Review

Contrastive lexical pragmatics as an effective strategy in teaching pragmatics: A review article

Farid Ghaemi[1] and Meisam Ziafar[2]*

Department of English Language Teaching, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran.
Department of English Language Teaching, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khouzestan, Iran.

Pragmatic aspect of formulaic language must be emphasized and employed in second language acquisition. Translation of formulaic speech can help learners better understand the pragmatic nature of L2 prefabricated language through comparing them with their L1 (first language) equivalents. This study proposes a contrastive lexical pragmatic approach in teaching pragmatics. It is demonstrated how lexical equivalents between two languages help in clarifying pragmatic aspect of L2 (second language). It is claimed that metapragmatics as an effective strategy in teaching and learning pragmatic aspect of language is highly apt to be achieved through a contrastive lexical pragmatic practice which results in learners' conscious raising and understanding about pragmatics. The claim made in this paper is that as rich sources of pragmatic (mostly pragmalinguistic) knowledge, comparisons made between L1 and L2 prefabricated expressions are highly effective in bringing second/foreign pragmatic acquisition and second/foreign language acquisition together. Whenever pragmatic failures occur, through a metapragmatic process, prefabricated expressions are revised in the light of their L1 equivalents in order to fulfill functions in certain contexts. Transleme is introduced as L1 stereotypical equivalents for a pragmeme which can almost always account for all its pragmatic actions.

Key words: Contrastive lexical pragmatics, prefabricated language, formulaic language, metapragmatics, transleme.

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatic aspect of language teaching and learning has been debated with the result of multifarious contentions and claims. According to Kasper and Rose (1999) language classrooms provide learners with two types of opportunities in learning pragmatics of a second or foreign language. The learners may learn pragmatics as a result of purposeful pedagogical exercises or due to the mere exposure to language input and also because of their language productions in the target language for which no pragmatic goals have been considered in advance. Schmidt (1993, in Kasper and Rose, 1999) contends that simply being exposed to target language is not sufficient in learning pragmatics, on the accounts that

pragmatic information is often not 'salient' for learners and is not noticed through prolonged exposure. Schmidt also maintains that even in the case of first language pragmatics, simple exposure does not guarantee learning and it must be mediated by certain strategies on the part of caregivers. Cohen (2008) also believes that based on the high frequency of pragmatic failures one commits in the target language, it can be claimed that acceptable pragmatic performance requires explicit instruction and does not happen through 'osmosis'. According to Kasper and Rose (1999) one reason that current second language acquisition (SLA) theories have rarely been employed in pragmatic research is the fact that it has not been made obvious how principles proposed for grammar instruction can be applied in pragmatic instruction due to the fact that pragmatics cannot be only a matter of form, but rather within a pragmalinguistic perspective one

---

*Corresponding author. E-mail: meisamziafar@yahoo.com.

needs to consider other aspects like meaning, force and context as well, and sociopragmatic units do not have to be related to any linguistic form at all. The other reason that pragmatic has not adequately incorporated recent SLA theory is the ambiguity in the idea of focus on form from a cognitive perspective. The purpose of this paper is to incorporate pragmatic aspect of language into a theory of second language acquisition which is based on employing Persian-English formulaic language equivalents as tools to enhance one's metapragmatic awareness.

Aim and approach

This paper is an attempt to illuminate how Persian-English formulaic language equivalents can compensate for the lack of context as a crucial factor in the proper use of a second language. As a library research, through a related literature review which introduces ways to deal with the concept of context in the case of formulaic language and also through providing related examples, this paper explains the fact that due to their metapragmatic forces, L1-L2 (first language-second language) translations for formulaic language provide second language learners with a short-cut in learning how to put their lexical (formulaic) knowledge into immediate use.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In an attempt to extend focus on form to pragmatics, Kasper and Rose (1999) likens the process of shifting focus from meaning to form in the case of grammatical errors to that of turning from pragmatics to metapragmatics in the case of pragmatic failures or as they put it 'a contextually inappropriate pragmatic feature'.

