

Irena Medvešek

Ana Bačić

Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku

Fanny Meunier and Sylviane Granger, eds. 2008. *Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 259. ISBN 978 90 272 3244.

‘Words mean things in the context of other words.’ Nick C. Ellis begins the preface of this volume stating the very starting point of the majority of phraseological research done in the past decade. Due to the technological advances and the consequent increase in the amount of research done in this area, phraseology has established itself as a linguistic discipline of its own.

Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching is one of three volumes published after an interdisciplinary conference on phraseology entitled ‘Phraseology 2005. Many Faces of Phraseology’ held in Louvain-la-Neuve in October 2005. The conference brought together about 170 participants from a wide range of countries with an aim to look at phraseology from a wide range of perspectives.

The volume has 259 pages and is divided into three thematic sections, *Extracting and describing phraseological units*, *Learning phraseological units* and *Recording and exploiting phraseological units*, which are organised in total of 11 chapters. In the final, fourth section, the editors Fanny Meunier and Sylviane Granger conclude by identifying the way for future theoretical and practical work in the field.

‘What of the phrase in second-language acquisition and instruction?’ is the question raised by Nick C. Ellis in the preface and it remains the key issue of all the 11 chapters in this volume. Since many of the classified articles deal with two or three perspectives, it makes sense to present each from the authors' point of view.

The author of the first article Graeme Kennedy (*Phraseology and language pedagogy*) describes the distribution of phraseology associated with eight high frequency lexical verbs (*enjoy, give, receive, start, begin, stop* and *finish*) based on the whole British National Corpus. He analyses their content word collocates, both by frequency and by Mutual Information Value, which is a useful indica-

tion of the strength of the association between words within the phrase. For example, END, the 129th most frequent lexical verb in BNC tends to precede nouns, is associated with big unpleasant processes (*war, conflict, siege, etc.*) as well as generally negative things (*tears, divorce, disaster, etc.*) FINISH, the 175th most frequent lexical verb in BNC is associated with more mundane or every-day activities or events (*works, jobs, meals*). MI values show that collocates of FINISH tend to be of a less spectacular or global nature (*eating, dressing, speaking*), therefore although END and FINISH appear to have much in common semantically, they do not strongly associate with the same words.

The author suggests that multi-word units are not arbitrarily bound together. In previous studies Sinclair (1987) and Louw (1993) introduced the phenomenon of 'semantic prosody', for example, verbs such as *set in* or *happen* were described as having negative semantic prosody. On the other hand Stubbs (2001:65) was of the opinion that 'semantic preference', i.e. 'the relation, not between individual words, but between a lemma or word-form and a set of semantically related words' should be taken into consideration. Kennedy's analysis shows that high frequency lexical verbs tend to associate with other words having particular grammatical features or belonging to particular semantic domains. The author concludes by speculating why phraseology has not been more present in language pedagogy and gives several possible reasons for this. In his opinion, there has not been a reliable way of establishing what multi-word units in a language are constituted of, there has been a dispute among teachers about whether teaching approach should be form-focused or message-focused and there is no established 'method' for teaching phraseology. Furthermore, there is a difference in explicit and implicit language learning. Since phraseology has mostly been a part of implicit learning which occurs when pedagogy is message-focused, it has not been easy to teach the abundance of phraseology within a corpus explicitly. The author states that while formulaic multi-word units are produced by native speakers and are seen as a mark of fluency, teachers have often perceived them as 'clichés'. However, language teachers should devise methodologies and maximise opportunities for implicit learning. The author is of the opinion that reading of all kinds provides exposure to language which enables implicit learning and corpus-based research can help language teachers to achieve this.

