

Uses of the Verb *Get* in Spoken English by Japanese Learners and Native Speakers: A Corpus-based Analysis

SUZUKI Yoko

1. Introduction

Collocational competence has been regarded as an important aspect in the acquisition of native-like fluency, and collocations often involve basic verbs frequently used in discourse, so-called “high-frequency verbs.” Previous studies have reported that learners have difficulty with these verbs although they are introduced to learners at an early stage and thus are familiar to them (Altenberg & Granger, 2001; Biber, Conrad, & Cortes, 2004). Altenberg and Granger (2001) and Nesselhauf (2004) compare native speaker writing with non-native speaker writing and point out that EFL learners feel safe with some uses of a given high-frequency verb while avoiding other uses of the same verb.

By comparing monologues spoken by Japanese learners of English (JLs) and native speakers of English (NSs), this study identifies the characteristic ways in which JLs use the verb *get* and explores factors that differentiate JLs’ language use from that of NSs. In support of a previous study examining the written data, this study also compares the verb *get*’s use in speech and writing and aims to provide a larger picture of its use in both registers. This paper will address the following research questions:

1. Do JLs tend to over- or under-use the verb *get* in speech?
2. What types of use of the verb *get* differentiate JLs from NSs?
3. Do JLs and NSs use the verb *get* differently in speech compared with written essays?

2. Background

2.1 Characteristics of High-frequency Verbs

Every language has a set of basic verbs called high-frequency verbs. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* lists the most common English verbs, including *say, get, go, know, think, see, make, come, take, want, give, and mean* (Biber et al., 1999). Researchers have mentioned that high-frequency verbs have characteristics distinct from other regular verbs. According to Viberg (1996), who examines high-frequency verbs from a cross-linguistic perspective, one of the characteristics is that they are highly abstract and versatile. Accordingly, they have multiple meanings and grammatical patterns. In addition to being main verbs, they can function as part of a semi-modal verb

(e.g., *have got to do*). They also appear in various idiomatic multi-word phrases. Biber et al. (1999) emphasize the versatility of the verb *get* as follows:

The verb *get* goes largely unnoticed, and yet in conversation it is the single most common lexical verb in any one register. The main reason that *get* is so common is that it is extremely versatile, being used with a wide range of meanings and grammatical patterns. (Biber et al., 1999, p. 391)

Another characteristic of high-frequency verbs is that they appear in light verb constructions such as *make noise* and *take a bath*. A light verb is a verb with little or no semantic content of its own and is used in combination with a direct object noun, or NP, which itself carries most of the meaning of the predicate (Trask, 1993). Despite the transparency of light verbs, there are strict restrictions on the range of nouns which can combine with specific light verbs. The restrictions are usually arbitrary, and it is hard to logically determine which light verbs nouns prefer (e.g., *make noise*, but not **make a bath*). High-frequency verbs in learners' native languages often do not share semantic specifications of their English counterparts, and learners' tendency to rely on their native languages leads to errors in their speech and writing (Ajimer, Altenberg, & Johansson, 1996). For instance, Viberg (1996) compares two common verb pairs in English and Swedish *go/gå* and *give/ge* and shows that the pairs correspond in only about a third of the cases. Although the members of the pairs are regarded as translation equivalents, they are in fact translated by other verbs in many cases. These characteristics make high-frequency verbs tricky for EFL learners despite their familiarity (Altenberg & Granger, 2001; Lennon, 1996).

2.2 High-frequency Verbs in EFL

The literature on EFL learners' use of high-frequency verbs has yielded mixed results. Some studies have reported that EFL learners tend to overuse high-frequency verbs. Hasselgren (1994), in an analysis of Norwegian learners, reports that even advanced learners overuse basic words such as *give, get, take, show, have, know, keep, tell, and make*. Granger (1996) and Källkvist (1999) have also observed similar tendencies in French-speaking learners and Swedish learners respectively. Other studies make the different observation that EFL learners avoid using high-frequency verbs. According to Sinclair (1991), learners hesitate to use common verbs, especially in idiomatic phrases: "Instead of using them, they rely on larger, rarer, and clumsier words which make their language sound stilted and awkward" (Sinclair, 1991, p. 79).

