Grammatical and Lexical Patterning of *Make* in Asian Learner Writing: A Corpus-Based Study of *ICNALE*

CHING-HSI LIN
National Taipei University of Technology, Taiwan

YEN-LIANG LIN (Corresponding author)
National Taipei University of Technology, Taiwan
ericlin@ntut.edu.tw

ABSTRACT

This study investigates lexical and grammatical features of the high-frequency verb "make" in English written essays among Asian English as a foreign language (EFL) learners based on the ICNALE, the largest corpora focusing on various Asian learner groups. Examining how lexical and grammatical patterning of "make" differ between English native speakers (ENSs) and Asian learners from different countries, this study investigates overuse and misuse patterns of "make" and how they correlate to proficiency. Results show that all Asian learner groups shared similar tendency to use "make" substantially more than ENSs, with producing and causative uses most common and delexical use least common. However, Asian learners tend to produce fewer varieties of delexical uses compared with ENSs. The adjective and verb complements in the causative category by Asian learners also differ from that of ENSs. Rates and types of misuses by Taiwanese learners were independent of proficiency. It is also evident that the high-frequency verb "make" expresses a variety of meanings and there are differences in lexical as well as grammatical patterning between Taiwanese learners and ENSs. Pedagogical implications regarding the use of high-frequency verbs are included in the discussion.

Keywords: Learner Corpus; High-Frequency Verb; ICNALE; Asian Learner Writing; EFL Learners

INTRODUCTION

Acquisition of verbs in a speaker's non-native language has been shown to be one of the most challenging tasks in many languages because patterns and structures of verb phrases often differ greatly among languages (De Cock & Granger, 2004; Fathema, Hakim & Karim, 2015; Wang, 2016). Much attention has been given to English verbs, which are a major challenge for English as foreign language (EFL) learners (Ädel & Erman, 2012; Lim, 2006; Fathema et al., 2015), particularly across proficiency levels (Altenberg & Granger, 2001; Kim, 2015; Namvar, 2012; Sung & Kim, 2016). High-frequency verbs, however, do not exist in isolation; they occur in various phraseological patterns in English, i.e. collocations. It is therefore not just the verb itself, but how it interacts with the rest of the language that can compound the difficulty of their use. Previous corpus-based studies have found that collocations involve high-frequency verbs (Groom, 2005; Lin, 2016) and that their polysemy and syntactic complexity, especially collocational restrictions, make them problematic for English learners (Ang et al., 2011, 2017; Namvar, 2012). Studies on EFL writing have shown these verbs are often used incorrectly, even among advanced learners (e.g. Nesselhauf, 2005; Wang, 2016), and that full control of language-specific, idiomatic, and collocational uses of common verbs often develop later in the language learning process. EFL learners often show difficulty identifying correct verb forms and appropriate functions because of the lack of structural congruity with their linguistic system (Housen, 2002). Furthermore, some verbs are difficult to decode, and EFL learners have difficulty encoding their restricted collocations (De Cock & Granger, 2004). Nesselhauf (2005) found that up to a third of collocations used by EFL learners are erroneous, independent of duration of study.

Previous research on EFL learner verb acquisition using Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis (CIA) has studied the high-frequency verb *get* in Japanese learners (Suzuki, 2015), *make* in French and Swedish learners (Altenberg & Granger, 2001), and grammatical and semantic distributions of *make* and *do* in Chinese learners (Fu, 2006; Liu & Shaw, 2001). These comparative studies have provided valuable insights into how high-frequency verbs and their collocations are used across various learner groups. While there is a burgeoning body of research on high-frequency verbs used by EFL learners, few studies have compared lexical and grammatical features of high-frequency verbs among learners across Asian countries based on a controlled learner corpus. This study examines the lexical and grammatical patterns of *make* among Asian learners in general and the common errors of *make* among Taiwanese learners at different English proficiency levels. This study addresses the following questions:

1. To what extent does the use of *make* display similar lexical and grammatical patterning among EFL learners from different Asian countries and between English native speakers (ENSs)?
2. Does the lexical and grammatical patterning of *make* differ between Taiwanese learners at different English proficiency levels?
3. What are the common types of misuse of *make* among Taiwanese EFL learners at different English proficiency levels?

LEARNER CORPORA AND CIA

Computer learner corpora are systematic electronic collections of spoken or written texts produced by second or foreign language learners (Granger, 2004), and are important research tools for language acquisition, development, and use (Cobb & Horst, 2015; Lin, 2015). These corpora are large, offering a comprehensive view to language use, and can be analyzed and compared with other corpora representing other learner groups or ENSs (Cobb & Horst, 2015). Efforts have been made in the past few decades to build learner corpora, such as *International Corpus of Learner English* (*ICLE*) and *Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays* (*LOCNESS*). Corpora specific to the Asian region have also been developed, such as *Japanese EFL Learner Corpus (JEFLL Corpus)*, *LTTC English Learner Corpus* (*LTTC-ELC*), and *The International Corpus Network of Asian Learners of English* (*ICNALE*).

