

Vladan Pavlović

University of Niš

Faculty of Philosophy

COLLOSTRUCTIONAL INSIGHTS INTO ALTERNATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN TEFL PERSPECTIVE¹

Abstract: The paper addresses three pairs of common near-synonymous syntactic constructions in English: the *get vs have something done*, the *will V-inf vs be going to V-inf*, and the ditransitive vs the prepositional dative constructions. It does so with the following aims: a) to present an overview of the results of the distinctive collexeme analysis (as a type of collostructional analysis suited to investigating alternative constructions) applied to the given pairs of constructions in the literature, and b) to check those results against their view in various TEFL-oriented reference books and establish how much the views presented there and the results of the given type of (statistical) analysis tie in with one another. It concludes that TEFL-oriented reference books, albeit quite valuable, tend to overlook at least a part of semantic and / or pragmatic differences between the given periphrastic constructions. The paper thus argues for a tighter integration of the results of theoretical linguistics based on state-of-the-art statistical methods applied to (massive representative) corpus data, on the one hand, and TEFL-related literature, on the other hand, as such an integration can prove useful in increasing the descriptive adequacy of the latter and can help improve EFL learners' language competence.

Key words: alternative constructions, distinctive collexeme analysis, collostructional analysis, TEFL.

1. Introduction

This paper addresses three pairs of common near-synonymous syntactic constructions in English: 1) the *get N2 V-en vs the have N2 V-en* constructions (*get this sorted out / have one's car serviced*), 2) the *will V-inf vs the be going to V-inf* constructions (*will finish soon / be going to invest a lot into the project*), and 3) the *V N2 N3* (the ditransitive) vs the *V N3 to N2* (the prepositional dative) constructions (*give someone a book / play the ball to someone*).

The given construction variants are often treated as interchangeable in TEFL-oriented reference books, especially when it comes to the pairs under 1) and 3).

¹ This study was supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia (Contract No. 451-03-9/2021-14/200165). The early version of the paper was presented at the *Third International Conference on Teaching Languages and Cultures in the Post-Method Era* held at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš, on 26th and 27th October 2018. That paper has not been published anywhere nor is it currently submitted for publication anywhere.

Even when they are not, as is the case in the pair under 2), the differences in the use of one construction variant as opposed to the other are sometimes not described adequately enough and may not be based on hard evidence, i.e., on the data from massive standardized corpora of English that are approached on the basis of strict observational and experimental protocols and relevant statistical methods.

The paper thus has the two following aims: a) to present an overview of the results of the distinctive collexeme analysis applied to the given pairs of constructions in the literature, and b) to check those results against the views of the given pairs of alternative constructions in various TEFL-oriented reference books (primarily student books in English grammar and use, such as Swan, 1995; Murphy, 1994; Vince & Sunderland, 1994; Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2002; Graver, 1986; and Thomson & Martinet, 1986), and establish how much the views presented there, on the one hand, and how the results of the given type of (statistical) analysis tie in with one another with respect to the given alternative constructions, on the other.

2. Collostructional analysis and its variants

Collostructional analysis, which distinctive collexeme analysis is a type of, is a family of statistical corpus-linguistic methods for analysing the relationships between words and the grammatical structures in which they occur, typically used within the theoretical framework of Construction Grammar.

It measures the degree of attraction or repulsion that words exhibit towards syntactic constructions (hence the term *collostruction* as a blend of the words *collocation* and *construction*). It was developed by Stefan Th. Gries and Anatol Stefanowitsch as an extension of existing collocation-based methods. As opposed to such methods, which focus on purely linear co-occurrence preferences and restrictions pertaining to specific lexical items, collostructional analysis is adapted to the investigation of the *lexis-grammar* interface and heavily relies on strict quantification and inferential statistics.

Some of the sources involving collostructional analysis (and its three variants, to be addressed shortly) include: Gries, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015; Gries & Stefanowitsch, 2004a, 2004b; Flach, 2015; Gries, Hampe & Schönefeld, 2005; Hilpert, 2006, 2012, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Stefanowitsch, 2006, 2011, 2013; Stefanowitsch & Gries, 2003, 2005, 2008; and Wulff, Stefanowitsch & Gries 2007, *inter alia*.

