

GILL PHILIP

“...and I dropped my jaw with fear”: The role of corpora in teaching phraseology

Abstract

This study addresses corpus-aided phraseological production in advanced learner writing. The writing task at the heart of the study is outlined in §2. This is followed by an analysis of phraseological patterns produced by learners, who are grouped by their preferred look-up medium: corpora, monolingual dictionary, or Internet. The analysis suggests that corpora particularly aid archetypically good language learners, who add corpus use to their inventory of language learning strategies.

1. Introduction

This research reports an ongoing study into phraseological production in advanced learner writing. While most studies of learner production, whether corpus-based or not, investigate problems and their likely causes, this study compares successful and less successful uses of language. The *Phrasebuilder* task, a semi-structured writing activity designed to elicit multiple versions of a single base text (see §2), makes this comparative approach possible, and is qualitatively different to the more commonly-used types of vocabulary elicitation, such as gap-fill, used in studies by Deignan et al. (1997) and Boers (2000) amongst others.

On-line corpora, paper and electronic dictionaries, Internet search engines and encyclopaedias were all familiar sources of language reference for the learners whose work is examined in the following sections¹. All the students were given basic training in corpus use during the course, including how to carry out some of the more frequently-

¹ The data presented in this study was gathered from five groups of learners following advanced (C1) general English courses at the University of Bologna, Italy.

used advanced search techniques such as those involving multiple nodes, POS tags and wildcards. Merely possessing these skills is no guarantee that corpora will be used efficiently, appropriately, or, indeed, at all. The task therefore was given a twofold purpose – to determine how proficient the students were at combining the keywords in running text, and to see which language resources they made use of in tackling the different phraseological challenges that the exercise presented. Some of the questions to be addressed in this contribution are:

- How can the effects of corpora on the language learning process be effectively assessed?
- Does corpus use aid students in a measurable way?
- Is there a marked qualitative difference between the work of students who make use of corpora in their studies and those who do not?

In other words, does corpus use necessarily lead to an improvement in students' language production, and if so, in what ways?

2. The *Phrasebuilder* exercise

The *Phrasebuilder* task is an exercise in guided creative writing. It consists of a fixed sequence of keywords and collocations, presented sequentially on flash cards or slides, forming the basic skeleton of a story which students must flesh out to produce their own short narratives. The keywords appearing on each consecutive slide collocate with each other, and they may also collocate with the keywords on the preceding or following slides. As with all language, however, they can also be used compositionally. The students' task is to write their own version of the story using all the words provided, sticking as closely as possible to the order in which the keywords are presented and avoiding changes to the word form provided (plurals should remain plural, tenses of verbs should not be modified). The keywords used in this study come from a version of the task devised by Goldsmith (2003): they are reproduced in their order of occurrence in the Appendix, alongside a model version of the story which incorporates them in the required sequence.

The *Phrasebuilder's* guided approach to creative writing is similar to the one described by Martinez (in Lewis 1997). However, the specific exercise described in this study is more complex than Martinez's version, built up around a single delexical verbs and its collocates, despite the apparent constraints that fixed keywords in a fixed sequence might suggest. In the first place, students are provided with the raw materials for constructing a story which are general enough to allow them to use their imagination, yet structured in such a way as to provide a beginning, middle and end – to ensure that the story will be complete – and limited in scope so that the task can be completed in a single session (in this case, a 2 hour lesson). Secondly, the presence of a well-delimited set of keywords allows the teacher and/or researcher to identify areas of language where students are in need of additional instruction, whether grammatical or lexical.

Although not designed with corpus research in mind, the potential for such tasks in learner-corpus studies is immediately apparent. A small corpus can be compiled from the students' contributions, differing from other learner corpora in that the texts are all variations of a single, hypothetical original. This can be likened favourably to Bowker & Bennison's (2003) approach to translator training, in which the multiple texts examined are all translations of a single source text. Such a corpus makes it possible to analyse general tendencies in language production over a large sample, in a much more detailed and systematic way than can be hoped for with manual correction alone. The guaranteed presence of the keywords in all the texts² means that the researcher can easily identify areas of language to analyse, safe in the knowledge that concordances will be retrievable with sufficient numbers to ensure that findings are relevant. S/he is also in a position to observe how a restricted set of keywords are made to combine in text, whether as collocations proper or in a looser, more compositional way. It is this feature that will form the main focus of the present study.

² Obviously, misspellings and typographical errors can have an affect on the location of keywords in the corpus.