Altenberg and Granger (2001) present a plausible explanation for these contradictory observations. They divide the instances of the verb *make* into eight categories by focusing on the

grammatical and lexical patterns of the verb and comparing the uses by Swedish learners, French-speaking learners, and NSs. Their results show that EFL learners, even at an advanced proficiency level, heavily rely on some uses of *make* such as *make* “to produce something” and causative *make* while they avoid other uses of the verb such as *make* “to earn money” and delexical *make*. The results confirm the two different observations, noting that learners’ use varies by grammatical and semantic categories.

Mochizuki (2007) and Suzuki (2014) confirm similar findings about essays written by JLs. Mochizuki (2007) reports that JLs overuse the verb *make*, especially idiomatic *make*, while they underuse other uses such as causative *make*, light verb *make*, and phrasal/prepositional *make*. Analyzing written essays extracted from the ICNALE-Written (Ishikawa, 2013), Suzuki (2014) examines JLs’ use of the verb *get* and confirms the complexity of its use in writing. JLs use the verb *get* significantly more frequently than NSs do in essays, and they especially overuse the *get*+Noun/NP construction. The high reliance on this construction is explained by the tendency that JLs produce atypical combinations such as *get+money/thing/friend*. On the other hand, JLs underuse other grammatical patterns including *get*+Adjective and *have got to*+Verb constructions.

Previous studies have discussed the use of high-frequency verbs mainly in written language, and their use in spoken language has not been fully analyzed. The present study examines JLs’ uses of the verb *get* in speech, as well as the differences in their use between speech and writing by comparing them with the results of Suzuki (2014).

3. Data and Method

3.1 Data

The data of JLs and NSs were extracted from the ICNALE-Spoken Monologue 2.0 (Ishikawa, 2014), a learner speech corpus. Focusing on Asian learners’ interlanguage, it contains controlled monologues from learners in 10 countries and areas in Asia including China, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan, and Thailand as well as the spoken data by NSs. Speaking conditions such as topic, time, and length are all controlled in the data collection. Participants are given two topics: “It is important for college students to have a part-time job” and “Smoking should be completely banned at all the restaurants in the country” and then asked to state whether they agree or disagree with the statements by providing reasons and specific details to support their answers. The length of the speech is set at 60 seconds, and all the participants are asked to talk about each topic twice and continue to speak until the time is up. The detailed task procedure is described in Appendix 1.

The numbers of words and speeches used for the present study are shown in Table 1. The JL data contains over 41,000 words produced by 150 JLs. The NS data contains around 94,000 words

produced by 150 NSs. As the table shows, the amount of speech production of the JLs is almost half that of NSs. According to Ishikawa (2014), JLs produce the least among 10 learner groups in the ICNALE-Spoken Monologue as well as in other spoken learner data.

Table 1 *Numbers of Words and Speeches in the ICNALE-Spoken Monologues*

	JLs	NSs
Number of words	41,737	94,168
Number of speeches	600	600

To compare the use between spoken and written language, the present study also uses the written data extracted from the ICNALE-Written (Ishikawa, 2013), the same data that Suzuki (2014) used. As in the case of the ICNALE-Spoken Monologues, the ICNALE-Written collects 200–300-word essays written by college students in the aforementioned 10 Asian countries and areas and those written by NSs. The numbers of words and essays are given in Table 2. The writing conditions are also strictly controlled. Participants write essays regarding the same two topics: college students having a part-time job (Topic A) and smoking in restaurants (Topic B). Detailed writing conditions are described in Appendix 2.

Table 2 *Numbers of Words and Essays in the ICNALE-Written*

	JLs	NSs
Number of words	179,042	90,613
Number of essays	800	400

Controlled conditions are effective for a reliable database for varied contrastive analyses, but it should be noted that the variation in word choice in the data tends to depend on the topics. For example, some words or phrases related to smoking or part-time jobs such as *smoke*, *college*, *student*, *job*, *work*, and *money* appear more frequently in the data, while other words unrelated to the topics do not.

JLs are grouped into four Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) levels according to their TOEIC or TOEFL test scores. The CEFR classifies language proficiency into six levels, A1 (Breakthrough), A2 (Waystage), B1 (Threshold), B2 (Vantage), C1 (Effective Operational Proficiency), and C2 (Mastery). To describe Asian learners' variety of L2 proficiency more properly, Ishikawa (2013) deletes the A1 level, merges B2, C1, and C2 into B2+ (Vantage or Higher), and subdivides B1 into B1_1 (Threshold lower) and B1_2 (Threshold upper). The proportions in proficiency levels in the present study are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 *Proportions of JLs at the Four Proficiency Levels (Number of Speeches and Essays)*

	A2	B1_1	B1_2	B2+
Spoken	20.0% (120)	31.3% (188)	28.7% (172)	20.0% (120)
Written	38.5% (308)	44.8% (358)	12.2% (98)	4.5% (36)

3.2 Procedures

The first step of the analysis is to extract and count all the instances of the verb *get* in the data through the use of the concordance program *AntConc 8.5.15* (Anthony, 2013). Overall frequencies were examined to determine whether JLs overused or underused the verb.

