RECYCLING OF VOCABULARY IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING: FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

Muhammad Umer Azim[1,] Zaheer Hussain[2], Azhar Munir Bhatti[3], Dr. Muhammad Iqbal[4]

ABSTRACT

The basic motive behind this study is to elicit most practical solutions for recycling lexical items for better vocabulary learning. The importance of lexical items is highlighted in lexical approach and it is made synonymous to language learning in general. Importance of teaching vocabulary and significance of recycling in learning and retention of vocabulary set the background to elicit best ways/suggestions to practically use it for the benefit of learners. In this qualitative study data is collected from four focus groups which were purposefully created on the basis of the qualification and experience of the participants. Each focus group discussed the research questions and compiled their suggestions and presented a written and agreed document. They gave valuable suggestions for 'book authors', 'teachers', 'learners' and 'test designers'.

Keywords: Recycling Vocabulary, Lexical Approach, Vocabulary Teaching, Vocabulary Learning, Language Teaching, Language Learning.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this research is to elicit the most practical solutions from the experienced and qualified language teachers regarding the recycling of lexical items for better vocabulary teaching and learning. Recycling of lexical items is a concept derived from Lexical Approach to English Language Teaching (ELT). It is considered a shift in the traditional paradigm i.e. from grammar to vocabulary/lexis in language teaching. The prime motive of this article is to highlight the importance of recycling for ELT and English Language Learning (ELL). It provides brief introduction of the current status of English language. Further, there is a brief review of historic developments of teaching methods and approaches in ELT which led to paradigm shift from grammar to lexis-centered language teaching. The lexical approach is discussed in some detail with special emphasis on the importance of recycling lexical items in the language teaching process. In this back drop the researcher conducted focus group discussions to provide long tested solutions to practically utilize the concept of recycling in teaching vocabulary effectively. The data collected in the focus group discussions is shared as research findings.

The research questions focused in the research are:

1.1. Research Questions

1. How can book authors write language teaching books considering recycling of lexical items for better vocabulary learning among ESL/EFL learners?
2. How can language teachers incorporate recycling of lexical items for effective teaching-learning of Vocabulary among ESL/EFL learners?
3. How can ESL/EFL learners learn and retain English vocabulary using recycling of lexical items?
4. How can test developers incorporate recycling of lexical items in developing vocabulary tests to create beneficial washback?

---

[1]University of Management & Technology, Lahore Pakistan
[2]National University of Modern Languages Lahore Campus
[3]Higher Education Department, Punjab, Pakistan.
[4]University of Management of Technology Lahore, Pakistan

2. Literature Review/ Background

Today the business world has accepted English as a lingua franca. Its use both as native non-native i.e. as L2 or FL is widespread. It is present in the academic institutions of almost every country, either as a medium of instruction or at least taught as a subject. It is a living and vibrant language of present times. English is spoken in many countries across the world which includes the United States of America (USA), Ireland, the British Isles, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Liberia, the Republic of South Africa, and many colonies/ countries under the United Kingdom and the USA. According to an estimate there are 400 million native English users and around 400 million more who are using it as second language; whereas there are about 600 to 700 million users of English as a foreign language. So there are around one and a half billion people living on this planet who can speak and understand English with varying proficiency. It means that it is the most taught second or foreign language of the world. This fact testifies the presence of bilingualism or multilingualism in almost every part of the world. History briefs us that bilingualism or multilingualism is no more an exception rather it has become a norm. The norm of multilingualism spans around 60% of today's population. This proves that language learning and teaching is and has always been an important phenomenon.

The development of English as 'Lingua Franca' created the need for the institutions of the world to teach English to produce efficient and proficient users of English. To achieve this goal of effective English language teaching made English language teachers experiment with their techniques and methodologies. This experiment gave birth to different methods and approaches. The brief review the development, features and proponents of these methodologies and approaches is given below.

The first model of FL teaching was provided by the studies of Classical Latin; in which, the foci was grammar and rhetoric. So the history of language teaching can be traced backward to the comparative teaching of classical Latin at 'grammar schools' of England. Grammar of Latin was taught through memorization of grammatical rules, parsing, conjugations and declensions (Kelly, 1969; Howatt, 1984). This was the beginning of Grammar Translation Method, whose main focus was on grammar and translation from and into the target language.

The reaction to complexities of grammar and translation resulted in 'The Reform Movement'. It was developed in 1880s. The reformers believed in the; primacy of speech, inclusion of phonetic science in language teaching, context based vocabulary teaching, inductive teaching of grammar, preference of listening over reading skill, exclusion of translation.

The Reform Movement's syllabi emphasized careful selection and grading of materials to be taught. That led to many developments in language teaching. Howatt (1984) mentioned these developments as 'natural methods of language teaching'. The popular 'Direct Method' (DM) was the outcome of the above mentioned reforms. The methodology proposed for DM was not rigidly structured like some of the methods before it. The theory of language learning as a natural process was the foundation of the new method. This natural process can be facilitated through proper conditions needed. For a long time, these methods dominated language teaching.

