rEFLections
Vol 25, No.2, July – December 2018

Investigating the Outlines of Semantic Prosody in Thai

PORNTHIP SUPANFAI
Department of Western Languages and Linguistics,
Mahasarakham University, Mahasarakham, Thailand
Author e-mail: pornthip.su@msu.ac.th

Article information

Article History:
Received: July 17, 2018
Accepted: November 19, 2018
Available online:
December 29, 2018

Keywords:
Semantic prosody
Thai words
EUM-Oriented approach
Sinclairian concept of
the Extended Unit of Meaning

Abstract

To date, there have been relatively few studies of semantic prosody in languages other than English. This study primarily aims to implement the two major approaches to semantic prosody in the literature on the Thai language for the first time in order to set out the parameters for subsequent research in this area. Three Thai words were selected for analysis: /kreeŋcay/ 'considerate', /kɔ̀ɔhâykàət/ 'cause', and /chɔ̂ɔp/ 'like' (in the sense of enjoying (doing) something). Each word was investigated using two contrasting approaches: one oriented towards contrasting negative and positive polarity of evaluation and the other oriented around the Sinclairian concept of the Extended Unit of Meaning. The findings reveal that both approaches can be viable routes to examine the semantic prosody of the words under study, although they are useful for different purposes.

INTRODUCTION

Semantic prosody is considered an important concept in corpus linguistics (Bednarek, 2008; Whitsitt, 2005). Given that it is a relatively new concept, there is no consensus on its definition (Zhang, 2009). In fact, the term has been used and defined differently by scholars such as Louw (1993), Sinclair (2004), Stubbs (1995; 2001), and Partington (1998; 2004; 2014), whose accounts of semantic prosody are briefly discussed below.

Louw was the first to introduce the term semantic prosody to the public (Whitsitt, 2005). He defines semantic prosody as "a consistent aura of meaning with which a form is imbued by its collocates" (Louw, 1993, p. 159). This definition may be read as suggesting that Louw views semantic prosody as a phenomenon of semantic transfer, that is, the meaning of the collocates is transferred to the node, and the node carries this transferred meaning as its semantic prosody[1]. Louw primarily identifies the semantic prosody of a word from its collocates identified through concordance reading. Examining the semantic prosodies of *days are, utterly, bent on, and symptomatic of,* for example, Louw (1993) argues that these items display negative semantic prosody, because in each case most of the collocates are negative. Louw restricts semantic prosody to being positive or negative, and argues that there are more negative semantic prosodies than positive ones[2] (Louw, 1993). Later work has, however,

[1] This is an issue first highlighted by Whitsitt (2005).

[2] Louw (1993) originally categorises semantic prosody as 'good' and 'bad'/'negative'. However, as subsequent work has standardised on the terms positive and negative, I will use these latter two terms.

identified some positive semantic prosodies. Xiao and McEnery (2006), for example, find that bring about tends to co-occur with positive objects and thus conclude that the verb has a positive semantic prosody.

Sinclair's view of semantic prosody is closely associated with his proposal of a model of the extended unit of meaning (Steward, 2010). Sinclair (2004) argues for the notion that "a linguistic item can be extended, at least for English, so that units of meaning are expected to be largely phrasal" (p. 29-30). This reflects Sinclair's (2004) proposal of the idiom principle, under which words are likely to go together and "make meaning by their combinations" (p. 29). Particularly, Sinclair (2004) argues that under this model, a lexical item or a unit of meaning has five components, of which three are optional and two are obligatory. The optional components are collocation, colligation and semantic preference. The compulsory components are the core (i.e. the basic word or words of the unit) and the semantic prosody, where the latter expresses the pragmatic function of a unit. Examining the concordance for the idiom *naked eye,* for instance, Sinclair (2004) finds a consistent pattern on the left of the node, which can be summarised as follows:

see/visible	with/to	the	naked eye
N-3	**N-2**	**N-1**	**node**

Sinclair (2004) argues that the co-occurrence between *naked eye* and the article *the* is an example of colligation or "the co-occurrence of grammatical choices" (p. 32). Similarly, the prepositions *with* and *to* in N-2 are also argued to be colligates. *See* and *visible* in N-3 are argued to form an instance of collocation, which is the co-occurrence of lexical choices. However, even though *see* and *visible* dominate N-3, there also exist concordance lines where N-3 is occupied by other words, all of which are either verbs or adjectives, such as *detect, spot, apparent, undetectable* and *evident.* Sinclair adds that this very restriction (to verb or adjective at N-3) is also a form of colligation. Based on all of these collocates, Sinclair argues that *naked eye* has a semantic preference for *visibility.* Closely examining the left-hand-side context of N-3, Sinclair (2004) further argues that the idiom *naked eye* has one more important element – a semantic prosody of *difficulty with visibility.* This pragmatic meaning is not evident from any individual word of the unit, but rather is spread across the unit. For instance, in too *faint to be seen with the naked eye,* difficulty with visibility is not evident from any individual word of the unit but is rather expressed jointly by *faint* and *seen* (Sinclair, 2004).

Stubbs' study of semantic prosody can be divided into two stages. In an early work on semantic prosody, Stubbs (1995) closely associates semantic prosody with collocation, which he defines as "a relationship of habitual co-occurrence between words" (p. 1). Particularly, he suggests that a word's semantic prosody can be determined by its collocates and that quantitative methods should be adopted in identifying those collocates. For example, examining the lemma *cause,* Stubbs (1995) finds out that it habitually occurs in unpleasant environments. He thus concludes that, due to its predominantly unpleasant collocates, the lemma has a negative semantic prosody. I would argue that at this point, Stubbs' account of semantic prosody is close to Louw's; they both identify semantic prosody from collocates. Nevertheless, they identify collocates quite differently. Whereas Stubbs employs quantitative

measures to identify collocates, Louw examines each concordance line and manually identifies collocates.

Stubbs' account of semantic prosody in his later work seems to develop in another direction. Specifically, he develops Sinclair's proposal of the extended lexical unit and argues, following Sinclair, that the semantic prosody is a compulsory element of the unit. Nevertheless, Stubbs does not follow Sinclair in using the term semantic prosody to refer to the pragmatic and discourse function of an extended lexical unit. Instead he changes the terminology to *discourse prosody* (Stubbs, 2001). Stubbs examines the discourse prosodies of a number of words. One of these is the lemma *undergo.* Examining its concordance, Stubbs (2001) concludes that *undergo* has a simple and typical pattern: "people involuntarily undergo serious and unpleasant events, such as medical procedures" (p. 89). Stubbs further argues that the lemma displays two related discourse prosodies: "involuntary" and "unpleasant", which are either expressed by particular words or implied by the surrounding text. Thus, although Stubbs, at this point, adopts Sinclair's proposal of the extended lexical unit, I would argue that his method for identifying semantic prosody is different from Sinclair's but still close to Louw's. Whereas Stubbs primarily identifies semantic prosody from individual co-occurring words, Sinclair observes pragmatic functions expressed over an extended co-text, rather than by looking at particular individual words.

