




THE INTEGRATION OF CORPUS-BASED APPROACH WITH EFL ACADEMIC WRITING IN THE SAUDI CONTEXT



 **Abdulaziz Ali Al-Qahtani**

*Assistant Professor of English at the University of Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.
Email: aalqahtani@uj.edu.sa*



ABSTRACT

Article History

Received: 14 August 2020
Revised: 17 September 2020
Accepted: 9 December 2020
Published: 6 January 2021

Keywords

Corpus
EFL
Language technology
Arab students
Learner corpora
Data-driven learning DDL
Writing skills
Earning autonomy
Collocations
Vocabulary learning.

This study aims to identify the role of integrating technology in enhancing the use of language. The impact of utilizing the corpus-based approach (CA) on EFL learners' academic writing is investigated; highlighting the effects of this integration on L2 learning and writing approaches. The competence development in EFL academic writing skills is asserted by tackling the contextual factors that influence corpus integration. This qualitative study is based on (10) case studies on non-native students in EFL academic writing courses. The corpus approach in this study was implemented during the fourth year of their English undergraduate program in the first semester of the academic year 2019/2020. Five different instruments were used to achieve the study purposes. The findings indicate the positive effect of incorporating corpus and its use in EFL students' academic writing development and language awareness. The lexico-grammar integration has also been promoted significantly. The corpus-based approach enables participants to solve the problems they encountered while writing independently. Students also gain more confidence and become more autonomous and independent EFL writers. In this study attention is drawn to the participants' language and learning background experience as factors that can shape the students' progress and success in corpus implementation. The distinctive role of general corpora in association with the development of the academic writing skills is further highlighted. It is hoped that that the current study will reinforce the tendency of incorporating grammatical language aspects such as collocations and phrasal verbs in the writing pedagogy process.

Contribution/ Originality: This study signifies the connection between teaching practices and technology integration approaches, which can be challenging, especially in the Arab region context where corpus linguistics is not a widely researched topic. Furthermore, since the study highlights individual students' experience, it deepens the understanding of integrating corpus approach in EFL contexts, in particular tertiary education.

1. INTRODUCTION

Teaching English for nonnative learners has been a major challenge that has evolved over history in terms of pedagogical approaches, techniques, implementation methods and educational tools. The advancement of technology has brought different and new insights to the language teaching and learning. Employing technology to enhance the language use has become a crucial concern in the language pedagogy. In the field of EFL, particularly teaching of writing there has been a great change. A good writing command is increasingly assumed to be crucial to prepare educators for success in the 21st century. Furthermore, in the light of the new numerical-data derived world, writing is now identified as one of the essential needs for proper communication (Hyland, 2003).

Accordingly, for [Jahin \(2012\)](#) writing is seen as a measurement for the academic success in the educational institutions. Hence, it is the medium that encourages thinking and learning by motivating people to communicate their thought ([Mekheimer, 2005](#)). Mainly, in the teaching process, writing serves as a productive tool that enhances other receptive and productive learning skills. In the EFL context, writing is one of the major skills that need to be developed and trained. Despite its importance, for many EFL learners, writing is generally considered as a difficult and complex task that needs a compiled balance of multiple skills such as vocabulary usage, grammar accuracy, content preference, organizational structure, punctuation, spelling and other mechanics ([Erkan & Saban, 2011](#); [Zacharias, 2007](#)). In the light of the increased emphasis upon the EFL writing skills, many studies have been evolved and conducted to assert the various learning approaches and strategy evolvement. In the context of EFL, technology is one of those approaches that emerged effectively in teaching and learning in general and writing in particular. According to [Abdel-Haq and Ali \(2017\)](#) “technology has had a massive impact on almost every facet of our life, and EFL learning and teaching in general” (p.14).

Teaching and learning in the educational contexts have been reinforced via technology where numbers of researchers emphasized that importance of integrating computer technologies in classrooms. These technologies have shown the positive influence on the educational outcomes and performance. New online applications and programs have brought new prospective into language learning and teaching ([Alshumaimeri, 2011](#); [Noytim, 2010](#); [Yang & Meng, 2013](#)). Technological literacy is now a crucial need for both teachers and students. In teaching writing, the emergence of technology has greatly contributed to creating more effective opportunities for EFL learners to improve their writing outcomes ([Ismail, Al-Awidi, & Almekhlafi, 2012](#)). Accordingly, integrating different technologies in writing classes has been depicted in a number of literatures such as ([Elola & Oskioz, 2010](#); [Fageeh, 2011](#); [Kutlu, 2013](#); [Miyazoe & Anderson, 2010](#)). [Qureshi and Akhter \(2019\)](#) illustrated that “With the emergence of the computers, there have emerged innovations in the theory and practice of the teaching and learning of the EFL vocabulary” p. 505. Hereupon, with the advancement age of the Internet along with the modern communication tools including Facebook and Twitter, the students are enabled with more chances to enhance their writing skills with more technological opportunities breaking the conventional teaching methods ([Mozaheb, Seifoori, & Beigi, 2013](#)).

The ability of storing huge amount of data via technology to be accessible at any time has made an outbreak in the teaching approaches with the presence of the CA use. By this approach, language data is stored in a digital format with the concordance power as an analysis tool ([Breyer, 2009](#)). In fact, the emergence of corpus has gained a wide acceptance in terms of language teaching and learning by widening the outstanding prospective of EFL teaching skills including vocabulary, grammar, reading and writing. Despite its great influence, the study of the CA in association with specific EFL language skills has been neglected in nonnative Arab studies. In response, this study utilizes the use of corpus in teaching EFL academic writing for non-native EFL students in terms of impact, challenges and the prospective factors.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. *What is Corpus Approach?*

With the increased drawbacks of the traditional methods of EFL teaching and learning, especially in the academic writing field, there was a tremendous need to explore different approaches that can provoke the teacher-centered classroom conventions. Interacting with the learners to be more active participants in the language acquisition, the process has gained a major concern where they can be more confident and responsible. The independence from the CA makes it a good fit for such purpose especially in teaching EFL. [Qureshi and Akhter \(2019\)](#) emphasize that “corpus is a recent innovation not only in foreign language teaching but also in all fields of linguistics. Its contribution in the field of applied linguistics is an “established” phenomenon (p. 508). [Sinclair \(1991\)](#) defines corpus as “a collection of naturally occurring language text, chosen to characterize a state or variety

of a language” (p. 171), whereas Aarts (1989) defines it as “a collection of samples of running texts which may be in spoken, written or intermediate forms of any length” (p. 45). Both definitions highlight the main characteristics of a corpus as a set of natural compilation of language that is stored electronically. In a simple way, a corpus can be further defined as a collection of texts (Kilgariff, 2014).

There are some examples of popular large-scaled English corpora such as BNC (the British National Corpus), which is powerful authentic language data (Aston, 1998). Other examples are the ANC (the American National Corpus) and COCA (the Corpus of Contemporary American English). As a web-corpora with more than ten billion words, enTenTen15 is a compilation of internet-data that belongs to TenTen corpus (Qureshi & Akhter, 2019). The selection of corpora in this study is for the Collins COBUILD Corpus which was adopted by Yoon (2008). A sampler of different concordances and collocations is provided in the Collins COBUILD website [<http://www.collins.co.uk/Corpus/corpussearch.aspx>].

2.2. Corpus-Based Approach in EFL Teaching

Nowadays, the EFL teaching environment has transformed drastically. Thanks to modern technology, most people are now relying more on it for every aspect in their life including work and study. The educational institutions are competing to integrate technology in the learning and teaching strategies. The learning approaches are now more convenient, flexible, mobile and experienced models. With the internet invasion, the CA has sparked the outstanding merits that learners can sustain their learning abilities and enhance EFL classroom’s effectiveness and efficiency.

