pISSN: 1906 - 6406 The Scholar: Human Sciences
eISSN: 2586 - 9388 The Scholar: Human Sciences
http://www.assumptionjournal.au.edu/index.php/Scholar

Reviewing Figurative Chunks

Zhang Yang*

Received: April 24, 2023. Revised: July 31, 2023. Accepted: August 16, 2023.

Abstract

In the field of second language learning, figurative language is difficult for L2 learners to understand. Being able to use it proficiently is even harder. Chunks can be stored as a whole and extracted from the brain. The combination of figurative language and chunks complementary, which can help L2 learner's better memorization and improve communication skills. But there are few studies on these two. By reviewing the concepts and classification of chunks and figurative language, combined with the research on the application of corpus linguistics, this research summarizes the connotation of figurative chunks that can be considered as prefabricated strings of coherent or incoherent non-literal language structures that are stored in memory as a whole and extracted directly. The review of the literature indicates that a) there has been research into metaphors, idioms, but few on other kinds of figurative language. There has not been a lot of research that examines such language from the perspective of lexical chunks and corpus linguistics, and also very few studies combined pragmatics; b) The concept of figurative chunks is proposed; c) providing translanguaging practices as teaching intervention can help students develop effective learning strategies, which can improve their figurative chunks comprehension competence and communication skills.

Keywords: Figurative Language, Chunks, Figurative Chunks, L2 Learner, Corpus Linguistic

JEL Classification Code

1. Introduction[1]

In the field of second language acquisition, two problems are difficult to explain by traditional formal linguistics theories. They are language fluency and native-like word selection. This is the problem of "a body of 'sentence stems' which are 'institutionalized' or 'lexicalized' (Pawley & Syder, 1983). Lewis (1993) refers to such forms as chunks while Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) operationalize them as lexical phrases. Another group of researchers refers to such language as formulaic language (Kecskés, 2016; Wood & Ebrary, 2010; Wray, 2013). 80% of native speakers' daily communication is considered formulaic (Altenberg, 1998). Kecskés said that "preferred ways of saying things are generally reflected in the use of formulaic language and figurative language. Selecting the right words and expressions, which is directly tied to pragmatic competence, is more important than syntax" (Kecskés, 2014). Figurative language is a common form of language in our daily life. Figurative language includes: idioms, metaphors, irony, or any other non-literal form (Giora, 2003). Colston has proposed that formulaic language is frequently figurative (Colston, 2020). Especially for L2 learners, it is very difficult to understand and learn non-literal language structures. However, it is much easier for L2 learners to combine the chunks that can be stored and remembered as a whole and improve their comprehension ability through comprehension strategies. Therefore, the

1* Zhang Yang, PhD Candidate, Graduate School of Human Sciences, Assumption University, Thailand. Lecturer, Heilongjiang International University. China. Email: 53932773@qq.com

ⓒ Copyright: The Author(s)
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (http://Creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits unrestricted noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The Scholar: Human Sciences

study of figurative chunks is of great significance. What follows is a discussion of definitions and classifications of chunks, figurative language and figurative chunks followed by a discussion of the role that translanguaging pedagogy can take in teaching figurative chunks. By analyzing the definition and classification of figurative language and chunks, the concept of figurative chunks is proposed. The teaching method is provided to teachers through the practice of translanguaging pedagogy, which can help the students improve the comprehension and practice of figurative chunks.

2. Chunks

2.1 Definition of Chunks

Due to the different research perspectives researchers, the definition and appellations of figurative chunks are various. Wray (2012) summarized 57 different appellations for chunks. For example, chunk, lexical chunk, prefabricated chunk, prefabricated pattern, formulaic language, speech formula, formulaic unit, collocation, lexical phrase, ready-made complex unit lexicalized sentence stem. Becker (1975) defined lexical chunks as prefabricated language chunks; emphasizing that chunks are a special multi-word phenomenon with traditional grammatical and lexical characteristics which are expressed as fixed, or semi-fixed, programmed language structure. Pawley and Syder (1983) defined chunks as lexicalized sentence stems. Sinclair noted that chunks refer to chunks that can be divided according to the surface structure of sentences (Sinclair, 1991). Nattinger and Decarrico (1992) defined chunks as lexical phrases noting that a chunk is a multi-word expression existing between the two poles of traditional vocabulary and syntax. It is a common and frequent unity of form and function.

Chunks have fixed meanings. Lewis (1993) pointed out that there is a phenomenon of speech formula in language, that is, strings of language structures. These structures are called lexical chunks or language chunks because of their high frequency and fixed situation and meaning. While these preferred strings are actually stored and retrieved as a unit or simply constructed preferentially, it has been widely proposed that they are handled, effectively, like single “big words” (Ellis, 1996). Biber (2000) and others distinguish multi-word units according to idioms, collocations and lexical grammatical relationships. On this basis, the concept of lexical bundle is put forward – common expressions in the use of natural language. A lexical bundle is defined as a sequence in which three or more words appear repeatedly. For Wray (2012) chunks are formal sequences that refer to a string of prefabricated coherent or incoherent words or other meaning units, which are stored in memory as a whole and extracted directly when used without grammar generation and analysis. Wray's (2012) definition of formulaic language emphasizes that it has the characteristics of prefabricated pattern. Chunks, lexical bundles and recurrent clusters are mainly used in corpus analysis. Schmitt (2004) and others believe that the reproduced word cluster (chunk) refers to the word string automatically retrieved by the corpus, but it may or may not be stored in the brain as a whole.

