

TEACHING SPANISH PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS TO ROMANIAN LEARNERS: DIDACTIC CHALLENGES

Marius RĂDOI

Instituto Cervantes de Bucarest / Universidad de Valladolid
mradoi@cervantes.es

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to provide a general overview of the most relevant empirical works in recent years focused on contrastive and applied phraseology to didactics of Spanish as a foreign language in both international and Romanian fields. We reflect on controversial issues such as the appropriate level for introducing the idiomatic component in the classroom, the creation and organization of a phraseological database, the relevant criteria for developing materials and the typology of activities. Moreover, we analyze the role of lexicographic sources and the theories of curricular documents, aiming to provide general methodological considerations with educational implication.

Keywords: *Phraseological Units; Didactics of Phraseology; Spanish as a Foreign Language.*

1. Introduction

Ruiz Gurillo (2000) complained that phraseology has not been treated with due depth and that in the Spanish textbooks for foreigners the space devoted to it was minimal. Although in the recent years we have witnessed a significant number of theoretical studies and several more applied proposals (sometimes hand in hand, in integrative works such as BA thesis or doctoral dissertations), we still lack a wide number of studies didactically “designed”. The field of contrastive phraseology has generated valuable works that sometimes include ideas and materials for teaching phraseological units (hereinafter PUs), aimed at a specific target audience comprised of native speakers of several languages: German (Aguilar Ruiz, Larreta Zuluategi), English (Leal Riol), Portuguese (Saracho), Spanish (Strohschen), Italian (D’Andrea, Minervini), Chinese (Wu Fan), Arabic (Salem, Haddouch, Sagban), etc.

With respect to the contrastive phraseology Spanish – Romanian, we have collected several papers: firstly, we owe Pisot (2003) a set of practical exercises for beginners and, above all, two important lexicographical works he co-authored: *Dictionar spaniol-român de expresii și locuțiuni* (2002) and *Dicționar român-spaniol de expresii și locuțiuni* (2005). Ortega (2006) focuses on

contrastive paremia, Rădulescu (2005, 2006, 2009) on the set expressions generated by support verbs, Oprica (2013, 2014) on specific onomasiological fields, Dumbrăvescu (2017) on communicative functions and (inter)cultural aspects, while Duță (2014) emphasizes somatic verbal idioms in Spanish and Romanian, which she analyzes from a morphosyntactic and semantic perspective. However, in the field of didactics of Spanish phraseology aimed at Romanian students we do not count on an extensive study that answers questions that are still current, such as: what type of phraseology to teach, how, when and even why.

2. From the early stages

In the first place, the great debate revolves around which is the best phase for introducing the idiomatic component in Spanish as foreign language (S/FL) materials.

In the field of Spanish didactics, we rely on two fundamental documents, which mark the roadmap in curriculum design, the creation of materials and the evaluation, in short, they articulate the global vision of what it means teaching and learning Spanish in the recent years: The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and The Cervantes Institute Curricular Plan (PCIC). Apart from several exceptions (routine formulas), both documents relegate phraseology to the levels of effective operational proficiency and mastery (C1-C2), since they consider the language component a mere indicator of the speaker's competence, not an essential element of the language. This view is shared by many theorists (López Vázquez, Ruiz Gurillo), who consider that learners should have sufficient linguistic resources before being exposed to formulaic language.

However, we share another line of thinking (Muñoz-Basols, Leal Riol, Saracho, etc.): if the native speakers recur to the use of PUs constantly, as long as they are present in conversations, songs, movies, media and advertising, it is inconceivable for the PUs to not be incorporated into teaching, even from the initial level.

A learner may not have sufficient resources to fully understand a fixed and idiomatic unit. Nevertheless

(...) if at the first levels other units receive a superficial treatment for their introduction and initiation and then they are studied in more depth in the following intermediate, advanced and superior levels, then why not apply this approach at the phraseological units (Leal Riol 2011:58)¹.

When referring to the place that the PUs occupy in the classroom, in textbooks and, by extension, in the teacher's perception of the value of phraseological content, Leal Riol (2011) states that Spanish phraseology is not taught in the S/FL classroom.

¹ (...) si en los primeros niveles otras unidades reciben un tratamiento superficial para su introducción e iniciación y luego se estudian con más profundidad en los siguientes niveles intermedio, avanzado y superior, entonces por qué no plantear eso con las unidades fraseológicas.

