

## The Repetition Effects on Learning Formulaic Language in Form-Focused Instruction \*

Jungyoon Choi\*\*

Hankook University of Foreign Studies

Hyunsook Yoon

Hankook University of Foreign Studies

**Choi, Jungyoon & Yoon, Hyunsook. (2018). The repetition effects on learning formulaic language in form-focused instruction. *Modern English Education*, 19(1), 76-85.**

Research on vocabulary has confirmed that repeated practice facilitates vocabulary retention. However, while considerable attention has been paid to the effect of spacing schedules, relatively little attempt has been made to find the effect of repetition practices on learning formulaic language with different teaching methods. The present study aimed to examine the effects of repetition practices on learning formulaic language in two different types of form-focused instruction. The forty-eight university students were divided into focus-on-forms and concordance-based instruction groups where they studied 20 phrasal verbs with repetition practices. The results of the study showed that there was a significant repetition effect under both instruction. Interestingly, however, the focus-on-forms instruction outperformed the concordance-based instruction in the initial learning stage. On the other hand, concordance-based instruction showed slightly better learning after each repetition practice than focus-on-forms instruction over time. Pedagogical implications are suggested based on the results.

[repetition/formulaic language/form-focused instruction/

반복/정형언어/형태초점교수법]

\* This paper is based on part of the first author's MA thesis and this work was supported by Hankook University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2017.

\*\* First author: Jungyoon Choi, Corresponding author: Hyunsook Yoon

Received 26 December 2017

Revised 23 January 2018

Accepted 12 February 2018

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Secondary/Tertiary

Jungyoon Choi  
Department of TESOL, Graduate School  
Hankook University of Foreign Studies  
107 Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul  
Tel: 02-2173-3978  
Email: nadia0308@naver.com

Hyunsook Yoon  
Department of English Education  
Hankook University of Foreign Studies  
107 Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul  
Tel: 02-2173-3978  
Email: hsyoon3@hufs.ac.kr

## I. INTRODUCTION

The second language learners' knowledge of vocabulary items is expected to decay over time (Schmitt, 2010). After initial learning of a new lexical item, another prompt encounter of the word is not only highly necessary but is a must for learners to recall the word (Pavlik Jr. & Anderson, 2005). However, the effort to maintain vocabulary knowledge is not actively made in many classroom environments as Bahrlick, Bahrlick, Bahrlick & Bahrlick (1993) noted, "The life span of knowledge is an important, but neglected concern for educators and students" (p. 320). In other words, repetition practices are often overlooked as a trivial burden in many classes because learning new vocabulary is more valued as a priority compared to reviewing already learned vocabulary. Therefore, most learners eventually forget a considerable amount of vocabulary they learned where there is an absence of repetition practice.

Research on vocabulary has confirmed that repetition or retrieval practice facilitates vocabulary retention (Nakata & Webb, 2016). Considerable attention has been devoted to how to space vocabulary learning sessions to facilitate the retention (Bahrlick, Bahrlick, Bahrlick, & Bahrlick, 1993; Bahrlick & Phelps, 1987; Cepeda, Coburn, Rohrer, Wixted, Mozer, & Pashler, 2009; Nakata, 2016). Most of the studies have found that spaced repetition is more effective than massed repetition in vocabulary retention. While the previous studies have focused on the effect of spacing, relatively little attempt has been made to find the adequate number of repetition that consolidates the learned knowledge. Also, most of the repetition studies have used L1-L2 word pair repetition (Nakata, 2016), but the effect of different teaching methods has not been explored. Another critical limitation in repetition studies is that most of the previous studies have focused on individual word learning, neglecting multi-word units that have been widely recognized as an important part of language use. Thus, research becomes a must to ascertain whether and how much repetition affects formulaic language acquisition.

All in all, the existing repetition literature leaves important gaps in the understanding of how many repetitions are needed to learn formulaic language and what teaching methods are effective for retention of the words. Therefore, the present study investigated the effects of different types of form-focused instruction on learning formulaic language with repetition practices. The findings can provide insightful information about how to help students enhance long-term memory of formulaic word knowledge in classroom settings.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1. The Effects of Repetition Practices and Formulaic Language in Vocabulary Learning

Repetition practices are essential for learning vocabulary items not only because one encounter of them is not sufficient to acquire them but because they should be known well for fluent access. Without a repetition practice, forgetting begins to occur immediately after the first learning (Nation, 2001). The study of Anderson and Jordan (1928) investigated how much vocabulary is retained through immediate posttest, one-week delayed posttest, three-week delayed posttest, and eight-week delayed posttest. The percentages of vocabulary that learners acquired were 66% for immediate posttest, 48% after one week, 39% after three weeks, and 37% after eight weeks of the initial learning. That is, learners lose what they have learned quickly without repetition.