There is an increasing interest in the great value of using corpus in language teaching where in the context of EFL, learners can gain a better source of proper language and authentic learning (Ackermann & Chen, 2013; Bahardoust, 2013; Huang, Chen, Tsao, & Wible, 2015; McEnery & Hardie, 2012; O’Keeffe & McCarthy, 2010). With regard to the relationship between EFL writing and the corpus use, many researchers have pointed out that CA is crucial to developing learners’ writing skills whether directly or indirectly (Chen & Deng, 2019; Lu, 2019; McKay, 1980a; Wang, 2018). In contrast with the native speakers’ problems in association with the language learning, the EFL learners suffer more to grab the essence of the target language writing to make it understood and sound more natural. Qureshi and Akhter (2019) argued that with the teacher-centered approach of the EFL, teachers and the learners are left with little autonomy that can hinder the EFL learning. Most EFL learners further encounter problems related to vocabulary selection especially when working upon their writing texts. Actually, they do not have a strong back of lexical expressions hence their native language has the main influence. In this vein, Kennedy (1998) further assert the CA role in dealing with EFL language difficulties and more other branches of linguistics. The corpus effect upon the learners’ autonomy in the learning process is highlighted hence this was not applicable with the traditional methods before.

For exploring how EFL students perceived incorporated CA activities and lessons, Sun and Wang (2003) conducted a study on Taiwanese college EFL students. The majority of the students reported positive feelings towards web-based concordance for helping them to gain information about the single words and phrases’ natural usage. Similar to this assumption, Breyer (2008) investigated the teacher’s role in the use of corpora and the challenges that meet the teachers by indicating that teachers have to be well trained on using corpora inside the classroom. Accordingly, Wu, Witten, and Franken (2010) assisted a system that used a web-derived corpus with different participants and illustrated how it was useful for increasing the collocational knowledge in writing. The study was worth mentioning, because the participants had direct access to a pre-processed and filtered collection of concordances in the revision process of collocational use in their writing tasks. Similarly, Reynolds (2016) partially incorporated direct corpus use in a writing course, where students self-edited their essays for verb-noun errors. Furthermore, Yilmaz and Koban (2020) indicated the effectiveness of CA teaching in oral production, and the need for learners to be engaged with the real language data, corpus data, to improve their pragmatic competences.

With reference to the collocation role in the corpus process, Hunston (2002) emphasizes the corpus contribution in EFL context through retrieving wordlists and other collocations. Hereupon, the learners' who achieved results in forms of concordance will facilitate their writing process. Furthermore, Leech (1991) suggest that both teachers and learners have to develop their corpora by implementing the corpora reference and multiple registers when interacting with EFL texts. Qoura, Hassan, and Mostafa (2018) indicate the CA program effectiveness upon reinforcing EFL writing skills and learners' self-autonomy; targeting the student at different education faculties. Respectively, the CA paves the way for lexical approach's investigation in terms of both methodological foundations and pedagogical implications where it differentiates between vocabulary and lexical usage. The Lexical approach also supports the notion of the existence of meaningful chunks in terms of language; where these chunks are compiled to coherent texts. The corpora advocates have been an argumentative issue. The corpora use can provide a powerful tool for learners to explore the authentic language patterns providing the necessary information as collocations and colligation (Bernardini, 2004; Hunston, 2002; Meunier, 1999). Furthermore, the CA language teaching has potential to motivate learners. It promotes the learners' autonomy which is highly valued in terms of language pedagogy (Aijmer, 2009; Kaltenbock & Mehlmauer-Larcher, 2005).

2.3 The Corpus Implications in Teaching EFL

For Bennett (2010) there are three ways for incorporating corpora into teaching language. These ways are: (1) corpus-influenced materials through the classroom textbooks and materials which are based on the obtained patterns and frequency from corpora; (2) corpus-cited texts including dictionaries and grammar books based on corpus data; (3) corpus-designed activities which include data driven learning. For Yoon (2008) "many corpus studies have focused on genre-based text analysis and materials development; however, few studies have examined students' writing experiences in association with corpus use" (p.31). Another issue that needs to be highlighted in using the CA in teaching writing for English for Academic Purpose (EAP) is selection of corpora. Most previous studies explored it in terms of specialized corpora and not as general ones hence general corpus can be as much helpful as the specialized one and can play a crucial part in (EAP) classrooms. This stipulates the fact that for many EFL teachers, there are some free- access general corpora where teachers do not need to construct their own. Considerably, the general corpora can make outstanding outbreak in teaching English writing for academic purposes (EAP).

In a study of students' behavior when using a corpus, and their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of corpora as an EFL writing tool, Yoon and Hirvela (2004) emphasize that the learners generally perceived the corpus approach to be beneficial for the development of EFL writing skills and to increase their confidence in EFL writing. Respectively, Nam (2010) studied how CA language learning enabled EFL learners to develop their lexical vocabulary in writing. The study results indicated that there were some identified differences in the ESL writing quality. Similarly, Yoon (2005) examined impact of the corpus implementation upon the students' writing quality experiences and their EFL competence. The study found that as the CA was conducted through the writing process, the students acquired more autonomy in approaching the linguistic resources. In another context, Tseng and Liou (2006) tested the effect of corpus search output in improving the accuracy of conjunctions in EFL writing. The participants in the study used online conjunction materials based on corpora for one month. The results revealed significant improvement in conjunction use after the online teaching as well as the overall writing quality enhancement.

In terms of types, there are two corpora. The first is corpus-based learning (CBL) where the language teacher uses the corpus and the students read and interpret the data given to them. The second is the data-driven learning (DDL) which refers to students' independent searching via online including collocations, concordance and colligation. Corpus-based approach is working with various tools that perform different functions including wordlist, concordance, keywords, to name only a few. On the contrary, data-driven learning, Sinclair (1991) argues,

benefits learners more efficiently if they became more independent in analyzing the language data from a corpus or a data-driven learning (DDL) technique. Sinclair stated the importance of this implementation in terms of enabling learners to analyze the concordance line searches, classify and organize the data for the sake of editing that acknowledge attention to the patterns of the language use. Based upon these patterns, the learners themselves can fulfill the missing elements in their search of concordance.

Accuracy in grammar is one such need in the writing process; examining grammar teaching through corpus-based is rare in literature. Vannestål and Lindquist (2007) examined the EFL students' attitudes towards grammar and the impact of using concordances. Studying grammar via corpora appears to be a useful approach in students' grammar instruction, whereas some students are particularly weak and find difficulties in studying with corpora. In the same vein, Varley (2009) investigates how corpora improves the students' vocabulary and grammar. The results indicate that the corpora are acknowledged as being helpful for students to learn the use of a certain language since it allows students to examine the language features in context. However, in a different context, Girgin (2011) studied the effect of using corpus-based activities on EFL learners who have lower level in learning grammar structures. The study revealed that learners were effectively able to use CA activities in order to learn the target grammar structures of English. Also, it was indicated that the lower level students had neither negative nor positive attitude regarding the CA activities in grammar learning.

Gilmore (2009) examined the effect of conducting online corpora training for learners to help them in revising their essays. 45 students' errors were highlighted and then students were asked to revise their second writing drafts by using online corpora. The results indicated that the second writing drafts of the students were more natural after the implementing the corpora changes. Ashouri, Arjmandi, and Rahimi (2014) further asserted that the direct CA collocation instruction can be a worthy alternative hence the results of their study showed that the experimental group students built an awareness of the existence of collocations and how to be used. Li (2017) investigated the role of direct CA in learners' collocational competence in academic writing. The study was conducted with two groups of Chinese postgraduates who had no previous knowledge or experience of corpora. The essays were analyzed regarding the learners' collocational use and verb-preposition collocations. The results revealed a significant improvement in the use of collocations, including a higher rate of accuracy or naturalness, and an increased use of academic collocations and fixed phraseological items.

2.4 The Corpus Integration Benefits

As an important linguistic tool, the corpus benefits encounter both teachers and students. They enable teachers to grasp their student's frequent errors while interacting with texts or conducting assignments. The learners, on the other hand, are becoming more autonomous by developing the skills identifying the occurrence of these errors. Language professionals of L2 have widely acknowledged the potential advantages of corpora in language learning and teaching. According to Wang, Liu, and Wang (2018) "corpus and concordances can provide them with feasibility and possibility for mobile, experienced teaching and learning" (p.1).

