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How can corpora be used in teacher education?

Fiona Farr

1 The language teacher education landscape

As I write an update of this chapter for the second edition of this Handbook, I am sitting at home during the great “lockdown” of the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic. Never has the face of teacher education changed as much globally as in the last six to eight weeks as we have scurried and rallied to move all of our teacher education programmes into some sort of acceptable technology-mediated distance format, with little time to check adherence to the kind of principles detailed by those more expert in the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) for programme delivery (for example, McCarthy 2016; Kiddle and Prince 2019). Face-to-face tutorials have become uploaded voiced-over presentations; classroom interactions with student teachers have become Skype, Zoom or MS Teams online gatherings; teaching practice has been abandoned and replaced with observations of videos followed by shared reflective blogs; and chat rooms and discussion fora have become part of everyday professional life. And with all of that, never have I been so convinced of the value of corpus linguistics (CL), nor so thankful for the free availability of such a vast range of corpora, which has meant that my student teachers have been able to continue to work quite independently with very little requirement for further support from me (more on that later).

Having moved beyond the important but limited use of corpora for language research and the development of reference materials, many in the language teaching profession have been busy investigating, discussing, designing and evaluating ways in which corpus techniques may be used with learners in both direct and mediated ways. All of these very worthy endeavours have placed applied linguists and language teachers in a very privileged position, with an array of corpus-based teaching and reference materials, online resources and an extended repertoire of approaches that can be employed in the classroom. In fact, ‘there has been a transition from the days when corpora were considered to be an obscure pursuit with few practical applications outside of the creation of dictionaries to the present when insights from corpus linguistics are having an ever-increasing influence on the design of teaching materials, from grammar- and vocabulary-learning materials to whole courses, and where learner corpora are more and more being
seen as valuable sources of evidence for language development’ (McCarthy 2016: 8). It is possible, and relatively easy, to prepare an English language class exclusively based on findings from corpus research, using corpus-based dictionary, grammar and course book material; prepare some frequency, keyword or concordance lists in advance; and even get students to do some independent exploring (for a meta-analysis of CL in language learning see Boulton and Cobb 2017). While such developments have been enhancing language teaching, I think I can now say with some confidence that the same can be said to be true of the integration of CL in ELTE. This is not what I said in the first edition of this Handbook. I acknowledge that some challenges remain (Leńko-Szymanska 2017; Callies 2019), but these are diminishing with time.

As a piece of light-touch survey research for the first edition, an online investigation of the curriculum contents of some MA programmes in ELT/TESOL/TEFL revealed that few of the programmes made any direct reference to CL in their syllabus descriptions. I undertook a similar search in preparation for writing this update, and it revealed that many such programmes now include CL. What is interesting this time is how it is framed within the programme. In cases where it occurs as a standalone module, it tends to be an optional choice for students. Otherwise, as part of a core module, it can generally be found to be integrated in any one (or more) of four ways. Firstly, as part of some sort of technology-enhanced learning module where the emphasis is typically on the use and integration of CL as a pedagogic tool. Secondly, it can be found included as part of a discourse or language analysis module with a focus on its potential for language research. Related to this is the place of CL in research methods courses as one of a range of technological tools, often alongside text analysis software such as NVivo. And fourthly, I have found examples of its presence in general pedagogy and materials development courses.

