Eva Schaeffer-Lacroix. *Corpus et didactique de l'allemand : La langue à bras-le-corps*. Éditions Lambert-Lucas, 192 p., 2019, 978-2-35935-276-4. ⟨hal-02149986⟩

The following pages correspond to the chapter 1 of this book translated with the help of DeepL and slightly adapted by the author.

# Scientific benchmarks for pedagogical corpus use

The contributions of corpus exploration to language teaching and learning are often discussed within the research community. Gabrielatos (2005) and Boulton (2013) list arguments against the pedagogical use of corpus tools, and Frankenberg-Garcia (2014) presents corpus-based activities that are likely to be beneficial to learners, but also others that are less so. These reviews suggest that corpus work could be too challenging for teachers and learners and that the ratio of time and energy investment to cognitive gains risks to be to too low. However, the obstacles are perhaps not so much technical as conceptual: the digital tool seems to reveal existing cognitive difficulties that characterise language learning in general. According to Bachelard, accessing the meaning of a text is, in all cases, a laborious and always incomplete undertaking.

> There is (...) such a long way from the book read to the book understood, assimilated, retained! Even in a clear mind, there are obscure zones, caverns where shadows continue to live (Bachelard 1934: 10).

In order to answer the question "What can be learnt from the exploration of corpora?", we first need to ask ourselves how we access knowledge. Under the heading of epistemology, this subject is dealt with, among others, in philosophy, science and applied linguistics (didactics). The various currents all emphasise the possibilities for the evolution or development of human thought. In English, the term epistemology has the broad meaning of "knowledge in general", whereas in French it refers primarily to scientific knowledge.

> [Epistemology] Section of philosophy whose object is the critical study of the postulates, conclusions and methods of a particular science, considered from the point of view of its evolution, in order to determine its logical origin, value and scientific and philosophical scope (cf. philosophy* of science, logical empiricism*) (Centre National de Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales 2012).

Before tackling the subject of resources and tools, and before looking at the procedures for implementing corpora, let us look at how a selection of thinkers and researchers interested in both epistemological issues and the study of teaching and learning can guide the integration of corpora into language teaching. In order to measure the possible contributions of corpus work to language learning, it seems relevant to look at what was discovered almost a hundred years ago in the field of the development of scientific concepts. The 1930s were particularly conducive to research in this area, as evidenced by Bachelard's *La formation de l'esprit scientifique* (1934), Bruner's research (1960, 1967) on teaching and learning in universities, Piaget's research (1937/1967) and Vygotski's research (1934/1997) on the cognitive development of children. While Vygotski attaches great importance to the helpful intervention of experts, Piaget and Bruner defend the idea that a certain number of developments take place spontaneously and incidently. The following section is dedicated to Bachelard, perhaps the most independent of the four thinkers cited above.

## 1.1 Overcoming barriers to learning

Bachelard (1934) presents access to scientific knowledge as a process of deconstruction of erroneous beliefs, based on immediate and partial empirical observations of the object studied. He thus calls into question "the intuition of real space" (p. 11).

> Scientific experience is therefore experience that contradicts common experience. Moreover, immediate and common experience always retains a kind of tautological character; it develops in the reign of words and definitions; it lacks precisely that perspective of rectified errors which, in our opinion, characterises scientific thought (p. 13).

Access to knowledge is sometimes slow and requires overcoming obstacles (p. 16):

> (...) it is in terms of obstacles that we must pose the problem of scientific knowledge. (...) it is in the very act of knowing, intimately, that slowness and troubles appear, by a kind of functional necessity (p. 16).

The formulation of working questions is crucial:

> And whatever one may say, in scientific life, problems do not arise by themselves. It is precisely this sense of problem that is the hallmark of the true scientific mind. For the scientific mind, all knowledge is an answer to a question. If there is no question, there can be no scientific knowledge. Nothing is self-evident. Nothing is given. Everything is constructed (p. 17).

The idea that nothing is given and everything is constructed in the field of access to knowledge is reminiscent of the warnings of Rastier (2004) and Poudat and Landagrin (2017: 141) regarding the hermeneutic status that can be given to the information obtained from corpora: by constructing them and annotating the text they contain, we condition the ways in which it will subsequently be possible to explore them and interpret the results of queries. Moreover, approaching corpora without knowing what you are looking for, even approximately, is not, in principle, a fruitful undertaking.

How can we overcome the pedagogical obstacles mentioned by Bachelard (1934: 21)? How can we "change the experimental culture", and how can we trigger the "intellectual and emotional catharsis" with which all scientific culture must begin (Bachelard 1934: 22)? In short, how can we create the right conditions for the development of a scientific culture? Piaget offers some ideas how to do this.

## 1.2 Develop a scientific culture

Piaget presents the development of a human being's thinking as a process in which his encounter with empirical data interacts with his provisional system of representations, which is called into question and then supplemented or modified.

> The constitution of the universe (...) continues throughout the development of thought (...), appearing at first to be repeated, before really progressing to encompass the data of action in an overall representative system (Piaget 1937/1967: 334).

He explains certain aspects of cognitive development using the decentration scheme:

> (...) a situation of decentration, in which an action is compared with other possible actions and especially with those of other subjects, leads to an awareness of the 'how' and to the operation (Piaget 1937/1967: 398).

Decentration, achieved through actions of comparison and delimitation, is an action that can be observed in corpus-assisted teaching-learning situations: when novice writers compare their productions with those of experts (Leblay 2014), they have the opportunity to find other possibilities of formulation and to grasp the degree of relevance of their own writing choices. Comparative actions are therefore a source of decentration and can support cognitive development. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1983), who specialise in written production, include comparison in their text revision model *CDO* (*Compare, Diagnose, Operate*). According to this model, the writer compares his or her draft with the text he intended to write, i.e. the planned text; he or she analyses the difference between the two versions and then reworks his work. It

seems legitimate to extrapolate this model by replacing the planned text with texts from the corpus, which can serve as examples to which apprentice writers can refer and rely on.

It seems justified to make a link between decentration and otherness, the latter being defined by Castellotti (2015) as an attitude of openness to other cultures. Comparing passages from texts produced by novices with equivalent passages in corpora would then be one of the possible paths towards the appropriation of a foreign language and culture. This seems all the more possible in the case of "corpus réflexifs" [reflective corpora] containing texts which all represent the same textual genre produced in a particular cultural context (Rastier 2004; Mayaffre 2002). One example is *BusiNew* (House 2011), a corpus containing manuscripts of end-of-year speeches given by company directors in a German-speaking context[1].

