



**JOURNAL OF ADVANCED
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**

ISSN: 0976-9595

Editorial Team

Editorial Board Members

Dr. Hazim Jabbar Shah Ali

Country: University of Baghdad , Abu-Ghraib , Iraq.

Specialization: Avian Physiology and Reproduction.

Dr. Khalid Nabih Zaki Rashed

Country: Dokki, Egypt.

Specialization: Pharmaceutical and Drug Industries.

Dr. Manzoor Khan Afridi

Country: Islamabad, Pakistan.

Specialization: Politics and International Relations.

Seyyed Mahdi Javazadeh

Country: Mashhad Iran.

Specialization: Agricultural Sciences.

Dr. Turapova Nargiza Ahmedovna

Country: Uzbekistan, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Specialization: Art and Humanities, Education

Dr. Muataz A. Majeed

Country: INDIA

Specialization: Atomic Physics.

Dr Zakaria Fouad Fawzy Hassan

Country: Egypt

Specialization: Agriculture and Biological

Dr. Subha Ganguly

Country: India

Specialization: Microbiology and Veterinary Sciences.

Dr. KANDURI VENKATA LAKSHMI NARASIMHACHARYULU

Country: India.

Specialization: Mathematics.

Dr. Mohammad Ebrahim

Country: Iran

Specialization: Structural Engineering

Dr. Malihe Moeini

Country: IRAN

Specialization: Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology

Dr. I. Anand shaker

Country: India.

Specialization: Clinical Biochemistry

Dr. Magdy Shayboub

Country: Taif University, Egypt

Specialization: Artificial Intelligence

Kozikhodjayev Jumakhodja Hamdamkhodjayevich

Country: Uzbekistan

Senior Lecturer, Namangan State University

Dr. Ramachandran Guruprasad

Country: National Aerospace Laboratories, Bangalore, India.

Specialization: Library and Information Science.

Dr. Alaa Kareem Niamah

Country: Iraq.

Specialization: Biotechnology and Microbiology.

Dr. Abdul Aziz

Country: Pakistan

Specialization: General Pharmacology and Applied Pharmacology.

Dr. Khalmurzaeva Nadira - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Japanese Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Mirzakhmedova Hulkar - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Iranian-Afghan Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Dilip Kumar Behara

Country: India

Specialization: Chemical Engineering, Nanotechnology, Material Science and Solar Energy.

Dr. Neda Nozari

Country: Iran

Specialization: Obesity, Gastrointestinal Diseases.

Bazarov Furkhat Odilovich

Country: Uzbekistan

Tashkent institute of finance

Shavkatjon Joraboyev Tursunqulovich

Country: Uzbekistan

Namangan State University

C/O Advanced Scientific Research,

8/21 Thamostraran Street,

Arisipalayam, Salem

THE LEXICAL APPROACH: COLLOCABILITY, FLUENCY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING

Rakhimova Shakhnoza Abdusharipovna

Allanov Didar Dovranovich

Allaberganova Umida Mammatovna

Lecturers, Department of Interfaculty Foreign Languages, Urgench State University of science and innovations.

Abstract As a composite of language form and function, lexical chunks indicate the positive interaction of semantics, syntax and pragmatics to promote further development of language utterances. The theory of lexical chunks is popular for English teachers to adopt in their classes. Based on theories of lexical chunks and lexical approach, this article's aims to discover the effective way for the English classes so as to improve students' language proficiency.

Keywords lexical chunks, lexical approach, college English classes

Introduction

English teachers should pay much attention to apply effective teaching approach in their classes in order to perfect their teaching and better students' language acquisition. As for the teaching approach, many have been developed, such as multiple intelligences teaching approach, comprehensive teaching approach, tentative approach, discipline-based English teaching approach, genre-based teaching approach, lexical approach, among which the lexical approach has aroused much attention to improve language learning. Teachers have become more aware of lexical chunks in their English teaching for the past decades. Thus, researches on ready-made chunks of language start to prevail, which consider the chunks as important as productive rules. This study tries to explore the appropriate lexical approach applied in college English classroom to see if it is influential to improve the English learning ability of students. Besides, students are expected to raise consciousness of lexical chunks and master some learning strategies.

