



Exploring Vocabulary Development Through Digital Dialogue: English Majors' Experiences in Learning Management Systems

Ryan S. Marzado 
Armand James A. Vallejo 

International Journal of Interdisciplinary Viewpoints (2)9, 9-15, 2026

<https://doi.org/10.64612/ijiv.v2i9.218>

Correspondence: ri.marzado@gmail.com

¹⁻²University of Mindanao Tagum College, Philippines

Abstract

Vocabulary development requires sustained exposure, contextualized practice, interaction, and opportunities for productive language use. However, these conditions may be difficult to sustain when second-language learning is mediated through learning management systems (LMSs). This study explored the experiences of English majors in Region XI as they developed vocabulary through digital dialogue within LMS environments. A qualitative phenomenological design was employed with 14 purposively selected English majors who had at least one academic year of experience using their institutional LMS. Data were collected through semi-structured in-depth interviews and a focus group discussion and analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis. Findings identified five challenges: complex vocabulary and limited lexical repertoire, affective barriers to confident vocabulary use, delayed feedback and resulting learning gaps, technological constraints on engagement, and limited interactive opportunities. Participants responded through six coping mechanisms: using digital tools, cultivating independent vocabulary-learning practices, reinforcing vocabulary through habitual strategies, seeking peer and instructor support, managing emotional stress, and extending vocabulary learning beyond the LMS. Participants further described vocabulary development as an active process and distinguished vocabulary recognition from productive use. They also emphasized contextual appropriateness, independent learning, alternative digital resources, and the need for more interactive LMS environments. The findings suggest that LMS-based vocabulary instruction should integrate contextualized lexical practice, timely feedback, meaningful interaction, self-regulated learning, and appropriately guided digital resources.

Keywords

vocabulary development, digital dialogue, English majors, learning management systems, technology-assisted language learning

How to Cite

Marzado, R., & Vallejo, A. J. (2026). Exploring Vocabulary Development Through Digital Dialogue: English Majors' Experiences in Learning Management Systems. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Viewpoints*, 2(9), 9–15.

<https://doi.org/10.64612/ijiv.v2i9.218>

Received: 27 July 2026

Accepted: 28 August 2026

Published: 30 September 2026

Copyright and License

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Edukar Publishing. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer Review Statement

This article underwent a double-anonymous peer review process in accordance with the editorial policies of the *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Viewpoints*. Both authors and reviewers remained anonymous throughout the review process.

Open Access Statement

The *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Viewpoints* is a fully open-access, peer-reviewed journal. All articles are freely available online immediately upon publication without subscription or access fees.

Funding Statement

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declared no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Author Contributions

The authors contributed to conceptualization, methodology, investigation, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review and editing, and supervision. The authors approved the final manuscript.

Ethics Statement

This study was conducted in accordance with ethical standards.

INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary knowledge is fundamental to second-language development because learners need lexical resources to comprehend input, construct meaning, participate in interaction, and communicate precisely. Digital learning environments have expanded opportunities for vocabulary exposure and practice beyond conventional classrooms. Technology-assisted vocabulary research shows that digital tools can support lexical learning through repeated exposure, access to lexical information, and opportunities for practice (Hao et al., 2021), while informal digital learning can provide additional English exposure, with vocabulary outcomes influenced by the quantity and quality of learners' engagement (Lee, 2019). Artificial intelligence has further expanded opportunities for individualized language support and vocabulary-related learning activities (Alhusaiyan, 2025). However, vocabulary development requires more than exposure; learners also need contextualized encounters, retrieval, application, and meaningful use of lexical knowledge (Nation, 2022). Interaction is

therefore central to digitally mediated vocabulary learning because communicative exchanges can facilitate meaning negotiation and language development (Loewen & Sato, 2018), while technology-mediated dialogue can provide opportunities for language practice when appropriately designed (Bibauw et al., 2022).