The approach of comparing learner interlanguage with a target native-speaker discourse of a similar type can be referred to as "Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis" (CIA) (Granger, 2004, 2015). The analysis is based on the comparative nature of two or more different datasets to identify the similarities and differences between them that may deserve further attention; that is, it reveals "aspects of the subjects that may not have been as easily seen if each was located in isolation" (Strawn, 2009, p.117). Such a comparative design enables qualitative (misuse) and quantitative (over- and underuse) analysis of learner interlanguage (Granger, 2015). This methodology has been widely used to analyze learner corpora (e.g., Appel & Szeib, 2018; Lin, 2015; Nesselhauf, 2005; Pallotti, 2017; Paquot, 2010; Vyatkina, 2012) and to establish distinctive features of particular interlanguage and assess their degree of generalizability across learner populations. Although CIA has been proven useful in better understanding learner grammar, the native vs. nonnative dichotomy has been questioned, particularly from the perspective of world Englishes or English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (e.g., Jenkins, 2009; Rajagopalan, 2004), which denies any need for specifically native-speaker norms as learners who use them may well risk adopting a false identity. Larsen-Freeman (2014) observed that "[b]y continuing to equate identity with idealized native speaker production as a definition of success, it is difficult to avoid seeing

the learner's IL [interlanguage] as anything but deficient" (p. 217). Although there has been considerable debate on whether to use native-speaker models in the EFL classroom, learners still need models of some kind as a point of reference (Cullen & Kuo, 2007). Learners from multiple countries and contexts of language use, particularly in Asia, have a strong desire to conform to native speakers' norms (e.g. Timmis, 2002). The benefit of such comparisons is obvious, providing important information on what learners do right or wrong, or partly wrong, in a particular skill or task, which can then be used to inform a wide range of pedagogical applications (Granger, 2015, p. 14). From this perspective, a corpus of ENSs can be useful reference to the analysis of learner discourse and further reveal the significant differences which deserve particular attention.

Numerous studies have employed CIA to investigate high-frequency verbs by EFL learners from different L1 backgrounds and ENSs. Suzuki (2015) found that Japanese learners use the verb *get* substantially more than ENSs. Altenberg and Granger (2001) found that French learners underuse the verb *make*, while Swedish learners use more than ENS students, and both Swedish and French learners use significantly less delexical structures (e.g., *make a decision/a reform*) of *make* than do ENS students. Mochizuki (2007) found that Japanese learners overuse the idiomatic (e.g., *make it*) and underuse the causative *make* (e.g., *make sb believe sth*). Kim (2015) found that for Korean learners causative and delexical uses of *make* are most common, that lower-proficiency learners overuse *make* due to L1 transfer, and that underuse or misuse of *make* was isolated to delexical uses. Although the patterning of *make* by various learner groups in comparison to ENSs have been studied, little attention has been paid to an internal comparison of learners at different proficiency levels and an external comparison of learners across different Asian countries and areas.

HIGH-FREQUENCY VERBS IN EFL LEARNERS

High-frequency verbs are those which are commonly used and taught early in language learning, including *say*, *get*, *go*, *know*, *think*, *see*, *make*, *come*, *take*, *want*, *give*, and *mean* (Biber et al., 1999). Despite their common use and emphasis during English learning, high-frequency verbs are problematic for English learners (Ädel & Erman, 2012; Hasselgren, 1994; Sinclair, 1991). As high-frequency equivalents exist in most languages, a pattern of misuse is common across various L1's, as well as overuse (Lin, 2015), a phenomenon called "lexical teddy bears" (Hasselgren, 1994, p. 237) or "collocational teddy bears" (Nesselhauf, 2005, p. 69) wherein learners overuse language which they feel is safe. Some learners may avoid high-frequency verbs entirely due to polysemy and language-specific tendencies, resulting in specialized meanings, collocations, and idiomatic uses (Altenberg & Granger, 2001). However, other studies have shown that high-frequency verbs are actually overused by EFL learners, who instead rely on "larger, rarer, and clumsier words" which make their language "stilted and awkward" (Sinclair, 1991, p. 79), or used in forms which give them "very little meaning" (ibid., p. 147). Examining cases or overuse, underuse, and misuse, it is clear that high-frequency verbs appear to be problematic for learners, particularly in an EFL context.

Not like English as a second language (ESL) context, where English is the dominant language, EFL learners have relatively limited amount, intensity, and duration of exposure to English academic practices (Yamashita & Jiang, 2010). Several studies have identified the error-proneness of these high-frequency verbs by EFL learners (e.g., Alvarez & Suárez, 2011; Crosthwaite, 2018; Fathema et al., 2015; Tan, 2005), showing that they may have a general understanding of verb meaning, but a restricted lexical knowledge about polysemy, collocations, phrasal verbs, and grammatical uses. This leads EFL learners to over-rely on the core meaning of polysemous verbs and make errors by their L1 equivalent translation. Although high-frequency verbs have a translational equivalent in most languages, cross-

linguistic similarity is mostly deceptive (Hugon, 2008) and studies have demonstrated the influence of learners' L1 influence and proficiency level on the use of *make* in Mandarin (Fu, 2006) and Korean (Kim, 2015) EFL learners.

METHODOLOGY

THE *ICNALE*

ICNALE is one of the largest learner corpora publicly available and also the only learner corpus with a focus on various Asian learner groups (Ishikawa, 2013, 2014). The data that form the basis of ICNALE were obtained from speeches and essays produced under controlled conditions from both non-native and native English speakers. This present study only analyzed the ICNALE-written sub-corpus, a collection of essays containing 1.3 million words written by 2,600 college students from 10 Asian countries and 200 ENSs from the USA, UK, Australia, and Canada. All written submissions included in the ICNALE-written were controlled for time, length, reference materials, and topic (see Table 1), which is suitable for a contrastive analysis of different writer groups (Ishikawa, 2013). Within the ICNALE-written, Asian writers were grouped into six *CEFR* (*Common European Framework of Reference*) levels according to their TOEIC or TOFEL test scores.

TABLE 1. *Instruction Sheet Given to Learners* (Ishikawa, 2013)

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Use reasons and specific details to support your answer.
(Topic A) It is important for college students to have a part-time job.
(Topic B) Smoking should be completely banned at all the restaurants in the country.
Instructions
1. Clarify your opinions and show the reasons for them and some examples.
2. You can use 20 to 40 minutes for each essay. This means that you have 40 to 80 minutes to complete two essays. Do not finish too early or spend too much time.
3. You must use MS Word or a similar word processor.
4. Do not use dictionaries or other reference tools.
5. Do not plagiarize anyone else's essays.
6. The length of your single essay should be from 200 to 300 WORDS (not letters). Too short or too long essays cannot be accepted. You can check the length of your essay using the word count function of MS Word.
7. You must run spell check before completing your writing.

