The Impact of Corpus-Based Program on Enhancing the EFL Student Teachers' Writing Skills and Self-Autonomy

Yousra Aly Abdel-Samea Qoura , Prof. Badran A Hassan Prof. Asmaa A Mostafa
Mansoura University , Faculty of Education
Curriculum & Instruction Department

Abstract

*T*he purpose of the present study was to investigate the effectiveness of the Corpus-Based Program Training on Enhancing EFL Writing Skills, and Self-Autonomy among Student teachers at the faculties of Education. To fulfill the purpose of the study, three instruments were constructed; An EFL Writing Skills Checklist designed to determine writing skills that student teachers need, a Pre-post EFL Writing Test, A Rubric for scoring the EFL Writing test, and Language Learning Autonomy Inventory developed to uncover language earning self-Autonomy concept of EFL student teachers. The validity and reliability of the study instruments were established before their use in the study. The study adopted the quasi-experimental design. The sample of the study consisted of 60 student teachers randomly selected from the Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Education in Mansoura University, in Mansoura city. where 30 student teachers represented the experimental group, and 30 represented the control group. The Corpus-Based Program training was administered to the experimental group for five weeks whereas the control group received the conventional teaching following the prescribed Teacher's Guide procedures. Results of the study revealed that Corpus-Based Program training led to significant improvement in student teachers' EFL Writing Skills, and their language learning Autonomy. A number of recommendations concerning the use Corpus-Based Program, EFL Writing skills, and course design were presented.
Key words: Corpus, Data-Driven Learning, Writing Skills, Language Learning Autonomy, Collocations, Vocabulary Learning.

Introduction:

The lexical approach to second language teaching which focuses on developing learners' proficiency with lexis, or words and word combinations is considered an alternative to grammar

based approaches lately. It's basic concept is the notion of comprehending and producing lexical phrases as unanalyzed wholes, or "chunks. Learners grasp patterns of language using these chunks (Lewis,1993,p.95). According to Lewis (1997 a p.212) instruction focuses on frequently spoken language fixed expressions such as "I'm sorry," "I didn't mean to make you jump", ," or "That will never happen to me," more than originally created sentences. This paves the way for illustrations both on methodological foundations as well as the pedagogical implications of the lexical approach.   The lexical approach differentiates between vocabulary (seen as a stock of individual words with fixed meanings) and lexis (seen as also the word combinations that we store in our mental lexicons).

The Lexical approach supports the idea that language consists of meaningful chunks. These chunks could be combined and produce coherent text. The role of formulaic, many-word lexical units have been stressed in both first and second language acquisition research. (See Richards & Rodgers, 2001, for further discussion.). Various labels have referred to such units as "gambits" (Keller, 1979), "speech formulae" (Peters, 1983), "lexicalized stems" (Pawley & Syder, 1983), and "lexical phrases" (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992). These lexical units are highly important for many reasons. for example, Cowie (1988) found that having such lexical units in a language like English helps in achieving the need of not only the native English speakers but also the EFL learners who have to generate lexical units from the scratch. The widespread "fusion of such expressions, which appear to satisfy the individual's communicative needs at a given moment and are later reused, is one means by which the public stock of formulae and composites is continuously enriched" (p. 136).

As computer technology made it possible to store and analyze a large volume of language data efficiently and the web-based corpora are readily available, the potential benefits of corpora in language learning and teaching have been widely acknowledged and even praised as a new language

teaching/learning tool by many language professionals. The advocates of using corpora have argued that corpora can provide a powerful tool with which learners can explore and discover patterns of authentic language, providing such information as collocations, colligation, and semantic prosody that are hardly obtainable otherwise (Bernardini, 2004; Hunston, 2002; Meunier, 1999). It has been also contended that corpus-based language teaching has potentials to motivate learners and promote learner autonomy that are highly valued in pedagogy (Aijmer, 2009; Kaltenbock & Mehlmauer-Larcher, 2005).

Due to those potentials of corpora in language teaching and learning, a number of researchers (Aston, 1998; Braun, 2007; Conrad, 2004; Hunston, 2002; Tribble, 1997) presented them as a valuable resource and an innovative teaching tool, and their use has been considered somewhat trendy among language professionals. Teacher should be knowledgeable about the use of concordance, collocation, and colligation software and be trained to categorize and interpret language data retrieved from corpora. One of the major causes for the gap between what can be done and what actually is done is that many teachers are not aware of the potentials offered by corpora and Data-Driven Learning (DDL) activities. Therefore, teachers whether pre-or in-service should be trained to use corpora and DD learning to help their students learn the structure and authentic use of the four language skills. Lee(2011) contends that it is necessary to develop a localized online database of corpus-based resources and that it can be a partial solution to the practical problems that most teachers have. That is, teachers can save their time and energy by using localized corpora and ready-made corpus-based activities on the Web.

In view of the many challenges facing student teachers both in their own learning and teaching EFL, Corpora or DD learning seem to be a promising source for solution of some learning and teaching problems. We have two types of corpora, the first one is corpus-based learning (CBL) that the teacher uses the corpus and

the students read the data given to them by the teacher, the second type is the Data-Driven Learning (DDL) refers to students' independent online searching for language data that include, collocations, concordance, and colligation.

Recently, the focus on vocabulary acquisition and knowledge in language teaching has increased, and the understanding of the issues involved in learning new words has deepened. Particularly, teachers now know that vocabulary knowledge and learning is a lot more than learning the definition of a word (Nation, 2001). Koda (2000) states that metalinguistic awareness is a term used to describe the knowledge of rules about language, parts of language, and how language works, or even a simple self-recognition of one's own language and the forms being used (p.54).

According to Nation (2001) metalinguistic awareness means 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). One of the merits of corpus linguistics is providing these aspects of knowing a word, particularly because teachers now are aware that vocabulary word and its surrounding context can affect this issue.

Corpora can be helpful in teaching these aspects of meta-linguistic awareness and demonstrating their usefulness. Corpora can also be effective in teaching some skills of vocabulary learning that are a part of meta-linguistic awareness, like synonymy and frequency, but are still necessary for word knowledge and interconnected with other skills of meta-linguistic awareness. Ozgul (2011) stated through his study that teaching vocabulary through collocations and corpus improved the vocabulary learning more than classical techniques.

It is helpful for students to understand how they gradually learn words. According to (Taylor, 1990 and Nation 2001), knowledge of a word implies the acquisition of information of

various types, which seem to be language universals. These different kinds of knowledge are knowledge of the frequency of occurrence of the word in a language, knowledge of collocation, both semantic and syntactic, knowledge of morphology, knowledge of semantics, knowledge of polysemy, i.e. knowing the different meanings associated with a word, knowledge of the equivalent of the word in the mother tongue, In addition other types of knowledge should be considered such as knowledge of the spelling of a word and knowledge of its pronunciation, including stress (p.3).

Corpora had been indirectly contributing to language instruction through their use in the creation of reference materials and textbooks for some time before Tim Johns, one of the first advocates for giving language learners direct access to corpus data, began criticizing these materials for keeping learners a step removed from the data. Johns felt that learners could benefit more from corpora by becoming language researchers themselves and analyzing the language data from a corpus first hand, a technique he named "Data-driven learning" (DDL).

According to Johns (1991), data- driven learning engages learners in analyzing the chosen concordance lines, arranging and editing them for the sake of drawing learners' attention to patterns of language use. These patterns could be induced from a list of concordance lines by learners. Learners can also fill in missing elements of concordance lines based on these patterns

Data-driven learning is utilizing computer- generated concordances in classrooms to help students investigate patterns in the target language, and create concordance based activities and exercises. Over the years, enthusiasm for using DDL and concordance output in the classroom with language learners has grown. Today, although there are a limited number of empirical studies outlining a clear connection between DDL and improved learning outcomes, applied linguists have outlined multiple theoretical reasons for using DDL with language learners. The main argument being that DDL creates learning conditions which

have been found to facilitate second language acquisition (SLA) processes.