Collostructional analysis is grounded in two frameworks, one theoretical and one methodological. The methodological framework is that of quantitative corpus linguistics. It is characterized by reliance on naturally occurring language data from representative and balanced corpora, that are subjected to strict quantification and statistical evaluation. The theoretical framework consists of grammatical theories that meet the following two criteria. Firstly, they consider grammatical structures at various levels of complexity (ranging from morphemes to sentences) and schematicity (ranging from completely schematized to completely lexicalized, e.g. *N1 V N2 N3, be*

going to *V-inf*, are going to invest) as meaningful in and of themselves, i.e. as signs (form–meaning pairs) and thus not fundamentally different from the lexicon. Secondly, they acknowledge the relevance of frequency distributions of linguistic items.

It is thus applied in the context of various usage-based constructivist approaches to language, for example, Boas's Cognitive Construction Grammar or Croft's Radical Construction Grammar, but mostly within the above-mentioned (usage-based) Goldbergian Construction Grammar (for the fundamentals on the last, see Goldberg, 1995, and Hoffman & Trousdale, 2013).

The basic goal in performing a collostructional analysis is to establish which lexical items are “typical” of a given grammatical construction, i.e. the appearance of which lexical items is statistically significant for the construction in question, such as the *keep on V-ing* construction (*keep on talking*), the *It be ADJ to inf. clause* construction (*It is impossible to do that right now*), the *V N2 into V-ing* construction (*She coerced him into confessing*), and the like, including the constructions addressed in this paper.

There are several reasons for conducting this kind of analysis. Firstly, simple descriptive data (in the form of simple raw frequency counts) is sometimes not reliable enough in establishing which lexical items are *statistically* significant for a construction. Rather than merely presenting which elements occur in the given construction most often, collostructional analysis uses relative frequency counts (statistical tests) to determine which elements occur more frequently in a construction than would be expected by chance, thus enhancing descriptive adequacy. Secondly, analysing the mutual dependencies between constructions and the lexical elements that appear in them, one can shed light on the semantics of grammatical constructions. In addition, the fact that some dependencies between particular lexical items and particular grammatical structures can indeed be established, provides strong evidence for theories like Construction Grammar, that, as indicated above, view grammatical structures as signs and that consider language as a repository of meaningful linguistic units of various degrees of schematicity or specificity. In other words, if syntactic structures were meaningless, no significant associations between them and specific lexical items used in them would be expected. Thirdly, collostructional analysis has implications for psycholinguistic studies of language acquisition (see Goldberg, 2006). And fourthly, reliance on statistical methods and the strict observational and experimental protocols that such methods require may help to empirically test the existing theoretical standpoints as they are practically applied in TEFL-oriented reference books (primarily student books in English grammar and use), which is quite important for the purposes in this paper.

There are three variants of collostructional analysis. Those are *simple collexeme analysis*, *distinctive collexeme analysis* and *co-varying collexeme analysis*, each of which is adapted to analysing particular aspects of the relationship between lexical items and grammatical constructions. In keeping with the topic of the paper, only the distinctive collexeme analysis will be presented here.

Distinctive collexeme analysis (*cf.* Gries & Stefanowitsch 2004a) aims to establish the differences between two or more alternative constructions, i.e., formally

different constructions with similar meanings in their respective collocational preferences. More specifically, it establishes which collexemes are over- and underrepresented in each variety at a statistically significant level, i.e., it identifies the lexemes which exhibit a strong preference for one alternative construction type as opposed to the other. It thus makes it possible to identify subtle differences between two apparently synonymous constructions, such as the active and the passive constructions, the particle-first vs. the object-first verb-particle constructions (*He picked up the book / He picked the book up*), as well as the construction pairs addressed in this paper.

