Congruent and Incongruent Collocations of High-Frequency Verbs:
Do, Get, Give, Have, Make, Take
คำปรากฏร่วมกลุ่มคำสอดคล้องและกลุ่มคำไม่สอดคล้อง กรณีคำกริยากลุ่มความถี่สูง:
Do, Get, Give, Have, Make, Take

ทิศากร ไชยมงคล (Thisakorn Chaimongkol)
คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏพิบูลสงคราม
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Pibulsongkram Rajabhat University

Abstract

This research aimed to explore which of the high-frequency verbs, *do, get, give, have, make* and *take* are congruent collocations with noun structures and which are incongruent collocations when translated into Thai and to explore the characteristics of congruent collocations and incongruent collocations when translated into Thai. The research methodology, especially the analysis criteria for congruency and incongruency, was adapted from Revier (2009), Jurko (2010) and Mustapic & Malenica (2013). The criteria used in this current study were divided into semantic parameters and structure parameters. The two resources used were one month of news articles from the Bangkok Post and The Nation and a corpus of previous delexical verbs related to the research were used as resources to find the target collocations with high-frequency verbs. All English-Thai translations were completed and rechecked by two professional translators. The findings revealed that there were 397 collocations with high-frequency verbs found in the two resources. Congruent collocations accounted for 64.48 percent (256 collocations), whereas incongruent collocations accounted for 35.52 percent (141 collocations). Nouns which co-occur with high-frequency verbs in congruency tended to be deverbal nouns. As a result, the conclusion summarized in this study was made in order to categorize which are congruent or incongruent collocations. The contrastive approach (translation between English-Thai) is a significant process to identify congruency and incongruency and is a learners' strategy for collocation learning as mentioned in previous studies. Therefore, the objective criteria to make categorizations are even more necessary. Finally, the pedagogical implications proposed that the corpus of 397 congruent and incongruent collocations developed from this study would be used to produce key materials or data for collocation teaching.

Keywords: congruent, incongruent, collocation, high-frequency verb

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อสำรวจคำกริยาความถี่สูงกลุ่ม do, get, give, have, make, take ที่ปรากฏ
ร่วมกับคำนามว่าคำใดเป็นคำสอดคล้องหรือคำใดเป็นคำไม่สอดคล้องกับภาษาไทย และเพื่อสำรวจลักษณะของคำ
สอดคล้องและคำไม่สอดคล้องเมื่อแปลเป็นภาษาไทย เกณฑ์ในการกำหนดว่าคำใดเป็นคำสอดคล้องหรือคำไม่
สอดคล้องประยุกต์เกณฑ์ดังกล่าวจาก Revier (2009), Jurko (2010) และ Mustapic & Malenica (2013) โดยแบ่ง
ออกเป็นสองประเด็นการวิเคราะห์ คือ เกณฑ์ด้านความหมายและเกณฑ์ด้านโครงสร้าง แหล่งข้อมูลของคำกริยา
ความถี่สูงที่ปรากฏร่วมกับคำนามนำมาจากสองแหล่งคือข่าวช่วงเดือนมกราคม 2563 ของหนังสือพิมพ์บางกอกโพสต์
และเดอะ เนชั่น และงานวิจัยก่อนหน้าที่ศึกษาเกี่ยวกับคำกริยาเบา คำแปลภาษาไทยแปลโดยนักแปลภาษาอังกฤษ-
ภาษาไทยมืออาชีพและถูกตรวจสอบอีกครั้งด้วยนักแปลมืออาชีพอีกหนึ่งท่าน ผลวิจัยได้คำสอดคล้องและคำไม่
สอดคล้องรวมจำนวน 397 กลุ่มคำจากสองแหล่งข้อมูล แยกออกเป็นคำสอดคล้องจำนวน 256 กลุ่มคำ คิดเป็นร้อยละ
64.48 และคำไม่สอดคล้องจำนวน 141 กลุ่มคำ คิดเป็นร้อยละ 35.52 คำนามที่ปรากฏร่วมกับคำกริยาความถี่สูงใน
กลุ่มคำสอดคล้องส่วนใหญ่เป็นคำนามอาการนาม ในงานวิจัยนี้สรุปว่ากระบวนวิเคราะห์ว่าคำใดเป็นคำสอดคล้องหรือ
คำไม่สอดคล้อง กระบวนการของภาษาเปรียบต่าง (Contrastive approach) โดยการแปลเป็นกระบวนการที่สำคัญ
และเป็นกลวิธีที่ผู้เรียนใช้ในการเรียนรู้และใช้คำปรากฏร่วมจากงานวิจัยก่อนหน้า ดังนั้นเกณฑ์การวิเคราะห์ที่เป็นวัตถุ
วิสัยจึงเป็นสิ่งจำเป็น เพื่อที่จะนำคลังข้อมูลคำสอดคล้องและคำไม่สอดคล้องจำนวน 397 กลุ่มคำนี้ไปใช้ในการเป็น
แหล่งข้อมูลการพัฒนาสื่อการสอนหรือใช้ในการสอนคำปรากฏร่วมในชั้นเรียน