Partington's studies of semantic prosody can also be divided into two stages. In his early studies, Partington (1998) defines semantic prosody as an aspect of expressive connotation, that is, it expresses the speaker's evaluation of what he describes. Partington highlights the difference between expressive connotation and semantic prosody. Expressive connotation, Partington argues, is an in-built evaluation of a lexical item. For example, the use of *rightly* and *flabby* alone reveals the speaker's positive or negative attitudes towards what he describes (Partington, 2014, p. 132). Semantic prosody, on the other hand, "spread[s] over a unit of language which potentially goes well beyond the single orthographic word and is much less evident to the naked eye" (Partington, 2004, p. 131-132). That is, it resides in "the collocational patterns of items in a text" (Morley & Partington, 2009, p. 150). Observing the concordance for *commit,* for instance, Partington (1998) finds that this verb tends to co-occur with negative words such as *offences* and *crime.* From these findings, Partington argues that *commit* shows a negative connotation or semantic prosody, which resides in *commit* and its individual co-occurring items or collocates.

In his later studies, Partington (2014) changes the terminology for the concept to *evaluative prosody.* He argues that evaluative prosody can be seen as a lexical item's "inherent potential to participate in evaluative interaction with other items of similar polarity" (Partington, 2014, p. 283). For example, as Partington argues, due to its positive evaluative prosody (which results from its habitual co-occurrence with positive items), *brimming with* tends to be selected by a speaker who wishes to express that an entity is full of something positive, say *confidence* or *hope,* because the positive evaluative prosody of this phrasal verb has the same evaluative polarity as *confidence* and *hope.* Their combination, say *brimming with confidence,* thus forms consistent positive evaluation in the discourse. On the other hand, a speaker who wishes to express that an entity is full of something bad would be more likely to select *fraught with,*

given its negative evaluative prosody and therefore its potential to combine with other negative words to form consistent negative evaluation.

Despite the change in terminology, the underlying concept of evaluative prosody is not greatly changed from that of semantic prosody; arguably, Partington's move primarily serves to clarify his view of semantic prosody as an aspect of evaluation. As in Partington's work on semantic prosody under that name, evaluative prosody is primarily contingent upon individual co-occurring items, and it is restricted to being positive or negative.

From the brief overview above, we see that in general there are two prevailing approaches to the study of semantic prosody. The first approach is represented by the studies of Louw, Stubbs, and Partington. Within this approach, semantic prosody is primarily identified from individual co-occurring words or collocates, and it is restricted to the positive vs. negative opposition. The second approach is represented by the work of Sinclair. Within this approach, semantic prosody is identified from pragmatic meanings that are expressed over an extended co-text. It is not confined to the positive vs. negative opposition, but can be any pragmatic function or meaning. In this study, I label Louw, Stubbs, and Partington's approach the polarity-oriented approach. Likewise, I label Sinclair's approach the EUM-oriented approach, where *EUM* stands for extended unit of meaning.

METHODOLOGY

Most existing studies on semantic prosody have explored semantic prosody in English. The relatively few studies on semantic prosody in other languages seem in large part to be contrastive studies between those languages and English. Some of these contrastive studies are Wei and Li (2013) and Xiao and McEnery (2006) who investigate the semantic prosodies of translation equivalents across English and Chinese and Munday (2013) who studies the semantic prosodies of the lemma loom large and its Spanish correspondent cernerse. The present study aims to advance this field of research; it aims to utilise the two primary approaches to semantic prosody in the literature to investigate semantic prosody in Thai, a language which has not been subject to studies of semantic prosody before, to set out the parameters for subsequent research in this area. Particularly, it aims to address the following question:

> What are the advantages and disadvantages of the major approaches to semantic prosody proposed in the literature for describing semantic prosody in Thai?

The data used in this analysis was the Thai National Corpus (TNC), which is a corpus of present-day standard Thai (Aroonmanakun, 2007). The TNC is designed to be comparable to the British National Corpus (BNC), although at present only written texts are included. The criteria for text selection are similar to those of the BNC in terms of domain and medium (Aroonmanakun, 2007). In terms of domain, the TNC aims to have 75% informative texts and 25% imaginative. In terms of medium, the TNC plans to have 60% of its texts from books, 20% from journals and newspapers, 5-10% from other published works such as brochures and

leaflets, 5-10% from unpublished works (namely letters and notes), and about 5% from texts on the Internet. Since the corpus aims to represent present-day standard Thai, its creators plan to sample 90% of the texts from the period 1998 to 2007 and only 10% from the period prior to 1997. Table 1, adapted from Aroonmanakun (2007), summarises the weights of domain, medium, and time in the TNC.

Table 1
Summary of weights of domain, medium, and time in the TNC
(after Aroonmanukun 2007, p. 7)

Domain	Weight	Medium	Weight
Imaginative	25%	Books	60%
Informative	75%	Periodicals	20%
Applied science		Published miscellanea	5-10%
Arts		Unpublished miscellanea	5-10%
Belief and thought		Internet	5%
Commerce and finance			
Leisure		**Time**	**Weight**
Natural and pure science		1998-2007	90-100%
Social science		1988-1997	0-10%
World affairs		Before 1988	0-5%

The TNC is designed to consist of at least 80 million words (Aroonmanakun, 2007). However, at present only approximately 33 million words have been added to the TNC (Thai National Corpus, n.d.). In this study, the TNC was accessed via CQPweb, a web-based corpus analysis system (Hardie, 2012).

Three Thai words were selected for the analysis. They were /kreeŋcay/ 'considerate', /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ 'cause', and /chɔ̂ɔp/ 'like' (in the sense of enjoying (doing) something). These words were selected for different reasons. The word /kreeŋcay/ is interesting because there seems to be no word in English that has exactly the same meaning. Although it is a verb in Thai, most of the possible English translations are adjectives. The closest translation-equivalent is probably 'considerate' or 'reluctant,' as in 'reluctant to impose on a person'. Also, as a native speaker of Thai, I find it difficult to explain the concept expressed by the word /kreeŋcay/ to westerners, as it is culture-bound. /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ is a translation-equivalent of English cause, which has been established to display a negative semantic prosody (Stubbs, 1995); it will thus be interesting to see if /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ also has a negative semantic prosody. Finally, my impression as a speaker of Thai is that /chɔ̂ɔp/ is normally used in a negative context, and it is interesting to see whether such a tendency to occur in unfavourable environments is evident in, or contradicted by, the corpus data.

Each word was examined using the polarity-oriented approach (Louw, Stubbs, and Partington's approach) and the EUM-oriented approach (Sinclair's approach). To apply Louw, Stubbs, and Partington's approach to semantic prosody, I mainly looked at the statistical collocates of the selected words. Within this approach, the whole corpus data was used. I chose to look at

the collocates within a span of four preceding and four following words around the node as suggested by Sinclair, Jones, Daley and Krishnamurthy (2004). The statistical measure of collocational strength used was Log Ratio (Hardie forthcoming). Log Ratio, Hardie argues, is a better statistic for keywords than log-likelihood. It is an "effect-size" statistic and "represents how big the difference between two corpora is for a particular keyword" (Hardie forthcoming). The Log Ratio statistic can also be used for collocation (Hardie forthcoming). In this case, the Log Ratio score of a collocate represents how much more frequent the collocate is near the node than elsewhere. For example, a collocate with a Log Ratio score of 1 occurs near the node twice as frequently as it occurs elsewhere, and "every extra point in Log Ratio score represents a doubling in size of the difference between the collocate's frequency near the node and its frequency elsewhere" (Hardie forthcoming). For this analysis, only items with a Log Ratio score of 3 or more that occur in at least five different texts were considered as collocates of a given node. That is, only items that occur at least eight times more frequently near the node than elsewhere, and that co-occur with the node in at least five different texts, were considered collocates. I chose a Log Ratio score of 3 as a cut-off point, because Log Ratio is very similar to the Mutual Information statistic[3] , and Hunston (2002) suggests that items with an MI-score of three or more can be considered to be significant.

