



UNIVERSITY OF MURCIA

*International Journal  
of  
English Studies*

**IJES**

<http://revistas.um.es/ijes>

---

## **Interactional construction grammar approach to ELF: The case of *I think it is* construction**

KATARZYNA PIĄTKOWSKA\*  
*Nicolaus Copernicus University*

Received: 05/03/2023. Accepted: 07/04/2026

### **ABSTRACT**

Recent discussion in linguistics indicates that English as a lingua franca can be analysed from the perspective of Construction Grammar (CxG). However, research on ELF has not focused on emerging patterns viewed as constructions. Instead, the majority of studies on spoken ELF so far have used Conversational Analysis to examine communication in ELF. Thus, in this paper spoken-language phenomena in ELF are viewed from the perspective of Interactional Construction Grammar (ICxG), which integrates CxG and Conversation Analysis. ICxG has been implemented only in research on conventional languages. The present study suggests that it can also be used in the analysis of spoken phenomena in ELF if we treat a turn as a construction. Therefore, the paper presents the results of a corpus-based study of *I think it is* construction in spoken ELF, demonstrating that it can be treated as a construction.

**KEYWORDS:** English as a lingua franca, construction grammar, conversation analysis, interactional construction grammar, spoken language, interaction

---

\**Address for correspondence:* Department of English Language, Nicolaus Copernicus University, ul. Bojarskiego 1, 87-100 Toruń, Poland email: [kapia@umk.pl](mailto:kapia@umk.pl)

© Servicio de Publicaciones. Universidad de Murcia. All rights reserved.  
Print ISSN: 1578-7044; Online ISSN: 1989-6131

*IJES*, 26(1), 45–62  
doi: 10.6018/ijes.559661

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Much of the research on English as a lingua franca (ELF) has been carried out within the framework of Conversation Analysis, which is an emic perspective obtaining meaning from the context of face-to-face verbal interactions (Canagarajah, 2018) and providing a methodology that describes socially constructed interactions in ELF. Current discussion (e.g., Hall, 2018; Mackenzie, 2014; Pirc, 2013; Watkowska, 2020; Yilmaz, 2020; Yilmaz & Römer, 2020) demonstrates that Construction Grammar (CxG) is a suitable framework for the analysis of ELF. Previous research has been based on a usage-based model, which replaces the concept of a grammatical rule with the notion of a construction emerging from language experience. For example, embracing Goldberg's and Croft's approach to constructions, Pirc (2013) proposes a grammatical description of ELF where the main assumption is that constructions, defined as form–meaning pairings, are able to emerge from any discourse (i.e., they are not stable or defined patterns), which, along with the speech events and their context, may influence the form of the construction (Pirc, 2013, p. 58). Based on an analysis of lexicogrammatical features in non-native discourse, Pirc (2013) suggests including formal and functional features in the description of a construction, which is difficult in ELF, as it is not stable and constructions may differ among users and emerge from occasional speech events. Furthermore, ELF is very often influenced by factors beyond form–meaning mappings and consequently requires a focus on communicative functions (i.e., functional use) rather than on linguistic features (Pirc, 2013). Thus, CxG appears to be a forward-looking approach in the analysis of ELF; however, studies within this framework are scarce, and “no coherent and comprehensive lingua franca model has been proposed” (Seidlhofer, 2001, p. 140) due to the unpredictable nature of ELF, which is governed by speakers' changing communicative needs. The uniqueness of ELF lies in the fact that its speakers have a different socio-cultural experience of the use of the target language in comparison to native speakers, as they have little access to authentic contexts and rely not only on their socio-cultural knowledge but also on the target language rules, usually learnt through formal instruction in a classroom (Alptekin, 2013; MacKenzie, 2014). Nevertheless, despite its unpredictability (Cogo, 2012; Hülmbauer, 2009; Pitzl, 2016; Seidlhofer, 2018; Shohamy, 2018), ELF is also a type of natural language and, as a consequence, general theories of language should be able to explain it (Pirc, 2013). Consequently, CxG, with its premise that constructions are emerging, should be able to account for ELF. Hence, the present paper discusses how constructions in ELF can be analysed using CxG, on the basis of an analysis of *I think it is* construction.

Recent developments in linguistics (e.g., Auer, 2006; Bückler, 2014; Deppermann, 2006; Günthner, 2006; Imo, 2014; Wide, 2014; Zima & Brône, 2011) point to the relationship between Conversation Analysis and CxG, which has resulted in a new approach –Interactional Construction Grammar (ICxG). Similarly to Matsumoto (2021) and Nikiforidou (2021), Fried and Östman (2005, p. 1754) note that grammatical knowledge is organized in conventional patterns and includes knowledge of communicative patterning, which suggests certain affinities between the analysis used in CxG and a study of interaction as carried out in Conversation Analysis and “its further development of Interactional Linguistics”. In other words, as Fried and Östman (2005), Deppermann (2006), Günthner and Imo (2006), Hall (2019), Imo (2014), or Wide (2014) state, CxG and Conversation Analysis are very close in objectives and interest, and the result of the linkage between the two approaches is a focus on communicative practice from a usage-based perspective, i.e., “analyzing syntactic structures from the perspective of their interactional functions” (Imo, 2015, p. 72). It is worth mentioning at this point that most theories of syntax are problematic for a linguist researching spoken interaction, as they focus on a reductionist view of language, i.e., context-free, where the

emphasis is placed on describing only a form (Imo, 2015; Wide, 2014). As a result, such theories of syntax are also ineffective in the analysis of ELF, which is always situated, unstable, irregular, emergent as well as dependent on the contingencies of a given situation, and therefore highly context-dependent (Baker, 2015; Bierbaumer, 2021; Björkman, 2013; Jenkins, 2014; Murata, 2016; Pirc, 2013), unlike CxG, which takes the context into account. Studies in both ELF and interactional linguistics provide evidence that interactional talk is always co-constructed by interlocutors, thus dependent on sequential links (Linell, 2009), which in this study are treated as context (i.e., sequential context). Furthermore, given the fact that spoken ELF is defined by “the functions it performs rather than the forms it takes” (Kaur, 2016, p. 163), I argue in this paper that ICxG is well suited for the explanation of the use of spoken ELF in interaction, especially if a construction is not seen as a sentence but as a turn (i.e., a turn-constructive unit), defined as “a unit of talk which can constitute the whole turn” (Schegloff, 1996, p. 88). Discussing tense markings in ELF, Ellis (2013) demonstrates that instead of using the -s or -ed suffixes when marking tenses, ELF users tend to rely on other features such as cues, salience, and blockings. Referring to Ellis, Pirc (2013, p. 65) concludes that such an influence “goes beyond sentence grammaticality”. Therefore, following Pirc (2013, p. 65), I argue that in order to explain the nature of ELF, the concept of construction should include “elements beyond the scope of the individual sentence”, which the latest discussion in CxG embodies. Thus, the goal of this paper is to initiate a discussion of how ICxG can contribute to the analysis and representations of spoken interaction in ELF.