Malinowskin (1923, in Bahns et al., 1986) emphasizes the pragmatic aspect of formulaic speech in phatic communication which is defined as the language used in order to maintain social relations. According to Bahns et al. (1986) this is in keeping with Coulmas's (1981) definition of 'routines' as tools used by individuals in their attempts to relate to others in satisfactory ways. Coulmas (1986, cited in Bahns et al., 1986: 695) contends that this is only possible since there exist "highly conventionalized prepatterned expressions, whose occurrence is tied to more or less standardized communications." Bahns et al. (1986) further the point that it is not only the expression which is constant and standardized, but it is also the situation that shows to be standardized and to have recurring features. They also puts the idea forward that although the study of formulaic expressions have been almost neglected in theoretical linguistics, formulas have always been taken into consideration in the study of language acquisition, albeit with varying degrees of importance assigned to their role.

The claim is that as rich sources of pragmatic (mostly

pragmalinguistic) knowledge, prefabricated expressions and comparisons of such expressions between L1 and L2 are highly effective in bringing second/foreign pragmatic acquisition and second/foreign language acquisition together in which whenever pragmatic failures occur, through a metapragmatic process, prefabricated expressions are revised in the light of their L1 equivalents in order to fulfill functions in the context. From a speech act theory viewpoint also it can be claimed that prefabricated structures (as locutionary forms) are the main building blocks in producing meaning (as illocutionary force) in our achieving of particular functions (as perlocutioary effect).

Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992, cited in Wood, 2002) classify lexical phrases into four categories. The first class includes polywords as phrases that function as single words which are fixed and allow no lexical insertion, such as 'in a nutshell', and 'by the way'. Institutionalized expressions, which are invariable and mostly continuous sentences such as 'nice to meet you', 'how do you do' and 'be that as it may'. As a third class, phrasal constraints allow variations of lexical and phrase components and are mostly continuous such as 'a day ago', 'a year ago', 'a very long time ago', etc. Finally sentence-builders are lexical phrases that allow the construction of full sentences within fillable slots, allowing lots of variation and insertions. Examples are 'I think that X', 'I think that it is a good idea', 'I think he ought to do it', and 'not only X, but also Y'. All these types of lexical phrases, according to Wood (2002) are social interactions, topics, and discourse devices. He further maintains that first and second language acquisition in children is largely influenced by attending to formulaic sequences in language input, adopting them for use and later segmenting and analyzing them. He maintains that the role of formulaic sequences in adult language acquisition involves more variability than those found in the case of child language acquisition and claims that the picture of adult language acquisition is more complex than that of children. The uncertain aspect of formulaic expression use by adults can be attributed to the fact that although adults also employ such units, further segmentation, analysis, and fusion, which further the development of other aspects of language, cannot be guaranteed. The author asserts that the use of formulaic sequences results in efficient mental processing through lightening the additional processing burdens of construction of utterances which allow for fast and fluid communication. The author emphasizes the role of formulaic expressions in accomplishing pragmatic competence and advocates inserting such expressions as an exposure process to large amount of input into language classrooms. It can be claimed that a contrastive strategy in teaching lexical pragmatics compensates for the adult second language learners in helping them delve

into further analysis of formulaic language in order to employ them in achieving pragmatic goals in the context. According to Nekrasova (2009) speech formulas are identified as fixed expressions related to certain predictable situations and are employed to realize speech functions. She contends that formulas have received their formulaicity from their adequacy in realizing particular functional demands which has resulted in their high predictability and frequency of occurrence within particular social situations.

Elman (2009, cited in Arnon and Snider, 2010) advocates an emergenist model. From this perspective language is viewed as a continually varying dynamic system in which lexicon knowledge is not comprised of 'fixed units', but rather dynamic patterns. Contrastive lexical pragmatics can be considered as a highly effective approach in dealing with this dynamicity in the case of formulaic language. It is argued that translation of lexical words helps learners to grasp the formulaic nature of language and the role of such formulaicity in acquiring pragmatic competence.

Kurumada (2009) emphasizes a discourse pragmatic, usage-based approach to language acquisition (through formulaic language) and cites Bates and MacWinney (1979) who contend that children first understand pragmatic topic-comment structure before they acquire syntax. Conklin and Schmitt (2008) maintain that at least one third to one-half of language is composed of formulaic elements. As they put it, formulaic expressions are much more than strings of words linked together through collocations, and communicative contents of language are highly composed of these phrasal structures. Such expressions are linked to single meaning/pragmatic function, which proves their considerable semantic/pragmatic utility. The authors contend that the prominent usefulness of formulaic utterances is in the field of pragmatics in accomplishing recurrent communicative needs through using conventionalized language. Formulaic expressions serve a quick and reliable way to achieve the desired communicative needs. The authors maintain that formulaic expressions are not only found in English, which calls for a contrastive investigation of such expressions between languages. Apart from sociofunctional explanations for the widespread scope of such expressions there are also psycholinguistic explanations such as the fact that, as single memorized units, they are more easily and quickly processed. They finally conclude that there exist a significant processing advantage for formulaic sequences over nonformulaic language in both L1 and L2 English speakers.

