Corpus use in enhancing lexico-grammatical awareness through flipped applications

Hatice Çelebi [a], Hatice Karaaslan [b] *, Serpil Demir-Vegter [c]

[a]*MEF University, İstanbul, Turkey*
[b]*Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Ankara, Turkey*
[c]*Koç University, İstanbul, Turkey*

Abstract

There is an increasing need for quality assurance in higher education, given the changes taking place around the world (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Yet another challenge for educators is to find ways to address this in a systematic way. This study presents a systematic endeavor towards this aim in an English language teaching (ELT) department in a higher education institution. In an effort to raise lexico-grammatical awareness as part of language competence, corpus linguistics and flipped classroom techniques were incorporated into a departmental course. Following the procedures planned in advance, the freshmen students in the ELT department viewed a set of videos instructing them on how to conduct basic studies on corpora and analyze findings using interactive and collaborative online activities. They completed subsequent tasks as part of the classroom work, which aimed to help them build meaningful connections with their online experiences (Strayer, 2012; Lukassen et al., 2014; Lane-Kelso, 2015). They then reflected on their experience, and their responses were evaluated with regard to the cultivation of quality culture, the use of corpora in language learning, and the incorporation of flipped applications. This study presents the findings and implications of incorporating corpus linguistics in the flipped classroom and the ways such incorporation helped cultivate quality teaching.

Keywords: Lexico-grammatical awareness; flipped learning; corpus linguistics; cultivating quality; higher education

1. Introduction

The last two decades have brought dramatic changes to higher education around the world. Biggs and Tang (2011) state that times have changed so much in higher education institutions today that there is greater student diversity and this diversity presents a challenge to cultivating quality in teaching. They illustrate the potential issue this diversity causes through the "Robert and Susan problem." Susan represents a student who is academically highly committed and has a high level of curiosity to learn, whereas Robert is a student whose main concern is to get a qualification for a decent

job. In a continuum of high-level and low-level engagement at two ends, academic Susan shows a tendency to move towards higher level engagement, vertically up, that is, from relating to applying and from applying to theorizing while Robert has a tendency to move in the opposite direction, vertically down, that is, from explaining to describing and from describing to note-taking and memorizing. The problem is closing the gap between Susan and Robert, and closing this gap is would be an indicator of quality teaching (Biggs and & Tang, 2011, p. 1: 7).

There are various general theories of teaching that operate on different learning principles (Piaget, 1950/1955; Bloom, 1956; Vygotsky, 1978; Marton, 1981; Gardner, 1983; Kolb, 1984). For a start, to be more systematic in our endeavor to cultivate quality in our own context, we focused mainly on the following five principles derived from constructivism, which are described as being present in the "deep approach" that the hypothetical student Susan uses (Biggs & Tang, 2011, pp. 26–27).

Learning emerges when students form:

appropriate background information and a well-structured knowledge base; and

a genuine preference for working conceptually rather than with unrelated details.

Learning emerges when teachers:

teach in such a way that encourages depth of learning rather than breadth of knowledge;

assess for structure rather than independent facts; and

create a positive atmosphere by allowing students to make mistakes and learn from them.

Our pedagogical model to put our principles into operation consisted of a combination of corpus linguistics and flipped classroom techniques through which we aimed to encourage depth of learning in language teaching in an ELT department. In this respect, for the reasons discussed in the sections on the use of corpus linguistics in language teaching and the flipped classroom in teaching, we hypothesized that, in our context, the bimodal teaching approach would generate the abovementioned principles of deep learning and facilitate more quality.

In keeping with our methodological principles, we selected one specific domain, i.e., lexicology. This was a problematic area for learners (Koban, 2011; Aşık et al., 2015), so we worked on lexico-grammatical awareness that supplements general language competence. Our hypothesis characterized the nature of our study, which we developed to be exploratory. In particular, the questions we explored under the quality-assurance premise were:

What are students' views on flipped applications?

What are students' primary points of consideration while analyzing language data in corpus-based tasks?

What are students' views on corpus use in language learning and teaching?

As we examined the findings that we arrived at, along with the procedures and materials we applied, we formulated insights and implications as to how the bimodal approach we followed helped deeper learning and quality assurance in language teaching. This study presents the ways, findings, and implications of this bimodal approach to quality assurance in language teaching departments in higher education, specifically aiming to increase the language competence level in prospective English language teachers.