## 2. INTERACTIONAL CONSTRUCTION GRAMMAR

Successful interplay of CxG and Conversation Analysis depends on the version of CxG we take into consideration (Fischer, 2015; Laury, Etelämäki & Couper-Kuhlen, 2014). While formally oriented versions of CxG such as Sign-Based CxG emphasize descriptive adequacy focusing on the possible sentences of a given language, Cognitive Grammar (Langacker, 2008) and the Cognitive CxG developed by Goldberg (1995, 2019) put emphasis not only on the correctness of sentences but also on linguistic creativity, language change, and contextual appropriateness in their attempt to develop a credible model of linguistic knowledge (Fischer, 2015, p. 4).

Contrary to rule-based theories of grammar, which assume that grammatical knowledge is independent of semantic or discourse functions, CxG views grammatical knowledge as consisting of constructions, defined by Goldberg (2019, p. 7) as “emergent clusters of lossy memory traces that are aligned within our high- (hyper!) dimensional conceptual space on the basis of shared form, function, and contextual dimensions”. This definition goes beyond a sentence, which makes it suitable for ELF. Furthermore, based on concepts such as emergent clusters, loss memory traces, and conceptual space, the definition refers to psychological terms, thus stressing the cognitive reality of constructions rather than their formal descriptions, which is in line with current psycho- and neurolinguistic perspectives (Ungerer & Hartmann, 2023). What differentiates Goldberg’s (2019) definition from others is that it does away with the concept of frequency as an essential criterion for a construction, which enables a linguist to consider a newly witnessed instance of a pattern as a construction. Such an approach to constructions is in line with the latest evidence from research on learning mechanisms, demonstrating that language users retain single instances of use, i.e., so-called exemplars (Ungerer & Hartmann, 2023, p. 10). In other words, evidence supports a view of grammatical

knowledge as emergent, which is a central assumption of CxG (Ungerer & Hartmann, 2023, p. 10) and in research on ELF.

The fundamental feature shared by CxG and Conversation Analysis is that both approaches are usage-based and emphasize the importance of corpora in the analysis of language, which is important in ELF, as it develops in a bottom-up manner where regularities derive from the actual utterances of ELF speakers (MacKenzie, 2014, pp. 42–43). Another essential shared characteristic between CxG and Conversation Analysis is that both are surface-oriented, i.e., focus on observable linguistic patterns (Goldberg, 2009; Imo, 2017; Ungerer & Hartmann, 2023). In other words, containing information about discourse functions, constructions are close to the concept of practices, which is crucial in Conversation Analysis (Groom, 2019; Imo, 2015; Pöldvere & Paradis, 2019). Furthermore, the two approaches are interested in not only core grammatical aspects but also non-standard linguistic structures (Imo, 2015, p. 72). Similarly to Conversation Analysis, CxG is interested in all chunks of language in its analysis: verbal and non-verbal, large and small, as Fried and Östman (2005, p. 1754) point out, without prioritizing any type of structure in the explanation of grammatical knowledge.

It is also worth mentioning that turns in Conversation Analysis and constructions in CxG have the same status; i.e., while turns, which are the basic units of analysis in Conversation Analysis, emerge from conversational patterns, constructions, which are the central building blocks in CxG, emerge from language use (i.e., both notions emerge from social practice) and combine syntax and semantics (Fried & Östman, 2005; Pekarek Doehler, 2021; Weissweiler, Hoffmann, Köksal & Schütze, 2023). In other words, one of the core assumptions of CxG is the interplay between syntax and semantics and the importance of the social aspect of language, which sets it apart from generative grammar with its separation of lexicon and grammar. As opposed to generative grammar, which treats grammar as consisting of compositional rules generating syntactically correct sentences, CxG views linguistic items (even larger ones such as idioms) as having non-compositional meanings (Weissweiler, Hoffmann, Köksal & Schütze, 2023). Furthermore, with its emphasis on grammar not involving any transformational or derivational component and semantics being associated with surface form, CxG is far removed from generative grammar (Goldberg, 2013). Another assumption which distinguishes CxG from generative grammar is that constructions are connected in a network, with nodes related by inheritance links (Goldberg, 2013).

Although many cognitive linguists hold the view that constructions are static units (see Dąbrowska, 2016 for details), some of them reject it, which brings CxG closer to Conversation Analysis (see Fischer, 2015). For example, dismissing schemata as fixed entities, Langacker (2008) proposes a basic assumption that entities are entrenched to a different degree. This premise has been supported with the findings of research carried out on various constructions across several languages, which demonstrate that due to differences in usage experience, grammatical knowledge is not the same between native speakers of a given language (Dąbrowska, 2012), which may point to various degrees of entrenchment of constructions across individuals (Hall, Joyce & Robson, 2017, p. 38). MacKenzie (2016) refers to this entrenchment as shaky and implies that it may be the reason leading to forms, which in second language acquisition would be described as errors. Consequently, this lack of entrenched memory representations is a typical feature of ELF users (MacKenzie, 2016).

