PEDAGOGICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR INTEGRATING REDUPLICATIVE UNITS INTO EFL CURRICULA: A COGNITIVE-PRAGMATIC APPROACH

Musaboyeva Lutfiya Ne'matjon qizi
Master's student, AIFU
Phone: +998 94 506 00 95
E-mail: musaboyevalutfiya@gmail.com
DOI:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23003059

ANNOTATSIYA: Mazkur tezisda ingliz tilini chet tili sifatida o'qitish (EFL) jarayonida reduplikativ birliklarni o'quv dasturlariga integratsiya qilishning pedagogik va metodik asoslari kognitiv-pragmatik yondashuv nuqtai nazaridan tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotda to'liq takror (bye-bye), ablaut takror (zigzag, chit-chat), rifmali takror (helter-skelter, teeny-weeny) hamda kontrastiv fokus reduplikatsiyasi (salad-salad) kabi turlarning shakliy motivatsiyasi va nutqiy vaziyatdagi pragmatik funksiyalari (ekspressivlik, intensivlik, baholash, norasmiylik, affektivlik) yoritiladi. Ushbu birliklarning ikonik va fonologik jihatdan motivatsiyalanganligi ularni ongli ravishda o'zlashtirishga va uzoq muddatli xotirada saqlashga imkon berishi asoslab beriladi. Natijada "anglash – tizimlashtirish – kontekstlashtirish – faol qo'llash" bosqichlaridan iborat to'rt bosqichli metodik model taklif etiladi va uni B1–C1 darajadagi o'quv dasturlariga tatbiq etish yo'llari ko'rsatib beriladi.

Kalit so'zlar: reduplikatsiya, reduplikativ birliklar, EFL, kognitiv lingvistika, pragmatik kompetensiya, formulaik til, leksik yondashuv, ikoniklik, o'quv dasturi, metodik model.

ABSTRACT: This thesis examines the pedagogical and methodological foundations for integrating reduplicative units into English as a Foreign Language (EFL) curricula from a cognitive-pragmatic perspective. It considers full reduplication (bye-bye), ablaut reduplication (zigzag, chit-chat), rhyme reduplication (helter-skelter, teeny-weeny) and contrastive focus reduplication (salad-salad), focusing on their formal motivation and their pragmatic functions in discourse, namely expressiveness, intensification, evaluation, informality and affect. It is argued that the iconic and phonological motivation of these units allows learners to acquire them through insight rather than rote memorisation and supports their long-term retention. As a result, a four-stage methodological model – noticing, systematisation, contextualisation and productive use – is proposed, and ways of implementing it in B1–C1 level syllabi are outlined.

Keywords: reduplication, reduplicative units, EFL, cognitive linguistics, pragmatic competence, formulaic language, lexical approach, iconicity, curriculum design, methodological model.

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary foreign language education, communicative competence is increasingly understood not merely as mastery of grammar and single-word vocabulary but as the ability to use multi-word, conventionalised and expressively marked units appropriately in real communication. Among such units, reduplicative formations occupy a distinctive place. Words such as chit-chat, flip-flop, hodgepodge, willy-nilly, okey-dokey or fancy-shmancy are highly frequent in informal spoken English, in media

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

discourse and in literary dialogue, yet they remain peripheral in most EFL textbooks and syllabi. Learners therefore often recognise them only vaguely, avoid them in production, or use them in pragmatically inappropriate contexts.

The English reduplicative stock is neither small nor random. As early as 1963, N. Thun collected more than two thousand reduplicative formations and demonstrated that they follow recurrent structural patterns and are concentrated in informal, emotive and child-directed registers[1]. From the standpoint of modern phraseology, such items belong to the broader domain of formulaic language, which, according to A. Wray, is stored and retrieved as prefabricated wholes and plays a central role in fluency and native-like selection[2]. Consequently, the systematic teaching of reduplicative units is directly linked to learners' lexical fluency and to the naturalness of their speech.

The aim of this thesis is to substantiate a cognitive-pragmatic framework for integrating reduplicative units into EFL curricula. The objectives are: (1) to summarise linguistic research on the structure and motivation of English reduplication; (2) to identify the pragmatic functions that make these units pedagogically relevant; and (3) to propose a stage-based methodological model applicable at intermediate and advanced levels.

Research on reduplication has developed along three interrelated lines: structural-phonological, semantic-cognitive and pragmatic-discursive. Within the structural tradition, N. Thun's monograph remains the most comprehensive descriptive source, classifying English reduplicatives into identical, ablaut and rhyme types and noting their stylistic markedness. D. Minkova later showed that ablaut reduplication is governed by strict prosodic regularities: the vowel of the first element is almost always higher and fronter than that of the second, as in tick-tock, ping-pong, riff-raff, and the pattern is closely connected with rhythm and verbal art[3]. This regularity is highly significant for teaching, since a predictable pattern can be explicitly presented to learners as a mnemonic rule.

From a morphological and typological perspective, S. Inkelas and C. Zoll interpret reduplication as morphological doubling motivated by meaning rather than by purely phonological copying[4]. Their Morphological Doubling Theory emphasises that the repeated element carries semantic content such as plurality, intensity, iteration or attenuation. This view is consistent with the cognitive notion of iconicity, according to which "more form" tends to signal "more meaning": repetition of form iconically reflects repetition, intensity or diversity in the denoted situation.

Pragmatic research has substantially broadened the understanding of reduplication. J. Ghomeshi, R. Jackendoff, N. Rosen and K. Russell described contrastive focus reduplication in English, as in I'll make the tuna salad and you make the salad-salad, where the doubled item singles out the prototypical, "real"

---

[1] Thun N. Reduplicative Words in English: A Study of Formations of the Types Tick-tick, Hurly-burly and Shilly-shally. – Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1963. – P. 11–15.

