DIADORIM

Revista Diadorim
e-ISSN: 2675-1216
v.26, n.1, e63478, 2024
DOI: 10.35520/diadorim.2024.v26n1a63478

Interview

The interface between Functional Linguistics and Construction Grammar: theoretical and methodological issues – an interview with Renata Enghels (Ghent University)

Edvaldo Balduino Bispo[1]

Fernando da Silva Cordeiro[2]

Renata Enghels[3]

[1]Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte. Natal, RN, Brasil.
[2]Universidade Federal Rural do Semi-Árido. Caraúbas, RN, Brasil.
[3]Ghent University. Ghent, Belgium.

E-mails: edvaldo.bispo@ufrn.br; fernando.cordeiro@ufersa.edu.br; renata.enghels@ugent.be

How to cite:
BISPO, Edvaldo Balduino; CORDEIRO, Fernando da Silva; ENGHELS, Renata. The interface between Functional Linguistics and Construction Grammar. *Revista Diadorim,* v.26, n.1, e63478, 2024. doi: https://doi.org/10.35520/diadorim.2024.v26n1a63478

The interface between Functional Linguistics and Construction Grammar has already proved to be productive for analyses of a wide range of phenomena on several languages. These theoretical frameworks share similarities in terms of the relevance of use in linguistic research. In Functional Linguistics, use is the fundamental reality of language, since language is shaped by the uses we make of it in communicative situations in which we engage. In Constructional Grammar, constructs – concrete instantiations of constructional schemes – are the means by which we build generalizations about patterns that emerge from our experience

of language use. Functional Linguistics and Construction Grammar also come closer by recognizing the close relationship between form and function, so crucial to functionalist studies and captured by Construction Grammar in the concept of construction.

However, this fruitful dialog can also present challenges of a theoretical-methodological nature, which puts us in the role of thinking about the extent to which these frameworks complement and differentiate each other, as well as which precautions should be taken when working with both. In this sense, we propose this interview with Prof. Dr. Renata Enghels (Ghent University), whose research illustrates very well how the interface between Functional Linguistics and Construction Grammar can result in a potential tool for analyzing phenomena of diverse nature. The questions aim to comprehend the perspective adopted by the researcher on the investigations she has coordinated and her point of view about the current theoretical-methodological challenges of the functional-constructionist approach. We invite you all to read it.

EDVALDO BALDUINO BISPO and FERNANDO DA SILVA CORDEIRO (EBB and FSC): Which topics have you been investigating, and which theoretical and methodological frameworks guide your research?

RENATA ENGHELS (RE): Over the course of my academic career, the focal points of my research have dynamically evolved, traversing various domains within the linguistic landscape. So, I would not identify myself as an expert in a specific area. Instead, by embracing topics that might seem quite diverging, I was able to identify underlying linguistic patterns and adopt a comprehensive, overarching perspective, what I like to describe as a 'helicopter' view. Moreover, although I have been focusing on specific phenomena within Romance languages, with a primary focus on Spanish, and extending into French and to some extent Portuguese, my goal has also been to contribute to the broader field of linguistics. The theoretical frameworks I have been working with can be defined by the overarching term 'functional', encompassing Cognitive Linguistics and Construction Grammar, and more recently, expanding to include aspects of Sociolinguistics. From a methodological viewpoint, I have consistently employed a 'bottom-up' and 'data driven' approach. Initially grounded in corpus studies, my methodological framework has, through interdisciplinary collaborations with colleagues in Psycholinguistics, Psychology, Sociology, and Literature, evolved into a 'multimethod' approach. This paradigm shift underscores my commitment to interdisciplinary research, reflecting the complexity and multifaceted nature of language.

In concrete, I started with a research project on the distinction between mass and count nouns in Spanish and French. My PhD project investigated the argument structure of perception verbs in these two languages, a topic that naturally extended into my postdoctoral studies, where I focused on causative verbs across Romance languages. While these topics might initially appear to align with quite 'traditional' syntactic studies, they were inherently interwoven with semantic and pragmatic dimensions. Guided by the principle of iconicity, my aim was to understand the underlying motivations for formal variations at the surface level of language structure. The Romance languages constitute an ideal laboratory for this purpose, due to their capacity for morphosyntactic variation to different degrees. I am particularly interested in the ways in which extralinguistic and conceptual factors, including communicative needs articulated by speakers, could explain variations in syntactic word order, case markings, and agreement mechanisms, among others.

