

Assessment of Lexically-Based Language Teaching with Accomplishment of English Learning

¹Mrs. V. Suzan Shalini

Research Scholar: “Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation”, KLEF GUNTUR,
Vaddesaramm, A.P

Working As: Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities, Vignan’s Institute of
Management and Technology for Women, Ghatkesar, Telangana, Hyderabad –.

Email: suzanshalini22@gmail.com

²Dr. S. Krupa Sheela

“Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation”, KLEF GUNTUR, Vaddesaramm, A.P
E-mail: Sheela.sk@kluniversity.com

Abstract: The Objective of this study is to observe the proficiency of Telangana high school students and to improve it through the use of Lexically -Based Language Teach (LBLT). In the present study, for the students of high school a diagnostic test was conducted to check their vocabulary, Out of which only 60 students got selected for the main study and are facilitated to use the Corpus-based language instruction to search different aspects of word knowledge such as Collocations, Definitions, and word phrases. Its main motive is to provide students with reliable corpus-based language descriptions and aid language learning through real data, sixty academic words have been taken as an example. Within 6 weeks, an experimental group was taught how to explore new words and phrases by observing and understanding, generalizing each week in the process reveals their existing knowledge which can help students in improve language proficiency. Patterns of language use and working with concordances in the classroom found evidence for their efficacy. In terms of vocabulary and reading comprehension, there was a significant difference between the two groups, but not in terms of grammar.

1. Introduction

An important part of language learning and education, vocabulary is an important part of the life of language learners. Things, actions, and thoughts can't be communicated without a language's essential building blocks: words (Thornbury, 2002). Grammar is still an important part of learning a language, but even an intermediate student has a significant lexical memory load (Schmit, 2000). Intermediate and advanced learners' grammatical knowledge is no longer seen as the fundamental difference, but rather the advanced learners' vastly expanded mental vocabulary (Lewis, 1997).

Vocabulary teaching has been emphasized as a way to help students enhance their ability to communicate and perform in English. Vocabulary building should be approached in a number of ways. Conventional methods like translation, elucidation, and explanation are unable to substantially increase vocabulary knowledge because they do not prepare learners for effective language use (Nunan, 1999). Vocabulary research in second language education has increased as a consequence, as has discussion over the most effective methods for teaching and acquiring vocabulary. (Hedge, 2008).

Vocabulary selection has a considerable impact on vocabulary teaching and training, as does how it is presented in instructional materials (Willis & Willis, 2006). Their inclusion in textbooks is mostly dictated by the writers' personal intuition, experience, and grasp of the subject matter at hand. It's easy to ignore the context of each word and the regularity with which it's used in real-world conversation (Thornbury, 2002).

While a person may communicate well despite substantial grammatical errors, communication is lost when vocabulary difficulties exist. 'Without grammar, little can be articulated; nothing can be delivered,' David Wilkins said many years ago. (8) (Lewis, 2000). Collocations, according to some applied linguists, are the most critical component of foreign language acquisition because they are the linguistic feature that distinguishes native speakers of a language from non-native speakers (Hsu, 2009; Salimi, 2007 and Keshavarz; Schmi, 2010 and Durrant; and Nation, 2001, for example).

Because there are no clear rules for how words should be paired, collocations are problematic. Traditional grammar texts often do not include sections on collocations or methods for spotting them. A word's natural or most often collocates are seldom included in standard dictionaries, which instead provide just a few examples and a few pronunciation symbols. Collocations may be honed by repetition, more contact with native speakers, and an intuitive grasp of the grammatical structure of a foreign language.

Despite the importance of collocations in ESL, there has been a lack of study in this area. One possible reason is that teachers believe that students' use of synonyms and paraphrases is sufficient for effective communication (Farghal and Obiedat, 1995). The difficulty and allure of developing intuition for new linguistic phenomena might also be a factor. Collocational knowledge is unrelated to general language knowledge, according to Shokouhi and Mirsalari (2010). Because vocabulary is a major part of learning a new language, collocations are essential (Lewis, 1993; Hill, 2002). Because of this, the lexical approach's potential applications must be seized upon immediately.