Liontas (2002) emphasizes the role of idiomatic language (as part of formulaic language) in second language learning and holds that idioms should be learned together with other graphophonic, semantic, pragmatic, sociolinguistic, cultural and conventional aspects of discourse. He further maintains that depriving learners from idiomatic aspect of language is like depriving them from culture in language, poetry in literature, history in politics, or time in space.

Kecskes (2000) relates the concept of formulaic expression to pragmatics through introducing situation-bound utterances (SBUs) as factors effective in knowledge in use. In sharp contrast to Kecskes's (2000) contention that errors in the use and comprehension of SBUs in adult L2 learners are due to their lack of native-like conceptual fluency in L2 and their reliance on their L1 conceptual system, it is argued that L1 can be employed as a very powerful and effective source in order to like SBUs as forms to SBUs as pragmatic meaning. The stance taken is that of Wierzbicka (1992, in Kecskes, 2000) who holds that "universal human cultural concepts are lexicalized in various forms in different languages" (Kecskes, 2000: 608). He defines SBUs as "highly conventionalized, prefabricated units whose occurrence is tied to standardized communicative situations" (Kecskes, 2000: 606). He maintains that if based on 'obligatoriness', and 'predictability' in social situations, types of formulaic language are placed on a cline which increases in obligatoriness to the right, situation-bound utterances will be placed on the rightmost place since the situation highly dictates their use. He further contends that SBUs lose their 'semantic transparency' since they are used to convey particular pragmatic functions related to certain situations. On the other hand they turn into formulae for certain social interactions. He contends a conventionalized pragmatic sense of linguistic forms. Kiefer (1995, cited in Kecskes, 2000) proposes that SBUs must be discussed within the constraints of 'frame semantics', since any stereotypical expression necessitates frames, which are interpretive tools which determine a term's arrangement within a specific context. Within each situation there is a sequence of events and actions taking place within the frame, which is called a script, and there exist sub-events for a specific script. It is contended that each SBU evokes a certain sub-event within a special script. Kiefer (1995, cited in Kecskes, 2000) contends that the higher the predictability of the link between a sub-event and an utterance, the bounded the expression. Kiefer (1995, in Kecskes, 2000) also contends that SBUs, like words, must be treated as lexicon with the difference that SBUs are pragmatic rather than lexical units, with a particular reference to a particular word or script. On the other hand each SBU must be characterized by the sub-events of scripts for the particular frame it is linked to. It is maintained that situational meaning and pragmatic aspect of SBUs are not possible to be applied out of the related frame and script since these functions and frames are not separable from one other. Kecskes (2000) provides two examples,

that is, 'you bet' and 'piece of cake' and maintains that it is hard to determine what they mean without a frame, since they might mean different things within different frames. It is argued that although providing frames, as a proper reference, helps in clarifying the situational and pragmatic meanings, providing equivalents in L2 is another reference which obviates, to some extent the need for introducing precise frames. 'You bet' can be equated with the Persian equivalent *'gol gofti'*, 'Piece of cake' can be equated with *'mesle abe xordan'*, regardless of the frame employed and still be pragmatic as situation-free units (SFUs). Other examples of such units are:

'Enough is enough' = *'dige base'* (to stop something from continuing)
 'We are almost there' = *'dige darim miresim'* (to note that the destination is close)
'I am not your type' = *'man mesle to nistam'* (to show dissimilarity to someone)

On the other hand, translation equivalents in L1 are clues to the situation and context in which language occurs. Cruse (1992, in Kecskes, 2000) distinguishes between words that do not possess any specific semantic properties and words that do. The former words are called 'plain words' when the latter words are called 'charged words'. Examples are 'surrender' and 'disappear' as plain words and their charged synonyms. Such diversity between plain and charged words can also be disclosed and demonstrated through providing L1 equivalents. Persian examples are *'taslim shodan'* for *'surrender'* and *'asir shodan'*, *'va dadan'*, *'dast keshidan'* and *'ja zadan'* for captivate, give up, quit, and chicken out respectively. All the arguments posed by Kecskes (2000) about plain, charged, and loaded words can be obviated through providing L1 equivalents. Although Bahns (1993) restricts the teaching of lexical collocations to terms for which there is no translational equivalent in English and the learners' L1, it is argued that despite such contention, a general contrastive study of lexical collocations serve the good job of teaching pragmatic aspect of the target language.

