

CORPUS-BASED ACTIVITIES AT LOWER LEVELS OF EFL PROFICIENCY: THE
EFFECTIVENESS OF USING CONCORDANCE LINES ON GRAMMAR LEARNING

A Master's Thesis

By

UFUK GİRGIN

THE PROGRAM OF

TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

BILKENT UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

June 2011

CORPUS-BASED ACTIVITIES AT LOWER LEVELS OF EFL PROFICIENCY:
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING CONCORDANCE LINES ON GRAMMAR
LEARNING

The Graduate School of Education

of

Bilkent University

by

UFUK GİRGIN

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

The Program of

Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Bilkent University

Ankara

June 2011

BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

June 30, 2011

The examining committee appointed by The Graduate School of Education
for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Ufuk GİRĞİN

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title: Corpus-Based Activities at Lower Levels of EFL Proficiency:
The Effectiveness of Using Concordance Lines on Grammar
Learning

Thesis Advisor: Vis. Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Asst. Prof. Dr. Philip Durrant
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
Dr. Simon Phipps
Bilkent University, Faculty of Education

ABSTRACT

CORPUS-BASED ACTIVITIES AT LOWER LEVELS OF EFL PROFICIENCY:
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING CONCORDANCE LINES ON GRAMMAR
LEARNING

Ufuk Girgin

MA. Program of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters

June 2011

This study investigated the effectiveness of using corpus-based activities on lower level EFL students' learning of English grammar. The purpose of the study was to determine whether lower level EFL learners would be able to use corpus-based activities effectively in order to learn five target grammar structures of English. This study also explored the attitudes of those students towards using corpus-based activities in English grammar learning.

Six intact lower level EFL classes at Erciyes University School of Foreign Languages participated in the study. The quantitative data were collected through the administration of three tests and an attitude questionnaire. The qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interviews.

The statistical analysis of the test results revealed that the students were able to use corpus-based activities effectively in the learning of the target grammar structures. Additionally, it was found that using corpus-based activities in the learning of the target grammar structures produced similar results when compared to using a course book. The analysis of the attitude questionnaire showed that the

students held somewhat neutral attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in the learning of the five target grammar structures. However, the analysis of the student interviews revealed more positive attitudes towards using these sources in English grammar learning.

Key words: Corpus-based activities, Concordance lines, English grammar learning, lower level EFL students, student attitudes.

ÖZET

CORPUS DESTEKLİ AKTİVİTELERİN DÜŞÜK SEVİYELERDEKİ
İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN İNGİLİZCE DİL BİLGİSİNİ ÖĞRENMEDEKİ
ETKİLERİ

Ufuk Girgin

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Program

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. JoDee Walters

Haziran 2011

Bu çalışma, corpus destekli aktivitelerin düşük seviyeye sahip İngilizce öğrencilerinin İngilizce dil bilgisini öğrenmedeki etkilerini araştırmak için yapılmıştır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, düşük seviyeye sahip İngilizce öğrencilerin beş gramer yapısını öğrenmede corpus destekli aktiviteleri etkili bir şekilde kullanıp kullanamayacaklarını belirlemektir. Bu çalışmanın diğer bir amacı da, öğrencilerin gramer eğitiminde bu tür corpus destekli alıştırmalar kullanımına karşı olan tutumlarını anlayabilmektir.

Bu çalışmada Erciyes Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nda eğitim gören düşük seviyede İngilizce bilgisine sahip altı sınıf yer almıştır. Bu çalışmadaki veri öğrencilere uygulanan üç gramer testi ve öğrenci tutumunu ölçen anket uygulamasından gelmektedir. Bu çalışmadaki diğer veri ise öğrencilerle yapılan görüşmelerden elde edilmiştir.

Uygulama sonrasında elde edilen test skorlarının istatistiksel analizi göstermiştir ki düşük seviyedeki İngilizce öğrencileri, corpus destekli aktiviteleri, beş gramer yapısını öğrenmede etkili bir şekilde kullanabilmişlerdir. Katılımcı

öğrencilerin tutum anketine verdikleri yanıtların analizi ise öğrencilerin gramer eğitiminde corpus destekli aktiviteler kullanımına karşı tarafsız kaldıklarını göstermiştir. Lakin katılımcı öğrencilerin görüşmelerde verdikleri yanıtların analizi göstermiştir ki görüşmeye katılan öğrenciler gramer eğitimlerinde corpus destekli aktiviteler kullanımına karşı daha olumlu tutumlar sergilemişlerdir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Corpus destekli aktiviteler, İngilizce dil bilgisi, düşük seviyedeki öğrenciler, öğrenci tutumları.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters for her invaluable guidance, feedback and continuous support in the process of writing this thesis. Without her invaluable instructions, rigorous academic coaching and endless assistance, this thesis would have been far weaker. I would also like to thank her for all the patience she showed.

I would like to thank Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı, Asst. Prof. Dr. Phil Durrant and Visiting Prof. Dr. Maria Angelova for their contributions to my professional development.

Special thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Zülküf Altan and Prof. Dr. Abdullah Saydam for allowing me to attend this program.

I would like to express my profound gratitude to Alison J. Kademoğlu in the School of Foreign Languages at Erciyes University for her invaluable cooperation and support in the process of conducting this study. I would also like to thank her for all the patience she showed. Special thanks to Erciyes University School of Foreign Languages instructors who cooperated with me in the process of conducting this study.

Last but not least, many thanks also go to my classmates for their support, encouragement, understanding during the years of my studying at Bilkent University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZET.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
CHAPTER 1- INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Study.....	2
Statement of the Problem	6
Research Questions	8
Significance of the Study	8
Conclusion	9
CHAPTER 2- LITERATURE REVIEW	10
Introduction	10
History of Corpus Linguistics	10
Corpora in Language Teaching.....	13
Indirect Applications of Corpora in Language Teaching.....	18
Direct Applications of Corpora in Language Teaching	21
Using Corpora in Vocabulary Instruction	21
Using Corpora in Writing Instruction	28
Using Corpora in Grammar Instruction	32

Conclusion	37
CHAPTER 3- METHODOLOGY	39
Introduction	39
Setting	39
Participants	41
Instruments and Materials	42
Tests	43
Scoring	44
Attitude questionnaire	44
Student interviews	48
The course book and Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA).....	50
Data Collection Procedure	51
Data Analysis	54
Conclusion	55
CHAPTER 4- DATA ANALYSIS	56
Introduction	56
Data Analysis Procedure	57
Results	58
The effects of using corpus-based activities on grammar learning.....	58
Comparison of pre-test scores, experimental and control groups	61
Comparison of pre-test and immediate post-test scores, experimental group	62
Comparison of pre-test and immediate post-test scores, control group	63
Comparison of gain scores	65

Comparison of retention scores.....	67
Attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction.....	70
Analysis of the attitude questionnaire and student interviews	70
Conclusion	80
CHAPTER 5 – CONCLUSION.....	82
Introduction.....	82
Findings and Discussion	82
The effects of corpus-based activities on grammar learning	83
Attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction.....	88
Limitations of the Study.....	95
Pedagogical Implications	98
Suggestions for Further Research	100
Conclusion	102
REFERENCES.....	103
APPENDICES	107
APPENDIX A: Grammar Tests (Pre-test, Immediate post-test, Delayed post-test)	107
APPENDIX B: Attitude Questionnaire (English and Turkish Versions)	110
APPENDIX C: Student Interview Questions (English and Turkish Versions)	114
APPENDIX D: A Sample of the Mini Grammar, grammar bank, gap-filling exercise sections from the Course book.....	116
APPENDIX E: A Screen Shot of Some Concordance Lines from COCA.....	119
APPENDIX F: Corpus-Based Activities (Concordance Lines, Leading Questions, Exercises).....	120

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – Pre-test medians, all groups	59
Table 2 – Pre-test medians, experimental and control groups	61
Table 3 – Pre- and immediate post-test medians, experimental group	62
Table 4 – Pre-test and immediate post-test medians, control group	64
Table 5 - Student numbers, gains vs. no gains	66
Table 6 – Gain score medians, experimental and control groups	67
Table 7 – Retention score medians, experimental and control groups	68
Table 8 - Frequencies for items 1- 11 in the attitude questionnaire.....	72

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 – The focus of the questionnaire items 46

CHAPTER 1- INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Corpus linguistics is one of the fastest-growing areas in contemporary linguistics. A corpus is a collection of texts which is used for linguistic analysis. These texts are generally assumed to be representative of a given language, dialect, or other subset of a language. Even though there has been an on-going debate among linguists whether to use corpora in language classes or not, corpora have been acknowledged as a valuable resource in describing language for language learners (Hunston, 2002). As a result, corpora have been applied to teaching either indirectly through dictionaries, textbooks, and course books or directly through corpus-based/corpus-oriented activities in language classes.

The use of corpora or corpus-based activities in language classes is very beneficial for EFL learners to get familiar with real authentic language. Language teachers also benefit from corpora to increase the meaningful input that is provided to learners. It is also to the advantage of textbooks writers to exploit corpora in order to gain an accurate reflection of the language actually used by speakers and writers in natural situations, rather than relying on their beliefs and intuitions while preparing materials in the field (Biber and Reppen, 2002).

Some language teachers and researchers encourage learners to make use of corpora in language learning and they care about learners' feelings, attitudes, and perceptions towards using corpus-based sources in language teaching. Some of them also have some concerns about the effectiveness of corpora on learners' performance on L2 learning. This study will try to examine the effectiveness of corpus-based

activities on lower level EFL students' performance on grammar learning, and their attitudes towards using these sources in their grammar learning will also be explored.

Background of the Study

Corpus linguistics is the study of language as expressed in samples (corpora) of 'real world' texts. A corpus is a collection of texts which is exploited in linguistic analysis. The role of corpora in EFL teaching is not to 'tell us what we should teach, but to help us make better-informed decisions, and motivate those decisions more carefully' (Gavioli & Aston, 2001, p. 239). Some scholars claim that a corpus approach provides meaningful and contextual input into the language side of L2 instruction (Chambers, 2007; Tao, 2001), and a corpus has its own 'potential to make explicit the more common patterns of language use' (Tao, 2001, p. 116). According to Yoon and Hirvela (2004), in order to promote teachers' and learners' pedagogical use of corpora, it is important to examine how and in what ways a corpus component is beneficial to the development of the L2 knowledge of EFL learners.

Some studies which have been conducted in the context of using corpus-based sources in L2 have targeted EFL learners' attitudes towards these sources in writing / reading instruction or in vocabulary instruction. The findings of some of these studies suggest that students have positive attitudes towards vocabulary learning through using corpus-based activities (Cobb, 1997; Thurstun & Candlin, 1998). Thurstun and Candlin (1998), for example, found that learners reacted positively towards using corpus-based sources in vocabulary learning. However, they also reported that some students reacted negatively because of the difficulty of the authentic academic texts. Sun's (2000) study aimed to explore how EFL students

reacted to a lesson in which corpus-based activities were used. In the study, Taiwanese college EFL students' feedback towards web-based concordancing was investigated via a questionnaire. He found that the majority of students felt positively towards web-based concordancing, generally because it allowed them to experience authentic language use. The students also indicated that the approach was mostly helpful in learning about the real usage of individual words as well as phrases, and in reading comprehension. Yoon and Hirvela (2004) examined the use of corpora in an ESL setting by studying intermediate and advanced proficiency level ESL students' attitudes towards using corpora in L2 writing instruction. The researchers also investigated how ESL learners perceived the use of corpora in second language writing instruction by asking the students what they thought the strengths and weaknesses of using corpora were. They found that corpus instruction was regarded as advantageous to the students' improvement of L2 writing, thereby increasing their confidence in this skill.

Some other studies have attempted to determine the effectiveness of corpus-based sources on EFL learners' performance on L2 learning in writing/reading or in vocabulary instruction. Sun and Wang (2003), for example, studied the effectiveness of inductive and deductive teaching on learning collocations by using a concordancer. They studied 81 senior high school students, who had been studying English for four years in Taiwan, by dividing them into two groups, an inductive group, and a deductive group. The study found that there was no significant difference between the groups in terms of learning collocations, but it was revealed that concordancers were beneficial tools to help learners develop their own effective learning strategies for language learning. Koosha and Jafarpour (2006) conducted a

study which tried to define the role of DDL (Data-Driven Learning) in the teaching of collocation of English prepositions to Iranian EFL adult learners. They aimed to find out whether concordancing materials which were introduced via data-driven learning (DDL) would have any effect in the instruction of collocation of prepositions. They studied 200 Iranian EFL adult learners by dividing them in two groups. One group received data-driven instruction whereas the other group received instruction in the conventional approach. The study showed that the participants who received data-driven instruction outperformed those who received conventional instruction in the learning of collocation of prepositions. Gilmore's (2009) study aimed to determine whether training learners in the use of online corpora would have any effect on helping students revise their essays. Forty-five second-year intermediate level Japanese university students' errors on their first writing drafts were highlighted, and then they were asked to revise their second writing drafts by exploiting online corpora, after receiving training in using online corpora. The study revealed that students' second writing drafts seemed to be more natural after the changes that they had made to their first writing drafts with the support of online corpora.

Studies that have been conducted in the context of grammar teaching through corpus-based sources are relatively rare. There are very few studies which have attempted to examine EFL learners' attitudes towards using corpus-based sources in grammar instruction. Vannestal and Lindquist (2007), for example, examined EFL students' attitudes towards grammar and how the use of concordancing would affect their existing attitudes. They studied advanced proficiency level EFL learners at Växjö University in Sweden, exploring the effects of using corpora on learners'

motivation to learn grammar. The study revealed that studying with corpora was perceived as a beneficial approach in grammar instruction by some students, whereas others, who were particularly weak students, found studying with corpora too challenging. The researchers also found that many students did not find corpora useful in the context of learning grammar rules; however, learners realized that using corpora could help them when writing texts in English.

Similarly, very few empirical studies have attempted to investigate the effectiveness of corpus-based sources on EFL learners' performance on grammar learning. Boulton (2009), for example, conducted a study with 132 first-year intermediate and lower levels of English students, looking at the use of corpora to deal with linking adverbials in English. In the study, the participants were randomly divided into groups, and four different groups dealt with linking adverbials in English by using either one of two traditional sources, bilingual dictionary entries (BD) or grammar/usage notes (GU), or one of two corpus sources, KWIC (Key Word in Context) concordances or short contexts (SC). The researcher found that the corpus groups (KW and SC) used the information more effectively than the traditional info group (GU and BD), but on a recall test, the differences were not significant among the groups. The researcher concluded that corpus data could be consulted by learners for reference purposes, and lower level learners could also benefit from data-driven learning.

In Boulton's (2009) study, it was also found that a wider range of learners could benefit from DDL (Data-Driven Learning), in contrast to the common assumption that corpus data was only appropriate for advanced learners. The study also suggests that more empirical studies need to be conducted in order to investigate

the effectiveness of using a DDL approach on lower level students' performance on L2 learning, and to determine whether the conclusions coming from previous corpus studies hold true for other learners at different levels.

Although many studies have been conducted in order to investigate the attitudes of L2 learners towards corpus-based sources in writing/reading or in vocabulary instruction and the effectiveness of these sources on L2 learners' performance on writing/reading or on vocabulary learning, very few studies have been conducted in the context of teaching grammar through corpus-based activities and exploring EFL learners' attitudes towards using these activities in grammar instruction. Moreover, these studies on corpus-based activities (Gilmore, 2009; Granath, 1998; Kennedy & Miceli, 2001; Sun, 2000; Sun, 2007; Sun & Wang, 2003) have mainly focused on intermediate or advanced level EFL learners' attitudes or language learning rather than on those of lower proficiency EFL learners. For this reason, empirical studies should be conducted in order to determine whether corpus-based sources can be used in grammar instruction and whether the conclusions coming from previous corpus studies hold true for students at different levels of learning proficiency, and whether students, regardless of level, feel that studying with corpus-based activities is effective in L2 learning.

Statement of the Problem

Research in second/foreign language teaching recognizes that corpora are widely acknowledged as a valuable resource in defining language but there is an on-going debate on 'its value in defining language for learners of English or its use in language classrooms' (Hunston, 2002, p. 192). Many studies (see Chan & Liou, 2005; Chujo, Utiyama & Miura, 2006; Gaskel & Cobb, 2004; Sun & Wang, 2003)

have attempted to examine whether corpus-based activities are effective with EFL learners in writing/reading or in vocabulary instruction. Students' attitudes towards using corpus-based sources in writing/reading or in vocabulary learning have also been explored in many studies (see Sun, 2000; Yoon & Hirvela, 2004). Most of these studies have attempted to use corpus-based sources at intermediate and advanced levels (Gilmore, 2009; Granath, 1998; Kennedy & Miceli, 2001; Koosha & Jafarpour, 2006; Sun, 2000; Sun, 2007; Yoon & Hirvela, 2004); however, to the knowledge of the researcher, there is no empirical study that has been conducted in the EFL context that examines either the effectiveness of corpus-based activities on lower level EFL learners' performance in L2 grammar or their attitudes towards using these resources in grammar learning. Hence, this study intends to examine the effects of corpus-based activities on lower proficiency level EFL learners' performance in grammar. The study also aims to explore their attitudes towards learning grammar through these activities.

In English preparatory schools in Turkey, instructors mostly use course book exercises to teach grammar at all proficiency levels. A special method to use corpus-based activities in grammar teaching has not been investigated or introduced yet to EFL learners or instructors. Instructors of English recognize that grammar is accepted as a set of rules by EFL learners and they also claim that learners want to be taught these rules explicitly. EFL students may need to be supported with corpus-based activities to help them become professional users of these resources so that they can make use of them throughout their following language learning processes. Therefore, the study aims to look at whether corpus-based activities are effective with Turkish EFL learners in the context of grammar teaching. It also examines

Turkish EFL learners' attitudes towards using these resources in their grammar learning.

Research Questions

The present study aims to address the following research questions:

1. What are the effects of using corpus-based activities on Turkish lower proficiency level EFL learners' performance in grammar learning?
2. What are the attitudes of Turkish lower proficiency level EFL learners towards learning grammar through corpus-based activities?

Significance of the Study

The data collected in this study will contribute to the literature on determining whether EFL learners at the early stages of language learning can be taught grammar through corpus-based activities. Corpus-based studies that can be found in the literature (see Gilmore, 2009; Granath, 1998; Kennedy & Miceli, 2001; Koosha & Jafarpour, 2006; Sun, 2000; Sun, 2007; Yoon & Hirvela, 2004) have focused on advanced or intermediate proficiency level EFL learners' performance on L2 learning in writing/reading or in vocabulary instruction, or their attitudes towards these resources in writing/reading or in vocabulary teaching; this study will provide evidence for whether corpus-based sources can be used in grammar instruction and whether those conclusions coming from previous corpus studies hold true for students at different levels of learning proficiency. This study will also provide evidence for whether students, at the early stages of language learning, feel that using corpus-based activities in L2 learning is an effective approach.

The findings of this study will also have a practical use in English preparatory programs at Turkish universities. In the English preparatory programs in Turkey, neither the effectiveness of corpus-based resources on EFL learners' performance on grammar learning nor their attitudes towards using these resources in grammar learning have been investigated yet. Therefore, the study will provide evidence for teachers questioning whether to use corpus-based activities with lower level students, and for curriculum designers considering incorporating such materials and activities for lower level EFL learners in English preparatory programs at Turkish Universities.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the rationale for the present study. In the first part, the topic of the study was introduced, and then the background of the study was presented. The problems that the study aimed to solve were discussed. Following this, the significance of the study was revealed.

The next chapter reviews the literature on corpus linguistics and the role corpora play in language teaching, as well as synthesizing the literature on the indirect and direct applications of corpora in language teaching. In the third chapter, the research methodology, including the participants, materials and instruments, data collection and data analysis procedures, is presented. The fourth chapter presents the data analysis procedures and the findings of the study. In the fifth chapter, the findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research are discussed.

CHAPTER 2- LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In this study, the effectiveness of corpus-based activities on lower level EFL learners' performance on grammar learning will be investigated. These learners' attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in their grammar learning will also be explored. In this chapter, a brief description of corpus linguistics will be introduced to readers as a starting point. Then, the controversy among linguists about whether to make use of a corpus-based approach in linguistics will be discussed in detail. In the following section, the role that corpora play in language teaching will be covered. Then, the debate that corpora have inspired among linguists in the context of language teaching will be presented to readers. After that, indirect applications of corpora in language teaching will be summarized. In the final section, previous empirical studies related to direct applications of corpora in language teaching (e.g., the effectiveness of corpora on language learners' vocabulary, writing, and grammar learning, and the attitudes of language learners towards using corpora in language teaching) will be summarized and synthesized.

History of Corpus Linguistics

The term corpus was first used in the 6th century to refer to a collection of legal texts, 'Corpus Juris Civilis', after it had evolved from the Latin word for body (Francis, 1992). A corpus basically consists of natural texts which are scrupulously collected and organized (Biber, Conrad & Reppen, 1998). Moreover, Hunston (2002) defines the term 'language corpus' as written, or spoken linguistic data collections, which are organized, or compiled with an aim to describe a specific pattern of a language, or present some varieties of a language. The definitions above can imply

that the term ‘corpus linguistics’ is the study of a language which presents ‘real life’ language use examples as well as using them to study that language (McEnery & Wilson, 1996).

Since the 1950s, when corpus linguistics started to develop, it has been amazing to see the debates it has created among linguists. Firstly, linguists started to question whether corpus linguistics was a branch of linguistics or a kind of methodology. McEnery and Wilson (1996, p. 2), for example, stated that ‘corpus linguistics is not a branch of linguistics in the same sense as syntax, semantics, sociolinguistics and so on’, and they claimed that corpus linguistics was a methodology that could be used in every area of linguistics. Secondly, a series of criticisms has been made of the corpus-based approach to linguistics. Chomsky (1988), for example, suggested that the corpus could never be a beneficial tool for a linguist because a linguist should model language competence rather than performance. He also claimed that corpus data could not distinguish wrong sentences from sentences which had not occurred yet, but intuition could distinguish which sentences were grammatically incorrect. Chomsky tried to emphasize that a corpus was a collection of natural utterances which were externalized, so a corpus would be a poor guide to model linguistic competence (McEnery & Wilson, 1996). Chomsky (1988) also suggested that because language was infinite, a corpus, which was always finite, could not be representative of an infinite language.