Although these are far from empirical findings, they do suggest that teachers may now more commonly be exposed to these concepts and techniques during their education. And, of course, it is no coincidence that this growth in integration has coincided with the more widespread and open availability of large-scale corpora and powerful analysis software, for example, the BYU billion-word multi-language collections, or the Sketch Engine resources (freely available to EU universities for at least the next couple of years) (see also Murphy and Riordan 2016). The issue which existed when I first started to use corpora in the mid-1990s was trying to get your hands on them. At the time they were rare, clunky to use and cost a lot of money. In addition, they rarely came with integrated software, which added another technological hurdle. Now students run a couple of Google searches and “there’s a corpus for that”. This easy access and growth in integration, however, bring another challenge. Corpora of the magnitude now available are generally compelling to the linguistics student. The temptation is to begin interacting with the corpus technology without any real understanding of the principles of corpus compilation, corpus searching or corpus interpretation. In other words, the technology becomes the pedagogy, and this, along with the distraction potential of the collections, can seriously undermine the value of this approach. To counteract this in instructional contexts I now begin with fairly extensive critical coverage of the theories behind CL, as well as providing lots of examples of corpus-based studies, before the student teachers get to experience using a corpus first-hand. This can be for a number of weeks in many cases so that by the time they search a corpus, they have a comprehensive understanding of what they are doing and why they are doing it. In very recent years my efforts in this respect have been greatly facilitated by online resources such as academic talks and even entire corpus MOOCs, such as the one
offered at the time of writing by Tony McEnery and his Lancaster colleagues on the FutureLearn platform (and although the concept of a MOOC itself could become dated or obsolete at some point in the future, the COVID-induced learning trends have triggered a significant increase in registration for these courses, which is likely to enhance their sustainability for some time to come). While the student teachers do still sometimes ask the “wrong” questions of the corpus or feel overwhelmed by the number of hits they get, the chances of this happening are greatly reduced.

Based on the examination of the MA programmes mentioned earlier, as well as reports in the published literature on the inclusion of CL in ELTE (Hunston 1995; Coniam 1997; O’Keeffe and Farr 2003; McCarthy 2008; Callies 2019; Farr and O’Keeffe 2019), two broad themes emerge. Firstly, a number of accounts relay how corpora can support the development and critical evaluation of pedagogic skills. These will be explored in Section 3. Secondly, CL is being used in the promotion of critical language awareness skills to provide new dimensions to language description. This will be elaborated on in Section 4. Both of these discussions will answer the question: How can CL be used to develop pedagogic and linguistic awareness on ELTE programmes? But there is a further question which might push the boundaries in terms of what we currently do with CL in the field of ELTE, and that is: What can corpus explorations tell us about the ways in which social interaction occurs in ELTE contexts and how these understandings can help us to develop as a profession of teacher educators? This essentially converts CL into a tool for the reflective practice, professional understanding and enhancement of not just student teachers but one which can be utilised by teacher educators to examine and improve their practices (in a context where there still doesn’t exist a formal and internationally recognised “train the trainer” qualification), as well as providing evidence-based accounts for those at the initial stages of embarking on such a career. These discussions will be given due attention towards the end of this chapter, as it is a field which is still at the relatively early stages of development.

2 Current philosophies of teacher education and the place of corpus linguistics

Where are we in terms of what we believe about good teacher education? It is probably safe to say that we are in a cocoon of post-transmissive and post-directive approaches, and we now find ourselves influenced strongly by notions of independent and self-directed learning and critical and reflective engagement (Walsh and Mann 2019). Certainly, in European and North American contexts, many teacher educators would claim close alliances with these approaches and their theoretical underpinnings. Social constructivism and the work of Vygotsky (1978) have had an important impact in how teacher education pedagogy is materialised (Golombek and Johnson 2019). An evolution from retrospective to prospective education has taken place and has come to a conclusion (Kozulin 1998; Kinginger 2002). In this move, the acquisition and reproduction of a body of information does not retain its former elevated status. The focus in current educational theory is on the continuing development of students’ cognitions. Consequently, their role becomes much more involved, stemming from two theoretical perspectives (Kozulin 1998: 157): Piaget’s thoughts on the need for a stimulating, problem-solving context so that innate discovery predispositions are best utilised (Farrell 2012), and Vygotskian views that an independent learner is the culmination of education and not an assumed given at the initial stages of learning. Consequently, there has been
much discussion of the development of the teacher as reflective practitioner and action researcher (Edge and Richards 1998; Wallace 1998; Burns 2010; Mann and Walsh 2017; T.S. Farrell 2019; Dragas 2019) in attempts to appropriate theory, practice and research and to allow for the integration of individual and contextual variables. Such developments are also a concerted attempt to close “the gap” (Baguley 2019) as student teachers move from ELTE programmes towards their professional careers. We continue to question the nature of knowledge, including practical knowledge (Thornbury 2019), and content (Morton 2019) in ELTE. More importantly, we have moved from transmission to a more holistic knowledge construction approach (Malderez and Bodóczky 1999: 10; Freeman 2001: 73–4).