The results of earlier studies indicate that students have positive attitude towards learning vocabulary through using corpus-activities (Gaskell & Cobb, 2004; Thurston & Candlin, 1998). Thurston and Candlin (1998) discover that learners have positive reaction regarding using corpus-based sources in vocabulary learning. However, they also find that some students have negative reactions due to the authentic academic texts' difficulty. Teaching collocations facilitates the learning of the language by increasing the student's proficiency. Therefore, Lewis (2000) assert a direct influence of teaching the language collocation especially on the field of EFL writing learning. The EFL learners suffer problems in combining words together; therefore, the corpus collocation can be the solution. According to Sinclair (1991) the importance of corpora relies upon the fact that they contribute directly to language functions implications through their usage by creating different reference materials and other textbooks. The corpora's potentials in language teaching and learning were also investigated by a number of researchers (Aston,

1998; Braun, 2007; Conrad, 2004; Hunston, 2002). They were represented as valuable resources and innovative teaching tools. This stipulates the need for teacher to be more knowledgeable regarding using concordance, collocation, colligation software and to be trained to analyze and interpret the retrieved corpora data. Lee (2011) recommended the need for teachers to develop their CA resources that can work as a partial solution to their classroom problems. With the CA, the teachers can save their time and energy.

Furthermore, the corpora can be helpful in teaching the metalinguistic awareness aspects demonstrating their usefulness. According to Coxhead and Nation (2001) “the metalinguistic awareness indicated that; to know a word, it is necessary to know not only its dictionary definition, but also to know its spelling, morphology, parts of speech, pronunciation, variant meanings, collocations, specific uses, and register related contexts of use” p. 60. Therefore, the corpora can also be more effective in teaching vocabulary skills that are a part of metalinguistic awareness such as synonyms and frequencies. Balci and Çakır (2012) asserted that teaching vocabulary through collocations and CA enhanced the vocabulary learning process more than traditional techniques.

To sum up, the corpus approach research findings are generally encouraging. However, the corpus use approach in the EFL academic writing is still underemphasized and has a promising future forward.

3. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Despite the importance of improving EFL writing skills, the EFL learners in general and EFL Saudi learners in particular do not focus upon these skills. Previous studies in the Saudi context mostly focused on analyzing English textbooks by using the CA analysis approach without giving ample attention to the learners’ perception such as (Aldera, 2017; Almujaivel, 2018). Mostly, in the EFL countries including Saudi Arabia, success in English at schools and universities is measured depending on the accuracy of their writing products. This is because, to the large extent in these countries, the educational system adopts product-oriented prospective. It can be noticed that despite the students’ learning success, they may achieve low scores in their writing assignments. Most of EFL learners fail to express their ideas clearly hence they lack the necessary EFL writing skills. Unfortunately, the Saudi learning environment is not fertile environment to conduct the CA in EFL writing learning. The teacher-centered environment haunted the EFL learning process with much effort and tasks on the educator’s behalf. The learners also, on the other hand, suffer lack of motivation under the force of their L1 effect.

The current paper is an attempt to fulfill the existing gap in literature in different aspects regarding the CA. It examines the writing process in terms of EFL teaching in association with corpus technology integration over a time period. It further investigates the effect of corpus integration use upon the student’s involvement in terms of the linguistic configuration in EFL writing classes; utilizing it as a method by which they can approach L2. It may be a challenging matter especially in the Arab context since corpus linguistic is not widely taught or explored in literature. Different educational implications can be aroused as a result of such integration where CA can help EFL undergraduates to achieve better learning outcomes and to become independent English learners. As a result, this study will be targeting EFL undergraduates; getting use of their familiarity with the English in their academic writing classes where CA can be utilized and applied throughout the multi-writing assignments. Focusing on the individual students’ experience within the learning context will enrich our understanding and deepen the study analysis of integrating the CA in EFL classrooms and, in specific, in tertiary education. Therefore, the evolved study questions will be as follows:

- How can EFL university students implement CA in their L2 academic writing classes?
- How can the CA integration affect EFL university students in terms of L2 language learning and writing approaches?
- What are the contextual factors that can affect the CA influence upon the EFL students’ writing?

4. METHOD

The current study adopted the qualitative approach to examine EFL students' writing progress over an extended period of time by using the CA. It focused on 10 case-study participants out of 25 in an advanced EFL writing class. The participants were all Arab students and were all from Saudi Arabia but from different regions. The 10 students were chosen at the beginning of the course reflecting diversity in writing experience and technology literacy to become the research main focus. The current study traced and examined the learning progress in their independent corpus implementation and their L2 writing development after finishing the writing course. The study further focused upon the students' independent corpus implementation outside their writing courses context. In this regard, it is somehow a response for other studies' recommendations in the field of corpus approach use.

This study took place in a tertiary education setting, specifically in an advanced EFL writing course at University of Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. The study scope focused upon the students who are enrolled in studying English in the language department. The final writing course for the students in the fourth year of the undergraduate bachelor degree was selected for this study deliberately. The course was taught by a Saudi non-native English lecturer who had a previous experience in learning and teaching English writing by using CA extensively through his postgraduate study in USA. One year prior to the current study, the preliminary study was conducted, with the assistance of the same lecturer, for the purposes of research design development and enhancement.

The participants' responses asserted the corpus implementation and their feedback and evaluation of its reflected value on their writing assignments in L2. The evaluation assessment included their corpus search logs, their emailed assignments and the initial interviews phase, their corpus search logs and their corpus implementation while writing. The advanced EFL writing course took place every week with two meetings of one and half hour time-period for approximately fourteen weeks. For the purpose of this study, the choice of the advanced writing course and the students in their fourth year was ideal hence the teacher will not pay extra effort for teaching the writing basics and principles. Accordingly, the incorporation of the CA in the curriculum can take part in the course regular activities. Through this study setting, more focus was directed to the general structure of the academic writing by following the main writing conventions. The participants, as undergraduate students, had the freedom to choose their own topic and to form their own writing contents based on their interest to encourage and motivate them.

The Saudi students, in their English courses, are not very familiar with the implementation of corpus technology, not in this stage of education or the previous ones at school. Therefore, the lecturer in the writing course used one of the available free online English corpora, the Collins COBUILD Corpus. To represent the common general issue of the language, these general corpora were used to utilize the language actual representativeness rather than the specialized ones as [Kaltenbock and Mehlmauer-Larcher \(2005\)](#) stated that "the corpus results always depend to a large extent on size and composition of the corpus" (p.76). The characteristics of The Collins COBUILD corpus make it a good fit for such study since it is more accessible and mainly size-adequate.

The Collins Corpus is an analytical English database with over 4.5 billion words based upon a careful design of a sampling methodology. Accordingly, as a corpus which was evolved over years and updated every month, it has a wide range of written materials from different websites, known newspapers and magazines and published books around the world along with multi identified spoken material from radio, TV and everyday conversations. The monthly updates assess the Collins' editors to identify new words and meanings from the moment they are first used. The website of Collins COBUILD [<http://www.collins.co.uk/Corpus/corpussearch.aspx>] provides a sample of different concordances and collocations. A number of selected concordance lines can be drawn randomly to observe the most frequent collocations statistically. The sampler facilitates the search by offering instructions although some technical skills needed to utilize the concordance and collocate the search process. Furthermore, and

hence the corpus is utilized as word class technology, the search would be easier by focusing upon parts of speech (e.g. Search “use/ ADJECTIVE”).

The lecturer’s role was to ensure the students’ integration of the corpus use in their writing assignments. This implies the need of the students to become responsible upon their corpus search according to their chosen research topics and to send the outcome they encounter to their lecturer’s email twice a week. The lecturer, with the aid of the researcher, can combine the student’s results by printing handouts that can be shared regularly to the students for the sake of corpus shared benefit. This stipulated the need for the lecturer to provide these students with the necessary feedback for their writing errors. The students were also encouraged to solve their writing problems through conducting a regular corpus search. In the same vein, the feedback was given to those students by encouraging them to find the solution options rather than applying the direct correction. The students, in one hand, were expected to generate their own lexicon learned and evoked from their errors. They were also expected to use the corpora to enhance their sentence-level problems. The lecturer, on the other hand, took the aid of different pedagogical teaching materials (Peck & Coyle, 1999) e.g., *The Student's Guide to Writing*) and different activities to support the organizational and rhetorical aspects of the academic writing teaching.

4.1. Data Collection and Analysis

As a qualitative study, this study used a triangulation method supported with data sources to ensure the credibility of data and to obtain deep analysis and understanding of the study topic. Triangulation refers to the process of comparative data analysis using differing methodologies that can support the converge resulting in answers that reinforce each other. The data in this study was obtained from five different sources, namely, the course observation notes, semi-structured interviews, corpus logs, corpus search assignments and finally written reflections upon the implementation process of the CA. The class observation notes over 14 weeks were kept as a tool reference. The semi-structured interviews took place every two weeks resulting into 7 interview-meetings over 14 weeks where every interview session took approximately an hour. The interviews highlighted the participants’ reflections and responses regarding their CA and the problems they encountered. The interviews were recorded and transcribed into a word file for the purpose of the analysis and interpretation. Consequently, the data analysis was conducted simultaneously along with the data collection process.