The debate Chomsky created in linguistics was actually related to the distinction between empirical and rationalist theories, which left the decision to linguists whether to choose to look at natural data, or to look at artificial data in their study of language (McEnery & Wilson, 1996). A rationalist theory is basically a

theory in which linguists make conscious judgments about artificial data in drawing conclusions about linguistics, whereas an empiricist theory of language relies on natural data by mainly using a corpus (McEnery & Wilson, 1996). According to McEnery and Wilson (1996), Chomsky suggested that linguistics should be more rationalist and less empiricist. Another linguist who argued against the corpus-based approach to linguistics was Hockett (1948, as cited in McEnery & Wilson, 1996). Hockett claimed that a linguist working in the structuralist tradition should aim to explicate all utterances which were included in his corpus as well as explicating all utterances which were not included in his corpus, and non-corpus-based utterances should test corpus-based grammars to demonstrate their predictive power.

Even though corpora were neglected for nearly two decades because of the debates they created in linguistics, important advances were made in the use of corpora during this time, the most important of which was the linking of the corpus to the computer (McEnery & Wilson, 1996). Furthermore, COBUILD project in lexical computing has shed light on many linguistic issues using corpus linguistic techniques and resulted in the creation of the largest corpus of English language texts in the world (Stuart, 2005). Therefore, the organization and collection of linguistic data (spoken, or written) in the computer have resulted in an increased number of corpus studies in the field since 1980. In the next section, the controversy among linguists about whether to make use of corpora in language teaching will be discussed. The role of corpora in language teaching will be presented in detail with an aim to understand how corpora, either directly or indirectly, have influenced the language teaching environment.

Corpora in Language Teaching

After Tim Johns (1986, 1991) suggested that the use of corpora in language learning could have numerous positive effects on EFL/ESL students' and teachers' way of describing a language, the potential of corpora for language pedagogy was widely acknowledged (Hunston, 2002). The contribution of corpora to the language learning environment had not developed for the last 50 years because until the 1980s, researchers did not start to emphasize that corpora could have a beneficial influence on foreign or second language teaching and learning (Chambers, 2007). However, the use of corpora has also inspired heated debates among linguists since it was introduced into the field of foreign/second language teaching. Widdowson (1991), for example, took issue with both the usefulness of corpora and the effectiveness of descriptions of corpora on language pedagogy. He also claimed that corpora in language teaching could provide language learners, teachers and researchers with important information about how language should be used; however, it should be more important to think about how useful the language emerging from corpora could be to language learners, teachers and researchers. He suggested that language learners, teachers and researchers should regard language descriptions arising from corpora as factors to be considered rather than facts to be uncritically incorporated into language teaching. According to him, language teaching should be informed by the descriptions that are emerging from corpus linguistics, rather than determined by it. Sinclair (1991) approved Widdowson's claims by stating that

'Corpus linguistics has no direct bearing on the way languages may be presented in a pedagogical context. Corpus linguistics makes no demands on the methodology of language teaching. It is not geared to serving any particular method, and the current software is quite neutral' (Sinclair, 1991, p. 489-99).

Controversy among linguists about whether to apply corpora to language teaching or not took another form after the article titled ‘Spoken grammar: what is it and how can we teach it?’ by McCarthy and Carter (1995) had been published. In the article, McCarthy and Carter (1995) argued that some choices related to written and spoken grammars needed to be presented to learners in order to let them make decisions between these two kinds of grammars. The researchers also claimed that the teaching of correct English was based on traditionally written examples; however, it was crucial to be informed about the interpersonal implications of spoken grammars, rather than only adopting the 3Ps (Presentation-Practice-Product) in traditional grammar books. They suggested that examples of informal spoken English were more appropriate for designing classroom materials than the spoken English encountered in textbooks (McCarthy & Carter, 1995). In opposition to what McCarthy and Carter (1995) suggested, Prodromou (1996) expressed some concerns about the instant transferability of research conducted in the context of corpora to language classes without being sure whether they really met language learners’ and language teachers’ needs and expectations, and he also emphasized that collaboration between researchers and teachers/materials developers was initially crucial before moving from the laboratory to the classroom. The controversy in the context of using corpora in language teaching later continued with Carter (1998) and Cook (1998). Carter (1998) stated that corpus linguistics was not a revolution, but the evolution of language teaching, and there should be more corpus description, particularly in international contexts. According to him, language description was not language teaching, but language teaching could benefit from better language descriptions. However, Cook (1998) argued that a corpus was a record of language behaviors and

these patterns of behaviors could not lead us to see how language was organized in the mind, and how it should be organized for language teaching. He also claimed that it was not well known whose language was recorded, and why such recording should be a model for language learners and teachers.

Despite the heated debates among linguists about whether to apply corpora to language teaching, some EFL teachers and researchers strongly claim that the use of corpora is very beneficial for EFL learners because corpora bring the natural and authentic real life language to the classroom to help the students to understand the descriptions of a language (Hunston, 2002). Especially since digital computers and corpus linguistics were introduced, new trends (e.g., concordancing, DDL (Data-Driven Learning), and corpus-based/corpus-oriented/corpus-driven approaches) have started to occur in the field of EFL/ESL with an aim to help language teachers and learners see real language descriptions and benefit from those descriptions in language learning and teaching. One of those trends, concordancing, has taken its place in language teaching as a new method. Concordancing is basically a kind of method which deals with language analysis, and studies structures and lexical patterns found in digital databases (Gaskell & Cobb, 2004). This method helps language learners study corpora with a computer program (i.e., a concordancer). A selected word and portions of sentences including that word, called the Key-Word-In-Context (KWIC), can be found via a concordancer. A concordance of a search can present many concordance lines for language learners to read and analyze. This format also lets users see the lexical or grammatical items that collocate with the key word. EFL learners and teachers can benefit from this information on lexical or grammatical patterns of real language (Gaskell & Cobb, 2004).

DDL (Data Driven Learning) has also taken its place in language teaching. The idea of DDL was actually first proposed by Johns (1991) with an aim to implement concordancing materials in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). It is an approach which differs from traditional learning approaches in that it requires students to observe a particular phenomenon of a language presented by concordance lines and hypothesize how this phenomenon of a language works, and then see whether the hypothesis is correct (Payne, 2008). DDL is the application of concordancing in language learning, and learners exploit corpora by using concordancing while dealing with a language phenomenon (Payne, 2008). Thus, a language learner who uses this approach is indeed a researcher who has access to authentic linguistic data (Koosha & Jafarpour, 2006). Learners are not seen simply as gainers of knowledge, but as researchers studying the regular patterns of the language, and teachers should encourage learners to search without knowing in advance what patterns they will discover (Hadley, 2002). DDL is indeed a pedagogic continuity from a product approach, which presents the specific aspects of language to the learners by exposing them to contexts, to a process approach in which DDL stimulates creativity and self-discovery learning among learners (Batstone, 1995). The teaching of grammar through DDL seems to rely on both product and process approaches, and it is suggested that grammar learning should mainly include activities which can raise language learners' consciousness rather than activities which try to focus on the teaching of rules (Hadley, 2002).

Corpus-based /corpus-oriented/corpus-driven approaches have taken their place in the field of EFL/ESL. Teubert (2010) distinguishes a corpus-based approach from a corpus-driven approach by stating that linguistic findings can be considered as corpus-based findings if everything that is included is validated by corpus evidence, whereas linguistic findings can be considered as corpus-driven findings if they are directly taken from corpora. Additionally, a corpus-based approach differs from concordancing or a DDL approach in that learners make use of concordancing (i.e., a concordancer) to search corpus data in the DDL approach in order to observe a language phenomenon, whereas in a corpus-based approach, they use corpus data in order to test their existing ideas (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001). Tognini-Bonelli (2001) also defines the corpus-driven/corpus-based/corpus-oriented approach as a methodology in which the corpus serves as an empirical basis where language researchers, learners and teachers see real linguistic data prior to their assumptions and expectations. The researcher also claimed that a corpus is an inventory of language data, and appropriate materials, for which the corpus-driven/corpus-based/corpus-oriented approach was taken into consideration while being prepared, could support intuitive knowledge, and verify expectations. The corpus-driven/corpus-based/corpus-oriented approach is apparently a method where data is used to confirm linguistic pre-set explanations and assumptions (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001).

An increasing number of corpus-based analyses in language teaching has led language teachers and learners to see empirical descriptions of language use, identify the frequent patterns, and understand the usage of particular forms and words in different registers (Biber & Reppen, 2002). The combination of corpora and

concordancers shows that a promising future in the field of language teaching and learning is offered to language teachers and researchers by letting learners discover specific patterns and change their minds by observing extensive naturally occurring examples in real texts (Hill, 2000). By using the information based on corpora, materials developers and teachers can also increase the meaningful input that is provided to learners (Biber & Reppen, 2002).

There are two ways in which corpora can influence language teaching. The indirect approach centers upon the researchers who are the provider of corpora for language teachers, materials designers, and course developers, all of which use the evidence derived from corpora while designing courses for language classes or developing teaching materials for the field (Hunston, 2002). On the other hand, the direct approach centers upon language learners and teachers who search and use corpora themselves in order to discover the specific patterns of language or the behavior of words (Bernardini, 2002). The next section will focus on the indirect applications of corpora in language teaching.

Indirect Applications of Corpora in Language Teaching

Even if most language teachers and learners have not heard of a corpus, they have been using the products of many corpus-based studies (McEnery, Xiao, & Tono, 2006). Taking the needs of language teachers and learners into consideration, the COBUILD dictionaries, grammars, usage guides, and concordance samplers (Capel 1993; Carpenter 1993; Goodale 1995; Sinclair et al. 1990; Sinclair et al. 1992; Sinclair et al. 2001) also present a variety of reliable information about the real use of English when compared to more traditional reference works and teaching materials. Even though most language teachers are not aware of what a corpus is and

how a corpus can raise their awareness to provide meaningful input to language learners, a corpus can have some crucial effects on the design of dictionaries, textbooks, course books, and grammar books, all of which are used in language classes. Language learning can be informed by linguistic descriptions that rely on the results that a corpus-based study reveals, and benefit from these results to provide input for language learners (Barlow, 1996). Teaching materials, and even course design can be affected by the results of a corpus-based investigation, and language teachers can make new decisions while introducing structures and new items to language learners (Romer, 2005).

According to Sinclair (2004), previous pedagogical descriptions which had not emerged from a corpus-based investigation can be evaluated in the light of ‘new evidence’, which is provided by corpus-based investigation (p. 271). In addition, in CLT (Communicative Language Teaching), the use of corpora can be a valuable source when language teaching syllabi are being designed; those items which will be most likely encountered can be introduced to the learners in order to help them come face to face with real communicative situations (Hymes, 1992). In addition, many corpus studies (see Biber & Reppen, 2002; Knoch, 2004) have also indirectly affected communicative language teaching syllabi by presenting the most common items in actual language use, and comparing these most common patterns found in the corpus with the same items in traditional teaching materials (e.g., course books, textbooks, and grammar books). Knoch (2004), for example, conducted a study to determine which comparative constructions in English were most commonly used by native speakers, by collecting data from the BNC (British National Corpus), and whether most comparisons were followed by an explicit basis of comparison. The

study compared the data from the BNC with textbooks, and the results showed that most textbooks did not present the full range of structures used by native speakers to compare or contrast. Biber and Reppen (2002) conducted a study which contrasted the presentation of information in six ESL grammar textbooks with empirical frequency findings based on corpus research done for the LGSWE (Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English). They defined three case studies, each reflecting one of three major issues: grammatical features to include or exclude; the order of the grammatical topics; and specific words to include when illustrating a grammatical feature. The priorities of six ESL textbooks were compared to the frequency findings of the three case studies. In terms of including or excluding grammatical features, corpus-based analysis showed that the adjective role of nouns (e.g., glass window, patrol car) was less commonly acknowledged in textbooks than in the corpus, and textbooks seemed to include adjectives and participial adjectives for noun modification, considering nouns as less important in their adjective roles. In terms of the order of grammatical topics, they found that textbooks considered progressives as more important than they actually were in the corpus. In terms of including specific words to illustrate a particular grammar feature, they found that there was little consistency across textbooks guiding the selection of illustrative vocabulary, and most common lexical verbs (e.g., try, put, use, leave) were neglected by all textbooks. This study's results suggest that corpus-based analysis may inform language teachers and course book writers in the development of materials and in the choices that teachers make in language classrooms. In the next section, direct applications of corpora in language teaching will be discussed in detail with an aim to understand how corpora have been directly integrated into language classes.

Direct Applications of Corpora in Language Teaching

In this section, the direct applications of corpora in language teaching will be presented. Specific language skills will be dealt with in turn. Several previous empirical studies which have directly attempted to determine the effectiveness of corpora on language learners' L2 (Second Language) learning will be summarized. The attitudes, perceptions, reactions, and the feelings of language learners towards using corpora in their L2 learning will also be discussed in detail.

Using Corpora in Vocabulary Instruction

Some previous empirical studies conducted in the context of using corpus-based activities, DDL, and concordances in L2 have attempted to determine the effectiveness of these sources and activities on EFL/ESL learners' performance on vocabulary learning. These studies have mainly aimed to investigate their effectiveness on language learners' learning of only one aspect of vocabulary learning, which was collocation learning. Sun and Wang (2003), for example, studied the effectiveness of inductive and deductive approaches on the learning of collocations by using a concordancer. They also aimed to examine the relationship between the difficulty of collocation patterns and learner performance. Eighty one senior high school students, who had been studying English for four years in Taiwan, were divided into two groups, an inductive group, and a deductive group. The participants were given a pre-test at the beginning of the study, and then they were taught how to search via concordancers. Students in the deductive group were given grammatical rules, and were required to correct the sentences through studying the rules and the examples presented, whereas students in the inductive group were required to search for five instances of use of the keyword on a web-based

concordancer, and then they were asked to understand the underlying patterns through those five instances. The researchers, then, asked the students in the inductive group to correct the sentences according to their own induced rules. After treatment, an immediate posttest was administered to all students to evaluate the students' performance on collocation learning. The findings showed that the inductive group performed significantly better than the deductive group on the learning of easy collocation patterns. The researchers concluded that the two teaching approaches only differed significantly in the learning of easy collocation patterns, and there was no significant difference between the two teaching approaches for the difficult patterns. This study's results revealed that concordancers could help language learners to become efficient self-discoverers of target language collocations for collocation learning.

Another empirical study's results (Chao, 2010), which also looked at the effectiveness of corpus-based activities on high school students' collocation learning, were similar to the results of Sun and Wang's (2003) study in terms of language learners' collocation learning. In the study, Chao (2010) aimed to investigate the effectiveness of concordancing on Taiwanese junior high school students' learning of receptive and productive collocations. Two classes of 71 second-grade junior high school students, who had been learning English formally for three years, participated in the study, and they were randomly divided into two groups, an experimental group and a control group. All students received 15 weeks of instruction. The concordancer, IWiLL, which was adapted by the researcher, was introduced to the students in the experimental group, and they were taught how to use it during their collocation learning, whereas the students in the control group used the regular

textbook to deal with the same target collocations. The students were given a pre-test and a post-test to examine the effects of using the concordancer on their collocation learning. The results of the pre-test revealed that there was no difference between the scores of the experimental group and those of the control group; however, the results of the post-test revealed that the students in the experimental group significantly outperformed the students in the control group, particularly in terms of learning productive collocations. The results of both studies (Chao, 2010; Sun & Wang, 2003) revealed significant differences between experimental and control groups in terms of the students' learning of collocations.

The results of the two studies above suggest very promising results for language teachers who question whether to use concordancing while teaching collocations to high school students. The effectiveness of concordancer on the students' learning of collocations in these studies shows that the students who have been learning English for three or four years can benefit from consulting a concordancer while learning English collocations.

Some empirical studies have investigated the possible effects of corpus-based activities, DDL, and concordancing on college, or university adult language learners' collocation learning. Koosha and Jafarpour's (2006) study, for example, tried to define the role of DDL in the teaching of collocation of English prepositions to 200 Iranian EFL adult learners, who were in three proficiency levels. The students were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups, all of which comprised totally six groups, and went through a fifteen-session treatment which was one hour per week in a fifteen-week semester. A completion test on collocations of prepositions was given to the 200 participants as a pre-test to determine their

collocational knowledge. The three control groups then received conventional instruction in which prepositions and their collocational patterns were explicitly taught to the participants in English or Farsi, whereas the three experimental groups received data driven-based instruction that was based on concordance lines taken from the Brown Corpus Online (2005), and presented in KWIC (Key-Word-In Context) format. After the instruction, a completion test on collocation of prepositions was administered as a post-test in order to determine the impact of the specific instruction the participants received. The results of the study showed that the students who received data-driven instruction outperformed the students who received conventional instruction in the use of prepositions in collocations. The researchers interpreted these results as indicating that the DDL approach proved to be highly effective in the teaching and learning of collocation of prepositions, and learners' proficiency levels had a great influence on their performance on collocation learning.

Some studies have investigated the effectiveness of using bilingual parallel corpora on language learners' collocation learning. Chan and Liou (2005), for example, conducted a study to investigate the possible effects of using five web-based practice units on learners' English verb-noun collocation learning with the help of a web-based Chinese-English bilingual concordancer (keyword retrieval program). The researchers gave 32 college EFL students in Taiwan a pre-test and two post-tests to examine whether a web-based Chinese-English bilingual concordancer would help EFL students to learn verb-noun collocations. The study revealed that students showed a significant level of learning from the five online units, thereby increasing their knowledge of verb-noun collocations. However,

delayed post-tests revealed that students' knowledge of verb-noun collocations declined after two and a half months but this knowledge was higher when compared to their initial verb-noun collocation knowledge.

Another study which tried to determine the effects of bilingual parallel corpora was Chujo, Utiyama and Miura's (2006) study, which aimed to investigate the effectiveness of Japanese-English bilingual parallel corpora on beginner level EFL learners' vocabulary learning. However, this study differs from the studies summarized above, by examining the effects of corpora on language learners' vocabulary learning, rather than collocation learning. Additionally, this study's findings differ from those of the other studies in that it reveals that lower proficiency level learners can also use a corpus effectively. In the study, the researchers combined a Japanese-English parallel corpus to produce corpus-based vocabulary activities, and then found a multilingual concordancer so that they could investigate the equivalences and contrasts between the two languages. The study aimed to determine whether learners would get used to using the bilingual parallel concordance tool, and whether the concordancing activity would be useful for learners. Seventy two beginning level students, who were studying engineering in three Japanese universities, took part in the study. The participants had one 90-minute class per week for four or five weeks in the study. DDL (Data-Driven Learning) activities were integrated into CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning) activities, and some target words were provided for students in several tasks. The researchers wanted students to compare the vocabulary and language patterns between the two languages to understand patterns and usage in both languages by using the bilingual Japanese-English parallel corpus. At the end of each

lesson, they gave a CALL-CD-ROM quiz to check the knowledge of the vocabulary that students had been exposed to that day. The study revealed that the beginning level EFL learners were able to use the concordancing tool for learning English vocabulary, and the bilingual concordancing tool resulted in successful vocabulary learning material for beginning level EFL students. The researchers also concluded that the bilingual parallel corpus was effective with beginning level EFL students in the context of discovering many relationships between the two languages, and exploring the lexicogrammatical and collocational patterns of English.

These studies' results suggest that bilingual parallel corpora seem to have positive effects on students' learning of vocabulary and collocations of English. College and university adult learners can benefit from bilingual parallel corpora in their vocabulary learning, and language teachers can adapt bilingual parallel corpora with an aim to help EFL learners compare and contrast the relationships between students' native language patterns and those of the target language.

Previous empirical studies have also explored the attitudes, perceptions, reactions, and feelings of language learners towards using corpus-based activities, DDL, and concordancing mostly in the context of collocation learning. Chan and Liou's (2005) study (described above), for example, aimed to find out what kinds of feedback students would give to a bilingual concordancer. The researchers also aimed to find out to what extent the students thought that the bilingual examples in the concordancer could help their learning of English verb-noun collocations. Questionnaires revealed that students felt positively towards learning English verb-noun collocations through the online practice units, and the majority of the students

enjoyed using the bilingual concordancer while trying to learn verb-noun collocations.

Another study which explored language learners' attitudes in the context of collocation learning was that of Chao (2010). The researcher explored 71 second-grade junior high school students' attitudes towards using a concordancer in their collocation learning. The results of a questionnaire showed that the students felt positively while learning collocations, and the students mostly agreed that concordancing was indeed effective with their collocation learning.

In Chujo, Utiyama and Miura's (2006) study, 72 beginner level EFL learners' reactions towards using concordance-based teaching activities in their vocabulary learning were explored. The researcher also tried to reveal what learners thought about the ease of using the concordancing tool. The students were required to write down their responses to using concordancing tools daily. They were also required to complete a final questionnaire in order to determine whether they were able to get used to using the concordancing tool, and whether they had learned anything from the concordancing activities. The results of the daily evaluations revealed that 63% of the participants got used to using the concordancing tool. The results of the final questionnaire revealed that 62% of the participants felt positively towards using a DDL approach in learning English vocabulary, and 40% of the participants stated that using the concordancing tool was easy for them.

There has been a growing interest in conducting studies investigating the effectiveness of corpus-based activities, DDL, and concordancers on EFL learners' performance on vocabulary learning, and exploring their attitudes towards these resources in vocabulary instruction. The findings of these studies mostly suggest that

students perceive corpus-based activities, DDL, and concordancing as beneficial for their knowledge of English words, particularly for learning the common usage and collocation of words. However, even though all of the studies summarized above suggest promising results for the realm of ELT, language teachers and learners in the field, these studies have mostly attempted to reveal some results for language learners' collocation learning rather than vocabulary learning in a general sense. Therefore, more empirical studies should be conducted in order to determine whether these conclusions coming from previous empirical studies which have been conducted in the context of language learners' collocation learning hold true for their general vocabulary learning, as well.

