



ISSN:1306-3111

e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy
2012, Volume: 7, Number: 1, Article Number: 1C0488

NWSA-EDUCATION SCIENCES

Received: September 2011

Accepted: January 2012

Series : 1C

ISSN : 1308-7274

© 2010 www.newwsa.com

Funda Sahillioğlu

Yunis Şahinkayası

Hamide Şahinkayası

Mustafa Kemal University

fundasahillioğlu@gmail.com

ysahinkayasi@gmail.com

hsahinkayasi@gmail.com

Hatay-Turkey

**EFFECTIVENESS OF TWO CORPUS TOOLS ON TURKISH STUDENTS' LEARNING
ENGLISH GRAMMAR**

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to compare the effectiveness of two corpus tools in a corpus-driven teaching approach in terms of achievement in grammar learning and attitude toward corpus use. These tools were Bringham Young University-British National Corpus (BYU-BNC) and Lawrence Anthony's Concordancer (AntConc). The study has two experimental research designs: the static group pretest posttest and the static group comparison. The sample of this study was chosen from junior students in the two sections of Computer Education and Instructional Technology Department in Mustafa Kemal University in Turkey. Compared to related literature, the converging and diverging findings of the study were discussed within the framework of the related literature.

Keywords: Corpus Linguistics, Corpus-based Teaching,
Corpus Tools, Grammar Teaching, EFL Students

**DERLEM TABANLI İKİ ÖĞRETİM YAKLAŞIMININ TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİN İNGİLİZCE
DİL BİLGİSİ ÖĞRENMELERİNE ETKİLERİ**

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı, derleme dayalı öğretim yaklaşımında kullanılan iki derlem aracının dilbilgisi öğrenme başarısına ve derlem kullanımına yönelik tutuma etkilerini karşılaştırmaktır. Bu araçlar Bringham Young Üniversitesinin İngiliz Milli Derlemi (BYU-BNC) ve Lawrence Anthony'nin tanıklı dizin (AntConc) aracıdır. Çalışmanın araştırma desenleri ön test son test statik grup ve statik grup karşılaştırmasıdır. Araştırmanın örnekleme Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Bilgisayar ve Öğretim Teknolojileri Eğitimi Bölümündeki birinci sınıf, birinci öğretim ve ikinci öğretim öğrencilerinden oluşmaktadır. Çalışma bulgularının ilgili literatür ile benzeşen ve ayrışan yönleri tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Derlem Dilbilim, Derlem Tabanlı Öğretim,
Derlem Araçları, Dilbilgisi Öğretimi,
EFL Öğrencileri



1. INTRODUCTION (GİRİŞ)

Corpus linguistics, a methodology based on electronically collected texts, has opened up a new horizon in language research. According to Vannestal and Lindquist (2007), "corpora [plural form of corpus] have been used for pedagogical purposes for more than two decades" (p. 1). Corpus linguistics, providing authentic data with the help of electronic tools, helps researchers investigate language at hand and promote pedagogical understandings in English Language Teaching (ELT).

The reasons for increasing corpus use in ELT are the facilities of corpus tool functions that enable learners to investigate language through frequency value, concordance hits, expanded contexts, register types, and collocations. Different from traditional methods, corpus-based language learning/teaching approach provide learners with frequency value of lexical structures. Being familiar with frequency value, learners become conscious of when and in which context to use a lexical item. Furthermore, concordance view of corpus tools help learners in sorting the left and right lexical occurrences. By doing so, learners find out collocation matches of the searched item and they learn language inductively. In case of split sentences, learners can shift to expanded context view, which help learners infer contextual meaning of the search item. Besides, corpus collections, especially big corpora like BYU-BNC, provide learners with various register choice, which supports them to discover different frequencies of lexical structures in different disciplines and acquire a sense of spoken and written language.