Forment Fernández (1998: 340) also points out that the reference to the PUs in the initial and intermediate level materials is basically non-existent, as “these idioms present morphological and syntactic peculiarities that would only make it difficult to retain the paradigmatic aspects of the linguistic system and, consequently, it seems appropriate not to introduce its teaching until the learner has mastered these basic rules²”. Notwithstanding these difficulties, she acknowledges the great interest that this part of the vocabulary sparks in the learners, and the intrinsic motivation that they demonstrate through the set expressions, due to the spontaneity that they bestow on the speech. As a didactization proposal, she provides lists of phrases developed around several lexemes (“boca”, “cabeza”, “ojo”, “pie”) and justifies her choice by “the unequivocal relationship between some parts of the body and certain activities or states that people develop through them. Furthermore, this is a fact that occurs for all of humanity, so we will have found at this point some of the phrases that can be translated almost literally into many languages³” (1998: 344). She recommends that the most motivated PUs should be taught at the beginning level, since “the clarity of the image behind the expression allows the student to avoid any sort of problem in reaching the idiomatic meaning⁴” (1988: 345).

Likewise, Navarro (2007) delves into the importance of the possible, necessary and gradually introduction of phraseology from the very early stages, especially in the case of related languages. Rodríguez and Bernardo Vila (2011) reiterate the same belief, according to which the introduction of phraseological elements should be carried out from initial levels:

just as a native speaker acquires them from his first contact with the language, initially as a passive competence and later as an active competence, a learner must be exposed to L2 in a natural way. In addition, the phraseological units introduced gradually encourage the development of metaphorical, ironic and referential skills⁵ (Rodríguez y Bernardo Vila 2011:171).

We share the same postulates and we promote the teaching of the PUs from the initial level, especially in the case of two related languages, such as Spanish and Romanian.

² estas locuciones presentan peculiaridades morfológicas y sintácticas que no harían más que dificultar la retención de los aspectos paradigmáticos del sistema lingüístico y, consecuentemente, parece apropiado no introducir su enseñanza hasta que el aprendiz ya domine esas reglas básicas.

³ la relación inequívoca entre algunas partes del cuerpo y ciertas actividades o estados que las personas desarrollan con ellas. Además, este es un hecho que se da para toda la humanidad, por lo que habremos encontrado en este punto algunas de las locuciones que se pueden traducir casi literalmente a muchas lenguas.

⁴ la claridad de la imagen que está detrás de la expresión hace que el alumno no tenga ningún problema en llegar al significado idiomático.

⁵ al igual que un nativo los adquiere desde su primer contacto con la lengua, en principio como competencia pasiva y más adelante como competencia activa, un aprendiente de una lengua debe estar expuesto a la L2 de modo natural. Además, las unidades fraseológicas introducidas de modo gradual incentivan el desarrollo de las competencias metafórica, irónica y referencial.

3. Selecting and organizing PUs

Another element to take into account is the correct selection of the phraseological component that one must bring to the classroom. We consider essential to carry out prior planning and to operate a correct grading. At the initial and intermediate levels, it is advisable to select only idioms belonging to the variety of standard Spanish spoken in the Peninsula and to discard all those PUs whose meaning is unknown to all native speakers. Although the term is somewhat debatable, we agree with Penadés (2019) that it is necessary to focus on those productions of "current" use, although the period of time included under this term is less scientific. Nonetheless, it is undoubtedly that those archaic or obsolete expressions must be discarded in order to avoid what we could metaphorically label as the "you speak like Don Quixote" syndrome.

Unlike the filters with which *Diccionario de Locuciones Idiomáticas del Español Actual* (DILEA) operates, we also exclude the vulgar utterances and slang, despite the fact that they generate a high number of set expressions which are actively used in the language. We consider that at the initial and intermediate levels the presence of these PUs is not justified as the learners do not yet master the speech registers (educated norm, formal, informal register, etc.) Therefore, these vulgar elements carry the risk of generating pragmatic prone mistakes in future oral or written productions.

Fundamentally, the answer to the challenging question of which phraseology to teach is very complex and subjective. We agree with Pisot (2003) that

The truth is the teaching proposals for PUs appear wrapped in a halo of prudence that avoids all dogmatism, probably because their introduction into the classroom is still a decision of the teacher - usually when addressing semantic fields or tasks - inevitably presided over by a large index of subjectivity (Pisot 2003: 33)⁶.