คำสำคัญ: คำสอดคล้อง คำไม่สอดคล้อง คำปรากฏร่วม คำกริยาความถี่สูง

Introduction

Currently, the English language is spoken in many parts of the world and has become
necessary for those who desire to be a part of the global community. It is an instrument for
exchanging culture, ideas, and feelings for both native speakers and non-native speakers. For this
reason, many scholars have attempted to search for methods and content to better teach the
English language to non-native speakers. For example in Pho Klang (2020), the authentic materials
are emphasized as one of the best tools for a bridge linking classroom lessons to the real world. It
is believed that the building blocks of learning and communication are not based upon grammar,
functions, notions, or any other units of planning and teaching but lexis, that is, words and word
combinations (Richards & Rodgers, 2003, p. 132). There are three types of word combinations:
collocations, compounds and idioms (Jurko, 2010, p. 59). Knowledge of collocations can support
learners to communicate naturally and be as close as possible to native speakers. Collocations such
as *make a mistake* or *strong coffee* are usually defined by the occurrence of two or more words
within a short space of each other in a text (Sinclair, 1991, p. 170). From these examples, *make a*

mistake or *strong coffee*, it may be easy for learners to understand their meanings, but not easy to produce naturally, as mentioned by Swan (2002, pp. 243-244).

The present paper focuses on collocations, including the high-frequency verbs *do, get, give, make, have* and *take*, for the following reasons: first, their bases (verbs: do, get, give, make, have and take) are used frequently, and second, previous studies found that learners make many errors using these words (Lee & Chen, 2009; Sanguannam, 2017). Furthermore, the external goal in language teaching is that the learners are able to communicate their thoughts effectively and clearly. Collocation knowledge, including high-frequency verb knowledge, is one key first step for non-native speakers to be able to share their thoughts in English effectively.

One strategy used by learners for learning foreign languages is direct translations from L1 into L2 or vice versa. Granger (1998) also mentioned that the first language (L1) plays an important role in the acquisition and use of prefabricated patterns, collocations and lexical phrases, in the second language (L2). Direct translations from L1 into L2 are also found to be a strategy for Thai learners as mentioned by Phetdannuea and Ngonkum (2016) who summarized, based on previous studies, that errors found in the Thai context, appearing at both lexical and syntactic levels, are due to direct translations, word borrowing, and the differences between English features and Thai features.

In order to develop a way to enhance the collocation usage, collocations including high-frequency verbs are the target for this study. The types of collocations, congruent collocations (having direct translation equivalence) and incongruent collocations (no direct translation equivalence), were investigated based on the contrastive approach (English-Thai translation equivalent) like Bahns (1993) who studied noun + verb and verb + noun collocations which have direct translational equivalence between German-English. Furthermore, in order to present a corpus of congruent collocations and incongruent collocations, two criteria for analysis are also offered in this study for a clear-cut division between congruent and incongruent collocations. Finally a corpus of congruent collocations and incongruent collocations is offered for use in classes or for developing teaching materials.

Problems with Usage of High-Frequency Verbs

Although the high-frequency verbs like do, get give, have, make and take are uncomplicated for learners for understanding, problems with usage of high-frequency verbs are still observed in learners from various nations (Lee & Chen, 2009; Altenberg & Granger, 2001; Perez & Taouis, 2019; Zhou, 2016). A study of high-frequency verb usage by Thai learners by Kitigosin and Phoocharoensil (2015) revealed that Thai learners rely on three major learning strategies: native language transfer, synonymy, and overgeneralization. For the pedagogical implication, they also suggested that the

English teacher should consider the significant role of these three strategies when teaching collocational delexical verbs. Panprem (2015) studied a variety of grammatical structures and the semantic constructions of delexical verbs (including *have, make, and take*) in 11 technical English textbooks. There were 304 delexical verbs identified from this study. The study also indicated that delexical verbs are mainly followed by nouns or noun phrases. Two groups of nouns were found in the ESP textbooks. First were deverbal nouns (nouns derived from verbs), such as *have a deal, make a commitment* and *keep in touch*. Second were nouns not in the form of verbs, such as *take time, take a photograph* and *run an engine*. The meanings of delexical verbs are interpreted on three different levels: literal (transparent) meaning, figurative (metaphorical) meaning and idiomatic meaning. The most frequent is literal meaning.

Collocations and Interlingual Transfer

Regardless of the increasing awareness that collocational knowledge is a crucial part of L2 proficiency, research on collocations has indicated that collocations even now are a fundamental problem for second language learners and the errors tend to be caused by interlingual transfer, as seen from previous studies (Nakata, 2007; Yan, 2006; Gass & Selinker, 2008; Ang et al., 2011; Kittigosin & Phoocharoensil, 2015). An interlingual error is an error that occurs at the beginning stages of learning a second language by transfer or interference from one's native language (Brown, 2007, pp. 263-266). The learner tends to transfer their native language knowledge onto the target language. Collocations which do not have translation equivalents in the first language, have especially been demonstrated to present more difficulty for learners than those which are congruent between L1 and L2 (Nakata, 2007). First language influences on collocation errors are found in a wide range of studies: the intralingual transfer in Malaysian learners' corpus (Ang et al., 2011), direct translation strategies in Lithuanian learners' essays (Jukneviciene, 2008), mother-tongue interference and intralingual transfer in Chinese learners' English corpus (Yan, 2006), the role of literal meanings between L1 and L2 in advanced German learners (Nesselhauf, 2003), and native language transfer, synonymy, and overgeneralization found in Thai learners' collocation use (Kittigosin & Phoocharoensil, 2015).

