Beyond corpus data – complementary and alternative methods in cognitive linguistics

Workshop proposal for the XLVIII Finnish Conference of Linguistics (May 12–14, 2022)
Convenors: Finnish Cognitive Linguistics Association (FiCLA), Anton Granvik, Gaïdig Dubois, Veera Hatakka & Olli O. Silvennoinen
Website: www.ficla.fi

As most empirical research within the field of usage-based / functional linguistics, cognitive linguistics research relies heavily on corpus data, defined broadly as observations of language use. It remains an unresolved issue to what degree corpus data actually reflects human cognition (e.g. Blumenthal-Dramé 2012; Divjak, Dąbrowska & Arppe 2016; Stefanowitsch & Flach 2016).

In an attempt to ensure the psychological reality and reliability of the corpus-based findings, many studies have resorted to additional methods, such as self-paced reading tasks, eye-tracking, similarity judgements, classification tasks, association tasks, production tasks etc. The aim has often been to look for converging evidence (Arppe et al. 2010; Schönefeld 2011). In this workshop, we want to address (the use of) different methods, beyond corpus data, and to discuss the insights that they bring into the workings of language as a cognitive phenomenon.

We invite papers using data that goes beyond the already produced utterances, which constitute the main body of linguistic material included in linguistic corpora. In other words, we look forward to receiving proposals that study the relationship between language and cognition by using e.g. experimental or quasi-experimental methods, interviews, questionnaires, diary data etc. instead of or in addition to traditional corpus data. Time permitting, we also welcome empirically grounded metatheoretical papers on the combination of methods in cognitive linguistics.

Questions we want to discuss and seek to answer include (but are not limited to):
- To what degree does data collected using alternative methods complement the view of language that has been constructed on corpus data?
- Does the use of complementary methods lead to (truly) converging evidence? What does it mean for the results of corpus analyses and experiments to converge?
- What can language use tell us about the cognitive representation of language?
- What additional insights do methods focusing on different facets of language (production, comprehension, conceptualisation, acquisition) bring to our understanding of the cognitive basis of language?
- What is the role of corpus methods in supporting the use of other methods (e.g. experiments)? Is it possible to do (cognitive) linguistics without a basis in observations of naturally occurring language use?

To participate in the workshop, please write an abstract of 300-400 words (excluding references) in English and send it to **veera.hatakka at helsinki.fi** by **February 28, 2022**. After a preliminary selection, the convenors will submit the workshop proposal together with the abstracts to the organising committee of the Finnish Conference of Linguistics.

References

Arppe, Antti, Gaëtanelle Gilquin, Dylan Glynn, Martin Hilpert & Arne Zeschel. 2010. Cognitive corpus linguistics: five points of debate on current theory and methodology. *Corpora* 5(1), 1–27.

Blumenthal-Dramé, Alice. 2012. *Entrenchment in usage-based theories: What corpus data do and do not reveal about the mind.* Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Divjak, Dagmar, Ewa Dąbrowska & Antti Arppe. 2016. Machine meets man: Evaluating the psychological reality of corpus-based probabilistic models. *Cognitive Linguistics* 27(1), 1–33.

Schönefeld, Doris (ed.). 2011. *Converging evidence. Methodological and theoretical issues for linguistic research.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Stefanowitsch, Anatol & Susanne Flach. 2016. The corpus-based perspective on entrenchment. In Hans-Jörg Schmid (ed.), *Entrenchment and the psychology of language learning: How we reorganise and adapt linguistic knowledge*, 101–128. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.