The verb *get* has multiple meanings and grammatical patterns. In the second step, every instance was categorized into eight groups according to their grammatical patterns based on the categories provided in Biber et al. (1999). Table 4 lists the coding categories and provides some examples found in the data for each category. With regard to *get+Noun/NP*, direct objects of the verb *get* often occur as combinations of an adjective and a noun. To capture a broader and clearer view of the uses of the verb, adjectives that modify nouns of direct objects are excluded from the analysis. For example, *get much money*, *get enough money*, and *get some money* are all counted as instances of the *get+Noun/NP* construction.

Table 4 *Major Uses of the Verb Get and Their Examples*

Category	Example
1) <i>get+Adverbial</i>	<i>get in school</i>
2) <i>get+Adjective</i>	<i>get sleepy, get happier</i>
3) <i>get+Noun/NP</i>	<i>get a part-time job, get enough sleep</i>
4) Ditransitive <i>get</i>	<i>get them a job</i>
5) Causative <i>get</i>	<i>get them ready, get them to quit smoking</i>
6) <i>have got to+Verb</i>	<i>have got to know the basics</i>
7) <i>get to+Verb</i>	<i>get to know the risk</i>
8) Phrasal/prepositional <i>get</i>	<i>get used to, get along with, get rid of, get by</i>

Finally, the frequency of each group was counted, and the differences between JLs' use and NS's use were examined. In addition, attention was paid to some atypical combinations in JL's data, and the reasons why they deviate from the NS's norms were explored. Frequency differences across the groups were tested by the chi-square test, with 5% ($p = .05$) as the critical level of significance. The chi-square test gives an approximation of the results of the exact test, and incorrect results could be

obtained from small-sized samples. Therefore, when the observed frequency was less than five, Fisher's exact test was used instead of the chi-square test.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Overall Frequency of the Verb *Get*

Table 5 shows the raw and normalized frequencies of the verb *get* in the spoken data. The chi-square test reveals no significant difference between the two groups, which indicates that JLs do not over- or under-use the verb *get* compared with NSs. This result is different from the case of written essays in that JLs significantly overuse the verb *get* compared to NSs in the written data. This can be explained by the fact that *get* is most common in conversation (Biber et al., 1999). Table 6 gives the results of the chi-square test for comparing the frequencies in the spoken and written data. NSs produce the verb *get* more frequently in the spoken data than in the written data ($\chi^2 = 4.70, p < .05$), whereas there is no such significant difference in JLs data. This result suggests that JLs do not change the use of the verb by the registers.

Table 5 *Raw and Normalized Frequencies of the Verb Get in the Spoken Data*

	JLs	NSs	χ^2	<i>p</i>
<i>get</i>	144	336	0.11	.74
normalized <i>get</i> (per 100,000 words)	345.0	356.8		

Table 6 *Frequencies of the Verb Get in the Spoken and Written Data*

	Spoken	Written	χ^2	<i>p</i>
JLs	144	714	2.53	.11
NSs	336	271	4.70	.03

4.2 Major Uses of the Verb *Get*

Table 7 shows the results of the chi-square and Fisher's exact tests regarding the eight coding categories. *Get+Noun/NP* construction is the most common in both datasets. This construction accounts for over 90% of JLs' use, suggesting that they heavily rely on this construction. Compared with NSs, JLs significantly overuse the verb in this construction ($\chi^2 = 22.38, p < .001$). It is reasonable to believe that JLs consider this construction to be a prototype for the use of the verb *get*. On the other hand, JLs significantly underuse some constructions including *get+Adjective*, causative *get*, and phrasal/prepositional *get*.