In a rare and relatively recent volume focussing exclusively on this field, Freeman (2016) discusses the predominant theoretical frameworks and introduces a “Design Theory” for second language teacher education as an alternative to ‘second language teacher education […] largely defined by prescriptive ideas about what the content should be and how it should be taught’ (2016: 227). He suggests that this theory, although highly descriptive, can function to proactively influence what happens in the future. This theory describes the six major components of contemporary ELTE as he sees them:

1. **Tools and opportunities** to use them, is the central purpose of teacher education;
2. **Social facts** – recognising and using the tools appropriately in practice in ways which are normative and accepted in the teaching community;
3. **Local and professional languages** – appropriate social knowledge and use of language in the profession and the local context;
4. **Communities**, with their theoretical origin in situated learning theory;
5. **Articulation**, defined as ‘the process of negotiating entry to a community of activity and explanation’ (Freeman 2016: 243). This takes place in the period when a newcomer is working to be recognised as part of the community and acting as if they were;
6. When articulation becomes full explanation in socially appropriate ways, it marks individuals as full members of the community. So articulation is “participating with”, as a peripheral member, whereas explanation is “participating in”, as a full member.

I suggest that a corpus-based approach is one way to support, promote and critically examine these philosophies in practice. It is not the only way, but in my experience over the last 25 years I have found many easy fits between the integration of CL approaches and current philosophies and practices in ELTE. There are different types of “knowledge” that student teachers acquire during an education programme. Farr and O’Keeffe (2019) summarise these as linguistic, pedagogic and technological content, couched in teacher research and wisdom of practice. Considering this content base, along with current practices (informed by theoretical and philosophical approaches), key alignments with CL are summarised here:

1. The construction of knowledge through scaffolded self-direction
   A clear principle of Vygotsky's approach is that learning is most effective within the Zone of Proximal Development (Golombek and Johnson 2019), which requires an individual to be supported so that they can attain a level of acquisition that could
not otherwise have been achieved. The pedagogic implementation of CL fits well here. Essentially there are two approaches to the use of CL in any educational context. One, and usually the first, is to prepare, edit and mediate corpus-based materials for use with the student teachers. The second is to allow the student teachers to experience the corpora first-hand in an unmediated way directly on the computer. Many use the first approach as a stepping-stone to the second (O’Keeffe and Farr 2003), and this fits perfectly with scaffolded learning. Another advantage here is that it allows for individual learner preferences, as some students like to engage immediately and directly with the technology, while others do not (Farr 2008), although I would suggest that this has become much more normalised in the last decade.

The idea that individuals take responsibility for their own learning fits perfectly with notions of discovery-based data-driven learning (Johns 1991; Warren 2016). Student teachers can explore corpora at their own pace and with their own hypotheses for investigation, and on the journey to discovering some of the answers they may also serendipitously uncover further interesting examples of language use. While acknowledging that knowledge transfer may be useful in specific contexts, it is now accepted that noticing, language awareness and inductive investigatory learning are preferred approaches. Corpora are artefacts in this respect, as the manipulation of the data through the use of computer software can help to highlight frequent and repeated patterns of language use which might not otherwise be visible in one-off examples of discourse.

2. The centrality of context, social facts and communities
A key aspect of ELTE is context-based learning, present in all dimensions of Freeman’s Design Theory summarised earlier. An understanding of the social context can be enhanced in two ways through CL. Firstly, the fact that language varies considerably in different contexts, varieties and genres is, thanks to corpus evidence, now beyond dispute (Reppen et al. 2002; Carter and McCarthy 2006). The judicious examination of a range of language varieties exposes student teachers to the influence of linguistic context. Secondly, in terms of pedagogic development, examples of practice from local and relevant situations, for example, EFL classroom data (A. Farrell 2019) or teacher education data (Riordan 2018), are of much greater benefit in the development of students’ own pedagogic repertoires (Bax 1997). In this way CL provides a very suitable framework for the collection, analysis and application of appropriate materials in and for the local teaching context.

3 Corpora and pedagogy
This section is about pedagogy, which has a range of complementary dimensions in teacher education. I will discuss three in the following subsections.