It can be seen from the above studies that these researchers define chunks from two perspectives. One is that chunks can be divided according to the surface structure of sentences and have traditional grammatical features. Another is the prefabrication of language chunks, which can be stored and extracted in the brain as a whole, continuous or discontinuous language structures, which can also provide a basis for corpus chunk recognition. Among them, Wray’s definition takes into account two aspects comprehensively, which are the most general and accurate. And especially for L2 learners, it is comprehensive and perable for teachers to conduct. Teachers can focus on the prefabrication of chunks and make students pay attention to the overall retrievability of chunks for memory and usage. L2 learners can remember chunks as a whole without grammar generation and analysis. It is because of these characteristics that L2 learners can better master chunks to improve English fluency (Kartal, 2018).

2.2 Classification of chunks

Different expressions of the names and definitions of chunks bring different classification standards to chunks. Becker (1975) divided chunks into six categories from the perspective of structure and function, poly words, phrasal constraints, meta messages, sentence builders, situational utterances, and verbatim texts. Pawley and Syder (1983) divided four types of lexical chunks according to the cohesive function of words in a text, polywords, institutionalized expressions, phrasal constraints, and sentence builders. Howarth (1998) divided chunks into four categories from a functional perspective: functional expressions, composite units, lexical collocations, and grammatical collocations.

Among the definitions discussed so far, those discussed by Nattinger and Decarrico (1992) and Lewis (1993) are the most commonly used. From the perspective of structure, Nattinger and Decarrico divided chunks into four categories: polywords, idiomatic expressions, phrasal constraints, and sentence builders. Lewis divided chunks into four categories: polywords, collocations, fixed expressions, and semi-fixed expressions. Nattinger and Lewis have basically the same classification, and both have polywords that can be regarded as words “have exactly the same status in the

The Scholar: Human Sciences

language as individual words (Lewis, 1997).” There are also fixed or semi-fixed institutionalized alternatives with pragmatic functions. However, there is a slight difference between phrasal constraints and collocations. Phrasal constraints focus on construction, but collocations focus on co-occurrence, which can predict possible collocation items. In addition to providing a framework for sentences, Lewis mainly referred to the connectives of textual cohesion.

Based on the above summary of the definition and classification of chunks, many scholars have conducted empirical studies on chunks from different perspectives to analyze learners' psychological representation, acquisition process and influencing factors, so as to better understand the role of chunks in English learning.

2.3 Empirical studies of chunks

The empirical research on chunks mainly focuses on three aspects. The first is the psychological representation and processing advantages of chunks. The second is the influence of chunk acquisition on language ability. The third is learners' internal and external factors affecting chunk acquisition.

Researchers have carried out a series of empirical studies on whether chunks are represented and stored as a whole in mental vocabulary. The common point of such studies is to extract the frequency of chunks from a large corpus, calculate their mutual information. Representative studies include Durrant and Doherty (2010), Ellis (2008) and Ellis and Simpson-Vlach (2009). Durrant and Doherty's research shows that the priming effect of chunks only exists in high-frequency chunks and fixed collocations, which depends on the frequency of chunks (Durrant & Doherty, 2010). The results of this study were not reported in similar studies (Ellis & Simpson-Vlach, 2009). These two studies prove that the determinant of whether chunks are represented and stored as a whole in mental vocabulary is mutual information rather than frequency. Mutual information can be conceptualised as “when we encounter one part of a word pair which has a high mutual information score, we can predict that the other part of the pair is likely to be nearby” (Durrant & Doherty, 2010). To a certain degree differences of experimental results is closely related to experimental designs. Durrant and Doherty (2010) counted the frequency and the mutual information of relevant chunks in the experiment, and classified chunks according to frequency. However, they did not take the mutual information and frequency as independent variables to investigate the independent impact of these two factors on the psychological reality of chunks. The latter two studies used regression analysis to determine the independent contributions of frequency and the mutual information in establishing the processing advantage of chunks. The common research entry point is the difference in processing between lexical chunks and non-lexical chunks.

Jiang and Nekrasova (2007) used the common online grammar judgment task in second language acquisition research to compare the processing differences between chunks with the same frequency and length and non-chunks. The results show that chunks have processing advantages compared with non-chunks. Whether native speakers or non-native speakers, the response time required to judge their grammatical legitimacy of chunks is significantly less than the non-chunks, and the accuracy is higher than the non-chunks. Conklin and Schmitt (2008), Siyanova-Chanturia et al. (2011) and Tremblay et al. (2011) used studied the differences between chunk and non-chunk processing from a psycholinguistic perspective. The study of line-by-line reading shows that whether native speakers or non-native speakers, the response time of chunk processing is significantly shorter than that of control word string, and the main effect of chunk type is significant (Conklin & Schmitt, 2008). Research from whole sentence reading and meaning group reading (Tremblay et al., 2011) and empirical data based on eye tracking (Siyanova-Chanturia et al. (2011) confirm that chunks have processing advantages for native speakers. The diversification of research paradigms provides broad ideas for relevant confirmatory research and the psychological reality of chunks. Cao and Badger (2021) found that 40% of chunks were influenced by the first language. Learners made errors with not only incongruent chunks, but also with congruent chunks.

Chunk acquisition in the development of language ability is also a topic explored by researchers which is regarded as a way to develop grammatical competence. Another tendency is to regard chunk as an output strategy to ensure the fluency of language output and the advantages of language processing. Secondly, chunk is regarded as a communication strategy to ensure communication effort saving (Myles et al., 1999). After being exposed to a large number of chunks, native speaking children use the two complementary mechanisms of “concretization of social cognition” and “modularization of grammatical analysis” to analyze the chunks, so as to summarize and construct relevant grammatical rules (Locke, 1993).

