

[Special Contributions]

## Linguistic Creativity in English as a Lingua Franca

Istvan Kecskes  
State University of New York

The paper argues that linguistic creativity is about the alternation of prefabricated lexical and grammatical units and ad hoc generated chunks and sentences that are amalgamated into simple and/or more complex utterances in speech production. This alternation is crucial for English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) because this is where the main difference between English as a Native Language (ENL) use and ELF use can be identified. Since ELF users cannot rely on norms, standards and conventions of ENL to the extent as native speakers do, they need to co-construct, co-create those in their temporary speech communities. Consequently, ELF users produce more ad hoc generated language than rely on prefabricated units of the target language when creating utterances than their ENL counterparts. The paper sets to explain this difference in linguistic creativity.

**Keywords:** linguistic creativity, norms, prefabricated units, temporary speech community, temporary extensions

### 1. Introduction

Jespersen (1904: 16–17) described phraseology as an ‘indispensable’ dimension of language competence. But the rise of the Chomskian generative approach (Chomsky 1965) changed the landscape in linguistics, and formulaic language was pushed to the periphery because it did not fit in generative syntax. Recently, however, the linguistic landscape has been changing again. There has been more discussion on the essence of linguistic creativity and the role of prefabricated language in language production in general, and its relationship to linguistic creativity in particular.

Kecskes (2016, 2019a) argued that linguistic creativity is about the alternation of prefabricated lexical and grammatical units and ad hoc generated chunks and sentences that are amalgamated into simple and/or more complex utterances in speech production. This alternation is crucial for English as a Lingua Franca because this can explain the main difference between English as a Native Language use and ELF use. Representing different levels of English proficiency ELF users cannot rely on norms, standards and conventions of ENL to the extent as native speakers do, so they need to co-construct, co-create those in their temporary speech communities. As a result, ELF users usually

produce more ad hoc generated language and less rely on norms and prefabricated units of the target language when creating utterances than their ENL counterparts.

The two types of processing (analytic—holistic) could be viewed as forming a continuum in any language production. Speakers of any language in their actual language use move up and down on a continuum with two hypothetical ends: “prefabricated language” and “ad hoc generated language”:

<----->

Prefabricated language Ad hoc generated language

Both in ENL and ELF, speakers move up and down on the continuum when they use English in actual situational contexts. They are always in between the two hypothetical ends. This means that in actual language production people use more or less prefabricated and ad hoc generated language depending on several factors such as communicative need, intention, topic, actual situational context, speech partners, etc.

In a study Kecskes (2015) claimed that the “idiom principle” (Sinclair 1987) is the most salient guiding mechanism not only in L1 but in any language production. However, the principle generates less formulaic language in L2 use than L1 because there are several factors that are not present in L1 but exist in L2, affecting the functioning of the idiom principle in a different degree. Such factors include limited core common ground, language proficiency, willingness to use certain formulas, language proficiency of other participants, and others (e.g. Pang 2020: Timpe-Laughlin and Dombi). These factors affect movement on the language use continuum and determine the combination of prefabricated units with ad hoc generated units. As a result, the actual production of target language formulaic expressions in the L2 will be likely to be lower than in L1 most of the time. This, however, does not mean that people in their L2 use are more creative linguistically than in their L1 or vice versa. The ‘idiom principle’ always has priority over the “open choice principle” in any language use. Speakers always prefer ready-made expressions to ad hoc generated ones if they are available and/or appropriate in most communicative situations. The question is how this priority can be demonstrated and what effect it has on production.

## 2. Idiom principle versus open choice principle

If we want to understand the alternation and interplay of prefabricated and ad hoc generated language use, we should start with the *economy principle*. Leopold (1930) discovered that there are two contradictory tendencies in any linguistic systems: Linguistic development follows two opposing tendencies, that is, towards distinctness on the one hand, and economy on the other. Either of these poles prevails, but both are present and alternately preponderant (Leopold 1930: 102). The tendency to distinctness originates from the fact that any speaker has, at any time, the predominant intention of being understood. The tendency to economy is “the innate tendency of man, wisely

given him by nature, not to spend more energy on any effort than necessary” (Leopold 1930: 102). Consequently, in communicative acts, one of the two factors usually prevails on the other, generating different balances depending on the social or professional level.