An area of language teaching which studied by descriptive analyses of corpora and have a growing need for DDL activities is vocabulary instruction. Specifically, the creation of general academic and discipline specific wordlists from corpora are beginning to inform vocabulary instruction for English for Academic purposes (EAP) and English for Specific purposes (ESP) courses. Simultaneously, vocabulary instruction within the CLT paradigm is moving away from teaching words in isolation, and placing a greater emphasis on exposing learners to lexical items in authentic and meaningful contexts. Moreover, there's a great evidence that much of the English language is formulaic (i.e., stored and retrieved in the mind as chunks of language). This shows that there are some limitations of teaching vocabulary separated from grammar. DDL has regarded an available technique which can keep vocabulary instruction current with the research by placing words from wordlists back into authentic and meaningful contexts. Furthermore, DDL, uses concordance lines of naturally occurring language. This leads to acquiring much formulaic language to promote noticing of these linguistic structures.

In contrast to grammar, vocabulary has long been neglected in teaching. It has always been taught through the other skills whereas grammar has been taught as a separate module, which has ranked vocabulary in an inferior position to grammar. Curricula are full of grammatical rules that are said to improve the learner's language as if teaching a language equals teaching its grammar. Although, the old approaches have tried to teach vocabulary, words have been introduced only in lists which proved to be useless. Many researchers have recently raised the importance of teaching vocabulary like Michael Lewis who questioned "the grammar-vocabulary dichotomy" and advocated a lexical approach (1993, 1997, 2000) which is mainly interested in teaching collocations or "common word combination" (2000: 127). The latter is a broader term that does not include only

collocations but also idioms, phrasal verbs, fixed phrases and semi-fixed ones.

Following Michael Lewis's views, we believe that teaching collocations would raise students' proficiency in language learning. Furthermore, we focus on the direct influence of teaching collocations on the field of foreign language writing where the students have a problem of combining words together. Even though the native speaker can also have a problem in associating words, foreign language students struggle more with making their writing sound natural.

The learner corpus is a useful diagnostic tool for teachers as it enables them to locate most frequent students' errors in specific text types and to be ready to preteach and pre-empt common errors. Learners, on the other hand, become more autonomous as they develop the skills to identify and explain recurrent errors, not to mention if they are the corpus designers themselves. O'Keeffe and Farr (2003) mention several different phenomena that can be studied when employing a learner corpus in class such as second language acquisition processes, interlanguage, fossilization, patterns of error, crosslinguistic studies.

Related Studies:

In this section, related studies are presented in terms of the variables of the study. First studies on corpus-based learning are discussed, followed by those of collocations, data driven learning and finally studies that targeted language learning autonomy. The section concludes with an analytical point of view on the studies reviewed.

Studies Related to Corpus-Based Learning:

Some conducted studies in the field of using corpus-based sources in L2 targeted the attitudes of EFL learners towards these sources in the vocabulary or instructions of writing or reading. The results of these earlier studies indicated that students have positive attitude towards learning vocabulary through using corpus-activities (Cobb, 1997; Thurstun&Candlin,

1998). Thurstun&Candline (1998) discovered that learners have positive reaction regarding using corpus-based sources in vocabulary learning. However, they also found that some students have negative reactions due to the authentic academic texts' difficulty.

Sun (2000) conducted a study aimed at exploring the way that EFL students reacted to a lesson that involves corpus-based activities. A questionnaire indicated the feedback of Taiwanese college EFL students towards web-based concordance. Major numbers of students were reported to have had positive feelings towards web-based concordance; the basic reason of this is that it allows the students to experience genuine use of language. It was also found that the approach was helpful in gaining information about the single words and phrases' natural usage in addition to reading comprehension.

However, some teachers are doubtful about using corpora in teaching modals and idioms because it is relatively a new trend in teaching. Therefore, Neff (2001) &Mendis (2003) avoid focusing on corpora in planning tasks and activities in their students. On the other hand, they indicated the importance of using corpus-analysis to get solutions for the problems that the non-native speakers of Englishface during their exposure to writing or studying in English.

Neff (2001) explored the use of modal verbs differences between Spanish learners and native learners in English. He examined a corpus of 400.000 words which consisted of argumentative essays that lead to results. Spanish learners were found to focus on (can and must) more than other modal verbs. "Can and must" tended to occur with the pronoun "we" more than other pronouns. Students tend to use might and may lightly but over use can. The reason for that is because "can" was the first learned modal for the Spanish learners. The result of the study indicated that most of the problems that learners met during their language learning of English modal verbs are due to the differences in discourse between their L1 and English.

Simpson &Mindes (2003) investigated the usefulness of corpora in acquiring idioms. Specifically, they explored the appearance and disappearance of idioms in corpora. 1.7 million Word corpus included academic spoken English was examined. They discovered that corpora contain idioms and consequently it could be used in designing materials for teaching. Researchers, in addition, claimed that corpora provide information about idioms pragmatic use to students, in addition to providing them with authentic contexts apart from isolation.

Although the previous studies indicated the effectiveness of corpora in language teaching, other studies indicated that there are some challenging facing teachers during their usage of corpora. These challenges must be bared in mind because they have the ability of affecting the usefulness of corpora. For example, Maddalena (2001) tried to use a well-established corpus in order to show students the differences between seemingly synonymous words in English. The results indicated that it was not very useful to use concordance lines for a number of reasons: first, students were not accustomed to these teaching methodologies in which they have to report on something which they looked at. Second, the students' basic goal was to pass the exam. It was more important for them to know the meaning of the word than to know the use of it. This study illustrates that the instructor or the researcher's role is essential when using corpus-based activities. In some conditions, concordance lines could be used to extract real life instances and use them with students instead of ask students to examine pages of sentences. This should be done with more advanced learners who are interested in the way that language works through.

Breyer (2008) supported maddalena's view about the crucial role the teacher has in using classrooms corpus. Therefore, in her study, Breyer investigates the teacher's role in the use of corpora and the challenges that meet the teachers. She indicated that teachers have to be well trained on using corpora inside the classroom. The researcher then mentioned the case

study that she did to support her view that training teachers is basic.

One of the reasons of the challenging nature of using corpora is that teachers have to be well trained in using corpora in order to use it in classrooms. Moreover, teachers have to develop materials and activities using corpora because they cannot find ready ones. It is important also to make the activities proper to the cultural and proficiency level of students. In addition, teachers need to know how to be monitors of the learning process inside the classroom.

Like Simpson &Mendis (2003), Breyer indicated that corpora provide learning language in contexts. This helps the student to discuss the features of language deeply in the class. Breyer also argued that after the training, the teacher became familiar with using corpora in addition to have awareness of the language they teach and the ways to teach it.

Yoon &Hirvela (2004) examined attitudes of students towards corpora usage in L2 writing instruction. They focused on the way of perceiving the use of corpora in second language writing instructions through asking the students what they thought the advantages and disadvantages of the corpora. It was found that corpus instructions was important for improving students' L2 writing, and so increasing their sense of confidence in this skill.

Other studies tried to determine the effectiveness of corpus-based sources on the performance of EFL learners in learning L2 writing or reading. Sun & Wang (2003) studied the effectiveness of inductive and deductive teaching on learning collocations by using a concordance. The sample of the study was 81 senior high school students studied English in Taiwan for four years; the researcher divided them into two groups; an inductive and a deductive groups. The result of the study indicated that there were no significant differences between the groups regarding learning collocations; it was also revealed that

concordances were effective tools to help learners develop their learning strategies.