Based on previous studies, collocations could be categorized into congruent and incongruent groups. According to Yamashita and Jiang (2010), this categorization is based on cross-linguistic relationships and differences. Congruent collocations include lexical components that are similar in L1 and L2, while incongruent collocations contain lexical components that are different in both languages. Jurko (2010) stated that lexical congruence refers to word combinations that have similar structures when they are translated to other languages; lexical non-congruence means that word combinations have structural changes when they are translated to other languages.

Many studies point out that learners take a long time to learn incongruent collocations and make significantly more errors on incongruent than on congruent collocations (Yamashita & Jiang, 2010; Zhou, 2016; Sanguannam, 2017; Nakata, 2007). Previous studies are indicative of the importance of further exploring congruent and incongruent collocations in second or foreign language settings, because they relate to interlingual transfer that learners tend to use when they come across collocations (by using direct translations). From these viewpoints, many studies (Kittigosin & Poolchareonsil, 2015; Hashemi & Eskandari, 2017) offer the practice of understanding congruent and incongruent collocations as one strategy for collocation learning. Therefore, in this study, a small corpus of congruent and incongruent collocations was developed in order to design teaching techniques or materials.

The Criteria for Congruent and Incongruent Collocations

According to Revier (2009), on the semantic level, collocations are divided into three levels of meaning transparency. If both the verb and the noun constituent are used in their literal or core sense, as in *make tea,* then the combination as a whole is classified as *transparent*. If the verb constituent is used in a non-literal or extended sense and the noun constituent in a literal sense, as in *make a complaint*, then the combination is classified as *semi-transparent*. If neither the verb nor the noun is used in its literal sense, as in *run the show*, or the two constituents form a unitary, then the combination is classified as *non-transparent.*

Mustapic and Malenica (2013) mentioned these three levels of transparency as three degrees of congruence: full, partial and zero. There are many studies using congruency as a means to assess learners' collocational proficiency (Nakata, 2006; Mustapic & Malenica, 2013; Hashemi & Eskandari, 2017), but there is not any clear criteria for which are congruent and which are not. It was also mentioned by Lee and Lin (2013) that the evaluation of collocational congruency is currently performed by human judgment and divided into a binary classification of congruent and incongruent collocations. The judgment could be ambiguous and inconsistent (Lee & Lin, 2013). This is because the judgment of which one is congruent or incongruent depends on first language translation which varies among individual native speakers of the translated language.

Nevertheless, there is one criterion to divide congruency from incongruency which can be seen in Jurko (2010). Jurko studied Slovene-English lexical collocations based on the contrastive approach. The contrastive approach to collocations can explain collocations' meaning and structure interlingually, as well as relevant corpus-derived data on the frequency of co-occurrence. The parameters for analysis are divided into structure parameters (lexical (non-) congruence) and semantic parameters.

Structural parameters can be divided into word class shifts, lexical expansion/reduction, change of grammatical number, or word order, all of which are classified as lexical non-congruence, and no structural change, which is classified as lexical congruency

Semantic parameters focus on two features of translation; one is translational unpredictability (the base or collocator, or both, had to be either omitted or treated inadequately in dictionaries), and the other is divergent translation equivalent (the translation of polysemous bases or collocators into several translation equivalents).

Analysis Criteria

Some structural parameters used by Jurko (2010) will be applied to this study. The structural parameters used as criteria are lexical expansion and lexical reduction. The word order can be omitted because the target collocations are verb + noun collocations which form word orders in English. The change of grammatical number is not applied because in Thai, there are no distinct grammatical forms, such as plural forms of nouns or articles, or verb conjugations (Arakkitsakul, 2019), so the word order and the change of grammatical number is not necessary for analysis here due to there being no difference in English and Thai. For semantic parameters, three levels of transparency are mentioned by Revier (2009) and Mustapic and Malenica (2013), and divergent translation equivalents by Jurko (2010) will be integrated for the analysis criteria as follows:

If a verb and noun have a literal Thai meaning or can be directly translated, then the collocations are classified as congruent. This is also the case for high-frequency verbs that have an extended or polysemous meaning as mentioned by Mustapic and Malenica (2013) and Jurko (2010); all would be categorized as congruent. If a verb and noun are partial, that is, only directly translated, and both verb + noun have a Thai meaning in the non-literal sense, then the collocations are classified as incongruent.

