," In M. McCarthy and A. O'Keeffe (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*, 152-166. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hunston, S., & Francis, G. 2000. *Pattern Grammar: A Corpus-Driven Approach to the Lexical Grammar of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hoey, M. (2009). "Corpus-driven Approaches to Grammar: The Search for Common Ground," In U. Romer and R. Schulze, (eds.), *Exploring the Lexis: Grammar Interface*, 33-48. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jung, Chae Kwan. 2013. Genre Analysis: Undergraduate Engineering Laboratory Report (UELR). *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 29-3, 33-73.

- Jung, Chae Kwan, & Wharton, Susan. 2012. Finding Textual Examples of Genres: Issues for Corpus Users. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 12-1, 129-148.
- Jung, Euen Hyuk (Sarah), & Choi, Sarah. 2008. The Authenticity of Lexical and Syntactic Aspects in Korean Middle School English Textbooks, *Korean Journal of Linguistics*, 33-1. 181-201.
- Kennedy, G. 1991. "Between and Through: The Company They Keep and the Functions They Serve", In K. Aijmer and B. Altenberg, (eds.), *English Corpus Linguistics: Studies in Honour of Jan Svartvik*, 95-110. London: Longman
- Kim, Jong-Bok. 2012. English Emphatic Reflexives: A Lexicalist Analysis. *Korean Journal of Linguistics*, 37-2, 301-323.
- Kwon, Heok-Seung, & Jung, Chae Kwan. 2012. *Corpus Linguistics*. Seoul: Hankookmunhwasa.
- Lee, Seung-Ah. 2004. Pseudocleft Constructions in English. *Korean Journal of Linguistics*, 29-2, 237-260.
- McCarthy, M. 1998. *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, M., & O'Keeffe, A. 2010. "Historical Perspective: What Are Corpora and How Have They Evolved?," In M. McCarthy and A. O'Keeffe (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*, 3-13. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Moon, R. 2010. "What Can a Corpus Tell Us about Lexis?," In M. McCarthy and A. O'Keeffe (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*, 197-211. Abingdon: Routledge.
- O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. 2007. *From Corpus to Classroom: Language Use and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus Concordance Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. 2004. *Trust the Text: Language, Corpus and Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Stefanowitsch, A., & Gries, S. 2007. "Corpora and Grammar," In A. Lüdeling und M. Kytö. (eds.). *Corpus Linguistics: An International Handbook*, 933-952. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Stubbs, M. 2009. "Technology and Phraseology: With Notes on the History of Corpus Linguistics," In U. Romer and R. Schulze, (eds.), *Exploring the Lexis: Grammar Interface*, 15-31. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Taylor, J. 2003. Near Synonyms as Co-extensive Categories: "High" and "Tall" Revisited. *Language Sciences*, 25, 263-284.

Adam Crafer (First author)
 English Language and Applied Linguistics
 Department of English
 University of Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom
 Tel: +44 (0)121 414 5668
 E-mail: ALC168@bham.ac.kr

Chae Kwan Jung (Corresponding author)
Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE)
Jeongdong Bldg, 15-5, Jeong-dong, Jung-gu
Seoul, 100-784, Korea
Tel: +82 (0)2 3704 5992
E-mail: ckjung@kice.re.kr

Received: May 20, 2014
Revised: June 17, 2014
Accepted: June 27, 2014

KICE