Learning how to use CL in the English language classroom
This aspect of CL often finds a home in pedagogy modules in ELTE. It relates to helping student teachers understand the affordances of CL as a pedagogic tool. Since writing this chapter for the first edition of this Handbook, two excellent resources have become available. The first relates to the integration of CL in schools (Braun 2007; Pérez-Paredes
There is an online resource centre hosted by Lancaster University as part of a project called *Corpus for Schools* led by Dana Gablasova. Of current relevance are the worksheets and activities that are being developed by the team for use in ESL classrooms and separately for A-level classrooms, for example, language and age, and spoken communication. Student handouts, supporting texts and very useful teacher notes are available for each of the topics. The second is an applied book series edited by McCarthy and O’Keeffe called *Routledge Corpus Linguistics Guides*. Although the series espouses to be research and practice oriented, I have found several of the volumes extremely useful when teaching student teachers about the potential pedagogic uses of corpora. Some obvious examples include *Corpus Linguistics for ELT* (Timmis 2015), *Corpus Linguistics for Vocabulary* (Szudarski 2017) and *Corpus Linguistics for Grammar* (Jones and Waller 2015). These two resources coupled with pedagogic corpora, or corpora which have been specifically designed for language teaching purposes (for example, the Backbone corpus and accompanying resources), rather than linguistic analysis per se now provide a wide-ranging repertoire for the student teacher.

In relation to pedagogic applications of corpora the task for ELTE programmes is simply one of making the student teachers aware of which are available and the possibilities for exploitation of corpus resources in the classroom, a topic on which many have now published (see, for example, O’Keeffe et al. 2007). And of course, we must remember that the largest corpus of all, albeit uncensored and unedited, is available to our student teachers in the form of the World Wide Web. *Sketch Engine* provides sophisticated tools to build corpora from the Web using combinations of search words and other criteria almost instantaneously (see Reppen 2016, and Chapter 2, this volume, for guidelines on how to design and build a corpus). Such resources and appropriate techniques provide a relatively easy route to the creation of relevant and interesting materials for classroom use. There is a related issue of using what are claimed to be corpus-based or corpus-informed publications (course books, etc.) by the publishers. It is important in teacher education programmes to alert student teachers to the type of criteria to use when evaluating the extent to which these claims hold true. This works well in a materials’ evaluation component of the programme by encouraging the student teachers to ask critical questions such as: Which corpus resources were used? How are they integrated into the coursebook? Have they been edited or modified in any way? Are corpus statistics integrated or were they used in arbitrating the content in any way? Is their inclusion appropriate for the targeted level and learners? And others. This will go some way towards engendering a critical disposition among student teachers, although these questions may not be immediately answerable.

**Using specialised corpora of classroom contexts to explore pedagogic practices**

Moving to the second dimension of corpora and pedagogy, I would like to discuss the potentials of CL to help student teachers understand and develop their own general classroom pedagogy and interactions (Sert 2019). This requires the examination of more specialised corpora collected from appropriate contexts. The first, and most obviously relevant, is a corpus of classroom language, which can give a much better insider’s perspective and can complement more traditional ELTE practices of classroom and peer observations. This type of work began in the 1970s with the publication of Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) volume, reporting on data collected in the British primary school.
context and which identified the typical IRF classroom interaction pattern formally. More recently, research by Walsh (2006) investigates the EFL context. Consideration has also been given to the ways in which CL and conversation analysis can be merged for the exploitation of this type of discourse (Walsh and O’Keeffe 2007), and this combines well with other debates on appropriate and triangulated methodologies for the analysis of corpus data (Egbert and Baker 2019).