To answer the first research question regarding the patterning of *make* among different Asian learner groups, data from the ICNALE database were filtered to only include written essays from ENSs and Asian EFL learners at the B1_2 level to make the learner data comparable. This level was selected due to the fact that it was the encompassed the majority of participants across most of the learner groups. Table 2 presents the number of tokens of ENSs and Asian EFL learners. The second and third research questions regarding the patterning of *make* across proficiency levels and misuses of *make* examined only the Taiwanese dataset for further analysis.

TABLE 2. *The Number of Tokens for ENSs and Asian EFL Learners at the B12 Level*

Sub-corpus (Code)	Tokens
English native speakers (ENS)	93,757
Taiwanese (TWN)	28,212
Chinese (CHN)	51,476
Indonesian (IDN)	39,316
Japanese (JPN)	22,132
Korean (KOR)	39,710
Thailand (THA)	45,480

DATA ANALYSIS

Data were extracted and analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively to understand uses of *make*. To calculate the frequencies of *make* in *ICNALE*, inflectional forms of *make*, including *make, makes, making,* and *made* were lemmatized. A comparative analysis was conducted to compare use of the lemma *make* in Asian learner and ENS data, as well as two proficiency level groups: low-intermediate (A2 and B1_1), and upper-intermediate (B1_2 and B2). Frequency differences across the samples were tested by means of Log-likelihood (LL) values for significance at the 0.01% level with a critical value of 15.13 (Rayson, 2008) and by means of the chi-square test, with 5% (p<0.05) significance. As both log-likelihood and chi-square tests produced similar results in this study, only Log-likelihood (LL) values for the test of significance was reported in this paper. Although frequencies often need to be normalized to a common base in a comparison involving corpora of different sizes, Rayson (2008) claims that there is no need to normalize the figures before doing the LL analysis as the calculation for the expected values takes account of the size of the two corpora.

A qualitative analysis based on Altenberg and Granger (2001) divided every use of *make* into eight types (Table 3). Types of lexical and grammatical patterns matching the above analytical framework were selected manually, facilitated by the concordance facility of *Wordsmith Tools 7.0.* Causative *make* in particular is a complex-transitive verb and most commonly used by Asian learners; therefore, it was further analyzed, involving three types of object + complement constructions: (1) adjective structures (e.g. *make something feasible*); (2) verb structures (e.g. *make somebody clean something*); and (3) noun structures (e.g. *make somebody a musician*). Verb complements can be subdivided into three semantic categories: (1) relational verbs: connecting two closely related concepts, usually either through equivalence or possession (e.g. *become, appear*, *seem*); (2) mental verbs: referring to cognitive states that are generally unavailable for outside evaluation (e.g. *think*, *realize*, *understand*); and (3) actional verbs: expressing something that a person, animal, or object can do (e.g. *work*, *pay*, *change*).

TABLE 3. *Altenberg and Granger's (2001) Major Uses of the Verb Make*

1. Produce sth (result of creation)	*make furniture, make a hole, make a law*
2. Delexical uses	*make a distinction/a decision/a reform*
3. Causative uses	*make sb believe sth, make sth possible*
4. Earn (money)	*make a fortune, a living*
5. Link verb uses	*She will make a good teacher*
6. Making it (idiomatic)	*If we run, we should make it*
7. Phrasal/prepositional	*make out, make up, make out of*
8. Other	*make good, make one's way*

This study also analyzed the misuse of *make* across learner proficiency levels in the Taiwanese data. All the instances of *make* were checked by the researchers and an ENS who have both taught EFL for over 10 years, to ensure the reliability of results. Misuse categories following Alvarez and Suárez (2011) are shown in Table 4. Type A was identified when *make* was used instead of another appropriate verb, as in (1), or when another verb was used instead of *make,* as in (2); Type B identifies erroneous noun choices, as in (3); Type C identifies an appropriate combination of words but with a meaning that was inappropriate in the given context, as in (4); Type D identifies combinations where non-lexical elements such as prepositions differed from that of ENSs were also, as in (5); and Type E identifies grammatical errors, as in (6). Although misuses of *make* were identified in the ICNALE, they were not excluded from total frequency lists as long as they matched the lexical and grammatical patterning presented in Table 3.

TABLE 4. *Five Types of Misuses of the Verb Make*

	Category		Examples of errors (with proper or intended statement)
A.	Wrong verb choice	(1)	make the role (play the role)
		(2)	take a mistake (make a mistake)
B.	Wrong noun choice	(3)	make benefits (make profits)
C.	Meaning	(4)	punishment makes rude students (can aggravate their bad behavior)
D.	Pre- or post-modification	(5)	the chair is made into wood (made of wood)
E.	Other grammatical errors	(6)	staying up makes me weakness (makes me weak)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