1.1. Literature review

1.1.1. Lexico-grammatical awareness

Contini-Morava and Tobin (2000, p. IX) point out that linguistic theories have always made a distinction between lexicon and grammar, despite underlying variations. For our study, we borrow the term "lexico-grammar" to emphasize the interdependence and continuity rather than the differences between the two. It has long been observed that one major challenge for language learners is handling vocabulary (Flores Rojas, 2008; Asgari & Mustapha, 2011). The comprehension, retention, and appropriate use of words with a consideration of their lexical and grammatical features requires studying these words in an enriched context where it is possible to observe their various instantiations. In this respect, learners often resort to dictionaries (printed or online) or other relatively decontextualized forms of language samples, which may in fact offer limited access to a word's semantic map (Oxford & Crookall, 1990) due to their scope and space limitations. On the other hand, when learners are presented with the basic tools of corpus studies, which allow the analysis of samples of real world texts in their natural contexts, they may develop the kind of lexico-grammatical awareness essential to acquiring vocabulary (O'Keeffe et al., 2007; Zimmerman, 2009; Hunston, 2010).

Conrad (2010) discusses three types of lexico-grammatical relationships. The first type covers the lexical items that tend to occur with certain grammatical structures such as *that*-clause objects, as in the example "**Reports suggest that** in many subject areas, textbooks and materials are not available" (p. 230). The other type demonstrates the relationship that causes specific words to function as they do along with the grammatical context, such as the example of "Never **mind**," where *mind* is used in present tense to express a mental, emotional, and logical state (p. 230). The third type of relationship is what is also called "semantic prosody." Sinclair (1991) points out that certain structures and types of meaning have a tendency to occur with positive or negative contexts. For example, the *get*-passive is often used similarly to the context "He got arrested" to express an unlucky situation. These examples illustrate how complex teaching and learning a language can be.

In discussing four aspects of language that "complicate the teaching and learning of languages" in relation to *ambiguity*, Sinclair (2004, p. 272) explains that words have many meanings and it is not possible to arrive at conclusions based on a simple correlation between form. In relation to another aspect, that is, *incompleteness*, he maintains that the meaning of a text lies in broader systems of language rather than the immediate context, so much so that, "There are no established terms, even in the grammar, for these aspects of organized meaning" (Sinclair, 2004, p. 273). He proposes that using corpus linguistics will lead to new discoveries about and informed descriptions of language items and alleviate and eliminate problems with the complex features of languages, since it widens the context and provides "a large enough 'window'" (p. 288).

1.1.2. Corpus linguistics

Contini-Morava and Tobin (2000, p. IX) point out that linguistic theories have always made a distinction between lexicon and grammar, despite underlying variations. For our study, we borrow the term "lexico-grammar" to emphasize the interdependence and continuity rather than the differences between the two. It has long been observed that one major challenge for language learners is handling vocabulary (Flores Rojas, 2008; Asgari & Mustapha, 2011). The comprehension, retention, and appropriate use of words with a consideration of their lexical and grammatical features requires studying these words in an enriched context where it is possible to observe their various instantiations. In this respect, learners often resort to dictionaries (printed or online) or other relatively decontextualized forms of language samples, which may in fact offer limited access to a word's semantic map (Oxford & Crookall, 1990) due to their scope and space limitations. On the other hand,

when learners are presented with the basic tools of corpus studies, which allow the analysis of samples of real world texts in their natural contexts, they may develop the kind of lexico-grammatical awareness essential to acquiring vocabulary (O'Keeffe et al., 2007; Zimmerman, 2009; Hunston, 2010).

Conrad (2010) discusses three types of lexico-grammatical relationships. The first type covers the lexical items that tend to occur with certain grammatical structures such as *that*-clause objects, as in the example "**Reports suggest that** in many subject areas, textbooks and materials are not available" (p. 230). The other type demonstrates the relationship that causes specific words to function as they do along with the grammatical context, such as the example of "Never **mind**," where *mind* is used in present tense to express a mental, emotional, and logical state (p. 230). The third type of relationship is what is also called "semantic prosody." Sinclair (1991) points out that certain structures and types of meaning have a tendency to occur with positive or negative contexts. For example, the *get*-passive is often used similarly to the context "He got arrested" to express an unlucky situation. These examples illustrate how complex teaching and learning a language can be.

In discussing four aspects of language that "complicate the teaching and learning of languages" in relation to *ambiguity*, Sinclair (2004, p. 272) explains that words have many meanings and it is not possible to arrive at conclusions based on a simple correlation between form. In relation to another aspect, that is, *incompleteness*, he maintains that the meaning of a text lies in broader systems of language rather than the immediate context, so much so that, "There are no established terms, even in the grammar, for these aspects of organized meaning" (Sinclair, 2004, p. 273). He proposes that using corpus linguistics will lead to new discoveries about and informed descriptions of language items and alleviate and eliminate problems with the complex features of languages, since it widens the context and provides "a large enough 'window'" (p. 288).