The effectiveness of digital language learning also depends on the quality of learner engagement and interaction. Online learning environments require meaningful exchanges among learners, instructors, and content rather than the simple provision of materials and assignments (Martin & Bolliger, 2018). Online discussion forums can facilitate engagement and learning when participation and communication are appropriately structured (Gasmi, 2022), while technology-mediated feedback can shape language-learning processes through different technologies and feedback sources (Loncar et al., 2023). In the Philippine context, however, online learning has been associated with challenges involving connectivity, technological resources, communication, engagement, and learner adaptation (Almahasees et al., 2021; Barrot et al., 2021). Philippine university English-language instruction has likewise involved challenges in interaction, feedback, and instructional adaptation in online environments (Tarrayo et al., 2022), while the digital reshaping of English instruction has required adjustments in instructional practices and communication processes (Tenedero et al., 2022). These conditions suggest that LMS-mediated vocabulary development may be influenced not only by access to digital resources but also by technological constraints, feedback processes, interaction opportunities, and learners' capacity to regulate their learning.

Learner agency is particularly important when digital environments do not consistently provide immediate interaction or feedback. Research indicates that self-regulated learning can support vocabulary knowledge and self-regulated learning skills among English language learners (Deng & Trainin, 2023), while broader evidence demonstrates the contribution of self-regulated learning interventions to academic achievement in online and blended environments (Xu et al., 2023). Nevertheless, existing research on technology-assisted vocabulary learning has largely established the potential effectiveness of digital tools without fully explaining how learners experience vocabulary development within specific LMS-mediated contexts (Hao et al., 2021). Important gaps therefore remain in understanding the lived experiences of English majors, particularly regarding how lexical difficulty, affective responses, feedback delays, technological constraints, peer interaction, and independent learning intersect during LMS-based digital dialogue. This contextual and methodological gap is particularly relevant in Region XI, where evidence concerning English majors' experiences of vocabulary development within institutional LMS environments remains limited.

This study addresses these gaps by examining the lived experiences of 14 English majors in Region XI who had at least one academic year of experience using their institutional LMS. Specifically, the study asks: (1) What challenges do English majors encounter in vocabulary development within LMS-mediated interactions? (2) What coping mechanisms do they employ to address vocabulary-development difficulties during LMS digital dialogues? and (3) What insights do they gain regarding how LMS environments can support vocabulary development? The study contributes qualitative evidence concerning digital dialogue, vocabulary development, learner self-regulation, interaction, and technological conditions in Philippine higher education. Rather than seeking statistical generalization, it provides contextual and analytical insight into how English majors experience, negotiate, and respond to vocabulary-development challenges within LMS-mediated learning.

METHODOLOGY

Design

The study employed a qualitative phenomenological design within an interpretive orientation. This approach was appropriate because the research questions focused on participants' experiences and interpretations of vocabulary development within LMS-mediated digital dialogue. Rather than measuring the frequency or statistical relationships of predefined variables, the study sought to identify shared patterns in how participants experienced lexical difficulty, interaction, feedback, technological constraints, coping practices, and opportunities for vocabulary development. The analytical orientation was consistent with the study's focus on interaction and digitally mediated learning. Interaction provides opportunities for learners to negotiate meaning and develop language through communication and feedback (Loewen & Sato, 2018). The Community of Inquiry framework likewise conceptualizes meaningful online learning through the interaction of social, cognitive, and teaching dimensions (Garrison et al., 1999). These perspectives informed the interpretation of how interactional and instructional conditions shaped participants' experiences.

Participants and Sampling

The study involved 14 English majors enrolled in colleges in Region XI during Academic Year 2025–2026. Purposive sampling was used because participants needed direct experience with LMS-mediated digital dialogue and vocabulary learning. Purposive sampling is appropriate when researchers require participants who can provide information-rich accounts relevant to a specific phenomenon (Suen et al., 2014).

Participants were included if they were bona fide students in Region XI during the study period, officially enrolled as English majors at any year level, and had at least one academic year of experience using their institution's LMS. Students outside Region XI, students who were not English majors, and students without LMS experience were excluded. The sample size was determined in relation to the depth of the phenomenological inquiry and the recurrence of patterns across the collected accounts. The researchers did not seek statistical representativeness. Instead, the objective was to obtain sufficiently detailed experiential accounts to address the three research questions.