English as a foreign language (EFL) learners, mainly intermediate, seem to be marked down because they don't know the four of five major collocations that serve as the defining vocabulary for the main idea they are writing about (Hill, 2000). This departure from the natural use of language is due to the violation of what Sinclair (1987) calls the "idiom principle". According to this idiomatic account of language production, any text is in nature a compilation of prefabricated utterances and semi-preconstructed phrases that are stored in our mental lexicon and retrieved as single choices for later use (Wray, 2002). Evidence that supports the pervasiveness of formulaic sequences, namely collocations, in the written production of language abounds in the literature. For instance, according Erman and Warren (2000) more than 40% of native speaker writing is in nature formulaic. In addition, Glucksberg (1989) asserts that on average four collocations are produced in every minute of fluent language use. Thus, non-native speakers may be at a disadvantage of producing language in violation of the holistic nature (idiom principle) and instead in favor of the use of separate words and novel constructs. This

tendency, which Sinclair (1991) refers to as “the open choice principle”, is usually attributed to the practices of unorthodox methods the likes of the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). Such primitive practices are very likely to produce L2 learners who are grammatically competent but communicative and collocationally impaired in the sense that their choice of words will be more typical of the first language (L1) than the target language. For this reason, our study proposes a set of classroom practices based on the lexical approach in order to increase EFL learners’ sensitivity towards idiomatic word combinations. The motive behind conducting this study is to answer the main question of whether there is any relationship between the implementation of the lexical approach (variable A) and the improvement of EFL learners’ collocational accuracy and ability to operate on the idiom principle (variable B). Our line of researching is then guided by the assumption that helping EFL learners acquire the habit of chunking the input reinforces their tendency to exhibit native-like output.

Review of Researchers

The Lexical Approach perceives language as being made up of ‘chunks’: multi-words, sentence heads, and institutionalised sentences. For example, the verb ‘make’ is difficult to explain to students when it stands alone. A dictionary definition may be ‘construct’ or ‘fabricate’, but this does not explain common phrases such as: “make a mess”, “make your mind up”, “make your bed”, “make amends for”, “make out” (I can’t see/hear it, I can’t make it out), “make-up” (cosmetics, restore friendship, invent). Thus, the function of this verb cannot be explained by one term or even rationally. It is often impossible for a teacher to provide a reason for the use of certain lexis and Lewis (1993) as well as many others (Brown, 2001; Cook 1993/2016; Cunningham & Moor, 2005; Ellis, 1985/2005; Harmer, 2005; Nattinger, 1980; Richards, 2006; Willis, 1990) maintain that it is best to admit this as a considerable amount of language is arbitrary. He cites the examples: “Happy New Year”, “Happy Christmas”, “Merry Christmas”, “Happy Birthday”; but never “Merry Birthday”. Hence, there is no lexical explanation for this (Lewis, 1993). The Lexical Approach regards teaching functions as less important than the CLT because it perpetuates that students already know the functions in their L1, thus all they need to learn is how to use them in the English language. Functions without lexis are not useful, what students need to learn is all the lexis they need to express for the function that they are learning. The Lexical Approach regards students’ prior knowledge and experiences important to the learning process. In the CLT part of the language for functions was irrelevant, therefore it was time-wasting. In the Lexical Approach instead of teaching irrelevant language, collocations can be presented. Authentic language is relevant to the lives of students and they will be more likely to acquire if the teacher offers useful lexical phrases so that they can produce coherently (Cook, 2016; Ellis, 2005; Harmer, 2005; Lewis, 1997; Richards, 2006; Willis, 1990). Interestingly, Lewis (1993) concurs to an extent with the controversial linguist Stephen Krashen (1985) that there is a similar process involved in L1 and L2 acquisition. He states that most people acquire their mother tongue ‘naturally’ and

many learners have “acquired an L2 in precisely the same way” (Lewis, 1993, p. 54). As the majority of second language learning happens in a classroom environment, then there is a valid case for “making language use in the classroom resemble, rather than be different from, real language” (Lewis, 1993, pp. 54-5). However, he does not advocate a spontaneous and unplanned teacher approach because, without direction, the learner is unlikely to be empowered. Nor does Lewis (1993) advocate the total omission of taught grammar from language lessons.

