TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION FORM		ii
ABSTRACT		iii
ABSTRACT		v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS		viii
LIST OF FIGURES		xvii
LIST OF TABLES		xviii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.0	Background to the Study	1
	1.0.1 Corpus Linguistics and Data-Driven Learning	1
	1.0.2 The Status of English in Malaysia	4
	1.0.3 The Importance of English in Legal Education in Malaysia	5
1.1	Statement of Problem	6
1.2	Purpose of the Study	16
1.3	Objectives of the Study	17
1.4	Research Questions	17
1.5	Theoretical and Conceptual Framework	19
1.7	Scope and Limitations of the Study	21
1.8	Summary	22

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0	Introduction	23
2.1	Corpus Linguistics and Data-Driven Learning (DDL)	23
	2.1.1 Introduction to Corpus Linguistics	23
	2.1.2 Corpus Linguistics in ELLT	25
	2.1.3 Theoretical Framework of DDL	27
	2.1.4 The Potentials and Limitations of DDL	34
	2.1.4.1 Potentials of DDL	34
	2.1.4.2 The Limitations of DDL	43
2.2	Collocation	47
	2.2.1 Colligation	49
	2.2.2 Patterns and Their Functions	50
	2.2.3 Collocation in ELT: The Lexical Approach	51
	2.2.4 Collocational Competence	54
	2.2.5 Collocation Errors and Their Factors	56

2.3 Colligations of Prepositions 58
2.3.1 Prepositions 59
2.3.2 The Forms of Preposition 59
2.3.3 The Status of Prepositions 61
2.3.4 Types of Colligations of Prepositions 62
2.3.5 The Strength of Collocability of Prepositional Patterns 65
2.3.6 The Semantic-Functions of Prepositional Phrases 66
2.4 Legal Discourse 69
2.4.1 The Properties of Written Legal Discourse 70
2.4.2 The Semantic-Functions of Colligations of Prepositions in Legal Discourse 74
2.4.3 The Essential of Colligations of Prepositions in Legal Discourse 76
2.5 Review of DDL Studies 78
2.5.1 Qualitative DDL Studies 78
2.5.2 Quantitative DDL Studies 84
2.5.3 Empirical Research Comparing DDL and Conventional Approaches (CA) 91
2.5.4 DDL Studies in EALP Context 95
2.6 Summary 97

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction 99
3.1 Research Design 99
3.1.1 The Setting of the Study 105
3.1.2 Population and Sampling 108
3.1.3 Preliminary Study: A Needs Analysis 111
3.1.3.1 Need Analysis 1: Pre-Course Interview 112
3.1.3.2 Problem Question (PQ) Essay Test 112
3.1.3.3 The Results of the Needs Analyses 118
3.1.3.3.1 Findings from the Pre-Experimental Course Interview 118
3.1.3.3.2 Findings from the Error Analysis Study 120
3.1.4 Teaching Instruments 121
3.1.5 DDL and Non-DDL Approaches and Intervention 125
3.1.6 Validity of the Module 130
3.1.7 Corpora 131
3.1.8 Pretest and Posttest Items 132
3.1.8.1 Test Components 132
3.1.8.2 Test Validity and Reliability 134
3.1.9 Pilot Studies 136
3.1.10 Equating Actual Participants 139
3.1.11 Experimental (Intervention) Course 141

3.2 Research Instruments and Data Collection 144
3.2.1 Pretest and Posttest 147
3.2.2 Post-Experimental Interview (10 DDL students) 150
3.2.3 Survey Questionnaire 146
3.2.4 Individual Students' Performance in the Pretest/Posttest 147
3.3 Data Analysis 147
3.3.1 Pretest/Posttest 147
3.3.2 Post-Experimental Interview (DDL group) 150
3.3.3 Survey Questionnaire 150
3.3.4 Individual Students' Performance 150
3.4 Summary 152

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction 153
4.1 Research Findings 155
4.1.1 Research Finding 1 155
4.1.2 Research Finding 2 161
4.1.2.1 Significant Impact on the Knowledge of Form 162
4.1.2.2 Significant Impact on the Knowledge of Meaning (Semantic Function) of Colligations of Prepositions 167
4.1.2.3 Non-significant Impact on the Production of Colligations of Prepositions 170
4.2 Within-group Findings 173
4.2.1 Within-group Findings: DDL 173
4.2.1.1 Significant Impact on the Knowledge of Form 173
4.2.1.2 Significant Impact on the Knowledge of Meaning (Semantic Function) 175
4.2.1.3 Significant Impact on the Production of Colligations of Prepositions 177
4.2.2 Within-group Findings: Non-DDL 178
4.2.2.1 Non-significant Improvement in the Gap-filling Task 168
4.2.2.2 Significant Impact on the Knowledge of Meaning 181
4.2.2.3 Significant Impact on the Production of Colligations of Prepositions 183
4.3 Research Finding 3 185
4.3.1 Findings from the Interview (10 DDL students) 186
4.3.1.1 The Effectiveness of DDL 186
4.3.1.2 Insufficient Time to Absorb All Rules 188
4.3.1.3 Increased Noticing Skill Helped in Minimising the Students' Errors 190
4.3.1.4 Increased Awareness of the Different Meanings and Usages of Prepositional Patterns 193