Ellis (1999) proposed a developmental sequence in second language acquisition research, which was from formulae, through low-scope pattern, to construction. Formulae was known as fixed languages, semi-fixed patterns of language called low scope patterns, and productive lexico-grammatical structures referred to constructions. Regarding whether chunk acquisition follows the development path of “formula, low scope pattern, construction” (Bardovi-Harlig, 2002), some distinctive empirical studies have been produced. Such studies mostly

The Scholar: Human Sciences

used the method of case study to track the change track of the usage of specific sentence building chunks of foreign language learners (Myles et al., 1999; Yuldashev et al., (2013). Relevant studies based on detailed analysis of diachronic data (Myles et al., 1999) revealed that the acquisition of sentence construction chunks of declarative sentences and interrogative sentences followed the path of fixed chunks. The use of target chunks from fixation to schematization showed that the learning of chunks and the construction of grammatical ruled complement each other (Myles et al., 1999). Oral fluency is another focus of attention. Boers et al. (2006) found that the number of chunks had a moderate correlation with oral fluency and accuracy. Oral fluency was included in the category of oral expression ability, while Wood (2009) took oral fluency as the only variable measured, quantified as average sentence length, investigating the impact of the use of chunks on oral fluency finding that the use of chunks promoted oral fluency. Jolsvai et al. (2020) stated that the meaning of chunks speeded up the decision time for chunks: the more meaningful a multi-word sequence was, the faster it was processed. This reflected the importance of considering meaning when considering chunks. Most of the above studies measure the impact of learners' chunk use on oral ability through correlation analysis. But the measurement of oral ability and chunk in such studies is mainly based on the impression evaluation of native speakers, and the validity of the experimental results needs to be further verified.

3. Figurative Language

3.1 Definition of Figurative Language

People use rhetorical devices in order to increase feelings, express politely, or describe vividly. Generally speaking, the literal meaning of such expressions is inconsistent with their actual meaning. It is necessary for the hearer to further understand its inner meaning through pragmatic inference. When people understand an utterance, they will understand the meaning of an utterance through the analysis of linguistic rules such as morphology and syntax. On the other hand, they will also analyze it through a series of comprehensive thinking processes, which are generally classified as pragmatics (Glucksberg, 2000). Figurative language refers to idioms, metaphors, irony, or any other non-literal forms of expression. When the context does not match the authenticity or relevance of the relevant words, the figurative meaning will be activated (Giora, 2003).

The best performance of the combination of language and creative thinking activities is figurative language. Figurative language exists not only in poetic expression, but also in our daily lives (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Figurative language can help express abstract, difficult to understand or difficult to articulate meanings, making language more vivid, easier to understand and more convincing (Albert et al., 1998). Colston (2020) also complements other general advantages of figurative language, such as expressibility, compactness, vividness, psychotherapeutic advantages, memorability, community identification, distancing, etc. Figurative language is effective and usually requires no special effort to produce and understand because it shows exactly what the speaker is trying to convey, which is an ideal tool for capturing our complex figurative thoughts and allowing others to understand our thoughts and feelings. (Colston & Gibbs, 2021).

3.2 Classification of Figurative Language

Roberts and Kreuz (1994) provided eight types of figurative language: hyperbole, idioms, indirect requests, irony, understatement, metaphor, rhetorical questions, and similes. Albert et al. (1998) pointed out that metonymy should be involved.

Since figurative language is expressed as the medium through language, the previous view is that metaphors are regarded as concepts in linguistics. But as Lakoff (1993) described, everyday life, thinking and even the physical world are all a conceptual system. Such a conceptual system is embodied in language, and metaphorical concepts that are used to express the system. The language we express also reflects our knowledge of use of a conceptual system, hence the conceptual system is reified through our use of language. Conceptual metaphors affect our understanding of everyday language (Gibbs, 1994; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

The conceptual metaphor view relies on conceptual mappings between source and target domains, which often link abstract concepts to more concrete ones. These mappings are shared primarily between interlocutors. The target domain involves a specific schema or other knowledge that the interlocutor must share (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Lakoff & Turner, 1989). Idioms refer to kinds of conventional words whose literal meaning are not simply the sum of the component morpheme meanings, and the structures and meanings are conventionally established. The meanings expressed by idioms are conventional, and are well known and accepted by social members in a certain area. Ginkel and Dijkstra (2020) found that the native speaker's understanding of idioms as a whole resulted in the suppression of the literal meaning. Koring (2020) analyzed pragmatically that the violation of the conditions of use of definite articles was one of the ways in which speakers produce figurative language. Irony means the use of words that are the opposite of the intended meaning to express negation, sarcasm, or ridicule. Hyperbole refers to the use of rich imagination to purposefully enlarge or narrow the

The Scholar: Human Sciences

image features of things on the basis of objective reality, so as to enhance the expressive effect. An indirect request is a language use to make requests to addressee in an indirect manner. Roberts and Kreuz (1994) argue that the main purpose of speakers using indirect requests is to get addressee to take some action. Indirect requests combine the goal of influencing behavior with the goal of being polite without sacrificing one's own face. Addressee are more likely to agree and participate when they are treated politely rather than coerced. This behavior ultimately makes addressee accept and participate in the behavior based on the speaker's polite behavior (Gibbs & Mueller, 1988).

Figurative language contains hundreds of forms (Lanham, 1991), but most studies are limited except idioms and metaphors. It has been widely studied in monolingual literature. Much research on second language teaching has proven that it is very difficult for non-native speakers to acquire second language figurative ability (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2008; Kecskés, 2016; Littlemore, 2006; Wray, 2012). However, there are few studies on how bilinguals understand figurative language (Heredia & Cieślicka, 2015).

4. Figurative Chunks

4.1 Definition of Figurative Chunks

As an important part of pragmatic competence, figurative language reflects the behavior similar to mother tongue and often expresses cultural values, social expectations and the attitude of the speaker (Kecskés, 2014). Kecskés pointed out that "preferred ways of saying things are generally reflected in the use of formulaic language and figurative language. Selecting the right words and expressions, which is directly tied to pragmatic competence, is more important than syntax" (Kecskés, 2014). It is dangerous for L2 learners to use formulaic language without understanding the social and cultural background of the language. Especially in situation-bound utterances, figurative meaning is usually dominant, rather than literal meaning. In daily communication, if L2 learners do not understand the metaphorical meaning of the chunk, they will deal with the discourse according to the literal meaning (Kecskés, 2014).