Under this approach, semantic prosody is restricted to being positive or negative (or neutral). To identify the semantic prosody, I classified the statistical collocates identified into positive, negative, and neutral. (In presenting results, I will underline collocates with a positive meaning, and present collocates with a negative meaning in bold. Collocates with a neutral meaning will be left unhighlighted.) As criteria for what makes a positive or negative semantic prosody are, to the best of my knowledge, not explicitly stated by any scholars investigating semantic prosody in the literature, I created my own rule of thumb. I considered whether there were more positive collocates or more negative collocates. Only when the difference in the proportion between positive collocates and negative collocates was at least threefold did I argue that a word has a clear positive or negative semantic prosody. In cases where the difference was less than threefold, I argued that the word does not have either a positive or a negative semantic prosody. However, if 70% or more of the collocates were neutral, the word was argued to not to have any clear positive or negative prosody, even if the difference in the proportion between positive and negative collocates was threefold or more. In such cases with no clear positive or negative semantic prosody, I referred to the word as having a neutral semantic prosody.

To investigate Sinclair's approach to semantic prosody, I examined 200 randomly-selected concordance lines for each of the selected words. I identified the major patterns around these words according to Sinclair's model of the extended unit of meaning, looking for colligation, collocation, semantic preference, and semantic prosody. Under this approach, a semantic prosody can be any pragmatic function or meaning. I will present each proposed extended unit of meaning in a one-line format, using the notations in Table 2.

[3] Log Ratio on its own is very similar to the Mutual Information statistic; they are both effect-size statistics. However, I opted for Log Ratio rather than the Mutual Information statistic because CQPweb combines "Log Ratio with a statistical-significant filter. The collocate list is sorted by Log Ratio but filtered using Log-Likelihood" (Hardie, n.d.).

Table 2
Notations for extended units of meaning

Notation	Meaning
Bold font	Lexical core of an extended unit of meaning.
(...)	Items in round brackets are optional.
[...]	Square brackets contain an explanation of what is found in this position (grammatical/semantic restriction).
Column	Items in a column are alternatives in the given position.
|	Sentence break.

Using these notations, for example, Sinclair's extended unit of meaning whose core is *naked eye* would be represented as follows:

[some pragmatic expression of difficulty]	[verb/adjective expressing visibility]	with	the	**naked eye**
		to		

FINDINGS

1. The Polarity-Oriented Approach

a. /kreeŋcay/ 'considerate'

There are 1,009 instances of /kreeŋcay/ in the corpus. The collocates of the word in order of Log Ratio score are:

> /khîi/ (grammatical particle), /kreeŋ/ 'fear', /róopkuan/ 'bother', /caŋ/ 'quite', /khaw-róop/ 'respect', /klâa/ 'brave', /klua/ 'afraid', /náamsĭaŋ/ 'tone', /penray/ (part of /mây penray/ 'Don't worry'), /tâataaŋ/ 'gesture', /rúusùk/ 'feel', /rɔ̀ɔk/ (pragmatic particle), /kəənpay/ 'too much', /ʔəəy/ 'utter', /phôɔmêɛ/ 'parents', /phûuyày/ 'adults'

Of the 16 collocates of /kreeŋcay/ that meet the criteria, 5 appear to have a negative meaning. There are two positive collocates and nine neutral collocates. It might thus be concluded that /kreeŋcay/ does not have either a positive or a negative semantic prosody. That is, it shows a neutral semantic prosody.

b. /kɔ̀ɔhâykə̀ət/ 'cause'

There are 4,685 instances of /kɔ̀ɔhâykə̀ət/ in the corpus. The collocates of the word ranked by Log Ratio score are:

> /rákhaaykhuaŋ/ 'irritate' /phŏnsĭa/ 'negative effect' /khwaamsĭahăay/ 'damage' / pháyantàraay/ 'danger' /monphaawá/ 'contamination' /phŏnráay/ 'negative effect' / dùatrɔ̀ɔn/ 'in trouble' /monphít/ 'pollution' /pànpùan/ 'frantic' /tɛ̀ɛkyêɛk/ 'disunited' /

yàylŭaŋ/ 'enormously' /sàthʉancay/ 'emotionally hurt' /phŏnkràtóp/ 'effect' /tuŋkhrîat/ 'serious' /lamʔiaŋ/ 'bias' /ʔantàraay/ 'danger' /wítòkkaŋwon/ 'worried' /ramkhaan/ 'annoyed' /khlûanwăy/ 'move' /phŏnláp/ 'result' /sʉamsoom/ 'deteriorate' /sùamsĭa/ 'tarnished' /yûŋyâak/ 'complicated' /sàpsŏn/ 'confused' /sĭahăay/ 'damaged' /ráayrɛɛŋ/ 'serious' /khwaamkhrîat/ 'stress' /câaŋŋaan/ 'employ' /khûusănyaa/ 'party' /lùam/ 'unequal' /khwaamkhàtyɛ́ɛŋ/ 'conflict' /rôokmáreŋ/ 'cancer' /lúklaam/ 'spread (of disease)' /wûnwaay/ 'in confusion' /máreŋ/ 'cancer' /nîi/ 'debt' /wípâakwícaan/ 'criticise' /rɛɛŋkòtdan/ 'pressure' /sìŋwêɛtlɔ́ɔm/ 'environment' /wítòk/ 'worried' /khwaamkhlûanwăy/ 'movement' /ʔànaamay/ 'hygiene' /sĭaprìap/ 'disadvantageous' /phlâətphləən/ 'enjoy' /plìanplɛɛŋ/ 'change' /kɛ̀ɛ/ 'for' /săntì/ 'peace' /sàthĭanráphâap/ 'stability' /phŏn/ 'result' /panhăa/ 'problem' /ʔàatyaakam/ 'crime' /pràyòot/ 'benefit' /wɛ̂ɛtlɔ́ɔm/ 'surround' /phanthúkam/ 'heredity' /dâyprìap/ 'advantageous' /sàmə̆əphâak/ 'equal' /thòkthĭaŋ/ 'dispute' /nítìkam/ 'juristic act' /sămphantháphâap/ 'relationship' /yɔ̂ɔm/ 'naturally' /wâaŋŋaan/ 'unemployed' /khàatkhlɛɛn/ 'lack' /sŭunsĭa/ 'lose' /raaydây/ 'income' /pàtìkìríyaa/ 'reaction' /rópkuan/ 'bother' /sŏmdun/ 'balance' /ʔùppàsàk/ 'obstacle' /phùukphan/ 'bond' /pràthêetchâat/ 'nation' /khwaamklua/ 'fear'

It is clear from the predominance of negative collocates that /kɔ̀ɔhâykə̀ət/ has a tendency to occur in semantically negative contexts. Of the 71 collocates, 44 have a negative meaning. There are 17 neutral and 10 positive collocates.