Instruments and Collection

Semi-structured interview guides were developed in accordance with the three research questions. Separate guides were used for the individual in-depth interviews and focus group discussion. The questions were open-ended and allowed participants to describe their experiences in their own terms. Three language teachers with relevant expertise reviewed the

instruments. Their comments were incorporated before implementation, and the instruments underwent a dry run before final use. During data collection, probing questions were used when participants provided accounts requiring clarification or elaboration. Individual in-depth interviews and the focus group discussion were conducted in mutually agreed settings. With participants' consent, sessions were audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim. The use of both individual interviews and a focus group discussion provided complementary forms of qualitative evidence and allowed the researchers to compare individual and group accounts.

Analysis

The researchers employed reflexive thematic analysis based on the six-phase process described by Braun and Clarke (2006). The analysis began with familiarization through repeated reading of transcripts and listening to the audio recordings. Initial codes were then generated systematically across the dataset. The researchers subsequently examined relationships among codes and developed candidate themes.

Themes were reviewed at both the coded-extract level and the level of the complete dataset. Themes were refined to ensure that they represented coherent patterns and were adequately supported by participant accounts. The researchers then defined and named the themes according to their central meanings and relationships with the research questions. The final analytical narrative integrated participant quotations with interpretation and relevant literature. The analysis was therefore not limited to categorizing responses. It examined how participants constructed meanings around vocabulary difficulty, digital interaction, feedback, learner autonomy, technological limitations, and coping practices. An audit trail was maintained to document coding decisions and analytical developments.

Reflexivity

The researchers recognized that their professional experiences as English education researchers and instructors familiar with LMS-mediated learning could influence interpretation. Reflexive journaling was therefore undertaken during data collection and analysis. Interview questions were maintained as open-ended and non-leading, and preliminary interpretations were repeatedly checked against the original transcripts. The researchers treated reflexivity as part of the analytical process rather than assuming that researcher influence could be completely eliminated. This approach is consistent with the reflexive orientation of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Ethical Considerations

Ethical clearance was obtained from the university's Research Ethics Committee before data collection. Participants received information concerning the study's purpose, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and right to withdraw without penalty. Participants were represented through anonymized codes, and audio recordings and transcripts were stored in password-protected files accessible only to the researchers. Because some questions concerned participants' academic difficulties and perceived language competence, participants were permitted to pause, decline to answer, or discontinue interviews. These procedures were implemented to protect participant welfare and confidentiality.

Rigor and Limitations

The study's qualitative and single-region design limits the transferability of its findings beyond contexts with similar characteristics. The sample consisted of 14 purposively selected English majors, and the findings should therefore not be interpreted as statistically representative of English majors generally. The reliance on participant accounts also introduces the possibility of recall and self-presentation effects. Rigor was strengthened through methodological triangulation involving individual interviews and a focus group discussion, repeated engagement with the dataset, systematic coding, reflexive journaling, an audit trail, and the use of verbatim quotations. The contextualized presentation of participants' experiences further supports readers' assessment of transferability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Thematic analysis generated five themes addressing the challenges experienced by participants, six themes concerning coping mechanisms, and six themes concerning participants' insights into LMS-supported vocabulary development. The organization of the findings follows the three research questions and preserves the participants' original accounts.

Complex Vocabulary and Limited Lexical Repertoire

Participants reported that academic jargon, sophisticated lexical items, and contextual meanings frequently challenged their existing vocabulary knowledge. Their accounts indicate that exposure to complex vocabulary can simultaneously create learning opportunities and reveal limitations in learners' lexical repertoires. IDI-002 stated: "The first major challenge I encountered was dealing with academic jargon... unfamiliar terms that I don't fully grasp yet." FGD-001 explained: "One of the biggest hurdles is encountering 'highfalutin' or overly sophisticated words."