MAKE USED AMONG DIFFERENT ASIAN EFL LEARNERS

Frequencies of major categories of *make* used among EFL learners at the B1_2 level from different Asian countries (China (CHN), Indonesia (IDN), Japan (JPN), Korea (KOR), Thailand (THA), and Taiwan (TWN)) were compared with ENSs (Table 5). Most Asian EFL learners used the verb *make* often, with Chinese, Indonesian, Korean, and Thai learners' use significantly greater than that of ENSs (LL>15.13, p <0.001), supporting previous studies (e.g. Fu, 2006; Mochizuki, 2007; Kim, 2015) that show *make* to be a verb on which Asian EFL learners rely heavily. To identify major categories of uses of *make* among Asian EFL learners, every instance of *make* was assigned to one of the eight categories of use (Table 5). All Asian EFL learner groups rely heavily on the first four categories, with significantly different uses in producing, delexical, and causative *make*. Use of *make* was significantly higher in producing uses (by Indonesian, Japanese, Korean, and Thai learner groups) and causative uses (for Chinese, Indonesian, Thai and Taiwanese learner groups), but less frequent in delexical uses (especially Thai and Indonesian learner groups). In particular, less variety of delexical *make* can be found in its collocation, in which 13, 14, and 17 types of collocates were found in Indonesian, Thai and Taiwanese learners, while 32 types were found in the ENS data. ENSs produced a wider variety of collocations of *make* (e.g., *make progress, make difference, make statement, make argument*), which were not used by Asian learners. In this regard, Asian learners tended to stick to a limited range of collocations (e.g., *make friend, make mistake, make decision, make sure*), which seem to be examples of "collocational teddy bears" (Nesselhauf, 2005). Such phenomenon can also be found across different L1 groups (e.g., Altenberg & Granger, 2001; Laufer & Waldman, 2001; Fan, 2009; Mochizuki, 2007; Suzuki, 2015).

TABLE 5. *Major Categories of the Uses of Make among Asian EFL Learners*

Category	CHN	IDN	JPN	KOR	THA	TWN	ENS
1. Producing (result of creation)	17	50*	19*	46*	43*	8	11
2. Delexical uses	58	10*	23	22	13*	19	101
3. Causative uses	112*	111*	27	60	174*	76*	92
4. Earn (money)	47	23	9	52	31	22	63
5. Link verb uses	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
6. Make it (idiomatic)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
7. Phrasal/prepositional uses	2	1	1	4	3	1	6
8. Other conventional uses	3	1	2	1	1	1	5
Total	239*	196*	81	185*	266*	127*	281

* p<0.05

This is possibly due to learners' avoidance strategies and insufficient input of EFL contexts. It is common for EFL learners to consciously avoid unfamiliar expressions to avoid mistakes (Fu, 2006). Learners rely on familiar lexical items they learned in the early stages of

language acquisition. In addition, textbook contents may not provide sufficient contextual learning input. The comparatively low use of *make* by EFL learners compared to ENSs could be partially caused by the low inclusion of *make* + speech action nouns (e.g., *argument, comment, claim*) in EFL textbooks (Altenberg & Granger, 2001; Shimizu, 2015). The verb *make* is often used with nouns expressing speech actions, often related to reporting verbs, while Asian leaners rarely use this pattern, a feature that may be universal in learner English. To address this, a greater variety of delexical *make* and its collocation should be included in textbooks and taught by teachers (Shimizu, 2015). Increasing exposure to delexical uses is important for language learners to facilitate encoding and decoding.

Causative *make* is the most commonly used category of *make* by all Asian learner groups, with a similar finding in Swedish and French-speaking EFL learners in Altenberg and Granger (2001). Causative *make* involves three forms of construction: adjective structures (e.g. *make something feasible*), verb structures (e.g. *make somebody clean something*), and noun structures (e.g. *make somebody a musician*). As can be seen in Table 6, the complement of causative use by ENSs are mostly adjective (56%), whereas the average use of verb complements across all Asian leaner groups is higher than that of adjective complements. In particular, they use the verb compliment *feel* frequently, as shown in the following examples:

(1) The cigarette will surely make other people in the restaurant <u>feel</u> uncomfortable. (CHN)
(2) It can make passive smokers <u>feel</u> dizzy. (IDN)
(3) Smoking makes a lot of people <u>feel</u> bad. (JPN)
(4) It sometimes made me <u>feel</u> exhausted. (KOR)
(5) It makes the government <u>feel</u> happy. (THA)
(6) This policy can make smokers <u>feel</u> extremely inconvenient. (TWN)

The presence of these linking verbs in the complementation of the structure of *Verb+Object+Bare infinitive* among Asian EFL learners results in redundancy relative to ENSs' preferred use of adjectival complement is attributed to L1 interference (Liu & Shaw, 2001). Future studies should address these patterns based on individual country typologies. The following section will take the Taiwanese dataset as an example for the analysis of *make* by learners of different proficiency levels.

TABLE 6. *Causative Uses of Make by Asian EFL learners*

Complement	CHN		IDN		JPN		KOR		THA		TWN	
	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%
Adjective	50	45	51	46	13	48	25	42	53	31	31	41
Verb	55	49	60	54	13	48	33	55	112	64	42	55
Noun	7	6	0	0	1	4	2	3	9	5	3	4
Total	112	100	111	100	27	100	60	100	174	100	76	100

MAKE BY LEARNERS OF DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY LEVELS

The second research question aims to identify the uses of *make* between Taiwanese learners across different proficiency levels. This study constructed two proficiency groups and compared the overall frequency in the use of *make*: low-intermediate (A2 and B1_1 levels) and upper-intermediate (B1_2 and B2). Use of verb *make* was not significantly different between proficiency groups (Table 7), showing that use of verb *make* by Taiwanese learners is independent of proficiency, i.e. no significant difference between the two groups. This finding is not consistent with previous studies (e.g., Altenberg & Granger, 2001; Kim, 2015), which report that lower-proficiency learners heavily overuse producing, delexical, and causative uses of *make* more than advanced learners do.