Tseng & Liou (2006) also used corpus output in class to improve the accuracy of conjunctions in writing. Nineteen English as foreign language (EFL) college learners used the on-line conjunction materials based on corpora for one month. To investigate the effects of on-line practice, students were given connector tests, and then were assigned essays to write, after which they were given questionnaires to fill out. Results revealed that not only did students show improvement in conjunction use after the on-line teaching, but also their overall writing quality was enhanced. Students also showed a positive attitude toward on-line practice of connector usage. This study shows that corpora use can be used not only to give grammatical pointers but also to help student improve their writing skills.

Studies that have been done to examinegrammar teaching through corpus-based sources are rare and few studies. Vannestal & Lindquist (2007) examined the attitudes of the EFL students towards grammar and the effect of using concordances on them. The result of the study revealed that studying via corpora is a useful approach in students' grammar instruction, whereas, some students were particularly weak and found difficulties in studying with corpora. The researchers also discovered that students although there are many students who face difficulties in using corpora in learning grammar rules, learners realized that using corpora is useful in writing texts in English.

Varley (2009) conducted a study on 19 students in order to find out the extent of corpora usefulness in developing language proficiency of students. She investigated how corpora improve the vocabulary and grammar for students and their attitudes towards using corpora. The results indicated that corpora are helpful for the students to learn about certain language uses. Moreover, it allowed students to examine the language features in context. Results also indicated that corpora are useful for

learners who depend on dictionaries and grammar books as references to them.

Gilmore's (2009) study aimed at examining the effect of training learners in the use of online corpora on helping students revise their essays. 45 errors of second year intermediate level students were highlighted and they were asked to revise their second writing drafts by using online corpora. The results of the study indicated that second writing drafts of the students seemed to be more natural after the changes the using of corpora did.

Bennet (2010) pointed out to three ways that corpora can be incorporated into teaching the language. These ways are: (1) corpus-influenced materials (they include textbooks and materials of the classroom that are based on patterns and frequency obtained from corpora); (2) corpus-cited texts (dictionaries and books of grammar based on corpus data); (3) corpus-designed activities (data driven learning). Language education is rapidly influenced by corpus linguistics in each one of these three categories.

Girgin (2011) studies the effect of using corpus-based activities on EFL learners who have lower level in learning five grammar structures. Also, the study explored the students' attitudes towards using corpus-based sources in grammar instruction. It was revealed that learners were effectively able to use corpus-based 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 corpus-based activities in grammar learning. However, the gathered data of students' interviews indicated that some students have positive attitudes regarding the use of sources in English grammar learning.

Fenik&Dikilitas (2014) examined the effectiveness of corpus-based activities integration into collocation learning and demonstration of this method through contextual action research. Short texts of business were given to sixty nine

students of university, and then they were asked to generate collocations inside and outside the text. After the business corpus training, students' comments about the impact of corpus-based activities were being elicited by questionnaires and open-ended questions. The result revealed that using corpus in learner-centered collocation learning increate the constructivist nature of language learning. Also, there was a great increase in learners' autonomy, discover-based learning and motivation to vocabulary learning.

Jezo (2013) examined the use of language corpus in teaching foreign language vocabulary. The study presented the effectiveness of the corpus-based teaching/learning in vocabulary acquisition. The corpus-based approach nature was indicated through the exercises examples presented to students, in which the concordances give the students the chance to examine the vocabulary in their natural context and draw generalization with the teachers' feedback. The results indicated the effectiveness of this approach through noticing the students' high scores in their vocabulary tests.

Jafarpour&Alipour (2013) conducted a study aimed at comparing the effects of the corpus-based approach with the traditional approach regarding learning collocations of near-synonymous pairs. The sample of the study was 2 groups of L2 learners. One group is experimental and included concordancematerials taken from BNC in studying; the other group is the control group and received the traditional approach in studying. The participants were similar in terms of their collocation competence and proficiency. A prewriting and a post writing tests were the instruments used in the study. It was revealed that there was a difference between the two approaches in their effect on the comprehension and production of the synonymous collocations.

Ashouri & Rahimi (2014) shaded light on the effect of corpus-based collocation on EFL learners' learning and awareness. The sample of the study was 60 Iranian EFL learners. They were divided into two groups; experimental group and

control group. The study suggested that the direct corpus-based collocation instruction can be a worthy alternative. The results of the study showed that the experimental group students built an awareness of the existence of collocations and known how to use it.

Abdulrahman (2014) conducted a study aimed at examining the effectiveness of the corpus-based program in improving teaching vocabulary and grammar among EFL secondary school teachers. The design of the study was a pre-posttest one group study. The participants of the study were 18 secondary school teachers and 120 first year secondary school students from the secondary schools in Assiut, Egypt. The results indicated that the vocabulary learning skills and grammar among students were improved as a result of developing their teachers' learning skills.

Nasr's (2015) conducted a study aimed at examining the effectiveness of a corpus-based program for developing the phraseological competence of Sinai University Media Students (SUMS). The study adopted the one experimental group design. It tests if there are statically significant differences between the mean scores of the treatment groups' students on the pre and post administration of the writing test of using phraseological units of nouns, verbs and prepositions in favor of the post administration. The study makes use of corpus-based tools of data collection, corpus-based tools of data analysis, a pre-posttest to measure SUMS progress in learningphraseological units of nouns, verbs and prepositions, and a pre-post writing test to measure SUMS use of phraseological units of nouns, verbs and prepositions. The study results supported the study hypotheses, and the suggested program.

As shown by numbers of the previous studies the relationship of corpus-based program use and ESL/EFL student achievement is almost a matter of fact.

Studies Related to Collocations:

Studying collocations, Mongkolchai (2000) investigated the ability of students about English collocations. The sample used

was third year English majors at Srinakharinwirot University. A test of collocation comprising 56 items, based on seven patterns of Lewis (2000) strategy, was administered as tool of the research. The results indicated that the students' ability in the pattern of noun+ noun collocation was at the highest level. Students' collocational violation analysis was conducted and explanations for the violations were presented. It was revealed that the violations' sources were the students limited knowledge of collocations (Nation, 2001; Howarth, 1998), the application of students of the strategy that transferring L1 to L2 collocations (Farghal, 1995), the source text patterning great effect (Baker, 1992), students' application of the strategy of synonymy (Farghal, 1995) and the limited knowledge of the students about the cultural specific collocations (Baker, 1992).

The effect of explicit instruction of vocabulary in collocations was studies by koc (2006) to detect if this instruction will have an impact on the usage of different techniques, development of collocational awareness, and on the retention of the vocabulary. The participants of the study were 160 EFL students of upper-intermediate proficiency level under the supervision of their regular course teachers. The results showed that students became aware of collocations that they could identify it in any text and categorize lexical collocations. In addition, students reached better results in terms of vocabulary retention. So finally, it was indicated that vocabulary collocations' instructions and using different techniques are helpful in developing collocational competence and vocabulary retention.

Hsu (2007) investigated the use of English lexical collocations and their relation to the online writing. The sample used in the study was 41 Taiwanese English majors and 21 non-English majors at a national science and technology University in southern Taiwan. Students were asked to perform a 45minute online English writing test. The results of the study showed that there was a significant correlation between Taiwanese college EFL learners' frequency of lexical collocations and their scores of

online writing, also there was a significant correlation between lexical collocations' variety of subjects and their scores in online writing.

Mounya (2010) studied teaching collocations' role in raising the proficiency of foreign language writing. The basic reason was that students met a variety of difficulties that make their writing not proficient while studying English as a foreign language. The major difficulty that they met was the lack of appropriate vocabulary which may be due to the ignorance of collocations. An experimental study has been conducted. The sample of the study was divided into two groups; an experimental and a control group. A pretest, posttest and questionnaire were instruments used in the study. The experiment used was based on explicit teaching of collocations to raise the students' proficiency of writing. The results revealed a strong linear correlation between writing proficiency and using collocations. Thus, the adaptation of a communicative collocational approach was recommended to teach writing.