In the *Relevance Theory* (Sperber and Wilson 1995), *economy* has been used with two functions: first to explain how cognitive processes are linked to utterance interpretation (processing efforts must be balanced by cognitive effects), second to explain how communication may be successful (inferences complete the underspecified content of the utterance to obtain its intended meaning). In other words, economy is a property of the cognitive system devoted to both utterance production and interpretation (and not just interpretation as RT theorists like to say), and is also required in order to ensure successful communication, by the computational devices, which are combined with linguistic decoding to yield the intended meaning of an utterance.

There is psycholinguistic evidence that fixed expressions and formulas have an important economizing role in speech production (cf. Miller and Weinert 1998; Wray 2002). Sinclair’s (1991) *idiom principle* says that the use of prefabricated chunks may ... *illustrate a natural tendency to economy of effort* (Sinclair 1991: 110). This can be interpreted as follows: in communication we want to achieve more cognitive effects with less processing effort. So formulaic expressions ease the processing overload not only because they are *ready-made* and do not require of the speaker/hearer any putting together, but also because their salient meanings are easily accessible in online production and processing. Wray (2002) maintained that by favoring formulaic units, speakers can reduce both their own processing—the larger the units, the fewer the operations needed to construct the message—and also the processing load of the hearer. On that account, she argued that there are major benefits to the speaker in ensuring that the hearer does not have to engage in too much processing. Wray also proposed that both parties are to some extent obliged to find ways of minimizing their processing, because the grammar of human languages is too complex for human memory to cope with all the time (Wray 2002: 15). Thus, Wray converged with Sinclair’s proposal (1991) that the formulaic option, which he calls the *idiom principle*, is the *default processing strategy*. Analytic processing, the *open choice principle* in Sinclair’s terminology, is invoked only when the idiom principle fails. As highlighted earlier this is a crucial point for English as a Lingua Franca research because *being the default processing strategy the formulaic option (i.e., idiom principle) is expected to be most salient in language production in general including ELF*. It means that the speaker is expected to come up primarily with utterances that contain ready-made, formulaic expression(s) if possible, appropriate and plausible. If it is not, the *open choice principle* steps in. This looks like a logical mechanism in L1 production where participants can rely on the mutual understanding of formulaic expressions that are motivated by common ground, conventions, commonalities, norms, common beliefs and mutual knowledge. Besides, the use of formulas will give them the tranquility of mind that they will be understood since

formulaic expressions are usually not polysemic. But is this also the case in ELF speakers when they use their L2? Does their mind pre-wired for the *idiom principle*? In order for us to answer these questions, we first need to look at how the *idiom principle* works in L1 language production and then in L2.

Let me make this clear that in L1 production there is hardly any doubt about the salience of the idiom principle. Coulmas (1981: 1-3) argued that much of what is actually said in everyday conversation is by no means unique. Rather, a great deal of communicative activity consists of enacting routines making use of prefabricated linguistic units in a well-known and generally accepted manner. He continued claiming that successful co-ordination of social intercourse heavily depends on standardized ways of organizing interpersonal encounters. Howarth (1998) and Pang (2020) also talked about the fact that native speaker linguistic competence has a large and significant phraseological component. This, in fact, has a profound effect on how we explain ELF interaction. In L1 both figurative and formulaic language are the result of conventionalization and standardization, which is supported by regular use of certain prefabricated lexical units in a speech community. However, ELF represents a temporary speech community with limited access to idiomaticity of the target/common language.

People using a particular language—who belong to a particular speech community—have preferred ways of saying things (cf. Wray 2002; Kecskes 2007) and preferred ways of organizing thoughts (Kecskes 2007, 2014). Preferred ways of saying things are generally reflected in the use of formulaic language and metaphorical/figurative language, while preferred ways of organizing thoughts can be detected through analyzing, for instance: the use of subordinate conjunctions, clauses, discourse markers and sequential structure of discourse segments. Selecting the right words and expressions and formulating utterances in ways preferred by the native speakers of that language (native-like selection) is more important than syntax. The following example from a sign in an Austrian hotel catering to skiers (source: Octopus, October 1995, Champaign, IL, p. 144) demonstrates this clearly. As we can see, the sentence shows wrong word choices but correct syntax.