TABLE 7. *Uses of Make by Low-Intermediate and Upper-Intermediate Taiwanese Learners*

Category	Low-Intermediate	Upper-Intermediate	LL Values
1. Producing (result of creation)	31	12	+4.09
2. Delexical uses	47	27	+1.23
3. Causative uses	157	101	+1.42
4. Earning (money)	30	25	-0.16
5. Linking	0	0	0.00
6. Making (idiomatic)	0	0	0.00
7. Phrasal/prepositional uses	4	1	+1.16
8. Other conventional uses	2	2	-0.08
Total	271	168	+3.73

The following examples provide some instances of producing uses by both groups:

(7) I think government should <u>make</u> a strict rule. (low-intermediate)
(8) …that restaurants have to <u>make</u> a place without smoke. (low-intermediate)
(9) The government <u>made</u> a law to restrict the right… (upper-intermediate)
(10)   If the rule could be <u>made</u> more strictly…(upper-intermediate)

Both groups often use *make a law* and *make a rule* in the producing category. In total 9 and 11 nouns collocate with producing *make* in low-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups respectively. There was limited variety in total uses of *make* in both groups, leaving them unable to recognize and process collocations as recurring lexical units (Durrant & Schmitt, 2010). This may be related to a shared limited exposure to English in varied contexts and co-texts. Similar patterning can also be found in causative *make*, with 15 and 11 types of collocates in low-intermediate and upper-intermediate groups respectively.

TABLE 8. *Causative Uses of Make by Low-Intermediate and Upper-Intermediate*

Complement	Low-Intermediate		Upper-Intermediate	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Adjective	65	41.4	38	37.6
Verb	90	57.3	60	59.4
Noun	2	1.3	3	3
Total	157	100	101	100

Table 8 shows that both groups of Taiwanese learners use noun compliments least, indicating that their use appears to be independent of proficiency. More than half the causative tokens in both groups are verb compliments, similar to Kim (2015) who found a similar pattern across learner proficiencies in Korean students. Causative *make* with verb complements can be subdivided into three semantic categories: relational verbs (e.g. *become, appear, seem*), mental verbs (e.g. *think, realize, understand*), and actional verbs (e.g. *work, pay, change*).

TABLE 9. *Semantic Types of Verb Complements with Causative Make by Low-Intermediate and Upper-Intermediate*

Types	Low-Intermediate		Upper-Intermediate	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Relational	20	22.2	19	31.7
Mental	40	44.5	23	38.3
Actional	30	33.3	18	30
Total	90	100	60	100

Taiwanese learners use mental verb compliments most often, and relational verb compliments least often, opposite to what is observed in ENSs, indicating ENSs tend to

mental verbs least and relational verbs most (Table 9). Mental verb complement is the most common use of causative *make* in both Taiwanese groups, with low-intermediate learners using relational and upper-intermediate learners using actional verb complements the least. Mental verb *know* with causative *make* is unique in that less proficient writers (low-intermediate learners) use it frequently (9 times) while it is absent in upper-intermediate learner and ENS data:

(11)   It makes college students <u>know</u> what the society is. (low-intermediate)
(12)   A part-time job can make college students <u>know</u> more about the related works. (low-intermediate)

Mental verb *know* with causative *make* does not seem to be natural. Taking (11) for example, a sentence such as *It helps college students learn about/understand…* would probably be more commonly accepted. Further, the most commonly used mental verb in both learner groups is *feel*:

(13)   Smoking makes another man <u>feel</u> uncomfortable. (low-intermediate)
(14)   …can make smokers <u>feel</u> extremely inconvenient smoking outside. (upper-intermediate)

The following are examples of ENSs' use of relational verb complements, forms which are missing in the Taiwanese corpus:

(15)   I think this makes our states <u>seem</u> much more healthy and clean.
(16)   They can actively pursue a part time position which will make them <u>appear</u> to be more responsible.

While Taiwanese learners use fewer relational verbs, they frequently use the relational verb *become* and *have*, a form not used by ENSs. The use of relational *become* and *have* is common across two leaner groups and is independent of proficiency:

(17)   That can make our earth and air <u>become</u> clean. (low-intermediate)
(18)   It makes people <u>become</u> addicted. (upper-intermediate)
(19)   It may make college students <u>have</u> more opportunity to… (low-intermediate)
(20)   Smoking will make others <u>have</u> different opinions about you. (upper-intermediate)

This shows learners' tendencies to use a verb complement after *make* in patterns, while ENSs would use the structure $V.+O.+C.$ [1] (e.g., *make non-smokers nearby uncomfortable*). The presence of these linking verbs in the complementation of the structure of $V.+O.+bare\ inf.$ results in redundancy relative to ENSs' preferred use of adjectival complements (Liu & Shaw, 2001).

This distinctive distribution may be attributed to the influence of L1 (Liu & Shaw, 2001), showing a salient transfer of L1 structure to the target language because sequences such as *make sb/sth feel…* and *make sb/sth become…* have similar translational equivalents in Mandarin (e.g., *rang tā jué de*), with a structure of $V.+O.+bare\ inf.$. Both groups may also be influenced by a preference for verbosity, with such a structure being wordier than the structure of $V.+O.+C.$ (Liu & Shaw, 2001). Wordy patterns lead to circumlocution, demonstrating learners' limited production lexicon; verbosity is universal

---

[1] V., O., and C. refer to Verb, Object, and Complement.

in interlanguage, independent of proficiency (Liu & Shaw, 2001; Selinker, 2014). This is shown in the present study by both groups using the adjectival structure, but prefer *V.+O.+bare inf.* to *V.+O.+C.* where they are interchangeable.

Similar results were found in French and Swedish EFL learners who opt for a semantically and grammatically *make+O.+C.* pattern to express their intended message (Altenberg & Granger, 2001). Causative *make* in Mandarin can be translated into *shǐ, jiào,* or *rāng*, which means the subject causes the object to take action, to change, or to be in a certain state (Li, 2004). Liu and Shaw (2001) showed that Mandarin EFL learners use the verb complement such as *become* in cases where ENSs are compatible with the adjective complements. In fact, in the causative *make* construction with adjective supplement *become* is redundant, in that it is intrinsic to and semantically covered by the adjective. This redundancy may be in response to interlanguage phenomenon, including L1 transfer, preference for verbosity, linguistic inadequacies and/or misconceptions (Liu & Shaw, 2001; Selinker, 2014; Van Vuuren & Berns, 2018).