Lexis was overlooked in language teaching as grammar was traditionally considered to be the jewel in the crown of language. Moreover, having effective communicative skills was seen as a matter of mastering the grammatical system of a given language. However, by the publications of Lewis' new views (1993, 1997, 2000) on language use, the latter becomes defined by the lexical approach's key principle as “consisting of grammaticalized lexis, not lexicalized grammar” (Lewis, 1993, p.36). Therefore, any fluent use of language is in nature a successful use of the building blocks of language, in particular collocation, which is the core element of the lexis approach. The central role of collocations in the creation of meaning was clearly explained by Lewis (1993) in the sense that we cannot, for example, decode the verb bark without referring to the noun dog. Since lexis carries meaning more than grammar, collocations have a generative power of meaning and this qualifies such a habitual co-occurrence of words to be the fulcrum of any classroom practice.

Implementing lexical approach in teaching process

Interestingly, Kryszewska (2003) has found the key elements of this theory useful in practice. She has designed her method of encouraging young learners to speak with some confidence during class. The fact that young learners are more motivated for language learning (Bećirović & Hurić-Bećirović, 2017) further contributes to the success of the method. She aims to elicit conversation from beginners by building on vocabulary that they already possess and in a way that produces quite sophisticated dialogue without using full sentences; i.e. “chunking” (Kryszewska, 2003). As her students grow in confidence, she offers more input that is comprehensible and in a realistic and relevant context. She cites one particular conversation with a beginner that would normally require the past simple tense (not yet acquired):

T: Maciek. Your weekend... Tell me.

S: Oh, nice. Very nice.

T: Your grandmother's house?

S: Yes, in Malbork.

T: A long walk?

S: Yes, to the castle.

T: And later?

S: Computer games.

T: How long?

S: 2 hours. My limit. You know. (Kryszewska, 2003, p. 2).

She was surprised when the boy aged 11 suddenly took charge of the conversation:

S: And you?

T: Oh typical.

S: Much work?

T: Well, some.

S: And then?

T: A film on TV

S: What title?

T: Don't remember. About the war.

S: No walk?

T: No, too lazy. In this case, the learner discovered that he could sustain a meaningful dialogue with the little language he had at his disposal. Kriyszewska (2003) goes on to maintain that in her experience, communication through “chunks” was also well received by lowlevel adult learners. She puts this down to the fact that they enjoy communicating without fear of making grammatical errors and her experience echoes the theorists when she cites that “an adult learner will often delay engaging in conversations until he/she is sure of error-free utterance”. Thus, this may delay authentic communication (Kryszewska, 2003, p. 3), which seems to be the case in many different EFL contexts (Dervić & Spahić, 2018; Rizvić & Bećirović, 2017).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

How to Apply the Lexical Approach during the class

Students' involvement into authentic materials.

Authentic materials are widely applied practice means of the language such as news, movies, songs, novels, channels, menus, videos. They are not just learning materials like manuals or tutorials; they are brand new materials, which make everyone's organ of perception really work. One of the platforms of full of authentic materials is FluentU. FluentU takes real-world videos—like music videos, movie trailers, news and inspiring talks—and turns them into personalized language learning lessons. FluentU takes a step back from the traditional textbook approach and encourages students to learn languages in a more natural way. **Highlight lexical chunks every chance you get.**

In the beginning your students hardly catch each of the collocations they encounter but you can help them with this. Just note them and explain the meaning and make some oral exercises in order to work with chunks. This would help them run directly into practice.

Translating chunks from the target language into English (and vice versa).

Usage of resources like idiom dictionaries for lexical chunks such as —The Big Red Book of Spanish Idioms,|| —2001 French and English Idioms|| or —German: Fast Track Learning from English Idioms would be one of the best methods.||

Consolidate prior chunks in later exercises.

Most teachers are most likely effectively acquainted with —connecting|| as a showing procedure: It is basically assessing old material you have instructed before by joining it into the new exercises. Suppose the class learned prepositional expressions like "at the corner," "before" and "go past" only couple days before. At

the point when you're up for a story or playing a great language game, remember these expressions for the exercises so they will stay new in your understudies brains. In a story, for instance, it could be said: "The princess was enticed to go past the doors. Recollect this expression, class? 'Go past.' Say it with me... Again! Alright, presently back to our story." The exercises should be a blend of old expressions that you survey and new ones that you present. The audits of past exercises will give understudies a whiff of the recognizable and give them certainty, while the new ones will make things fascinating and keep the learning cycle pushing ahead.

Invest in listening and reading activities.

