
การศึกษาการใช้คำพหูพริยภาษาอังกฤษในกลุ่มคำศัพท์ทางวิชาการ โดยใช้คลังข้อมูลคำ
A Corpus-Based Study on the Use of English Multi-word Verbs in the
Academic Word List

สุวนันท์ อินมณี*

Suwanan Inmanee

พยุ่ง ชีตาร**

Payung Cedar

บทคัดย่อ

กลุ่มคำศัพท์ทางวิชาการที่เสนอโดย Coxhead (2000) แม้มีการใช้อย่างแพร่หลายในการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษก็ยังมีจุดอ่อนในการนำเสนอ โดยเฉพาะอย่างยิ่งการมองข้ามความสำคัญของคำปรากฏร่วม (Collocations) ซึ่งเป็นส่วนประกอบที่สำคัญของงานเขียนที่ใช้ในสถานการณ์จริง งานวิจัยชิ้นนี้มุ่งศึกษาคำปรากฏร่วมของคำกริยาชนิดคำบุพบท หรือเรียกโดยรวมว่า คำพหูพริย รวมถึงรูปแบบการใช้คำกริยาดังกล่าวในประโยค ในการดึงชุดคำกริยาดังกล่าวจากกลุ่มคำศัพท์ทางวิชาการของ Coxhead ผู้วิจัยได้พจนานุกรมคำปรากฏร่วมและคลังข้อมูลคำ (Corpus) ร่วมกับการหาค่า T-score ซึ่งเป็นตัวชี้วัดความถี่ที่แน่นอนของคำปรากฏร่วม ผลการวิเคราะห์พบคำพหูพริย 32 คำ แบ่งเป็นคำบุพบทกริยา 30 คำ คำกริยาลี 1 คำ ได้แก่ *sum up* และจำแนกไม่ได้ 1 คำ คือ *dispose of* นอกจากนี้ จากการศึกษารูปแบบการใช้คำพหูพริยจากคลังข้อมูลคำพบว่า คำกริยากลุ่มนี้มีแนวโน้มที่จะปรากฏในรูปแบบประธานวาจก (active voice) มากกว่ากรรมวาจก (Passive Voice)

คำสำคัญ : คำปรากฏร่วม / คลังข้อมูลคำ / คำพหูพริย / กริยาลี

ABSTRACT

Despite being widely used in English language education, Coxhead's academic word list still lacks important dimensions on collocations which largely account for authentic English texts. This study aimed at adding collocational knowledge of verbs in the list by exploring verb + preposition collocations, or in the other comparable term, multi-word verbs (Henceforth: MWVs). A collocational dictionary, corpus use, and T-score calculations were combined to extract the MWVs. With the procedures involved, thirty-two multi-word verbs were extracted. While thirty of them are prepositional verbs, one of them, *sum up*, is a phrasal verb, and one verb, *dispose of*, cannot be categorized. The results also showed that academic MWVs in this study were less likely to be used as the passive voice when compared with the active voice.

Keywords : Collocations / Corpus / Multi-word Verbs / Phrasal Verbs

*A student in Doctor of Philosophy in Arts, English Major, Naresuan University

**An Associate Professor at Faculty of Humanities, Naresuan University

Statement of the Problem

With the rise of computational research technology in 1980s, evidence from authentic language examples gathered from a wide variety of English texts known as corpora (p[ar]t of a corpus) has highlighted two important areas which have fostered the development of vocabulary study and the field of English language teaching as a whole. One area is the discovery of collocations, and the other is the development of vocabulary lists.

Based on corpus data, more than a few linguists (e.g. Hunston, 2002; Lewis, 1997; Nation, 2001; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Sinclair, 1991; Wray, 2000) have increasingly questioned Chomskyan views of language description that usually see language systems or grammars as a milestone of language competence. Instead of seeing grammatical structures as language frames for individual words to fill in, corpus evidence shows that vocabulary is central to language patterns as words tend to occur with preferred syntactic sequences (Sinclair, 1991). Based on Sinclair's (1991) discoveries, individual words are not chosen to form a sentence in a random manner. In fact, the chances of words to be mentioned together are "greater than random frequency" (Lewis, 1997, p. 44). For example, the verb *commit* does not occur with every type of actions, but it occurs with an illegal or immoral action such as *commit a crime*, *commit a murder*, and *commit suicide*. Therefore, unlike free combinations, collocations' constituents cannot be easily substituted by other words.