## 1.3 Imply experts

How can learners be helped in the process of deconstructing and reconstructing their system of representations? Vygotski's research specifies the role of experienced people accompanying learners; this helps complementing the interaction between empirical and internal processes, described by Bachelard and Piaget, by the interaction between humans. Young children use "everyday concepts" to understand events they encounter in the world (Vygotski 1934/1997)[2]; these concepts correspond to a naïve and immediate vision of phenomena, fed by representations, some of which may be invalidated by empirical observations. It is only after the age of twelve that elaborate reasoning is put in place, based on observations and then on logical deductions, even in the absence of direct observations (Troadec 1999: 57). According to Vygotski, children and adolescents develop their scientific concepts gradually (Vergnaud 1989). The parallel with Piaget's stages of cognitive development is quite striking. In his comments on the English version of chapters 2 and 8 of Vygotski's *Thought and Language* (L'Hermitte 1987), Piaget agreed with Vygotski that the school should help children's spontaneous concepts to evolve into scientific concepts (Vygotski 1985: 394):

> (...) the school, which ignores all the advantages it could draw from the spontaneous development of pupils (...) should reinforce it by appropriate means instead of thwarting it as it often does (Piaget in Vygotski 1985: 396).

The opinions of the two researchers differ, however, as regards the degree of need for "didactic intervention[3] by the adult" (Piaget in Vygotski 1985: 397): Piaget suggests trusting children and letting them work out new concepts fairly freely; it would be enough to "trigger their interest" and "pose the problems in a form that corresponds to the structures already constructed by the child himself" (already quoted).

Bachelard argues that deconstructing naïve and immediate concepts requires a major effort (can we do it alone?); Vygotski argues that cognitive evolution is unthinkable without the support of others; and Piaget suggests other, more individual and spontaneous possibilities for evolution.

Cobb and Johns justify the integration of corpora in language teaching and learning by the idea that data exploration would support the development of socioconstructivist attitudes in learners: by exploring corpora, learners would have the opportunity to act as learner-researchers, or even learner-linguists (Cobb 2006) or investigators: "the detective, learning to recognise and draw conclusions from clues in the data." (Johns 2002: 108)

Could the use of corpus exploration tools serve as a catalyst for the formation of scientific

---

[1] See also BusiReden, derived from House's data (Schaeffer-Lacroix 2022).
[2] The original Russian version of this term was translated into German as *Alltagsbegriff*.
[3] Our use of the term "didactic" corresponds to what Bailly (1999) calls "pedagogical".

concepts? Perhaps, but beware of exaggerated optimism (or even positivism?): access to knowledge does not always follow the laws of logic; it can also be guided by less standardised developments, namely "fertile ideas" (Bachelard 1934: 13-14) and "intuitions" (chapter 4 of Bruner 1960/2002).

## 1.4 Evolve through intuitive thinking

Bruner's concept of *intuitive thinking* refers to a cognitive activity that leads to hypotheses that are not based on deductions or inferences from clearly identified and explicitly stated elements; rather, it is a crystallisation of thought. The vision offered by a kaleidoscope seems to represent this activity quite well: we obtain an image that seems to be due to chance; it is random, ephemeral and, at first sight, unimportant. But sometimes an intuitive act of thinking leads to discoveries that we would not have been able to make if we had proceeded rationally and deductively. The condition, however, is that this act is nourished by sufficient factual knowledge and by the ability of the thinker to foresee singular relationships between different elements. The next step is to put this intuition or initial hypothesis to the test of facts, which will enable it to be validated or invalidated. The data collected in corpora can represent such facts. Certain graphic representation tools can support the formation of intuitive hypotheses.

The idea of *intuitive thinking* is reminiscent of incidental learning during corpus exploration (Bernardini 2004: 15). This unplanned learning takes place practically as we "go along". It depends heavily on what is already there in the learner's brain, but also on his or her ability to recognise structures, combine elements, extrapolate, and so on.

It is legitimate to wonder how much can be learned from corpora without being guided by specific questions or by experts. **Is it enough to read a lot of concordance lines in order to assimilate and reproduce the language structures they represent? Does this approach make it possible to recreate certain conditions for immersive learning of a mother tongue? Does it dispense with the need for grammatical references?**

Audin (2008) carried out research in an institutional context on the teaching of English at primary school. She showed that the approach based on *chunks*, i.e. expressions made up of several lexemes, has its limits if it goes hand in hand with the avoidance of any reflection on language. According to his research, many of the children taught in this way had difficulties accessing meaning and structuring statements, for example identifying the subject of a statement (Audin 2008: 147)[4] .

According to Logan (1988, cited in Hulstijn 2007), the frequency of data can be one of the elements that promote learning, provided that this data is approached through the filter of a grammatical reference. Logan does not use the term *chunk*, but rather *phrase*, defined as a meaning-bearing unit that is shorter than a sentence.

> (...) learners may start off with a rule (e.g., "Use a and an when the following word begins with a consonant or vowel, respectively"), but each time they produce or perceive a phrase in which this rule is instantiated, they store that phrase as an instance in their memory. With increasing experience, these instances will become stronger in memory, raising their activation levels. Eventually, retrieval of a stored instance will be faster than rule application.

Logan's comments have a connectionist content: repeated encounters with linguistic data that can be considered as realisations (instantiations) of grammatical references would help to make them accessible quickly, without explicit mental recall of the reference, during language

[4] This does not mean that we should give up on language learning based on chunks: Narcy-Combes (2005: 46) presents the benefits of their use.

production[5] . This view argues in favour of the idea that encountering a certain number of occurrences offered by a concordancer would be helpful: the more examples we have access to representing an enunciation situation comparable to the one we are dealing with, the more likely we are to end up expressing ourselves fluently, without needing to remember in detail the references that explain their constitution.

But let's not forget that, for Logan, the starting point for learning is grammatical reference; he seems to regard it as the *sine qua non* for lasting memory. We can conclude from this that, even at an early stage of learning, recourse to explicit references concerning the functioning of language is probably necessary, at least if we place ourselves in a framework which considers the comprehension of linguistic phenomena and access to meaning as a necessity.

In order to grasp what intuitive thinking and incidental learning can lead to in unguided corpus consultation situations, it seems necessary to use protocols that include verbalisation, such as questionnaire surveys, semi-structured interviews or the *Think aloud* method, i.e. verbal interaction between several learners. However, we run the risk of remaining speculative if we restrict ourselves to what learners say about their discoveries and experiences with the corpora. The next section presents the theory of cognitive load based on the material traces of corpus-based activities, which will enable us to estimate their potential contribution more accurately.

## 1.5 Reduce cognitive load

Cognitive load is a theoretical construct in the field of cognitive psychology. Researchers use it to identify the factors that hinder or promote learning (Chanquoy, Tricot and Sweller 2007). The extent of cognitive load can be estimated and sometimes even physically measured by analysing the individual's abilities, the nature and complexity of the task being performed, and the learning environment (Chanquoy *et alii* 2007: 12). When performing a written task, we measure, for example, eye movements (*eyetracking*, see Bax 2013), the length of pauses, hesitations, erasures or the way in which rewriting takes place (Leblay 2014). If we are aiming for a high degree of control, collecting this type of data requires specific equipment and laboratory conditions. However, it is also possible to collect traces of digital actions in an ecological environment, for example, using tools that record what is done using the keyboard (see *Inputlog* presented in Leijten and Van Waes 2013 or the *Windows* action recorder) or what happens on a computer screen (see *Screencast-O-Matic*, Big Nerd Software nd). Some digital tools such as *TitanPad* (Renner 2010) and *Google Docs* (nd) keep a history of online publication actions.

The cognitive load is particularly high when learning biologically secondary skills (Sweller 2016) involving explicit and planned training, for example, learning to produce written work. This learning requires a high degree of conscientization (Vygotski in Yvon and Zinchenko 2011: 154). Vygotski establishes a close link between the development of written production skills and grammatical skills.

> There is always a direct and immense interdependence between the development of grammatical understanding and the development of written language, i.e. between the child's awareness of what he or she is doing and the deliberate construction of written language (Vygotski in Yvon & Zinchenko 2011: 157).

According to Hulstijn (2007), learners' performance varies according to external criteria which

[5] See also R. Ellis (2014): "According to connectionist theories of language implicit knowledge does not consist of rules but is housed in a complex neural network of associations among phrases, chunks, words and bits of words, which is built up gradually through (...) 'sequence learning'".

can be influenced to some extent[6] : the social environment (e.g. the physical organisation of the classroom, working in pairs, etc.), the nature and quantity of the data with which the learner is confronted and more personal factors. Personal factors include the learner's literacy, which can be expressed in terms of metalinguistic knowledge and problem-solving strategies.

One of the ways of reducing cognitive load is to make available an approach to solving a problem that we are invited to reproduce (see the idea of the benefits of an imitative approach, section 5.5): "The use of worked examples rather than solving the equivalent problems is one of the earliest and probably the best known cognitive load reducing technique" (Paas, Renkl & Sweller 2003).

If we apply these parameters to the situation of institutional corpus-based foreign language learning, the concordancer has every chance of being a relevant learning tool within a scenario that places the emphasis on written production and reflection on language. The fact that the size of the concordance lines can be varied flexibly and individually is likely to reduce the cognitive load and thus facilitate observation of the language.

## 1.6 Conceptualise and categorise

Vygotski (1934/1997: 266) theorises the process of categorisation that structures the development of children's thinking. He defends the idea that the institutional organisation of learning can bring about cognitive changes that would be less likely to occur spontaneously, in unguided situations. In his view, however, it is beneficial to draw inspiration from and formalise the ways of learning that take place outside the institution.

Chanquoy et alii (2007: 107) describe some of the contributions made by research into the development of cognitive abilities: in their view, concept formation is the basis for the creation of the schemas that are necessary for the proceduralisation and automation of certain gestures. These same authors (2007: 106) describe concept formation as a type of implicit learning with a relatively low cognitive cost if it takes place without any planned external intervention. It is formed by identifying common features between several elements, a gesture that leads to the ability to classify them in the same category. This category will then be compared with other categories with which it has a relationship which may, for example, be of the hyperonomy or hyponomy type. To give an example: "flower" is the hypéronomy of "rose" and "rose" is the hyponom of "flower". The more examples we come across that we can classify in a category, the more relevant we are able to categorise (Chanquoy et alii 2007: 106).

Artificially organised learning, for its part, can bring about conceptual changes (Chanquoy *et alii* 2007: 106). Tyler and Ortega (2018: 9) make a link between learning a foreign language and questioning established categories: "learning an L2 (...) means re-categorising many aspects of the world" . In other words, institutional learning can help learners to establish more relevant representations of the world than they had before. As corpora contain a large number of examples, they are, in principle, good allies for the formation of relevant concepts.

Pastré, Mayen and Vergnaud (2006: 148) distinguish between two types of representation, one called the "cognitive image" and the other the "operative image". These types correspond to two forms of conceptualisation, "one that states properties and relations about objects, the other that selects certain features of an object to turn them into concepts that guide and organise the activity" (already quoted). Language teaching is probably more concerned with the second form, that which selects and modifies the object of knowledge according to the needs of action. It is this concern, among others, that distinguishes it from descriptive linguistics and discourse

[6] They also depend on internal neurological and mental criteria that are difficult to influence in an institutional context.

analysis. Its adoption can have the following consequences: when we use corpus data to have learners observe language, we do not necessarily aim for an exhaustive description, classification or perfect hierarchisation of language facts and features. The important thing is that the act of reflecting on language should lead to an awareness of how the language works in areas which are likely to have an impact on the quality of language production.

## 1.7 Develop metalinguistic awareness

Language awareness can be stimulated by asking students questions that can lead to cognitive development (Trévise 1994, Gombert 1996, Bailly 1999, Matthey 2010, Pinto & el Euch 2015). During guided language awareness activities, learners compare ways of saying certain things, they realise that certain syntactic, semantic or other characteristics of their mother tongue or another language they know well do not appear in the same way as those of a language they are in the process of learning. This type of observation can help to take a step back. According to Vygotski, awareness of how language works, made possible by learning a foreign language, can contribute to a better understanding of the meaning of words in the mother tongue:

> (...) mastery of the foreign language also raises the mother tongue to a higher level in the sense that the child becomes aware of linguistic forms, generalises verbal phenomena, uses the word more consciously and voluntarily as an instrument of thought and an expression of the concept (Vygotski 1934/1997: 295) (Translated from Russian by Françoise Sève).

According to Vergnaud (1989), this contribution is reciprocal, i.e. metalinguistic activities help students to acquire certain aspects of the foreign language in a lasting way.

## 1.8 Interact verbally

Verbal interaction is one of the recurring themes of Bruner and Vygotski (Bronckart 2003). It appears to be beneficial from a cognitive point of view: research by Pérez, Carreiras and Duñabeitia published in 2017 illustrates how verbal interactions leave observable traces in the brain. According to Pekarek Doehler (2000), they support language learning. Mangenot and Nissen (2016) recall the interest of this topic for language didactics in their introduction to the special issue *Pedagogical scenarios and online interactions* of the *CJLT* journal *RECAT* (*The Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*). Bigot (2016) uses the term *didactic interaction*, which makes the link with the context of institutional teaching and learning.

In addition to the cognitive and didactic aspects, there is also a scientific argument in favour of verbal interaction: if we want to access learners' discoveries, if we want to see what they are able to observe and to what extent they are able to modify their erroneous representations, it seems useful, even necessary, to make them talk[7] . This idea is behind the development of *Think aloud-type* protocols (Ericsson and Simon, 1987): the person taking part in a research project is asked to describe and comment on what they are doing and to say what is going through their mind as they carry out their action. Unfortunately, this type of verbalisation requires additional cognitive resources; moreover, it has the artificial character of monologues. Getting pairs to talk to each other might be a good alternative.

## 1.9 Put thoughts into motion

What can learners gain from using corpus tools? According to Murison-Bowie (1993: 46), analysing the occurrences of a query in a corpus sometimes triggers an avalanche of questions rather than resolving one of them in particular. Exploring corpora can, in fact, lead learners into unexpected cognitive territory; it may plunge them into the abyss of knowledge. To put it

[7] Another way of accessing learners' representations is to have them draw pictures (Audin 2007). However, it is questionable to what extent graphic representations can capture aspects other than visual and spatial ones.

another way: learning a language using corpora puts thought in motion; people who make corpus queries are on a quest, like researchers, they are on their way towards remote horizons of knowledge.

## References

These are the references of the whole book (not only those provided in the sample above).

Adam Jean-Michel et Viprey Jean-Marie, 2008, « Corpus de textes, textes en corpus. Problématique et présentation. », *Corpus*, 8|2009, p. 5-25.

Anthony Laurence, 2013, "A critical look at software tools in corpus linguistics, *Linguistic Research*." Vol. 30|2, p. 141-161.

Aston Guy, 2001, *Learning with Corpora*. Houston : Athelstan.

Audin Line, 2007, « "Rapunzel rebels" en ARB ». *Enseigner les langues autrement*. Site Internet institutionnel.

Audin Line, 2008, « Langues étrangères à l'école primaire : recherches INRPR 1988-2003 », dans D. Chini et P. Goutéreaux (éds), *Psycholinguistique et didactique des langues étrangères. Travaux du GEPED en hommage à Danielle Bailly*. Paris, Éditions Ophrys, p. 143-154.

Bachelard Gaston, 1934, *La formation de l'esprit scientifique – Contribution à une psychanalyse de la connaissance objective*. Paris : Librairie philosophique J. VRIN, 5e édition, 1967. Collection : Bibliothèque des textes philosophiques.

Bailly Danielle, 1999, « Les conditions de réussite dans l'appropriation de la langue étrangère en classe », *Les Langues Modernes* n° 3|1999, p. 8-25.

Bax Stephen, 2013, "The cognitive processing of candidates during reading tests: Evidence from eye-tracking." *Language Testing* 30(4), p. 441–465.

Benzecri Jean-Paul, 1973, *L'analyse des données*. Paris / Bruxelles / Montréal, Dunod.

Bereiter Carl and Scardamalia Marlene, 1983, "Does learning to write have to be so difficult?" In A. Freedman, I. Pringle and J. Yalden, J. (eds.), *Learning to write: First language, second language*. New York, Longman.

Bernardini Silvia, 2004, "Corpora in the classroom. An overview and some reflections on future developements." In J. Sinclair (ed.), *How to Use Corpora in Language Teaching*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, p. 15-36.

Bigot Violaine, 2016, « L'analyse des interactions didactiques dans la formation initiale des enseignants de français langue seconde », *Communiquer* [disponible en ligne], 18|2016, p. 5-27.

Boch Françoise et Frier Catherine, 2015, « Travailler le texte : ponctuation, anaphores et collocations », dans F. Boch et C. Frier (éds), *Écrire dans l'enseignement supérieur : Des apports de la recherche aux outils pédagogiques*. Grenoble, UGA Éditions (Didaskein), p. 53-109.

Boettcher Wolfgang, 2016, „Komma & Co unter dem Kooperationsprinzip: Interpunktionslernen im Kompetenzbereich 'Schreiben und Sprachreflexion'", in R. Olsen, C. Hochstadt und S. Colombo-Scheffold (Hg.), *Ohne Punkt und Komma ... Beiträge zu Theorie, Empirie und Didaktik der Interpunktion*. Berlin, RabenStück Verlag, p. 326-361.

Bommier-Pincemin Bénédicte, 1999, *Diffusion ciblée automatique d'informations : conception et mise en oeuvre d'une linguistique textuelle pour la caractérisation des destinataires et des*

*documents*. Thèse sous la direction de François Rastier. Paris, Université de Paris IV.

Bouchard Robert, Simon Jean-Pascal et Vourzay Marie-Hélène, 2004, « L'intertextualité au service de l'interdiscursivité, étude de la production d'une synthèse de documents : à la recherche du "lieu commun », dans *Actes du XXIVe colloque d'Albi, Langages et signification, l'intertextualité*, 2003. CALS/CPST. Toulouse : Presses de l'Université de Toulouse le Mirail, p. 93-103.

Boulton, Alex, 2008, « Esprit de corpus : Promouvoir l'exploitation de corpus en apprentissage des langues », *Texte et Corpus*, vol. 3, p. 37-46.

Boulton Alex, 2013, "Separating fact and fiction: The real story of corpus use in language teaching." In L. Bradley and S. Thouësny (eds.), *20 Years of EUROCALL: Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future*. Dublin, Research-Publishing.net, p. 51-56.

Boulton Alex et Tyne Henry, 2014, *Des documents authentiques aux corpus – Démarches pour l'apprentissage des langues*, Paris, Didier.

Braun Sabine, 2007, "Integrating corpus work into secondary education: From data driven learning to needs-driven corpora." *ReCALL* 19|3. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 307-328.

Bredel Ursula und Maaß Christiane, 2016, *Leichte Sprache – Theoretische Grundlagen. Orientierung für die Praxis*. Berlin, Duden Verlag.

Breyer Yvonne, 2011, *Corpora in Language Teaching and Learning: Potential, Evaluation, Challenges*. Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang.

Bronckart Jean-Paul, 1997, *Activité langagière, textes et discours. Pour un interactionisme socio-discursif*. Paris, Delachaux et Niestlé.

Bronckart Jean-Paul, 2003, « Constructivisme piagétien et interactionnisme vygotskien. Leurs apports à une conception des apprentissages et de la formation », dans J.-M. Ferry et B. Libois (éds), *Pour une éducation postnationale*. Bruxelles, Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, p. 129-147.

Bruner Jerome, 1960, 1967, *The process of Education. A Landmark in Educational Theory*. Cambridge, Masachusetts, London, Harvard University Press. 26ème édition (2002).

Bruner Jerome, 1971, *The Relevance of Education*. New York, Norton.

Brunet Étienne, 1991, "What Do Statistics Tell Us ?" In Hockey, S., Ide, N., Lancashire, I. (eds), *Research in Humanities Computing*, vol. 1, Clarendon Press, Oxford, p. 70-92.

*Cadre européen commun de référence pour les langues. Apprendre, enseigner, évaluer*, 2001, Division des politiques linguistiques, Strasbourg. Paris, Didier.

*Cadre européen commun de référence pour les langues. Volume complémentaire avec de nouveaux descripteurs*, 2018, Division des politiques linguistiques, Strasbourg. Disponible en ligne.

Candelier Michel et Dabène Louise, 2003, *L'Éveil aux langues à l'école primaire, EVLANG : bilan d'une innovation européenne*, Bruxelles, De Boeck.

Candelier Michel et Macaire Dominique, 2001, « L'éveil aux langues à l'école primaire et la construction de compétences – pour mieux apprendre les langues et vivre dans une société multilingue et multiculturelle ». Actes de colloque de Louvain *Didactique des langues romanes : le développement des compétences chez l'apprenant*. Bruxelles, De Boek, p. 495-506.

Cappeau Paul, Chuquet Hélène et Valetoupolos Freiderikos, 2010, *L'exemple et le corpus – Quel statut ?* Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Castellotti Véronique, 2015, « Diversité(s), histoire(s), compréhension. Vers des perspectives relationnelles et alterdidactiques pour l'appropriation des langues », *RDLC*, vol. 12|1, p. 293-331.

Chachkine Elsa, 2014, « La résolution collective d'énigmes linguistiques : une approche de la grammaire pour le public LANSAD ? », *Recherche et pratiques pédagogiques en langues de spécialité*, Vol. XXXIII n° 3|2014, p. 121-133.

Chachkine Elsa et Champseix Elisabeth, 2012, « Impacts d'une réflexion métalinguistique collective médiée par un forum », dans O. Bertrand et I. Schaffner (éds), *Enseigner la grammaire*. Paris, Éditions de l'École Polytechnique, p. 345-356.

Chachkine Elsa, Demaizière Françoise et Schaeffer-Lacroix Eva, 2013, « Pour un apprenant réfléchissant », *Linguistik online* 60, 3|2013, p. 23-42.

Chambers Angela, 2005, "Integrating Corpus Consultation in Language Studies", *Language Learning & Technology*, 2005, vol. 9, n° 2, p. 111-125.

Chanquoy Lucile, Tricot André and Sweller John, 2007, *La charge cognitive*. Paris, Armand Colin.

Charlirelle, 1975–1986, *Behind the Words. Manuels de l'élève, livres du maître.* Paris, OCDL.

Charaudeau Patrick, 2015, « De la linguistique de la langue à la linguistique du discours, et retour », dans G. Engwall et L. Fant (éds), *Festival Romanistica. Contribuciones lingüísticas – Contributions linguistiques – Contributi linguistici – Contribuições linguísticas*. Stockholm Studies in Romance Languages. Stockholm, Stockholm University Press. 2015, p. 3–12.

Charles Maggie, 2007, "Reconciling top-down and bottom-up approaches to graduate writing: Using a corpus to teach rhetorical functions", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 6, p. 289–302.

Charles Maggie, 2015, "Same task, different corpus", in A. Leńko-Szymańska and A. Boulton (eds.), *Multiple Affordances of Language Corpora for Data-driven Learning* [Studies in Corpus Linguistics 69], Amsterdam, John Benjamins, p. 129–154.

Charles Maggie, 2016, "Using a Corpus as a Resource for Writing. Information for Supervisors." *Research supervision pages*. Oxford, University of Oxford, 4 pages.

Cobb Tom, 2006, "Constructivism, applied linguistics, & language education", in K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics. Foundations of linguistics*, vol. 32. Oxford, Elsevier, p. 85-88.

Cobb Tom and Boulton Alex, 2017, "Corpus Use in Language Learning: A Meta-Analysis." *Language Learning* vol. 67, n° 2, p. 348-393.

Comby Émeline et Mosset Yannick, 2016, « Introduction. Le corpus à l'interface des humanités et des sciences sociales », dans É. Comby, Y. Mosset et S. Carrara (éds), *Corpus de textes : composer, mesurer, interpréter*. Lyon, ENS Éditions, p. 8-18.

Comby Émeline, Mosset Yannick et de Carrara Stéphanie, 2016, *Corpus de textes : composer, mesurer, interpréter*. Lyon : ENS Éditions.

Culioli Antoine, 2002, *Variations sur la linguistique. Entretiens avec Frédéric Fau*. Bonchamp-lès-Laval, Klincksieck, 2009 pour la présente édition.

Dabène Louise, 1992, « Le développement de la conscience métalinguistique : un objectif

commun pour l'enseignement de la langue maternelle et des langues étrangères », *Repères, recherches en didactique du français langue maternelle*, vol. 6|1, p. 13-21.

Delagneau Jean-Marc, 2003, « Langues allemandes de spécialité : implications pédagogiques de la recherche au niveau du lexique et de la syntaxe », *Cahiers de l'APLIUT*, vol. XXII 3|2003.

Delagneau Jean-Marc, 2004, *Étude quantitative assistée par ordinateur d'une langue allemande de spécialité*. Thèse sous la direction de Maxi Krause. Caen, Université de Caen.

de Schryver Gilles-Maurice, 2002, "Web for/as corpus : a perspective for the African languages", *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, vol. 11, n° 2, p. 266-282.

Dodd Bill, 1997, "Exploiting a corpus of written German for advanced language learning", in A. Wichmann, S. Fligelstone, T. McEnery and G. Knowles (eds). *Teaching and Language Corpora*. London, Longman, p. 131-145.

Dominik Hans, 1908, *Die Reise zum Mars*. Accessible sur *Project Gutenberg*.

Dupuis Jean-Yves, 1998-2017, *Heidi – une histoire pour les enfants et pour ceux qui les aiment* (Traduction de Spyri, Johanna,1880, *Heidis Lehr- und Wanderjahre*. Édition de référence : H. Georg, 1882, Bâle et Genève). La Bibliothèque électronique du Québec.

Duteil-Mougel Carine, 2005, « Introduction à la rhétorique », *Texto!* (septembre 2005).

Eberlein Norbert, 1997-2017, *Neues aus Büttenwarder*. Série télévisée. Audiodescriptions réalisées par le *NDR Fernsehen* (Norddeutscher Rundfunk).

Ellis Nick & Wulff Stefanie, 2018, "Usage-based approaches to second language acquisition", in D. Miller, F. Bayram, J. Rothman and L. Serratrice (eds.), *Bilingual Cognition and Language: The state of the science across its subfields*, chapter 3, p. 37–56.

Ellis Rod, 2014, "Grammar Teaching for Language Learning", *Babylonia* 02|14, p. 10-15.

Ericsson K. Anders and Simon Herbert A., 1987, "Verbal reports on thinking", in C. Faerch and G. Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in Second Language Research*. Clevedon, Avon, Multilingual Matters, p. 24–54.

Favriaud Michel, 2011, « Approches nouvelles de la ponctuation, diachroniques et synchroniques », *Langue française*, 4|2011, n° 172, p. 3-18.

Fillmore Charles J., 1992, ""Corpus linguistics" or "Computer-aided armchair linguistics"", in J. Svartvik (eds.), *Directions in Corpus Linguistics*. Proceedings of Nobel Symposium 82 Stockholm, 4–8 August 1991. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, p. 35-60.

Flitner Andreas & Scheuerl Hans (Hg.), 1967, *Einführung in pädagogisches Sehen und Denken*. Édition révisée, 2010. Landsberg, Beltz Taschenbuch.

Frankenberg-Garcia Ana, 2014, "How language learners can benefit from corpora, or not", *Recherches en didactique des langues et des cultures* 11-1, 16 pages.

Gabrielatos Costas, 2005, "Corpora and Language Teaching: Just a fling or wedding bells? " *TESL-EJ*, vol. 8|4, 37 pages.

Gautier Laurent, 2014, « Des langues de spécialité à la communication spécialisée : un nouveau paradigme de recherche à l'intersection entre sciences du langage, info-com et sciences cognitives ? », *CODFREURCOR* (Études Interdisciplinaires en Sciences humaines, Collège Doctoral Francophone Régional d'Europe Centrale et Orientale en Sciences Humaines), 2014, vol. 1, p. 225-245.

Gerbault Jeannine, 2009, « Littératie numérique – Les nouvelles dimensions de l'écrit au 21ième

siècle », *Recherches en didactique des langues et des cultures : Les Cahiers de l'Acedle*, vol. 9|2, 2012. *Notions en Questions (NeQ) en didactique des langues – Les littératies*, p. 109-128.

Geyken Alexander, 2013, „Wege zu einem historischen Referenzkorpus des Deutschen: das Projekt Deutsches Textarchiv“, in I. Hafemann (Hg.), *Perspektiven einer corpusbasierten historischen Linguistik und Philologie. Internationale Tagung des Akademienvorhabens "Altägyptisches Wörterbuch" an der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 12.-13. Dezember 2011*. Berlin, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, p. 221-234.

Gilbert Eric, 2005, « Ébauche d'une formalisation des prépositions In, On et At », *Cycnos*, vol. 21|1.

Gombert Jean Émile, « 1996, Activités métalinguistiques et acquisition d'une langue », *Acquisition et interaction en langue étrangère* 8, p. 41-55.

Granger Sylviane, Hung Joseph and Petch-Tyson Stephanie (eds) (2002). *Computer Learner Corpora, Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Grosbois Muriel, 2007, « Didactique des langues et recherche expérimentale ». *Les Cahiers de l'Acedle*, n° 4, p. 65-83.

Gross Maurice, 1998, « La fonction sémantique des verbes supports », *Travaux de Linguistique : Revue Internationale de Linguistique Française*. 1998, 37|1, p. 25-46.

Groussier Marie-Line, 1997, « Prépositions et primante du spatial : de l'expression de relations dans l'espace à l'expression de relations non-spatiales », *Faits de langues*, vol. 5|9, p. 221–34.

Habert Benoît, Nazarenko Adeline et Salem André, 1997, *Les linguistiques de corpus*. Paris, Armand Colin.

Hardie Andrew, 2014, “Modest XML for Corpora: Not a standard, but a suggestion”, *ICAME Journal*, Volume 38, p. 73-103.

Hawkins Eric W., 1984. *Awareness of Language: An Introduction*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hawkins Eric W., 1992, « La réflexion sur le langage comme "matière-pont" dans le programme scolaire », *Repères* 6, p. 41-56.

Hawkins Eric W., 1999, “Foreign Language Study and Language Awareness, Language Awareness”, vol. 8|3-4, p. 124-142.

Hess Annette, 2010, *Weissensee*. Script de la série télévisée du même nom.

Heymann Robert, 1909, *Der rote Komet*. Accessible sur *Project Gutenberg*.

Hoffmann Ernst Theodor Amadeus, 1816-17, *Sandmann*. Accessible sur *Project Gutenberg*.

Hulstijn Jan, 2007, “Psycholinguistic perspectives on second language acquisition”, in J. Cummins and C. Davison (eds.), *The international handbook on English language teaching*. Norwell, MA, Springer, p. 701-713.

Huver Emmanuelle, 2017, « Peut-on (encore) penser à partir du CECR ? Perspectives critiques sur la version amplifiée », *Mélanges CRAPEL, Revue en didactique des langues et sociolinguistique* n° 38/1 *(2017 - Éclectisme en didactique des langues : hommage à Francis Carton)*.

Janitza Jean, 2003, *Babel en éducation : linguistique allemande et didactique des langues*.

Textes réunis par Monique Travers et Bernard Viselthier. PIA (Publications de l'Institut d'Allemand) n° 33. Paris, Université de Paris III Sorbonne nouvelle, Institut d'allemand d'Asnières.

Johns Tim, 1988, "Whence and Whither Classroom Concordancing? " In T. Bongaerts, P. de Haan, S. Lobbe and H. Wekker (eds.), *Computer Applications in Language Learning*. Dordrecht, Foris, p. 9-27.

Johns Tim, 1991, "Should you be persuaded – two samples of data-driven learning materials", in T. Johns and P. King (eds), *Classroom concordancing. English language research journal 4*. Birmingham, Birmingham University, p.1-13.

Johns Tim, 1997, *Kibbitzing one-to-ones*. Version numérisée de notes de présentation au *BALEAP meeting on Academic Writing*, Université de Reading, 29 novembre 1997.

Johns Tim, 2002, "Data-driven Learning: the Perpetual Challenge", in B. Kettemann and G. Marko (eds), *Teaching and Learning by Doing Corpus Analysis*. Amsterdam, New York, Éditions Rodopi B.V., p. 107-117.

Káňa Tomáš, 2014, *Sprachkorpora in Unterricht und Forschung DaF/DaZ*. Brno, Masarykova univerzita.

Kennedy Claire and Miceli Tiziana, 2001, "An evaluation of intermediate student's approaches to corpus investigation", *Language Learning & Technology*, vol. 5|3, p. 77-90.

Kilgarriff Adam, Baisa Vít, Bušta Jan, Jakubícek Miloš, Kovář Vojtěch, Michelfeit Jan, Rychlý Pavel and Suchomel Vít, 2014, "The Sketch Engine: ten years on", *Lexicography*, vol.1|1, p.7-36.

Kochanski Greg P., Shih Chilin and Shosted Ryan, 2010, "Should Corpora Be Big, Rich, or Dense?", *ArXiv*.

Kraif Olivier, 2016, « Corpus parallèles, corpus comparables : quels contrastes ? », *Texto!* Volume XXI - n°2 (2016). Coordonné par Audrey Moutat.

Kravchenko-Biberson Olga, 2011, « Le modèle cognitif et la TOE : deux points de vue sur l'identité sémantique des unités polysémiques ». *CORELA - RJC Cotexte, contexte, situation*, HS-11 | 2012. DOI : 10.4000/corela.2024

Krumm Hans-Jürgen, 2008, „Ziele, Wirkungen und Nebenwirkungen – Der Gemeinsame europäische Referenzrahmen für Sprachen", *FREMDSPRACHE DEUTSCH. Zeitschrift für die Praxis des Deutschunterrichts*, vol. 38, p. 26-28.

Leblay Christophe, 2014, « Les écritures intermédiaires réflexives en littératie avancée », *Le Français Aujourd'hui – Pratiques de l'écrit en formation*, vol. 2014|1 (n° 184), p. 103-115.

Lemnitzer Lothar und Zinsmeister Heike, 2015 (3. Auflage), *Korpuslinguistik – Eine Einführung*. Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag.

Leńko-Szymańska Agnieszka, 2017, "Training teachers in data-driven learning: Tackling the challenge", *Language Learning & Technology*, vol. 21|3, p. 217–241.

L'Hermitte René, 1987, « Vygotski, Pensée et langage, P. 1985, Éditions Sociales [compte rendu] », *L'Information Grammaticale*, 32|1, p. 44-46.

Lombardi Alessandra & Moletta Silvia, 2013, „Von der Hochschule in die Berufswelt und wieder zurück. Berufsbezogene Korpusarbeit im Unterricht Deutsch als Fachsprache", in Cécile Desoutter, Dorothee Heller und Michele Sala (Hrsg.), *Corpora in Specialized Communication. Korpora in der Fachkommunikation. Les corpus dans La communication*

*spécialisée*. Bergamo, CELSB Libreria Universitaria, p. 189-208.

Longuet Frédérique, 2012, *L'impact des outils d'évaluation qualitative et du web 2.0 sur le développement et l'identification des compétences professionnelles des enseignants de langues*. Thèse sous la direction de Dominique Macaire. Paris, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris 3.

Lüdeling Anke, 2001, *On particle verbs and similar constructions in German*. Stanford, CA, Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Mangenot François et Nissen Elke, 2016, « Éditorial », dans F. Mangenot et E. Nissen (éds), *Scénarios pédagogiques et interactions en ligne*. *CJLT RECAT*, vol. 42|2, n° spécial, été 2016. 6 pages.

Matthey Marinette, 2010, « Interaction : lieu, moyen ou objet d'acquisition ? », dans C. Vargas, L.-J. Calvet, M. Gasquet-Cyrus, D. Véronique et R. Vion (éds), *Langues et sociétés : Approches sociolinguistiques et didactiques*, p. 31-42. Paris, L'Harmattan.

Mayaffre Damon, 2002, « Les corpus *réflexifs* : entre architextualité et hypertextualité », *Corpus* [disponible en ligne], 1|2002.

Mayaffre Damon, 2010, « Corpus et web-corpus. Réflexion sur la corporalité numérique », *Cahiers de praxématique*, vol. 54-55. Montpellier, Pulm, p. 233-248.

Mayaffre Damon 2015, « Marc Debono (éd.) – Corpus numériques, langues et sens. Enjeux épistémologiques et politiques. Bruxelles : Peter Lang, 2014. », *Corpus* 14|2015.

Mondada Lorenza, 2005, *Chercheurs en interaction – Comment émergent les savoirs*. Lausanne, Presses polytechniques et universitaires romandes (PPUR).

Muller Charles, 1969, « La statistique lexicale », *Langue française*, n°2, sous la direction de Louis Guilbert, p. 30-43.

Murison-Bowie Simon, 1993, *MicroConcord Manual*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Narcy-Combes Jean-Paul, 2005, *Didactique des langues et TIC : Vers une recherche-action responsable*. Paris, Éditions Ophrys.

Nissen Elke, 2009, « Formation hybride vs. présentielle en langues : effets sur la perception des apprenants liés au mode de formation et à l'encadrement pédagogique », *Recherches en didactique des langues et des cultures*, vol. 6-1|2009.

Nissen Elke, 2014, « Les spécificités des formations hybrides en langues », *Alsic*, vol. 17|2014.

Noille Christine, 2014, « Les genres du discours dans l'ancienne rhétorique : listes, schémas et mode d'emploi, avec un exemple (le discours de Germanicus) », *Exercices de rhétorique*, vol. 3|2014.

O'Keeffe Anne, McCarthy Michael and Carter Ronald, 2007, *From Corpus to Classroom. Language Use and Language Teaching*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

O'Keeffe Anne and McCarthy Michael, 2010, *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*. London, New York, Routledge.

Paas Fred, Renkl Alexander and Sweller John, 2003, "Cognitive Load Theory and Instructional Design: Recent Developments", *Educational Psychologist*, 38|1, p. 1–4.

Pastré Pierre, Mayen Patrick et Vergnaud Gérard, 2006, « La didactique professionnelle », *Revue française de pédagogie*, 154 (janvier-mars), p. 145-198.

Pekarek Doehler Simona, 2000, « Approches interactionnistes de l'acquisition des langues étrangères : concepts, recherches, perspectives », *Acquisition et interaction en langue étrangère*

12|2000.

Pélissier Daniel, 2016, *Initiation à la lexicométrie – Approche pédagogique à partir de l'étude d'un corpus avec le logiciel Iramuteq* (avril 2016, V2), 33 pages.

Pérez Alejandro, Carreiras Manuel and Duñabeitia Jon Andoni, 2017, "Brain-to-brain entrainment: EEG interbrain synchronization while speaking and listening", *Scientific Reports* 7, Article number: 4190.

Piaget Jean, 1937/1967, *La construction du réel chez l'enfant*. Neufchatel, Delachaux et Niestlé.

Pincemin Bénédicte, 2006, « Concordances et concordanciers : de l'art du bon KWAC », dans F. Rastier, M. Ballabriga, C. Duteil-Mougel et B. Fouquié (éds), *XVIIe colloque d'Albi Lagages et signification - Corpus en Lettres et Sciences sociales : des documents numériques à l'interprétation* (juillet 2006), Albi, CALS-CPST, p. 33-42, 2007.

Pincemin Bénédicte et Heiden Serge, 2008, « Qu'est-ce que la textométrie ? Présentation », Site Internet du projet *Textométrie*.

Pinto Marie-Antonietta et El Euch Sonia, 2015, *La conscience métalinguistique – Théorie, développement et instruments de mesure*. Laval, Presses de l'Université Laval.

Poudat Céline et Landragin Frédéric, 2017, *Explorer un corpus textuel : Méthodes – pratiques – outils*. Louvain-la-Neuve, De Boeck Supérieur.

Puren Christian, 2004, « De l'approche par les tâches à la perspective co-actionnelle », *Cahiers de l'APLIUT*, vol. XXIII|1, p. 10-26.

Rastier François, 2004, « Enjeux épistémologiques de la linguistique de corpus », *Texto!* (juin 2004).

Ratinaud Pierre et Marchand Pascal, 2014, « Des mondes lexicaux aux représentations sociales. Une première approche des thématiques dans les débats à l'Assemblée nationale (1998-2014) », *Mots. Les langages du politique* 108|2015, p. 57-77.

Reppen Randi, 2010, *Using Corpora in the Language Classroom*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Rösler Dietmar, 2008, „Deutsch als Fremdsprache mit digitalen Medien – Versuch einer Zwischenbilanz im Jahr 2008", *Info DaF* (Informationen Deutsch als Fremdsprache), vol. 4|34, p. 373-389.

Roussel Stéphanie, 2008, *Les stratégies d'autorégulation de l'écoute et de leur influence sur la compréhension de l'oral chez des apprenants de l'allemand langue seconde.* Thèse sous la direction de Jean-Luc Nespoulous et d'André Tricot. Toulouse, Université Toulouse 2.

Roy Mickaël, 2016, *La réalité virtuelle pour l'apprentissage des langues : l'influence de l'immersion, de l'interaction et de la présence sur la communication en langue étrangère : une étude exploratoire auprès d'adolescents apprenant le français ou l'allemand*. Thèse en co-tuelle sous la direction d'Anemone Geiger-Jaillet et de Gerald Schlemminger. Strasbourg, Université de Strasbourg.

Salengros-Iguenane Isabelle, 2013, « Approche culturelle et écriture réflexive pour un public Lansad », *Recherches en didactique des langues et des cultures*, vol. 10-2|2013, 14 pages.

Schaeffer-Lacroix Eva, 2009, *Corpus numériques et production écrite en langue étrangère – Une recherche avec des apprenants d'allemand*. Thèse sous la direction d'André Salem et de Françoise Demaizière. Paris, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris III.

Schaeffer-Lacroix Eva, 2015, « Impact de discussions métalinguistiques sur l'apprentissage de

la production écrite en allemand, langue étrangère », *Linx* 72 | 2015, p. 233-237.

Schaeffer-Lacroix Eva, 2016, "Talking about German verb particles identified in concordance lines–From spontaneous to expert-like metatalk", *Language Awareness*, vol. 25, issue 1-2, p. 127-143.

Schaeffer-Lacroix Eva, 2022 (Ed.). *BusiReden [Corpus]*. Sens Texte Informatique Histoire - EA 4509 (STIH). ORTOLANG (Open Resources and TOols for LANGuage); https://hdl.handle.net/11403/korpora. www.ortolang.fr

Schmidt Richard, 1990, "The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning", *Applied Linguistics*, 1990, 11/2. Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 129-158.

Schmoll Laurence, 2016, *Concevoir un scénario de jeu vidéo sérieux pour l'enseignement-apprentissage des langues ou comment dominer un oxymore*. Sous la direction d'Anemone Geiger-Jaillet. Strasbourg, Université de Strasbourg.

Seliger Herbert W., 1983. "The Language learner as a linguist: Of metaphors and realities", *Applied Linguistics*, 4|3, p. 179-191.

Sitri Frédérique et Tutin Agnès, 2016 « Présentation », *Lidil*, vol. 53|2016.

Spyri Johanna, 1880, *Heidi's Lehr- und Wanderjahre*. Gotha : Friedrich Andreas Perthes. Diffusé par *Project Gutenberg*, ainsi que par *Deutsches Textarchiv*.

Spyri Johanna, 1881, *Heidi kann brauchen, was es gelernt hat*. Gotha, Friedrich Andreas Perthes. Diffusé par *Project Gutenberg*.

Stevens Vance, 1995, "Concordancing with Language Learners: Why? When? What?" *CAELL Journal* (Computer Assisted English. Language Learning), vol. 6, n° 2, p. 2-10.

Sweller John, 2016, "Working memory, long-term memory, and instructional design", *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, vol. 5|4, 360 – 367.

Teubert Wolfgang, 2006, Korpuslinguistik, Hermeneutik und die soziale Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit. *Linguistik Online* 28, 3/06. p. 41-60.

Teubert Wolfgang, 2009a, « La linguistique de corpus : une alternative [version abrégée] », *Semen*, vol. 27|2009.

Teubert Wolfgang, 2009b, "Corpus Linguistics: An Alternative", *Semen*, vol. 27|2009.

Thomas James, 2015, *Discovering English with Sketch Engine*. Brno, Versatile.

Tiedemann Jörg, 2016, "Finding Alternative Translations in a Large Corpus of Movie Subtitles", in *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation* (LREC 2016).

Todirascu Amalia, Grass Thierry, Navlea Mirabela et Longo Laurence, 2014, « La relation de hiérarchie 'chef' : une approche translingue français-anglais-allemand », *Meta*, vol. 59| 2. Montréal, Presses de l'Université de Montréal, p. 436-456.

Travers Monique, 1979, *Analyse d'une expérience d'enseignement programmé de la grammaire allemande en milieu universitaire*. Thèse sous la direction de Jean Janitza. Paris, Paris 3 Sorbonne Nouvelle.

Travers, Monique, 1985, *Enseignement assisté par ordinateur des langues étrangères*. Paris, Hatier.

Trévise Anne, 1994, « Représentations métalinguistiques des apprenants, des enseignants et des linguistes: un défi pour la didactique », *Bulletin VALS-ASLA* (Association suisse de linguistique

appliquée) 59, p. 171-190.

Troadec Betrand, 1999, *Le développement de la pensée chez l'enfant – Catégorisation et cultures*. Toulouse, Presses Universitaires du Mirail.

Tyler Andrea E. and Ortega Lourdes, 2018, "Usage-inspired L2 instruction through three lenses", in Tyler Andrea E., Ortega Lourdes, Uno Mariko and Park Hae (eds), *Usage-inspired L2 instruction–Researched pedagogy*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 3-26.

Tyne Henry, 2013, « Corpus et enseignement-apprentissage des langues », *Bulletin VALS-ASLA* (Association suisse de linguistique appliquée) : *Apprentissage sur corpus: théories, méthodes, applications, perspectives*, vol. 97|2, p. 7-15.

Verch Angelika, nd, *Hybrider un cours d'allemand par la vidéo : quels processus d'apprentissage suscités ?* Thèse en cours depuis 2016, sous la direction d'Elke Nissen. Grenoble, Université Grenoble-Alpes.

Vergnaud Gérard, 2004, *Didactique professionnelle et didactique des disciplines*. Vidéo publiée sur *Canal U*. Paris, Fondation Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Vergnaud Gérard, 1989, « La formation des concepts scientifiques. Relire Vygotski et débattre avec lui aujourd'hui », *Enfance*, vol. 42|1, p. 111-118.

Verreman Alain, 1999, *La vidéo en classe de langue, un révélateur des modèles et des matrices d'une discipline : Étude des livrets pédagogiques accompagnant les vidéos en allemand*. Thèse sous la direction de Maurice Sachot. Strasbourg, Université de Strasbourg 2.

Verreman Alain, 2002, « Utilisation de l'Internet pour l'apprentissage de l''allemand : deux expériences », *Recherche et pratiques pédagogiques en langues de spécialité*, vol. XXI, n° spécial|2002.

Viselthier Bernard, 2003, Présentation du chapitre 5 de ==> Janitza 2003, p. 260.

Von Voß, Julius, 1810, *Ini. Ein Roman aus dem 21. Jahrhundert*. Accessible sur *Project Gutenberg*.

Vygotski Lev Semionovitch, 1934/1997[3], *Pensée et langage*. Paris, La Dispute/SNÉDIT.

Vygotski Lev Semionovitch, 1985, *Pensée et langage*. Paris, Éditions Sociales.

Wassermann Jakob, 1908, *Caspar Hauser oder Die Trägheit des Herzens* de (1908), DVA Stuttgart, Leipzig.

Weisser Martin, 2016a, *Practical Corpus Linguistics. An Introduction to Corpus-based Language Analysis*. Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.

Wenski Christiane, 2005, *Utilisation de produits multimédia pour la construction de compétences lexicale : analyse linguistique, psycholinguistique et didactique des apports des cédéroms, des sites Internet et du travail en tandem pour l'apprentissage de l'allemand langue seconde*. Thèse sous la direction de Jacques Poitou. Lyon, Université Lumière Lyon 2.

Yan Rui, Bardet Julie, Baudrillart Alexandre, Carrissimo-Bertola Manon, Charles Emilie, Gauthier Rozenn, Courchinoux Sandrine, Dione Amadou, Gilles Fabrice, Hatier Sylvain, Kogkitsidou Eleni, Metz Lucie, Roderon Armelle, Toua Léonie, Rousset Isabelle, Thi Thu Hoai Tran, Bayle Aurélie, Vernet Samuel, Zampa Virginie, Blondel Carole, Boutolini Gaëlle, Buson Laurence, 2014, « Modelisation des patrons lexico-syntaxiques dans le corpus Scientext : exemple des verbes d'opinion », *CEDIL14* (*Colloque international des Etudiants chercheurs en DIdactique des langues et en Linguistique*), Grenoble, Université Grenoble-Alpes.

Yvon Frédéric et Zinchenko Yuri (éds), 2011, *Vygotsky, une théorie du développement et de l'éducation : recueil de textes et commentaires*. Moscou, Faculté de psychologie de l'Université d'État de Moscou Lomonossov.