Corpus linguistics is used to carry out linguistic analyses focusing on many different linguistic questions and what a language may reflect in various domains of the humanities and other disciplines. A corpus can be defined as a computerized collection of naturally occurring texts of language, systematically representing several subcategories such as text types, varieties, and so on. The analysis of the language is based on naturally occurring data, as opposed to data based on a researcher's intuition (introspection), a user's comments (informant's intuitions), and anecdotal evidence. A corpus analysis can be carried on lexical, structural, lexico-grammatical, discourse, phonological, or morphological language patterns. An unrestrictive range of samples of patterns containing the linguistic item of focus is reached and listed for the researcher to observe and analyze what regulates the sample occurrences.

A representative approach to corpus linguistics and language teaching is proposed by Johns (e.g., 1991), namely *data-driven learning*. Johns maintains that, similar to linguists, learners can discover the language, and they should be guided and encouraged to do so. Bernardini (2004, pp. 16–17) highlights the effects of such an emphasis on inductive versus deductive learning and states that the roles of teachers and students, along with the complexity of the grammar in teaching should be reframed in the context of data-driven learning. The teacher becomes the coordinator of research and a facilitator; the learner becomes the observer and interpreter of the data, and grammar becomes an entity, which is no longer abstract. She calls this view *learning as discovery* and comments that:

…(i)t encourages learners to follow their own interests whilst providing them with opportunities to develop their capacities and competences so that their searches become better focused, their interpretation of results more precise, their understanding of corpus use and their language awareness sharper. This may be confusing at first, as learners are asked to abandon deeply rooted norms of classroom behavior, but soon becomes liberating for both teachers (who can stop pretending to be

sources of absolute and limitless knowledge) and learners (who start to see themselves as active participants in the teaching-learning process) (2004, p. 23).

Learning as discovery through corpus analysis leads to autonomy, self-direction, and motivation (Leech, 1997), as the learners are encouraged to follow the practice of selecting from a large range of responses and arriving at hypotheses. If this process is carried out regularly, it empowers both the learners and teachers because their expertise of "learning strategies," especially those in an English as a foreign language context. Structuring grammar rules based on their intuition and on their L1 comes into play, as opposed to "native-speaker" intuitions on acceptability and appropriateness of language use (Bernardini, 2010; Cook, 1998).

1.1.3. Flipped classrooms

The idea of flipping was first introduced by high school chemistry teachers Jon Bergmann and Aaron Sams (2012) to provide the students who missed classes with an opportunity to catch up on the missed content. In its most recent form, a flipped classroom is a learning environment that blends two learning platforms, one outside and one inside the classroom (Basal, 2015). The instruction is delivered online outside the class while homework or higher cognitive activities are reserved for the classroom. Having introduced new content through short, informative videos to be viewed prior to lessons, teachers guide and monitor the students while they work together in the classroom on more complex tasks based on the new material.

Any act of implementing flipping in classes needs to have taken into consideration some important elements of widely accepted learning theories such as constructivism (Basal, 2015). In an ideal flipped design, objectives are clearly defined and in accomplishing those objectives, various options are provided for individual learners. There is an emphasis on goal-setting, decision-making, problem-solving, meaning-making, and autonomy-building using various patterns of interaction which may range from student-content, student-student, to student-instructor. Such classes allow students view a set of videos about the new content, analyze it using interactive and collaborative online activities, and complete subsequent tasks as part of the classroom work, all of which aim to help build meaningful connections with their online experiences (Strayer, 2012; Lukassen et al., 2014; Lane-Kelso, M., 2015).

The opportunities offered in a blended learning environment are appealing to language teachers in Turkey as well, and flipped practices have been experimented with in various higher education contexts in departmental language courses (Basal, 2015; Shannon-Chastain & Fell-Kurban, 2016). Flipping greatly contributes to the teaching-learning process in terms of allowing personalized learning (e.g., learner needs, pace) and variety, student preparation in advance, increasing student participation and interaction, efficient use of class time, and overcoming time-related limitations.