The decision to turn the paper exercise into a digital one was based on several factors, corpus construction actually being quite low in the order of priorities. Several disadvantages became immediately apparent in the paper version, first among which was the difficulty of reformulating the texts in the light of new keywords as the story progressed. Space on paper is limited, and students soon tired of having to score out text and re-write chunks. There were also, unsurprisingly, repercussions on legibility. Timing also proved problematic. Students were presented the keywords on slides, and while some were quick to incorporate the new elements into their existing texts, others inevitably fell behind and missed parts of the sequence. It also became evident that students working at their desks with pencil and paper did not think of switching on their computers to make use of the reference sources available to them on the Internet. As a result, the students completing this task the first time it was run rarely used reference tools, which was hardly ideal as the task was intended as a language learning exercise, not an assessment.

Switching the exercise from paper to computer solved all three of these problems, with the added advantages of obtaining finished texts that were legible enough to correct and easily convertible into corpus material. Students worked one to a computer, with several windows open on the screen in front of them – one with the slides, so they would work at their own pace, one with a word-processor, and at least one other with monolingual or bilingual dictionaries, a search engine (usually Google), or a concordancer (typically WordBanks Online).³ There were also paper copies of the main advanced learner dictionaries available in the room.⁴

3 <<http://www.collins.co.uk/corpus/corpussearch.aspx>>.

4 Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced learners, Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, Collins COBUILD Advanced Learners English Dictionary, Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary.

3. Outline of the study

The findings discussed here are the result of the analysis of five groups' work, with data gathered over four academic semesters. A total of 41 students completed the exercise, and for the purposes of analysis they have been divided into four groups: *corpus users*, *Googlers*, *mixed-resource users*, and *dictionary users*. These groupings were made on a post-hoc basis, after observing which resources each individual tended to make most use of. As a means of evaluating the usefulness of corpora and the Internet in particular, the presence of a control group was indispensable. This group of ten students completed the task without the aid of any on-line resources, and accounted for ten of the *dictionary users*. Of the remaining 31 students, the *corpus users* numbered six, the *Googlers* three, *dictionary users* two, with the vast majority of students falling into the *mixed-resource users* group.

The *corpus users* were those who not only used the corpus, but, most importantly, were also happy to experiment with advanced searches, for example in order to find a suitable adverb to complete a verb phrase. Some even used the corpus as a source of ready-made examples which they could copy and paste into their text. The *Googlers* eschewed traditional forms of language reference, preferring to use fairly elementary single-word searches on the Internet as a means of locating possible expressions, by counting the number of hits, looking at the short extract accompanying the retrieved URLs, and occasionally going into the full text. The *dictionary users* not belonging to the control group appeared uncomfortable with corpora and the Internet, preferring to use only dictionaries, usually in paper or hand-held electronic form, which they habitually brought to class with them: those in the control group might of course have belonged elsewhere had they been given the option. The *mixed-resource users* used all resources to a greater or lesser extent, although it should be pointed out that within this group, there is a range running from students who selected particular sources to address different kinds of linguistic problems to ones who displayed no apparent sense of purpose in their choices, and/or made minimal use of reference tools. Were this experiment to be repeated, it might be

useful to adopt a query record sheet such as that used by Frankenberg-Garcia (2005) to log the students' referencing behaviour.

A few unanticipated problems arose within the task itself. On some occasions, students changed the order of occurrence of the keywords, or indeed omitted one or more of them, despite being able to self-pace. As far as the individual compositions are concerned, this matters very little, but if viewed in the light of investigating students' ability to recognise potential collocations, omissions caused some disruption to the data set as a whole. In a similar vein, despite instructions to avoid alterations to the word forms, many students were tempted to use alternative inflected forms of the keywords provided, changing their meanings in the process. Different inflected forms collocate in distinct ways, and the apparently innocuous change from singular to plural noun can play havoc with phraseological meaning: *I lost my nerves* does not express the same meaning as *I lost my nerve*. A third problem, from the point of view of corpus analysis, is that keywords were at times misspelled, whether as a result of typographical mistakes at the keyboard (*sleeeep* for *sleep*), persistent spelling errors (*toughts* for *thoughts*), or imprecise copying of less familiar words from the slides to the composition (*jew* for *jaw*). Inaccuracies such as these affected retrieval of the keywords from compositions using corpus query software.

The problems outlined above were infrequent, and hence only a minor cause of trouble. On the whole, students had no difficulty in carrying out the task, and every one of them came up with an individual interpretation of the underlying story, in spite of the apparent constraints imposed by the keywords. The next section discusses the ways in which students dealt with four different types of phraseological meaning that the keywords were intended to elicit, demonstrating some of the differences in the quality of the writing produced by the *corpus users*, the *Googlers*, the *mixed-resource users*, and the *dictionary users*.