Table 7 Results of Chi-Square and Fisher's Exact Tests for Comparing the Frequencies of the Verb *Get* in JL and NS Speaking

Category	JLs	NSs	χ^2	<i>p</i>	Trend
1) <i>get</i> +Adverbial	0	9		.07	
2) <i>get</i> +Adjective	5	44	9.69	<.001	underuse
3) <i>get</i> +Noun/NP	131	172	22.38	<.001	overuse
4) Ditransitive <i>get</i>	0	5		.33	
5) Causative <i>get</i>	1	21		.005	underuse
6) <i>have got to</i> +Verb	0	4		.32	
7) <i>get to</i> +Verb	2	17		.08	
8) Phrasal/prepositional <i>get</i>	5	64	17.86	<.001	underuse
Frequency of <i>get</i>	144	336	0.27	.60	
Total number of words	41,737	94,168			

Regarding the same eight coding categories, the differences in the use of spoken and written language were also analyzed for each group, and two significant differences were confirmed. First, NSs produce the causative *get* construction significantly more frequently in speech than they do in written essays ($\chi^2 = 4.35$, $p < .05$). Second, JLs underuse the phrasal/prepositional *get* constructions in speech ($\chi^2 = 7.53$, $p < .01$). All the test results are given in Appendixes 3 and 4. In the following sections, the *get*+Noun/NP construction, the most common construction in JL speaking, is examined first, followed by an analysis of causative and phrasal/prepositional *get* constructions.

4.3 *Get*+Noun/NP Construction

As discussed in the previous section, JLs significantly overused the verb *get* in the *get*+Noun/NP construction. To identify verb and noun combinations that are typical of JLs, nouns used as direct objects of the verb *get* are investigated here. Table 8 lists 10 nouns that are commonly used, and Table 9 gives the results of chi-square and Fisher's exact tests on the two groups regarding the top-5 nouns in JL speaking. Many of the nouns are frequent in both data, but there are significant differences between JLs and NSs. JLs significantly overuse combinations of *get*+*money/experience*. Their overuse of *get*+Noun/NP construction can be explained by JLs' dependence on these two combinations. On the other hand, the most common combination among NSs, *get*+*job*, is significantly underused by JLs. Suzuki (2014) points out a similar trend of overuse of *get*+*money* and underuse of *get*+*job* in written essays. In other words, this finding also suggests that JLs do not change the uses of the verb depending on the registers.

Table 8 *Top 10 Direct Objects of the Verb Get and Their Frequencies*

Ranking		JLs		NSs
1	<i>money</i>	62	<i>job</i>	54
2	<i>experience</i>	16	<i>experience</i>	18
3	<i>job</i>	7	<i>money</i>	15
4	<i>smoke</i>	5	<i>grade</i>	8
5	<i>cancer</i>	4	<i>cancer</i>	6
6	<i>experiment</i> ²⁾	4	<i>smoke</i>	6
7	<i>skill</i>	4	<i>choice</i>	3
8	<i>thing</i>	4	<i>credit</i>	3
9	<i>harm</i>	3	<i>expense</i>	3
10	<i>illness</i>	3	<i>smoking</i>	3

Table 9 *Results of Chi-Square and Fisher's Exact Tests for Comparing the Frequencies of Get+Noun/NP Construction in JL and NS Speaking*

Combination	JLs	NSs	χ^2	<i>p</i>	Trend
<i>get+money</i>	62	15	89.83	<.001	overuse
<i>get+experience</i>	16	18	4.27	.04	overuse
<i>get+job</i>	7	54	10.61	.0011	underuse
<i>get+smoke</i>	5	6	1.12	.33	
<i>get+cancer</i>	4	6		.051	

Get+money/experience are grammatically correct and produced by some NSs in spoken language. The problem is that JLs use them excessively. Some examples of the combinations in the data are given in (1) and (2). As shown in (1a), (1b), and (2a), the combinations would give an awkward impression to listeners if they are repeated in successive sentences. *Get+money* could be better replaced with *make money* or *earn money*. A JL produces *get money* first and then rephrases it as *earn money* in (1c), suggesting that *get money* is an easier choice for learners who are aware of more conventional combinations.