The benefits of repeated practices for long-term retention are supported by the distributed practice effect (Bahrlick & Phelps, 1987), desirable difficulty framework (Bjork, 1994; Nakata, 2016), and retrieval effort hypothesis (Pyc & Rawson, 2009). The distributed practice effect suggests that the longer spacing between repeated vocabulary practices generate the better long-term retention than the repetition practices with shorter spacing or massed repetition (Bahrlick & Phelps, 1987; Bahrlick et al., 1993; Cepeda et al., 2009; Nakata, 2016). In other words, repetition practices need to occur across days, not within a single day, in order to generate the long-term effect. J. H. Huh (2009) supported that repetition practices were highly effective in the delayed posttest compared to the immediate posttest. Dempster (1988) also reported that the effectiveness of spaced repetition was twice as high as that of massed repetitions.

The desirable difficulty framework (Bjork, 1994; Nakata, 2016) explains that higher task difficulty derives the better long-term retention than the task with lower difficulty. In the same vein, the retrieval effort hypothesis (Pyc & Rawson, 2009) explains that more effortful and difficult retrievals enhance learning than less effortful retrievals. What those two frameworks suggest is that learners make more effort when they retrieve a vocabulary item after a longer period time which finally contributes to long-term retention than they meet shortly after the learning. While most of the retention studies have focused on the effect of spacing and different repetition schedules, the attempt to find the adequate number of repetition to enhance retention has not been made. Also, the studies have been mainly concerned with single word items, but the benefits of repeated practices on multi-word items are not yet researched.

Recently, the importance of formulaic language has been widely recognized in L2 learning and use. Formulaic language can be defined in many different terms such as chunks, collocations, fixed expressions, idioms, formulae, and multi-word units (Wray, 1999). Wray adopted a term "formulaic sequence" which is defined as series of words that are stored and retrieved as a whole. According to Marinez and Schmitt (2012), the usage of formulaic sequences is extensive; they make up as much as a half of discourse. Also, formulaic language delivers a wide range

of communicative expressions. Formulaic sequences can be processed more quickly and fluently than non-formulaic language (Conklin & Schmitt, 2008), which enhances efficient and effective communication (Alai & Schmitt, 2012).

The present study explores *phrasal verbs* as a type of formulaic language. The definition of phrasal verbs is described as “an idiomatic phrase consisting of a verb and another element, typically either an adverb, as in *break down*, or a preposition, for example *see to*, or a combination of both, such as *look down on*” (Look down on, 2018). Phrasal verbs consist of multiple words, and deriving the meaning of them only from the meanings of each component word is not always possible. These multi-word units were often demoted to an optional or a peripheral part of vocabulary learning (Wray, 2002) in spite of their critical roles in language pedagogy (Erman & Warren, 2000; Kuiper, 1996; Kuiper & Haggo, 1984; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Pawley & Syder, 1983).

Like individual word learning, formulaic language is mastered after many exposures. Wood (2002) argues that repetition is highly important to learn formulaic sequences and to enhance proficiency. Formulaic language learning should be investigated whether it shows similar learning patterns as the learning of single word vocabulary which is learned through repetition practices and teaching methods.

## 2. Form-Focused Instruction

Form-focused instruction (FFI) can be divided into two types which are focus-on-form and focus-on-forms (Laufer & Girsai, 2008). Focus-on-form (FonF) is defined as a type of pedagogical approach in which learners draw their attention to elements of language features when performing communicative activities. On the other hand, focus-on-forms (FonFs) is the traditional method where learners intensively focus on linguistic structures which are discrete in a separate lesson (Laufer & Girsai, 2008). In a FonF instruction, a student is considered as a language user and the linguistic elements are tools for communication. On the other hand, a student is considered as a language learner in a FonFs instruction and linguistic elements are the object to be studied.

### 1) Focus on Forms Instruction

Some studies have revealed the significant advantages of FonFs instruction in vocabulary learning. Laufer (2006) compared FonF and FonFs learning sessions where 158 subjects were asked to learn English words. FonF group was given a text with target vocabulary items, and they solved comprehension questions through discussion, while FonFs group was given target vocabulary with their meanings and example sentences, and they learned the vocabulary as discrete items and solved form and meaning quizzes. The result showed that FonFs group performed significantly better than FonF group on the immediate

posttest and two-week retention test. Laufer concluded that FonFs is an indispensable L2 vocabulary teaching method.

Szudarski (2012) conducted an experiment to investigate the effectiveness of meaning-focused and form-focused vocabulary instruction. Forty-three Polish EFL learners were divided into three groups: meaning-focused, meaning-focused followed by FonFs, and a control group. The target items were verb-noun collocations that subjects knew receptively but had difficulty in making production. The learning task of meaning-focused group involved reading comprehension passages with true or false questions and completing sentences where students focused on meaning. The meaning-focused plus FonFs group involved reading comprehension with true or false questions and completing FonFs materials which included cloze, definitions, and a table. The result revealed that the meaning-focused group did not show much improvement, whereas meaning-focused plus FonFs group showed significant enhancement at both receptive and productive levels. The study concluded that FonFs instruction provided learners with a greater impact on their collocational competence, and thus teachers should adopt FonFs instruction for their classroom practice, especially in learning collocations.

### 2) Concordance-Based Instruction

In contrast, other studies argued for the advantages of FonF instruction. Concordance-based instruction is considered to be a modern and relatively new type of FonF instruction in vocabulary teaching (Liu & Jiang, 2009). The instruction associates itself with concordance lines which have been extracted from corpus. Concordance-based instruction specifically enables learners to access a large amount of data where the target vocabulary items are used in the real world. Also, the data makes it possible for learners to be exposed to the authentic discourse of native speakers and to get closer to the native-like English at hand. As Sinclair (2004) supported that language teaching based on corpus presented a new revolution, much of the current research in L2 teaching with regard to FonF involves corpus or concordancing and confirms the effects on vocabulary learning (Binkai, 2012; Conrad, 2005; Jalilifar, Mehrabi, & Mousavinia, 2014; Liu & Jiang, 2009; Römer, 2010; Schmitt, 2000).

There have been many studies that examined the benefits of concordance materials. Johns (1986) explained that printed concordance materials offer students substantial advantages. The concordance materials reduce the difficulties when students are at risk of being exposed to a massive amount of data which is irrelevant or incomprehensible. Thurston and Candlin (1998) also showed the importance of concordancing in material development. In their study, students were required to look at the key word and surrounding words in the concordances and analogized the meanings of the key words. Then, they were familiarized with the language patterns which surrounded

the key word while solving the given tasks. After that, they practiced the key words without the concordances. Finally, they created their own writing with the words they learned. The study showed that the type of concordance materials allowed students to acquire collocations and grammatical structures beyond the meanings of target words. Boulton (2009) suggested that learners take more advantage of keyword in context (KWIC) concordances than full-sentence concordances. In the KWIC searching of concordances, the keyword is highlighted, and essential words surrounding keywords are displayed in bold which provide learners with a “novel visual format” (p. 23). Boulton explained that teaching formulaic language with concordance lines in printed materials is ideally recommended. Jalilifar et al. (2014) explored the effects of vocabulary instruction by using printout materials of concordance lines on EFL learners’ performance and retention. The results revealed that the group with concordance instruction outperformed the conventional instruction group, and concordance lines enhanced students’ retention of vocabulary. Many other studies have also showed that the usage of concordance-based materials was advantageous and contributed to building the knowledge of vocabulary (Binkai, 2012; Schmitt, 2000).

In summary, repetition is well-known and widely spread in vocabulary teaching pedagogy. However, there are three issues to further consider in relation to repetition studies. First, few repetition studies dealt with formulaic language as target words. Numerous studies focused on single vocabulary items even though the importance of repetition studies on formulaic language was highlighted (Wood, 2002; Alali & Schmitt, 2012). Second, vocabulary teaching methods have not been applied on repetition practices for students to learn vocabulary items. The usage of teaching methods should also be emphasized since formulaic language is not as easy as single vocabulary items to be stored in the memory to retrieve. Third, it is still in question how many repetitions are needed for the adequate learning of formulaic language.

The aim of the present study is to explore the effects of form-focused instruction applied on repetition practices, which is directly applicable in learning formulaic language in a real university classroom environment. To address this issue, this study employed spaced repetition practices as well as two different teaching methods which are FonFs and concordance-based instruction. The three research questions guiding this study are as follows:

- 1) Which type of teaching method is more effective between FonFs and concordance-based instruction with spaced repetition practices in learning formulaic language for short-term effects?
- 2) Which type of teaching methodology is more effective between FonFs and concordance-based instruction with spaced repetition practices in learning formulaic language for long-term effects?
- 3) How many repetition practices are needed for the adequate learning of formulaic language in

FonFs and concordance-based instruction?

### III. METHOD

#### 1. Participants

The participants were 48 university students in Seoul, Korea, who were enrolled in a TOEIC Speaking Class. The students included male and female students from freshman to senior students and their majors were various from Arts to Science. They were divided randomly into two groups. Each group had 24 subjects whose age was ranged from 20 to 28. Their TOEIC scores are between 600 and 700 and their average score is 745, and their English proficiency level is considered to be intermediate.

#### 2. Target Vocabulary

Sixty phrasal verbs were extracted from collocation dictionary for TOEIC, TEPS, and TOEFL titled *Idiom Master* from Nexen Media in Korea. This book was chosen since the main goal of the students was to improve their scores on those tests. That is, the target words were associated with the goal of the class and the students. The participants took a pre-test which included 60 phrasal verbs. Twenty of them were selected from the results of the pre-test that students had no knowledge of. All 20 phrasal verbs contain the same number of words and have similar sequential structures to remove the variability which comes from various levels of difficulty of a learning item. The sequences of phrasal verbs are presented in verb, adverb, and preposition order, e.g., *boil down to*.

#### 3. Task Materials

Different task materials for FonFs and concordance-based instruction groups were provided in each practice session and students were required to complete the tasks. Both types of tasks were given in printed materials. The FonFs task materials were adopted from Alali and Schmitt (2012) to corresponded to the characteristics of the class. The materials include L1 vocabulary on the left side of the paper and L2 translation as a fill-in-the-blank form is given on the right side (see Appendix 1). As for the concordance-based instruction materials, the concordance lines are extracted from Corpus of Contemporary American English with KWIC search which provides better outcome than full sentence lines for intermediate learners (Boulton, 2009) and edited to remove unwanted lines. The design of task materials is adopted from the task materials of Boulton’s (2010) data-driven learning to meet the characteristics of the class (see Appendix 2).

#### 4. Procedure

The present study involved a pretest, five learning ses-

sions and a four-week delayed posttest. Table 1 presents the procedures of the study. Five learning sessions include one presentation of target vocabulary and four repetition practices. Each repetition practice was held with the average spacing of seven days to the next repetition practice. For example, the first repetition practice was held seven days after the first presentation of the target vocabulary, and the second repetition practice was held seven days after the first repetition class. After each learning session, an immediate posttest was held. A delayed-test was held four weeks after the last immediate-posttest.

**TABLE 1**  
Procedures of the Study

Session	Procedure	Group1	Group2	Test
1	Pre-test	Pre-test	Pre-test	Pre-test
2	1st Presentation	FonFs	Concordance-based	IP 1
3	1st Repetition	FonFs	Concordance-based	IP 2
4	2nd Repetition	FonFs	Concordance-based	IP 3
5	3rd Repetition	FonFs	Concordance-based	IP 4
6	4th Repetition	FonFs	Concordance-based	IP 5
7	Delayed posttest	Delayed posttest	Delayed posttest	Delayed posttest

Note. IP stands for immediate posttest.

FonFs instruction consisted of two parts. In the first part, students went through all phrasal verbs one by one with their teacher and wrote the correct answers for 15 minutes. In the second part, students in pairs practiced recall of L2 translation verbally for 5 minutes. The group mainly focused on remembering and recalling the correct L1-L2 pairs. Concordance-based instruction also consists of two parts. In the first part, students in pairs were asked to translate English phrasal verbs into Korean while discussing the answers with their partners for 15 minutes. In the second part, students went through the correct answers with their teacher for 5 minutes. The group mainly focused on inferring the meanings of L2 phrasal verbs in concordance lines.

### 5. Pretest, Immediate Posttests, and Delayed Posttests

The participants were asked to answer the total number of 40 questions, which included 20 target words and 20 distracters. The scores for the 20 distracters were excluded during the scoring process. Therefore, the total score was 20 points for each test. The pre-, immediate-, and post-test were identical. The test included two parts where two

different formats were used to favor both types of instruction. The first half consisted of form-recall questions and the second half involved meaning-recognition questions. The order of questions was changed on each test to reduce testing effects.

### 6. Data Analysis

In order to answer the research questions which were asked to explore the spaced repetition effects on learning phrasal verbs, repeated measures ANOVAs were used to find out the different short-term effects between the two teaching methods. Also, an independent samples *t*-test was used to compare the means of a one month delayed posttest of the two instruction groups for long-term effects.

## IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics of five immediate tests and one delayed test in FonFs and concordance-based instruction group. For the FonFs group, mean scores of all immediate posttests except for the fifth increased from the first to the fourth ( $M = 10.58, M = 12.17, M = 14.00,$  and  $M = 15.50$  in order). Interestingly, the mean score of the last repetition dropped by 0.08 points ( $M = 15.42$ ) from the fourth repetition. On the other hand, as for the concordance-based instruction group, the results showed continuous increase from the first to the fifth ( $M = 7.00, M = 12.42, M = 15.50, M = 16.08,$  and  $M = 16.83$  in order).

The first research question intended to find the better teaching method between FonFs and concordance-based teaching methods in learning formulaic language for

**TABLE 2**  
Descriptive Statistics of FonFs and Concordance-based Instruction

Repetition	Group	N	M	SD
IP1	FonFs	24	10.58	3.72
	Concordance	24	7.00	2.43
IP2	FonFs	24	12.17	4.66
	Concordance	24	12.42	3.81
IP3	FonFs	24	14.00	4.63
	Concordance	24	15.50	4.12
IP4	FonFs	24	15.50	3.97
	Concordance	24	16.08	4.03
IP5	FonFs	24	15.42	4.30
	Concordance	24	16.83	3.58
DP	FonFs	24	13.58	4.67
	Concordance	24	13.42	3.30

Note. Max score = 20, IP stands for immediate posttest, DP stands for delayed posttest.

short-term effects. In order to examine the differences between two types of repeated instruction, a mixed-design 2 (instruction: FonFs or concordance-based) x 5 (repetition: immediate posttest 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) repeated-measure ANOVA was performed. Table 3 shows the result of main effect of instruction. There were no significant differences between the types of instruction  $F(1, 46) = .000, p = 1.000, \eta^2 = .000$ . In other words, the results indicated that the difference between FonFs and concordance-based instruction was not statistically significant to show short-term effects.

**TABLE 3**  
Results of Between-subject Effects of Instruction

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	F	p	$\eta^2$
Intercept	52812.500	1	703.997	.000	.939
Instruction	.000	0	.000	1.000	.000
Error	3450.833	46			

In contrast, Table 4 reveals that there was a statistically significant interaction between repetition and instruction, and its effect size was large ( $F(3.633, 167.129) = 10.439, p < .05, \eta^2 = .185$ ).

**TABLE 4**  
Results of Within-subject Effects of Instruction

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	F	p	$\eta^2$
Repetition	1791.500	3.633	88.915	.000	.659
Repetition* Instruction	210.333	3.633	10.439	.000	.185
Error (Repetition)	926.833	167.129			

In order to examine which repetition interacted with the instruction, pairwise comparisons of means as post hoc were computed. In order to prevent Type I errors, a Bonferroni correction adjusted the interval of confidence. The alpha level was set as significant at .05. Table 5 shows the results of pairwise comparisons of means. The results indicated that FonFs yielded 3.538 points higher performance than concordance-based instruction on the first immediate test which was held after the initial learning stage. In other words, the FonFs teaching method outperformed the concordance-based instruction during the initial learning time when learning formulaic language.

**TABLE 5**

Pairwise Comparisons of Means Between Instruction

Group			Mean Difference (I-J)	SE	p
IP1	FonFs	Concordance	3.583	.907	.000
IP2	FonFs	Concordance	-.250	1.229	.840
IP3	FonFs	Concordance	-1.500	1.264	.241
IP4	FonFs	Concordance	-.583	1.155	.616
IP5	FonFs	Concordance	-1.417	1.143	.221

Note. Max score = 20. IP stands for Immediate posttest.

In order to determine the main effects of repetition under FonFs and concordance-based teaching methods, a paired samples t-test was conducted. Table 6 shows that all improvements of repetitions excluding the fourth and fifth repetition pair were statistically significant for the FonFs instruction. The mean score of the last pair dropped even though the decrease was not statistically significant  $t(23) = 1.147, p = .873$ . As for the concordance-based instruction, only the first  $t(23) = -8.117, p < .05$  and the second pair  $t(23) = -5.099, p < .05$  yielded a statistically significant mean gain. The third and fourth pair showed improvements of mean scores, but the learning gains were not statistically significant. In other words, the FonFs instruction improved learners' formulaic language acquisition significantly on the first, second, and the third repetition practices, while the concordance-based instruction improved their formulaic language significantly on the first and the second repetition practices.

**TABLE 6**

Paired Samples t-tests on the Immediate Posttests of Instruction

Instruction	Pair	M	SD	t	df	p
FonFs	IP1-IP2	-1.583	3.53	-2.200	23	.038
	IP2-IP3	-1.833	1.95	-4.609	23	.000
	IP3-IP4	-1.500	2.27	-3.244	23	.004
	IP4-IP5	.083	2.52	.162	23	.873
Concordance	IP1-IP2	-5.417	3.27	-8.117	23	.000
	IP2-IP3	-3.083	2.96	-5.099	23	.000
	IP3-IP4	-.583	1.74	-1.640	23	.115
	IP4-IP5	-.750	2.58	-1.427	23	.167

Note. IP stands for Immediate posttest.

The second research question asked to find the better teaching method between FonFs and concordance-based teaching methods in learning formulaic language for long-term effects. An independent t-test on one month delayed posttest was performed, and the results did not yield significant differences  $t(46) = .017, p = .887$  as shown in

Table 7.

**TABLE 7**

Independent *t*-tests on One Month Delayed Posttest Between Instruction

Instruction	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
FoFs	13.58	4.67	.143	.887
Concordance	13.42	3.30		

In sum, the results of both repeated-measure ANOVA and independent *t*-test for short-term and long-term effects indicated that both types of instruction generated significant improvements through repetitions. One of the most interesting findings was the superiority of FonFs instruction in the initial learning stage. The reason could be attributed to the simplified form of learning. That is, since formulaic language is relatively long for students to memorize all at once, the simple format in which students learn the formulaic language items with L1 translation is benefitted the learning gains in the beginning.

The research question 3 aimed to find out how many repetitions were adequate in order to acquire formulaic language. The mean percentage of each immediate posttest was computed, and the descriptive statistics of the percentage of mean score is presented in Table 8.

**TABLE 8**

Descriptive Statistics of FonFs and Concordance-based Instruction

Test	Group	<i>N</i>	Mean percentage (%)
IP1	FonFs	24	52.90
	Concordance	24	35.00
IP2	FonFs	24	60.85
	Concordance	24	62.10
IP3	FonFs	24	70.00
	Concordance	24	77.50
IP4	FonFs	24	77.50
	Concordance	24	80.40
IP5	FonFs	24	77.10
	Concordance	24	84.15

Note. Max mean score = 20, IP stands for Immediate posttest.

In the first repetition, FonFs achieved 52.9% of learning while concordance-based instruction reached only 35%. In the second repetition, concordance-based instruction started to precede FonFs by reaching 62.1% while FonFs scored 60.85%. In the third repetition, concordance-based instruction was way ahead of FonFs and the percentage did not go down until the last fifth repetition. Concordance-based instruction achieved 77.5% while

FonFs instruction reached 70%. The percentage of FonFs in the fourth repetition reached the same as that of concordance-based instruction in the third repetition. That means, learning formulaic language with concordance-based instruction needed fewer repetition practices compared to learning with FonFs instruction. By the fourth repetition, concordance-based instruction achieved over 80% of learning while FonFs instruction only reached 77.1%. That made 7.05% of gap between concordance-based instruction and FonFs instruction. It means that concordance-base instruction is suggested for students to achieve over 80% of formulaic language with fewer repetitions.

## V. CONCLUSION

This study was designed to reveal the optimal number of repetition practices for learning formulaic language and to give pedagogical suggestions on what teaching methods can be beneficial in learning formulaic language in the real classroom environment.

The results showed that both FonFs and concordance-based instruction had significant effects when learning formulaic language with no statistically significant difference. The result is consistent with the study of Laufer and Girsai (2008), which indicated that both FonF and FonFs instruction were effective in vocabulary teaching. However, when the instruction was combined with repetition practices, a different effect emerged depending on the instruction. FonFs instruction outperformed concordance-based instruction during the initial learning stage. It seemed that FonFs instruction helped students to familiarize themselves with the formulaic language items better than the concordance-based instruction in the beginning. Therefore, form-meaning link in FonFs is suggested in the initial stage of vocabulary learning. Even though memorization practices of vocabulary are often considered a tedious task, they can be beneficial to learning, especially when combined with repetition schedules.

On the other hand, the repeated practices showed a different picture over time. Concordance-based instruction showed slightly better learning after each repetition practice than FonFs instruction. Even though the difference between the methods during the repetition sessions was not significant, it is still meaningful because the learning kept growing with concordance-based instruction while the learning was not consistently growing with FonFs instruction.

The findings of the study suggest that repetition classes should be planned in the real classroom environment when learning formulaic language, since this study has shown that a single learning class was not effective enough for students to remember most of formulaic language. The results showed that a minimum of 2 repetition classes are needed in order to achieve at least 50 percent of formulaic language under concordance-based repeated instruction, and 4 repetition classes were needed in order to achieve at

least 75 percent of formulaic language for both instruction. In order to achieve over 80% of learning, four repetitions were needed for concordance-based instruction, while even five repetitions could not reach that level with FonFs instruction. Both teaching methods could not reach 85% on even the last repetition practice. Therefore, the present study suggests that FonFs instruction is useful when the repetition practices are held less than three times since that type of instruction enhances learning especially in the initial stage. On the other hand, focus-on-form is highly recommended when the repetition practices are held more than three times, and the students are required to achieve more than 80% of learning target vocabulary.

This study provides an important insight into the understanding of formulaic language learning with repetition practices, yet the study has limitations. The study employed four repetitions after the first presentation of target words. The number of exposures is greater than the previous studies, but still more number of repetitions is required to find the higher percentage achievement of students' vocabulary learning. Also, more target vocabulary can be added in order to examine the significant difference between FonFs and concordance-based instruction. The task difficulty can be raised by increasing the number of target vocabulary, which might lead to the distinction between the two teaching methods. Lastly, future research can investigate individual word learning with the teaching methods and repetition practices in order to find out whether the results are consistent with formulaic language learning.

## REFERENCES

- Alali, F. A., & Schmitt, N. (2012). Teaching formulaic sequences: The same as or different from teaching single words? *TESOL Journal*, 3(2), 153-180.
- Anderson, J. P., & Jordan, A. M. (1928). Learning and retention of Latin words and phrases. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 19(7), 485-496.
- Bahrack, H. P., Bahrack, L. E., Bahrack, A. S., & Bahrack, P. E. (1993). Maintenance of foreign language vocabulary and the spacing effect. *Psychological Science*, 4(5), 316-321.
- Bahrack, H. P., & Phelps, E. (1987). Retention of Spanish vocabulary over 8 years. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 13(2), 344-349.
- Binkai, J. (2012). An empirical study on corpus-driven English vocabulary learning in China. *English Language Teaching*, 5(4), 131-137.
- Bjork, R. A. (1994). Memory and metamemory considerations in the training of human beings. In J. Metcalfe & A. Shimamura (Eds.), *Metacognition: Knowing about knowing* (pp. 185-205). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Boulton, A. (2009). Data-driven learning: on paper, in practice. In T. Harris & M. Moreno (Eds.), *Corpus Linguistics in Language Teaching* (pp. 17-52). New York: Peter Lang.
- Boulton, A. (2010). Data-driven learning: Taking the computer out of the equation. *Language Learning*, 60(3), 534-572.
- Cepeda, N. J., Coburn, N., Rohrer, D., Wixted, J. T., Mozer, M. C., & Pashler, H. (2009). Optimizing distributed practice: Theoretical analysis and practical implications. *Experimental Psychology*, 56(4), 236-246.
- Conklin, K., & Schmitt, N. (2008). Formulaic sequences: Are they processed more quickly than nonformulaic language by native and nonnative speakers? *Applied Linguistics*, 29(1), 72-89.
- Conrad, S. (2005). Corpus linguistics and L2 teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 393-409). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dempster, F. N. (1988). The spacing effect: A case study in the failure to apply the results of psychological research. *American Psychologist*, 43(8), 627-634.
- Erman, B., & Warren, B. (2000). The idiom principle and the open choice principle. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 20(1), 29-62.
- Huh, Jin-Hee. (2009). The effects of retrieving words in decontextualized vocabulary instruction. *Modern English Education*, 10(3), 17-41.
- Jalilifar, A., Mehrabi, K., & Mousavinia, S. R. (2014). The effect of concordance enriched instruction on the vocabulary learning and retention of Iranian EFL learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 742-746.
- Johns, T. (1986). Microconcord: A language-learner's research tool. *System*, 14(2), 151-162.
- Kuiper, K. (1996). *Smooth talkers. The linguistic performance of auctioneers and sportscasters*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kuiper, K., & Haggio, D. (1984). Livestock auctions, oral poetry, and ordinary language. *Language in Society*, 13(2), 205-234.
- Laufer, B. (2006). Comparing focus on form and focus on forms in second-language vocabulary learning. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(1), 149-166.
- Laufer, B., & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: A case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 694-716.
- Liu, D., & Jiang, P. (2009). Using a corpus-based lexicogrammatical approach to grammar instruction in EFL and ESL contexts. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 61-78.
- Look down on. (2018). In *Oxford Dictionary of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martinez, R., & Schmitt, N. (2012). A phrasal expressions list. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(3), 299-320.
- Nakata, T. (2016). Does repeated practice make perfect? The effects of within-session repeated retrieval on second language vocabulary learning. *Studies in*

- Second Language Acquisition*, 39(4), 653-679.
- Nakata, T., & Webb. (2016). Does studying vocabulary in smaller sets increase learning? The effects of part and whole learning on second language vocabulary acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 38(3), 523-552.
- Nation, I. S. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nattinger, J. R., & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pavlik, P. I., & Anderson, J. R. (2005). Practice and Forgetting Effects on Vocabulary Memory: An Activation-Based Model of the Spacing Effect. *Cognitive Science*, 29(4), 559-586.
- Pawley, A., & Syder, F. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory. In J. Richards & R. Smith, *Language and communication*, (pp. 191-226). New York: Longmans.
- Pyc, M. A., & Rawson, K. A. (2009). Testing the retrieval effort hypothesis: Does greater difficulty correctly recalling information lead to higher levels of memory? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 60(4), 437-447.
- Römer, U. (2010). Using general and specialized corpora in English language teaching: Past, present and future. In M. Campoy, M. Cubillo, B. Belles-Fortuno, & M. Gea-Valor (Eds.), *Corpus-based approaches to English language teaching*, (pp. 18-35). London: A&C Black.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. London: Springer.
- Sinclair, J. M. (Ed.). (2004). *How to use corpora in language teaching*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Szudarski, P. (2012). Effects of meaning-and form-focused instruction on the acquisition of verb-noun collocations in L2 English. *Journal of Second Language Teaching & Research*, 1(2), 3-37.
- Thurston, J., & Candlin, C. N. (1998). Concordancing and the teaching of the vocabulary of academic English. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17(3), 267-280.
- Wood, D. (2002). Formulaic language in acquisition and production: Implications for teaching. *TESL Canada Journal*, 20(1), 1-15.
- Wray, A. (1999). Formulaic language in learners and native speakers. *Language Teaching*, 32(4), 213-231.
- Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**APPENDIX 1**

Learning Materials for Focus-on-Forms Group

A. How would you translate following Korean phrasal verbs into English?

1. 요약하다	b	_____	_____	_____
2. 병에 걸리다	c	_____	_____	_____
3. 정면으로 맞서다	f	_____	_____	_____

B. Let's check the correct answers for question A.

C. Look at question A again and practice form-recall with your partner.

**APPENDIX 2**

Learning Materials for Concordance-based Group

**A. Please identify meanings of phrasal verbs using concordance lines.**

1. boil down to \_\_\_\_\_

" These " best practices " **boil down to** this: (1) carefully verify that the signal is truly many cooling techniques **boil down to** one basic principle: Keep the air moving.

The things I believe in **boil down to** three major categories: # 1. Rock' n' roll. FUNDAMENTALS OF survival **boil down to** the Rule of Three: You can live three minutes reasons for not going green **boil down to** one, so elegantly put by a frog who

2. come down with \_\_\_\_\_

goes to the lawyer, though, she **come down with** sickness. All over in a few days. Her if they were ever going to, he **come down with** a cold and got pneumonia and died testing are about half as likely to **come down with** the disease over a 14- month period since no one else in California had **come down with** food poisoning either. I doubt one of Time Square offices had **come down with** swine flu. There are now at something nasty. " Mr. CarOme has **come down with** a fever. He can not work today.

**B. Let's check the correct answers for question A.**

**C. Look at question A again and practice meaning-recall with your partner.**