4. Phraseological production in the *Phrasebuilder* task

The *Phrasebuilder* task is designed to elicit phraseological language through the presentation of particular word forms in a predetermined sequence. Essentially, four types of phraseological language are involved, and each of these is discussed in the subsections that follow. The most simple is the formation of collocations, such as the decision to combine keyword nouns to make a compound or the addition of known collocates in order to incorporate the keywords into running text. This can be contrasted with non-formation of collocations, whereby the keywords are treated compositionally, occurring at some distance from one another in the text. The second type is the generation of phrases from a single keyword – typically one which has relatively low frequency and/or is presented in a precise inflected form which is expected to trigger the recognition (or location in reference works) of a limited range of expressions. The third type is the use of 'filler' phraseology, the lexical and grammatical choices made by students in order to link keywords which collocate strongly in the real world but fit rather more weakly in the text. Finally, the problems posed by figurative and idiomatic meaning are examined, by observing how well students are able to recognise when a keyword should not be used in its literal sense, to appreciate its intended meaning and to tackle its integration into their text.

4.1 Collocation versus free combination: wine + party

The keywords used to investigate students' awareness and use of collocation, as opposed to a compositional treatment of language, are *wine* and *party* (see Appendix for their place in the overall sequence). These words can form a compound or be used in a looser collocation which still conforms to the standard definition of collocation as being words which co-occur within five words of the node (Sinclair *et al.* 1970/2004: 5).

It may be surprising to learn that only one student produced the compound *wine party*, with all others settling for the looser type of

collocation relating to the real-world occurrence (especially true for these Italian students) of *wine* being drunk at *parties*. This is an example of the influence of ‘psychological collocation’ (Partington 1998: 16–17) intruding on textual collocation, and this tendency is nicely illustrated in the data for these keywords. Apart from the lone occurrence of *wine party*, one other compound was present (*wine cellar*), and five occurrences of other collocations: *bottle of wine* (2) and *glass of wine* (1), as well as *red wine* (2). By far the most frequent collocate for *wine*, however, was *drink* (14), usually accompanied by the colligational feature of quantifiers (of which *too much* occurred in 9 of the 14), completing the picture of people drinking wine to excess at parties:

- (1) *It was a strange party, the alcohol was flowing like a river, I had drunk too much wine and I was very drunk.*

Given that *wine* and *party* are both high-frequency and easily contextualisable, there were no great differences in students’ approach to their inclusion in texts, though *dictionary users* produced remarkably consistent results, shown in Fig. 1. The student who used *wine party* was an assiduous *dictionary user*, not from the control group, while all but one of the control group used a variant of the pattern *drink too much wine*, with *party* appearing in the context nearby.

Yesterday, we drank a lot of **wine** at the party. When I went to bed to a party, where I drank too much **wine**. Not only the headache and to sleep because I drank too much **wine** at the party, and so I had a

Last night I drank too much **wine** to a party and when I went to onfusing...maybe I drank too much **wine**. Now I feel a terrible headache in my house and drank too much **wine**. How could I lay down and sleep to sleep. Maybe I drank too much **wine** at the party. A terrible headache went to a party. I drank too much **wine**. Now, I feel a terrible headache like a river, I had drunk too much **wine** and I was very drunk. That and I think to have drunk too much **wine**, in fact when I came back home I had really exaggerated with red **wine**! Considered that I mustn’t have my standard. Because I went to the **wine** party with my colleagues. It

Fig 1. KWIC concordance for *wine* – dictionary users only.

There were few apparent instances of free combination with this pair of keywords, though in a number of instances they were too far separated to qualify statistically as collocates. They were produced by all groups of students except the *dictionary users*, though the worst culprits were the *Googlers*. Examples (2) and (3) show typical examples of free combinations, while (4) illustrates a case where the keywords were moved around or indeed omitted (*party* should occur between *sleep* and *wine*, with *headache* at the end of this sequence).

- (2) *This morning I went to a wine cellar, to buy 50 liters of Sangiovese for the party I and my girlfriend would give in the evening.*
- (3) *I went to my kitchen desperately looking for a glass of wine, maybe there was one bottle left after the party!*
- (4) *They say: “If you can’t sleep, if you’ve got an headache...just drink some red wine, and you’ll be better in a while!”*

That only one student used the compound *wine party* may serve as proof that students on the whole did not feel the need to look up *wine*, being quite convinced that they already knew its meaning(s). Had any of them checked in the corpus, they would not only have found confirmation that *wine* and *party* do collocate closely, but they would also have discovered that the pair actually tend to form a trio with *cheese*. It is easy to forget, both as teachers and as learners, that looking up common words can be a worthwhile exercise in vocabulary building and – as in this instance – in the unearthing of cultural information.