- (1) Not to perambulate the corridors in the hours of repose in the boots of descension.

Correct form: Don't walk in the halls in ski boots at night.<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that the author of this sign compiled this sentence by using a dictionary verbatim to convey the meaning needed for the warning sign. The result is understandable, but a native speaker would never say anything even close to this sentence.

---

<sup>1</sup> The example is from Kecskes (2019a) as some of the other ones in this paper.

### 3. Linguistic creativity in ELF

Now that we have discussed the role of formulaic elements in language use in general, we shall turn to the issue of linguistic creativity in ELF. Relatively small number of studies (e.g. Langlotz 2006; Holmes 2007; Prodromou 2007; Pitzl 2011, 2012; Wang 2013) have addressed this problem. As an example, Pitzl's study (2012) discussed this topic in depth. She proposed a working definition of linguistic creativity which, in her words is "... the creation of new (i.e. non-codified) linguistic forms and expressions in ongoing interaction/discourse or the use of existing forms and expressions in a non-conventional way (Pitzl 2012: 38)." This can be considered both a product-oriented and a process-oriented definition although Pitzl's main goal is to accommodate the linguistic forms and expressions created by ELF speakers in interactions which do not represent the 'preferred ways of saying things' by ENL speakers. Furthermore, relying on Widdowson's and Pope's research, Pitzl (2012) emphasized the importance of the idea of "potentialities already available" put forward by Pope who used that with regard to creativity in general: "[i]nvention', then, is hardly ever a making-up entirely from scratch. It is the 'coming-in' and in effect the 'coming-together' of potentialities already available" (Pope 2005: 64). Similarly, Widdowson talked about his concept of virtual language, which refers to a speaker "exploit[ing] linguistic resources to produce a novel combination, not allowable by the conventional code, but nevertheless a latent possibility which is virtual in the language though not actually encoded (Widdowson 1997: 137)."

I think we must be careful with the idea of 'potentialities already available' and 'virtual language' in ELF production. There are no concrete examples in Pitzl (2012) to illustrate what this really means in practice. In my view, 'potentialities already available' may take us back to Chomsky who speaks about a potential of speakers to create infinite number of sentences within the potentials of a coded system (conventions of language: grammar). If the potential of creating a given form derives from the system itself, we must consider that as a possible product of the system although it is not coded yet. Here are some examples:

(2) ELF:

The crualism of those people was not understandable.

The basical fact remains that the members misused the system.

These are all 'potentialities already available' that were created by stretching the system, creating something that is not encoded in the system yet. This usually happens on the morphological and lexical level. However, this creativity may work differently on the semantic and discourse level.

The problem with ELF speakers is that when they use English, they rely not only on their existing limited English language system but also their L1 system. So their 'creations' can often be considered as the result of a hybrid or synergic system which is

neither English nor Russian, German or whatever the L2 of the ELF speaker is, but a blend of the two systems (see Kecskes 2010).<sup>2</sup> This is especially true for the semantic and discourse level. That dual language system can create utterances like below.

- (3) They started the meeting off on a bad foot.  
You are not very rich in communication.

This type of linguistic creativity can go beyond established norms, and bypass existing rules and break current conventions. It is important to underline that this activity or production should make sense within the confines of the actual situational context. The question is where to draw the dividing line between the products and creations that can still be considered the output of the existing system or a *temporary communicative extension* of the system (TCE hereafter). By TCE I mean *expressions and utterances that violate the existing norms and conventions but still make sense in a given actual situational context and can be considered a possible output of the English language system*. These are word-choices and word-combinations and utterances that are conceptually “foreign” for the target language system (English). Here are some examples:

- (4) Let’s rest the sleeping lion.  
We connect with them.  
Can you illuminate my cigarette?

As we can see, these expressions make sense in English. But they are not preferred ways of saying things at all, and unlikely to be used by other speakers. What I am trying to call attention to here is that TCEs play a crucial role in ELF, for they are the results of what I call “deliberate creativity” (see Kecskes 2016). These TCEs may reflect L1-motivated word selection, unusual syntactic formulations, ad hoc-created metaphors, etc.