While conducting a corpus-based study, some issues such as type and size of a corpus need to be considered. According to Evan (2006), type of corpus can be specified as, general, specialized, comparable, and historical. Similarly, size of a corpus can be classified as small and large. Considering the discussions as to which corpus is suitable to use in teaching/learning English, many researchers focused on using small corpus in classrooms. However, As Bernardini (2001) stated "...the pedagogic applications and implications of concordancing large general language corpora have received much less attention" (p. 220). Considering representative feature of big corpus, it could be more beneficial to introduce big corpus to high level students.

Although there is not a certain consensus on whether to use small or big corpus in classrooms, corpus studies support language learning of students of English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a second language (ESL). Findings of many studies on direct corpus consultation, carried out whether in teaching grammar (Liu & Jiang, 2009; Liu, 2011) or in teaching writing (Yoon & Hirvela, 2004; Cobb & Gaskel, 2004; O'Sullivan & Chambers, 2006), indicated gradual positive attitudes toward learning English with corpus and an increase in language awareness of students. However in the instance of Vannestal and Lindquist (2007) the attitudes of the students in the experimental group, especially in the first trial, was unexpected in that learning grammar with corpus was "found more boring and more difficult...but slightly useful". The researchers postulated that the reason for the situation is "at least some extrinsic, if less intrinsic, motivation" (Vannestal & Lindquist, 2007, p.337-338).

Common points in these studies are that participants' English level mostly changes from intermediate to advance level and research designs are either qualitative or quantitative except for Yoon and Hirvela (2004) in which both methods were employed. Actually, in the literature of corpus-based studies, it is hard to find both qualitative and quantitative methods in one research. Furthermore, Zhao (2003) claims that studies remain small sample size "which makes

it difficult to produce reliable quantitative data" (as cited in Chambers, 2007, p. 5).

Chambers (2007) points out that "the absence of beginners is noteworthy in corpus-based studies" (p. 8). On the other hand, Aston (2001) states that it is important to note, however, that corpus driven learning may not be appropriate for beginners or low-level students due to their limited English proficiency (as cited in Liu & Jiang, 2009). Possible reasons for the absence of beginners may be the fact that corpus consists of authentic language samples in nature, so dealing with such a complicated language system may make students to get lost in the naturally occurring texts. In addition to this, EFL beginner students need guided teaching in order to acquire basic grammar structures and enhance more complicated structures. However, considering Krashen's second language acquisition theory, beginner students need to interact with authentic language data. When students do not expose to real language samples, they may perceive some sets of grammatical rules as fixed and they may acquire fabricated language which may cause fossilization in learning English. In this sense, exposing to authentic English and producing native-like English are of significance for EFL students not only at intermediate level but also at beginner level.

Traditional language teaching methods like grammar translation are likely to be more effective through corpus-driven teaching approach. In this method students are given literary texts and they are made to translate these texts. In return, they memorize vocabulary and grammatical structures derived from these texts. As Griffiths and Parr (2001) describe, the method "...relied heavily on teaching grammar and practicing translation as its main teaching and learning activities" (p.247). One profit of adapting this method with corpus is that EFL students frequently consult for translation in understanding written language; therefore, in translating authentic language, EFL students are exposed to real English and they make use of grammar in various contexts. As Liao (2006) proposes, "It appears that learners very often use translation as a learning strategy to comprehend, remember and produce a foreign language" (p. 192). When grammar translation method is improved with authentic language samples and corpus tools, learners could benefit from various registers (language samples from various genres).

In the present study, it was investigated how EFL students benefited from the two corpus tools within corpus-based teaching approach and grammar translation method in learning English grammar. It was aimed to enhance students' grammar knowledge and translation strategies by using corpus, which raises students' language awareness about authenticity and changes fossilized grammatical rules in a student-centered teaching context.

2. RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE (ÇALIŞMANIN ÖNEMİ)

Discussions about using corpus in language teaching or learning focus on corpus size (small or large) and the English proficiency level of subjects (high or low), which need to be agreed on a common ground through upcoming researches. Therefore, this study is of significance in that it attempts to enlighten the issues aroused from using small or large corpus in the corpus-based teaching approach. With this study, it is possible to compare the effectiveness of small and big corpus. As to sample, contrary to the studies that prefer selecting intermediate or advanced level students, the subjects were consisted of low-level EFL students. In doing this, it was aimed to fill the gap in the literature.

3. METHODOLOGY (YÖNTEM)

3.1. Sample (Örneklem)

The study was carried out in Mustafa Kemal University, Education Faculty, Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technology (CEIT) in Turkey. The subjects were composed of two freshman sections; daylight (44) and evening (43). Majority of them were composed of low-level students, but few were intermediate ones. They had never been interacted with corpus methodology. Being enrolled to CEIT department, subjects are already computer literate and interested in using computers. We randomly assigned the two corpus tools (AntConc and BYU-BNC) to the sections. General demographic information of subjects is given in the Table 1. As can be seen, they are similar.

Table 1. Demographic information of the sample
 (Tablo 1. Örneklem demografik bilgileri)

	Gender		Mother Tongue				GPA (Grade Point Average)					First Term English Grade						
	Male	Female	Turkish	Arabic	Kurdish	Others	4.00-3.50	3.49-3.00	2.99-2.50	2.49-2.00	Less than 2.00	AA	BA	BB	CB	CC	DC	DD & less
BYU-BNC	21	19	34	1	4	1	3	6	9	11	11	11	4	3	5	7	8	2
AntConc	22	15	34	2	1	-	-	2	8	13	13	6	4	3	4	4	7	9

3.2. Corpus Tools and Corpus Training

(Derlem Araçları ve Derlem Eğitimi)

In this study, two corpus tools, AntConc and BYU-BNC, were used in teaching English grammar. AntConc is a freeware concordancer that is used with specialized or small corpus and it is not a web-based tool and it hasn't got its own corpus, thus we collected 160.000 words of corpus from children's books section of project Gutenberg free e-books site which can be downloaded as plain text. We used the books corpus in the sense that the language of such books is more suitable for beginner students. Besides, we used academic and historical texts with the intuition that the grammar topics to be thought throughout the term would be frequently occurred in these registers. The other corpus tool, BYU-BNC is a large web-based corpus with 100.000.000 words and it includes approximately seventy registers. *The reason for using both corpus sizes was to compare the effectiveness of using small or large corpus on students' achievement.*

A training program, including what corpus is, how it is used and how students benefit from it, was done for nine hours within three weeks. We selected the common functions of the tools about grammar teaching such as *part of speech, concordance view, frequency values and expanded contexts*, and we omitted other functions such as register variety and collocation query which are more suitable for writing courses. In the introduction session of the training, we informed students about key terms that will frequently be used in the treatment such as corpus, concordancer, part of speech etc. *The instructor explained how to use the functions by example queries and encouraged students to make similar ones.*

3.3. Teaching Procedure (Öğretim Süreci)

The English courses in Turkish universities are compulsory courses for all freshman students. Therefore, we continued to follow the curriculum of the first term. English courses took place at the faculty's computer laboratory with internet connection. While doing the courses, students were guided to make inferences from concordance

lines and after a while their findings were discussed in the class. Note that students' English competence was low, so they were in serious need of understanding the meaning of the sentences; *therefore, students frequently consulted to translation.* While explaining grammatical structures, students' attention was directed to the two words that occur on left and right side of the searched term. By doing so, *it was attempted to make them form grammatical rules through constantly occurring words around the searched term.* Instances that did not match with the rule were discussed and subjects' language awareness levels were aroused. Students interpreted the concordance lines through whole-class and pair discussion *methods.* Students were given translation tasks at the end of each course in order to help students reinforce interpretation skills. There was student-instructor interaction during in-class activities and in assignments. The students were given oral feedback in class and written feedback for assignments *as much as possible after the sessions.*