Kecskés argued that it has a profound effect on how we explain intercultural interaction because both figurative and formulaic language, which Lewis called chunks, was the result of conventionalization and standardization that was supported by regular use of certain lexical units for particular purposes in a speech community (Kecskés, 2014). Colston (2020) found that formulaic language was frequently figurative. For intermediate and advanced L2 learners, chunks are the biggest obstacle in their communication to sounding nativelike (Wray, 2012). Figurative chunks can be considered as prefabricated strings of coherent or incoherent non-literal language structures that are stored in memory as a whole and extracted directly.

The most common figurative chunks are idioms. Idioms play an important role not only in dictionaries, but also in our lives (Philip, 2011). The meaning expressed by idioms is conventional, and is well known and accepted by social members in a certain area. Idioms are "highly over-learned word sequences that learners have experience with as holistic units" (Titone & Connine, 1999). It is difficult to understand figurative chunks, especially idioms, which are one kind of chunks according to Lewis in intercultural communication, because the semantic meanings of metaphor and idioms are opaque and involve people's thinking and culture. "listen with half an ear", "let the cat out of the bag" are all figurative chunks which are opaque, which need to be inferred to comprehend the meaning.

Another common form of figurative chunks is metaphor. According to Lakoff (1993), the theory of conceptual metaphor holds that metaphor is a systematic mapping from a concrete conceptual domain to an abstract conceptual domain. Metaphor is a way of thinking and means of cognition, which can be reflected in language. Conceptual metaphors include structural metaphors, orientational metaphors, and ontological metaphors. Structural metaphor is the construction of one concept into another. Therefore, the related mappings are gradually fixed with the transformation between the two fields, so relatively fixed expressions are formed, such as "time is money". Derived fixed expression "waste of time" can be preserved and extracted as a whole. "She is a woman with a stony heart." Rocks are considered as hard, cold things, but hearts are soft and warm, so "a stony heart" means the heart is hard and cold, which means she is ruthless and immune to emotion. Although there is a process of metaphor derivation for "a stony heart", L2 learners needn't to infer again when they use it. As a metaphorical chunk, it can be stored as a whole, which can save time and make their expressions more vivid and idiomatic.

Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) claimed that grammatical metaphor included ideational metaphor and interpersonal metaphor. For ideational metaphor, the signified is consistent, but signifier is inconsistent, so it will not affect the comprehension. For interpersonal metaphor, mood is also metaphorical. "Could you tell me the truth?" is metaphorical form of "Tell me the truth.", which is from question mood to command mood. So the chunk "Could you tell me.....?" is the figurative chunk of "Tell me...". Likewise, for metaphor of modality, "I think Lily knows" is subjective, and it is metaphorical of "Lily will know" which

The Scholar: Human Sciences

is objective. The chunk "I think" is a metaphorical form which can make objective transform into subjective.

Hyperbole is a rhetorical way of exaggerating or reducing the image, characteristics, effect, degree and other aspects of things in order to achieve a certain expression's effect. Hyperbole is a figure of speech that enlarges or diminishes the image features of things purposefully on the basis of objective reality with rich imagination, so as to enhance the effect of expression. "I am dying for a cup of tea." The chunk "dying for" is a hyperbolic way to express a person who thirsts for something. "Whenever you need (a favor)", "anything you need" can be used to express that the speaker would like to help someone again in a similar situation in the future, but in an exaggerated way to show that the speaker is extremely willing to help (Colston, 2020). Hyperbolic chunks can strongly express the emotions of speakers with exaggerated expressions through fixed modes of overall storage and extraction. Fixed patterns can save time for speakers to understand and output expressions, and also help speakers to express their emotions more appropriately.

Irony is an ironic tone or writing technique when speaking or writing. It is impossible to understand what it really wants to express simply from its literal meaning, but in fact its original meaning is exactly the opposite of what it can understand literally, so it is usually necessary to understand its meaning from the context. "Look, who's talking" is not really referring to someone the speaker is not sure about, but rather not directly referring to the interlocutor. The speaker actually accuses the interlocutor of doing it himself but blames the speaker for doing so. L2 learners can remember this chunk and the context for using irony for this, and apply it as a whole in a similar context.

Metonymy refers to the fact that two things are not similar in nature, but they are often related in social life, and use this relationship to replace B with the name of A. Its inner thinking relation is not similar relation but associative relation. "Grey hairs should be respected." Old people all have common features, that is, their hair is gray, so gray hair can refer to old people. The chunk "grey hair" can be remembered as a whole, and it is easy for L2 learners to use as an idiomatic expression. "We are all ears." When listening to someone carefully, people will use both ears, so "all ears" refers to listening carefully. It is a chunk that is figurative and fixed for L2 learners to extract and use as a whole.

Other forms of figurative language, such as indirect requests, irony, understatement, formulated questions, and similes, are also found in many non-literal fixed forms, which can be formed figurative chunks. The study of figurative chunks can improve L2 learners' English comprehension and language use ability.

4.2 Research on figurative chunks

Research on figurative chunks has focused on idioms, as idioms are both chunks and figurative language. Although it is very important, there are very few other studies, and only Colston explored the figurativity of formulaic language.

Idiom is considered as one type of fixed expressions according to Lewis, and also as one type of figurative language which has attracted the attention of many scholars. A lot of research has been done on this. Many studies have described idioms as a formulaic language (Gibbs & Colston, 2012), or as "a sequence, continuous or discontinuous, of words or other meaning elements, which is, or appears to be prefabricated: that is, stored and retrieved whole from memory at the time of use, rather than being subject to generation or analysis by the language grammar" (Wray & Perkins, 2000).