The lexical approach was designed mainly as a form of language training that is lexical in nature. According to Michael Lewis (2008), the inventor of the lexical approach, this strategy is justified by the fact that "the most fundamental linguistic result of the Lexical Approach is that a substantial amount of the lexicon is constituted of multi-word items of different sorts." Similarly to Krashen, the Natural and Communicative Approaches, the Lexical Approach emphasises the importance of meaning communication in the formation of language. The

Assessment of Lexically-Based Language Teaching with Accomplishment of English Learning

importance of language in transmitting meaning is highlighted in this manner. Fluency is supposed to be constructed on a firm foundation of prefabricated fixed and semi-fixed items, since any language creativity or originality is based on this assumption.. We cannot begin to examine classroom implications unless we have a good grip on the several varieties of lexis.

In the following table 1., Lewis (2008) outlines instances where the Lexical Approach is more favourable and areas where it is less advantageous:

Table 1: Favourable Lexical Approach

More attention will be paid to:	Less attention will be paid to:
<p>Lexis - different kinds of multi-word chunks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific language areas not previously standard in many EFL texts • Listening (at lower levels) and reading (at higher levels) • Activities based on L1/L2 comparisons and translation • The use of the dictionary as a resource for active learning • Probable rather than possible English • Organizing learners' notebooks to reveal patterns and aid retrieval • The language which learners may meet outside the classroom • Preparing learners to get maximum benefit from text 	<p>Sentence grammar - single sentence gap-fill and transformation Practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncollected nouns • Indiscriminate recording of 'new words' • Talking in L2 for the sake of it because [we] claim to use 'a communicative approach'

Since the emergence of language corpora, we've been able to analyse word usage and collocate frequency more easily. When Thorndike attempted to establish the frequency of English terms in the early twentieth century, this was a major departure (Alexander, 1981). Charles Ogden's general service list for Basic English lessons consisted of these word frequencies in their simplest form (Ogden, 1940). Thus, research on language and language development started to be conducted utilising a variety of corpora (for example Kennedy, 2003; Webb and Kagimoto, 2010; Hang, Rahim, Hua and Salehuddin, 2012).

With the growth of technology and language training resources, colloquialisms may now be easily learned and assimilated. Examples abound, including Google, online specialised dictionaries like "ozdic.com," the Oxford dictionary of collocations (2003), well-designed series like McCarthy and O'dell's "English collocations in usage" (2005), and conventionalized grammar books like Thornbury's "Natural grammar" (2001).) (2004). (2003).

From lexically-based language instruction, there is substantial study evidence that vocabulary acquisition may be improved (Willis & Willis, 1989; Sinclair, 1991, 2004). This type of language training, known as lexically-based language teaching, is founded on the idea that lexis, or words and word combinations, are the building blocks of learning and communication in a language (Richards & Rodgers, 2003). Language, lexicography, textbook development, and syllabus design all benefited greatly from the work of LBLT (Nunan &

Carter, 2002). According to Willis (90), a focus on language usage in the classroom necessitates an emphasis on vocabulary and a lexical syllabus. Students will learn to recognise commonly used phrases and patterns, as well as the ideas they represent and the sentences in which they are utilised, via the usage of this syllabus. As a result, the lexical syllabus contains not only a structural syllabus but also information on how the syllabus's structures are employed in spoken language. When studying second language acquisition and language usage using the lexical approach, researchers look at the lexicon's role in both the structure of the native language and the learning of new languages in chunks of several words (Willis & Willis, 2006).

Lexical chunks were an important part of Lewis (1993)'s style of teaching. This author emphasises the need of learning lexico-grammatical patterns and building fluency at the same time. As Widdowson (1991) points out, such works are critical to the definition of communication competence:

The ability to communicate effectively is not a question of understanding the rules of sentence structure. A toolbox of rules and the capacity to apply the rules to make whatever modifications are required in response to contextual demands is more important than having a store of partly created patterns, formulaic frameworks, and rules. To this way of thinking, communication ability is essentially a result of adaptation, with social standards serving only to regulate it.