Using Corpora in Writing Instruction

Many previous studies have attempted to determine the effectiveness of corpus-based activities, DDL, and concordances in EFL/ESL learners' performance in writing, with an emphasis on the use of concordancers. Gilmore (2009), for example, conducted a study in which 45 second-year intermediate proficiency level Japanese university students were required to use the British National Corpus (BNC) and the COBUILD Concordance and Collocations Sampler in revising their writings. The study aimed to find out whether these tools could be effective tools for language learners to write second drafts of their writings. Initially, the students were required to write a report, on which the teacher highlighted sentence-level, lexical, and grammatical problems. After the students had been trained for about 30 minutes, they were asked to use the BNC and COBUILD corpora while correcting the problems in their writings. After that, they were required to write the second drafts of their

writings accordingly. The results of the study revealed that 61% of the students' revised writings included more natural language.

Another study which investigated the possible effects of using concordancers on language learners' revision of their writings was that of Gaskell and Cobb (2004). The researchers conducted a study to determine whether 20 adult Chinese students, who were intermediate level English learners, would be able to use concordancers to correct their writing errors, and whether there would be any decrease in students' errors in free writing after they had corrected their errors in their writings with the support of concordancers. The researchers also aimed to find out whether learners would be able to use concordancers independently after the training. Initially, the students were given written assignments. The instructor gave feedback to each learner's assignment by presenting online concordance links for selected errors. After that, the instructor asked the students to resubmit the writings. The results of the study showed that an accurate correction was found in the majority of the revised writings, and seven students out of the 20 students became persistent users of the online concordancer. The study also revealed that learners improved their writing by making use of concordancing to correct their errors.

The studies described above mainly suggest useful results for language learners to make use of concordancers to revise their written texts. According to findings of the studies above, if language teachers pay enough attention to lead language learners to use concordancers to correct the errors of their written texts after the necessary training, language students can effectively use these tools to improve their writing skills in English.

Some studies have also explored the reactions of language learners towards using concordancers in writing instruction. Gaskell and Cobb's (2004) study (described above), for example, also aimed to determine whether students found the concordancing activities beneficial for correcting their writing errors. The students were asked via a questionnaire whether they had liked using the concordancing activities while correcting the errors of their written texts, and they were also asked whether they had learned anything from concordancing. According to the results of the questionnaire, all of the 20 students stated that they had learned a great deal of information from concordancing, and they had thought that concordancing improved their English writing skills. In addition, eight students out of the 20 students stated that their grammar knowledge also improved while using concordancing.

Another study which also explored intermediate proficiency level language learners' reactions towards concordancers in writing was that of Gilmore (2009). The researcher aimed to explore the students' reactions towards using BNC and COBUILD online corpora for revising their written texts. The results of the study revealed that 95% of the students gave positive feedback on the activities, mostly agreeing that online corpora were beneficial for them to revise their essays.

The studies summarized above generally targeted EFL (English as Foreign Language) learners' reactions towards concordancers, and the findings of these studies revealed that EFL learners mostly felt positively towards using concordancers for improving their writing skills. Some studies in the literature also targeted ESL (English as Second Language) learners' reactions towards using corpora for improving their writing skills. Yoon and Hirvela's (2004) study, for example, attempted to explore ESL students' attitudes towards using corpora in the L2 writing

classroom. This study also differs from the studies summarized above, in that it explores language learners' attitudes towards using corpora for improving their writing skills in the classroom, rather than their attitudes towards using concordancers for correcting the errors in their written texts. In other words, the study aims to explore language learners' reactions towards using corpora in writing instruction rather than using them in error correction. In the study, the researchers aimed to find out whether ESL students found the use of corpora for learning L2 writing beneficial, and how they felt about using corpora in writing instruction. In a ten-week term, eight students participated in an intermediate level ESL writing course and 15 students participated in an advanced level ESL writing course at an American university. All of the students in both classes used the Collins COBUILD Corpus, and received instruction in conducting a concordance search from an instructor. The instructor also helped them to interpret the results of the concordance search. The researchers used a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews to explore the attitudes of the students towards using corpora in writing instruction. The study revealed that the students in both classes mostly agreed that using a corpus was helpful and beneficial for them to learn the usage of vocabulary and phrases, and the students mostly felt positively towards using corpora in L2 writing instruction. More specifically, the study revealed that the students who participated in the intermediate level ESL writing course were more satisfied with the information that they gained via corpus searches than the students who participated in the advanced level ESL writing course. The researchers suggested that the teacher's different type of emphasis on the corpus work in the advanced level ESL writing course might have affected the students' perceptions of the corpus use, and it may have been difficult

for the students who took the advanced level ESL writing course to express positive feelings if they were not satisfied with what their corpus searches produced. The researchers concluded that the use of corpora was especially beneficial for ESL students for learning word patterns in the target language, thereby improving their L2 writing skills.

The studies described above investigated the effectiveness of concordancers on language learners' performance on writing skills. The findings of these studies suggest that language learners are able to use concordancers to correct the errors in their written texts, and concordancers help language learners to revise their writing texts, thereby supporting them to produce more natural language in their writings. Some of these studies also explored how language learners reacted towards using concordancers for correcting the errors in their written texts or revising their written texts. The findings of the studies indicated that the language learners felt positively towards using concordancers for improving their writing skills. Most of the language learners also believed that they learned a great deal of information for improving their writing skills through using concordancers.

Using Corpora in Grammar Instruction

From the two corpus-based studies that have been conducted in grammar instruction from the two perspectives (i.e., investigating the effectiveness of corpus-based activities on grammar instruction and exploring attitudes towards these sources in grammar instruction), only one empirical study has directly centered upon the effectiveness of corpus-based activities on EFL learners' learning of English grammar. Boulton's (2009) study investigated whether a DDL approach, using a concordance print-out, could be beneficial for 132 first-year intermediate and lower

level English students , and whether the learners could benefit from a DDL approach without having training. In the study, the participants, who were studying English for specific purposes, were randomly divided into groups. In an experimental design , four different groups dealt with linking adverbials in English by using either the following traditional sources: bilingual dictionary entries (BD) or grammar/usage notes (GU), or using the following corpus sources: KWIC (Key Word in Context) concordances or short contexts (SC). The researcher assigned the students into one of the four groups in order to test them in terms of their ability to interpret, apply and recall different information types. The WebCorp, an integrated system for web-text search, was used in order to include five short contexts for each test item in the short context sheets, and eight concordance lines for each test item in the keyword in context sheets. The Collins-Robert Senior dictionary, a large desk dictionary, was used for each test item in the bilingual dictionary entries. As for the grammar/usage notes, Swan's Practical English Usage, which includes everyday language, was used for each test item. A first test (a pre-test) was given to the participants in order to know about the participants' existing knowledge and ability before the experiment. A second test (a test where the students could consult the information sheets) was given to the participants in order to see how the learners progressed in using DDL for reference purposes. Lastly, a third test (a recall test), ten days later, was given in order to see the recall of the different information types. There were two exercises in each test (ten questions about ten target items, and multiple-choice gap-filling). The same testing instrument was given to all students without taking their group into consideration. The researcher analyzed the data in terms of test results (the changes among the three tests), level (the scores among three bands of proficiency in

English), and information type (the scores among the groups (SC, KW, GU, BD) according to the type of information they received during the second test). The lowest scores were seen on the first test, and the second test revealed significantly higher scores than those of the first test. The recall test revealed lower scores than those of the second test but significantly higher scores than those of the first test. In terms of the level, the study revealed that all levels showed the same development over the three tests: the lowest scores on the first test , the highest scores on the second test , and a decrease in scores on the third test. In terms of information level, the corpus groups (KW and SC) used the information more effectively in the second test than the traditional information groups (GU and BD), but on the recall test, the differences were not significant among the groups. The researcher concluded that corpus data could be consulted by learners for reference purposes, and lower level learners could also benefit from data-driven learning.

The students in Vannestal and Lindquist's (2007) study also used corpora in their grammar learning. However, this study differs from that of Boulton (2009), by focusing on attitudes towards using concordancing in grammar learning. Vannestal and Lindquist (2007) explored advanced proficiency level EFL learners' attitudes towards using concordancing in grammar learning. The researchers also tried to determine the effects of corpora on the learners' motivation to learn grammar. To conduct the study, two trials were designed. In the first trial, which lasted six months, the researchers divided the learners into two groups, an experimental and a control group. The language focus in the study was on subject-verb agreement and the use of articles. In the experimental group, some of the ordinary problem solving exercises, whose answers could be found in the grammar book, were replaced by corpus

exercises whereas the control group only used the grammar book and regular exercises. The experimental group and the control group participated in a final exam which included a grammar test and a composition test. Both groups were compared in terms of an initial diagnostic test, which all students took at the beginning of the semester, and final exam results. The students' attitudes also were investigated through questionnaires. The results of the diagnostic test revealed that the control group had outperformed the experimental group. The comparison of the students' diagnostic test and final exam results showed that both groups' improvement was the same. That is, the control group improved as much as the experimental group, in contrast to what the study hypothesized. According to the results of the questionnaires, the students in the experimental group felt positively towards using corpora in grammar learning.

In the second trial, which also lasted six months, the researchers introduced corpora to all students instead of using an experimental group and a control group. The researchers used the COBUILD Concordance Sampler for the exercises and the learners carried out exercises primarily based on printed-out concordance lines. After the introduction, the students explored a number of problematic grammatical areas with the help of the corpus exercises developed in the project, half of the pairs doing some of the exercises and the other half doing the rest. The researchers evaluated the students in the second trial by only focusing on their attitudes towards using the concordancer in grammar learning, so they interviewed the students to learn what their experiences and opinions of the corpus work were. The results of the interviews revealed that several of the students did not find corpora very useful for learning about grammatical rules, but realized that they could use corpora when writing texts

in English. The researchers concluded that working with corpora was a method that some students appreciated, while others, especially weak students, found it difficult or boring.

Vannestal and Lindquist's study (2007) showed that advanced level language learners realized the useful potential of using a concordancer for increasing their motivation for writing texts in English rather than learning some grammar points to improve their knowledge of these grammar points. Boulton's study (2009) revealed some results about the effects of a DDL approach on lower level language learners' grammar learning. The findings of the study showed that there was no significant difference between the scores of the corpus groups and those of the traditional information groups in terms of recall purposes. On the other hand, the study revealed that as a reference tool, the corpus examples in the corpus groups' information sheets worked better for the learners than the sources in the traditional information groups because it was observed that the corpus groups apparently used the information more effectively than the traditional information group in the second test. However, the particular gap, the researcher's defining the participants of the study as lower level learners, has not been filled by the study, because the participants in the study were the students of intermediate and lower level of English. The students had been studying English for approximately 6.6 years, and their average score (51.29%) on the TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) exam revealed that they were low-intermediate proficiency level students (p. 41). Therefore, this study's findings suggest that more empirical studies should be conducted to determine the effectiveness of corpora on actual lower level EFL students' performance on grammar learning.

Many studies (see Chao, 2010; Sun, 2000; Yoon & Hirvela, 2004) have been conducted in order to explore the attitudes of L2 learners towards corpus-based sources in writing and vocabulary instruction. The effectiveness of these sources on L2 learners' performance on writing and vocabulary learning has also been examined by many studies (see Chan & Liou, 2005; Chujo, Utiyama & Miura, 2006; Gaskel & Cobb, 2004; Sun & Wang, 2003). Very few studies (see Vannestal & Lindquist, 2007) have been conducted in the context of teaching grammar through corpus-based sources and exploring EFL learners' attitudes towards using these sources in grammar instruction. Moreover, these studies on corpus-based activities (Gilmore, 2009; Granath, 1998; Kennedy & Miceli, 2001; Sun, 2000; Sun, 2007; Sun & Wang, 2003) have mainly focused on intermediate or advanced level EFL learners' attitudes or language learning rather than on those of lower proficiency EFL learners. This study primarily aims to examine the effectiveness of corpus-based sources on lower proficiency level EFL learners' performance on grammar learning. The study will also explore their attitudes towards using these sources in the learning of English grammar.

Conclusion

In this chapter, immediately after introducing corpus linguistics to readers, the controversy among linguists about whether to use corpora in linguistics has been discussed in great detail. As well as covering the role that corpora played in language teaching, this chapter has also presented the debate that corpora inspired among linguists in the context of language teaching. In addition to presenting how corpora have indirectly influenced language teaching, a review of literature on direct applications of corpora in language teaching have been presented by covering several

previous empirical studies which have been conducted in order to understand how corpora have been directly integrated into language classes.

In the next chapter, the research tools and methodological procedures of the study will be presented. In addition, information about the setting and the participants will be provided.

CHAPTER 3- METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study investigated the effectiveness of corpus-based activities on lower level EFL learners' learning of English grammar. Those learners' attitudes towards these activities in grammar classes were also examined. This study tried to answer two research questions:

1. What are the effects of using corpus-based activities on Turkish lower proficiency level EFL learners' performance in grammar learning?
2. What are the attitudes of Turkish lower proficiency level EFL learners towards learning grammar through corpus-based activities?

Setting

The study was conducted at Erciyes University (EÜ), in the School of Foreign Languages (EÜ YDYO) in the spring term of the 2010-2011 academic year. There are two main departments in the EÜ YDYO, the Department of Modern Languages and the Department of Basic English. The Department of Modern Languages is responsible for instructing vocational and basic English in the different departments of the Erciyes University, whereas the aim of the Department of Basic English is to help students develop necessary language skills before starting to follow a four- year program with 30% English-medium instruction, through the English preparatory program at Erciyes University. All students are provided compulsory intensive language education for one academic year in the Department of Basic English. Before the beginning of the academic year, a proficiency test is administered to all incoming students. If they score 60 or above out of 100 on the proficiency test, they gain the right to start studying at their own departments. EÜ

YDYO basic English department divides the learners who cannot achieve this score into four main classes, A, B, C, and D, according to the results of the proficiency test. Intermediate level learners are placed in A classes, pre-intermediate level learners are placed in B classes. C and D classes consist of the learners who are at beginner or elementary levels of English.

At EÜ YDYO, one academic year is divided into two terms, thirty-four weeks in total. Students participate in classes twenty or twenty-two hours per week in all levels. During the thirty-four weeks of English instruction, students take speaking, grammar, vocabulary, writing, reading, and listening lessons. All students in all levels are regularly required to take part in the monthly proficiency exams, which provide evidence for the instructors to see whether the students make progress in developing necessary language skills. At the end of the first term of the academic year, all levels are expected to have completed an upper-intermediate level main course book in order to take the first-term exit exam. Students have the right to start studying at their departments at the end of the first term of the program if they score 60 or above out of 100 on the first-term exit exam that is administered at the end of the first term of the program. In order to gain the right to participate in the first-term exit exam, the students' grade average points in A, B, and C classes have to be 65 or above, and the students' grade average points in D classes have to be 70 or above out of 100. Those who cannot manage to gain the right to complete the program at the first term of the academic year in either way are placed in the C or D classes to study more English in the spring term of the academic year. Students also have the right to start studying at their departments at the end of the academic year without participating in the exit exam that is administered at the end of the year. In order to

do this, the students' grade average points in A, B, and C classes have to be 65 or above, and the students' grade average points in D classes have to be 70 or above out of 100.

Participants

One hundred and twenty-six students from six intact lower level classes took part in the study. Each intact class consisted of 21 students. The students were in the age range of 18 to 21. Sixty-six of these students were male and 60 of them were female.

Thirteen teachers in the EÜ YDYO instructed the lessons in the six intact classes. Eight of these teachers were female and five of them were male. Out of 13 teachers, five had more than ten years of teaching experience, and eight had less than three years of teaching experience. One of the teachers who had more than ten years of teaching experience held a PhD degree in English language teaching, and two teachers who had less than three years of teaching experience held MA degrees in English language teaching. The other teachers held bachelor's degrees either in English language teaching or linguistics.

The six intact lower level classes were chosen in cooperation with EÜ YDYO administrative staff on the basis of the results of the learners' first-term proficiency exit exam. EÜ YDYO placed the students who could not manage to complete the program in the first term of the academic year in C and D classes. The scores of those students' proficiency exit exam were analyzed in order to determine which of the classes could be the study's six intact lower level classes. Because this study aims to investigate the effects of using corpus-based activities on lower level EFL learners' English grammar learning as well as exploring their attitudes towards these

activities, the six intact classes whose scores appeared to be the lowest ones were chosen to participate in the study. The means of the proficiency scores of the six intact classes were then compared by using SPSS, and it was found that there were no significant differences among the classes in terms of their proficiency scores. That is, the six intact classes were homogenous in terms of their knowledge of English at the beginning of the treatments.

The study was designed to have three experimental groups and three control groups. Randomly, three of the six intact classes were assigned as the experimental groups, and the other three of them were assigned as the control groups for the study. This design was employed with the aim of eliminating or minimizing the possible teacher effect, which could emerge from using just one experimental and one control group. Out of 126 participants in the six intact classes, 96 took part in the three testing sessions. Even though all students may have participated in the treatments, only the results of these 96 students were taken into consideration while conducting the data analysis. However, the results of the students who completed the attitude questionnaire without taking part in the testing sessions were taken into consideration while analyzing the attitude questionnaire. Out of 63 students in the three experimental groups, 50 completed the attitude questionnaire.

Instruments and Materials

The instruments used in this experimental study were grammar tests, an attitude questionnaire, and audio-taped semi-structured interviews. Some of the instruments were created by the researcher, whereas some of them were adapted from previous research. The materials used in the study were corpus-based activities,

a course book, and a corpus. All prepared materials that were used in the study were prepared in consultation with the administration of EÜ YDYO.

Tests

After having chosen five target grammar structures and two distractor structures by looking at the structures planned to be taught during the time period of the study, three tests (pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test) were prepared. The selected target grammar structures were passive voice, relative clauses, third conditional, question tags, and indirect questions. Articles and reported speech were chosen as distractor items so that students would not pay more attention in class or on the tests to the structures being studied via corpus-based activities.

In order to prepare parallel versions of the three tests, the researcher made a question pool of the test items for each target structure and the distractor structures. Approximately 105 questions in total were written for the question pool, and when the pool was completed for each structure, the researcher asked some experienced English language instructors to look at the questions in the pool in order to give their judgments about whether the questions were all at the same level of difficulty. After receiving feedback from the other experienced English language instructors about those items and making the necessary adjustments, the three tests were constructed for each structure by choosing randomly from the question pool. Each test consisted of 35 questions, including five questions for each target structure and five questions for each distractor structure. The questions prepared for the tests were gap-filling questions. After constructing the three tests, the English language instructors were asked one more time to look at the prepared tests to make sure that they were all of equal difficulty. After receiving the second feedback from the instructors and making

the necessary changes, the three tests were prepared for the study. Before the tests were given to the students, one example sentence was written for each structure, including the distractor items. The tests can be seen in Appendix A.

Scoring

After the pre-tests, immediate post-tests , and delayed post-tests of the students were collected, all of the tests were scored by three people, including the researcher. The scorers did not know which groups the students were in while they were scoring the papers. The test items for each structure, including the distractor items, consisted of gap-filling questions. In the scoring of two structures (i.e., relative clauses and question tags), scoring was based on a 0-1 point scale for each gap-filling question: 0 represented no response or incorrect response; 1 represented a complete correct response. In the scoring of the other three structures (i.e., third conditional, passive voice, and indirect questions), scoring was based on some partial scores. The sentences for which the errors did not make a substantial change in the meaning were given some partial scores (i.e., 0, .5, and 1) if the students managed to use those three structures correctly. Thirty test papers from the three tests (10% of the tests) were then selected at random and scored by a different rater, and the interrater reliability was 93%, which showed that the reliability of the scoring was sufficient.

Attitude questionnaire

In order to investigate the second research question, the students in the experimental groups were asked to complete an attitude questionnaire immediately after the three-week treatment. According to Dörnyei (2003), administering a questionnaire to a group of people can provide a huge amount of information about the opinions, attitudes, beliefs, interests, and values of research participants. Due to

their effective usability with a variety of people in a variety of situations targeting a variety of topics, questionnaires are seen as versatile tools of research (Dörnyei, 2003). Therefore, it was deemed appropriate to use a questionnaire in this study with an aim to explore the attitudes of the students in the experimental groups towards using corpus-based activities in grammar learning.

The questionnaire was given to the students immediately after they took the immediate post-test in order to gather the data when the students' minds were still fresh. The questionnaire, which was in a Likert Scale format, consisted of 11 items rated on various 6-point scales. The items in the questionnaire were mostly adapted from the studies of Vannestal and Lindquist (2007) and Yoon and Hirvela (2004), and only one item was constructed by the researcher. First of all, eight items from the questionnaire that Vannestal and Lindquist (2007) used for their study were modified so that they required the students to directly specify their opinions about the difficulty and usefulness of the corpus-based activities. Secondly, 11 items from the questionnaire that Yoon and Hirvela (2004) used for their study were modified so that they required the students to directly specify their opinions regarding the helpfulness of the corpus-based activities. Those 19 items taken from the two studies by making some modifications in the wording were simplified for the lower level learners, and out of 19 items, 10 items centering upon student reactions towards using corpora in L2 learning were chosen to be included in the attitude questionnaire. One item which was designed to make the students specify their preferences regarding the types of grammar activities used in the study (corpus-based grammar activities or course book grammar activities) was constructed by the researcher. In Figure 1 below, the focus of the questionnaire items is presented.