Formulaic language is considered as one type of chunk by Lewis (1997). Lewis (1997) divides lexical chunks into four categories: polywords, collocations, fixed expressions, semi-fixed expressions. And formulaic language are fixed or semi-fixed expressions. Formulaic language has the characteristics of figurative language. Colston (2015) studied a well-versed problem in linguistic research from a psycholinguistic perspective in his book Using Figurative Language. He believed that formulaic language was one type of figurative language. Colston explored the figurativity of formulaic language, especially gratitude acknowledgements, like "Thanks a million", "You are a life saver". Through three experiments, he found that exaggeration is often used as part of its function. The results showed that the speaker uses figurative gratitude acknowledgements to achieve the pragmatic effects of politeness, respect, and love. Which means the more figurativity of gratitude acknowledgements, the better the expression of politeness, respect and love. Participants who expressed politeness, respect and affection produced significantly more figurativity than those who were not very polite, respectful and fond of their addressee.

It can be seen from the above studies, there has been research into metaphor, idioms and figurative language, but there has not been a lot of research that examines such language from the perspective of lexical chunks. It is clear that a research gap in figurative chunks needs to be explored.

4.3 A Cross-language Study of Figurative Chunks Based on Corpus Linguistics

Originally applied to the study of vocabulary and grammar, the methods of corpus linguistics are now extended to a wider range of fields, including: discourse analysis, translation studies, first and second language acquisition, as well as other branches of the humanities and

The Scholar: Human Sciences

social sciences (Semino, 2017). Our intuition is often wrong when it comes to things like semantics and syntax. Corpus provides evidence for our intuition about language. It not only provides an empirical basis for testing our intuitions about language, but also reveals features that our intuitions about language fail to understand. The contribution of corpus linguistics to the description of language we teach is indisputable (O'Keeffe et al., 2007).

Corpus linguistic research on figurative chunks has focused on metaphor. Corpus can bring abundant information to language research, most notably the frequency and context of metaphorical expression, which provides support for the interpretative power of the actual existence of conceptual metaphor. As conceptual metaphor is a language research paradigm based on a top-down approach, people often use intuition to test whether metaphorical expressions in real life show the basic characteristics of conceptual metaphor, and large corpora can provide language support for the conceptual process of metaphor. Deignan (2005) pointed out that the purpose of metaphorical corpus research is to prove how conceptual metaphor theory interprets metaphor in natural language, which includes two aspects: searching corpus and discovering metaphor usage patterns and rules. The ideology behind metaphor can be explained by using corpus method. The representative idioms contain profound cultural information, which native speakers have heard and used since childhood. These figurative chunks seem to set up insurmountable obstacles for non-native speakers, no matter how proficient they are (O'Keeffe et al., 2007).

From the beginning of the 20th century, some scholars (Chung, 2008; Deignan & Potter, 2004; Semino et al., 2004; Potts & Semino, 2017; Semino, 2017; Shitikov & Shitikova, 2021) conducted a cross-language study to demonstrate that metaphor is not unique to one language. The cross-language similarities found by these researchers suggest that at least some conceptual metaphors are widely shared.

Deignan and Potter (2004) conducted a cross-language corpus comparative study on metaphorical expressions of body source domain in English and Italian, and extracted four core English words for comparative analysis in the corpus. The study uncovered a range of equivalence and asymmetry in the two languages, as well as cases in which the semantic connotation is the same but the way words are implemented is slightly different. This shows that the universal body experience can inspire many metaphorical expressions, but this process is extremely complex and does not necessarily exist in different languages, because of the differences in culture and language. Metonymy was found to have great potential to shape thinking, and there is an interactive relationship between metonymy and metaphor, but this was not discussed in detail.

Semino et al. (2004) focus on metaphorical analysis in specific texts. They discuss methodological problems encountered in metaphor recognition and analysis in the dialogue corpus about cancer, including the following aspects: first, how to determine the boundary between literal and metaphorical expression in the process of language metaphor recognition; second, how to accurately identify the tenor and vehicle; third, how to deduce conceptual metaphor from linguistic metaphor; fourth, how to infer conventional metaphors from data models. They put forward a good method to identify metaphor in discourse through corpus.

Chung (2008) made a comparative analysis of the use of "market" metaphor in Chinese, Malay and English. The results show that the three languages conceptualize "market" differently, not only in the linguistic analysis of their source domain, but also in grammatical relations. This study provides a new perspective for the cross-language comparison of metaphors. It not only analyzes the semantic level, but also considers the collocation and syntactic level, and provides intuitive and credible data demonstration for readers. However, the corpus scope of his research only focuses on "market", so it is too general to speculate the economic conditions of countries with different languages only by using the metaphor of "market".

Potts and Semino (2017) studied the use of violent metaphors in healthcare from corpora, combining qualitative analysis with corpus-based quantitative methods to analyze the frequency and variety of violent metaphors in language used by patients, family caregivers and healthcare professionals in the UK when talking about cancer and hospice care. They added contrast and cross-cultural elements to the study of metaphor in hospice care. They found that there was no significant difference in the frequency of violent metaphors between the two corpora in the UK and the US, but there were some differences in the topics that these metaphors were used to discuss, and reflected on the methodological implications of this approach for corpus-based metaphor analysis.

Semino (2017) believes that cultural cognition is a multidisciplinary concept integrating anthropology, linguistics, psychology and sociology. The research focused on the conceptual metaphorical construction of collective identity, especially the culture-specific interpretation of national identity. Semino introduced corpus linguistics and its relevance to metaphor research, different types of corpus and corpus linguistic methods, and discussed the different types of contributions that corpus methods have to metaphor theory and metaphor analysis.