[2] Wray A. Formulaic Language and the Lexicon. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. – P. 9.

[3] Minkova D. Ablaut reduplication in English: the criss-crossing of prosody and verbal art // English Language and Linguistics. – 2002. – Vol. 6, No. 1. – P. 133–169.

[4] Inkelas S., Zoll C. Reduplication: Doubling in Morphology. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. – P. 6–9.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

instance of a category[5]. This construction demonstrates that reduplication in English is productive and context-dependent, and that its interpretation requires the hearer to infer the speaker's intention – a clear illustration of the interaction between cognitive categorisation and pragmatic inference. Similarly, shm-reduplication (fancy-shmancy, Oedipus-Shmoedipus) conveys dismissive or ironic evaluation, which learners can hardly grasp without explicit pragmatic instruction.

In applied linguistics, the lexical approach advanced by M. Lewis shifted attention from isolated words to chunks and fixed expressions as the basic building blocks of language teaching. Building on cognitive linguistics, F. Boers and S. Lindstromberg provided empirical evidence that raising learners' awareness of the motivation behind figurative and phraseological units – including phonological patterns such as alliteration and assonance – significantly improves comprehension and retention[6]. Since reduplicatives are strongly motivated by sound symbolism, rhyme and ablaut, they represent an ideal testing ground for this "insightful learning" paradigm.

Finally, research on second language pragmatics shows that pragmatic competence does not develop automatically alongside grammatical proficiency. G. Kasper and K. R. Rose argue that explicit instruction combined with meaningful practice is more effective than exposure alone in developing learners' sensitivity to register, politeness and speaker stance[7]. Because reduplicative units are strongly register-bound and often signal familiarity, irony or affect, their use constitutes a pragmatic as well as a lexical skill. Nevertheless, the literature reveals a clear gap: while the linguistic description of reduplication is well advanced, integrated methodological frameworks for teaching it in EFL contexts remain scarce.

On the basis of the reviewed studies, a four-stage cognitive-pragmatic model is proposed. At the noticing stage, learners encounter reduplicatives in authentic input – dialogues, podcasts, film excerpts, comics – and identify doubled forms, which activates attention to form-meaning connections. At the systematisation stage, the teacher guides learners in classifying units into identical, ablaut, rhyme, shm- and contrastive focus types and makes the underlying motivation explicit (for example, the i–a–o vowel sequence in zigzag, flip-flop, tick-tock). At the contextualisation stage, learners analyse pragmatic value: register, degree of informality, evaluative colouring and possible face-threatening effects, comparing reduplicatives with their neutral equivalents (chit-chat vs. conversation). At the productive use stage, learners employ the units in role-plays, creative writing and discourse-completion tasks, receiving feedback on both accuracy and appropriateness.

In terms of curriculum design, identical and simple rhyme forms (bye-bye, teeny-weeny) are recommended for the B1 level; ablaut forms and common idiomatic reduplicatives (wishy-washy, hotchpotch) for B2; and pragmatically complex types such as contrastive focus and shm-reduplication for C1. Contrastive analysis with learners' first language, where reduplication is also a productive device

---

[5] Ghomeshi J., Jackendoff R., Rosen N., Russell K. Contrastive focus reduplication in English (the salad-salad paper) // Natural Language & Linguistic Theory. – 2004. – Vol. 22, No. 2. – P. 307–357.

[6] Boers F., Lindstromberg S. Cognitive Linguistic Approaches to Teaching Vocabulary and Phraseology. – Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008. – P. 1–24.

[7] Kasper G., Rose K. R. Pragmatic Development in a Second Language. – Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. – P. 237–260.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

(e.g. Uzbek asta-sekin, katta-katta), may further facilitate positive transfer while preventing false equivalence.

CONCLUSION

The analysis demonstrates that English reduplicative units are not marginal curiosities but a structurally regular, cognitively motivated and pragmatically rich layer of the lexicon. Their phonological regularities and iconic meaning make them particularly suitable for insight-based rather than rote learning, while their register sensitivity and evaluative functions make them an effective vehicle for developing pragmatic competence. The proposed four-stage model – noticing, systematisation, contextualisation and productive use – integrates these cognitive and pragmatic dimensions and allows reduplicatives to be introduced gradually and purposefully across proficiency levels. Future research should verify the effectiveness of the model through experimental studies, develop graded corpora-based inventories of reduplicative units for EFL learners, and design assessment instruments measuring both lexical and pragmatic mastery of these units.

REFERENCES

1. Boers F., Lindstromberg S. Cognitive Linguistic Approaches to Teaching Vocabulary and Phraseology. – Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008. – 390 p.
2. Ghomeshi J., Jackendoff R., Rosen N., Russell K. Contrastive focus reduplication in English (the salad-salad paper) // Natural Language & Linguistic Theory. – 2004. – Vol. 22, No. 2. – P. 307–357.
3. Inkelas S., Zoll C. Reduplication: Doubling in Morphology. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. – 268 p.
4. Kasper G., Rose K. R. Pragmatic Development in a Second Language. – Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. – 368 p.
5. Lewis M. The Lexical Approach: The State of ELT and a Way Forward. – Hove: Language Teaching Publications, 1993. – 200 p.
6. Minkova D. Ablaut reduplication in English: the criss-crossing of prosody and verbal art // English Language and Linguistics. – 2002. – Vol. 6, No. 1. – P. 133–169.
7. Thun N. Reduplicative Words in English: A Study of Formations of the Types Tick-tick, Hurly-burly and Shilly-shally. – Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1963. – 348 p.
8. Wray A. Formulaic Language and the Lexicon. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. – 332 p.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.