#### 4. Deliberate creativity

In ELF both the idiom principle and the economy principle are present just like in L1. But in ELF the functioning of these two principles cannot produce formulaic language the way it does in L1. But because of the priority of the idiom principle in any language production there is a pressure on the hybrid, synergistic system that ELF users rely on to produce more formulaic language. But what type of formulaic language is that? To answer this question, we need to recall the Bolingerian view. Bolinger (1976) referred to prefabricated expressions as “remembering and putting together” which cannot work the way it does in L1 because for “remembering” ELF speakers would need

---

<sup>2</sup> The interlanguage researchers spoke about a similar phenomenon (see, for instance, Selinker [1972]).

to have access to the same psychological saliency of formulas as L1 speakers do have access to. But this is hardly possible in ELF. However, this problem may be solved by what I called ‘deliberate creativity’ (Kecskes 2016: 11–12). *Deliberate creativity is a process that is used by ELF speakers to create and/or co-construct formulas which either resemble those of L2 (English) or L1 (speaker’s L1) or are just the result of temporary communicative extension of the system (TCE)*. In order for us to understand this type of ELF processing we need to examine the nature of this ‘deliberate creativity’.

First, we need to discuss how idiomatic/formulaic language use fits into creative language processing. Our point of departure should be the hypothesis that prefabricated language does not preclude linguistic creativity. In fact, there is quite a bit of evidence for this in corpus linguistics. Skehan (1998) talked about the fact that “language users are adept at shifting in and out of the analytic mode and move between the systems quite naturally (Skehan 1998: 54).” Some researchers even mentioned that the two types of processing (analytic—holistic) could be viewed as forming a continuum (cf. Skehan 1998; Wray 2002; Carter 2004). In the course of interaction, prefabricated expressions may mean islands of temporary stability demonstrating varying degrees of variation and possibilities for further development in sync with the dynamics of discourse. In this sense, “*linguistic creativity refers to the ability of combining prefabricated units with novel items (ad hoc generated items) in a syntax-and discourse-affecting way to express communicative intention and goals and create new meaning*” (Kecskes 2016: 12). This ability is an essential part of a person’s language competence that is deployed mainly subconsciously and automatically based on the existing knowledge of the speaker and his/her actual situational communicative needs. As a result, *linguistic creativity is a graded phenomenon* ranging from the more conventional and predictable to the less conventional and unpredictable.

The more conventional and predictable side is operated by the idiom principle while the less conventional and more unpredictable side of the continuum is governed by the open choice principle. Of course, these are just hypothetical ends of the continuum on which there are constant alterations in any communicative process.

CONVENTIONAL and PREDICTABLE ----- UNCONV. and UNPREDICTABLE

More reliance on the right end of the continuum (open choice principle) can be called *deliberate creativity* (Kecskes 2016). It is ‘deliberate’ because it is mostly (but not always!) a conscious process in which language users prefer to generate their own utterances rather than resorting to prefabricated units or the combination of ad hoc generated units and ready-made expressions. The process exists in both L1 and ELF, however, its nature may differ significantly depending on which language the speaker (L1 or L2) uses. In L1, deliberate creativity is reflected mainly in the ways in which the speaker tries to manipulate speaker meaning, while in L2 or ELF it can be demonstrated through the significant overuse of ad hoc generated utterances and less reliance on L2 (English, target language) formulaic expressions.

#### 4.1. Deliberate creativity in L1

The speaker can fully control what s/he wants the audience to believe/understand but s/he cannot control what the audience will actually believe and/or understand. The two aspects of speaker meaning (individual and conversational) and recipient design give the chance to the speaker to manipulate speaker meaning according to his/her needs; that is to leave meaning conversationally open for interpretation or signal his/her intention with cues, and markers. In the abovementioned cases, the speaker aims to promote his/her own agenda by trying to manipulate the interpretation process. There are several instances of this case. However, here, as an example we will focus only on one of them: manipulating hearer's salience.

Sometimes the speaker attempts to manipulate the saliency of certain linguistic expressions for the hearer. This manipulation is usually based on collective salience. We can demonstrate this manipulation the following example:

- (5) In one of his films *Survivors*, Robin Williams says the following line:  
— I had to sleep with the dogs. Platonically, of course ...”

The speaker thinks that the sexual connotation of ‘sleep with’ (collective salience) is too strong so a clarification is indispensable. He tries to cancel this effect with the adverb ‘platonically’.