3.4. Data Collection Instruments (Veri Toplama Araçları)

3.4.1. Achievement Test (Başarı Testi)

In order to assess whether there was any difference in learning tenses (past simple, past progressive, present perfect, simple future and to be going to) and modals (ability, necessity, obligation and permission) within and between groups, we developed an *achievement test with 54 multiple choice items.* Also, we used this test to compare the tools in terms of effectiveness in teaching grammatical structures. In preparing the questions, we considered the steps in Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive domain for instructional objectives which are; knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

3.4.2. Forming Grammatical Structure Test (Dil Bilgisi Yapısı Oluşturma Testi)

The test was designed to measure the effect of part of speech query (POS) query in acquiring grammatical rules across the groups. *The usage of POS codes at the corpus tools* was different, so two different forms were prepared for each group. For example, the codes in BYU-BNC have already been placed in the options of the website, but the codes in AntConc require manual typing. The questions were asked in a way that *could* remind the grammatical rules. For example, it was asked that "which of the POS codes help us find the rule about using enough?" In order to choose the correct item, students need to remember which grammatical words are used with enough, which evaluates the competence of forming grammatical structures. The tests were administered to sections at the end of the term.

3.4.3. Demographic Information Questionnaire and Self-confidence Test (Demografik Bilgi Anketi ve Kendine Güven Testi)

The demographic information questionnaire was developed to get information about subjects' English background, self-confidence in using English, and computer use. We adapted the questionnaire from Yoon and Hirvela (2004). Essentially, it is composed of three parts.

In the first part, we asked common questions about gender, age, grade point average, first term English grade etc. In the second part, students were asked to evaluate how confident they feel about using the grammatical structures in written English. This part was given to the students before and after the treatment as pre and posttest. In the third part, students' computer use was inquired in terms of frequency, software language preference, having personal computer, having internet connection, electronic and paper-back dictionary use and familiarity with corpus sources.

3.4.4. Questionnaire of Reaction to Corpus Use (Derlem Kullanımı Tutum Anketi)

The attitude questionnaire was also an adaptation from Yoon and Hirvela (2004) study of ESL student's attitudes toward corpus use in second language (L2) writing. We translated items into Turkish and adapted those about writing into grammar items. Since there were two different corpus tools and some items displayed difference across BYU-BNC and AntConc corpus, we produced two questionnaires. The questionnaires were organized in a seven points Likert-type scale and administered as pre and posttest. The choices of the questionnaire were 1: strongly disagree, 2: disagree, 3: somewhat disagree, 4: somewhat agree, 5: agree, 6: strongly agree, and 0: No idea.

3.4.5. The Overall Assessment of Corpus Work Questionnaire (Derlem Çalışması Genel Değerlendirme Anketi)

The questionnaire was prepared to have thoughts about students' overall assessment of corpus use. It was composed of five questions. We derived the questions from the study of Liu and Jiang (2009). Similar to reaction to corpus use questionnaire, it is a seven point Likert-type scale. Furthermore, this and the previous questionnaires were translated to Turkish and reviewed by a Turkish Teacher.

3.5. Data Collection Procedure (Veri Toplama Süreci)

At the beginning of the term, students filled the demographic information questionnaire as pretest form. After they learnt how to make corpus search, the first grammar topic was taught, which was considered as the practice part of training. Then subjects took achievement test and reaction to corpus as pretest.

At the end of the term, students took all the posttests of achievement, self-confidence in using grammatical structure, forming grammatical structure, overall assessment of corpus tools in learning English, and reaction to corpus use.

3.6. Data Analysis Procedure (Veri Analizi Süreci)

At the end of the term, the researchers collected data from five data collection instruments. However, the number of subjects at both groups was not equal in pre and posttests; therefore, the students taking both pre and posttests were remained for within-group comparisons. In between-group comparisons, all the available data were included. For within and between-group comparisons, paired samples t-tests and independent samples t-test were respectively conducted with the help of statistical software. Note that we set the alpha level at .05.