However, some limitations of the practice with respect to video length, video delivery, elements of fun and humor, and assessment have also been reported (Basal, 2015; Shannon-Chastain & Fell-Kurban, 2016). In order to increase student engagement with flipped applications, some precautions have been offered such as limiting video length, launching videos at least four days prior to the actual in-class session, incorporating more elements of fun and humor into the videos so that students can get the feel of genuine interaction with the instructor and content, and finally, including some assessment (quizzes, in-class tasks or assignments) based on video content to ensure students watch the videos and prepare for the in-class sessions in advance. These suggestions have been considered in the design of the flipped modules used for the purposes of this study.

2. Method

2.1. Instrument(s)

In order to identify students' views on flipped applications, course-specific flipped materials were developed and used for the purposes of this study. These included introductory videos, website forum discussions, and subsequent in-class discussions. Upon the completion of the implementation process, the survey on students' views toward flipped learning was administered.[†] The details regarding the materials and the survey are outlined below.

Flipped materials: The students were provided with the theoretical background and introductory examples using videos scripted by the researchers, and recorded and made accessible by their instructor (one of the researchers). Each lasted between seven and eleven minutes and contained the following information:

Week 1: What is a corpus? Which tools are used in corpus studies? What are concordancing programs?

Week 2: What is a corpus used for? How are lexical and grammatical features investigated using a corpus?

Week 3: How does an awareness of collocation and colligation help language learners?

Week 4: How predictable are collocations? Do patterns such as connotation, animacy, and metaphor help in accurate and appropriate language use?

Website forum discussions: The students used the class website to get immediate peer and/or instructor help and share ideas about issues ranging from some practical aspects, such as downloading the corpus files or running a word search using the software, to critical discussions or comments on their findings. This forum site set the grounds for a smooth transition from the background information provided in the videos to the in-class discussions based on practice.

In-class discussions: Upon viewing the videos and completing the tasks, these students had the opportunity to reflect upon their hands-on experience and ask for further instructor support and guidance during in-class discussions every week.

Survey of students' views on flipped learning: The students were asked to complete a 24-item Likert-type (1: strongly disagree, 5: strongly agree) questionnaire which aimed to reveal their views on flipped learning in terms of motivation, course structure, student-instructor interaction, student-student interaction, and student-content interaction. It contained items such as "The course materials are well organized and delivered."

In order to identify students' primary points of consideration while analyzing language data in corpus-based tasks, two sets of materials were used. First, the students were required to analyze the letters written to a story character by a group of English preparatory school students in terms of collocation and colligation use. Then, they were required to respond to a final exam question about corpus use asking them to generate possible research questions based on hypothetical corpus search results. The details regarding these materials are outlined below.

Student letters: The students at the English preparatory school were required to read a graded version of *The Time Machine* extensively over a period of four weeks, participate in weekly class

---

[†] This survey is used as part of a needs assessment project conducted by a research assistant at the department and is referred here with her permission (Birgili, 2016).

discussions on various aspects of the story such as plot and main characters, and eventually write a letter to one of the characters, presenting their own ideas and feelings about the character's thoughts, feelings, and actions, and making suggestions for the future. Their letters were used for collocation and colligation analyses by the students at the ELT department.

Student final exam responses: The students at the ELT department were required to respond to the following final exam question about corpus use asking them to generate possible research questions based on hypothetical corpus search results. The questions asked were modified from the corpus study examples suggested by Gabrielatos (2005). They are as follows:

Choose <u>one</u> of the situations given (A, B, or C) and write <u>three questions</u> that you would try to answer using your hypothetical search results.

Suppose you have run a word search for the noun 'diet' using AntConc and identified the verbs, phrasal verbs, or expressions 'diet' collocates with.

Suppose you have run a search for if-sentences using AntConc.

Suppose you have run separate word searches for 'sorrow' and 'grief' using AntConc to devise a dictionary entry for each.

In order to identify students' views on corpus use in language learning and teaching, two sets of materials were used. The students were first asked to write a semi-guided reflective paragraph, and then they were required to write a guided reflective paragraph based on their observations and experiences in relation to corpus use in language learning and teaching. The details regarding these materials are outlined below.

Student reflections: Student reflections were gathered twice:

Semi-guided reflection: The students in the ELT Department were required to write a reflective paragraph based on their experiences over the four-week period with reference to using corpus in language learning and analyzing language samples in terms of collocation and colligation use.

