

Lexical Approach and Reading-Writing Competence among Foreign Language Learners

Jennifer S. Hombre & Chester M. Derequito*, PhD

Graduate Studies and Applied Research, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0391>

Received: 08 June 2026; Accepted: 14 June 2026; Published: 29 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This study investigated how the Lexical Approach improves the reading-writing competence of foreign language learners. Specifically, using a quantitative, one-group pre-test post-test pre-experimental research design, the study involved 37 students from the Special Program in Foreign Language (SPFL)-Korean at Boot National High School during the school year 2025-2026.

The findings indicated that the Lexical Approach has a significant impact on improving reading and writing competence among the respondents. In terms of reading, there were improvements in Word Recognition (where 97.2% needed improvement, while 65% were Highly Competent in the post-test) and Vocabulary Knowledge (89% reached the Highly Competent level after the implementation of the Lexical Approach). In writing competence, Accuracy and Fluency demonstrated improvements, with 91.9% and 81% of students reaching the Highly Competent level, respectively. However, the study found no significant difference in Language Comprehension and Coherence, suggesting that these higher-order competences might require more instructional periods.

Based on the results, the study concludes that the Lexical Approach is an effective instructional methodology for improving learners' reading and writing competence.

Keywords: Lexical Approach, Reading Competence, Writing Competence Korean Language, Word Recognition, Vocabulary Knowledge Fluency and Accuracy, Foreign Language Acquisition.

INTRODUCTION

Language is a vital tool for communication and a key component of academic and social interactions. Developing reading and writing competence in a foreign language is a vital component of foreign language education. However, many foreign language learners have difficulty attaining proficiency in the target language. Methods that focus on the teaching of grammar have traditionally been widely used in foreign language classrooms but often fail to provide the language use skills that are necessary for learners to develop reading and writing competence in the foreign language.

These challenges are not limited to the global level but also exist within the Philippine educational system. Given the increasing demand for individuals who can speak multiple languages in a globalized world, the Department of Education (DepEd) offered the Special Program in Foreign Language (SPFL) to teach foreign languages to students in secondary school. Through this program, public secondary schools are permitted to teach various foreign languages, including Korean. Additionally, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) required foreign languages to be offered as electives in all higher education institutions through Memorandum Order No. 23, Series of 2010. This memorandum was issued pursuant to Republic Act No. 7722, also known as the Higher Education Act of 1994.

Foreign Language refers to all languages except English; therefore, languages such as Korean (Hangul), Japanese (Nihongo), and Chinese (Mandarin) can be added to the Philippine Curriculum. According to DepEd Order No. 46, s. 2012, the purpose of the Special Program in Foreign Language Korean is to develop students who can communicate at a global level and meet local and international requirements. This program will allow students to experience diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Although many programs have been developed to assist learners, proficiency in foreign languages still poses challenges for Filipino learners. Research has indicated that one major obstacle for many students learning foreign languages is the structural differences between the students' first or second languages and the language they are attempting to learn. Andres, Santos, Cruz and Villanueva (2023) pointed out that many Filipino learners find it difficult to master the Korean language because of grammatical and syntactic differences when comparing Korean with the two widely spoken languages by Filipinos, Filipino and English.

At Boot National High School, one of the schools offering the Special Program in Foreign Language Korean since 2019, students have been able to participate in global communications and have developed their ability to interact across cultures. However, many students still display significant limitations in their linguistic abilities, especially in reading and writing. The fact that so many students continue to experience difficulty in both reading and writing in a foreign language clearly indicates that there remains a need for improved teaching practices that place emphasis on the use of meaningful language over grammatically focused teaching practices.

The most difficult challenge for all foreign language learners is vocabulary. Vocabulary is one of the obstacles to developing a learner's overall competence in reading and writing. As Lewis (1993) states, "Language consists of grammaticalized lexis not lexicalized grammar." This illustrates that learners who focus on vocabulary patterns and collocations will generally be more fluent and better comprehend what they read or hear than those who rely primarily on isolated grammar rules. This is particularly important when learning a foreign language such as Korean. Many Korean words have fixed collocations or meanings. Without familiarity with the lexical chunking of these phrases, learners will likely find it difficult to produce natural-sounding sentences. Therefore, lexical competence is a fundamental aspect of foreign language proficiency. For example, research by Biskup (1992) demonstrated that learners were able to write more effectively and produce more natural-sounding language when instructed via lexical chunks, compared with learners instructed using traditional grammar-based teaching methodologies.

As a result of these challenges, the Lexical Approach presents a promising alternative. Emphasizing vocabulary, lexical chunks, and collocations as the basis for language acquisition provides a framework that enables individuals to acquire and use language in authentic contexts. It would be beneficial to investigate whether the Lexical Approach improves the overall competence of foreign language learners, particularly in the areas of reading and writing. Thus, this study seeks to assess how instruction based on lexicalization could improve learners' performance in a foreign language environment within the Philippine educational system.

METHODOLOGY

The objective of this research is to determine how the Lexical Approach can improve the development of reading and writing competence among foreign language learners in Korean. A pre-experimental research design was used, based on an empirical (quantitative) approach. A pre-test and a post-test were administered, both designed to assess learners' reading and writing abilities prior to exposure to the Lexical Approach. The design was chosen because it best suits classroom instructional research that examines how much better a student learns after an intervention. Cornwell (2020) stated that a one-group pre-test and post-test design is effective for determining the impact of an intervention on the same group of students. This design enabled the researcher to directly assess whether there was improvement in the learner's Korean language abilities after exposure to the Lexical Approach. Because the participants were all part of the existing class, randomization into separate classes and the inclusion of a control group were not feasible. Cresswell (2014; 2018) points out that pre-experimental designs are most often employed in educationally based research in which the researchers seek to assess the improvement of an instructional methodology, initially within a classroom setting. The design may be particularly suited for establishing whether or not a teaching strategy can show some degree of

positive impact prior to using more complicated experimental methodologies to explore this further. Additionally, Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002) point out that due to their relatively simple nature and low cost, pre-experimental designs are also frequently utilized in applied education research as a preliminary evaluation of instructional intervention. In this study, a pre-test was administered to assess the learners' baseline performance in two key areas: Reading competence in Korean- measured through a reading test that evaluates vocabulary recognition, lexical chunks, and reading comprehension. Writing competence in Korean- measured through a writing test that evaluates use of lexical chunks, sentence coherence, and written accuracy. After the initial evaluation, the participants spent three weeks of intervention using the Lexical Approach. During these sessions, the students engaged with reading and writing activities that employ vocabulary patterns and appropriate reading and writing contexts. Similar assessment instruments were used to administer a post-test after the intervention to determine students' reading and writing competence. The researcher assesses the students' improvement in reading and writing competence using the Lexical Approach in a controlled classroom setting. To determine whether the reading and writing competence of foreign language learners in Korean has significantly improved, the gathered data were statistically examined using a paired-sample t-test.