The second article in this section, *Essential Collocations for Learners of English: The Role of Collocational Direction and Weight* by Susanne Handl explores the variety of ways collocations are represented in dictionaries. The author believes that a method of finding out which collocations are most relevant to learners and a method of signalling their importance to them should be devised. Therefore, she tries to develop a more comprehensive multi-dimensional

classification based on three gradable criteria: semantic transparency, collocational range and frequency. She then uses these criteria to establish three dimensions: semantic, lexical and statistical dimension, each ranging from minimum to maximum. In this way she determines a core area of prototypical collocations for each dimension and excludes extremes (idioms and free ad hoc combinations) on both sides of the scale. Furthermore, she determines two different frequency scores for each collocational partner. The resulting collocational factor describes the impact a lexical item has on the collocation it occurs in. This also holds for semantic and lexical dimensions, so that it leads to a more complex picture of collocation and enables defining a collocational profile and its position on each of the dimensions.

In order to develop a method of determining which collocations are relevant for a learner, the author ran 250 high frequency words through the BNC and they returned 200 statistically significant collocates each. However, the obtained scores did not show their relevance, so she proposes a new factor (CF-Collocational Factor) which relates the frequency of each collocational partner to the frequency of the item within the collocation, and is calculated as ratio between the frequency of the collocation and the frequency of the independent word ($CF(a) = \frac{F_{combined}(a+b)}{F_{isolated}(a)}$). Based on the results Handl makes two general observations about CF: The less frequent the word, the higher its CF and vice versa. Generally, these statistical findings support the findings from the lexical dimension but detailed semantic analysis would be needed in order to establish collocational relevance, since semantic contribution in some of the collocations is high. The author establishes two types of collocations according to collocational weight: the directional class with one partner leading the combination and the level class with both partners having very similar or identical CF. From this, she concludes that stronger lexemes which also hold a certain attraction should be learned. According to the author, collocational index, i.e. level of collocate attraction, should be incorporated into dictionaries and proposes the way this should be done.

In the third article entitled *Phraseology effects as a trigger for errors in L2 English, The case of more advanced learners* John Osborne looks at four errors that are produced by learners of English as L2: pluralized adjectives (*What happened to the good olds times?*), plural use of mass nouns (*A huge amount of informations in our google box*), omission of the 3rd person -s (*Modern life seem to be very chaotic*) and inappropriate adverb placement (*People accept passively brainwashing*). In order to establish whether they are random cases of backsliding or the specific context in which they appear can be identified the author compared LOCNESS and ESCALE corpus to Chambersy Corpus and ICLE of different national subcorpora. He comes to the conclusion that although there

might be some randomness in learners' errors, it seems that something in the context in which errors reappear has a facilitating effect. After close examination of the contexts in question, Osborne identifies three main types of contributing factors for all error occurrences: Blending, bonding and burying. Blending occurs when elements which are combined to form a larger unit share or transfer grammatical features amongst themselves, resulting in features that are not allowed by grammar (e.g. in multi-word units *natives speakers*).

Bonding occurs when lexical or grammatical elements that have formed associations in the learner's lexicon or grammar become bonded to each other in such a way that they not only co-occur, but also appear in adjacent position (e. g. adverb+verb collocations such as *follow blindly everything...*).

Burying occurs when elements are imbedded inside larger units, therefore become less salient and lose grammatical features they would normally have, e. g. *...loves when a tender and careful woman waits for him at home and after a busy day meet him with a kind smile and moral support.*

The author of the next chapter, *Contrasting English – Spanish interpersonal discourse phrases*, JoAnne Neff van Aertselaer contrasts interactional phrases used by novice and expert writers of argumentative texts in English and Spanish. She examines and compares the use of hedging expressions, certainty expressions and passive constructions using four corpora, SPICLE (Spanish EFL ADVANCED LEARNERS) – NOVICE, LOCNESS (American university writers) – NOVICE, Spanish editorialists (Peninsular Spanish texts) and English editorialists (British and American texts). After identifying the most frequent clusters she compares the results of the Spanish EFL writers to the ones of the signed editorial texts in order to calculate significance. She also carries out statistical tests for the comparison of the American novice writers' and the Spanish novice writers' texts with those of the expert writers' in English in order to distinguish negative transfer factors from novice writer's factors.