3. Methodological Framework

The underlying method broadly consists of the following steps: firstly, the researcher must find the relevant e-corpus. As distinctive collexeme analysis is a type of statistical analysis, it is especially suited to investigating large masses of data. Such data can, for example, be found in massive e-corpora such as the English Corpora created by Professor Mark Davies (<https://www.english-corpora.org/>). They include (but are not limited to) the *Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)*, *Global Web-Based English (GloWbE)*, *News on the Web (NOW)*, *iWeb: The Intelligent Web-based Corpus*, and others, all of which contain several hundred million, sometimes several billion tokens each. Secondly, the researcher should then extract all the examples of the construction of interest (which typically requires manual clean-up of the thus obtained subcorpus as the search syntax can automatically return a number of faulty instances of the construction under investigation). Thirdly, the following numerical data should then be obtained: a) the number of times a lexical item filling the target slot and one of the alternative constructions, (c1) co-occur; b) the number of times the lexical items which are otherwise found in the target slot appear in the other alternative construction (c2); c) the number of times c1 co-occurs with words other than the lexical items appearing in the target slot, and d) the frequency of all units except the lexical items from the target slot that occur within c2. In short, the data needed are those related to presence of both a token and c1 (the case under *a*), none of them (the case under *d*), when one of them is present and the other one is absent (the cases under *b* and *c*). These are entered into spreadsheet files, which are then converted into *.txt* or *.csv* files and uploaded into R (an open-source software for statistical analysis). The researcher can then use the script written by Stefan Th. Gries (2014) or the R package by S. Flach (2017), to prompt the user for the relevant quantitative data. The results obtained consist of *p*-values that can serve as an indicator of collostructional strength (the lower the *p*-value, i.e. the closer it is to zero, the stronger the mutual attraction of individual lexical items and a construction). In addition, the negative base-10 logarithm of the *p*-value can be used as well (the larger the given logarithm of the *p*-value, the stronger the mutual attraction of individual lexical items and the constructions in question, cf. Gries, Hampe & Schönefeld, 2005; Stefanowitsch & Gries, 2005). The given

value is typically referred to in this context as an index of collocation strength (henceforward, ICS). The statistical test used in this kind of analysis is Fisher's exact test (henceforward, FET). Whichever distributional statistic is used (the *p*-value or the ICS), its results are used to compare the *observed* occurrences of the two forms (the lexical items filling a particular slot, on the one hand, and the construction in question, on the other hand) with their *expected* frequencies in order to determine which combinations are noteworthy, i.e., statistically significant. The lexical items occurring in the target slot of a construction can then be ranked according to the strength of their association with the given construction, starting with those most attracted to it and ending with those most strongly repelled by it.

The qualitative account of the quantitative results typically includes: a) focusing on the top significantly attracted collexemes to the given construction(s), as well as focusing on the top significantly repelled ones (the latter can provide insight into the constraints that govern the usage of a construction, so interpretation in negative terms can also be useful); b) classifying those collexemes semantically, whereby this classification is then used in the (typically cognitively oriented) discussion of the different senses of the construction(s) in question, including the one taken as central.

As indicated above, the section that follows will present an overview of the results of the application of distinctive collexeme analysis to the above-mentioned pairs of alternative constructions already available in the literature and, more importantly for the purposes of this paper, it will check those results against the view of the given pairs of alternative constructions in various TEFL-oriented reference books. Therefore, the focus will be on how much the views presented there and the results of the given type of statistical analysis tie in with one another with respect to the given constructions. More specifically, the focus will be on how the results of distinctive collexeme analysis in the given cases can contribute to TEFL-related reference literature.

4. Data and discussion

4.1. The *get N2 V-en* vs the *have N2 V-en* constructions

The most important results of the distinctive collexeme analysis applied to the *get something done* and the *have something done* constructions are summarized in Table 1 below.