Dam-Jensen and Zethsen (2007) advocate corpus analysis in order to reveal systematically structured phraseological patterns in the language system as opposed to certain linguistic phenomena related to language usage and independent from language system. In this regard Stubbs (2001, cited in Dam-Jensen and Zethsen, 2007) maintains that "pragmatic meanings are often conventionally encoded (in the text) rather than inferred" (Stubbs, 2001, in Dam-Jensen and Zethsen, 2007: 1621). It is claimed that another effective strategy in order to reveal structural systematicity within phraseological patterns in the language system is a lexical contrastive analysis.

Pragmemes

According to Kecskes (2010) Mey's pragmatic act has been an attempt to illustrate how pragmemes are portrayed in pragmatic acts in speech situations. Pragmemes are defined as situational prototypes for pragmatic acts within situations. On the other hand a particular pragmeme are represented and realized through instances of pragmatic acts. Mey (2001, cited in Allan, 2010: 2920) defines pragmemes as follow: The theory of pragmatic acts (focuses) on the environment in which both speaker and hearer find their affordances, such that the entire situation is brought to bear on what can be said in the situation, as well as on what is actually being said. The emphasis is not on conditions and rules for an individual (or an individual's) speech act, but on characterizing a general situational prototype, capable of being executed in the situation; such a generalized pragmatic act I will call a pragmeme. The instantiated individual pragmatic acts, practs, refer to a particular pragmeme in its realizations.

It can be asserted that although pragmemes lend themselves very easily to contrastive equivalents, instances of pragmatic acts can also be translated and contrasted which results in their less dependence on situations. As an example the pragmeme 'I do not care' is translated as *'vasam mohem nist'*. The pragmatic acts can be 'I do not mind' translated as *'ahamiat nemidam'*, and 'it's none of my business' translated as *'be man rabti nadare'*.

Kecskes (2010) equals SBUs with pragmatic acts (practs) since they are concrete realization of a pragmeme as a general situational prototype, or, a socio-cultural concept with usually several possible realizations. Kecskes (S criticizes Mey's overemphasis on the role of context and situation by contending that the explanatory movement acts from outside in.

First, lexical items encode the history of their use. His claim that the explanatory movement in a theory of pragmatic acts is from the outside in gives too much weight to actual situational context and appears to ignore that utterances as linguistic units (encoding prior contexts) play as important a role in meaning construction and comprehension as the situation. Linguistic units encode the history of their use, that is, the situations in which they have been used.

Contrastive lexical pragmatics

This history of use within lexical bundles is what compensates for the lack of situation and context especially when they are committed to contrastive practices. Kecskes (2010) furthers the point by asserting

that what is important is the fact that the encoded context in the utterances match with the actual situations. What L1 equivalents do is to provide clues to such encoded contexts and even to the proper practs in the actual contexts. Kecskes (2010) also criticizes Austin and Searle's position since they have neglected the importance of the actual situational context, and proposes a third stance through which "the explanatory movement in any pragmatic theory should go in both directions: from the outside in (actual situational context [towards] prior context encoded in utterances used) and from the inside out (prior context encoded in utterances used [towards] actual situational context)" (Kecskes, 2010: 2894).

In order to demonstrate the effect of actual situational context on the meaning, Kecskes (2010: 2895) provides the following examples:

(a) Sam: - Coming for a drink?
Andy: - Sorry, I can't. My doctor won't let me.
Sam: - What's wrong with you?

(b) Sam: - Coming for a drink?
Andy: - Sorry, I can't. My mother-in-law won't let me.
Sam: - What's wrong with you?