This interest in the dynamic interplay between form and function, and specifically in how speakers select among different outcome members of an overarching 'schema' was further continued in more recent research projects. Although they might seem quite different from the 'first wave' topics, they are in fact intrinsically related by a common thread: the exploration of linguistic choice and variation within the framework of functional theories. In concrete, they are concerned with:

i. The examination of specific phenomena in informal colloquial Spanish. This domain offers a fertile ground for observing spontaneous linguistic choices, including, but not limited to, pragmatic markers, as well as intensification and attenuation strategies.
ii. The exploration of patterns that have influenced the historical development of highly productive categories in Romance languages, such as verbal periphrases and pragmatic markers. This research refers to grammaticalization and constructionalization theories to unravel the evolutionary trajectories of these linguistic elements, contributing to our understanding of language change and development.
iii. An inquiry into the 'meaning' of specific linguistic items within age-related sociolects, with a particular focus on youth language. This research line aims at describing the multifaceted meanings embedded in the language practices of younger generations, revealing how linguistic innovation might reflect broader social and cultural shifts.
iv. The analysis of the underlying 'grammar' governing patterns of codeswitching. In these projects we concentrate on the variation observed both interindividually and within communities, aiming to outline the systematic nature of codeswitching as a linguistic phenomenon.

The unifying thread among these topics is an exploration of how syntactic and overall formal variations are inherently linked to the 'meaning' a speaker intends to convey, where 'meaning' is understood in a broad sense. Besides lexical, semantic, and pragmatic meaning, I believe that linguistic choices are simultaneously guided by conceptual and social meanings. Such meanings reflect an individual's perception of the external world, their personality traits, their positioning within specific communicative contexts, and the identity they aim to project through their linguistic choices. Recent reflections have led me to embrace the perspective that "it is all connected", in the sense that phenomena that are typically studied by Sociolinguistics, Historical Linguistics or Pragmatics, to name just a few, seem to be driven by comparable, transversal, linguistic principles. These include considerations of economy (the need for linguistic efficiency), iconicity (the mirroring of form and meaning), creativity (the capacity for innovative expression), expressiveness (the need to express emotions and stance), and productivity (the generative ability of linguistic systems to produce variations of a pattern).

(EBB and FSC): How do you evaluate, theoretically and methodologically, the approximation (convergence?) between Functional Linguistics and Construction Grammar?

(RE): Functional Linguistics and Construction Grammar are of course very closely related as concerns their primary goals and theoretical underpinnings. Both theories start for a strong focus on explaining language use in (social) contexts. Whereas Functional Linguistics has evolved by developing an array of models, theories and case studies starting from the role of communicative functions in language use, (Cognitive) Construction Grammar has emphasized a view of language as a complex constructicon, or network of form-meaning pairs, thus constructions.

As a consequence, there are many points of theoretical convergence between the two frameworks. They both commit to approach language mainly as a tool for communication, with a strong emphasis on meaning and use. Language is seen as a continuum, rejecting the strict separation between linguistic levels such as lexicon, semantics, syntax etc. So 'meaning' is defined broadly, extending far beyond the traditional boundaries of semantic content with recent integrations of socially relevant elements of meaning at the functional side of constructions in Construction Grammar. Besides other shared basic premises, the theories also align in their view of 'emerging grammar' and the importance of context and use to understand the essence of language.

Therefore, both models heavily align on similar methodological approaches including empirical data that are representative of actual language use (for instance corpus data but also the outcomes of online and offline experiments). However, although there is no strict division of labor, there are some differences as to the preferred methods for analyzing these data. In Functional Linguistics, the focus may lie more on qualitative assessments of discourse by closely looking into language patterns in interactions, whereas (Cognitive) Construction Grammar often implies quantitative modelling that provides insights into how constructions are produced and processed by speakers.

I believe the convergence between both approaches is highly valuable and makes perfectly sense. When observing concrete case studies, I find it sometimes hard to distinguish between them. What I find particularly appealing in the constructional approach is the premise of language being organized around more or less abstract 'schemas', corresponding to different functional needs (the meaning side), and the idea that they are organized in a network (and even a 'dynamic' one, following Diessel's model) built upon different types of constructional relations. That is a complementary insight that the constructional model has to offer to the functional one. Moreover, as said before, I believe that the concept of meaning should be defined broadly, and as such, the 'definition' of a construction or any linguistic phenomenon could highly benefit from the description of context-related nuances, revealed through detailed functional analyses. Comprehensive discourse analyses and quantitative modelling of patterns observed in 'big data' should go hand in hand.