There have been a number of different lexical chunk models suggested for language learning. These include idioms and expressions, phrase frames, social formulae, and discourse markers (Thornbury, 2002). Using the lexical method of language instruction, students learn to employ the language's most frequently occurring words and sentence structures. Concordances, either online or printed by professors, may help students learn about real-world instances and their patterns (Lewis, 1997). In corpus linguistics and concordances have made it easier for learners and scholars to find instances of real-world language use that are genuine and natural (Willis & Willis, 1989; 2006). Using concordance technology, teachers and students alike may benefit from its rich tapestry that includes examples of various language properties in a range of rhetorical situations. Using samples from published or recorded information, it helps users deduce the meanings and patterns of use (Bloch, 2009).

1.1. The current study

This lack of attention to word patterns and the order in which they appear in these patterns is a concern with Telangana's English textbooks, particularly in high-school. Additionally, there is a lack of focus on naturally occurring language in their curriculum (authentic language). Using their own experiences and instincts, the teachers and writers of educational materials choose the example sentences they employ to demonstrate new terminology concepts (Mazlum, 2010). Concepts are not well described and demonstrated, according to studies; vocabulary-related activities are also lacking in quantity (Doudman, 2007). Students' performance in vocabulary, grammar, and reading comprehension are all being tracked in this experiment.

Assessment of Lexically-Based Language Teaching with Accomplishment of English Learning

As a result, the initiative seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. Is Corpus of Contemporary American English a potential source for learning lexically-based language instruction for high school students' performance in vocabulary acquisition?
2. Does lexically-based language instruction influence the ability of high school students to master grammar?
3. Will lexically-based language instruction have an effect on high school students' reading ability?

2. Literature Review

The literature on learning and teaching collocations appears to fall into three broad categories: a) studies analysing errors in collocations made by foreign language learners, b) studies analysing and comparing native and non-native uses of collocations, and c) research examining the effectiveness of collocation training programmes or the use of collocation training to improve other abilities.

Students' and instructors' ability to use collocations in language was evaluated by Farghal and Obiedat (1995). English majors at Yarmouk University in Jordan were given a fill-in-the-blanks exam on basic topics like food, weather, and colour. Astonishingly, both professors and students had a poor level of understanding and application of collocations, even though they were given the identical exam. Collocation training should be included into university-level English courses, say the authors, since students' inability to cope with common English collocations serves as a wakeup call.

In (2008) Dyson has developed a system in which the questions were formulated through ESL learners. The goal of this research was on a critique that alleges that such work emphasizes form while ignoring the interaction among form and meaning. To address this problem, a lexical-grammatical approach to ESL speed processing has been used in the latest version of the staged paradigm. This scheme was investigated through a study that followed two Chinese-speaking ESL learners during their first academic year in Australia. In addition to providing further evidence of the stage of question formation, the study also sheds light on how learners map meaning and form in questions. Although they initially depended on the meaning of basic terms, fixed word order, and intonation, they gradually added grammatical meaning by changing the order, form, and argument structure of terms. The implications of these findings for assessment, in particular the idea that phase schedules should complement proficiency testing, are explored.

An investigation on verb-noun collocational mistakes was conducted in Malaysia by Hong et al. (2012) in an effort to identify the kinds and causes of these errors. There were 130 essays in all, written by Malay students in three different districts of Malaysia. Their analysis found that preposition-related collocations were the most often incorrect.. Synonymy, overgeneralization, and intralingual transfer were shown to be the most common types of student mistakes. Collocation learning in Iran was studied by Shokouhi and Mirsalari (2009)

to investigate whether a strong foundation in languages is linked to this ability. A 90-question multiple-choice proficiency exam was administered to the 35 students. According to the findings, there was no correlation between the overall language competency of ESL learners and their collocation usage.

Students from Russia who studied English as a Second Language (ESL) wrote essays for the study. According to the findings, the utilisation of permitted collocations by native speakers (NS) and nonnative speakers (NNS) was almost identical (NNS). Collocation frequency was one area in which a significant difference was seen between NNSs (less intuitive) and NSs (more sluggish to process).

