The Foundations and Versatility of English Language Teaching (ELT)

The Foundations and Versatility of English Language Teaching (ELT)

Edited by

Christoph Haase, Natalia Orlova and Joel Head

The Foundations and Versatility of English Language Teaching (ELT)

Edited by Christoph Haase, Natalia Orlova and Joel Head

This book first published 2018

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2018 by Christoph Haase, Natalia Orlova, Joel Head
and contributors

CONTENTS

PREFACE

While the field of ELT studies continues to see horizontal and vertical diversification, it is also time to take stock of what has made the discipline into the field it is today. In regard to horizontal diversification we can identify trends that involve a continued inclusion of more fields of study in the family of methods and approaches of ELT. Especially in the technical sense, e-learning has matured and new forms of online learning and teaching emerge, be it via teleconferences or short-message services for vocabulary training. But a massive extension has occurred in so-called social media. The vertical dimension affects a depth of analysis not seen even a decade ago when, for example, small and relatively simple learner corpora were used for linguistic analysis that rarely went beyond rote frequency counts. The increasing sophistication in these two dimensions – the horizontal and the vertical – is also reflected in the research papers collected in this volume. It is, like previous volumes, organized into three large thematic sections, beginning with applied linguistics, approaches in methodology and bookended by cultural and literary studies.

In this volume, the linguistics section is spearheaded by the study by Silvia Cacchiani who reflects on the morphological competence of second-langauge learners of English, a theme that is carried a step further into lexical competence by Gabriela Zapletalová's look at lexical clusters in L2 writing. Dara Tafazoli and Maryam Rafiei investigate recent approaches in CALL. The subsequent papers concern the compilation and use of corpora, first by Kateřina Šteklová who describes a novel corpus of adult Czech learners of English, then Róbert Bohát, Beata Rödlingová and Nina Horáková's contribution on an academic corpus at the high school level adds the dimension of younger learners while Christoph Haase and Kateřina Šteklová's corpus involves the youngest groups of preschoolers and first-year primary school pupils who are early acquirers of English as a second language. This age dimension is diversified further by Adam Pluszczyk and Artur Świątek who test different levels of proficiency on complexity issues in English. Identity construction is the topic of Michaela Slezák Polónyová's study while Yuri Maslov details the conditions from the unusual perspective of Belarus. Two contributions of a more systematic linguistic nature are the theoretical one by Radek Vogel who analyses folk taxonomies of 'living things' while Dušan Melen and

Monika Hřebačková take a highly applied approach to teaching English vowels.

The methodology section starts out with Natalia Orlova's reflections on the important topic of host teachers from the viewpoint of novice teachers. Michael Hall finds compelling arguments in his piece on learner confidence in language learning while emphasizing the relevance of learner independence. Two concluding contributions in this section report on the outcomes of two major European research projects in methodology, Paloma Castro and Elena González-Cascos report on TC4PI (Teacher Competences for Plurilingual Integration) from the Spanish perspective while Lora Tamošiūnienė and Vilhelmina Vaičiūnienė summarize the Lithuanian view of the same project.

In the cultural and literary studies section, Mary Ellen Toffle tackles an important and current topic – the use of English in ISIS recruitment strategies. Joel Cameron Head investigates the human as a container and the substance contained in his contribution on the two poetic vessels, while Zinaida Chemodurova chooses a wide-angle view of teaching postmodernist fiction. In Jana Marešová's take on Canadian indigenous literature two protagonists, sky woman and windigo, are discussed. Mark Andrew Brandon raises questions of race and scientific authority while Aneta Červenková closes the section with a look at a particular work by Ernest J. Gaines. The volume concludes with two reviews by Stanislava Kaiserová on two selected publications, one methodological (on First Certificate English) and one in literary theory.

The editors hope that the current volume will contribute to the continuum of ELT resources to the benefit of educators and academics alike.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SECTION 1:

APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

Fostering Morphological Awareness in the Teacher Trainee Class: Some Reflections on –*ous* and Rival Adjectival Suffixes

Silvia Cacchiani
University of Modena and Reggio Emilia

Teacher trainees are seen as a relatively homogeneous group of non-native speakers with the same L1, similar length and type of instruction, and extensive implicit knowledge of morphology. This, however, does not immediately and automatically translate into metalinguistic awareness, knowledge of the explicit rules of the L2 grammar and the ability to produce acceptable TL explanations. But, if teacher trainees are highly proficient in English and fully engaged adult students (Svalberg, 2007, 2009), then we can devise activities and tasks especially intended for attentive trainees with a positive attitude towards language/s and what it/they represent/s, typically willing to interact, to reflect on language with peers, and to receive and provide corrective feedback. In principle, enhancing morphological awareness in the teacher trainee class or in refresher courses, should help teachers compensate for the scant attention that textbooks devote to derivation and other word-formation processes. On these grounds, we offer some initial suggestions that instructors may want to take up to develop complex tasks (Ur, 2012, p. 43) that aim at fostering morphological awareness in the teacher trainee class.