FGD-002 stated: "My main struggle is having a limited range of vocabulary, which makes it hard to express my thoughts precisely." IDI-007 explained: "I struggled to find the right words to express my ideas clearly." FGD-005 added: "The biggest struggle... is understanding the specific context of how a word is used in a sentence."

The findings suggest that lexical difficulty involves both vocabulary breadth and contextual knowledge. Learners may recognize individual words while still experiencing difficulty interpreting their meaning within particular sentences or producing them accurately. This distinction is important because vocabulary learning requires repeated and meaningful encounters with lexical items rather than isolated exposure (Nation, 2022). Digital vocabulary tools may provide useful supplementary support by giving learners access to definitions, examples, and additional opportunities for practice (Babazade, 2024; Hao et al., 2021).

Affective Barriers to Confident Vocabulary Use

Participants described anxiety, hesitation, overthinking, self-doubt, and fear of embarrassment as factors that reduced their willingness to use unfamiliar vocabulary. IDI-002 stated: "I often feel a bit of anxiety about whether I'm using the term

correctly." FGD-001 explained: "I feel a lot of pressure... I often find myself overthinking every word I use." IDI-007 stated: "This makes me even more hesitant to try out new or unfamiliar words." FGD-002 explained: "Nobody corrects my word choice right away... I am always left wondering if my sentences sound natural or weird." IDI-005 added: "I personally didn't want to look like I didn't understand basic concepts... I would just stay quiet."

These accounts demonstrate that vocabulary learning involves affective as well as cognitive processes. When learners are uncertain about their lexical choices, they may reduce their participation and avoid experimenting with unfamiliar vocabulary. Interaction can provide opportunities for learners to test language, receive responses, and refine their understanding (Loewen & Sato, 2018). Online engagement strategies are similarly important because interaction with peers, instructors, and content can shape students' participation in digital environments (Martin & Bolliger, 2018).

Delayed Feedback and Resulting Learning Gaps

Delayed instructor responses were identified as another important challenge. Participants explained that waiting for clarification or correction sometimes weakened the connection between the original language problem and the eventual feedback. IDI-003 stated: "The biggest limitation is the delayed response time when asking for help." FGD-002 explained: "The lack of immediate feedback... it feels like it just goes into a void." FGD-005 stated: "Some instructors take a long time to grade or comment... we are left in the dark." IDI-007 explained: "Since the interaction isn't immediate, I can't get instant feedback on whether I'm using a word correctly." FGD-001 attributed some delays to workload: "Our instructors are overwhelmed with workload... feedback until the semester is almost over."

The findings indicate that feedback timing is particularly relevant to digitally mediated vocabulary learning. Technology-mediated feedback research suggests that the characteristics and delivery of feedback affect learners' opportunities to respond to language-related information (Loncar et al., 2023). In the present study, delayed responses were experienced as gaps in the learning process because participants could not immediately resolve uncertainty concerning vocabulary meaning or usage.

Technological Constraints on Student Engagement

Participants reported connectivity problems, delayed notifications, limited interface functionality, and insufficient integrated vocabulary support. IDI-005 stated: "If the connection becomes unstable, the audio gets choppy... I couldn't catch it clearly." IDI-007 explained: "One of the main issues... delayed notifications... we often end up cramming." FGD-001 stated: "The LMS interface is very plain and just text-based." IDI-003 explained: "Having a built-in dictionary within the platform would be a huge help." FGD-007 stated: "We have to constantly leave the LMS app to look things up."

These accounts correspond with documented technological challenges in Philippine online learning (Almahasees et al., 2021; Barrot et al., 2021). For language learning, such limitations may be particularly consequential because learners frequently require immediate access to lexical information and opportunities for communicative practice. The growing use of artificial intelligence in language learning suggests possible avenues for supplementary support, although such tools require appropriate pedagogical guidance (Alhusaiyan, 2025).