4.2 Building collocations: nerves

Nerves – note the plural form – is the keyword that was chosen in order to investigate how students tackled the generation of phrases from a single keyword. *Nerve* is not a very frequent word, but it is polysemous, with some of its meanings being restricted to the plural inflection alone. This detail proved crucially important, as did the mismatch between *nerve(s)* and its Italian equivalent, *nervi*, whose semantic range and phraseological patterns only partially overlap. But apart from the expected learner errors caused by calquing, some of the unexpected col-

locations that occurred cannot reasonably be ascribed to L1 interference (see (5) and (6) below). There appears to have been real confusion regarding the meaning of this keyword, yet the data suggests that few students actually turned to a dictionary to clarify the meaning or to look up possible phrases to use.

- (5) *I shooked my nerves, trying to forget it was less than ten minutes I was awake.*
 (6) *Noise and silly conversations were the cause of Jack's headache; his nerves were too tired to bear meaningless smiles and honey words.*
 (7) *In addition to this, it started raining. In fact, it really got me nerve.*
 (8) *In my personal point of view rain is the third kind of weather that stand on my nerves, snow is the second and windy is the first.*

Examples (7) and (8) also appear not to have been produced with the help of a dictionary, but merely used in a half-remembered, or back-translated form. In these examples, the underlying meaning can be identified, but the word forms used are not the ones (*got on my nerves* in both instances) that typically communicate the intended meaning. As Hanks points out, “linguistic behaviour among users of a language is highly stereotypical, even in matters of fine detail” (2004: 246). Such fine detail includes limitations on which inflected forms can express particular meanings, as the examples above illustrate. One pedagogical question that inevitably arises is how and when such detail should be taught, given that language teaching tends not to devote as space much to the fine details of lexis as it does to those of grammar.

Of the four groups of students, none produced flawless texts, but the use of appropriate collocations with *nerves* was quite obviously the preserve of those who had looked the word up in one or other of the language reference tools available.⁵ The *Googlers* produced expressions which verged on the incoherent, featuring the collocates *calm* and *break down* (see (9) and (10) below). Even allowing for the fact that *calm + nerves* is acceptable, its use in the text points to a lack of com-

5 It is worth remembering that students are unlikely to have looked up every single keyword in the task: by comparing the tendencies of each group, however, a general picture emerges, and from this it is possible to determine which choices were influenced by reference tools and which were not.

prehension, and a consequent inability to contextualise the phrase appropriately. The phrase may well have been found on the Internet, but the student failed to look further than the search results page to check its meaning in context.

- (9) *...so the party finished and we had to calm ours nerves backing home a little bit drunk*
 (10) *I had spent all the morning working hard – and the rain didn't make things easier –, my nerves broke down and I went into a heavy depression.*

The dictionary users were also guilty of making up collocations, including *irritate one's nerves* (11), and they also fell into the trap of thinking that the plural form could substitute the singular in collocations such as *lose one's nerve* (12). Overall, however, when the students in this group used acceptable collocations such as *get on one's nerves* (13), and *nerves + on edge* (14), they did so correctly, presumably due to the presence of examples in the dictionary entry.

- (11) *More, a strong wind and an incessant rain irritated my nerves.*
 (12) *...I lost my nerves and I had so much fear that my jaw was moving itself without my will.*
 (13) *...a terrible storm was shaking my house, and the rain on the windows was getting on my nerves.*
 (14) *I began to walk towards my home when it began to rain. My nerves were on edge.*
 (15) *Outside the window an heavy rain was falling. It hurted my nerves.*
 (16) *I shooked my nerves, trying to forget it was less than ten minutes I was awake.*
 (17) *That night were getting on my nerves!*
 (18) *...I could even perceive the light smell of the rain I began to be a bundle of nerves.*
 (19) *I listen a strong wind, which is starting to get on my nerves; it's pouring with the rain...*
 (20) *...I felt anxious, I made an effort to calm my nerves.*

The collocations produced by the *mixed-resource users* were much like the dictionary users' ones: a few invented collocations such as *hurt one's nerves* (15) and *shake one's nerves* (16), some standard collocations (typically *get on one's nerves*), and a couple of instances of more idiomatic phrases such as *bundle of nerves*. The general level of textual accuracy was lower than that of the *dictionary users* group: (17) and

(18) illustrate how the phrase itself can be faultless but yet not run on seamlessly from the preceding text. This error was not present in the *corpus users'* texts (19) and (20), whose use of collocation was phraseologically accurate, with the chunk being incorporated into the rest of the text with no apparent breaks. It may be the case that when corpora are used, the phrasal boundaries are less clearly cut than they appear in a dictionary entry, so a student using corpus data for reference will have a better model of how to mould the cotext around the chunk to make it fit properly. Clearly, this is the reason why dictionaries include example phrases, but a KWIC concordance makes repeated patterns more immediately recognisable, and so may have more influence on a student's choice of words.