1. Introduction

Italian graduates join a two-year teacher training programme to be awarded qualified teacher status in secondary school. At this stage, developing teachers' language awareness (Wright & Bolitho, 1997; Andrews, 2003) and metalinguistic knowledge is as imperative for effective teaching as enhancing language proficiency and pedagogical

skills (Derwing & Munrow, 2005; Llurda (Ed.), 2005). As important as it is to develop morphological awareness though, it is not easy for non-native teacher trainees to verbalize and exploit explicit knowledge of L2 morphology.

English suffixes that derive adjectives from nouns show extensive overlap in meaning and selective preferences (e.g. Bauer, Lieber & Plag, 2013; Dixon, 2014), which results in a plurality of (morphological) translation equivalents (Lowie, 2001) in Italian. Setting up parameters of variations is expected to help teacher trainees turn second-order rules and preferences spelt out in the relevant literature into acceptable first-order rules (or rules of thumb) required by a teacher and appropriate to the learner context.

We thus try to devise a set of parameters for comparison and analysis of English adjective-forming denominal and deverbal suffixes of possession (Hamawand, 2011; see also Grossmann, & Rainer, 2004; Bauer, Lieber & Plag, 2013: *translational suffixes*):*-(er)ous*,*-(t)ious*, *-(s)y/-(s)ey*, *-ful*, *-some* and related suffixes (*-able*, *-ive*, *-ing*). More particularly, we explore examples taken from children's literature that exploits language play (Cook, 2001) and creative errors (Rodari, 1973) –specifically, Roald Dahl's *The BFG* and its Italian translation, *Il GGG*. This shall enable us to provide some initial suggestions for building tasks and activities that can foster and encourage teacher language awareness (Andrews, 2005; Ellis, 2009). The motivation for focusing on creative errors is to be found in the contribution that in-class discussion of relevant grammatical judgments can offer to verbalizing first-order rules and encouraging teacher (trainee)'s morphological awareness.

2. Morphological awareness in the teacher trainee class

2.1. A grammatical adjectival derivation and non-words in *The BFG*

To the best of our knowledge, fostering morphological awareness is not part of the syllabus of teacher training programmes in Italy. We are interested in agrammatical adjectival derivation. Derivation is a matter of (more or less) abstract schematization (Heyvaert, 2009, following Langacker's 1987, 2001 Cognitive Grammar): if, speakers build patterns that unify sound, morphosyntax and meaning based on usage, rival morphological processes in complex words can be accounted for in terms of structural constraints, affix semantics, and restrictions on productivity.

In *The BFG*, the Big Friendly Giant cannot speak very good English. He is a good-natured giant that makes friends with children and protects them. Like children, he makes speech errors mainly based on phonetic substitution and violation of word-formation rules and preferences. In more technical terms, while still making himself understood, the BFG makes systematic recourse to non-conventional schematization (or schema extension, cf. Heyvaert, 2009), and comes up with non-words, or new, agrammatical complex words, as in (1)

(1) "It is *sickable*! It is *rotsome*! Try yourself this *foulsome* cucumber! It is *disgustive*, you'll like it, my little friend!" (*The BFG*: 195).

Sickable (En. *sickening*), *rotsome* (En. *rotten*), *foulsome* (En. *foul*), *disgustive* (En. *disgusting*) are speech errors originating in non-conventional schematization and agrammatical adjectival derivation. Asking teacher trainees to notice and explain these errors contributes to *inductive explicit learning* of the grammar of word-formation: trainees should be able to eventually discover and verbalize some explicit rules or preferences (Ellis, 2008) as well as violations of general rules and preferences.

Implicit knowledge, reflection on the L2 input, comparison with dictionary equivalents (from *Il Ragazzini, 2011*), metalinguistic feedback on observed speech errors and explanations of acceptability judgments, all work towards enhancing metalinguistic awareness of morphological rules.

2.2. First-order rules for explicit knowledge of morphology

We proceed on the assumption that exploring the acceptability of examples from *The BFG* may encourage reflexion on competition among suffixes within a given morphological domain. The main emphasis lies on the semantic relation of 'possession' (Hamawand, 2011): 'is / is full of / is characterized by / has / shows (quality expressed by the) base'.