Significance of the Present Study

As mentioned above, there are no clear-cut criteria to specify which collocations are congruent or incongruent from previous studies. The contributions of this study are summarized as follows:

1. The present research revised the aforementioned dataset of high-frequency verbs with noun structures for the congruent and the incongruent in Thai for over 397 words. The corpus is composed of pairs of English high-frequency verbs with noun structures and their Thai meanings along with the structural and semantic parameters.

2. The present research proposes structural parameters and semantic parameters adapted from the semantic parameters of Revier (2009) and Mustapic and Malenica (2013), and the semantic

and structural parameters of Jurko (2010). These parameters are able to decrease the subjectivity of analysis of Thai meanings with congruency and incongruency as mentioned in Lee & Lin (2013). That evaluation of collocational congruency is currently performed by human judgment. Although in this study, human judgment is one key factor, the criteria for judgment were employed to avoid the dependence on only individual lexical knowledge and the interpretations of the meanings of words. Furthermore, the translation of Thai meanings was conducted by a professional English-Thai translator, and verified by another professional translator, and confirmed again through two dictionaries (Se-ed's Modern English-Thai Dictionary and the Oxford Basic English Dictionary).

Objectives

1. To explore which of the high-frequency verbs with noun structures are congruent collocations and which are incongruent collocations when translated into Thai.

2. To explore the characteristics of congruent collocations and incongruent collocations when translated into Thai.

Methodology

The followings are the processes to clarify the study:

First, high-frequency verbs with noun structures from two resources, authentic materials and previous studies were cumulated and analyzed using AntConc (version 3.5.8). The total amount of high-frequency verbs with noun structures collected from the two resources were 684 word tokens and 397 word types. Idioms found from authentic resources, such as *make hay while the sun shines (น้ำขึ้นให้รีบ ตัก)* were not subject to analysis. The target high-frequency verbs with noun structures were checked for their acceptability using the Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English (2009), and previously related research. All high-frequency verbs with noun structures were translated into Thai language by one professional English-Thai translator and were verified by another professional English-Thai translator. If the second translator agreed with the Thai translation, she/he would check each with a tick (✓). If she/he did not agree, she/he would give a difference Thai translation for that collocation.

A congruent collocation and an incongruent collocation were analyzed based on structure parameters and semantic parameters, and then the corpus of congruent collocations and incongruent collocations of high-frequency verbs with noun structures was summarized, and suggestions for applying collocation to teaching in classes were mentioned.

This study used high-frequency verbs with noun structures from two main resources including authentic materials, one month of news articles from the Bangkok Post and The Nation (January, 2020), and previous studies. (Swan, 2002, p. 163; Akpınar & Bardakçı, 2015, pp. 19-20; Sanguannam, 2017). The

target verbs of this research include high-frequency verbs: do, get, give, have, make and take. The reason for using newspapers, the Bangkok Post and The Nation, as resources was to include a variety of target high-frequency verbs with noun structures, and to make a contrast between high-frequency verbs with noun structures that have already been judged as collocations and delexical verbs in previous studies, and the ones in the authentic materials that have been never analyzed.

In this study, the definition of congruent collocation is based on the aforementioned analysis criteria. A collocation (a high-frequency verb with noun structure) that has no effect on the lexical components (no reduction or no expansion in structure) and is translated literally into Thai (including extended or polysemous meanings) is a congruent collocation. If a collocation effects change of lexical components (reduction or expansion in structure), and only the noun is directly translated into Thai, it is an incongruent collocation. The incongruent collocation also includes the case that both verb and noun have Thai meaning in non-literal senses.

Results and Discussion

During the process of double-checking Thai meanings by the two professional translators, there were 40 collocations where the two translators gave different translations. Thirty-one collocations were given the same structures with different words, but identified as having the same meanings, for example, *"do damage"* ก่อความเสียหาย-สร้างความเสียหาย and *"have the ability"* มีความสามารถ-มีศักยภาพ. Only nine collocations were translated with different structures that affected the congruent and incongruent collocation selection. In order to decide which ones should be congruent or incongruent collocations, the nine collocations were checked and judged again by comparing them to the criteria and previous research which resulted in them being categorized as delexical structures, the incongruent meanings would be selected. Examples of this included *take a risk* <u>เสี่ยง</u>-ใช้โอกาส, *do analysis* <u>วิเคราะห์</u>-ทำการวิเคราะห์, and *have access* <u>เข้าถึง</u>-มีการเข้าถึง; these three cases were categorized as incongruent collocations.

Table 3 indicates the total amount of congruent and incongruent collocations found in the authentic materials (newspapers) and previous research, in order to explore which of the high-frequency verbs with noun structures are congruent collocations and which are incongruent collocations when translated into Thai.

In order to explore the characteristics of congruent collocations and incongruent collocations when translated into Thai, Table 4 and Table 5 display the characteristics of nouns co-occurring with high-frequency verbs from all resources. Furthermore, Table 6 displays the comparison of meaning and congruence or incongruence between the present study and previous studies for reconfirming the analysis result.