The results show that Spanish EFL writers are influenced by three factors: Incomplete mastery of the English modal system including modal adverbs (*It could be thought*), novice writer factor such as the use of forceful adjectival phrases and adverbs (*It is sure that...*) as well as transfer from L1 which results in the Spanish use of fewer lexical phrases for hedging as well as preference for the reflexive passive impersonal constructions in the present tense (*it is said*) which are sometimes non-existent in English (*it is proved that*).

The author concludes that ESL and EFL students need to be provided with a stock of nativelike expert phrases for evaluating the claims they wish to make

and suggests that this study be used in the teaching of Academic English in tertiary institutions.

In the last article in this section entitled *Exemplification in learner writing: A cross-linguistic perspective* Magali Paquot examines the influence of mother tongue on learners' production of multi-word units which are typically used for exemplifying. As the comparison of native and non-native corpora shows, EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners tend to overuse a limited number of frequent English collocations and underuse a whole set of native-like phraseological units in academic writing. The author extracts the phraseological patterns for five exemplifying lexical items from Paquot's (2007) productively-oriented academic word list and analyses the two fixed conjuncts *for example* and *for instance*, the noun *example* and the verbs *illustrate* and *exemplify* in five sub-corpora of the International Corpus of Learner's English (ICLE) (Granger et al. 2002). Texts comprise argumentative essays written by upper-intermediate to advanced learners of five different mother tongue backgrounds: Dutch, French, German, Polish and Spanish, which she then compares to the extended version of *Louvain Corpus of Native Speaker Essays* (Granger 1996). She uses two types of comparison: Contractive Analysis (CA) and Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis (CIA) and employs the Integrated Contrastive Model (ICM) to approach the data. In order to explain CIA findings she uses the explanatory approach. The analysis shows that there are similar patterns of overuse among the five mother tongue backgrounds, i. e. *for instance* and *for example* are strongly overused by the vast majority of learners which leads the author to the conclusion that students' repertoires for introducing examples are restricted to those they felt confident in using. According to Paquot, this is due to the fact that they are taught as functionally equivalent forms. On the other hand, learners tend to underuse the verb *exemplify* as well as the passive form of *illustrate*, but overuse the active structures with *illustrate* with human subject. However, French learners massively overuse the sequence *let us take the example of*, which is transfer from their mother tongue and is extremely rare in native speakers' academic essays. These findings support the view that 'linguistic patterns and rhetorical conventions of the L1 often transfer to writing in ESL and thus cause interference' (Connor 2002: 494). Like the author of the previous article, Paquot also believes that learners should be specifically taught the native-like patterns for introducing examples and suggests these findings to be used in the academic writing classes to help learners conform to 'the native stylistic norms for a particular register' (Connor 2002: 494).

In the first article (*Why can't you just leave it alone? Deviations from memorized language as a gauge of nativelike competence*) of the second section entitled *Learning Phraseological Units*, the authors Alison Wray and Tess Fitz-

patrick investigate the language learners' capacity to improve their linguistic skills by memorizing specially targeted linguistic material. Six intermediate/advanced Japanese and Chinese learners were asked to memorize and then use nativelike sentences in real interaction in order to establish deviations from the given material. Before that, the subjects had taken two independent measures of proficiency (EVST5 and LLAT). When a non-native speaker is asked to memorize something, the number and the kind non-native errors depend on the individual's command of the target language and their ability to focus on the form as well as on the message. Therefore, the authors examined the distribution of nativelike and non-nativelike repairs to incompletely recalled targets (deviation profiling) and in this way established the proficiency measure. They also measured the level of risk taken as indicated by the overall closeness of the output to the target. The deviations were classified as native or non-nativelike, as well as morphological, lexical or phrasal (multiword). Phrase-level deviations were most common, two out of three were judged nativelike, lexical deviations accounted for one third of the total and more than two thirds were nativelike, whereas one quarter of the deviations were morphological. Inflections and articles were most likely to be changed in a non-nativelike way. The authors conclude that deviation profiling can offer a useful insight into individual's command of L2. 'A profile is a representation of knowledge, attention and perception of risk, and it is for the individual, ultimately to decide whether the balance between them is optimal for their own goals'. The subjects reported that the use of memorized sentences was a liberating experience and it seems that it provides advantages in relation to learning, confidence building and proficiency evaluation.