Importantly, we take the first steps towards turning second-order rules into first-order rules. Though terminological precision and technical detail are unavoidably lost, recourse to broad intelligible and transparent rules of thumb in the form of accessible and transparent explanations of form-meaning connections, is primarily intended to enable teacher trainees to concentrate on the possible dimensions along which individual suffixes might be found to compete, overlap or vary.

To this purpose, we simplify information gathered from scholarly grammars (for English: Quirk et al., 1985; Bauer & Huddleston, 2002), reference works and studies on word formation and adjectival derivation

(for English: Marchand, 1969; Ljiung, 1970; Hamawand, 2011; Bauer, Lieber & Plag, 2013; Dixon, 2014; for Italian: Grossman and Rainer (Eds.), 2004; Dardano, 2009), and encyclopedic monolingual dictionaries (for English: OED − Oxford English Dictionary; for Italian: GRADIT: Grande Dizionario Italiano dell'Uso). Particularly, we draw heavily on Bauer, Lieber & Plag's (2013) *Oxford reference guide to English morphology* and Dixon's (2014) monograph on *Making new words*. Whereas the former relies on extensive quantitative investigation of contemporary English, Dixon's (2014) monograph covers over 100 affixes, giving etymological information, uses of the affix and overlaying competitors, and explanations that are very easy to understand.

3. Creative errors for inductive learning of explicit rules

This section compares and contrasts the use and combinative roles of rival morphological suffixes within the 'possession' domain. Speech errors are taken from *The BFG*. Italian translations from *Il GGG* are also used to point to formal (non-)equivalences when dictionary articles comprise equivalent cognates. We suggest that the instructor promotes acceptability judgment and error correction tasks carried out without time constraints, peer discussion and metalinguistic corrective feedback among peers. S/he would also encourage trainees to produce acceptable TL explanations and, consequently, to verbalize transparent rules. While the emphasis lies on knowledge *about* language, this can also contribute to implicit language learning via schema entrenchment (Heyvaert, 2009).

Sections 3.1 to 3.2.1 provide basic information about some fundamental questions that the activities might put to teacher trainees. Sample questions are as follows: What is the meaning of the suffix *-ous*? Which affixes are available in English to express a meaning relation R between a modified noun and the base of the adjective, e.g. 'possession'? How does the suffix *-some* differ from quasi-equivalents within the same domain? When would you use the suffix *-ing*? Which parts-of-speech use *-y* selected as their bases? Is there any correlation between suffix selection, origin of the suffix and etymology of the base? Do the structural features of the base restrict affix selection?

3.1. -ous, -(er)ous

If adjectives specify a property in the noun they modify, 'A *-ous* N' can be paraphrased as 'N characterized by A', where N is a Noun (not a Name). Still, **gigantous* (2) is agrammatical because En. *-ous* attaches to

free bases and *gigant-* is not a free base affected by allomorphy, and, additionally, because *gigantous* is blocked by En. *gigantic* which came into English from Greek through Romance languages. (See the Italian cognate *gigante*, an N to A conversion which does double duty as A and N):

(2) *gigant*ous*: En. gigant*ic* //It. 'gigant*e*'A ← 'gigant*e*'N 'giant' [conversion]

If we now turn to examples (4) to (7), they are speech errors based on phonetic substitution that results in phonetic and visual orthographic neighbors (Rastle, 2009) of the correct English counterpart, or misspelling and wrong pronunciation in first-order terms. Though *wonderous* appears to be a neighbor of *wondrous* (an English native word originating from N + Genitive), an additional explanation for (4) might be that the BFG creates *wonderous* based on analogy with *murderous* (3) and other derivatives from nouns ending in *-er*.

(3) En. murd*erous*← murder N // It. 'omicid*a*' A/N ← 'omicidio' N

(4) *wond*erous* (BFG; En.) ← wonder N // It. 'miracol*oso*' A ← 'miracolo' N

(5) ?cantanst*erous*← En. cantankerous ← cankerous (A← N) + rancorous (A← N) [blend], Coll. // It. 'irasc*ibile*' A ← 'ira' N

(6) *disast*erous* : En. disastrous A ← disaster N // It. 'disastr*oso*' A← 'disastro' N

(7) *propspost*erous*← En. preposterous // It. 'irragion*evole*', 'assurdo', 'insens*ato*'

In (7), language play amounts to phonetic substitution in a borrowing from classical Latin *praeposterous*. As is apparent, the consonant cluster of the non-word *propsposterous* violates the phonotactics of English.