Figure 1 – The focus of the questionnaire items

The focus of the questionnaire items	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Difficulty	Very difficult		↔		Very easy	
2. Usefulness	Very useless		↔		Very useful	
3. More difficult (corpus-based activities vs. the course book)	Strongly disagree		↔		Strongly agree	
4. More boring (corpus-based activities vs. the course book)	Strongly disagree		↔		Strongly agree	
5. The students' participation	Very inactive		↔		Very active	
6. Improving the students' grammar skill	Strongly disagree		↔		Strongly agree	
7. Increasing the students' confidence	Strongly disagree		↔		Strongly agree	
8. Preferences (corpus-based activities vs. the course book)	Strongly disagree		↔		Strongly agree	
9. More helpful (corpus-based activities vs. the course book)	Strongly disagree		↔		Strongly agree	
10. The students' attitudes	Strongly disagree		↔		Strongly agree	
11. The students' recommendations	Strongly disagree		↔		Strongly agree	

In the questionnaire, the students were to select one of the six options for each item rated on various 6-point scales, as can be seen in Figure 1. While Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 10 were adapted from Vannestal and Lindquist's (2007) study, Items 6, 7, 9, and 11 were adapted from Yoon and Hirvela's (2004) study. The only item constructed by the researcher was Item 8. The first two items required the students to directly specify their opinions regarding the difficulty and usefulness of the corpus-based activities used in the experiment. While Items 3 and 4 required the students to compare the use of corpus-based activities with the use of course book in grammar learning in terms of their boringness and difficulty, the fifth item required the students to evaluate their own participation in the course while learning the grammar

structures via corpus-based activities. Items 6 and 7 required the students to directly specify their opinions about whether using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction increased their confidence in grammar learning and improved their English grammar skill. While Item 8 was constructed in order to require the students to specify their preferences (i.e., corpus-based activities or a course book) in grammar learning, Item 9 required the students to compare the use of corpus-based activities with the use of course book in grammar learning in terms of their helpfulness. Items 10 and 11 intended to tap into the students' attitudes and recommendations regarding the use of corpus-based activities in grammar learning.

It was thought that it would be better to administer the questionnaire in Turkish in order to ease the task of responding for the students and to gather more reliable data. Thus, the method of back translation was employed. The questionnaire, which was originally designed in English, was translated into Turkish by the researcher. Then the Turkish version was translated back to English by a colleague in the MA TEFL program. A native speaker of English who is another colleague in the MA TEFL program was consulted in order to find out whether the English version that was originally design by the researcher and the version that was back-translated were similar in terms of content, wording and clarity of expression. The native speaker of English agreed that the two versions were similar to one another. Both the Turkish and English versions of the questionnaire can be seen in Appendix B.

Since the questions prepared for the questionnaire were adapted from the two studies (i.e., Vannestal and Lindquist (2007) and Yoon and Hirvela (2004)), and the questions in the questionnaire were the kind of questions which required the students to specify their reactions towards the use of corpus-based activities in grammar

learning, the researcher did not pilot the questionnaire. Because of that, the questionnaire's reliability was not analyzed until after it was used in the study. After the questionnaires were collected and the items involving negative statements were reversed, a Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated for the overall reliability of the questionnaire in order to ensure its reliability and check the internal consistency of the questions as a whole and individually. The measure of the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the whole questionnaire in the study was .898.

Student interviews

According to McNamara (1999), interviews are very useful for understanding the story behind research participants' experiences, and they are also useful as follow-up to particular respondents to questionnaires in order to further examine their responses. In addition, in a semi-structured interview format, each respondent's individual case can be freely explored in greater detail (Williams & Burden, 1999). Therefore, it was decided appropriate to use semi-structured interviews in this study in order to further explore the students' attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar learning.

The interviews for the study were conducted with nine students. Three students from each experimental group were asked to participate in an interview session, which was held in three different focus groups, after they had taken part in the delayed post-testing session. The students who were asked to participate in the interview session were chosen after the attitude questionnaire was analyzed. According to the results of the questionnaire, three students whose attitudes were the highest, lowest, and neutral towards the use of corpus-based activities were chosen respectively from each experimental group. In total, four female and five male

students were chosen for the interview session. Each interview in the focus groups was conducted in Turkish with an aim to ease the task of responding for the students and obtain more reliable data, and the interviews were also audio-taped. Seven questions were asked in each focus group interview. While six of them were repeated questions that were previously asked in the questionnaire, only one question, which was adapted from the study of Yoon and Hirvela (2004), was not from the questionnaire, and it was asked in order to require the students to directly specify their opinions regarding the difficulty of using the concordance lines to formulate the rule for the grammar structures. The six questions were chosen from the questionnaire because it was thought that more detailed information was needed from the students on those six questions. While two of them required the students to compare corpus-based grammar activities with the course book grammar activities in terms of their difficulty and boringness, three of them required the students to specify their opinions about whether corpus-based activities increased their confidence about learning English grammar, whether they would recommend that teachers should use corpus-based activities so as to teach English grammar structures, and whether they participated actively in the course while their teacher was teaching the grammar structures via corpus-based activities. The last question asked aimed to tap into the students' attitudes towards the use of corpus-based activities in grammar instruction. Both the Turkish and English versions of the interview questions can be seen in Appendix C.

The course book and Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)

The course book (The New English File Intermediate Student's book) (Oxenden & Latham-Koenig, 2006) was used by the three control groups in order to deal with the targeted grammar structures. In the course book, the five targeted grammar points were presented as mini-grammar sections including a grammar bank for each grammar structure at the end of the course book. The learners were also required to do some gap filling exercises which followed the grammar banks where students read the rules for the grammar structures. A sample of the mini-grammar sections, grammar bank sections, and gap-filling exercises of the course book can be seen in Appendix D.

In this experimental study, the regular activities in the course book were replaced with corpus-based activities for the three experimental groups. Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) (Davies, n.d.) was used as a resource for the researcher in order to prepare appropriate concordance lines for the target grammar structures. However, the concordance lines prepared for the current study were used only for presentation and practice purposes. It should be noted that concordance lines can also be used for other purposes, such as learning about low- and high-frequency words of English. In this study, it was deemed appropriate to use several concordance lines taken from COCA because the study required the students to see the usage of the target grammar structures in their real contexts. Additionally, since the students in the study were at lower levels of EFL proficiency, it was decided that preparing concordance lines beforehand and taking them to class would be more appropriate than expecting the students to use corpora themselves. A screen shot of some of concordance lines from COCA can be seen in Appendix E. After

getting the concordance lines for the target grammar structures from COCA, the researcher prepared leading questions which were thought to be helpful for the students in order to derive the rules by analyzing the concordance lines. Then, the students were required to practice the grammar items by dealing with gap-filling exercises which were also prepared by using sentences taken from COCA. The concordance lines, leading questions, and gap-filling exercises prepared for the five target structures can be seen in Appendix F.

Data Collection Procedure

After completing the necessary permission procedures with the EÜ YDYO administration, Erciyes University English Preparatory School's 2010-2011 academic year spring term's lower level grammar syllabus was checked to learn which grammar structures would be covered during the study's defined data collection time. Accordingly, the researcher decided which grammar structures would be appropriate to be taught via corpus-based activities. A six-week possible period for data collection had been defined to offer flexibility in choosing the most appropriate structures. As a result, five particular grammar points were selected as target items in this experimental investigation.

Before the experiment started, the tests, the questionnaire, and the interview questions were developed by the researcher, and corpus-based activities that were used to teach the target grammar structures in the experimental groups were prepared. After forming the three experimental and the three control groups, the researcher presented a demo lesson to the experimental group students so that they could get familiar with using corpus-based activities in their grammar learning. Because the researcher was not the teacher who instructed the experimental groups

during the treatments, the researcher also gave training to the experimental groups' instructors about how they would conduct the grammar lessons via corpus-based activities. Each lower level class in the preparatory program at Erciyes University had three different instructors who worked as partner colleagues. Therefore, each grammar structure was covered by randomly scheduled different instructors both in the experimental groups and in the control groups. The same instructors who taught some grammar structures in the experimental groups may have taught the same grammar structures in the control groups. The study lasted approximately six weeks, and the treatments lasted three weeks for each condition. All of the 13 instructors cooperated with the researcher during the six-week data collection time.

After presenting the demo lesson to the three experimental groups' students and giving the training to the three experimental groups' instructors, the study was initiated with the pre-testing session in both conditions. During the three-week treatment, the instructors in the three experimental groups used the course book to cover the activities related to the other skills (i.e., speaking, listening, writing, reading, or vocabulary), but when it was time to cover the mini-grammar sections of the course book for the target grammar structures, the instructors taught them via corpus-based activities. The students in the experimental groups were told not to consult the course book activities while they were dealing with the targeted grammar structures. For each grammar structure, the instructors firstly gave the concordance lines which were taken from the corpus (COCA) to the students in the experimental groups on a separate paper. After giving some time to the students to analyze the concordance lines, the instructors asked the students to work on the leading questions together. The students were required to answer the leading questions, which guided

them to derive the rules for each grammar structure, by analyzing the concordance lines. After the instructors made sure that all of the students had clearly formulated the necessary rules for the each grammar structure by answering the leading questions, they asked the students to practice what they had learned with the help of the exercises which had also been prepared by using sentences taken from the corpus (COCA) and given to them on separate papers. In the three control groups, the course instructors continued with the normal instruction with the help of the course book. The students in the control groups were not presented any other different material but the course book and the instructor. The instructors in the control groups asked the students to look at the mini-grammar sections in the course book for each grammar structure, and asked the students to consult the grammar bank sections at the end of the course book to complete the blanks in the sentences in the mini-grammar sections after giving some time to the students to read the rules for each grammar structure from the grammar bank sections. The instructors in the control groups helped the students to understand the rules for each grammar structure while the students were trying to understand the explanations in the grammar bank sections. After making sure that all of the students clearly understood the rules for the each grammar structure, the instructors asked the students to do the gap filling exercises which were also presented to the students at the end of the course book.

Immediately after the five target grammar structures were covered in both conditions in three weeks, all students took part in the immediate post-testing session at the same time. After approximately 25 days later, the students in both conditions participated in the delayed post-testing session. After the tests were scored, the data were entered into SPSS for analysis.

Immediately after the students in the experimental groups had taken part in the immediate post-testing session, they were given the questionnaires in order to examine attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in English grammar learning. After the questionnaire had been analyzed and the students had taken part in the delayed post-testing session, audio-taped semi-structured interviews, which were held outside of the class time with the three students from each experimental group, were conducted to explore in greater detail attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction.

Data Analysis

In order to answer the first research question of the study, quantitative analysis of the test scores of the students was used to compare the students' initial performance with their final performance on grammar tests. Additionally, the performance of the experimental groups was compared with the performance of the control groups on the tests. In the analysis of the tests, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used. First of all, the data were analyzed to see whether the pre-test scores of the three experimental groups and the three control groups were equivalent in terms of all five structures. Afterwards, the experimental groups' pre-test scores were compared to those of the control groups to see whether the groups were homogenous in terms of the knowledge of the target five grammar structures at the beginning of the treatments. The experimental groups' pre-test scores were then compared to their immediate post-test scores, and the control groups' pre-test scores were compared to their immediate post-test scores in order to see whether the groups demonstrated learning of the target grammar structures. Lastly, the gain and retention scores of the experimental groups were compared to those of the control groups in

order to see which of the groups, if any, learned and retained more knowledge of the grammar structures.

In order to answer the second research question of the study, the data obtained through the attitude questionnaire were analyzed by using quantitative analysis. The frequencies of the items were examined, and the interview data which were obtained through the student interviews were analyzed to support and clarify the questionnaire data. The common and different reactions of the students towards the use of corpus-based activities were explored.

Conclusion

This chapter provided information about the research questions, setting, participants, materials and instruments, the treatment period, and the data collection procedure. In the following chapter, the results of the tests and the questionnaire will be presented, and the student interviews will be analyzed.

CHAPTER 4- DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The first aim of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of corpus-based activities on lower level EFL learners' performance on grammar tests. In addition to this, the study was designed to explore the attitudes of lower level EFL learners towards using corpus-based activities in the teaching of five grammar structures. The answers to the following questions were sought in the study:

1. What are the effects of using corpus-based activities on Turkish lower proficiency level EFL learners' performance in grammar learning?
2. What are the attitudes of Turkish lower proficiency level EFL learners towards learning grammar through corpus-based activities?

One hundred and twenty six students from six intact lower level classes took part in the study. The three experimental groups consisted of 63 students, and the three control groups consisted of 63 students. Out of 13 instructors, some of them carried out the corpus-based tasks related to the study in the experimental groups, whereas some of them continued with traditional instruction with the help of the course book in the control groups.

The study lasted approximately six weeks, and it was initiated with the pre-testing session in both conditions. Over the three weeks of the treatment, the three experimental groups were provided with five corpus-based activities regarding the five grammar structures, whereas the three control groups were provided with only the course book's grammar activities to cover the target five grammar structures. The experimental groups analyzed the concordance lines for each target grammar structure, and worked on the leading questions to formulate the rules for the five

target grammar structures. Lastly, they practiced what they had learned with the help of the corpus-based exercises. The control groups studied the mini grammar sections in the course book for the each target grammar point, and read grammar banks at the end of the course book to learn about the rules of each grammar structure. Lastly, they practiced what they had learned with the help of the gap-filling exercises. Immediately after the five target grammar structures were covered in both conditions, all students in both groups took part in the immediate post-testing session at the same time. Approximately 25 days later, all students participated in the delayed post-testing session. When the treatment period was over for both conditions, all of the students in the experimental groups were administered an attitude questionnaire that aimed to explore their attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in learning of the English grammar structures. Additionally, for the qualitative part of the study, audio-taped semi-structured interviews were conducted with three students from each experimental group in order to explore in greater detail attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction.

Data Analysis Procedure

In order to investigate the first research question of the study, the pre-test scores, the immediate post-test scores, and the delayed post-test scores of the students from the three experimental groups and the three control groups were analyzed to see whether the data were normally distributed or not. It was found that the data were not normally distributed, so non-parametric statistical methods were considered appropriate to use. However, when three means were compared, ANOVA was used, as it is considered to be robust to violations of assumptions of normality (Field, 2005, p. 324).

The students' responses to the attitude questionnaire were also analyzed by using statistical measures in order to investigate the second research question of the study. The frequencies that were obtained for each of the items in the questionnaire were analyzed in order to explore the students' attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction. The qualitative data obtained through the interviews were transcribed, and then translated into English. The data were analyzed under the premises of the interview questions. The common and different answers of the students were pointed out in order to shed more light on the quantitative data.

Results

The effects of using corpus-based activities on grammar learning

Out of 126 students, ten students did not participate in any of the three testing sessions in the six classes in total. Additionally, 20 students' test papers were eliminated from the study, because ten of them only participated in the pre-testing session, six participated in immediate post-testing session, and four did not participate in the immediate post-testing session. Therefore, while conducting the data analysis for the first research question, only the results of 96 students were taken into consideration. Among these 96 students, seven students in the experimental groups and two students in the control groups only participated in the pre-testing and immediate post-testing sessions but did not participate in the delayed post-testing session. Because the study lost many participants due to absence on the testing days, the mean proficiency scores of the students who were included in the study were compared again by using a one-way independent samples ANOVA, and it was found that there were no significant differences among the classes in terms of their proficiency.

The data were initially analyzed to see whether the pre-test scores of the three experimental groups and the three control groups were equivalent in terms of all five structures. All groups' pre-test scores were compared in order to decide whether the three groups could be considered together as one experimental group and the other three groups could be considered together as one control group. In Table 1 below, the medians and interquartile ranges of the pre-test scores of the three experimental groups and the three control groups for the five grammar structures are presented.

Table 1 – Pre-test medians, all groups

	Passive Voice (max. score 5)			Relative Clauses (max. score 5)		Third Conditional (max. score 5)		Question Tags (max. score 5)		Indirect Questions (max. score 5)	
	N	Mdn	IQR	Mdn	IQR	Mdn	IQR	Mdn	IQR	Mdn	IQR
Experimental Group 1	16	.62	1	4	.75	2.75	4.06	5	1.75	0	1.18
Experimental Group 2	17	.50	1.87	4	0	.75	3.50	4.50	4	0	1.37
Experimental Group 3	14	.25	1.25	4	1	1.25	2.56	5	.50	1	2.25
Control Group 1	18	1	2.06	4	0	1.75	3.12	5	1	1	2.62
Control Group 2	16	0	2.12	4	0	1.75	3.12	4	4	.87	3
Control Group 3	15	0	1.75	4	1	1.75	2.50	1	5	0	1
Total	96										

The medians presented in Table 1 above appear to show that there were some differences among the experimental groups in terms of their pre-test scores for some of the target grammar structures. The median scores of the three experimental groups for the pre-test were compared using a one-way independent samples ANOVA test, and the test showed that there were no significant differences among the groups in terms of their pre-test scores for any structure except question tags. For question tags,

the test revealed that the difference among the three groups was approaching significance (p (two-tailed)= .092). In order to see where the differences lay in terms of question tags, a post-hoc comparison was used to compare the pre-test scores of the experimental groups for question tags. The only significant difference found was between experimental group 2 ($Mdn= 4.50$, $IQR= 4$) and experimental group 3 ($Mdn= 5$, $IQR= .50$), p (two-tailed)=.021).

The medians presented in Table 1 above appear to show that there were also some differences among the control groups in terms of their pre-test scores for some of the target grammar structures. The median scores of the three control groups for the pre-test were also compared by using a one-way independent samples ANOVA test, and the test showed that there were no significant differences among the groups in terms of their pre-test scores for any target grammar structure except question tags (p (two-tailed)= .012). In order to see where the differences lay in terms of question tags, a post-hoc comparison was used to compare the pre-test scores of the control groups for question tags. The post-hoc contrasts revealed significant difference between control group 1 ($Mdn= 5$, $IQR= 1$) and control group 3 ($Mdn= 1$, $IQR= 5$), p (two-tailed) =.010).

From these results, it can be claimed that the three experimental groups were homogenous in terms of their knowledge of all of the target grammar structures except question tags at the beginning of the treatments. However, in spite of this one difference, it was decided that the experimental groups could be considered together as one group for the study. Additionally, it can also be claimed that the three control groups behaved the same in terms of the pre-test scores for all grammar structures

except question tags. However, in spite of this one difference, it was decided that it was also appropriate to accept the three control groups as one group for the study.

Comparison of pre-test scores, experimental and control groups

The pre-test scores of the experimental and control groups were compared in order to see whether the two groups were homogeneous in terms of their knowledge of the five target grammar structures before the treatments started. In Table 2 below, the medians and interquartile ranges of the pre-test scores of the experimental group and the control group can be seen.

Table 2 – Pre-test medians, experimental and control groups

	Experimental group N=47		Control Group N=49		Mann-Whitney test results
	Mdn	IQR	Mdn	IQR	
Passive Voice (max. score 5)	.50	1	1	1.87	P(two-tailed)= .887
Relative Clauses (max. score 5)	4	0	4	0	P(two-tailed)= .960
Third Conditional (max. score 5)	1.75	3.50	1.75	2.75	P(two-tailed)= .973
Question Tags (max. score 5)	5	2	4	4	P(two-tailed)= .211
Indirect Questions (max. score 5)	.50	1.75	.25	2.25	P(two-tailed)= .776

The medians presented in Table 2 appear to show that there were some slight differences between the groups in terms of their pre-test scores for some of the target grammar structures. A Mann-Whitney test was conducted to compare the medians of the pre-test scores of both conditions, and the test showed that there were no significant differences between the experimental group and the control group for any of the five target grammar structures. From these results, it can be claimed that the

two groups were equivalent in terms of their knowledge of the target five grammar structures at the beginning of the treatments.

Comparison of pre-test and immediate post-test scores, experimental group

The pre-test scores and the immediate post-test scores of the experimental group were compared in order to see whether the students in the experimental group demonstrated learning for the target grammar structures. In Table 3 below, the medians and interquartile ranges of the pre-test scores and the immediate post-test scores of the experimental group are presented.

Table 3 – Pre- and immediate post-test medians, experimental group

	Experimental Group (N=47)				Wilcoxon Signed Rank test results
	Pre-test		Immediate post-test		
	Mdn	IQR	Mdn	IQR	
Passive Voice (max. score 5)	.50	1	2	3	P (two-tailed)=.000
Relative Clauses (max. score 5)	4	0	5	1	P (two-tailed) =.002
Third Conditional (max. score 5)	1.75	3.50	4.50	.50	P (two-tailed) =.000
Question Tags (max. score 5)	5	2	4	2	P (two-tailed) =.751
Indirect Questions (max. score 5)	.50	1.75	2	3	P (two-tailed) =.001

The medians presented in Table 3 above appear to show that the experimental group demonstrated learning for all target structures but one structure, question tags. The medians of the pre-test scores and the immediate post-test scores of the experimental group were compared, and the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test showed that there were significant differences between the experimental group's pre-

test scores and immediate post-test scores for all grammar structures except question tags. For question tags, there was no significant difference between the experimental group's pre-test scores and immediate post-test scores. This might be due to the fact that two of the experimental groups (i.e., experimental group 1 and experimental group 3) within the experimental group appeared to know a lot already about question tags. That is, the median scores of the groups ($Mdn=5$, $IQR=1.75$ and $Mdn=5$, $IQR=.50$ respectively) were relatively high at the beginning of the treatments. However, when the remaining experimental group's (i.e., experimental group 2) median scores of the pre-test and immediate post-test for question tags were compared using the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test, it was found that on the immediate post-test, the students in experimental group 2 scored significantly higher ($Mdn=5$, $IQR=.75$) than they did on the pre-test ($Mdn=4.50$, $IQR=4$, $T=16$, p (two-tailed) = .038), thereby demonstrating significant learning of question tags. There was a large effect size ($r=-.50$). From these results, it can be claimed that the experimental group, who used corpus-based activities, did not demonstrate learning on question tags because two of the experimental groups did not have much left to learn on question tags because of the two high-scoring groups. However, the experimental group demonstrated significant learning for the other target grammar structures.

Comparison of pre-test and immediate post-test scores, control group

The pre-test scores and the immediate post-test scores of the control group were compared in order to see whether the students in the control group demonstrated learning for the target grammar structures. In Table 4 below, the medians and interquartile ranges of the pre-test scores and the immediate post-test scores of the control group are presented.