- (1) Examples of *get+money* by JLs
- a. College cost us much money, so we need to **get money**. The way we **get money** is part-time job. (JPN_PTJ2_050_A2_0)¹⁾
 - b. I can't understand how difficult to **get money**. But after I **get money** myself, I use money

more carefully and I – I didn't stick with a bad person before take much – before I . . .
(JPN_PTJ1_061_B1_1)

- c. First, we can **get money** – earn money for after working part-time . . . (JPN_PTJ1_143_B1_1)

(2) Examples of *get+experience* by JLs

- a. If I have a part-time job we **get** a lot of money and **a lot of experience** that we often not – do not **get experience** in class in learning every day and . . . (JPN_PTJ1_101_A2_0)
- b. And they **get experience** to get the money by themselves. (JPN_PTJ1_090_B1_1)
- c. And second of all, they can **get lots of social experience** through the part-time job. (JPN_PTJ2_011_B2_0)

Focusing on the type frequency of *get+Noun/NP*, JLs produced 25, compared to 57 for NSs, indicating that JLs use the verb *get* in a very limited number of combinations compared to NSs. Interestingly, this result is the opposite of the behavior observed in writing. In written essays, JLs are more likely than NSs to produce *get+Noun/NP* in combination with a wide range of nouns (Suzuki, 2014). In speech, however, the combinations available to JLs are more limited than those available to NSs. This tendency indicates that the variation in expressions available to JLs varies between written and spoken language. In speaking, learners have little time to plan and organize their thoughts. JLs may thus cling to simple and familiar combinations.

4.4 Causative *Get* Construction

Only one instance of causative *get* construction is found in the data, as shown in (3), while 21 instances are found in the NSs' data. JLs significantly underuse this construction compared with NSs. However, it is important to note that there was no significant difference in the use of this construction in the written data (Suzuki, 2014). As stated in section 4.2, in contrast, NSs produce this use significantly more frequently in speech than they do in writing. Some examples produced by NSs are given in (4) below.

- (3) Part-time jobs **get us – to get money** and we can – we . . . (JPN_PTJ1_098_B1_1)

(4) Examples of causative *get* by NSs

- a. . . . they have to go to class and go to work and **get homework done** all within 24-hour time period. (ENS_PTJ2_126_XX_1)
- b. . . . they don't – aren't used to having to work to **get things accomplished** because they naturally **get things done** without much effort. (ENS_PTJ2_144_XX_1)
- c. So, yeah I think it's important for college and university students to have a job, **get them**

prepared for their job in the future . . . (ENS_PTJ1_005_XX_2)

Causative *get* can be divided into sub-categories by the complement following the object. Of the 21 instances of this use by NSs, 13 of the complements are in the past participle form. This suggests that the *get something done* (past participle) construction is more preferred in spoken language.

4.5 Phrasal/Prepositional *Get* Construction

JLs underuse the phrasal/prepositional *get*. As shown in (5), instances of this construction include the uses of *get up*, *get out*, and *get rid of*, which are probably among the first phrasal verbs with the verb *get* that JLs learn.

(5) Examples of phrasal/prepositional *get* by JLs

- a. . . . some students can't – can't ***get up*** in next morning so they can't attend . . . (JPN_PTJ2_028_B1_1)
- b. Firstly, it's necessary for them to ***get out*** money because they will spend out money buying food, books, or use money – using money to give (JPN_PTJ2_074_B1_2)
- c. But if we should ban tobacco, ban smoking completely the smokers can't ***get rid of*** stress. (JPN_SMK1_117_B1_2)

On the other hand, native speakers use more variety of expressions for the verb *get*. Some examples are listed in (6).

(6) Examples of phrasal/prepositional *get* by NSs

- a. They learn how to ***get along with*** people, whether they like the people or not, and . . . (ENS_PTJ1_059_XX_2)
- b. I want to enjoy the food that I'm tasting not having to have a taste of the cigarette smoke in my face all the time. It ***gets in – in the way*** of the enjoyment and my time out with my friends enjoying that wonderful time having a good meal together. (ENS_SMK1_034_XX_2)
- c. . . . it's really good that students should have some kind of part-time work before graduation because they help us to ***get used to*** the work life and scheduling ourselves and managing between working and studying. (ENS_PTJ2_072_XX_1)

What is interesting is that JLs use phrasal/prepositional *get* in written language to the same extent as NSs. For example, JLs produce *get along with*, *get used to*, *get accustomed to*, *get out of*, and *get through* in written essays. Their underuse of these expressions in spoken language can be explained

by the difference between the two registers, spoken and written language. Speech is spontaneous whereas writing is planned. Learners need to organize their thoughts, put them into words, and respond quickly when they speak. It is reasonable to assume that JLs are aware of expressions of this use but have trouble producing them in spontaneous speech.