The twentieth century was marked by the description and analysis of English language. In this regard the works of Hornby, Gatenby, and Wakefield in 1953, Palmer and Blandford in 1939, and Hornby in 1954 were very influential. These specialists contributed to the development of 'Situational Language Teaching' or 'Oral Approach'. The major facets of Oral approach were systematic selection; grading and presentation of lexis and grammar. This approach gave importance to speaking and listening at the start of language learning. Reading

and writing were introduced once the learner had achieved sufficient knowledge of vocabulary and grammar. Target language is introduced through situational use.

During World War II language teaching entered a new phase. First method which appeared on the scene had the strong philosophical and theoretical basis. Its theory of language was based on structural linguistics and learning theory was based on behavioral psychology. For psychologist like Skinner (1957) and Brown (1980) language learning was habit formation. The theories of linguistics and psychology were used to propose a method which was to develop accuracy and fluency in the oral skills. All other skills of language were considered as a tool for enhancing, enriching and polishing the speaking skills. Dialogues and drills constitute the major part of the classroom activities. Repetition and memorization were main skills a learner should possess. It was most wide spread in 1960s. It was used in popular courses of that time like English 900 and Lado English Series. The popularity of this method rapidly decreased because of the severe criticism on its theories of language and language learning. Chomsky (1966) declared that language is beyond just habit formation because for the use of basic language structure are innovated and for the formation of sentences abstract and intricate rules are required.

Chomsky criticized structural methods by declaring creativity and uniqueness as basic characteristics of language which are missing in the idea of habit formation. Applied linguists in Britain point out some other fundamental characteristics of language –functional and communicative. This led to Communicative Language Teaching. The prominent scholars involved in providing the theoretical basis for communicative language teaching were Christopher Candlin, Dell Hymes, Henry Widdowson, john Austin, MAK Halliday, John Firth, John Gumperz, William Labov, and John Searle. The method focused on developing 'communicative competence' (Hymes, 1972). It referred to applying the knowledge of a language for an effective communication. The method emphasized real life communication tasks for the classroom activities that involved information sharing, negotiation of meaning, argumentation, etc. It was a learner centered method and promoted teaching integrated skills. Communicative Language Teaching is best because of its flexibility features and cultural orientation in syllabus (Azim, Bhatti, Hussain, & Iqbal, 2018). It is still in practice all over the world with differences that have resulted from the individual's interpretation of this method. It had the issues as pointed by Swan (1985) of teacher training, material development, testing and evaluation.

The modern trends saw many methods and approaches coming into the field of language teaching and getting their share of attention and appreciation like Total Physical Response by James Asher (1965, 1966, 1969, 1977), The Silent Way by Caleb Gattegno (1972, 1976), Community Language Learning by Charles A. Curran (1972, 1976) and La Forge (1971, 1975, 1977, 1983), The Natural Approach by Tracy Terrell (1977, 1981, 1982), and Suggestopedia by Georgi Lozanov (1978). In most recent trend both applied linguists and syllabus designers are favouring Eclectic Approach which is the combination of all the methods and approaches that existed previously. But an important and interesting development in this field has been the reawakening of interest in the teaching of vocabulary. It gave a complete shift from grammar orientation to the lexical dimension of the language. It produced a different approach of language teaching—lexical approach.

2.1. Lexical Approach

The modern age is full of innovation and rapid research in the area of English language teaching. Use of information communication technologies and new approaches in language

teaching have made their way into this dynamic and ever growing field in past fifteen to twenty years. One of the most important developments to many researchers is the shift from lexicalized grammar to grammaticalized lexis. The principle is known as the key principle for using lexical approach. This approach is highly regarded for FL or L2 teaching as a perfect alternative to approaches based upon grammar. Its basic focus is on producing lexical proficiency in Language learners. It defines language ability in terms of comprehending and producing lexical phrases which are called "chunks". These chunks help the learners to comprehend the patterns of any language and are called grammar of any language traditionally (Lewis, 1993).

Michael Lewis (1993) coined the term *lexical approach* and proposed some principles as follow:

- Language is based upon lexis.
- The basic reason of misunderstanding lexis is considering grammar as basis of language and it is misjudged as a pre-requisite for effective communication.
- The key principle is to consider grammaticalized lexis as a unit of language, not the concept of lexicalized grammar.
- Lexis should be considered in central position to create any meaning-centered syllabus.

There is a different way of defining vocabulary and lexis in this approach. Vocabulary is a combination of individual words having fixed meanings. Lexis is all single words, any combination of words, the sentence frames, and text frames etc. to be stored in our mental lexicons. This approach was based on the importance of 'meaningful chunks' which combine together to produce meaningful, continuous and coherent text.

Richards & Rodgers stressed for the acquisition of Multi-word lexical items both in first and second language acquisition research (2001). There are many labels used for the multi-word lexical units, like Keller (1979) used "gambits", Peters (1983) said "speech formulae", Nattinger & DeCarrico (1992) shared "lexical phrases" and Pawley & Syder (1983) mentioned "lexicalized stems". Cowie discussed about these lexical units as mixing of such expressions are continuously used by the speakers to satiate their communicative needs that enrich the public stock of these lexical phrases (1988). Lewis classified lexical units, starting from words, polywords, word partnership or collocations, utterances used in an institution, sentence heads and frames (1997b).