#### 4.2. Deliberate creativity in ELF

Deliberate creativity works differently in ELF. Since ELF interlocutors are all nonnative speakers of English, we will need to look first at how the default idiom principle affects their L2 use at different levels of proficiency. Recent research in L2 (relevant to ELF) has demonstrated that there is a difference in formulaic language use between less and more proficient non-native speakers. Based on the longitudinal studies both Howarth (1998) and Ortactepe (2012) came to the conclusion that less proficient learners pick up formulaic expressions and overuse them, while more advanced learners prefer to generate their own sentences rather than resorting to prefabricated units.

Wray and Perkins (2000: 23) argued that formulaic expressions provide non-native speakers with survival phrases that achieve basic socio-interactional functions. They have automatic access to prefabricated chunks, and this eases communication especially in the early stages of language learning (cf. Nattinger and DeCarrico 1992; Wray 2002). However, there is a problem with this practice for a couple of reasons. Firstly, L2 or ELF users may pick up formulas easily, but this may happen without their clear knowledge of the conceptual load attached to those expressions with psychological saliency in the given speech community. It may take them quite a long time through a trial and error process to actually acquire the appropriate use of those expressions. Secondly, their selection of formulas may be subjective (e.g. Kecskes 2007; Dynel 2020; Ortactepe 2012). L2 users/learners pick up expressions that they like for some reasons, and may overuse them such as ‘you know’; ‘you bet’; ‘I’ll talk to you later’; ‘let me tell you



something', etc. Also, according to Segalowitz and Freed (2004: 403), at later stages of language development, formulaic expressions function as a database from which language learners abstract recurrent patterns, leading to the mastery of grammatical regularities. Wray (2002: 147) considers this creative tendency of advanced learners as a major problem resulting from the production of perfectly grammatical utterances that are simply not used by native speakers. This claim is in line with my finding about the language use of lingua franca speakers (see report in Kecskes 2007). Further, Pawley and Syder (1983) referred to this kind of 'deliberate creativity' of relatively advanced L2 learners as a process of over-generating and producing grammatical, non-idiomatic utterances due to not having accumulated the native repertoire of formulaic expressions as natively competent and fluency demand such idiomaticity (see in Ellis 2003: 12).

The danger for lingua franca speakers in the use of formulaic language, as mentioned above, is that they often pick up these expressions without comprehending the sociocultural load attached to the expressions. This is especially true for situation-bound utterances in which, it is usually the figurative meaning that is dominant rather than the literal meaning. In ELF communication, if one of the interactants does not know this figurative meaning and processes the utterance literally, misunderstanding or confusion may occur, such as in the following conversation.

(6) Conversation between a Chinese student and a Turkish student:

T: - You look worried. *Why don't you tell me what bothers you?*

Ch: - I have no reason not to tell you.

T: - Ok, then go ahead.

Here the Turkish student used the expression 'why don't you tell me ...' in a figurative sense as a formula, but the Chinese student seems to have processed it literally. At least this is what his response shows. He assured the Turkish student that there was no reason for him not to tell his friend what bothered him. I would not call this case a complete misunderstanding, but certainly there was some kind of confusion between the two ELF speakers. In order to avoid cases like this, *ELF speakers usually stick to literal meanings of expressions rather than figurative ones*. The use of semantically transparent language resulted in fewer misunderstandings and communication breakdowns than was expected in my studies (Kecskes 2007, 2015). This finding corresponds with House's observation about the same phenomena (House 2003).

The most important and unique role of deliberate creativity in ELF is the endeavor of ELF speakers to create their own temporary formulas. This phenomenon fully confirms the general priority of the idiom principle as most salient in any language production. Speakers—monolinguals or multilinguals alike—make an effort to use formulas, no matter which language of theirs they use. In my former studies, the formulas our international interlocutors created can be split into two categories (Kecskes 2007, 2015). In the first category, we can find expressions that are used only once and demonstrate an effort to sound metaphorical and/or idiomatic. This endeavor is usually driven either

by the L1 of the speaker in which there may be an equivalent expression for the given idea, or by not remembering the exact words within the sequence. For instance:

- (7) Formulas that demonstrate an effort to sound metaphorical.
- it almost skips from my thoughts.
  - you are not very rich in communication.
  - take a school.
- (8) Not remembering the exact words within the sequence
- draw the limits (cf. ‘draw the line’),  
 preserve their face (cf. ‘save [sb’s] face’),  
 turn a blank eye (cf. ‘turn a blind eye’), (These examples are from the VOICE database)<sup>3</sup>

These expressions are created on the spot during a conversation and are also picked up by the other members of the temporary speech community. One of the participants creates or coins an expression that is needed in the discussion of a given topic. However, this is just a temporary formula that may be entirely forgotten when the conversation is over.