Other researchers (e.g., Imo, 2015; Fischer, 2015; Fried & Östman, 2005; Wide, 2014) emphasize that despite the fact that CxG and Conversation Analysis share some features, they also differ in certain aspects, but that these differences can be reconciled. For instance, noticing that Conversation Analysis emphasizes mainly “empirically attested routines in interaction”, whereas CxG is interested in “the psychological entrenchment of linguistic units”, Imo (2015)

suggests that both aspects can be undertaken through the combination of the cognitive and the interactional in the explanation of grammatical structures. Another distinction between CxG and Conversation Analysis refers to what both approaches consider essential in linguistic description (Fischer, 2015; Fried & Östman, 2005). Researchers working within the framework of Conversation Analysis take into consideration the influence of a given utterance on the addressee, which is central in defining the meaning of that utterance (Fischer, 2015; Fried & Östman, 2005). Thus, the addressee, together with activity types, topical context, interactive context, and sequential structure, constitutes context, which determines meaning (Auer, 2006; Deppermann, 2006; Fried & Östman, 2005; Günthner & Imo, 2006; Imo, 2014). Similarly to Conversation Analysis, CxG stresses the significance of context, which is, however, defined in terms of factors essential for grammar; i.e., the meaning of an utterance and its conditions of use are governed by interpretive frames, which structure semantic information (Fischer, 2015; Fried & Östman, 2005; Hsieh & I-Wen Su, 2021; Kaneyasu, 2021). Consequently, CxG assumes that meaning does not emerge only in interaction but is specified in a given construction and is part of the user's knowledge of language (Fried & Östman, 2005; Ungerer & Hartmann, 2023). In other words, CxG acknowledges the relevance of meaning negotiation in human interaction; however, it also bases its assumption on construing meaning on the fact that part of meaning is indeterminate (Fried & Östman, 2005; Ungerer & Hartmann, 2023). Another aspect which distinguishes Conversation Analysis from CxG is the approach to variability and language change (Fried & Östman, 2005). While Conversation Analysis examines how grammatical patterns emerge from social interaction and which patterns are deployed by users to achieve a particular social action (Hsieh & Huang, 2005; Fried & Östman, 2005), CxG is concerned with what is stable in language and focuses on "variability within the grammatical code" (Dunn & Madabushi, 2021; Fried & Östman, 2005, p. 1756).

To sum up, in setting various goals and analysing language from different perspectives, both approaches make generalizations about how language functions, with Conversation Analysis focusing on social interaction, and CxG concerned with elements shared across speakers (Auer, 2006; Fried & Östman, 2005; Imo, 2014; Zima & Brône, 2011). Consequently, while Fried and Östman (2005, p. 1756) define constructions as "abstract grammatical patterns distinct from concrete linguistic expressions", in Conversation Analysis constructions are seen as "context changing/construing entities, grounded in concrete instances of dynamically negotiated meaning" (Fried & Östman, 2005, Imo, 2014, Wide, 2014, Zima & Brône, 2011). Consequently, CxG and Conversation Analysis, although compatible in only some respects, accomplish their goals in a complementary way (Auer, 2006; Fried & Östman, 2005; Günthner & Imo, 2006), and the consequence of an integration of the two approaches is an interest in examining "structures from the perspective of their interactional functions" (Bücker, 2014; Deppermann, 2006; Imo, 2015), which has resulted in several studies of interactional phenomena (see Imo, 2015, for details). However, so far ICxG has been applied to conventional languages, and no research has been undertaken to explain interactional phenomena in ELF using this approach. Therefore, in the next section I briefly present an analysis of *I think it is* construction in ELF from the perspective of ICxG.

### 3. *I THINK IT IS* IN ELF

The aim of the following study is to examine if ICxG can be applied to the analysis of spoken phenomena in ELF if we treat a turn as a construction. *I think it is* has been chosen as it is one

of the most frequent sequences used in ELF as a result of unsteady entrenchment (Mauranen, 2012). The findings are based on the analysis of a number of occurrences of the construction in authentic conversations in ELF taken from the Vienna–Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE). The corpus has been chosen as it is a major corpus consisting of naturally occurring spoken interactions between experienced ELF users from a variety of first language backgrounds (50 different first languages). The corpus includes speech events of various domains (professional, educational, leisure), function (exchanging information, engaging in social relationships), and participant roles and relationships (VOICE, 2021). It includes various types of conversations such as seminar discussions, working group discussions, workshop discussions or conversations, etc.

### 3.1. Methodology

This study is based on a qualitative analysis of *I think it is*. In line with ICxG, it adopts a dynamic approach to the construction, whose interactional functions emerge out of utterances. These functions result from users' experience of situations (i.e., their knowledge of how a given construction is used to accomplish what functions) and are thus affected by social and cognitive influences arising from interactions. Therefore, the following discussion is based on a qualitative and context-sensitive analysis (i.e., sequential context). Consequently, it analyses actual instances of the construction in spoken ELF, using the method of ICxG for describing the interactional and formal features of *I think it is* in specific interactional roles as well as its sequential context. The analysis consists of identifying, counting, and classifying all occurrences of *I think it is* construction.

### 3.2. Results

Structurally, *I think it is* construction consists of a main clause and a complement clause. In the VOICE there are 23 hits of this construction. In 22 of them the complementizer *that* has been omitted, which is typical in conversation, especially when *think* is the main verb clause (Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2002, p. 321). There is only one example where the complementizer *that* is present in the construction. While *I think it is* fundamentally relies on the propositional form: "I think: my belief", the following data suggest that in ELF interaction, it functions as a specialized interactional construction. This is evidenced by its deployment in specific sequential slots, such as sequence-terminating confirmations, where its meaning is not only "belief" but interactional alignment. Furthermore, the formal variations observed (e.g., the ellipsis of the predicate in the "confirming" role) indicate that speakers are not just expressing a proposition but are utilizing a turn-constructional unit specifically adapted for local interactional work. This study posits that ICxG is uniquely positioned to account for these phenomena because it bridges the gap between formal and interactional analysis. To consider the null hypothesis alternatives, a purely formalist approach would likely categorize these instances as "errors" or non-standard syntax, failing to capture their interactional utility. While a standard Construction Grammar (CxG) approach might identify the internal form–meaning pairing, it would lack the tools to account for how specific roles, such as the "confirming" role, are triggered by sequential placement. Conversely, a standard Conversation Analysis (CA) approach would identify the social action (confirmation) but might overlook how specific formal types (like ellipsis) are systematically paired with those actions. Thus, ICxG is necessary to explain the integration of linguistic form and sequential function that neither framework captures in isolation. Due to space limitations, I present only two examples of the following roles: expressing an opinion, giving explanation, confirming others' utterance, and drawing a conclusion, and one example of providing an answer.

