ADOPTING AND ADAPTING AMERICAN SPEECH ROUTINES. FORMULAIC SEQUENCES IN THE DISCOURSES OF SERVICE ENCOUNTERS IN POST COMMUNIST ROMANIA[1]

Diana Hornoiu
Ovidius University, Constanța

1. Introduction

In today's spoken Romanian, the highly formulaic discourse of the iconized franchised systems like McDonald's or Pizza Hut brings forth a new dimension unknown to the discourse of commercial transactions before 1989. This new kind of transactional discourse is characterized by excessive simplification when the phatic component is reduced to the minimum.

The aim of this paper is twofold. First it proposes a theoretical framework for the analysis of formulaic language. Second, it provides an analysis of a corpus of formulaic sequences taken from service encounters in McDonald restaurants, establishing the inventory of forms and functions.

Having set the theoretical and empirical scenes, the study also proposes several hypotheses for further research. Thus, we advance the hypothesis that, at least for some recipients, the simplified phatic component reduced to repetitive formulaic sequences becomes artificial in a positive politeness ethos.

Alongside specific speaking practices, the McDonald's franchised system offers a story that reflects American ideology (Caputo 50). In America, the icon operates around the myths of well being, happy family and beneficent technology (Ciugureanu 131). Thus, another research question that arises is whether, outside the States the icon operates around the same myths, or it is the vehicle for a different story.

2. Setting the theoretical scene

[1] This work is part of the research project "Translations of American Myths, Icons and Brands in Post-Communist Romanian Culture (TRANSMIT)", supported by CNCSIS-UEFISCSU, Project number PNII – IDEI – 802/2009.

2.1. Identification and classification of formulaic language

Linguistic performance is less free and unconstrained and more pre-patterned than is generally acknowledged. Social factors impose significant limitations on what can be said and how it can be said. Linguistics constraints are often context-specific. Consequently, as part of their communicative competence, speakers are required to be familiar with an actual form of words, an idiom or a formula or a set of formulae which perform a cultural role, along with the norms for using such expressions. Apologies are a case in point. A language has a set of formulaic sequences for apologizing. To be a native apologizer in a particular language, one must know at least some of these formulae and the speech events one is supposed to use them. Not using the appropriate formulaic sequences in such a situation or using a non-formulaic sequence can trigger long-term social problems (Ferguson 137-51).

Before analyzing formulaic sequences in naturally occurring conversation it is important to define formulaic speech and to differentiate it from non-formulaic speech. These conceptual clarifications can be achieved by looking into the nature of formulaic language at the structural and lexical levels. We will first carry out a brief review of the classifications *formulaic sequences* proposed by researchers, then we will look into the structuring components and vocabulary of formulaic sequences to reach the conclusion that formulaic speech cannot be exclusively defined in structural or lexical terms.

The classification of formulaic sequences is rather difficult to establish since there is no generally agreed upon definition. In the relevant literature, formulaic sequences are usually differentiated according to their degree of variability. Thus while Hakuta distinguishes between **routines** and **prefabricated patterns**, Nattinger and De Carrico consider all formulaic expressions to be "lexical phrases" and classify them in terms of their various functions in the organization of discourse. Many researchers follow Hakuta in distinguishing *prefabricated routines*, which are memorized whole utterances or phrases that can be used without any knowledge of their internal structure (Krashen and Scarcella 283), and *prefabricated patterns* which are partly creative and partly memorized wholes. Thus, prefabricated patterns consist in sentence frames with an open slot for a word or phrase (Krashen and Scarcella 283).

A similar distinction is drawn by Bohn (188) who uses the term **formula** to refer to "expressions in which no part is substitutable", and the term **frame** to refer to "expressions that contain slots for more or less extensive paradigms of lexical elements". Thus, what Bohn calls formulaic

sequences includes both frames and formulas, along with the additional category of amalgams, which are defined as polymorphemic strings that are treated monomorphemically.

Thus, a formulaic sequence will be used in this paper to describe a phenomenon that encompasses various types of word-strings which appear to be stored and retrieved whole from memory. A useful working definition can be the one supplied by Wray and Perkins (1):

> A sequence, continuous or discontinuous, of words or other meaning elements, which is or appears to be, prefabricated: that is, stored and retrieved whole from memory at the time of use, rather than being subject to generation or analysis by the language grammar.