It can thus be concluded that like English cause, /kɔ̀ɔhâykə̀ət/ has an overall negative semantic prosody. However, the fact that it has a strong tendency towards co-occurrence with negatively evaluated items does not prevent it from appearing in neutral or even positive environments, albeit less often.

c. /chɔ̂ɔp/ 'like'

/chɔ̂ɔp/ appears 20,942 times in the corpus. Its collocates ranked by Log Ratio score are:

/chɔ́ɔp/ 'like (emphatic reduplication)' /sămmaasàtì/ 'mindfulness' /sămmaasàmaathí/ 'right concentration' /khĭinâa/ 'face' /taamcay/ (part of /taam cay chɔ̂ɔp/ 'as you please') /sɔ̀ɔtrúusɔ̀ɔthĕn/ 'snoop' /sŭŋsĭŋ/ 'keep company with' /phaatphŏon/ 'adventurous' /trèe/ 'hang around' /chít/ (person's name) /waaŋthâa/ 'act big' /cùkcìk/ 'fussy' /khlùk/ 'absorbed in' /chaŋ/ 'hate' /phet/ 'spicy' /pràphrʉ́t/ 'behave' /pûanpîan/ 'loiter' /cíap/ (person's name) /yèɛ/ 'tease' /damrì/ 'think' /thútcàrìt/ 'corrupt' /yĭŋ/ 'woman' /tʉ́ʉ/ 'pester' /heehaa/ 'enjoy oneself' /cûucĭi/ 'fussy' /chóktɔ̀ɔy/ 'have a fight' /laaŋ/ (part of an idiom 'one man's meat is another man's poison') /piinpàay/ 'climb' /súkson/ 'naughty' /líaŋchĭip/ 'make a living' /búu/ 'action' /nísăy/ 'characteristic' /ʔôoʔùat/ 'boast' /keeree/ 'mischievous' /mí/ 'no' /ʔùppànísăy/ 'characteristic' /klaaŋcêɛŋ/ 'outdoors' /tɛ̀ɛŋtua/ 'get dressed' /khúkkĭi/ 'cookie' /tûmhŭu/ 'earring' /ʔàdìrèek/ 'hobby' /pràcòp/ 'flatter' /kèptua/ 'introvert' /nʉ́ʉphleeŋ/ 'lyric' /yúy/ (person's name) /hăarûʉŋ/ 'pick a quarrel with' /thamtua/ 'act' /phlɛ̌ɛŋ/ 'peculiar' /rûʉypùʉy/ 'aimlessly' /lâap/ (Thai dish) /ʔawprìap/ 'take advantage of' /mâykhɔ̂ɔy/ 'not quite' /câwchúu/ 'flirty' /raŋkɛɛ/ 'bully' /phàconphay/ 'take adventure' /ninthaa/ 'gossip' /khwaamchɔ̂ɔp/ 'liking'

/chôɔpcay/ ‘pleased’ /khǒɔŋwǎan/ ‘dessert’ /sôn/ ‘heel’ /prîaw/ ‘sour’ /chɔ́ɔp/ ‘shop’ / sǎŋsǎn/ ‘socialise’ /sàtaay/ ‘style’

Of the 64 collocates, 26 have a negative meaning. It is interesting that many of these negative collocates are verbs. Thus, it might be said that /chôɔp/ has a negative semantic prosody, which is especially strongly expressed by verbal collocates.

2. The EUM-Oriented Approach

a. /kreeŋcay/ ‘considerate’

Of the 200 concordance lines, 196 were suitable for analysis: two instances were repetitions [4], and in two instances, /kreeŋcay/ was being referred to as a word. Overall three consistent patterns emerged. The first pattern is presented below.

/cà/ [verb] ([object/adverb]) (/tὲɛ/) /kô kreeŋcay/ ([person])
/yàak/
/yàak cà/

This pattern arguably forms an extended unit of meaning with /kô kreeŋcay/ as its core. /cà/ is a challengebility marker; /yàak/ and /yàak cà/ both mean ‘want to’. Between the verb and /kô kreeŋcay/, there may be an object or an adverb, depending on the nature of the verb, which may in turn be followed by /tὲɛ/, a counjunction meaning ‘but’. Overall the unit expresses the semantic prosody of ‘refraining from performing an action due to consideration for other(s)’. This meaning cannot be derived from any individual word in the sequence; there are no individual words that mean ‘refraining from’ or that show negation. Rather, it is spread across the whole sequence and is a pragmatic interpretation, as shown in Example 1[5] .

Example 1

yàak	cà	chuan	khǎw	pay	thŭu	lăŋ	dûay
want	CM	invite	3SG	go	scrub	back	with
tὲɛ	kô	kreeŋcay					
	but	LP	considerate				

‘(I) want to invite him to go and scrub our backs together, but I feel considerate so I won’t.’

[4] These repetitions result from erroneous double-inclusion of a text in the TNC.
[5] The abbreviations used in line 2 of Thai examples are listed in Appendix 1.

The second pattern has the modal auxiliary /tôɔŋ/ 'must/have to' in the first position to the left of the node /kreeŋcay/. /tôɔŋ kreeŋcay/ is in turn preceded by the negator /mây/. /mây tôɔŋ kreeŋcay/ means literally 'do not have to be considerate'. The sequence functions as an imperative, in which case a better translation would be 'don't worry, it's no trouble'. These imperatives always refer implicitly to an imposition expressed in a preceding sentence. /mây tôɔŋ kreeŋcay/ may in turn be followed by one of the pragmatic particles /ná/ and /rɔ̀ɔk/. /ná/, when used with imperatives, requests or encourages compliance, whereas /rɔ̀ɔk/ "is used to counter argue or correct an assumption that an addressee has" (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005, p. 190, 195, 201).

Example 2

thâa	klaaŋkh~~uu~~n		d~~ù~~kd~~ù~~un	păa	kàət	pen	ʔàray
if	night		late	dad	happen	COP	REL
thoo	rîak	ʔôɔ		dây	ləəy	ná	
ring	call	Or		POT	PP	PP	
mây	tôɔŋ	kreeŋcay					
NEG	must	considerate					

'If at night something happens to you, Dad, feel free to ring me. Don't worry, it's no trouble.'

In the above example, the expression /mây tôɔŋ kreeŋcay/ is bound up with the previous sentence, in which the fictive speaker encourages the interlocutor to feel free to ring her. It functions to reassure the interlocutor that the action of ringing the speaker would not be an imposition.