4.3.1.5 Increased Awareness of Collocations 194
4.3.1.6 Difficulty in Coping with the Hardest Task (Determining the Semantic Function) 197
4.3.1.7 Motivating and Inspiring Task (Determining the Semantic Function) 201
4.3.1.8 The Benefits of Background Knowledge (Previous Legal Education) 203
4.3.1.9 Unchallenging Task: Gap-filling and Error-identification and Correction 204
4.3.1.10 Persistent Difficulty with Some patterns and Sentence Structures 205
4.3.1.11 Preference for Traditional Teaching Materials to Concordance Lines 208
4.3.1.12 Difficulty in Understanding Cut-off Concordance Lines 210
4.3.1.13 Increasing Need to include DDL in the Law Syllabus 211
4.3.2 Survey Questionnaire 216
4.3.2.1 Preference for DDL in Preposition Instruction 217
4.3.2.2 Students' Preference for Online DDL 219
4.3.2.3 Preference for an Early Teacher Intervention 221
4.3.2.4 Multiple Affordances of DDL 223
4.3.2.5 Lack of Difficulties with Corpus Use 226
4.3.2.6 A Good Approach for ESP Grammar and Preposition Learning 232
4.3.2.7 The Potentials of DDL in Increasing the Respondents' Academic Success 234
4.3.3 Analysis of Individual Students' Performance in Pretest/Posttest 236
4.3.3.1 The Impact of Previous Legal Education on the Foundation in Law Students 239
4.3.3.2 The Impact of General English Proficiency 239
4.3.3.3 The Impact of Previous Legal Education on the Diploma in Law Students 244
4.3.3.4 The Impact of Students' Familiarity with Legal Phraseology 245
4.4 Summary 249

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.0 Introduction 250
5.1 Summary of Findings 252
5.1.1 Research Question 1 252
5.1.2 Research Question 2 253
5.1.2.1 Research Question 2(a) 253
5.1.2.2 Research Question 2(b) 255
5.1.2.3 Research Question 2(c) 256
5.1.3 Research Question 3

5.1.3.1 Post-Interview Responses 261
5.1.3.1.1 The Effectiveness of DDL 261
5.1.3.1.2 Insufficient Time to Absorb Prepositions Rules 261
5.1.3.1.3 Increased Noticing Skill 262
5.1.3.1.4 Increased Awareness of Prepositional Patterns 262
5.1.3.1.5 Increased Awareness of Collocations 262
5.1.3.1.6 Difficulty with the Semantic Function Task 262
5.1.3.1.7 Motivating and Inspiring Task 263
5.1.3.1.8 The Impact of Previous Legal Education 263
5.1.3.1.9 Easier Tasks 263
5.1.3.1.10 Persistent Difficulty with Some Patterns 263
5.1.3.1.11 Preference for Traditional Materials 263
5.1.3.1.12 Difficulty in Understanding Cut-off Concordance Lines 264
5.1.3.1.13 Inclusion of DDL in the Law Syllabus 264
5.1.3.2 Survey Questionnaire Responses 264
5.1.3.2.1 Preference for DDL to the Traditional Method 264
5.1.3.2.2 Preference for Online DDL to Concordance Printouts 265
5.1.3.2.3 Preference for an Early Teacher Intervention 265
5.1.3.2.4 Teacher as the Sole Knowledge Provider 265
5.1.3.2.5 Multiple Affordances of DDL 265
5.1.3.2.6 Lack of Difficulties with Corpus Use 265
5.1.3.2.7 The Effectiveness of DDL in ESP Instruction 266
5.1.3.2.8 The Potential of DDL 266
5.1.3.3 The Impact of Previous Legal Education 266
5.1.3.3.1 The Impact of Previous Legal Education on the Foundation in Law Students in the DDL Group 266
5.1.3.3.2 Lack of Schemata Reduces DDL Students' Acquisition Rate of Legal Phraseology 267
5.1.3.3.3 The Impact of Previous Legal Education on the Diploma in Law Students in non-DDL group 267
5.1.3.3.4 Lack of Schemata Reduces non-DDL Students' Acquisition Rate of Legal Phraseology 267
5.2 Conclusions 268
5.2.1 Conclusion 1: The Impact of Task Types, Previous Legal Education, and General English Proficiency 269
5.2.2 Conclusion 2: Scaffolded DDL is Truly DDL. 272
5.2.3 Conclusion 3: Some Patterns are More Difficult to be Acquired than Others. 274
5.2.4 Conclusion 4: Producing Well-Crafted Legal Sentences Requires more than the Bottom-up Approach. 276
5.2.5 Conclusion 5: Explicit Teaching of Preposition May Reduce Law Students' Linguistic Deficiency. 278
5.2.6 Conclusion 6: Teaching Prepositions in Isolation Deprives of Learners' Skill of Guessing Meanings through Contexts. 280

5.3 Recommendations 281
5.3.1 DDL should be included in ESP Courses. 281
5.3.2 Scaffolded DDL should be Introduced to First Time Users. 283
5.3.3 Legal Colligations of Prepositional Patterns should be Explicitly Taught. 284
5.3.4 Prepositions should be Taught in Contexts. 285
5.3.5 ESP Practitioners should be Equipped with Proper Training of DDL. 287
5.4 Suggestions for Further Research 288
5.5 Concluding Remarks 289

REFERENCES 291

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Learner Profile 330
APPENDIX B: Problem-Question Questions 333
APPENDIX C: DDL Module 334
APPENDIX D: Non-DDL Module 395
APPENDIX E: Pretest/Posttest 437