Formulaic language encompasses a wide range of pre-fabricate linguistic structures that can be placed on a *continuum* from fixed to novel, including, at one end, highly idiomatic and immutable strings of words, such as *by and large*, which are both semantically opaque and syntactically irregular, and, at the other end, transparent and flexible ones containing slots for open class items, such NP be-TENSE sorry to keep-TENSE you waiting. (Pawley and Syder 210)

Empirical research has shown (Kjellmer 1984; Baayen and Lieber 1991; Altenberg 1993; Barkema 1993) that the patterning of words and phrases in ordinary language shows far less variability than could be predicted on the basis of grammar and lexicon alone, and most natural language, written and spoken, appears to consist largely of collocational sets (Aijmer, 1996, Coulmas, 1979, Tannen 1989; Renouf and Sinclair 1991; Renouf 1992).

Various terms have been used in the literature to describe one or more types or subtypes of formulaic language, including those given in **Table 1**.

Amalgams	Idioms
Automatic	Lexicalised phrases
Chunks	Lexicalised sentence stems
Clichés	Multiword units
Co-ordinated constructions	Non-compositional
Collocations	Non-computational
Conventionalized forms	Non-productive
Fixed expressions	Petrification
Formulaic language	Preassembled speech

Formulaic speech	Prefabricated routines and patterns
Formulas/formulae	Ready-made expressions
Fossilized forms	Ready-made utterances
Frozen phrases	Routine formulae
Gambits	Schemata
Gestalt	Semi-preconstructed phrases that constitute single choices
Holistic	
Holophrases	Unanalyzed chunks of speech
Idiomatic	

Table 1. Terms used in the literature to label formulaic language

There seems to be two basic ways of classifying formulaic sequences: either by their *function* or by their degree of *variability*. However, the **fixedness** or variability of a sequence is difficult to determine accurately.

Form-based taxonomies

Many researchers have offered descriptions and/or categorizations of formulaic sequences in adult native language, including Becker (1975), Coulmas (1979, 1994), Lattey (217-233), Van Lancker (49-119) Moon (1998) and Howarth (24-44). Although by no means the most detailed, Becker's basic six-category taxonomy of adult native speaker linguistic formulae is a useful reference point:

- **Polywords**, e.g *(the) oldest profession*; *for good* .
- **Phrasal constraints**, e.g. *by sheer coincidence*
- **Meta-message**, e.g. *for that matter*…. (message: 'I just thought of a better way of making my point'); ….. *that's all* (message: 'don't get flustered')
- **Sentence builders**, e.g. *(person A) gave (person B) a (long) song and dance about (a topic)*
- **Situational utterances**, e.g. *how can I ever repay you*?
- **Verbatim texts**, e. g. *better late than never*

(adapted from Becker 6f)

2.2. Formulaic sequences and creative sequences: a few differentiating criteria

Most researchers (Hakuta 1974; Ellis 1994; Miller and Weinert 1998; Radford 1997) agree on the fact that formulaic sequences are *unanalyzed wholes*. But the most difficult thing is to detect whether a sentence or phrase

is unanalyzed. A review of the relevant literature on formulaic language enables us to draw up a tentative list of the factors that allow the definition and identification of formulaic sequences:

- high frequency
- relatively short sentence length
- syntactic correctness as a result of their being learned and used as unanalyzed chunks
- repetition
- influence of the context (topic, language task, setting, etc.)
- lack of variability
- community-wide use
- embodies a societal knowledge shared by a community
- lack of internal pauses, an aspect that reinforces the "learned-as-whole" and "retrieved-as-whole" features and also point to their status as pragmatic devices used spontaneously
- delimitation by code-switching phenomena (in second language acquisition)

The difference between formulaic speech and creative speech is very vague and formulaic speech itself seems to evince various degrees of formulaicity. Three elements seem to be instrumental in labelling an utterance formulaic: linguistic fixedness, communicative fixedness and socio-cultural fixedness. Thus, while frames are as linguistically fixed as formulas, they are more flexible at the communicative and socio-cultural levels. Similarly, idioms (i.e. "a string of words which has an idiosyncratic meaning", Radford 510) differ from formulas in that their socio-pragmatic function is less flexible. However, the boundary between these categories is very difficult to drawn.