In this approach lexis with all types have great emphasis in the development of ELT and ELL. Nattinger (1980) suggested that language teaching should consider language production as a process through which ready-made units are put together considering their appropriacy for a particular situation. In this respect only the introduction of the lexical items is not enough. The lexical items should be properly and systematically recycled to help it become the part of learner's mental lexicon.

Lexical approach was groomed and developed because of the development in the field of corpus linguistics and lexicology. Corpus linguistics provided an enormous database of language corpora. There are many contributors to these corpora, like the British National Corpus, the International Corpus of Cambridge University, and the COBUILD Bank of English Corpus. The COBUILD Bank of English Corpus was a project of Birmingham University in England. It has observed and examined written and spoken material for phrase and phrase patterns and clause sequence used in the communication. Sinclair mentioned that the basic aim of the project was to accurately describe the English language as it exists to be used as the foundation to design lexical syllabus (1987). COBUILD researchers perceived this syllabus as independent and unique because it didn't match with any methodology existed in domain of language teaching (Sinclair & Renouf, 1988). This all effort and hard work resulted in 'the Collins COBUILD English

Course' (Willis & Willis, 1989). This was the first syllabus based upon lexical principles and first approach too to use lexical approach in a textbook but further research in the field of strategies of learning and language input suggested that without proper teaching and recycling of the lexis in all aspects of teaching-learning process the lexical approach is not going to produce the required outcomes.

Although the use of Lexical Approach in language teaching never gained much attention but it put vocabulary teaching and recycling at the center of every language teaching method and opened new avenues for research in vocabulary teaching.

2.2. Vocabulary Teaching

2.2.1. Vocabulary Acquisition (Incidental and Intentional)

Nagy along with other researchers pioneered a theory which gained popularity in first and second language vocabulary acquisition (Nagy et al. 1985; Nagy et al. 1987). The theory puts weight behind the argument that incidental vocabulary learning needs repeated engagements with word/s which makes it a relatively slow process. This kind of learning is through receptive skills i.e. listening (Vidal, 2003; Mason & Krashen, 2004; Barcroft & Sommers, 2005), and reading (Elgort & Warren, 2014). This type of learning is not focused and mostly contribute to subconscious learning of vocabulary.

In intentional learning, learners try to memorize the information related to the focused vocabulary. They use different strategies like mnemonic (Paradis, 1994). This kind of learning does not take into account the context of the words. It is achieved by using word lists (monolingual or bilingual) or flash cards (word cards). Researchers in the field of vocabulary acquisition argued that natural exposure to language which is based on the 'usage' of the words is not enough, it should be supplemented by focused or deliberate learning of vocabulary which is form-focused   (Hulstijn, 2003; Laufer, 2005; Nation, 2007; Ellis, 2008;). Both these approaches of vocabulary teaching are good for introducing vocabulary but retention can be a big concern.

2.2.2. Lexical Inferencing

Contextual guessing or inferencing can lead to vocabulary acquisition according to many researchers (Paribakht, 2005; Paribakht &Wesche, 1999). The use of reading comprehension tasks for this guessing and inferencing of unfamiliar words and the success of second language learners' vocabulary acquisition is a worthwhile line of inquiry (Nassaji, 2004; Paribakht, 2005). Research indicated that L2 learners use lexical inferencing which encountering new words in their reading tasks (Parry, 1993; Paribakht & Wesche, 1999). This proves that skill of inferencing is an important way of learning vocabulary. In contrast, many researches (e.g., Coady, 1993; Stein, 1993) declare inferencing as an ineffective method of vocabulary acquisition. According to Ko (2012) L2 learners cannot learn through inferencing as their knowledge of language and vocabulary is limited which hinder their intelligent guessing of meaning. Nagy (1997) has the same opinion, learners should have a considerable vocabulary before being able to guess the meaning. This is a good strategy that can lead to word retention but it focuses on receptive skills like reading and listening but productive skills practice is required to make the learnt vocabulary part of active and long-term vocabulary.

2.2.3. Involvement Load Hypothesis

It is another research interest of researchers in the field of vocabulary learning. Involvement Load Hypothesis was proposed by Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) which took its inspiration from the notions presented by Craik & Lockhart (1972) and Craik &Tulving, (1975). These were *depth of processing* and *elaboration* respectively. This concept emphasize that the

way information is processed actually determines its retention in long-term memory (Kim, 2011). Learners retain the lexical items when they are presented with rich context. This theory is supported by many empirical researches (Keating, 2008; Kim, 2008, 2011; Nassaji & Hu, 2012) which suggest that rich and loaded reading text can lead to better retention. This also favours that vocabulary should be presented in multiple ways and with richness of contexts (linguistic and social), this can lead to better retention. This is a strong argument in the favour of systemized recycling of vocabulary items/ lexis.

2.2.4.   *Learning vocabulary from Reading*

A number of studies are done to reveal the importance of reading and context in acquisition of vocabulary/ lexical items (Hulstijn, 1992; Nagy, 1997; Laufer, 1997; Paribakht and Wesche ,1997; Zahar, et al, 2001). The research also suggests that when words are learnt in context, their retention increases immensely (Corrigan, 2007). This suggests that words or lexical items should be presented in multiple contexts so that words along with their contextual properties become the part of the memory of the leaners. This argument also favours creative recycling and promotes reading to enhance vocabulary.