In the second article in this section, *Phraseology and English for Academic Purposes*, the author Averil Coxhead outlines some of the challenges teachers, students and researchers face when dealing with formulaic language. The author emphasises the importance of phrases in EAP, and tries to provide some insight into what phrases should be taught and how. Academic discourse is marked by formal lexis, which Corson (1995) calls predominantly Graeco-Latin vocabulary. This poses a challenge to undergraduate non-native students and is therefore necessary to be addressed in EAP courses. In order to find out what phraseological units students need to know one has to look at EAP vocabulary at the word level. Some guidance on words with reasonable frequency and range has been provided in the AWL (Academic Word List), which is currently being expanded by identifying common collocations and recurrent phrases to assist teachers with selecting phrases which students need to know. Further studies which provide useful insight into lexical bundles and EAP include a frequency-based analysis of lexical bundles in university textbooks and classrooms by Biber et al. (2004), an exploratory study by Jones and Haywood (2004) on learn-

ing and teaching formulaic phrases found in four EAP coursebooks and a corpus-based study by Simpson and Ellis (2005) with statistical measures such as MI value. The author also discusses the question as to what pedagogical approach should be used when teaching and learning formulaic sequences and gives an overview of articles on this subject matter. In her classroom she employs the three psychological conditions of noticing, retrieval and generation. However, doubt about how effective these techniques are, still remains. The author refers to her pilot study on the EAP learning experience of six students in order to identify the difficulties encountered by students which result in not using formulaic sequences in their academic texts. The students reported that a lack of knowledge of the words, a lack of time, and avoidance of risk are common reasons for this. A further barrier is a pragmatic learning approach, i. e. students find it more pragmatic to memorise verbs and nouns, than adjectives or adverbs. Averil concludes that further research should be conducted and students interviewed in order to convince teachers and learners that 'it is worth focusing on more than just one word at the time'.

The third chapter, *Multiword expressions and the digital turn* by David Wible traces some of the implications of the digital turn for the learning of multiword expressions. In the early stages of learning, the learner perceives lexical chunks as wholes before detecting their parts. This poses a challenge for a text-dependent learner, which has rarely been noted in the literature on pedagogy. The author believes that this problem could be addressed by facilitating digital language input. He compares paper and machine-readable dictionaries and describes the limitations and the static nature of the traditional dictionary representations as well as the possibilities opened by digitalisation of both dictionaries and texts. Digitalisation has made it possible to introduce a contextual approach and describe a practical implementation for helping learners learn lexical bundles.

The author illustrates this by describing an application called Collocator. It has been designed by him and his colleagues in order to offer an alternative to traditional dictionaries. The tool applies MI measures to pairs of words that appear in a five-word window of each other. At a user's request, it actively searches the current webpage to detect collocations which the user might not be able to recognise. This enables learners and teachers to use the Web for learning or teaching multiword expressions and create well-motivated and dynamic resources for improving the learning process.

In the first chapter (*Phraseology in learners' dictionaries*) of the third section *Recording and exploiting phraseological units*, Dirk Siepmann analyses the way fully transparent spoken-language collocations and fully transparent written-