4.2. Participant Background

In this study, the selected students were given a two-week extensive workshop to become familiar with the CA usage before the start of the academic semester. Furthermore, the participants’ names were replaced with pseudonymous alphabets such as (A) and (B) to ensure confidentiality. [Table 1](#) provides a detailed description of the 10 participants’ experience which asserted the cumulative understanding of the students’ writing experience.

[Table 1](#) presents the information of ten participants majoring in English or English related majors such as English translation and English literature. The English advanced writing course is a main requirement for both English education and literature students where they have to pass two preceded writing courses successfully as prerequisites with no less than 70% of the total course evaluation. Therefore, the students were assumed to be at similar, if not the same, levels of writing proficiency. Since the students were Saudi students, most of them studied the basics of English in their school but their extensive English study was through their bachelor education. Some of them were studying in private international schools where extensive effort was paid in teaching English more than their counterpart government schools. All the participants, except participant (D), did not receive a specialized English education before bachelor while participant (D) studied two diploma-years in the major of English for specific purposes (ESP).

Table-1 Participants' description

Participants	Gender	Age	Program of study	Years of learning English	Unique experience	L2 writing skills or courses	Computer literacy
A	M	22	English education	12	No	2 Previous Writing Courses (Writing 1 And Writing 2)	Low
B	M	20	English literature	15	No	2 Previous Writing Courses (Writing 1 And Writing 2)	High
C	M	20	English education	15	No	2 Previous Writing Courses (Writing 1 And Writing 2)	High
D	M	22	English education	15	ESP two years diploma	2 Previous Writing Courses (Writing 1 And Writing 2)	High
E	M	22	English literature	15	No	2 Previous Writing Courses (Writing 1 And Writing 2)	Intermediate
F	M	23	Translation	15	No	2 Previous Writing Courses (Writing 1 And Writing 2)	High
G	M	23	English education	15	No	2 Previous Writing Courses (Writing 1 And Writing 2)	High
H	M	20	English education	15	No	2 Previous Writing Courses (Writing 1 And Writing 2)	Low
I	M	22	English literature	15	Exchange students in USA	2 Previous Writing Courses (Writing 1 And Writing 2)	High
J	M	20	Translation	15	No	2 Previous Writing Courses (Writing 1 And Writing 2)	Intermediate

Participant (I) got an opportunity to be a one-semester exchanged students in USA in the third year of his study. All the participants were between the age of 20 and 23.

The researcher conducted an initial interview with all participants. Table 2 illustrates the interviewees' responses. It utilized a detailed description of students' point of views about L2 learning and their writing processes. The descriptions focused upon the grammatical confidence, writing interest in general, L1 academic writing experience, L2 writing confidence, use of L1 and L2 writing, L2 writing difficulties, L2 writing processes, L2 writing goals and finally the initial attitude of the corpus approach use.

Participant (A) had been enrolled in the English education program for the last three years because of his interest in the English language for future opportunities and communication purposes. He wanted to be an English teacher; therefore, he paid lot of attention to his study. He expressed his confidence in grammar functions and his interest in accomplishing his writing tasks. He did not have much content knowledge before his study; nevertheless, he showed L1 writing experience and L2 confidence as a result of his motivation. At the same time, he wanted to improve his writing content and overcome his problem in identifying and using idioms and language expressions properly.

Participant (B), too, expressed his interest in English writing; however, he was not very confident in terms of grammar proficiency. He also expressed his experience in L1 writing and L2 writing confidence. He was struggling to write a proper content since he did not achieve excellent grades in the previous writing courses. His aim was mainly to focus upon achieving success in good writing content. He expressed the fact that he was not learning English to work as a teacher; his aim was to start his own entrepreneurship project which requires a perfect deal of English content writing.

In contrast to participant (A) and (B), participant (C) did not show any interest in L2 writing. He was even semi-experienced in L1 and showed lack of confidence in L2 writing. He frankly spoke about his direct way to

translate his Arabic thoughts directly into writing English causing him to be subjected to lots of mistakes and language errors. His results in the previous writing prerequisites showed less progress than expected from such students in this level. He mainly expressed his wish to express his personal ideas properly and just to pass the course, no more or any less.

The strong education background had an influence on the participants. This was evident in participant (D) who had studied two years diploma in ESP program and accordingly this had given him more confidence in grammar and L2 writing. He explained that his main wish at that time was to stop at this level and not to complete his education. However, he felt happy with his positive experience in the diploma phase and decided to proceed. The assignments he took previously had shaped his experiences in the L2 writing process; however, he said he still needed to improve his overall writing structure. He also wanted to rely upon his study to sustain his writing content and future communication.

Participants (E), (H), (F) and (J) respectively shared similarities in their responses. They enjoyed writing in general and had confidence in their grammatical levels. They were regular students who studied to possess the main requirement for graduation and to obtain the necessary certificate that would enable them to enroll successfully in their future courses. Their main objective was to focus upon writing and proper content and to overcome their writing difficulties in terms of structure and organization.

The participant (G), the eldest participant, showed negative responses where he did not like writing in general and even was inexperienced in L1. For him, writing was just difficult and stressful. He had a negative experience from his school education, but he was enrolled in this study to be justified to his parents' wish as his father wanted him to travel abroad. Thus, he was not confident in writing L2. In fact, he further reported a great difficulty in L2 academic writing from the beginning. He also showed lack of confidence in grammar. For him, L2 writing was a burden that required extra hard work.

In contrary, participant (I) had a great diverse experience as a result of gaining a scholarship for an exchange program for one semester in the USA. This experience was reflected in his responses where he showed great confidence in grammar and L2 writing. His exchanged program incorporated corpus-based approach; therefore, he was the only participant who had already been exposed to corpus. He was also willing to participate in the prior study phase where he showed a positive attitude towards the corpus implementation. For him, writing in English was not difficult. He said his confidence came from his experience in writing courses. Accordingly, he did not express difficulty in writing and his main goal was to improve his English communication to the advanced level. All the participants expressed initial positive attitude with respect to the corpus use approach. In contrast, participants (C) and (E) were less motivated and had negative experience. In specific, their attitude was based upon different reasons. Furthermore, participant (C) questioned the efficiency and usefulness of this over the dictionary use while participant (E) showed less qualification in dealing with the technology issues in the search techniques.

What was obvious in this phase, is that the students' L2 writing progress was evolved as a result of their L1 academic writing experience, their L2 learning background experience and finally their pragmatic culture knowledge and experience.

5. FINDINGS

5.1. Students' Corpus approach Use in L2 Writing

This section highlights the study findings of 10 participants representing study cases. Their responses assert the corpus implementation and their feedback and evaluation of its reflected value on their writing assignments in L2. With observation, (A), (B), (D), (E) and (F) implemented the CA more frequent than (C) and (G). This was illustrated within the interviews as well as a number of corpus search logs mainly (20 pages and 12 pages on averages respectively).

Table-2 The interviews' responses

Participants	Confidence in grammar?	Enjoy writing?	L1 academic writing experience	Confidence in l2 writing?	Uses of l1 in l2 writing	L2 writing processes	Difficulties in l2 writing	Writing foci / goals of l2 writing	Initial attitude to corpus
A	Yes	Yes	Experienced	Yes	For thoughts and expression	Many drafts and revisions	Using idioms and language expressions	Good writing content	Positive
B	No	Yes	Experienced	Yes	For ideas	Many drafts and revisions	Writing a proper content	Good writing content	Positive
C	No	No	medially experienced	No	For thoughts and expressions	Little revisions	Thinking in Arabic and organization structure	Express ideas properly	Negative
D	Yes	Yes	Experienced	Yes, high	Rarely rely on l1	Whole writing composition then full revision	Writing structure	Good writing content	Positive
E	Yes	Yes	Experienced	Yes	For organizing ideas	Many drafts and revisions	Writing expression and culture	Good writing content	Unsure
F	Yes	Yes	Experienced	Yes	For organizing ideas	Many drafts and revisions	Writing expression and culture	Good writing content	Positive
G	No	No	Inexperienced	No	For thoughts and expressions	Little revisions	Weak writing contents and structure organization	General English knowledge interest	Negative
H	Yes	No	Experienced	Yes	For organizing ideas	Many drafts and revisions	Organizational structure	Good writing content	Positive
I	Yes	Yes	Experienced	Yes, very high	Rarely rely on l1	Whole writing composition then full revision	No major difficulties	Improve language and communication	Very positive
J	Yes	Yes	Experienced	Yes	For organizing ideas	Drafts then revisions	Structure and organization	Good writing content	Positive

For more clarifications, the participants (A) and (B) used the course search for all their academic purposes while studying and that included other writing assignments in different courses related to literature and linguistics. Nevertheless, the other participants showed a tendency in depending upon the search use for the present writing course only. The researcher justified that due to their studying motivation and their English studying purposes. Other factors may be due to their proficiency in using technology effectively while studying.