2.2.5.   *Glossing*

In this technique a short contextual definition of newly introduced word is provided in a text for the support of the learners (Nation, 2001; Bowles, 2004). This is an important technique for the introduction of new vocabulary. A number of studies have proven the efficacy of 'glossing' in learning L2 vocabulary (Cheng & Good, 2009; Ko, 2012)**.** The study of Ko (2012) establishes that learning of words through 'glossing' is much higher than the learning and retention of words without the use of 'glossing' technique.

There are different advantages 'glossing'. Nation (2001) shared four advantages of glossing: First, learners' facilitation in reading and second, learning accurate meanings. Third, it doesn't let the reading hindered unnecessarily. Fourth, focus on the gloss words ensure learning. Yousefi & Biria (2015) through their experimental research prove that endnote is better than marginal gloss. They also argued that endnotes are engaging and established links between the meaning of the words and their context. This method is again good for introduction and at later stages glosses can refer to the pages where the vocabulary already appeared or ask the meaning in exercises.

2.2.6.   *Repeated Exposure (Recycling) to L2 vocabulary Items*

The research has proven that repeated occurrence and the relative elaboration of lexical items lead to better understanding and retention (Brown, et at, 2008. The theme-related texts provide the necessary condition of repetition of vocabulary items thus leading to effective teaching and learning of vocabulary among second language learners (Nation, 2001). Researches on repetitive frequency of words in a reading text (Horst et al., 1998; Zahar et al., 2001), establish positive effect of higher repetitive frequency in learning vocabulary. This means that words with higher repetitive frequency in the reading text are more likely to be learnt by the learners. The study of Eckerth and Tavakoli (2012) proved that practicing words immediately after reading produces better learning than only reading activities. Rott's (1999) experiment on effect of multiple encounters with the lexical items proves that six encounters with words proved higher gains than two and four encounters.

Once this is established that recurrence, repetition and recycling had definite positive effect on the learning of vocabulary, the it becomes obvious to incorporate these research findings into teaching-learning process. Proper and systematic recycling of the lexical items is a must for the syllabus of lexical approach and language teaching in general. It is correctly pointed

out by Nation (1990) that coursebooks' lack of recycling "provide[s] considerable cause for alarm". He proposed that 10 to 12 times of repetitions or recycling of lexis is required higher level of learners. He warns that vocabulary teaching without necessary recycling will not bring the desired results rather it will be a wasted effort. Similarly, Kojic-Sabo & Lightbown (1999) emphasise the difference between the vocabulary learning of EFL learners and ESL learners, where former need more recycling/ repetition as compared to the later. EFL learners' surroundings do not offer opportunities to practice the learnt lexis in a natural way on the other hand ESL learners have more opportunities to practice. So classroom practice and recycling of lexis becomes immensely important for EFL learners. This recycling/reviewing should be done over an extended period of time so that learners have the opportunity to review and practice again and again until the learners have considerable mastery of learnt chunk (Harwood 2000; Lewis 1997).

Harwood (2000) examined a set of twelve advanced and upper intermediate course books and found none systematically recycling the pre-decided lexical items. Littlejohn's (1992) findings regarding ELT materials were not different. On the basis of the discussion till this stage, the experience of more than ten years of teaching ESL and EFL students at varied levels and situations, and extensive discussions carried out with learned colleagues, the researcher believes that teaching and recycling of the lexis should be one of the key features of every aspect of language teaching process.

For getting practical suggestions the researcher initiated focus group discussions. There were four focus groups which discussed and gave their recommendations for the stake holders of the teaching-learning process to incorporate teaching and recycling of the lexis in this process. These practical suggestions will definitely benefit the learners and all involved in the process of making the learners to learn a foreign or second language vocabulary effectively.

3. Methodology

The research in hand is conducted to seek suggestions from the English language teaching professionals to incorporate recycling of lexical items in teaching learning process. Research has proven that vocabulary learning is the one of the key factors in learning a second or a foreign language. Vocabulary teaching and learning techniques and strategies are also proven. One of the important aspect of recycling, repetition and recurrence is also proven in the researches discussed above, but the practical implications of the research findings are missing at almost every level of teaching and learning process. The research in hand aims at finding and proposing solutions for the practical implications of research findings in the field of vocabulary learning and retention through recycling of lexical items. It is a qualitative research and includes the findings of four focus groups which are in the form of suggestions. The suggestions are compiled by the focus groups after rigorous discussion on the issue.

3.1.Population

The population of the study is based on English Language Teachers and Teacher Trainers of the Punjab. These professionals who have considerable experience of teaching English language, designing courses, evaluating books and training English language teachers.

3.2.Sample

It is purposive sampling as the professionals are chosen on the basis of their profiles. Their experience of language teaching at multiple levels, syllabus design, material development, books evaluation and training teachers is considered. Their minimum qualification is M.Phil (Linguistics or Applied Linguistics). Four of them were Ph. Ds (two local Ph. Ds and two foreign Ph. Ds). Twelve of them were M.Phil.