Table 4 – Pre-test and immediate post-test medians, control group

	Control Group (N= 49)				Wilcoxon Signed Rank test results
	Pre-test		Immediate post-test		
	Mdn	IQR	Mdn	IQR	
Passive Voice (max. score 5)	1	1.87	3	3	P (two-tailed) =.000
Relative Clauses (max. score 5)	4	0	5	1	P (two-tailed) =.000
Third Conditional (max. score 5)	1.75	2.75	4.25	.75	P (two-tailed) =.000
Question Tags (max. score 5)	4	4	4.50	1	P (two-tailed) =.095
Indirect Questions (max. score 5)	.25	2.25	2	2.68	P (two-tailed) =.014

The medians presented in Table 4 above appear to show that the control group demonstrated learning of all target grammar structures. However, the medians of the pre-test scores and the immediate post-test scores of the control group were compared, and the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test showed that there were significant differences between the control group's pre-test scores and immediate post-test scores for all target grammar structures except question tags. For question tags, there was no significant difference between the control group's pre-test scores and immediate post-test scores. However, it should be noted that the difference between the control group's pre-test scores and immediate post-test scores for question tags was approaching significance. This might also be due to the fact that two of the control groups (i.e., control group 1 and control group 3) within the control group appeared to know a lot already about question tags. That is, the median scores of the

groups (Mdn= 5, IQR= 1 and Mdn=1, IQR= 5 respectively) were relatively high at the beginning of the treatments. However, when the remaining control group's (i.e., control group 2) median scores of the pre-test and immediate post-test for question tags were compared using the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test, it was found that on the immediate post-test, the students in control group 2 scored significantly higher (Mdn=5, IQR=1) than they did on the pre-test (Mdn=4, IQR=4, $T=16$, p (two-tailed) = .039), thereby demonstrating significant learning of question tags. There was a large effect size ($r=-.50$). From these results, it can be claimed that the control group also did not demonstrate learning on question tags because two of the control groups did not have much left to learn on question tags because of the two high-scoring groups. However, the control group demonstrated significant learning for the other target grammar structures. From these results, it can be claimed that both groups demonstrated learning on four out of the five grammar structures.

Comparison of gain scores

In order to see how much was learned from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment, a learning gain score for each individual student was calculated by subtracting the pre-test score from the immediate post-test score. Firstly, the number of the students was calculated in order to determine the number of the students who gained and did not gain in both conditions. In Table 5 below, the number of the students who gained and did not gain in both conditions from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment can be seen.

Table 5 - Student numbers, gains vs. no gains

	Experimental Group (N=47)		Control Group (N=49)	
	Gains	No Gains	Gains	No Gains
Passive Voice	33	14	36	13
Relative Clauses	31	16	33	16
Third Conditional	37	10	46	3
Question Tags	18	29	17	32
Indirect Questions	27	20	27	22

The numbers presented in Table 5 above appear to show that the number of students who gained in the control group was relatively higher for only one structure, third conditional, but overall, the two groups showed similar patterns for gains versus no gains. In order to see whether one group learned more than the other group, for each structure, the gain scores of the students in the experimental group were compared to those of the students in the control group. In Table 6 below, the medians and interquartile ranges of the gain scores of the experimental and the control group are presented.

Table 6 – Gain score medians, experimental and control groups

	Experimental Group (N=47)		Control Group (N=49)		Mann-Whitney test results
	Mdn	IQR	Mdn	IQR	
Passive Voice	1	2.50	1	3.50	P (two-tailed) =.210
Relative Clauses	1	1	1	1	P (two-tailed) =.439
Third Conditional	2	3.50	2.75	2.37	P (two-tailed) =.985
Question Tags	0	2	0	1.50	P (two-tailed) =.391
Indirect Questions	.75	2.75	.75	2	P (two-tailed) =.369

The medians presented in Table 6 above appear to show that the control group's gain scores were higher for only one structure, third conditional. However, a Mann-Whitney test was conducted again to compare the medians of the gain scores of the both conditions, and the test showed that there were no significant differences between the gain scores of the experimental group and the control group for any of the five target grammar structures. From these results, it can be claimed that the tests used in the current study were not able to detect any differences between the two groups; this is probably due to the fact that the tests for each structure were very short, with only five questions.

Comparison of retention scores

The retention scores of the students in the experimental group were compared to those of the students in the control group in order to see which group retained or improved more on the target grammar structures. In order to calculate the retention scores of the students in both conditions, their delayed post-test scores were subtracted from their immediate post-test scores for each target structure. Thus, a

retention score of 0 or less indicates that the students retained or improved on those grammar structures, whereas a retention score greater than 0 indicates some degree of forgetting of those grammar structures. In Table 7 below, the medians and interquartile ranges of the retention scores of the experimental group and the control group can be seen.

Table 7 – Retention score medians, experimental and control groups

	Experimental Group (N=40)		Control Group (N=47)		The Mann-Whitney test results
	Mdn	IQR	Mdn	IQR	
Passive Voice	0	1.50	.25	4	P (two-tailed)=.642
Relative Clauses	1	2	0	2	P (two-tailed)=.188
Third Conditional	.25	.93	0	.81	P (two-tailed)=.357
Question Tags	-.50	1	0	1,12	P (two-tailed)=.872
Indirect Questions	-1	3.12	-2.50	1.81	P (two-tailed)=.002

Table 7 shows that even though the students in the experimental group appear to have forgotten some of what they had learned on relative clauses and third conditional, they appear to have retained or improved on passive voice, question tags and indirect questions. Additionally, Table 7 shows that even though the students in the control group appear to have forgotten some of what they had learned on passive voice, they appear to have retained or improved on relative clauses, third conditional, question tags, and indirect questions. A Mann-Whitney test was conducted to compare the medians of the retention scores of both conditions, and the test showed that there were no significant differences between the medians of the retention scores of the experimental group and the control group for any of the target

grammar structures except indirect questions. On indirect questions, the control group, who received traditional instruction with the help of the course book, improved significantly more ($Mdn = -2.50$ $IQR = 1.81$) than the experimental group ($Mdn = -1$, $IQR = 3.12$) ($U = 293$, p (two-tailed) = .002) even approximately 25 days after the immediate post-test was administered. There was a large effect size ($r = .99$). However, even though the difference between the two groups for indirect questions was significant, the experimental group also improved on indirect questions. From these results, it can be claimed that all students were essentially equal in terms of their retention scores of all structures except indirect questions. That is, the students in the experimental group retained as much knowledge of four out of the five target grammar structures as the students in the control group, with the control group improving significantly more than the experimental group on indirect questions. However, the experimental group, who used corpus-based activities to learn indirect questions, did not forget what they had learned.

From these results presented above, it can be claimed that the students in the experimental group, who were lower proficiency level EFL learners, were able to use corpus-based sources effectively in order to learn four out of five target grammar structures, because it was found that the students in the experimental group demonstrated significant learning for all grammar structures except question tags. Additionally, it was also found that the students in the control group were able to learn four out of five target grammar structures effectively via the course book; it was also found that the students in the control group, like those in the experimental group, did not demonstrate significant learning for question tags. However, in both conditions, when the two low-scoring groups' immediate post-tests were compared

to their pre-tests, it was found that these groups in both conditions also demonstrated significant learning for question tags. Thus, it can be claimed that the type of instruction did not affect the students' ability to complete the fill-in-the-gap test items on the grammar tests.

Attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction

Analysis of the attitude questionnaire and student interviews

Following the three-week treatment, 50 out of the original 63 students from the three experimental groups were required to fill in an attitude questionnaire that was designed to target their attitudes towards the use of corpus-based activities in English grammar instruction. The questionnaire, which was in a Likert-scale format, included 11 items rated on various six-point scales. Additionally, three students from each experimental group were asked to respond to seven questions in the interview session, which was held in three different focus groups, after they had taken part in the delayed post-testing session. Six of the questions asked in the interviews were repeated questions that were previously asked in the questionnaire; only one question was not from the questionnaire.

The data obtained from the students' responses to the questions asked in the interviews were analyzed under the premises of the interview questions, which were intended to support and clarify the questionnaire data. Thus, after presenting the quantitative data for a particular questionnaire item, the qualitative data which was related to that particular question is presented.

The data obtained from the students' responses to the questionnaire were entered into SPSS, and a Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated for the overall reliability of the questionnaire. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the whole

questionnaire was .898. The frequencies for each of the responses to the items were then examined. Table 8 on page 72 presents the means, overall mean, and frequencies for items 1-11 in the attitude questionnaire.

The overall mean of the mean scores of the students was initially calculated by reversing two of the items (i.e., Items 3 and 4), so that a higher response for all items indicates a better attitude. As seen in Table 8, the overall mean of the mean scores of the students who completed the attitude questionnaire shows that the students' attitudes were somewhat neutral towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction.

The frequencies presented for the first item show that out of 50 students who completed the attitude questionnaire, half of the students found learning the grammar structures through corpus-based activities somewhat difficult; however, the other 25 students found learning the grammar structures through corpus-based activities somewhat easy. However, there were 31 students who responded to the first question by selecting either 3 or 4, which indicates that the majority of the students had mixed, uncertain, or conflicting feelings about the difficulty of using corpus based activities in grammar instruction.

Table 8 - Frequencies for items 1- 11 in the attitude questionnaire

Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mean	Std. Dev.	
1. What do you think about the difficulty of learning English grammar through corpus-based activities?	Very difficult					Very easy	3.56	1.16	
	3	4	18	13	11	1			
2. How useful do you find learning English grammar through corpus-based activities?	Very useless					Very useful	3.32	1.47	
	6	6	8	10	18	2			
3. I think that learning English grammar through corpus-based activities is more difficult than learning English grammar through a course book.	Strongly disagree					Strongly agree	2.98	1.54	
	7	14	18	1	3	7			
4. I think that learning English grammar through corpus-based activities is more boring than learning English grammar through a course book.	Strongly disagree					Strongly agree	3.14	1.61	
	9	9	15	8	1	8			
5. How do you evaluate your own participation in the course while learning English grammar via corpus-based activities?	Very inactive					Very active	3.18	1.15	
	3	10	20	11	4	2			
6. Using corpus-based activities in learning of English grammar structures improved my English grammar skill.	Strongly disagree					Strongly agree	2.92	1.27	
	6	15	14	8	6	1			
7. Using corpus-based activities in learning of English grammar structures increased my confidence about learning English grammar.	Strongly disagree					Strongly agree	3.12	1.39	
	5	16	10	7	11	1			
8. I prefer using corpus-based activities in learning of English grammar structures to using a course book in learning of English grammar structures.	Strongly disagree					Strongly agree	2.94	1.49	
	9	12	16	2	8	3			
9. I think that corpus-based activities are more helpful than a course book in learning of English grammar structures.	Strongly disagree					Strongly agree	3.18	1.42	
	5	12	17	5	7	4			
10. I really felt positively towards using corpus-based activities in learning of English grammar structures.	Strongly disagree					Strongly agree	3.42	1.35	
	1	15	13	8	9	4			
11. I recommend that teachers should use corpus-based activities so as to teach grammar structures in EFL classes.	Strongly disagree					Strongly agree	3.22	1.54	
	8	11	9	9	10	3			
							Overall	3.39	1.03

When the students were asked to compare using corpus-based activities with the use of course book activities in grammar instruction in terms of their difficulty (Item 3), the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that learning the grammar structures via corpus-based activities was more difficult than learning them via the course book. When this question was asked to the students in the interviews, all the students in the three focus groups agreed that corpus-based activities were not more difficult than the activities that the course book presented. Student 2 from focus group 1 directly compared using corpus-based activities with using the course book in grammar instruction in the following way:

I still remember how I learned third conditional easily through corpus-based activities. I think that deriving the rule of this grammar structure through using corpus-based activities seems easier when compared to the learning of the structure through the course book, because reading some rules of the grammar structures in the course book does not mean that one can learn these grammar structures easily. (Student 2, focus group 1)

The student's response reveals that there was a particular grammar structure (i.e., third conditional) which the student had learned more easily through using corpus-based activities. However, two of the students stated that using corpus-based activities was difficult for them because they could not understand one of the grammar structures (passive voice) through these activities at all. They stated that they would learn passive voice easily through the activities that the course book presented; however they agreed that they did not have any difficulty in the learning of two of the grammar structures (third conditional and question tags) through these activities.

When the students were asked whether they had difficulty in analyzing the concordance lines in the interviews, they had very similar answers. Student 4 from focus group 2 noted that:

Deriving the rules of the grammar structures through the concordance lines seemed more difficult than understanding the rules of the structures through the course book. When the teacher firstly gave us the concordance lines on a separate paper without any explanation, it was so difficult to understand the sentences on the paper because the sentences did not mean anything. Thus, I felt psychologically negatively towards using the concordance lines in the first place. However, after we worked on the leading questions with the help of the teacher, it was easier for us to analyze the concordance lines. (Student 4, focus group2)

The student's response reveals that the appearance of the concordance lines seemed very challenging for the students at first. The majority of the students stated that they needed help or guidance from the teacher in order to analyze or understand the concordance lines. However, one student from focus group 3 stated that the students in his class did not have any particular difficulty in understanding the information provided for one of the structures (i.e., question tags) from the concordance lines.

The frequencies presented for the second item in the questionnaire show that the majority of the students found using corpus-based activities in the learning of grammar structures useful. However, the frequencies for Item 9 show that most of the students disagreed with the idea that corpus-based activities helped them to learn the grammar structures better than the course book. Thus, it is interesting to note that even though the majority of the students considered using corpus-based activities as useful tools in order to learn English grammar structures, they did not think that corpus-based activities were more helpful than the course book in the learning of English grammar structures.

When the students were asked to directly specify their preferences (i.e., learning grammar structures via a course book or via corpus-based activities), the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that they would prefer using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction to learn English grammar structures (Item 8). Additionally, the frequencies for Item 11 show that the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that instructors should use corpus-based activities to teach English grammar structures in EFL classes; however, 21 students thought that it would be a good idea for instructors to use corpus-based activities while teaching English grammar structures to EFL learners. When this question was repeated again in the focus group interviews, all students agreed that teachers should be trained in the first place in order to use these activities while teaching English grammar structures. Student 7 from focus group 3 noted that:

I really recommend that teachers should use corpus-based activities in EFL classes; however, I think that there are some grammar structures that a course book can teach better than corpus-based activities. I do not think that all grammar structures can be taught via corpus-based activities. If teachers think that one particular grammar structure of English can be understood when it is taught via corpus-based activities, they should teach it via these activities; however, if they think that some of the structures of English cannot be understood when they are taught via corpus-based activities, they should use course books to teach these structures. I think that teachers should be trained in the first place in order to know which of the grammar structures of English can be understood when they are taught via corpus-based activities.
(Student 7, focus group 3)

The analysis of the student's response reveals that corpus-based activities can be used in order to teach some grammar structures of English in EFL classes. However, all students agreed with the idea that teachers should be given training before using corpus-based activities in EFL classes.

The frequencies presented for Item 10 in the questionnaire show that the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that they really felt positively towards using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures. However, almost half of the students responded positively to the question. Additionally, when this question was asked in the interviews, the majority of the students' comments demonstrated that they benefited from using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures. While some of the students stated that they felt positively towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction because they generally thought that the effects of learning English grammar via formulating the rules of the grammar structures would last longer than those of learning English grammar via reading the rules of the grammar structures, some of them agreed that they felt positively towards using these activities because they thought that they would be more successful in their exams.

When the students were asked to compare the use of corpus-based activities with the course book activities in terms of their boringness, the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction was more boring than using a course book (Item 4). Additionally, when this question was repeated again in the interviews, all students agreed that they liked using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures. They agreed with the idea that using corpus-based activities was not boring when compared to using the course book to learn English grammar structures. When they were asked about the reason why they thought so, some of them stated that deriving the rules of the grammar structures was something new for them, and some of them stated that the activities presented for them were more different and diverse when compared to

the activities that the course book presented. Only two students stated that using corpus-based activities was more boring than using the course book. They stated that using the concordance lines was very time-consuming in order to understand the rules of the grammar structures. They thought that reading the rules and working on the exercises afterwards were more enjoyable than trying to formulate the rules on their own in order to work on the exercises.

The frequencies presented for Item 6 reveal that only 15 of the students responded that using corpus-based activities improved their English grammar skill. The majority of the students disagreed with the idea that using corpus-based activities helped them improve their English grammar skill. Additionally, the frequencies presented for Item 7 reveal that the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that using corpus-based activities increased their confidence about learning English grammar. Only 19 of the students agreed that these activities helped them increase their confidence about learning English grammar. When this question was asked again in the interviews, all students reflected that using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures did not increase their confidence about learning English grammar. Even though the majority of the students stated that corpus-based activities helped them learn the grammar structures, they still thought that there were some grammar structures of English which they would not understand when they were taught either via corpus-based activities or via a course book.

The frequencies presented for the fifth item show that most of the students thought that they were somewhat inactive in the course while the instructors were teaching the grammar structures via corpus-based activities. Only 17 of the students thought that they participated actively in the course while the instructors were teaching the grammar structures via corpus-based activities. However, when this question was asked again in the interviews, the majority of the students agreed that they participated actively in the course while the teachers were teaching the structures through corpus-based activities. They stated that they did not want to raise their hands when the teachers asked them to analyze the concordance lines because they did not understand what the sentences in the concordance lines meant. However, when the teachers gave them the papers on which they saw the leading questions, they knew that they were required to answer the questions on the papers. As the questions required the students to derive the rules of the grammar structures from the concordance lines, they stated that they started to raise their hands in order to answer the questions on the leading question papers. Thus, the majority of the students agreed that they had to participate in the course actively because of the leading questions.

It was found that three questions asked in the questionnaire revealed different results when they were repeated in the interviews. The students' responses to one of the questions asked in the questionnaire revealed that the majority of the students did not participate actively in the course while the teachers were teaching the grammar structures via corpus-based activities; however, when the same question was repeated in the interviews, the students' responses to the question demonstrated that the interviewed students felt that they had participated actively during these activities.

Moreover, the students' responses to one of the questions asked in the questionnaire demonstrated that the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that teachers should use corpus-based activities in EFL classes; however, when the same question was repeated in the interviews, the interviewed students agreed with the idea that teachers can use corpus-based activities in EFL classes. Lastly, the students' responses to one of the questions asked in the questionnaire demonstrated that the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that they really felt positively towards learning the grammar structures via corpus-based activities; however, when the same question was repeated in the interviews, the interviewed students' responses indicated positive attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction.

The results described above revealed some conflicts between the questionnaire responses and the interview data, even though the interview data supported some of the quantitative data obtained through the questionnaire. The results of the questionnaire revealed that the students, who were lower level EFL learners, held neither negative nor positive attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in their grammar learning. Their attitudes were found to be somewhat neutral towards using these sources in the learning of English grammar. However, the students who were interviewed appeared to demonstrate more positive attitudes towards using these sources in their grammar learning.

Conclusion

This study investigated the effectiveness of corpus-based activities on lower level EFL learners' performance on five target grammar structures. Comparison of the experimental group's pre-test scores and immediate post-test scores revealed that the experimental group demonstrated learning for all target structures, except for question tags. Comparison of the control group's pre-test scores and immediate post-test scores showed that the control group also demonstrated learning for all target structures, except for question tags. Additionally, when the experimental group's gain scores were compared with the control group's gain scores, it was found that there were no significant differences between the gain scores of the experimental group and the control group for any of the five target grammar structures. The comparison of the retention scores of the groups indicated that the students in the experimental group retained as much knowledge of four out of the five target grammar structures as the students in the control group, with the control group improving significantly more than the experimental group on indirect questions, although the experimental group also improved on this structure.

The results of the attitude questionnaire revealed that the students' attitudes were somewhat neutral towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction. Although the questionnaire revealed that the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that they really felt positively towards using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures, the student interviews demonstrated that the interviewed students felt positively towards using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures. The questionnaire and the student interviews both demonstrated that the majority of the students agreed with the idea that using

corpus-based activities was not more difficult than using a course book in order to learn English grammar. Even though the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that using corpus-based activities was more boring than using a course book to learn English grammar, the questionnaire revealed that they did not participate in the course actively while learning the grammar structures via corpus-based activities. However, the student interviews revealed that the interviewed students participated actively in the course while learning the grammar structures via corpus-based activities.

In the next chapter, the findings of the study will be discussed, and some implications for using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction will be presented. Additionally, Chapter 5 will consider the limitations of the study and directions for future research.

CHAPTER 5 – CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study investigated the effectiveness of using corpus-based activities on lower level EFL learners' performance on grammar tests. The study also explored these learners' attitudes towards using these sources in grammar learning. In order to seek answers to the first research question, the required data were gathered through the students' grammar tests, which were administered to 96 participant students from six intact lower level classes at Erciyes University School of Foreign Languages. In addition, following the three-week treatment, 50 students from the experimental groups completed a questionnaire related to the second objective of the study, which aimed to explore their attitudes towards the use of corpus-based activities in grammar learning.

In this chapter, the findings, pedagogical implications and limitations of the study are discussed. Finally, suggestions for further studies and overall conclusions are presented.

Findings and Discussion

The findings of the current study regarding the effects of using corpus-based activities on lower level EFL learners' learning of English grammar will be presented and discussed with reference to the literature. Then, the findings related to attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar learning will be presented and discussed.

The effects of corpus-based activities on grammar learning

The quantitative data were gathered from the students' pre-, immediate post-, and delayed post-tests which were administered respectively: before the treatment, after the three-week treatment, and approximately 25 days after the immediate post-test was administered. The immediate post-test scores of the groups were compared to their pre-test scores in order to see whether the students in both groups demonstrated learning for the target grammar structures. Both groups' gain scores were then compared with each other to see whether one form of instruction was more effective than the other. The retention scores of the students in the experimental group were then compared to those of the students in the control group in order to see which group retained more knowledge of the grammar structures. The comparison of the groups' immediate post-test scores to their pre-test scores indicated that all participants in both groups demonstrated learning for all grammar structures except question tags, possibly because four of the groups, two in each condition, scored quite high on the pre-test for question tags, leaving little room for improvement. This hypothesis was confirmed by comparing the remaining two groups' immediate post-test scores to their pre-test scores in both conditions. The comparison revealed that these groups in both conditions demonstrated significant learning for question tags.