Get N2 V-en			Have N2 V-en		
No	Collexeme	ICS	No	Collexeme	ICS
1	sort out	44.99	1	cut	24.95
2	do	40.17	2	perm	16.12
3	sort	10.43	3	do	13.04
4	finish	8.33	4	build	8.99
5	organise / organize	7.85	5	cut off	7.33
6	dress	5.87	6	put down	7.33

7	wash	5.50	7	put	7.09
8	fix	5.14	8	service	4.99
9	book	4.56	9	clean	4.45
10	start	3.08	10	remove	3.73
11	dry	2.61	11	put up	3.63
12	write down	2.57	12	shave	3.63
13	deliver	2.42	13	test	3.48
14	do up	1.99	14	put in	3.37
15	insure	1.99	15	put on	3.14
16	set up	1.99	16	replace	2.96
17	cook	1.96	17	trim	2.96
18	line up	1.96	18	repair	2.92
19	send off	1.96	19	take out	2.49
20	warm up	1.96	20	make	2.22
21	work out	1.96	21	check out	2.20
22	kill	1.60	22	highlight	2.20
23	make up	1.43	23	knock down	2.20
24	backdate	1.30	24	put across	2.20
25	blow	1.30	25	shape	2.20

Table 1. Top distinctive collexemes for the *get N2 V-en* vs the *have N2 V-en* constructions (adapted from Gaëtanelle, 2006)

Even though both constructions are commonly characterized as roughly synonymous, the data above show that they actually have different collostructional profiles. Namely, the lexical items significantly attracted to the *V*-slot of the two alternative constructions are quite different. The only collexeme that appears in both lists is the verb *do*, which indicates that the two constructions are indeed not interchangeable despite their formal similarity.

Semantically speaking, the verbs appearing in the *get something done* variant generally have to do with organisation (e.g. *sort / sort out, finish, organize / organize*) and daily actions (e.g. *dress, wash, cook*). In addition, an analysis of the immediate context of the given variant shows two additional things. Firstly, the given construction is typically used when some sort of effort or difficulty is implied, or when there is reference to an impending deadline (*We must get it done by Sunday afternoon at 2:00, Now, let's get it sorted out quickly and quietly. Shall we?*). And secondly, *getting something done* (*getting something finished / sorted out, getting oneself dressed* etc.), typically implies that one does it oneself.

On the other hand, most verbs appearing in the *have something done* alternative confirm the common knowledge that this construction type is related to service: *having one's hair cut / permed / trimmed / done, having something built, having a particular machine, gadget etc. serviced or repaired, having a hedge, grass etc. trimmed, having something tested / cleaned / removed / replaced*, etc. In that sense, the basic meaning of the *having something done* construction is *to commission someone to do something on another's behalf*.

Naturally, the *get something done* construction can also express commissioning someone to do something on another's behalf (e.g., *He got his car fixed yesterday*),

but distinctive collexeme analysis shows that this meaning (as indicated by the verbs significantly attracted to it), while possible, is not statistically probable as the verbs appearing in the *have something done* construction are not distinctive enough for the *get something construction*, either. This is often confirmed by the fact that even if the verb *get* appears in the given construction with one of the collexemes that the verb *have* typically appears with (such as *build*), the whole construction is once again used to indicate that something is done with effort and difficulty and usually with an impending deadline, which is the sense not present in the *have* counterpart (e.g. *In order to get it built quickly and quietly, they'd hire anybody who could do the job*).

Most importantly, for our purposes in this paper, the consulted reference books typically do not mention this distinction at all. The only difference that they concentrate on is that *get* can be used in the *same* way as *have* [*sic!*], and that the former one is more colloquial (Thomson & Martinet, 1986, p. 119), i.e. that it is used mainly in informal spoken English (Murphy, 1994, p. 90).

The only authors that actually do get close to the distinction outlined above are Vince & Sunderland (1994, p. 40), who claim that *get* is more likely to be used than *have*: a) when there is a feeling that something must be done (*really must get / have my hair cut*), b) when there is a feeling of eventually managing to do something (*eventually got / had the car fixed at the Fast Service garage*), and c) in orders and imperatives (*Get your hair cut!*). Still, this remains imprecise enough in light of the above observations, and the fact that these authors typically cite both *give* and *have* in the above examples, implies that they fail to make adequate distinctions between what is merely possible, as opposed to what is (statistically) probable in the given situations.

Swan (1995, p. 222) adds that the *get* variant means *finish doing something*, which is also not precise enough in view of the observations above. In addition, he states that the past participle here has a *passive meaning*, an observation reiterated in Graver (1986, p. 114). This observation is also dubious since, as indicated above, the *get something done construction* often implies that one does something oneself, i.e. it remains unclear what the term *the passive meaning* here refers to. In other words, the results of this kind of statistical analysis appear to undermine some commonplace descriptions of the pair of alternative constructions in question and to provide sound evidence on which some common terms should be reconsidered.