3.3.Tool of Data Collection

Four focus group discussions were conducted. Each focus group was of five members. One research question was given to each focus group to discuss. They were requested to provide their agreed suggestions in the form of a document. Each group was given ninety minutes (the group was asked to take more time if they wanted). Most of the groups compiled their suggestions during the specified time. One respectable doctor (PhD) and four worthy M.Phils. constituted each focus group. The time distribution of focus group was; 15 minutes' presentation by the researcher on the importance of recycling lexical items, discussion on the issue, presentation of the research question, and explaining the task of the focus group. Next, one hour for the discussion and argumentation to arrive at the mutually agreed suggestions in response to the question posed. Last, fifteen minutes to formally write the draft of mutually agreed suggestions.

3.4.Data Analysis

There was no need to analyse data as the formal document provided by the specific group contained analysed and refined data.

3.5.Delimitation

The study is limited to the language teachers and trainers of the Punjab province. The students are important part of teaching-learning process but they are not given any representation. Next study should also include one student to represent the concerns of the students to be incorporated.

4. Data Analysis/ Research Findings/ Suggestions

All the material of this section is submitted by the focus groups. There was no need of any interpretation or analysis because the work of focus groups was complete.

4.1.Focus Group 1

Research Question: How can book authors write language teaching books considering recycling of lexical items for better vocabulary learning among ESL/EFL learners?

Suggestions/Findings

Textbook Authors (Syllabus Designers, Material Developers, Content Writers etc.)

Recycling of lexical items should be the part of syllabus design. Book authors should take it as their professional duty to weave recycling into the very fabric of course books. Although it is already a conceptual part of modern syllabus design but the book authors are not following it in its true spirit. Book authors need to inculcate the following suggestions while authoring the books for language teaching to get maximum benefit i.e. the better learning outcomes.

- The frequency of introducing new vocabulary should be determined by the level (beginner, intermediate, advance) and kind (ESL, EFL, young, Adult) of learners. The input vocabulary should relate to the already existing vocabulary of the learner which will help the learner to assimilate that new knowledge easily.
- After determining the level and kind of students, book authors need to introduce and recycle the lexical items creatively through the receptive skills of listening and reading. Then they (book authors) have to devise opportunities for the learners to practice and recycle the learnt lexical items in their productive skills of speaking and writing. It demands a good deal of integrated activities. One activity should lead to the other in a natural way.

  The researcher will start with receptive skills activities and then will discuss the productive skills activities.

- Text books need to cover variety of listening topics which give book authors an opportunity to include variety of materials of both types (authentic and non-authentic). To cover a single topic, the book authors should choose at least two activities for both intensive and extensive listening from the variety of forms available to them like dialogues, monologues, recitation of poems, short stories, literary extracts, advertisement, brochures, news, letters, etc. so that the recycling of vocabulary is done creatively and in many possible formats and contexts.

- Textbooks also need to cover variety of reading topics which give book authors an opportunity to include variety of materials of both types (authentic and non-authentic). To cover a single topic the book authors should choose at least more than one from the variety of text forms available to them like poems, short stories, literary extracts, advertisement, brochures, newspaper cuttings, articles, essays, letters, etc. so that the recycling of vocabulary is done creatively and in many possible formats and contexts. The lexical input in these two receptive skills activities should provide enough understanding and practice that the learner can use the taught lexical item in productive skills.

- In speaking skills, the authors need to choose interesting and integrated topics of discussion or presentation so that the lexical items can be further practiced and recycled. The oral practice is necessary as it helps in making passive lexical items active ones.

- In writing skills, the activities or topics for writing should summarize and provide enough opportunity to the learner to practice all the newly learnt lexical items. The writing tasks should be in a variety (from matching similar/opposite meaning words to choose a word or a group of words to be fill in the blanks to write a full length essay, etc.). But these tasks should be integrated with previous tasks of listening, reading and speaking.

- Book authors should include revision units after regular intervals where the revision of all the previously taught lexical items can be done creatively in all the four skills of the language.

- There should be a variety and good number of practice activities and exercises with a perfect blend of newly taught and previously taught lexical items.

4.2. Focus Group 2

Research Question: How can language teachers incorporate recycling of lexical items for effective teaching-learning of Vocabulary among ESL/EFL learners?

Suggestions/Findings

Teachers

Another important factor in the process of teaching-learning is teachers. Teachers are actual performers because they are in direct contact with the learners and use the tools like course books, language labs, etc. to achieve their goal of successful language teaching and learning. There are many fears of the teachers regarding recycling and revision which cause reluctance in them to do recycling or revision of lexical items taught. Lewis (1997) explains the unwilling attitude of teachers to recycle vocabulary and lexis appropriately in the following words "Doing the same thing twice is still widely considered time-wasting and potentially boring". Lewis implicitly put forward a very important point here that although recycling and repeating is at the heart of language teaching and learning process in lexical approach but this must be achieved in a way that is interesting, engaging, and refreshing. There should be variety of activities and exercises to practice the learnt chunk in novel ways. Memorization and monotonous repetition should be avoided in recycling while teaching a course book. Teachers further have a pressure to

finish or cover the syllabus within the given time limits. This made them think that if they *waste* their time in revision and recycling then they will not be able to finish the course contents. The teachers further have a feeling that it is not worth doing recycling and revision.