MISUSES OF *MAKE*

This study assigned the misuses of *make* in different proficiency groups of Taiwanese EFL learners' corpora to one of five categories (Alvarez & Suárez, 2011), as in Table 10. Both groups made errors with the verb *make*, though the low-intermediate group made substantially more in total than upper-intermediate (52 and 17 errors, respectively), such as:

Wrong Choice of Verb
  (21) …the disease that smoking <u>makes</u>. (low-intermediate)
   (appropriate form: *causes*)
  (22) The risk <u>made</u> by secondhand smoke… (low-intermediate)
    (appropriate form: *posed*)
  (23) …there are always lots of deaths <u>made</u> by the diseases. (upper-intermediate)
    (appropriate form: *caused*)

Examples (21) and (23) show that inappropriate use of *make* (instead of appropriate *cause*) is independent of proficiency, suggesting, errors are attributed to a poor grasp of verb usages (Abe, 2007) and negative transfer of their L1 (Chen, 2002).

Wrong Choice of Noun
  (24) …want to stop smoking <u>make a determination</u> to quit smoking. (low-intermediate)
    (appropriate form: *make a decision*)

This study shows that low-intermediate learners use awkward or deviant collocation, supporting findings by Kim (2015) who found that low-proficiency Korean learners have a higher rate of misuse of delexical *make* than advanced learners do. The results also support Nesselhauf (2005), who found that L2 learners tend to rely on using L1 translation equivalents responsible for major errors in collocations.

Meaning
  (25) Smoking often hurt the body and <u>make people have sickness</u>. (low-intermediate)
   (appropriate form: *make people sick*)
  (26) We need to<u> make people walk in the shop and push them buying</u>. (low-intermediate)
   (appropriate form: *make people buy/purchase things*)

(27) … so it <u>makes me have more good economics</u>. (upper-intermediate)
   (appropriate form: *it makes me more economically stable*)
(28) The bad smell really <u>makes me difficultly breathe</u>. (upper-intermediate)
   (appropriate form: *makes it difficult for me to breathe*)

Examples (25) to (28) show clumsy and mechanical uses of *make* from both groups, known as the decompositional strategy, where learners use a causative construction; in contrast an ENS would prefer a more synthetic alternative (Altenberg & Granger, 2001).

Other Grammatical Errors
(29) … instead will make itself <u>to increase</u> the expense. (low-intermediate)
  (appropriate form: increase)
(30) Although smoking can make smoker <u>to reduce</u> pressure… (upper-intermediate)
  (appropriate form: reduce)

Misuses resulted from both groups substitution of *to*-infinitives for the intended bare infinitives, as shown in examples (29) and (30). Huang (2007) similarly found that Taiwanese learners are prone to use non-finite clauses with subjects after a transitive verb, with the *to*-infinitive construction the most common.

TABLE 10. *Five Types of Misuses of Make by Taiwanese Learners of Different Proficiency Levels*

Error Types	Low-Intermediate		Upper-Intermediate	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
A. Wrong choice of verb	9	17.3	1	5.9
B. Wrong choice of noun	2	3.8	0	0
C. Meaning	24	46.2	10	58.8
D. Pre- or post-modification	0	0	0	0
E. Other grammatical errors	17	32.7	6	35.3
Total	52	100	17	100

Use of verb *make* in both groups is complex, and errors mainly lie in meaning and grammar categories showing that they have the same problem using causative *make*. This suggests that language learning is non-linear (Larsen-Freeman, 2009) and that errors are independent of proficiency. Cross-linguistic influences contribute to misuses of causative *make* by Taiwanese learners, such as intralingual complexities, teaching-induced, and assimilation (Hsu, 2009), as well as intralingual complexity of the verb syntactic rules themselves. Most early-age grammar courses focus on the causative structures of the verb *make* as, with less attention paid to other causative verbs such as *cause* and *get* (Altenberg & Granger, 2001), potentially leading to confusion and limited use as it is difficult to find a good description of the usage differences between these verbs; therefore, it is understandable that English learners rely on the early-acquired causative *make*. Further complicating the use of *make* by Taiwanese learners is assimilation, where it is difficult to predict which form is likely to follow which verb. For instance, the sentence "My brother got me to try sushi at a Japanese restaurant" may lead learners to produce an inappropriate sentence by assimilation, such as "Smoking can *make* smoker *to reduce* pressure". The English *to*-infinitive usually expresses an action which is unreal, unfulfilled or potential; however, bare stem infinitive of causative construction is used to encode the co-temporality between the causing event and the caused event (Talmy, 2000) features which appear to be unknown or unused by Taiwanese learners.

CONCLUSION

This study analyzed the ICNALE learner corpus to first examine lexical and grammatical patterns of the use of *make* among Asian EFL learners. The focus of the analysis then focused on Taiwanese learners' uses and misuses of *make* across different proficiency levels. The findings show that all Asian EFL learner groups in INCALE shared similar tendency regarding the patterning of *make*, using substantially more *make* than ENSs (delexical *make* the most common, causative *make* least common). Across Asian learner groups causative, *make* tended to be used with verb complements, while causative *make* with adjective complements occurred most frequently in ENS data. Further, Taiwanese learners in particular were found to over-rely on the basic meaning of *make* and lack variety of collocation use, and their uses of causative *make* were prevalent across proficiency levels. Misuses of *make* were also found in Taiwanese learners of different proficiency levels, mostly from errors in meaning and grammar. These inappropriate uses of *make* reflect the influence of intralingual complexities and assimilation (Hsu, 2009). The findings of this study provide additional evidence of Asian learner interlanguage influencing the use of the high-frequency word *make*.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Corpora are useful resources for both teachers and learners, such as identifying uses of high-frequency verbs, collocations or to demonstrate variation in grammar across different contexts and groups of learners. This study shows that although Asian EFL learners from different nationalities frequently used the verb *make*, there were some grammatical and lexical patterning deviant from that of ENSs. As Altenberg and Granger (2001) stated, "high-frequency verbs are encountered very early in instructional programs, so learners are at a risk of having only a very crude knowledge of their grammatical and lexical patterning" (p. 190). This study supports their findings, as even though learners were taught *make* early, they remained unfamiliar with its grammatical and lexical patterning. The acquisition of patterning of *make* is important for EFL learners, and it would benefit students to be exposed to more authentic and varied uses of language by being exposed to corpus resources of real-world English use throughout their EFL education.