To conclude this section, it seems that stretches of written or spoken discourse can be considered as formulaic not by their nature, but rather by the way they are perceived and by the use that is made of them. In fact, the factors in this list above should only be considered as clues to recognizing formulaic sequences.

3. Setting the empirical scene

3.1 Macro socio-cultural aspects

In what follows I will examine the case of McDonald operators, a situation where they perform rituals of encounters in the form of *service encounters* as

part of a highly formulaic discourse. I will use as a working definition of service encounters the one provide by Merrit (321):

> By a service encounter I mean an instance of face-to-face interaction between a server who is 'officially posted' in some service area, and a customer who is present in that service area, that interaction being oriented to the satisfaction of the customer's presumed desire for service and the server's obligation to provide that service

In the iconized franchised systems like McDonald's the waiter and the chef have been replaced by a number of more specialized employees who performer the tasks the waiter and the chef used to perform along with their assistants. McDonald operators perform the following routine tasks. They take customers' orders, place the items on the tray, tally the prices of the items ordered by the customers and accept payment for the goods. If necessary, they also pack the takeaway items. This specialization involves a transfer of labour costs from the personnel to the customer. It is the customer who carries the order to the table and occasionally clears the table. The transaction is conducted at the counter. This leaves less time for speech than the protracted interaction between the waiter and his customer who have time to talk over the merits of various products. The interactions with customers are brief, being of the order of a few minutes, while the selection of dishes is small. Consequently, the (trans)action in McDonald's restaurants is reduced to a *repetitive routine* that has been likened to *an assembly line*.

3.2 Micro socio-cultural aspects

A small queue of customers is lined up at the counter in a McDonald's restaurant. Usually an earlier customer is being served as the next customer comes potentially within the view of the McDonald's operator behind the counter. The operator does not acknowledge the presence of one customer until having bid farewell to the previous customer. Then he or she will make eye contact with the new customer and greet the customer. The greeting is the opening linguistic move of the service encounter.

The actions which the operators perform are almost entirely rule-governed. They begin by enquiring as to what the customer would like to order, place the items on the tray, the total is tallied by the cash register and the total is conveyed to the customer. The customer then pays, takes the tray and goes to his or her table. Should the customer wish to take the items away, the operator pack the items and the customer leaves with his or her order.

In addition to this major routine and its possible sub-routines, another routine is being transacted, a *speech routine*. Just like an ordinary conversation, this speech routine has a beginning, middle and end (Schegloff 292-295; Schegloff and Sacks 289-327). The opening and closing sequences have a strong tendency to be formulaic because what they need to accomplish is a matter of social ritual.

What is going on in a McDonald's restaurant is people performing *physical routines* in the way both the operator and customer perform their tasks, and *linguistic routines/rituals* in conducting talk with the customers. This context for talk allows us to make the prediction that, with great regularity, routine actions which require routine speech tasks will have those routine speech tasks performed primarily by *using formulaic sequences*.

3.3 Database and methodology

This study has been undertaken as part of a research project meant to analyze the speaking practices promoted the iconized franchised American systems like McDonald's and Pizza Hut in post-communist Romania. These speaking practices add a new dimension to the discourse of service encounters, which emerges with the effect of globalization and the tendencies of standardization, automatization and efficiency of society.

This research is based on the analysis of original data gathered in McDonald's restaurants in Constanta and Bucharest. The corpus contains 100 excerpts which are uncontrolled samples of face-to-face naturally occurring interactions in service encounters. The corpus amounts at approximately 5 hours of conversation. The data have been gathered through *ethnographic observation* by noting down on paper (immediately after the interaction) the natural speech event in which the researcher was a passive participant without revealing his role and identity. In noting down the data the transcription conventions of *conversation analysis* have been employed (Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson 461-65), which enabled me to render sufficient linguistic and extra-linguistic details for a fine-grained analysis. The data gathered in Bucharest are used as a control sample to check whether the linguistic patterns identified are restricted to a geographic area or can be generalized to a larger population.