Regarding the internal organization of the corpus, we notice the desire to create PUs databases, following different criteria, but (in many cases) similar interests: Rădoi (2021), Saracho (2015), Duță (2014), Leal Riol (2011), etc. focus on a specific onomasiological field, on a specific student target and/or on certain levels. Our analysis strongly highlights that nowadays it is impossible to conceive a database that is not virtual. Authors such as González and Mogorrón Huerta (2011: 10-11) already warned of the:

⁶ Lo cierto es que las propuestas de enseñanza de UFS aparecen envueltas en un halo de prudencia que evita todo dogmatismo, probablemente porque su introducción en el aula no deja de ser una decisión del profesor/a – normalmente al abordar campos semánticos o tareas – inevitablemente presidida por un gran índice de subjetividad).

need to develop computerized linguistic databases, according to various criteria, that facilitate the handling of information in an acceptable way and, due to the conditions of the tool, speed up the process of assigning a better equivalence in each case, either by consulting them thoroughly, either by Automatic Language Processing (ALP)⁷.

In an increasingly technological world, we are fortunate to have numerous work instruments and collaborative digital tools in the cloud. Versatile, easily accessible and with a very intuitive handling, these software provide us with a scaffolding to form a lively database: set expression in Spanish, its definition, its Romanian equivalents (if applicable), usage and registration explanations, degree of transparency, morphosyntactic clarifications, restrictions, recommended level for teaching, issues of cultural nature, etc.

4. Didactic actions

When designing activities, one should take into account modern methodological and didactic principles. Starting from the communicative approach as a fundamental postulate, we support an integration of elements, materials and tasks: although at first sight they may seem obsolete, if they respect the learning style of our students, their long educational tradition and they provide concrete results, we do not exclude any type of activity in the classroom. In this sense, we partake the concept of “method” as being out of date, in accordance with Kumaradivelu (2001) and Brown (2002) theories.

The designed materials should meet a number of requirements. Our immediate reality, with classes, projects and online exams through various platforms (ZOOM, GOOGLE CLASSROOM, SEESAW, MICROSOFT TEAMS, etc.), shows us once again the importance of the versatility of materials, which go from print to digital format. It is essential to design flexible materials, easily adjustable to other formats and tools (such as kahoot.it, thinglink.com, bubbl.us, genial.ly, etc.). Likewise, the teacher can integrate them into the inverted class or subject them to gamification techniques.

We share in its entirety Tomilson's criteria (1998) to develop high quality materials for the foreign language class: materials should achieve impact, should help learners to feel at ease and develop confidence, should require and facilitate self-investment from the learners. Learners should perceive what they are being taught as relevant and useful, must be ready to acquire the elements

⁷ necesidad de elaborar bases de datos lingüísticas informatizadas, según criterios diversos, que faciliten el manejo de la información de forma aceptable y, por las condiciones de la herramienta, agilizar el proceso de asignación de una mejor equivalencia en cada caso, bien consultándolas bien por medio del tratamiento automático del lenguaje (TAL).

taught and focus on the linguistic features of the input. Furthermore, materials should expose the learners to an authentic use of the language, should provide them with the opportunity to use the target language to achieve communicative purposes, should take into account that the positive effects of instruction are usually delayed. They also should take into account that learners differ in learning styles, in affective attitudes, and should maximize the learning potential by encouraging intellectual, aesthetic and emotional involvement, which stimulates both right and left-brain activities. Materials should not rely extensively on controlled practice and should provide opportunities for outcome feedback. All these requirements are even more evident in the case of the didactics of phraseology, which entails further difficulties due to the very nature of PUs: formal fixation and semantic idiomaticity.

Seradilla Castaño (2011), also in favor of teaching/learning the PUs from the initial stages, considers that the teacher should set aside metalinguistic explanations and must carefully weigh the amount of phraseological input, so that it is not excessively forced in real life.

(...) this teaching-learning process must start from real language input and, on the other hand, and although it may be debatable since many works go along this line, I want to point out that I am not in favor of teaching phraseology through a single base term, that is, for example, to teach all phrases that contain the word *mano*: *estar mano sobre mano, echar una mano, dar la mano, ir de mano en mano, abrir la mano, estar en buenas manos, poner la mano, ser la mano derecha...* I consider that these expressions belong to very different areas and their assimilation can be difficult since the student might get confused and mix them up if exposed to them jointly in the same session. Fernández Prieto (2004) is positioning along the same lines (Seradilla Castaño 2011: 81-82).⁸