During the writing course and through the phases of writing and revising the assignments, the participants were seeking to optimize solutions for the writing difficulties they encountered such as word patterns and lexical

patterns. Table 3 presents some of the participants' corpus search. Many of the observation results showed a tendency to search for the preposition use, the correct usage of the selected words and contexts. The implementation incorporated their interrogations regarding the use of verb phrases and collocations, noun clauses which can be problematic for EFL language learners especially in their writing. This also exceeded the type of verbs selection in course of active and passive forms. Respectively, the verb forms were the most frequent search in the word class search illustrating that the participants had the most interest in the verb usage level.

While viewing the responses in Table 3, a higher and more frequent use of Adjectives and Nouns can be observed. Special details can be analyzed for participant (A) who showed the most frequent results in his corpus search. He focused mainly upon flourishing his content's patterns rather than focusing upon parts of speech or word class forms. As he clarified, it is part of his enthusiasm and curiosity to understand how it works. His search differed from the other participants who focused upon the substantial aspects of language including the sentence structure, the lexical class form of nouns and prepositions.

It is noticeable that, while participant (A) showed a clear interest in using corpus, other participants focused more upon using it as a tool to solve their pragmatic problems. Their responses showed contradictive opinions what they needed but still were not convenient for them. The participant (C) rightly illustrated, "it brought me faster solutions, that's it. It was not interesting for me". In the same regard, (F) explained that "it was helpful in writing my assignments. It might work for all my future assignments. I hope". This also signifies that the participants' frequent use of corpus appears to be related to the tasks they were obliged to accomplish.

Table-3. The participants' corpus search examples

Purpose	A				D			
	Item	Remark	Helpful	Time	Item	Remark	Helpful	Time
Contexts use	Interested	in?	yes	10 m	seem	+ clause?	yes	2m
	Related	to?	yes	10 m	obscure		yes	20s
	possess a quality	of + ing?	yes	15 m	consist		yes	30s
	negotiation	need with?	yes	5 m	evaluate		yes	6m
	memorizing	considerable/-ly?	yes	6m	blame	also prep	yes	30s
	(noun? /verb?)							
	evaluating							
	(noun? /verb?)		no	10m				
	in the same time? / at the same time?		no	12m				
consist	passive							
V+ N	water (noun)			3 m	struggle		no	15s
	support			1m	experience		yes	2m
	employ		need what?	1m				
Adj + N	fluency	good?	yes	11m	approach		no	20s
Adv + adj	quiet?	quite	yes	4m				
	completely?	helpful?	yes	25s				
Adv + V	advanced?		yes	25m	strongly?	agree	yes	1m
V + adj	appeal	difficult?	yes	8m				
N+ N	window? frame?	helpful	yes	2m				

Table 4 illustrates the numbers of each participant's writing assignments in the study phases. It signifies that at least nine to twelve assignments were assigned for each one in the first phase. The other assignment from the other courses which are not related to the writing course varied considerably.

Table-4. Participants' writing assignments

Participants	1 st phase	2 nd phase
A	6 course evaluation assignment and 10 weekly journals for the course requirements. 6 articles for other three courses	2 research papers, 1 article review, 1 paper presentation
B	6 course evaluation assignment and 10 weekly journals for the course requirements. 2 major articles 1 proposal	2 research papers, 1 article review, 1 paper presentation
C	6 course evaluation assignment and 10 weekly journals for the course requirements. 2 articles review	1 short research paper 1 article review
D	6 course evaluation assignment and 10 weekly journals for the course requirements. 2 reflection papers	1 short research paper
E	6 course evaluation assignment and 10 weekly journals for the course requirements. 1 article review	1 short research paper
F	6 course evaluation assignment and 10 weekly journals for the course requirements. 2 article reviews	1 short research paper 1 article review
G	6 course evaluation assignment and 10 weekly journals for the course requirements. 3 journal review	1 short research paper
H	6 course evaluation assignment and 10 weekly journals for the course requirements.	1 short research paper
I	6 course evaluation assignment and 10 weekly journals for the course requirements. 1 paper presentation	1 short research paper
J	6 course evaluation assignment and 10 weekly journals for the course requirements.	1 short research paper 1 article review

Although participant (J) and (H) showed positive attitude towards the CA, they did not use it wide often. The participant (J) stated that it is because he only needed it when there were major assignments; where teachers were focusing highly upon the elevated language level. He added also that somehow his English improved over years of studying in the English program so it might be easier now than ever before. On the other hand, (H) stated that he did not have a lot of written tasks that can force him to use the corpus every time. It seemed that the confidence level also stipulated the level of the use of the corpus. Nonetheless, they asserted that they planned to implement corpora more often when they encountered more writing assignments and formal complicated writing tasks later.

Although (G) showed a negative attitude towards implementing corpora in the initial phase, his attitude turned to be positive with an increased frequent use. The frequent usage gave him more encouragement to practice as well as to accomplish his tasks successfully and independently. This reinforced the fact that the English language learners need to integrate technology and expose to it frequently to overcome the inconveniences of the resulted challenges. This unfortunately was not applicable for all participants; hence, (C)'s lower English level hindered his progress in the CA. He even needed a lot of time to practice the integrated search technology to use it properly later in his assignments. This was because he kept questioning whether his search was correct or not and always needed help in interpreting the analysis results. After all, his attitude turned to be positive later.

The positive resulted sign is that those who showed noticeable negative attitude such as (C) and (G) turned to reflect positive altitude later. In fact, (G) showed more frequent corpus usage over the practice time. His search logs

reached up to 4 exceeding his peers who reached up to 2 search logs only. It could be seen as the resulted expected since the researcher had indicated that less advanced EFL students should rely more upon support of new technologies or extra enrichment materials and dictionaries. Therefore, (G) depicted a noticeable progress.

In their corpus implementation, the participants tried to use the corpus search either within their assignment writing or in the revision phase. Some participants showed extensive frequency of the CA usage in the composing phase such as (A) and (B); while those of less frequency used it in their revisions. In more details, (E) reported that he could only use the search in the revision phase; hence his first draft was handwritten and he had to retype it to become applicable to use it in the search. With reference to the participants' point of view, most of them asserted the benefit of the corpus usage in terms of facilitating sentence patterns and context usage. Furthermore, it assisted the participants by providing the necessary help in contextual writing. The question that emerged here stipulates the role of corpora in language learning. The participants' comments enlightened this sense where (F) emphasized that he did not see this as a part of language learning since he had to check and review his writing different times, therefore, he did not realize any linguistic progress. There was no progress in his learning level. He said, (his response was transcribed and translated from Arabic into English):

For me, all what I was doing was a form of guessing and checking my English background, hence, I had to recall some phrasal verbs out of my memory instead of learning new ones. Even by using the corpus, I tried to use my memory rather than thinking and guessing the words in advance (Interview 2.)

Other participants questioned the importance of thinking, analyzing and interpreting the data, and questioned which should come first. (C) states that:

Really, to some extent, I am confused. I feel that I am counting on my prior knowledge rather than learning new. When analyzing the corpus data output, I become hesitant if my prototype search is correct or not (Interview 4).

Consequently, the prior knowledge can assert people's language acquisition. In this regard, CA requires a certain background in terms of grammar and word composition and knowledge of sentence structure. It is difficult to imagine that by looking at students' corpus behavior it is possible to determine that corpus helped to expand their learning. Some participants though used corpus as a dictionary to check their linguistic patterns. They mainly did not use it to learn new phrases or expressions. This was not surprising as they were after all still non-native EFL learners.