3.2.1. *Expressing an opinion*

There are 11 examples in the VOICE that refer to the expression of an opinion. The first example illustrates how *I think it is* is used to express an opinion, appearing turn-finally after a sequence of turns. In this conversation the speakers discuss the issue of the approval of curricula in the context of joint European master’s degrees of European universities. Speaker 1 (Austrian) leads the discussion and is the main speaker in the conversation. He initiates the discussion on the approval of curricula and continues to express several factual statements in this respect throughout the dialogue. A large part of the interaction takes place between speaker 1 and speaker 5 (Finnish). In turn 185, speaker 1 terminates this sequence of statements with an expression of opinion –concerning the number of master’s degrees by 2006– with *I think it is*, preceded by the interjection *er*. Additionally, by uttering his opinion, the speaker refers to speaker’s 5 utterance in turn 182, when there is a reflection on the date of granting the first joint European master’s degrees. In this interaction *I think it is* occurs in a highly schematized sequential structure, in which the construction fulfils its function –expressing an opinion: an expression of facts –reaction initiation– expression of opinion (reference to a previous interlocutor). Thus, the construction has responsive properties. Grammatically, *I think it is* is followed by a predicative adjective (preceded by its modifier –an adverb), followed by a clause functioning as an adverbial in a post-predicate position. The adjective in this case is evaluative (feasible), which is typical of the language used in conversation (Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2003, p. 201).

- (1)<sup>2</sup>
- Pomtg315:163 S1: exactly what one one example would be who approves  
of curricula
- Pomtg315:164 S4: mhm
- Pomtg315:165 S1: in some cases it’s the university in other cases it’s the  
ministry in yet other cases you have er
- Pomtg315:166 S4: yes
- Pomtg315:167 S2: yes
- Pomtg315:168 S1: external accreditation
- Pomtg315:169 SX: mhm
- Pomtg315:170 S1: and all that has to become transparent so because it
- Pomtg315:171 SX: yah
- Pomtg315:172 S1: it then leads to how much time do you need in order to  
establish a program because it has to go through different stages
- Pomtg315:173 SX: mhm
- Pomtg315:174 S5: that’s a very crucial point I think is do they set some sort  
of time limit or time sort of aspiration that we wish to see [org1] masters because it would  
be nice to have a big watch
- Pomtg315:175 SX-f: mhm
- Pomtg315:176 S1: mhm er
- Pomtg315:177 S5: for the publicity for the marketing for the approvement
- Pomtg315:178 SX-f: mhm
- Pomtg315:179 S1: yeah
- Pomtg315:180 S5: and for funding purposes also we can say that this is  
where we aim at like two thousand and seven or something
- Pomtg315:181 S1: mhm
- Pomtg315:182 S5: this is when there’s a big bang

<sup>2</sup> This paper uses the VOICE transcription conventions. See VOICE Project. 2007. *VOICE Transcription Conventions* [2.1]. [http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/voice.php?page=transcription\\_general\\_information](http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/voice.php?page=transcription_general_information) for more details.

Pomtg315:183 S1: er my my if I may if I may have a vision  
 Pomtg315:184 SX-f: mhm  
 Pomtg315:185 S1: then my aim would be to have ten 52english52 masters  
 in the fall of two thousand and six if if possible if it is eight it is eight if it i- no but you  
 y- you have to have your goals a bit you know er **I think it is** basically feasible because  
 some projects are already in the pipeline

The speakers in the next interaction discuss the aspects of quality assurance in European higher education. They focus specifically on the European vision and national realities, as well as on the role of European stakeholders in reviewing reports on national systems of assuring quality in education. Most of the discussion takes place between speaker 1, who is Danish, and speaker 9 (British), with other interlocutors breaking in, usually with the exclamation *hm*, implying that they are thinking about what other interlocutors say. In turn 465, speaker 1 introduces the necessity to meet European expectations in quality assurance, which evokes speaker's 9 reaction, who starts expressing his opinion in turn 471 with the conjunction *but*, which suggests that the following opinion will contrast with speaker 1's utterance. He then warns other interlocutors not to call quality assurance a "meta evaluation" and continues expressing his viewpoint with reference to speaker's 1 utterance, which is repeated in turn 492, until turn 497, where he terminates his opinion with reference to the stakeholders' right by using *I think it is*. Therefore, similarly to the previous example, in this interaction *I think it is* is used in a highly sequential, schematized structure, as the conversation starts with an expression of facts in turn 465, continues with a reaction initiation by speaker 9 in turn 471, and ends with an expression of opinion in the last turn. Therefore, this is another example where the construction occurs at the end of a sequence of turns, which may speak to the fact that the sequential structure in which ELF users place the construction may influence its interpretation (to terminate a discussion with an opinion).

The construction is coupled with a predicative adjective which, as in the previous example, is evaluative (right). The adjective is followed by a complement that-clause, which is more typical of academic prose rather than conversation (Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2003, pp. 201–202). It is worth mentioning at this point that speaker 9, who is the author of this turn, is a higher education network representative of the European Union, which may point to the fact that his language experience in the university setting has influenced his choice of language.

(2)

Pomtg546:465 S1: hh and er the the problem is that when we introduce into such a context of as the bologna follow- -up group the contrast between national realities and the english visions as I hear it there's a surprising tendency for the english vision to come out stronger in the arguments than the national realities so I'm back to my point if we do not put in something which meets these expectations

Pomtg546:466 SX-6: hm  
 Pomtg546:467 SX-6: hm  
 Pomtg546:468 S1: then others will and they may not be  
 Pomtg546:469 SX-6: hm  
 Pomtg546:470 S1: hh as deft at hh doing this with the right wordings and the right balance as as er as the [org3] er membership will be able to do it so it's in that sense that's a very political explanation to this  
 Pomtg546:471 S9: hh but  
 Pomtg546:472 S9: I think  
 Pomtg546:473 SX-6: hm  
 Pomtg546:474 S9: I think that the er the the the trick that we got to try and pull off is to not call it a metaevaluation

- Pomtg546:475 SX-m: @  
 Pomtg546:476 S9: because a metaevaluation involves  
 Pomtg546:477 S1: hm  
 Pomtg546:478 S9: a review itself  
 Pomtg546:479 S10: mhm  
 Pomtg546:480 S1: hm  
 Pomtg546:481 S9: erm and possibly a judgment which I think is what has  
 to be avoided but I think what one can do is offer it  
 Pomtg546:482 S1: hm  
 Pomtg546:483 S9: as information on national systems er th- the review  
 report would go to er er er er er er er er a 53nglis-wide stakeholder body for information  
 and comment  
 Pomtg546:484 S10: hm  
 Pomtg546:485 S9: I mean xxx to stop such a good commenting on the  
 reports  
 Pomtg546:486 S11: no it's not  
 Pomtg546:487 S9: in whatever way they felt appropriate  
 Pomtg546:488 S10: hm  
 Pomtg546:489 S11: yah okay okay fine  
 Pomtg546:490 S9: but they would not be in the position to to make  
 judgements about this  
 Pomtg546:491 S10: hm  
 Pomtg546:492 S1: no no but that I hope I made that point clear  
 Pomtg546:493 S9: I I think that would be they have no authority to  
 xxxxxxxx xxx  
 Pomtg546:494 S1: no no  
 Pomtg546:495 S10: mhm this is problem  
 Pomtg546:496 S10: hm  
 Pomtg546:497 S9: or to claim an authority they don't have but it **I think it**  
**is** right that their views are looked to and er er er xxxx reporting