The fact that a relatively small number of words account for authentic written and spoken English (Nation, 2001) is another crucial discovery that corpus studies provided for the field of English language teaching as a whole. Due to this fact, researchers have elicited lists of word families which are significantly used in English in different contexts from corpora. Particularly, three major lists have been subsequently used by numerous researchers, dictionary developers, as well as coursebook writers. These lists include West's (1953) General Service List of English Words (GSL), Xue and Nation's (1984) University Word List (UWL), and Coxhead's (2000) Academic Word List (AWL).

As discussed above, collocations and the initiations of different word lists are the important offspring of corpus use. However, despite the significant contributions to the field of vocabulary study and English language teaching, these two areas have been separately presented. The important instances are the word lists as mentioned earlier. They were not initiated with the realization that collocations greatly account for 70% of authentic spoken and written English (Hill, 2000). Moreover, while these word lists contain words ranked by frequency of occurrences in a corpus, other specifications are not provided, for example, parts of speech and patterns in which these words are likely to occur.

Due to these crucial limitations of pioneer word listings, the current study attempted to expand Coxhead's AWL, one of the most accepted word lists, with a part of

collocational knowledge by means of corpus-based research. Criticizing Xue and Nation's (1984) UWL for its lack of coverage of words due to a small size of corpora used, Coxhead proposed the academic word list (AWL) in the year 2000. The AWL consists of 570 academic word families developed from a corpus of 3.5 million words of written academic texts compiled from academic articles, university coursebooks, laboratory manuals, book chapters as well as other academic corpora from various academic fields.

Meanwhile, verb + preposition collocations of Coxhead's AWL will be the target type of collocations to be extracted due to two important reasons.

1. Verb + preposition collocations have been reported to be one of the most problematic language features to all learners of English as a foreign language (Henceforth: EFL) (Bhumadhana, 2010; Chen, 2002; Hama, 2010; Hong et al., 2011; Li, 2005; Liu, 1999; Miyakoshi, 2009; Nesselhauf, 2003; Phoochareonsil, 2011; Phoochareonsil, 2013). Especially for Thai students, they usually omit prepositions due to the lack of use of the same features in Thai language. As Phoochareonsil (2013) exemplified, Thai students often omitted the preposition after verb + preposition collocations such as omitting *to* after *listen* and omitting *of* after *take care*.

2. Coxhead's AWL consists of the greatest number of verbs (389 verbs [Bhumadhana, 2010]) which account for approximately 68 percent of the list.

However, since characteristics of collocations are differently conceived by different researchers, to avoid this theoretical inconsistency, the current study investigated and analyzed "verb + preposition collocations" in Coxhead's AWL using the classifications and definitions of "multi-word verbs" (MWVs) proposed by Biber, Conrad, and Leech (2002) and Cowan (2010). Like verb + preposition collocations, MWVs are composed of a verb and a certain preposition. According to Biber et al. (2002) and Cowan (2010), three major classes of MWVs include: (1) phrasal verbs, (2) prepositional verbs, and (3) phrasal-prepositional verbs. Nevertheless, since phrasal-prepositional verbs have a very thin chance to appear in academic written English (Biber et al., 2002), they were not mentioned and investigated in the current study. Hence, phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs are two types of MWVs which were focused in the current study.

Research Objectives

This study was administered in order to find MWVs out of word combinations in Coxhead's AWL. It also explored the voicing patterns in which these MWVs recur. The results from this study were expected to provide an expansion of collocational knowledge which is rarely offered by vocabulary lists. These include the preposition collocates of verbs. Even though this kind of knowledge may be provided by typical English dictionaries, most of them usually generalize verb + preposition collocations as phrasal verbs, but overlook the existence

of prepositional verbs. Additionally, although dictionaries provide variations of verb forms including regular/irregular verb forms in different tenses and aspects, as well as examples of use, their recurring verb forms and uses in authentic written English are not well emphasized. These limitations are particularly important since it is a central concept of collocations that words tend to occur with preferred syntactic sequences or structures (Sinclair, 1991). In response to this, two research questions helped guide the current study as follows.