Guided reflection: The students at the ELT Department were required to write a reflective paragraph based on their observations and experiences in relation to corpus use in language learning and teaching as part of their course, elaborating on two of the following headings:

Corpora as a source of material/examples (that reflect language in use)

Corpora to determine the syllabus (what to teach and when)

Corpora as a source of explanation/evidence (for subtle differences)

Corpora for discovery learning through exploratory tasks

2.2. Data collection procedures

A group of freshmen students in an ELT department were trained in the use of corpora in language teaching as part of a language use and competence course. They were provided with theoretical background, practical examples, and hands-on experience over a period of four weeks. Prior to their classes each week, students viewed a seven to eleven-minute long video informing them about a specific aspect of corpus work with examples, and then completed the task required in each video in order to prepare for the subsequent in-class discussions as well as contribute to the forum discussions on the class website. The tasks included: (1) getting familiar with corpora and tools used in corpus studies (e.g., concordancing software), (2) getting familiar with corpus-based dictionary research and examining the lexico-grammatical profiles of words with reference to the concepts of collocation and

colligation, (3) analyzing and reflecting on a set of words and expressions in context from their own texts (their written answers to exam questions) compiled by their instructor, (4) developing a more detailed understanding of collocations and their predictability with the help of patterns such as connotation, animacy, and metaphor, and (5) analyzing and reflecting on the letters written to a story character by a group of English preparatory school students in terms of collocation and colligation use, selecting the items for analyses themselves. Finally, they were required to respond to two final exam questions about corpus use: one asking them to generate possible research questions based on hypothetical corpus search results, and another asking them to present their views on corpus use in language learning under specific headings.

2.3. Data analysis

Quantitative data were collected through a 24-item Likert-type questionnaire to answer the first research question as to the students' views on flipped learning. The data gathered through the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations).

In order to answer the second research question regarding the students' primary points of consideration while analyzing language data in corpus-based tasks, qualitative data were collected through open-ended questions. The responses for the letter analysis and final exam question were compiled by the researchers. Their content analysis (Creswell, 2012) was carried out as follows: (1) organize the data, (2) explore and code the data, (3) construct descriptions and themes, (4) identify the qualitative findings, (5) interpret the findings, and (6) validate the accuracy of the findings. During the data analysis, the answers were read individually and grouped based on the points students considered. At the same time, two of the researchers analyzed and generated questions in order to determine common themes. All three researchers compared and discussed the content analysis to finalize the themes. The explanations were aligned with these findings. The findings were presented (shown below) without comment to demonstrate the actual data, and then the results were interpreted.

In order to answer the third research question regarding students' views on corpus use in language learning and teaching, qualitative data were collected through semi-guided and guided written reflection questions. The responses were compiled by the researchers and a content analysis (Creswell, 2012) was carried out. During the data analysis, the answers were read individually and grouped based on the students' views on corpus use in language learning and teaching. The data were categorized based on the similarities and differences in views, and explanations were aligned with these findings. The findings were presented without any comment to demonstrate the actual data, and then the results were interpreted.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Students' views on flipped learning

The means and standard deviations of the students' ratings of the flipped learning scales are reported in Table 1, below. The students had positive views about the flipped applications across all subscales, with all items (except one) receiving ratings with means above 3.30.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of the flipped learning scales

	T*	M	SD	N	%
Motivation	35	24.2	8.54	18	69
Course Structure	30	23.4	5.64	18	78
Student-Instructor Interaction	25	20.7	4.85	18	83
Student-Student Interaction	15	11.5	3.63	18	77
Student-Content Interaction	15	11.5	2.85	18	77
Total SILL	120	91.3	25.51	18	

T* represents the highest mean score possible; e.g., for the motivation subscale, it is 5 (the highest point on the scale); *7 (number of items in this subscale) = 35.

In order to be able to compare student ratings across subscales with varying numbers of items, the relevant percentages (the "%" column in Table 1, above) were calculated using the totals (the highest mean possible in each case) and the actual mean values of the data collected. Based on these percentages, it was revealed that the student-instructor interaction subscale, which included items such as "I am satisfied with the response time for the instructor feedback that I have received," received the highest ratings from the students (83%). The subscales of course-structure, student-student interaction, and student-content interaction received the second highest set of ratings (78%, 77%, and 77%, respectively) while the motivation subscale received relatively lower ratings, standing close to 70%.

In order to determine the specific items that were rated relatively negatively and thus needed further attention in the flipped class design in later applications, we needed to examine the students' ratings for each item under each subscale more closely. Therefore, the individual means of all items in the survey were computed and compared against the mean of the subscale each belongs to divided by the total number of items in that subscale. Accordingly, six items that were below their respective subscale means were selected and enlisted as high-priority items to be dealt with in later flipped applications. One such item was "The structure of flipped learning adequately reflects individual differences and needs."