Although we essentially agree with this theory, we consider the introduction of several activities that revolve around a certain lexeme useful, convinced that the range of learning styles is very wide, that learners interact in different ways with information and that each one (depending on cognitive, cultural and other motivational parameters) organizes and processes it differently. However, the common thread of all activities should be the communication function, which provides, in our opinion, the greatest guarantee of success. In order to render credibility to the

⁸ este proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje debe partir de modelos reales de lengua y, por otro lado, y aunque puede resultar discutible ya que muchos trabajos van en esta línea, quiero señalar que no soy partidaria de enseñar la fraseología a través de un único término base, es decir, por ejemplo, enseñar todas las locuciones que contienen la palabra *mano*: *estar mano sobre mano, echar una mano, dar la mano, ir de mano en mano, abrir la mano, estar en buenas manos, poner la mano, ser la mano derecha...* Considero que estas expresiones pertenecen a ámbitos muy diversos y su asimilación puede verse dificultada ya que el alumno puede liarse y mezclar unas con otras si se expone a ellas de forma conjunta en una misma sesión. En la misma línea se posiciona Fernández Prieto (2004).

didactic proposals, it is necessary to integrate several functions in a single activity, as a faithful reflection of the speech specific to the native, who does not limit his/her productions to a single semantic field, does not isolate the communicative functions or restrict messages to a limited number of lexemes or PUs: personal and social relationships, information and communication, communicative actions, feelings, opinions, tastes and preferences, descriptions, references to physical needs and everyday realities, just to mention the large groups contemplated by the PCIC. Aspects of everyday reality such as politics, sports or advertising largely recur to the idiomatic component and, furthermore, they represent an ideal vehicle to provide visual support to the PU. The activities should aim to increase the communicative and phraseological competence of the Romanians learning Spanish as a foreign language due to the acquisition of contextualized PUs, as well as promote their linguistic awareness regarding certain phenomena such as fixation and idiomaticity, reflecting on them from a contrastive perspective and giving value to L1; in the same time, they should motivate the students and provide them with more information and control of their learning process, of which they are the true protagonists.

Regarding the typology of activities, it is necessary to find a balance between skills, never letting aside the importance of “action”, as understood in the terms set by the CEFR: “The action-based approach (...) also takes into account the cognitive, emotional and volitional resources and the full range of abilities specific to and applied by the individual as a social agent” (CEFR 2001: 9).

In activities that promote interpretive skills, it is advisable to select authentic texts (sometimes previously manipulated), since

Using realia can make the learning process meaningful and more memorable for the learners as they can connect it with their real life, thus, adding a new dimension in the language learning process. They feel motivated and get involved with the learning process as they can apply their knowledge in everyday situations (Tasubha and Nusrat 2017: 1).

There are multiple possible tasks: reading texts and identifying PUs, filling in the blank spaces in a text with one or more words, answering questions about a text, mimicking what a text says, summarizing a text, organizing a text and / or PUs that appear in a text, translating a text, etc. In what concerns the tasks that correspond to expressive skills: brainstorming, conversations about topics of interest, role-playing games and dialogues that reflect real situations (to activate oral expression) and a wide set of tasks to reinforce written expression: write / answer letters and messages, express personal opinions in short compositions, create slogans and advertising campaigns, complete stories, turn a diary into a report, etc. All activities should introduce as much cultural content as possible, encourage cooperation in the classroom, and cover a wide range of topics.

Regarding the presentation of the meaning of the PUs, after analyzing the monolingual dictionaries, we verified that the definitions provided often exceed the difficulty of the phraseological unit itself, sometimes more transparent, explicit or suggestive. It is by no means a

criticism directed at lexicographers, since the recipients of these explanations are native speakers. However, an S/FL learner who is exposed to these types of definitions could lose motivation and feel frustration. In the case of bilingual dictionaries, explanations of use are lacking; restrictions applicable on numerous occasions (diastratic, diaphasic or diatopic). It is the teacher's duty, therefore, to act as an intermediary, adapt the input and provide clearer, more illuminating and, above all, contextualized definitions.

We have reached the conviction that this part of the language is the one that best suits a contrastive approach, that is, morphology or syntax can be treated from a more global perspective, for a “universal” target student body, whereas in the case of the phraseological component, the creators of materials always bear in mind a final recipient of the “product” (in our specific case, the Romanian S/ FE learners).