(3), (4), (5, a blend) and (6) are derivations from abstract nouns, with 'A *-ous* N' meaning 'characterized by / is a / that denotes a property expressed by the base'.

Italian dictionary equivalents are cognate *-oso*, competitors *-evole*, *-ibile*, and Past Participle *-ato*. Broadly, they allow paraphrases like 'suitable for', 'characterized by', 'showing'. Yet, there are different facets to individual suffixes and pairs of equivalents: It. *-evole* and It. *-ibile* (and En. *-ible*, its cognate) derive adjectives in the passive voice; they activate 'patientivity' and describe situations that change through time and are thus 'capable of undergoing the action described by the base'. It. *-ato* and En. -

ed (its dictionary equivalent) 'describe the effect of an action on the receiving patient' in the 'voice' domain or a 'state' in the 'aspect' domain (the condition activated in the past and resulting from being affected by the action denoted by the base). Conversely, It. *-oso* and En. *-ous*, instead, describe the 'quality that causes / induces' the action. Hence, *murderous*, where *-ous* translates into causative It. *-a* − which foregrounds agenthood, or, activates 'cause' in the 'voice' domain and 'achievement' / 'accomplishment' in the 'aspect' domain−, or, again, En. *disasterous* and It. *disastroso*, meaning 'which causes / induces N' in the 'possession' domain.

3.1.1. -(t)ious, -(s)y, -(s)ey

Under the learned suffix-learned word correlation rule, examples (8a) and (8b) are highly implausible. Based on play with sound shapes (that is, phonetic substitution), scrumptious appears to be a close neighbour of dialectal scrimption (OED: scrimption); it would thus instantiate the -tion/-tious pair as in conspiration/conspiratious, contention/contentious):

(8a) ?delunctious← En. delicious + En. scrumptious (blend) // It. 'delizioso' [Coll; Int] ← 'delizia' [N]

(8b) ?scrumdiddlyumptious ← En. scrumptious + creative Infix -diddly- // It. 'delizioso' [Coll.; Int] ← 'delizia' [N]

We now turn to examples (9a) t (10b). *lumptiousis a non-word, an agrammatical word-formation grounded in play with sound shapes. A most plausible candidate here would be lumpy: lumpy: 1. Full of lumps; 4. Intoxicated, drunk (slang)), where, very broadly, -y indicates 'possession' (OED). Sense 1 reflects the use of -y with concrete, countable Nouns ('having the appearance of the thing expresses by the base', cf. Hamawand 2011). And, in a slightly different manner, Sense 4 from the OED adds traits to appearance. This is not any different from the general meaning of –ous ('possession'). Contrary to -ous, however, as a native suffix -y is more comfortable with native bases.

(9a) ?delumptious ← En. delicious + *lumptious (blend) // It. 'delizioso' [Coll.; Int] ← 'delizia' [N]

(9b) ?glumptious← g + *lumptious // It.'delizioso' [Coll.; Int] ← 'delizia' [N]

(10a-10b) gives some examples for -y or, better, -s-y and allomorphs in jocular formations. Given Latin origin and matching preference for non-native polysyllabic bases, -ous would be agrammatical: thus, -

ousshuns native English monosyllabic bases, jocular infix -s- and evaluative morphology (-y/-ie):

(10a) En. jump-s-y // It. 'irritabile'← 'irritare' [V]

(10b) En. wack-s-ey // It. 'spassoso' ← 'spasso' [N]

Here, En. -y has the sense 'having the trait of the (abstract) N/of the thing expressed by the base'.

3.2. -ful, -some

If two suffixes within the same domain attach to the same base, then we must expect some kind of meaning specialization. To illustrate, En.-*ous* and -*ful* denote a possession relation. Though very much alike, however, in *wondrous* (11a) and *wonderful* (11b), they specialize with respect to *wonder*:

(11a) En.wondr*ous* // It. 'miracol*oso*'

(11b) En.wonder*ful* // It. 'meravigli*oso*'

In general, -*ful* denotes a possession relation of the type 'full of' and can be paraphrased as 'showing a quality' or 'giving rise to the abstract quality denoted by the base'; with -*ous* the noun is characterized by the quality denoted by the base because that 'quality is abundant or characteristic of the base'. On these grounds, *wondrous* can be taken to express stronger approbation than *wonderful* (Dixon, 2014, p. 254).

In **grueful* (12), -*ful* means 'likely to do the action denoted by the base', or 'full of the quality denoted by the nominal base'.