5. Pedagogical Implications

The findings of the present study have some pedagogical implications. First, it is important to draw learners' attention to the wide variety of structures high-frequency verbs can have. As JLs tend to cling to simple and familiar patterns, leading to their overuse, explicit teaching of collocations can help them develop their productive knowledge about the words they know and increase their fluency. There are several approaches to achieving this goal. One approach is teaching verbs with their collocational patterns. Learning individual words and their meanings does not suffice to achieve fluency. Learning by collocational patterns or phrases allows learners to predict the next possible use of a word and to use pre-fixed expressions rather than putting words together one by one. It also gives learners more time to put their thoughts into words. This would be useful for learners especially in speech, where they need to respond quickly. Another approach is data-driven learning (DDL). DDL, the use of computer-generated concordances to get students to explore restrictions of patterns in the target language, could draw learners' attention to collocations inductively (Johns, 1991). For example, instructors can provide concordance lines of a high-frequency verb produced by JLs and NSs and ask learners to discuss how JLs and NSs use the verb differently. It would be even better if the productions conveying similar ideas could be displayed side-by-side. In the case of *get+money/experience*, the most frequent combinations JLs produce, the following collocations from the NSs' productions are available to JLs: *make/earn money*, *support oneself*, *have/gain experience*, *give someone experience*, *in one's experience*, and *give/provide real-world experience*. The ICNALE designates the same two topics, and it has the advantage of providing such examples.

Secondly, it is important to help learners understand the importance of collocations and registers. The results of the present study show that there is no significant difference in JLs' uses of the verb *get* in speech and writing. Although it is hard to decide whether this was due to a lack of knowledge about registers, it is clear that JLs need to use appropriate words according to register. Registers, differences in language formality, include not only spoken or written language but also newspaper English or business English. There are different collocations preferred by different registers. As learners become sensitive to the importance of collocations and registers, their style in speech and writing improves, and they can have a greater variety of ways to express their ideas.

6. Conclusion

Previous studies have reported that EFL learners have problems with high-frequency verbs (Altenberg & Granger, 2001; Mochizuki, 2007; Suzuki, 2014). The present study also confirms the complexity of the use of the verb *get* in JL speaking. JLs feel safe with some uses of the verb *get* and tend to overuse them, whereas they avoid other uses of *get*. To conclude, this study has identified the following in response to the research questions:

1. There is no significant difference in the overall frequency of the verb *get* between JLs and NSs.
2. JLs overuse the *get*+Noun/NP construction, and this use accounts for over 90% of JLs' use of *get*. The dependence can be attributed to their high reliance on the combinations of *get*+*money*/*experience*. On the other hand, they underuse the causative *get* and phrasal/prepositional *get* constructions.
3. NSs produce the verb *get* more frequently in spoken language, while JLs show no difference in the frequency of use by the registers. NSs use causative *get* more frequently in spoken language. In contrast, JLs use phrasal/prepositional *get* less frequently in spoken language.

High frequency verbs are often neglected, once they have been taught. This is unfortunate because the uses of these verbs are extremely complex and EFL learners are at risk of having deficient knowledge about how words work together. To help learners use high-frequently verbs more effectively, it is important for language teachers to focus their attention on the relationship between words that are often used together. Teaching how to find, record, and learn collocations would also be helpful for raising learners' awareness of collocations.

References

- Ajimer, K., Altenberg, B., & Johansson, M. (1996). Text-based contrastive studies in English. Presentation of a project. In K. Ajimer, B. Altenberg, and M. Johansson (Eds.), *Languages in contrast* (pp. 73–85). Lund: Lund University Press.
- 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.
- Anthony, L. (2013). AntConc (Version 3.3.5m) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from <http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/>
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, D., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004). *If you look at. . .*: Lexical bundles in university teaching and