The comparison of the groups' gain scores indicated that that all students demonstrated the same amount of learning of the target grammar structures. That is, the students in the experimental group learned the grammar structures as well as the students in the control group. The comparison of the retention scores of the groups indicated that the students in the experimental group retained as much knowledge of

four out of the five target grammar structures as the students in the control group, with the control group improving significantly more than the experimental group on indirect questions, although the experimental group also improved on this structure. All these results indicated that the success of using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction was consistent across the five grammar structures. Thus, it can be claimed that the results of using corpus-based sources did not differ when compared to using a course book in the teaching of the grammar structures. In other words, the type of instruction did not affect the students' ability to complete the fill-in-the-gap test items on the grammar tests.

The present study confirms the findings of previous studies that have been conducted in the context of using corpus-based activities, DDL, and concordances in L2 learning (Chan & Liou, 2005; Chao, 2010; Chujo, Utiyama & Miura, 2006; Gaskell & Cobb, 2004; Gilmore, 2009; Sun & Wang, 2003). All of these studies have attempted to determine the effectiveness of these sources and activities on EFL/ESL learners' performance on vocabulary learning or their performance in writing. Chujo, Utiyama and Miura (2006) carried out an experiment that investigated the effectiveness of Japanese-English bilingual corpora on beginner level EFL learners' vocabulary learning. The participants were required to compare the vocabulary and language patterns between two languages to understand patterns and usage in both languages by using the bilingual corpora. The researchers investigated the effectiveness of the bilingual corpora on the students' vocabulary learning by giving a CALL-CD-ROM quiz at the end of each lesson. The study revealed that the beginning level EFL learners were able to use the bilingual corpora effectively in order to learn English vocabulary. Even though the current study

differs from that of Chujo, Utiyama and Miura (2006), by investigating the effectiveness of corpus-based activities on EFL learners' learning of English grammar, this study also found that the students were able to use corpus-based activities effectively in order to learn English grammar, as demonstrated by their improved performance on the grammar tests. Additionally, the learners in both studies were lower level EFL learners. Thus, it can be claimed that using corpora (i.e., using corpus-based activities or bilingual corpora) in L2 teaching can be effective with lower level EFL learners.

The findings of the current study are also in line with the propositions of the Data-Driven Learning (DDL) approach. This approach posits that grammar teaching should mainly include activities which can raise language learners' consciousness rather than activities which try to focus on the teaching of rules (Hadley, 2002). Additionally, in the DDL approach, the specific aspects of language are presented to language learners by exposing them to contexts, which fosters creativity and self-discovery learning among learners (Batstone, 1995). Since the corpus-based activities used in the present study included concordance lines and leading questions, both of which were the kind of activities that could raise the students' consciousness of the target grammar structures, these activities may have provided the students with an opportunity to facilitate their self-discovery learning by showing them the grammar structures in some real contexts. This finding also supports the conclusions of a study that also used a DDL approach in order to teach collocations of prepositions (Koosha & Jafarpour, 2006), in which the DDL approach proved to be highly effective in the teaching and learning of collocation of prepositions.

The present study also confirms the findings of an empirical study which also investigated the effectiveness of a DDL approach on lower level English students' learning of linking adverbials in English (Boulton, 2009). However, Boulton's study differs from that of Koosha and Jafarpour (2006), by investigating the effectiveness of a DDL approach on lower level learners' learning of English grammar.

Additionally, this study is the only study in the literature that has determined empirically the effectiveness of a DDL approach on lower level students' English grammar learning. The researcher required the students in the study to use one of the following four sources in each of the four groups in order to deal with linking adverbials: bilingual dictionary entries (BD), grammar/usage notes (GU), KWIC (Key Word in Context) concordances, and short contexts (SC). The study revealed that the corpus groups (KW and SC) used the information more effectively than the traditional information groups (GU and BD). Therefore, the study showed that lower level English learners could benefit from data-driven learning. Similarly, in the current study, the findings indicated that the lower level learners were able to use corpus-based activities effectively in order to learn the target grammar structures of English.

The approach to grammar teaching in the current study is also consistent with an inductive approach to students' grammar learning. This approach posits that in grammar teaching, many examples of particular grammar structures are presented in context, from which language learners discover the rules of the structures without being given any explicit guidance (Abraham, 1985). This is in contrast to a deductive approach to grammar teaching, in which a teacher gives an explicit statement of the rule and then asks language learners to apply it to many examples (Gollin, 1998).

Since the corpus-based activities in the current study encouraged the students to derive the rules of the grammar structures from the examples presented in the concordance lines, it can be claimed that the present study also used an inductive approach in the teaching of the grammar structures.

From this perspective, the findings of the current study confirm the findings of a study that contrasted the effectiveness of inductive instruction with deductive instruction on 61 high-intermediate proficiency level students' learning of participial phrases in English (Abraham, 1985). Abraham's study uncovered no significant difference between the two approaches in the teaching of participial phrases. This finding is also consistent with the finding of another study that also investigated the relative effectiveness of deductive and inductive instruction on 319 high school students' learning of grammar (Shaffer, 1989). Shaffer's study also revealed no significant difference between the two approaches in the teaching of grammar. Similarly, in the current study, the results of using corpus-based activities in the teaching of the grammar structures did not differ when compared to using a course book, in which the students studied the rules of the grammar structures by means of explicit course book and teacher guidance and then applied them to many gap-filling exercises.

According to Hunston (2002), the use of corpora is very beneficial for EFL learners because corpora bring natural and authentic real life language to the classroom to help students to understand the descriptions of a language. Additionally, language learners discover specific patterns and change their minds by observing extensive naturally occurring examples in real texts (Hill, 2000). Since the students in the present study were exposed to naturally occurring examples of the target

grammar structures presented through the concordance lines, these examples may have helped them to discover the rules of the target grammar structures.

Attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction

The second research question, which was related to student attitudes towards the use of corpus-based activities in English grammar learning, was addressed through the questionnaire that was completed by 50 out of the original 63 students from the three experimental groups. The students' responses revealed that they held somewhat neutral attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar learning.

It was seen that more than half of the students expressed uncertainty when they were asked about the difficulty of using corpus based activities in grammar instruction. This could stem from the fact that corpus-based activities in the study consisted of three sections, the concordance lines, the leading questions, and the gap-filling grammar exercises. Apart from analyzing the concordance lines, the other two tasks may have been somewhat easy for the students to deal with, since the majority of the students in the student interviews stated that only dealing with the concordance lines seemed very challenging for them, and they needed help or guidance from the teacher only in order to analyze or understand the concordance lines. Therefore, this assumption may support why the students had conflicting feelings about the difficulty of using corpus based activities in grammar instruction. However, it would be more insightful to ask the students about the difficulty of each separate task that they had to deal with in the study in order to get more consistent answers.

However, the majority of the students agreed with the idea that learning the grammar structures via corpus-based activities was not more difficult than learning them via the course book. Additionally, when this question was asked to the students in the interviews, all the students in the three focus groups also agreed that corpus-based activities were not more difficult than the activities that the course book presented. The reason that the students' responses to the third item were consistent with their responses to the first item in the questionnaire may be due to the fact that the students were able to make a clear distinction between the course book's grammar activities and corpus-based grammar activities used in the current study.

It should be remembered that one of the rationales behind the use of corpora in grammar instruction for this study is to help the students see the information that is included in the concordance lines and then help them derive the necessary rules for the grammar structures. It is interesting to note that the majority of the students found using corpus-based activities in the learning of grammar structures useful, thereby agreeing that using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction achieved this function. However, most of the students disagreed with the idea that corpus-based activities helped them to learn the grammar structures better than the course book. This might be linked to the fact that the majority of the students felt that the corpus-based grammar activities and the course book grammar activities were equal in terms of teaching them English grammar.

The majority of the students disagreed with the idea that they would prefer using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction to learn English grammar structures. Additionally, even though there were 21 students who thought that it would be a good idea for instructors to use corpus-based activities in grammar

instruction, the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that instructors should use corpus-based activities to teach English grammar structures in EFL classes. These two perceptions might be linked to the fact that the use of corpus-based activities requires participation in the course and the students have to spend a considerable amount of effort on analyzing concordance lines and deriving the rules of grammar structures.

It should also be remembered that the students who participated in the study were at lower levels of English proficiency. For lower level students, understanding the information provided in concordance lines in order to understand the rules of grammar structures seems more challenging than reading the rules of grammar structures in a course book. These students had always studied the rules of the grammar structures presented at the end of their course books, until they were asked to understand the rules of the grammar structures by studying the concordance lines. The fact that the procedure was so different might explain why the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that they really felt positively towards using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures. However, the students who were interviewed felt positively towards using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction because they generally thought that the effects of learning English grammar via formulating the rules of the grammar structures would last longer than those of learning English grammar via reading the rules of the grammar structures, and they thought that they would be more successful in their exams.

However, the majority of the students agreed with the idea that using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction was not more boring than using a course book. This might be linked to the fact that ‘boringness’ is associated with teachers’ using the same kinds of activities or explanations to teach grammar structures in the students’ minds. Studying the concordance lines and working on the different activities might have been interesting for the students. The student responses to the same question in the interviews supported this fact; these students stated that deriving the rules of the grammar structures was something new for them, and the activities presented for them were more different and diverse when compared to the activities that the course book presented.

Only 15 of the students thought that using corpus-based activities improved their English grammar skill. Additionally, the majority of the students disagreed with the idea that using corpus-based activities increased their confidence about learning English grammar. Only 19 of the students agreed that these activities helped them increase their confidence. These two perceptions might be linked to the fact that the students may have thought that there were some specific grammar structures of English that could not be learned easily, and even using corpus-based activities could not help them to learn those structures. When the students were asked in the interviews whether using corpus-based sources in grammar learning increased their confidence about learning English grammar, the majority of the students still thought that there were some grammar structures of English which they would not understand when they were taught either via corpus-based activities or via a course book.

Most of the students thought that they did not participate actively in the course while the instructors were teaching the grammar structures via corpus-based activities. This might be due to the fact that it was the first time that the students had been asked to analyze concordance lines and try to formulate rules for grammar structures. Analyzing concordance lines and deriving some rules for grammar structures require a considerable amount of effort on the part of the students. This finding might also be a possible explanation for the students' somewhat neutral attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar learning. The possibility is that if more students had participated actively in the course while learning the grammar structures via corpus-based activities, they might have held more positive attitudes towards using these sources in grammar learning.

In the literature, only one study has explored student attitudes towards using corpora (i.e., concordancing) in grammar learning. Vannestal and Lindquist (2007) designed two trials in order to explore advanced proficiency level EFL learners' attitudes towards using concordancing while learning subject-verb agreement and the use of articles. In the first trial, the results of the questionnaires revealed that the students in the experimental group felt positively towards using corpora in grammar learning. In the second trial, the results of the interviews revealed that several of the students did not find corpora very useful for learning about grammatical rules, but realized that they could use corpora when writing texts in English. In Vannestal and Lindquist's study, the students appeared to have more positive attitudes towards using corpora in L2 learning in comparison to the students who took part in the current study. This might be linked to the fact that the students in the Vannestal and Lindquist's study had a lot more time (i.e., a six-month period for each trial) to get

used to concordancing when compared to the students in the current study, who were required to use the corpus-based activities in only a three-week period. However, in the second trial, the results of the interviews in the Vannestal and Lindquist's study revealed that several students had conflicting feelings about using concordancing in grammar learning. Similarly, in the current study, the results of the questionnaires revealed that several students had conflicting feelings about the use of corpus-based activities in grammar learning. Nonetheless, on the questionnaires, the majority of the students in the experimental groups found using corpus-based activities in grammar learning useful. Additionally, the interviews in the present study revealed that the students who were interviewed held positive attitudes towards using these sources in grammar learning. The students' responses indicated that they benefited from using corpus-based activities in grammar learning.

The current study also confirms the findings of a study that explored language learners' attitudes towards concordancing in the context of collocation learning (Chao, 2010). In the study, the researcher found that the students mostly agreed that concordancing was indeed effective with their collocation learning. Similarly, in the current study, the results of the student interviews revealed that using corpus-based activities was effective with their grammar learning.

Moreover, a study by Chan and Liou (2005) revealed that the majority of the students enjoyed using the bilingual concordancer while trying to learn verb-noun collocations. In the present study, the results of the questionnaires revealed that the majority of the students did not find using corpus-based activities in grammar learning boring. Additionally, the students' responses in the interviews demonstrated

that they enjoyed using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures.

The results of some previous studies in the literature which have also explored students' attitudes towards using corpora in vocabulary learning and in writing showed that students tended to have more positive attitudes towards using corpora in L2 learning in comparison to the students who took part in the current study. Yoon and Hirvela's (2004) study, for example, revealed that the students mostly felt positively towards using corpora in L2 writing instruction. Moreover, Chujo, Utiyama and Miura's (2006) study found that 62% of the participants felt positively towards using a DDL approach in the learning of English vocabulary. Given the fact that using corpus-based activities in grammar instruction allowed the students in the current study to learn the target grammar structures as effectively as the course book, one would expect more positive answers from the students regarding their attitudes towards using these sources in grammar learning. The analysis of the attitude questionnaire in the current study showed that the students held somewhat neutral attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar learning. However, the results of the interviews in the current study demonstrated that the students who were interviewed held more positive attitudes towards using corpus-based sources in grammar learning. This conflict between the questionnaire data and the interview data might be due to the fact that the students gave contrasting answers to some of the items in the questionnaire. To exemplify, although the majority of the students found using corpus-based activities in the learning of grammar structures useful, a great majority did not express a specific desire to work with corpus-based activities in the learning of grammar structures of English. This

might be related to some problems in the wording of the items in the questionnaire as well as the students' not giving much thought to the ideas expressed in the items of the questionnaire.

As a result, even though the results of the questionnaire revealed that the lower level EFL students in the current study held somewhat neutral attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures of English, the students' responses to the questions asked in the interviews demonstrated that the students who were interviewed held somewhat more positive attitudes towards using these sources in English grammar learning.

Limitations of the Study

The findings of the present study have revealed that the lower level EFL learners were able to use corpus-based activities effectively in order to learn the target grammar structures of English. In addition, it was found that using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures produced similar results when compared to using a course book. Despite these promising though limited findings, there are several limitations that need to be considered.

First of all, it should be noted that since seven grammar structures (including two distractor items) were tested at the same time, only five items for each structure were included in the grammar tests, because of the time limitations of the classrooms and fatigue factor for the students. This meant that the small number of items included in the tests for each structure may not have sampled enough behaviors to provide reliable results. This may be why the grammar tests used in the current study were not effective in showing a clear difference between the two approaches (using corpus-based activities vs. using a course book). More detailed tests might

have demonstrated significant differences between the learning from the two types of activity.

Second, while scoring the tests, it was seen that there were some students who left some sections of the tests blank. For these blank sections of the tests, a score of 0 was given, thereby accepting that those students did not learn the grammar structures in those sections. However, the students who left some sections of the tests blank may have run out of time on the test, or may not have been present during the instruction of those grammar structures. In the latter case, the study failed to control whether all of the students who took the post-tests were present during the instruction of those grammar structures.

Third, the participants of the study were lower level EFL students attending a nine-month intensive language program at a state university. Additionally, the students in the current study may not have been well-motivated or good language learners when compared to the other learners in the school who were able to start studying at their departments at the end of the first term of the language program. In this respect, the findings may be limited to participants with a similar profile. Additionally, although the number of the participants who were involved in the study was 126, only the results of 96 of them were taken into consideration while analyzing the data for the first research question, because the study lost many participants due to absence on the testing days. If the study had had more participants, the results revealed by the current study might have been generalisable to students at lower levels of EFL proficiency.

Fourth, the study was conducted over a three-week treatment period in order to teach only five different grammar structures via corpus-based activities, because of institutional restraints and time constraints. Seeing the long term effects of using corpus-based activities, with more English grammar structures, would have been more helpful to broaden and deepen our understanding of using corpus-based sources in grammar instruction.

In addition, the course book used in the current study used a combination of deductive and inductive approaches in the teaching of English grammar. On the other hand, the corpus-based activities used in the current study only used an inductive approach in the teaching of the grammar structures. Thus, the study failed to control this variable in the teaching of the grammar structures.

Furthermore, because of institutional restraints and time constraints, the study failed to administer a post-test for each target grammar structure immediately after the structure was covered in both conditions. Instead, the students took one big immediate post-test for all five target grammar structures after those structures were covered in both conditions. Thus, the time between the instruction of the five target grammar structures and the immediate post-test differed for each target structure in the study. That is, the study failed to take into consideration the time effects on the students' performance on the post-tests.

Finally, as the study was conducted with the help of 13 instructors from the institution, it failed to control who was teaching which structure. In other words, the study failed to control the teacher effect on the students' learning of the grammar structures. Additionally, as previously described in Chapter 3, the institution requires three instructors to teach in each lower level class by working as partner colleagues,

and each class has one instructor who has at least ten-years of teaching experience in the field. The other two instructors, who are required to work with the experienced instructor as partner colleagues, have less than three-year of teaching experience in the field. It was likely that some of the target grammar structures were covered by experienced instructors, whereas some of them were covered by inexperienced instructors both in the experimental groups and in the control groups. Hence, the study failed to determine the experienced teacher effects on the students' learning of the target grammar structures in both conditions.

Pedagogical Implications

The present study has provided evidence of the potential effectiveness of using corpus-based activities on lower level EFL learners' learning of English grammar. With regard to exploiting corpus-based sources in grammar instruction, a number of implications for English grammar teaching and materials development could be discussed.

First of all, the present study has provided evidence that corpus-based sources can also be used in grammar instruction for students at lower levels of English. The study has provided some evidence that EFL learners who are at the early stages of language learning can effectively be taught English grammar through using corpus-based activities. Therefore, the study has also provided evidence for changing the existing beliefs, which appear to be that corpus-based sources are most appropriate and useful for advanced and sophisticated learners of English with significant training (Boulton, 2009).

Second, this study has provided evidence that students at the early stages of language learning feel that using corpus-based activities in L2 learning is an effective approach. Although the results of the attitude questionnaire have shown that the lower level students hold somewhat neutral attitudes towards using these sources in grammar learning, the data gathered from the interviews have revealed that the students who were interviewed hold more positive attitudes towards using these sources in grammar learning.

Furthermore, the study has provided evidence for language teachers questioning whether to use corpus-based activities with lower level students. For each target grammar structure defined in the present study, corpus-based activities were prepared by the researcher by taking concordance lines from the corpus (COCA), preparing several leading questions to help the students derive the rules, and designing gap-filling grammar exercises, in which several sentences were also taken from the corpus (COCA). Thus, if language teachers who want to make use of corpus-based sources to teach English grammar to lower level EFL students are informed about these designs and principles, they can create their own corpus-based grammar activities to teach grammar structures to lower level EFL students. Since the data obtained through the questionnaires and the interviews in the current study revealed that the students tended to be bored with using the same activities presented in the course book to learn English grammar structures, it can also be suggested that language teachers can also make use of these corpus-based sources in language classes in order to break up the routine in the classroom and make language learning more interesting for language learners.

According to Biber and Reppen (2002), materials developers can also use the information based on corpora in order to increase the meaningful input provided for language learners. The present study suggests that curriculum designers might want to consider incorporating such materials and activities for lower level EFL learners in language programs.

Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the findings of the present study, various important areas can be suggested for further research related to the use of corpus-based activities in the learning of English grammar. First of all, the study was limited to 96 lower level EFL students. It is necessary to conduct a corpus-based study with a larger number of lower level students from different backgrounds (i.e. students who are learning English as a second language (ESL), students who use English for academic purposes (EAP), and students who use English for specific purposes (ESP)) in order to determine whether the conclusions coming from the present study hold true for students from those different backgrounds.

Second, as previously described in Chapter 3, the students who participated in the study were false beginners who could not manage to complete the language program at the first term of the academic year and were placed in C and D classes according to their proficiency levels. That is, the participants of the study were false beginners of English, although the results of their proficiency scores revealed that they were lower level learners of English. Thus, it is necessary to conduct a study with students who are complete beginners of English in order to see whether those conclusions coming from the present study also hold true for students who are complete beginners of English.

Third, the present study only investigated the effectiveness of corpus-based sources on the lower level EFL learners' performance on the grammar tests. Thus, some empirical studies should definitely be conducted in order to investigate the effectiveness of learning of English grammar structures through corpus-based sources on students' ability to use these grammar structures effectively in other skills (i.e., writing and speaking) of English. That is, the long-term effects of corpus-based sources on students' use of English grammar skills in writing and speaking should be examined.

Fourth, the students in this study used corpus-based sources to learn only five structures of English grammar. Hence, it is necessary to conduct more empirical studies in order to investigate the effectiveness of these sources on students' learning of other structures of English grammar. That is, some empirical studies should be conducted with an aim to determine which of the structures of English grammar can be effectively taught via using corpus-based sources.

Furthermore, the present study did not aim to investigate how student attitudes were affected by their gain scores or vice versa. It would be interesting to learn how lower level students' attitudes towards using corpus-based sources can be affected by their gain scores. In other words, it would be informative to conduct a study which aims to explore the attitudes of the students who gained more than the other students.

It should also be noted that it would be informative to learn the results of experimental studies that also aim to explore language teachers' attitudes towards using corpus-based sources in grammar instruction.

Conclusion

This study investigated the effectiveness of using corpus-based activities on lower level EFL learners' learning of five grammar structures. The study also explored those students' attitudes towards using corpus-based sources in grammar instruction. The results of the study revealed that the lower level EFL learners were able to use corpus-based activities effectively in order to learn the target grammar structures of English. In addition, the data gathered from the administration of the attitude questionnaire showed that the lower level students had neither negative nor positive attitudes towards using corpus-based activities in grammar learning. That is, the students' attitudes were somewhat neutral towards using corpus-based sources in the learning of English grammar. However, the data gathered from the student interviews showed that the students who were interviewed appeared to demonstrate somewhat more positive attitudes towards using these sources in the learning of English grammar.