The avoidance of genuine formulaic language, the creation of temporary formulas and preference for semantically transparent expressions can be explained by another factor. The analysis of the database and the ‘think aloud’ sessions in two studies (see Kecskes 2007, 2015) shed light on something that is hardly discussed in the literature. It seems that multiword chunks might not help L2 language use and ELF use in the same way as they help L1 processing. ELF speakers usually do not know how flexible formulas are linguistically, namely, what structural changes they allow without losing their original function and/or meaning. Linguistic form is a semantic scaffold; if it is defective, the meaning will inevitably fall apart. This is one of the things that lingua franca speakers worry about as was revealed in the ‘think aloud’ sessions of my studies (Kecskes 2007, 2015). Lingua franca speakers may not be able to continue the expression if they break down somewhere in the middle of its use. Let us look at an example.

- (9) A Korean and a Turkish student are talking:
- T: — I like but ... they like but they haven’t time. I see in Albany too many people like sport. And they run and fitness.
- K: — Yeah.
- T: — They fitness. Too many people play tennis. So I think they sport.  
*They, they keep yourselves healthy. ... They keep healthy yourselves ...*
- K: — Healthy.

---

<sup>3</sup> VOICE: Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English

T: — Yes.

K: — I agree with you.

As we can see, the Turkish student tried to use the formula ‘keep oneself healthy’. However, he had a problem with the use of the appropriate pronoun. Instead of using ‘themselves’, he inserted ‘yourselves’ into the formula. However, he did not realize that the problem is not with the place of the pronoun in the sequence but with the selection of the pronoun.

## 5. Summary

It was argued that language use is a well-balanced alternation between more conventional and novel, ad hoc generated units and a blend of the two. It does not matter whether the speaker uses his/her L1 or L2, this creative blending of prefabricated units with ad hoc generated ones prevails. The only question is which side of the alternation can be considered dominant in a particular moment in an interaction, and this always depends on the speaker’s communicative intention and needs.

What makes language a language is the presence of norms, standards and conventions, both in the linguistic system and in its practical use (e.g. Kecskes 2019b; Mao 2020). Commonalities, conventions, common beliefs, shared knowledge and the like all create a core common ground, a kind of collective salience on which L1 communication is based on. This inherent endeavor of human beings to create mutual understanding in any speech community results in an everlasting process of reoccurring attempts for normativization and conventionalization in the language system through its use. The result is prefabricated language that functions as core common ground. This endeavor for normativization is present in ELF as well. However, when this, often prefabricated language-dependent, core common ground of the English language appears to be missing or limited, ELF interlocutors cannot take them for granted, rather they need to co-construct them, at least temporarily. So, there appears to be a shift in emphasis from the communal to the individual, from the more conventional to the less conventional, from the more formulaic to the less formulaic as we claimed in the introduction. Consequently, the importance of deliberate creativity increases in L2 language use in general, and ELF in particular because speaker rely more on the “open choice principle”. However, in ELF this principle is used not only for generating language ad hoc but also generating new temporary formulas that can be considered temporary extensions of the target language system. This is how ELF speakers try to compensate for the limited access to the idiomaticity of the target language, and this is why deliberate creativity is a driving force in ELF interactions.