The participants of the study were 37 foreign language learners enrolled in the Special Program on Foreign Language - Korean at Boot National High School for S.Y 2025-2026. All of them completed the validated pre-test and post-test exams to assess learners' reading and writing competence in Korean. The researcher used all thirty-seven (37) participants who took the test before and after the implementation of the Lexical Approach. Additionally, cluster sampling was used as the sampling technique in this study. One entire class was randomly selected from the population, which included multiple groups studying Korean as a foreign language, to serve as the experimental group. This approach ensured that the selected respondents had comparable exposure to and experience with learning Korean.

Pre- and post-test assessments, as well as structured Lesson Plans developed using the Lexical Approach, are used as the primary instrument in this study to determine whether the Lexical Approach can improve the Reading and Writing Competence of Foreign Language Learners of Korean. The lesson plan was created using the lexical approach to provide learners with direct instruction on lexical chunks (word combinations), collocations, and formulaic expressions. Vocabulary patterns, word combinations, and common expressions were the focus of the lesson; therefore, these sessions focused on developing learners' lexical knowledge and its application in reading and writing Korean. Performance on both the pre-test and post-test was assessed. The composition writing test assessed students' ability to construct coherent written compositions while using lexical chunks, appropriate vocabulary, and correct sentence structure. The reading test measured students' reading competence in Korean. All research instruments were validated by language experts before the administration of the intervention.

The study included a well-designed three-week instructional intervention that used Michael Lewis's Lexical Approach as its primary method for teaching. This allowed students to gain an advantage over their peers in vocabulary development, the use of contextual language, and communicative competence by providing them with multiple opportunities to become familiar with "chunks" or groups of words that are combined into larger units such as phrases and sentences. Vocabulary is developed using this approach by exposing students to these pre-developed, authentic language examples on a repetitive basis. Instructing within this framework involved implementing several steps in a sequential manner. The researcher conducted oral drills, repeatedly incorporated technology (information and Communication Technologies) into learning experiences, created collaborative projects, taught students how to segment large pieces of vocabulary into smaller, usable "chunks," and provided students with numerous examples of how to use vocabulary in context to support their development of reading and writing abilities in the Korean language. During the instructional period, English was used as the medium of instruction. This reduced student confusion and ensured clarity by enabling them to understand what was being taught about developing language by using "blocks" rather than one word at a time.

The initial week of the intervention featured a formal introduction to the Lexical Approach, highlighting the importance of lexical chunks, collocations, idiomatic expressions, and formulaic language for foreign language learners. Students were systematically presented with target expressions from the Sejong Korean A2 (세종한국어 A2+) textbook and the corresponding (익힘책) workbook to ensure a coherent presentation of the linguistic material. To ensure thematic exposure, the researcher used Thematic Exposure rather than

isolated vocabulary lists. Lessons were based on real-world communication situations, such as Online Shopping and Online Activities, providing students with targeted exposure to vocabulary through word combinations similar to those used by native speakers, such as (물건을 주문하다 to order an item) and (온라인쇼핑몰에 들어가다 to enter an online mall). During this week, ICT was integrated by showing video clips of online shopping scenarios and screenshots of Korean shopping applications, allowing students to observe how these thematic expressions function in authentic social settings.

In addition, the researcher conducted the “Noticing” Step. While this step focuses on a particular approach to teaching in which students notice the relationship of a specific feature of language, in this case either the contrastive marker (ㄴ/은/는데요 "but / however") or the choice particle (이나/나 “or”) to other elements of a sentence, the teacher does not teach grammar as if it were an isolated series of mathematical equations. Rather than providing students with lists of words that she defines for them, the researcher also used interactive vocabulary noticing techniques to guide students in identifying repeated word combinations with functional dialogue cards. The purpose of this technique is to help students observe how the grammatical features they are learning will naturally be used in combination with fixed blocks of lexical items in real-time conversation. As a result of their participation in these noticing activities, students developed a better understanding of both the linguistic meaning and the contexts associated with those features. The researcher employed multimedia resources, including PowerPoint presentations, internet videos, and digital vocabulary exercises, along with pair-work and group discussion activities that allowed students to interact meaningfully.

For the second week, students moved into more advanced practice to improve their ability to retain what they had learned. The researcher led all classwork for the weeks, with activities such as sentence completion, building short dialogues, acting out roles, telling stories, and doing contextual drills. A central activity during this week was the guided chunk drill. In developing decoding skills and high-frequency vocabulary, the researcher used a systematic approach, conducting repetition drills with a “Vocabulary Chunk Box,” flashcards, and matching and completion-type activities. All drills focused on common formulaic expressions found in everyday conversation, such as (환불하려고 해요 I want a refund) and (사이즈가 안 맞아요 the size does not fit). Rather than translating each individual word from English to Korean, students worked on substitution and transformation drills. Students were required to move around pre-learned chunked expressions as single units of meaning. The researcher continued to integrate ICT by using online quizzes, audio/video materials, whiteboard illustrations, and printed handouts of dialogues to keep students motivated and actively participating in these drills. The researcher also conducted formative assessment, along with peer and teacher feedback, to closely monitor students’ progress. This allowed the researcher to support both fluency and vocabulary retention through repetition and meaningful production.

During the third week of the intervention, students participated in communicative and performance-oriented tasks designed to assess their ability to apply lexical expressions accurately. These tasks included oral presentations, dialogic performances, paragraph writing, and collaborative interaction, using a variety of target lexical items and related grammatical forms. Students also used the expressions they had learned in guided reading exercises, identifying lexical items from various sources and in written form, and applying grammar, for example, the polite expression (ㄴ/은/는데요), combined with their acquired lexical items. Throughout this period, the researcher documented students’ fluency, vocabulary use, comprehension, and confidence in each activity. Student engagement, peer collaboration, and overall performance on all tasks were also used as data points to evaluate whether the treatment improved students’ reading and writing competence.

The post-test, identical to the pre-test, was administered at the end of this 3-week intervention period. Raw data from both tests were processed and statistically analyzed to assess improvements in the Lexical Approach’s impact on reading and writing competence among foreign language learners. Qualitative observations of student participation during class interactions, including engagement with instructional materials and willingness to participate in group work and respond to context-based tasks, also supported this methodology. The improvement in learners’ performance is evident through the combination of repetition through oral drill, ICT integration, collaborative learning, vocabulary chunking, and contextualized practice.

After administration, the researcher collected all completed instruments and gathered the necessary data. The interpretation of scores was adapted from internationally recognized language proficiency frameworks, such as the CEFR, ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines, and IELTS band descriptors, which use performance-based descriptors to categorize language competence. These were operationalized into Highly Competent, Competent, and Needs Improvement for classroom-based assessment. A summary of the information gathered from the test will be forwarded to the statistician for statistical treatment. The researcher used several tables to help understand the information gathered after the statistician’s results were received and the data analysis was completed; these data are used to highlight and answer the researcher’s questions posed in the statement of the problem.

Ethical considerations were strictly observed throughout the process. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection. They were informed that their participation was voluntary and that all responses collected would be kept confidential and used for research purposes.

The data gathered in this research were analyzed using quantitative methods. For the test scores, the researcher employed the mean and standard deviation to determine the average scores and the extent to which the scores were spread. A paired-samples t-test was used to compare the pre-test and post-test scores and to determine whether there was a significant improvement in learners’ reading and writing competence in Korean after exposure to the Lexical Approach. In addition, frequency and percentage were used to present the distribution of learners across different performance levels (low, average, high). Statistical computations were performed using appropriate tools to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the data collected from the participants as well as a summary of their analysis and interpretations. The information in this section is organized by the problem identified within the study.

Table 1. Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of the Respondents in Reading Competence in Terms of Word Recognition (Decoding)

Word Recognition	Pre test		Post test		Level
	f	%	f	%	
4-5	-	-	24	65%	Highly Competent
3	1	2.70%	9	24%	Competent
1-2	36	97.20%	4	11%	Needs Improvement
	37	100%	37	100%	

Table 1 shows the increase in the respondents’ word recognition (decoding) abilities following the introduction of the Lexical Approach. In terms of the pre-test, nearly all participants (97.20%) were at a need-for-improvement level in their decoding abilities and recognized little about Korean lexical items. After the intervention, 65% of the respondents achieved Highly Competent levels in word recognition (decoding)

Most participants had difficulty recognizing words (decoding), as demonstrated by difficulty with written words and lexical chunks and their proper English meanings. These results demonstrate a lack of knowledge of vocabulary and its application in context. Participants also experienced difficulty distinguishing between different forms of written Korean and connecting those forms to their intended meaning. These results reflect the poor foundational word recognition (decoding) skills possessed by the participants, which negatively impacted their reading competence.

After students were exposed to chunk-based lexical activities, their word recognition (decoding) ability increased. This indicates that students improved their ability to recognize written Korean words or groups of words and to interpret them properly, using both familiar word recognition skills (understanding known words in context) and decoding skills (reading letters, sounds, and patterns). Students’ vocabulary became more familiar and easier to understand. Students also became aware of common words such as 주문하다 (to order)

and knew how these words are used in real-life situations. A few students fell under the Competent level (24%), where they could correctly recognize and decode words but sometimes required additional time or instruction to choose the most appropriate meaning based on the context.

The increase in the students’ scores demonstrates that, through a focus on lexical-based instruction, the students have become more aware of how to identify words and how to find appropriate patterns for each set of words. This aligns with Michael Lewis’s (1993) view that “the language we use is composed of word-chunks,” which allows learners to interpret their second language in a more natural and automatic manner. The initial data from the pre-test revealed that respondents had trouble recognizing and decoding words due to limited vocabulary knowledge. Recent studies support this finding and explain that both the quantity and organization of learners’ mental vocabulary affect reading accuracy and speed. A study conducted by Incognito et al. (2023) showed that when students practice vocabulary, their reading becomes much faster and smoother. Instead of sounding out letters one by one, they begin to see whole words at a time.

Table 2. Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores in Language Comprehension

Language Comprehension	Pre test		Post test		Level
	f	%	f	%	
4-5	31	83.80%	28	75%	Highly Competent
3	4	10.80%	8	22%	Competent
1-2	2	5.40%	1	3%	Needs Improvement
	37	100%	37	100%	

Table 2 shows how 37 students performed on the language comprehension task. Prior to testing, approximately 83.80% of the students (or 31 students) were identified as Highly Competent demonstrating an understanding of texts. By the post-test, this percentage had decreased slightly to 75% (28 students). There was an increase in the number of students under the Competent level, from 10.80% to 22%. The number of students identified at the Needs Improvement level decreased from 2 to 1. The scores demonstrated a shift, as reflected in the fact that many more students were placed at the Competent level after taking the post-test.

As shown in the pre-test scores, it was evident that almost all of the students showed a high level of reading comprehension by identifying the main idea and locating details in the passage. Almost 83.80% of the students were identified as Highly Competent. There were 2, however, who fall under the Needs Improvement in reading comprehension skills. This implies that while they are able to read words, they have difficulty identifying the main idea and specific information in the passage.

Results of the post-test indicate that the majority of the students continue to perform at a high level, 97% of the class scored in the Highly Competent and Competent levels. However, the number of students at the Highly Competent level decreased slightly from 31 to 28. At the Competent level, the number increased from 4 to 8 students, while the Needs Improvement level declined from 2 to 1.

The change in the post-test scores showed that the students were able to process the information from written texts. The students are better at finding accurate information in the text regarding details such as dates. Students are better at relating what a sentence says to its truth or falsity. Also, they were able to move beyond the Needs Improvement level and were able to clearly give the main point of a text and were not getting confused by the details in the reading passage.

Research into language has shown that there’s more to reading than just recognizing individual words. You need to be able to identify the author’s purpose and notice the small details. Liu et al. (2022) showed that students who read well do so by identifying and using the most efficient way to locate key information. This is why students were able to improve their performance on the post-test. Kili et al. (2024) argue that proficient readers are required to achieve full comprehension of what an author is trying to say. In other words, students who initially did poorly may have lacked the ability to see the larger picture of the writing. Orellano et al.

(2024) assert that one of the reasons so many learners fail to achieve advanced reading proficiency is poor reading practices that prevent them from going beyond merely viewing the written word. On the other hand, Calanza et al. (2026) demonstrated through empirical evidence that students can transition from frustration to competence when they learn to hone in on specifics. Hojjat and Haism (2023) explained that the strongest indicator of improvement is when students develop the capacity to recognize both explicit and implicit messages within a piece of writing.

Table 3. Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores in Vocabulary Knowledge

Vocabulary Knowledge	Pre test		Post test		Level
	f	%	f	%	
4-5	3	8.10%	33	89%	Highly Competent
3	-	-	3	8%	Competent
1-2	34	91.80%	1	3%	Needs Improvement
	37	100%	37	100%	

The data indicate an improvement in the students’ vocabulary scores from the pre-test to the post-test. While 91.8% of the respondents were categorized in the Needs Improvement level during the pre-test, only 3 respondents were classified as Highly Competent. However, the post-test indicated a difference, 89% of the students (33 out of 37) reached the Highly Competent level, while only one remained in the Needs Improvement level, proving that the entire class demonstrated growth in their ability to use vocabulary well.

Prior to the pre-test, it was obvious that the students lacked knowledge of how to connect words naturally. This lack of knowledge is reflected in both the students’ inability to identify appropriate collocations and meanings for individual words and their inability to make the appropriate choices when combining words to convey their intended message. In other words, even though they may have had some knowledge of a single word’s meaning, they would be unable to select the proper verb to combine with a given noun. For example, during the pre-test, it is possible that they may not have been able to determine what combination of words should be used to express “to receive a discount”, such as “the price”, or what action word should be used when expressing something like “an online lecture” as a result of this, they would often provide incorrect answers based on pure guessing.

The post-test demonstrated an increase in students’ ability to accomplish tasks. A comparison of pre-test and post-test results indicated a significant difference in students’ ability to accurately match nouns with their corresponding natural verbs in context. Based on the data, 89% (33 students) reached the Highly Competent level and 8% (3 students) reached the Competent level, showing that 97% of the students were able to complete sentences about online activity (posting comments, pressing like, or taking online classes). This indicates that these students were able to use vocabulary naturally in sentence form, rather than just being familiar with individual words. Students demonstrated mastery of this skill through consistent review of the material throughout instruction.

The rise in test results for this increase in the percentage of students’ scores was based on Nation’s theory of understanding words in combination with other words. This aligns with the concepts of Wang and Webb (2026), which hold that an individual can understand a single word and still not know how to relate it to its paired counterparts. Thus, many students initially struggled because they did not know what certain words meant. According to Huang and Choi (2026), acquiring mastery of these word pairs is an important element of fluency development. Students are able to process the language faster and more accurately when combining the words. When students learn these pairs appropriately, they begin to view entire phrases as single units. Cappelle et al. (2021) identify viewing phrases as units as an important component in developing speakers who speak similarly to native speakers. Learning how to pair words together is also a primary factor in making reading easier, since Quinn et al. (2025) have determined that vocabulary has been the greatest contributor to reading development. Lastly, Sun (2022) states that learning these minute components will assist students in transitioning from being confused to being Highly Competent.

Table 4. Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores in Coherence

Coherence	Pre test		Post test		Level
	f	%	f	%	
4	12	32.4%	7	18.9%	Highly Competent
3	-	-	1	2.7%	Competent
2	9	24.3%	19	51.4%	Needs Improvement
1	16	43.2%	10	27.0%	Beginning
	37	100%	37	100%	

The results in Table 4 show that most students are doing much better at organizing ideas. Only 43.2% (16 students) began at the beginning level. By the post-test, this number dropped to 27% (10 students), indicating that most low writers are progressing. Also, the Needs improvement level reached the Competent level, wherein 24.3% (9 students) to 51.4% (19 students) improved. Even though there are fewer students who reached the Highly Competent level in the post-test, the results are still good.

Only 43.2% (16 students) were at the beginning level for organizing ideas during the pre-test. It shows that these students did not fully understand how to organize their ideas. For example, the student may have understood what was said about buying a bag, the bag being too small and wanting to exchange the bag, but they could not tell you that one idea must happen before another. As an example, if they wanted to exchange the bag because it was too small, then the problem (too small) must happen before the solution (exchanging the bag). This means that students could not use logical markers such as **그래서** (so/therefore) to decide the correct order of the story.

In the post-test, the percentage of students at the Beginning level dropped to 27%, while the Needs Improvement group surged to 51.4%. This shows that students can now recognize a timeline of events in their writing. In the post-test question about using a smartphone at night (ㄱ) and waking up late (ㄴ), students demonstrated they can now connect an action to its consequence. They are no longer just looking at sentences as separate pieces; they can now follow a logical "story arc" from watching YouTube (ㄷ) to the result of waking up late (ㄴ) and the final decision to sleep early (ㄹ). This proves they have moved from random guessing to understanding how sentences must flow to make sense to a reader.

The increase in student scores shows they are improving at organizing their writing. According to Rahman (2022), students often initially treat sentences as separate units. To improve, they must learn to link those units into a chain. This aligns with the well-known theory of Halliday and Hasan (1976), who argue that writing only makes sense when sentences are "glued" together. In the first test on online shopping, many students struggled. Lee and Yoon (2025) explain that beginners often focus on word meaning rather than the order of the story. However, by the final test, over half the class (51.4%) moved up to the Needs Improvement level. Zhang and Cheng (2024) call this a "big step forward" in which students begin to see how one idea leads to the next.

Although it took time, this progress is normal. Crossley (2020) points out that organizing ideas is much harder for the brain than simply learning new words. Finally, using simple topics like smartphones helped students focus. As Kim (2023) notes, when the topic is easy to understand, it is easier for students to see the logic, such as how watching YouTube late at night can cause someone to wake up late the next day. This shows that students are moving from "total confusion" to a stage where they can finally plan their writing.

Table 5. Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores in Accuracy

Accuracy	Pre test		Post test		Level
	f	%	f	%	
5-6	1	2.7%	34	91.9%	Highly Competent
3-4	-	-	2	5.4%	Competent
2-1	36	97.3%	1	2.7%	Needs Improvement
	37	100%	37	100%	

The results in Table 5 clearly indicate a huge improvement in students' ability to use language correctly. In the pre-test, 97.3% (36 students) were at the Needs Improvement level, meaning almost the entire class had difficulty with grammar and word forms. By the post-test, however, 91.9% (34 students) achieved the Highly Competent level, demonstrating that every student moved from the bottom level to the top, showing a total mastery of the grammar rules they were taught during the instruction.

Data from the pre-test indicated that students were unable to use the correct vocabulary while applying the grammar rules. Although students were able to access the appropriate vocabulary in the Chunk Bank, they were generally unsuccessful in changing word endings to meet the requirements of a conversation. For example, although some students may have been familiar with the word 작다 (small), they did not know how to change the word endings to follow the rules of the conversation; as a result, students' sentences were grammatically incorrect.

The post-test shows that the students were able to construct coherent sentences using correct grammar. Since 34 students met the highest standard on the post-test for the intended grammar 려고/으려고 하다 (Plan to/Intend to), this proves that the students have mastered the use of the targeted vocabulary word and changed the form of the words based on the context. This indicates that the students have progressed from a stage of making many errors to being able to follow all of the established grammar rules with no errors in order to express their thoughts during a conversation.

The high increase of student scores in accuracy moving from only 2.7% to 91.9% is supported by several key studies. By providing a chunk bank, students were able to use what Wray (2002) calls "formulaic language." This made it much easier for them because they did not have to build every sentence from zero; instead, they could focus their brain power on fixing the grammar endings. Furthermore, DeKeyser (2007) argues that this type of focused practice is exactly what helps students move from just knowing a rule to actually using it correctly. This progress was measured through a conversation task, which Ellis (2009) describes as the best way to see if a student can use grammar in a real-life situation. Finally, Nassaji (2015) points out that teaching specific grammar forms leads to big improvements in writing. This studies, prove that by using familiar word chunks and focusing on specific grammar rules, the students successfully moved from making many mistakes to writing sentences that are both correct and easy to understand.

Table 6. Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores in Fluency

Fluency	Pre test		Post test		Level
	f	%	f	%	
8-10	-	-	30	81%	Highly Competent
5-7	-	-	7	19%	Competent
1-4	37	100.0%	-	-	Needs Improvement
	37	100%	37	99.9%	

In the data shown in Table 6, it is evident that the students' writing had progressed to the Highly Competent Level Competency as a result. As for the pre-test, all 37 students were at the Needs Improvement Level. Therefore, every student would make mistakes in using the correct word and grammar and would have no idea what to write next. However, on the post-test, none of the students remained at the Needs Improvement level, 81% (30 students) were Highly Competent in writing, while the other 19% were Competent. This shows that the student's ability to continue committing mistakes and is now able to write correctly.

Initially, students had difficulty connecting their ideas together to form a whole sentence. Prior to this study, students spent far too long thinking about every single word of their writing. Their writing contained many errors due to a lack of mastery over the vocabulary available to them. Also, because they lacked understanding of transition words, sentence structures and proper grammatical structure to clearly communicate their thoughts.

During the post-test, the number of students who reached the Highly Competent level was 30. It means that they have learned to apply both the appropriate vocabulary and grammar structures correctly. It has been further demonstrated by the fact that there were able to express themselves in an organized and smooth fashion regarding their online activities and future plans. More specifically, they appropriately utilized the S-O-V (Subject-Object-Verb) sentence structure, the correct conjugation for each word ending; and the transition to connect the ideas expressed.

Table 7. Significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores in linguistic competence in reading.

Reading Competence	Pre-test		Post test		statistic	df	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Word Recognition	0.89	0.774	3.81	0.967	-12.665	36	<.001
Language Comprehension	4.32	0.884	4.19	0.877	0.657	36	0.515
Vocabulary Knowledge	1.19	0.995	4.51	0.768	-20.774	36	<.001
Total	6.41	1.481	12.51	1.484	-19.289	36	<.001

Legend: $p \leq .05$ (Significant); $p \geq .05$ (Not significant)

Table 7 compares the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in terms of their reading competence. The mean score increased significantly from 6.41 on the pre-test to 12.51 on the post-test. With a total value of <.001, this indicates the improvement was caused by the effective teaching approach used.

The results of the Word Recognition show a clear increase, as indicated by a large rise in mean scores from 0.89 to 3.81. The P-value for this area was less than .001. Thus, it can be concluded that these changes are statistically significant and very likely due to student recognition of and reading of Korean words. Students can read and recognize word chunks much faster. This leads to greater accuracy when recognizing unfamiliar words. According to Adam et al., (2025) when foreign language students receive focused instructional interventions designed to facilitate decoding and identification of larger units of foreign language words, they exhibit accelerated rates of learning and decreased frequency of error when encountering unfamiliar orthographies.

In terms of Language Comprehension, the results showed a slight drop from 4.32 to 4.19. However, the P-value associated with this section was 0.515. Therefore, since this P-value is greater than .05, we have no evidence of statistical significance in language comprehension. It appears that the students' ability to identify words has increased; however, their overall comprehension of longer pieces of writing did not improve significantly.

The results for Vocabulary Knowledge showed the most impressive growth, with the mean score rising from 1.19 to 4.51. The p-value of < .001 confirms that this improvement is highly significant. This proves that the students successfully mastered the meanings of the new words they were taught. DeKeyser (2007) supports this by stating that focused practice helps students move from forgetting words to knowing them automatically, which is clearly reflected in these high post-test scores.

In summary, the statistical data prove that the intervention was highly successful. By using specific vocabulary tasks, and multimedia tasks, which Lai et al. (2019) describes as an effective way to build language skills, the students nearly doubled their total reading competence. The significant labels across the table confirm that the students are now much more capable of recognizing Korean words and understanding vocabulary than they were at the start of the study. This results in a more confident learner who can process foreign text with greater efficiency. This outcome is consistent with Misuari-Abdurasul (2023), who argues that there is a positive relationship between developing vocabulary and reading comprehension therefore, knowing how to recognize words and vocabulary knowledge is the essential foundation for increasing a student's total reading competence.

Table 8. Significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores in linguistic competence in writing.

Writing Competence	Pre-test		Post test		statistic	df	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Coherence	2.05	1.508	2.05	1.153	0	36	1
Accuracy	0.27	0.732	5.43	0.899	-28.077	36	<.001
Fluency	1.03	1.28	8.54	1.095	-30.423	36	<.001
Total	3.35	2.519	16.03	1.572	-27.068	36	<.001

Legend: $p \leq .05$ (Significant); $p \geq .05$ (Not significant)

The data presented in Table 8 demonstrate a large difference between the pre- and post-tests with respect to students' ability to use language effectively in writing. The students' total mean scores increased from 3.35 on the pre-test to 16.03 on the post-test. With a p-value of <.001 which supports the conclusion that there is a significant difference between the two tests. The data collected proves that the students made improvements because of the intervention as it relates 'to the students; overall ability to write in the target language.

In Coherence, the mean score remained the same at 2.05 for both tests, yielding a p-value of 1. Since this value is much higher than 0.05, there is no significant difference in this area. This indicates that while students improved in other skills, their ability to logically organize a full essay or paragraph structure stayed at the same level. As Nassaji (2015) suggests, high-level structural skills such as coherence often require more long-term instruction than specific linguistic rules.

The accuracy scores were improved dramatically. The mean score went from 0.27 to 5.43. The p-value was less than .001, so the improvement in accuracy was statistically significant. So, the data show that students are able to use correct grammar and word forms more accurately. When students receive focused practice on specific aspects of their language, they can significantly reduce errors and achieve the Highly Competent level. The students' improvements in accuracy demonstrate that they have developed into competent writers as defined by Talosa & Maguddayao (2018) and as demonstrated through the correction of grammar, mechanical, and word choice deficiencies frequently Hikmah, Akmal & Buffe (2019).

There was also an improvement in fluency, as shown by the increase in the mean from 1.03 to 8.54. Since the p-value of .001 is less than .05, the result is statistically significant. This means that students are producing written texts with ease and using correct grammar, sentence patterns, and transitional words. Students create written texts with more ease due to reduced cognitive load, as described by Wray (2002). Wray states that since students develop lexical chunks, it takes less mental effort for students to construct sentences. Alobaid (2020) study found that students produce greater volumes of written output over time after receiving extensive structured linguistic exposure.

The large increases in the Total Mean Scores in Table 8 confirm that the Intervention using the Lexical Approach has been highly effective in improving students' writing skills. A p-value less than .001 indicates an extremely high probability that the large differences were due to the intervention rather than random chance. Although Coherence remained relatively constant ($p = 1$) during this time period, both accuracy and fluency increased significantly. The increase in Fluency was most dramatic, rising from 1.03 to 8.54. Therefore, the evidence clearly shows that the students have progressed from being unable to write competent texts to being able to produce fluent and error free writing which would be classified as Competent or Highly Competent.

This result is also highly consistent with research by Bilge and Kalenderoğlu (2022), which demonstrates that writing fluency can be achieved as function of the automaticity of producing words correctly, thus greatly reducing cognitive load involved in processing text. Additionally, Alobaid (2020) demonstrate through their research that when students engage in structured linguistic practice, they become more adept at organizing their thoughts and using appropriate vocabulary, grammar, transitional phrases, and sentence structures to produce written work effectively. Lastly, Taskiran, Yazici and Erdem Aydin (2024) conclude that utilization of lexical bundles (word chunks) is a key indicator of successful student writers as it enables them to create more

coherent and well-organized writing samples. These three studies provide evidence that supports the reliability of the study's findings.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores in reading competence is not supported, as significant improvements were observed in word recognition and vocabulary knowledge, except in language comprehension. This may be because students learned expressions as “ready-made blocks” but had limited practice analyzing longer texts in which ideas are connected across sentences. In addition, because learners tend to focus more on decoding words and lexical chunks than on fully understanding the overall meaning of the text, this affects their comprehension.

On the other hand, the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores in writing competence is not supported, as significant improvements were observed in accuracy and fluency, except in coherence. Although lexical chunks helped improve fluency, students often used these expressions in isolated sentences rather than organizing them into logically connected ideas across paragraphs. This suggests that students would benefit from further practice in organizing their thoughts and building cohesive texts.

Based on the results and conclusions from this research, it is recommended that foreign language teachers should consider integrating the Lexical Approach into their daily teaching by emphasizing fixed phrases, word pairing and natural expressions to improve students’ reading and writing competence. Teachers should also develop teaching strategies that focus on enhancing students’ language comprehension and coherence through reading instruction, Discourse-based instruction, and guided writing activities. Furthermore, future researchers may utilize the Lexical Approach in teaching larger groups, over a longer intervention period, may use an experimental group of respondents and in developing other macro skills such as listening and speaking.

REFERENCES

Books

1. Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Rand McNally.
3. Creswell, J. W. (2014/2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.
4. DeKeyser, R. (2007). *Practice in a second language*. In Cambridge University Press eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667275>
5. Hikmah, N., Akmal, A., & Buffe, F. (2019, November). *Writing skills of junior high school students of the University of Saint Anthony, Iriga City, Philippines*. In 2019 Ahmad Dahlan International Conference Series on Education & Learning, Social Science & Humanities (ADICS-ELSSH 2019) (pp. 156-159). Atlantis Press.
6. Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.
7. Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and a way forward*. Language Teaching Publications.
8. Nassaji, H. (2015). *The interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning: Linking Theory, Research, and Practice*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
9. Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
11. Nation, I. S. P., & Hunston, S. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. In Cambridge University Press eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139858656>
12. Perfetti, C. A., & Adlof, S. M. (2012). *Reading comprehension: A conceptual framework*. In

Measuring up: Advances in how to assess reading ability (pp. 3–20).

13. Perfetti, C. A., & Hart, L. (2002). *The lexical quality hypothesis*. In Precursors of functional literacy (pp. 189–213).
14. Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for causal inference*. Houghton Mifflin.
15. Stani, M. D., Malik, H. A., & Yuliwati, Y. (2024, December). *The effect of phonological awareness, sight recognition, decoding on reading skills children*. In Proceeding of International Conference on Education (Vol. 3, pp. 51-62). <https://doi.org/10.37640/ICE.03.983>
16. Stranovská, E., Ficzer, A., & Gadusova, Z. (2020). *Cognitive structure and foreign language reading comprehension*. In INTED2020 Proceedings (pp. 5010-5016). IATED. <https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2020.1369>
17. Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. In Cambridge University Press eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511519772>

Journals

1. Adam, P., Droop, M., Kleemans, T., & Segers, E. (2025). Parental Language and Literacy and Not the Home Literacy Environment Predict Language and Early Literacy in Indonesian Low SES Kindergartners. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 41(6). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2025.2469241>
2. Alobaid, A. (2020). Smart multimedia learning of ICT: Role and impact on language learners' writing fluency YouTube online English learning resources as an example. *Smart Learning Environments*, 7(1), 24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-020-00134-7>
3. Andres, H. M., Santos, M., Cruz, A., & Villanueva, R. (2023). Problems, strategies, and developments of Filipino KFL learners in learning the Korean language. *International Journal of Language Learning and Language Teaching*, 5(1), 23-34.
4. Anindita, P. (2024). Cohesion and coherence problems among non-native English students' writing essays. *Journal of Lensa: Linguistics, Literature, and Culture*, 14(1), 58–79.
5. Araujo, K. L. E., Marcaida, J. L. M., Balderama, A. C., Lozano, W. M., Carinan, J. A., Quizon, E. M. T., & Artagame, J. K. T. (2024). The power of the pen: An analysis on the coherence and cohesion skills of senior high school students. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(2), 204–225.
6. Attya, A. E. S. E. S., Qoura, A. A., & Mostafa, A. A. (2019). Using the lexical approach-based activities to enhance EFL preparatory stage students' vocabulary learning. *Journal of Research in Curriculum Instruction and Educational Technology*, 4(2), 73–91.
7. Barbecho, E. T., Gorro, K. D., Comerros, J. S., & Capuno, G. R. J. (2025). Linguistic features of the writing competence of the Alternative Learning System students. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 19(4), 2128–2138.
8. Barrot, J., & Gabinete, M. K. (2021). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in the argumentative writing of ESL and EFL learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 59(2), 209–232.
9. Bernardo, A. B. I. (2004). McKinley's questionable bequest: Over 100 years of English in Philippine education. *World Englishes*, 23(1), 17–31.
10. Bilge, H., & Kalenderoglu, I. (2022). The relationship between reading fluency, writing fluency, speaking fluency, reading comprehension, and vocabulary. *Education and Science*, 47(209), 25–53.
11. Biskup, D., & Acquisition, L. L. (1992). L2 lexical acquisition from dictionaries. *Language Learning*, 42(2), 217-244.
12. Bittmann, F. (2025). Reading begets reading? Disentangling the dynamic interplay between reading competence and reading exposure with a special focus on gender differences. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 60(1), e566. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.566>
13. Blas, F. A., et al. (2018). Articulated difficulties of Grade 11 students at Taytay Senior High School in English proficiency. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 1186–1202.
14. Calanza, R., Nalagon, S. M., Enario, H. G., & Cahapay, M. (2026). iRead333: An intervention to improve silent reading comprehension skills of learners in English. *International Journal of Professional Development, Learners and Learning*, 8(1), e2607. <https://doi.org/10.30935/ijpdll/18052>
15. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language

- teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
16. Cancino, M., & Iturrieta, J. (2022). Assessing the impact of the Lexical Approach on EFL perceived oral proficiency. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 41–66.
 17. Cappelle, B., et al. (2021). Constructional variation – unveiling aspects of linguistic Knowledge. *Revista da Anpoll*, 52(esp), 258-306. <https://doi.org/10.18309/ranpoll.v52iesp.1596>
 18. Caraig, R., & Quimbo, M. A. (2022). Assessing reading comprehension difficulties in core science subjects of senior high school students. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 14(3), 1983–2010.
 19. Chen, T., Xu, X., Hao, Y., & Ke, S. E. (2023). Connecting the dots: the contribution of orthographic knowledge to L2 Chinese reading comprehension through serial mediation of word decoding and listening comprehension. *Reading and Writing*, 36(5), 1261-1282. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S11145-022-10342X>
 20. Cho, Y. (2009). Lexical chunking in second language writing: Korean EFL learners. *English Teaching*, 64(2), 3–25.
 21. Crossley, S. A. (2020). Linguistic features in writing quality. *Journal of Writing Research*, 12(2), 415-443. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2020.12.02.04>
 22. Dobrovolska, N. (2025). Techniques for developing foreign language competences in reading and speaking. *Actual Problems of Humanities*, 83(2), 265. <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/83-2-39>
 23. Dong, Y., Tang, Y., Chow, B. W. Y., Wang, W., & Dong, W. Y. (2020). Contribution of vocabulary knowledge to reading comprehension among Chinese students: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 525369.
 24. Fitriani, V. (2024). Coherence and cohesion: An analysis of students' narrative paragraphs. *Jurnal Penelitian Mahasiswa Indonesia*, 4(2), 134–152.
 25. Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. *Remedial and Special Education*, 7(1), 6–10.
 26. Guanoluisa Toapanta, L. C. (2021). Lexical Approach method to improve speaking skill of 7th year students.
 27. Habók, A., & Magyar, A. (2019). The effects of EFL reading comprehension and certain learning-related factors on EFL learners' reading strategy use. *Cogent Education*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1616522>
 28. Hojjat, M., & Hasim, Z. (2023). Implicit form-focused instruction: The impact on the implicit and explicit knowledge of Malaysian ESL learners. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 380–391. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i2.63081>
 29. Huang, B. H., & Choi, J. Y. (2026). Exploring the relationships among language input-output, vocabulary knowledge, and English Reading development of emergent bilinguals in dual language immersion programs. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 29(1), 65–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2025.2546423>
 30. Incognito, O., Mercugliano, A., & Bigozzi, L. (2023). Influence of Lexical Development on Reading and Spelling Skills: Effects of Enhancement on Second-Grade Children Primary School. *Children*, 10(8), 1416. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children10081416>
 31. Kamarudin, R., Abdullah, S., & Abdul Aziz, R. (2020). Examining ESL learners' knowledge of collocations. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 9(1), 1-6.
 32. Kim, H. J. (2023). Cognitive load and sentence ordering tasks in Korean as a foreign language. *Korean Linguistics Today*, 18(1), 45-68. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S123456782300012X>
 33. Kormos, J. (2023). The role of cognitive factors in second language writing and writing to learn a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 45(3), 622–646. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263122000481>
 34. Lai, A.-F., Chen, C.-H., & Lee, G.-Y. (2019). An augmented reality-based learning approach to enhancing students' science reading performances from the perspective of the cognitive load theory. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50, 232-247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12716>
 35. Laufer, B., & Nation, I. S. P. (1999). A vocabulary-size test of controlled productive ability. *Language Testing*, 16(1), 33–51.
 36. Lee, H., & Kim, Y. (2014). Lexical inference strategies in L2 Korean reading. *Korean Language Education Research*, 10(1), 45–68.

37. Leonard, K. R. (2019). Examining the relationship between decoding and comprehension in L2 listening. *System*, 87, 102150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.10215>
38. Liu, H., Chen, X., & Liu, X. (2022). Factors influencing secondary school students' reading literacy: An analysis based on XGBoost and SHAP methods. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.948612>
39. Lorente, C. L., & Tupas, R. (2014). (Re)imagining English language teaching in the Philippines. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 12, 3–22.
40. Misuari-Abdurasul, S. A. M. (2023). Vocabulary proficiency: Its influence on reading comprehension skills. *International Journal of Management Studies and Social Science Research*, 5(03), 382–395.
41. Northbrook, E., & Conklin, K. (2019). Is formulaic language a recipe for success in the EAP classroom? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 42, 100790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100790>
42. Orellana, P., Silva, M., & Iglesias, V. (2024). Students' reading comprehension level and reading demands in teacher education programs: the elephant in the room? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1324055>
43. Perfetti, C., & Stafura, J. (2014). Word knowledge in a theory of reading comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 18, 22–37.
44. Quinn, J. M., et al. (2025). Exploring the relationships among language input-output, vocabulary knowledge, and English Reading development. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2025.2546423>
45. Ratminingsih, N. M., Marhaeni, A. A. I. N., & Vigayanti, L. P. D. (2018). Self-assessment and writing competence. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(3), 277–290.
46. Reyes, D. Z. (2020). A fondness for lexical teddy bears. *Alipato: A Journal of Basic Education*, 12, 165–180.
47. Riswanto, R. (2021). Cohesion and coherence of EFL students' essay writing. *JPGI*, 6(4), 850–856.
48. Rohm, T., Carstensen, C. H., Fischer, L., & Gnambs, T. (2021). The achievement gap in reading competence: the effect of measurement non-invariance across school types. *Large-scale Assessments in Education*, 9(1), 23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-021-00116-2>
49. Santillan, J. P., & Daenos, R. G. (2020). Vocabulary knowledge and learning strategies of senior high school students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(6), 2474–2482.
50. Sewbihon-Getie, A. (2021). Impact of lexical instruction on EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(3), 456–467.
51. Sun, Y. (2022). Role of Extensive Reading in Vocabulary Development, Reading Comprehension, and Reading Speed: A Systematic Literature Review. ERIC Document Reproduction Service. <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.11108>
52. Talosa, A. D., & Maguddayao, R. N. (2018). Evaluation of second language learners' syntactic errors. *TESOL International Journal*, 13(4), 172–181.
53. Taskiran, A., Yazici, M., & Erdem Aydin, I. (2024). Automated feedback and English writing competence. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 21(1), 24–41.
54. Tinkel, J. (2023). Lexical-based programs and recognition of lexical chunks in L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 14(2), 201–218.
55. Tupas, T. R. F. (2015). Inequalities of multilingualism in the Philippines. *World Englishes*, 34(3), 387–399.
56. Urbano, C. M., Gumangan, M. A., Gustilo, L., & Capacete, M. P. A. (2021). Reading and writing needs of senior high school students. *Modern Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Literature*, 3(1), 140–166.
57. Wang, Y., & Webb, S. (2026). Second language knowledge of academic collocations and its relationship with knowledge of academic words. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226312400034X>
58. Wawire, B. A., & Zuilkowski, S. S. (2021). The role of vocabulary and decoding language skills in reading comprehension: a cross-linguistic perspective. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 15(1), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2020.1753953>
59. Webb, S. (2007). The effects of repetition on vocabulary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*.
60. Zhao, J., & Huang, J. (2023). A comparative study of frequency effect on acquisition of grammar and

- meaning of words between Chinese and foreign learners of English language. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1125483>
61. Zhou, L., Xi, Y., & Lochman, K. (2023). The relationship between second language competence and willingness to communicate: the moderating effect of foreign language anxiety. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 44(2), 129–143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1801697>
62. Ziafar, M., & Namaziandost, E. (2019). Linguistics, SLA and lexicon as the unit of language. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 2(5).