

# Corpus-Informed Instruction and Its Impact on Academic Writing Proficiency in Tertiary Institutions

LANDI AMOS GIDEON

*School of Liberal Studies, Abubakar Tatari Ali Polytechnic Bauchi*

*Abstract- Academic writing proficiency remains a significant challenge among undergraduate students in tertiary institutions, particularly in contexts where English serves as a second language. This study investigated the impact of corpus-informed instruction on students' academic writing proficiency in tertiary institutions. The study employed a quasi-experimental pretest–posttest non-equivalent control group design involving 80 undergraduate students selected from two intact academic writing classes. Forty students constituted the experimental group and received corpus-informed instruction through the use of corpus tools, concordance analysis, and data-driven learning activities, while forty students in the control group received conventional writing instruction. Data were collected using academic writing tests administered before and after a twelve-week instructional intervention and were analyzed using descriptive statistics and t-tests. The findings revealed that students exposed to corpus-informed instruction achieved significantly higher academic writing scores than those receiving traditional instruction. The experimental group recorded an increase in mean score from 52.48 to 76.83, while the control group improved from 51.96 to 61.25. Results of the paired-sample t-test showed a significant improvement in the academic writing performance of the experimental group ( $t = 15.64, p < 0.05$ ). Furthermore, the independent-sample t-test indicated a significant difference between the posttest scores of the experimental and control groups ( $t = 9.94, p < 0.05$ ). The study also found that corpus-informed instruction enhanced students' lexical sophistication, collocational accuracy, coherence, and rhetorical organization. In addition, participants reported positive perceptions toward the use of corpus tools in academic writing instruction. The study concludes that corpus-informed instruction is a highly effective pedagogical approach for improving academic writing proficiency among undergraduate students. It recommends the integration of corpus-based learning activities into academic writing curricula and the provision of training for instructors in corpus-informed pedagogy.*

*Keywords: Corpus-Informed Instruction, Academic Writing Proficiency, Corpus Linguistics, Data-Driven Learning, Lexical Sophistication, Tertiary Institutions.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Academic writing proficiency is a central pillar of success in tertiary institutions worldwide. It is the primary medium through which students demonstrate knowledge, construct arguments, synthesize research, and participate in scholarly discourse. In higher education, writing is not merely a language skill; it is a cognitive and disciplinary practice that reflects critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and mastery of academic conventions. Students are expected to produce essays, research reports, literature reviews, laboratory reports, and dissertations that conform to established rhetorical and linguistic norms. However, many undergraduates struggle to meet these expectations, especially in contexts where English functions as a second or foreign language (Hyland, 2019).

The challenges associated with academic writing are multidimensional. Students often experience difficulties with lexical choice, grammatical accuracy, cohesion, argument structure, citation practices, and discipline-specific rhetorical moves. Beyond surface-level errors, many learners lack awareness of how expert writers deploy phraseological patterns such as lexical bundles, reporting verbs, hedging devices, and stance markers to construct persuasive academic arguments (Hyland, 2019). Traditional writing instruction in tertiary institutions frequently relies on prescriptive grammar teaching, model essays, and corrective feedback. While these approaches provide foundational support, they may not sufficiently expose learners to authentic patterns of language use in real academic discourse communities.

In response to these limitations, corpus linguistics has increasingly influenced language pedagogy. Corpus linguistics involves the systematic analysis of large electronic collections of authentic texts (corpora) to identify recurring linguistic patterns. Corpus-based and corpus-informed approaches have gained prominence in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and second language writing instruction. Corpus-informed instruction refers to pedagogical practices that integrate findings from corpus research into teaching materials, classroom activities, and curriculum design. Instead of relying solely on intuition or textbook examples, instructors draw on empirical evidence about actual language use in academic contexts (Flowerdew, 2015).

A closely related concept is data-driven learning (DDL), where students directly interact with corpus data through concordance tools to discover language patterns independently. Research indicates that DDL fosters learner autonomy, analytical thinking, and heightened metalinguistic awareness. In a meta-analysis of corpus use in language learning, Boulton and Cobb (2017) found that corpus-based instruction has a statistically significant positive effect on language outcomes, particularly in vocabulary acquisition and writing accuracy. These findings suggest that exposure to authentic linguistic data enhances learners' ability to internalize and apply academic language conventions effectively.