4. FINDINGS (BULGULAR)

- **Is there any significant improvement in the mean scores of learning grammatical structures in each group?**

A paired-samples t-test was conducted for each group to evaluate whether there was any significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of learning grammatical structures. Results for BYU-BNC group indicated that there was a significant difference in the scores of pretest (N = 41, M = 47.22, SD = 17.05) and posttest (N = 41, M = 58.86, SD = 16.37); conditions $t(40) = -6.658$, $p = .000$. Similarly there was a significant difference in the scores of AntConc, pretest (N = 42, M = 44.86, SD = 15.59) and posttest (N = 42, M = 57.38, SD = 18.65); conditions $t(41) = -5.532$, $p = .000$. It was observed that both corpus tools seem to increase the achievement of learning grammatical structures in each group respectively.

- **Which of the corpus tools is more effective in increasing students' learning grammatical structures?**

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the pretest scores of both groups. Accordingly, there was no significant difference between pretest scores of the groups, BYU-BNC group (N = 41, M = 47.22, SD = 17.05) and AntConc (N = 42, M = 44.86, SD = 15.59); conditions $t(81) = .659$, $p = .512$. Therefore, the groups were accepted as homogenous at the level of English before the treatments. To compare the posttest scores of the groups, another independent samples t-test was conducted. The results revealed that there was no significant difference in the groups of BYU-BNC (N = 41, M = 58.86, SD = 16.37) and AntConc (N = 42, M = 57.38, SD = 18.65); conditions $t(81) = .383$, $p = .703$. When posttest scores considered, it was seen that both groups had similar means with no significant difference. In other words, both corpus tools displayed similar effect on teaching/learning grammatical rules.

- **Through part of speech (POS) query in BYU-BNC and AntConc, is there any difference in the level of forming grammatical structures between groups?**

An independent samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether there was any difference in the level of forming grammatical structures between the groups. The results displayed that there was a significant difference in posttest of forming grammatical structures of the groups, BYU-BNC (N = 41, M = 69.71, SD = 21.56) and AntConc (N = 43, M = 82.86, SD = 20.39); conditions $t(82) = -2.87$, $p = .005$. It can be derived that subjects who used POS functions in AntConc was more successful in forming grammatical structures than it was in BYU-BNC group. In other terms, POS facilities of the AntConc corpus tool were more helpful in forming grammatical structures than that of BYU-BNC.

- **Does each corpus tool improve the self-confidence of students in:**
 - **Using tenses such as past simple, past progressive, present perfect, simple future and to be going to?**
 - **Using modals such as ability, necessity, obligation, and permission?**

Paired samples t-tests were conducted to evaluate whether there were any differences in students' self-confidence level in using tenses and modals before and after the treatment. The result for tenses suggested that there was no significant progress for BYU-BNC group, pretest (N = 37, M = 51.11, SD = 33.66), posttest (N = 37, M = 58.11, SD = 25.75), conditions $t(36) = -1.535$, $p = .134$. Descriptively, there was an increase in students' self-confidence. Similarly, there was no significant progress in the AntConc group, pretest (N = 32, M = 54.94, SD = 31.39), posttest (N = 32, M = 58.91, SD = 30.63), conditions $t(31) = -.737$, $p = .466$. Therefore, both tools appeared to be ineffective in increasing students' self-confidence level of using tenses in written English.

As for modals, the results of paired samples t-test revealed that there was a significant progress for BYU-BNC group, pretest (N = 36, M = 46.81, SD = 32.22), posttest (N = 36, M = 56.81, SD = 26.84); conditions $t(35) = -2.609$, $p = .013$. Nevertheless, the paired sample t-test results for AntConc group was not significant, (N = 32, M = 43.41, SD = 28.56), posttest (N = 32, M = 43.75, SD = 28.40); conditions $t(31) = -.087$, $p = .932$. This means that the self-confidence level of AntConc group did not change at the end of the treatment. To sum up, while BYU-BNC seemed to increase the self-confidence of using modals in written English, AntConc did not.