Table 3 *The Amount of Congruent and Incongruent Collocations for Each Resource*

Criteria	Structural Parameter				Semantic Parameter			Total
	no	with	no	with	both verb and noun have Thai meaning in literal senses	verb and noun have partial, only noun that is direct translated	both verb and noun have Thai meaning in non-literal senses	
Types of Resources	Lexical Expansion		Lexical Reduction		Congruent Collocation	Incongruent Collocation		
Authentic Resources	0	0	188	33	188	31	2	221
Total for Congruent and Incongruent Collocations					188	33		221
Percentage					85.07%	14.93%		100%
Structure Type					Lexical Structure	Delexical Structure		
Previous Research.	0	1	72	103	68	104	4	176
Total for Congruent and Incongruent Collocations					68	108		176
Percentage					38.64%	61.36%		100%
Total		1	260	136	256	135	6	397
Total for Congruent and Incongruent Collocations					256	141		397
Percentage					64.48%	35.52%		100%
Structure Type					Lexical Structure	Delexical Structure		

The 397 collocations were found from the two different resources, the 221 collocations from the authentic materials, and the 176 collocations from the previous research. From the authentic materials, 188 congruent collocations (85.07 percent) and 33 incongruent collocations (14.93 percent) were found. From previous research resources, 68 congruent collocations (38.64 percent) and 108 incongruent collocations (61.36 percent) were found.

As seen in 221 collocation structures found from the authentic resources (newspapers), they are classified into two main types of semantic meanings. Most had congruent meanings, or could be grouped as congruent collocations of which 188 collocations were found, such as *have a debt (มีหนี้สิน), have a choice (มีทางเลือก), have evidence (มีหลักฐาน), give an incentive (ให้แรงจูงใจ), make a profit (ทำกำไร),* while there were 33 incongruent collocations found in the authentic resources (newspapers), such as *have access (เข้าถึง), give notice (แจ้ง, ประกาศ (ล่วงหน้า)), do a trip (ท่องเที่ยว), make a bid (ประมูล),* and *take responsibility (รับผิดชอบ).* In these collocations as seen from some examples, only the noun is directly translated, whereas the verbs function as delexical verbs that have no meaning or have a light meaning. Two incongruent collocations found in the newspaper

resources where both verbs and nouns have a Thai meaning in the non-literal sense were *get a free ride (ติดรถ),* and *get a windfall (ส้มหล่น, ได้ลาภ).* Their meanings are hard for learners to grab.

It could be concluded that from the authentic materials, the congruent meanings account for more than 80 percent of all meanings. On the other hand, the total results of congruent collocations in contrast with incongruent collocations from previous researches, found 176 collocation structures that claim all as delexical structures that take delexical verbs as one constituent. The incongruent meanings account for 61.36 percent or 108 collocations. Based on the findings, it could be summarized that although they were treated as delexical structures in previous research, not all structures are non-literally translated when they are analyzed based on contrastive approaches which specifies translation equivalence between languages. There are 68, or 38.64 percent, that have a Thai meaning in a literal sense. All 68 congruent collocations take no reduction and no expansion on lexical components (2 components): *do good (ทำดี), do damage (สร้างความเสียหาย, ก่อความเสียหาย), give an example (ยกตัวอย่าง), get home (ถึงบ้าน), have difficulty (ประสบปัญหา, มีปัญหา, มีความลำบาก, มีความยุ่งยาก), make a mistake (ทำพลาด, ทำผิด), and take an advantage (ฉวยประโยชน์, ใช้ประโยชน์).* This was in contrast to 108 incongruent collocations where verbs had no visible meaning. Only nouns were translated into Thai and both verb and noun had Thai meaning in non-literal senses; therefore, they were classified as incongruent collocations and delexical structures. Nouns that co-occur with verbs in 141 delexical structures from two sources were shown as follows.

Table 4 Nouns in Delexical Structures as Incongruent Collocations in Authentic Materials

Delexical Verbs	Nouns			
Do +	an (in-depth) analysis	(some) work	the job	
Get +	a free ride*	a windfall*		
Give +	notice			
Have +	(insufficient) access			
Make +	a bid	a bridge**	a (down) payment	a (huge) impact
	a (minimum) contribution	a start	acquisitions	adjustments
	a suggestion	an appearance	an investment	an announcement
	a purchase	a reference	refunds	the ban
	the turnaround	withdrawals		
Take +	a (cautious) approach	a (more global) view	a vacation	caution
	charge	action	responsibility	a reservation
	a rest	the lead		

Table 4 shows nouns in delexical structures treated as incongruent collocations, taken from the authentic materials.