Although the difference between two conversations is that the word doctor has been changed into mother-in-law, the meaning of the expression 'what's wrong with you' changes radically. Kecskes (2010) maintains that if we change the expression into 'my wife' because of the weakness of the conceptual load within this expression the actual situational context becomes prominent. Considering the Persian equivalent of the expression 'what's wrong with you' which is *'chet shode',* all these disputes are settled down since Persian speakers will know the pragmatic force of this expression in Persian and are capable of transferring their knowledge into English, albeit, there are exception to such straightforward translations, which necessitate taking into consideration the vagaries of actual situational context, and their effects on deciding the proper translational equivalents. On the other hand mere reliance on context may turn out to be detrimental and put non-native speakers at a disadvantage in the case of pragmatic aspect of utterances. Kecskes (2010) brings the example of 'Please, help yourself' for which nonnative speakers lack the necessary prior experience and background knowledge in order to get rid of the literal meaning and perceive the right meaning which is derived from interface between the prior situational context and actual situational context of use. If the equivalent in Persian is provided which is *'lotfan az xodetun pazirai kinid'*, almost always works in clarifying the pragmatic meaning of the expression without any recourse to the actual context.

Such contention may be in sharp contrast with what many scholars contend. As an example, Verscheren (1999, cited in Capone, 2005:1356), in order to emphasize the role of context, puts the following:

In isolation, just all utterances are highly indeterminate because of the multiplicity of contextual constellations they can fit into. Far from introducing vagueness, allowing context into linguistic analysis is therefore a prerequisite for precision. As said before, however, we should avoid the mistake of reifying or petrifying context.

Transleme

The following discussion tries to confirm the claim that transleme (the word coined by the authors), defined as stereotypical L1 equivalent for each pragmeme in L2, which can almost always account for all pragmatic acts (of the related pragmeme) in L2, provides learners with metapragmatic awareness about formulaic language in L2. Although, L1 and L2 are relative and can be assigned to any language, this paper deals with Persian as the L1 and English as the L2.

The additional pragmatic meaning which cannot be encoded within utterances, increasing the dependency on the actual situational context, can be compensated for through providing equivalents together with explanations about the differences between pragmatic forces of utterances in two languages, when an exact match cannot be found. Capone (2005) provides some examples from English-Italian contrasts. When an Italian teacher says *'Vienil'* to a student, the pragmatic force is more than the pragmatic force of the word 'Come' in English. It is a request for getting closer and also answering the question. The English equivalent 'come closer and answer the questions' serves the good job of revealing the pragmatic force of this utterance. As another example the equivalent to 'can I help you' which is *'mitunam komaketun konam'* in Persian poses no severe problem and misunderstanding whether it happens in a shopping mall or directed to someone who has been hit in an accident. Even in the case of expressions like 'how are you' and 'how do you do' which are equally translated in Persian as *'chetori'* or *'hale shoma chetore'*, the pragmatic force of the second expression can be expanded by notifying learners that it is only used when you meet someone for the first time without any need to provide contextual evidence.

To put it into Kiefer's (1995, in Kecskes, 2000) terms, the frames, scripts and the subcomponent sub-events which are evoked by SBUs are all explainable through providing equivalents in learners' L1. As an example 'enough is enough' means *'dige base'* when you want to stop something from happening and *'tamumesh kon(id)'* when you want others stop doing something, although

the first translation can be applied in the second situation as well. On the other hand, it can be claimed that as there are pragmemes to account for stereotypical situations, with SBUs dictating particular pragmatic acts, there are also L1 stereotypical equivalent for a pragmeme which can almost always account for all pragmatic acts of the related pragmeme in L2, such L1 equivalent can be called a transleme. As an example, consider the Persian stereotypical equivalent (transleme) for the pragmeme 'you are right', which is *'doroste'*. Considering the pragmatic acts as realizations of SBUs, this expression, depending on the situational context, can be transformed into 'you bet' which means *'gol gofti'*, 'you can say that again' which means *'hagh ba shomast'*, and 'certainly' which means *'mosallaman'*. The Persian equivalent *'doroste'* as a transleme can be applied in all the situations without posing any problems. This does not mean that other equivalents can be dispensed with, but rather they must be precisely brought into conscious metapragmatic awareness. What is emphasized is that through introducing translemes the prominence of contextual vagaries is reduced and formulaic expressions find their chance to be viewed as carriers of pragmatic load.