From that observation, it might be argued that /mây tôɔŋ kreeŋcay/ is the core of the following extended unit of meaning:

[imposition of hearer on speaker] | /mây tôɔŋ kreeŋcay/ (/ná/) (/rɔ̀ɔk/)

This extended unit of meaning occurs six times. In all the six instances, the unit of meaning stretches into the previous sentence and encourages the interlocutor to perform an action or accept an offer. This action or offer is normally an imposition on the speaker. By saying /mây tôɔŋ kreeŋcay/, the speaker attempts to remove the imposition implied in the previous sentence, reassuring the interlocutor that it will not be a bother. Thus, this extended unit of meaning has the pragmatic function of 'reduction of imposition' – which is thus its semantic prosody.

The final pattern has the negator /mây/ immediately to the left of /kreeŋcay/. /mây kreeŋcay/ means 'without consideration (for)/inconsiderately'. The position immediately to the left of the expression is dominated by /yàaŋ/, /bɛ̀ɛp/ and /dooy/, which are grammatical particles that create an adverbial clause. There are 17 instances of this pattern altogether. In all these instances, /yàaŋ/, /bɛ̀ɛp/, or /dooy/ followed by /mây kreeŋcay/ modifies the verb of the

containing clause. Many of the verbs in question refer to unpleasant actions, such as /hŭarɔ́ sámtəəm/ 'laugh insultingly', /tàkoon hɛɛkpàak/ 'yell out', /thĭaŋ hŭa chon făa/ 'wrangle', and /sùup phôn khwan pŭy pŭy / 'puff out smoke', as shown in Example 3.

Example 3

khon	lên	kiitâa	tàkoon	hɛ̀ɛkpàak	
person	play	guitar	shout	yell	
sĭaŋ	daŋ	yàaŋ	mây	kreeŋcay	khray
sound	loud	AZP	NEG	considerate	REL

'The man who played the guitar inconsiderately yelled out.'

There are a few neutral or even positive verbs in this context, such as /lóm tua loŋ nɔɔn/ 'lie down' and /yím khwâaŋ thŭŋ bayhŭu/ 'grin from ear to ear'. However, in context these refer to actions unpleasant to another party, as can be seen from Example 4.

Example 4

pêe	yím	khwâaŋ	thŭŋ	bayhŭu		yàaŋ	mây	
Pay	grin	broad		till	ear		AZP	NEG
kreeŋcay		khon	nâa	pen	tùut	thîi	nâŋ	yùu
considerate		person	face	COP	ass	SBR	sit	ASP
khâaŋ	khâaŋ							
next.to	next.to							

'Pay grinned from ear to ear, without consideration for the person sitting next to him who was frowning.'

Within this context, it might be said that /mây kreeŋcay/ is the core of the following extended unit of meaning:

[action inconsiderate to another]	/yàaŋ/ /bɛ̀ɛp/ /dooy/	/mây kreeŋcay/	([person])

This unit of meaning could thus be argued to have a semantic prosody expressing 'disapproval of behaviour'. That is, use of the unit is motivated by the speaker's wish to express disapproval of an action, encoded by the verb of the containing clause, which they deem inconsiderate.

We have seen from the above analyses that /kreeŋcay/ is part of the core of (at least) three different extended units of meaning. Across the 196 instances, three patterns emerged, as summarised in Table 3.

Table 3
Frequency of occurrence of each extended unit of meaning containing /kreeŋcay/

Extended units of meaning	Frequency of occurrence
/cà/ [verb] ([object/adverb]) (/tɛ̀ɛ/) **/kô kreeŋcay/** ([person]) /yàak/ /yàak cà/	6
[imposition of hearer on speaker] | **/mây tôɔŋ kreeŋcay/** (/ná/) (/rɔ̀ɔk/)	6
[action inconsiderate to another] /yàaŋ/ **/mây kreeŋcay/** ([person]) /bɛ̀ɛp/ /dooy/	17

In the remaining 167 instances, I found that /kreeŋcay/ is used as a straightforward verb meaning '(to) be considerate', and does not form part of any discernible fixed pattern. However, as a transitive verb of cognition, it does have the colligations and semantic preferences one would expect of a verb of this type. For example, it colligates with a subject and an object, which in turn have a semantic preference to be human. /kreeŋcay/ also has the colligations that are generally characteristic of any kind of verb. For instance, it also colligates with /khwaam/ to create a noun, /khîi/ to create an adjective, and /yàaŋ/ to create an adverbial clause, these being grammatical particles which with any Thai verb may co-occur.

b. /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ 'cause'

Of the 200 concordance lines, 190 concordance lines were suitable for analysis. Of these 190 instances, my observation of the right contexts reveals as many as 188 instances where /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ is used as the verb of a clause and is (immediately) followed by a noun. The fact that /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ is mostly followed by a noun does not come as a surprise, considering the fact that /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ is a transitive verb and thus would be expected to have an object after it. Interestingly, 174 of these nouns refer to abstract concepts. 74 of these abstract nouns are formed by the nominalising particles /kaan/ and /khwaam/, such as /kaan plìanplɛɛŋ/ 'change', /kaan phátthánaa/ 'development', /khwaam lamʔiaŋ/ 'bias', and /khwaamkhàtyɛ́ɛŋ/ 'conflict'.

In terms of semantics, of the 188 noun tokens that follow /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/, 107 can be considered negative. The three most frequently co-occurring negative nouns are /panhăa/ 'problem', /khwaamsĭahăay/ 'damage', and /ʔantàraay/ 'danger', with 14, 12, and 8 examples respectively. 46 other noun tokens are positive. /pràyòot/ 'benefit' is the most frequent positive noun (8 times). There are 35 instances where the noun after /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ is neutral in meaning.

Some of these object nouns can be categorised into more specific semantic categories such as health (/rôok/ 'disease' (3[6]), and /máreŋ/ 'cancer'), difficulty (/panhăa/ 'problem' (14), and /ʔùpàsàk/ 'obstacle'), and danger (/ʔantàraay/ 'danger' (8), and /phay/ 'hazard' (3)). Examples 5 shows the use of /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ in context.

[6] Brackets show numbers of occurrences greater than one.

Example 5

mɯ̂a	khun	kròot	khwaamrúusɯ̀k		thîi	mák	cà
when	3SG	angry	feeling		SBR	often	CM
kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt		panhăa	kô	khuu	khwaam		kròot
cause		problem	LP	COP	NMLZ		angry

'When you are angry, the feeling that often causes you a problem is anger.'

Examining the left contexts, I found that many of the subjects of /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ are abstract nouns, many of which are, again, formed by the grammatical particles /kaan/ or /khwaam/, such as /kaan namkhâw/ 'import' and /khwaamrúusùk/ 'feeling'. There are also cases where the subject is a pronoun making general reference to the preceding clause(s). However, this pronoun is omitted, leaving only the preceding verb clause(s). These two types of subjects are linked, because they both involve a subject whose reference is the general situation under discussion. There are also a few concrete noun subjects, such as /sĭaŋ/ 'sound' and /yaa/ 'medication'.