Table 5 Nouns in Delexical Structures as Incongruent Collocations in Previous Research

Delexical Verbs	Nouns			
Do +	exercise	trip	an exam	(the) shopping
	sums	(the) ironing	(the) washing	(the) drying
	a test	a survey	a favor	time*
Get +	a shock	the impression	the sack*	
Give +	a decision	a hug	a lecture	credence
	a cry	a laugh	a scream	a shout
	a smile	a glance	a kick	a punch
	a slap	a knock	a kiss	an answer
	a report	a speech	a talk	a warning
Have +	a chat	an argument	a look	a go
	a rest	a try	a conversation	a drink
	a shower	a haircut	a swim	a listen
	a dispute	a fight	a quarrel	a row
	a brawl	a discussion	a talk	a call
	a bath	a wash	a scrub	a sunbath
	a break	a holiday	a nap	a sleep
	a cough	success	a bite	a check
Make +	a journey	an offer	an arrangement	a suggestion
	a decision	an attempt	an effort	an excuse
	an exception	a change	provision	a confession
	a noise	a phone call	love	peace
	a statement	claim	a plan	a speech
Take +	a break	risks	a chance	turns
	care	action	a liking (to)	an interest
	a seat	a walk	a breath	a bath
	a shower	a wash	a listen	a look
	a decision	the trouble*	a fight	a raincheck*

Nouns in Tables 4 and 5 can be categorized as mentioned by Panprem (2015). They are deverbal nouns, such as *work, notice, access, acquisition, suggestion, purchase, view, ironing, survey, decision, chat, offer* and *walk,* and nouns not in the form of a verb, such as *shower, holiday* and *journey.* Most are deverbal nouns.

When English collocations are categorized based on cross-linguistic relationships between two languages, in this case between English and Thai, collocations including high-frequency verbs can have congruent and incongruent meanings. It can be concluded that collocations including high-frequency verbs are not always incongruent collocations. We can mention this because the analysis data were picked up from different resources. One was from previous research that studied delexical

verbs, so the data from these were all claimed as delexical verbs or delexical structures. Another was authentic materials in which the collected data tends to be either lexical or delexical verbs. As a result, the treatment of congruent or incongruent collocations was not based on aforementioned resources or previous findings, but it was based on their equivalent meanings in Thai.

Nevertheless, it was found that the congruent or incongruent meaning sometimes depended on the context, such as in the case of *make a bridge* that can be translated into *สร้างสะพาน* with a congruent meaning in Thai and *เชื่อมต่อ* with an incongruent meaning in the context *make a bridge between the data team and....* In this research, it was found in a news context, so the meaning in Thai is *เชื่อมต่อ* which was classified as an incongruent collocation.

As mentioned above, in this study congruent and incongruent collocations are decided according to cross-linguistic relationships between English and Thai. It has not been seen in research on English delexical verbs in Thailand that there is clarification of the criteria for judging congruency and incongruency of collocations (Panprem, 2015; Kittigosin & Phoocharoensil, 2015). However in Sanguannam (2017), there is a quite clear explanation of what criteria is used for selecting congruent and incongruent delexical verb + noun collocations in task types used to examine the role of L1 that affects the collocation errors. Only semantic criteria, *direct translation (translated word-for-word from English to Thai)*, is used for dividing congruent and incongruent items. Furthermore, Thai meanings claimed as equivalent meanings or non-equivalent meanings have been checked by only the researcher. Based on the different criteria and research processes, it found both differences and similarities between this present study and that of Sanguannam (2017) (in Sanguannam (2017), non-congruent is used as the technical term of incongruent in this study).

Table 6 The Comparison of Meaning and Congruence or Incongruence between the Present Study and Sanguannam (2017)

| Collocations | In Sanguannam (2017) | | In the present study | | |
	Its meaning	Its Congruence (C) or Non-Congruence (NC)	Its meaning	Its structure	Its Congruence (C) or Non-Congruence (NC)
have a right	มีสิทธิ์	C	มีสิทธิ์	no reduction	C
have an opportunity	มีโอกาส	C	มีโอกาส	no reduction	C
have power	มีอำนาจ	C	มีอำนาจ	no reduction	C
have an effect	มีผลกระทบ	C	มีผลกระทบ	no reduction	C
have an advantage	ความได้เปรียบ	C	มีข้อได้เปรียบ	no reduction	C
do a job	ทำงาน	C	ทำงาน	no reduction	C

	In Sanguannam (2017)		In the present study		
do work	ทำงาน	C	ทำงาน	no reduction	C
make a decision	ตัดสินใจ	NC	ตัดสินใจ	reduction	NC
make an effort	พยายาม	NC	พยายาม	reduction	NC
make a mistake	ทำผิด	C	ทำผิด	no reduction	C
get a job	ได้งาน	C	หางาน	no reduction	C
get the message	เข้าใจ (ความหมาย)	NC	เข้าใจ	reduction	NC
get an impression	รู้สึก	NC	ประทับใจ	reduction	NC
take a view	มีทัศนคติต่อ	NC	มอง	reduction	NC
take the lead	นำ, เป็นผู้นำ	NC	นำ	reduction	NC
take a risk	เสี่ยง	NC	เสี่ยง	reduction	NC

As seen above, though the results of the congruency or incongruency analysis show no difference (Sanguannam studied only 30 delexical collocations), there is a difference in the criteria used for analysis and there are some Thai meanings that differ from others, for example, *get a job (ได้งาน/หางาน) or get an impression (รู้สึก/ประทับใจ).*

Pedagogical Implications

This study has offered the criteria, the structural parameters and the semantic parameters to analyze what are congruent or incongruent collocations, when the analysis is carried out using the contrastive approach. Furthermore, this study also offered a corpus of congruent and incongruent collocations which have high-frequency verbs, as a resource for Thai learners.