An excellent recent example is Farrell (2019), who researches a 60,000-word corpus of EFL classrooms to provide a rare corpus-based account of the issues and challenges that arise from the use of “non-standard” varieties of spoken English by teachers, alongside the use of Standard British English. The quantitative results and qualitative analysis using a wide range of classroom language extracts provide rich material for student teachers to explore classroom discourse, pedagogic practices and relevant sociolinguistic issues. This type of highly relevant applied research is expanding, and a forthcoming volume likely to be of interest is Nicaise’s Native and Non-Native Teacher Talk in the EFL Classroom: A Corpus-Informed Study (2021). Baumgart’s research (2012) highlights a second strand to data collected from such educational contexts, which has not normally been married with corpus linguistics, but which, arguably, should. Reference is being made here to the type of data used to uncover social and linguistic issues of specific communities, usually in mainstream education. More general sociolinguistic dimensions have also been explored through the lens of CL in volumes such as Murphy (2010) and Friginal (2017).

Using learner corpora for pedagogic purposes

A more direct route to learners’ linguistic difficulties is often found in the examination of learner corpora (Meunier 2016; Friginal et al. 2017, and Chapters 22, 23 and 30, this volume). It is extremely useful for student teachers to have access directly to learner language in order to identify differences and possible errors and the frequency with which these occur. The International Corpus of Learner English project was one of the first large-scale endeavours of this type. Now at Version 3, it is a corpus of writing by higher intermediate to advanced learners of English. It contains 3.7 million words of EFL writing from learners representing 16 mother tongue backgrounds. Although a very useful resource, it could be suggested that the greatest benefit can be derived from student teachers engaging in action research projects where they actually collect, create and analyse their own learner corpora. Student teachers always gain enormous insights into methodological issues (Egbert and Baker 2019) and experience a real sense of achievement from being in the role of teacher researcher. Corpora are also being used to profile learner competencies, especially in relation to vocabulary and grammar across the levels of proficiency in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (see Chapter 22, this volume).

4 Corpora and language awareness

However it is labelled, a knowledge and awareness of the way in which a language operates in formal, functional, discoursal and pragmatic ways, is inevitably a core component in ELTE. In the achievement of this goal, language teacher educators are very much indebted to CL in two very significant ways. Firstly, we are in the enviable position of having an array of reference materials available commercially, which are
completely corpus-based, and this includes two comprehensive grammars based on authentic examples, frequency information and context-differentiated comparative accounts (Biber et al. 1999; Carter and McCarthy 2006). Secondly, much has been written on how to use corpora both in teaching and ELTE contexts for raising language awareness. Corpus-based language awareness now extends far beyond word- and sentence-level descriptions to more discourse-oriented perspectives (Cutting 2014; Clancy and McCarthy 2019), many with an important pragmatic focus (Rühlemann 2019; O’Keeffe et al. 2020). In this section, we discuss two associated issues of language awareness that relate specifically to language varieties.

At the time of the first edition of this book, many language genres had not yet been the subject of corpus-based examination. This has changed radically over the last ten years, and we now see very specific language contexts appearing in the research literature (see, for example, the Routledge series *Applying Corpus Linguistics*). These are all potentially extremely rich sources to use in ELTE programmes for the purposes of developing language awareness skills, and it may encourage student teachers to collect their own corpora and interpret them in an emic way. One of the primary motivations behind the creation of the Limerick Corpus of Irish English (LCIE) (Farr et al. 2004) was to capture the variety of English spoken in Ireland, which had not been done in any systematic way when the project began. This has proved a very worthwhile investment. Not only is it a significant source of spoken casual conversation, it is localised and therefore more relevant for learners in the Irish-English context in helping them to appreciate language variety issues but also in heightening awareness of their own personal language use before entering the world of ELT. Over the last ten years there has been a small explosion of corpus-based research into Irish English using L-CIE and complementary corpora (for example, Vaughan and Clancy 2016; Amador-Moreno and O’Keeffe 2018). In general, there is much overlap between the ways in which corpora are useful for raising language awareness in both ELT and ELTE contexts, the former of which receives much attention in this volume and therefore has received briefer attention in this chapter.