All in all, the results of the present study and the pedagogical implications discussed in this chapter might assist language teachers who want to use corpus-based sources to teach English grammar structures to lower level EFL students, and curriculum designers who want to incorporate corpora for lower level EFL learners in English preparatory programs.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, R. (1985). Field independence-dependence and the teaching of grammar. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 689-702.
- Barlow, M. (1996). Corpora for theory and practice. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-37.
- Batstone, R. (1995). Product and process: Grammar in the second language classroom. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn, & E. William (Eds.), *Grammar and the language teacher* (pp. 224-236). London: Prentice Hall.
- Bernardini, S. (2002). Exploring new directions for discovery learning. In B. Kettemann & G. Marko (Eds.), *Teaching and learning by doing corpus analysis* (pp. 165-182). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Biber, D., & Reppen, R. (2002). What does frequency have to do with grammar teaching? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 199-208.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boulton, A. (2009). Testing the limits of data-driven learning: Language proficiency and training. *ReCALL*, 21(1), 37-54.
- Capel, A. (1993). *Collins COBUILD concordance samplers 1: Prepositions*. London: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Carpenter, E. (1993). *Collins COBUILD English guides 4: Confusable words*. London: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Carter, R. (1998). Orders of reality: CANCODE, communication and culture, and reply to Guy Cook. *ELT Journal*, 52(1), 43-64.
- Chambers, A. (2007). Integrating corpora in language learning and teaching. *ReCALL*, 19(3), 249-251.
- Chan, T., & Liou, H. (2005). Effects of web-based concordancing instruction on EFL students' learning of verb-noun collocations. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 18(3), 231-250.
- Chao, P. (2010). *A study of collocation learning of junior high students in Taiwan via concordance*. Paper presented at the 2010 international conference on English teaching, Kaohsiung, Taiwan. Retrieved 14.02.2011, from http://www2.kuas.edu.tw/edu/afl/20100430Final/Word/2010comp_EPCA.pdf.
- Chomsky, N. (1988). *Language and problems of knowledge*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Chui, K., Utiyama, M., & Miura, S. (2006). Using a Japanese-English parallel corpus for teaching English vocabulary to beginning-level students. *English Corpus Studies*, 13, 153-172.
- Cook, G. (1998). The uses of reality: A reply to Ronald Carter. *ELT Journal*, 52(1), 57-63.
- Davies, M. (n.d.). The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA): 425 million words (1990-present). Available online at <http://www.americancorpus.org>.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics through SPSS*. London: Sage.
- Francis, W. N. (1992). Language corpora BC. In J. Svartvik (Ed.), *Directions in corpus linguistics* (pp. 17-34). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gaskell, D., & Cobb, T. (2004). Can learners use concordance feedback for writing errors? *System*, 32(3), 301-319.
- Gilmore, A. (2009). Using online corpora to develop students' writing skills. *ELT Journal*, 63(4), 363-372.
- Gollin, J. (1998). Key concepts in ELT: Deductive vs. inductive language learning. *ELT Journal*, 52(1), 88-89.
- Goodale, M. (1995). *Collins COBUILD concordance samplers 4: Tenses*. London: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Hadley, G. (2002). Sensing winds of change: An introduction to data-driven learning. *RELC Journal*, 33(2), 99-124.
- Hill, J. (2000). Revising priorities: From grammatical failure to collocational success. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation: Further development in the lexical approach* (pp. 47-69). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1992). The concept of communicative competence revisited. In P. Martin (Ed.), *Thirty years of linguistic evolution. Studies in honour of Rene Dirven on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday* (pp. 31-57). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Johns, T. (1986). Micro-concord: A language learner's research tool. *System*, 4(2), 151-162.

- Johns, T. (1991). From printout to handout: Grammar and vocabulary learning in the context of data-driven learning. *ELR Journal*, 4, 27-45.
- Johns, T. (1991). Should you be persuaded: Two examples of data-driven learning. *ELR Journal*, 4, 1-16.
- Knoch, U. (2004). A new look at teaching comparisons: A corpus-based study. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 2(2), 171-185.
- Koosha, M., & Jafarpour, A. (2006). Data-driven learning and teaching collocation of prepositions: The case of Iranian EFL adult learners. *Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 8(4), 192-209.
- McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (1995). Spoken grammar: What is it and how can we teach it? *ELT Journal*, 49(3), 207-218.
- McEnery, T., & Wilson, A. (1996). *Corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McEnery, T., Xiao, R., & Tono, Y. (2006). *Corpus-based language studies. An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
- McNamara, C. (1999). General guidelines for conducting interviews. Retrieved 17.06.2011, from <http://www.managementhelp.org/evaluatn/intrview.htm>.
- Oxenden, C., & Latham-Koenig, C. (2006). *New English file: Intermediate student's book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Payne, J. S. (2008). Data-driven south Asian language learning. Retrieved 10.06.2011, from <http://salrc.uchicago.edu/workshops/sponsored/061005/DDL.ppt>.
- Prodromou, L. (1996). Correspondence. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 88-89.
- Romer, U. (2005). *Progressives, patterns, pedagogy. A corpus-driven approach to English progressive forms, functions, contexts and didactics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Seidlehofer, B. (2003). *Controversies in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shaffer, C. (1989). A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 395-403.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). Shared knowledge. In J. Atlati (Ed.), *Georgetown university round table in language and linguistics. Linguistics and language pedagogy: The state of the art* (pp. 79-103). Washington DC: Georgetown University.

- Sinclair, J. (1992). *Collins COBUILD English usage*. London: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Sinclair, J. (2001). *Collins COBUILD English dictionary for advanced learners*. Glasgow: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Sinclair, J. (2004). *How to use corpora in language teaching*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sinclair, J., Bullon, S., Krishnamurthy, R., Manning, E., & Todd, J. (1990). *Collins COBUILD English grammar*. London: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Stuart, K. (2005). New perspectives on corpus linguistics. Retrieved 05.07.2011, from dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/fichero_articulo?codigo=1426958&orden...
- Sun, Y-C. (2000). *Using on-line corpus to facilitate language learning*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the teaching of English to speakers of other languages, British Columbia, Canada. Retrieved 23.03.2011, from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1060374304000190>.
- Sun, Y-C. (2007). Learner perceptions of a concordancing tool for academic writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 20(4), 323-343.
- Sun, Y-C., & Wang, L-Y. (2003). Concordancers in the EFL classroom: Cognitive approaches and collocation difficulty. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 16(1), 83-94.
- Teubert, W. (2010). Our brave new world. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 15(3), 354-358.
- Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus linguistics at work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vannestal, M. E., & Lindquist, H. (2007). Learning English grammar with a corpus: Experimenting with concordancing in a university grammar course. *ReCALL*, 19(3), 329-350.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1991). The description and prescription of language. In J. Atlatis (Ed.), *Georgetown university round table in language and linguistics. Linguistics and language pedagogy: The state of the art* (pp. 11-24). Washington DC: Georgetown University.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1999). Students' developing conceptions of themselves as language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 193-201.
- Yoon, H., & Hirvela, A. (2004). ESL student attitudes toward corpus use in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 257-283.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Grammar Tests (Pre-test, Immediate post-test, Delayed post-test)

Pre-test

<p>A. Complete the sentences using a/an, the, or no article "Ø". Example: He is <u>a</u> student.</p> <p>1. Taiwan is _____ island. 2. May I ask you _____ question? 3. He is _____ really good person. 4. She has _____ my car today. 5. _____ girl that I told you about is standing over there.</p>	<p>D. Complete the sentences with who, which, where, whose. Example: The cat <u>whose</u> leg was broken died yesterday.</p> <p>1. Did you live in a house _____ window was broken? 2. Her friend _____ is a cook made a cake for her. 3. You are reading the book _____ I want to read. 4. The Babs is the restaurant _____ we meet every Friday. 5. My friend _____ is a policeman came to the party.</p>
<p>B. Complete the Sentences using reported speech. Example: 'Where is the key?' - He asked me <u>where the key was</u>.</p> <p>1. 'Tell me everything!' - Jenny told me _____. 2. 'Please sit down!' - I asked him _____. 3. 'Do you need help?' - I asked her _____. 4. 'What do you want to wear for the party?' - They asked me _____. 5. 'I am not going to go to school.' - She said _____.</p>	<p>E. Complete the sentences using the passive. Example: The questions <u>were answered</u> correctly. (to answer- Simple Past)</p> <p>1. The book _____ by the students. (to read – Simple Past Continuous) 2. The clothes _____ by mum on Monday. (to wash- Future) 3. He _____ to the party yesterday. (to invite - Simple Past) 4. The key _____. (to lose – Present Perfect) 5. The letters _____ by the secretary. (to type - Simple Present)</p>
<p>C. Complete with a question tag (are you?, isn't it?, etc.) Example: She is a doctor, <u>isn't she?</u></p> <p>1. He will still be popular, _____? 2. My mother helped you study English, _____? 3. It is a bittersweet victory, _____? 4. It would be difficult for my students to answer these questions, _____? 5. She hasn't decided whether to go out with her friends or not, _____?</p>	<p>F. Make indirect questions. Example: What is her name? - Could you tell me <u>what her name is</u> ?</p> <p>1. What do we need to do before going abroad? - Do you know _____ before going abroad? 2. Was he studying English when you were in the room? - Could you tell me _____ when you were in the room? 3. Does she speak German fluently? - Do you know _____ fluently? 4. Where did they get married? - Can you remember _____? 5. What time does the plane take off? - Do you know _____?</p>
<p>G. Complete the third conditional sentences with the correct form of the verbs. Example: If you <u>had listened</u> to me, you <u>would not have been</u> ill. (listen, not be)</p> <p>1. If I _____ your phone number, I _____ you. (know, call) 2. John _____ a different language if he _____ born in a different country. (speak, be) 3. Elena _____ her job if she _____ late for work. (not lose, not be) 4. She _____ to answer all of the questions in the exam if she _____ hard. (not fail, study) 5. If my friend _____ his leg last week, he _____ in the match. (not break, take part)</p>	

Immediate post-test

<p>A. Complete the sentences using a/an, the, or no article "Ø".</p> <p>Example: He is <u>a</u> student.</p> <p>1. This is _____ easy question. 2. He is one of _____ smartest people I know. 3. Antalya is _____ city in the south of Turkey. 4. Bill enjoys reading _____ mystery novels. 5. What is _____ name of the next station?</p>	<p>D. Complete the sentences using the passive.</p> <p>Example: The questions <u>were answered</u> correctly. (to answer- Simple Past)</p> <p>1. Our rooms _____ . (to clean- Present Perfect) 2. The words _____ by the teacher today. (to explain - Simple Past) 3. English _____ all over the world. (to speak-Simple Present) 4. The homework _____ tomorrow. (to do – Future) 5. A lecture _____ by him in the lecture hall. (to give – Simple Past Continuous)</p>
<p>B. Complete with a question tag (are you?, isn't it?, etc.)</p> <p>Example: She is a doctor, <u>isn't she?</u></p> <p>1. We haven't visited our grandparents for 5 years, _____? 2. She remembers hearing such a loud noise, _____? 3. You would like to dance at the party, _____? 4. Damon will have a new car, _____? 5. The students were very sorry when they heard that Jeremy died, _____?</p>	<p>E. Complete the sentences with who, which, where, whose.</p> <p>Example: The cat <u>whose</u> leg was broken died yesterday.</p> <p>1. This is the palace _____ the Queen lives. 2. Where is the boy _____ ordered fish? 3. Did you receive the postcard _____ I sent you? 4. Do you know the children _____ mother is a doctor? 5. I wanted to buy a book _____ was written by Elif Şafak.</p>
<p>C. Complete the Sentences using reported speech.</p> <p>Example: 'Where is the key?' - He asked me <u>where the key was</u>.</p> <p>1. 'Make me a cake!' - My mother told us _____.</p> <p>2. 'Please do not smoke in the room!' - My mother asked my father _____.</p> <p>3. 'Does Elena want to go out?' - She asked me _____.</p> <p>4. 'What time are you going to be ready for the cinema?' - Jack asked us _____.</p> <p>5. 'They will be late for work.' - He said _____.</p>	<p>F. Make indirect questions.</p> <p>Example: What is her name? - Could you tell me <u>what her name is?</u></p> <p>1. Will they visit their grandparents in London? - Do you know _____ in London?</p> <p>2. What is she doing in the kitchen? - Do you know _____ in the kitchen?</p> <p>3. Did she do her homework? - Could you tell me _____?</p> <p>4. Where does he spend his time in town? - Do you know _____ in town?</p> <p>5. What time does the movie start? - Can you tell me _____?</p>
<p>G. Complete the third conditional sentences with the correct form of the verbs.</p> <p>Example: If you <u>had listened</u> to me, you <u>would not have been</u> ill. (listen, not be)</p> <p>1. If Jenny _____ to the party, we _____ her. (come, see) 2. If I _____ about the concert, I _____. (hear, go) 3. They _____ the bus if you _____ so late. (catch, not be) 4. If they _____ well, they _____ the game. (play, not lose) 5. We _____ the train if we _____ late. (not miss, not wake up)</p>	

Delayed post-test

<p>A. Complete the sentences using the passive.</p> <p>Example: The questions <u>were answered</u> correctly. (to answer- Simple Past)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A novel _____ about the incident. (to write – Simple Past Continuous) 2. Ferrari cars _____ in Italy. (to make-Simple Present) 3. A new restaurant _____ next week. (to open - Future Perfect) 4. The bill _____ by John. (to pay- Present Perfect) 5. The money _____ by the thief. (to steal – Simple Past) 	<p>D. Complete with a question tag (are you?, isn't it?, etc.)</p> <p>Example: She is a doctor, <u>isn't she?</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You won't be the chair of the organization, _____? 2. They have cleaned the table, _____? 3. We didn't really know that she would be successful, _____? 4. They often watch TV in the afternoon, _____? 5. I can't force them to do that, _____?
<p>B. Complete the sentences with who, which, where, whose.</p> <p>Example: The cat <u>whose</u> leg was broken died yesterday.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. She has never been to Turkey, _____ people speak Turkish. 2. Do you like the people _____ Sarah invited to her party? 3. The watch _____ my uncle bought is very expensive. 4. The room _____ door was painted yesterday was booked for us. 5. I bought a computer _____ was very cheap. 	<p>E. Complete the sentences using a/an, the, or no article "Ø".</p> <p>Example: He is <u>a</u> student.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I need _____ hour to get ready for the party. 2. I went to _____ seaside during my summer vacation. 3. Do you have _____ dictionary that I can borrow? 4. _____ milk is good for your health. 5. Do we really need _____ sleep?
<p>C. Make indirect questions.</p> <p>Example: What is her name? - Could you tell me <u>what her name is?</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What time does the bus leave for the airport? - Could you tell me _____ for the airport? 2. Where are the children playing? - Can you tell me _____? 3. Has she ever been to Italy? - Do you know _____ to Italy? 4. What should I write for my paper? - Could you tell me _____? 5. Does he play football professionally? - Do you know _____ professionally? 	<p>F. Complete the Sentences using reported speech.</p> <p>Example: 'Where is the key?' - He asked me <u>where the key was.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'Can I come to see you?' - The boy asked her _____. 2. 'Jeremy did not tell him about the party.' - Mary said _____. 3. 'Why is he so intelligent?' - The woman asked her _____. 4. 'Come here!' - Her grandfather told her _____. 5. 'Please open the window!' - They asked him _____.
<p>G. Complete the third conditional sentences with the correct form of the verbs.</p> <p>Example: If you <u>had listened</u> to me, you <u>would not have been</u> ill. (listen, not be)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They _____ better grades if they _____ harder at school. (get, study) 2. We _____ a car accident if my dad _____ asleep while driving. (not have, not fall) 3. She _____ me a postcard from Italy if she _____ me so much. (not send, not love) 4. If his father _____ so angry with Tyler, he _____ Tyler go out with us. (not be, let) 5. If she _____ that I was so ill, she _____ to visit me in hospital. (not know, not come) 	

APPENDIX B: Attitude Questionnaire (English and Turkish Versions)

English Version

Please read the statements below carefully and circle the number that best describes you.

1. What do you think about the difficulty of learning English grammar through corpus-based activities?

Very difficult ←————→ Very easy
 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. How useful do you find learning English grammar through corpus-based activities?

Very useless ←————→ Very useful
 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. I think that learning English grammar through corpus-based activities is more difficult than learning English grammar through a course book.

Strongly disagree ←————→ Strongly agree
 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. I think that learning English grammar through corpus-based activities is more boring than learning English grammar through a course book.

Strongly disagree ←————→ Strongly agree
 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. How do you evaluate your own participation in the course while learning English grammar via corpus-based activities?

Very inactive ←————→ Very active
 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Using corpus-based activities in learning of English grammar structures improved my English grammar skill.

Strongly disagree ←————→ Strongly agree
 1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Using corpus-based activities in learning of English grammar structures increased my confidence about learning English grammar.

Strongly disagree ←————→ Strongly agree
 1 2 3 4 5 6

8. I prefer using corpus-based activities in learning of English grammar structures to using a course book in learning of English grammar structures.

Strongly disagree ←————→ Strongly agree
 1 2 3 4 5 6

9. I think that corpus-based activities are more helpful than a course book in learning of English grammar structures.

Strongly disagree ←————→ Strongly agree
 1 2 3 4 5 6

10. I really felt positively towards using corpus-based activities in learning of English grammar structures.

Strongly disagree ←————→ Strongly agree
 1 2 3 4 5 6

11. I recommend that teachers should use corpus-based activities so as to teach grammar structures in EFL classes.

Strongly disagree ←————→ Strongly agree
 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. İngilizce gramer yapılarını öğrenirken corpus destekli alıştırmalar kullanılması
İngilizce gramer becerimi arttırdı.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum ←————→ Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1 2 3 4 5 6

7. İngilizce gramer yapılarını öğrenirken corpus destekli alıştırmalar kullanılması
İngilizce gramerini öğrenmemde kendime olan güvenimi arttırdı.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum ←————→ Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1 2 3 4 5 6

8. İngilizce gramer yapılarını corpus destekli alıştırmalarla öğrenmeyi ders kitabı ile
öğrenmeye tercih ederim.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum ←————→ Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1 2 3 4 5 6

9. İngilizce gramer yapılarının öğrenilmesinde, corpus destekli alıştırmalar ders
kitabından daha çok yardımcı olmaktadır.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum ←————→ Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1 2 3 4 5 6

10. İngilizce gramer yapıları öğrenilirken corpus destekli alıştırmalar kullanılması
hakkında oldukça olumlu düşünüyorum.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum ←————→ Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1 2 3 4 5 6

11. Öğretmenlerin, İngilizce gramer yapılarını, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen
Hazırlık sınıflarındaki öğrencilere corpus destekli alıştırmalar ile öğretmesini tavsiye
ediyorum.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum ←————→ Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1 2 3 4 5 6

APPENDIX C: Student Interview Questions (English and Turkish Versions)

English Version

1. Did you like using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures? Was it more boring than learning English grammar through a course book?
2. What do you think about learning the grammar structures through corpus-based activities? Is it more difficult than learning English grammar structures through a course book?
3. Did you have any difficulty in using the concordance lines to formulate the rules of the grammar structures?
4. How do you evaluate your own participation in the course while learning the structures via corpus-based activities?
5. Do you feel positively towards using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures?
6. Do you recommend that teachers should use corpus-based activities so as to teach grammar structures in EFL classes?
7. Do you think that using corpus-based activities in the learning of the grammar structures increased your confidence about learning English grammar?

Turkish Version

1. Corpus destekli alıştırmalar ile gramer yapılarını öğrenmeyi sevdiğiniz mi? Bu alıştırmalar ile gramer yapılarını öğrenmeyi ders kitabı ile öğrenmekten daha mı sıkıcı buldunuz?
2. Corpus destekli alıştırmaların İngilizce gramer yapılarını öğrenmede kullanılması hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz? Bu alıştırmalar ile gramer yapılarını öğrenmek ders kitabı ile öğrenmekten daha mı zor?
3. İngilizce gramer yapılarının kurallarını keşfetmenizde, bu yapıların cümlelerde yerlerini gösteren dizinleri kullanmakta zorluk çektiniz mi?
4. Corpus destekli alıştırmalar ile İngilizce gramerini öğrenirken derse katılımınızı nasıl değerlendirmektesiniz?
5. İngilizce gramer yapıları öğrenilirken corpus destekli alıştırmalar kullanılması hakkındaki tutumunuz nedir?
6. Öğretmenlerin, İngilizce gramer yapılarını, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilere corpus destekli alıştırmalar ile öğretmesini tavsiye eder misiniz?
7. İngilizce gramer yapılarını öğrenirken corpus destekli alıştırmalar kullanılması İngilizce gramerini öğrenmede kendinize olan güveninizi arttırdı mı?

APPENDIX D: A Sample of the Mini Grammar, grammar bank, gap-filling exercise sections from the Course book

Mini Grammar Section (Passive Voice)

2 GRAMMAR passive: *be* + past participle

- a Read about *The Beach* again. Underline an example of the present passive, the past passive, and the present perfect passive. How do you form the passive?
- b Look at the active sentences in the chart below and underline the verbs. What tense are they? In pairs, complete the chart with passive verbs.

Active	Passive
Films inspire people to travel.	People <i>are inspired</i> to travel by films.
Sydney Pollack directed <i>Out of Africa</i> .	<i>Out of Africa</i> <i>was directed</i> by Sydney Pollack.
They're making the film on location.	The film _____ on location.
They will release the film next year.	The film _____ next year.
Thousands of fans have visited the country.	The country _____ by thousands of fans.

- c  **p.140 Grammar Bank 6B.** Read the rules and do the exercises.