Alsakran (2011) examined the productive and receptive knowledge of lexical and grammatical collocations among advanced Arabic speaking learners of English. Furthermore, it investigated the influence of the language environment on collocations' acquisition. In addition to examined the significant differences between the performances of participants on three collocations' types: verb-noun, adjective-noun, and verb-preposition. The participants of the study were 68 (38 Saudi students at the institute of public administration in Riyadh, and 30 Arab students in the intensive English program at Colorado University). Three gap filling tests and a judgement test were the tools used in the study. The results indicate that Arabic learners of English demonstrated poor knowledge of collocations in the four tests.

Kamal (2014) examined the effect of explicit and implicit instruction on the acquisition of verb+ noun collocations. He also investigated the attitudes of L2 learners towards learning collocations explicitly and implicitly. 40 intermediate Egyptian

L2 learners were the participants of the study and they received a test of collocation familiarity from which the researcher select the 21 least familiar target collocations to be included in the study. The design of the study included two experimental groups consisted of 20 participants; one group received the explicit method in learning, while the other group received the implicit method. A posttest was administered to students in the two groups, a Likert scale survey also was conducted on the 40 participants to investigate the students' attitudes towards learning collocations; all of these were the tools of the study. The results showed that the group who learned through collocations explicitly was improved in their knowledge of the verb+ noun collocations. Both two groups' general attitudes about using collocations were positive.

Nurmukhamedov (2015) studied the impact of three collocation tools (two online and one book dictionary) on collocation correction. The participants of the study were three groups of L2 English writers these groups consisted of 45 students in the intensive English program in Southwestern USA. Each group received training in using collocation tool. The study adopted Latin square design; the participants were asked to use a tool and correct 16 miscollocations in an essay, this procedure was repeated three times so, each group used the three tools in different orders. Tests, questionnaire and interviews were tools of the study. The results of the study have direct implications for collocation instruction in the writing related course in the PIE.

In brief, researchers generally agree that there is a positive relationship between collocation use and academic achievement in the second and foreign language context, especially in the writing improvement.

Studies Related to Data Driven Learning (DDL)

Koosha&Jafarpour (2006) conducted a study to examine the effectiveness of concordancing material on the collocation teaching of prepositions. The sample of the study was 200 Iranian EFL adult learners who were divided into two groups. One group learned through data-driven instruction, while the

other group received instruction in the conventional approach. The results indicated that the participants of the study outperformed those who received conventional instruction in the collocation learning of prepositions.

Rapti (2010) examined the impact of DDL on a group of students in Greece in order to investigate the motivation to learn grammar by DDL and its benefit. The study adopted a design that included dividing students into experimental and control group; the experimental group received concordance-based grammar materials, while the control group used a conventional grammar book. The tools of the study were questionnaires and interviews. Most learners favored concordance-based learning without total independence of the conventional grammar book. The qualitative evidence indicated that students acknowledged the importance of corpora, while the quantitative indicated that the experimental group's participants scored higher than those of the control group.

Chujo, Anthony and Uchibori (2012) conducted three year comparative case study of computer-based, paper-based and combined computer and paper-based DDL using a parallel corpus. The study conducted on beginner level university students. a work sheet guided tasks was designed for students to follow to understand target grammar patterns and follow up practice. The exercises of the DDL were applied on a bilingual concordance using corpus of the newspaper. The results revealed that DDL approaches can be efficient in developing basics of the grammar such as understanding and producing noun phrases. It was also indicated that students used all three approached and made significant gains.

Jalilifar, Mehrabi & Mousa (2014) investigated the effect of enriching the vocabulary instruction with the concordance lines printouts on learning and retention of Iranian EFL students. 70 students took part in the study the study group studied with the instruction enriched with printouts of concordance, while the control group received the conventional instruction. A pre and post-tests and a delayed vocabulary recall test were

administered to both groups. The experimental group achieved better results than the control group in both the posttest and the delayed vocabulary recall test. The results indicated that enriching vocabulary instruction with concordance lines improves students' achievement and retention of EFL vocabulary.

Yunus &Awab (2014) investigated the impact of DDL instruction on colligations' production of prepositions among low under-graduates at Malaysia University. Pre and post-tests were tools used in the study to collect data. The participants of the study were 40 students who were divided into two groups; the experimental and control group. Each group consisted of 20 students. The experimental group received the module and DDL approach, while the control group received non-DDL module and followed the traditional approach of teaching. Results indicated that the students' performance In the DDL group was better than the students' performance in the comparison group regarding the gap-filling task,and the error- identification and correction task. However, no significant difference was found in the single-sentence writing task.

The previous studies have indicated that there is a positive relationship between using DDL and learning English language. Higher performance's learners use DDL more frequently. In addition, most of the above mentioned studies discovered that successful students used DDL most frequently.

Studies Related to Language Learning Autonomy:

A number of studies were conducted on language learning autonomy at various school levels. Dafei (2007) investigated the relation between learner autonomy and English proficiency. The sample of the study was 129 non-English majors in a college of teachers in China by tools such as questionnaires and interviews. The results of the study demonstrated that the students' proficiency in English was positively related to the autonomy of their leaners, and there are no significant differences among the autonomy of the students' learner when their English proficiency is not different. But there are significant differences among the

autonomy of the students' learner when their English proficiency is significantly different.

BalciKanli (2008) study aimed to enhance learner autonomy through a number of activities to be exploited at preparatory school, Gazi University. The sample of the study was two classes randomly selected, each class consisted of 20 learners studied English as experimental and control group. Learner autonomy and questionnaire were administered to both groups. The experimental group received autonomy implementation, while the control group received the regular way of teaching. The results displayed that the learners' scores in the experimental group were higher than their counterparts in the control group, and they had a strong tendencies towards autonomy than in the control group.

Ustunluoglu (2009) investigated the university students' perception and teachers in terms of responsibilities and abilities related to autonomous learning, and autonomous activities inside and outside the classroom. The study examined also the ability of these activities to be changed according to students' level or gender. The sample of the study was 320 students and 24 teachers. The results demonstrated that both students and teachers need to understand the necessity of learner independence, and autonomous learning training program should be integrated in the language curriculum, especially with regard to administration.

Learners' autonomy level and relationship to learning style was investigated by Nematipour (2012) by means of two questionnaires. The result indicated that there is a positive relationship between visual and auditory learning styles with their learner autonomy. However, there were no significant differences between males and females in language learning style and autonomy level.

Foroutan, Nooren&Baki (2013) studied the relation between autonomy in language learning and learning styles in eastern contexts. The participants of the study were 360 form 6

students at Selangor, Malaysia. The results revealed that most Malaysian students are auditory learners. Also, students' language learning autonomy was positively related to learning styles, except individual and group styles of learning.

Shangarffam (2013) investigated the relationship among EFL learners' autonomy, first and second language essay writing in task-based instruction. The participants of the study were 145 EFL University students of teaching English at Islamic Azad University. The tools used were questionnaire and essays writing tests. The results of the study indicated that there is a positive relationship among EFL learners' autonomy, first and second language essay writing in task-based instruction. Also, it was indicated that autonomy was a better predictor of English essay writing in comparison with Persian essay writing.

Tanyeli & Kuter (2013) examined perceptions of the freshman law students regarding their autonomy in writing classes and perceptions of their teachers regarding writing skill area in the curriculum in promoting learner autonomy in foreign language. The results showed that there was positive attitude of students towards language learning, yet they do not consider themselves as autonomous learners in learning and writing skill. The problem of students in language use and their dependence on teachers were reported to be impeding their autonomy in learning.

Nga (2014) examined the teachers' understanding of learner autonomy concept and how they applied it in their teaching practice. Data were collected through two tools of the study; survey and interviews. The results showed that teachers generally lacked understanding about learner autonomy and there was an alignment between teachers' beliefs and their real practices regarding learner autonomy.