4.3 Filler phraseology: heart + chest

While identifying correct or suspect collocates for a keyword is a fairly straightforward procedure, the analysis of filler phraseology is often relegated to second place in collocation studies, especially those dealing with learner data. A lot of filler phraseology is grammatical, and perhaps this is the reason why it tends to be ignored in favour of the more colourful lexical collocates. However filler phraseology, both grammatical and lexical, is an important part of language production. It is the glue with which lexical chunks are stuck together. This subsection investigates the lexical and grammatical choices made by students linking the keywords *heart* and *chest*.

In the real world, *hearts* are found in *chests*; or, to be more specific, the heart muscle is located within the chest cavity. It is not normally deemed necessary to make this sort of specification, but both of these keywords are polysemous, and it is really only by virtue of their proximity that we are inclined to interpret them both as parts of the body. One student did exploit the polysemy (25): for the others there was no question that the meaning was anatomical, especially since the language was intended to describe the emotions felt by the narrator in the light of the events up to this point in the text. Fear, trepidation and anticipation

are all manifested by physical responses, typically including an increased heart rate. But how did the students express this familiar intercultural concept in a foreign language?

The four groups of students followed distinct patterns of usage in their filler phraseology, though the same general structures were adopted in order to express the idea of the heart beating fast within the chest. One interesting recurring feature in the students' filler phraseology was the presence of verbs such as *beat* and *bump* in the progressive aspect or gerund form (following *start* or *begin*), which emphasised the immediacy of the events. A further interesting aspect was the presence of adverbs, which were not used a great deal elsewhere in the texts.

his **heart** beating in his chest:
 my **heart** is beating fast in my chest.
 my **heart** was beating more fast
 My **heart** started beating madly.
 My **heart** started beating incredibly fast
 My **heart** began to beat so rapidly that...
 my **heart** started to beat very quickly
 the **heart** in my chest and his beating was almost deafening
 The **heart** begins bumping in my chest
 my **heart** began to thump wildly in my chest.
 My **heart** jumped out of my chest!

Fig. 2. Verbs collocating with *heart*.

The *Googlers* used simple, high-frequency verbs, did not use any adverbs and used compositional language throughout ((21) and (22)). While the cartoon-style image of a heart literally jumping out of somebody's chest is clearly intended in both these examples, they both lack the conventional wording which would make this meaning immediate. Similar meanings are expressed more successfully in (23) and (24) (produced by a *dictionary user* and a *mixed-resources user* respectively).

- (21) *That's the reason why, I suppose, when I suddenly heard someone knocking at the door, my **heart** tried to escape from my chest.*
 (22) *I couldn't open the door and my **heart** was got off my chest*
 (23) *My **heart** started beating incredibly fast I thought it would have popped out of my chest.*

- (24) *My heart began to beat so rapidly that I feared it was going to jump out my chest.*
 (25) *My heart started beating madly. How could I save myself? The chest! I jumped inside.*
 (26) *The heart begins bumping in my chest with the decisive sound similar to footsteps on a stairs.*
 (27) *I suddenly heard something strange and my heart began to thump wildly in my chest.*
 (28) *I suddenly heard a door slammed just over me. Even more violently slammed the heart in my chest and his beating was almost deafening.*

Of the remaining three groups, patterns in verb and adverb usage are discernable. The *dictionary users* opted almost invariably for the verb *beat* accompanied by a range of adverbs relating to speed, including *quickly* and *fast*, as well as adverbs of manner such as *madly* ((23) and (25)). *Mixed-resource users* drew upon a wider range of verbs, including *bump*, *run* and *pound*. While *beat* was invariably accompanied by adverbs (24), the more specific verbs tended not to be, though there are some interesting run-ons, such as that in (26). Finally, *corpus users* used a wide range of verbs, usually in combination with specific adverbs, as illustrated in (27) and (28).