5. Conclusions

Our direct and personal experience in the classroom attests to the total involvement of the learners, who are even preparing (we would even dare to say “premeditating”) the ideal communicative context to insert the phraseological element newly learned. Romanian students feel motivated by these types of structures that bring them closer to native speakers and improve their lexical competence in general and phraseological competence in particular. Therefore, it is unthinkable to reach a level comparable to that of a native speaker in the target language without appropriating the PUs. Regarding the instruction process,

(...) teachers need to be made aware of why metaphor and figurative language in general is so important for language proficiency. We believe that without awareness it will be difficult to provoke sufficient enthusiasm for rethinking the language teaching curriculum in general and the Spanish curriculum in particular. As Vygotsky (1986) insisted with regard to education, theoretical knowledge disconnected from practical activity results in intellectualism, but practical activity without theoretical thinking is most often pointless (Lantolf and Bobrova 2014: 60).

We reiterate our conviction that is necessary to introduce the idiomatic component from the early stages of learning and we agree with Muñoz Basols (2016) on the advantages of using a contrastive approach to the morphosyntactic structures and metaphors underlying the PUs, in order to frame the samples and to bolster the development of strategies that lead to the correct storage of these structures in the long term. The contrastive aspect is of vital importance: the fact that the PUs have a total, partial or zero equivalence in both languages has repercussions when it comes to its understanding, subsequent production and selecting the appropriate level for insertion.

Related languages, Spanish and Romanian, share not only morphosyntactic structures, but also an important cultural background. This aspect fosters the acquisition of the phraseological

component, fundamental in the construction of a communicative competence. The main vector in the teaching/learning process is the learner. With an adequate, modern and effective methodology that respects his/her learning style, the phraseology in the S/FL classroom could be “smooth as silk” and “piece of cake”.

References

- Aguilar Ruiz, M.J. (2011). Enseñanza de E/LE y fraseología: algunas consideraciones teórico-prácticas para la enseñanza de fraseología a aprendices germano-hablantes (I). *Foro de Profesores de E/LE* (7),1-11. <https://doi.org/10.7203/foroele.0.6680>
- Brown, H.D. (2002). English Language Teaching in the “Post-Method” Era: Toward Better Diagnosis, Treatment, and Assessment, J. C., Richardsy W. A. Renandya (Eds.). *Methodology on Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*, 9-18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190.003>
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of References for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Language Policy Unit Strasbourg: Cambridge University Press.
- D’Andrea, L. (2019). *Las construcciones con verbo soporte en español y en italiano: análisis contrastivo y aplicación didáctica a E/LE*. (Doctoral dissertation). Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- Dumbrăvescu, D. (2017) Una perspectiva contrastiva en rumano y español sobre las unidades fraseológicas que expresan confianza/ desconfianza y facilidad / dificultad, *Intertext* 1-2 (41-42) 150-160.
- Duță, O. (2014). *Paralelismos estructurales y semánticos en la fraseología del español y rumano*. (Doctoral dissertation). Bucharest: Universitatea din București.
- Forment Fernández, M. (1998). La didáctica de la fraseología ayer y hoy: del aprendizaje memorístico al agrupamiento en los repertorios de funciones comunicativas. *Actas del ASELE VIII*, Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, 339-347.
- Gómez Molina, J.R. (2000). Las unidades fraseológicas del español: una propuesta metodológica para la enseñanza de las locuciones en la clase de ELE. *Quaderns de Filología. Estudis Linguistics* V, Universitat de València, 111-134.
- Haddouch, B. (2013). *Las unidades fraseológicas en la enseñanza del español: caso del alumnado marroquí del Instituto Cervantes de Tetuán* (Doctoral dissertation). Rabat: Universidad Mohamed V Agdal.
- Instituto Cervantes (2006). *Plan Curricular del Instituto Cervantes*. Madrid: Instituto Cervantes – Biblioteca Nueva.
- Kumaravadelu, B. (2001). Toward a Postmethod Pedagogy, *Tesol Quarterly* 35(4), 537-560. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3588427>