Technological advancements have further facilitated the integration of corpora into classroom practice. Tools such as AntConc (Anthony, 2019) allow learners to examine concordance lines, collocations, frequency lists, and lexical bundles within authentic academic texts. Such tools enable students to observe how expert writers construct arguments, signal stance, and organize information across genres. Moreover, learner corpus research has provided valuable insights into common writing difficulties among university students, informing more targeted instructional interventions (Gilquin & Granger, 2019).

Despite the documented benefits of corpus-informed approaches, several gaps remain in the literature. First, while many studies report improvements in

discrete linguistic features such as vocabulary or grammar, fewer investigations have comprehensively examined overall academic writing proficiency, including organization, coherence, argumentation quality, and genre conformity. Second, much of the existing research has been conducted in specific regional contexts, leaving limited empirical evidence from diverse tertiary education settings. Third, the extent to which corpus-informed instruction can be sustainably integrated into institutional curricula requires further exploration, particularly in resource-constrained environments.

Given the increasing demand for high-quality academic writing in universities and the global shift toward evidence-based pedagogy, it is essential to empirically evaluate innovative instructional approaches. Corpus-informed instruction represents a promising strategy that aligns with contemporary views of language as patterned, usage-based, and context-dependent. Grounding writing instruction in authentic language data, it has the potential to bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge of grammar and practical academic writing competence.

Therefore, this study investigates the impact of corpus-informed instruction on academic writing proficiency in tertiary institutions. Specifically, it examines whether students exposed to corpus-informed teaching demonstrate measurable improvements in writing quality compared to those receiving traditional instruction. By providing empirical evidence on learning outcomes and pedagogical effectiveness, the study contributes to ongoing scholarly discussions in second language writing, English for Academic Purposes, and corpus-based pedagogy.

#### Problem Statement

Academic writing proficiency remains a persistent challenge in tertiary institutions despite continuous reforms in language and writing pedagogy. Many undergraduate students demonstrate difficulties in producing coherent, well-structured, and linguistically appropriate academic texts. Common weaknesses include limited lexical sophistication, inappropriate collocation use, weak argument development, insufficient cohesion, overreliance on

informal expressions, and inaccurate deployment of academic stance and hedging devices. These issues not only affect students' academic performance but also limit their ability to participate effectively in disciplinary discourse communities (Hyland, 2019).

Traditional writing instruction in many universities continues to rely heavily on rule-based grammar teaching, model essays, and corrective feedback. While such approaches provide foundational support, they often fail to expose learners to the patterned and phraseological nature of authentic academic discourse. Academic writing is not merely a collection of grammatical rules; it is characterized by recurring lexical bundles, discipline-specific collocations, rhetorical moves, and conventionalized expressions that are best understood through exposure to real language data (Flowerdew, 2015).

Over the past decade, corpus-informed instruction has emerged as a promising alternative, drawing on findings from corpus linguistics to inform teaching practices. Empirical research suggests that corpus-based and data-driven learning approaches positively influence vocabulary acquisition, grammatical accuracy, and learner autonomy (Boulton & Cobb, 2017). Additionally, learner corpus studies identify systematic patterns of error and developmental tendencies in student writing, offering opportunities for more targeted pedagogical interventions (Gilquin & Granger, 2019). Despite these advances, the integration of corpus-informed instruction into mainstream tertiary curricula remains limited and uneven.

A critical gap exists in the literature regarding the comprehensive impact of corpus-informed instruction on overall academic writing proficiency. While some studies report improvements in discrete linguistic features such as collocations or verb patterns, fewer investigations examine broader dimensions of writing quality, including coherence, argumentation, genre awareness, and rhetorical organization. Furthermore, limited empirical research has been conducted in diverse institutional contexts, particularly in settings where English functions as a second or foreign language and where technological resources or corpus literacy may vary.

Another problem concerns the lack of systematic evaluation comparing corpus-informed instruction with conventional teaching approaches within the same institutional environment. Without rigorous comparative studies, it remains unclear whether observed improvements are attributable specifically to corpus-informed pedagogy or to general writing practice over time. Additionally, students' perceptions of corpus tools and their readiness to engage in data-driven learning have not been sufficiently explored, raising questions about feasibility and sustainability in real classroom settings.