*Grammar Bank Section (Passive Voice)***6B** the passive: *be* + past participle

A lot of films are shot on location.	My bike has been stolen.
My car is being repaired today.	You'll be picked up at the airport.
<i>Death in Venice</i> was directed by Visconti.	This bill has to be paid tomorrow.
She died when the film was being made.	

- We often use the passive when it's not clear or important who does an action, e.g. *My bike has been stolen* (= Somebody has stolen my bike. I don't know who.)
- If you want to say who did the action, use *by*.

Gap-filling Exercise Section (Passive Voice)

6B

a Correct the mistakes in the highlighted phrases.

Lada cars made in Russia. are made in Russia.

- 1 A new motorway is being build at the moment.
- 2 The film based on a famous novel.
- 3 This programme were watched by millions of people.
- 4 My bag was stole when I was in Florida.
- 5 The Harry Potter books were written for JK Rowling.
- 6 I couldn't send you an email because my computer was repairing.
- 7 You will taken to your hotel by taxi.
- 8 Oh no! Our flight has being cancelled.
- 9 English is spoke in this restaurant.
- 10 Seat belts must wear at all times.

b Rewrite the sentences with the passive.

They sell cold drinks here. Cold drinks are sold here.

- 1 They subtitle a lot of foreign films.
A lot of foreign films _____.
- 2 Someone threw the letters away by mistake.
The letters _____.
- 3 Some people are painting my house.
My house _____.
- 4 They have sold all the tickets for the concert.
All the tickets for the concert _____.
- 5 They will play the match tomorrow.
The match _____.
- 6 Somebody must pay this bill tomorrow.
This bill _____.

APPENDIX E: A Screen Shot of Some Concordance Lines from COCA

CORPUS OF CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN ENGLISH					
425 MILLION WORDS, 1990-2011				COMPARE RESULTS: COCA COHA TIME BNC	
KEYWORD IN CONTEXT DISPLAY					history
					Help / information / contac
DI	15	2010	SPOK	Fox_Beck	A B C remember my grandparents used to watch the " 700 Club, " and they were inspired by this man. But over the last several years, Pat Robertson has said
SE	16	2010	SPOK	CNN_Behar	A B C . BEHAR: Really? BENATAR: Mm-hmm. BEHAR: And that you were inspired as when you were a bank teller by Liza Minnelli. Did she come into
ST	17	2010	MAG	PopMech	A B C , an organization that, yes, creates robotic musical instruments). They were inspired by the work of Mark Pauline, whose Bay Area group Survival Research L
W	18	2010	MAG	MotherEarth	A B C 63202 " I hope that many other readers were inspired and will use the valuable information to create their own honeybee colony. " Monoculture
(S)	19	2010	MAG	TownCountry	A B C The jewel-toned Devi Ratn's copper-trimmed rooms, latticed windows, and black-river-stone bathrooms were inspired by 18th-century Indian observatories. '
C	20	2010	MAG	TownCountry	A B C partner (and Miss Porter's classmate), Courtney Moss, and I were inspired to launch Glamourpuss. We wanted something a little bit more glamorous and fem
P	21	2010	MAG	USAToday	A B C mastodons were not only a source of food. In Europe, early people were inspired by these impressive beasts and depicted them in cave paintings and miniat
LIS	22	2010	MAG	MotherEarth	A B C 'Keeping Bees Using the Top-Bar Beekeeping Method' (October/November 2009). We were inspired to do more research and planning (some would say plott
R	23	2010	NEWS	WashPost	A B C an organization that helped homeless veterans and was even feted by military groups who were inspired by his stories from the Vietnam War. # In an intervi
SE	24	2010	NEWS	AP	A B C from the skies, far away, but from Hometown, U.S.A. # Some were inspired by the U.S. involvement in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, federal prosecutors s
SH	25	2010	NEWS	CSM	A B C her performance at a press conference afterward. " I realized how much people were inspired by me. " Indeed. The throngs that rose to their feet to applaud
I	26	2010	NEWS	CSM	A B C of education. Despite the long running time, Ms. Hisa says the teens were inspired . " The actual opera was an amazing experience, " says Steven Mayorga,
SO	27	2010	NEWS	Houston	A B C ago, just as the Christian MMA scene began to get popular. Both were inspired by fighters-turned-pastors who used metaphors such as " hitting the devil sever
AN	28	2010	NEWS	NYT	A B C . ' In a phone interview, Mr. Weitz said that Harry's problems were inspired by his own experience of finding that success " threw things out of whack in
	29	2010	NEWS	Chicago	A B C same artists. The musicians working in the traditional album model - maybe they were inspired by consistent reports of its demise amid a rising online-driver
	30	2009	MAG	PsychToday	A B C organization? Everyone. Not only did they owe it to Gary, they were inspired by his generosity and really wanted him to succeed. The event raised so much
	31	2009	MAG	RollingStone	A B C catwalks into the crowd and a pair of drum kits. " The drums were inspired by seeing Genesis, " says Nick. " That was amazing. " The
	32	2009	MAG	Atlantic	A B C , and, as Gooch shows, many of her stories' outlandish elements were inspired by actual events. O'Connor declared self a realist, albeit one pushing " toward
	33	2009	MAG	TownCountry	A B C big jewelry. Because we were designers and not gemologists, and because we were inspired by the Golden Age of Hollywood, we made fine jewelry that look
	34	2009	NEWS	SanFrancisco	A B C seems wise beyond his years. He says many of the album's lyrics were inspired by a box of newspapers dating back to the ' 20s that he found at

APPENDIX F: Corpus-Based Activities (Concordance Lines, Leading Questions,
Exercises)

Concordance Lines (Passive Voice)

1. bed is known as a St Ursula bed. The design **was inspired** by the Carpaccio picture of "The Dream
2. ausescu fell. He and a few of his colleagues **were inspired** by the early struggles of Solidarity in P
3. nducting a wedding ceremony, but nothing **was stolen**. Father Maire was said to have received
4. was involved in a fighting incident, a letter **was sent** by the principal to the parents describing
5. from which so few were to return; Kemper **was being shot** down; Armistead was falling as he
6. pt watching me coolly. I had the sense that I **was being watched** by two different people at

7. "DHSS should ensure that all general managers **are made** aware of all the possibilities for economy
8. into the shell lip with a hacksaw. The groove **is repaired** but the " scar" remains. It
9. with a " salvage' title from Georgia. The car **is sold** to SOM Auto Broker, which resells it to
10. ls of the mantle are damaged. Damaged shells **are repaired**, but the later-
11. Astronomer Carl Sagan may not believe we **are being visited** by aliens. But at the same time the
lable and unfilled whilst social support **is being paid** to an immobile work force. Wherever possible
13. you will see progress. By the roads that **are being built**, including one that will reach
14. old, and they just cannot maintain it. It **has been painted** by many great artists, including
15. porter waved a sign declaring, " Our votes **have been stolen**. " # The Democrats have been using

16. in cash upon completion and the balance **will be paid** in the form of a loan note redeemable on 1st
17. YITZHAK SHAMIR: If such a decision **will be taken** by anybody, any foreign body,
18. ttern. If the growing lip is damaged it **will be repaired**, but the scar remains. As the animal grow
19. tr and producer met for lunch. The film **will be shot** in Blackpool, the director's
20. donow that ultimately the history of Russia **will be written** by Russians and the future of

21. the street? These are the questions which **must be answered** by American politicians, not to divert
22. when or how to wear the garment. This shirt **must be worn** as an overshirt,' reads t
23. Yeah. I think there are two things that **have to be said**. First of all, as people are saying, it's more
24. he cost of operating a business: Taxes **have to be paid**, and just as fuel and power bills are borne,

*Leading Questions (Passive Voice)***Task 1 : Analyze the concordance lines above and answer the questions.**

1. How do you form the passive in English?

2. By analyzing the concordance lines, write

One example of the past passive: _____

One example of the present passive: _____

One example of the present perfect passive: _____

One example of the future passive: _____

One example of the present continuous passive _____

One example of the past continuous passive: _____

3. After examining the concordance lines for ' the passive', what can you say about the reason why the passive is used?

4. if you want to say who did the action, we use _____.

Exercises (Passive Voice)

A. Look at the active sentences below and underline the verbs. Decide what tense they are. Then, transform the sentences into the passive forms.

1. They are making very extensive changes in the internal structure of this hospital under the direction of the Trustees.

-Very extensive changes _____ in the internal structure of this hospital under the direction of the Trustees.

2. According to the sources, the government has picked up a number of middle-rank military officers and some younger ones.

-A number of middle-rank military officers and some younger ones _____ by the Government, according to the sources.

3. They will almost certainly release the announcement today.

-The announcement almost certainly _____ today.

4. Both the Presidents, Mr. Adams and Mr. Jefferson successively visited us.

-We _____ successively by both the Presidents, Mr. Adams and Mr. Jefferson.

5. After he repaired the engine, he set about getting the rest of the ship to move.

-After the engine _____, he set about getting the rest of the ship ready to move.

B. Correct the mistakes in the *highlighted* phrases.

1. No words **have to say** at the moment. _____
2. There is no one here to care for her. Something **must decide** to help her.

3. The materials **will organize** around four basic choices. _____
4. Several people **have taken** away in ambulances. _____
5. I **visit** daily by crowds of curious people. _____
6. The Autobiography of Willie Mays **wrote** by her two years ago.

Concordance Lines (Relative Clauses)

1. n my presence during the round table): " I choose the artists who do something that makes sense for
 2. em for an anonymous tourist but for someone known to him who visited his home. As our conve
 3. services. During my fieldwork I interviewed several people that believed they had been healed by s
 4. t she tells a personal story. Its stray hairs belong to a person that cannot be identified, let alone a p
 5. her good or ill to be born rich, you must adopt a profession which will afford you a subsistence and
 6. who turn databases into worlds, I will describe a community that has taken a virtual world and
 7. mple, the current definition excludes hESCs from an embryo that fails to develop to the blastocyst
 8. a workshop in the city center, just behind Jairos Jiri, a store where curios are sold to tourists.
 9. icson liked the idea of having a murderer on the same street where he himself lived.
 10. o the postwar human sciences as well. But this is a question whose answer lies beyond the scope of
 11. eb " of Nasrallah's fond imaginings, Israel remains a country whose citizens are willing to defend it
 12. abused. " * Chew your idea or assignment over with someone whose writing you admire. This is Y
 13. ing me and most of us here, I imagine, and it's the rare writer whose early journals aren't embarrass

Leading Questions (Relative Clauses)

Task 1: Analyze the concordance lines above and answer the questions.

1. Look at the concordance lines, and try to complete the sentences.

- We use _____ for people, _____ for things, and _____ for places.
We use _____ to mean 'of who/of which'.

2. Look at the concordance lines, and try to complete the sentence.

- We can use **that** instead of _____ or _____.

3. What do you think about the reason why we use the relative clauses in English?

Exercises (Relative Clauses)

A. Complete with *who, which, where, or whose*.

1. Those were the houses _____ people slept and ate.
2. The singer _____ was also a dancer died yesterday.
3. John met a woman _____ husband was arrested two days ago.
4. We will visit London, _____ there are lots of things to see.
5. They are devices _____ make decisions for people.
6. He is a kind of person _____ uses different means of finding answers to such troubling questions.

B. Correct the mistakes in the *highlighted* words.

1. She lives in a country **which** people speak many different languages. _____
2. There are also numerous third-party websites **where** provide data on objects in-world such as Wow Head and Wow Wiki. _____
3. The Village Virus, **who** has poisoned America, is now poisoning Canada.

4. He was the actor **who** girlfriend was murdered two years ago. _____
5. The football player **which** has blue eyes has broken his leg. _____

Concordance Lines (Third Conditional)

If Clause

1. what would have happened to her **if she had stayed** in Savannah with them. It would have destroyed
 2. money would have arrived too late **if we had not followed** all the standard procedures. I think the
 3. they would not have seen her **if they had not gone** into business. " Start somewhere, anywhere, he
 4. Still, I would have looked closer **if I had known** what saints were depicted, what background, what
 5. that he might have recognized it **if the journalist had been** a naturalist. The " waste " was an expanse
 6. what I would have ordered you to do **if I had known** anything about it, and then do that. " She took
 7. "I would have met you long before now **if you had gone** to Clearwater. " Jerry asked if he could hold
 8. I never would have met the people here **if it had not been** for HOURS. The only problem that I see
 9. we might have missed something **if we had had** only the networks to rely on. # I heard one of the
 10. you might have died suddenly **if I had not arrived** to cover you with my poncho. " Tomason care
 11. What I could have watched on TV last week **if we had had** cable. # Twenty minutes pass, and I get
 12. they could have seen my bed **if they had looked** in that direction. KEEP OUT. I didn't want them

The Result Clause

1. what **would have happened** to her if she had stayed in Savannah with them. It would have destroyed
 2. money **would have arrived** too late if we had not followed all the standard procedures. I think the
 3. they **would not have seen** her if they had not gone into business. " Start somewhere, anywhere, he
 4. Still, I **would have looked** closer if I had known what saints were depicted, what background, what
 5. what I **would have ordered** you to do if I had known anything about it, and then do that. " She took
 6. "I **would have met** you long before now if you had gone to Clearwater. " Jerry asked if he could hold
 7. I never **would have met** the people here if it had not been for HOURS. The only problem that I see
 8. he **might have recognized** it if the journalist had been a naturalist. The " waste " was an expanse of
 9. we **might have missed** something if we had had only the networks to rely on. # I heard one of the
 10. you **might have died** suddenly if I had not arrived to cover you with my poncho. " Tomason care
 11. What I **could have watched** on TV last week if we had had cable. # Twenty minutes pass, and I get
 12. they **could have seen** my bed if they had looked in that direction. KEEP OUT. I didn't want them t

Leading Questions (Third Conditional)

Task 1 : Analyze the concordance lines above and answer the questions.

1. Look at the concordance lines. How do you form the **if clause** of the third conditional in English? To make a **if clause** sentence in third conditional, we use **if** + _____.

2. Look at the concordance lines. How do you form **the result clause** of the third conditional in English? To make a **result clause** sentence in third conditional, we use _____ + past participle.

3. What do you think about the reason why third conditional sentences are used in English?

4. Look at the concordance lines. It can be noticed that the result clause can contain '_____' and '_____' in addition to '**would**'.

Exercises (Third Conditional)

A. Look at the sentences below and complete them by using third conditional.

1. If I _____ him coming I _____ the other way. (**see, go**)
2. It _____ more damage if the bullet _____ a higher caliber. (**do, be**)
3. She _____ any of those things to upset her father if she _____ how sick he was. (**not do, know**)
4. If you _____ me you were coming I _____ you. (**tell, warn**)
5. If you _____ to expose me, I _____ myself. (**come, kill**)

B. Match the Phrases.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. If I had made that kind of money, | a. if I had given him my phone number. |
| 2. If she had known how to dance, | b. she would have come to the Salsa night with us. |
| 3. They would have answered more questions, | c. we would not have waited so long to open the door. |
| 4. If we had not forgotten the key, | d. if they had studied hard. |
| 5. He would have called me, | e. I would have bought a home by now. |

Concordance Lines (Question Tags)

1. anger publicly. He's president of the Miss America Organization, **isn't he?** The world of an equal m
 2. You apparently are having a conversation with Claudine Radcliffe, **aren't you?** It would be a simple
 3. Iraq. We're very different than what the Republicans are saying, **aren't we?** The second question s
 4. ered by it. This is not some great pep rally thing we're doing, **is it?** Well, I don't know that
 5. It does not mean that people will pay more for their insurance, **does it?** In fact, they'll end up
 6. difference here. Senators get treated better than other people, **don't they?** Is that so unreasonable
 7. The files were not taken out of the office without signing a log, **were they?** Do you have any- Is that
 8. ele of Florida formed the Tax and Budget Commission in 1988, **didn't they?** Everything in
 9. r you had spent. It was to study the state's budget and tax system, **wasn't it?** I think if it's
 10. We have seen real people receive real money and real returns, **haven't we?** The county plan also
 11. History has shown that these negotiations have to be conducted, **hasn't it?** A systematic and n
 12. I will never. When you get out of here, you will not do anything, **will you?** I am not smoking ciga
 13. He will not walk away from people with pre-existing conditions, **will he?** He will not walk away f
 14. out that. And it's an enormous success. We'll talk about that too, **won't we?** Are you- are the wife
 15. s. If they had not wanted you to run, you would not have been sick, **would you?** That's what I'm as
 16. in private employment, there would be a statute of limitations, **wouldn't there?** and I offer no
 17. e out having problem. You can tell that Mommy and Daddy love her, **can't you?** We'll be down t
 18. occupy us atmosphere. Is that where we're headed? WE cannot afford it, **can we?** Well, I think we

Leading Questions (Question Tags)

Task 1 : Analyze the concordance lines above and answer the questions.

1. How do you form a question tag in English?

To form a question tag, we use:

- the correct auxiliary verb, e.g. _____ for the present, _____ for the future, etc.
- a pronoun, e.g. he, _____, _____, _____, etc.
- a _____ tag if the sentence is positive, and a _____ tag if the sentence is negative.

2. Look at the concordance lines. How do we form the question tag if it is negative?

3. After examining the concordance lines for 'question tags', what can you say about the reason why a question tag is used in English?

_____.

Exercises (Question Tags)

Look at the sentences below and write tag questions by using correct auxiliary verbs.

1. They are going to compel you to buy a more expensive car, _____?
2. She will end up paying a little bit less, _____?
3. The writer does not condone what Torry Hansen did, _____?
4. When it was all over, she was dead, _____?
5. This absolutely proves that smoking does not help you lose weight, _____?
6. They have done everything they can to try and run them over, _____?
7. We can hear this cheering all the way in Washington, DC, _____?
8. He is going to do everything he can to deflect that, _____?
9. The President will not walk away from the American people, _____?
10. If Martin Luther King Jr. were alive, he would march on this White House,
_____?

Concordance Lines (Indirect Questions)

1. d but that's only speculation. I do not know. [Do you know if](#) they were having any personal
 2. ken his heart, who had kept secrets from her. [Do you know if](#) she was seeing anyone else?
 3. protestingly to the third floor, he asked: [Could you tell me if](#) there's a place with medical
 4. Unidentified Woman 6: I don't believe it, but [could you tell me if](#) I have kids or if I'm marr
 5. s, Belgium. Hello Yes, good evening. Sylvia, [can you tell me whether](#) I'm going to have
 6. ell, Walter, I met this cute guy last night. [Can you tell me whether](#) I should go for it? # F
 7. n a medication that's potentially addictive. [Can you tell me whether](#) you notice my perso
 8. . familiar. I feel like I've seen it before. [Do you know whether](#) it symbolizes anything? "

9. To go over to him. Excuse me, Mr. Bialik, I said, [could you tell me what time](#) it is?' " "
 10. side, school shooter, very vague emails. SAMMON: [Do you know what time](#) the e-mail
 11. ets of the Bill Collectors. " 2nd BILL COLLECTOR: [Do you know what time](#) she'll be in
 12. awaken you when he knocked, Tina? " # " No. " # " [Do you know what time](#) it was whe
 13. ial. " Adrian bit his lower lip, then pressed on. " [Could you tell me what](#) is
 14. me of one detail about what was found in the house. [Do you know what](#) I'm talking about
 15. my pad and look up. " OK, what about the hair dye? [Do you know what](#) color it was? "
 16. tossed it to the floor. " I'm looking for Gwynet. [Could you tell me where](#) she is, please"?
 17. as certain a minute ago that he was Bill Peterson. [Do you know where](#) you live? Helen a
 18. ed on what he imagined to be a businesslike smile. [Do you know where](#) I can find him?
 19. hat. I know The Chronicle frowns on diatribes, but [can you tell me where](#) I can get a co
 20. allied pilots, most of whom had been brutalized. [Can you remember where](#) you saw t
 21. :30, and woke my wife, who hadn't expected me: " [Can you remember where](#) I put my

Leading Questions (Indirect Questions)

Task 1 : Analyze the concordance lines above and answer the questions.

1. Look at the concordance lines below, and try to guess the original question sentences. One example was already given to you.
 - Can you tell me if I'm going to have any children? Am I going to have any children?
 - Do you know whether they were having any personal problems?
_____?
 - Could you tell me if there's a place with medical care?
_____?

*After writing the original question sentences, now try to write how the indirect questions are made from these original questions.

- If a question begins with an auxiliary verb (e.g., **Are you a teacher?**, **Is it a dog?**), we add _____ after 'Could you tell me?', 'Do you know.....?', 'Can you remember.....?', and 'Can you tell me.....?'
2. Look at the concordance lines below, and try to guess the original question sentences. One example was already given to you.
 - Could you tell me what time it is? What time is it?
 - Can you tell me where I can get a copy of this report?
_____?
 - Do you know where you live? _____?

a. What happens to the subject and verb when the **WH- question** is made into an indirect question?

- If a question sentence begins with a Wh- question (e.g., **What is it?**, **Where are you?**), we add **What /Where / What time** + _____ + _____ after 'Could you tell me?', 'Do you know.....?', 'Can you remember.....?', and 'Can you tell me.....?'

b. What happens to the subject and verb when the **yes/no question** is made into an indirect question?

- If a question sentence begins with a **yes/no question** (e.g., **Are you studying English?**, **Does she know me?**), we add **if/whether** + _____ + _____ after 'Could you tell me?', 'Do you know.....?', 'Can you remember.....?', and 'Can you tell me.....?'

*Exercises (Indirect Questions)***A. Make indirect questions.**

1. Is she having a boy or girl?
Could you tell me _____?
2. Where is the meeting taking place?
Do you know _____?
3. What time did the exam start?
Can you remember _____?
4. What will she buy for her mother?
Do you know _____?
5. Has he saved enough money to buy a car?
Can you tell me _____?

B. Are the **highlighted phrases right or wrong. Correct the wrong ones.**

1. Could you tell me **where is the bus stop**? _____
2. Do you know **if there will be an exam**? _____
3. Can you remember **what time are they going to eat**? _____
4. Do you know **where did Maria get that dinosaur toy**? _____
5. Can you tell me **if Mr. Harris is working today**? _____