



The Effects of a Usage-driven Feedback Approach on Students' Use of Functional Lexical Chunks

Kenn Arcenal (Korea University)



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Received: July 29, 2024

Revised: December 17, 2024

Accepted: January 15, 2025

Kenn Arcenal

Ph.D. Student, Department of English Education, Korea University

Email: kennarcenal@korea.ac.kr

ABSTRACT

Arcenal, Kenn. 2025. The effects of a usage-driven feedback approach on students' use of functional lexical chunks. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 25, 98-130.

There has been a consensus among language researchers regarding the apparent advantages of learning lexical chunks. Conventional pedagogies (e.g., memorizing, drilling, input flooding, typographic enhancement) have been utilized in diverse research to determine an effective way of raising students' awareness of and encoding chunks; however, these practices have produced mixed results. Most of these studies have positioned learners in a passive role and have focused on increasing breadth with retention of forms as the primary goal (Boers and Lindstromberg 2009). Furthermore, the students' meaningful use of language and feedback from the teacher was rarely considered during the process. Considering how memory works, these conditions could explain the learner's low retention rate and inconsistencies in the literature. The present exploratory, mixed-methods, classroom-based study veers away from the traditional ways of raising awareness of lexical chunks. It investigates the effects of a usage-driven feedback approach on lexical chunk use and uptake, which emphasizes the value of meaningful production and the importance of receiving feedback in the creation process. Four college students with different proficiency levels in an English-speaking course were investigated for ten weeks. Results from several quantitative and qualitative measures revealed that the function-focused production tasks accompanied by productive feedback from the facilitator and the students led to a significant increase in lexical chunk use.

KEYWORDS

lexical chunks, feedback, usage-driven feedback approach, second language acquisition

1. Introduction

A plethora of studies demonstrated that lexical chunks or multiword units (i.e., the string of words that people call to mind and produce as fixed units) are ubiquitous in every language, especially in English. Empirical evidence from well-known studies indicated that lexical chunks are advantageous in easing language processing (Conklin and Schmitt 2008), thereby encouraging reading comprehension (Kremmel et al. 2017), fluency (Bybee 2002, Schmitt et al. 2011, Skehan 1998, Wood 2006), speech rate (Nattinger and DeCarrico 1992, Pawley and Syder 1983, Wood 2001) and proficiency ratings (Boers and Lindstromberg 2012, Koosha and Jafarpour 2006). This linguistic feature is responsible for distinguishing native from second-language speakers of a language (Lewis 1997, Pawler and Syder 1983). Unfortunately, beginning learners, especially second language learners, typically have limited lexical chunks at their disposal (Le-Thi et al. 2018). A rather similar behavior was found with advanced learners. Siyanova and Schmitt (2008) hypothesized that although advanced learners may have better receptive knowledge of lexical chunks, they have a tendency not to use them effectively and would rely only on either a narrow range of high-frequency items (Durrant and Schmitt 2009) or use those familiar items they feel confident about (Granger 1998). For example, the pretest-posttest comparisons of the studies of Boers et al. (2006) and Stengers et al. (2010) showed no evidence of any differential uptake of lexical chunks between the control group that regularly employed text chunking and the experimental group that did not. These studies appeared to have failed to increase the chunk uptake of the subjects in various contexts due to how the chunks were learned. Both studies admitted that the pedagogical interventions utilized in the available research still had a lot to improve and that there is still a need for more research focused on learning lexical phrases in second language classrooms and, most importantly, its deliberate practice.

The current research focuses on functional lexical chunks (e.g., sentence starters, frames, stems) as they are not reducible to simple definitions or direct translation between languages, unlike most vocabulary items and other types of lexical chunks (e.g., idiomatic expressions), which can be typically taught through basic approaches (e.g., rote memorization, translation). In addition, these chunks facilitate various communicative functions in a given discourse more than other lexical chunks (e.g., idiomatic expressions and collocations). In addition, functional lexical chunks are more oriented towards production and have a more pragmatic discursual interactive function as opposed to a purely semantic or linguistic function (Willis 2003). For example, lexical chunks that express opinions in formal and informal conversation (e.g., I think, in my opinion, I beg to disagree), giving instructions (e.g., The first thing you do, once you have done, in the end). Concerning the form of functional lexical chunks, they can take the form of sentence heads or stems (e.g., In my opinion), polywords (e.g., As soon as), transitional links (e.g., First of all), institutionalized utterances (e.g., I would be delighted to), and even a few idiomatic expressions with discourse function (e.g., Hold your horses). Unfortunately, due to the limited language models utilized by language teachers, teaching and learning functional lexical chunks can be challenging (Kim 2009, Kim 2019).

Schmidt (1990) posited that raising awareness is a key factor for input to become intake. One available strategy for raising awareness of lexical chunks is *text chunking* through typographic enhancement. Various quantitative studies have explored the effects of this method. For instance, Lewis (1997) directed students to highlight or underline word strings in an authentic text that they considered multiword units (e.g., strong collocations). Boers et al. (2006) replicated Lewis' (1997) study in the course of a school year for one group of advanced adult EFL learners. Both studies found that more lexical chunks were seen in the narratives produced by the experimental groups. However, these students generally recycled word strings verbatim from the text, which did not necessarily lead to the active learning of lexical chunks beyond the experiment. Stengers et al. (2010) repeated the experiment

with one group of advanced EFL learners and one cohort of advanced Spanish learners. Unfortunately, similar to the previous studies of Lewis (1997) and Boers et al. (2006), the study failed to find significant evidence that a school year of chunking practice by typographic enhancement contributed significantly to chunk uptake. Another awareness-raising treatment was done by Taguchi (2007) through memorization and repeated presentation of an extremely controlled set of lexical chunks. Taguchi's (2007) highly controlled study posited that memorization could benefit novice language students. Several research studies have also used another treatment to stimulate independent learner uptake of lexical chunks through input flooding, i.e., ensuring that the same sequence recurs several times in a relatively short stretch of discourse through reading or listening. The studies of Webb et al. (2013) and Waring and Takaki (2003) both confirmed the positive influence of multiple encounters. This finding is similar to Boers and Stengers' (2008) suggestion that to identify a word sequence as a lexical chunk, students must have encountered the sequence a couple of times before. However, Peters' (2012) study posited that L2 learners are not likely to autonomously recognize or attend to chunks in a text beyond those emphasized by the teacher or materials writer.

Most of the studies on lexical chunk learning have invested heavily in input. However, the Input Hypothesis and input flooding are oversimplifications of complex cognitive processing that occurs in vocabulary learning (Laufer and Hulstijn 2001). Moreover, most existing pedagogical techniques prevalent in lexical chunks learning are receptive (e.g., through reading and memorizing) with no clear communicative and productive goal. Regrettably, the idea of heightening students' awareness of the existence of chunks and their potential benefits on the learners' linguistic ability through oral pushed output and feedback on their spoken language use has been underwhelming. Thus, following the concerns of Boers et al. (2006) and Stengers et al. (2010) on the limited language models in learning lexical chunks, the present study attempts to introduce a new technique through meaningful production and feedback in improving awareness and chunk uptake. This study offers an alternative to the existing pedagogical practice of learning lexical chunks through meaningful production.

In addition to the production-oriented approach, the current treatment emphasizes the importance of formative, positive feedback in the language classroom. Erdogan (2005) states that feedback plays an important role in the learning process as it significantly improves not only the learner's performance but also the teacher's awareness and assessment of the student's ability. Although there are contradicting views concerning the effectiveness of feedback in various contexts (see Glover and Brown, 2006), Klimova (2015) suggests that feedback should be an inseparable part of any assessment and course evaluation and is still worthy of scrutiny for lexical chunk learning. Furthermore, the studies showing inconsistencies in the results mostly applied corrective feedback. The kind of feedback in the current research (i.e., usage-driven feedback) goes beyond giving corrections; rather, it highlights the positive elements of students' linguistic production and, most importantly, provides a range of possible lexical chunks that fit in the same context of the student's performance. Given all these considerations, the researcher attempts to shed light on a new approach to lexical chunk learning. Thus, the research questions:

1. Can students with varied proficiency levels increase their active knowledge of functional lexical chunks through meaningful production and feedback?
2. How does the usage-driven feedback approach affect the students' beliefs and attitudes toward learning functional lexical chunks?

In this paper, the researcher, who also took the role of the group leader (GL) of the subjects, gave two types of feedback based on the timing. Firstly, immediate feedback means, but is not limited to, (1) emphasizing and putting in context the chunks from the resource materials that are presented in the classroom, which includes articles,

instructions, teacher talk, and group discussions, and (2) highlighting student performance regarding chunks use in class and their speaking homework. Secondly, the delayed feedback recordings that were sent weekly to the students. These recordings included remarks on the students' use of lexical chunks and GL's suggestions for using more appropriate lexical chunks for the specific target functions.

It must be noted that, given the limitations, the present study does not intend to demonstrate a causal relationship between lexical chunk use and proficiency. This paper introduces the students' attitude towards a new way of learning lexical chunks (i.e., a usage-driven feedback approach) and the possibility of lexical chunk uptake from the subjects' heightened awareness despite their varied levels of proficiency.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Lexical Chunks and Its Variations

Lexical chunks came into the spotlight when Michael Lewis (1993) introduced the Lexical Approach as one of the alternatives to the traditional grammar-based syllabi, which was deeply rooted in the structuralism of Saussure (1916). According to Lewis (1993), language consists of grammaticalized lexis, not lexicalized grammar, in that "these chunks become the raw data by which learners perceive patterns of language traditionally thought of as grammar" (p. 95). In other words, language is formed by combining meaningful lexical chunks, which naturally make continuous, coherent texts. Therefore, in this view, grammar is only secondary, and lexis is the foundation of language; thus, creating a language syllabus must be organized around lexis instead of grammar. However, the emphasis on lexis in language learning is not entirely new. The earlier studies of Willis and Willis (1989) and Sinclair (1991) have also undertaken lexis-based language teaching, which discusses the meaning of words and phrases and the environment in which they are used. Widdowson (1991) also highlighted the role of lexical chunks in defining the idea of communicative competence. With the rise and popularity of Corpus Linguistics and the COBUILD project (Sinclair 1987), the Lexical Approach has continuously benefited and gained momentum in the scholarly dialogue on Second Language Acquisition.

The number of types of lexical chunks available in the literature varies depending on the source. Allison et al. (1998, p. 81) suggest that there are four types of lexical chunks, namely: (1) polywords or fixed phrases consist of two or more words, such as *by the way*, *all in all*; (2) conventionalized fixed or semi-fixed phrases such as proverbs, and social language (e.g., *how do you do?* *how are you?*); (3) phrasal constraints that use specific fixed vocabulary that can be found in various phrases as needed like *ago* in a *couple of days ago* and *a few years ago*; (4) sentence builders or stems in fixed and semi-fixed forms that represent some degree of organization in discourse such as, *in my opinion*, *there is no doubt....*. In the same manner, Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992, p.37) classify lexical chunks into five, namely: (1) collocations or words that always appear together in several contexts; (2) discourse markers that show the structure of the discourse; (3) sentence builders; (4) fixed lexical chunks to which most idioms are categorized; (5) prepositional phrases. However, Willis (2003) seems to encompass the various available categorizations of lexical chunks, even that of Lewis (1993), and provides enough details on the lexical structure of certain chunks. Willis (2003) categorizes lexical phrases into four, specifically: polywords (e.g., *what a pity*, *so far so good*); frames (e.g., correlative conjunctions); sentence stems/starters (e.g., *in my opinion*, *would you mind if...*, *It is good but...*); patterns (Verb + for + Noun/Pronoun, It + BE + Adj. + to-infinitive).