Another benefit of corpus is that it offers the participants with more psychological advantage regarding language learning. This was found by checking their assignments which gave them more confidence in their writing level. The participant (B) asserted that "by using the corpus to check my writing problems, I feel so confident and happy especially when I realized that they are correct". Furthermore, (E) emphasized that when "I had a freedom to choose up to 40 sentences which were all correct, this made me more comfortable and feel positive about the language". This profoundly reflects the overall language learning especially regarding L2 writing. However, there is a contradiction which was illustrated previously by the participant (I) that the advanced level of English proficiency may lead to the decline of the corpus usage.

5.2. Advantages of Corpus-Based Approach

Most participants were concentrating upon combining vocabulary and grammar interchangeably; meaning that dealing with words to form the meaning and using grammar to link between these words. At the end of the study, grammar was viewed through the collocation:

All what we learned through the corpus use was evolving around using collocation; mainly we learned grammar in the form of collocations. We have learned to use stands up "for" not stands up "in" or any other form. They all are collocation (Interview 7).

Most of the students writing problems, as being EFL learners, were often related to grammatical problems rather than the word usage. The CA gave them more insight to integrate language with the word usage where they can be combined properly for the sake of language improvement and positive lexico-grammar perception. In fact, the corpora sustained these students to address their writing problems meaningfully.

Increasing the participants' awareness of the importance of collocations, was another benefit of the CA. Realizing the importance of understanding collocations and their usage in writing enabled the participants to pay more attention to their writing patterns and the words combination. This surpassed the writing learning into learning reading and speaking as well. (A) claimed that he started paying much more attention to the collocations since beginning usage of corpus. In one of the reflections notes, (A) emphasized:

Since English is not my native language, I always paid much attention upon understanding the major context rather than focusing upon the words pattern and collocation and the words use. After proceeding in this study, I shifted my interest for more focusing upon the language aspects. (Interview 1).

In all, the use of corpus has many benefits in terms of implementation in L2 EFL writing class. These benefits evolved from the improvement of the positive attitude in dealing with the corpus in terms of solving the various language problems and difficulties. It increases their language awareness in terms of identifying the importance of collocations and the other word usages. This also might enhance the learner's confidence towards language learning. In the initial phases of the study, the main writing difficulties that encountered the participants were located into three main purposes: 1) unfamiliarity with the pragmatic culture of L2, 2) inadequate knowledge of the target language and 3) insufficient content knowledge. During this study, the participants showed noticeable improvements in some of these difficulties, however, they are still reporting difficulties in terms of inadequate knowledge of the target language since they are still EFL learners.

In the second phase, the participants expressed more confidence in writing even those who showed less interest in phase one. Their success was mainly attributed to different factors such as incorporating in the writing course that was a CA and the positive writing experience and reinforcement of the language usage. For (B) and (C) the positive experience from implementing the CA was reflected upon their writing progress. For them, writing in the second phase of the research became easier and error free. Despite the positive attitude in general, some participants expressed their disappointment of repeating some grammatical mistakes. The participant (G) tried to minimize the frequency of the grammatical writing mistakes. He also explained his lack of expressions and new collocations varieties. Mainly he had to rely upon his backup brain memory and the familiar old expressions:

The writing problems are not the same. It is much easier now. However, I still have to search for prepositions and some collocations. I will try hard to integrate them not only in my writing assignments but also in all my study assignment with the help of the corpus use (Interview 5).

To sum up, the corpus usage in L2 writing manifested different advantages. The participants gained better words usage and had confidence in terms of the target language use. The CA helped the participants to overcome their writing difficulties. Furthermore, the participants indicated the need to implement it in other courses and not to be limited to the academic writing course only.

Through the overall process of the participants' writing experience including drafting, composing, and revising was not affected by the CA. Nevertheless, there were minor changes. The participants tried to devote extra emphasis upon the word usage and collocation during writing and revising. The CA use helped them to integrate a self-editing step which gave them more speed and confidence in writing. The participant (A) reported a change by using corpus, not only in the process, but also in the quality of his writing hence the CA has given him more confidence in his writing:

My writing style did not change, but since I kept checking my writing with the corpus, the quality and process of my writing has changed drastically. I had to check my writing now before handing it to my lecturer and that gave me more confidence. (Interview 3)

The introduction of the CA in the writing process has enabled the participants to be more responsible for their writing through checking the possible options and using the correct collocations. Now they can approach their academic writing with more confidence and deliver error free assignments.

6. DISCUSSION

The aim of the current study was to explore the effects of CA implementation on the EFL students' L2 writing experiences. The study findings emphasized the positive effect of the CA in reinforcing the EFL language awareness which is reflected positively upon the participants' approaches in learning L2 writing. Despite their corpus frequency use, the participants showed respective improvements in terms of using collocations and common usage expressions in English. Hence, the CA aided the students with the needed language through their learning stages. Although the current literature indicates the effectiveness of corpora in language teaching, there are still few studies that hint at challenges faced by teachers and learners during their usage of corpora. These challenges might hinder the usefulness of corpora. The result here is not constituent with Maddalena (2001) who indicated that it was not very useful to use concordance lines in teaching for a number of reasons suggesting to conduct such study but with advanced learners who are interested in the way that language works.

The gradual improvement in the participants writing took time hence it was not a direct shift of change. The participants first got to the habit of using the CA and become more familiar in conducting the necessary writing by checking while composing their writing assignments. The participants were more cautious regarding the quality of their work because they were given many correct choices to polish their writing. Instead of just writing drafts and later checking them up, the participants became more independent to take over both while composing. The sense of responsibility and confidence were achieved since these participants got familiar to the fact that the CA will be their continuous backup, so they did not have to worry regarding their assignment's quality anymore. Of course, the overall satisfaction enabled their language learning control over the difficulties they encountered in that domain. Girgin (2011) lined with the current study that the corpus program increased the students' Language learning Autonomy.

The participants, as EFL learners, have major difficulties in terms of being non-native English speakers. Their writing difficulties will be mainly upon the linguistic aspects of the language as well as the language usage in the context of the academic discourse. It is true that they all are students from English related departments but again the influence of their native language affected their composing hence some of them are still with the habit of thinking in their L1 and transmit these thoughts into L2 writing. Given the fact that they took two previous writing courses, it is not enough in the academic context to achieve the necessary academic English writing skills. But later, after the corpus implementation, the confidence in their writing made it easier for them to grab the main needed skills and to polish their writing. The struggle with the linguistic feature will remain a major challenge for these participants as EFL learners.

In terms of L2 writing research and pedagogy, the research literature asserts the importance of the global discourse aspects of the language such as content and the rhetoric but in combination with grammar and lexical accuracy. The linguistic domain can be a challenge for language learners where they have to keep constancy between their content and grammar. Most Arab teachers focus upon teaching grammar without giving their students a sense of the needed linguistic demands of the L2 especially in the field of writing. A major concern therefore should be paid to those aspects in order to sustain EFL students to be competent academic writers. In this vein, implementing technology such as the corpus search would serve as a promising pedagogical tool for L2 writers to encounter their linguistic writing problems. The corpus approach can enhance the linguistic features functions and understanding along with rising the learners' language awareness as it was in line with other studies as Lee (2011).

It is concluded therefore that the learners' background and language experience has shaped their access to CA and their language expressions selections along with analysis and interpretation. This consequently leads to corpus resources exploitation. The participants' experience in this study served as a factor that shaped the study findings in terms of CA. These factors include the student's proficiency level in English language in general and their L2 writing course in specific, their writing interest, their grammatical level, the availability of time, the nature and numbers of their writing assignments. These factors shaped the CA response and appeal hence the efficiency of this implementation can be measured in terms of the participants' engagement interest as well their need-based attitude. The study in this prospective is in line with other researchers who asserted some differences in the effect of corpus approach use on language learning related to personal backgrounds, such as language proficiency and familiarity with the new approach (Turnbull & Burston, 1998; Yoon & Hirvela, 2004).