As another example consider the Persian stereotypical equivalent (transleme) for the pragmeme 'I do not care', which is *'ahamiat nadare'*. Considering the pragmatic acts as realizations of SBUs, this expression, depending on the situational context, can be transformed into 'I do not mind' which means *'ahamiat nemidam'* and 'it's none of my business' which means *' be man rabti nadare'*. Again the Persian equivalent *'ahamiat nadare'* as a transleme can be applied in all the situations without posing any problems. A contrastive lexical pragmatic study can be employed in order to reveal all these equivalents, and it will be advantageous for learners to be supplied with such translations as carriers of pragmatic load.

CONCLUSION

A contrastive approach toward lexical phrases present in both L1 and L2 has been proposed as an effective strategy in revealing the pragmatic nature of such phrases. Presenting mere context in teaching pragmatics puts the heavy burden of disclosing the pragmatic forces on the learners' shoulders and contrastive equivalents catalyze the process of learning the pragmatic aspects of formulaic phrases through providing learners with a metacognitive standpoint. Although explicit teaching of pragmatic aspects of language has always been emphasized in the literature, there have been few studies aimed at providing effective pragmatic teaching strategies, since findings of SLA fall short of being

applied in teaching pragmatics, due to the fact that context and extralinguistic factors also come into play. Metapragmatic awareness can be optimally brought about through a contrastive lexical pragmatic analysis through which the pragmatic forces of formulaic utterances are brought into conscious consideration. As a dynamic and emergenist system, formulaic language helps in clarifying the pragmatic nature of language forms. SBUs have a twofold nature in that they simultaneously represent the characteristics of actual situational context and also the prior context encoded within utterances. Such a nature can be put into a pragmeme/pragmatic act paradigm in which pragmemes represent situational prototypes of speech acts within situations. It is claimed that both pragmeme and pragmatic acts lend themselves to a contrastive analysis through which the pragmatic forces of formulaic utterances as main representatives of pragmatic information are compared between L1 and L2. Although there are times that contrastive equivalents of formulaic utterances do not match precisely, such contrast reduces the prominence of the role of context in disclosing the pragmatic nature of utterances. There are times; however, that providing context seems inescapable, a state which can also be dispensed with through meaning expansions in the L1 in order to illuminate the exact pragmatic message at play. What is more is that the instances of translemes defined as the L1 stereotypical equivalents for L2 pragmemes reduces the dependency on contextual factors accounting for the pragmatic act forms.

REFERENCES

Allan K (2010). Referring as a pragmatic act. J. Pragmat., 42: 2919-2931.

Arnon I, Snider N (2010). More than words: Frequency effects of multi-word phrases. J. Mem. Lang., 62: 67-82.

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

Bahns J, Burmeister H, Vogel T (1986). The pragmatics of formulas in L2 learner speech: Use and development. J. Pragmat., 10: 693-723.

Capone A (2005). Pragmemes: A study with reference to English and Italian. J. Pragmat., 37: 1355-1371.

Cohen AD (2008). Teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics: What can we expect from learners? Lang. Teach., 41(2): 213-235.

Conklin K, Schmitt N (2008). Formulaic sequences: Are they processed more quickly than nonformulaic language by native and nonnative speakers? Appl. Linguist.. 29(1): 72-89.

Dam-Jensen H, Zethsen KK (2007). Pragmatic patterns and the lexical system: A reassessment of evaluation in language. J. Pragmat., 39: 1608-1623.

Kasper G, Rose KR (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. Annu. Rev. Appl. Linguist., 19: 81-104.

Kecskes I (2000). A cognitive-pragmatic approach to situation-bound utterances. J. Pragmat., 32: 605-625.

Kecskes I (2010). Situation-bound utterances as pragmatic acts. J. Pragmat., 42: 2889-2897.

Kurumada C (2009). The acquisition and development of the topic

marker wa in L1 Japanese: The role of NP-wa? in child-mother interaction. In Formulaic Language, Corrigan, Roberta, Edith A. Moravcsik, Hamid Ouali and Kathleen M. Wheatley (eds.), 347 ff.

Liontas J (2002). Exploring second language learners' notions of idiomaticity. System, 30: 289-313.

Nekrasova TM (2009). English L1 and L2 speakers' knowledge of lexical bundles. Lang. Learn., 59(3): 647-686.

Wood D (2002). Formulaic language in acquisition and production: Implications for teaching. TESL Canada J., 20(1): 1-15.