We have thus seen that /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ has a semantic preference for abstractness. It also has a colligation for nouns, especially those beginning with two particular grammatical particles (nominalizers). These requirements apply to both the subject and the object of /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/. Since the grammatical particles which /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ attracts are abstract noun-forming particles, we can say that the semantic preference and the colligation are linked here. Despite these associations, I would argue that the pattern in which /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ is regularly used, that is, an abstract noun subject followed by /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ followed by an abstract noun object, is not an extended unit of meaning in Sinclair's sense. Rather, /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ is used as a unit of meaning on its own in these examples. Its requirements for a subject and an object noun colligation are just the general requirements one would expect of any transitive verb, although in this case the object nouns tend to be (negative) abstract concepts. More importantly, this pattern does not have a clear pragmatic function that is distinct from its literal meaning. Thus, the single-word unit of meaning has colligations and semantic preferences, but not a semantic prosody beyond its base meaning.

c. /chɔ̂ɔp/ 'like'

Of the 200 instances, 184 were suitable for analysis. Of the rest, /chɔ̂ɔp/ is a person's name in two; in 11, /chɔ̂ɔp/ means 'righteous' (a homophone); in one, /chɔ̂ɔp/ is part of a proverb; and in two instances, /chɔ̂ɔp/ is part of a compound noun.

More than half of the words immediately to the right of the node are nouns or verbs. There are 55 noun tokens and 66 verb tokens. Table 4 illustrates distribution of the co-occurring noun and verb tokens across meaning categories.

Table 4
Distribution of co-occurring noun and verb tokens across meaning categories

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Total
Pattern with noun complement	9	8	38	55
Pattern with verb complement	2	27	37	66

From this distribution, it might be said that when /chɔ̂p/ is followed by a noun, it does not have a tendency to co-occur with a positive or negative word in particular. There is little difference in proportion between the positive and negative nouns, although the majority are neutral. However, this does not seem to be the case when /chɔ̂p/ is followed by a verb (to create a serial verb structure). There are 27 instances where /chɔ̂p/ is followed by a negative verb, but only 2 where the verb is positive. The negative verbs include /bìatbian/ 'take advantage of', /klɛ̂ɛŋ/ 'tease', /khùu/ 'threaten', /wícaan/ 'criticise', and /pân ra̰aŋ/ 'make up stories'. Example 6 exemplifies these verbs in context.

Example 6

thɔɔŋ	sàay	nâa	bɔ̀ɔk	wâa	phûuyĭŋ	phan	níi
Tong	shake	face	tell	COMP	woman	kind	DEM
chɔ̂p	pân	ra̰aŋ	hây	tuaʔeeŋ	lṵkláp	nâa	kónhăa
like	make	story	CAUS	REFL	mysterious	PFX	earch

'Tong shook her head, saying that this kind of women likes to make up stories to make themselves intriguing.'

Looking at the left contexts of the 121 instances where /chɔ̂p/ is followed by a verb or a noun complement, I found that the majority of subjects of /chɔ̂p/ are human beings.

Thus, we see that /chɔ̂p/ frequently appears in the pattern of a subject plus /chɔ̂p/ plus a noun or a verb complement. However, I would argue that when /chɔ̂p/ is followed by a noun complement, it is used as a single-word unit of meaning – that is, as a straightforward verb meaning 'like'. The overall sequence of /chɔ̂p/ plus a noun complement does not have a clear pragmatic meaning beyond the literal meaning of 'someone liking a thing'. The /chɔ̂p/ unit of meaning is, however, a transitive verb of cognition, and therefore has requirements for its (nominal) complement and for its subject, which has to be a human being or at least a conscious being, these being the general colligation and semantic preference characteristics of a verb of this type.

However, arguably /chɔ̂p/ forms part of an extended unit of meaning in Sinclair's sense when it is followed by a verb, as follows:

[person] /chɔ̂p/ (/thîi cà/) [verb] ([object/adverb])

Here, /chôɔp/ is the core of the extended unit of meaning. This unit colligates with a verb complement. Unlike the pattern where /chôɔp/ is followed by a noun complement, this extended unit has a pragmatic meaning beyond its literal meaning of 'someone liking something'. In all the examples, the reference is to a habit of the clause subject. This unit of meaning is frequently associated with bad habits or neutrally-evaluated habits, and only rarely associated with good habits. This reference to a habit is very rarely, if ever, present in the pattern where /chôɔp/ is followed by a noun complement. For instance, a bad habit is attributed to the clause subject in Example 6: the habit of making up stories. This is thus the unit's semantic prosody, since the meaning of habit is not implied individually by either /chôɔp/ or the verb that follows it. We can see, for instance, that "likes to make up stories" does not directly imply that this is a (bad) habit, in the sense of a recurring behaviour, but in Thai, this meaning is present. This pragmatic meaning is spread across the unit.

Of the other 61 instances, there are four instances where /chôɔp/ is followed by a clause preceded by the causative marker /hây/, which literally means 'give'. This sequence forms a causative serialisation that consists of a causing and a resulting situation (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005, p. 239), as shown in Example 7.

Example 7

ran	tôɔŋ	phâəm		náamnàk	lɛ́ɛw	ná
Run	must	increase		weight	ASP	PP
ʔǐŋ	chôɔp	hây	ran	kɛ̂ɛm	yúy	yúy
Ing	like	CAUS	Run	cheek	chubby	chubby

'Run, you must increase your weight. I want you to have chubby cheeks.'

It is arguable that /chôɔp hây/ is the core of an extended unit of meaning with the pragmatic function of expressing a desire for someone to do something. In Example 7, the speaker's desire for Run to have chubby cheeks is expressed across the whole unit rather than by any individual word of the unit. This extended unit of meaning can be laid out as follows:

[person] /chôɔp hây/ [another person] [verb] [(object/adverb])

Of the remaining 57 instances, there are five where /chôɔp/ appears in a fixed sequence; it is preceded by /taam/ 'follow' in /taam chôɔp/. There are also two instances where /cay/ 'heart' or /tɛ̀ɛ/ 'but' occurs between /taam/ and /chôɔp/ in /taam cay chôɔp/ and /taam tɛ̀ɛ chôɔp/ respectively. These three fixed sequences all literally mean 'as you please'. Pragmatically, they are politeness markers expressing deference to someone else's choices. Thus, they might be argued to constitute a set of variants of one single extended unit of meaning as follows:

/taam/ (/cay/) (/tɛ̀ɛ/) /chôɔp/

Example 8

kày	yâaŋ	thîi	nîi	pen	kày		yâaŋ	thîi
chicken	grill	at	DEM	COP	chicken		grill	SBR
hêɛŋ	nûm	mây	chum	náamman	sə̀əp	prɔ́ɔm		cɛ̀ɛw
dry	tender	NEG	soak	oil	serve	together		sauce
lɛ̂	náamcîm		hây	lʉ̀ak	taam	chɔ̂ɔp		
and	dip		CAUS	chose	follow	like		

'The grilled chicken here is dry and tender. It is not oily. It is served with a variety of dips for you to choose as you please.'

In the remaining 52 instances, /chɔ̂ɔp/ is also used as a verb meaning 'like', but no frequent patterns stand out clearly. Here, /chɔ̂ɔp/ is followed by a variety of types of object. In 41 instances, there is no explicit object after /chɔ̂ɔp/. Rather, the thing liked can be inferred from context (mostly the preceding discourse). In nine instances, /chɔ̂ɔp/ is followed by a pronoun (all but one referring to human beings). In two instances, /chɔ̂ɔp/ precedes an object clause beginning with /thîi/ (which is a complementizer) followed by a subject and a verb.