There were a few limitations of the study. First, due to the nature of the qualitative study approach, the findings of this study cannot be generalized; moreover, there were a limited numbers of participants. However, a qualitative approach provided a considerable knowledge about the process of writing in the context of EFL tools and supplementary technology. Another limitation of this study was that it focused upon the participants experience while using the CA without concentrating upon their writing outcome. Likewise, one limitation was related to the nature of the participants since they were all non-native Arab students and did not show any diversity. Future research may target more participants from different non-native Arab countries.

6.1. Implications for Pedagogy

The pedagogical implications in this study can be employed in terms of L2 teaching and in the context of EFL learning. This implies the integration of the corpus technology into language instructions addressing the discourse aspects in writing as well as the language use itself. This asserts the need for educational approaches and techniques that can help to assist the language learning in the long-term rather than focusing upon the traditional class tactics especially in a nonnative culture where pragmatic competence can be challenging. Another implication of this study is the focus on the learner's interdependency in learning. The confidence and responsibility the participants achieved in this study enabled them to be responsible of their language learning in terms of checking and editing. This further stipulates the role of both the teacher and the students in the learner-centered environment. This can assert a pedagogical benefit in terms of language learning and approaches to L2 writing.

The focus on collocation and the language use was one of the corpora benefits which enabled L2 learners to acquire conventional use and fluency in isolation from studying grammatical roles. This asserts a strategy to combine the grammatical features with the language along with language use and instructions. The combination of both factors can enhance language L2 practices in teaching writing.

These implications can also be applicable to the language teachers elsewhere especially in the EFL classrooms. They have to pay considerable notice to the learner's background experience and the difficulties they encounter in learning a language as nonnative students. The teacher's role in the corpus implementation is challenging. One major cause for the gap between the actual reality within the EFL and what should be is done is the lack of the teachers' awareness of the capabilities offered by corpora and data-driven learning (DDL) activities. As a result, the teachers need a specialized use of corpus and (DDL) training in order to assist their EFL teaching and to help their students learn the structure and authentic use of the four language skills. However, some studies indicate the teachers' doubt about using corpora in teaching (Neff, 2001; Simpson & Mendis, 2003). Therefore, they avoid encouraging teachers to plan their tasks or classroom activities by using corpora. They only indicted the corpora benefit in terms of solving problems that the EFL or nonnative speakers encounter in writing while learning English.

Finally, the study asserts the need to integrate technology as a tool to assist language learning especially in teaching writing. Since the world is characterized with a rapid technology revolution, this technology should

mainly play an integral part in facilitating the language usage worldwide. There is also a crucial need to place alternatives for the sake of learners' benefit that incorporate means of technology such as the CA. This is also was reinforced in various literature as in (Ismail et al., 2012).

7. CONCLUSION

A corpus-based approach in teaching is assumed to be helpful for both teachers and learners in terms of providing the language which is actually being used by native speakers. The student's exposure to rich corpus data will widen their horizons to become more pragmatically competent. When combined with other skills, CA in teaching can yield long-lasting learning. The results of the present study indicate the participants' positive attitude of utilizing the corpus-based approach in the EFL writing skills. It has proven to be a significant potential in terms of EAP writing contexts. Accordingly, the CA can be estimated as being effective in achieving the goals of the present study.

Integrating the corpora as a linguistic resource helps students to allocate immediate and long-term solutions for their encountered EFL writing problems. Furthermore, it stimulates the learners' interest to become more independent, responsible and autonomous writers with the aid of this technology. The achieved experience out of such integration will be reflected upon the learner's overall writing development. The positive impact of utilizing CA in EFL teaching writing ascertains the need for more learner-oriented classrooms where learners become self-autonomous, more involved, more confident and responsible for their learning. Furthermore, courses on corpus linguistics should be acknowledged in teacher education programs to train future language teachers to employ CA within their EFL classes and in writing classes in particular.

Based upon the study findings, the researcher suggests conducting further future studies regarding the effect of the CA on developing EFL writing skills in comparison to other categories of EFL language skills such as reading in Saudi or any other nonnative contexts. Moreover, there is a need to conduct other researches with other EFL language learners such as high school students or employing further deep analysis on the EFL teachers' role in accordance with the corpus approach use.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The author declares that there are no conflicts of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

Acknowledgement: The acknowledgment is for the EFL Saudi academic students for their participation in this study.

REFERENCES

- Aarts, B. (1989). Verb-preposition constructions and small clauses in English. *Journal of Linguistics*, 25(2), 277-290. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022226700014109>.
- Abdel-Haq, E. M., & Ali, H. S. (2017). Utilizing the corpus approach in developing EFL writing skills. *Journal of Research in Curriculum Instruction and Educational Technology*, 3(2), 11-44. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.21608/jrciet.2017.24458>.
- Ackermann, K., & Chen, Y. H. (2013). Developing the academic collocation list (ACL): A corpus-driven and expert-judged approach. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(4), 235-247. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.08.002>.
- Aijmer, K. (2009). Introduction: Corpora and language teaching. In K. Aijmer (Ed.), *Corpora and language teaching* (pp. 1-10). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Aldera, A. S. (2017). Teaching EFL in Saudi Arabian context: Textbooks and culture. *Journal of Language and Teaching and Research*, 8(2), 221-228. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0802.03>.
- Almujaiwel, S. (2018). Culture and interculture in Saudi EFL textbooks: A corpus-based analysis. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(2), 414-428.

- Alshumaimeri, Y. (2011). The effects of wikis on foreign language students writing performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 28, 755-763.
- Ashouri, S., Arjmandi, M., & Rahimi, R. (2014). The impact of corpus-based collocation instruction on Iranian EFL learners' collocation learning. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 2(6), 470-479.
- Aston, G. (1998). What corpora for ESP? In M. Pavesi & M. Bernini (Ed.), *Language learning at the University: Special Languages* (pp. 205-226). Roma: Bulzoni.
- Bahardoust, M. (2013). Grammatical collocation in writing production of EFL learners. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 9(1), 266-279.
- Balci, Ö., & Çakır, A. (2012). Teaching vocabulary through collocations in EFL Classes: The case of Turkey. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 1(1), 21-32. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2012.v1i1.31>.
- Bennett, G. R. (2010). *Using corpora in the language learning classroom: Corpus linguistics for teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bernardini, S. (2004). Corpora in the classroom. How to use corpora in Language teaching (pp. 15-39). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Braun, S. (2007). Designing and exploiting small multimedia corpora for autonomous learning and teaching. In: Hidalgo, E., Quereda, L. and Santana, J. (Eds.), *Corpora in the Foreign Language Classroom: Selected papers from TaLC 2004* (pp. 31-64). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Breyer, Y. (2009). Learning and teaching with corpora: Reflections by student teachers. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 22(2), 153-172. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220902778328>.
- Breyer, Y. (2008). Learning and teaching with corpora: Reflections by student teachers. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 22(2), 153-172. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220902778328>.
- Chen, Y., & Deng, F. (2019). Book review: Corpus approaches to evaluation: phraseology and evaluative language. *Pedagogical Research*, 4(2), em0030. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/5767>.
- Conrad, S. (2004). Corpus linguistics, language variation, and language teaching. In J.M. Sinclair (Ed.), *How to use corpora in language teaching* (pp. 67-85). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Coxhead, A., & Nation, I. S. P. (2001). The specialized vocabulary of English for academic purposes. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purpose* (pp. 252-267): Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Elola, I., & Oskioz, A. (2010). Collaborative writing: Fostering foreign language and writing conventions development. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(3), 51-71.
- Erkan, D., & Saban, A. (2011). Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in Turkish tertiary-level EFL. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 13(1), 163-191.
- Fageeh, A. I. (2011). EFL learners' use of blogging for developing writing skills and enhancing attitudes towards English learning: An exploratory study. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 2(1), 31-48.
- 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.
- Girgin, U. (2011). *Corpus-based activities at lower levels of EFL proficiency: The effectiveness of using concordance lines on grammar learning*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Bilkent University, Turkey.
- Huang, P., Chen, C., Tsao, N., & Wible, D. (2015). The development of a corpus-based tool for exploring domain-specific collocational knowledge in English. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 12(2), 117-141.
- Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ismail, S., Al-Awidi, H., & Almekhlafi, A. (2012). Employing reading and writing computer-based instruction in English as a second language in elementary schools. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(12), 265-274.
- Jahin, J. H. (2012). The effect of peer reviewing on writing apprehension and essay writing ability of prospective EFL teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(11), 60-84.