Eventually, Biber, Conrad & Leech (2002, p. 309) discuss the given pair of constructions within their discussion of various verb complements. They say that *-ed* complement clauses (*I got the door locked, They had carnival rides trucked and installed on the great green lawns*) are rare and very restricted in their distribution. They add that these clauses can complement only verbs (rather than other word classes) and that only a few main clause verbs can control them (*get* and *have*, as well as *want*, *need*, *see* and *hear*). In other words, the given authors do not address the difference in the use of the given pair of constructions at all. This is quite surprising since the given grammar book is exceptional in its reliance on corpora, not only for authentic examples, but also for coverage of language variation, including the coverage of preference and frequency of grammatical structures across

registers, regional dialects and other factors which may influence the use of various constructions, which is one of its main professed outcomes (Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2002, p. 3).

Eventually, it should be briefly observed here that the given authors, naturally, also address examples such as *He had his arm broken during a fight*, which refer to instances when something bad happens to someone. The use of the given construction pair with this meaning is outside the scope of this paper and will not be addressed further.

4.2. The *will V-inf* vs the *be going to V-inf* constructions

The table below presents the most important results of the distinctive collexeme analysis applied to the given two alternative constructions expressing futurity in English.

will V-inf			be going to V-inf		
No	Collexeme	FET p-value	No	Collexeme	FET p-value
1	see	0.0004	1	say	1.12E-12
2	find	0.0015	2	do	2.02E-08
3	give	0.0047	3	happen	4.77E-05
4	know	0.0108	4	have	0.0001
5	provide	0.0177	5	go	0.0004
6	depend	0.0285	6	win	0.0005
7	want	0.0305	7	stay	0.0014
8	receive	0.0305	8	use	0.0045
9	consider	0.0361	9	buy	0.0059
10	remain	0.0458	10	talk	0.0060
11	become	0.0553	11	show	0.0213
12	finish	0.0581	12	get	0.0275
13	hold	0.0736	13	suggest	0.0315
14	include	0.0736	14	be	0.0357
15	notice	0.0736	15	put	0.0362
16	follow	0.0934	16	invest	0.0444
17	reach	0.0934	17	measure	0.0444
18	need	0.0985	18	perform	0.0444
19	send	0.1080	19	photocopy	0.0444
20	accept	0.1184	20	rehearse	0.0444

Table 2. Top distinctive collexemes for the *will V-inf* vs the *be going to V-inf* constructions (adapted from Gries & Stefanowitsch, 2004a)

As it emerges from the table above, the main difference between the two lists of top collexemes is dynamicity. Namely, the distinctive collexemes for the *will* variant dominantly refer to relatively non-agentive or low-dynamicity actions (*find, receive, hold, finish, reach*, e.g., *I will finish this paper soon*), including events related to perception and cognition (*see, know, want, consider, notice, need, accept*, e.g., *They won't consider your application any time soon*), as well as to states (*depend, remain*, e.g., *He will remain in custody*). Only five of the top

20 collexemes refer to dynamic actions (*give, provide, include, follow, send*). On the other hand, only five of the top 20 collexemes distinctive for the *be going to V-inf* variant encode states or non-agentive actions (*have, stay, be, happen, get*, e.g., *We're going to stay but you guys go*); the remaining collexemes encode very dynamic actions. The second difference is related to the specificity of the actions and events involved – the list for *be going to* contains some very specific actions (*invest, measure, photocopy, rehearse*), as opposed to the *will V-inf* variant. In short, the *be going to* variant encodes more dynamic and more specific actions and events than *will* variant.