Given the aim of the research project there was no attempt to control for social variables such as the age, socio-economic status or gender of the customers. I was interested in the formulaic inventory and discourse structure used by McDonald's operators, as well as the customers' contribution to the interaction. I was interested in the ritual aspects of the interactions rather than the sociolinguistic variables that accompanied them.

3.4 Discussion of findings

The overall discourse structure of the service encounter

The events for any normal transaction in a McDonald's restaurant constitute a finite system. In the normal course of events, only certain tasks can occur and they occur in certain sequences and not others. In other words, these tasks occur as a matter of routine.

The interaction routinely begins with a greeting from the operator to the customer. The greeting can be occasionally followed by a welcoming formula. The only occasions when greetings are omitted are when the customer pre-empts the greeting with a question. Quite frequently, as excerpt (1) shows, even when the customer pre-empts the greeting, the operator returns to it once pre-emptive question has been dealt with.

(1)

Customer: mai este valabila oferta pentru meniu big mac? → pre-emptive move by customer
Operator: sigur → response to pre-emptive move by the operator
buna ziua cu ce sa va servim? → opening sequence: start + welcoming formula

It is apparent from the data that, despite such pre-emptive moves from the customer, the greeting by the operator is virtually obligatory. This stands in sharp contrast to other types of service encounters (e.g. at the supermarket checkout, at the grocer's, at the chemist's, etc.) when talk may begin with a greeting to the operator from the customer, or with greetings at all.

More remarkable is the highly formulaic nature of these opening moves. The greetings follow the rules for opening conversations as established in Schegloff (1972, 2002). In other circumstances, such as telephone conversations analyzed by Schegloff (1972), interlocutors must identify themselves. In service encounters, participants omit identify each other because their identities in so far as they have a bearing on the interaction are implicit. Operators wear badges with their first names on them. These name badges worn by operators stand as the identification move. It is a convention of service encounters, however, that identification of the customers is not necessary. Customers are not generally known to the operators and even when they are it is often not by name.

Once participants have identified themselves, they must signal the beginning of the interaction. This is often done by exchanging *start formulae*

such as greetings. Their function is to be the opening move in a verbal interaction and in ordinary conversation they make up an adjacency pair. However, service encounters interchanges are not conducted between equals. Thus, in the majority of cases *the start* (i.e. the first part of the adjacency pair) is delivered by the operator and in many cases the costumers makes no reply to the start formula. The start stage of the interaction may be followed by a *welcoming formula* which routinely is not reciprocated by the customer.

START → buna ziua/ buna seara/ buna ziua bine ati venit la McDonalds/ buna ziua bine ati venit → **STOP**
Figure 1 Opening formula (start + welcoming formula)

The start of the *core action* of the matrix interchange is generally signalled by a formula the function of which is to elicit the customer's order. Occasionally this move is followed by information regarding special offers and price reductions.

STOP → doriti sa comandati/cu ce va pot servi/cu ce sa va servesc/cu ce sa va servim/pot sa va iau comanda → **STOP**
Figure 2 Elicitation formula

The obligatory constituent of the core action section is the operator's indication to the customer of the total value of the customer's order. The customer does not respond verbally to the cash call but provides payment and the operator thanks the customer for it, again with a formula. If there is change to be counted out, the operator then counts out the change, again with a formula.

START → X lei va rog/va costa X lei/X ron/in total face X/totul este X lei/face X lei/in total face X lei → **STOP**
Figure 3 Cash-call formula

START → poftiti/comanda dumneavoastra/poftiti comanda/uitati comanda dumneavoastra/aici este comanda dumneavoastra/imediat va aduc si comanda → **STOP**
Figure 4 Offering formula

START → multumesc/multumim → **STOP**
Figure 5 Receipt of cash formula

START → poftiti restu dumneavoastra/ si restu/poftiti restu/poftiti aici si restu dumneavoastra→ **STOP**

Figure 6 Change-counting formula

Once items have been placed on the tray or packed, the core action section is complete and the costumer leaves the counter and heads for the table. Following Schegloff and Sacks (289-327), it can be suggested that the *closing section* has a set of discourse constituents. The closing section may start with *back references* to what has taken place earlier in the core action of the exchange. Back references are 'thank you' formulae thanking the customer not for their money, but for the entire transaction.