I do believe that there is still work to be done to make the approximation between these approaches more explicit in the literature, as to posit more explicitly which are the main points of convergence but also the (methodological and theoretical) challenges in integrating them. So, merging them in a more transparent way may well constitute a pivotal future objective for (Brazilian) research groups working within these domains.

(EBB and FSC): Which precautions should we have in mind while working with these two theoretical fields altogether?

(RE): This is a question not so easy to answer. Overall, I believe that linguistic models and theories are there as instruments allowing the researcher to organize and explain the patterns that (s)he observes in the data, and not the other way around. This would mean that observations are 'forced' into a preestablished model. So, we should be cautious not to let ourselves be unduly bound by a particular framework or approach. I guess that the precautions with these theoretical fields could be extended to linguistics research in general. Here are some additional challenges that need to be addressed.

First, it is important to start from a clear terminology. As we discussed before, both theories come with specific terminologies and conceptual premises, but also within each field there are diverging views (for instance in Construction Grammar, when the notion of 'construction' actually applies to an observed pattern and when not). A researcher ought to work with a transparent lexicon and with clearly defined terms at the outset. This ensures that theoretical models are not prematurely applied to interpret the data. So, I would encourage a deliberate and evidence-based application of both theories.

Second, as is important for (linguistic) research overall, the models have to be applied with sufficient methodological rigor. In particular, given the emphasis of both fields on empirical data, I think it is really important to carefully select the data sources (thus, the corpora), methods and validation techniques depending on the research question one wants to answer. For instance, in the past I learned that, if you want to work with productivity measures, a topic we will address later on, but which is widely used in the constructional approach, a careful sampling of the data is crucial. This is especially important if you want to compare communicative settings, for instance, from a historical or sociological perspective. If you do not pay enough attention to this methodological aspect, there is a risk that your empirical conclusions are biased. Overall, transparency is important in our methodology and analyses so that they can be replicated by others. Ghent University has implemented a policy from 2023 requiring that all datasets used in our research be published in Open Access formats, such as the Trolling repository. This initiative underscores the importance of accessible, transparent research practices that facilitate validation and further exploration by our colleagues.

Finally, in order to avoid circular reasoning and, at times, too intuitive interpretations of the data, I think it is important to pursue in both fields, as much as possible, objective validation criteria. Particularly when addressing pragmatic and semantic phenomena, it's imperative not to assume functional interpretations without rigorous analysis. Questions arise such as: why is a specific element considered a stance marker? What contextual evidence supports one interpretation over another? While collocational research has become a prevalent method for unravelling the nuances of 'meaning', this approach might not always be applicable, or might present challenges, for example, in the study of pragmatic markers. In such cases, it remains essential for functional analyses to strive towards identifying more objective clues. This approach ensures that interpretations are not solely reliant on our subjective judgments but are grounded in observable and verifiable evidence.

(EBB and FSC): Talking about methodology, how can we define an adequate sample (corpus) for an empirical investigation of a discourse phenomenon?

(RE): This is a highly relevant question which, in fact, relates to a point I raised earlier. When studying discourse-related phenomena, it is highly important to base our analyses on a balanced and representative sample. Nevertheless, despite all efforts to ensure the sample's adequacy, it's crucial to recognize that our findings are specific to that sample alone, and that we must be cautious before generalizing these conclusions to different genres or discourse contexts.

So, given the distinct nature of discourse-specific phenomena, it is important to have access to representative oral data. In the field of Romance languages, access to relevant data has long been limited or nearly nonexistent. For example, the first informal spoken corpus of Peninsular Spanish only became available in the 1970s. Fortunately, researchers have become increasingly more aware of the fact that discourse-related phenomena can best be understood through the analysis of spoken corpora, and that these data needed to be collected and preserved. As a result, for Spanish, we now have access to a broader range of spoken corpora representing spontaneous speech of the 21st century. Our research team has made a significant contribution to the field by recently recording and transcribing three corpora: a corpus of spontaneous colloquial Chilean Spanish, a highly comparable corpus of Spanish spoken in Madrid (known as the CORMA corpus), and finally, a bilingual Spanish-English corpus of spontaneous speech in El Paso, USA. Despite these contributions, it's important to note that these corpora represent specific variants of the language and are often limited in size and scope. From our experience, gathering authentic and representative data is an extremely costly and time-consuming process, a fact that is frequently overlooked by the academic community. Nonetheless, when working with this type of corpus, the ecological validity of the research is substantially assured. Therefore, I would argue that the most crucial characteristic of an adequate sample is its authenticity.