As opposed to Graver (1986), which makes no mention of the differences in the use of the two alternative constructions, all the other reference books used for the purposes of this paper do so. Those differences can be summarized as follows:

- a) *be going to* is used for more planned, “premeditated” actions than *will + infinitive*, which expresses intention at the moment of decision or an immediate decision (e.g., Thompson & Martinet, 1990, p. 180–210; Murphy, 1994, p. 16; Vince & Sunderland 1994, p. 7; Murphy, 1994, p. 42, 46; Swan, 1995, p. 221);
- b) when talking about future events not involving oneself, *be going to* expresses a greater certainty on the part of the speaker than *will* (Thompson & Martinet, 1990, p. 180–210; Murphy, 1994, p. 16);
- c) *be going to* is used for talking about a more immediate future than *will* (Thompson & Martinet, 1990, p. 180–210; Murphy, 1994, p. 16);
- d) *will + infinitive* is also used for offering, agreeing and promising to do something, and asking somebody to do something (Murphy, 1994, p. 42), whereas *be going to* is used for predicting the future on the basis of present evidence (typically outside of one’s control) (Swan, 1995, p. 221), as well as for jokingly predicting the future, with no meaning of intention, e.g. *I think I am going to die* (Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2002, p. 182)
- e) the *be going to* variant is very rare in academic prose as opposed to conversation (Biber, Conrad & Leech 2002, p. 182).

What the given distinctions do not explicitly mention, and what constitutes the main point of the distinctive collexeme analysis applied to the given constructions, is the “degree of dynamicity” referred to above. Therefore, although the reflexes of this criterion can actually be seen in some of the differences presented, this criterion should explicitly be added as an additional factor distinguishing between the two alternative constructions in the relevant reference books.

4.3. The *VN2 N3* (the ditransitive) vs *VN3 to N2* (the prepositional dative) constructions.

The top distinctive collexemes of the ditransitive, as opposed to the prepositional dative constructions, are available in the table below.

V N2 N3			V N3 to N2		
No	Collexeme	FET p-value	No	Collexeme	FET p-value
1	Give	1.84E-120	1	Bring	1.47E-009
2	Tell	8.77E-058	2	Play	1.46E-006
3	Show	8.32E-012	3	Take	2.00E-004
4	Offer	9.95E-010	4	Pass	2.00E-004
5	Cost	9.71E-009	5	Make	6.80E-003
6	Teach	1.49E-006	6	Sell	1.39E-002
7	Wish	5.99E-004	7	Do	1.51E-002
8	Ask	1.30E-003	8	Supply	2.91E-002
9	Promise	3.60E-003			
10	Deny	1.22E-002			
11	Award	2.60E-002			

Table 3. Top distinctive collexemes for the ditransitive (*V N2 N3*) and the prepositional dative (*V N3 to N2*) constructions (adapted from Stefanowitsch 2013, and Gries & Stefanowitsch, 2004a)

The results above show that the two construction variants also have different collostructional profiles. As it can be seen, the distinctive collexemes of the ditransitive construction mostly refer to literal or metaphorical transfer situations where the agent and the recipient are in close proximity to each other (*give, tell, show, offer, teach, wish, ask, promise, deny, award*, e.g. *She taught him English, She gave me her new book, I offered him a drink*). On the other hand, the top distinctive collexemes of the prepositional dative refer to transfer situations where the agent must overcome some distance or exert some effort – literal or metaphorical, in order to effect the transfer (*bring, play, take, pass, sell, do, supply*, e.g. *We will definitely pass the queries to the authorities, Novartis supplied the drug to 5,000 additional patients under the compassionate-use provision*).

Quite importantly, for our purposes in this paper, our investigation of the consulted reference books presented above has shown that this distinction is not addressed in any of them. To be more precise, some of those reference books do indeed address the given alternatives in general, focusing on structural differences between them and, more broadly speaking, on complementation patterns of different verbs. For example, Swan (1995, p. 608) points out that many verbs can be followed by two objects – one indirect and one direct. Usually, the indirect object refers to a person and comes first (*Let me make you some tea*). Alternatively, he adds, we can also put the indirect object after the direct object. In this case, it normally has a preposition, usually *to* or *for* (*I handed my licence to the policeman*). The given author goes on to discuss similar types of data regarding the two constructions but does not mention the differences in their use outlined above at all, implying that he considers them to be semantically and / or pragmatically interchangeable. Similarly, Biber, Conrad & Leech (2002, p. 423) state that ditransitive verbs often allow two options which are equivalent in meaning [*sic!*], namely indirect object + direct object (*I'll fix you some tea later*) and direct object + preposition *to* or *for* + prepositional object (*I'll fix it for you*). They also add that for the former pattern, the

principle of end-weight can influence the appearance of the indirect object first if it is much shorter than the (following) direct object (*The Academy never granted him membership that was his wife's ambition*). In addition, they discuss various other structural traits of the given pair of constructions (for example, the situations when the direct and indirect objects are expressed by pronouns, nominal clauses, etc.), all the while adhering to their view quoted above that the use of one as opposed to the other alternative construction produces no change in meaning.