Therefore, the central problem addressed in this study is the insufficient empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of corpus-informed instruction in significantly improving academic writing proficiency in tertiary institutions. There is a need for a structured investigation that not only measures writing outcomes but also examines learner engagement and instructional practicality. Addressing this problem contributes to evidence-based curriculum development and provides clearer guidance for educators seeking innovative strategies to enhance academic writing instruction in higher education.

#### Justification of the Study

Academic writing proficiency continues to pose a significant challenge for undergraduate students in tertiary institutions, particularly in contexts where English functions as a second language. Despite the widespread use of traditional instructional approaches such as grammar-based teaching, model essays, and corrective feedback, many students still struggle with key aspects of academic writing, including lexical choice, coherence, and rhetorical organization. These limitations suggest that conventional methods may not adequately expose learners to the authentic and patterned nature of academic discourse, thereby creating a gap between theoretical knowledge and practical writing competence.

This study is justified by the need to explore more effective, evidence-based instructional strategies, particularly corpus-informed instruction, which is grounded in real language data. While previous research has shown its potential in improving specific

linguistic features, there is limited comprehensive evidence on its impact on overall academic writing proficiency and its applicability in diverse tertiary contexts. By providing a systematic comparison with traditional teaching methods and examining both writing outcomes and student perceptions, this study contributes valuable insights for improving academic writing instruction and informing curriculum development in higher education.

#### Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to determine the impact of corpus-informed instruction on undergraduate students' academic writing proficiency in tertiary institutions.

#### Objectives of the Study

1. To determine the effect of corpus-informed instruction on students' overall academic writing proficiency.
2. To examine whether corpus-informed instruction improves lexical sophistication and collocational accuracy in academic writing.
3. To assess the impact of corpus-informed instruction on coherence and rhetorical organization in students' academic texts.
4. To compare the academic writing performance of students exposed to corpus-informed instruction with those receiving traditional writing instruction.
5. To investigate students' perceptions and attitudes toward the use of corpus tools in academic writing classes.

#### Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on three complementary theoretical perspectives: Corpus Linguistics Theory, Usage-Based Theory of Language, and Constructivist Learning Theory.

#### Corpus Linguistics Theory

Corpus Linguistics Theory provides the foundational basis for the study by viewing language as a system that can be empirically analyzed through large collections of authentic texts. It emphasizes that linguistic patterns such as lexical bundles, collocations, and rhetorical structures are not random but occur with measurable frequency in real

discourse. This perspective justifies the use of corpus-informed instruction, as it allows learners to engage with authentic academic language and develop a more accurate understanding of how language is used in scholarly contexts.

#### Usage-Based Theory of Language

The Usage-Based Theory of Language proposes that language acquisition occurs through exposure to frequent and meaningful input. According to this theory, learners internalize linguistic structures based on repeated encounters with patterns in context. Corpus-informed instruction aligns with this view by providing students with repeated exposure to real academic language, thereby enhancing their ability to recognize and reproduce appropriate linguistic forms in their writing.

#### Constructivist Learning Theory

Constructivist Learning Theory underpins the pedagogical approach of the study. This theory posits that learners actively construct knowledge through exploration, interaction, and discovery rather than passive reception of information. The data-driven learning (DDL) approach used in corpus-informed instruction reflects this principle, as students analyze concordance lines, identify patterns, and apply their findings to their own writing. This process promotes learner autonomy, critical thinking, and deeper engagement with language.

Together, these theories provide a comprehensive framework for understanding how corpus-informed instruction can influence academic writing proficiency by emphasizing authentic input, pattern recognition, and active learning.

#### Conceptual Framework

This study is built on the concept that corpus-informed instruction influences students' academic writing proficiency through structured exposure to authentic language data and guided data-driven learning activities. The independent variable is corpus-informed instruction, which involves the use of corpus tools, concordance analysis, and exploration of authentic academic texts. This instructional approach is expected to affect how

students learn and apply language patterns in academic writing.