4.4 Figurative language: my jaw...

Jaw is not a word in everyday usage: *jaws* do not arouse a great deal of interest and are not brought up in conversation very often. It was therefore unsurprising that many students felt perplexed by the presence of this keyword near the end of their task. While *heart* and *chest* were easy to fit into the story, *jaw* appeared not to be. Why should this part of the head be important?

A proficient user of English should recognize that *my jaw...* (and not *jaws* plural) leads into a restricted set of possible verb collocates, namely *drop* or *clench* and their synonyms. Even an advanced student may not have come across either of these expressions, and it should not be surprising that even at this level students do not realise that the keyword is intended to elicit one of these metaphors (probably the former, given the context). Yet problems are not wholly negative. The confu-

sion that *my jaw* caused had the fortunate consequence of prompting students to look up possible uses, and as a result only eight students chose to interpret the word literally (29).

- (29) *Too tired and angry to switch the light on I jumped in the bed hitting my jaw on the floor: it was the wrong direction.*

The *Googlers*, in line with their previous tendencies, either gave a literal interpretation or miscued on the necessary wording ((30) and (31)). Most *dictionary users* completed the phrase with *dropped*, although *clenched* also appeared once, alongside four literal, compositional interpretations ((32)–(34)).

- (30) *I was surprised too when opened my jaw and I realized that it was the wrong house.*
 (31) *My jaw fell down to the floor.*
 (32) *My jaw dropped, my heart started to beat very quickly and my chest was almost hurting!*
 (33) *My mind was completely flooded by frightful thoughts, my jaw was clenched.*
 (34) *Ok, now is the moment – I'm at the end of the bed! I feel a soft ache in my jaw. I can call my neighbour, he's doctor.*

The tendencies displayed by the *mixed-resource users* ((35)–(36)) were similar to the *dictionary users'* ones, using *dropped*, but there were several instances of the less common active form of the verb (36). This also occurred amongst the *corpus users*, who also produced some unexpectedly inventive interpretations of the keyword (37). This burst of inventiveness is strikingly uncharacteristic in the light of the corpus users' performance elsewhere in the task, as is the literal interpretation shown in (38). Why does this apparent lapse occur at this stage?

- (35) *It took some seconds, but when I realized what had just happened my jaw dropped.*
 (36) *My teeth were chattered and I dropped my jaw with fear.*
 (37) *My jaw was clicking like a typewriter for the fear.*
 (38) *My jaw hardened to an unsustainable degree, all my muscles were stiff and, because of the fright, I could hardly breath.*

At this point, it is enlightening to take a closer look at the corpus data. There were only 14 occurrences of *my+jaw* in the WordBanks Online

data when these students completed their task, all of which are reproduced in Fig. 3. Although the conventional collocate *dropped* is present three times – twice to the right of the node (lines 3–4), and once to the left (line 12) – these frequencies are inadequate for any tendencies to be identified. This may well account for the presence of active forms of the verbs amongst the *mixed-resource group*.

A second glance at line 8 in the concordance explains the mystery of (37).

1 and my camera, not to mention	my jaw , free-fell to the floor. Japan's
2 in a hotel without dislocating	my jaw on my knees. I can sleep in tents
3 you propose to get it out [p]	My jaw dropped Oh God, I never thought
4 in open water. I glanced up and	my jaw dropped, for only thirty feet
5 and I felt horribly miserable.	My jaw ached from grinning all night
6 out at about 2.45am. Whether	my jaw muscles simply retired hurt, or
7 me but about the pain in	my jaw . Mind you, judging by the stares
8 Worse still, my teeth ached and	my jaw was clicking like a typewriter.
9 me on the head Another said:	' my jaw fell to the floor and fractured
10 from my stomach clear up to	my jaw . The peace symbols swirled
11 thigh, then landed squarely on	my jaw . I kept both hands on the wheel.
12 I asked, trying not to drop	my jaw . I admire Gail. She's one of the
13 [M02] No I dislocate	my jaw all the tie. I [ZGY] smashed
14 a ha ha. No. No. Please no more	my jaw 's aching all [tc text=pause]

Fig. 3. *my+jaw* (WordBanks Online: all concordances).

Is it right to criticise students for cherry-picking their way through corpora rather than restricting their interest to frequent, recurrent forms? Corpora provide native-speaker models, real examples of language in use that are there for the taking, and this student should probably be applauded for having embraced corpora so warmly. High-frequency patterns have to be learned in order to communicate effectively, but this does not necessarily mean that low-frequency forms have to be ignored completely. Should learners be denied the right to be creative and opportunistic for no better reason than the fact that they are non-native speakers? This previously hidden aspect of learner corpus use is incredibly interesting, and certainly worthy of more detailed investigation before any pedagogical conclusions can be drawn legitimately.