1. Of Coxhead's AWL, which multi-word verbs are considered phrasal verbs, which ones are considered prepositional verbs based on dictionary consultation, manual corpus analysis, and a collocation formula?

2. In what voicing patterns do these phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs in Coxhead's AWL recur?

Theoretical Framework

According to well-known English grammar manuals including *Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English* written by Biber et al. (2002) and *the Teacher's Grammar of English* written by Cowan (2010), the two classes of multi-word verbs, phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs, have the same construction with a verb followed by a particle or preposition. However, there are three distinctive features which characterize these two types of verbs, that is, idiomatic meanings, particle movement, and adverb insertion.

To begin with, most phrasal verbs have idiomatic meanings, whereas prepositional verbs can be literally translated. That is, the meanings of the phrasal verbs' parts (either a verb or a preposition) cannot predict the meaning of the whole. Especially, as a part of phrasal verbs, the preposition does not have a literal meaning which usually signifies places and directions. Examples include *set up*, *hand in*, and *give up*. The original meanings of *up* in *set up* and *in* in *hand in* is not retrievable because as a whole, they mean *to begin or to construct* and *to return or submit* respectively. Meanwhile, the original meanings of both *give* and *up* in *give up* are not conveyed since *give up* is considered as another combination of words which altogether means "to surrender". On the other hand, prepositional verbs such as *ask for* and *listen to* have literal meanings, not at all idiomatic.

Secondly, even though both types of MWVs can appear in this same pattern *NP + V + prep + NP* (or a MWV followed by one direct object), the particle of a transitive phrasal verb can be moved after a direct object (DO) if that DO is a pronoun or a short phrase. Examples include *look it up*, *take your shows off*, and *pick a few up*. Prepositional verbs, on the other hand, do not allow particle movement after a DO. For instance, *apply for the job* and *depend on him* are correct, but *apply the job for* and *depend him on* are incorrect. However, in case of two objects (a direct object and an indirect object), a preposition can be separated from a verb by a DO, such as *remind me of it* and *said something to me*.

Finally, phrasal verbs cannot be separated by an adverb, but an adverb insertion is allowed in prepositional verbs. For example, *depend largely on him* and *look exactly like her mom* are proper since they are prepositional verbs, but for phrasal verbs, *shut suddenly up* and *get early up* are improper phrases.

The table below summarizes distinctive characteristics which differentiate prepositional verbs and phrasal verbs. This table was used in the study for classifying MWVs into phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs.

Table 1: Distinctive Characteristics of Phrasal Verbs and Prepositional Verbs

Types of MWVs	Characteristics of MWVs		
	Idiomatic meaning	Particle movement after one DO (NP + V + prep + NP)	Adverb insertion
1 Phrasal verbs	+	+	-
2 Prepositional verbs	-	-	+

Additionally, when compared by the frequency of occurrences in different text types, according to Biber et al. (2002), prepositional verbs are the most frequently used multi-word verbs in English conversations, fictions, news, and academic texts, whereas phrasal verbs come the second with far less frequent occurrence. Especially, the proportion of prepositional verbs in academic English exceeds the proportion of other types of MWVs. Some prepositional verbs commonly appear as past participles in the passive voice (Biber et al., 2006) such as *be accused of* and *be based on* due to the likeliness of some academic verbs to recur in the passive voice, usually without a *by*-phrase (Coxhead & Byrd, 2007).

Research Methodology

The current study is corpus-based research which employs a top-down research approach as the basis. This approach attempts to elaborate existing language features via corpus evidence as it studies how those features occur in a corpus (Conrad, 2000). For this study, the existing language features were verbs in Coxhead's (2000) academic word list. There were three stages involved in the extraction of multi-word verbs: dictionary consultation, concordancing and corpus analysis, and T-score calculation. Then, two additional stages were conducted to answer two research questions: the identification of phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs and the identification of voicing patterns.

1. Dictionary consultation—The Oxford Collocations Dictionary software (2009) for Windows, which includes the information from both American English and British English, was

used. By adding keywords in the search box, if the searched words appeared with a preposition and were listed as *phr verb* (phrasal verb), which, in fact, is meant to be any verb phrases, those words were selected in the first place.