language collocations are treated in four major monolingual learners' dictionaries. He comes to the conclusion that today's leading monolingual dictionaries as well as several bilingual ones (French and German) largely ignore these semantically transparent items. The test has also revealed several reoccurring error types across different categories of multi-word markers. Therefore, the author is of the opinion that there is an acute need to provide teachers and students with dictionaries that provide relevant information on linguistic formulae, which will, at the same time, be easy to find. Furthermore, he suggests that the corpus for extracting relevant language should contain at least 150 million words of particular domain. Since the BNC or the *Bank of English* are not large enough, Siepman stresses the need to use the Internet manually, i.e. fan fiction, e-mails and weblogs for assembling the spoken-language corpus and academic journals for assembling the academic writing one. He suggests that the frequency of each inventoried item should be determined and an arbitrary frequency threshold established in order to select the entries. He then turns to classification systems and proposes the conceptual arrangement of semantically transparent collocations because, in this way, synonymy can be handled in a clear and space-saving manner which makes language material considerably easier to acquire. He concludes that 'the only way to enable foreign learners to use semantically transparent collocations productively is via semasiological dictionary, or, even better, via bilingual semasiological dictionary' because concepts are less frequently expressed by single words, than collocations.' Finally, Siepman informs that such bilingual pedagogic thesauri are currently being developed as a part of Bilexicon project (cf. Siepman 2006).

The third chapter in this section, *Compilation, formalisation and presentation of bilingual phraseology, Problems and possible solutions* by Mojca Pecman continues the argument for devising bilingual semasiological dictionaries and explores the problems that occur in processing bilingual phraseology on the example of scientific phraseology in English and French taken from three related domains: physics, chemistry and biology. She identifies fifteen obstacles to bilingual phraseology processing for the lexicographical purposes and tries to offer concrete solutions. She illustrates the model for processing bilingual phraseology which was developed within a research project carried out at the University of Nice (Pecman 2004, 2005b). The corpus for this was designed using scientific articles, abstracts, activities reports, communications, etc. It included phraseological properties of English for Academic Purposes and English for Science and Technology and the sublanguage is referred to as General Scientific Language (GSL) (Pecman 2004: 124–147, 2005b). The corpus was searched both manually and automatically and it contained 2,000 translation units. Then, 125 semantic categories were identified, a conceptual analysis was carried out and the ontology devoted to this specific discourse community was constructed.

The author illustrates a model that exploits the semantic component of a language with an aim to offer potential users a flexible approach to collocations, one that is semasiological and another that is onomasiological. Since the bilingual phraseology is stored in an electronic database, users are offered multiple choices for retrieving phraseological units through queries. Furthermore, she presents the bilingual phraseology graphically and provides a model of a production orientated, dynamic and reverse dictionary which takes a high degree of paradigmatic variation within a phraseological frame into account using a cluster representation developed around semantically related nodes. By doing this, she bypasses the major difficulties in compiling, formalising and presenting the phraseological data.

The final article in this section, *The phraseological patterns of high-frequency verbs in advanced English for general purposes, A corpus-driven approach to EFL textbook analysis* by Celine Gouverneur, focuses on the treatment of the two high-frequency verbs *make* and *take* in three series of EGP, Cutting Edge, Inside Out and New Headway. The reason for this is a lack of similar analyses as well as several pioneering articles on this subject matter which suggest that delexicalised verbs are not sufficiently represented in textbooks and therefore not acquired even at the advanced level. The data she used for the analysis is based on a corpus of *Textbook Material* called TeMa. By conducting an in-depth analysis of the vocabulary exercises, she attempts to identify the selection, sequencing and presentation principles underlying the lexical syllabus of the three books. On this basis she attempts to answer six questions: (1) How many instances of the verb lemmas *make* and *take* do the textbooks contain? (2) What meanings and patterns are included and what proportion of these meanings and patterns are phraseological? (3) What are the different types of learning activities encountered? (4) What aspect of the pattern is focused on? (5) To what extent and how is acquisition acquired? (6) Do the three textbooks bear some similarities in the meanings and patterns they contain? After identifying and breaking up the exercise subcorpus of the intermediate and advanced levels in the three series, she concludes that the phraseological units are strongly present but surprisingly unevenly distributed in the textbooks and across the levels. The phraseological patterns of *make* and *take* are in a direct focus of 83% of all the exercises at the intermediate level, but only 38% at the advanced level. This might be the reason why advanced learners have difficulties dealing with high frequency verbs. Gouverneur then analyses the type of exercises in the books at both levels and notices that there is a relatively high degree of continuity in the activities from one level to another and a lack of exercises which require retrieval from the mental lexicon at advanced level. Finally, she looks into lexical focus of the exercises in question. The result shows that only 7% of the exercises at the advanced level focus on the verb of a collocation with *take* or *make*.