5. Corpora, users, and language learning

Relatively few students in this study chose to use the corpus as their main source of language reference. One immediate reason for this is that it was a newly-encountered tool: even those who had used corpora in previous courses had only ever encountered them in their university studies, while they had been using dictionaries since primary school. A further reason, unlikely as it may sound, is that there are still students reaching degree level who are barely computer-literate and who avoid using the computer whenever there is an alternative available. In order to gain the maximum benefit from what corpora have to offer, students need to have training in how to formulate search queries so as to obtain the data that is most relevant to their needs. Such training takes precious time away from other aspects of language learning, and as not all teachers are prepared to invest time in cultivating corpus skills, many advanced students fail to reap the full benefits offered by corpus data. Although the success of a query is dependent on the effectiveness of the search syntax used, learning the query language for any corpus seems worthwhile – not least because of its knock-on effect of improving use of search-engine syntax. An accomplished *corpus user* also becomes a more efficient *Googler*.

So corpora and corpus-based reference tools both aid students' vocabulary learning demonstrably, but this can only be true if they are indeed consulted. The data presented here, as well as other learner data discussed in Philip (2005, 2006) confirms the fears of many language teachers: advanced students limit their looking up to the bare minimum, usually only to check the meaning of new words. Some students see consultation as a sign of weakness, believing that only less-proficient students need to check meanings (form appears to come even lower down the priority list). Thus, out of embarrassment or fear of shame, they relegate dictionaries and corpora to tasks where they are explicitly required. Other students fall foul of the belief that once a word has been encountered, it has been 'learned', forgetting that such learned lexis is rarely revisited, hindering the learning of sub-senses, figurative extensions and phraseology. Students generally encounter words in their lit-

eral sense first, match them to a translation equivalent in their L1, and from then on, unless instructed otherwise, use the word in calqued forms of the L1 phraseology. The relative success of this strategy effectively masks the underlying problem, which is more serious than simply getting collocations wrong. Persistent calquing actually prevents students from acquiring a sense of the word's conceptual range in the L2, negatively affecting textual fluency and cohesiveness.

The data presented here demonstrate that corpora do indeed have a positive effect on language production, but the advantages are not restricted to hands-on use. Corpus-based advanced learner dictionaries condense and select information from the corpus and also provide examples and usage notes. The differences identified between *corpus users* and *dictionary users* are not easily quantified, but this study shows some of the qualitative differences present in students' written production when aided by dictionaries as opposed to corpora, or indeed by a combination of the two. At the same time it suggests that the Internet, while undeniably useful as a linguistic ready-reckoner, fosters neither accuracy nor variety in the acquisition and use of lexis and phraseology.

One of the most interesting points to emerge from this study was the observation that higher-quality texts are not produced by *corpus users* simply because they are using a corpus, but because the *corpus users* display traits associated with the archetypal 'good language learner' (Oxford 1990). These traits are shared to a lesser extent by the more discerning amongst the *mixed-resource users*, as well as the control-group *dictionary users* (though these students were explicitly asked to consult their dictionaries as often as possible). Adventurous *corpus users* are students who are motivated enough to make the effort to learn to use the query syntax. They then take care to identify precisely what forms of language they wish to locate, and are prepared to try various permutations of their queries before they settle on the data that best satisfies their needs. They appear to actively avoid translating directly from their L1, especially when the language is figurative, preferring to copy the native-speaker models present in the data. In other words, they are students who have simply added corpus use to an already productive repertoire of effective language learning strategies.