3.2. Students' points of consideration in analyzing language data

Student letters: Take-home exam letter analyses

In the letter analyses, which were completed as a take-home exam with running a corpus search as part of the task requirements, students considered grammatical accuracy, efficient use of context in resolving issues such as ambiguity or redundancy, expressive power that contributes to meaning-formation, and mechanics (spelling and punctuation) as points of analysis. The overall tendency was to focus on discrete points mainly referring to grammatical accuracy while a more holistic perspective referring to register, contextual issues, or expressional quality was avoided by some students. This variance might have possibly resulted from how competent each felt in language use and corpus use. However, over the four-week intervention period, students, at their own pace, seemed to develop a better understanding of corpus analysis, which was largely observed in the kinds of questions they posed in response to the first final exam question reported in the next section.

Student final exam responses

A majority of the students responded to the question on *if-sentences*. They generated questions on frequency of use, functional properties, types of conditional sentences, the differences in meaning among them, tense or modal-related rules, and punctuation rules. Following *if-sentences, diet* was the second most frequently chosen item for which the students generated questions on checking for likely or most frequent patterns (e.g., is it possible to say "run a diet?"), and examples of its use with adjectives, prepositions, or verbs. They mainly focused on its collocations. Finally, the item asking

about *sorrow* vs. *grief* was the least preferred one, chosen by only one student, and his questions were about whether there is any overlap in meaning, and if there have been any changes in meaning over time.

On the whole, although there were some students who preferred to work on the task that required collocational or semantic analyses, most of them seemed to find it more manageable or felt more confident making comments about grammar topics in an exam situation. However, this was also a sign of awareness in that they already realized the importance of gathering real corpus data while investigating subtle differences. Moreover, their analyses of *if-sentences* did not target purely grammatical aspects; they wanted to see what happens function- and meaning-wise when contexts vary.

3.3. Students' views on corpus use in language learning and teaching

Semi-guided reflection

In the semi-guided reflective paragraphs in which students presented their ideas about corpus use in language learning and teaching, the most frequently cited example was the kind of native speaker knowledge—correct, reflecting natural use, and objective—that could be attained using a corpus. They would not be restricted to dictionaries, as corpora in a way represent the extended versions of these dictionaries. In this way, they believed they could have easier access to information on accurate and appropriate language use. Students also focused on having the opportunity to keep themselves constantly updated as the language changes and having the ability to predict patterns to achieve expressional quality. Finally, some students offered some complementary ideas along with corpus use, such as creating face-to-face communication opportunities for language in real life.

Guided reflection

In the guided reflection paragraphs they wrote as part of their final exam (presenting their ideas under specific headings), the corpus was reflected mainly as a source of materials and examples illustrating language in use. They stated that corpora could be used for practicing tenses and phrasal verbs, introducing words or structures in context to reinforce appropriate use, generating realistic and up-to-date language samples, saving time via easy and rapid access to language samples, and having access to a much richer set of language samples (both written and spoken) compared to dictionaries. They also perceive corpora as a source of explanation/evidence (of subtle differences), as in having access to evidence on appropriate use to support teacher input, explaining various aspects of language, and resolving confusion or uncertainties. The next point they highlighted was the use of corpora for discovery learning through exploratory tasks in deriving word meaning by searching through corpus examples, correcting mistakes, and observing creative language use. Finally, they had no entries for the final heading that corpora determine the syllabus (what to teach and when), most probably due to a lack of related background as they are only prospective language teachers in their first year of teacher training.

Based on both sets of reflection data, it can be concluded that students found it worthwhile to conduct corpus analyses to understand and resolve various linguistic issues.

4. Conclusions

This study was put into practice in an effort to cultivate quality of teaching in an ELT department. It was mainly exploratory in nature, and the data were collected in stages in variety of ways. A bimodal approach was followed, borrowing principles and techniques of corpus linguistics and the flipped classroom. The materials and procedures were planned in light of considerations about complex features of language such as lexico-grammar and how corpus linguistics and flipped

classrooms could be used to raise lexico-grammatical awareness in our teaching context. We hypothesized that a systematic trend 1) emphasizing discovery through data-driven learning supported by techniques of corpus linguistics and 2) material presentation tailored to the needs of students emphasizing higher-level skills such as decision-making, problem-solving, meaning making, and autonomy-building through the medium of the flipped classroom would enhance the quality of our instruction of freshman students in the ELT department.