2. Concordancing and corpus analysis were conducted to extract MWVs including phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs from Coxhead's AWL. Developed by Tom Cobb in 1997, the CompleatLextutor version 6.5 was the concordancing program which the study used. The program is freely available online at website http://www.lexutor.ca/concordancers/concord_e.html and has been recently updated in July, 2014. Among different corpora provided by the program, Brown corpus and BNC (Sampler version) written corpus, which consist of 2,000,000 words in total, were selected as the sources of data.

As the processes of corpus analysis, tagging and parsing were done manually due to two purposes of grammatical analysis: (1) to differentiate verbs from other parts of speech when a keyword had more than one part of speech and (2) to reveal the voicing patterns in which the multi-word verbs recur. Although manual tagging and parsing are time-consuming, the outputs are usually more accurate than an automatic approach (Hunston, 2002). Despite manual corpus tagging and parsing, the researcher fostered the reliability of the results by means of intra-coder data analysis, which involves two occasions of analyses of the same set of data by one researcher (the first author). The first analysis and the final analysis were conducted with a two-week interval.

3. T-score calculations were conducted to extract the final list of MWVs and to reveal voicing patterns in which these verbs recurred. Developed by Church, Gale, Hanks, and Hindle (1991, cited in Stubbs, 1995), the T-score formula was used as "a measure of the absolute frequency of collocations" (Stubbs, 1995, p. 10). This formula is appropriate for extracting grammatical collocations such as verb + preposition collocations.

T-score formula:
$$T = [f(n,c) - f(n)f(c)/N] / \sqrt{f(n,c)}$$

The values represent different things as follows: *n* as *node* or *the keyword (verb)*, *c* as *collocate (preposition)*, *N* as *the size or the number of words stored in a corpus*. Meanwhile, $f(n,c)$ is the joint frequency of node and collocate, and $f(n)$ and $f(c)$ are their independent frequencies. The following criteria based on Stubbs (1995) were used in selecting the collocations:

(1) All cases of which their joint frequency equals 1 or lower were discarded because being a collocation, a node and a collocate must appear together with a frequency, at least larger than a single co-occurrence.

(2) All cases where *T* is less than 2 were discarded. This number confirms a strong association between a node and a collocate in a corpus and, hence, is an indicator of being a collocation.

After all, the MWVsextracted by the three procedures above were further analyzed and classified into phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs based on three criteria guided byBiber et al. (2002), Cowan (2010), and *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English of Advanced Learners2009 edition*.

Conclusion and Discussion

Research question 1: Of Coxhead’s AWL, which multi-word verbs are considered phrasal verbs, which ones are considered prepositional verbs based on dictionary consultation, manual corpus analysis, and a collocation formula?

The initial list of multi-word verbs from Coxhead’s AWL obtained from the consultation of *Oxford Collocations Dictionary software (2009) for Windows*includes forty-sixverb phrases.These verbs were then concordanced via the CompleatLextutor version 6.5 to obtain frequency information for T-score calculation. The table below reports the f(n,c) values and the T-score values in rank order.

Table 2 :The Joint Frequency of a Verb and a Preposition, and the T-score

Rank order	Verbs	f(n,c)	T	Rank order	Verbs	f(n,c)	T
1	consist of	173	13.12	24	restore to	16	3.96
2	contribute to	143	11.92	25	reside in	15	3.85
3	remove from	81	8.93	26	quote as	14	3.68
4	derive from	78	8.80	27	intervene in	12	3.44
5	concentrate on	76	8.68	28	shift to	11	3.25
6	participate in	63	7.91	29	file for	10	3.08
7	rely on	52	7.19	30	release from	8	2.75
8	focus on	42	6.46	31	submit for	6	2.37
9	attribute to	36	5.98	32	shift into	5	2.20
10	submit to	36	5.97	33	conflict with	4	1.98
11	adapt to	34	5.80	34	suspend from	4	1.92
12	benefit from	34	5.80	35	channel into	3	1.73
13	coincide with	32	5.64	36	offset against	3	1.73
14	expose to	32	5.61	37	deviate from	3	1.72
15	transform into	28	5.27	38	volunteer for	3	1.70
16	dispose of	28	5.27	39	abandon to	3	1.60
17	occur to	28	5.16	40	survive on	3	1.47
18	link to	25	4.95	41	impact on	1	0.99
19	conform to	21	4.57	42	discriminate against	1	0.99
20	recover from	19	4.32	43	channel to	1	0.97
21	sum up	18	4.24	44	register at	0	0.44
22	exclude from	18	4.20	45	trigger of	0	0.12
23	compensate for	17	4.11	46	prospect for	0	0.00