### 3.2.2. Giving explanation

There are 3 examples of the use of *I think it is*, where the main interactional function is to give explanation. In the first example the discussion focuses on the role of women and men in reproduction policies. Speaker 17 (Portuguese) discusses the differences between the behaviour of men and women, expressing his own opinion in this matter, to which speaker 3, who is Austrian, refers in the last turn in this discussion and agrees with this opinion (delineated by the use of *yeah okay*) in what constitutes a longer utterance, starting with *I think it is*. The sequence is used to express a further explanation by relating to a new topic, i.e., planning to make a collection of the proceedings of the conference focusing on the approaches to the role of men and women. *I think it is* in this function occurs at the end of a sequence of turns and terminates the discussion with an explanation, which may point to certain regularities in where ELF users place the construction to express certain functions of language. *I think it is* is followed by a finite clause as a subject predicate, which is less common in English (Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2003, p. 226). In this case the subject predicate has a complex construction with many phrases and clauses. The interaction is built on a schematic structure, i.e., there is an opinion (speaker 17 in turn 222) and a responsive reaction with an explanation (speaker 3, turn 227), which further supports a responsive feature of the construction.

(3)

Prpan13\_u\_222: S17: because x x xxx the ways that get the question of er the male er model xx x xx and we have to be very erm shocked sociologically this approach because I was remembering for instance how can we explain the favor of the female kind of there was really putting xx it never gets er a generalized er news erm er and it could be much more interesting for instance for putting it against ads for instance preventing ads to stimulate women to use er female canons men make canons and what we what was er institutions o n gs and so on you see pretty freely free for charge make canons when we know men are much more is possible in their behavior sexual behavior and because of that and er sense of lust x x x xx xx I suppose we are my sense is that we are xxx xx xx

Prpan13\_u\_223: SS: @@@@

Prpan13\_u\_224: SX: xxxx

Prpan13\_u\_225: SS: @@@@

Prpan13\_u\_226: S1: okay [S3]

Prpan13\_u\_227: S3: yeah okay **I think it is** there is there is much left much we can do right now er so maybe an announcement as already mentioned we are planning to make a collection er a quotations of the proceedings of this conference (...)

The following conversation is the only example in the VOICE where the complementizer *that* has not been omitted in *I think it is*. In this conversation the speakers focus on aspects concerned with establishing cooperation between European universities and joint European master's degrees. In this excerpt four speakers talk about receiving the label of one of the universities and the financial aspect associated with receiving such a label. Speaker 6, who is a Croat, starts the discussion, pointing out that the universities will meet the requirements and will apply for the university label in order to receive money. This triggers a reaction in turn 269 from speaker 1, who notices that the label does not entail receiving money, which speakers 2 and 6 agree with in further turns. What follows next is an exchange of turns, where speaker 1 leads the discussion and explains that the label is a quality marker (turn 273) that may help in raising money from other sources (turn 273) and demonstrates quality (turn 278). Other speakers (S2, who is Polish; S6; and SS, who is an unidentified speaker) react positively to these explanations by expressing their agreement through either an interjection (*mhm* in turns 274 and 279) or an adverb (*yah* in turn 275). Speaker 1 mentions potential candidates to receive the university label in turn 286 and continues in this respect in turn 288, where he uses *I think it is* to explain that receiving the label is associated with a good programme.

This conversation follows the same sequential pattern as the previous one, i.e., an opinion (uttered by speaker 6 in turn 268), and a responsive reference, here from speaker 1 in turn 288. As in the previous example, the two turns are interlaced with several interruptions from other speakers containing short clauses, phrases, or exclamations.

The construction under discussion is followed by a prepositional phrase as a subject predicate, which is atypical in English (Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2003, p. 142). Additionally, the prepositional phrase is combined with an extraposed *to*-clause, which is also very rare in English grammar, although they are used in expository writing (Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2003, pp. 338–340).

(4)

Pomtg315:268 S6: but it still can be made a little bit at the time xxx this money the seed money was beginning and then these x is er xxxx consortia will apply around all these er good practice er requirement for getting the [org1] label or xxx

Pomtg315:269 S1: yah but yah but the erm the [org1] label doesn't give you money

Pomtg315:270 S2: ideally  
 Pomtg315:271 S6: ideally yeah  
 Pomtg315:272 S6: yeah of course xxxxxx  
 Pomtg315:273 S1: yah i- i- it's it's it's a kind of quality stamp  
 Pomtg315:274 S2: mhm  
 Pomtg315:275 S6: yah  
 Pomtg315:276 S1: that might help in raising money from other sources  
 Pomtg315:277 SS: yes  
 Pomtg315:278 S1: yah because we would be able to communicate that we  
 have very strict quality lines  
 Pomtg315:279 S2: mhm  
 Pomtg315:280 S1: and it is not quite so easy to get er to get the [org1] label  
 xx  
 Pomtg315:281 S6: and and this fifteen for instance this fifteen er  
 Pomtg315:282 S1: mhm  
 Pomtg315:283 S6: cases  
 Pomtg315:284 SX-2: projects  
 Pomtg315:285 S6: are po- projects are potential candidates potential  
 Pomtg315:286 S1: are potential candidates for the [org1] for the [org1]  
 label yes yah definitely  
 Pomtg315:287 S6: yah  
 Pomtg315:288 S1: I mean er I expect erm I expect well first of all I think  
 that [org1] universities are all good universities yah erm secondly **I think that it is** in the  
 interest of each of our member universities to develop good programs yah so what will  
 happen is that they try to unite good points and strong points from different institutions

### 3.2.3. Confirming the other's utterance

Three examples illustrate an occurrence of *I think it is* where the purpose is to confirm the other's utterance. In the following dialogue three speakers talk about the nature of German. *I think it is* completes a sequence of turns of the speakers by confirming the interlocutors' previous utterances, i.e., speakers 5 (Dutch) and 8 (Serbian) express an opinion that German is a complicated language, which results in speaker 1 confirming this opinion through *I think it is*. The confirmation is further strengthened by the use of the adverb *yeah*, which precedes *I think it is*. It is clear that *I think it is* marks the completion of the discussion, after which speaker 8 takes over in turn 875. Consequently, the construction has responsive features. In this interactional role *I think it is* occurs with ellipsis in predicate or post-predicate constructions, which is common in conversation (Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2003, p. 348)

The sequential structure of this interaction is the following: a statement of facts (speaker 1 in turn 871), responsive opinions (uttered by speakers 5 and 8 in turns 872 and 873), and a confirmation (speaker 1, turn 874).