- **Which tool better improves the self-confidence of students in**
 - **Using tenses such as past simple, past progressive, present perfect, simple future, and to be going to?**
 - **Using modals such as ability, necessity, obligation, and permission?**

An independent sample t-test was conducted to understand which corpus tool better improves students' self-confidence in using modals and tenses in written English. There was no significant difference between the pretest results of tenses, BYU-BNC group (N = 40, M = 50.78, SD = 32.39) and AntConc group (N = 36, M = 52.31, SD = 32.19), conditions $t(74) = -.206$, $p = .837$. Similarly, there was no significant difference between the groups' pretest scores indicating the initial self-confidence levels in modals, the BYU-BNC group (N = 40, M = 47.13, SD = 30.87) and AntConc group (N = 36, M = 41.22, SD = 29.15); conditions $t(74) = .855$, $p = .396$. Therefore groups were accepted as homogenous in terms of self-confidence in using tenses and modals at the beginning of the study.

As for the posttests, independent samples t-test results of tenses showed that there was no significant difference between the groups, BYU-BNC (N = 39, M = 59.10, SD = 24.76); AntConc (N = 40, M = 58.49, SD = 31.22); conditions $t(80) = .098$, $p = .922$. Likewise, there was not a significant difference in posttest results of modals for the groups of BYU-BNC (N = 38, M = 56.32, SD = 26.45) and AntConc (N = 43, M = 45.93, SD = 29.51); conditions $t(79) = 1.659$, $p = .101$. Note that all the students who took posttests included in these analyses, which may have changed the posttest means. Nevertheless, to evaluate descriptively, BYU-BNC group seemed to feel more confident in using modals than did AntConc group. On the other hand both tools seem to have similar effects on students' self-confidence in using tenses.

- **What are the reactions of students toward corpus use in learning English grammar?**

Two paired samples t-tests were conducted to evaluate whether there was any difference in students' attitudes toward using corpus in learning English grammar before and after the treatment. The results for BYU-BNC group showed that there was a significant decrease in their attitudes, pretest (N = 30, M = 4.05, SD = .57), posttest (N = 30, M = 3.73, SD = .68); conditions $t(29) = 2.515$, $p = .018$. As to the AntConc group, there was no significant change in their attitudes, pretest (N = 31, M = 3.78, SD = .56), posttest (N = 31, M = 3.49, SD = .79); conditions $t(30) = 1.764$, $p = .088$. It was seen that both groups' attitudes tended to decrease after corpus treatment but the attitudes of BYU-BNC decreased more sharply than that of AntConc group.

An independent samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether there was any difference in BYU-BNC and AntConc groups' initial attitudes toward using a corpus tool in learning English grammar. The result indicated that at the beginning of the study the pretest attitude score of BYU-BNC group was higher than the AntConc group's, BYU-BNC (N = 30, M = 4.05, SD = .57); AntConc (N = 35, M = 3.77, SD = .56); conditions $t(63) = 2.037$, $p = .046$. To compare the attitudes of BYU-BNC and AntConc group after the treatment, an independent samples t-test was conducted. The results revealed that there was no significant difference in posttest attitude scores, BYU-BNC (N = 40, M = 3.78, SD = .66) and AntConc (N = 42, M = 3.54, SD = .76); conditions $t(80) = 1.511$, $p = .135$. After the treatment, the attitudes of both groups decreased and became homogenous.

- **What are the students' overall assessments of corpus tools in learning English?**

In order to compare overall effectiveness of the corpus tools, an independent samples t-test was conducted. The result suggested that there was no significant difference between BYU-BNC and AntConc group students' assessment of corpus use in learning English, BYU-BNC (N = 43, M = 3.05, SD = .62), AntConc (N = 44, M = 2.85, SD = .87); conditions $t(77.698) = 1.262, p = .211$. It was depicted that BYU-BNC group's overall assessment of the effectiveness of the corpus tools was slightly more appreciating, but the difference was not significant.

5. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS (TARTIŞMA, SONUÇ VE ÖNERİLER)

The distinctive features of the study are derived from the sample being low-level, or beginner, students and corpus sizes by which it was possible to compare the effectiveness of small and large corpus in teaching, which is a deficiency in the literature. Considering the common outcomes of the studies in literature such as an increase in achievement and attitude, we have convergent and divergent results. To start with achievement test of grammar learning, we expected an increase in learning grammatical structures and this was realized. The increase in the within group achievement scores for both groups indicated that being exposed to corpus data, whether small or big, assists in learning grammatical structures.

Another achievement was recorded in acquiring the forms of grammatical structures through POS query. When two groups compared, AntConc group showed higher success. AntConc, being a freeware concordancer, has more user-friendly POS codes than that of BYU-BNC. Therefore, the success of AntConc group could be due to this facility.

Although some studies reported positive attitude toward corpus use in grammar learning (Liu & Jiang, 2009; Liu, 2011), this was not corroborated in this study. The attitude of BYU-BNC group was decreased significantly in our case. As for AntConc group, no increase was recorded. The negative reply of students to corpus use in learning English grammar has been also recorded in the first trial of the study of Vannestal and Lindquist (2004). The thing that was surprising in our case was that despite the success in achievement tests, students' reaction to corpus remained negative. Therefore, it can be inferred that having been successful in achievement tests may not be associated with positive reflection. One reason for the decrease in the attitudes could be the students' low-level of English. It is clear that students were lack of basic English grammar knowledge. They had to spend a lot of time and effort in interpreting the real English samples, which caused frustration among them. In other words, coping with corpus samples was not suitable to their levels. Another reason for low attitudes can be explained with corpus-based teaching approach. As Sun (2003) claimed concordancing doesn't automatically lead to inductive learning in all students, one important factor being their previous lack of familiarity with inductive thinking (as cited in Vannestal & Linquist, 2007, p. 345). Most of the students in each section requested from the instructor to turn back to deductive teaching especially when they had difficulty in understanding a complex grammatical structure. It was until the instructor changed the inductive teaching into deductive teaching then students started to actively participate in the class, thus it is seen that deductive teaching is indispensable for low-level students. In this sense, the researchers need to consider when to apply deductive and inductive teaching in corpus-based teaching approach, since complex grammatical

structures seem to be better thought with deductive teaching for low-level EFL students. A third reason for low attitudes could be explained with limited time of training and teaching. It is highly recommended to extend the teaching period into two terms for measuring the real changes in attitudes.

Another attitude-based part of the study was the effect of corpus use on self-confidence of students about using grammatical rules in written English. There was an increase in the self-confidence level of BYU-BNC group in using modals. This finding can be intuitively explained with the modal code function in POS part of BYU-BNC in which it provides better results in terms of variety of registers at one search. Also once the Modal code was chosen, students could list all modal verbs, but the AntConc group had to type each modal separately. Another reason for the decrease in self-confidence could be related with exposure to real English which may cause anxiety about producing native-like English. Therefore, it is recommended to encourage students about spending more time to gain self-confidence and experience in corpus samples.

The findings of the study put forward that there is a trade-off in using corpus for low-level EFL students. When low-level EFL students are exposed to corpus, their perception of real English is enhanced with various sentence forms in various registers. However, this exposure may bring a decrease in the attitudes of students toward learning English language. This is crucial especially for students with poor English, since they are not familiar with English grammar and are in need of teacher guidance. From this point, it was recommended to include both deductive teaching and grammar translation method with corpus-based teaching approach.