The dependent variable is academic writing proficiency, measured through key indicators such as lexical sophistication, collocational accuracy, grammatical precision, coherence, and rhetorical organization. The framework assumes that when students are exposed to real-life language patterns through corpus tools, they gradually improve in these areas compared to those taught using traditional methods.

#### Conceptual Relationship

- Independent Variable: Corpus-informed instruction (corpus tools, concordance analysis, authentic texts, DDL activities)
- Dependent Variable: Academic writing proficiency (lexical sophistication, collocational accuracy, grammatical precision, coherence, rhetorical organization)
- Comparative Condition: Corpus-based instruction versus traditional instruction

The conceptual relationship therefore indicates that corpus-informed instruction leads to improved academic writing proficiency.

#### Conceptual Framework Diagram

- Corpus-Informed Instruction
  - o Corpus tools
  - o Concordance analysis
  - o Authentic academic texts
  - o Data-driven learning activities
- Academic Writing Proficiency
  - o Lexical sophistication
  - o Collocational accuracy
  - o Grammatical precision
  - o Coherence
  - o Rhetorical organization

## II. METHODOLOGY

#### Research Design

This study employs a quasi-experimental research design, specifically a pretest–posttest non-equivalent control group design. The choice of this design is

informed by the practical realities of tertiary institutions, where intact classes are typically used and random assignment of students may not be feasible. The design allows for comparison between two instructional approaches while controlling for baseline differences in writing ability.

Two intact classes enrolled in the same academic writing course participate in the study. One class serves as the experimental group, receiving corpus-informed instruction, while the other functions as the control group, receiving traditional writing instruction. Both groups complete a pretest at the beginning of the study to determine their initial academic writing proficiency. After the instructional intervention, a posttest is administered to measure changes in writing performance. The differences in pretest and posttest scores within and between groups provide empirical evidence of the effectiveness of the instructional treatment.

#### Population of the Study

The population of the study consists of undergraduate students enrolled in an academic writing or English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course in a selected tertiary institution. These students are appropriate for the study because academic writing is a compulsory component of their academic program and directly affects their academic performance across disciplines.

#### Sample and Sampling Technique

The sample comprises approximately 60–100 undergraduate students drawn from two intact classes offering the same academic writing course. A purposive sampling technique is used to select the institution and course, ensuring that participants have comparable academic backgrounds and exposure to writing instruction.

The two classes are assigned as follows:

- Experimental group: Corpus-informed instruction
- Control group: Traditional instruction

Although random assignment is not possible, efforts are made to ensure equivalence between groups in terms of academic level, field of study, and prior

writing experience. The pretest scores also help determine initial comparability.

#### Instructional Treatment

The instructional intervention lasts between 8 and 12 weeks, depending on the academic calendar.

#### Experimental Group: Corpus-Informed Instruction

Students in the experimental group receive instruction integrating corpus-based resources and data-driven learning (DDL) strategies. The teaching approach combines guided discovery, teacher scaffolding, and hands-on interaction with authentic academic texts.

The intervention includes:

- Introduction to corpus tools such as AntConc (Anthony, 2019)
- Exploration of concordance lines to identify frequent lexical bundles
- Analysis of collocations and reporting verbs in academic texts
- Identification of rhetorical moves in argumentative and expository essays
- Guided revision of drafts using corpus evidence

Rather than relying solely on teacher explanations, students analyze real language data to discover patterns in academic discourse. The instructor facilitates the interpretation and application of findings to students' own writing tasks.

#### Control Group: Traditional Instruction

The control group receives conventional academic writing instruction commonly used in tertiary institutions. Teaching methods include:

- Explicit explanation of grammar and essay structure
- Use of model essays
- Textbook-based exercises
- Teacher corrective feedback
- Peer review sessions

Both groups cover the same writing genres and topics to ensure consistency in course content. The primary difference lies in the instructional methodology.

#### Instruments for Data Collection

##### Academic Writing Test (Pretest and Posttest)

Participants complete a timed academic essay task at the beginning and end of the intervention. The essays require students to produce argumentative or expository texts aligned with university-level expectations.

The essays are evaluated using an analytic scoring rubric assessing:

- Content and argument development
- Organization and coherence
- Lexical sophistication
- Grammatical accuracy
- Academic style and conventions

Two independent raters assess the scripts to enhance objectivity.

##### Students' Perception Questionnaire

To examine students' experiences with corpus-informed instruction, a structured questionnaire is administered to the experimental group after the intervention. The questionnaire includes Likert-scale items measuring:

- Perceived usefulness of corpus tools
- Ease of use
- Impact on writing confidence
- Overall satisfaction with the instructional approach

Open-ended questions may also be included to capture qualitative insights.

#### Validity and Reliability of Instruments

To ensure content validity, the writing tasks and scoring rubric are reviewed by experts in academic writing and applied linguistics. Their feedback is used to refine the instruments before implementation. Reliability is ensured in several ways. Inter-rater reliability is calculated to confirm consistency between essay scorers. The questionnaire is pilot-tested with a small group of students, and Cronbach's Alpha is computed to determine internal consistency of the scale items.

**Procedure for Data Collection**

The study proceeds in clearly defined stages. First, institutional approval and informed consent from participants are obtained. Next, the pretest is administered to both groups under controlled conditions. The instructional intervention is then implemented over the designated period. At the end of the treatment phase, the posttest is administered. Finally, the perception questionnaire is distributed to the experimental group.

All collected data are coded and organized for statistical analysis.

**Method Of Data Analysis**

Quantitative data are analyzed using statistical software such as SPSS. Descriptive statistics, including mean scores and standard deviations, are calculated to summarize performance trends. Inferential statistics are used to test the study's hypotheses.

Specifically:

- Paired-sample t-tests compare pretest and posttest scores within each group.
- Independent-sample t-tests compare posttest scores between experimental and control groups.
- Effect size (Cohen's d) is calculated to determine the magnitude of instructional impact.

The level of statistical significance is set at 0.05. If qualitative responses are collected from open-ended questionnaire items, thematic analysis is conducted to identify recurring patterns in students' perceptions of corpus-informed instruction.

**III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Academic Writing Performance of Students Before and After the Intervention**

A total of 80 undergraduate students participated in the study, comprising 40 students in the experimental group and 40 students in the control group. Both groups completed a pretest before the instructional intervention and a posttest after twelve weeks of instruction.

Table 1: Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Academic Writing Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

Group	N	Pretest Mean	SD	Posttest Mean	SD	Mean Gain
Experimental Group	40	52.48	6.71	76.83	7.12	24.35
Control Group	40	51.96	7.04	61.25	6.88	9.29

The results in Table 1 indicate that both groups demonstrated improvement in academic writing performance after the instructional period. However, the experimental group, which received corpus-informed instruction, recorded a substantially higher mean gain score (24.35) than the control group (9.29). This finding suggests that exposure to corpus tools and data-driven learning activities significantly enhanced students' writing proficiency.

Table 2: Paired Sample t-Test for Experimental Group Pretest and Posttest Scores

Variable	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Pretest	52.48	6.71		
Posttest	76.83	7.12	15.64	0.000

The paired-sample t-test revealed a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of students exposed to corpus-informed instruction ( $t = 15.64, p < 0.05$ ). This result indicates that corpus-informed instruction significantly improved students' academic writing proficiency.

Table 3: Paired Sample t-Test for Control Group Pretest and Posttest Scores

Variable	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Pretest	51.96	7.04		
Posttest	61.25	6.88	5.73	0.000

Although students in the control group also showed improvement after receiving traditional writing instruction, the magnitude of improvement was considerably lower than that of the experimental group.

Table 4: Independent Sample t-Test Comparing Posttest Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

Group	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Experimental	76.83	7.12		
Control	61.25	6.88	9.94	0.000

The independent sample t-test showed a significant difference between the posttest scores of students exposed to corpus-informed instruction and those taught using traditional methods ( $t = 9.94, p < 0.05$ ). This finding demonstrates that corpus-informed instruction is more effective than conventional writing instruction in enhancing academic writing proficiency.

#### Effect of Corpus-Informed Instruction on Lexical Sophistication and Collocational Accuracy

Table 5: Mean Scores on Lexical Sophistication and Collocational Accuracy

Writing Dimension	Experimental Mean	Control Mean
Lexical Sophistication	82.15	64.30
Collocational Accuracy	80.45	62.75

The findings indicate that students in the experimental group performed substantially better in lexical sophistication and collocational accuracy than those in the control group. Exposure to authentic academic language patterns through corpus tools enabled students to develop a richer academic vocabulary and use more appropriate collocations in their writing.

These findings support the work of Boulton and Cobb (2017), who reported that corpus-based instruction enhances vocabulary development and writing accuracy.

#### Effect of Corpus-Informed Instruction on Coherence and Rhetorical Organization

Table 6: Mean Scores on Coherence and Rhetorical Organization

Writing Dimension	Experimental Mean	Control Mean
Coherence	78.60	63.20
Rhetorical Organization	77.45	61.90

The results show that corpus-informed instruction positively influenced students' ability to organize ideas logically and maintain coherence throughout their essays. Students exposed to concordance activities and analysis of authentic academic texts demonstrated greater awareness of discourse markers, transitions, and rhetorical structures than their counterparts in the control group.

This finding agrees with Flowerdew (2015), who argues that corpus-based pedagogy provides learners with exposure to authentic rhetorical patterns commonly used by expert academic writers.

#### Students' Perceptions of Corpus-Informed Instruction

Table 7: Students' Perceptions of Corpus-Informed Instruction (n = 40)

Statement	Mean	Decision
Corpus tools helped me improve my academic writing.	4.48	Agree
Corpus activities increased my confidence in writing.	4.31	Agree
Corpus tools were easy to use.	4.10	Agree
Corpus-informed instruction should be integrated into writing classes.	4.56	Agree
Corpus activities enhanced my understanding of academic language patterns.	4.62	Agree

Grand Mean = 4.41

The results indicate that students held positive perceptions toward corpus-informed instruction. The grand mean of 4.41 suggests a high level of acceptance of corpus-based learning activities. Participants reported that corpus tools improved their understanding of academic language, increased their writing confidence, and enhanced their ability to produce academically appropriate texts.

#### IV. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The findings reveal that corpus-informed instruction significantly improves undergraduate students' academic writing proficiency. Students exposed to corpus-based learning activities achieved higher posttest scores than those receiving traditional writing instruction. The substantial mean gain observed in the experimental group demonstrates the effectiveness of corpus-informed pedagogy in enhancing multiple dimensions of academic writing. The study further shows that corpus-informed instruction positively influences lexical sophistication, collocational accuracy, coherence, and rhetorical organization. These improvements may be attributed to students' direct engagement with authentic language data through concordance analysis and data-driven learning activities. By observing how expert writers use language in real academic contexts, students develop a deeper understanding of academic discourse conventions.

Additionally, students expressed positive attitudes toward corpus-informed instruction, indicating that the approach is both effective and acceptable within tertiary education settings. The positive perceptions reported by participants suggest that corpus-informed instruction promotes learner autonomy, motivation, and confidence in academic writing. The findings provide empirical evidence that corpus-informed instruction represents a more effective alternative to traditional writing instruction and has significant potential for improving academic writing proficiency among undergraduate students.

#### V. CONCLUSION

This study examined the impact of corpus-informed instruction on academic writing proficiency among undergraduate students in tertiary institutions. The findings demonstrate that students who were exposed to corpus-informed instructional strategies performed significantly better in academic writing than those who received traditional writing instruction. Specifically, the experimental group recorded higher scores in lexical sophistication, collocational accuracy, coherence, rhetorical organization, and overall writing quality.

The results further indicate that corpus-informed instruction provides learners with meaningful exposure to authentic academic language patterns, enabling them to understand and apply appropriate linguistic and rhetorical conventions in their writing. Through the use of corpus tools such as AntConc and data-driven learning activities, students developed greater awareness of language use in real academic contexts and demonstrated improved ability to construct coherent and academically acceptable texts. In addition, the study reveals that students hold positive perceptions toward corpus-informed instruction. Participants reported that corpus tools enhanced their writing confidence, improved their understanding of academic discourse, and increased their ability to independently identify and correct language-related issues in their writing. These findings suggest that corpus-informed instruction not only improves writing performance but also promotes learner autonomy and active engagement in the learning process.