It is also suggested that high-frequency verbs not be taught in isolation. In *ICNALE*, *make* collocations by learners differ from those in ENSs' data, indicating that learners do not understand how ENSs commonly use the verb *make*. To help learners, verbs should be taught as semantic sequences, and their collocation should also be introduced to students at the same time (Hunston, 2011). In the present study, EFL learners lack lexical competence and consistently use the same collocation (such as *make friend*). Teachers are suggested to instruct students on how to express their opinions and appropriate collocations of high-frequency verbs as well as concordance tools or online corpora as learning tools when looking for the appropriate collocations of a verb. Using CIA and corpus analytical tools can help to identify those linguistic features that deserve further attention, providing a reasoned basis for drawing learners' awareness to linguistic features specific to their own and the native-speaker discourse (Lin, 2015; Rayson, 2008). For example, selected concordance lines can be provided to learners to observe the useful patterns of the language use in context. This learning process "confronts the learners as directly as possible with the data," and tries to "make the learner a linguistic researcher" (Johns, 2002, p. 108). Finally, it is hoped that this study helps curriculum designers, English teachers, and lexicographers to develop English teaching materials, reference books, textbooks and learners' English dictionaries based on corpus-based instructional materials for EFL students. EFL learners will thus be exposed to appropriate expressions of high-frequency verbs, such as *make* in different communicative situations.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE STUDY

Not all high-frequency verbs appear to be equally problematic for EFL learners, and consequently, as this study only analyzed *make*, it is advised that future studies incorporate multiple high-frequency verbs and make cross comparisons. Although this study investigated learners from different Asian countries, it is difficult to define the linguistic typologies of different Asian learners and this should be incorporated into future studies. In addition, ENS source data in *ICNALE* are from the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; however, current makeup of these traditionally English speaking countries is ever changing, and the concept of the ENS and the native-non-native dichotomy has come under criticism (i.e. World Englishes) (Jenkins, 2009; Rajagopalan, 2004). Ignoring learners' uniqueness and identity and comparing with ENSs corpora can reflect "imperialistic assumptions about the ownership of English" (Tan, 2005, p.128). As this study used ENSs' writing as reference, the influence of immigrants, the perspective of World Englishes, and the diversity of English use within and between English speaking countries cannot be underestimated.

REFERENCES

Ädel, A. & Erman, B. (2012). Recurrent word combinations in academic writing by native and non-native speakers of English: A lexical bundles approach. *English for Specific Purposes*, *31*(2), 81-92.

Abe, M. (2007). Grammatical errors across proficiency levels in L2 spoken and written English. *The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics*, *49*, 117-129.

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.

Alvarez, E.G. & Suárez, S,M.D. (2011). Take + noun sequences in native and learner writing data. *RAEL*, *10*, 55-68.

Ang, L. H., Rahim, H. A., Tan, K. H. & Salehuddin, K. (2011). Collocations in Malaysian English learners' writing: A corpus-based error analysis. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature®*, *17*, 31-44.

Ang, L. H., Tan, K. H. & He, M. (2017). A corpus-based collocational analysis of noun premodification types in academic writing. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature®*, *23*(1), 115-131.

Appel, R. & Szeib, A. (2018). Linking adverbials in L2 English academic writing: L1-related differences. *System*, *78*, 115-129.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, D. & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow, England: Pearson.

Chen, W. (2002). Acquisition of English passive voice by Chinese learners: a corpus based approach. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, *34*(3), 198-202.

Cobb, T. & Horst, M. (2015). Learner corpora and lexis. In S. Granger, G. Gilquin, & F. Meunier (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of learner corpus research* (pp.185-206). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Crosthwaite, P. (2018). Does EAP writing instruction reduce L2 errors? Evidence from a longitudinal corpus of L2 EAP essays and reports. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *56*(3), 315-343.

De Cock, S. & Granger, S. (2004). High frequency words: the Bête Noire of Lexicographers and learners alike. In G. Williams & S. Vessier (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh EURALEX International Congress* (pp. 233-243). Lorient, France: University of South Brittany.

Fan, M. (2009). An exploratory study of collocational use by ESL students: A task based approach. *System*, *37*(1), 110-123.

Fu, Z. (2006). What to follow "Make" and what to follow "Do": corpus-based study on the de-lexical use of "make" and "do" in native speakers' and Chinese students writing. *US-China Education Review*, *3*(5), 42-71.

Fathema, F., Hakim, A. & Karim, S.M.S. (2015). Common errors on the usage of verbs in English composition: A case study of Bangladeshi EFL learners. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, *3*(2), 1-7.

Groom, N. (2005). Pattern and meaning across genres and disciplines: An exploratory study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *4*(3), 257–277.

Granger, S. (2004). Computer learner corpus research: Current status and future prospects. In U. Connor, & T. A. Upton (Eds.), *Applied corpus linguistics: A multidimensional perspective* (pp.123-145).

Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi.