(12) **grueful*: En. grue*some* // It. 'raccapriccia*nte*'

Teacher trainees are highly proficient L2 speakers. Since *gruesome* is most probably listed in their mental lexicon, they would immediately dismiss **grueful* as agrammatical. The speech error made by the BFG might make sense given that both -*ful* and -*some* are native suffixes that describe a possession relation and are comfortable on native and non-native bases. The obsolete *gruesome*, however, would represent an exception to the free base rule in that it was coined on a bound base at a time when -*some* was productive (Middle English, cf. OED: GRUESOME, Bauer et al. 2013, p. 305). The question is whether -*ful* and -*some* can be diversified drawing on formal and semantic features, etymology and productivity. Though productivity would call for extensive investigation into general corpora, for purposes of this research, recourse to enriched

input from the literature on adjectival derivation will suffice. Based on Dixon (2014), it is indeed easy to claim that -*ful* has a strong preference for combining with abstract nouns, as in *peaceful* 'quieto', *purposeful* 'risol*uto*', *thoughtful* 'pensier*oso*', 'preoccup*ato*', *lawful* 'lecito', *dutiful* 'rispett*oso*', 'obbedi*ente*', *joyful* 'gioi*oso*, fest*oso*', *fearful* 'spavent*oso*', *regretful* '*pieno di*rammarico', *wrongful* 'ingiusto', 'iniquo', *rightful* 'legittimo'.

Broadly, -*ful* can be paraphrased (and translated) as 'N showing A', 'N characterized by A' or even 'full of' as in *regretful*. The BFG, however, makes systematic recourse to 'N -*some*' ('apt to have or be an N/quality denoted by the N', cf. Dixon, 2014, adapted). Given that the suffix -*some* is no longer productive in English and it is most likely to be found in unusual and highly infrequent word-formations coined in the Middle English period (e.g. unusual *frightsome* and *filthsome*), its use in *The BFG* might testify to the longevity of the BFG and to his isolation from humans. Additionally, the BFG appears to overgeneralize selection of negative entities in -*some*, which indicates that the noun modified 'triggers the negative action denoted by the base' in complex words like *bothersome*, *frightsome*, *lonesome*, *plaguesome* (OED), *fearsome* and *burdensome* (Hamawand, 2011). From the BFG: **foulsome*, *?venomsome*, *?frightsome*, **rotsome*, **filthsome* (13a to 13e) as against *?healthsome* (13f).

(13a) *foul*some*: En. *foul* // It. disgust*oso*

(13b) ?venom*some* [OED: dialectal] : En. venom*ous* // It. velen*oso*, venef*ico*

(13c) ?fright*some* [OED: unusual]: En. frighten*ing*, fright*ful* // It. 'spavent*oso*, *spaventevole*'

(13d) *rot*some*: En. rott*en* // It. 'disgust*oso*'

(13e) *filth*some*: En. filth*y* // It. 'ripugn*ante*'

(13f) ?health*some* [OED: unusual] : En. health*y* // It. 'salut*are*'

Specifically, blocking from *foul* makes **foulsome* an agrammatical non-wording (13a). Dialectal *?venomsome* (13b) could be also dismissed as agrammatical (**venomsome*) by teacher trainees – unlikely to be familiar with the word − based on the tendency of Latinate and Romance bases to keep company with Latin and Romance suffixes (accordingly, *venomous* as against *?venomsome*). Conversely, the fully grammatical counterparts of (13e) **filthsome?* and health*some* (13f) are *healthy* and *filthy*, which testify to the selection of monosyllabic native bases by adjective-deriving -*y*.

3.2.1. -able, -ive, -ing

Other speech errors that are particular to the BFG involve deverbal adjectives. The BFG is not able to derive grammatical adjectives from verbs. Examples here are ?*frightsome* as against En. *frightening* (13c), with -*ing* expressing agenthood – or activating 'activity' in the 'aspect' domain -, and *rotsome as against En. *rotten* (13d)- with -*en* expressing 'resemblance' to the substance / base. To take complex non-words with other suffixes, consider also **sickable*, for En. *sickening* (14) and **disgustive*, for En. *disgusting* (15).