(5)  
 Lecon562:871 S1: I've had I have had a long conversation in german today  
 so I hope I know german  
 Lecon562:872 S5: it's incredibly complicated  
 Lecon562:873 S8: yeah it is complicated  
 Lecon562:874 S1: yeah **I think it is**  
 Lecon562:875 S8: trust me

The next conversation is another example of the use of *I think it is* as a confirmation of the other's utterance. In this interaction, six speakers discuss the cover of a booklet accompanying individual projects of several language schools in Europe working on a joint programme in relation to teaching languages. They refer specifically to the use of national flags on the cover and the correspondence between the names of several European countries and the names of the languages of these countries. The speakers exchange their opinions in this respect. The occurrence of *I think it is* comes at the end of the discussion (in turn 340), summing up the conversation and signalling a connection between the interlocutor's opinion, expressed in a prior utterance (verbalized by *yeah* in turn 336), and the speaker's confirmation. It is possible that speaker 5, who is British, was going to place *I think it is* in turn 337, which would be a logical way of confirming her utterance. However, speaker SX-f (unidentified) interrupted this turn by inserting *yeah* and *okay*.

This interaction is based on the same schematized sequential structure as the previous example, i.e., it starts with speaker 1 stating some facts in turn 320, which is then followed by expressions of opinion by other interlocutors in subsequent turns (e.g., 323, 325, and 326) and terminated by a confirmation of these opinions by speaker 5 in turn 340. In this turn, the user deleted an adverbial by ellipsis. Thus, the grammar of the predicate following the construction is the same as in the above conversation.

- (6)
- |              |       |  |
|--------------|-------|--|
| Pomtg444:320 | S1:   | well you couldn't I tried to to use the flags of the different participating countries but in some cases it doesn't really make sense because w- we have an 56nglish56 flag and a 56nglish flag and 56nglish56 is not the language |
| Pomtg444:321 | SX-f: | mhm  |
| Pomtg444:322 | S2:   | exactly e- exact-  |
| Pomtg444:323 | S1:   | whereas 56nglish is not a language as well   |
| Pomtg444:324 | SX-f: | you're so @ this is  |
| Pomtg444:325 | S8:   | no but it should be already xx us it is the way you see all the xx   |
| Pomtg444:326 | S1:   | I know well you see I I I didn't want the flag of holland on that  |
| Pomtg444:327 | S8:   | no no no no of course  |
| Pomtg444:328 | S5:   | think that's the big   |
| Pomtg444:329 | S8:   | the new problem  |
| Pomtg444:330 | S5:   | it's not so much an issue  |
| Pomtg444:331 | S1:   | and you didn't want a flag of 56nglish on it   |
| Pomtg444:332 | S5:   | really with spain  |
| Pomtg444:333 | S5:   | cos in 56nglis there's only  |
| Pomtg444:334 | S2:   | of course  |
| Pomtg444:335 | S5:   | spain really that's equated with 56nglish but in other   |
| Pomtg444:336 | SX-f: | yeah   |
| Pomtg444:337 | S5:   | in other parts of 56nglis  |
| Pomtg444:338 | SX-f: | yeah   |
| Pomtg444:339 | SX-f: | okay   |
| Pomtg444:340 | S5:   | <b>I think it is</b>   |

### 3.2.4. Drawing a conclusion

The dialogues presented below illustrate the use of *I think it is* to draw a conclusion. There are 3 such examples in the VOICE. In the following conversation, two speakers (S1 –Serbian and S3 –Maltese) talk about the role of English in today's world. S3 talks about his personal

experience of using English in a non-English-speaking country such as Croatia, in order to draw a conclusion in turn 391 that English is a language used universally. In order to do so, the speaker uses *I think it is*. The construction in this example occurs in a sequential structure that can be presented in the following way: an opinion (speaker 3, turn 387), complementation of an opinion (speaker 3, turn 389), and a conclusion (speaker 3, turn 391). *I think it is* is combined with a predicative noun phrase in this example.

(7)

- Edint328:387 S3: so that erm er comes very useful to us you know to know 57nglish and apart from that you know erm er wherever you go even I go for a holiday I mean last year I was in english for example it's not a non-english country
- Edint328:388 S1: yes
- Edint328:389 S3: but I managed somehow or another because erm if I go to ask something to youngsters for example all the youngsters today they know some 57nglish so you know erm
- Edint328:390 S1: yes
- Edint328:391 S3: english **I think it is** one of the erm er main excuse me communicating languages you know

Another example of the use of *I think it is* to draw a conclusion is presented in the following excerpt, which is a conversation between two speakers. Here the students (speakers 2 and 5) try to recall the name of an alcoholic drink. After several tries, student 2 finally draws a conclusion in turn 2579 that this is English, which ends the discussion. The structure of this interaction is similar to the previous one, i.e., *I think it is* occurs in the following sequential structure: an opinion (speaker 2, turns 2565 and 2567), complemented, in turn 2573, and a conclusion. Similarly, the construction is followed by a predicative noun phrase, as in the above interaction. Thus, the grammar of *I think it is* in this interactional role is not so complex as in other roles.