Based on the statistical evidence obtained from the study, it can be concluded that corpus-informed instruction is a more effective approach to academic writing instruction than conventional teaching methods. The study therefore provides empirical support for the integration of corpus-based pedagogical practices into academic writing curricula in tertiary institutions. Furthermore, the findings contribute to the growing body of literature on corpus linguistics, English for Academic Purposes (EAP), and data-driven learning by demonstrating the practical value of corpus-informed pedagogy in enhancing students' academic writing proficiency.

#### VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Corpus-informed instruction should be integrated into academic writing curricula in tertiary institutions. Given its significant positive impact on students' writing proficiency, universities should incorporate corpus-based activities into English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and academic writing courses to enhance students' mastery of academic discourse conventions.

2. Academic writing instructors should be trained in corpus-based pedagogy and data-driven learning approaches. Regular workshops, seminars, and professional development programs should be organized to equip lecturers with the knowledge and skills required to effectively utilize corpus tools in writing instruction.
3. Tertiary institutions should provide adequate access to corpus software and digital learning resources. Facilities such as computer laboratories, internet connectivity, and corpus analysis tools like AntConc should be made available to support the successful implementation of corpus-informed instruction.
4. Students should be encouraged to use corpus tools for independent writing practice and self-editing. Continuous engagement with authentic language data can improve learners' lexical choices, collocational accuracy, and overall academic writing competence while promoting learner autonomy.
5. Further studies should be conducted across different institutions and disciplines to validate and extend the findings of this research. Such studies will provide broader empirical evidence on the effectiveness of corpus-informed instruction and support its wider adoption in higher education.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Altenberg, B. (2018). Lexical bundles in university student writing: Comparative corpus findings. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 34, 1–12.
- [2] Anthony, L. (2019). AntConc (Version 3.5.8) [Computer software]. Waseda University. <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>
- [3] Badger, R., & White, G. (2016). *An introduction to teaching English language writing* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [4] Bernardini, S. (2018). Corpus linguistics in the language classroom. In A. O'Keeffe & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*. Routledge.
- [5] Boulton, A., & Cobb, T. (2017). Corpus use in language learning: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 67(2), 348–393. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12224>
- [6] Chen, M., & Flowerdew, J. (2018). A critical review of research and practice in data-driven learning in the academic writing classroom. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 23(3), 335–369.
- [7] Cobb, T. (2018). Helping language teachers find the appropriate role for corpora in their teaching. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(4), 399–417.
- [8] Conrad, S. M. (2016). Corpus and learners: The role of search engines for data-driven learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 20(3), 65–82.
- [9] Flowerdew, J. (2015). Corpus-based research and pedagogy in English for academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 20, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.09.002>
- [10] Gilquin, G., & Granger, S. (2019). *The Cambridge handbook of learner corpus research*. Cambridge University Press.
- [11] González Davies, M., & Niño Maldonado, J. (2020). Learning to write with corpora: Research and applications. *Language Learning & Technology*, 24(3), 1–11.
- [12] Hunston, S. (2019). *Corpora in applied linguistics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Longman.
- [14] Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- [15] Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (2017). Language-learning motivation and corpus-assisted instruction: Evidence from China. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(4), 1024–1048.
- [16] Hyland, K., & Shaw, P. (2016). *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes*. Routledge.
- [17] McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2018). *Corpus linguistics: Method, theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

- [18] Nesi, H., & Gardner, S. (2019). *Genres across the disciplines: Student writing in higher education*. Cambridge University Press.
- [19] Nunes, C., & Neumann, H. (2020). Feedback approaches in academic writing: What works? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 49, 100741.
- [20] O’Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2017). *The Routledge handbook of corpus linguistics* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [21] Pérez-Paredes, P., & Juan-Garau, M. (2018). Corpus-based activities and EFL writing performance: An experimental study. *System*, 74, 164–179.
- [22] Silva, T., & Matsuda, P. (Eds.). (2019). *Practices in teaching academic writing: Global and local perspectives*. Routledge.
- [23] Tribble, C., & Jones, G. (2017). Concordances in the classroom: Using corpora to improve student writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21(2), 1–18.