Based on Stubbs' (1995) first criterion, six cases of which their joint frequency equals 1 or lower were discarded. These include: *impact on*, *discriminate against*, *channel to*, *register at*, *trigger of*, and *prospect for*. Meanwhile, the other eight cases were discarded due to the second criteria, discarding all cases of which the T-score values are less than 2. These were: *conflict with*, *suspend from*, *channel to*, *offset against*, *deviate from*, *volunteer for*, *abandon to*, and *survive on*. Thus, despite being mentioned in the collocation dictionary fourteen verb phrases were not qualified collocations based the two criteria.

Thirty-two multi-word verbs extracted were further analyzed and classified into phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs based on Biber et al. (2002) and Cowan (2010). The results showed that only *sum up* was found to meet three criteria, while *dispose of* meets two criteria. This is consistent to Biber et al.'s (2002) report in that prepositional verbs have far more chances to appear in all text types, especially in academic texts. Table 3 displays how *sum up* and *dispose of* meet the three criteria of being phrasal verbs.

Table 3: Phrasal verbs found in Coxhead's AWL

Phrasal verbs		Characteristics of phrasal verbs		
		Idiomatic meaning	Particle movement after one	Adverb insertion
		(+)	DO (+)	(-)
1	Sum up	+	+	-
2	Dispose of	+	+	+

As illustrated in Table 3, *sum up* is the only one MWV in Coxhead's academic word list which meets all the three criteria. That is, (1) *sum up* has an idiomatic meaning since *up* does not actually tell the direction, (2) it allows particle movement after one direct object such as *sum it up*, and (3) it does not allow an adverb insertion. However, *dispose of*, despite having an idiomatic meaning like a phrasal verb, allows an adverb insertion just like a prepositional verb. While the original meaning based on LDCE (p. 488) of *dispose* refers to *to arrange them or put in their places*, the combination *dispose of* provides various meanings different from the original's including: *to get rid of something*, *to sell something*, *to deal with a problem or a question successfully*, and *to defeat an opponent*. One of these examples includes: *The Secretary may dispose of water and byproducts resulting from his operation*. In this context, *dispose of* means *to get rid of something*. However, based on corpus data, this verb allows an adverb insertion like an ordinary prepositional verb, as shown in one language sample from the corpus data: *the Government's most embarrassing problem is how to dispose inconspicuously of 100 million tons of surplus far*

m. This kind of use, despite appearing once in the 2-million-word Brown and BNC written corpus, was also found in the other corpus which was not used in the study, such as *to dispose safely of* and *to dispose subsequently of* in *BYU-BNC: British National Corpus*. As a result, based on the three criteria proposed by Biber et al. (2002) and Cowan (2010), only *sum-up* can be categorized as a phrasal verb, whereas *dispose of* cannot be categorized.

Research question 2: In what voicing patterns do these phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs in Coxhead's AWL recur?

After T-score calculations, the rest thirty-two MWVs were further analyzed for their recurring voicing patterns. As academic English verbs are likely to be used as the passive voice (Coxhead & Byrd, 2007), the results will be presented with the focus on this characteristic as a priority.

The findings showed that six MWVs including *link to*, *expose to*, *transform into*, *exclude from*, *attribute to*, and *derive from* were reported to be used more frequently in the passive voice than in the active voice. As illustrated in Table 4, the proportions of the active voice per the passive voice occurring with the six MWVs compared by percentages were: 24:76, 25:75, 36:64, 44:56, 39:61, and 45:55 respectively. Meanwhile, the proportion of two voicing patterns of *release from* was 50:50 percent.