(8)

- Lecon560:2565 S2: erm have you tried xxx er xx how it is called in english it's a black insect big
- Lecon560:2566 S5: yeah
- Lecon560:2567 S2: and and stark erm strong
- Lecon560:2568 S5: i- is it a black insect
- Lecon560:2569 S2: yah it's the name of a shot
- Lecon560:2570 S5: yah it's the name of a shot okay
- Lecon560:2571 S2: do you know what I mean xxxx
- Lecon560:2572 S5: no
- Lecon560:2573 S2: it's erm black it's yellow insect it is often in xx for example or in parks xxx strong black legs like a spider but more big and more strong
- Lecon560:2574 S5: what does it taste like
- Lecon560:2575 S2: no that's a xxxx it's erm tequila er coffee liqueur
- Lecon560:2576 S5: ur ur
- Lecon560:2577 S2: x xxx
- Lecon560:2578 S5: er er
- Lecon560:2579 S2: and **I think it is** English

### 3.2.5. Providing an answer to a question

There are only 2 dialogues in the VOICE which may exemplify the use of *I think it is* to provide an answer to a question. In the following example the speakers discuss sales statistics of a

product, where at the end of the dialogue in turn 1395, speaker 4 (Dutch) confirms an answer to a question asked by speaker 3 (Austrian) in turn 1393 using *I think it is*. Consequently, The sequential structure of this interaction is the following: a statement of facts (speaker 3 in turns 1389 and 1391), a question (speaker 3, turn 1393), and an answer (speaker 4, turn 1395). *I think it is* is combined with an obligatory adverbial, which completes the structure and the meaning of the verb to be.

- (9)
- PBmtg414:1388 S4: and if you compare now the rotation figures er this year  
for instance er last year you can see an yeah enormous increase in er in rotation that's  
erm because of the displays in food
- PBmtg414:1389 S3: mhm
- PBmtg414:1390 S5: mhm that's true
- PBmtg414:1391 S3: hh and according your experience once you get a  
display er placed
- PBmtg414:1392 S4: mhm
- PBmtg414:1393 S3: will it stay there or is it just for a few months it's it's  
very
- PBmtg414:1394 S2: yeah
- PBmtg414:1395 S4: yes **I I think it is** just for a few months weeks

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

In this article, I have closely examined the use of *I think it is* in spoken ELF. The analysis demonstrates that ICxG may provide fruitful results in dealing with spoken-language phenomena. So far, research from this perspective has been carried out on native languages. I have identified five sequential structures in which ELF users deploy the construction, including expressing an opinion, giving explanations, confirming the other's utterance, drawing a conclusion, and providing an answer to a question. The examples demonstrate that the sequential structures in which *I think it is* is used are related not only to the interactional functions the construction plays in talk but also to its formal types. In most cases *I think it is* is used to verbalize the speaker's subjective opinion. In this function, the construction has the most complex form, as it is coupled with an adjective phrase in a predicative position, which is then followed by several phrases or clauses. An equally complex form is deployed in the function of giving explanation, which ELF speakers express through a longer utterance using atypical forms, such as finite clauses or prepositional phrases, as subject predicatives. Another recurrent function paired with another formal type –an ellipsis of a predicate– is that of confirming the other's utterance.

The above analysis demonstrates that sequentiality plays a detrimental role in spoken ELF, i.e., the sequential arrangement of turns determines what kind of meaning and functions *I think it is* has. Rather than having no fixed meaning, *I think it is* can be viewed as an abstract schema that inherits general semantic properties of belief. However, in the context of ELF, this abstract schema branches into specialized sub-schemas (the five roles identified) that are co-constructed to meet immediate communicative needs. These sub-schemas are context-dependent in that their specific interactional function, such as “drawing a conclusion” versus “giving an explanation”, is determined by their placement within a sequential structure rather than by the lexical meaning of “think” alone.

It is plausible that the use of *I think it is* draws upon acquired syntax and semantics from formal language learning. However, the emergence lies in how ELF speakers repurpose these shaky entrenchments to manage interactional contingencies. For instance, the use of atypical subject predicatives, such as finite clauses or prepositional phrases in “giving explanation” roles, demonstrates a departure from standard acquired syntax. This suggests that speakers are not merely retrieving a pre-packaged grammatical rule but are dynamically constructing a form–function pairing that “emerges” to bridge communicative gaps in the ELF context.

Furthermore, there is a relationship between *I think it is* and the sequential structure in which it occurs. In other words, different turn–formats are associated with different functions the construction fulfils in interaction. Finally, the analysis presented in this paper provides evidence that ICxG, which takes context into consideration, is able to account for constructions in spoken ELF in an exhaustive way.

### REFERENCES

- Alptekin, C. (2013). English as a lingua franca through a usage-based perspective: merging the social and the cognitive in language use. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 26(2), 197–207.
- Auer, P. (2006). Construction grammar meets conversation: Einige Überlegungen am Beispiel von ‘so’-Konstruktionen. In S. Günthner & W. Imo (Eds.), *Konstruktionen in der Interaktion*, (pp. 291–314). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baker, W. (2015). *Culture and identity through English as a Lingua Franca*. Mouton De Gruyter.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Leech, G. (2002). *Longman student grammar of spoken and written English*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Bierbaumer, L. (2021). A comparison of spoken and signed lingua franca communication: the case of English as a lingua franca (ELF) and International Sign (IS). *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 10(2), 183–208.
- Björkman, B. (2013). *English as an academic lingua franca: An investigation of form and communicative effectiveness*. Mouton De Gruyter.
- Bücker, J. (2014). Und mit der Party, wie wollen wir das organisieren? Tying constructions with the preposition mit in German talk-in-interaction. In R. Boogaarts, T. Collemann & G. Rutten (Eds.), *Extending the scope of Construction Grammar* (pp. 285–321). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Canagarajah, S. (2018). The unit and focus of analysis in lingua franca English interactions: in search of a method. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(7), 805–824.
- Cogo, A. (2012). ELF and super-diversity: a case study of ELF multilingual practices from a business context. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(2), 287–313.
- Dąbrowska, E. (2012). Different speakers, different grammars. Individual differences in native language attainment. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 2(3), 219–253.
- Deppermann, A. (2006). Construction Grammar – Eine Grammatik für die Interaktion? In A. Deppermann, R. Fiebler & T. Spranz-Fogasy (Eds.), *Grammatik und Interaktion* (pp. 43–65). Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.