- The first step is to convince the teachers about these important concepts of recycling and revision. In this regard teacher's training is very important both pre-service teacher training and in-service teacher training. For immediate use, workshops can be arranged for the teachers to give them a review of researches done on this issue and hands on experience of doing the important tasks of recycling and revision in an interesting and creative way. If the teacher is convinced and he believed in the effectiveness of the concepts, then he/she can perform in a much better way.

- Researcher has observed as educational supervisor and teacher trainer that most of the teachers are not trained for controlled or planned teacher's talk. Generally, teachers talk to their students without considering the level (Grade 1 or 2 or 3 or 10 or University Graduates) of their students. Teacher's talk in the classroom is not the expression of teacher's scholarship it is meant to communicate with the students so it should be properly controlled and planned. It should include the words that are previously taught to the students if a word is new it should be explained by bringing into class 'realia' or 'virtual realia'. Teacher's ability to act and explain can also help. Teacher should talk to model the use of recently and previously taught lexical items so that he can provide a permanent source of recycling and revision in the class.

- Teachers should have the ability to plan and design additional activities for the students keeping in mind the format and level of activities in the course books.

- Teachers should have the ability to plan additional tasks for the students like projects or homework, which can provide the learners with ample practice of recently and previously learnt lexical items.

- Teachers should be able to use the rich material available for Information Communication Technologies (ICT). The teacher should know the internet resources available so that they can be recommended to the students for the revision and practice purposes. It should be properly planned and executed to get the maximum benefit.

- Teachers should have the ability to motivate the students to learn and practice new and previously learnt lexical items.

4.3.Focus Group 3

Research Question: How can ESL/EFL learners learn and retain English vocabulary using recycling of lexical items?

Suggestions/Findings

Learners

The success of any teaching-learning process is determined by its learners' abilities to communicate effectively with the outside world both in speech and in writing. So learners are very important part of the teaching learning process. Their role is very important and we can only give some pieces of advice to them.

- Their prime responsibility and role is to respond well to the challenges and tasks provided by the books and teachers.

- They need to follow the content of the textbooks.

- They need to follow the teacher's instructions.

- They need to perform the tasks provided to them ensuring the required standard.

- They should develop integrated motivation for practicing the taught vocabulary.

4.4.Focus Group 4

Research Question: How can test developers incorporate recycling of lexical items in developing vocabulary tests to create beneficial washback?

Suggestions/Findings

Test Designers

They can be the course book writers or teachers of the course but it is put in the separate header as it is really important.

- A text book is designed for an academic session (four to six months) which usually consists of 15 to 16 units. These units are supported by work books and some teacher's selected additional reading supplements, writing tasks, listening activities, mini research based presentation or discussion topics.
- It is suggested that during this academic session there should be four quizzes of 40 percent weight (4*10=40), 1 midterm exam of 20 percent weight and 1 final exam of 40 percent weight.
- First quiz should be taken after four units and all lexical items in the units should be included to test the understanding of the students. Both receptive and productive skills regarding the lexical items should be tested.
- Second quiz should be from 5th to 8th units and here recently taught units' lexical items should get the 70 percent weight and first four units should get 30 percent weight. This quiz should be followed by the revision unit/s.
- Then there should be the midterm exam where all units' lexical items get equal weight.
- Third quiz should be from 9th to 12th units and here recently taught units' lexical items should get 60 percent weight and earlier 8 units should get 40 percent weight.
- Fourth quiz should be from 13th to 16th units. Here the recently taught units' lexical items should get 50 percent weight and rest of the 12 units get 50 percent weight. This quiz should be followed by revision unit/s and then the final examination where all units' lexical items get equal percentage.

Conclusion

Language teaching today is both an art and science so the language teachers have to be artists and scientists at the same time to facilitate the process of language teaching and learning. Language teachers have to assess their situation and adopt or adapt the language teaching materials and methodologies accordingly. But the teacher alone cannot do everything and in this regard all involved in the process of language teaching and learning should join hands to make it a success story. One of the important aspects in this regard is the teaching of new lexical items and recycling of already learnt ones. All stake holders of the process should understand its importance and do their part for the smooth and effective execution of the same. Books should provide ample opportunities of teaching new lexical items and recycling of already learnt lexical items. Learners should respond to the tasks maintaining the required standards. Test developers should ensure the testing of all four skills in all quizzes and exams. The testing of newly learnt lexis should be balanced with previously learnt lexis. Teachers have to organize their talk in the class as a model for introduction of new lexis and revision of previously learnt lexis. They should ensure that language teaching tasks and activities are interesting and appropriate. Everyone has to understand the importance of it and contribute to maximize the learning outcomes of the students.

Future Research Topics

1. Quantitative studies on the four mentioned aspects to confirm or reject the suggestions presented in the article.
2. Inclusion of ESL/EFL learners in future studies along with existing participants to verify or reject the suggestions.
3. Experimental researches on the suggestions given in the article.