(14) *sick*able*: En. sicken*ing* // It. 'stomach*evole*, disgust*oso*'

(15) *disgust*ive*: En. disgust*ing* // It. 'disgust*oso*'

Setting aside **rotsome* / En. *rotten* (13d), complex words such as *frightening* (13c), *sickening* (14) and *disgusting* (15) combine a verb base and causative -*ing* (meaning 'that Vs' or 'that causes the action denoted by the base') to denote an activity or process that might go on indefinitely (Hamawand, 2011). Rather than agentivity, -*able* describes ability to undergo an action, or 'patientivity' in the 'voice' domain. Other suffixes that diverge from -*ing* in terms of voice and aspect, are -*ive* and -*ant* ('liable to V', 'that can do V', cf. Dixon, 2014). They indicate an action initiated by an agent (the head) and profile a process that happens at a certain point in time or comes to an end. This accounts for the agrammaticality of **disgustive* (15) as against *disgusting* though not of **repulsant* (16).

(16) **repuls*ant*: En. repuls*ive* // It. repell*ente*

As suffixes of Latin origin, -*ive* and -*ant* show a strong preference for non-native bases. What makes **repulsant* a non-word is a formal requirement: only the suffix -*ive* forms word-families with consonantal alternation from a verb of Latin origin to a derived noun in -*ion*, -*tion* and -*(at)ive*, as in *extensive* ← *extend*, *permissive* ← *permit*, *descriptive* ← *describe*, *competitive* ←*compete* (Dixon, 2014, p. 184).

4. Conclusions

This chapter has provided some basic observations and necessarily brief suggestions for fostering morphological awareness in the teacher trainee class. While space has precluded a more exhaustive exploration into the meaning and structural features of suffixes of possession, the examples discussed are sufficient to make one crucial point: the type of

first-order information given can help teachers verbalize transparent rules of thumb based on the dimensions of variation.

As regards structural features, suffixes may differ based on the part of speech selected (here, N or V) and subcategories such as abstract or concrete. Second, origin is also key: non-native suffixes (*-ous*) show a strong preference for polysyllabic, non-native bases; the other way round, although they may combine with both native and non-native bases, native suffixes (*-y*) have a preference for the former. As to semantics, suffixes may vary along domains and subdomains the meaning of which can be described using first-order paraphrases: next to 'possession' (*-ful*, *-ous*, *-some*, *-y*), we thus spell out facets of 'voice' (active: *-ive*; passive: *-ible*, *-ed*; cause: *-ing*), and 'aspect' (state: *-ed*; activity: *-ing*; accomplishment and achievement: *-ive*). Another domain is 'evaluation', whereby one can draw a line between *-ous* and *-some*, which selects for negative bases. Last, productivity must enter into the equation: in this respect, we have seen that the BFG has extensive recourse to *-some*, which is no longer productive in English.

Altogether, we hope to have minimally demonstrated that in-class reflection on creative errors from children's literature can help activate peer discussion and promote debate on adjectival derivation, and thus assist the instructor in introducing trainees to problematic aspects of grammatical word-formation for inductive explicit learning of form-meaning connections. However, rule-searching during practice activities is time consuming and can only return a more or less partial picture dependent on the input presented. A shift is therefore needed, from activities and tasks on rule searching and speech errors to materials that provide direct proactive explicit instruction (Ellis, 2008) and that have been compiled by the instructor based on data analysis of corpus data and extensive literature review.

References

Andrews, S. J. (2003). Teacher language awareness and the professional knowledge base of the L2 teacher. *Language Awareness,* (Vol. 2), 81-95.

Bauer, L., & Huddleston, R. (2002). Lexical word-formation. In G. K. Pullum & R. Huddleston (Eds.), *The Cambridge grammar of the English language* (pp. 1623-1721). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauer, L., Rochelle, L., & Plag, I. (2013). *The Oxford reference guide to English word-formation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, G. (2000). *Language play, language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dahl, R. (1982/2013). *The BFG*. Illustrated by Quentin Blake. Puffin Books. (Ziliotto, D., 1987/2004, Trans.). *Il GGG*. Salani Ragazzi.

Dardano, M. (2009). *Costruire parole. La morfologia derivative dell'italiano.* Bologna: Il Mulino.

Dixon, R. M. W. (2014). *Making New Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Derwing, T. M., & Munrow, M. J. (2005). Pragmatic perspectives on the preparation of teachers of English as a Second Language. Putting the NS/NNS debate in context. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers* (pp.179-191). New York: Springer.

Ellis, N. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*, (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction. In R. Ellis, S. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philp & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching* (pp. 3-26). Bristol, Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

GRADIT: De Mauro, T. 1999, 2003, 2007. *Grande Dizionario Italiano dell'Uso*. Turin: UTET.

Grossmann, M., & Rainer, F. (Eds.). (2004). *La formazione delle parole in italiano*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Hamawand, Z. (2011). *Morphology in English. Word formation in Cognitive Grammar*. London: Continuum.