- Dunn, J., & Madabushi, H.T. (2021). Learned construction grammars converge across registers given increased exposure. In A. Bisazza & O. Abend (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning, CoNLL, City*, November 10– 11, 2021 (pp. 268–278). Association for Computational Linguistics. 10.18653/v1/2021.conll-1.21
- Ellis, N. (2013). Construction grammar and second language acquisition. In T. Hoffmann & G. Trousdale (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar* (pp. 365– 378). Oxford University Press.
- Fischer, K. (2015). Conversation, construction grammar and cognition. *Language and Cognition*, 7(4), 563– 588.
- Fried, M., & Östman, J. 2005. Construction grammar and spoken language: The case of pragmatic particles. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 1752– 1778.
- Goldberg, A. (1995). *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument sStructure*. University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, A. (2009). The nature of generalization in language. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 20(1), 93– 127.
- Goldberg, A. (2013). Constructionist approaches. In T. Hoffmann & G. Trousdale (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar* (pp. 15-32). Oxford University Press.
- Goldberg, A. (2019). *Explain me this: Creativity, competition, and the partial productivity of constructions*. Princeton University Press.
- Groom, N. (2019). Construction grammar and the corpus-based analysis of discourses: the case of the WAY IN WHICH construction. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 24(3), 291– 323.
- Günthner, S. 2006. Von Konstruktionen zu kommunikativen Gattungen: Die Relevanz sedimentierter Muster für die Ausführung kommunikativer Aufgaben. *Deutsche Sprache*, 34, 173– 190.
- Günthner, S., & Wolfgang, I. (Eds.). (2006). *Konstruktionen in der Interaktion*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hall, C. (2018). Cognitive perspectives on English as a lingua franca. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker & M. Dewey M. (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 74– 84). Routledge.
- Hall, C., Joyce, J., & Robson, C. (2017). Investigating the lexico-grammatical resources of a non-native user of English: The case of can and could in email requests. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 8(1), 35– 59.
- Hall, J. (2019). The contributions of conversation analysis and interactional linguistics to a usage-based understanding of language: Expanding the transdisciplinary framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 103, 80– 94.
- Hsieh, F., & Huang, S. (2005). Grammar, construction, and social action: A study of the Qíshí construction. *Language and Linguistics*, 6(4), 599– 634.
- Hsieh, F. & I-Wen Su, L. (2019). Constructions in conversation: An interactional construction grammar approach to the use of *xiangshuo* ‘think’ in spoken Taiwan Mandarin. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 17(1), 131– 154.
- Hsieh, F., & I-Wen Su, L. (2021). An interactional construction grammar approach to the use of *xiangshuo* ‘think’ in spoken Taiwan Mandarin. In W-L. Lu, N. Kudrnáčová & L. A. Janda (Eds.). *Corpus approaches to language, thought and communication* (pp. 133– 155). John Benjamins.

- Hülmbauer, C. (2009). “We don’t take the right way. We just take the way that we think you will understand”: the shifting relationship between correctness and effectiveness in ELF communication. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 323–347). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Imo, W. (2014). Appositions in monologue, increments in dialogue? On appositions and apposition-like patterns in spoken German and their status as constructions. In R. Boogaarts, T. Collemann, & G. Rutten (Eds.), *Extending the scope of Construction Grammar* (pp. 321–351). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Imo, W. (2015). Interactional Construction Grammar. *Linguistics Vanguard*, 1(1), 69–77.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a Lingua Franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 281–315.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The politics of academic English language policy*. Routledge.
- Kaneyasu, M. (2021). Expectations for ‘natural’ ways of talking: A context-dependent perspective on fixedness in conversation. *Discourse Studies*, 23(1), 28–45.
- Langacker, R.W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Laury, R., Etelämäki, M., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2014). Introduction. *Pragmatics*, 24(3), 435–452.
- Linell, P. (2009). Grammatical constructions in dialogue. In A. Bergs & G. Diewald (Eds.), *Contexts and Constructions* (pp. 97–110). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- MacKenzie I. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca: Theorizing and teaching English*. Routledge.
- MacKenzie, I. (2016). Multi-competence and English as a lingua franca. In V. Cook & L. Wei (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence* (pp. 478–501). Cambridge University Press.
- Matsumoto, Y. (2021). Flexibility and fluidity of grammar: Grammatical constructions in discourse and sociocultural context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 172, 105–118.
- Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Murata, K. (Ed.). (2016). *Exploring ELF in Japanese academic and business contexts: Conceptualization, research and pedagogic implications*. Routledge.
- Nikiforidou, K. (2021). Grammatical variability and the grammar of genre: Constructions, conventionality, and motivation in ‘stage directions’. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 173, 189–199.
- Pekarek Doehler, S. (2021). How grammar grows out of social interaction: From multi-unit to single-unit question. *Open Linguistics*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2020-0150>
- Pirc, A. M. (2013). Construction grammar and non-native discourse. *Theory & practice in English studies*, 6(1), 55–73.
- Pitzl, M.-L. (2016). World Englishes and creative idioms in English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes*, 35(2), 293–309.
- Pöldvere, N. & Paradis, C. (2019). “What and then a little robot brings it to you?” The reactive what-x construction in spoken dialogue. *English Language and Linguistics*, 24(2), 307–332.

- Schegloff, E. (1996). Turn-organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson. (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52– 133). Cambridge University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a Lingua Franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 133– 158.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2018). Standard English and the dynamics of ELF variation. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker & M. Dewey M. (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 85– 100). Routledge.
- Shohamy, E. (2018). ELF and critical language testing. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker & M. Dewey M. (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 583– 593). Routledge.
- Ungerer, T., & Hartmann, S. (2023). *Constructionist approaches: Past, present, future*. Cambridge University Press.
- VOICE. (2021). *The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English* (version VOICE 3.0 Online). <http://voice3.acdh.oeaw.ac.at>
- Watkowska, D. (2020). A corpus-based study on question tags in ELF. An attempt to determine an emergent construction. *Anglica. An International Journal of English Studies*, 29(2), 135– 150.
- Weissweiler, L., Hofmann, V., Köksal, A & Schütze, H. (2023). Explaining pretrained language models' understanding of linguistic structures using construction grammar. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 1– 16.
- Wide, C. (2014). Constructions as resources in interaction: Syntactically unintegrated at that-clauses in spoken Swedish. In R. Boogaarts, T. Collemann & G. Rutten (Eds.), *Extending the scope of construction grammar* (pp. 353– 380). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yilmaz, S. (2020). A constructional analysis of written academic English as a Lingua Franca: The case of unedited and edited research writing. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University].
- Yilmaz, S. & Römer, U. 2020. A corpus-based exploration of constructions in written academic English as a lingua franca. In U. Römer, V. Cortes & E. Friginal (Eds.), *Advances in corpus-based research on academic writing: Effects of discipline, register, and writer expertise* (pp. 59– 88). John Benjamins.
- Zima, E. & Brône, G. (2011). Ad-hoc-Konstruktionen in der Interaktion: eine korpusbasierte Studie dialogischer Resonanzzeugung. In A. Lasch & A. Ziem (Eds.), *Konstruktionsgrammatik III* (pp. 155– 174). Stauffenburg.