Limited Interactive Opportunities

Participants also described limited direct interaction, restricted visibility of peer responses, and passive participation. IDI-003 stated: "One of the main struggles... was the lack of direct interaction." IDI-007 explained: "We are unable to see the responses of our classmates." IDI-004 stated: "Online classes become really passive... there's that barrier in communication." FGD-005 explained: "It feels more like an assignment submission portal rather than an interactive digital space." IDI-004 added: "Nobody responds or actively engages on the platform thread."

These experiences indicate that the instructional use of an LMS may be more important than the platform itself. Discussion environments can facilitate learning when they encourage meaningful participation, interaction, and engagement (Gasmi, 2022). The Community of Inquiry framework similarly emphasizes the relationship among social, cognitive, and teaching dimensions in online learning (Garrison et al., 1999). The participants' descriptions suggest that when these dimensions are weakly represented, the LMS may function primarily as a repository rather than as a language-learning environment.

Coping Mechanisms

Using Digital Tools

Participants used AI platforms, search engines, dictionaries, translation tools, and language-learning applications to address vocabulary difficulties. IDI-003 stated: "Usually, I copy the confusing instruction and prompt ChatGPT by saying, 'Help me understand this instruction.'" IDI-002 explained: "I immediately look it up on Google or in a dictionary." FGD-003 stated: "I use Google Translate to find its synonyms... then I ask an AI if my grammar is correct." FGD-006 explained: "We have to maximize technology to compensate for the lack of immediate feedback." IDI-004 stated: "Duolingo and Grammarly... really help me learn and apply vocabulary."

These practices illustrate learner agency in technology-assisted vocabulary learning. Digital tools can provide immediate access to lexical information and opportunities for repeated practice (Hao et al., 2021). Artificial intelligence may also provide additional language-learning support, although learners require guidance in evaluating and using AI-generated information appropriately (Alhusaiyan, 2025).

Independent Vocabulary Learning

Participants also adopted self-directed strategies, including contextual inference, independent searching, and personal responsibility for vocabulary learning. IDI-002 stated: "If I encounter a word or concept I don't understand, I immediately look it up." FGD-005 explained: "I try to figure out the meaning based on the professor's sentence first before verifying it on Google." IDI-002 stated: "I rely on context clues... I read the entire sentence or paragraph." IDI-003 explained: "If I rely too

heavily on waiting for a response... I will fall behind." FGD-002 emphasized: "Independent study is a must... I must be prepared to research vocabulary on my own."

These practices reflect self-regulated learning, which involves learners' active management of their learning processes. Self-regulated learning interventions have been associated with vocabulary development among English language learners (Deng & Trainin, 2023), while broader evidence indicates the relevance of self-regulated learning in online and blended environments (Xu et al., 2023).

Habitual Vocabulary Reinforcement

Participants reported reading, repeated application, vocabulary recording, flashcards, and daily communication as strategies for reinforcing lexical knowledge. IDI-001 stated: "My main strategy is reading. I read a lot of books, especially fiction." FGD-002 explained: "You have to actually use it in actual assignments to remember it." IDI-005 stated: "Whenever I hear an unfamiliar word... I list it down immediately." IDI-006 explained: "If I have time, I create physical flashcards." The same participant stated: "I make a conscious effort to use that word in my daily conversations."

These practices reflect the importance of repeated encounters and active vocabulary use. Vocabulary development requires opportunities to encounter, retrieve, and apply lexical items across contexts (Nation, 2022). Informal digital learning can further increase opportunities for repeated English exposure (Lee, 2019).

Peer and Instructor Support

Participants used peers and instructors as sources of explanation, feedback, encouragement, and language practice.

IDI-002 stated: "Many of my peers have a very deep vocabulary, and I learn a lot just by interacting with them." FGD-002 explained: "Messaging my classmates on Messenger... helps me improve my sentences." FGD-001 stated: "When I see my classmates are also struggling... I feel less pressured." FGD-006 explained: "If you ask them directly about a word, they are always happy to explain." IDI-006 stated: "Teaching others is the most effective method."