The selection and characteristics of a sample should indeed be closely tailored to the phenomenon under investigation, indicating that the sample must align precisely with the research questions and objectives at hand. For example, when studying verbal argument structures, the inclusivity of the data in the sample may not be as heavily influenced by the variety of discourse settings in which specific constructions or verbs are utilized. Conversely, if the focus is on phenomena characteristic of orality (such as the use of pragmatic markers, and strategies for intensification and attenuation), the specific social and/or communicative contexts in which these are employed become significantly more relevant. This distinction suggests a need

for different approaches to data collection: for studying verbal argument structures, utilizing data from a broad-based source like Sketch Engine, which aggregates content from diverse internet sources, might be suitable due to its vast dataset. However, for research into discourse phenomena where the social and communicative context is crucial, a more controlled approach is necessary, necessitating data that includes detailed sociological profiles of the speakers and specific discourse settings. Despite the allure of Sketch Engine's extensive database, its lack of detailed speaker profiles makes it less ideal for studying discourse-related phenomena, highlighting the importance of selecting data sources that provide a comprehensive understanding of the speakers' backgrounds and the contexts of their conversations.

This brings me of course to another pending issue which is the size of the corpus. Overall, size has been defined as crucial to ensure statistical significance. However, once again it depends on your research objectives. If you want to provide an in depth, multidimensional analysis of a structure, a construction, or a linguistic expression, it can be more valuable to try and capture the specific nature of the phenomenon you are studying by focusing on a more limited sample but adding additional research parameters. A key consideration is that the sample must remain manageable within the constraints of available time and analytical resources. Striking a balance between the breadth of data and the depth of analysis ensures that research findings are both significant and insightful.

Overall, I think that the best way to deal with the issue of representativeness of samples is to be transparent about its compilation, composition and processing. By being open and clear about these aspects, researchers facilitate the reproducibility of their analyses by others using different samples. This transparency is essential for advancing the field, as it allows for the validation and comparison of research findings across various studies. Thus, the best practice in addressing the representativeness of samples lies in thorough documentation and openness, providing a foundation for ongoing scholarly dialogue and exploration.

(EBB and FSC): How to conciliate and/or balance quantitative and qualitative factors in usage-based research? Could you give us any example?

(RE): This highly important question was partially addressed before. As said, it is crucial to complement quantitative with qualitative research and the other way around. Even in the case of multivariate statistics, that simultaneously takes into account the impact of different parameters on one and the same linguistic outcome, the quantitative modeling needs to be designed and fed by information that comes from a meticulous qualitative examination of the data. This step ensures that the quantitative analysis is grounded in a nuanced understanding of the linguistic phenomena being

studied. researchers with a strong proficiency in quantitative methods may lack the intuitive grasp of the nuanced pragmatic implications conveyed by the use of specific structures within particular communicative contexts. Conversely, there is a risk among researchers who focus predominantly on qualitative analyses to overgeneralize from a limited set of observations. They may construct comprehensive theories based on detailed examinations of a few instances of a phenomenon, without verifying the statistical significance or generalizability of the observed patterns and correlations.

Therefore, I think that a first phase of any research project on a new topic should consist of the close reading of representative corpora in which the phenomenon will be studied. As highlighted by the example of studying intensification strategies in contemporary Spanish, a topic being explored by our PhD student Linde Roels, this approach is invaluable. It allows researchers to immerse themselves in real language usage by examining transcriptions, methodically identifying a range of competing variants, and understanding their function and nuances within language.

This qualitative analysis is crucial for uncovering how these linguistic features are employed in various communicative strategies, including those aimed at maintaining politeness and managing face work among speakers. Such an analysis provides insights into the dynamic nature of language and its use in social interaction, revealing the complex interplay between linguistic choices and communicative intentions. Only after these qualitative insights have been established, can researchers proceed to define the relevant variables with precision. This step is essential for the subsequent development of more sophisticated quantitative models.

(EBB and FSC): How are the computational tools/resources helping the research you have been developing?

(RE): I guess we all agree that the various computational tools that we have at our disposal today, constitute an exceptional added value to our research. Without them, the 'empirical turn', and more specifically, the 'quantitative turn' in linguistics would not have been possible. I started my PhD research in an area when we were happy to have at our disposal the regular Windows packages. There was no further need to manually collect and transcribe relevant corpus examples – imagine doing that today – but we were able to gather all these data in databases, such as Access, not so frequently used nowadays, and Excel, still indispensable in the daily practice of linguistic researchers. It might seem a basic resource, but some more advanced knowledge of the tool allows you to perform so many operations with the data: extracting random samples, carefully (and sometimes automatically) annotating the data, get some quick insights into patterns in the data through cross-tables, visualizing the data etc. In my opinion, this tool remains indispensable in the field of corpus linguistics.