Shitikov and Shitikova (2021) discussed the application of corpus research methods in metaphor research. They assess the application of corpus tools in the context of cognitive linguistics and pedagogy, and propose a complex algorithm for metaphor analysis that includes the stages of

The Scholar: Human Sciences

metaphor recognition, interpretation, and translation, as well as identifying their connection to the conceptual basis of thought. The results of comparative analysis of the implementation of paternity metaphor in the Ancient Greek original and translations into English and Russian of Bible corpus were presented. Shitikov and Shitikova had shown that the keywords identified by the corpus analysis were the representative of the conceptual metaphor of the author's word usage. A classification of translation models by the criterion of preserving the word - concept connection was proposed.

According to the above research, the corpus selected for cross-language comparative research should be balanced, including size, corpus time, corpus source and other aspects. Metaphorical corpus research should not only focus on the frequency level of metaphorical expression, but also on the conceptual level, that is, comparative analysis of cross-domain mapping, so as to discover deeper social and cultural differences.

5. Translanguaging Pedagogical Implications for Figurative Chunks

When L2 learners comprehend chunks, they tend to take literal meaning as the conventional interpretation of chunks, which is one of the most important reasons for misunderstanding. Therefore, to avoid frequent occurrence of misunderstanding, students need to pay attention to both the figurative chunks comprehension according to literal meaning and figurative meaning. It is necessary to elaborate on the opaqueness of semantic chunks to help students understand (Hellman, 2018). Due to the close relationship between language, culture and thinking, language influences people's perception of the objective world and thinking (Everett, 2012). Kecskés argued that using a particular language and belonging to a particular speech community means having preferred ways of saying things and preferred ways of organizing thoughts (Kecskés, 2014). It can be seen from the above research that comprehending the formation mechanism of figurative chunks leads to a better comprehension and memory of figurative chunks.

Baker views translanguaging as "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages". (Baker, 2001). From a cognitive perspective, he regards translanguaging as a psychological process by which bilingual users can realize meaning construction and effective communication. Although people communicate through different languages and different languages reflect different ways of thinking, people will have common perception of the same thing (Lakoff, 1993) and the same works with figurative chunks. Figurative chunks can be analyzed by discussing the differences between the two languages. Therefore, translanguaging can be considered as a good pedagogy to teach figurative chunks.

García (2009) views translanguaging as multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to "make sense of their bilingual worlds". Translanguaging, she points out, is an approach that does not focus on languages, but on the observable and real communicative practices of bilinguals. The translanguaging practices in bilingual communities can be properly interpreted and practiced in schools as a strategy for promoting students' cognitive, language and literacy abilities. García (2011) further explains translanguaging, is more than code-switching and translation in education because it goes beyond these simple practices, which consider two languages as separate systems and simply shift from each other, and takes into account the myriad multimodal ways of bilingual students' practices. García and Sylvan (2011) further developed translanguaging as an effective means of learning by research in the International Network of Public High Schools in the United States. In terms of "plurilingualism from the students", they refer to it as the fact that students use "diverse language practices for purposes of learning, and teachers use inclusive language practices for purposes of teaching" (García & Sylvan, 2011). Lewis et al. (2012) further note that translanguaging cannot only promote understanding of meaning but also develop balanced bilingualism by using the stronger language to reinforce the weak one. In the learning process led by figurative chunks, the learning of the weaker language is led by the stronger language. Hence, to deduce the meaning of figurative chunks of the weaker language the learners uses the stronger language for comprehension.

García makes the abstract concept of translanguaging explicit as a language phenomenon, that is, language practice, which learners use to understand everything in the surrounding world. García and Lin (2017) further pointed out that translanguaging is not only a complex and flowing language practice, but also a teaching method to present these language practices. Traditional bilingualism has suggested that bilingual users have two independent language systems, and bilingual ability only involves the independent mastery of two language abilities. This concept cannot explain complex multilingual phenomenon, and began to be denied by the dynamic view and holistic view of translanguaging. García emphasizes the fluidity and integrity of translanguaging. First, language is not static, but always in a continuous process of change, with continuous flow and integration between languages. Second, although the user has multiple language abilities, these language systems do not exist in isolation, but as a whole. Speakers can freely mobilize any language resources in their possession for the purpose of communication.

The Scholar: Human Sciences

Baker (2001) defined translanguaging teaching as a process of creating meaning, shaping experience, acquiring understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages. Translanguaging teaching emphasizes that students make use of all the language resources they can make use of to maximize their learning and understanding potential. In other words, all languages can be used through dynamic and functional integration and understood and mastered in the way of organization and mediation (Lewis et al., 2012). Through this translanguaging teaching, a variety of communication resources of different students can be recognized and valued to the greatest extent, and students' subjective initiative can be brought into full play. They actively participate in the use, creation, interpretation and development of multi symbol resources in these communication libraries (Hornberger & Link, 2012).

Li Wei summarizes seven different goals which translanguaging is used by teachers in schools to ensure that bilingual students learn both content and language. These include: differentiate and adapt, build background knowledge, deepen understanding, develop and extend new knowledge, critical thinking, cross-linguistic transfer and metalinguistic awareness, cross-linguistic flexibility, identity investment and positionality, and interrogate linguistic inequality (Li, 2014). He also gives some possible strategies which can be used to construct the channels that use both languages to comprehend meanings and express themselves fluently. The comprehension of figurative language is a way of thinking. Some figurative chunks from different languages have similar generation mechanisms, like "Thanks a million", also exists in Chinese making it easier to infer meaning. But some are hard to infer because of the different background. People from different cultural backgrounds will have different comprehension due to different background knowledge, which is a great difficulty especially for second language learners. Teachers can use some strategies of translanguaging to teach figurative chunks, which are collaborative dialogue, collaborative grouping, inner speech, word walls, and multilingual vocabulary inquiry and so on to achieve the teaching goals. Li (2014) presents seven goals: teaching to learn content and language through translanguaging, which are differentiate and adapt, building background knowledge, deepen understanding, develop and extend new knowledge, critical thinking, cross-linguistic flexibility, identity investment and positionality, and interrogate linguistic inequality. (Li, 2014). Teachers can guide students to analyze the comprehension mechanism of figurative chunks in two languages through the comparison of figurative chunks in two languages.