REFRENCES

Asher, J. 1965. The strategy of total physical response: an application to learning Russian. International Review of Applied Linguistics 3: 291—300.

Asher, J. 1966. The learning strategy of total physical response: a review. Modern Language Journal 50: 79—84.

Asher, J. 1969. The total physical response approach to second language learning.Modern Language Journal.53: 3—17.

Asher, J. 1977. Learning Another Language Through Actions: The Complete Teacher's Guide Book. Los Gatos, Calif.: Sky Oaks Productions. (2nd. ed. 1982.)

Austin, J.L. 1962. How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Azim, M. U., Bhatti, A. M., Hussain, Z., & Iqbal, M. (2018). Culturally oriented textbooks and English Language Teachers. *Hamdard Islamicus*, 41(4), 301-317.

Barcroft, J. & Sommers, M.S. (2005). Effects of acoustic variability on second language vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 387– 414.

Bowles, M.A. (2004). L2 glossing: To CALL or not to CALL .*Hispania*, 87, 541–552.

Brown, H.D. 1980. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Brown, R., R. Waring and S. Donkaewbua. (2008). 'Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition from Reading, Reading-while-listening, and Listening to Stories '*Reading in a Foreign Language*, 20.2: 136– 163.

Candlin, C. N. 1976.Communicative language teaching and debt to pragmatics.In C. Rameh (ed.), Georgetown University Roundtable 1976. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Cheng, Y., & Good, R.L. (2009). L1 glosses: Effects on EFL learners' reading comprehension and vocabulary retention. *Reading in a Foreign Language,* 21, 119–142.

Chomsky, N. 1957.Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. 1966.Linguistic Theory.Reprinted in J.P.B. Allen and P. Van Buren (eds.) Chomsky: Selected Readings, pp. 152-9. London: Oxford.

Coady ,J.(1993).Research on ESL/EFL vocabulary acquisition :Putting it in context. In T. Huckin, M. Haynes ,& J. Coady(Eds.),*Second language reading and vocabulary learning* (pp.3-23).Norwood, NJ :Able.

Corrigan, R. (2007). An experimental analysis of the affective dimensions of deep vocabulary knowledge used in inferring the meaning of words in context. *Applied inguistics*.28/2: 211- 240.

Cowie, A. P. (Eds.). (1988). Stable and creative aspects of vocabulary use.In R. Carter & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary and language teaching* (pp. 126-137). Harlow: Longman.

Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 11, 671–684.

Craik, F. I. M., &Tulving, E. (1975). Depth of processing and the retention of words in Episodic Memory .*Journal of Experimental Psychology*; General, 104, 268–294.

Curran C. A. 1976. Counseling-Learning in Second Languages. Apple River, III.: Apple River Press.

Curran, C. A. 1972. Counseling-Learning: A Whole-Person Model for Education. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Eckerth, J. & Tavakoli , P.(2012). The effects of word exposure frequency and elaboration of word processing on incidental L2 vocabulary acquisition through reading . *Language Teaching Research.*16 (2). 227-257.

Elgort, I, & Warren, P. (2014). L2 vocabulary learning from reading: explicit and tacit lexical knowledge and the role of learner and item variables. *Language Learning.* 64;2, 365-414

Ellis, N. C. (2008). Usage-based and form-focused language acquisition. In P . Robinson & N. C. Ellis (Eds.),Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition(pp. 372–405). New York: Routledge.

English Language Service. 1964. English 900. New York: Collier Macmillan.

Firth, J. R. 1957. Papers in Linguistics: 1934—1951. London: Oxford University Press.

Gattegno, C. 1972. Teaching Foreign languages in Schools: The Silent Way. 2nd. ed. New York: Educational Solution.

Gattegno, C. 1976. The Common Sense of Teaching Foreign Languages. New York: Educational Solutions.

Gumperz, J. J., & D. Hymes(eds.). 1972. Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1973. Explorations in the Functions of Language. London: Edward Arnold.

Harwood, N. (2000) "At the end of the day they don't tally": what researchers tell us about gambits and how materials writers teach gambits.Unpublished MA dissertation, Lancaster University.

Hornby, A.S. 1954. A Guide to Patterns and Usage in English. London: Oxford University Press.

Hornby, A.S., E.V. Gatenbt, and H. Wakefield. 1953. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. London: Oxford University Press.

Horst, M., Cobb, T., & Meara, P. (1998). Beyond a clockwork orange: Acquiring second language vocabulary through reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 11, 207–23.

Howatt, A. P. R. 1984. A History of English Language Teaching. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Hu, M., & Nassaji, H. (2012). Ease of inferencing, learner inferential strategies, and their relationship with retention of word meanings inferred from context. *Canadian Modern language Review*, 68(1), 54-77.

Hulstijn, J. (1992). Retention of inferred and given word meanings: Experiments in incidental vocabulary learning. In P.J.L. Arnaud & H. Bejoing (Eds.) . *Vocabulary and applied linguistics* (pp.113-125). London: Macmillan.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2003). Incidental and intentional learning. In C. J. Doughty & M. H Long (Eds.),*The handbook of second language acquisition*(pp. 349–381). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hymes, D. 1972. On communicative competence.In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.), Sociolinguistics, pp. 269—93.Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Keating, G.D., (2008). Task effectiveness and word learning in a second language: the Involvement Load Hypothesis on trial. *Language Teaching Research*, 12 (3), 365- 386 .