Table 4: The Proportions of the Active Voice per the Passive Voice per MWVs

No.	MWVs	f (n,c)	Active		Passive		No.	MWVs	f (n,c)	Active		Passive	
			f	%	f	%				f	%	f	%
1	Link to	25	6	24	19	76	17	File for	10	9	90	1	10
2	Expose to	32	8	25	24	75	18	Conform to	21	19	90	2	10
3	Transform into	28	10	36	18	64	19	Recover from	19	18	95	1	5
4	Exclude from	18	8	44	10	56	20	Rely on	52	50	96	2	4
5	Attribute to	36	14	39	22	61	21	Consist of	173	172	99	1	1
6	Derive from	78	35	45	43	55	22	Contribute to	143	143	100	0	0
7	Release from	8	4	50	4	50	23	concentrate on	76	76	100	0	0
8	Adapt to	34	19	56	15	44	24	participate in	63	63	100	0	0
9	Remove from	81	48	59	33	41	25	benefit from	34	34	100	0	0
10	Dispose of	28	18	64	10	36	26	coincide with	32	32	100	0	0
11	Quote as	14	10	71	4	29	27	Occur to	28	28	100	0	0
12	Restore to	16	12	75	4	25	28	Compensate for	17	17	100	0	0
13	Submit to	36	28	78	8	22	29	Reside in	15	15	100	0	0
14	Sum up	18	14	78	4	22	30	intervene in	12	12	100	0	0
15	Focus on	42	34	81	8	19	31	shift to	11	11	100	0	0
16	Submit for	7	6	86	1	14	32	Shift into	5	5	100	0	0

Despite being regularly used as the passive voice, these verbs could be also used as the active voice, but usually in a pattern of prepositional verbs in the case of two objects separated by a preposition (Biber et al., 2002) as exemplified below.

The active voice	The passive voice
The gangplank that <i>linked</i> the slipway to the boat...	The name of Brazenose, which <i>was linked to</i> the "brazen head" and...
I consider it to be my job to <i>expose</i> the public to what is being written today.	But millions of human beings <i>were exposed to</i> Lueger's propaganda...

In spite of being found more frequently as the active voice, there were other six MWVs which could be used with the same patterns as these six verbs. That is, when they were found frequently in the passive voice, their active voice pattern needs two objects with a preposition in the middle. These verbs are: *adapt to*, *remove from*, *quote as*, *restore to*, *submit for*, and *file for*.

Meanwhile, the rest nineteen verbs including *conform to*, *recover from*, *rely on*, *consist of*, *contribute to*, *concentrate on*, *participate in*, *benefit from*, *coincide with*, *occur to*, *compensate for*, *reside in*, *intervene in*, *shift to*, *shift into*, *submit to*, *sum up*, *focus on*, and *dispose of* were found to be used as the active voice with one direct object. Eleven of them were 100 percent occurring in the active voice including *contribute to*, *concentrate on*, *participate in*, *benefit from*, *coincide with*, *occur to*, *compensate for*, *reside in*, *intervene in*, *shift to*, and *shift into*. Some of the language samples of these MWVs provided by Brown and BNC written corpus are demonstrated as the following.

- a. The beer's name was also changed to *conform to* its traditional image.
- b. The current government's reluctance to *intervene in* the workings of...
- c. It wouldn't *occur to* the participants for one second that...

The results illustrate that the MWVs in Coxhead's AWL are more likely to be used as the active voice. A number of them only occur in the active voice. Meanwhile, some of them are used as the passive voice or have an alternative pattern to be written in the passive voice, and these verbs are prepositional verbs. This finding is somewhat consistent with Biber et al. (2002) and Coxhead and Byrd (2007) that some (not most) academic verbs and some prepositional verbs frequently appear as past participles in the passive voice, usually without a *by*-phrase.

To conclude, based on a collocation dictionary, corpus data, and T-score calculations, thirty-two MWVs were extracted from Coxhead's (2000) AWL. Of this number, only one is a qualified phrasal verb based on a theoretical framework guided by Biber et al. (2002) and Cowan (2010), whereas the other thirty are prepositional verbs. The results also show that words and patterns correlated as certain verbs only recur with either the active voice or the passive voice. They were not freely composed with random patterns. This

provides evidence to support what Sinclair (1991) claimed before, that vocabulary is central to language patterns as words tend to occur with preferred syntactic sequences.

Implications of the Study

This study has provided a further insight into collocational knowledge and language descriptions of multi-word verbs in Coxhead's (2000) AWL. Not only does the study reveal the prepositions which are used with the verbs in the list and the patterns of use, it also provides further considerations on classifications of multi-word verbs by attempting to test theoretical perspectives proposed by Biber et al. (2002) and Cowan (2010). Especially, as phrasal verbs are dominantly mentioned in commercial English instructional materials which the authors have been used, the finding that there are more prepositional verbs than phrasal verbs in usual English texts leads to two important questions. Are Thai learners appropriately exposed to these two types of multiword verbs? If not, should this knowledge be recognized more by English language education stakeholders?

