E.ISSN.2614-6061
P.ISSN.2527-4295
DOI : 10.37081/ed.v14i2.7701
Vol. 14 No. 2 Edisi Mei 2026, pp.826-838

A QUALITATIVE EXPLORATION OF CORPUS AND CHATGPT INTEGRATION IN HOSPITALITY ENGLISH LEARNING

Oleh :
Andi Rizki Fauzi
STIPARY Tourism Academy Yogyakarta
email: fauziandirizki2@gmail.com

Informasi Artikel
Riwayat Artikel :
Submit, 27 Oktober 2025
Revisi, 26 Mei 2026
Diterima, 29 Mei 2026
Publish, 31 Mei 2026

Kata Kunci :
Corpus linguistics,
ChatGPT,
Speaking Development,
Hospitality English,
AI-Enhanced Learning.

ABSTRACT
English speaking proficiency remains a critical challenge for Indonesian hospitality students, with vocabulary limitations, pronunciation difficulties, and speaking anxiety significantly hindering their professional readiness. While corpus linguistics and artificial intelligence offer promising pedagogical affordances, limited research examines their integrated application in ESP contexts. This qualitative study explored hospitality students' lived experiences integrating corpus-based learning with ChatGPT for speaking development, investigating both affordances and constraints of this pedagogical approach. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with eleven hospitality students at STIPARY Tourism Academy Yogyakarta who engaged in an eight-week integrated corpus-ChatGPT intervention. Thematic analysis using QdA Miner Lite software identified six major themes addressing research questions regarding student experiences, integration strategies, and perceived benefits. Findings revealed that corpus consultation provided authentic language exposure and contextual awareness, though information overload challenged lower-proficiency learners. ChatGPT facilitated interactive practice, immediate feedback, and anxiety-free experimentation, despite technical limitations and reliability concerns. Students employed diverse integration strategies—sequential, reverse, and dialogic—creating personalized learning ecosystems. Perceived benefits included confidence enhancement, vocabulary expansion, fluency development, and grammatical awareness, with successful transfer to hospitality-specific tasks. The integrated approach effectively addresses multidimensional speaking competencies by combining corpus authenticity with ChatGPT interactivity. However, successful implementation requires proficiency-differentiated scaffolding, explicit strategy instruction, reliable technical infrastructure, and positioning AI as preparation for authentic human communication rather than replacement.

Corresponding Author:
Nama: Andi Rizki Fauzi
Afiliasi: STIPARY Tourism Academy Yogyakarta
Email: fauziandirizki2@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian hospitality industry has experienced remarkable recovery following pandemic-related disruptions, with accommodation businesses increasing by 7.73% to reach 29,742 establishments in 2022 (BPS, 2022). Concurrently, foreign tourist arrivals surged by 503.34% in January 2023 compared to the previous year (Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy, 2023), intensifying demands for English-proficient hospitality professionals capable of effective international guest communication.

English speaking proficiency constitutes a fundamental professional competency in hospitality contexts, where successful service delivery depends critically on clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive verbal communication (Blue & Harun, 2003; Disilva & Arun, 2017). However, Indonesian hospitality students consistently struggle with speaking challenges, including limited vocabulary, pronunciation difficulties, grammatical inaccuracies, and debilitating speaking anxiety (Robah & Anggrisia, 2023; Sayuri, 2016). These obstacles do not only constrain academic achievement but also threaten professional readiness and career prospects in the globally competitive hospitality sector.

Traditional speaking instruction in Indonesian ESP contexts has demonstrated limited effectiveness, typically emphasizing grammar-focused approaches with insufficient authentic interaction opportunities (Rahayu, 2019). This pedagogical inadequacy persists despite widespread recognition that speaking development requires extensive, meaningful practice with authentic language resources and immediate corrective feedback (Nation & Newton, 2009). The persistent gap between instructional approaches and learning outcomes necessitates innovative pedagogical interventions leveraging contemporary technological affordances.

Corpus linguistics offers powerful resources for authentic language learning, providing learners with access to extensive collections of naturally occurring language use across diverse contexts (Johns, 1991). Data-Driven Learning (DDL) approaches position learners as researchers discovering linguistic patterns through guided corpus exploration, potentially developing more sophisticated awareness of contextual variation, collocational patterns, and register-appropriate usage than traditional textbook-based instruction provides (Boulton & Cobb, 2017). For ESP learners, domain-specific corpora enable targeted observation of professionally relevant language, supporting development of specialized communicative competencies.

Simultaneously, artificial intelligence technologies, particularly large language models like ChatGPT, present unprecedented opportunities for interactive language practice. ChatGPT can function as tireless conversational partner, providing immediate responses, corrective feedback, and clarification on demand without human evaluative judgment that often triggers speaking anxiety (Deci & Ryan, 2000). These affordances address persistent challenges in EFL contexts where authentic speaking practice opportunities remain severely limited by large class sizes, teacher-centered pedagogies, and examination-focused curricula.

Despite promising individual affordances, research examining integrated corpus-ChatGPT approaches remains scarce, particularly in ESP contexts where domain-specific language requirements demand specialized pedagogical solutions. While studies document corpus effectiveness for written production and ChatGPT utility for conversational practice separately, empirical investigation of their synergistic integration for speaking development is notably absent. This research gap is particularly consequential for hospitality education, where speaking competency directly impacts professional performance and career advancement.

This study addresses these gaps by investigating how Indonesian hospitality students experience and integrate corpus-based learning with ChatGPT for speaking development. Specifically, it explores: (1) How do students experience corpus consultation for discovering authentic hospitality language patterns? (2) What challenges do students encounter when using corpus and ChatGPT for speaking practice? (3) How do students strategically integrate corpus and ChatGPT in their learning processes? (4) What benefits do students perceive for their speaking development?

By foregrounding student voices and lived experiences through qualitative inquiry, this research contributes empirical evidence regarding integrated technology-enhanced speaking pedagogy in ESP contexts, offering practical insights for hospitality educators seeking innovative approaches to address persistent speaking challenges.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Speaking Challenges in Indonesian EFL Contexts

English speaking proficiency represents a multidimensional construct encompassing linguistic knowledge (vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation), processing automaticity (fluency), interactional competence (turn-taking, repair strategies), and pragmatic appropriateness (register, politeness) (Bygate, 2009). Indonesian EFL learners characteristically struggle across these dimensions, with speaking consistently identified as the most challenging language skill (Sayuri, 2016).