While you need to sharpen your class senses of finding lexical chumps in the objective language, you will have to give them a lot to read and listen to (preferably with hard copies). With rehashed hearable introduction, their ears will become used to the rhythm and rhyme of the target language. Through a lot of reading, the normally happening phrases that pepper real material will start to slowly pop out of the page and poke them in the eye. These tips will assist you with working the lexical methodology into your language classroom. With this methodology, your understudies will get the objective language quicker, and they will sound more familiar, as well! Yet, do not think this is the main instrument in your box: the wide range of various encouraging techniques and ways to deal with unknown dialect instructing has a spot in your collection also. Used together, these instruments will send your understudies rushing towards fluency!

Conclusion

The emergence of the CLT and subsequently the Lexical Approach has created a dramatic turn-around in the field of language teaching. It is difficult to assess how successful the movement away from the traditional methods has been, but it is clear that emphasis is being placed on the communicative classroom; not only in the field of language teaching but also across the subject range in educational establishments. The Lexical Approach is a current 'buzzword' amongst language teachers and trainers and the fact that it is a holistic approach rather than just a suggestion for new syllabi means that it will be much harder to implement as often people are resistant to change. Some teachers are no doubt set in their 'methodological ways' and even if new texts and syllabi emerge, this does not necessarily mean that they will be delivered in a way conducive to the Lexical Approach. However, this approach requires a change in attitude towards the whole language teaching and learning process. The major space generally is taken up by the teaching of verb tenses and many limited grammar aspects and voice needs to be freed up for learners to receive lexically oriented input. More importantly, Willis (1990) points out that it would save time and complexity if the teaching of the conditionals is confined to making sure that if, might and could are understood and that some hypotheses are unreal. If that practice is not adopted, then language learners will continue to have problems.

Collocation is an important aspect of natural language processing and an essential prerequisite to produce native like language. This research paper therefore provides a major contribution to the ongoing discussion of the acquisition of native-

like building blocks. The instructional paradigm we tested in this study proved to be highly effective in the sense that helping EFL learners acquire the habit of perceiving language as building blocks correlates with the acquired ability to produce language idiomatically. In the light of this study results, it can be concluded that the success of the lexical approach lies in the fact that its underlining methodology is of more exploratory nature than explanatory one since the lexical nature of language itself is arbitrary, i.e. it is unlikely to be adequately explained by the grammatical system. Besides, developing learners' sensitivity towards the arbitrary nature of word co-occurrence in L2 can tremendously help them positively transfer their tendency from operating on the L1 idiom principle to that of the L2.

References:

- Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1997). *The BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations*. John Benjamins Pub. Co., Amsterdam, Philadelphia.
- Bolinger, D. (1979). *Meaning and Memory. Experience Forms: Their Cultural and Individual Place and Function*. 95-111.
- Chen, W. (2017). *Profiling Collocations in EFL Writing of Chinese Tertiary Learners*. RELC Journal. 0033688217716507.
- Durrant, P., & Schmitt, N. (2009). *To What Extent Do Native and Non-Native Writers Make Use of Collocations?* *International Review of Applied Linguistics*.47, 157-177.
- Erman, B., & Warren, B. (2000). *The Idiom Principle and the Open Choice Principle*. *Text-Interdisciplinary. Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 20 (1), 29-62.
- Glucksberg, S. (1989). *Metaphors in Conversation: How are they Understood? Why are they Used?* *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 4, 125--143.
- Granger, S. (1998). *Prefabricated Patterns in Advanced EFL Writing: Collocations and Formulae*. In A. Cowie (Ed.), *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications* (pp. 145-160). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Granger, S., & Bestgen, Y. (2014). *The Use of Collocations by Intermediate Vs. Advanced non-Native Writers: A Bigram-Based Study*. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52(3), 229-252.
- Hill J. (2000). *Revising priorities: From Grammatical Failure to Collocational Success*. in M. Lewis (ed.), *Teaching Collocation: Further Development in the Lexical Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 47 – 69.

Howarth, P. (1998). The Phraseology of Learners' Academic Writing. In A.P. Cowie (Ed.).

Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications (pp. 161-186). Oxford: Oxford

University Press.

Lewis, M. (1993). The Lexical Approach :The State of ELT and a Way Forward. London:

Teacher Training. Language Teaching Publication.

Lewis, M. (1997). Implementing the Lexical Approach: Putting Theory into Practice, Hove,

England: Language Teaching Publications.