Yang and Lau (2003) have studied the attitudes towards students of ESL prior and after their studies. The researchers have considered 35 students for their studies and compare the language situation of students studied in Hong Kong. They have studied that to learn English language is important since from 1997. From the study it has been observed that English is necessary for both careers as well as for personal growth.

Those looking to improve the use of collocations and those looking to enhance other aspects of language via the use of collocations comprise the third research stream. Fan's (2005) research, which looked at the influence of different levels of attention on verb collocation learning, falls under the first type. Semantic processing (embedded collocations), recall memory (in preparation for a later recall test), rule supplied (a study of the target collocation rules), and rule given with negative evidence were the four degrees of attention she identified (impossible collocates).

Mandarin University students were separated into four groups and assigned to one of four different concentration exercise routines, totalling 94 individuals. Study participants in the rule-oriented groups (third and fourth conditions) performed better on all parts of the exam, including memorising passage collocations, developing new collocations, and assessing wrong collocations than those in the semantic processing group.

The effectiveness of visual/textual input-based augmentation on Iranian EFL students' verb-noun collocation learning was examined by Fahim and Vaezi (2011). Collocation instruction in reading passages was given to 96 intermediate students in three groups: those who received capitalization or bolding of collocations, those who received conventional collocation instruction within enhanced visuals, and those who received no collocation instruction in their reading passages. Visually enhanced collocations were shown to be more effective than the other two research groups.

Kumar et al. (2016) have analyzed different creative schemes and their maximum uses in an English classroom. The language teaches by the modern tools enhances the language learning not for the primary language but also for the secondary learners. The researchers also concluded that the compression has been solved by the creative thinking not from the recent technologies.

A questionnaire, inspections of students' notebooks, and samples of their writing were some of the other approaches used to gather data. The study's findings revealed that teaching

Assessment of Lexically-Based Language Teaching with Accomplishment of English Learning

students how to utilize collocations explicitly helped them produce better work, which already showed a strong usage of collocations. While Amer (2010) built a mobile application. Lee (2016) have investigated the teacher's attitude and different kinds of code function switching used by English language teachers to teach secondary school students. The paper also reported the effect of use of code-switching³.. to deliver lecture in English. The survey was performed on total of 42 English language teachers. A survey was prepared that consists of a questionnaire contains different factors like attitude, uses, and students opinion towards code switching in classroom. The survey indicates that most of the teachers shows positive attitude towards code switching and accepted that code switching plays a great role to facilitate secondary language. For the same reason, Zengin (2009) explored the advantages of Google for teaching and learning in the context of a co-located environment. A bigger number of search results may be a macro indication of collocations, according to her studies. A practical and free resource, according to her, Google can help EFL students make educated guesses about the frequency of collocations.

Final research looked at the impact of receptive vs. producing activities on the establishment of particular collocations by Falahi and Moizadeh (2012). There were two groups in each study, with one acting as a control group. As opposed to the first experimental group, which concentrated on reading passages with collocations, the second experimental group focused on task categories requiring creation (cloze tests). The control group was not given any instruction on how to co-work.

Collocation comprehension improved significantly for both experimental groups in both tests. The Japanese research, on the other hand, found that higher-level students were more likely to benefit from the producing activity, while lower-level students were more likely to benefit from the receptive job. The second series of experiments, on the other hand, made use of collocations to help in the development of language in various contexts. Collocation training on Taiwanese EFL students' speaking skills was studied by Hsu and Chiu (2008). Learners' ability to communicate successfully was strongly correlated with their mastery of lexical colloquialisms.