## References

- Bolinger, D. 1976. "Meaning and Memory." *Forum Linguisticum* 1, 1-14.
- Carter, R. 2004. *Language and Creativity: The Art of Common Talk*. New York: Routledge.
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Coulmas, F. (Ed.). 1981. *Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Dynel, M. 2020. Laughter through Tears: Unprofessional Review Comments as Humor on the Shit My Reviewers Say Twitter Account. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 17(5), 513-544.
- Holmes, J. 2007. Making Humour Work: Creativity on the Job. *Applied Linguistics* 28(4), 518-537.
- House, J. 2003. Misunderstanding in intercultural University Encounters. In J. House, G. Kasper and S. Ross (eds.) *Misunderstanding in Social Life: Discourse Approaches to Problematic Talk*, 22-56. London: Longman.
- Howarth, P. 1998. "Phraseology and Second Language Proficiency." *Applied Linguistics* 19(1), 24-44.
- Jespersen, O. 1904. *How to Teach a Foreign Language?* London: S. Sonnenschein & Co.
- Kecskes, I. 2007. "Formulaic Language in English lingua Franca." In I. Kecskes and Horn, L. R (eds.) *In Explorations in Pragmatics: Linguistic, Cognitive and Intercultural Aspects*, 191-219. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kecskes, I. 2014. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kecskes, I. 2015. "Is the Idiom Principle Blocked in Bilingual L2 Production?" Chapter 2. In Roberto Heredia and Anna Cieslicka (eds.) *Bilingual Figurative Language Processing*, 28-53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kecskes, I. 2016. Deliberate Creativity and Formulaic Language Use. In Keith Allan, Alessandro Capone, Istvan Kecskes (eds.) *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use, Perspectives in Pragmatics, Philosophy & Psychology* 9, 3-20.
- Kecskes, I. 2019a. *English as a Lingua Franca: The Pragmatic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kecskes, I. 2019b. "Impoverished Pragmatics? The Semantics-pragmatics Interface from an intercultural perspective." *Intercultural Pragmatics* 16(5), 489-517.
- Langlotz, A. 2006. *Idiomatic Creativity: A Cognitive-linguistic Model of Idiom-representation and Idiom-variation in English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Leopold, W. 1930. "Polarity in Language." *Curme Volume of Linguistics Studies* 6(4), 102-109.
- Mao, T. 2020. "Redefining Pragmatic Competence among Modular Interactions and beyond." *Intercultural Pragmatics* 17(5), 605-631.
- Miller, J. and R. Weinert. 1998. *Spontaneous Spoken Language: Syntax and Discourse*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nattinger, J. R. and J. S. DeCarrico. 1992. *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ortaçtepe, D. 2012. *The Development of Conceptual Socialization in International Students: A Language Socialization Perspective on Conceptual Fluency and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Pawley, A. and F. H. Syder. 1983. Two Puzzles for Linguistic Theory: Nativelike Selection and Nativelike Fluency. *Language and Communication* 5, 191-226.

- Pitzl, M. L. 2012. Creativity Meets Convention: Idiom Variation and Remetaphorization in ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1(1).
- Pitzl, M. L. 2011. *Creativity in English as a Lingua Franca: Idiom and Metaphor*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Vienna, Austria.
- Pope, R. 2005. *Creativity: Theory, History, Practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Prodromou, L. 2007. "Bumping into Creative Idiomaticity." *English Today* 23(1), 14-25.
- Segalowitz, N. and B. F. Freed. 2004. "Context, Contact, and Cognition in Oral Fluency Acquisition: Learning Spanish in at Home and Study Abroad Contexts." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 26, 173-199.
- Selinker, L. 1972. "Interlanguage." *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 10(1-4), 3-34, 209-232.
- Sinclair, J. 1987. "Collocation: A Progress Report." In R. Steele and T. Treadgold (eds.) *Language Topics: Essays in Honour of Michael Halliday*, 319-331. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skehan, P. 1998. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Timpe-Laughlin, V. and J. Dombi. 2020. "Exploring L2 Learners' Request Behavior in a Multi-turn Conversation with a Fully Automated Agent." *Intercultural Pragmatics* 17(2), 221-257.
- Pang, Y. 2020. "The Cognitive Saliency of Word Associations of Verbs of Speech in English as a Lingua Franca Interactions." *Intercultural Pragmatics* 17(4), 417-443.
- Wang, Y. 2013. "Non-conformity to ENL Norms: A Perspective from Chinese English Users." *Journal of English Lingua Franca* 2(2), 255-282.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1997. "EIL, ESL, EFL: Global Issues and Local Interests." *World Englishes* 16(1), 146-153.
- Wray, A. 2002. *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.