- Lantolf, J. and Bobrova, L. (2014) Metaphor instruction in the L2 Spanish classroom: theoretical argument and pedagogical program, *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, 1 (1), 46-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2014.898515>
- Larreta Zuluategui, J.P. (2001). *Fraseología contrastiva del alemán y el español. Teoría y práctica a partir de un corpus bilingüe de somatismos*, Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.
- Leal Riol, M^a. J. (2011). *La enseñanza de la fraseología en español como lengua extranjera. Estudio comparativo dirigido a estudiantes anglófonos*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- Minervini, R. (2019). Las expresiones idiomáticas en la enseñanza/aprendizaje de E/LE: un estudio sobre el nivel intermedio (B1/B2). *Rhesis: International Journal of Linguistics, Philology and Literature*, 10.1. Cagliari: Università degli Studi di Cagliari.
- Muñoz-Basols, J. (2015). Enseñanza del léxico idiomático. *Enciclopedia de Lingüística Hispánica* (coord. Gutiérrez-Rexach, J.), London: Routledge, 422-453.
- Navarro, C. (2007). Fraseología contrastiva del español y el italiano (análisis de un corpus bilingüe). *Tonos Digital* (13) 1-21.
- Oprica, D. (2013). Estudio intercultural de las unidades fraseológicas rumanas relativas a los alimentos. *Paremia* (22), 135-148.
- Oprica, D. (2014). Las unidades fraseológicas rumanas relativas al hogar y su correspondencia española. *Paremia* (23), 187-198.
- Ortega Román, J.J. (2006). Paremia y fraseología comparadas españolas y rumanas: buscando equivalencias, acercando idiomas. *Paremia* (15), 73-81.
- Penadés, I. (2019). *Diccionario de Locuciones Idiomáticas del Español Actual* (on-line) <http://www.diccionariodilea.es/inicio>
- Pisot, R., Mahalu, L. and Teodorovici, C. (2002). *Dicționar spaniol-român de expresii și locuțiuni*. Iași: Polirom.
- Pisot García, R. (2003) Fraseología en el aula de español. Aplicación didáctica de un glosario, *Forma* (6), SGEL, 29-64.
- Rădoi, M. (2021). *Unidades fraseológicas somáticas: análisis contrastivo español-rumano y aplicación a E/LE* (Doctoral dissertation), Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- Rădulescu, R. A. (2005). Construcciones idiomáticas con el verbo “salir” en español, inglés y rumano. *Verba hispánica* (13), 99-112. <https://doi.org/10.4312/vh.13.1.99-111>
- Rădulescu, R. A. (2006). Verbo de habla no convencionales en español y rumano: estudio contrastivo de expresiones idiomáticas con los verbos *dar* y *bate*. En M. Villayandre Llamazares (Ed.), *Actas del XXXV Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística*. León: Universidad de León, 1546-1564.
- Rădulescu, R. A. (2009). Sobre cuánto puede dar de sí el verbo *dar* en fraseologismos españoles y rumanos. *Fronteras de un diccionario: las palabras en movimiento*, 469-500.
- Rodríguez, M. and Bernardo Vila, N. (2011). La importancia del léxico y su didáctica: introducción al aprendizaje de refranes y expresiones, *VIII Jornadas de EPELE*, Nápoles: Instituto Cervantes, 162-176.

- Ruiz Gurillo, L. (2000). Un enfoque didáctico de la fraseología española para extranjeros, *Quaderns de Filologia* (5), 259-276.
- Sagban, M. (2010). *La fraseología comparada del español y del árabe en Irak: su aplicación a la enseñanza de las unidades fraseológicas en el aula de E/LE* (Doctoral dissertation). Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Salem, T. (2013). *La fraseología en español y en árabe: estudio, comparación, traducción y propuesta de un diccionario* (Doctoral dissertation). Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- Saracho Arnáiz, M. (2015). *La fraseología del español: una propuesta de didactización para la clase de ele basada en los somatismos* (Doctoral dissertation). Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.
- Serradilla Castaño, A. (2014). La fraseología en el aula de ELE: nuevos enfoque y propuestas didácticas. *¿Qué necesitamos en el aula de ELE?: reflexiones en torno a la teoría y la práctica*, (Eds. J. González, M. Alonso, J. Pazó y J. García), Madrid: MECED, 73-98.
- Strohschen, C. (2016). *El Tratamiento de la Fraseología en los Manuales de DaF de los Niveles B1 y B2: Análisis y Propuesta Didáctica* (Doctoral dissertation). Murcia: Universidad de Murcia.
- Tasubha, B. and Nusrat, D. (2017). Using Realia as an Effective Pedagogical Tool, *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 22 (11), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2211040107>
- Teodorovici, C. and Pisot, R. (2005). *Dicționar român-spaniol de expresii și locuțiuni*. Iași: Polirom.
- Tomilson, B. (1998). *Materials Development in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wu, Fan. (2012). *La fraseología en chino y en español: caracterización y clasificación de las unidades fraseológicas y simbología de los zoónimos. Un estudio contrastivo*. (Doctoral dissertation). Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.