As mentioned by Altenberg and Granger (2001), Yamashita & Jiang (2010), and Hashemi and Eskandari (2017), congruent and incongruent collocations are significant factors for learning collocations successfully. Once the collocations are stored in learners' memories, the process of collocation usage can become independent from their first language. The corpus of congruent and incongruent collocations could be applied in English classrooms to help teachers in teaching English vocabulary. According to previous research, learners learn collocations through interlingual transfer. Therefore, teaching congruent and incongruent collocations with their Thai meanings may help learners easily remember collocations and be able to use them in an appropriate context.

In addition, the corpus of congruent and incongruent collocations, including the 397 collocations, can be developed into teaching materials, such as a collocation instructional package or learning practice, in order to increase Thai learners' awareness of collocations. Through teaching materials or learning practice, learners can learn about high frequency verbs with noun collocations with their equivalent and non-equivalent Thai meanings from the beginning.

References

Akpınar, K. D. & Bardakçı, M. (2015). The effect of grouping and presenting collocations on retention. TESL-EJ (Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language: *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, *18*(4), 1-22.

Altenberg, B. & Granger, S. (2001). *The Grammatical and Lexical Patterning of Make in Native and Non-Native Student Writing. Applied Linguistics, 22*(2), 173-195.

Ang, L. H., Hajar, A. R., Tan, K.H. & Khazriyati, S. (2011). Collocations in Malaysian English Learners' Writing: A Corpus-based Error Analysis. 3L: *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *17*(Special Issue), 31-44.

Arakkitsakul, Y. (2019). Five Things that Thai Teachers have to Consider Before Teaching English Grammar. *Journal of Southern Technology, 12*(2), 257-263.

Bahns, J. (1993). Lexical collocations: a contrastive view. *ELT Journal*, *47*(1). 56-63.

Brown, H. D. (2007) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (Fifth edition).* NY: Pearson Education.

Burrudge, S. (1981). *Oxford Basic English Dictionary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course.* New York: Routledge.

Granger, S. (1998). *Prefabricated patterns in advances EFL advanced EFL Writing: Collocations and lexical phrases, in A.P. Cowie (ed.). Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications*. Clarendon Press: Oxford, 145-160.

Hashemi, M. R. & Eskandari, R. (2017). *The Learning of Congruent and Incongruent Collocations Utilizing Dynamic Assessment.* The Language Teacher Online. Retrieved from http://jalt-publications.org/tlt

Jukneviciene, R. (2008). Collocations with High-Frequency Verbs in Learner English: Lithuanian Learners & Native Speakers. *Kalbotyra, 59* (3), 119-127.

Jurko, P. (2010). Slovene-English Contrastive Phraseology: Lexical Collocations. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries, 7*(2), 57-73. doi.org/10.4312/elope.7.2.57-73

Kittigosin, R. & Phoocharoensil, S. (2015). Investigation into Learning Strategies and Delexical Verb Use by Thai EFL Learners. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 21*(2), 63-72.

Lee, C. Y. & Lin, C. C. (2013). *Evaluation on Second Language Collocational Comgruency with Computational Semantics Similarity*. 27th Pacific Asia Conference on Language Information, and Computation, 534-541.

Lee, D.Y.W. & Chen, S.X. (2009). Making a bigger deal of the smaller words: Function words and other key items in research writing by Chinese learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*, 281-296.

McIntosh, C., Francis, B., & Poole, R. (2009). *Oxford collocations dictionary: For students of English (2ndEdition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mustapic, E. & Malenica, F. (2013). Collocations as a part of an English LSP – The importance of congruence for achieving English language proficiency. *The International Language Conference on The Importance of Learning Professional Foreign Languages for Communication between Cultures 2013*, 19-20 September 2013 Celje, Slovenia, 207-214.

Nakata, T. (2007). English collocation learning through meaning-focused and form-focused activities: Interactions of activity types and L1-L2 congruence. *Proceedings of the 11th Conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics,* 154-168.

Nesselhauf, N. (2003). The Use of Collocations by Advanced Learners of English and Some Implications for Teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 24*(2), 223-242.

Panprem, H. (2015). Investigation of Delexical Verbs in English for Specific Purpose Textbooks for Engineering, Science and Technology. *Journal of Education Research, Faculty of Education Srinakharinwirot University, 9*(1), 184-194.

Perez, S. L. & Taouis, H. B. (2019). Analysis of noun (direct object) collocations with the high-frequency verb DO by Spanish students in an online learner corpus. *Complutense Journal of English Studies, 27*, 99-120.

Phetdannuea, F. & Ngonkum, S. (2016). An analysis of interlingual errors and intralingual errors in Thai EFL Students' writing at Khon Kaen University. *KKU Research Journal (Graduate Studies), 4*(2), 35-51.