DISCUSSION

We have seen that both the polarity-oriented approach and the EUM-oriented approach proved viable routes to investigate the semantic prosody of the words under investigation. Using the polarity-oriented approach, I discovered that /kɔ̀ɔhâykə̀ət/ and /chɔ̂ɔp/ display a negative semantic prosody. /kreeŋcay/ was found to have a neutral semantic prosody, as it does not tend to co-occur particularly with positive or negative words. Using the EUM-oriented approach, on the other hand, I was able to identify various extended units of meaning around /kreeŋcay/ and /chɔ̂ɔp/ and to characterise these units' pragmatic function. The EUM-oriented approach does not discover any extended units of meaning around /kɔ̀ɔhâykə̀ət/, however. What we have found is that /kɔ̀ɔhâykə̀ət/ is always used independently as a single-word unit of meaning, at least in the 200 random examples that I looked at.

The above results fit with my expectations in the cases of /kɔ̀ɔhâykə̀ət/ 'cause' and /chɔ̂ɔp/ 'like'. The semantic prosody of cause has been extensively studied in the literature. It has been established to display a negative semantic prosody in English (Stubbs, 1995). Its translation equivalents in Danish and Chinese have also been found to display a negative semantic prosody (Dam-Jensen & Zethsen, 2008; Xiao & McEnery, 2006). Therefore, the fact that /kɔ̀ɔhâykə̀ət/ also has a negative semantic prosody does not come as a surprise.

Before investigating the corpus, I had the impression that /chɔ̂ɔp/ is normally used with a negative verb, such as /máw/ and /ninthaa/, which mean 'gossip', in a serial verb construction to indicate negatively-evaluated personal habits. The word /ninthaa/ does appear as a collocate of /chɔ̂ɔp/. Of the 19 total instances of /ninthaa/, 14 appear after /chɔ̂ɔp/ in a serial verb structure such as /chɔ̂ɔp ninthaa/, /chɔ̂ɔp maa ninthaa/, or /chɔ̂ɔp phùut ninthaa/, all of which mean 'like to gossip'. Employing the EUM-oreinted apporach, I discovered the extended unit

of meaning formed by a serial verb construction and expressing the pragmatic function of a negative habit.

My only prior impression regarding /kreeŋcay/ is that it tends to be used in contexts that express that /kreeŋcay/ ("being considerate") is a quality that (Thai) people are expected to have. I did not have any intuition regarding its semantic prosody. In line with this, the collocate analysis of /kreeŋcay/ does not seem to indicate a positive or negative semantic prosody. Employing Sinclair's approach, on the other hand, I discovered a number of extended units of meaning with different pragmatic functions.

The preceding analysis has thus allowed me to demonstrate the differences between Louw, Stubbs, and Partington's approach and Sinclair's approach in great depth. In terms of methodology, Louw, Stubbs and Partington's approach generally relies on collocate analysis. These scholars consider semantic prosody as a word's tendency to co-occur with positive or negative words. To identify the prosodies of /kreeŋcay/, /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/, and /chôɔp/, it was necessary merely to examine whether they tend to co-occur with positive or negative collocates. /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ and /chôɔp/ were found to display a negative semantic prosody. /kreeŋcay/ does not display a positive or negative semantic prosody, as there is little difference in the proportion of positive and negative collocates.

By contrast, the Sinclairian approach relies on concordance analysis. To identify the semantic prosody of the extended unit of meaning around /kreeŋcay/, for instance, I had to examine its extended co-text. This enabled me to identify extended units, such as /cà/ [verb] ([object/adverb]) (/tɛ̀ɛ/) /kô kreeŋcay/ ([person]), with its semantic prosody of 'refraining from performing an action due to consideration for other(s)'. This EUM-oriented method discovers not only semantic prosody, but also colligation and semantic preference. Thus, under this Sinclairian approach, semantic prosody cannot be discussed independently of colligation and semantic preference. Stubbs (2001) notes in a discussion of "semantic schemas" (i.e. units of meaning that "these semantic schemas can be modelled as clusters of lexis (nodes and collocates), grammar (colligation), semantics (preferences for words from particular lexical fields), and pragmatics (connotations or discourse prosodies)" (p. 96).

The analysis has allowed me to demonstrate in a very clear and concrete way the differences in both methodology and underlying concept between the two approaches, as applied to Thai. In fact, these differences have recently been made obvious by Partington's proposal to change the terminology to evaluative prosody. Evaluative prosody, Partington (2014) argues, is a word's inherent evaluative potential to co-occur with other items of the same evaluative polarity. Exactly this kind of evaluative potential is evident for /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ and /chôɔp/ on the basis of the collocate analysis. Having a negative evaluative prosody, /kɔ̀ɔhâykɛ̀ɛt/ and /chôɔp/ tend to occur in negative environments to maintain evaluative harmony in the discourse. Within the Sinclairian approach, on the other hand, semantic prosody belongs to an extended unit of meaning rather than to a word and can express any pragmatic function that is not limited to an expression of evaluation.

In sum, then, my answer to the question of "what are the advantages and disadvantages of the major approaches to semantic prosody proposed in the literature for describing semantic prosody in Thai?" is as follows:

Both approaches are useful, but they are most effective for different purposes. The polarity-oriented approach is useful when one's aim is to examine a word's tendency to appear in an evaluatively positive or negative context. Particularly, it reveals the implicit evaluation of a word whose evaluative potential is not immediately obvious from its core semantics, as we have seen with /kɔ̀ɔhâykàət/ and /chôɔp/. The knowledge obtained from this type of analysis will thus be useful for scholars interested in study of evaluation in discourse. It will also be beneficial for those who wish to exploit a semantic prosody for stylistic effects. That said, a disadvantage is that semantic prosody identified through this approach is limited to the positive vs. negative opposition rather than allowing a variety of expressions of evaluation. Unlike the polarity-oriented approach, which reveals only the implicit evaluation of a word, the EUM-oriented approach gives us more details about the patterns in which the word occurs: not only semantic prosody, but also colligation and semantic preference. Moreover, within this approach, a semantic prosody can be any pragmatic function or meaning, and is not confined to the positive vs. negative opposition or expression of evaluation or attitude. However, this approach also has a limitation. As its name suggests, the EUM-oriented approach is only applicable when we work under Sinclair's theory of language. Scholars who do not work within, or in ways compatible with, Sinclair's framework of the extended unit of meaning may find it of little use.

It might be objected that these answers to my research question are already obvious in the literature. I would argue that employing both of the approaches to analyse the Thai data has in fact yielded outcomes that I could not have obtained without carrying out the analysis, as follows.

First, the analysis reveals that both approaches do operate in Thai, as they do in English. Even though Thai is not very different from English in terms of syntax, it would theoretically be quite possible for syntactic differences between the languages to have the effect that only one of the approaches operates, whereas the other does not. That both approaches do operate in Thai proves the cross-linguistic validity of both.