We use other tools to perform specific research activities: Praat, EXMARaLDA and ELAN for the transcription of recordings of conversational data, for instance; the integration of online tools in platforms like Sketch Engine facilitates PoS-tagged and lemma-based corpus searches, streamlining the process of identifying linguistic patterns within large datasets.

For the processing and concrete search of patterns in the data, and thus statistical modelling, I originally learned to work with the SPSS program. However, it soon became clear that the *de facto* standard for data analysis was the open-source and free software environment R. R provides a wide array of statistical and graphical techniques and is highly extensible through new packages. The only drawback is its steep learning curve: it requires quite some effort to become familiarized with the programming language, but once you have become acquainted with the fundamentals, a vast set of capabilities unfolds, encompassing data manipulation, statistical calculation, and advanced graphical display.

At this moment I am exploring the possibilities of GAI applications, such as ChatGPT, for the analysis of corpus data. My first experience is that, when you manage to input the data in a format readable by the Chatbot, it might become a highly useful (and more accessible) tool for analysing underlying patterns in the data. However, since these tools are still relatively new, the output should be handled with care, and compared with the results of other resources. I'm quite eager to witness the future evolution of this field and its potential to become an integral tool in the daily work of every (corpus) linguist.

(EBB and FSC): Regarding productivity, which aspect(s) do you consider the most relevant for measuring the productivity of a construction? Why?

(RE): The phenomenon of linguistic productivity, as a fundamental property of rules in our mental grammar constitutes, in my opinion, is one of the most fascinating research topics. It is interesting to observe that different constructions, making up our grammar, have their own domain of application, meaning their own potential applicability to incorporate new lexical words or new members. Moreover, this level of productivity interacts with sociological and cognitive features of the speakers who produce them and evolves through time. Also, the relationship between this natural property of the grammatical system and the phenomenon of creativity, defined as the speaker's ability to use language in novel and innovative ways, showcasing the immense flexibility and adaptability of human language, presents a rich area for future research exploration.

As we have argued in previous research conducted by our interdisciplinary research group Language Productivity@work (see our website: http://www.languageproductivity.ugent.be), the major issue with the productivity concept is that it constitutes a black box: it is crucial for language, but forms part of the implicit linguistic knowledge of speakers, and therefore it cannot be observed directly. It is a theoretical construct that must be deduced from its observable manifestations. But this is where another difficulty arises: there are many different manifestations: in the realized language production, but also in how language is processed by both the speaker and hearer when produced, and this for every speaker or hearer individually. So if you want to get a complete image of the productivity of a specific construction, I would say that the best way to go is to adopt a multimethod approach, to see how its productivity is realized in contemporary and/or past language, how speakers evaluate specific instances of a construction (offline), or what happens in the brain (online) when they are confronted with new (and possibly creative) instances of a pattern, and finally how all these measures might vary among different communities or individuals.

I guess the question mostly relates to the vision of a corpus linguist, and how (s)he observes productivity. In fact, as corpus linguists we look at the 'accumulated language use', at the result of productivity at work. So, we perform different types of counts in large text databases. These are the most important ones, which I believe are all relevant:

i. the token frequency, or general frequency of occurrence of a construction;
ii. the type frequency, or different lexical types attested in a particular slot of a construction. The general idea is, the more different types attested, the more productive the construction. This has led to a measurement of type/token ratio;
iii. another important measure is the hapax/token ratio, measuring how many different new types appear in a construction. The idea is, the more different 'one offs' or hapaxes, the more the construction is potentially productive.

Measures that are much less discussed in the literature, but are at least as insightful, I believe, are the potential measures of 'anti-productivity'. These indicate what is possibly detrimental to productivity, and include counts of the most frequent fillers, the mean and standard deviation of the three most frequent fillers, and the slope of the fitted Zipfian distribution (of token frequency counts as a curve-based measure of productivity). The underlying principle here is that high-token frequency and the conventionalization of top-frequent items would hinder productivity. For further reading on this topic, I would recommend the PhD thesis of Niek Van Wettere (2021).