Pho-Klang, K. (2020). Using News Articles as Authentic Materials for EFL studens. *Liberal Arts Review, Huachiew Chalermprakiet University, 15*(1), 79-91.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2003). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (2nd edition)*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Revier, R. L. (2009). Evaluating a New Test of Whole English Collocations, in Barfield A. & Gyllstad, H. (eds.). *Researching Collocations in Another Language – Multiple Interpretations*, pp. 139-152.

Sanguannam, S. (2017). A study on "Delexical Verb+Noun" collocation errors of Thai EFL intermediate and advanced learners. *Journal of Liberal Art, 17* (2), 59-84.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swan, M. (2002). *Practical English Usage (International student's edition).* (8th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thiengburanathum, W. (1998). *Se-ed's Modern English-Thai Dictionary* (Complete&Updated) Super-
    Mini Edition). Bangkok: Se-education Public Company Limited.

Yamashita, J. & Jiang, N. (2010). L1 influence on the acquisition of L2 collocations: Japanese ESL users and
    EFL learners acquiring English collocations. *TESOL Quarterly, 44*, 647-668

Yan, Q. (2006). A corpus-based analysis of the verb "Do" used by Chinese Learners of English.
    CELEA Journal, 29(6), 37-41.

Zhou, X. (2016). A corpus-based study on high frequency verb collocations in the case of "Have".
    International Forum of Teaching and studies, 12(1), 42-50.

Appendix: Some Congruent and Incongruent Collocations

Do-Congruent		*Do-Incongruent*	
do a transaction	ทำธุรกรรม	do exercise	ออกกำลังกาย
do things	ทำอะไรบางอย่าง	do a trip	ท่องเที่ยว
do reports	ทำรายงานค่าใช้จ่าย	do an exam	สอบ
do work	ทำงาน	do sums	คิดยอดรวม
do the job	ทำงาน	do the drying	ตากผ้า
do good	ทำดี	do shopping	ซื้อของ
do sport	เล่นกีฬา	do a test	สอบ
do an experiment	ทำการทดลอง	do a survey	สำรวจ

Get-Congruent		*Get-Incongruent*	
get a boost	ได้รับการกระตุ้น	get a shock	ตกใจ
get experience	ได้ประสบการณ์	get the impression	ประทับใจ
get a loan	ได้เงินกู้	get the message	เข้าใจ
get a reduction	ได้ส่วนลด	get the sack	ถูกไล่ออก

Give-Congruent		*Give-Incongruent*	
give information	ให้ข้อมูล	give a decision	ตัดสินใจ
give protection	ให้ความคุ้มครอง	give a hug	กอด
give grades	ให้เกรด	give a lecture	บรรยาย
give incentives	ให้แรงจูงใจ	give a cry	ร้องไห้
give confidence	ให้ความมั่นใจ	give a laugh	หัวเราะ
give money	ให้เงิน	give a scream	กรีดร้อง
give opportunities	ให้โอกาสมากขึ้น	give a shout	ตะโกน
give a choice	ให้ทางเลือก	give a smile	ยิ้ม
give a promise	ให้สัญญา	give an answer	ตอบ

Have-Congruent		*Have-Incongruent*	
have knowledge	มีความรู้	have access	เข้าถึง
have a daughter	มีลูกสาว	have a chat	พูดคุย
have a background	มีพื้นฐาน	have an argument	ถกเถียง
have a value	มีค่านิยม	have a look	ดู
have a choice	มีทางเลือก	have a go	ลอง
have a plan	มีแผนงาน	have a rest	พักผ่อน
have a strategy	มีกลยุทธ์	have conversation	พูดคุย
have a direction	มีทิศทาง	have a drink	ดื่ม
have a debt	มีหนี้สิน	have a shower	อาบน้ำ

Make-Congruent		*Make-Incongruent*	
make a difference	ทำให้เกิดความเปลี่ยนแปลง	make a bid	ประมูล
make a profit	ทำกำไร	make a bridge	เชื่อมต่อ
make a report	ทำรายงาน	make a start	เริ่มต้น
make concessions	ให้สัมปทาน	make an investment	ลงทุน
make revenue	สร้างรายได้เพิ่มขึ้น	make announcements	ประกาศ
make products	ผลิตสินค้า	make purchases	ซื้อ
make space	เคลียร์พื้นที่	make refunds	คืนเงิน

Take-Congruent		*Take-Incongruent*	
take a course	เรียนรายวิชา	take caution	ระมัดระวัง, ตักเตือน
take a shortcut	ใช้ทางลัด	take charge (of)	ควบคุม ดูแล รับผิดชอบ
take an advantage	ฉวยประโยชน์, ใช้ประโยชน์	take action	ดำเนินการ
take delivery	รับสินค้า	take responsibility	รับผิดชอบ
take effect	มีผล, ส่งผลกระทบ	take reservation	จอง
take feedback	รับข้อมูลป้อนกลับ	take a rest	หยุดพัก