- Kaltenbock, G., & Mehlmauer-Larcher, B. (2005). Computer corpora and the language classroom: On the potential and limitations of computer corpora in language teaching. *ReCALL*, 17(1), 65-84.
- Kennedy, G. (1998). *An introduction to corpus linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Kilgariff, A. (2014). Corpora in English language teaching. Retrieved from <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/corpora-english-language-teaching>. [Accessed January 11, 2018].
- Kutlu, Ö. (2013). Using technology for developing writing in an ESP class. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 267-271. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.064>.
- Lee, S. (2011). Challenges of using corpora in language teaching and learning: Implications for secondary education. *Linguistic Research*, 28(1), 159-178.
- Leech, G. (1991). The state of the art in corpus linguistics (pp. 8-29). London: Longman.
- Lewis, M. (2000). *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach*. Hove, UK: Language Teaching Publications.
- Li, S. (2017). Using corpora to develop learners' collocational competence. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21(3), 153-171.
- Lu, H. (2019). *A study on corpus-based EFL vocabulary teaching*. Paper presented at the 3rd International Seminar on Education Innovation and Economic Management (SEIEM 2018). Atlantis Press.
- Maddalena, S. R. (2001). An Investigation into how corpus analysis may be used in the second language classroom to solve some of the problems surrounding non-native speakers' understanding of seemingly synonymous Words. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED458795.pdf>.
- McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus linguistics: Method, theory, and practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McKay, S. (1980a). Teaching the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic dimensions of verbs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14(1), 17-26.
- Mekheimer, M. (2005). *Effects of internet-based instruction, using webquesting and emailing on developing some essay writing skills in student teachers*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Cairo University.
- Meunier, F. (1999). The pedagogical value of native and learner corpora in EFL grammar teaching. In: Granger, S., Joseph, H. & Petch-Tyson, S. (Eds.), *Computer Learner Corpora, Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching* (pp. 119-142). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Miyazoe, T., & Anderson, T. (2010). Learning outcomes and students' perceptions of online writing: Simultaneous implementation of a forum, blog, and wiki in an EFL blended learning setting. *System*, 38(2), 185-199. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.03.006>.
- Mozaheb, M. A., Seifoori, Z., & Beigi, A. B. (2013). Effective Iranian EFL writing teachers (a technology-based framework). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 18-27. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.034>.
- Nam, D. (2010). *Productive vocabulary knowledge and evaluation of ESL writing in corpus-based language learning*. Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University.
- Neff, J. (2001). *A contrastive study of qualification devices in native and nonnative argumentative texts in English*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics, February, 2001: St. Louis, MO.
- Noytim, U. (2010). Weblogs enhancing EFL students' English language learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 1127-1132. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.159>.
- O'Keeffe, A., & McCarthy, M. (2010). *The Routledge handbook of corpus linguistics*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Peck, J., & Coyle, M. (1999). *The student's guide to writing: Grammar, spelling and punctuation*: Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Qoura, Y. A., Hassan, B., & Mostafa, A. (2018). The impact of corpus-based program on enhancing the EFL student teachers' writing skills and self-autonomy. *Journal of Research in Curriculum Instruction and Educational Technology*, 4(1), 11-53. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.21608/JRCIET.2018.24488>.
- Qureshi, A. H., & Akhter, S. (2019). Core English vocabulary for EFL learners: A corpus-based perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(2), 505-512.

- Reynolds, B. (2016). Action research: Applying a bilingual parallel corpus collocational concordancer to Taiwanese medical school EFL academic writing. *RELC Journal*, 74(2), 213–227. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688215619518>.
- Simpson, R., & Mendis, D. (2003). A corpus-based study of idioms in academic speech. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(3), 419–441.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1076/call.16.1.83.15528>.
- Thurston, J., & Candlin, C. N. (1998). Concordancing and the teaching of vocabulary of academic English. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17(3), 267 – 280.
- Tseng, Y.-C., & Liou, H.-C. (2006). The effects of online conjunction materials on college EFL students' writing. *System*, 34(2), 270–283.
- Turnbull, J., & Burston, J. (1998). Towards independent concordance work for students: Lessons from a case study. *On-Call*, 12(2), 10–21.
- Vannestål, E. M., & Lindquist, H. (2007). Learning English grammar with a corpus: Experimenting with concordancing in a university grammar course. *Recall*, 19(3), 329–350.
- Varley, S. (2009). I'll just look that up in the concordancer: Integrating corpus consultation into the language learning environment. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 22(2), 133–152.
- Wang, X. (2018). *Effect of a corpus-based grammar teaching method in the Chinese EFL environment*. Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Education, Economics and Management Research (ICEEMR 2018). Atlantis Press.
- Wang, X., Liu, C., & Wang, Y. (2018). Empower English teachers with corpus in EFL classroom. *International Journal of Contemporary Education*, 1(1), 27–35. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.11114/ijce.v1i1.3202>.
- Wu, S., Witten, I., & Franken, M. (2010). Utilizing lexical data from a web-derived corpus to expand productive collocation knowledge. *Recall*, 22(1), 83–102. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344009990218>.
- Yang, Y.-F., & Meng, W.-T. (2013). The effects of online feedback training on students' text revision. *Language Learning & Technology*, 17(2), 220–238.
- Yilmaz, N., & Koban, K. D. (2020). Developing pragmatic comprehension and production: Corpus-based teaching of formulaic sequences in an EFL setting. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(1), 474–488. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.712880>.
- Yoon, H. (2005). *An investigation of students' experiences with corpus technology in second language academic writing*. Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University.
- Yoon, H. (2008). More than a linguistic reference: The influence of corpus technology on L2 academic writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 12(2), 31–48.
- Yoon, H., & Hirvela, A. (2004). ESL student attitudes toward corpus use in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 257–283. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.06.002>.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2007). Teacher and student attitudes toward teacher feedback. *RELC Journal*, 38(1), 38–52. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206076157>.

Appendix A

Observation Consent Survey

To achieve the study purposes, the academic writing course will be observed regarding implementing the corpus in EFL writing courses. The class activities will be documented to identify the corpus perception in EFL writing instruction in terms of use and interaction.

Name: _____

Signature Date _____

Appendix C.

Transcribed Interview

A.	Since English is not my native language, I always paid much attention upon understanding the major context rather than focusing upon the words pattern and collocation and the words use. After proceeding in this study, I shifted my interest for more focusing upon the language aspects.
B.	By using the corpus to check my writing problems, I feel so confident and happy especially when I realized that they are correct. It is about grammar and vocabulary. I think this is the major issue. I found the corpus implementation is helpful and I think I will try to repeat using it in my other assignments.
C.	My writing style did not change, but since I kept checking my writing with the corpus, the quality and process of my writing has changed drastically. I had to check my writing now before handing it to my lecturer and that gave me more confidence.
D.	Really, to some extent, I am confused. I feel that I am counting on my prior knowledge rather than learning new. When analyzing the corpus data output, I became hesitant if my prototype search is correct or not.
E.	I had a freedom to choose up to 40 sentences which are all correct, this made me more comfortable and feel a positive common language sense. The writing problems are not the same. It is much easier now. However, I still have to search for prepositions and some collocations. I will try hard to integrate them not only in my writing assignments but also in all my study assignment with the help of the corpus use
F.	It was helpful in writing my assignments. It might work for all my future assignments. I hope. I felt much comfortable and more secure of handing an assignment to be error free. I feel it is helpful but what about the rest of the students who did not participate. I think it should be acknowledged in teaching.
G.	All what we learned through the corpus use was evolving around using collocation; mainly we learned grammar in the form of collocations. We have learned how to use “stands up for” not stands up in or any other forms. They all are collocation.
H.	As nonnative English speaker my concern is to understand and to pass my assignments successfully. It did give me considerable help, but I think we are still need to focus upon the basics
I.	My good command of English enabled me to you it faster than my peers. I worked upon this technology before so I have much experience. I remember at that time it was a challenge, but it is not a burden anymore.
J.	It is helpful but still I feel it is complicated. I still need the teacher's help but what should I do alone at home. I think I still need more practice.

Appendix D.

Overall Evaluations

Name: _____

What are the advantages of using the corpus in your English writing?

What are the disadvantages of using the corpus in your English writing?

What are the difficulties of using the corpus in your English writing?

What are the factors that supported using the corpus in your English writing?

What would increase your use of the corpus?

Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.