**5 The discourses of ELTE: using specialised corpora for the reflective practices and professional development of educators and student teachers**

In the final substantive section of this chapter, I return to the important issue raised in the introduction, and which has the potential to further discussions on ways in which we can extend the potential uses of CL in ELTE contexts. For me, this is the most exciting and innovative aspect. The key question here is what can corpus explorations tell us about the ways in which we conduct ELTE and how can we develop as a profession of teacher educators? The basic idea is to add to the techniques and tools used by teacher educators for the purposes of reflective practice and continued professional development by providing evidence-based accounts, as called for by many (Mann and Walsh 2017). We are all familiar with activities such as attending courses and conferences, keeping diaries, peer observations and personal development activities, among others, as part of our professional development (Farr 2015). The suggestion I make here is to record everyday professional activities and have them available for our own and others’ reflection, critique and ultimate improvement. This can be done through audio-recordings and transcriptions and the collection of written artefacts from teacher education contexts,
but in the move towards multi-modal corpora (see Chapter 3, this volume), it would probably be even more beneficial if at least some of those corpora were to exist in visual format also.

The present author’s work in this area began some years ago, at first focusing on the teaching practice (TP) arena. A number of one-to-one TP feedback sessions were recorded, transcribed and analysed. The big departure from previous work is the fact that the examination was corpus-based. Some of the early examinations of the data (Farr 2005a) focused on the corpus as a piece of discourse and identified the relational strategies used by both parties in the interactions, as well as types of authoritative interventions (including prescriptive, informative and confrontational) and facilitative interventions (including supportive, catalytic and cathartic) (Farr 2005b). Both of these established this type of interaction as being generally within the area of support and advice type discourse used in ELTE contexts and in therapeutic contexts, which is really important given the focus on emotional aspects of teaching (Gkonou et al. 2020). The corpus analysis produced, for example, statistics on levels of participation for the student teachers and the tutors (a ratio of approximately 30:70 per cent) and identified the language which is relatively more significant in corpus data (metadiscourse, cognitive and cathartic words, personal and impersonal referencing techniques, words indicating interactivity and hedges) (for a full account, see Farr 2010).

In addition to my own endeavours investigating the social interactions in ELTE Riordan (2018) has expanded the range of contexts under scrutiny. In this highly relevant work, she collected a corpus of online and face-to-face interactions between student teachers and mentors. Her analysis shows different patterns of interaction depending on a range of speaker variables. Even more recently, Farr et al. (2019) created the Teacher Education Corpus (TEC). Using results from the analysis of this expanded corpus (consisting of the TP feedback and online interactions just mentioned, plus data in the form of spoken, written and online discourse from more experienced teachers), we examine three overlapping thematic areas in detail, all of which have high relevance in ELTE. The first of these is teacher socialisation and communities of practice (see Vaughan 2007 and Chapter 33, this volume); the second is identity and how it is articulated; the third is how teachers reflect and develop professionally during their ELTE programmes. This research has strongly influenced how we engage with our student teachers but also, perhaps more valuably, provide us with an excellent range of authentic data from the very context in which these teachers are studying. As well as being a rich source for action research, the data can be used as an awareness-raising tool for the induction of new tutors into teaching practice and for new student teachers who can now get a preview of what the various contexts will entail before being fully immersed. In other words, it allows for another mode of legitimate peripheral participation in the social contexts of ELTE and provides support for evidencing transformations in practice (for example, Vásquez and Reppen 2007).

This chapter has illustrated the ways in which CL can support current models and approaches in teacher education and how its adaptation into many of the subject contents can aid in the development of student teachers’ awareness and understanding of pedagogic issues and practices, as well as their appreciation of formal, discoursal and pragmatic aspects of language used in a variety of contexts. All of this can be done in exploratory and investigatory ways through both mediated and direct access to corpora, which have the potential to enhance the educational experience and complement other effective, existing approaches. However, to reiterate what I said earlier, I see CL as one...
approach in ELTE, among others. I fully agree with McCarthy’s position (2020: 10) that ‘as a profession, we have been at our best when not hamstrung by ideology, whether it be exclusive slot-and-filler structuralism, blinkered CLT, narrow-minded SLA, dogmatic ELF or a heedless juggernaut of corpus-driven zeal’. For publishers, corpora are a given; for researchers, corpora are a given; and now our future teachers have become actively and critically engaged with corpus linguistics in their ELTE. For this to continue to happen, teacher educators need to take an active role in affording corpus integration the required space in education programmes, not as a segregated specialisation, but as a thread woven through many components of the course delivery. In my own practice over the past 20 years, this seems to have worked well.
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