Granger, S. (2015). Contrastive interlanguage analysis: a reappraisal. *International Journal of Learner Corpus Research*, *1*(1), 7-24.

Hasselgren, A. (1994). Lexical teddy bears and advanced learners: A study into the ways Norwegian students cope with English vocabulary. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 237-260.

Housen, A. (2002). A corpus-based study of the L2-acquisition of the English verb system. In S. Granger, J. Hung, & S. Petch-Tyson (Eds.), *Computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 77-117). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.

Hsu, H.M. (2009). *An Analysis of Taiwanese junior high students' performance on causative verbs.* (Unpublished MA thesis). National Chengchi University, Taipei.

Huang, H.S. (2007). *An analysis of errors in verb forms and verb complements in Taiwanese high school students' English composition*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). National Kaohsiung Normal University, Kaohsiung.

Hugon, C. (2008). High-frequency verbs: Starting block or stumbling block for advanced L2 communication? Insights from native and learner corpora. In G. Rawoens (Ed.), *Taal aan den lijve: Het gebruik van corpora in taalkundig onderzoek en taalonderwijs* (pp. 69–98). Gent, Belgium: Academia Press.

Hunston, S. (2011). *Corpus approaches to evaluation: phraseology and evaluative language*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ishikawa, S. (2013). The ICNALE and sophisticated contrastive interlanguage analysis of Asian Learners of English. In S. Ishikawa (Ed.), *Learner corpus studies in Asia and the world, 1* (pp. 91-118). Kobe, Japan: Kobe University.

Ishikawa, S. (2014). Design of the ICNALE-Spoken: A new database for multi-modal contrastive interlanguage analysis. In S. Ishikawa (Ed.), *Learner corpus studies in Asia and the world, 2* (pp. 63-76). Kobe, Japan: Kobe University.

Jenkins, J. (2009). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*. London, England: Routledge.

Johns, T. (2002). Data-driven learning: the perpetual challenge. In B. Kettemann & G. Marko (Eds.), *Teaching and learning by doing corpus linguistics* (pp. 107-117). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kim, S. J. (2015). The effect of learner proficiency and L1 transfer on the use of *Make* by Korean EFL learners of English. *Language Research*, *51*(1), 139-166.

Laufer, B. & Waldman, T. (2011). Verb-noun collocations in second-language writing: A corpus analysis of learners' English. *Language Learning*, *61*(2), 647-672.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2009). Adjusting expectations: The study of complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, *30*(4), 579-589.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2014). Another step to be taken: Rethinking the endpoint of the interlanguage continuum. In Z. Han & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Interlanguage: Forty years later* (pp. 203-220), Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Li, W.X. (2004). *Grammaticalization of shi, jiao, and rang in jianyu construction in modern Chinese*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Henan University, Henan.

Lin, Y. L. (2015). Contrastive analysis of adolescent learner interlanguage in asynchronous online communication: A keyness approach, *System*, 55, 53-62.

Lin, Y. L. (2016). Development of multi-word sequences by adolescent EFL learners through online interaction, *English Today*, 32(4), 27-32.

Lim, J.M.H. (2006). Associating interference with strategy instruction: an investigation into the learning of the present continuous. *Asian EFL Journal*, *8* (2), 55–75.

Liu, E.T.K. & Shaw, P.M. (2001). Investigating learner vocabulary: A possible approach to looking at EFL/ESL learners' qualitative knowledge of the word. *IRAL*, *39*(3), 171–194.

Mochizuki, M. (2007). The uses of MAKE in EFL learner corpus of Japanese university students. *Journal of Foreign Language Education and Research*, *14*, 31–45.

Namvar, F. (2012). The relationship between language proficiency and use of collocation by Iranian EFL students. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature®*, 18(3).

Nesselhauf, N. (2005). *Collocations in a learner corpus*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Pallotti, G. (2017). Applying the interlanguage approach to language teaching. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *55*(4), 393-412.

Paquot, M. (2010). *Academic vocabulary in learner writing: From extraction to analysis*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The concept of 'World English' and its implications for ELT. *ELT Journal*, *58*(2), 111-117.

Rayson, P. (2008). From key words to key semantic domains. International *Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *13*(4), 519-549.

Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual.* Basingstoke, Emgland: Palgrave

Macmillan.

Selinker, L. (2014). Interlanguage 40 years on: Three themes from here. In Z.H. Han & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Interlanguage: Forty years later* (pp. 221–246). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Shimizu, M. (2015). Quantification of MAKE collocations in high school English course textbooks. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *JALT2014 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

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

Strawn, B. A. (2009). Comparative approaches: History, theory and the image of God. In J. LeMon & K. Richards (Eds.), Method matters: Essays on the interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David L (pp.117–142). Petersen. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Sung, M. C. & Kim, H. (2016). Tracing developmental changes in L2 learners' structuring of phrasal verbs: A corpus study of native and non-native argumentative essays. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature®*, *22*(2).

Suzuki, Y. (2015). The Uses of *Get* in Japanese Learner and Native Speaker Writing: A Corpus-based Analysis. *Komaba Journal of English Education, 6*, 3-18.

Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics (vol. I): concept structuring systems*. Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press.

Tan, M. (2005). Authentic language or language errors? Lessons from a learner corpus, *ELT Journal*, *59*(2), 126-134.

Van Vuuren, S. & Berns, J. (2018). Same difference? L1 influence in the use of initial adverbials in English novice writing. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *56*(4), 427-461.

Wang, Y. (2016). *The idiom principle and L1 influence: a contrastive learner-corpus study of delexical verb + noun collocations*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Yamashita, J. & Jiang, N.A.N. (2010). L1 influence on the acquisition of L2 collocations: Japanese ESL users and EFL learners acquiring English collocations. *TESOL Quarterly*, *44*(4), 647-668.