Merc (2015) investigated the possible effects of learner autonomy training on the study habits on first year University students. The instrument of the study was a questionnaire that was administered to 122 students. The data analysis revealed a

significant difference in the study habits of students before and after the training in terms of study skills. The results indicated the effectiveness of learner autonomy training on decreasing the anxiety of students.

As shown above from the previous studies that learners autonomy has a positive relationship with English language learning as it attributes to the students success rate in learning the language.

Pilot studies:

Pilot Study (1):

In order to provide evidence for the problem of the study, the researcher conducted a pilot study to determine student teachers' level in writing skills in general. An Essay Writing Test was administered to a sample of 30 fourth year student teachers in the Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Education, Mansoura University. Following are the results of the Essay Writing Test.

Table (1): Essay Writing Test Results(Maximum Score = 20)

Skills		Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.Deviation
Organization	30	1.00	5.00	3.3667	1.03335
Structure	30	1.00	4.00	2.6000	.85501
Cohesion	30	1.00	4.00	2.3000	.98786
Coherence	30	1.00	4.00	2.4333	.89763
Total	30	8.00	15.00	10.700	1.78403

Table (1) reveals that the mean score in organization is 2.5 out of 5 and the mean score that the student-teachers achieved is 3.3 this result indicates that the students' performance in organization is slightly above of the mean score. On the other hand, students' mean score in structure, coherence, and cohesion is almost the same (ranges from 2.3-2.6) which amounts to a mediocre score for EFL student-teachers.

The average of the total mean score is 10 and the total mean score that the students' achieved is 10.7 (= 53.2%) which indicates that the student-teachers' performance in Essay writing skills is in the average level.

Pilot Study (2):

In order to validate the discussion above, the researcher administered Language Learning Autonomy Inventory (LLAI) based on Dafei's Study to 30 fourth grade student-teachers in the Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Languages, Mansoura University order to determine if the student- teachers have language learning Autonomy is high enough to support their independent EFL learning. Results of the LLAI administration are reported in table (2) Appendix (5).

Table (2) showed that student-teachers' responses to about 50% of the statements (1,2,4,5,7,8,10,11,13,14,21) approached the average level (K2 is significant at the .05 level). Responses clustered around the choice "sometimes". Around 30% of the responses ,however, moved towards the choice "rarely" in statements 3,6,8,12,15, 16 and 20 (K2 is significant at the .05 level). In only two statements (17 and 18) did student-teachers' responses move towards the choices "often" and " always" .

These results indicate that 52.3% of student-teachers' responses were at the average level in the language learning.

Pilot Study (3):

In order to validate the study problem, the researcher administered a Collocations Test (CT) to 30 fourth grade student-teachers in the Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Education , Mansoura University in order to determine their level in proper use of collocations.(Table 3) below.

Table (2) : The Collocations Test Results (Maximum Score = 20)

		Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.Deviation
Collocations	30	5.00	14.0	9.2000	2.61824

From the above table, it can be noticed that the average mean score of the collocations is 10 and the student-teachers' mean score is 9.2, which points to students' low level in the proper use of collocations (M=9.200 &%=46).

Statement of the problem:

EFL student teachers lack the Collocations needed to produce correct written English. Besides, they use inappropriate

word combinations when they write; i.e., words that do not go together. As a result, their writing is not proficient. Based on the literature review and results of the pilot study, it is evident that student teachers are not doing well in writing skills and seem not to use corpus-Based programs in their learning, this, in turn, may affect their EFL learning and teaching.

Questions of the study:

The study aimed at answering the following questions:

1. What are the EFL Writing Skills necessary for the fourth grade student teachers at the faculty of Education?
2. What are the features of the proposed Corpus-Based Program?
3. What is the impact of using Corpus-Based Program in the EFL Writing Skills of the fourth grade student teachers at the faculty of Education?
4. What is the impact of using Corpus-Based Program in the EFL Language Learning Autonomy of the fourth grade student teachers at the Faculty of Education?

Hypotheses of the study:

1. There is a statistically significant difference between the experimental and the control groups in the EFL Writing Skills in favor of the experimental group after conducting the Corpus-Based Program.
2. There is a statistically significant difference between the experimental and the control groups in the Language Learning Autonomy in favor of the experimental group after conducting the Corpus-Based Program.

Delimitations of the study:

The present study was delimited to:

1. Fourth grade EFL student teachers in the Department of Foreign Language, Faculty of Education, Mansoura University.
2. British National Corpus (BNC).

3. EFL Collocations Section necessary for student teachers at the Faculty of Education.
4. The variable autonomy is specifically delimited to Language Learning Autonomy.

Instruments of the study:

For meeting the purposes of this study the following instruments were used:

1. An EFL Writing Skills Checklist.
2. Writing Test (pre/post).
3. A Rubric for scoring the EFL Writing test.
4. Language Learning Autonomy Inventory (pre/post) (LLAI).

The design of the study

This study was a quasi-experimental study that aimed to investigate the effectiveness of Corpus-Based Program in improving vocabulary, writing and Autonomous learning of the Fourth grade student teachers. Two groups were randomly selected from the Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Education in Mansoura University. One group of 30 students was the experimental group and received Corpus-Based program The other group of 30 students served as a control group and received only the regular teaching.

Definition of terms:

In this study the corpus is defined as the collocations represented in fourth grade EFL student teachers' writing textbook and their online extention.

Data-Driven Learning:

defined by Johns (1991) as" using computer-generated concordances in classrooms to involve students in exploring concordance based output regularities of patterning in the target language and how can the activities and exercises be developed.

Hunston (2002, p.170) also points out that "DDL involves setting up situations in which students can answer questions

about language themselves by studying corpus data in the form of concordance lines or sentences".

Writing Skills:

EFL writing skills are defined in this study as: skills required for producing a piece of writing including: content, syntax, grammar, word choice, organization and mechanics skills.

Autonomy:

Dickinson (1987: 11) defined autonomy as 'the situation in which the learner is totally responsible for all of the decisions concerned with his learning and the implementation of those decisions'.

Benson (2006) described Autonomy as a capacity to take charge of, or take responsibility for, or control over your own learning. From this point of view, autonomy involves abilities and attitudes that people possess, and can develop to various degrees.

Collocations:

For general language teaching and research, collocation is a sequence of words with certain non-idiom meaning in the text that could be used in certain grammatical forms to help in the sequences' occurrences with a greater probability than accident. (Wei, 2001).

Vocabulary:

Students' vocabulary knowledge is a building process that occurs over time as they make connections to other words, learn examples and nonexamples of the word and related words, and use the word accurately within the context of the sentence (Snow, Griffin, & Burns, 2005).

Lenkeit (2007) clarified that vocabulary is commonly defined as "all the words known and used by a particular person".

Results of the study:

Results of the Writing Test:

Hypothesis #1: "There is a significant difference at the .05 level between the mean score of the control group and the

experimental group on the post administration of the EFL writing test in favor of the experimental group due to implementing of the Corpus-Based Program"

To verifies hypothesis #1 the researcher used the t-test for independent samples. See table (3)

Table (3)Comparing the performance of the control and experimental groups on the post-administration of the EFL Writing Test.

Writing Skills	Control Group		Experimental Group		t-value	Sig.	Effect Size
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D			
Pre-Writing skills	10.3	1.73	21.0	0.02	39.170	0.01	95%
During Writing Skills	9.40	1.90	18.9	0.70	30.205	0.01	92%
Post Writing skills	5.66	0.90	12.00	0.015	46.571	0.01	97%
total	25.32	3.03	51.90	0.70	53.894	0.01	97%

Table (3) reports that the T- values were (39.17, 30.205, 46.571, 53.894) and that all of them were statistically significant at (0.01). This means that there were significant differences between the Experimental and the control groups in the post-administration of the EFLWT. This also signifies that the Corpus-Based program had its effect on all interacted levels of the Writing Skills and not just on each Writing skills level per se.