Heyvaert, L. (2009). Compounding in cognitive linguistics. In R. Lieber, & P. Štekauer (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding* (pp.233-254). New York: Oxford University Press.

Il Ragazzini 2011: Ragazzini, G. (Ed.). (2010). *Il Ragazzini 2011. Dizionario italiano-inglese, inglese-italiano*. Retrieved from http://www.zanichelli.dizionari.it.

Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol.1: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

—. (1991). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. 2*: *Descriptive Applications*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Llurda, E. (Ed.). (2005). *Non-native language teachers*. New York: Springer.

Lowie, W. (2000). Cross-linguistic influence on morphology in the bilingual mental lexicon. *Studia Linguistica, 54* (2), 175-185.

Marchand, H. (1960). *The categories and types of English word-formation*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

OED (1989-). Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd Ed. Later additions retrieved from http://www.oed.com.

Plag, I. (1999). *Morphological productivity. Structural constraints in English derivation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Rastle, K. (2009). Visual word recognition. In M. G. Gaskell (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of psycholinguistics* (pp. 71-87). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rodari, G. (1973). *Grammatica della fantasia. Introduzione all'arte di inventare storie*. Torino: Einaudi.

Svalberg, A. M.-L. (2007). Language awareness and language learning. *Language Teaching, 40*(4), 287-308.

Svalberg, A. M.-L. (2009). Engagement with language: Developing a construct. *Language Awareness, 28*(3-4), 242-258.

Ur, P. (2012). *A course in English language teaching* (2nd rev. ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, T., & Bolitho, R. (1997). Towards awareness of English as a professional language. *Language Awareness, 6*(2-3), 162-170.

Exploring Formulaic Clusters in L2 English Expert Writing: Academic ELF Discourse

Gabriela Zapletalová
University of Ostrava

Research into various aspects of formulaic language in academia has revealed that recurrent formulaic clusters (lexical bundles/sequences, multi-word combinations, chunks, prefabs) are genre-, discipline- and register-dependent as well as user-oriented. No scholarly attention has so far been paid to the use of formulaic clusters by L2-English experts in research papers that have not undergone professional language brokering services. The present study examines the forms, structures, and functions of n-word clusters employed by L1 Czech experts submitting their texts for publication in anglophone journals. The analysis shows that ELF texts reveal a tendency for phrasal constructions while verbal and clausal constructions are much less employed. These are signals of L1 expert production, however, L2 experts use fewer stance-oriented clusters. Research-oriented clusters dominate 3-word chunks and discourse-oriented clusters are typical of 4-word chunks. Potential approximation reveal very low frequencies and a tendency towards conventional ENL forms.

1. Introduction

In the past two decades, formulaic and conventionalized language structures have received undying research attention. Formulaic structures are formed by fixed and semi-fixed word sequences; they comprise a large repertoire of multi-word expressions from highly invariable and relatively fixed structures such as idioms, collocations and colligations to less fixed two-to-more-word phrasal or clausal combinations such as *from my point of view* or *it should be noted*, and article/prepositional framing patterns such as *the [case, use] ... of the ...* (cf. Biber et al., 1999; Byrd & Coxhead,

2010). Research on formulaic language suggests that "formulaic sequences are thought to be psycholinguistically real" (O'Donnell et al., 2013, p. 84) and that fluent interaction is based on "the retrieval of semi-constructed chunks of language from memory" (Carey, 2013, p. 209), which means that words naturally co-occur in particular established patterns and are co-selected rather than chosen on each particular occasion as individual units which then form a new utterance.

Previous research into formulaic language has focused on investigating primarily the nature and use of lexical clusters across genres, disciplines and registers (e.g. Biber et al., 1999; Biber, 2006; Biber & Barbieri, 2007; Byrd & Coxhead, 2010; Hyland, 2008). The complementary research strand has centered on developmental changes in the use of the sequences which are seen as markers of linguistic proficiency between learner/novice and expert writers, or L1-English and L2-English learner/expert writers (e.g. Cortes, 2004; Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010; Ädel & Erman, 2012; Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2012, 2013; Staples et al., 2013; Povolná & Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2014). Much research is modelled on native-like fluency: non-native users' production is measured in terms of how proficiently and 'appropriately' formulaic clusters are employed in the target register. Pan et al. (2016, p. 61) admit that some of these studies "have confounded the influence of expertise with the influence of L1" because no unanimous decision has been reached as to whether the use of formulaic bundles is a matter of developmental interlanguage progress on the learner – expert/L1 – L2 combination scale. Recent research into lexical patterns of L1 vs. L2 English academic professionals (Pérez-Llantada, 2014; Pan et al., 2016) suggests that differences between the two groups lie mainly in the use of structural (L1: phrasal vs. L2: clausal preference) and functional bundle types (L1: more research-oriented vs. L2: more stance-oriented bundles). In consequence, nativeness is not a decisive factor in the production of efficient academic communication; it is "the interplay of L1 and expertise" (Pan et al., 2016) which offers an explanation for the differences found.