6. Conclusions

Figurative chunks are very important language forms and one of the key elements of fluency. It combines the characteristics of chunks which is a fixed form and extract as a whole with the characteristics of figurative language that is non-literal and difficult to understand. At present, the study of idioms is the most extensive, but much research lies in the comprehension of idioms. And there has not been a lot of research that examines such language from the perspective of lexical chunks. In particular, the comprehension of figurative language by L2 learners has received less attention (Heredia & Cieślicka, 2015). There is little research exploring the comprehension and usage of figurative chunks of L2 learners, which is a gap to fill. In particular, the research should not only stay at the level of comprehension, but also combine pragmatics to improve communicative competence. The literature review above in terms of figurative chunks can provide some ideas for learners of fluency and idiomatic expression, especially for L2 learners and teachers of English teaching. Teachers can provide some materials based on corpus. Figurative chunks are creative thinking activities (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), and translanguaging teaching is a process of creating meaning, shaping experience, acquiring understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages (Baker, 2001). So, teachers can use translanguaging practices for promoting students' cognitive, language and literacy abilities on figurative chunks learning.

References

Albert, K., Katz, A., Cacciari, C., Gibbs, R., & Turner, M. (1998). *Figurative language and figurative thought.* Oxford University Press.

Altenberg, B. (1998). On the phraseology of spoken English: The evidence of recurrent word-combinations. In A. P. Cowie (Ed.), *Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications* (pp. 101-122). Clarendon Press.

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism.* Multilingual Matters.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2002). A new starting point? investigating formulaic use and input in future expression. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24*(2), 189-198. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263102002036

Becker, J. (1975). *The Phrasal Lexicon.* Bolt and Newman. https://doi.org/10.3115/980190.980212

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (2000). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English.* Pearson Education Limited.

Not Official Human Studies

Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (2008). *Cognitive linguistic approaches to teaching vocabulary and phraseology*. Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199161

Boers, F., Eyckmans, J., Kappel, J., Stengers, H., & Demecheleer, M. (2006). Formulaic sequences and perceived oral proficiency: Putting a lexical approach to the test. *Language Teaching Research*, *10*(3), 245-261. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr195oa

Cao, D., & Badger, R. (2021). Cross-linguistic influence on the use of L2 collocations: the case of Vietnamese learners. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 14(3), 421-446.

Chung, Siaw-Fong (2008). Cross-linguistic comparisons of the market metaphors. *Corpus Linguistics & Linguistic Theory*, *4*(2), 141-175. https://doi.org/141-175.10.1515/CLLT.2008.007

Colston, H. L. (2015). *Using figurative language*. Cambridge University Press.

Colston, H. L. (2020). On why people don't say what they mean: Production of figurative formulaic language. In Barnden, J., & Gargett, A. (Eds.), *Figurative thought and language* (pp. 129-174). University of Alberta. https://doi.org/10.1075/ftl.10.06col

Colston, H. L., & Gibbs, R. W. (2021). Figurative language communicates directly because it precisely demonstrates what we mean. *Canadian journal of experimental psychology*, *75*(2), 228-233. https://doi.org/10.1037/cep0000254

Conklin, K., & Schmitt, N. (2008). Formulaic sequences: Are they processed more quickly than nonformulaic language by native and nonnative speakers?. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(1), 72-89. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm022

Deignan, A., & Potter, L. (2004). A corpus study of metaphors and metonyms in english and italian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *36*(7), 1231-1252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.010

Deignan, A. (2005). *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics*. John Benjamins

Durrant, P., & Doherty, A. (2010). Are high-frequency collocations psychologically real? investigating the thesis of collocational priming. *Corpus Linguistics & Linguistic Theory*, *6*(2), 125-155. https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt.2010.006

Ellis, N. C. (1996). Sequencing in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18*(1), 91-126. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100014698

Ellis, N. C. (1999). Cognitive approaches to SLA. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *19*, 22-42. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190020

Ellis, N. C. (2008). The dynamics of second language emergence: cycles of language use, language change, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, *92*(2), 232-249. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1540-4781.2008.00716.X

Ellis, N. C., & Simpson-Vlach, R. (2009). Formulaic language in native speakers: triangulating psycholinguistics, corpus linguistics, and education. *Corpus Linguistics and Lingustic Theory*, *5*(1), 61-78.

Everett, D. L. (2012). *Language: The cultural tool*. Profile Books

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley/Blackwell.

García, O. (2011). Educating new york's bilingual children: Constructing a future from the past. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, *14*(2), 133-153. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2010.539670

García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern language journal*, *95*(3), 385-400.

García, O., & Lin, A. M. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual education. *Bilingual and multilingual education*, 117-130.

Gibbs, R. W., & Mueller, R. A. (1988). Conversational sequences and preference for indirect speech acts. *Discourse Processes*, *11*(1), 101-116.

Gibbs, J., & Colston, H. L. (2012). *Interpreting figurative meaning*. Cambrige University Press.

Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge University Press.

Ginkel, W. V., & Dijkstra, T. (2020). *The tug of war between an idiom's figurative and literal meanings: Evidence from native and bilingual speakers*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728918001219

Giora, R. W. (2003). *On our mind: Salience, context, and figurative language*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(92)90026-S

Glucksberg, S. (2000). Understanding figurative language: From methaphor to idiom. *Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions*, *13*(13), 316-24. https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI.2000.13.3.316

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar.* Routledge.