2.2 Learning Single-Lexis and Lexical Chunks

Researchers agree that high-frequency single-word items are expected to be learned faster than lower-frequency single-word items (e.g., Ellis 1985, 2008; Nation 2001). This also seems to be the case between learning single-unit lexis and lexical chunks, however, not because of the difference in cognitive processing but in exposure. Bahns and Eldaw (1993) posited that lexical chunks have a very low occurrence rate compared to single words or their single-word components and, therefore, are less likely to be encountered enough or recognized by L2 learners. Furthermore, curriculum developers and teachers either delay or bypass the learning of lexical chunks, and most of those learned in the beginning stages of acquisition are often incidental. Unfortunately, incidental learning of low-occurrence items is more demanding than high-occurrence items. This means that the amount of exposure to lexical chunks needs to be much higher than the single words they are made up (Webb et al. 2013, Boers and Lindstromberg 2012) to recognize the patterns and to be a part of one's active vocabulary knowledge. Thus, they posit that both intentional and incidental learning are especially warranted in L2 learning, given the limited input L2 learners get from their context. However, input is not the only thing that is needed. Instead, a sufficient amount of production is also necessary. Ample studies on memory- its complexity, and the variables that directly affect learning (Marklund et al. 2007, Ratey and Galaburda 2001) suggest that it is not just input and encoding but also the process of retrieval that determines learning. That is, students must produce or replicate what they have successfully encoded through task-based activities. In addition, reconsolidation occurs only in the process of retrieval and continued use (Alberini and Ledoux 2013). Through reconsolidation, people can build new combinations, associations, and schemas that they can use when specific needs arise; thus, there is a need for approaches that incorporate implicit and explicit learning of lexical chunks and language production tasks in the second language classroom.

Despite the extensive research on the positive correlation between lexical chunks and measures of general proficiency and fluency both in L1 and L2, lexical chunks seem to remain secondary in vocabulary learning and language building. Single-unit lexis and rules for combining them are still the primary method of learning vocabulary following the traditional notion that words (i.e., single-unit lexis) are the foundation of language learning and processing (Pinker 1991), and although lexical chunks uptake greatly facilitates L1 learning the process in L2 is more complicated. Arnon and Christiansen (2017) suggested that L2 learners tend to focus on individual words instead of multiword combinations, which brings forth difficulty in learning lexical chunks. Indeed, the groundbreaking finding of the usefulness of lexical chunks does not appear to reverberate in the language classroom (Lewis 1993, Boers and Lindstromberg 2009). That is, most students, even the proficient ones, are not too aware of their use of lexical chunks in their speech all the time, thus disregarding the importance of this feature in language. This calls for a paradigm shift from seeing single-unit lexis to multi-word units as the building blocks of language learning and processing and the need to develop more effective strategies for raising L2 learners' awareness of lexical chunks. Unfortunately, language instructors who do not have enough exposure to recent and innovative research-based pedagogies tend to teach language learners how they traditionally learned the language, which seems to be not that effective and efficient anymore given all the development of technology as well as the consequences to learning that come with it. In short, most EFL classrooms stick to the traditional approach of teaching grammar and literacy in the interest of the students getting a high score in exams instead of demonstrating the fundamental function of language, which is to meet various transactional and interactional goals (Brazil 1995, Nunan 1989, Yule 1989). Kingen (2000) postulates that combining these two dimensions of speaking encompasses all the communicative purposes of language. However, the latter appears to be optional in most traditional language classrooms.

2.3 Language Learning and Feedback

Various researchers define feedback slightly differently. The most renowned, perhaps, is that feedback is any information an agent provides regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding (Hattie and Timperley 2007).

Several meta-analyses have been conducted through the years about the effectiveness of feedback in learning. The major meta-analyses of Hattie and Timperley (2007), Hattie (2009), and Hattie and Zierer (2019) revealed that feedback had significant effects on student achievement; however, these studies found considerable variance of effects and the need to develop more effective information processing strategies and understanding. The types of feedback-in-question on these meta-analyses also varied considerably, given the diverse types of feedback based on different aspects.

The type of feedback that drew the attention of most researchers seems to be the general form of feedback, specifically corrective feedback, that produced a voluminous body of research, including meta-analyses in the past few decades (Li and Vuono 2019, Plonsky and Brown 2015). According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), there are six types of corrective feedback, namely: (1) recast or the implicit feedback from the teacher that immediately reformulates the student's error into corrected discourse; (2) clarification request or the asking of the teacher to repeat a specific part of the discourse that gives the student opportunity to self-correct; (3) repetition or the way the teacher repeats the error in the language of the student; (4) elicitation or the repeating of the incorrect utterance and leaving a gap where the student made an error; (5) metalinguistic cue or the giving of clues on which part of the utterance is incorrect; (6) direct correction or the explicit correcting of the student's error. All of these are considered negative feedback, even the implicit ones, as they highlight the negative evidence in the learner's performance.

Feedback does not easily pass scrutiny despite its known positive effects on learning. On the one hand, there is an abundance of authors and researchers who have shown evidence of the advantages of feedback not only in language acquisition but learning in general (see Ellis 1990, Ferguson 2011, Goo et al. 2015, Li 2010, Long 1996, Nassaji 2016). On the other hand, almost a third of studies (see Bangert-Drowns and Kulik 1991, Kluger and DeNisi 1998) found negative effects of feedback on the target learning objectives. In language learning, for example, despite numerous authors vouching for the importance of feedback, Semke (1984), who investigated corrective feedback and its effects on 141 German students, found that correction did not improve the subjects' language competence. In the same vein, a longitudinal study conducted on 147 university students by Glover and Brown (2006) on the effectiveness of written corrective feedback found that feedback was not often effective. However, they argued that it might have been due to the nature of the feedback given to the students, which was mostly corrective and hyper-specific (Willingham 1990). Corrective feedback does not largely contribute to change in behavior (Schwartz 1993). Similarly, the study of Kim (2004) suggested that corrective and negative feedback do not necessarily facilitate system building in L2 development. In addition, the inconsistency in the feedback provided by the tutors in the study in terms of both quantity and quality could have also affected the result. It follows the earlier studies on feedback that gave the same possible explanations of the ineffectiveness of feedback (Connors and Lunsford 1993, Ding 1998;). Moreover, Glover and Brown (2006) speculated that it was because of the lack of information and relevance of corrective feedback to future endeavors in class. In other words, despite the students attending to the initial feedback given to them, they will not have the chance to act on them in the coming lessons and thus would have moved on.

Most of the negative views on feedback seem to highlight not the disadvantages of receiving feedback *per se* but rather on the type of feedback (e.g., corrective feedback) and the manner it is delivered (e.g., negative evidence), as well as the missed opportunity for it to be contemplated and realized. Glover and Brown (2006) stated that feedback is not properly utilized as, most of the time, it lacks the necessary quality, is inconsistent in quantity, and the crucial time of providing feedback has lapsed. The authors speculate that this is due to the workload of teachers who have no time to provide enough feedback and rather work on the numerical value of the student's performance. The concern of the feedback being a comparative measurement among students (e.g., ranking system) is detrimental to the overall learning process. Studies by Butler (1987), Narciss and Hutt (2004), and Chan and Lam (2010), to name a few, argued that this strategy puts feedback in a bad light and diminishes its original purpose of motivating students as it encourages the opposite that negatively affect their overall performance.

After a comprehensive review of the available literature on feedback, Hattie and Timperley (2007, p. 87) created a student-centered feedback model that stresses the value of experience and collaboration between the interlocutors. This feedback model highlights the student's progress, not the errors, and how to advance further. That is, the learner's achievement involves evaluation from the teacher, but also from himself and his peers, and not necessarily through corrective feedback. Hattie and Timperley (2007) believe this is crucial as learners always seek cues to their performance. They also contend that tests are not the absolute assessment criterion of learning as test scores do not specifically provide the feedback students need in the process, such as their strengths and weaknesses. *Feedforward*, which the authors noted as the most impactful kind of feedback on the learning process, is the development of self-regulatory skills, automaticity, working strategies, etc., that promote system building. According to Mufidah (2017) and Nassaji (2018), corrective feedback, even implicit and unobtrusive ones such as recasts, still pose some threats to the learner's motivation as they are solely negative evidence. Researchers such as Nassaji (2018) and Sanz (2018) argue the importance of providing balanced feedback, which includes positive evidence or the teacher's recognition and reinforcement of the learner's correct language use that may maximize the effectiveness of feedback in wider contexts.

2.4 A Usage-driven Feedback in Learning Lexical Chunks

Based on the meta-analyses conducted by Alsowat (2020) and Lee and Huang (2008), among others, traditional EFL classrooms put too much emphasis on learning syntax and rules and rely heavily on explicit instructions through restructuring and drilling, with not enough language production. Another meta-analysis by Marulis and Neuman (2010) mentioned the same vocabulary-building strategy. This is the prevailing notion in language learning, as rule-based explicit instruction is considered the ideal teaching model addressing the different macro skills in language learning (Hollingsworth and Ybarra 2009). However, explicit instruction does not seem to be the only deciding factor in chunk uptake. Also, a high score in tests does not guarantee a sustained level of motivation, depth of knowledge, or acquisition of the pragmatic aspects demanded by a plethora of possible situations. The mixed results from the previous studies on lexical chunk uptake that used explicit instruction such as memorizing, text chunking, and text highlighting cannot fully support the idea that overt instruction leads to learning.

Another equally important aspect of the new approach is feedback. It must be noted that the inconsistent findings from the meta-analyses were mostly geared toward input and corrective feedback. It seems that there is a dire need to introduce a certain type of feedback and method for effective information processing and understanding that

follows the suggestions of Hattie and Timperley (2007), Hattie and Zierer (2019), Nassaji (2018), Young (1991) on the notion of *Feedforward*.

Therefore, the usage-driven feedback formulated for the study addresses the negative notions that plague corrective feedback. That is, rather than providing basic error corrections such as recast and other negative evidence on the language production of the subjects that substantially focus on the accuracy of language forms instead of the function of language, usage-driven feedback puts the language in question in perspective by providing more context and information through positive reinforcement and providing positive evidence. This is done by acknowledging the correct language use by the students, telling them what they can already perform and what else they can do, praising their efforts in using lexical chunks, reducing their language anxiety, and providing authentic input. For example, when a student mistakenly says, *in a matter of fact* instead of *as a matter of fact*, usage-driven feedback acknowledges first the student's effort, "Excellent! Good use of chunks! The use of it made your message clearer. Given that situation, when do you think we usually say, *as a matter of fact*? It is when we wish to add more details or information on something just mentioned. Say your professor asks you to read one book chapter, and you read two! The next time your professor asks you if you did the reading, you would answer, *Yes, as a matter of fact, I also read the next chapter!*" Based on the example, the feedback first acknowledged the attempt of the student to use lexical chunks in her speech, which is a form of positive reinforcement, and then proceeded with a recast of the lexical chunk in another example and provided more information on situations that can employ the lexical chunk. In ordinary recast, the degree of implicitness and its effectiveness are doubtful because nobody would know if a learner was aware enough that a correction was made in his utterance. The usage-driven feedback addresses this concern by drawing more attention from the learner and providing more relevant information. Moreover, the usage-driven feedback goes further by suggesting other possible variants of lexical chunks that can be used in various types of discourse (e.g., informal or formal, casual or polite, etc.) that can develop both breadth and depth of knowledge of lexical chunks. In the given example above, the facilitator would then, "... and we could also use other lexical chunks to replace *as a matter of fact* such as *in truth, for the record, if truth be told, etc.*"

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The subjects of this study were four female undergraduate students at a university in Seoul, South Korea. The group was specifically created by the researcher and the class professor based on the research's goal. All the students in class completed a survey before the formation of groups. After deliberation, four out of 16 students were assigned to the researcher's group as subjects. Employing a heterogeneous group was deemed necessary in addressing the first research question, which aimed to answer whether learning lexical chunks through productive tasks and positive feedback applied to a range of students with varying proficiency levels. Thus, four students with varied English language proficiency levels, university year level, language exposure, experience, and personality were chosen to participate in the study. Table 1 shows the subjects' personal and linguistic backgrounds from the demographic survey the researcher conducted before the treatment.

Despite the small number of participants, the researcher considered that the students were suitable for the research since they represented an actual classroom comprised of different types of learners. The members' variability could provide interesting individual and group insights. Furthermore, this group of individuals made

excellent subjects for the research since these students had not been exposed to the idea of lexical chunks and feedback as tools to raise awareness and improve chunk uptake before the treatment. Moreover, the participants admitted in the initial survey that they all felt some degree of frustration in producing L2 speech.

Table 1. Summary of the Participant's Demographic Information

Demographic Information	Subjects			
	MK	GE	HK	SE
University Level	Senior	Junior	Freshman	Freshman
University Major	Amer. & British Literature	English Lang. & Literature	Entrepreneurship	English Lang. & Literature
Yrs of Learning L2	8 yrs	10 yrs	12 yrs	15 yrs
Ave Use of L2/Week	< 3 hrs	< 6 hrs	< 6 hrs	< 6 hrs
Exp. Living Abroad	None prior Korea	None	None	None
Private Tutoring Exp.	None	None	10 yrs	6 years
Personality	Introverted	Extroverted	Introverted	Extroverted
Mock OPIc 1 Level	Inter. Low	Inter. Mid	Inter. High	Advanced Low

Note. The average use of L2 per week includes the subjects' use of L2 inside and outside the university. In addition, the subjects' proficiency levels were determined by the OPI-trained class professor who employed the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages proficiency guide (ACTFL 2012). The students' mean age was 21 years and two months. They received in-class and out-of-class feedback and production-focused supplementary materials.

3.2 Treatment Design

The researcher selected English in Action Speaking (EiAS) as the setting due to the nature and design of the course. The class followed a usage-based TBL approach and complemented the theoretical framework the researcher wished to investigate. That is, the students were expected to fulfill a series of performance tasks that would encourage them to practice and produce real language. The subject was an English elective course open to all majors under the Department of English Language and Literature. That is, the students were not forced to enroll, which reflected the degree of intrinsic motivation of the students to improve their speaking skills. Moreover, it was a student-centered language development class.

The class consisted of the professor, who acted as the main facilitator; four group leaders, who directly facilitated the students within the groups; and 16 students. The researcher performed the role of a group leader (GL) and investigated four students of the class. The remaining students did not partake in the research. The class ran for 15 weeks and met twice a week. The in-class data collection commenced on the 2nd, while the treatment began on the 5th week. Table 2 summarizes the weekly procedure the GL/researcher followed throughout the study.

Reading homework was assigned weekly. One part of the RH was the overt introduction of functional lexical chunks. The reading material also had dedicated worksheets for the students to practice on. The activities included gap-fill activities, identification, matching tasks, rearranging words and sentences, etc. The idea was for the students to use and apply what they have been exposed to (i.e., functional lexical chunks and sentence structure) to accomplish more complicated interactional speaking tasks in class. Another *Before Class* treatment was the provision of supplementary resources. This part of the treatment was exclusive to the participants. Students were advised to investigate the target lexical chunks and their use by studying some corpus. Another example was introducing an online, dedicated dictionary where they could overtly learn/relearn lexical chunks' contextual and syntactic uses. Other resource materials were activities involving lexical chunks that were more informal than the activities in the reading homework. These supplementary resource materials were forwarded through an online

messaging application days before the class. The supplementary materials provided in the treatment acted as scaffolding in developing students' motivation and autonomy.

Table 2. Step-By-Step Weekly Procedure of the Usage-Driven Feedback Approach

Procedure	Description
Before Class	
Reading Homework (RH)	The group was tasked with completing weekly reading homework, which included texts, passages, speaking strategies, and worksheets.
Supplementary Resources	The group received extra practice days before each class through various online sites that explained and demonstrated the use of the target lexical chunks.
During Class	
Encouragement/Reminder	The group members and the GL/researcher met at least 5 minutes before every class to briefly review the target lexical chunks from the RH and supplementary resources.
In-class Feedback	The researcher highlighted functional lexical chunks as they were used at the moment of production
Survey (Likert Scale)	The group completed a written survey every session regarding the treatment
After Class	
Speaking Homework	All the students in the class were tasked to accomplish speaking homework every week
Out-of-class Feedback	The group members received a recording of the feedback of the GL/researcher.

Note. Only the researcher's group members received the above treatment procedures except the RH and speaking homework. The other class members also received feedback on the speaking homework; however, it did not include the use of functional lexical chunks.

In terms of the *During Class* treatment, the GL began the class by encouraging language production and reminding the students to use the target lexical chunks or any formulaic sequences they could remember from last week's meeting, speaking homework feedback, or reading and supplementary materials. The reminder became the overt way to get the attention of the students, actively recall what they had learned from the activities done before the class, and convert the receptive knowledge into productive knowledge. In-class Feedback was also a part of the *During Class* treatments. The GL provided feedback on various instances in class. Immediate feedback was given when a student used a functional lexical chunk in her discourse, when the professor/main facilitator or the group leader uttered lexical chunks while giving directions, and when a student missed an opportunity to use a lexical chunk to describe or explain something.

Toward the end of each class, the researcher handed in a 1-minute written survey as part of the *After Class* treatment. A 4-point Likert scale was employed in the study for the respondents to provide a clear opinion without being neutral. The questionnaire comprised seven questions intended to give a numerical value to what the students felt about the tasks, feedback, and their performance in class (see Table 5). Two short answer-type questions were added to see which chunks they mostly remembered. In short, the questions referred to the student attitudes and perceptions of the feedback approach. In addition to the survey, speaking assignments were assigned weekly to the students. As part of his assessment procedure, the professor gave the whole class weekly speaking homework. The homework was designed following the week's theme and communicative function (e.g., giving instructions, narration, reporting, giving opinions, etc.). The difficulty (e.g., formality, function, etc.) varied weekly and progressively. Finally, the last element of the *After Class* treatment was the out-of-class feedback. The GL/researcher received the audio files of the group members' speaking homework and listened to the recordings. After listening, the GL gave individual feedback on the student's performance based on a rubric (i.e., global task

and function, text type, accuracy, content). In addition, the GL highlighted the good parts done by the students and provided suggestions on using other forms of functional lexical chunks in their speaking assignments.

3.3 Data Collection

The study collected various data sets through demographic surveys, individual post-treatment interviews, participants' survey forms, weekly speaking homework, and mock OPIc test scores. These quantitative and qualitative instruments aimed to triangulate the data and answer the two research questions posed by the study.

The survey forms provided a numerical value on the students' perceptions of their lexical chunk use during the class. The weekly speaking tasks demonstrated whether the functional lexical chunks from the reading homework, supplementary materials, and in-session feedback were utilized in fulfilling the speaking assignments. They were designed to follow the construct of the weekly theme and language functions, which included vocabulary and functional lexical chunks. They were recorded and uploaded in an LMS by the students and consequently given recorded feedback by both the professor and the GL/researcher. The students' OPIc ratings also became a measure of the uptake of lexical chunks and overall language development. The task of assessing the students' proficiency levels was accomplished by the professor-in-charge of the English in Action Speaking class. This means that the results from the periodic OPIc tests were dictated solely by the raw performance of the subject as assessed by the OPIc-trained professor and retained the highest degree of objectivity. Finally, the individual post-treatment semi-structured interview provided insights into the participants' perceptions of the different elements of the feedback approach, which directly answered the second research question.

Table 3. Overview of the Data Collection Instruments and Procedures

Instrument	Frequency	Data Source	Purpose
Written Survey	Every session: Twice a week	Subjects	To provide a quantitative value to the attitudes and perspectives of the subjects.
Speaking Homework	Weekly	Subjects	To investigate whether the chunks from the materials and feedback given by the GL are recycled and employed in the weekly speaking tasks.
Mock OPIc Tests	Thrice (Weeks 2, 8, 15)	Professor	To investigate the long-term effects of the treatment on the participants' proficiency.
Post-treatment Individual Interview	Once (Week 15)	Students	To gain insights into the perceptions and attitudes of the students concerning the feedback approach.

3.4 Statistical Analysis of the Data

Descriptive statistics was used for the quantitative data gathered in the research (i.e., participants' survey, weekly speaking homework, and OPIc tests). Descriptive statistics was utilized to describe the characteristics of the data set, such as the frequency of distribution and measures of central tendency involving some of the data. The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) was also used to validate the MWUs in counting functional lexical chunks in the student's discourse in the weekly speaking homework and OPIc test. However, note that only discourse-facilitating lexical chunks were considered in the study.

Two procedures were conducted on the periodic OPIc tests. Firstly, the audio recordings of the subjects from the three tests (e.g., Week 2, Week 8, Week 15) were retrieved from the professor and then transcribed. Afterward,

the researcher tallied all the lexical chunks found in the subjects' responses in the first OPIc test and compared them with those of the second and third OPIc tests. Unfortunately, given the small set of data, a correlation test was not possible for the OPIc results. Secondly, the general speaking proficiency levels from the first periodic OPIc test were compared to the general proficiency of the students determined by OPIc tests 2 and 3.

For the weekly speaking homework, the students' recordings were collected weekly from the second week until the conclusion of the class. The speaking homework from Weeks 2 to 4 served as the pre-treatment period, while the remaining weeks from Weeks 5 to 13 were labeled as the treatment period since it was only then that the GL/researchers started using the feedback approach. Since the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test could not be performed given the small sample size, Welch's t-test was reported instead to compare the pre-treatment to in-treatment weekly speaking homework functional lexical chunk use given the difference in their duration. Firstly, a Welch's t-test was run for the whole group to see whether a significant change occurred between the pre- and in-treatment periods. This was performed to verify whether a heterogeneous group could produce positive results. Subsequently, another Welch's t-test was conducted for individual performances to determine whether a significant change occurred in each subject's lexical chunk use. The individual results displayed the varying degrees of difference in each subject's performance. In addition, a measure of central tendency was conducted using the subjects' individual and group performances to verify further the result from Welch's t-test between the pre-and-in-treatment periods.

3.5 Thematic Analysis of the Data

Inductive coding, specifically values coding, was performed for the qualitative research data set (i.e., semi-structured oral interview). Values coding recorded the students' worldviews, perceptions, and attitudes towards the feedback approach, as this type of coding expressed the personal preferences and dislikes of the participants. The coding was done in two levels: initial coding and line-by-line coding. Initially, the audio interviews were all transcribed using an audio-to-text transcription tool (i.e., notta.ai). The transcription was then reviewed manually by the researcher to correct any inaccuracies the audio transcription tool committed.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Results from the Student Surveys

A series of statements were listed in the participants' survey to determine whether the feedback approach helped raise students' awareness and use lexical chunks, at least on how they perceived their chunk use in class. The statements were constructed based on the four elements comprising the usage-driven feedback approach, namely: (1) the Pre-class Treatment, (2) the In-class Treatment, (3) Themes, Tasks, and Functions; and (4) the Student's Self-evaluation. The questionnaire was checked and approved by the professor and researcher's advisor; however, it did not undergo scale reliability tests. Table 4 summarizes the items corresponding to each element of the feedback approach, while Table 5 outlines the outcomes of the participants' survey responses from Weeks 5 to 14. The findings revealed that all four subjects responded positively in all four areas of the feedback approach.

Table 4. Student's Survey Form Items

Content Area	Items (Students' Survey Form)
Pre- and Out-of-Class Treatments	3
In-class Treatment	5, 6, 7
Role of Themes, Tasks, and Functions	1
Students' Self-evaluation	2, 4

Table 5. Summary of Responses to Student's Survey Form (N = 4)

Items	Student				M	SD
	MK	GE	HK	SE		
1. I liked the theme and the tasks overall	3.89	4.00	3.89	3.67	3.86	0.14
2. I was satisfied with my performance today	3.27	4.00	3.72	3.56	3.64	0.31
3. The pre- and out-of-class activities were helpful	3.77	4.00	3.83	3.50	3.76	0.18
4. I was able to use a fair amount of target words and phrases from the RH	3.33	4.00	3.39	3.20	3.48	0.36
5. I was given a fair amount of feedback from my GL	3.67	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.85	0.19
6. I appreciate the suggestions of my GL on how to say things better	3.72	4.00	3.89	3.94	3.89	0.12
7. I noticed that my groupmates used lexical chunks	4.00	4.00	3.61	3.50	3.78	0.26

Note. 1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Agree, 4: Strongly Agree.

Everybody in the group was almost in perfect agreement ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 0.14$) concerning the role of the course's themes, tasks, and functions. GE gave it the maximum possible rating ($M = 4$), while SE rated it the lowest ($M = 3.67$). Item no. 1 got the second-highest rating in the entire questionnaire. Possibly, the elements of TBL (i.e., themes, tasks, functions) played a pivotal role in the usage-driven feedback approach. Note that EiAS was a task-based language class that emphasized collaboration and language production through meaningful tasks. In a similar fashion, the feedback approach also depended on how much the students were willing to work with the GL and their peers and be open to feedback. Thus, the high rating of Item No. 1 is because the TBL and Usage-driven feedback approaches overlap in many areas.

Similarly, the subjects also reported a consensus on the helpfulness of the pre-and out-of-class materials and feedback ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 0.18$). GE reported the highest value in the group ($M = 4$), while HK rated this area the lowest ($M = 3.50$). This area was the least among the three areas concerning the treatments of the approach, the other two being the *Role of Themes, Task, and Functions* and *In-class Treatment*. These areas were rated lower than the other two, which the nature of the tasks may explain. Note that pre- and out-of-class treatments were done outside of class hours, which could have caused some stress for the subjects. Nevertheless, the subjects positively emphasized the helpfulness of the pre-and out-of-class treatments throughout the survey.

The three items listed under the In-class treatment (i.e., Items 5, 6, and 7), where the participants got immediate feedback from the GL and their peers, garnered the highest ratings in the entire survey (Item 5: $M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.19$; Item 6: $M = 3.89$, $SD = 0.12$; Item 7: $M = 3.78$, $SD = 0.26$). This may be interpreted as the students' preference over another type of feedback concerning timing. That is, immediate feedback was favored by the subjects over delayed feedback. Perhaps this is because immediate feedback puts things in perspective since such feedback is tied to the present context that students are physically and psychologically experiencing, thus resulting in better reception. Looking closely, it was GE, again, who expressed perfect agreement ($M = 4$) in all items under the In-class Treatment area, while HK, in the same manner as the previous area, gave the lowest average rating ($M = 3.72$). Interestingly, both GE and SE expressed perfect agreement on Item 5, which talked about the amount of feedback given to them by the GL. Likewise, GE and MK also gave a perfect rating for Item 7, corresponding with

noticing other group members' use of lexical chunks, while SE rated it relatively low. Interestingly, GE and MK were the bottom two when it came to functional lexical chunk use in the speaking homework (see Table 6 below); however, they were the ones who reported the highest rating in the survey for noticing lexical chunk use among the group. This may mean two possible notions. Firstly, noticing something does not automatically relate to actuating what was noticed. Secondly, the higher the noticing ability, the more the person becomes cautious. Item 6, which corresponded to the appreciation of the GL's suggestions, recorded the highest degree of agreement among the participants ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 0.12$) not only in the area of In-Class Treatment but also in the entire questionnaire. This supports the idea that feedback is vital for students and their development. It must be noted, however, that the feedback being promoted by the approach is robust, qualitative feedback and not numerical, corrective feedback.

Finally, the students' Self-evaluation area was marked as the lowest of the four areas (Item 2: $M = 3.64$, $SD = 0.31$; Item 4: $M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.36$). This indicates a higher degree of self-awareness among the students, which is one of the goals of the current study; thus, this finding is very much welcomed. Overall, the students still agreed that they were generally satisfied with their performance.

4.2 Results from the Weekly Speaking Assignments

As mentioned in Section 3.4, the students recorded and submitted weekly speaking assignments that followed the week's theme and function. The researcher listened to these and counted specific lexical chunks that facilitated discourse, such as sentence heads or stems (e.g., In my opinion), polywords (e.g., As soon as), transitional links/sentence starters (e.g., First of all), institutionalized utterances (e.g., I would be delighted to), and idiomatic expressions with discourse function (e.g., Hold your horses). It must be noted that the researcher counted repetitions of lexical chunks in each homework as one entry. This means that the numbers presented below are the numbers of unique lexical chunks.

Table 6. Individual Lexical Chunk Use in Speaking Homework

Week	No. of Chunks Use in Speaking Homework				Total	<i>M</i> (Pre- and In-Treatment)
	MK	GE	HK	SE		
2	6	4	7	4	21	26.67
3	6	5	9	10	30	
4	9	4	10	6	29	
5	4	5	7	7	23	
6	11	9	19	16	55	45.88
7	10	16	11	11	48	
9	9	4	13	15	41	
10	11	13	11	12	47	
11	13	11	12	14	50	
12	15	10	12	15	52	
13	12	11	13	15	51	
Total	106	92	124	125	447	

Note. Pre-Treatment Period: Weeks 2 to 4, In-Treatment Period: Weeks 5 to 13.

Table 6 shows the total number of students' chunk use from Week 2 to Week 13. The researcher recorded the performance within the treatment period (i.e., Weeks 5 to 13), as well as the weeks before the actual treatment took place (i.e., Weeks 2 to 4).

As can be seen in Table 6, Week 5 garnered the lowest use of lexical chunks. Interestingly, this week was also the beginning of the treatment stage, when the researcher introduced the idea of lexical chunks. Thus, the small number of lexical chunk use was expected. The mean of chunks used before the treatment was 26.67, while it was at 45.88 in the in-treatment stage. It was also noticeable that the upsurge in the use of lexical chunks began in Week 6 and has never gone below the average of the pre-treatment since. However, in Week 9, the week right after the midterm examinations, the students showed a minor decline in the use of lexical chunks. In short, there was an interruption in the treatment. It must be noted, however, that it was due to the decrease in the use of lexical chunks of the lower proficiency students. The more proficient participants sustained the high use of lexical chunks in their speaking assignments. This means that less proficient students need consistent scaffolding in order to fully embed the practice of using lexical chunks in their language.

The use of chunks was counted during the pre-treatment period ($n = 3$) and the in-treatment period ($n = 8$). The mean score during the pre-treatment period was 26.67, with a standard deviation of 4.93. The mean score of the in-treatment period was 45.88, with a standard deviation of 10.12. Even just by looking at the raw data, one can already conclude that there was a huge difference in the use of lexical chunks between the pre-and-in treatments. Nevertheless, a Welch's t -test was performed to confirm whether there was a significant difference in the performance of the group between the pre-and in-treatment periods. The t value was 4.20, with $df = 7.76$. The results show that there was a statistically significant difference in the use of lexical chunks between the pre-treatment and the in-treatment periods ($p < 0.01$). Table 7 shows the results from Welch's t -test performed on the given data.

Table 7. Result from the Welch's t -test on Group Performance

Pre- and In-Treatment	t	df	P
	-4.20	7.76	0.003**

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. Welch's t -test is reported because the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test indicated that the sample size was not enough to run the test.

Similarly, the same test was performed for the individual performances of the subjects. Table 8 indicates that there were statistically significant differences in the use of lexical chunks of all four participants between the pre-and-in-treatment stages, although the degree varied from one person to another, with GE showing the largest statistically significant difference ($p < 0.01$) among the four subjects.

Table 8. Result from the Welch's t -test on Individual Performance

Student	t	df	P
MK	-2.38	7.18	0.047*
GE	-3.86	7.73	0.005**
HK	-2.43	8.11	0.040*
SE	-3.13	3.57	0.040*

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

4.3 Results from the Periodic OPIc Tests

The students took a series of mock OPIc tests throughout the semester. One was performed in Week 2, when the treatment had not yet taken place, while two OPIc tests (OPIcs 2 and 3) were conducted during the treatment period in Week 8 and Week 15, respectively. Table 9 illustrates the students' proficiency levels from the students'

periodic OPIc tests. Similar to the manner of counting lexical chunks for the Weekly Speaking Homework, the researcher also only accounted for unique entries for the OPIcs.

Table 10 presents an overview of the subjects' performance in the OPIc tests in Weeks 2, 8, and 15. It is apparent from this table that there is an overall increase in the use of lexical chunks among the participants between OPIc 1, which was performed at the beginning of the semester and the pre-treatment period, and OPIc 3, which was done in the final assessment week. Overall, MK marked a 126.67% increase from the first OPIc test. HK also had a triple-digit growth with a 153.85% increase. This was followed by SE, who reported a modest increase of 34.15% in use, and lastly GE, with 16%.

Table 9. Proficiency of the Subjects in Various Treatment Stages

Subject	General Proficiency (ACTFL)		
	Pre-treatment	In-treatment	
	OPIc 1	OPIc 2	OPIc 3
ME	IL	IH	IH
GE	IM	IH	AL
HK	IH	AL	AL
SE	AL	AM	AM

Note. IL: Intermediate Low, IM: Intermediate Mid, IH: Intermediate High, AL: Advanced Low, AM: Advanced Mid.

Table 10. Statistical Analysis of the Students' Use of Chunks During OPIc Tests

Student	OPIc 1	OPIc 2	Diff from Previous OPIc	OPIc 3	Difference from Previous OPIc	Overall Difference (OPIc 1 & OPIc 3)
MK	15	34	126.67%	34	0%	126.67%
GE	25	26	4%	29	11.54%	16%
HK	13	20	53.85%	33	65%	153.85%
SE	41	49	17.07%	55	12.25%	34.15%

For OPIc tests 1 and 2, MK had a considerable positive change in use, with a 126.67% increase between scores. HK followed it with, still, a noticeable increase in the use of lexical chunks at 53.85% from the previous OPIc test. Both SE and GE also showed a moderate increase in use at 17.07% and 4%, respectively. Interestingly, a closer examination of the table shows that MK, after a big jump from OPIc 1 to OPIc 2, has instead maintained her chunk use and has not reported any change from OPIc 2 to OPIc 3. The reason behind this cannot be fully explained as different possible factors are at play. Perhaps it is due to the increasing difficulty of the class, including the shift from informal to formal language use, or some unknown personal or environmental factors during the final OPIc test. Nevertheless, the rest of the subjects consistently improved their use, with HK marking another significant growth of 65%. Both SE and GE, despite not having a remarkable change in use between OPIc 2 and 3, still reported a moderate increase in lexical chunk use at 12.25% and 11.54%, respectively. In addition, note that SE and GE, even before the treatment, used many functional lexical chunks in their OPIc 1. Despite having a relatively lesser increment from OPIc 1 to OPIc 3 compared to the other two subjects, both GE and SE sustained their high use of chunks throughout the semester.

All in all, there was a difference of 19.21 in the average score between the pre-treatment and the in-treatment period. This shows a significant overall growth of 92.54%. In addition, the t-test with Welsh correction found a significant difference value of $p < 0.0032$. Despite the current study not claiming any correlation between the use of lexical chunks and proficiency, the result is still consistent with previous studies' notions and results on the positive relationship between lexical chunk awareness and use and general oral proficiency.

Task 4 of the three OPIc tests, which corresponded to narrating (OPIc 1 and 2) and describing (OPIc 3) functions, was selected to demonstrate the difference in the qualitative as well as quantitative change in the use of lexical chunks throughout the research. Table 11 shows all the lexical chunks used by the four subjects.

Table 11. Sample Functional Lexical Chunks from a Task of OPIcs

Subject	OPIc 1	OPIc 2	OPIc 3
MK	<i>I will explain, At the end</i>	<i>As soon as, and after that, At last</i>	<i>I will describe, On the one hand, In addition, On the other hand from this result, it says that, I recommend to</i>
GE	<i>Then suddenly, and that's it</i>	<i>I will present the</i>	<i>In this graph, First of all, has the highest result, I think that this, In contrast to</i>
HK	<i>so we have to</i>	<i>This story is about a, When he turned</i>	<i>This graph shows, As you can see from in the graph, compared to the, For the conclusion, I can interpret this as</i>
SE	<i>Found a way out, At last, This means that</i>	<i>About to get, as fast as he can, but after a few, Right after the, screams in horror, This is what happens</i>	<i>According to this graph, It is evident that, In contrast, We can see from the graph, as for the, It is interesting to note that</i>

It can be observed that the lexical chunks used by the students were different from the ones they used from the first OPIc, indicating an uptake of new lexical chunks. In addition, it seems that the frequency of use varies depending on the function. Students tend to use more lexical chunks when describing rather than narrating. Furthermore, the lexical chunks used for OPIc 3 (describing a graph) were more formal, signifying a possible heightened awareness of the students of the needed form in various contexts. Note that the above data is only a sample of the OPIc tests comprising six tasks.

4.4 Results from the Post-Treatment Individual Interview

In Week 15 of the semester, the students underwent a semi-structured interview regarding their overall experience with the feedback approach. In an hour interview with each student, the researcher inquired about two broad categories, namely: (1) the facilitation or the ways of raising students' awareness on lexical chunks both in the pre-class and in-class interventions; (2) students' self-evaluation on their use of chunks and overall perception towards the treatment. Data saturation was reached after transcribing and performing a thematic analysis using different kinds of coding, and themes began to emerge. Table 12 contains the categories that were noted in the coding process.

Despite the richness of the interview data, only the most relevant interview excerpts (i.e., Effects of the Feedback Approach) directly related to the research questions were listed.

The following section represents the most prominent total coded responses from the interviews with 104 codes. The theme, Effects of the Usage-driven Feedback Approach, was divided into three sub-themes, namely: (1) Socialization Effects of the In-class Feedback, (2) Effects of Out-of-class Feedback on Autonomy, (3) General Effects on Self-efficacy. The third sub-theme was broken down into smaller categories to reveal the nuances of the data gathered. In addition, all the subjects' responses to these were included in this section.

Table 12. General Themes from the Thematic Analysis

Category	Frequency
Usage-based Instruction in Learning Lexical Chunks (34)	Naturalistic way of learning (9), the role of functions and tasks (8), providing an opportunity to speak (8), the role of the facilitator (6), knowing the purpose (2), finding pleasure in doing (1)
Raising Awareness through Feedback (57)	Validating (10), putting into context (8), varying source of input (8), recycling (8), providing notes/list (6); treating lexical chunks as one unit (4); suggesting (5), reminding (4), praising (3), modeling (3)
Feedback Approach VS Traditional Approach (18)	Putting pressure on students (6), less opportunity to speak (5), decontextualized learning (4), use of native language in learning the target language (2), focus on grammar and writing (1)
Unfamiliarity with Lexical Chunks (6)	Difficulty in retrieval (3), lack of motivation (3)
Effects of the Feedback Approach (104)	General effects on self-efficacy (61), socialization effects of the in-class treatment (33), effects of the out-of-class treatment (10)
Preference on the Type of Feedback (7)	Immediate feedback (4), delayed feedback (3)

Note. () = Frequency of Occurrence

4.4.1 Socialization Effects of the In-class Feedback

The table below presents the subjects' attitudes and perceptions towards the in-class treatment. This treatment represents all the strategies the GL utilized to raise awareness in class, such as validating, suggesting, modeling.

Table 13. Socialization Effects of the Feedback Approach Based on the Interviews

Code	Student	Comment
Socialization Effects of In-class Feedback: Peer Influence (33)	ME	"I think my groupmates were able to remake better sentences than before after he gave and suggested some lexical chunks to them, and after I listened to their conversation, I would also try using the said chunks myself."
	GE	"...for example, <i>hold your horses!</i> It was mentioned by one of my teammates and it was interesting to know more than the literal meaning of these phrases, and also I learned the way that we could have deeper understanding using chunks because if I don't know the meaning of the chunks, we couldn't keep the conversation going, but if both people knew the meaning of the chunk, then it would have better conversation and better bonded."
	HK	"My GL was native, and my groupmates were non-natives. I thought that if my groupmates who were non-native students can able to use lexical chunks, then so can I. When I hear them using lexical chunks and I know that we're on the same level, it makes me inspired to also use lexical chunks, and also there is a group member who is really good at using lexical chunks and I really like her speaking and it makes me wonder how did she able to learn these things and it affects me positively and not negatively because this class is for learning together and not for competing against each other. Through feedback, I can improve my speaking, and I can say that I got inspired by her."
	SE	"Giving feedback to others helped me a lot because we're all in the same level, and I thought that maybe what my groupmate is going through is the same problem that I am going through, so when the GL explains something to her, that's also my situation so I would also listen to the explanation, and everyone could develop together."

From the statements above, it appears that modeling has become an integral part of learning lexical chunks. However, it is not only the GL's modeling that greatly affected the students but also that of their peers. This

reveals that students tend to follow more of what they see from their peers. One possible explanation for this is that, perhaps, their peers are more relatable than the GL since they share similar backgrounds (i.e., being a student, being on the receiving end of the learning spectrum, etc.), thus their closer affinity. In support of this notion are HK and SE statements. This also positively reflects task-based instruction's belief in interactive learning.

Furthermore, note that the students have varying English proficiency levels. Their statements suggest that lower proficiency learners can significantly benefit from feedback from the GL and their higher proficiency peers, as stated by GE and HK.

4.4.2 Effects of Out-of-class Feedback on Autonomy

The students received out-of-class feedback through reading homework, online resources, Kakao correspondences, and speaking homework feedback during the treatment.

Table 14. Effects on Learner Autonomy of Out-of-Class Feedback

Code	Student	Comment
Effects of Out-of-class Feedback: Autonomy (10)	ME	"I will use these lexical chunks which I learned from this class to improve my English skill when I speak or write and I would like to know and use much more lexical chunks by finding chunks through some materials such as books, conversations, movies or something by myself."
	GE	"In my case, when I need to debate something online in English, I could review the materials again. I would also use them for the speaking homework. It was good that the materials were left in my Kakao. If I don't know them, I search more about chunks by myself without any pressure from the professor."
	HK	"They were helpful because without my GL, I would never search these materials by myself, so it really helpful to be exposed and provided with real material, authentic materials because I never searched for them before, and now I do."
	SE	"Whenever I would outline my speaking assignment, I'd use chunks, I'd think that maybe I should use <i>come up with or at this point</i> ."

As can be seen from the remarks (see Table 14 above), the students have entirely expressed positive views towards the out-of-class feedback. One student, HK, mentioned that the consistent giving of materials by the GL made her develop a desire to expand her knowledge by searching for new materials herself, which she had never done before the treatment. This is an instance of self-directed learning. In the same manner, GE demonstrated learner independence by searching for more lexical chunks she could use, revisiting the supplementary materials, and recycling them for purposes other than those employed in class. She, once again, mentioned the absence of pressure in the process, which she relates to a more naturalistic, incidental type of learning. SE also found herself using the lexical chunks she learned in class and from the reading homework to fulfill her speaking assignment. At the same time, MK expressed a more passive approach by identifying lexical chunks from different sources. Despite having different courses of action, all the participants noted promising responses toward the out-of-class treatment and exhibited various degrees of autonomous learning.

4.4.3 General Effects of Receiving Feedback on Self-Efficacy

This section comprises six sections demonstrating and discussing six different effects coded from the participants' interviews. These are (1) Change in Attitude and Belief, (2) Motivation, (3) Openness to Feedback, (4) Introspection, (5) Productive Skills, and (6) Receptive Skills.

Note that a statement may relate to several sub-themes. After all, they fall under one theme: Effects on self-efficacy. Nevertheless, the researcher still tried to categorize them as precisely and neatly as possible to capture the richness and complexity of the data.

4.4.3.1 Change in Attitude and Belief

This sub-theme garnered 15 codes, corresponding to the students' initial thoughts and general realizations from the treatment. Table 15 (see table below) shows the students' change in perceptions regarding language and vocabulary learning.

Based on the statements, the subjects emphasized different points for discussion. For MK, there was a change in behavior in using lexical chunks. She mentioned that her new-found knowledge of lexical chunks and developed an openness to feedback from the treatment made her quickly learn lexical chunks and gain more confidence. Furthermore, she learned how to associate them in appropriate situations and improved her quality of encoding and storing information, which led to the easier recall of lexical chunks. Similarly, SE also remarked that having a renewed sense of learning phrases from the treatment made her more aware and appreciative of them. In the case of HK, it seems that the treatment gave her more meaning to seek more options instead of adhering to what she was taught before, thus her eagerness to vary her language. The treatment made GE more confident in speaking English after knowing the importance of lexical chunks in the language. She also felt renewed enthusiasm to practice her language skills after the treatment.

Table 15. Effects on Attitude and Beliefs of the Feedback Approach

Code	Student	Comment
General Effects on Self-Efficacy: Change in Attitude and Belief (15)	ME	"I wasn't conscious about some phrases which are actually lexical chunks before taking this class. I didn't know their exist. Now that I can use them easily. I was able to know and remember a lot of lexical chunks, and I realized that lexical chunks are useful in making sentences. Also, I was able to know the situations in which these chunks could be used."
	GE	"After this class, I could know that speaking English is the same with all people, the difference is just how much chunks and confidence a person has in speaking. When I have more confidence, then I would be more eager to speak more and develop more. Also, if I would be able to study abroad next year, then I would also use chunks and learn more from native speakers in Canada, or the US."
	HK	"I thought my writing was always the same because I would always write first, second, third, so I thought I didn't want to write in that way anymore, now I learned more about lexical chunks and learned and used more options that can replace first, second, third."
	SE	"We've learned about phrases in traditional education and that's about it, we would forget it afterwards. In this class we learned the term 'lexical chunks' and its importance. It was elaborated by the GL. So, I kind of knew before what lexical chunks were but not the exact term and not really knowing about much about them. I kind of learned about them as phrases, now I know that those phrases were actually lexical chunks, and I could connect my knowledge now of lexical chunks in what I learned before. It makes sense now."

4.4.3.2 Motivation

With the change in attitude and beliefs comes an increase in the motivation of the subjects in the study. Based on their statements (see Table 16 below), it appears the treatment has ignited their interest in further developing their English language skills through learning more lexical chunks. For example, ME acknowledged her current struggles and language skills, which made her want to practice more even after the treatment. Similarly, GE

conveyed the same sentiments as ME with an emphasis on learning them within context, which makes learning lexical chunks in the treatment different from the traditional approach. In the case of HK, it is apparent that throughout the treatment, she harbored some frustrations about how she could not fully apply what was mentioned in class. Nevertheless, this is a positive indication that she is acting on what she has learned, and her feeling motivated by the feedback also suggests that learning took place. For SE, the constant encouragement from both the GL and the professor pushed her to speak more and trust her language ability. One interesting point she mentioned in her comment was the facilitators' tolerance of the students' mistakes. This raises an issue of how teachers can ensure a safe space for the students while providing feedback on the students' performances. In sum, all the students exhibited increased motivation due to the treatment.

Table 16. Effects on Student Motivation of the Feedback Approach

Code	Student	Comment
General Effects on Self-efficacy: Motivation (9)	ME	"I think I need to do better, and I need to learn more. I thought of this because other people say and use lexical chunks more naturally, so I need to use them better. This is a good thing for me because I've realized that I am not at my best now and I need more time to practice and learn even after the class."
	GE	"For chunks, I think the context is clearer. I think it's not too different from memorizing single words, and I am more eager to memorize and learn chunks than single words because with the traditional Korean educational system, I had to memorize a lot of single words and it was boring. With chunks and how we learned chunks in class through this course, it didn't make feel like studying with pressure."
	HK	"I think about I have to use more lexical chunks but I couldn't speak what I first initial thought, although when I record my speaking homework, I would have some confusion if I was doing it properly, but the GL would give me enough feedback what could have been improved, what I did great, and those things should me the way on how I have to speak, and I feel motivated."
	SE	"The GL and the professor always encouraged us and told us to speak anything, and they would be tolerant with my mistakes and whatever I say so I think it really helped me to be more confident than before in speaking."

4.4.3.3 Openness to Feedback

Table 17 (see table below) shows the students' perceptions towards the usage-driven feedback approach, with instances of the subjects giving feedback to one another on some of the speaking homework.

The result from the interview suggests that the constant giving of productive feedback led to better student receptiveness and student satisfaction. ME mentioned that the feedback she received from the GL made her language more sophisticated. HK highlighted that feedback made her ruminate more on the usefulness of lexical chunks in improving her speech, to which she eventually agreed. GE and SE noted the same change in perception and stressed that the chance to give feedback to their peers made them more aware not only of their peer's language but also of their own. Moreover, all four subjects raised an interesting realization about indirect feedback, which they all experienced throughout the treatment. As per the subjects, indirect feedback also made them more aware of her capabilities (see SE's comment regarding indirect feedback in Table 17 below).

All in all, the students underlined that the usage-driven feedback approach shaped how they think about feedback generally, which affected their receptiveness and desire to improve their lexical use.

Table 17. Effects on Openness to Feedback of the Feedback Approach

Code	Student	Comment
General Effects on Self-Efficacy: Openness to Feedback (8)	ME	He pointed out these things and it made me improve my English skills more. I felt happy to hear the feedback because I was never given feedback on how I used English before, so the feedback given by the GL and the professor were very helpful for me.
	GE	I knew that sharing and giving each other some feedback is very useful to developing myself. Not only from our GL's feedback but also the feedback from the speaking HW where I had to give some feedback to my other member's speaking HW.
	HK	When I first started the class, I was not aware of the importance of lexical chunks, but in the beginning of the class, the GL would always talk about its importance so I started thinking about that it might really be useful.
	SE	Giving feedback to others helped me a lot because we're all in the same level, and I thought that maybe what my groupmate is going through is the same problem that I am going through so when the GL explains something to her, that's also my situation so I would also listen to the explanation, and everyone could develop together. I also thought giving feedback was actually hard because it needed more objectivity and not based on my emotions. It helped me to give feedback objectively based on the rubric and not my emotion."

4.4.3.4 Introspection

The usage-driven feedback approach has led the subjects to contemplate their performances and language abilities. It also made them deepen their knowledge of lexical chunks. ME and HK remarked that the treatment made them re-evaluate their strengths and weaknesses in English. In the same way, GE, although in the beginning, experienced disappointment over not learning about lexical chunks earlier, became more motivated to learn and more open to collaborating with others during the treatment. Moreover, her comment conveyed her preference for a task-based approach. In the case of SE, despite starting the treatment with an advanced low proficiency, she still thought that her current level needed improvement and that lexical chunks would help her further develop her language skills through conscious effort. Table 18 contains all the most prominent codes for introspection.

Table 18. Effects on Students' Self-evaluation of the Feedback Approach

Code	Student	Comment
General Effects on Self-Efficacy: Introspection (9)	ME	This course is divided into different functions and themes. I can remember several chunks because of the different situation. It was helpful because I realized my good and bad points.
	GE	Actually, at first I felt sorry for myself because I didn't know some chunks used by my classmates and my GL and I felt I needed to study more, but after that I noticed that I could learn chunks more and easier from other students and not simply researching by myself and it was more comfortable to learn chunks in English in this way.
	HK	I was also able to compare my performance and my classmates' use of lexical chunks. I noticed their good points and I was able to recycle the lexical chunks they used.
	SE	"I thought that I should learn more of these kinds of things to make my English more elaborate and sophisticated. Sometimes, I use vague language and repetitive language like also instead of in addition and more. This helped me be more conscious with my language and use chunks and advance my speaking."

4.4.3.5 Productive Skills

The usage-driven feedback approach employed function-focused tasks that directly addressed the objectives of each session. Furthermore, these tasks ensured enough opportunities for speaking and recycling lexical chunks in the reading homework.

Coding was done in the semi-structured interviews, and one of the subthemes that emerged was the improvement of the students' productive skills. All four participants noted the difference in learning lexical chunks from the treatment and learning them as phrases in the traditional approach. All the subjects have also expressed their proclivity towards the former as it made them recall the lexical chunks better. In addition, MK also commented that the treatment encouraged her to speak to a greater extent, encouraging her to use some lexical chunks she had learned in the process. Likewise, SE emphasized that after the intervention had heightened her awareness of lexical chunks, she consciously used the lexical chunks in different classroom activities, which led her to use more chunks than before. Interestingly, GE shared similar sentiments but with an emphasis on the out-of-class situations where she used her learning (i.e., using lexical chunks in speaking with foreign friends and teachers). This shows that students like GE, who are highly driven to utilize their learning, find new avenues to practice, which is an example of self-directed learning. Another student, HK, exhibited the same opportunity-seeking act when she mentioned that she would also use the lexical chunks she learned in various courses she was taking during the semester. Table 19 shows some excerpts from the interviews related to improving productive skills.

In sum, the students' statements provided insight into how the usage-driven feedback approach made them more aware of lexical chunks, encouraged them to employ them in their speech, and made speaking English undemanding.

Table 19. Effects on Productive Skills of the Feedback Approach

Code	Student	Comment
General Effects on Self-Efficacy: Productive Skills (13)	ME	I only know some phrases, but I didn't recognize these phrases as lexical chunks so it was hard to remember. But knowing lexical chunks now, it is now easier for me to make sentences and remember them. Also, before this class, I didn't practice speaking English a lot, I just practiced reading and writing so this course was good for me because it made me learn lexical chunks and practice my speaking. It is easier to speak using lexical chunks.
	GE	I tried using chunks that I learned in class when I speak with other foreigners, for example, I am studying English with a Philippine teacher via phone. I try using the chunks at least one chunk every session with her.
	HK	... in writing scripts and also debating. I would also use them in courses that need formal language and formal speaking because in formal speaking, we have to organize our speech and with this, lexical chunks are really helpful.
	SE	The GL gave a lot of opportunities to speak, and to everyone! For example, in presenting our charts, the GL would ask everybody to present. We had the chance to talk a lot. When I write or speak, I would think more chunks, I could use them more consciously like "maybe I could use a chunk here in this sentence or this chunk is better in this context". It made me more conscious.

4.4.3.6 Receptive Skills

Improvement in receptive skills was noticed in the coding of the individual interviews. This was supported by the comments made by the students, who mentioned that their increased awareness gave rise to enhanced receptive skills. This finding, however, is somewhat expected and not groundbreaking as awareness of something always leads to better noticing. The students all mentioned that noticing chunks in people's speech became a habit, and it somehow became intuitive to look for lexical chunks in any situation. SE, in particular, remarked that it gave her a sense of accomplishment whenever she identified lexical chunks. It seems that not only did they learn lexical chunks, but the subjects were also able to learn the strategies used by the GL to increase their awareness. Table 20 illustrates the statements of the students concerning their increased receptive skills.

Table 20. Effects of the Usage-driven Feedback Approach on Receptive Skills

Code	Student	Comment
General Effects on Self-Efficacy: Receptive Skills (7)	ME	...in asking us to give feedback to the speaking homework of our partners, I was able to remember some chunks better and notice them, the theme and the functions better.
	GE	I didn't have any idea about chunks before. So now, I can listen to chunks people use and use those chunks with other people. Now, I would also think that 'oh, that's a chunk' in my head when I hear a chunk.
	HK	I can pick out and spot lexical chunks now although I still have little difficulty in the definition of lexical chunks. I can't define it properly, but I know it in my mind so when I hear other people speaking, I could spot some lexical chunks.
	SE	I would pick out the chunks I've heard from my groupmates even though it was not highlighted by the GL. It made me think if something is a chunk. Even without the GL, sometimes I would already think of chunks from the things that I've heard and if something was picked out by the GL and I also did, I would tell myself that I got the chunk right.

4.5 Research Question 1

As seen in the results, there was a significant increase in the students' use of lexical chunks in their speaking homework and OPIc tests. These results were in congruence with the results from the student survey and the individual interviews. It appears that the approach significantly contributed to the increase in the use of lexical chunks of all the subjects. In short, the feedback approach positively affected both higher- and lower-level proficiency students. Furthermore, the results have shown a rather proportional effect among the subjects, which is interesting as it challenges the traditional notion that lexical chunks are hard to learn as they require more from the capacity-limited working memory, and a certain L2 linguistic threshold must be achieved first before L2 learners can process and learn lexical chunks. The current study, together with the more recent studies in L1 and L2, rejects the idea that learning lexical chunks must be delayed. Much research has already supported that compounds such as lexical chunks do not require more working memory processing than single-lexis units (see Conklin and Schmitt 2012, Mondini et al. 2002). In fact, Wray (2002) argued that lexical chunks are also very much represented in memory as a single unit, which means that the process of learning chunks is not harder than learning single-word units. This gives the impression that a wider range of students, at least in the intermediate to advanced range, as per the current study, can benefit from learning lexical chunks. Instead of delaying the learning of functional lexical chunks, teachers and curriculum developers must find more creative and effective teaching methods.

The current paper emphasizes the importance of laying the groundwork in EFL classrooms. That is (1) focusing on discourse-facilitating chunks first, (2) building context and promoting student involvement in the learning process, and (3) providing productive feedback by introducing new linguistic forms in the form of functional lexical chunks. This means that the discourse-facilitating chunks must be the priority in EFL classrooms as they are both goal-oriented and context-dependent and deemed more helpful to students' language production and communicative goals. In addition, the role of the students as contributors rather than passive learners must be strongly advocated. The EiAS course followed a task-based approach, which, in turn, pushed the learners to produce language more compared to the traditional lecture-based approach. The present study adds to the plethora of studies that provide supplementary support for the Output Hypothesis, TBL, and usage-based approaches. Similar to the findings of Basterrechea et al. (2014) and Izumi (2002), the study also revealed that pushed output tasks heightened students' awareness of the differences in gaps between their interlanguage and L2 forms. Awareness of content by the subjects was also observed in these output-driven studies. Finally, the study also

agrees that summative assessments, numerical value assignments, and corrective feedback are insufficient (Chan and Lam 2010, Glover and Brown 2006, Narciss and Hutt 2004) in developing the students' communicative competence. Formative and productive feedback must also be given enough attention in a language classroom as it provides a clearer picture of the learning objectives. In the case of the current study, this was done through the highlighting of the lexical chunks in the various class materials and language of the students as well as providing various alternative forms of target lexical chunks, which ultimately compelled the incorporation of lexical chunks in the students' speech in all aspects of the class.

4.6 Research Question 2

The results illustrated that the subjects' close collaboration with their peers and the GL encouraged a series of paradigm shifts.

Firstly, the subjects became more receptive to feedback and noted a change in their attitude and perception not only in lexical chunks but in English in general. The students openly expressed their past disappointments in their language skills and their renewed enthusiasm to augment their current state. The treatment made them realize they could improve their linguistic skills after observing and working with one another. Specifically, the higher proficient student, SE, became a role model to the lower proficient ones to practice more and incorporate lexical chunks in their speeches. Interestingly, the other students did not see her as a competition but an inspiration. This supports Cohen and Lotan's (2014) statement that higher proficiency students help lower-level ones increase their determination to achieve. The three subjects noted that since SE shared a similar background (i.e., a college student in a Korean university, a non-native English speaker), they could also achieve such linguistic feat. In addition, the fact that SE was also elated to receive feedback from the GL and her peers in class made the others more open to different feedback. Perhaps this was because of the environment built by a heterogeneous group. This phenomenon can also be further attributed to the negative correlation between the derogative effect of Language Anxiety (Horwitz 2010, MacIntyre 1999) and Willingness to Communicate (Kang 2005, MacIntyre et al. 1998). In the context of the study, the lower level of anxiety experienced by the students, which was documented in their interviews, made them collaborate with their peers better and speak more in class. This instance of speaking more than they used to have in their previous English language classes made them feel satisfied with their performances in the in-class (e.g., group discussions, pair work, debates, presentations, etc.) and out-of-class tasks (e.g., reading homework, speaking homework, OPIs). This, then, emphasizes how a language classroom must be built. That is, a heterogeneous group allows the students to be more engaged in their learning and more open to input from all their peers, regardless of their level of abilities, thus leading to greater awareness.

Additionally, the subjects' motivation level was also perceived to have positively changed. Their motivation to learn improved since the learning felt natural to them as they were actively partaking in the process as both observers and collaborators in the function-focused set-up of the class, which relates to how things are done in the real world. The difference was especially noticeable in the students' interviews, which discussed the supposed differences between the feedback and traditional approaches. All four subjects exhibited an experience of what can be attributed to increased motivation during and after the treatment. The increase in motivation seems to have been rooted in observing one another's performance and the GL's feedback for the other students. That is, the subjects were more perceptive of their peers' language than that of the GLs. This is crucial in language learning as motivation is a critical element in learning (Dörnyei 1998). Gardner (1985) also stressed that the motivation and attitude of a learner toward the target language significantly determine the outcome of the learning process.

The increase in motivation of the students also led to learner autonomy. This phenomenon is unsurprising as many studies on motivation and learning suggest similar findings (see Dickinson 1995, Vakhnenko 2014). According to the study by Shapiro (2022), learning autonomy has three facets: (1) self-directed learning, (2) self-regulation, and (3) self-determination. The subjects in the current study demonstrated all these three.

The results show that the participants exhibited self-directed learning when they mentioned fulfilling online and offline tasks. Notably, the online tasks from the supplementary materials were not part of the course assessment. Additionally, these were exclusively sent to the subjects, while the rest of the class did not receive any supplementary materials besides the weekly reading homework. Nevertheless, the students still performed them out of their own volition. They appreciated the materials as they made the in-class tasks and the speaking homework easier to handle.

Self-regulation was also demonstrated in the preparations the subjects made by studying in advance using the supplementary materials, communicating with the GL for clarification on the out-of-class tasks, and incorporating the target lexical chunks raised in the class discussions in the speaking homework. Their positive opinion towards the online resources, as documented in the survey forms and the interviews, demonstrated the value of innovative approaches in language learning. In this modern world, language learning happens in class and outside wherever and whenever the student decides to enact. Furthermore, unlike the traditional approach, teachers are no longer the sole and absolute source of information, as there is a vast aggregate of online learning materials. There are too many available resources students can access anytime and anywhere. One thing a teacher needs to impart to his students, however, is the skill to filter good sources from the bad (e.g., those that use authentic language and provide enough context in the language). One way of doing this, which can also be considered an indirect form of feedback to the students, is the initial introduction of these suitable materials and trusted websites. This is a way of raising awareness and guiding the students on which ones to focus on since they have limited experience and exposure. The students became more receptive and appreciative after being introduced to useful materials. They expressed their desire to learn more lexical chunks even after the treatment.

Concerning self-determination exhibited by the subjects, by the end of the treatment, each expressed satisfaction over their performances in class. This is in congruence with the studies of Espasa and Meneses (2010) and Narciss and Hutt (2002) on feedback and learning. However, in the initial stages of the feedback approach, MK and HK conveyed some insecurities noted in some of the weekly surveys and were quite hesitant to appreciate their efforts. Nevertheless, as the treatment progressed, with the constant encouragement and unobtrusive feedback from the professor and the GL, they slowly came around. This, again, poses a critical issue regarding how teachers give feedback to students that may negatively affect their self-esteem. Students like HK and MK seem overly focused on accuracy and are always careful with what they produce. In a traditional approach, students are expected to receive corrected feedback from the teacher. They are inevitably accustomed to receiving such feedback, mainly drawn to their weaknesses, and a teacher rarely emphasizes their strengths. Thus, it is hardly surprising to have students like HK and MK who underestimate their ability and potential to learn. Teachers can help students augment their self-belief by shifting from providing corrective feedback to a more balanced one. That is, teachers may recast the error, yet the feedback should be geared towards the effort made by the student and how the student can use the target language in the future by providing more information on the function and the context rather than the correctness of the utterance.

5. Conclusion

In sum, after incorporating various learning theories in the treatment often overlooked in SLA (e.g., feedback, language anxiety, context, motivation), all four students have expressed proclivity to the function-driven feedback approach over the traditional learning approach. The various steps undertaken in the former, especially the providing of feedback to the students whenever the need arose (in-class and out-of-class), made them more aware of lexical chunks and encouraged them to reproduce them in their speech. Furthermore, the students conveyed an increase in motivation to learn lexical chunks even after the treatment, which also resulted in autonomous learning.

In a traditional approach, students are expected to receive corrected feedback from the teacher. They are inevitably accustomed to receiving such type of feedback, which is mostly drawn to their weaknesses and rarely does a teacher emphasize their strengths. Thus, it is hardly surprising to have students like HK and MK, who underestimate their ability and their potential to learn. Teachers can help augment students' self-belief by shifting from providing corrective feedback to that of a more balanced one. That is, teachers may do a recast of the error, yet the feedback should be geared towards the effort made by the student and how the student can use the target language in the future by providing more information on the function and the context rather than the correctness of the utterance.

Researchers agree on the advantages of learning lexical chunks in improving linguistic ability and communicative competence. However, the traditional pedagogical practices such as rote memorization and drilling (Taguchi 2007), text chunking or typographic enhancement (Boers et al. 2006, Lewis 1997, Stengers et al. 2006), multiple presentations and encounters through input flooding (Waring and Takaki 2003, Webb et al. 2013) to name a few demonstrated varying results on lexical chunks uptake and failed to identify a method that could produce consistent results or change in attitudes over time. Furthermore, most of these awareness-raising methods seem to position learners in passive roles, which is detrimental to developing learner autonomy. This study has attempted to investigate a possible approach to language learning that emphasizes meaningful production and the importance of receiving appropriate feedback linked to a given, real-world task. This is in the hopes of learners' better noticing of the prevalence of chunks and increased system building. That is, a usage-driven feedback approach takes into account not only how usage-based approaches work but also how students develop intrinsic motivation to go beyond just noticing linguistic forms.

Even though some EFL classrooms have already made lexis central in language learning in recent years due to the emphasis given to it by the research community (see Carter and McCarthy 1988, Coady and Huckin 1997, Nation 1990, Schmitt 1997, 2000), it appears that the awareness-raising strategies and methods of teaching them have not yet fully developed. Perhaps it is because teachers lack confidence in choosing the best practice teaching vocabulary (Berne and Blachowicz 2008). Vocabulary for most means a single-word item, which explains the customary and uncreative ways of teaching them (e.g., use of realia, enumeration, use of gestures, miming, etc.) (Alqahtani 2015). It is worth noting, however, that some language books display lexical chunks in every chapter. Nevertheless, it stays foreign and distant to language learners since they are barely utilized in class. The challenge remains in fully equipping teachers with the available innovative approaches to language teaching that maximize the proven advantageous effects of lexical chunks.

6. Limitations and Further Study

Despite the study recruiting learners with varied levels of proficiency, the small sample size may not be enough to support a generalization. This is an opportunity for future research. However, a study on a larger scale of usage-driven feedback approach may pose classroom management concerns. One of the challenges for replication of the

study in a whole class setting is the feedback intensity. That is, both the quality and quantity of the feedback from the facilitator/teacher in a more populated research may be inconsistent with the strength of the feedback provided in the current study. It will be difficult for one facilitator to give enough meaningful feedback to 20-30 students all at once. Thus, granted that the course is set up properly in a way that the students are not geared towards competition, one way to address this challenge is to divide the larger class into smaller groups of four to six students and train specific students in each group, especially those that have higher proficiencies, to consistently give feedback on their sub-groups. This ensures that each student gets enough feedback from peers and the teacher. In addition, it may also address the negative views on feedback by students highlighted by Hanrahan and Isaacs (2001) (e.g., the difficulty in maintaining objectivity and discomfort in giving feedback). In terms of the design of the tasks, it would be advisable to have the giving of feedback integrated into some of the tasks. Secondly, although the length of ten weeks is relatively enough given the current goals of the study, longitudinal research with delayed assessment may further support the findings of the current study. The long-term effect of the treatment is something to be studied further, and a delayed assessment may also reveal a shift in the attitude of the students from passively noticing lexical chunks to actively looking for them after the treatment. Lastly, there is a lack of an official inter-rater reliability score and scoring system for the measures. Although the professor and research advisor scrutinized the measures, official inter-rater reliability would further boost the robustness of the study.

Finally, this research paper mentioned the role of peers in language learning. This topic is worth exploring since peer feedback has never been highly regarded in most language classes. Similarly, investigating the uptake of other types of lexical chunks is also an area for future research.

References

- Alberini, C. M. and J. E. Ledoux. 1993. Memory reconsolidation. *Current Biology* 23(17), 746-750.
- Allison, D., L. Wee, B. Zhiming and S. A. Abraham, eds. 1998. *Text in education and society*. Singapore University Press.
- Alqahtani, M. 2015. The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education* 3(3), 21-34.
- Alsowat, H. H. 2020. Evidence-based practices of English language teaching: A meta-analysis of meta-analyses. *English Language Teaching*, 13, 75.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. 2012. *ACTFL proficiency guidelines*.
- Arnon, I. and M. H. Christiansen. 2017. The role of multiword building blocks in explaining L1-L2 differences. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 9(3), 621-636.
- Bahns, J. and M. Eldaw. 1993. Should we teach EFL students collocations? *System* 21, 101-114.
- Bangert-Drowns, R. L., C.-I. C. Kulik, J. A. Kulik and M. Morgan. 1991. The instructional effect of feedback in test-like events. *Review of Educational Research* 61(2), 213-238.
- Basterrechea, M., M. d. P. García Mayo and M. J. Leiser. 2014. Pushed output and noticing in a Dictogloss: Task implementation in the CLIL classroom. *Porta Linguarum: Revista Internacional de Didáctica de las Lenguas Extranjeras* 22, 7-22.
- Berne, J. and C. Blachowicz. 2008. What reading teachers say about vocabulary instruction: Voices from the classroom. *The Reading Teacher* 62(4), 314-323.

- Boers, F. and H. Stengers. 2008. Adding sound to the picture: Motivating the lexical composition of metaphorical idioms in English, Dutch, and Spanish. In M. S. Zanotto, L. Cameron and M. C. Cavalcanti, eds., *Confronting metaphor in use*, 63-78. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Boers, F., J.E. Brussels, J. Kappel, H. Stengers and M. Demecheleer. 2006. Formulaic sequences and perceived oral proficiency: Putting a lexical approach to the test. *Language Teaching Research* 10(3), 245-261.
- Boers, F. and S. Lindstromberg. 2009. *Optimizing a lexical approach to instructed second language acquisition*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boers, F. and S. Lindstromberg. 2012. Experimental and intervention studies on formulaic sequences in a second language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 32, 83-110.
- Brazil, D. 1995. *A grammar of speech*. Oxford University Press.
- Butler, R. 1987. Task-involving and ego-involving properties of evaluation: Effects of different feedback conditions on motivational perceptions, interest, and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 79(4), 474-482.
- Bybee, J. 2002. Phonological evidence of exemplar storage of multiword sequences. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24, 215-221.
- Carter, R. and M. McCarthy. 1988. *Vocabulary and language teaching* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Chan, J. and S. F. Lam. 2010. Effects of different evaluative feedback on students' self-efficacy in learning. *Instructional Science* 38, 37-58.
- Coady, J. and T. Huckin. 1997. *Second language vocabulary acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, E. and R. Lotan. 2014. *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom*. Teachers College Press.
- Conklin, K. and N. Schmitt. 2008. Formulaic sequences: Are they processed more quickly than nonformulaic language by native and nonnative speakers? *Applied Linguistics* 29, 72-89.
- Conklin, K. and N. Schmitt. 2012. The processing of formulaic language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 32, 45-61.
- Connors, R. J. and A. Lunsford. 1993. Teachers' rhetorical comments on student papers. *College Composition and Communication* 44, 200-223.
- Dai, Z. and Y. Ding. 2010. Effectiveness of text memorization in EFL learning of Chinese students. In D. Wood, ed., *Perspectives on Formulaic Language: Acquisition and Communication*, 71-87. Continuum.
- Dickinson, L. 1995. Autonomy and motivation: A literature review. *System* 23(2), 165-174.
- Ding, L. 1998. Revisiting assessment and learning: Implications of students' perspectives on assessment feedback. Paper presented at the Scottish Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Dundee, September 25-26.
- Dörnyei, Z. 1998. Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching* 31(3), 117-135.
- Durrant, P. and N. Schmitt. 2009. To what extent do native and non-native writers make use of collocations? *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 47, 157-177.
- Ellis, R. 1985. *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 1990. *Instructed second language acquisition: Learning in the classroom*. Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. 2008. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Erdogan, V. 2005. Contribution of error analysis to foreign language teaching. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education* 1(2), 261-270.
- Espasa, A. and J. Meneses. 2010. Analysing feedback processes in an online teaching and learning environment: An exploratory study. *Higher Education* 59(3), 277-292.

- Ferguson, P. 2011. Student perceptions of quality feedback in teacher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 36(1), 51-62.
- Gardner, R. 1985. *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold.
- Glover, C. and E. Brown. 2006. Written feedback for students: Too much, too detailed or too incomprehensible to be effective? *Bioscience Education* 7, 1-16.
- Goo, J., G. Granena, Y. Yilmaz and M. Novella. 2015. Implicit and explicit instruction in L2 learning. In P. Rebuschat, ed., *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*, 443-482. John Benjamins.
- Granger, S. 1998. Prefabricated patterns in advanced EFL writing: Collocations and formulae. In A. P. Cowie, ed., *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications*, 79-100. Oxford University Press.
- Hanrahan, S. J. and G. Isaacs. 2001. Assessing self- and peer-assessment: The students' views. *Higher Education Research & Development* 20(1), 53-70.
- Hattie, J. 2009. *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses related to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hattie, J. and H. Timperley. 2007. The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research* 77(1), 81-112.
- Hattie, J. and K. Zierer. 2019. *Visible learning insights*. Routledge.
- Hollingsworth, J. R. and S. E. Ybarra. 2009. *Explicit direct instruction (EDI): The power of the well-crafted, well-taught lesson*. Corwin Press & Data Works Educational Research.
- Horwitz, E. 2010. Foreign and second language anxiety. *Language Teaching* 43(2), 154-167.
- Iwashita, N., A. Brown, T. McNamara and S. O'Hagan. 2008. Assessed levels of second language speaking proficiency: How distinct? *Applied Linguistics* 29, 24-49.
- Izumi, S. 2002. Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24(4), 541-577.
- Kang, S. 2005. Dynamic emergence of situational willingness to communicate in a second language. *System* 33(2), 277-292.
- Kim, J. H. 2004. Issues of corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics* 4(2), 1-24.
- Kim, N. B. 2009. A corpus-based lexical analysis of the speech texts: A collocational approach. *English Language & Literature Teaching* 15(3), 151-170.
- Kim, N. B. 2019. Effects of the use of lexical chunks on practical English proficiency. *English Language & Literature Teaching* 25(1), 59-79.
- Kingen, S. 2000. *Teaching language arts in middle schools: Connecting and communicating*. Routledge.
- Klimova, B. 2015. The role of feedback in EFL classes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 199, 172-177.
- Kluger, A. N. and A. DeNisi. 1998. Feedback interventions: Toward the understanding of a double-edged sword. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 7(3), 67-72.
- Koosha, M. and A. Jafarpour. 2006. Data-driven learning and teaching collocation of prepositions: The case of Iranian EFL adult learners. *Asian EFL Journal* 8(8), 64-82.
- Kremmel, B., T. Brunfaut and C. Alderson. 2017. Exploring the role of phraseological knowledge in foreign language reading. *Applied Linguistics* 38(6), 848-870.
- Laufer, B. and J. Hulstijn. 2001. Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics* 22, 1-26.
- Lee, S. and H. Huang. 2008. Visual input enhancement and grammar learning: A meta-analytic review. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 30, 307-331.

- Le-Thi, D., M.P. Rodgers and A. Pellicer-Sánchez. 2018. Teaching formulaic sequences in an English-language class: The effects of explicit instruction versus coursebook instruction. *TESL Canada Journal* 34(3), 111-139.
- Lewis, M. 1993. *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and the way forward*. Language Teaching Publications.
- Lewis, M. 1997. *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*. Language Teaching Publications.
- Li, S. 2010. The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 60(2), 309-365.
- Li, S. and A. Vuono. 2019. Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in *System* 84, 93-109.
- Long, M. 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia, eds., *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*, 413-468. Academic Press.
- Lyster, R., and L. Ranta. 1997. Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19(1), 37-66.
- MacIntyre, P. 1999. Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. In D. J. Young, ed., *Affect in Foreign Language and Second Language Learning: A Practical Guide to Creating a Low-anxiety Classroom Atmosphere*, 24-45. McGraw-Hill.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Z. Dörnyei, R. Clément and K.A. Noels. 1998. Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal* 82(4), 545-562.
- Marklund, P., P. Fransson, R. Cabeza, K.M. Petersson, M. Ingvar and L. Nyberg. 2007. Sustained and transient neural modulations in prefrontal cortex related to declarative long-term memory, working memory, and attention. *Cortex* 43(1), 22-37.
- Marulis, L. M. and S. B. Neuman. 2010. The effects of vocabulary intervention on young children's word learning: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research* 80(3), 300-335.
- McGuire, M. and J. Larson-Hall. 2017. Teaching formulaic sequences in the classroom: Effects on spoken fluency. *TESL Canada Journal*.
- Mondini, S., G. Jarema, C. Luzzatti, C. Burani and C. Semenza. 2002. Why is "red cross" different from "yellow cross"?: A neurophysiological study of non-adjective agreement within Italian compounds. *Brain and Language* 81, 621-634.
- Mufidah, Z. 2017. The impact of oral corrective feedback on the level of language anxiety. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research* 145, 219-227.
- Narciss, S., and K. Hutt. 2004. How to design informative tutoring feedback for multimedia learning. In H. M. Niegemann, D. Leutner and R. Brunken, eds., *Instructional Design for Multimedia Learning*, 181-195. Waxmann.
- Nassaji, H. 2016. Anniversary article: Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis of current research. *Language Teaching Research* 20(4), 535-562.
- Nassaji, H. 2018. Corrective feedback. In J. L. Liantas, ed., *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* 5, 1683-1690. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Nation, I. S. P. 2001. *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. Newbury House.
- Nattinger, J. R. and J. S. DeCarrico. 1992. *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. 1989. *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pawley, A. and F.H. Syder. 1983. Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt, eds., *Language and Communication*, 191-226. Longman.

- Peters, E. 2012. Learning German formulaic sequences: The effect of two attention-drawing techniques. *The Language Learning Journal* 1, 65-79.
- Pinker, S. 1991. Rules of language. *Science* 253(5019), 530-535.
- Plonsky, L. and D. Brown. 2015. Domain definition and search techniques in meta-analyses of L2 research (Or why 18 meta-analyses of feedback have different results). *Second Language Research* 31(2), 267-278.
- Ratey, J. J. and A.M. Galaburda. 2001. *A user's guide to the brain: Perception, attention, and the four theaters of the brain*. Pantheon Books.
- Sanz, C. 2018. Implicit versus explicit grammar feedback. In J. L. Liontas, ed., *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* 5, 1683-1690. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Saussure, F. 1916. *Course in general linguistics*. Duckworth.
- Schmidt, R. 1990. The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11, 17-46.
- Schmitt, N. 1997. Vocabulary learning strategies. In N. Schmitt and M. McCarthy, eds., *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition, and Pedagogy*, 99-227. Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. 2000. *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N., X. Jiang and W. Grabe. 2011. The percentage of words known in a text and reading comprehension. *Modern Language Journal* 95, 26-43.
- Schwartz, B. D. 1993. On explicit and negative data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behavior. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15(2), 147-163.
- Semke, D. H. 1984. Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals* 17(3), 195-202.
- Shapiro, R. 2022. *The construction of Korean adult EFL learner autonomy in the online environment*. [Master's thesis, Sookmyung Women's University].
- Sinclair, J. 1987. Collocation: A progress report. In R. Steele and T. Treadgold, eds., *Essays in Honor of Michael Halliday*, 319-331. John Benjamins.
- Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford University Press.
- Sivanova, A. and N. Schmitt. 2008. L2 learner production and processing of collocation: A multi-study perspective. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 64, 429-458.
- Skehan, P. 1998. *A cognitive approach to language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Staehr, L. S. 2009. Vocabulary knowledge and advanced listening comprehension in English as a foreign language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 31, 577-607.
- Stengers, H., F. Boers, A. Housen and J. Eyckmans. 2010. Does "chunking" foster chunk-uptake? In S. De Knop, F. Boers and A. De Rycker, eds., *Fostering Language Teaching Efficiency Through Cognitive Linguistics*, 99-117. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stengers, H., F. Boers, A. Housen and J. Eyckmans. 2011. Formulaic sequences and L2 oral proficiency: Does the type of target language influence the association? *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 49, 321-343.
- Swain, M. 2000. The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf, ed., *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*, 97-114. Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. 2005. The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel, ed., *Handbook of research in second language and learning*, 471-483. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Taguchi, N. 2007. Chunk learning and the development of spoken discourse in a Japanese as a foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching Research* 11(4), 433-457.
- Tomasello, M. 2003. *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Harvard University Press.

- Vakhnenko, Y. 2014. Autonomous learning in a CALL EFL classroom: An exploratory case study (T) [Master's thesis, University of British Columbia].
- Waring, R. and M. Takaki. 2003. At what rate do learners learn and retain new vocabulary from reading a graded reader? *Reading in a Foreign Language* 15, 130-163.
- Webb, S., J. Newton and A. Chang. 2013. Incidental learning of collocation. *Language Learning* 63, 91-120.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1991. *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Willingham, D. B. 1990. Effective feedback on written assignments. *Teaching of Psychology* 17(1), 10-13.
- Willis, D. 2003. *Rules, patterns and words*. Cambridge University Press.
- Willis, J. and D. Willis. 1989. *Collins COBUILD English course*. Collins COBUILD.
- Wood, D. 2001. In search of fluency: What is it and how can we teach it? *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 57, 573-589.
- Wood, D. 2006. Uses and functions of formulaic sequences in second language speech: An exploration of the foundations of fluency. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 63(1), 13-33.
- Wray, A. 2002. *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge University Press.
- Young, D. J. 1991. Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *The Modern Language Journal* 75, 426-439.
- Yule, G. 1989. The spoken language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 10(2), 163-173.

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Level: Tertiary