Vocabulary limitations constitute a primary obstacle, constraining expression precision and forcing learners into circumlocution, oversimplification, or communication abandonment (Robah & Anggrisia, 2023). Research documents that hospitality students particularly struggle with domain-specific terminology, contextually appropriate register variation, and nuanced meaning distinctions critical for professional communication (Fauzi, 2024). These lexical deficiencies reflect insufficient exposure to authentic, contextualized language use in traditional textbook-dominated instruction.

Pronunciation difficulties compound lexical challenges, stemming from phonological differences between Indonesian and English sound systems (Gilakjani, 2016). Hospitality students report particular struggles with consonant clusters, vowel distinctions, and stress patterns absent or differently

realized in Indonesian (Fauzi, 2024). Without structured pronunciation practice and authentic native speaker models, learners develop fossilized errors that persist despite years of instruction.

Speaking anxiety represents perhaps the most debilitating obstacle, with Indonesian learners exhibiting high anxiety levels rooted in fear of negative evaluation, face-threatening error exposure, and perfectionist tendencies (Horwitz et al., 1986; Sayuri, 2016). In collectivist Indonesian culture where face-saving is paramount, public speaking errors carry substantial social costs, inhibiting risk-taking essential for skill development. Traditional classroom structures emphasizing accuracy over communication further exacerbate anxiety by positioning errors as failures rather than learning opportunities.

Corpus Linguistics for Language Learning

Corpus linguistics involves systematic analysis of large, electronically stored collections of naturally occurring language texts, enabling identification of authentic usage patterns, frequency distributions, and contextual variations (Sinclair, 1991). Johns' (1991) Data-Driven Learning (DDL) approach adapts corpus methodologies for pedagogical purposes, positioning learners as researchers discovering language patterns through guided concordance exploration rather than passive recipients of decontextualized rules.

DDL approaches offer several theoretical advantages for speaking development. First, exposure to authentic native speaker usage provides more accurate models than pedagogically simplified textbook language (Römer, 2008). Second, observing multiple exemplars supports pattern abstraction and generalization through cognitive processes of comparison and categorization (Bybee, 2008). Third, discovery-based learning promotes deeper processing and more durable retention than explicit instruction alone (Craik & Lockhart, 1972). Fourth, awareness of contextual variation develops pragmatic competence essential for register-appropriate communication (Kachru & Nelson, 2006).

Empirical research demonstrates corpus effectiveness for developing collocational knowledge, grammatical awareness, and lexical sophistication, particularly at intermediate and advanced proficiency levels (Boulton & Cobb, 2017). For ESP contexts, specialized corpora enable targeted observation of domain-specific language, supporting development of professional communicative competencies (Flowerdew, 2015).

However, corpus consultation also presents significant challenges. Information overload from extensive concordance data can overwhelm learners lacking strategic competence for selective processing (Braun, 2007). Linguistic complexity—unfamiliar vocabulary, decontextualized fragments, structural variation—may exceed processing capacity, particularly for lower-proficiency learners (Bernardini, 2004). Without adequate scaffolding, these challenges may frustrate learners and undermine potential benefits.

AI Chatbots for Language Learning

Artificial intelligence chatbots, particularly large language models like ChatGPT, present unprecedented affordances for language learning through conversational interaction, immediate feedback, and on-demand availability (Rudolph et al., 2023). Unlike rule-based chatbots with limited response capabilities, generative AI models can engage in open-ended dialogue across diverse topics, approximating authentic conversational dynamics.

For speaking development, AI chatbots address several persistent challenges in EFL contexts. First, they provide unlimited practice opportunities unconstrained by teacher availability, class schedules, or willing human partners (Fryer & Carpenter, 2006). Second, immediate feedback supports error awareness and correction without human evaluative judgment that triggers anxiety (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Third, privacy enables experimentation and risk-taking essential for skill development but inhibited in public classroom contexts (Young, 1992). Fourth, adaptive scaffolding can provide comprehensible input calibrated to individual proficiency levels.

Empirical research demonstrates chatbot effectiveness for improving fluency, confidence, and willingness to communicate, with learners reporting reduced anxiety and increased engagement compared to human interaction (Huang et al., 2022). Particularly for anxious learners, non-judgmental AI practice provides psychological safety enabling intensive practice that social contexts inhibit.

However, AI chatbots also present limitations requiring pedagogical consideration. Accuracy concerns emerge from models' probabilistic text generation, which may produce plausible-sounding but incorrect language—so-called "hallucinations" (Rudolph et al., 2023). Unlike corpus data reflecting authentic usage, AI output represents statistical patterns that may not correspond to native speaker norms. Technical challenges—voice recognition errors, connectivity requirements, interface complexity—can frustrate users and undermine potential benefits. Economic barriers emerge from premium features requiring paid subscriptions, raising equity concerns.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This qualitative study employed phenomenological inquiry to explore students' lived experiences integrating corpus-based learning with ChatGPT for speaking development. Phenomenology seeks to understand how individuals make meaning of particular phenomena through detailed investigation of their subjective experiences, perspectives, and sense-making processes (Creswell

& Poth, 2018). This approach aligns with the study's aims to understand not merely whether the integrated approach "works" but how students experience, understand, and strategically employ these tools in their learning processes.

The study was conducted at STIPARY Tourism Academy Yogyakarta, a specialized institution preparing students for hospitality industry careers. Participants comprised eleven hospitality students enrolled in an English for Hospitality course who engaged in an eight-week pedagogical intervention integrating corpus consultation with ChatGPT for speaking practice.

Participants were selected through purposive sampling, with inclusion criteria requiring: (1) enrollment in the English for Hospitality course; (2) completion of all intervention activities; (3) willingness to share experiences through interviews. The final sample included seven female and four male students representing diverse proficiency levels (self-reported basic to intermediate), ensuring variation in experiences and perspectives. Pseudonyms (A., D., E., H., I., Ak., Ar., V., N., De., Af.) protect participant confidentiality while enabling individual voice representation in findings.

Data Collection

The eight-week intervention integrated corpus consultation with ChatGPT practice targeting hospitality-specific speaking development. Students received explicit instruction in: (1) using the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) to search hospitality-relevant expressions; (2) analyzing concordance lines to identify usage patterns and contextual variation; (3) engaging ChatGPT in hospitality role-plays incorporating corpus-observed language; (4) requesting and utilizing ChatGPT feedback for error correction.

Weekly activities followed a consistent cycle: corpus exploration of target structures (e.g., "how much is it," complaint language, recommendation expressions), analysis and discussion of observed patterns, ChatGPT practice incorporating target language in simulated hospitality interactions, and reflection on learning experiences. The intervention culminated in a video project requiring students to demonstrate hospitality communication competencies in authentic task simulations.

Semi-structured interviews served as the primary data source, conducted individually with all eleven participants following intervention completion. The interview protocol comprised open-ended questions exploring: experiences using corpus for discovering language patterns, challenges encountered during corpus consultation, experiences practicing with ChatGPT, integration strategies employed, perceived benefits for speaking development, and suggestions for improvement.

Interviews were conducted in Indonesian to ensure participants could express nuanced perspectives without language constraints, lasting 20-35 minutes each. All interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and translated into English for analysis while preserving meaning and voice authenticity.

Data Analysis

Thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework was employed, facilitated by QdA Miner Lite software. Analysis proceeded through: (1) familiarization via repeated reading of transcripts; (2) generating initial codes identifying interesting features; (3) searching for themes by collating codes into broader patterns; (4) reviewing themes for internal coherence and external distinctiveness; (5) defining and naming themes; (6) producing the scholarly report with vivid data extracts.

Analysis was iterative and recursive, with constant comparison ensuring themes accurately represented participant experiences. Member checking was conducted by sharing preliminary findings with participants, inviting corrections or elaborations to enhance trustworthiness.

The study received institutional approval from STIPARY Tourism Academy. All participants provided informed consent after receiving detailed information about study purposes, procedures, risks, and benefits. Participation was voluntary, with assurance that withdrawal would not affect academic standing. Confidentiality was maintained through pseudonymization and secure data storage.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Corpus as Gateway to Authentic Language Patterns

Students consistently reported that corpus consultation provided unprecedented access to authentic native speaker language use, representing a qualitative shift from textbook-based instruction. Ar. articulated: *"I think this is very helpful in improving my English skills... when I don't know some sentences that don't come to my mind, I want to search more in the corpus because it's very helpful and the corpus... has a lot of data used by native English speakers."* This recognition of authenticity was reinforced by D., who explicitly contrasted corpus with traditional materials: *"as a student in the tourism program, it's very helpful because in real life, English is important, so for the corpus, it can be said to be very helpful."* The phrase "in real life" signals awareness that corpus represents language as actually used in authentic contexts.

Particularly significant was students' discovery of contextual variation and phrasal alternatives. Ar. explained: *"we know ourselves that the use of English has many examples. To say how much, you can use how much is it, how much the cost. So it's not monotonous to just one phrase."* This awareness represents sophisticated pragmatic competence—understanding that linguistic choices should vary based on context and communicative

purpose. Ak. elaborated: *"I thought how much is it was only used in this form, but because of the corpus, I understand that how much is it is not only in this form but also in other forms."* This captures a crucial learning moment, realizing that authentic usage is far more variable than textbook presentations suggest.

Data revealed that proficiency level significantly mediated corpus experiences. Higher-proficiency students like Af. valued corpus for grammatical refinement: *"more understanding in word placement... so more precise in word placement."* Conversely, lower-proficiency student E., who self-identified as basic-level, stated: *"my English is at basic level, so I can't really combine vocabulary... so the corpus really helped me arrange vocabulary, arrange words for use in what context."* This proficiency-mediated pattern suggests that effective implementation requires differentiated scaffolding rather than one-size-fits-all approaches.

Several students appreciated corpus for exposing them to hospitality-specific language. D. noted: *"in the corpus section, those are words that are commonly used daily, so it's very helpful."* N. elaborated on application: *"I applied it in the video, as a tour guide, so I know a lot of the sentences... we're not confused about what to say, what to ask."* D. made professional relevance explicit: *"next month will start OJT [on-the-job training] and I plan to take Front Office, so the corpus used is very much used in the FO industry."* This perception of relevance is crucial for motivation and transfer to professional contexts.

Navigating Information Overload

Despite appreciating corpus richness, nearly all participants reported experiencing significant information overload. Ar. articulated this with notable frustration: *"the challenge is because there's so much data that we have to sort through several from the corpus that we have to read. And the challenge is because there's too much, so it's difficult to read."*

E. described interpretive difficulty: *"when reading this... oh what does this mean, where's the context going."* This reveals that processing burden stemmed not only from quantity but from cognitive complexity of interpreting decontextualized concordance lines. H. emphasized that complexity required iterative processing: *"it has to be like what's the language like, it has to be doubled first before understanding."* This recursive engagement, while potentially beneficial for deep learning, substantially increases time investment and cognitive load.

The challenge of information overload was compounded by vocabulary limitations. I. described her initial experience with notable intensity: *"the first time I saw the Corpus for the first time made me feel confused because what is this, because there are many words I don't understand in English."* Ho. elaborated: *"the words are different and the usage is also different and maybe I just found out... the words are maybe very foreign to me."* V. specified how sentence complexity amplified difficulty: *"if the sentence is longer, there's more English, so there are still many words I don't know."*

Students struggled with interpreting contextual appropriateness from concordance lines. D. explained: *"the words after that to make the context... sometimes still confused about the context, what comes after that."* N. described uncertainty about application: *"there are several corpus that I don't quite understand how to apply in sentences or whether it's a question sentence or what."* This reveals that observing patterns does not automatically enable productive use. Ho.'s coping strategy revealed selective engagement: *"I look for words that aren't strange to me, so just the ones that are easy to understand."* While pragmatically adaptive, this potentially limits learning by avoiding challenging patterns.

Substantial individual variation emerged in managing information overload. De. demonstrated adaptive processing: *"actually if at the beginning it's difficult, but if you're used to it and we're encouraged again to keep reading, then we actually know more."* Conversely, H.'s response suggested persistent struggle: *"the challenge is memorizing... memorize all the how much is it."* Her focus on memorization reveals possible misunderstanding of pattern abstraction goals. V. acknowledged limited utilization: *"not too much... I just learned from you [the teacher], because it's new."* Without sufficient exposure time, initial difficulty may prevent sustained engagement.

ChatGPT as Interactive Practice Partner

Students consistently reported positive experiences with ChatGPT, particularly emphasizing its interactive nature. E. characterized ChatGPT's appeal with enthusiasm: *"according to me, it's interesting, then because ChatGPT also always gives feedback, so it makes us always want, what do you call it, like addicted to wanting to interact."* The use of "addicted" suggests sustained intrinsic motivation. I. emphasized the interactive dimension: *"I'm happy because I can talk even though there's no person but can respond to what I say."* This reveals that even artificial interaction provides some satisfaction of social needs.

Feedback is central to the learning experience. E. explains: "*ChatGPT also provides corrections, for example if we use the wrong word in a sentence or use a word incorrectly, ChatGPT provides feedback so we know where the mistake is, so we are more confident in saying it*." De. emphasizes the importance of understanding feedback: *"In ChatGPT, we know what we mean, and ChatGPT is very helpful."* This interview shows that learners generally worry about whether their communication is effective. N. explains how feedback supports grammatical awareness: "*We know, for example, that if we use this sentence, the correct sentence is like*

this, and ChatGPT will correct it." This statement captures a very memorable moment of discovery in the learning process.

Several students emphasized that ChatGPT interaction reduced evaluative anxiety compared to human interaction. D. provided the most explicit account: *"because they evaluate without judging, so if with friends, they judge, sometimes they judge your English... so it doesn't get judged."* The repetition of "judge " emphasizes how salient this concern was. Ak. elaborated: *"maybe according to me, maybe a little confident because we speak English with AI, that is, if we talk to real human people, we definitely lack confidence. But if we talk with Chat GPT because we consider it like a machine, so we're just normally confident."*

I. emphasized confident solo practice: *"yes, because there I also speak alone, then from there I can also learn, for example if words are wrong, ChatGPT can correct my wrong words."* The ability to practice "alone" without audience provides privacy for experimentation without embarrassment. This anxiety-reduction function has particular significance for EFL contexts where speaking anxiety is pervasive and debilitating. ChatGPT offers practice without human evaluation, enabling experimentation that many students would not risk in social contexts.

Beyond practice and feedback, students discovered ChatGPT's versatility for multiple learning functions. Ar. described using ChatGPT for idiom learning: *"If we want to search for idioms or some colloquial sentences in English, it's very helpful... I use the FONDI application, an application where we meet various people and most of them use idioms and colloquial words. So I go to ChatGPT to find the sentences they tell."* I. described using ChatGPT to generate contextual examples: *"maybe if for example there's a word I rarely use, then I search in the corpus for what this word is used for, and if for example in the Corpus there are many difficult words to understand, I can ask Chat GPT."*

Despite enthusiastic endorsement, several students reported significant technical difficulties, particularly with voice recognition. Ho. provided detailed description: *"a bit difficult because maybe from my pronunciation is unclear or incomplete, so in the chat GPT it doesn't come out, not all the words appear, only a few words appear, so there's no answer from chat GPT."*

H. experienced similar difficulties: *"I couldn't use it... it was disturbed, couldn't be used... I speak but it doesn't come out, it comes out but I don't know what."* Af. noted premium feature limitations: *"for ChatGPT, because the better features have to be paid for... the voice to talk feature that's like talking with native speakers is very helpful but it's limited... the speaking session is only 10 minutes."* This economic barrier means students unable to afford premium subscriptions access only limited functionality.

Strategic Integration of Corpus and ChatGPT

The most prevalent pattern involved using corpus for initial pattern discovery, followed by ChatGPT for clarification and practice. Ar. explained: *"corpus is more valid because the data comes directly from native speakers and can be trusted 100%... connecting corpus and ChatGPT, for example if you find a difficult word there then you check it in ChatGPT."* De. articulated straightforward integration: *"there are several words I don't know in the corpus, then we translate to chat GPT and chat GPT can translate and explain what's in the corpus."* I. described similar integration: *"if for example there's a word I rarely use, then I search in the corpus for what this word is used for, and if for example in the Corpus there are many difficult words to understand, I can ask Chat GPT."*

Some students reported reverse integration—encountering language through ChatGPT and subsequently consulting corpus for verification. Af. explained: *"the opposite, I search for words that are strange to me according to me, then I search in the corpus... from ChatGPT strange, you try to look at the corpus."* This recursive process—ChatGPT generates exposure to new language, learner identifies unfamiliar items, corpus provides authentic usage examples—creates a discovery cycle where tools mutually support expanding competence.

Some students described sophisticated integration involving extended ChatGPT dialogue incorporating corpus-observed patterns. N. articulated: *"first we search for what are the examples of how much is it sentences in the corpus, then we add like if we ask how much is it blah blah, then Chat GPT answers, if we really don't understand, then chat GPT corrects it."* E. explained: *"I practiced the tour guide, I combined about what's it called, in the context at the tourist place, I used the corpus for some of the questions."* This contextualized practice supports transfer to authentic performance.

Several students integrated corpus and ChatGPT with additional resources, creating complex learning ecosystems. Ar. described extensive integration: *"for me myself, I mentioned earlier, I use the FONDI application where it helps me practice my English a lot and also I can find a lot of people from around the world like every country and it improves my English speaking."* V. reported using Duolingo alongside corpus and ChatGPT: *"I usually use the Duolingo application which also has speaking, then there's film watching."* N. and I. both mentioned TikTok as learning resources. N. explained: *"since yesterday it's more about watching videos on TikTok using English, it's very motivating in my opinion, like oh so the pronunciation is like this."*

This multi-source integration reveals sophisticated learner agency and ecological perspectives on learning—constructing personalized learning environments combining formal instruction,

technology tools, authentic media, and social interaction.

Not all students achieved smooth integration. H. experienced technical barriers: *"I couldn't use it... it was disturbed, couldn't be used, I used N.'s but N. also had the same disturbance... ChatGPT doesn't detect."* V. acknowledged limited corpus utilization: *"not too much... I just learned from you [the teacher], because it's new... maybe it helps but because I haven't used it too often, so I'm not too familiar with it."* Af. admitted minimal integration: *"For that I haven't tried it yet... connecting corpus with ChatGPT, for speaking practice."* Despite classroom experience, he had not independently integrated the tools.

These integration failures underscore that effective technology-enhanced learning requires not just tool access but adequate time, technical reliability, explicit strategy instruction, and scaffolding for autonomous transfer.

Perceived Benefits for Speaking Development

Students consistently reported that the integrated approach enhanced speaking confidence. Ar. stated emphatically: *"it certainly greatly increases my confidence... because on one side I also need to search for various sentences and that really helps me and at the same time becomes a friend or partner for speaking English."* E. specifically linked ChatGPT feedback to confidence: *"ChatGPT also corrects, like if we have a wrong word in word placement or wrong word usage, it gives feedback so we know where the mistake is, so we're more confident in saying it."*

I. explained confidence mechanisms: *"yes because there I also speak alone, then from there I can also learn, if for example the wrong words are wrong, ChatGPT can correct my wrong words... because there we talk alone, then from there I also learn."* Ak. provided nuanced analysis: *"maybe according to me, maybe a little confident because we speak English with AI, that is, if we talk to real human people, we definitely lack confidence. But if we talk with Chat GPT because we consider it like a machine, so we're just normally confident."* This distinction between AI confidence and human interaction confidence is analytically important.

Substantial vocabulary expansion was frequently mentioned. Ar. confirmed: *"Many new vocabulary words that I didn't understand, I can understand again."* E. noted: *"more vocabulary is added, pronunciation too, better."* I. emphasized: *"maybe adding vocabulary that is rarely used... for learning English vocabulary... makes it easier if for example making papers or something like that."* De. emphasized comprehensive lexical benefits: *"more helpful because more complete, the vocabulary and the arrangement of words are more appropriate in my opinion."*

Students reported developing more natural, spontaneous speaking. E. described this vividly: *"I practiced, it was spontaneous, using oh yesterday it was like that, so in memory it's more absorbed."* D. reflected similar spontaneity: *"I also just learned yesterday with friends, so it's just spontaneous, I ask using English."* N. described fluent application: *"so we're not confused about what to say, what to ask to the tour guide or vice versa, so we just apply it from the corpus, so we're not confused about what to say."*

This development toward naturalness and spontaneity represents crucial speaking development, progressing from careful, monitored production toward automatic, fluent expression characteristic of proficient speakers.

Several students reported improved grammatical awareness. Ak. provided detailed explanation: *"For changes, there are many... from grammar... if it's just word for word, the sentences don't connect. Well, whereas in Chat GPT... it's also displayed... if I translate sentences... the meaning isn't just one... it's also displayed by ChatGPT."* N. emphasized learning through correction: *"we know like oh it turns out if we use this sentence the correct one is like this, Chat GPT corrects it."* Af. noted awareness of word placement: *"more understanding in word placement... so more precise in word placement."*

Several students explicitly noted applying learned language in hospitality-relevant contexts. D. made professional relevance most explicit: *"next month will start OJT and I plan to take Front Office, so the corpus used is very much used in the FO industry."* N. described project application: *"as a tour guide, so I know a lot of the sentences... so knowing how to use it more."* E. described project performance: *"excited, happy like flowing, can talk using English spontaneously, it's comfortable."*

This practical application addresses persistent challenges in ESP—ensuring that language instruction develops competencies genuinely useful for professional practice.

Challenges and Areas for Improvement

Despite enthusiastic endorsement, several students expressed concerns about ChatGPT accuracy. Ar. articulated: *"ChatGPT also provides information that's not quite right for me, so I have to search in manual dictionaries, then to ChatGPT again to ensure it... for ChatGPT, I think it's less, what is it called, the sentences are not quite right."* D. echoed reliability concerns: *"ChatGPT's disadvantage is... it's not precise according to me, the sentence is not quite right... but for the advantage, it's very fast in finding the information we're looking for."* These concerns align with documented issues in large language models regarding "hallucinations." For language learning, unreliability is particularly problematic because learners may lack competence to evaluate whether AI-generated language is accurate and natural.

Technical difficulties significantly hampered experiences. Ho. described voice recognition

frustration: *"a bit difficult because maybe from my pronunciation is unclear or incomplete, so in the chat GPT it doesn't come out, not all the words appear, only a few words appear, so there's no answer from chat GPT... we have to wait a long time."* H.'s experience was more problematic: *"I couldn't use it... it was disturbed, couldn't be used, I used N.'s but N. also had the same disturbance... about ChatGPT, the disturbance is how... I speak but it doesn't come out, it comes out but I don't know what, not detected."* These voice recognition failures may stem from multiple sources: non-native pronunciation challenging recognition algorithms optimized for native speakers, acoustic environments degrading audio input, internet bandwidth limitations, and AI model limitations in handling accented speech. Regardless of cause, the effect undermines the tool's core utility for speaking practice.

Connectivity emerged as another constraint. De. noted: *"maybe the disadvantage of corpus is technology, so if for example there are problems like no signal and so on."* I. added: *"we have to have good signal."* These infrastructure dependencies mean learning opportunities are constrained by technical circumstances beyond learner or teacher control. I. identified prompt engineering difficulty: *"good keywords too... if our words are wrong, what we mean is not conveyed to ChatGPT."* This reveals that effective ChatGPT use requires literacy in formulating appropriate queries—a skill that must be explicitly developed.

Several students noted that advanced ChatGPT features requiring paid subscriptions created economic barriers. Af. explained: *"for ChatGPT, because the better features have to be paid for, so that's it... the voice to talk feature that's like talking with native speakers is very helpful but it's limited, the speaking session is only 10 minutes."* V. reinforced this: *"the disadvantage is maybe because we can't request voice... because we use the free one, we, because if you use the paid one, maybe there is."* This economic stratification in educational technology access is deeply problematic from equity perspectives. If premium features provide substantially better learning support, students' educational opportunities become function of family wealth rather than ability or effort, potentially exacerbating achievement gaps.

Several students noted that instructional time was insufficient for developing deep competence. D. stated explicitly: *"for the disadvantage for me is that the time to learn is not long enough... not long enough."* De. recommended more intensive implementation: *"class meetings that use corpus and ChatGPT every day, so more often."* His call for daily use indicates recognition that sporadic practice is inadequate. V. acknowledged that limited exposure prevented full integration: *"not too much... because I haven't used it too often, so I'm not too familiar with it."* These time-related concerns align with general principles of skill acquisition—complex competencies require extensive practice distributed over time. Brief practice sessions may create awareness but not deep skills.

Some students expressed ambivalence about potential over-reliance on AI tools. E. raised but then questioned this concern: *"we become dependent, what is it... dependence... on ChatGPT... is that a disadvantage? Not really, right?... because ChatGPT does help."*

Several students implicitly acknowledged ChatGPT limitations for authentic communication. Ak. noted confidence differences: *"if we talk to real human people, we definitely lack confidence. But if we talk with Chat GPT because we consider it like a machine, so we're just normally confident."* While framed as advantage, this also reveals limitation—confidence with machines may not transfer to human interaction. H. distinguished between ChatGPT and human interaction: *"if Chat GPT is more for individual learning, if for example if our skill has to be with people."* This mature understanding suggests technology should supplement rather than replace authentic communication.

D. compared learning experiences: *"for corpus, it's more number one, so ChatGPT is number two, because corpus is more fun if we learn with the person directly, whereas with ChatGPT it's with a phone."* These concerns highlight an important pedagogical principle: AI tools should be positioned as preparation for and supplement to authentic human communication, not as replacement.

Suggestions for Pedagogical Improvement

Students provided various suggestions for enhancing the integrated approach. E. suggested multimodal enhancement: *"maybe there's video, the conversation dialogue has voice... from AI conversation... a video maybe shown with dialogue conversation from AI maybe."* Ar. recommended greater care and precision: *"I have to be more careful and thorough in using the ChatGPT and corpus applications."* While framed as personal responsibility, this implies need for explicit instruction in critical evaluation and strategic use.

De. and V. emphasized frequency: *"maybe having to use it more often, so more often."* The convergence on frequency recommendations indicates students recognized that sporadic use was insufficient. N. recommended enhanced contextualization: *"for context, if we're in the tourism world, we study about tourism, what do we usually ask in tourism or what's the application of corpus... so we know more clearly about what we'll talk about in the future."*

Ak. emphasized prompt engineering: *"if to learn to be effective too, if we ask Chat GPT or corpus, maybe the prompt has to be adjusted... adjusted according to what we'll discuss, we'll find out."* H. suggested corpus simplification: *"if corpus is more simplified... because it's more difficult to*

access... this is my experience, if friends can maybe yes, maybe indeed on my phone can't."

These diverse suggestions reveal that students had sophisticated perspectives on limitations and potential improvements, underscoring the value of incorporating learner feedback in implementation refinement.

Discussion

The findings illuminate both the affordances and constraints of integrating corpus-based learning with ChatGPT for hospitality students' speaking development, revealing complex, nuanced experiences extending beyond simple assessments of tool utility. This discussion synthesizes findings with theoretical frameworks and prior research, offering insights for ESP pedagogy.

Corpus Affordances and the Data-Driven Learning Paradigm

Students' consistent recognition that corpus provided access to authentic native speaker usage validates Johns' (1991) Data-Driven Learning conceptualization, wherein learners function as researchers discovering language patterns through authentic data exploration. The discovery of contextual variation and phrasal alternatives—exemplified by Ar.'s realization that "how much" can be expressed through multiple forms—represents sophisticated pragmatic competence development essential for hospitality contexts where register appropriateness critically impacts service quality (Kachru & Nelson, 2006).

The proficiency-mediated experiences observed align with Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development concept. Higher-proficiency students like Af. derived grammatical refinement benefits, while lower-proficiency students like E. valued fundamental compositional support. This differential effectiveness has important pedagogical implications—effective corpus implementation requires proficiency-appropriate scaffolding rather than one-size-fits-all approaches. Teachers must provide differentiated support: simplified concordance lines, vocabulary glosses, and explicit pattern guidance for lower-proficiency learners; minimal scaffolding encouraging autonomous discovery for advanced learners.

Students' appreciation for domain-specific language exposure addresses a fundamental ESP principle—language instruction should target learners' specific professional needs (Basturkmen, 2010). D.'s explicit connection between corpus language and Front Office industry usage demonstrates that students recognized practical relevance, a crucial factor for motivation and transfer to professional contexts (Blue & Harun, 2003).

Information Overload and Cognitive Load Management

Despite corpus benefits, nearly universal reports of information overload underscore that mere access to authentic data does not automatically translate into effective learning. Ar.'s frustration with "too much data" and E.'s interpretive difficulties reveal that cognitive processing capacity critically mediates corpus utility, validating extensive DDL research documenting this challenge (Braun, 2007; Boulton & Cobb, 2017).

The compounding effect of linguistic barriers—vocabulary limitations, unfamiliar structures, contextual ambiguity—transforms manageable data quantity into overwhelming complexity for developing learners. I.'s initial confusion ("what is this?") and Ho.'s discovery of linguistic unfamiliarity indicate that without adequate linguistic resources, students experience corpus as bewildering rather than informative.

These findings have crucial pedagogical implications. Teachers must implement explicit scaffolding strategies: pre-teaching key vocabulary appearing in concordance lines; limiting concordance line quantity to prevent cognitive overload; providing explicit guidance on identifying patterns; teaching metacognitive strategies for managing complexity; and gradually reducing scaffolding as learners develop autonomous competence.

The individual variation observed—with some students like De. developing adaptive processing while others like H. struggled persistently—highlights that corpus success depends not just on tool design but on learner characteristics including metacognitive awareness, strategic competence, persistence, and tolerance for ambiguity. This variation necessitates differentiated support, with some students requiring more explicit strategy instruction, structured guidance, and encouragement through initial difficulty periods.

ChatGPT as Motivational Catalyst and Anxiety Reducer

Students' enthusiastic endorsement of ChatGPT, particularly E.'s characterization as "addicting," reveals that AI interaction generated sustained intrinsic motivation rather than requiring external pressure. This aligns with Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), which posits that autonomy, competence, and relatedness support intrinsic motivation. ChatGPT provides autonomy through on-demand availability, competence support through immediate feedback, and some relatedness satisfaction through interactive dialogue, even if artificial.

The anxiety-reduction function emerged as perhaps ChatGPT's most distinctive affordance. D.'s explicit contrast between AI ("evaluates without judging") and peers ("judge") reveals sophisticated understanding that AI provides performance assessment focused on improvement while peers may provide face-threatening social judgment. In collectivist Indonesian culture where face-saving is paramount (Sayuri, 2016), this judgment-free space may be particularly valuable for enabling practice that social contexts inhibit.

Ak.'s distinction between AI confidence and human interaction confidence is analytically important—the intervention built confidence for non-evaluated performance but did not necessarily transfer to social interaction confidence. This limitation suggests pedagogical progression: initial private practice with ChatGPT building foundational skills and confidence, followed by scaffolded human interaction gradually approximating authentic communicative challenges. ChatGPT serves preparatory functions rather than replacing authentic interaction.

The immediate corrective feedback dimension addresses a persistent challenge in autonomous learning—students encounter difficulty but lack immediate expert clarification. ChatGPT's on-demand explanation enables students to resolve comprehension obstacles without waiting for teacher availability, supporting the Interaction Hypothesis claim that negotiation of meaning facilitates acquisition (Long, 1996). E.'s observation that feedback made errors explicit and comprehensible, building both accuracy and confidence, demonstrates feedback's dual cognitive and affective functions.

Strategic Integration and Learning Ecosystem Construction

The diverse integration patterns observed—sequential (corpus → ChatGPT), reverse (ChatGPT → corpus), dialogic (extended conversation incorporating corpus patterns), and multi-source triangulation—demonstrate sophisticated learner agency in strategically deploying tools according to individual needs and learning preferences.

The most prevalent sequential pattern (corpus discovery → ChatGPT practice) exploits complementary affordances: corpus provides authentic input exemplars; ChatGPT enables interactive practice and feedback. This sequence aligns with effective language learning progressions—input and observation, comprehension verification, production practice—supporting movement from receptive processing to productive use (DeKeyser, 2007).

The reverse pattern (ChatGPT discovery → corpus verification) demonstrates flexibility and learner initiative. Af.'s approach of encountering language through ChatGPT, identifying unfamiliar items, and investigating through corpus creates a discovery cycle where tools mutually support expanding competence. This learner-initiated discovery potentially supports greater autonomy and intrinsic motivation than teacher-determined tasks.

The dialogic integration exemplified by N.—corpus pattern identification, production attempt with ChatGPT, feedback, refinement—combines form-focused attention with meaning-focused interaction, aligning with effective instructed SLA principles (Ellis, 2016). This integration addresses the persistent challenge of balancing accuracy and fluency in communicative language teaching (Lightbown & Spada, 2013).

Particularly striking was students' construction of comprehensive learning ecosystems integrating corpus, ChatGPT, language learning apps (Duolingo), authentic media (TikTok, films, music), and social interaction platforms (FONDI). This multi-source approach reflects ecological perspectives on learning—participation in rich, varied environments rather than simple skill transfer from instruction (van Lier, 2004). Ar.'s tripartite system (corpus for input, ChatGPT for AI practice, FONDI for authentic interaction) demonstrates sophisticated understanding that different resources serve different purposes, creating comprehensive support for multidimensional competence development.

However, integration failures experienced by students like H. (technical problems), V. (insufficient exposure), and Af. (lack of transfer to autonomous practice) underscore that integration success requires multiple supports: adequate time, technical reliability, explicit strategy instruction, guided practice, and scaffolding for autonomous transfer. Without these supports, even well-designed tools may remain underutilized.

Multidimensional Competence Development

The reported benefits spanning affective (confidence), linguistic (vocabulary, grammar), procedural (fluency), and pragmatic (contextual appropriateness) dimensions suggest the integrated approach addresses speaking holistically rather than targeting isolated subskills. This multidimensional development addresses persistent challenges in traditional instruction, which often overemphasizes either accuracy at fluency's expense or vice versa.

The confidence enhancement reported by all students addresses one of the most debilitating obstacles for Indonesian EFL learners. Ar.'s conceptualization of technology as supportive "friend or partner," I.'s emphasis on private practice enabling risk-taking, and E.'s observation that feedback paradoxically builds confidence by making errors correctable rather than shameful—all suggest the intervention created psychological conditions supporting risk-taking essential for skill development.

The vocabulary expansion aligns with research showing that engagement with comprehensible input containing new words in context supports acquisition more effectively than decontextualized memorization (Nation, 2001). Ak.'s incidental vocabulary acquisition through ChatGPT interaction, combined with De.'s appreciation for both quantity ("more complete") and appropriateness ("more appropriate"), suggests developing vocabulary breadth and depth—understanding nuanced meanings, collocations, and contextual constraints.

The development toward natural, spontaneous expression represents crucial speaking development progression. E.'s description of spontaneous, "absorbed" language and N.'s elimination of confusion through automatic pattern application indicate internalized knowledge supporting fluency—the hallmark of proficient speaking (Skehan, 2009).

The successful transfer to hospitality-specific tasks, evidenced by D.'s explicit connection to OJT preparation and N.'s confident tour guide performance, demonstrates that the intervention achieved ESP's ultimate goal—developing competencies genuinely useful for professional practice (Basturkmen, 2010).

Critical Challenges Requiring Pedagogical Response

The reliability concerns raised by Ar. and D. regarding ChatGPT accuracy align with documented issues about AI "hallucinations" (Rudolph et al., 2023). For language learning, this unreliability is particularly problematic because learners may lack competence to evaluate whether AI-generated language is natural and appropriate. Pedagogical responses must include: explicitly teaching critical evaluation skills, positioning ChatGPT as hypothesis generator requiring verification, combining with corpus as accuracy standard, and providing teacher oversight to identify and correct errors before internalization.

The technical difficulties—particularly voice recognition failures experienced by Ho. and H.—fundamentally undermine speaking practice affordances. These failures may disproportionately affect students most needing practice (those with pronunciation challenges), creating a cruel irony where technology meant to support struggling learners actually disadvantages them. Pedagogical responses require: ensuring reliable infrastructure before implementation, providing technical troubleshooting support, offering alternative text-based practice for students experiencing voice recognition failures, and advocating for improved AI recognition of non-native speech.

The economic barriers created by premium features requiring paid subscriptions raise serious equity concerns. If premium features provide substantially better learning support, educational opportunities become function of family wealth rather than ability or effort, exacerbating achievement gaps. Institutional responses should include: purchasing institutional subscriptions providing all students premium access, developing equivalent free alternatives, redesigning pedagogy to work within free tier limitations, or advocating for educational pricing from technology companies.

The time constraints identified by multiple students underscore that effective technology integration requires substantial, sustained engagement rather than brief interventions. Speaking development requires extensive practice over prolonged periods (Nation & Newton, 2009), and corpus/ChatGPT competence develops gradually through repeated use. Curriculum reorganization allocating substantial time—not superficial add-ons—is essential for realizing potential benefits.

The ambivalence about over-reliance, particularly Ak.'s observation about confidence differentials between AI and human interaction, highlights crucial pedagogical positioning: AI tools should prepare for and supplement authentic human communication, not replace it. Pedagogical progressions should move from private AI practice building foundational skills toward scaffolded human interaction approximating authentic communicative challenges.

4. CONCLUSION

This qualitative study on hospitality students' lived experiences integrating corpus-based learning with ChatGPT for speaking development highlights key findings: corpus consultation fosters authentic language awareness and contextual variation but is hindered by information overload and linguistic complexity, necessitating proficiency-differentiated scaffolding; ChatGPT enhances interactive practice, motivation, and confidence while facing technical, reliability, and economic barriers; students demonstrate agency through diverse integration strategies (sequential, reverse, dialogic, and multi-source), yielding multidimensional benefits in affective, linguistic, procedural, and pragmatic domains, with successful transfer to ESP tasks. Theoretically, it contributes empirical evidence to corpus linguistics pedagogy, AI-enhanced language learning, ESP instruction, and learner autonomy by documenting affordances and constraints. Pedagogically, it advocates for proficiency-based scaffolding, cognitive load management, anxiety reduction strategies, critical digital literacy, explicit strategy instruction, and equitable access to maximize effectiveness. Despite limitations such as the small sample size, self-reported data, and short intervention duration, which constrain generalizability, future research should employ mixed-methods designs, longitudinal studies, and comparative analyses across ESP contexts to quantify impacts and address equity. Overall, this study affirms the potential of technology integration for holistic speaking development in ESP, emphasizing evidence-based, student-centered approaches that balance affordances with pitfalls to foster autonomous and inclusive learning ecosystems.

5. REFERENCES

Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing courses in English for specific purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Bernardini, S. (2004). Corpora in the classroom: An overview and some reflections on future developments. In J. Sinclair (Ed.), *How to use*

corpora in language teaching (pp. 15-36). John Benjamins.

Blue, G. M., & Harun, M. (2003). Hospitality language as a professional skill. *English for Specific Purposes, 22*(1), 73-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(01)00031-X

Boulton, A., & Cobb, T. (2017). Corpus use in language learning: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 67*(2), 348-393. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12224

BPS. (2022). *Statistik hotel dan akomodasi lainnya di Indonesia 2021*. https://www.bps.go.id/publication/2022/12/14/7cf6a9c0c0a5f7cd83b244b4/statistik-hotel-dan-akomodasi-lainnya-di-indonesia-2021.html

Braun, S. (2007). Integrating corpus work into secondary education: From data-driven learning to needs-driven corpora. *ReCALL, 19*(3), 307-328. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344007000535

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bybee, J. (2008). Usage-based grammar and second language acquisition. In P. Robinson & N. C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 216-236). Routledge.

Bygate, M. (2009). Teaching and testing speaking. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 412-440). Wiley-Blackwell.

Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 11*(6), 671-684. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(72)80001-X

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227-268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

DeKeyser, R. M. (2007). *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*. Cambridge University Press.

Disilva, F., & Arun, M. (2017). Communication skills to develop the professional competencies of undergraduates. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, 8*(3), 1237-1242.

Ellis, R. (2005). Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge of a second language: A psychometric study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27*(2), 141-172. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050096

Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 83-107. https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512

Ellis, R. (2016). Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research, 20*(3), 405-428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816628627

Fauzi, A. R. (2024). Breaking up vocabulary: An investigation of vocabulary boundaries among hospitality students. *Jurnal Education and Development, 12*(3), 188-194. https://doi.org/10.37081/ed.v12i3.6404

Flowerdew, L. (2015). Data-driven learning and language learning theories: Whither the twain shall meet. In A. Leńko-Szymańska & A. Boulton (Eds.), *Multiple affordances of language corpora for data-driven learning* (pp. 15-36). John Benjamins.

Fryer, L., & Carpenter, R. (2006). Bots as language learning tools. *Language Learning & Technology, 10*(3), 8-14.

Gilakjani, A. P. (2016). English pronunciation instruction: A literature review. *International Journal of Research in English Education, 1*(1), 1-6.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(2), 125-132. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x

Huang, W., Hew, K. F., & Fryer, L. K. (2022). Chatbots for language learning—Are they really useful? A systematic review of chatbot-supported language learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 38*(1), 237-257. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12610

Johns, T. (1991). Should you be persuaded: Two examples of data-driven learning. *English Language Research Journal, 4*, 1-16.

Kachru, B. B., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hong Kong University Press.

Lightbown, P. M. (2000). Anniversary article: Classroom SLA research and second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 21*(4), 431-462. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/21.4.431

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Academic Press.

Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy. (2023). *Arrivals of foreign visitors to Indonesia*. https://www.kemenparekraf.go.id

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.

Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. Routledge.

Rahayu, D. (2019). Persepsi pelaku industri pariwisata terhadap kebutuhan English for Tourism Purposes (ETP) bagi lulusan D3 pariwisata. *Jurnal IPTA, 7*(1), 96-106. https://doi.org/10.24929/jfs.v7i1.496

Robah, S. U., & Anggrisia, N. (2023). English vocabulary learning challenges faced by vocational high school students majoring in tourism. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal, 6*(1), 90-97. https://doi.org/10.24235/eltej.v6i1.11741

Römer, U. (2008). Corpora and language teaching. In A. Lüdeling & M. Kytö (Eds.), *Corpus linguistics: An international handbook* (Vol. 1, pp. 112-130). Mouton de Gruyter.

Rudolph, J., Tan, S., & Tan, S. (2023). ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education? *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching, 6*(1), 342-363. https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.9

Sayuri. (2016). English speaking problems of EFL learners of Mulawarman University. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics, 1*(1), 47-61. https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefll.v1i1.4

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. *Applied Linguistics, 30*(4), 510-532. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp047

van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Young, D. J. (1992). Language anxiety from the foreign language specialist's perspective: Interviews with Krashen, Omaggio Hadley, Terrell, and Rardin. *Foreign Language Annals, 25*(2), 157-172. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1992.tb00524.x