She concludes that intermediate textbooks devote many exercises to the explicit practice of *make* and *take*, while advanced textbook writers play down their role.

In the final chapter *Where to from here?*, the editors establish phraseology as the key factor in improving learners' reading and listening comprehension, alongside fluency and accuracy in spoken and written production. Since language is acquired, stored and processed in chunks they are of the opinion that it should occupy a central and uncontroversial position in instructed second language acquisition (ISLA). In order to help learners and teachers deal with the challenges that lie before them when facing the abundance of formulaic patterns, the phraseological information should be rapidly and easily accessible. Therefore, they believe that 'the phraseological (r)evolution in foreign language teaching will be electronic or simply will not be.' Nevertheless, its role in language learning still remains to be explored and the teachers trained in order to help them balance the teaching material and expose their students to a wide range of multiword expressions without overwhelming them or disregarding the useful rules of grammar.

We might conclude that due to the rapid increase in the research on phraseology, hand in hand with the rapid development of computational linguistics, it is only a matter of time until this new insight into phraseology is validated and assessed in the classrooms giving rise to a new and a more successful method of teaching and learning a foreign language.

References:

- Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad, Viviana Cortes (2004). *If you look at...: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks*. *Applied linguistics* 25.3: 371–405.
- Connor, Ulla (2002). New directions in contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly* 36.4: 493–510.
- Corson, David (1995). *Using English words*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Granger, Sylviane (1996). From CA to CIA and back: An integrated approach to computerized bilingual and learner corpora. In Karin Aijmer, Bengt Altenberg, Mats Johansson, eds. *Languages in Contrast- Text-Based Cross-Linguistic Studies*. (Lund Studies in English 88). Lund: Lund University Press, 37–51.
- Granger, Sylviane, Estelle Dagneaux, Fanny Meunier, eds. (2002). *The International Corpus of Learner English. CD-ROM and Handbook*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses universitaires de Louvain. (Available from <http://www.i6doc.com>).
- Jones, Marta, Sandra Haywood (2004). Facilitating the acquisition of formulaic sequences: An exploratory study in EAP context. In Norbert Schmitt, ed. *Formulaic Sequences*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 269–291.
- Louw, Bill (1993). Irony in the text or insincerity of the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. Mona Baker, Gill Frances, Elena Tognini-Bonelli, eds. *Text and*

- Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 157–176.
- Paquot, Magali (2007). Towards a productively-oriented academic word-list. Jacek Walinski, Krzysztof Kredens, Stanisław Goźdz-Roszkowski, eds. *PALC 2005 Proceedings*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 127–140.
- Pecman, Mojca (2004). Phraséologie contrastive anglais-français: Analyse et traitement en vue de l'aide à la rédaction scientifique. Thèse de doctorat. 9 déc. 2004. Dir. H. Zinglé. Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis.
- Pecman, Mojca (2005b). Les apports possible de la phraséologie à la didactique des langues étrangères. *Apprentissage des Langues et Systèmes d'Information et de Communication (ALSIC)* 8.1: 109–122.
- Sinclair, John (1987). *Looking up*. London: Collins
- Siepman, Dirk (2006). 'Collocation, colligation and encoding dictionaries. Part II: Lexicographical aspects', *International Journal of Lexicography* 19.1: 1–39.
- Simpson, Rita, Nick Ellis (2005). An academic formulas list. Christelle Cosme, Céline Gouverneur, Fanny Meunier, Magali Paquot, eds. *Proceedings of the Phraseology 2005 conference. Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, 13–15 October 2005*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université catholique de Louvain, 391–394
- Sinclair, J. (1987). *Looking up*. London: Collins
- Stubbs, Michael (2001). *Words and Phrases*. Oxford: Blackwell.