The findings demonstrate that interaction can function as both a learning resource and a confidence-building mechanism. Learners can develop language through interaction, negotiation, feedback, and collaborative meaning-making (Loewen & Sato, 2018). Online engagement research likewise emphasizes the importance of meaningful interaction in sustaining participation (Martin & Bolliger, 2018).

Managing Emotional Stress

Participants described taking breaks, seeking social support, remaining patient, and reframing difficulties as strategies for maintaining engagement. IDI-003 stated: "I usually vent or share my concerns with my friends." FGD-002 explained: "I step away from the screen for a few minutes to calm my mind." FGD-003 stated: "I just try to accept that learning a language takes time." FGD-006 explained: "I try to be understanding and wait patiently instead of stressing out." IDI-005 stated: "I remind myself that I am learning."

These accounts demonstrate that participants recognized emotional regulation as part of their learning processes. Research on emotions in second-language acquisition emphasizes the importance of affective experiences in understanding language-learning processes (Li, 2020). The findings therefore suggest that supportive digital learning environments should allow learners to experiment with language without making mistakes excessively threatening to participation.

Expanding Learning Beyond the LMS

Participants supplemented formal LMS learning through other digital platforms and informal communication environments. IDI-004 stated: "I go away from the platform... to find opportunities outside the platform to use the language."

FGD-007 explained: "Combining formal LMS learning with casual peer support on Messenger." IDI-004 stated: "Vocabulary contents on my algorithm really help me learn and apply them." IDI-007 explained: "Google Classroom is better because we can discuss through the chat feature." FGD-007 stated: "Discussing lesson vocabulary informally with friends helps me understand the tone and meaning."

These practices indicate that learners construct broader digital learning ecosystems beyond their institutional LMS. Informal digital learning can contribute to vocabulary development by increasing exposure to English in diverse contexts (Lee, 2019). The findings therefore support a complementary relationship between formal LMS instruction and purposeful informal digital engagement.

Insights Regarding LMS-Supported Vocabulary Development

Participants' insights indicate that vocabulary development was understood as an active, contextual, socially mediated, and self-regulated process. They distinguished between vocabulary recognition and productive use, emphasized the importance of context, used alternative digital resources, and expressed a need for more interactive LMS environments. IDI-001 stated: "Vocabulary growth in college cannot happen passively; it requires deep personal initiative." IDI-007 explained: "Expanding vocabulary cannot be done by just memorizing definitions. It requires consistent practice." IDI-003 stated: "If you don't expose yourself to literature, you will never encounter new words." FGD-002 explained: "Just looking up a word's meaning isn't enough—you have to actively use it."

These accounts reinforce the distinction between lexical exposure and productive vocabulary development. Repeated encounters and meaningful use are important components of vocabulary learning (Nation, 2022). Participants also recognized a gap between passive and active vocabulary. IDI-005 stated: "My passive vocabulary is much stronger than my active vocabulary." FGD-001 explained: "I can understand complex words when I read them slowly, but I still struggle using them naturally." IDI-007 stated: "You have to apply the word in the right context." FGD-002 explained: "I have a hard time choosing the right synonyms and distinguishing between formal and informal tones." FGD-006 stated:

"I need to expand my knowledge on word tones, not just basic definitions." These accounts indicate that learners' concerns extend beyond vocabulary size to contextual and pragmatic appropriateness. Productive language use requires learners to select vocabulary according to communicative purpose, audience, and context (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2023).

Participants also described the importance of alternative digital resources. IDI-001 stated:

"I developed a practical strategy of utilizing alternative AI platforms." IDI-002 explained: "AI-powered tools provide significantly richer contextual examples and real-time explanations." FGD-003 stated: "Technology like AI and translation tools can be great study assistants." FGD-006 explained: "We have to maximize technology to compensate for the lack of immediate feedback."