5. Conclusions

The discussion above has shown that TEFL-oriented reference books, albeit quite valuable, can highly profit from the insights of distinctive collexeme analysis. Namely, construction variants that are syntactically, semantically, lexically or pragmatically similar, such as the ones discussed in this paper, deserve to be given more prominence in such textbooks (and in TEFL in general), especially in view of the Principle of no-synonymy (adopted in Cognitive Linguistics in general, and Construction Grammar in particular), which states that “if two constructions are syntactically distinct [we would also add – lexically distinct, as in the *get vs have something done* constructions], they must be semantically and / or pragmatically distinct” (Goldberg 1995, 67). This appears to be overlooked to varying degrees in the given type of literature since construction variants are often treated as interchangeable or are not described adequately enough. The paper thus argues for a tighter integration of the results of theoretical linguistics that are based on the data from (massive standardized) corpora and on strict observational and experimental protocols and state-of-the-art statistical methods, such as the data offered by distinctive collexeme analysis, on the one hand, and TEFL-related reference literature, on the other hand. Such an integration can prove useful in increasing the descriptive adequacy of the latter and hence in improving EFL learners' linguistic competence.

References

- Biber, D., Conrad, S., and Leech, G. (2002). *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Flach, S. (2015). Let's go look at usage: A constructional approach to formal constraints on go-VERB. In T. Herbst & P. Uhrig (eds), *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association* (vol. 3, pp. 231–252). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Flach, S. (2017). *Collostructions: An R implementation for the family of collostructional methods*. R package version 0.1.0. Retrieved from: www.bit.ly/sflach.
- Gilquin, G. (2006). The verb slot in causative constructions. Finding the best fit. *Constructions*, 1(3): 1–46.
- Goldberg, A. E. (1995). *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument*

- Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, A. E. (2006). *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: OUP.
- Graver, B. D. (1986). *Advanced English Practice*. Oxford: OUP. (3rd edition).
- Gries, S. T. (2010). Cluster Analysis and the Identification of Collexeme Classes. In S. Rice & J. Newman (eds.), *Empirical and Experimental Methods in Cognitive/Functional Research* (pp. 73–90). Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Gries, S. T. (2012). Frequencies, probabilities, association measures in usage-/exemplar-based linguistics: Some necessary clarifications. *Studies in Language*, 36(3): 477–510.
- Gries, S. T. (2013). Data in Construction Grammar. In T. Hoffman & G. Trousdale (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar* (pp. 93–108). Oxford: OUP.
- Gries, S. T. (2014). *Coll.analysis 3.5. A script for R to compute perform collostructional analyses*. Retrieved from: <http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/faculty/stgries/teaching/groningen/>.
- Gries, S. T. (2015). More (old and new) misunderstandings of collostructional analysis: on Schmid & Küchenhoff (2013). *Cognitive Linguistics*, 26(3): 505–536.
- Gries, S. T. & Stefanowitsch, A. (2004a). Extending collostructional analysis: A corpus-based perspective on ‘alternations’. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 9(1): 97–129.
- Gries, S. T., & Stefanowitsch, A. (2004b). Co-varying collexemes in the *into*-causative. In M. Achard & S. Kemmer (eds.), *Language, culture, and mind* (pp. 225–236). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Gries, S. T., Hampe, B., & Schönefeld, D. (2005). Converging evidence: bringing together experimental and corpus data on the association of verbs and constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 16(4):635–76.
- Hilpert, M. (2006). Distinctive collexemes and diachrony. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 2(2): 243–56.
- Hilpert, M. (2012). Diachronic collostructional analysis. How to use it, and how to deal with confounding factors. In J. A. Robinson & K. Allan (Eds.), *Current methods in historical semantics* (pp. 133–160). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hilpert, M. (2014a). Collostructional analysis: Measuring associations between constructions and lexical elements. In D. Glynn and J. A. Robinson (Eds.), *Corpus Methods for Semantics: Quantitative studies in polysemy and synonymy* (pp. 391–404). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hilpert, M. (2014b). Corpus-based Approaches to Constructional Change. In T. Hoffman & G. Trousdale (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar* (pp. 457–475). New York: OUP.
- Hilpert, M. (2014c). *Construction Grammar and its Application to English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hoffman, T., & Trousdale, G. (Eds.). (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Murphy, R. (1994). *English Grammar in Use: A self-study reference and practice book for intermediate students, with answers*. Cambridge: CUP. (2nd edition).