Effect size was calculated using eta square where (1% -< 6%) indicates small effect size and (6% >- 20%) indicates medium effect size and 20% is large effect size.

The multivariate effect is (0.95, 0.92, 0.97, 0.97 respectively) which means that (95%, 92%, 97%, 97% respectively) of the variance in the dependent variable could be ascribed to the effectiveness of the Corpus-Based program (among other variables not included in the current study such as school environment, private tutoring, etc). The Corpus-Based program had a large effect when all Writing Skills levels interacted with each other. Therefore, the First hypothesis of the study is verified and accepted. Diagram () indicates these results.

It is worth mentioning that, the results of the first hypothesis are in line with those of *Bennett (2010); Fenik and Dikilitas (2014)*; *Ashouri, Arjmandi and Rahimi (2014);Nasr (2015)* as they all stated that the use of Corpus-Based Program improved the students' Writing Skills.

Hypothesis #2: "There is a significant difference at the .05 level between the mean score of the experimental group in the pre- and post- administration of the writing test in favor of post-administration due to the implementation of the Corpus-Based Program"

T-test for dependent samples was used to compare the difference between the mean score of the experimental group students in the writing test before and after administering the Corpus-Based Program.

Table(4)Comparing the Writing Performance of the experimental group on the pre –post administration of the EFL writing test.

Writing Skills	Post-Administration		Pre-Administration		t-value	Sig.	Effect Size
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D			
Pre-Writing Skills	10.32	2.36	21.00	0.02	28.5	0.01	95%
During Writing Skills	8.68	2.1	18.9	0.70	31.21	0.01	96%
Post Writing Skills	5.53	0.96	12.00	0.015	42.638	0.01	98%
Total	24.53	3.082	51.90	0.70	44.939	0.01	95%

Results in table (4) reveal that the mean score in the post-administration of the EFLWT was greater than that of the pre-administration in all Writing Skills.

The above table reports that:

1. T-test value was significant at (0.01) for the three Writing Skills levels and the total use of all Writing Skills (28.5, 31.21, 42.63, 44.93 respectively).
2. All differences were in favor of the post-administration of the WT.
3. Values of differences between mean score were all > 0.5 (21.00; 18.9; 12.00; 51.90 respectively). The greatest

value was in the total use of Writing Skills and the least was in the "Post-Writing Skills" level.

4. The (Zero) value was found outside the Confidence Interval of differences for all Writing Skills levels. These results affirm the significance of the t-test value for the difference between the pre-post WT administrations for the experimental group.

5. The Effect Size was calculated as (0.95) which means that (95%) of the variance in the total dependent variable could be ascribed to the effectiveness of the Corpus-Based program (among other variables not included in the current study such as school environment, private tutoring, etc) . This large effect size of the program was evident when all Writing Skills levels interacted with each other.

It is, thus, evident that the training program made a great difference in the use of the Writing Skills for the experimental group.

Previous studies *(i.e Yoon and Hirvela (2004) ;Breyer* (2008); *Gilmore* (2009))supported the results of this study in that training in the use of Corpus-Based Program has a great effect in enhancing students' EFL Writing Skills.

On the other side, some studies concluded that Corpus-Based program is not a useful tool and didn't effect on students' learning language in general and their Writing skills in particular such as *Andor 2004; Stubbs 1993; Landau 2001;and Dash 2004.*

Results of Language Learning Autonomy Inventory:

Hypothesis #3: "There is a statistically significant difference at the .05 level between the experimental and the control groups in the post administration of Language Learning Autonomy in favor of the experimental group.

To validate this hypothesis, the researcher used the t-test for independent measures. See table (5) below.

Table(5)Comparing the control and experimental groups' learning Autonomy on the post-administration of the LLAI.

Variable	Control Group		Experimental Group		t-value	Sig.	Effect size
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D			
Autonomy	47.80	5.24	62.93	15.61	5.828	0.01	30%

Table (5) shows that the t-value for the difference between the two groups was in favor of the experimental group (62.93) where the t-value was (5.828) and it was significant at the (0.01).

In addition, the effect size of the Corpus-Based program on the students' Language Learning Autonomy was substantially large (.0.3) which means that the effect size of the training program on students' Language Learning Autonomy improvement is 30%.

It is worth mentioning that the results of the present study are consistent with the results of the studies conducted by *Kocak* (2003); Dafei (2007); Balcikanli (2008) ; Ustunluoglu (2009); Nematipour (2012) in assuring effectiveness of using Corpus-Based Program in increasing students' Language Learning Autonomy.

Hypothesis #4: "There is a statistically significant difference at the .05 level between the mean score of the experimental group in the pre-post-administration of the LLAI in favor of the post administration due to using Corpus-Based Program"

To test this hypothesis, the researcher used the t-test for repeated measures. Table (6) below displays mean, standard deviation and the effect size in the pre- and post- administration of the LLAI on the experimental group.

Table(6)Comparing the results of the experimental group on the pre – and post administration of LLAI.

Variable	Pre-administration		Post-administration		t-value	Sig.	Effect size
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D			
Autonomy	49.15	6.68	62.92	15.61	5.88	0.01	47%

Results in table (6) illustrate that, the t-test value was (5.88) and it was significant at (0.01) and difference was in favor of the post-administration of the LLAI. This value differences between the mean scores were > 0.5 (62.92). The (Zero) value was found outside the confidence Interval differences for the total LLAI score. These results supported the significance of the t-test values for the difference between the pre- and post-administration of the LLAI on the experimental group.

Results thus, reported that the training program had sizable positive impact on students' EFL Language Learning Autonomy perception.

Again, results of the current study add up to those of the previous studies of *Foroutan, Nooreen, Gani and Baki (2013); Shangarffam and ghazisaeedi (2013); Nga (2014)* that Corpus-Based Program increase students' Language Learning Autonomy in English Language Writing Skills.

Results of this study (supported by a considerable number of previous studies) reveal that training students in Corpus-Based Program may very much help them improve their English Writing, increases their use of such Writing skills, and enhance their Language Learning Autonomy.

Discussion of Results:

The results of the present study revealed the effectiveness of the experimental treatment. Before the administration of the proposed treatment, a corpus based program training designed to help 4th grade student teachers to enhance their writing skills and self-Autonomy. The participants' writing skills were significantly improved including pre writing skills (planning to write- structure), While writing skills(coherence-cohesion-organization skills),and post writing skills (revision skills) and every sub-skills of these skills has many micro skills. By the end of the implementation of the study program, the experimental group achieved a high level of writing skills. They enjoyed searching for the new words, knowing new uses of every word

they write on the corpus program, comparing the uses of a lot of words to decide which word is the best to choose and use, and checking their paragraphs in the word and sentence level, so their self-autonomy was increased as well. This result supports Shangarffam and ghazisaeedi (2013) who came to the conclusion that using corpus-based program enhances students' language learning Autonomy.

The control group students who did not have the opportunity to participate in the proposed treatment did not show much progress in their writing skills or in their language learning Autonomy.

To sum up, the present study proved that using Corpus-Based program is effective in enhancing EFL student teachers' writing skills and language learning Autonomy.