The participants' accounts are consistent with the growing role of digital technologies in language learning (Alhusaiyan, 2025) and with evidence concerning technology-assisted vocabulary learning (Hao et al., 2021). However, the findings also indicate that technology was sometimes used to compensate for limitations in formal instructional interaction. This distinction is important: digital tools may supplement language learning, but their use does not necessarily resolve underlying interactional or instructional constraints. Participants further emphasized independent learning. IDI-003 stated: "Vocabulary growth requires a lot of personal initiative... the platform itself won't teach you much." IDI-005 explained: "I started practicing rigorous note-taking in a personal journal." IDI-006 stated: "I create physical flashcards... and revisit these cards periodically." FGD-002 explained: "Independent study is a must... I cannot expect immediate corrections." FGD-004 stated: "I know how to use AI tools strategically to digest massive amounts of academic vocabulary." These findings are consistent with research linking self-regulated learning with vocabulary development and online learning outcomes (Deng & Trainin, 2023; Xu et al., 2023). They suggest that LMS design should provide opportunities for learner autonomy rather than encouraging complete dependence on instructor responses.

Finally, participants proposed specific ways in which LMS environments could better support vocabulary development. FGD-001 stated: "Adding a built-in dictionary or vocabulary tool directly into the platform." FGD-005 explained: "An auto-vocabulary tracking feature... personalized vocabulary list to review." IDI-006 stated: "The platform focuses almost exclusively on reading and writing... speaking and listening are neglected." IDI-004 explained: "Face-to-face classes do tend to have that kind of spontaneity." FGD-006 stated: "It would be incredibly helpful if we could participate... even without internet." These suggestions demonstrate that participants' expectations extend beyond content delivery. They envision LMS environments that integrate vocabulary support, interaction, multimodal language practice, and accessibility. Online learning research emphasizes the importance of engagement strategies (Martin & Bolliger, 2018), while research on collaborative synchronous online learning indicates the value of interactive environments for language education (Karacan & Bekereci-Şahin, 2025). The findings therefore suggest that LMS-based vocabulary development may be strengthened by integrating lexical support with opportunities for communication and collaborative learning.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study examined how English majors in Region XI experienced vocabulary development through LMS-mediated digital dialogue. Five challenges characterized their experiences: complex vocabulary and limited lexical repertoire, affective barriers, delayed feedback, technological constraints, and limited interaction. These challenges indicate that digital access alone does not ensure meaningful vocabulary development. Participants demonstrated agency in addressing these challenges through digital tools, independent learning, habitual vocabulary practice, peer and instructor support, emotional regulation, and learning beyond the LMS. Their accounts further indicate that vocabulary development involves a progression from exposure and recognition toward contextual interpretation, productive use, and sustained practice. The study contributes contextual qualitative evidence showing that LMS-based vocabulary development is shaped by the interaction of technological affordances, instructional practices, social interaction, learner autonomy, and affective conditions. The findings support the development of LMS environments that provide meaningful dialogue, contextualized vocabulary practice, timely feedback, integrated lexical resources, and opportunities for self-regulated learning. Given the qualitative and geographically bounded design, these implications should be interpreted as context-specific rather than statistically generalizable.

English language instructors should integrate vocabulary development into interactive LMS activities rather than limiting vocabulary learning to independent reading or assignment completion. Activities should provide opportunities for contextual interpretation, productive use, peer interaction, revision, and feedback. Institutions should consider improving LMS accessibility and functionality through reliable connectivity support, integrated vocabulary resources, responsive notifications, and opportunities for synchronous and asynchronous interaction. Instructor workload should also be considered when designing expectations for online feedback. Learners should be encouraged to develop self-regulated vocabulary practices involving contextual inference, vocabulary recording, repeated retrieval, reading, writing, and communicative application. Digital tools and artificial intelligence may be used as supplementary resources, provided learners receive guidance on evaluating the accuracy and appropriateness of generated information. LMS developers and instructional designers should consider features that directly address language learners' needs, including vocabulary tracking, dictionaries, contextual examples, interactive lexical tasks, multimodal activities, and offline-accessible resources where technically feasible. Future research should examine the phenomenon across multiple Philippine regions and institutions, compare different LMS designs, investigate specific vocabulary-learning interventions, and examine how artificial intelligence can be integrated into LMS-mediated vocabulary development. Longitudinal research could further examine changes in learners' vocabulary strategies and productive lexical use over time.

References

- Alhusaiyan, E. (2025). A systematic review of current trends in artificial intelligence in foreign language learning. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, 5(1), 1-16.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/SJLS-07-2024-0039>
- Almahasees, Z., Mohsen, K., & Amin, M. O. (2021, May). Faculty's and students' perceptions of online learning during COVID-19. In *Frontiers in education* (Vol. 6, p. 638470). Frontiers Media SA. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.638470>
- Babazade, Y. (2024). The impact of digital tools on vocabulary development in second language learning. *Journal of Azerbaijan Language and Education Studies*, 1(1), 35-41.
<https://doi.org/10.69760/jales.2024.00103>

- Barrot, J. S., Llenares, I. I., & Del Rosario, L. S. (2021). Students' online learning challenges during the pandemic and how they cope with them: The case of the Philippines. *Education and information technologies*, 26(6), 7321-7338. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10589-x>
- Bibauw, S., Van den Noortgate, W., Francois, T., & Desmet, P. (2022). Dialogue systems for language learning: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning & Technology*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.64152/10125/73488>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Deng, Q., & Trainin, G. (2023). The effect of a self-regulated intervention on vocabulary knowledge and self-regulated learning skills for English language learners. *Reading Psychology*, 44(7), 761-791. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2023.2187908>
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2023). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003004943>
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (1999). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The internet and higher education*, 2(2-3), 87-105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516\(00\)00016-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6)
- Gasmi, A. A. (2022). Through the Lens of Students: How Online Discussion Forums Affect Students' Learning. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 5(4), 669-684. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.291>
- Hao, T., Wang, Z., & Ardasheva, Y. (2021). Technology-assisted vocabulary learning for EFL learners: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 14(3), 645-667. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2021.1917028>
- Karacan, C. G., & Bekereci-Şahin, M. (2025). Exploring a Collaborative Synchronous Online Learning Environment in an Initial Language Teacher Education Program. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, 16(3), 477. <https://doi.org/10.37237/202404>
- Lee, J. S. (2019). Informal digital learning of English and second language vocabulary outcomes: Can quantity conquer quality?. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(2), 767-778. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12599>
- Li, C. (2020). Emotions in second language acquisition: A critical review and research agenda. *Shanghai International Studies University*. <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/32797>
- Loewen, S., & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. *Language teaching*, 51(3), 285-329. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000125>
- Loncar, M., Schams, W., & Liang, J. S. (2023). Multiple technologies, multiple sources: Trends and analyses of the literature on technology-mediated feedback for L2 English writing published from 2015-2019. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 36(4), 722-784. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1943452>
- Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. *Online learning*, 22(1), 205-222. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v22i1.1092>
- Nation, P. (2022). Teaching and learning vocabulary. In *Handbook of practical second language teaching and learning* (pp. 397-408). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003106609>
- Suen, L. J. W., Huang, H. M., & Lee, H. H. (2014). A comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *Hu li za zhi*, 61(3), 105. <https://doi.org/10.6224/JN.61.3.105>
- Tarrayo, V. N., Anudin, A. G., Mendoza, H. B., & Parungao-Callueng, E. S. (2022). Challenges and opportunities in teaching writing online amidst the pandemic: Voices from English language teachers in Philippine universities. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, 47(4), 74-90. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2022v47n4.5>
- Tenedero, P. P. P., Lintao, R. B., & Madrunio, M. R. (2022). The digital reshaping of English instruction in a Philippine university during the time of pandemic. *Asian Journal of English Language Studies (AJELS) Volume*, 62. <https://doi.org/10.59960/10.a2>
- Xu, Z., Zhao, Y., Zhang, B., Liew, J., & Kogut, A. (2023). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of self-regulated learning interventions on academic achievement in online and blended environments in K-12 and higher education. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 42(16), 2911-2931. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2022.2151935>