- Stefanowitsch, A. (2006). Negative evidence and the Raw Frequency Fallacy. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 2(1): 61–77.
- Stefanowitsch, A. (2011). Cognitive linguistics as a cognitive science. In M. Callies, W. R. Keller & A. Lohöfer (Eds.), *Bidirectionality in the cognitive sciences* (pp. 296–309). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Stefanowitsch, A. (2013). “Collostructional Analysis.” In T. Hoffman & G. Trousdale (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar* (pp. 290–306). Oxford: OUP.
- Stefanowitsch, A., & Gries. S. T. (2003). Collostructions: Investigating the interaction between words and constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 8(2): 209–243.
- Stefanowitsch, A., & Gries. S. T. (2005). Covarying collexemes. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 1(1): 1–43.
- Stefanowitsch, A., & Gries. S. T. (2008). Channel and constructional meaning: A collostructional case study. In G. Kristiansen & R. Dirven (Eds.), *Cognitive sociolinguistics* (pp. 129–152). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Swan, M. (1995). *Practical English Usage. International Student's Edition*. Oxford: OUP. (2nd edition).
- Thomson, A. J., and Martinet, A. V. (1986). *A Practical English Grammar*. (4th edition).
- Vince, M., and Sunderland, P. (1994). *Advanced Language Practice with Key*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Wulff, S., Stefanowitsch, A., & Gries. S. T. (2007). Brutal Brits and persuasive Americans: Variety-specific meaning construction in the into-causative. In G. Radden, K.-M. Köpcke, T. Berg & P. Siemund (Eds.), *Aspects of meaning construction* (pp. 265–281). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Владан Павловић

КОЛОСТРУКЦИОНИ УВИДИ У АЛТЕРНАТИВНЕ КОНСТРУКЦИЈЕ ИЗ УГЛА НАСТАВЕ ЕНГЛЕСКОГ КАО СТРАНОГ ЈЕЗИКА

Резиме

У раду се разматрају три пара синтаксичких конструкција која су у честој употреби у енглеском језику и која се могу сматрати синонимичним. У питању су конструкције *get* и *have something done*, конструкције *will V-inf* и *be going to V-inf*, као и пар који чине дитранзитивна и предложна конструкција. Циљеви рада су следећи: а) дати преглед резултата доступних у литератури који се добијају применом анализе дистинктивних колексема на дате парове алтернативних конструкција, и б) размотрити како се ти резултати уклапају у виђење датих конструкција у референтној литератури која се користи у настави енглеског као страног језика. Закључује се да таква референтна литература, иако корисна и

вредна, неретко занемарује део значајних семантичких и / или прагматских разлика између таквих конструкција. Рад се тако залаже за тешњу интеграцију резултата до којих се долази у теоријској лингвистици, и то таквих који су засновани на подацима из великих (балансираних и репрезентативних) корпуса и на савременим статистичким методима обраде таквих података, као што је анализа дистинктивних колексема, са једне стране, и референтне литературе која се користи у настави енглеског као страног језика, са друге стране, будући да таква њихова интеграција може унапредити како дескриптивну адекватност такве литературе тако и језичку компетенцију оних који уче енглески као страни језик.

vladan.pavlovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs