



Castledown

 OPEN ACCESS

# Technology in Language Teaching & Learning

ISSN 2652-1687

<https://www.castledown.com/journals/tltl/>

*Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, 8, 103350 (2026)

<https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.2026.103350>

## A Corpus-Based Approach to Teaching Polysemous Verbs in French Institutional Discourse



ALMAN NAUFAL<sup>a</sup> 

TRI INDRI HARDINI<sup>b</sup> 

ERI KURNIAWAN<sup>c</sup> 

<sup>a</sup>*Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia*  
almanaufal@upi.edu

<sup>b</sup>*Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia*  
tihadini@upi.edu

<sup>c</sup>*Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia*  
eri\_kurniawan@upi.edu

### Abstract

Nuanced differences of quasi-synonymous verbs tend to be hard to identify, because dictionary definitions are naturally non-contextual; this obscures the complex power dynamics and attitudinal nuances essential for near-native competence, particularly when navigating the rigid registers of professional and institutional discourse. This study investigates the functional and sociolinguistic distinctions between these two verbs within the authoritative discourse of the French Ministry of Education. Utilizing a specialized corpus extracted from the French Web Corpus 2023 (frTenTen23), the research employs a multi-layered analytical framework combining lemmatization, collocation extraction, and semantic tagging (USAS) to map the semantic prosody of each term. The findings reveal that these verbs function as administrative antonyms rather than synonyms. “Mettre à disposition” is characterized by a “rhetoric of enablement,” and “fournir” is governed by a “rhetoric of compliance.” The study argues that these lexical choices construct distinct administrative realities: one of support and one of judgment. Drawing on these findings, the paper proposes an Institutional Corpus-Based Pedagogy (ICBP) model. This framework offers a systematic approach for educators

**Copyright:** © 2026 Alman Naufal, Tri Indri Hardini & Eri Kurniawan. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. **Data Availability Statement:** All relevant data are within this paper.

to transition learners from simple lexical definition to sociolinguistic precision, using data-driven and corpus-based learning to decode the hidden curriculum of institutional French.

**Keywords:** French language learning, French for specific purposes, semantics features, corpus-based, data-driven learning, quasi-synonyms, institutional discourse, polysemy, corpus linguistics

---

## Introduction

The mastery of advanced second language (L2) vocabulary requires more than the memorization of definitions; it demands a sophisticated understanding of lexical intricacies, register, and collocations (Boas, 2020; Cullen, 2012; Goldberg, 1995). For advanced language learners, a persistent pedagogical challenge lies in distinguishing between seemingly synonymous verbs (Fillmore, 1982; Sarda, 2022). While these terms share semantic fields, their usage in professional and institutional contexts often diverges significantly, governed by unwritten rules of semantic prosody and administrative nuance (Bourmaysan & Ashino, 2021; Ma & Crosthwaite, 2026; Osuna & Baldi, 2016). As Satake (2022) argues, while dictionaries provide static definitions, they frequently lack the contextual depth necessary for learners to produce naturalistic collocations, a gap that corpus-based approaches are uniquely positioned to fill.

In fact, recent scholarship highlights the growing reliance on digital tools, ranging from mobile applications (Huang, 2024) to multimedia corpora (Topal, 2025). However, the mere availability of these tools does not guarantee pedagogical efficacy; Alruwaili (2023) notes that while teachers acknowledge the utility of corpora, successful implementation requires specific training to navigate the overwhelming volume of data. Furthermore, Nitta (2025) emphasizes that in the age of AI, the challenge has shifted from accessing data to fostering “Illustration-Induction-Interaction,” where learners actively engage with linguistic patterns rather than passively receiving information. This underscores the urgency of moving beyond general vocabulary lists towards discipline-specific corpora that reflect the complex realities of professional communication (Uehara et al., 2022).

In addition, the previous study also shows that semantic categorizations are done through empirical validation via USAS tagging to differentiate lexical items into semantic domains with corpus linguistic method (e.g., “X2.2+ [Mental Processes]” for decision-making vs. “M1 [Moving, Transport]” for travel) based on contextual usage (Rayson, 2023). Through USAS framework, we will be able to reveal that polysemous verbs were shifting in semantic preferences based on its collocation. The dynamics, particularly in polysemous French verbs, indicate constant negotiation through syntactic structure and semantic tagging interactions, as their shifts are computationally traceable to combinatorial patterns in large-scale corpora (Levinson & Wilkins, 2023; Hellwig et al., 2023). Consequently, these semantic configurations generate specific meaning-pairings that convey distinct, idiomatic senses within particular discourse genres (Hauk et al., 2022).

However, polysemous verbs operate at the intersection of embodied cognition and syntactic modulation. Their meanings are not arbitrary but are systematically rooted in sensorimotor experiences, which are then metaphorically extended through specific syntactic arrangements, such as the distinction between “mettre en œuvre” (“implement”) and “mettre en place” (“set up”) (Bergen, 2012; Dancygier & Sweetser, 2023; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). It is through frequent exposure to these patterns that speakers navigate polysemy, relying on probabilistic associations derived from actual language utilization rather than static definitions (Divjak et al., 2023; Tomasello, 2003).

In the realm of semantic study, meaning is thus determined not in isolation but by its collocation and semantic preferences (Hauser & Schwarz, 2023; Xiao, 2022; Yu, 2022). Concordance analysis provides powerful visualization tools for identifying these usage patterns, allowing researchers to observe the behavior of words in context (Gillings & Mautner, 2024; Semino et al., 2018; Zottola, 2018). This perspective emphasizes an analytical framework that goes beyond simple quantification; it identifies the specific lexical environments that commonly co-occur with a target word (McEnery et al., 2021). Consequently, researchers utilize corpus tools to map these tendencies, categorizing word juxtapositions based on frequency counts across vast datasets (Bednarek, 2008; McEnery & Brezina, 2022).

From a pedagogical standpoint, corpora facilitate language learning by granting learners direct access to this collection of authentic written and spoken data (Boulton & Tyne, 2014; Bozhinova, 2018; Richards & Reppen, 2014; Saunders et al., 2018; Schaeffer-Lacroix, 2014). Incorporating corpora allows for the processing of massive quantities of data involving heterogeneous subjects and contexts, thereby exposing learners to the full complexity required for advanced language study (Biber, 2006; Blondeau et al., 2019; Marchi, 2018; Mautner, 2022).

Despite the expansion of corpus-based research, a critical research gap remains regarding the pedagogical exploitation of institutional discourse. Existing studies have successfully employed corpus-assisted discourse analysis to uncover socio-political sentiments, such as xenophobia in media (Yeh, 2021), or to analyze the life cycle of learning technologies (Huang, 2024). However, there is a scarcity of research examining how the authoritative language of state institutions can serve as a primary pedagogical resource for teaching semantic precision. While Uehara et al. (2022) demonstrated the value of high-frequency word lists for science majors, and Xerri (2025) highlighted the importance of reflective practice in teacher education; few studies have operationalized the “official” language of a government body to decipher polysemous verbs for L2 learners.

This gap is particularly pressing given the “burning issue” of linguistic standardization versus usage. Institutional discourse doesn’t merely communicate information; it regulates relationships and establishes hierarchies (Hu & Wang, 2025). Consequently, dissecting why an official body selects the phrasal verb, such as “mettre à disposition” over the single-word “fournir,” reveals crucial attitudinal nuances: issues of power, agency, and formality that are invisible in standard dictionaries. Neglecting these nuances risks producing advanced learners who are grammatically correct but semantically or pragmatically inept in professional settings. Moreover, as teachers face increasing immunity challenges and stress from rapid technological interventions (Haghi et al., 2025), there is a clear need for replicable, effective corpus-based models that streamline, rather than complicate, vocabulary instruction.

To address those stipulations, this study utilizes a specialized corpus scraped from *education.gouv.fr* to analyze the semantic preference and prosody of “mettre à disposition” and “fournir.” By grounding the analysis in the discourse of the official French language regulator, this research aims to bridge the divide between linguistic theory and classroom practice. The study is guided by the following research questions:

- 1) How does corpus-based analysis reveal the functional differences between synonymous verbs?
- 2) How do these corpus-based findings imply a pedagogical strategy for teaching advanced French vocabulary and register?

## Methods

To investigate the functional and attitudinal distinctions between “mettre à disposition” and “fournir” within an institutional register, this study utilized a specialized sub-corpus derived from the French

Web Corpus 2023 (frTenTen23). The primary data source was restricted to the official domain of the France Ministry of Education (education.gouv.fr). This selection was driven by the need to analyze language that is not only authentic but also authoritative; as the official regulator, the Ministry's discourse embodies the standardized norms and prescriptive hierarchies intended for global dissemination.

### Data Collection and Corpus Construction

The reliability of the corpus was ensured through a rigorous, multi-stage filtration process aimed at maximizing linguistic value and significance. The initial crawl was performed using Spiderling, followed by spam elimination via JusText to remove non-linguistic elements such as navigation bars, headers, and footers, preserving only complete sentences (Suchomel, 2020, 2021). To maintain the integrity of the statistical analysis, a deduplication procedure was executed using the Onion tool (Jakubíček, 2013; Suchomel, 2012). This process operated at the paragraph level; if near-identical paragraphs were detected (including slightly adapted, shortened, or extended versions), the subsequent instance was discarded. Approximately 40–60% of the raw crawled content was eliminated to ensure that the final dataset provided sufficient context for qualitative linguistic analysis.

The resulting specialized corpus comprises 56,407 tokens (see Table 1). Preliminary quantitative analysis revealed that the verb “mettre” ranks as the 8th most frequent verb within this domain. Specifically, the phrasal construction “mettre à” appears in 878 sentences, totaling 43,564 words. Among the prepositional variations of mettre (including “en,” “sur,” “dans,” “de,” “par,” and “sous”), the specific collocation “mettre à disposition” was overwhelmingly dominant, with the noun disposition occurring 706 times, accounting for 80.49% of all “mettre à” instances. This high frequency underscores the construct's significance in institutional rhetoric and justifies its selection as the primary node for analysis.

**Table 1** *Summary Table of Corpus Size*

| Target Verb            | Total Tokens | Occurrences |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 'mettre à disposition' | 24,921       | 646         |
| 'fournir'              | 31,486       | 883         |
| Corpus Size            | 56,407       | 1529        |

### Data Processing and Lemmatization

Given that French is a highly inflected language with complex syntactic and morphological flexibility, surface-level analysis is often insufficient for capturing semantic patterns. To address this, the corpus was fully lemmatized using Python scripts and the spaCy library. This methodological choice was critical for aggregating various inflected forms (e.g., fournir, fournit, fourni, fournissent) into a single base lemma (fournir), thereby enabling a robust analysis of lexical concepts rather than mere orthographic forms (Aurnague, 2022, 2024).

The analysis adopted a multi-layered approach, progressing from quantitative observation to qualitative interpretation (Aurnague, 2025; Sarda, 2022). By treating the lemmatized corpus as the sole primary data source, the study ensured that all subsequent collocation and semantic analyses were grounded in a consistent and grammatically neutralized dataset.

## Collocation Extraction and Semantic Analysis

The analytical framework focused on *mettre à disposition* and *fournir* as “node” words. To identify significant collocates (words co-occurring with the nodes with a frequency greater than chance) a symmetrical window of five words to the left and five words to the right of each node was established. This span was selected to capture immediate grammatical relationships (such as direct objects) as well as broader phrasal contexts necessary for determining semantic prosody.

Following the extraction of collocates, the study moved beyond frequency counts to a thematic analysis using the UCREL Semantic Analysis System (USAS) French Semantic Tagset. This phase involved distinct tagging categories to map the semantic roles within the institutional discourse: 1) Agent: The entity providing the resource, 2) Object: The resource being provided (e.g., documents, personnel), and 3) Recipient: The target beneficiary.

Each co-occurring lexical item was assigned a USAS semantic code (e.g., Q1.2 for Documents papier et écriture, S7.1 for Pouvoir, autorité, administration). This systematic annotation allowed for the quantification of semantic preferences, revealing how often specific conceptual categories appeared in relation to each verb. Finally, these quantitative profiles were interpreted through the framework of semantic prosody to elucidate the subtle functional differences (specifically regarding power dynamics and utility) that distinguish “*mettre à disposition*” from “*fournir*.” Gemini 2.5 Pro is also utilized to generate precision in French to English translation and fix some possible grammatical errors to keep the text comprehensible.

## Results and Discussion

The application of corpus-based analysis to the institutional discourse of the France Minister of Education has yielded significant insights into the functional and attitudinal divergences between the quasi-synonyms “*mettre à disposition*” and “*fournir*.” While standard lexicographical resources often present these terms as interchangeable markers of “providing,” the corpus data reveals a stark division of labor. The analysis of collocations, semantic preferences, and prosody indicates that these verbs do not merely describe the transfer of objects; they construct distinct power dynamics, operationalize different aspects of the educational hierarchy, and signal divergent communicative functions; one oriented towards benevolent institutional enablement, and the other towards bureaucratic compliance and verification.

### The Rhetoric of Institutional Enablement: Morpho-Syntactic Patterns and Agency

The analysis of “*mettre à disposition*” reveals a highly specific morpho-syntactic and semantic profile that serves to reinforce the authority and benevolence of the educational administration. As evidenced in the collocation data, this phrasal verb functions as the primary linguistic vehicle for the “top-down” distribution of resources.

A defining characteristic of “*mettre à disposition*” within this register is its overwhelming occurrence in the passive voice. The quantitative analysis of the first left collocate (L1) identifies “*être*” (“to be”) as the most dominant item (155 hits), indicating a predominant use of the past participle construction (see Table 2). This syntactic preference is not stylistic but functional which also indicates a pattern of “agentless events” (Sauntson & Cunningham, 2026); it highlights the availability of the resource while often backgrounding the specific human actor, thereby framing the act of provision as a systemic, institutional state of affairs rather than a personal favor.

**Table 2** Collocations of “Mettre à Disposition”

| L2                | L1                | Hit         | R1         | R2                 |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| le (57)           | être (155)        |             | de (167)   | le (70)            |
| de (30)           | et (40)           |             | par (25)   | un (17)            |
| et (12)           | ou (39)           |             | le (11)    | enseignant (16)    |
| détacher (8)      | personnel (28)    |             | être (11)  | jury (13)          |
| dossier (7)       | de (17)           | mettre à    | sur (11)   | établissement (10) |
| que (6)           | enseignant (14)   | disposition | ou (6)     | charger (8)        |
| établissement (6) | à (14)            |             | pour (5)   | élève (5)          |
| un (5)            | ressource (12)    |             | dans (4)   | son (5)            |
| ressource (5)     | information (8)   |             | devoir (4) | candidat (4)       |
| il (4)            | fonctionnaire (5) |             | un (3)     | service (4)        |

However, when an agent is grammatically explicit (often indicated by the L2 article “le” or the R1 preposition “par”), the semantic preference is exclusively institutional. The corpus shows a near-total absence of private individuals acting as the grammatical agents of “mettre à disposition.” Instead, the subject positions are occupied by authoritative bodies: “le ministère” (“the ministry”), “l’administration,” “le gouvernement,” “le rectorat,” and specialized agencies such as “le Clemi” or “le DEPP.” When individuals appear as agents, they are defined solely by their hierarchical rank, such as “le chef de établissement” or “le proviseur.” This distribution suggests that “mettre à disposition” is a marker of power; it is an act performed by the institution for the benefit of its constituents. The semantic prosody here is one of “official enablement;” the institution possesses the resources and significantly grants access to them; it aligns with Hendawy et al.’s (2024) observation which showed that official discourse creates specific “imaginaries” to legitimize top-down interventions.

### Semantic Preference: The Digital and Pedagogical Shift

The analysis of the object collocations (R1 and R2 positions) further clarifies the nature of this “enablement.” The phrase demonstrates a rigid semantic preference for abstract, functional, and increasingly digital resources. The USAS semantic tagging reveals a high concentration of terms categorized under Q1.1 (Communication) and Y2 (Information Technology) (see Table 3).

Unlike the generic “provision” of physical goods, “mettre à disposition” is preferentially selected to describe the deployment of pedagogical and technological infrastructure. The corpus abounds with collocations such as “un site Internet,” “une plateforme,” “un environnement numérique de travail” (digital workspace), and “un dispositif numérique.” This pattern suggests that the Ministry uses this specific verb to frame its modernization efforts; it indicates verbal nodes that often possess multiple core meanings defined strictly by their patterning (Yamagata et al., 2026). By “making available” these digital spaces, the institution is not just handing over an object but opening a space for professional activity. Furthermore, the objects provided include human resources and financial means: “personnel,” “un assistant technique,” “un budget,” “le crédit nécessaire.” The verb thus encapsulates the logistical support system of the national education service. It connects the provider (the State) to the means of production (funds, staff, digital tools) necessary for the educational mission.

**Table 3** *Semantic Categorization and Frequencies of “Mettre à Disposition”*

| USAS Tag | Category Description                         | Role & Keywords                                                                                                       | Freq. |
|----------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Q1.1     | Communication en général                     | Object: information, ressource, donnée, documentation, dossier, guide, sujet, outil                                   | 28%   |
| I3.1     | Travail et emploi: En général                | Agent/Recipient: personnel, enseignant, professeur, chercheur, formateur, candidat, chef de établissement, inspecteur | 21%   |
| G1.1     | Gouvernement (or formal entity)              | Agent: ministère, administration, gouvernement, DEPP, rectorat, service académique                                    | 11%   |
| P1       | Éducation en général                         | Agent/Recipient: établissement, école, collège, lycée, cfa, université                                                | 9%    |
| S5       | Groupes et affiliation                       | Agent/Recipient: association, membre, partenaire, communauté éducatif, équipe                                         | 9%    |
| S2       | Personnes                                    | Recipient: élève, famille, parent, usager, public                                                                     | 8%    |
| Y2       | Technologie de l'information et informatique | Object: plateforme, site internet, espace numérique, logiciel, application                                            | 5%    |
| O2       | Objets (général)                             | Object: matériel, équipement, moyen                                                                                   | 4%    |
| M7       | Lieux                                        | Object: local, lieu, espace, bureau                                                                                   | 3%    |
| I1.1     | Argent (en général)                          | Object: budget, crédit, subvention, financement                                                                       | 2%    |

The analysis of the recipient role (often introduced by “à” or “de” in the R1/R2 window) confirms a unidirectional flow of resources. The beneficiaries are almost exclusively internal actors within the educational ecosystem: “de enseignant,” “de professeur,” “de personnel,” and “de établissement.” Interestingly, the corpus also identifies the wider community, such as “de famille,” “de parent,” “de un public large,” as recipients. This reinforces the public service nature of the verb. The institution “met à disposition” (“makes available”) resources to equip teachers to teach and students to learn. Consequently, the semantic prosody is inherently positive and constructive; there is no demand attached to this provision, only the implication that the necessary tools for success have been supplied by the competent authority; it demonstrates semantic prosody as a critical resource for generating “attitudinal meaning” within Appraisal Theory (Cimen et al., 2026).

### **The Rhetoric of Bureaucratic Compliance: Bidirectionality and the Dual Agent**

In sharp contrast to the benevolent, resource-rich environment constructed by “mettre à disposition,” the verb “fournir” operates within a strict lexical environment of transaction, obligation, and verification. While it shares the core meaning of “to provide,” its usage in the institutional register is inextricably linked to the administrative “gatekeeping” of the education system.

Unlike the unidirectional “mettre à disposition,” “fournir” exhibits a complex, bidirectional agency. The corpus data indicates that while institutional bodies do act as agents (providing materials to candidates), a significant portion of the agency is assigned to the “users” of the system: the students, candidates, and families.

The quantitative analysis shows “fournir” frequently occurring in contexts of obligation (e.g., L2 devoir—“must”). The collocations reveal a transactional relationship: the institution provides the

**Table 4** Collocations of “Fournir”

| L2           | L1              | Hit     | R1        | 2                |
|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|------------------|
| le (105)     | être (155)      | fournir | par (147) | le (219)         |
| de (78)      | et (40)         |         | un (128)  | candidat (24)    |
| et (21)      | ou (39)         |         | à (87)    | de (14)          |
| devoir       | (19)            |         | le (84)   | un (12)          |
| un (18)      | de (17)         |         | au (39)   | occasion (12)    |
| il (13)      | document (16)   |         | dans (18) | pièce (11)       |
| pouvoir (12) | enseignant (14) |         | de (15)   | information (10) |
| pièce (12)   | à (14)          |         | en (14)   | élève (9)        |
| qui (10)     | ressource (12)  |         | pour (12) | liste (9)        |
| être (10)    | information (8) |         | et (11)   | élément (8)      |

“sujet” (exam paper) or “matériel,” but the individual must “fournir” the “pièce justificative” (“supporting document”) or “prevue” (“proof”). This usage patterns “fournir” as a “compliance verb.” It appears frequently in embedded clauses outlining regulations (e.g., “documents devant être fournis”—documents that must be provided) (see Table 4). Here, the linguistic function shifts from “enabling” to “demanding.” The agent (the student/candidate) is placed in a subordinate position where “providing” is a mandatory condition for navigating the institutional system; it indicates that modality was used to transform prediction into irrefutable fact (Rosa & Romero, 2021; Wei, 2024).

### Semantic Prosody of Verification and Truth

Perhaps the most striking finding regarding “fournir” is its semantic prosody, which is heavily colored by the semantic field of evaluation and forensic truth. The application of USAS tags highlights a unique intersection between Q1.2 (Paper Documents) and A5.2 (Evaluation: True/False) (see Table 5).

While the direct objects of “fournir” are often bureaucratic artifacts (e.g., “attestation,” “certificat,” “dossier,” “formulaire,” “justificative”), the surrounding context creates a prosody of scrutiny. The

**Table 5** Semantic Categorization and Frequencies of “Fournir”

| USAS Tag | Category Description              | Role & Keywords                                                                                                                         | Freq. |
|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Q1.2     | Documents papier et écriture      | attestation, bulletin, certificat, contrat, copie, document, dossier, formulaire, imprimé, justificatif, livret, modèle, pièce, rapport | 29%   |
| A5.2     | Evaluation: Vrai/faux             | exactitude, valable, fraude, incontestablement, véracité                                                                                | 16%   |
| Q1.1     | Communication en général          | bilan, donnée, explication, indication, information, liste, renseignement, état                                                         | 16%   |
| S7.1     | Pouvoir, autorité, administration | administration, commission, examinateur, jury, ministère, recteur, service                                                              | 14%   |
| S2       | Personnes                         | candidat, famille, parent, usager, élève, étudiant                                                                                      | 12%   |
| I3.1     | Travail et emploi: En général     | effort, service, travail                                                                                                                | 6%    |
| O2       | Objets (général)                  | équipement, matériel, produit                                                                                                           | 6%    |

corpus analysis reveals that “fournir” frequently collocates with terms related to validity and fraud: “exactitude,” “valable,” “véracité,” and conversely, “fraude.” Sentences such as “confrontation de document fournir... établissait le fraude” (comparison of the document provided... established fraud) demonstrate that the act of “providing” is never neutral in this register. It is a performative act that subjects the provider to judgment. When a candidate “fournit” a document, they are submitting to an evaluation of their legitimacy; it demonstrates that linguistic structures motivate audiences to adopt specific behaviors that align with the speaker’s constructed reality (Darani, 2014).

This finding fundamentally distinguishes the two verbs. One does not audit the resources “mis à disposition” (“made available”) by the Ministry; one accepts them as tools. However, everything that is “fourni” (“provided”) by a candidate is subject to verification. The verb “fournir” thus encodes the administrative anxiety regarding authenticity and adherence to procedure.

In the end, the data suggests that “fournir” often functions as a performative speech act within the administrative domain. The collocations with Q1.1 (Communication) and S7.1 (Authority) (including jury, commission, examen) indicate that the act of providing changes the status of the participants. For instance, providing a “certificat médical” changes a student’s status from “absent” to “excused.” Providing a “copie” to a jury allows for the transition from “candidate” to “graduate.” In fact, Ma and Crosthwaite (2026) also already show that this systematic recurrence of particular words shapes a coherent ideological narrative.

The object collocations further support this. The preference for “evidentiary” objects (“pièce,” “justificatif,” “rapport”) over “pedagogical” objects (which prefer “mettre à disposition”) signals that “fournir” is the engine of bureaucratic procedure. It is the verb that moves files from one desk to another, that completes dossiers, and that validates claims. The recurring collocation with “dans le délai” (“within the deadline”) further emphasizes this procedural, constrained nature. This observation resonates with Eriksson et al.’s (2025) discussion on the “prescriptive role” of institutional language and digital objects.

Eventually, our findings show that the synonymous relationship between “mettre à disposition” and “fournir” collapses under the weight of institutional context. “Mettre à disposition” encodes a “High-to-Low” power dynamic (Institution to User), framed as support. Conversely, “fournir” frequently encodes a “Low-to-High” dynamic (User to Institution), framed as compliance, or a transactional “High-to-Low” dynamic (Institution to User) restricted to testing materials. Through USAS tagging, the study identifies a clear boundary in object preference. “Mettre à disposition” claims the domain of Modernization and Pedagogy (Tag Y2, Q1.1), associated with digital tools and learning resources. “Fournir” claims the domain of Bureaucracy and Verification (Tag Q1.2, A5.2), associated with evidence, forms, and legality. Finally, the most critical functional difference lies in the attitudinal environment. “Mettre à disposition” carries a positive, enabling prosody; it is the language of a supportive state. “Fournir” carries a neutral-to-negative prosody of scrutiny; it is the language of the gatekeeping state.

### Quantitative Summaries of Empirical Data

The semantic tagging analysis (USAS) reveals a distinct functional divergence between the two terms. “Mettre à disposition” is predominantly associated with capacity building and resourcing, with its top categories being “Communication/Information” (28%) and “Work/Employment” (21%). This indicates its primary function is to equip actors with intangible resources (information, data) or human resources (personnel). In contrast, “fournir” exhibits a strong administrative and bureaucratic orientation. Its leading category is “Documents/Writing” (29%), followed significantly by “Evaluation/Truth”

(16%). This suggests “fournir” is preferentially used in contexts requiring the submission of physical proof, certification, or mandatory paperwork rather than the provisioning of general resources.

Moreover, collocation analysis of the immediate context (L2–R2) underscores the differing syntactic roles of the node words. The strongest R1 collocate for “mettre à disposition” is the preposition “de” (167 hits), which typically introduces the beneficiary of the action (e.g., *mettre à disposition de l’enseignant*). This confirms a “recipient-oriented” structure. On the other hand, the strongest R1 collocate for “fournir” is the preposition “par” (147 hits), indicating a frequent passive construction (e.g., *documents fournis par le candidat*). Additionally, the high frequency of “un” (128 hits) in the R1 position suggests “fournir” is often used with specific, countable singular nouns (specific documents), whereas “mettre à disposition” governs broader categories or collective nouns.

In summary, the data highlights a clear division in Agent-Object relationships. “Mettre à disposition” is strongly linked to institutional agents such as “Gouvernement/Ministère” (11%) and “Groups/Associations” (9%), reflecting a top-down provision of resources. While “fournir” is inextricably linked to “Documents” (*justificatif, pièce, dossier*), “mettre à disposition” also governs a wider range of technological objects (e.g., Category Y2, 5%) such as platforms and software, reinforcing its modern usage in digital educational contexts.

### **Pedagogical Implications: Modelling the Institutional Flow**

The linguistic divergence identified in this study (between the benevolent, top-down enablement of “mettre à disposition” and the scrutinizing, compliance-driven nature of “fournir”) necessitates a paradigm shift in how advanced French vocabulary is taught to learners aiming for professional or institutional proficiency. Traditional pedagogical approaches, often reliant on synonym lists or decontextualized dictionary definitions, fail to capture the “invisible” power dynamics and semantic prosodies that govern the usage of these terms (Satake, 2022). As Nitta (2025) suggests, in an era where Artificial Intelligence can provide instant definitions, the role of the educator shifts from a provider of meaning to a facilitator of “Illustration-Induction-Interaction.” Thus, a systematic Institutional Corpus-Based Pedagogy (ICBP) framework is resurfaced by leveraging the specific findings regarding agency, object preference, and prosody to move learners from simple lexical accuracy to sophisticated sociolinguistic competence.

Firstly, our findings show that “Synonym Myth” is deconstructed through Semantic Prosody as a core component of vocabulary acquisition. Students might lexically default to “fournir” as a generic translation for “to provide,” and be unaware that in an institutional register, this choice may inadvertently signal bureaucracy or subordination. To anticipate this, educators must present “mettre à disposition” not merely as a verb of transfer, but as a marker of institutional support. The corpus findings provide a wealth of “positive evidence” that can be converted into Data-Driven Learning (DDL) materials. For instance, the analysis highlighted that the objects of “mettre à disposition” are overwhelmingly “helpful” tools (e.g., “*outil pédagogique*,” “*plateforme*,” “*kit de information*”).

Then, a proposed pedagogical implication involves the “Benevolence Audit,” where learners are presented with concordances derived from the study’s data, for example: “...mettre à disposition de enseignant et de professionnel de le éducation de outil pédagogique pour le accompagner.” Learners would be guided to identify not just the verb, but the purpose encoded in the sentence (“pour le accompagner”). By clustering such examples, where the agent is a federated body and the outcome is support, learners can induce the rule that “mettre à disposition” is the “verb of empowerment.” This aligns with Uehara et al.’s (2022) argument for discipline-specific high-frequency lists; here, the frequency is not just of the word, but of the supportive context.

Conversely, the teaching of “fournir” must be reframed around the concept of “administrative burden” and “verification.” The corpus revealed that “fournir” co-occurs with distinctively scrutinizing terms like “fraude,” “exactitude,” and “véracité.” A “Synonym Swap” activity could demonstrate the conflicting effect of misapplication. If a learner were to write, “L’étudiant a mis à disposition les preuves” (“The student made available the proofs”), it would imply a voluntary, benevolent act by the student, disrupting the expected power dynamic. By contrast, showing the corpus-derived string “confrontation de document fournir... établissait le fraude” illustrates that “fournir” exposes the subject to judgment.

This comparative approach creates a “lexical warning system” for learners: when the context involves proving one’s legitimacy or obeying a rule, “fournir” is the requisite term. In general, this direct link between lexical choice and legal/academic consequence is absent in dictionaries; but is abundant in the education.gouv.fr corpus.

### Conducting Institutional Corpus-Based Pedagogy (ICBP)

The translation of Institutional Corpus-Based Pedagogy (ICBP) into classroom practice requires a structured approach that explicitly connects vocabulary instruction to the social hierarchies of the target culture. Educators can initiate this process by utilizing “Power Maps” to visualize the directionality of agency established in this study. In this activity, learners map the downward flow of resources by connecting institutional subjects, such as “Le Ministère” or “Le DEPP,” via the verb “mettre à disposition” to beneficiaries like “enseignants” or “chercheurs.” This visual strategy reinforces the pedagogical focus on the passive voice or the “absent agent,” teaching learners that official discourse often backgrounds the provider to emphasize the systemic availability of the service. Conversely, to map compliance, learners trace the upward flow from the subject “Candidat” or “Élève” via “fournir” to evidentiary objects like “pièce justificative” or “dossier.” This contrast highlights the “modal pressure” identified in the corpus, allowing teachers to instruct that “fournir” is rarely a choice for the student-agent but rather a response to an institutional imperative.

To ensure these insights are accessible despite the constraints of “teacher overload” and lack of training cited by Alruwaili (2023), this implementation model proposes the use of pre-curated “Digital Kits” rather than raw data searches. By filtering the corpus through the specific USAS semantic categories identified in this study, educators can bypass the “noise” of irrelevant data and address the “immunity” concerns raised by Haghi et al. (2025). For instance, teachers can be provided with a kit containing concordance lines for “mettre à disposition” filtered by tags Y2 (IT/Computing) and P1 (Education) to instantly facilitate lessons on modernization discourse, while a separate kit for “fournir” filtered by tags Q1.2 (Documents) and A5.2 (Evaluation/Truth) can be used to teach bureaucratic compliance. Ultimately, this structured exposure enables a form of “Register Repair” that moves beyond simple error correction to address pragmatic failures. By aligning syntactic instruction with corpus findings, such as practicing the “Topic-Initial Position” for “mettre à disposition” to introduce resources and the “Embedded Clause” position for “fournir” to express conditionality, teachers can provide the “explanatory depth” that advanced learners require (Xerri, 2025), ensuring they avoid using the “arrogant” “mettre à disposition” when in a subordinate position or the “transactional” “fournir” when describing generous institutional initiatives.

Subsequently, this pedagogical implication will enable learners to produce writing that fits the institutional register. The corpus findings regarding “Topic-Initial Position” for “mettre à disposition” (contributing to informational flow) versus the “Embedded Clause” position for “fournir” (contributing to conditionality) offer a blueprint for syntactic instruction. Consequently, learners will be able to practice writing official announcements using “mettre à disposition” in the active or passive voice to introduce new resources (e.g., “Un nouveau budget est mis à disposition...”). The focus is on harmonizing

the syntactic structure with the text's objective of maintaining a clear and seamless informational flow. Conversely, when learners practice writing exam regulations, they will be compelled to use “fournir” within conditional or obligation structures (e.g., “Pour s’inscrire, le candidat doit fournir...”). The focus is on mimicking the “facilitative” and/or “transactional” tone found in the corpus.

Thus, this “Register Repair” implication moves beyond simple error correction. It treats the misuse of these verbs not just as a vocabulary error, but as a pragmatic failure. By using the corpus data to show that “fournir” implies scrutiny, teachers can explain why a certain sentence feels “aggressive” or “too informal,” providing the “explanatory depth” that advanced learners require (Xerri, 2025).

## Conclusion

We deliberately chose educational discourse to assist stakeholders in this field in recognizing and employing this verb with greater accuracy, reflecting the empirical patterns demonstrated in our results. In institutional French, “mettre à disposition” enacts the role of institutional benevolence or structural support, while “fournir” encodes compliance and accountability. Their distribution reflects different practical strategies: one aimed at enabling, the other at enforcing. While both “fournir” and the phrasal verb “mettre à disposition” can be translated as “to provide” or “to make available,” their application within the administrative-educational corpus reveals significant differences in their semantic preferences and prosody. These differences show that they are not interchangeable; rather, they are used to frame the act of provision in two distinct ways: one centered on obligation and the other on enablement (see Table 6).

**Table 6** *Conclusion: Contrast and Implications*

| Feature            | Mettre à disposition                            | Fournir                                           |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Voice Preference   | Passive (agent omitted)                         | Passive/active (agent specified)                  |
| Agent Role         | Facilitator                                     | Responsible actor                                 |
| Semantic Role      | Availability                                    | Delivery, compliance                              |
| Tone               | Supportive, service-oriented                    | Procedural, obligatory                            |
| Discourse Function | Thematic framing, topicalization                | Evidential support, regulatory anchoring          |
| Connotation        | Positive (empowerment, support, and enablement) | Neutral (transactional, official, and obligatory) |

This semantic preferences and semantic prosody lens highlight not only lexical but practical distinctions in institutional communication. In conclusion, because “mettre à disposition” consistently co-occurs with words representing helpful resources, supportive actions, and a constructive institutional framework, it has a clear and positive semantic prosody in our data. It is a phrase that signals enablement and the provision of beneficial things. Unlike “mettre à disposition,” which often implies making a resource generally accessible, “fournir” carries a more direct, transactional, and often obligatory connotation. It is the primary verb used to describe the required exchange of documents, evidence, and specific information between individuals and institutions. Unlike “mettre à disposition” which had a positive prosody of enablement, “fournir” describes a direct exchange. It is less about making a resource generally available and more about supplying a specific item from one party to another to complete a process. In conclusion, the decision to use *mettre à disposition* or *fournir* will depend on what sentences are wanting to be conveyed, whether to facilitate or to obligate its recipients, and whether to collocate with the object of empowerment or with the currency of bureaucracy.

## Methodological and Pedagogical Contributions

Methodologically, this study reinforces the necessity of specialized, register-specific corpora for advanced linguistic analysis. As argued by Uehara et al. (2022) and Topal (2025), general corpora may dilute the specific semantic preferences of a professional field. By isolating the discourse of the official regulator, this study was able to detect the “official voice.” The rigorous filtration process (using Spiderling, Onion, and JusText) ensured that the findings were based on high-quality, representative data.

Pedagogically, this research provides a replicable model for the Institutional Corpus-Based Pedagogy (ICBP) framework. It bridges the gap between the theoretical benefits of Data-Driven Learning and the practical constraints of the classroom (Alruwaili, 2023; Nitta, 2025). By mapping the complex “power-geometries” of these verbs, the study offers educators a concrete tool to teach the “hidden curriculum” of language; the unwritten rules of hierarchy and politeness that define near-native competence. It shifts the focus from “what does this word mean?” to “what does this word do in this specific social context?”

## Limitations and Future Directions

While this study offers robust insights into the educational register, its scope is limited to the discourse of the French Ministry of Education. The semantic prosody of these verbs may differ in corporate, legal, or medical corpora. Future research could productively apply this comparative methodology to other professional registers to see if the “benevolent vs. compliant” dichotomy holds true in the private sector. Furthermore, while this study proposes a pedagogical model, empirical classroom research is needed to measure the efficacy of these specific corpus-informed interventions on learner retention and pragmatic accuracy (Huang, 2024).

In the end, this research demonstrates that in the high-stakes environment of institutional communication, synonymy is a comfortable illusion. To “make available” (“mettre à disposition”) and to “provide” (“fournir”) are two fundamentally different acts; one grants a privilege, the other fulfills a duty. Understanding this distinction is the key to mastering the voice of authority in French.

## References

- Alruwaili, A. (2023). An online training course on the use of corpora for teachers in public schools. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 19(1), 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v19n1.675>
- Aurnague, M. (2022). Implicit landmarks and opposite polarities in French motion predicates. In L. Sarda, & B. Fagard (Eds.), *Neglected aspects of motion-event description: Deixis, asymmetries, constructions* (pp. 125–148). John Benjamins.
- Aurnague, M. (2024). Telic motion constructions in French and the notion of tendentiality. *Lingua*, 311, Article 103791. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2024.103791>
- Aurnague, M. (2025). A propos des emplois spatiaux de parvenir: Constructions du verbe et sous-bassements sémantiques. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 35, Article e9. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959269525000055>
- Bednarek, M. (2008). Semantic preference and semantic prosody re-examined. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 4(2), 119–139. <https://doi.org/10.1515/CLLT.2008.006>
- Bergen, B. (2012). *Louder than words: The new science of how the mind makes meaning*. Basic Books.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (2006). *Corpus linguistics investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511804489>

- Blondeau, H., Mougeon, R., & Tremblay, M. (2019). Analyse comparative de ça fait que, alors, donc et so à Montréal et à Welland: Mutations sociales, convergences, divergences en français laurentien. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 29, 35–65. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959269518000169>
- Boas, H. C. (2020). Frame semantics. In N. Reimer (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of semantics* (pp. 28–44). Routledge.
- Boulton, A., & Tyne, H. (2014). *Des documents authentiques aux corpus – Démarches pour l'apprentissage des langues*. Didier.
- Bourmayan, A., & Ashino, F. (2021). Sans doute et probablement: Des synonymes? *Journal of French Language Studies*, 31, 363–383. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959269521000107>
- Bozhinova, K. (2018). Intégration de corpus de petite taille et d'outils multilingues dans un dispositif de formation hybride centré sur les tâches. *Alsic [En ligne]*, 21. <https://doi.org/10.4000/alsic.3447>.
- Cullen, R. (2012). Grammar instruction. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to pedagogy and practice in second language teaching* (pp. 258–66). Cambridge University Press.
- Dancygier, B., & Sweetser, E. (2023). *Figurative language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Darani, H. L. (2014). Persuasive style and its realization through transitivity analysis: A SFL perspective. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 158, 179–186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.066>
- Divjak, D., Milin, P., & Medimorec, S. (2023). Frequency in language: Memory, attention and learning. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 34(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2022-0034>
- Eriksson, O., Johannesson, P., Bergholtz, M., & Agerfalk, P. (2025). Turning conceptual modeling institutional – The prescriptive role of conceptual models in transforming institutional reality. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 156, Article 102404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.datak.2024.102404>
- Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame semantics. In *Linguistics in the morning calm* (pp. 111–137). Hanshin.
- Gillings, M., & Mautner, G. (2024). Concordancing for CADS: Practical challenges and theoretical implications. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 29(1), 34–58. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.21168.gil>
- Goldberg, A. E. (1995). *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. University of Chicago Press.
- Haghi, S., Jafarpour, M., Behroojeh, M., & Kamali, J. (2025). Technological interventions and language teacher immunity: A narrative inquiry into triggers and coping strategies. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, 7(2), Article 103221. <https://doi.org/10.29140/tl.v7n2.103221>
- Hauk, O., Davis, M. H., & Pulvermüller, F. (2022). Modulation of brain activity by multiple linguistic structures: Syntax-biased noun-verb ambiguity resolution. *Cerebral Cortex*, 32(6), 1289–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhab287>
- Hauser, D. J., & Schwarz, N. (2023). Semantic prosody: How neutral words with collocational positivity/negativity colour evaluative judgements. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 32(2), 98–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214221127978>
- Hellwig, O., Nehrdich, S., & Sellmer, S. (2023). Data-driven dependency parsing of Vedic Sanskrit. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 57(2), 1173–1206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10579-023-09636-5>
- Hendawy, M., Husar, M., da Silva, N. L., & Al Mansour, Z. (2024). Envisioning of smart cycling in seven cities: Discourse analysis of official city documents. *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*, 15(8), Article102820. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2024.102820>.
- Hu, D., & Wang, C. (2025). Hybrid media warfare: Discourse analysis of Russian and Ukrainian MFA websites on the Bucha Incident. *Telematics and Informatics Reports*, 20, Article 100256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teler.2025.100256>

- Huang, W. (2024). Investigating the life cycle of language learning applications: Going beyond the hype cycle. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, 6(2), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n2.1187>
- Jakubiček, M. K. (2013). The TenTen corpus family. In *7th International Corpus Linguistics Conference CL* (pp. 125–127). UCREL, Lancaster.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Levinson, S. C., & Wilkins, D. P. (2023). *Grammars of space: Explorations in semantic typology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ma, L., & Crosthwaite, P. (2026). Constructing China's national image through political discourse: A corpus-based diachronic analysis of government work reports (2001–2025). *Applied Corpus Linguistics*, 6(1), Article 100179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acorp.2025.100179>
- Marchi, A. (2018). Dividing up the data: Epistemological, methodological and practical impact. In C. Taylor, & A. Marchi (Eds.), *Corpus approaches to discourse: A critical review* (pp. 174–196). Routledge.
- Mautner, G. (2022). What can a corpus tell us about discourse? In A. O'Keeffe, & M. J. McCarthy (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of corpus linguistics* (pp. 250–262). Routledge.
- McEnery, T., & Brezina, V. (2022). *Fundamental principles of corpus linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- McEnery, T., Baker, H., & Dayrell, C. (2021). Analysing the impacts of 19th-century drought: A corpus-based study. In M. Fuster-Márquez, C. Gregori-Signes, J. Santaemilia, & P. Rodríguez-Abrunheiras (Eds.), *Exploring discourse and ideology through corpora* (pp. 47–70). Peter Lang Publishing Group.
- Nitta, S. (2025). An introduction to corpus technology in the age of AI. *JALTCALL Trends*, 1, 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jct.v1n1.2162>
- Osuna, D. G., & Baldí, M. E. (2016). La retórica discurso administrativo - Rhetoric and administrative discourse. *Contaduría y Administración*, 61, 582–598. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cya.2015.06.003>
- Rayson, P. (2023). Semantic tagging with USAS: Evolution, applications, and challenges. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 19(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt-2022-0048>
- Richards, J. C., & Reppen, R. (2014). Towards a pedagogy of grammar instruction. *RELC Journal*, 45(1), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214522622>
- Rosa, V. M., & Romero, E. D. (2021). Epistemic and non-epistemic modals: The key to interpreting the spirit of counter-terrorism United Nations Security Council resolutions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 180, Article 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.04.009>
- Sarda, L. (2022). Similarités et différences entre trois verbes quasi-synonymes: Arriver, parvenir et atteindre. *Cahiers de Lexicologie*, 121, 87–117. <https://doi.org/10.48611/isbn.978-2-406-14565-3.p.0087>
- Satake, Y. (2022). The effects of corpus use on L2 collocation learning. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 18(1), 34–53. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v18n1.520>
- Saunders, B., Sim, J., Kingstone, T., Baker, S., Waterfield, J., Bartlam, B., Burroughs, H., & Jinks, C. (2018). Saturation in qualitative research: Exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. *Quality & Quantity*, 52(4), 1893–1907. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-017-0574-8>
- Sauntson, H., & Cunningham, C. (2026). The end of civilisation? Exploring children's eco-narratives. *Language Sciences*, 114, Article 101779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2025.101779>
- Schaeffer-Lacroix, E. (2014). Utiliser des corpus numériques avec un public Lansad. *Apprentissage des langues et systèmes d'information et de communication (Alsic)*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.4000/alsic.2720>
- Semino, E., Demjén, Z., Hardie, A., Payne, S., & Rayson, P. (2018). *Metaphor, cancer, and the end of life: A corpus-based study*. Routledge.

- Suchomel, V. (2020). *Better web corpora for corpus linguistics and NLP* [Doctoral thesis]. Masaryk University, Faculty of Informatics.
- Suchomel, V. (2021). Genre annotation of web worpora: Scheme and issues. In K. Arai, S. Kapoor, & R. Bhatia (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Future Technologies Conference (FTC) 2020, Volume 1* (pp. 738–754). Springer Nature Switzerland. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63128-4\\_55](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63128-4_55).
- Suchomel, V. & Pomikálek, J. (2012). Efficient web crawling for large text corpora. *Seventh web as corpus workshop (WAC7)* (pp. 39–43). Masaryk University.
- Tomasello, M. (2003 ). *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Harvard University Press.
- Topal, I. T. (2025). PlayPhrase.Me: A multimedia corpus for foreign language education. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, 7(1), Article 102405. <https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v7n1.102405>
- Uehara, S., Haraki, H., & McLean, S. (2022). Developing a discipline-specific corpus and high-frequency word list for science and engineering students in graduate school. *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, 11(2), 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.7820/vli.v11.2.uehara>
- Wei, J. (2024). I think and I know: Authority and solidarity in UK government COVID briefings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 223, 31–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.02.002>
- Xerri, D. (2025). Enhancing reflective practice in language teacher education: Technology as a critical reflective partner. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, 7(2), Article 103214. <https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v7n2.103214>
- Xiao, S. (2022). A study on the differentiation of the meaning of ‘happiness’ type emotional verbs through semantic preference - Focusing on ‘gippeuda, jeulgeopda, bangapda, jaemiitda and haengbokada’. *The Society Of Korean Language And Literature*, 74, 531–565. <https://doi.org/10.15711/WR.74.0.18>
- Yamagata, S., Carrol, G., & Walker, C. (2026). Exploring the potential of multiple CORE meanings in learning L2 verb-noun collocations: A corpus-based discovery learning approach. *Applied Corpus Linguistics*, 6(1), Article 100166. <https://doi.org/10.e1016/j.acorp.2025.100166>
- Yeh, A. (2021). A corpus-assisted discourse analysis of Taiwanese students’ sentiments toward Asianphobia on the news amid COVID-19. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 37–59. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v4n2.492>
- Yu, I. (2022). An analysis of the semantic preference about degree adverb ‘kajang’- Focusing on korean native speakers and korean learners corpus. *Korean Language*, 70, 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.52636/KL.70.1>
- Zottola, A. (2018). Transgender identity labels in the British press: A corpus-based discourse analysis. *Journal of Language and Sexuality*, 7(2), 237–262. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jls.17017.zot>