Second, the analysis reveals that the approaches produce the same kind of results both in English and in Thai. Employing the Sinclairian approach, I identified a number of discernible extended units of meaning in Thai, as we have seen with /kreeŋcay/ and /chôɔp/, just as Sinclair finds with, for example, naked eye. In addition, in the cases where the words are used independently as a unit of meaning on their own, the concordance analysis leads to a characterisation of the very general patterns in which they are used. This is similar to what Hunston and Francis (2000) arrive at in terms of Pattern Grammar.

We have so far discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the two major approaches. Particularly, I have argued that these two approaches are useful for different purposes. Whereas the polarity-oriented approach reveals the hidden evaluative potential of a word,

the EUM-oriented approach gives details about its phraseological behaviour. Therefore, if time is not an issue, and we do not have a specific purpose in mind, applying both approaches to the study of a word will allow us to have a more comprehensive understanding of the word in question. Baker and Egbert (2016) refer to the use of multiple approaches, similarly to the combined method that I suggest, as methodological triangulation.

For instance, it is straightforward to argue that the results obtained from the polarity-oriented approach, which uses all the corpus data, can help enhance the results gained from the EUM-oriented approach, which uses much less data. In my analyses of /kɔ̀ɔhâykàət/ and /chɔ̂ɔp/, the polarity-oriented approach and the EUM-oriented approach produced much the same results. In the case of /kɔ̀ɔhâykàət/, the polarity-oriented approach discovers that the verb tends to occur with negative words, many of which are negative abstract nouns. The EUM-oriented approach likewise reveals that /kɔ̀ɔhâykàət/ is frequently followed by a negative abstract noun. In the case of /chɔ̂ɔp/, the polarity-oriented approach demonstrates that /chɔ̂ɔp/ tends to co-occur with negative verbs. Similarly, the EUM-oriented approach reveals that the verb is frequently followed by a negative verb in a serial verb structure. The sequence of /chɔ̂ɔp/ followed by a negative verb forms an extended unit of meaning with a pragmatic function of expressing a bad personal habit. In these cases, then, it is easily arguable that applying both approaches is beneficial, as the results gained from one approach helps to increase the credibility of the results obtained from the other.

That said, we have also seen a case, namely /kreeŋcay/, where the results from the two approaches do not appear to have much in common, if anything. In this case, applying both approaches does not seem to increase the credibility of the results. Rather, as earlier argued, it maximises our understanding of the word's hidden evaluative potential and its phraseological behaviour – but separately.

So we have seen the benefits that can be gained from methodological triangulation. Further studies of semantic prosody in Thai might quite legitimately opt to triangulate in this way.

This study has a limitation in terms of the corpus data. As previously pointed out that the TNC is under development and so far no spoken texts have been added to the corpus, the analysis of the present study was restricted to the written texts. The results of the study might have been more reflective of the semantic prosodies of the Thai words under study should the spoken data had been included in the analysis.

CONCLUSION

The study has shown that both the polarity-oriented approach and the EUM-oriented approach can be applied without major difficulty to the study of semantic prosody in the Thai language, but that they are useful for different purposes. While the polarity-oriented approach reveals the hidden evaluative potential of a word, the EUM-oriented approach gives us details about the phraseologies where the word occurs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to Andrew Hardie for his constructive comments on this paper.

THE AUTHOR

Pornthip Supanfai is a lecturer of English at the Department of Western Languages and Linguistics, Mahasarakham University. She received her PhD in Linguistics from Lancaster University, UK. Her research interest is corpus linguistics.
pornthip.su@msu.ac.th

REFERENCES

Aroonmanakun, W. (2007). Creating the Thai National Corpus. *MANUSYA: Journal of Humanities, 13,* 4-17.

Baker, P., & Egbert, J. (2016). Introduction. In P. Baker & J. Egbert (Eds.), *Triangulating methodological approaches in corpus-linguistic research* (pp. 1-19). London, England: Routledge.

Bednarek, M. (2008). Semantic preference and semantic prosody re-examined. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory, 4*(2), 119-39.

Dam-Jensen, H., & Zethsen, K. (2008). Translator awareness of semantic prosodies. *Target, 20*(2), 203-21.

Hardie, A. (2012). CQPweb – combining power, flexibility and usability in a corpus analysis tool. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 17*(3), 380-409.

Hardie, A. (n.d.) Retrieved from https://cqpweb.lancs.ac.uk/

Hardie, A. *(forthcoming).* A dual sort-and-filler strategy for statistical analysis of collocation, keywords, and lockwords.

Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in Applied Linguistics.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hunston, S., & Francis, G. (2000). Pattern Grammar: *A Corpus-Driven Approach to the Lexical Grammar of English.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Iwasaki, S., & Ingkaphirom, P. (2005). *A reference grammar of Thai.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Louw, W. E. (1993). Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. In M. Baker, G. Francis & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and technology: In honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 157-76). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Morley, J., & Partington, A. (2009). A few frequently asked questions about semantic - or evaluative - prosody. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 14*(2), 139-158.

Munday, J. (2013). Looming large: A cross-linguistic analysis of semantic prosodies in comparable reference corpora. In A. Kruger, K. Wallmach & J. Munday (Eds.), *Corpus-based translation studies: Research and applications* (pp. 169-186). London, England: Bloomsbury Academic.

Partington, A. (1998). *Patterns and meaning: Using corpora for English language research and teaching.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamin.

Partington, A. (2004). "Utterly content in each other's company": Semantic prosody and semantic preference. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 9*(1), 131-56.

Partington, A. (2014). Evaluative prosody. In K. Aijmer & C. Rühlemann (Eds.), *The handbook of corpus pragmatics* (pp. 532-80). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. (2004). *Trust the text: Language, corpus and discourse.* London, England: Routledge.

Sinclair, J., Jones, S., Daley, R. & Krishnamurthy, R. (2004). *English collocational studies: The Osti report.* London, England: Continuum.

Stewart, D. (2010). *Semantic prosody: A critical evaluation.* London, England: Routledge.

Stubbs, M. (1995). Collocations and semantic profiles: on the cause of the trouble with quantitative studies. *Functions of Language, 2*(1), 23-55. Retrieved from https://www.uni-trier.de/fileadmin/fb2/ANG/ Linguistik/Stubbs/stubbs-1995-cause-trouble.pdf

Stubbs, M. (2001). *Words and phrases: Corpus studies of lexical semantics.* Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Thai National Corpus (n.d.) Retrieved from http://www.arts.chula.ac.th/ling/tnc/searchtnc/

Whitsitt, S. (2005). A critique of the concept of semantic prosody. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 10*(3), 283-305.

Xiao, R. Z. & McEnery, T. (2006). Near synonym, collocation and semantic prosody: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Applied Linguistics,* (27)1, 103-129.

Zhang, W. (2009). Semantic prosody and ESL/EFL vocabulary pedagogy. *TESL Canada Journal, 26*(2), 1-12.

APPENDIX

List of abbreviations used in line 2 of Thai examples

3	third person
ASP	aspect
AZP	adverbializing particle
CAUS	causative
CM	challengeability marker
COP	copula
COMP	complementizer
DEM	demonstrative
LP	linking particle
NEG	negation/negative
NMLZ	nominalizer
PFX	prefix
POT	potential
PP	pragmatic particle
REFL	reflexive
REL	relative
SBR	subordinator
SG	singular