Based on the findings it seems obvious that expertise is a key parameter when measuring the degree of expert level of academic production. The present research builds on this premise and complements it with an alternative approach by stressing the role of writers and authors as active expert users of the language whose texts originate in scholarly contexts and are aimed for academics; these users are not viewed as learners whose production is rooted in instructional and educational environments. No study so far has focused on exploring formulaic clusters

in corpora consisting of unpublished ELF data. The research questions arise:

1. Which are the most frequent formulaic clusters in the particular L2 variable?

2. What are the structural and functional characteristics of the top-of-the-list clusters in comparison with those reported in studies of ENL and ELF academic writing?

2. Corpus and Methodology

The study draws on data from the corpus WrELFA (2015), which was designed for academic/scientific writing practices research to study the principles and conventions of English-as-a-lingua-franca discourse, and consists of three components: the SciELF corpus, PhD examiner reports and academic research blogging. The study's focus is on the SciELF component (SciELF 2015), a 759,300 word collection of 150 research articles (RAs) written by L2 users of English from ten different L1 backgrounds. The composition assigns the corpus the status of second-language use (SLU) compilation: an essential quality of the ELF data is that they represent unelicited, naturally occurring authentic SLU material. All RAs are classified as unpublished, final-draft research manuscripts which have not undergone any checking by a professional native speaker editor. The data fall into two comparable sets of texts, representing the sciences, and the social sciences and humanities. The present research focuses on RAs by Czech users of English: the first set (Sci) comprises 12 texts from geology, biology and entomology; the second set (SSH) includes 10 texts from economics, linguistics, philology and psychology. Table 1 shows the lexical profile and overall statistics for both Czech subcorpora, making the total of 22 papers within the SciELF corpus.

The Czech subcorpus represents a relatively small-scale 113,999-word collection of data, which simultaneously fulfills the criteria of specialized and special-purpose corpora (cf. Bowker & Pearson, 2002). The reliability of specialized corpora lies in their "inherent advantages from a methodological perspective over general corpora" (Flowerdew, 2004, p. 16), which makes two points crucial for data analysis and interpretation: first, the context of situation and culture is preserved since "[t]he compiler-cum-analyst [acts] as a kind of mediating ethnographic specialist informant to shed light on the corpus data" (Flowerdew, 2004, p. 16); and second, the size, composition and precise genre contextualization of specialized corpora "allow for more top-down, qualitative, contextually-

informed analyses than those carried out using general corpora" (Flowerdew, 2004, p. 18).

Table 1 SciELF-Cz statistics

	SciELF – CZ	Sci – CZ	SSH – CZ
Tokens (runningwords) in text	113,999	52,754	61,245
Types (distinctwords)	9,560	5,152	6,575
Type/token ration TTR	8.75	10.39	11.03
Standardised TTR	40.38	39.61	41.04
Standardised TTR standard deviation	57.79	57.75	56.81
Sentences	4,764	2,370	2,394
Mean (in words)	22.93	20.93	24.91
Standard deviation	13.97	12.74	14.83

Since previous research has amply documented discipline-oriented trends in the use of formulaic clusters, their occurrence and function in particular academic domains is thus of secondary interest. The present study primarily focuses on formulaic clusters as such, i.e. on their nature and overall occurrence in L2 English expert academic writing. The research method follows that of Carey (2013), which is based on the investigation of frequency and distributional features of textual multi-word formulaic clusters in academic ELF.

2.1 Analytic procedure

The dominant research tradition in the field recommends selecting target clusters by taking into account variables of item frequency, dispersion across texts, and the sequence length. The frequency cut-off points for identifying clusters differ according to materials used; e.g. Biber et al. (1999) set a minimal cut-off point of 10 occurrences per million words for four-word clusters, Hyland (2008) uses 20 times per million words, while Pan et al. (2016) agree on more 'standard' 40 per million words. The distribution criterion ensures that high-frequency clusters are not idiosyncratic to particular writers. Extremely common three-word clusters behave as "extended collocational association[s]" (Biber et al., 1999, p. 992) which together with their right context can reveal "the