References

- Boers F. (2000) Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics* 21, 553–571.
- Bowker L. & P. Bennison (2003) Student translation archive: design, development and application. In Zanettin, F., S. Bernardini & D. Stewart (eds) *Corpora in translator education*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Deignan A., D. Gabrys & A. Solska (1997) Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities. *ELT Journal* 51, 352–360.
- Frankenberg-Garcia A. (2005) A peek into what today's language learners as researchers actually do. *International Journal of Lexicography* 18, 335–355.
- Goldsmith P. (2003) Working wonders with words. Paper presented at 37th IATEFL conference, Brighton 22–26 April.
- Hanks P. (2004) The syntagmatics of metaphor and idiom. *International Journal of Lexicography* 17, 245–274.
- Lewis M. (1997) *Implementing the lexical approach: putting theory into practice*. Hove: Thomson Heinle LTP.
- Oxford R. (1990). *Language learning strategies. What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Partington A. (1998) *Patterns and meanings. Using corpora for English language research and teaching*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Philip G. (2005) From concept to wording and back again: features of learners' production of figurative language. In Barnden J., S. Glasbey, M. Lee, A. Wallington & L. Zhang (eds) *Proceedings of the Third Interdisciplinary Workshop on Corpus-Based Approaches to Figurative Language*. Birmingham: Birmingham University Press, 46–53.
- Philip G. (2006) Metaphor, the dictionary, and the advanced learner. In E. Corino, C. Marengo & C. Onesti (eds.) *EURALEX Proceedings of the XII International Lexicography Congress*. Alessandria: Dell'Orso, 895–905.
- Rundell, M. (ed.) (2002) *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Sinclair J., S. Jones & R. Daley (1970/2004) *English Collocation Studies: The OSTI Report*. 2nd Edition, R. Krishnamurthy (ed.), London & New York: Continuum.
- Sinclair, J.M. (ed.) (2006) *Collins COBUILD Advanced Learners English Dictionary*. 5th edition. Glasgow: HarperCollins.
- Summers, D. (ed.) (2003) *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Wehmeier, S. (ed.) (2005) *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 7th edition. Oxford: OUP.

Appendix

Phrasebuilder: *keywords in sequential order*

I; bed; unable to sleep
 went to
 wine; party
 headache; stomach; wind
 rain; nerves
 remember; film
 turn; key; lock
 suddenly heard; door
 heart; chest
 footsteps; stairs
 thoughts; my mind
 think; save myself
 door; open
 something; end of the bed
 my jaw
 neighbour; wrong house

Phrasebuilder: *model text*

Last night **I went to bed** but I was **unable to sleep**. I had got home late after my friend's **party**, and I'd definitely had too much **wine**. I had a terrible **headache** coming on, and my **stomach** was churning. Outside the **wind** was howling, and the **rain** battering on my window was getting on my **nerves**. For some strange reason, it made me **remember** a **film** I'd seen.

The sound of a **key turning** in the **lock** downstairs brought me back to earth. I **suddenly heard** my own front **door** slam shut. My **heart** started pounding in my **chest** as I realised that I had an intruder in the house! I heard **footsteps** steadily making their way up the **stairs**. All manner of **thoughts** went through my **mind**, as I tried desperately to **think** how I could **save myself**. But there was no time. I lay in terror as the **door opened** slowly, and in the darkness of my bedroom I could make out **something** near the **end of the bed**.

My jaw dropped when the light was abruptly switched on and I came face to face with my **neighbour**, James, who had been at the party with me. He was in a worse state than I was, and had come back to the **wrong house**!

Bibliographic information published by die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet
at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data: A catalogue record
for this book is available from The British Library, Great Britain

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Corpora, language, teaching, and resources : from theory to practice /
Natalie Kübler (ed.).

p. cm. – (Etudes contrastives; 12)

ISBN 978-3-0343-0054-4

1. Language and languages—Study and teaching. 2. Corpora (Linguistics)

I. Kübler, Natalie.

P51.C65 2011

407.1—dc23

2011020104

Cover design: Thomas Jaberg, Peter Lang SA

ISBN 978-3-0343-0054-4

ISSN 1424-3563

© Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers, Bern 2011

Hochfeldstrasse 32, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland

info@peterlang.com, www.peterlang.com, www.peterlang.net

All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright.

Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the
permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution.

This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and
storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

Printed in Switzerland

Contents

NATALIE KÜBLER (University Paris Diderot)	
Introduction	9
<i>Part one</i>	
<i>Bringing corpus use to effective practice</i>	
BERNHARD KETTEMANN & GEORG MARKO (University of Graz)	
Data-driving Critical Discourse Analysis	19
GILL PHILIP	
“...and I dropped my jaw with fear”: The role of corpora in teaching phraseology	49
ALEX BOULTON (CRAPEL-ATILF/CNRS, Nancy Université)	
Bringing corpora to the masses: Free and easy tools for interdisciplinary language studies	69
ANGELA CHAMBERS (University of Limerick)	
Language learning as discourse analysis: playing games in a corpus of French journalistic discourse	97
MAGGIE CHARLES (Oxford University Language Centre)	
Corpus evidence for teaching adverbial connectors of Contrast: <i>however, yet, rather, instead</i> and <i>in contrast</i>	113
JOSTA VAN RIJ-HEYLIGERS (University of Auckland, New Zealand)	
Breaking the chains of rhetorics in academia: Corpus-based research as tool for transformation in discourse?	133