Hellman, A. B. (2018). *Teaching Lexical Chunks*. American Cancer Society. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0777

The Scholar: Human Sciences

Heredia, R. R., & Cieślicka, A. B. (2015). Bilingual figurative language processing: Figurative language processing. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *21*(1), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64099-0_4

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens: international journal of bilingual education and bilingualism, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *15*(3), 261-278. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.658016

Howarth, P. (1998). Phraseology and second language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, *19*, 24-44. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.1.24

Jiang, N. A., & Nekrasova, T. M. (2007). The processing of formulaic sequences by second language speakers. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*(3), 433-445.

Jolsvai, H., Mccauley, S. M., & Christiansen, M. H. (2020). Meaningfulness beats frequency in multiword chunk processing. *Cognitive Science*, *44*(10), 2-17. https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12885

Kartal, G. (2018). Phrasal verbs in ELT coursebooks used in Turkey: A corpus-based analysis. *Cumhuriyet Uluslararası Eğitim Dergisi*, *7*(4), 534-550. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.556421

Kecskés, I. (2014). *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Kecskés, I. (2016). Is the idiom principle blocked in bilingual L2 production?. In Heredia, R. R. & Cieślicka, A. B. (Eds.), *Bilingual figurative language processing* (pp. 28-52). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139342100.005

Koring, L. (2020). Producing figurative meanings: the case of idioms. In Barnden , J. & Gargett, A. (eds.), *Producing figurative expression* (pp. 237-262). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lakoff, G. (1993). How metaphor structures dreams: The theory of conceptual metaphor applied to dream analysis. *Dreaming*, *3*(2), 77-98. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0094373

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Conceptual metaphor in everyday language. *Journal of Philosophy*, *77*(8), 453-486. https://doi.org/10.2307/2025464

Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason.* The University of Chicago Press.

Lanham, R. A. (1991). *A handlist of rhetorical terms.* University of California Press.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research & Evaluation*, *18*(7), 655-670. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research & Evaluation*, *18*(7), 641-654. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488

Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach*. Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (1997). *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*. Language Teaching Publications.

Li, W. (2014). Translanguaging knowledge and identity in complementary classrooms for multilingual minority ethnic children. *Classroom Discourse*, *5*(2), 158-175. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2014.893896

Littlemore, J. (2006). Metaphoric competence, second language learning, and communicative language ability. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(2), 268-294. https://doi:10.1093/applin/aml004

Locke, J. L. (1993). *The child's path to spoken language*. Harvard University Press.

Myles, F., Mitchell, R., & Hooper, J. (1999). Interrogative chunks in french l2. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *21*(1), 49-80. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263199001023

Nattinger, J. R., & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching.* Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M. J., & Carter, R. A. (2007). *From Corpus to Classroom: language use and language teaching.* Cambridge University Press

Pawley, A., & Syder, F. H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (eds.), *Language & Communication*, Longman (pp.191-228).

Philip, G. (2011). *Colouring meaning: Collocation and connotation in figurative language*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.43

Potts, A., & Semino, E. (2017). Healthcare professionals' online use of violence metaphors for care at the end of life in the us: a corpus-based comparison with the uk. *Corpora*, *12*(1), 55-84. https://doi.org/10.3366/cor.2017.0109

Roberts, R. M., & Kreuz, R. J. (1994). Why do people use figurative language?. *Psychological Science*, *5*(3), 159-163. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1994.tb00653.x

Schmitt, N. (2004). *Formulaic sequences: Acquisition, processing and use.* John Benjamins Pub.

Semino, E. (2017). Corpus linguistics and metaphor. In Dancygier, B. (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 463-76). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316339732.029

The Scholar: Human Sciences

Semino, E., Heywood, J., & Short, M. (2004). Methodological problems in the analysis of metaphors in a corpus of conversations about cancer. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *36*(7), 1271-1294.

Shitikov, P. M., & Shitikova, M. N. (2021). Experience of using corpus methods in the study of metaphor (based on the material of the Bible corpus of John). *Scientific Essays of Higher Education, 2*(3). https://doi.org/10.20339/PhS.2-21.016

Sinclair, J. (1991). Corpus, concordance, collocation. *Modern Language Journal*, *78*(3), 110-115

Siyanova-Chanturia, A., Conklin, K., & Schmitt, N. (2011). Adding more fuel to the fire: An eyetracking study of idiom processing by native and non-native speakers. *Second Language Research, 27*, 251-72.

Titone, D. A., & Connine, C. M. (1999). On the compositional and noncompositional nature of idiomatic expressions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*(12), 1655-1674. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00008-9

Tremblay, A., Derwing, B., Libben, G., & Westbury, C. (2011). Processing advantages of lexical bundles: Evidence from self-paced reading and sentence recall tasks. *Language Learning, 61*(2), 569-613. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00622.x

Wood, D. (2009). Effects of focused instruction of formulaic sequences on fluent expression in second language narratives: A case study. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *12*, 39-57.

Wood, D., & Ebrary, I. (2010). *Perspectives on formulaic language: Acquisition and communication*. Continuum.

Wray, A. (2012). What do we (think we) know about formulaic language? An evaluation of the current state of play. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 32*(1), 231-254. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051200013X

Wray, A. (2013). Formulaic language. *Language Teaching, 46*(3), 316-334. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444813000013

Wray, A., & Perkins, R. (2000). The functions of formulaic language: An integrated model. *Language and Communication, 20*, 1-28.

Yuldashev, A., Fernandez, J., & Thorne, S. L. (2013). Second language learners' contiguous and discontiguous multi‐word unit use over time. *The Modern Language Journal, 97*(S1), 31-45.

The Scholar: Human Sciences