START→ multumim/va multumim/va multumim si noi→ **STOP**
Figure 7 Back-reference formula

The closing section may also include a farewell formula containing *positive face strokes* (Brown and Levinson 1987) in which the operator wishes the customer well. *O zi buna* ('have a nice day') is a typical version of such a formula, which sometimes is reciprocated by the customer with a similar formula. At the extreme end of the interaction there may be a *termination move* to parallel the start move, again with a formula. *La revedere* ('good bye') is a typical formulaic sequence that exemplifies terminations.

START → o zi buna/sa aveti o zi buna in continuare/sa aveti pofta/pofta buna/o zi buna mai poftiti pe la noi/pofta buna va mai asteptam pe la noi/sa aveti pofta o zi buna va dorim/va mai asteptam/o seara buna in continuare → **STOP**
Figure 8 Positive face-stroke formula

START → la revedere/la revedere o zi buna/la revedere o zi buna in continuare/la revedere va mai asteptam/la revedere va mai asteptam pe la noi → **STOP**
Figure 9 Termination formula

It appears that operators in McDonald's restaurants make use of a particular **discourse structure** for their matrix interchanges which can be described schematically along the following lines:

Matrix interchange → Opening + Core action + Closing
Opening → Start + (Welcoming formula)

Core action → Info/elicitation formula + Total + (Receipt) + Offering formula+ Change
Closing → Back ref. + Positive face-stroke + Termination

The functions of formulaic sequences

The formulaic sequences analyzed so far function as **tools for social interaction** achieving various actions through their illocutionary forces (request for action, request for information, thanking, greeting, etc.) and triggering the corresponding perlocutionary effects. These functions relate to the speaker's manipulation of his world and the assertion of his own distinct identity or of his group identity (Wray and Perkins 14). Asserting group identity is achieved by employing a welcoming formula such as *bine ati venit la McDonalds* or positive face-stroke formulae such as *mai poftiti pe la noi*, *va mai asteptam pe la noi*, *va multumim si noi* (i.e. the person deictic item *noi* 'we' does not necessarily include a reference to the speaker only, but to the personnel working in the respective company). Identity can also be expressed through the manipulation of person deixis. Thus, shifting from first person singular verbs (e.g. *cu ce sa va servesc*) to first person plural verbs (*cu ce sa va servim*) can be another way of asserting group identity, while the reverse shift will focus on asserting individual identity. Moreover, asserting group identity can be also achieved to the extent to which this type of highly formulaic discourse is recognizable as belonging in the script of a McDonald's restaurant.

In addition to functioning as devices of social interaction, *formulaic sequences* have cognitive functions to the extent to which they are **short-cuts to processing**. As Becker points out, it makes little sense to produce from scratch those word strings which are used frequently, and apparently formulaic sequences are employed to reduce the amount of new processing to only that stretch of discourse that *has* to be new. Employing formulaic sequences becomes a convenient way of producing more linguistic input more *efficiently*.

Moreover, formulaic sequences benefit not only the speaker, but also the addressee. Strings of words stored and retrieved together are associated with agreed meanings and illocutionary forces, which may be entirely transparent or rather more indirect (e.g. *put the kettle on, will you?* meaning 'please make me a hot drink'). Thus, the benefits of prefabricated language in reducing processing effort can account for why an individual or indeed an entire speech community comes to prefer certain collocations and expressions of an idea over other equally permissible ones (Pawley and Syder 191-226).

Within the uniformed standardized system operating in McDonald's restaurants, the focus is on the transactional component whose formulaicity makes it highly efficient. The use of formulaic sequences enables both the service operator and the customer to focus their analytic abilities away from the linguistic 'packaging' and onto the production and evaluations of propositions, the updating of contextual information and the making of predictions about what is going to happen next. Thus, this *cognitive function* of formulaic sequences, i.e. *short-cut to processing*, ensures that the speaker achieves successful production while the addressee achieves successful comprehension. We can see thus how formulaic sequences are instrumental in an **efficient** and **effective** use of language. In so being, they best serve the purpose of a McDonaldized place whose alluring dimensions, as Ritzer (11) has put it, are: efficiency, calculability, predictability and control.

4. Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to set the theoretical and empirical scene for the analysis of a highly formulaic type of discourse promoted by the iconized franchised systems like McDonald's or Pizza Hut which, in today's spoken Romanian, brings forth a new dimension unknown to the discourse of commercial transactions before 1989.

The analysis of the empirical data gathered in McDonald's restaurants corroborates the hypothesis that where routine actions are accompanied by routine speech, such speech is largely formulaic. The paper has shown *formulaic sequences* to perform two sets of functions: **cognitive** and **socio-interactional**. The cognitive function of formulaic sequences relates to by-passing the generative system and thus becoming a short-cut to processing, especially in settings where competing concurrent physical actions take place. The driving force behind the processing short-cuts is ensuring that the speaker's production is fluent and that information is available when required: formulaic language by-passes, partially or entirely, depending on the form, the generative system.

At the same time, formulaic sequences are efficient socio-interactional formulae. Although these socio-interactional functions can be equally achieved by using innovative structures showing a greater degree of novelty, the examples cited has shown that, more often than not, it is formulaic sequences that speakers associate with these functions. The driving force behind the socio-interactional formulae is ensuring that the speaker gets what he/she wants and is perceived as an individual in the group. Significantly, formulaic language is better suited to this than novel language is, because an addressee is more likely to understand a message if

it is in a form he/she has heard before, and which he/she can process without recourse to full analytic decoding.

At this stage several research questions relating to the interpretation of these speaking practices arise. First, it should be pointed out that another distinctive feature of the type of transactional discourse promoted by McDonald's restaurants is the *excessive simplification* of the *phatic component* which is reduced to the minimum. The encounter's openings and closings between operator and customer can be viewed as a kind of small talk, albeit simplified, since only the exchange section is fully functional and there are other settings and/or cultures where verbal greetings and partings are much rarer in various types of commercial transactions. These characteristics raise the question as to whether this type of phatic component is interpreted, at least by within some segments of Romanian society, as artificial, given the fact that in Romanian society speakers tend to engage in interaction according to an ethos of positive politeness (Hornoiu 2004, 2006).

Second, in addition to the speaking routines analysed in this paper, McDonald's offers a story that reflects the American ideology (Caputo 50). In the States, the icon operates around the myths of *well being*, *happy family* and *beneficent technology*. Researchers have pointed that outside America, the McDonald icon is the vehicle for a significantly different story (Ciugureanu 131). The reasons why Americans go to McDonaldized places may differ from those that motivate Europeans. Thus, another research question that arises relates to the degree to which the story is adapted to the social dimensions of post-communist Romania.

WORKS CITED

Aijmer, Karin. *Conversational Routines in English*. Longman: London and New York, 1996.

Altenberg, Bengt. "Speech as Linear Composition." *Proceedings from the Fourth Nordic Conference for English Studies*. Eds. G. Caie, K. Haastrup, A.L. Jakobsen et al. Vol.1 Department of English, University of Copenhagen, 1993. 133-143.

Baayen, Harald and Rochelle Lieber. "Productivity and English Derivation: A Corpus-based Study". *Linguistics* 29. (1991): 801-843.

Barkema, Henk. "Idiomaticity in English NPs." *English Language Corpora: Design Analysis and Exploitation*. Eds. J. Aarts, P. De Hahn, N. Oostdijk Rodopi: Amsterdam, 1993. 257-278.

Becker, Joseph. "The Phrasal Lexicon." *Bolt Beranek and Newman Report No. 3081*, *AI Report No. 28.* 1975.

Bohn, Ocke-Schwen. "Formulas, Frame Structures, and Stereotypes in Early Syntactic Development: Some New Evidence from L2 Acquisition." *Linguistics* 24. (1986): 185-202.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Caputo, John. "The Rhetoric of McDonaldization. A Social Semiotic Perspective." *McDonaldization Revisited. (Critical Essays on Consumer Culture)*. Eds. M. Alfino, J.S. Caputo and R. Wynyard Westport. Connecticut, London: Praeger, 1998.

Ciugureanu, Adina. *The Boomerang Effect. A Study in Twentieth-Century American Popular Culture.* Constanța: Ex Ponto, 2002.

Coulmas, Florian. "On the Sociolinguistic Relevance of Routine Formulae." *Journal of Pragmatics* 3. (1979): 239-266.