Our findings suggest that the learners gained more proficiency in regards to the targeted domain, that is, lexico-grammatical competence. They demonstrated their awareness through their views on the use of corpus linguistics in teaching and learning a language by stating that, e.g., compared to dictionaries, corpus linguistics reinforces appropriate use, generates realistic and up-to-date language samples, saves time via easy and rapid access to language samples, and gives access to a much richer set of language samples (both written and spoken). They commented on data-driven learning and learning through discovery positively by stating they can follow language change and they have the ability to predict patterns and achieve expressional quality like "real language users" (meaning "native-speakers") of the target language. They offered views on teaching/learning collocations, reinforcing lexical inference, offering useful alternatives to overused vocabulary items, pointing out the differences between easily confused words, examining grammar rules critically, and offering specific warnings to alert learners about common errors.

In relation to material presentation through the flipped classroom, relatively high scores were given to the items on the scale evaluating motivation, course structure, student-instructor interaction, student-student interaction, and student-content interaction. The materials were systematically designed around achievable objectives for each video and in each video, new content was introduced and a new language discovery task was assigned. This encouraged the learner-students to actively work outside class at their own pace and around their own availability, and interact both with the content and their classmates. Supported by a Learning Management System that enabled online interaction both among classmates and with the instructor, the flipped classroom application items on the scale on student-instructor interaction, student-student interaction, and student-content interaction received high scores.

Overall, the study illustrates that our bimodal approach combining corpus linguistics and the flipped classroom to raise lexico-grammatical competence and cultivate quality substantiates a potential for depth of learning. Corpus linguistics presents an opportunity for students to work with genuine examples rather than the isolated and readily presented examples found in dictionaries or textbooks, and the flipped classroom allowed them to work at their own pace. A combination of the two is desirable to promote the use of exploratory tasks based on contextualized samples instead of decontextualized, independent drill exercises, as well as to balance the product/process dichotomy and improve the practice of learner-centred, self-directed autonomy building in a task-based learning platform.

References

Asgari, A. & Mustapha, G. (2011). The type of vocabulary learning strategies used by ESL students in university Putra Malaysia. *English Language Teaching, 4*(2), 84–90.

Aşık, A., Şarlanoğlu-Vural, A., & Akpınar, K. D. (2016). Lexical awareness and development through data driven learning: Attitudes and beliefs of EFL learners. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 4*(3), 87–96.

Basal, A. (2015). The implementation of a flipped classroom in foreign language teaching. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE, 16*(4)*, 28–27.

Bergmann, J. & Sams, A. (2012). *Flip Your Classroom: Reach Every Student in Every Class Every Day.* Eugene, OR: ISTE.

Bernardini, S. (2004). Corpora in the classroom: An overview and some reflections on future development. In J. M. Sinclair (Ed.), *How to Use Corpora in Language Teaching*, (pp. 15–38). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Biggs, J. B. & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University, 4th Ed.* Maidenhead: McGraw Hill Education & Open University Press.

Birgili, B. (2016). Needs analysis. Unpublished Study. Middle East Technical University.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Co. Inc.

Conrad, S. (2010) What can a corpus tell us about grammar? In M. McCarthy & A. O'Keeffe (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*, (pp. 227–40). London: Routledge.

Contini-Morava, E. & Tobin, Y. (Eds.) 2000. *Between Grammar and Lexicon*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamins.

Cook, G. (1998). The uses of reality: A reply to Ronald Carter. *ELT Journal, 52*(1), 57–64.

Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research, 4th Ed*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Flores Rojas, M. M. (2008). Exploring Vocabulary Acquisition Strategies For EFL Advanced Learners. *MA TESOL Collection.* Paper 192. Retrieved on March 10, 2016 from: http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/ipp_collection/192

Gabrielatos, C. (2005). Corpora and language teaching: Just a fling or wedding bells? *TESL-EJ, 8*(4), 1-37.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Handford, M. (2010). What can a corpus tell us about specialist genres? In M. McCarthy & A. O'Keeffe (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*, (pp. 255–269). London: Routledge.

Hunston, S. (2010). *Corpora in Applied Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johns, T. (1991). Should you be persuaded? Two samples of data-driven learning materials. In T. Johns & P. King (Eds.), *Classroom Concordancing*, (pp. 1–16). [ELR Journal, 4].

Koban, D. (2011). A Case Study of Turkish ESL Learners at LaGuardia Community College, City University of New York, NYC: Error Analysis. *International Proceedings of Economics, Development and Research: Languages, Literature and Linguistics,* 26, 168-172.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Lane-Kelso, M. (2015). The pedagogy of flipped instruction in Oman. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 14*(1), 143–150.