By using the Corpus-Based program, students exposed to great number of words these words collected from the native speakers of English (from recorded interviews, newspapers, books, etc.) and this made them very excited to know much more about these words, how to use them, what collocation can be used along with these words, and were exposed to a lot of examples for these words. Students also were very excited when they used the Corpus-Based program in the pre-writing stage, they applied a great number of pre-writing techniques by using Corpus-Based Program,(eg, looping, listing, mapping, charting,etc.) the students wrote the word and found a many words that came along with this word and began to make a chart for these words, list, or a map of these words, this makes them very excited and increased their language learning autonomy. In the "While Writing" stage, the students used the Corpus-Based program to know the various ways of using such a word, comparing between two words and deciding which word to use. They also knew the collocation for each of these words, so in this level; the students used the Corpus-Based program as a catalyst to make a decision in some grammatical problems. The students also enjoyed using the Corpus-Based program before writing

their essays as an assessment tool; they consulted the Corpus to make the final draft of their essays.

Beside all of this, using Corpus-Based program enhanced the students' language learning Autonomy and gave them the chances to decide what to write, what words to choose, and to correct their writings by themselves.

Students liked to work on the Corpus and they benefited from the way they could use corpus to write a good essay as they said in the KLW Evaluation Forums (see Appendix) and they mentioned that they learned a lot of pre-writing strategies such as (listing, outlining, free writing, etc.) and how to use it to write a good essay. They also learned how to register to the BNC and how to search on it. They aslo very interested when they learned how to brainstorm a lot of words and collocation from BNC and knew the differences of using such an adjectives with a certain nouns. Students mentioned in the KLW forums that they interested in correcting their punctuation and grammar using the BNC. They interested for using BNC because it is an easy way to search on vocabularies and grammar but they said that they met some obstacles in using BNC such as the huge amount of information and concordances they found on it, and also how to read these concordances in the right way and the researcher helped them to get rid of these obstacles.

The results of the present study are in line with the results of the study conducted by Jezo, (2013) in the idea that the corpus-based approach raises the awareness of awareness that combined with the use of a concordances and learning tasks, which guide the students' vocabulary examination can be effectively used in foreign language classes at university level.

Also, Celik and Elkatmis (2013) line with the present study that there was a great effect on the students' English learning when exposing to corpus data and these data guiding them to make deductions on the acquisition of punctuation marks for their writings.

Jafarpour, Hashemian and Alipour (2013) also echo with this study in the effect of the corpus-based approach in students' use of collocations of near-synonymous pairs and showed that there was a great effect on the comprehension and production of collocations of synonyms when they use corpus-based approach.

Abdulrahman (2014) study showed that, the learning skills of vocabulary and grammar among students were improved as a result of developing their teachers' teaching skills. And this result agreed with the present study.

Girgin (2011) lined with the present study that the Corpus-Based program increased the students' Language learning Autonomy.

In the other hand, some studies didn't prefer using Corpus-Based Program in Language learning such as Chomsky 1957 wrote in his book that " ...it is obvious that the set of grammatical sentences cannot be identified with any particular corpus of utterances . . . ", ". . . a grammar mirrors the behavior of the speaker, who, on the basis of a finite and accidental experience with language, can produce or understand an indefinite number of new sentences", and " . . . one's ability to produce and recognize grammatical utterances is not based on notions of statistical approximations or the like."

Andor, 2004, also reported that "Corpus linguistics doesn't mean anything. It's like saying suppose a physicist decides, suppose physics and chemistry decide that instead of relying on experiments, what they're going to do is take videotapes of things happening in the world and they'll collect huge videotapes of everything that's happening and from that maybe they'll come up with some generalizations or insights." But beside all of this contradicted studies we cannot forget the importance of using Online learning and Technology in teaching and learning English as a Foreign Language such as using Corpus-Based program in improving students' writing skills and increase their Language learning Autonomy.

Conclusion:

With reference to the results of this study, the following points were concluded:

1. The current study provided evidence to the effectiveness of using Corpus-Based Program Training in enhancing EFL Writing skills. This result adds to the validity of other studies investigating similar aspects such as that Cobb (1999), Simpson and Mendis (2003), and Yoon and Hirvela (2004).
2. The present study provided evidence to the effectiveness of using Corpus-Based Program Training in enhancing the use Collocation in the Student teachers' EFL Writing.
3. This study provided evidence to the impact of using Corpus-Based Program Training in helping to enhance student teachers' Language Learning Autonomy.

Recommendations of the Study:

Based on the results and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. Ministry of Higher Education should train EFL teachers onthe use new Technology; computer skills and Corpus-Based Program are included, in order to help their student teachers learn English language skills more effectively.
2. EFL teachers should train their students in the use of the various types of technology specially the Computer skills.
3. EFL teachers should hold symposiums, workshops, and conferences to share experience and views on teaching and learning new Technology techniques.
4. EFL teachers need to plan activities that motivate students to use new technology and provide practice opportunities.
5. Course designers should consider the inclusion of Corpus-Based program and new computer technology when developing EFL courses particularly at university level.

6. New techniques for enhancing writing skills should be explored and exploited, so that language learners will easily make their way to their proficiency goals.

REFERENCES:

Abdulrahman, S. (2014). The Effectiveness of Using a Corpus Based on the Internet Technology Program in Developing Teaching Vocabulary and Grammar among EFL Secondary School Teachers. PHD. Thesis. Assuit University, Egypt.

Aijmer, K. (2009). Introduction: Corpora and language teaching. In K. Aijmer (Ed.), Corpora and language teaching (pp. 1-10). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alsakran, R. (2011). The Productive and Perceptive Knowledge of Collocations by Advanced Arabic-speaking ESL/EFL Learners. Published Master thesis. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Andor, J. 2004. The master and his performance: An Interview with Noam Chomsky. Intercultural Pragmatics 1: 1.

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 Pavesi, M., and Bernini, G. (eds.), L'apprendimento linguistico all'universita: le lingue speciali, Roma: Bulzoni. PP. 205-226.

Baker, M. (1992). In other words. London: Routledge.

Balcikanli, C. (2008). Fostering Learner Autonomy in EFL Classrooms. Kastamonu Education Journal.16, (1), 277-284.

Bennett, G. R. (2010). Using corpora in the language learning classroom: Corpus linguistics for teachers. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Benson, P. (2006). Autonomy in Language Learning. Retrieved on April 20, 2015 from http://ec.hku.hk/autonomy/#k

Bernardini, S. (2004). Corpora in the classroom: An overview and some reflections on future developments. In Sinclair, J.

(Ed.), How to Use Corpora in Language Teaching, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins, pp. 220-249.

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., Amsterdam: Rodopi ,pp. 31-64

Breyer, Y. (2008). Learning and teaching with corpora: Reflections by student teachers. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 22(2), 153-172. doi: 10.1080/09588220902778328.

Celik, S. & Elkatmis, M. (2013). The Effect of Corpus Assisted Language Teaching on the Learners' Proper Use of Punctuation Marks. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice - 13(2) • Spring • 1090-1094.

Chomsky, N. (1957). Syntactic Structures. Mouton publishers, The, Hagu. Paris. pp.15-17.

Chujo, K., Anthony, L., Oghigian, K. & Uchibori, A. (2012). Paper-Based, Computer-Based, and Combined Data-Driven Learning Using à Web-Based Concordancer. Language Education in Asia, 3(2), 132-145.

Cobb, T. (1997). From concord to lexicon: Development and test of a corpus-based lexical tutor. Montreal: Concordia University, PhD dissertation. Retrieved November 4, 2016 from http://132.208.224.131/ResearchWeb/.

Cobb, T. (1999). Breadth and depth of vocabulary acquisition with hands-on concordancing. Computer Assisted Language Learning 12, 345 - 360.

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.

Cowie, A. P. (Eds.). (1988). Stable and creative aspects of vocabulary use. In R. Carter & M. McCarthy (Eds.), "Vocabulary and language teaching" (pp. 126-137). Harlow: Longman.

Dafei, D. (2007). An Exploration of the Relationship Between Learner Autonomy and English Proficiency. Professional Teaching Articles.

Dash, Niladri Sekhar (2004) "Issues involved in the development of a corpus-based machine translation system". International Journal of Translation. 16(2): 57-79.