Coulmas, Florian. "Formulaic Language." *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Ed. R.E. Asher. Oxford: Pergamon, 1994. 1292-1293.

Ellis, Rod. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Ferguson, Charles. "The Structure and Use of Politeness Formulas." *Language in Society* 5. (1976): 137-51.

Hakuta, Kenji. "Prefabricated Patterns and the Emergence of Structure in Second Language Acquisition." *Language Learning* 24. (1974): 297-297.

Hornoiu, Diana. "Small-talk in Close-contact Service Encounters." *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*. Ed. A. Cornilescu. Vol. VI. Nr. 2. Bucureşti: EUB. 2004. 66-75.

Hornoiu, Diana. "Engaging in High-involvement Style: A Balkan Speciality (?)." *Balkan Cultural Identities*. Eds. A. Ciugureanu, M. Irimia and E. Vlad. Constanta: Ovidius University Press, 2006. 307-322.

Howarth, Peter. "Phraseology and Second Language Proficiency." *Applied Linguistics* 19(1). (1998): 24-44.

Kjellmer, Goran. "Some Thoughts on Collocational Distinctiveness." *Corpus Linguistics: Recent Developments in the Use of Computer Corpora in English Language Research*. Eds. J. Aarts, W. Meijs. Rodopi: Amsterdam, 1984. 163-171.

Krashen, Stephen and Scarcella, Robin. "On Routines and Pattern in Second Language Acquisition and Performance." *Language Learning* 28. (1978): 283-300.

Lattey, Elsa. "Pragmatic Classification of Idioms as an Aid for the Language Learner." IRAL 24 (3). (1986): 217-233

Miller, Jim, and Regina Weinert. *Spontaneous Spoken Language. Syntax and Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Meritt, Marilyn. "On Questions Following Questions in Service Encounters." *Language in Society* 5. (1976): 315-57.

Moon, Rosamund. *Fixed Expressions and Idioms in English*. Oxford: Claredon Press, 1998.

Nattinger, James, and Jeannette de Carrico. *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Ochs, Elinor, Emmanuel Schegloff and Sandra Thompson. *Interaction and Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Pawley, Andrew and Syder Frances Hodgetts. "Two Puzzles for Linguistic Theory: Native like Selection and Native like Fluency." *Language and Communication*. Eds. J.C. Richards, R.W. Schimdt Longman: New York, 1983. 191-226.

Radford, Andrew. *Syntactic Theory and the Structure of English*,.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Renouf, Antoinette. "What Do You Think of That? A Pilot Study of the Phraseology of the Core Words of English." *New Directions in English Language Corpora: Methodology, Results, Software Developments*. Ed. G. Leitner. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin, 1992. 301- 317.

Renouf, Antoinette and John Sinclair. "Collocational Frameworks in English." *English Corpus Linguistics: Studies in the Honour of Jan Svartvik*. Eds. K. Aijmer and B. Altenberg Longman: London, 1991. 128-143.

Ritzer, George *The McDonaldization of Society (New Century Edition)*.Thousand Oaks, California, London, New Delhi: Pine Forge Press, 2000.

Schegloff, Emmanuel. "Sequencing in Conversational Openings." *American Anthropologist* 70 (1972): 1075-1095.

Schegloff, Emmanuel. "On Opening Sequencing: a Framing Statement". *Perpetual Contact: Mobile Communication, Private Talk, Public Performance*. Eds. James E. Katz and Mark A. Aakus, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 321-385.

Schegloff, Emmanuel and Harvey Sacks. "Opening up Closings." *Semiotica* 7. (1973): 289-327.

Tannen, Deborah. *Taking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Van Lancker, Diana Roupas. "Nonpropositional Speech: Neorolinguistic Studies." *Progress in the Psychology of Language*. Ed. A.W. Ellis. Vol. 3. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1987. 49-118.

Verstraten, Linda. "Fixed Phrases in Monolingual Learners' Dictionaries." *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*. Eds. P.J.L. Arnaud and H. Bejoint. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992. 28-40.

Wray, Alison and Michael Perkins. "The Functions of Formulaic Language: an Integrated Model." *Language & Communication* 20. (2000): 1-28.