Leech, G. (1997). Teaching and language corpora: A convergence. In A. Wichmann, S. Fligelstone, T. McEnery, & G. Knowles (Eds.), *Teaching and Language Corpora*, (pp. 1–23). London: Longman.

Lukassen, N. B., Pedersen, A., Nielsen, A., Wahl, C., & Sorensen, E. K. (2014). Digital education with IT: How to create motivational and inclusive education in blended learning environments using flipped learning: A study in nurse education, *13th European Conference on E-Learning* 2014, 305-312.

Marton, F. (1981). Phenomenography: Describing conceptions of the world around us. *Instructional Science, 10*(2), 177–200.

O'Keeffe, A. & McCarthy, M. (Eds.) (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. (2007). *From Corpus to Classroom: Language Use and Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. & Crookall, D. (1990). Vocabulary learning: A critical analysis of techniques. *TESL Canada Journal, 7*(2), 9–30.

Piaget, J. (1950/1995). Explanation in sociology. In J. Piaget (1995), *Sociological Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Shannon-Chastain, J. & Fell-Kurban, C. (2016). Just one more hit: Student engagement with pre-class videos in the evolution of an English for Academic Purposes course from traditional to flipped. *The Global e-Learning Journal, 5*(2), 1-7

Sinclair, J. (1991) *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, M. J. (2004) New evidence, new priorities, new attitudes. In J. M. Sinclair (Ed.), *How to Use Corpora in Language Teaching*, (pp. 271–300). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Strayer, J. F. (2012) How learning in an inverted classroom influences cooperation, innovation and task orientation. *Learning Environment Research 15*, 171–193.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zimmerman, C. B. (2009). *Word Knowledge: A Vocabulary Teacher's Handbook.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Derlem kullanımı ve ters yüz uygulamalar ile kelime ve dil bilgisi farkındalığının arttırılması

Öz

Değişen dünyamız yüksek öğretimde kalite kavramını ön plana çıkarmıştır (Biggs ve Tang, 2011). Eğitimciler için önem taşıyan bir nokta da kalitenin sistematik bir şekilde ele alınabilmesi olmuştur. Bu çalışmada bir üniversitenin İngiliz Dili Öğretimi bölümünde bu doğrultuda yapılan faaliyetler değerlendirilmiştir. Dil bilgi ve birikiminin bir parçası olarak kelime ve dil bilgisi farkındalığını arttırmak amacıyla bir bölüm dersi kapsamında derlem dilbilim ve ters yüz (flipped) sınıf uygulamaları kullanıldı. İngiliz Dili Öğretimi bölümündeki birinci sınıf öğrencileri, sınıf içi ders öncesi, temel derlem araştırma çalışmalarını nasıl yürüteceklerini anlatan videolar izlediler ve bulgularını elektronik ortamda, etkileşimli olarak analiz ettiler. Bu çalışmaların devamında elektronik ortamdaki deneyimlerini pekiştirebilmek ve anlamlı bağlantılar kurabilmek için sınıf içi etkinlikler yaptılar (Strayer, 2012; Lukassen ve ark., 2014; Lane-Kelso, 2015). Yaptıkları uygulamalı çalışmalar ve bu

çalışmalar hakkındaki görüşleri hem dönem içinde hem de dönem sonunda uygulanan test ve anketlerle toplanıp dil eğitiminde derlem dilbilim ve ters yüz öğrenme tekniklerinin kullanımı ile kalite kültürüne katkıları bakımından değerlendirildi ve ilgili bulgular sunuldu.

Anahtar sözcükler: Kelime ve dil bilgisi farkındalığı; ters yüz öğrenme; derlem dilbilim; kalite kültürü; yüksek öğretim

---

AUTHOR BIODATA

Hatice Çelebi is an assistant professor at MEF University, English Language Teaching Department. Her research interests are (im)politeness, corpus linguistics, collaborative learning and learner training. [celebih@mef.edu.tr]

Hatice Karaaslan is a language instructor at Yıldırım Beyazıt University, with a PhD in Cognitive Science from METU. Her interests include corpus linguistics, argumentation and critical thinking, advising in language learning and blended learning. [hkaraaslan@ybu.edu.tr]

Serpil Demir-Vegter is a language instructor at Koç University, and a PhD candidate in Linguistics at Tilburg University, the Netherlands. Her interests include language acquisition, bilingualism and academic language. [svegter@ku.edu.tr]