There was no link found between the participants' usage of collocations and their verbal fluency. For more than just recognition, it is important to practise the use of collocations in your speech. Colloquial training has been shown to improve reading comprehension and vocabulary acquisition in the same group of students. The academic achievement of Taiwanese college English majors was categorised into three distinct categories. For each of the three groups, there were three distinct educational approaches used in class: teaching on single-item vocabulary, instruction on lexical collocation, and no training at all. Reading comprehension, on the other hand, seems to have had no effect on vocabulary development, as seen by the results of this study. In the context of vocabulary and reading education, this outcome implies that direct collocation training may be worth examining. An instructional programme that she devised for six months was based on Van Lier and Lewis's (1996) three-part curriculum design (awareness, autonomy, and authenticity). The results showed that the

experimental class increased their English reading skills significantly more than the control class.

3. Problem Statement

Historically, English majors at Telangana region, as well as other regions in India, or in other countries have shown a lack of ability in detecting and using collocations. Most students follow the rules of grammar, textbook use, and since collocations are not taught in grammar textbooks, students don't appear to understand the value of developing a sense of how to utilise them. Around 20 students were failed a multiple-choice exam on collocations in a pilot project. They scored less than 50%. Based on this assumption, the current research proposes a lexical-based programme that aims to improve the aforementioned lack of collocation intuition by using a variety of exercises.

4. Methodology

4.1. Participants

Sixty students from 8th and 10th high school standards whose age group lies between 13-15years were considered for research. They were all studying **math**. Six courses from a small town in Telangana were utilised to form the groups. The study team was able to employ easy sampling procedures since they had access to a computer lab. Randomly splitting the classes into two groups, the researcher used a quasi-experimental study design. At the time of the research, none of the participants attended any institutions where English was taught.

4.2. Instruments

One exam measured linguistic ability, while the other measured academic accomplishment. This study employed both of these assessments. The research began with a pre-test: a four-part assessment of language proficiency (reading, writing, listening, and speaking). To determine the test's reliability, the KR20 formula was employed. All students in the province must take the accomplishment test, which was created by the educational office as a final exam. There were three parts to the evaluation of performance (vocabulary, grammar, and reading comprehension).

Single-answer, multiple-choice, fill in the gaps, and even matching questions are available. KR20 was used to assess reliability, and it was found to be .75.

4.3. Procedure

Between 2020 and 2022, the study was conducted. We picked two school (n=60) and assessed the control group (n=30) and the experimental group (n=30). The students were gathered in the computer language lab in their free classes and were taught about how to use COCA app. The researcher gave a talk to the experimental group on how to utilise dictionaries effectively for vocabulary development. At the outset of the investigation, both groups took a language proficiency exam.

The instructor used a variety of vocabulary teaching techniques, including definition, translation, and explanation. Collocations with a specific phrase were given to students in the experimental group, on the other hand. This dictionary's word associations were discovered

Assessment of Lexically-Based Language Teaching with Accomplishment of English Learning

via the use of online concordancers and the COCA app. Lewis (1997) asserts that six key LBLT techniques were used, including:

1. Numerous opportunities for listening and reading in the target language;
2. Comparing and interpreting portions of the first and second languages;
3. Activities that are repeated and recycled;
4. Inferring the meaning of vocabulary items based on their context;
5. Observing and recording linguistic trends and colloquial expressions; and
6. Making use of dictionaries and other reference sources.

At the conclusion of the trial, both groups sat for the final examination (the achievement).

5. Results and Conclusion

Multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was performed using achievement test scores from three subcategories as the dependent variables and grouping (2 levels) as the independent variable to determine if LBLT had any influence on the results. The covariate in this analysis was the participants' results on a language competence test provided before to the research. We did preliminary assumption testing to ensure normality, linearity, and the absence of univariate and multivariate outliers. "The Box's M Test of Covariance Matrices was used to determine the homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices (Box's $M=8.538$, $F=1.343$, $p=.234>.001$), which indicates that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are identical across groups. The results from the Multivariate tests table suggested a significant multivariate main effect for group, Wilks' $\lambda = 293$, $F =44.305$, $p=0.000$, and partial eta squared = .707".