To come back to your question: the different measures highlight different aspects of productivity, and I would recommend calculating all of them in order to get a more precise idea of the productivity of (a) construction(s). Still, we showed in a recent paper (Van Hulle, Lauwers, Enghels, 2024)[1] that the so-called 'anti-productivity' measures on the one hand, and the productivity measures on the other hand, strongly correlate and constitute opposites along the same dimension of lexical openness.

This brings me to the last point, namely the need to integrate 'meaning' into productivity studies. Instead of only counting numbers of instances, you might want to know what the semantic coverage is of a construction or of (competing) micro-constructions. Or whether new instances of a construction appear within a preferred semantic domain, or whether they are all over the onomasiological space. This is only marginally addressed by the previously mentioned measures, for instance in the type/token ratio. However, a lot can be learned about the degree of 'semantic openness' of a construction by looking into additional measures such as semantic range (as the proportion of semantic clusters covered by a specific (micro-) construction) and semantic sparsity (as the average semantic relatedness of the types of a (micro-)construction).

(EBB and FSC): You have investigated Spanish pragmatic markers from a constructionist perspective. What are the challenges you have faced when dealing with discourse phenomena from this theoretical framework and what have you done to overcome them?

(RE): Indeed, in some of my papers on pragmatic markers I have argued in favour a constructional approach to these discourse-level phenomena. This squares with a recent development in the field of Construction Grammar, completely in line with its *all-inclusive* and integrationist principle, which declines to distinguish between core (as in morphosyntactic) and peripheral (as in pragmatic) patterns. In such a view (raised by Östman in 1999 and Östman & Fried in 2005, to name just a few), it is crucial to define discourse-level frames or discourse patterns that also stand in different types of relationships with each other, including inheritance relationships within a constructional network.

From this viewpoint, spoken expressions of interactional language that share similar functions and formal features – such as various types of conversational pragmatic markers – are considered examples of a broader construction. This overarching construction acts as a template that not only forms, but also aids in interpreting new expressions.

[1] The paper has been published: https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2023-0087

After having studied different individual pragmatic markers, I found many pending issues, questions and dilemmas, that other researchers were also confronted with, but apparently could not be addressed appropriately. These include: the tension between micro and macrofunctions, the desire to work with objective criteria to define their function, the need to complement the widely spread semasiological perspective (starting from concrete pragmatic marker forms) by an onomasiological perspective (starting from the discourse functional needs pragmatic markers fulfil). At some point, I realized that a constructional approach could possibly provide an answer to some of these issues. For instance, it allows to account for different levels of analysis in their functional behaviour, referring to their polyfunctionality as politeness markers, modal markers and/or argumentative and/or metadiscursive elements. Adopting a constructional perspective, these diverse levels are not considered to be mutually exclusive; instead, they collectively enrich the 'meaning' aspect of the schema. The features constituting the formal side of the coin would then include patterns as to its positional behaviour or the presence of specific collocational elements, that allow to discern subschemas or micro-constructions of the overarching pragmatic marker schema. Also, if you start from the idea that speakers wish to instantiate and express regular patterns with specific conventionalized patterns, one naturally broadens expands his/her perspective. This approach transcends the limits of particular pragmatic markers categorized by their lexical origins, such as those derived from motion verbs, perception verbs, and – I believe – comes much closer to how language actually operates in the brain.

Nevertheless, since this method is relatively new and not as widespread, applying the analytical tools originally developed for argument structure constructions to higher-level discourse phenomena presents several (methodological) challenges related to terminology, conceptual categories, and representational strategies. For instance, I found it hard to define the structure of the network itself: at what level of the constructicon do different structural variables operate? Do notions such as micro-construction, meso-construction, etc. equally apply? What counts as a micro-construction or subschema of the overarching pattern? How to define the different 'slots' of a discourse-level construction? And, in the light of the productivity measures we already discussed, what counts as a different type of a discourse-level construction? Does it only concern the internal formal makeup of the construction, or does it encompass different functional (including pragmatic) properties? How to include features of a wider dialogical conversational pattern?

So, besides these remaining questions, one of the main challenges, I believe, is to further disentangle the 'meaning' side of the construction, as to include not only semantic and pragmatic features of the conversational patterns, but also indexical social meaning. At the formal side more work could be done as to include prosody

in the definition of the constructions. As other formal criteria often fail to help and understand the functioning of pragmatic markers, prosodic features might constitute additional cues.

So, these questions, along with numerous others, highlight that this is both a promising and demanding research field, offering many opportunities to undertake state of the art studies in the hopeful near future.