Additionally, the result that the verb *dispose of* cannot be categorized based on the classifications shows that using the theoretical perspectives proposed by Biber et al.'s (2002) and Cowan's (2010) may be limited. Due to this limitation, further research may test other related theories alongside in order to perfectly answer the research questions and find the best framework for classifying multi-word verbs.

References

- Bhumadhana, S. (2010). **A study of the use of academic verb collocations and English writing ability of undergraduate English-major students**. Master's thesis, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S. & Leech, G. (2002). **Longman student grammar of spoken and written English**. London: Longman.
- BYU-BNC: British National Corpus. (1980-1990). **Oxford University Press**. [Online]. Available : <http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>. [2014, December 1].
- Chen, P. C. (2002). **A corpus-based study of the collocational errors in the writings of the EFL learners in Taiwan**. Master's thesis, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Cobb, T. (2014, July). **The Complete Lextutor 6.5**. [Online]. Available : <http://lextutor.ca/conc/eng/>. [2014, December 1].
- Conrad, S. (2000). Will corpus linguistics revolutionize grammar teaching in the 21st century? **TESOL Quarterly**, 34(3), 548-460.

- Cowan, R. (2010). **The teacher's grammar of English : A course book and reference guide.** Cambridge : Cambridge University.
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. **TESOL Quarterly**, 34(2), 213-238.
- Coxhead, A. & Byrd, P. (2007). Preparing writing teachers to teach the vocabulary and grammar of academic prose. **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 16, 129-147.
- Hama, H. Q. (2010). **Major sources of collocational errors made by EFL learners at Koya University.** Master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara, Iraq.
- 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). London : Language Teaching Publications.
- Hong, A. L., Rahim, H. A., Hua, T. K. & Salehuddin, K. (2011). Collocations in Malaysian English learners' writing : A corpus-based error analysis. **The Southeast Asian of English Language studies**, 17, 31-44.
- Hunston, S. (2002). **Corpora in applied linguistics.** Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Kucera, H. & Francis, W. N. (1961). **Brown corpus.** [Online]. Available : <http://lextutor.ca/conc/eng/>. [2014, December 1].
- Lewis, M. (1997). **Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice.** Hove: Language Teaching Publications.
- Li, C. (2005). **A study of collocational error types in ESL/EFL college learners' writing.** Master's thesis, Ming Chuan University, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Liu, C. P. (1999). An analysis of collocational errors in EFL writings. **The proceedings of the eighth international symposium on English teaching** (pp. 483-494). Taipei : Crane Publishing.
- Longman dictionary of contemporary English of advanced learners.** (2009). Essex : Pearson Education Limited.
- Miyakoshi, T. (2009). **Investigating ESL learners' lexical collocations : The acquisition of verb + noun collocation by Japanese learners of English.** Doctoral thesis, The University of Hawai'i. United States.
- Nation, I. S. (2001). **Learning vocabulary in another language.** Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Nattinger, J. & DeCarrico, J. (1992). **Lexical phrases and language teaching.** Oxford : 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.
- Oxford collocations dictionary for students of English. (2009). Oxford : Oxford University Press.

- Phoocharoensil, S. (2011). Collocational errors in EFL learners' interlanguage. **Journal of Education and Practice**, 2(3), 103-120.
- Phoocharoensil, S. (2013). Cross-linguistic influence: Its impact on L2 English collocation production. **English Language Teaching**, 6(1), 1-10.
- Sinclair, J. M. (1991). **Corpus, concordance, collocation**. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1995). Collocations and semantic profiles : On the cause of the trouble with quantitative methods. **Function of Language**, 2(1), 1-33.
- The BNC Sampler, XML version. (2005). **Distributed by Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium**. [Online]. Available : <http://lextutor.ca/conc/eng/>. [2014, December 1].
- West, M. (1953). **A general service list of English words**. London : Longman, Green.
- Wray, A. (2000). Formulaic sequences in second language teaching : Principles and practices. **Applied Linguistics**, 21(4), 463-489.
- Xue, G., & Nation, I. S. P. (1984). A university word list. **Language Learning and Communication**, 3, 215-229.