- Uses of the Verb *Get* in Spoken English by Japanese Learners and Native Speakers: A Corpus-based Analysis textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(3), 371–405.
- Granger, S. (1996). Romance words in English: From history to pedagogy. In J. Svartvik (Ed.), *Words: Proceedings of an international symposium* (pp. 105–121). Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International.
- 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, 237–260.
- 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 Vol. 1*, (pp. 91–118). Kobe: 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 Vol. 2*, (pp. 63–76). Kobe: Kobe University.
- Johns, T. (1991). From printout to handout: grammar and vocabulary teaching in the context of data-driven learning. In T. Johns & P. King (Eds.), *Classroom Concordancing. English Language Research Journal*, 4, 27–45.
- Källkvist, M. (1999). *Form-class and task-type effects in learner English: A study of advanced Swedish learners*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Lennon, P. (1996). Getting “easy” verbs wrong at the advanced level. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 34, 23–36.
- Mochizuki, M. (2007). Nihonjin daigakusei no EFL gakushusha corpus ni mirareru make no shiyo. *Kansai Daigaku Gaikokugo Kyoiku Kenkyu*, 14, 31–45. [The uses of MAKE in EFL learner corpus of Japanese university students].
- Nesselhauf, N. (2004). Learner corpora and their potential for language teaching. In J. Sinclair (Ed.), *How to use corpora in language teaching* (pp. 125–152). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Suzuki, Y. (2014). The uses of *get* in Japanese learner and native speaker writing: A corpus-based analysis. *Komaba Journal of English Education*, 6. Tokyo, Japan: The University of Tokyo.
- Trask, R. (1993). *A dictionary of grammatical terms in linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Viberg, Å. (1996). Cross-linguistic lexicology: The case of English *go* and Swedish *gå*. In K. Aijmer, B. Altenberg & M. Johansson (Eds.), *Language in contrast* (pp. 151–182). Lund: Lund University Press.

Appendix 1: Task Procedure of the ICNALE-Spoken Monologue (Ishikawa, 2014)

1. Self-Introduction Task (60 seconds)
2. Preparation (20 seconds) + Task 1, Trial 1 (60 seconds)
3. Preparation (20 seconds) + Task 1, Trial 2 (60 seconds)
4. Preparation (20 seconds) + Task 2, Trial 2 (60 seconds)
5. Preparation (20 seconds) + Task 2, Trial 2 (60 seconds)
6. Self-evaluation (0 (Very bad) to 5 (Very good))

Appendix 2: Task Procedure of the ICNALE-Written (Ishikawa, 2013)

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Use reasons and details to support your opinion.

(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.

1. Clarify your opinions and show the reasons 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.

Appendix 3 Results of Chi-Square and Fisher's Exact Tests for Comparing NSs' Uses of the Verb *Get* in the Spoken and Written Data

Category	Spoken	Written	χ^2	<i>p</i>
1) <i>get</i> +Adverbial	9	3		.10
2) <i>get</i> +Adjective	44	43	0.01	.94
3) <i>get</i> +Noun/NP	172	152	0.59	.44
4) Ditransitive <i>get</i>	5	2	1.17	.28
5) Causative <i>get</i>	21	9	4.35	.04
6) <i>have got to</i> +Verb	4	7		.33
7) <i>get to</i> +Verb	17	9	2.16	.14
8) Phrasal/prepositional <i>get</i>	64	46	2.30	.13
Frequency of <i>get</i>	336	271	4.70	.03
Total number of words	94,168	90,613		

Appendix 4 Results of Chi-Square and Fisher's Exact Tests for Comparing JLS' Uses of the Verb *Get* in the Spoken and Written Data

Category	Spoken	Written	χ^2	<i>p</i>
1) <i>get</i> +Adverbial	0	2		.49
2) <i>get</i> +Adjective	5	48	3.10	.08
3) <i>get</i> +Noun/NP	131	563	0.00	.98
4) Ditransitive <i>get</i>	0	1		.63
5) Causative <i>get</i>	1	8		.55
6) <i>have got to</i> +Verb	0	1		.63
7) <i>get to</i> +Verb	2	16		.40
8) Phrasal/prepositional <i>get</i>	5	71	7.53	.006
Frequency of <i>get</i>	144	714	2.53	.11
Total number of words	41,737	179,042		

- 1) The coding system for the language examples is as follows: First Language_Topic(Trial 1 or 2)_Identifier_CEFR Proficiency Level. For example, "JPN_PTJ2_050_A2_0" indicates the second speech about part-time jobs by Japanese learner #050, whose CEFR proficiency level is A2. Regarding the section of CEFR proficiency levels, NSs are coded as one of the three groups: XX_1: College Students (including graduate students), XX_2: English Teachers, and XX_3: Others.
- 2) Some students seem to wrongly use the word *experiment* instead of *experience* in four instances. One of the examples is as follows:
 Second if we do the apartment job, we can ***get the social experiment***. This experiment is very good. (JPN_PTJ2_064_A2_0)