As for limitations of the study, firstly, the course was compulsory in both sections and the sections were intact, so it was not possible to make a random assignment of subjects to the sections. Secondly, we have studied corpus for one term and two hours in a week. This caused less teacher guidance and less exposure to corpus, which may not be sufficient to acquire a positive attitude toward corpus use for low-level EFL students. In fact, getting used to corpus tools takes time. For those who are interested in teaching grammar to low-level EFL students, it is highly recommended to spend more time with corpus training and corpus work in class hours and it would be more productive to spend two or more education terms. Finally, as course material, we included only the corpus data in order to measure their effects on grammar learning and attitudes. Otherwise, including a course book and audiovisual material would be a threat to the internal validity of the study. On the other hand, it could be more motivating to enhance the course with these instructional materials.

In conclusion, despite the unexpected results, the study was significant in terms of comparing small and large corpus and studying with low-level students, which gave us understanding about pedagogical value of integrating grammar translation method with guided teaching in corpus-based teaching approach. As for the effectiveness of the two corpus tools, we deduced that both tools were effective in teaching grammatical structures. Nevertheless, there may be a decrease in the attitudes of low-level students. In this sense, the underlying reasons of why students have negative reaction to the corpus-based teaching approach and corpus tools need to be investigated in an upcoming qualitative research.

NOT (NOTICE)

Bu çalışma, 22-24 Eylül 2011 tarihleri arasında Elazığ'da düzenlenen "(ICITS-2011) 5. Uluslararası Bilgisayar ve Öğretim Teknolojileri Sempozyumu"nda sözlü bildiri olarak sunulmuştur.

REFERENCES (KAYNAKLAR)

1. Bernardini, S., (2001). Spoilt for choice: A learner explores general language corpora. In Aston, G. (ed), Learning with corpora (9). Retrieved from:
http://www.google.com/books?hl=tr&lr=lang_en&id=7XgmWEeL7UC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=learning+with+corpora+bernardini&ots=jmPzg3orm0&sig=P_z4zZa4xxXWjGd3l7YTPMgUbzI#v=onepage&q=learning%20with%20corpora%20bernardini&f=false
2. Chambers, A., (2007). Popularizing corpus consultation by language learners and teachers. In Hidalgo, E., Querada, L., Santana J. (eds), Language and Computers-Studies in Practical Linguistics: Corpora in Foreign Language Classroom: Selected Papers from the Sixth International Conference on Teaching and Language Corpora (1). Retrieved from:
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/mkemal/edf.action?p00=&docID=10380418&page=16>
3. Cobb, T. and Gaskell, D., (2004). Can learners use concordance feedback for writing errors? *Sytem*, 32 (301-319).
doi:10.1016/j.system.2004.04.001
4. Evans, D., (2006). Department of Linguistics: Corpus building and investigation for the humanities. Retrieved from: <http://humcorp.bham.ac.uk/humcorp/information/corpusintro.html>
5. Griffiths, C. and Parr, J.M., (2001). Language learning strategies: Theory and perception. *ELT Journal*, 53 (247-254).
doi: 10.1093/elt/55.3.247
6. Liao, P., (2006). EFL Lernalers' belief about and strategy of translation in English learning. *RELC Journal*, 37 (191-215).
doi: 10.1177/0033688206067428
7. Liu, D., (2011). Making grammar instruction more empowering: An explotory case study of corpus use in learning/teaching of grammar. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 45 (353-377). Retrieved from: <https://secure.ncte.org/store/2011-may-rte-v45-4>
8. Liu, D. and Jiang, P., (2009). Using a corpus-based lexicogrammatical approach to grammar instruction in EFL and ESL contexts. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93 (61-78). doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00828.x
9. O'Sullivan, I. and Chambers, A., (2006). Learners' writing skills in French: Corpus consultation and learner evaluation. *Journal of Second Langugae Learning*, 15 (49-68). doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2006.01.002
10. Vannestal, M.E. and Lindquist, H., (2007). Learning English grammar with a corpus: Experimenting with concordancing in a university grammar course. *ReCALL*, 3 (329-350).
doi:10.1017/S0958344007000638
11. Yoon, H. and Hirvela, A., (2004). ESL student attitudes toward corpus use in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13 (257-283). doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2004.06.02