Table 2. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p	Partial Eta Squared
Pre-test	Vocabulary	198.188	198.188	1.286	.262	.022
	Grammar	4.190	4.190	.042	.838	.001
	Reading	16.926	16.926	.178	.675	.003
Group	Vocabulary	4125.119	4125.119	26.764	.000*	.320
	Grammar	260.711	260.711	2.620	.111	.044
	Reading	8450.788	8450.788	88.648	.000*	.609

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics

Independent variables	Group	Mean	SD	N
Vocabulary	Control	50.200	11.3908	30
	Experimental	66.800	13.4174	30
	Total	58.500	14.9104	60
Grammar	Control	41.666	9.8934	30
	Experimental	45.833	9.8934	30
	Total	43.750	10.0317	60
Reading	Control	33.365	7.6597	30
	Experimental	57.096	11.3702	30
	Total	45.231	15.3480	60

Mean differences in vocabulary and reading sections were found to be significant, but not in grammar, in a test of between-subject effects (table 2). As a result, after taking into account the students' level of language proficiency, it can be said that LBLT improved the reading and vocabulary skills of the experimental group. Students' skill in English grammar was unaffected by the drug (table 3). Students in the experimental group performed better on vocabulary and grammatical tests than students in the control group, according to descriptive statistics for groups. The experimental group's mean grammatical performance is not statistically significant compared to the control group's (table 3).

6. Discussions

In this study, the major goal was to examine the impact of LBLT on ESL students' ability to learn English in the classroom. It is a teaching technique that emphasises teaching vocabulary in contexts where it is most often used. The study indicated that LBLT had a positive impact on pupils' improvement in vocabulary and reading abilities. Because LBLT tactics allow students to access real (authentic) language in its natural setting, they may achieve substantial success in learning a new language with LBLT methods and techniques (Willis & Willis, 2006; Lewis, 2006). Additional advances in reading comprehension may be achieved via concordance consulting and the use of corpora as well (Chang & Sun, 2009). Incorporating the role of language explorer into the corpus consultation process, students may improve their capacity to acquire new linguistic concepts by becoming active analyzers (Johns & Plass, 2002). Additionally, learners may utilise concordances to have access to the most commonly used words in the language, as well as their own use patterns, in order to improve their language comprehension and proficiency (Belz, 2008). Learners need a lot of time with text before they can start using new terms effectively (Huang, 2007; Gardner, 2007). This shows that graded readers and online extended reading may help students broaden their vocabulary and hence their linguistic expertise (Huang, 2007; Gardner, 2007).

It was shown that LBLT had minimal impact on pupils' grammatical knowledge. This finding goes against the grain of previous research on the impact of LBLT on grammar acquisition, at least in the context of this study. They claim that the lexical method emphasises the use of lexical terms or lexical and grammatical words as well as individual words in education; most importantly, it combines grammar teaching into vocabulary instruction as well as the other way around (e.g., Fan, 2009; Willis & Willis, 2006). Students may use concordancers to examine syntactic and lexical elements in real rhetorical settings, allowing them to "marry grammar and rhetoric" (Kolln, 2007, p. xi), "which highlights how rhetorical context impacts grammatical choice" via the use of collocations (Kennedy, 1990). (Bloch, 2009, p. 59).

However, a number of other studies have highlighted doubts regarding the effectiveness of the lexical method in teaching grammar. Even though the lexical approach includes tactics and activities to enrich information and raise awareness, Schmit (2001) contends that learners must be given a grammatical explanation of the grammatical aspects that are not addressed by the approach. McEnery, Wilson, and Baker (1997) undertook an empirical study to establish how corpora may be utilised to meet the needs of pre-tertiary-level grammar training in the United Kingdom. The authors conclude that a corpus should be included into education, although they aren't sure if it would increase the efficacy of grammatical training.

Assessment of Lexically-Based Language Teaching with Accomplishment of English Learning

Additionally, the objective of learning and teaching grammar may play a role in emphasising the function of LBLT in grammar learning. According to Bloch (2009), “this method has shifted the emphasis of grammar instruction away from knowing prescriptive rules and toward making acceptable choices” (p. 59). Thus, rather of teaching what is grammatically proper and what is wrong, a learning environment is developed in which the learner must make judgments about what is acceptable for them. As a result, when grammar is assessed on the basis of correctness rather than appropriateness, it may seem as if students have not met the language course's grammatical objectives.