Dickinson, L., (1987). Self-Instruction in Language Learning[M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Farghal, M. & Obiedat, H. (1995). Collocations: a neglected variable in EFL writing, IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 33, 315- 331. Retrieved September 2015 from ProQuest Direct (No.0019042X).

Fenik, S. & Dikilitas, K.(2014). Integrating Corpora into Collocation-based Vocabulary Learning . Humanising Language Teaching. Issue 5, ISSN 1755-9715.

Foroutan, M. Nooreen, N. Gani,H. &Baki,R. (2013). The Relationship Between Language Learning Autonomy Extent and Learning Styles in Malaysian Context. World Applied Sciences Journal 24 (3): 395-402.

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.

Howarth, P. (1998). Phraseology and Second Language Proficiency, Applied Linguistics.19(1), 24-44.

Hsu, J. (2007). Lexical Collocations and their Relation to the Online Writing of Taiwanese College English Majors and Non-English Majors. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 192–209. Retrieved in 20-6-2017 from http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v4n22007/hsu.pdf.

Hunston, S. (2002) Corpora in Applied Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hunston, S. (2002). Pattern grammar, language teaching, and linguistic variation. Applications of a corpus-driven

grammar. In Reppen, R. et al. (Eds.) Using Corpora to Explore Linguistic Variation. pp. 167-83, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jafarpour, A. & Koosha, M. (2005). Data-driven learning and teaching collocation of prepositions: the case of Iranian EFL students. Journal of Faculties and Research of Humanities, 49, 25-45.

Jafarpour, A. Hashemian, M. &Alipour,S. (2013). A Corpus-based Approach toward Teaching Collocation of Synonyms. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 51-60.

Jalilifar, A., Mehrabi, K. & Mousa, S. (2014). The Effect of Concordance Enriched Instruction on the Vocabulary Learning and Retention of Iranian EFL Learners. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 98, 742 – 746.

Jezo, E.D. (2013). Using Language Corpus in Teaching Foreign Language Vocabulary . Krakow, Poland. Jagiellonian University, International Multidisciplinary e-Journal, ISSN 2277 – 4262.

Johns, T. (1991). Should you be persuaded: two examples of data driven learning. ELR Journal (New Series), 4. 1-16.

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.

Kamal, O. (2014). Investigating the effect of explicit and implicit instruction on the acquisition of verb + noun collocations: a case of L2 Egyptian learners. Published Master Thesis. The American University in Cairo. Egypt.

Keller, E. (1979). Gambits: Conversational strategy signals. "Journal of Pragmatics, 3," 219-237.

Koc, G. (006).Developing Collocational Awareness. Published Master Thesis. School of Education. Bilkent University. Ankara. Turkey.

Kocak, A. (2003). A Study on Learners' Readiness for Autonomous Learning of English As a Foreign Language. Middle East Technical University.

Koda, K. (2000). Cross-linguistic variations in L2 morphological awareness. Applied Psycholinguistics, 21, 297-320.

Landau, Sidney I. (2001) Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography. 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, S. (2011). Challenges of Using Corpora in Language Teaching and Learning: Implications for Secondary Education. Linguistic Research. 28(1), 159-178.

Lenkeit (2007) Introducing cultural anthropology Boston: McGraw-Hill (3rd. ed.).

Lewis, M. (1993). "The lexical approach: The state of ELT and the way forward." Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (1997). "Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice." Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (Ed.). (2000). Teaching collocation: Further development in the lexical approach. Oxford: Oxford University 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 ERIC database No. ED477143.

Merc, A. (2015). The Effect of a Learner Autonomy Training on the Study Habits of the First-year ELT Students. Academic Journals. Vol,10(4), pp 378-387.

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. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. PP. 119-142.

Mongkolchai, A. (2000). A Study of University Students' Ability in Using English Collocations. Master's Project, M.A. (English). Bangkok: Graduate School, Srinakharinwirot University. Project Advisor: Assistant Professor Sirinna Boonyasaquan.

Mounya, A. (2010). Teaching Lexical Collocations to Raise Proficiency in Foreign Language Writing. Published Master Thesis. GUELMA UNIVERSITY. ALGERIA.

Nasr, A. (2015). A Corpus-based Program for Developing the Phraseological Competence of Sinai University Media Students. Ain Shams University. Egypt.

Nation, P. (2001). Learning vocabulary in another language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nation, P. (2001). Learning vocabulary in another language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nattinger, J., & DeCarrico, J. (1992). "Lexical phrases and language teaching." Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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.

Nematipour, M. (2012). A Study of Iranian EFL Learners' Autonomy Level and its Relationship with Learning Style. English Linguistics Research, 1(1).

Nga,N.(2014). Learner Autonomy in Language Learning: Teachers' Beliefs.Published Ph.D Thesis. Faculty of Education. Queensland University of Technology.

Nurmukhamedov, U. (2015). An Evaluation of Collocation Tools for Second Language Writers. Northern Arizona University.

O'Keeffe, A. & Farr, F. (2003). Using language corpora in initial teacher education: Pedagogic issues and practical applications. TESOL Journal Quarterly, 37, 389-418.

Ozgul, B. (2011). Teaching vocabulary through collocations in EFL Classes: The case of Turkey. International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 1(2), 21-32.

Pawley, A., & Syder, F. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Native-like selection and native-like fluency. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), "Language and communication" (pp. 191-226). London: Longman.

Peters, A. (1983). "The units of language acquisition." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rapti, N. (2010). A study of classroom concordancing in the Greek context: Data-driven grammar teaching and adolescent EFL learners. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Nottingham, UK.

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). "Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis" (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shangarffam, N. & Ghazisaeedi,F. (2013). The Relationship among EFL Learners' Autonomy, First Language Essay Writing Tasks and Second Language Essay Writing Tasks in Task/Content Based Language Instruction. Global Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology. (ISSN : 2322-2441) Issue 5, pp. 177-191.

Simpson, R. & Mendis D. (2003). A corpus-based study of idioms in academic speech. TESOL Quarterly, 27 (3), 419-441.

Snow, C. E., Griffin, P., & Burns, M. S. (Eds.). (2005). Knowledge to support the teaching of reading: Preparing teachers for a changing world. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stubbs, Michael (1993) "British tradition in text analysis: from Firth to Sinclair". In: Baker, M., G. Francis, and E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.) Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair. Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Pp. 1-35.

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.

Sun, Y-C. (2000). Using on-line corpus to facilitate language learning. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, British Columbia, Canada. (An online ERIC Database Fuultext No ED.442275)

Tanyeli, N., & Kuter, S. (2013). Examining learner autonomy in foreign language learning and instruction. Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 53/A, 19-36.

Taylor, L. (1990). Teaching and learning vocabulary. London: Prentice Hall.

Thurston, J., & Candlin, C. N. (1998). Concordancing and the teaching of vocabulary of academic English. English for Specific Purposes, 17, 267 – 280.

Tribble, C. (1997). Put a corpus in your classroom: Using a computer in vocabulary development. Alexandria, TESOL Journal. pp. 266-268.

Tseng, Y.-C. And Liou, H.-C. (2006).The effects of online conjunction materialson college EFL students' writing. System, 34: 270-283.

Ustunluoglu, E. (2009). Autonomy in Language Learning: Do Students Take Responsibility for their Learning?. Journal of Theory and Practice in Education. 5 (2):148-169.

Vannestål, M. and 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.

Wei, N.X. (2001). The definition and study of word collocation. Shanghai: Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press.

Yoon, H. and Hirvela, A. (2004). ESL student attitudes toward corpus use in L2 writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 13: 257–283.

Yunus, K. & Awab, S. (2014). The Impact of Data-Driven Learning Instruction on Malaysian Law Undergraduates' Colligational Competence. Kajian Malaysia, Vol. 32,79–109.