References:

- 1) Belz, J. A. (2008). The role of computer mediation in the instruction and development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 27, 45-75.
- 2) Birjandi, P., Ananissarab, M. and Samimi, D. (2010). English for pre-university students: Learning to read. Ministry of Education, Tehran: IR Iran. Available online: www.talif.sch.ir.
- 3) Bloch, J. (2009). The design of an online concordancing program for teaching about reporting verbs. *Language Learning & Technology*, 13(1),59-78.
- 4) COBUILD Dictionary on CD-ROM. (2006). US: Collins Publications.
- 5) Chang W.L. and Sun, Y.Ch (2009).Scaffolding and web concordancers as support for language learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*,22(4), 283-302.
- 6) Doudman, M. (2007). Investigating EFL program's problems in high-schools of Hormozgan province. MA thesis. Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.Available online: www.irandoc.ir.
- 7) Fan, M. (2009). An exploratory study of collocational use by ESL students -A task based approach. *System*, 37, 110-123.
- 8) Gardner, D.(2007).Validating the construct of word in applied corpus-based vocabulary research: A critical survey. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2),241-265.
- 9) Hedge, T. (2008). *Teaching and Learning in Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 10)Huang. H.T. (2007). Vocabulary learning in an automated graded reading program. *Language Learning & Technology*, 11(3), 64-82.
- 11) Jones, L., & Plass, J. L. (2002). Supporting listening comprehension and vocabulary acquisition with multimedia annotations. *The ModernLanguage Journal*, 86, 546-561.
- 12) Kennedy, G.D., 1990. Collocations: where grammar and vocabulary teaching meet. In: Anivan, S. (Ed.), *Language Teaching Methodology for the*
- 13) Nineties. (pp. 215-229). SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, Singapore,.
- 14) Kolln, M. (2007). *Rhetorical grammar: Grammatical choice, rhetorical effects*. New York: Pearson.
- 15) Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and a way forward*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications

- 16) Lewis, M. (1997). *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.
- 17) Mazlum, Z., F.(2010). A Corpus-based Analysis of Iranian High School English textbook. *Roshd FLT Quarterly*, 25(1).45-54. Available online:www.magiran.ir.
- 18) McEnery, T., Wilson, A. and Baker, P. (1997). Teaching grammar again after twenty years: Corpus-based help for teaching grammar. *ReCALL*,9(2), 8-16.
- 19) Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Learning and Teaching*. New York. Newbery House.
- 20) Nunan, D. and Carter, R. (eds) (2002). *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* .Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 21) Ricahrds, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2003). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge Unviersity Press.
- 22) Schmitt, N. (2001). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 23) Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 24) Sinclair, J. (ed). (2004). *How to use corpora in language teaching*. Amesterdam: John Bejamins.
- 25) Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to teach vocabulary*. London: Longman Pearson.
- 26) Widdowson, H. (1991). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 27) Willis, D. (1990). *The lexical syllabus: A new approach to language learning*. London: Collins ELT.
- 28) Willis, J. and Willis, D. (1989). *Collins COBUILD English course*. London: Collins COBUILD.
- 29) Willis, D. and Willis, J. (2006). *Doing Task-based Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 30) Dyson, B. (2008). What we can learn from questions: ESL question development and its implications for language assessment. *Prospect*, 23(1), 16-27.
- 31) Ting, S. H., & Kho, T. P. (2009). Gender and communication strategy use in learning English as a second language. *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 157(1), 93-108.
- 32) Yang, A., & Lau, L. (2003). Student attitudes to the learning of English at secondary and tertiary levels. *System*, 31(1), 107-123.
- 33) Kumar, S. S., Kumar, R. S., & Sankar, G. (2016). Creative thinking of English language teaching to the secondary language learners. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 2(4), 150-155.
- 34) Lee, H. L. J. (2016). Code switching in the teaching of English as a second language to secondary school students. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 6(1), 45.