Keller, E. (1979). Gambits: Conversational strategy signals. *Journal of Pragmatics, 3,* 219-237.

Kelly, L. G. 1969. 25 Centuries of Language Teaching. Rowley, Mass. Newbury House.

Kim, Y. J. (2011). The role of task- induced involvement and learner proficiency in L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*. 61, 100–140.

Ko, H.M. (2012). Glossing and second language vocabulary learning. *TESOL QUARTERLY*. Vol.46, No.1. 56-79.

Kojic-Sabo, I. & P.M. Lightbown (1999) Students' approaches to vocabulary learning and their relationship to success.*Modern Language Journal* 83.2: 176–92.

La Forge, P. G. 1971. Community language learning: a pilot study. Language Learning 21 (1): 45—61.

La Forge, P. G. 1975. Research Profiles with Community Language Learning. Apple River, III.: Apple River Press.

La Forge, P. G. 1977. Uses of social silence in the interpersonal dynamics of Community Language Learning. TESOL Quarterly 11 (4): 373—82.

La Forge, P. G. 1983. Counseling and Culture in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.

Lado, R. 1977. Lado English Series.7 books. New York: Regents.

Laufer, B. (1997). What's in a word that makes it hard or easy: Some intralexical factors that affect the learning of words. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.),*Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 140–180). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laufer, B. (2005). Focus on form in second language vocabulary acquisition. In S. Foster-Cohen, M. P. Garcia-Mayo, & J. Cenoz (Eds.),EUROSLA Yearbook 5 (pp. 223–250). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement .*Applied Linguistics*, 22, 1–26.

Lewis, M. (1993).*The lexical approach: The state of ELT and the way forward.* Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (1997) *Implementing the lexical approach: putting theory into practice.*Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (1997b). Pedagogical implications of the lexical approach. In J. Coady& T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy* (pp. 255-270). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Littlejohn, A. (1992) Why are English language teaching materials the way they are? Unpublished PhD Thesis, Lancaster University.

Lozanov, G. 1978. Suggestology and Outlines of Suggestopedy. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Mason, B. & Krashen, S. (2004). Is form-focused vocabulary acquisition worthwhile? *RELC Journal*, 35, 179–85.

Nagy, W. (1997).On the role of context in first-and second-language vocabulary learning .In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds*.), Vocabulary description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp.64— 83).New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Nagy, W. E., P. Herman ,and R. C. Anderson (1985)' .Learning words from context,' *Reading Research Quarterly.*20: 233–53.

Nagy, W. E.and P. A. Herman.(1987). 'Breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge: implications for acquisition and instruction,' in M. McKeown and M. Curtis (eds):*The Nature of Vocabulary Acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 19–3.

Nagy, W. E.andP. A. Herman.(1985). 'Incidental vs. instructional approaches to increasing reading vocabulary,*' Educational Perspectives23*: 16–21.

Nassaji, H. (2004). The relationship between depth of vocabulary knowledge and L2 learners' lexical inferencing strategy use and success. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61(1), 107-134.

Nassaji, H., & Hu, M. (2012). The relationship between task-induced involvement load and learning words from context. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching (IRAL),* 50,69-86.

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

Nation, I. S. P. (2007). The four strands. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching,* 1, 1–12.

Nation, I.S.P. (1990) *Teaching and learning vocabulary.* New York: Newbury House.

Nattinger, J. (1980). A lexical phrase grammar for ESL.*TESOL Quarterly, 14,* 337-344.

Nattinger, J., &DeCarrico, J. (1992).*Lexical phrases and language teaching.*Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Palmer, H.E., and F.G. Blandford. 1939. A Grammar of Spoken English on a Strictly Phonetic Basis. Cambridge. Heffer.

Paradis, M. (1994). Neurolinguistic aspects of implicit and explicit memory: implications for bilingualism and SLA. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 393–419). London, UK: Academic Press.

Paribakht, T, & Wesche, M. (1999). Reading and "incidental" L2 vocabulary acquisition: An introspective study of lexical inferencing .*Studies in Second Language quisition*,21, 195–224 .

http://epistemology.pk/

Paribakht, T. S. (2005). The Influence of L1 Lexicalization on L2 Lexical Inferencing: A Study of Farsi-Speaking EFL Learners. *Language Learning*, 55 (4), 701-748.

Parry, K. (1993). Too many words: Learning the vocabulary of an academic subject. In T. Huckin, M. Haynes, & J. Coady (Eds.),*Second language reading and vocabulary Learning* (pp. 109–127). Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Pawley, A., &Syder, F. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Native-like selection and native-like fluency. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 191-226). London: Longman.

Peters, A. (1983). *The units of language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rott, S. (1999). The effect of exposure frequency on intermediate language learners' incidental vocabulary acquisition and retention through reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*,21, 589–619.

Searle, J. R. 1969. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. M. (Ed.). (1987). *Looking up: An account of the COBUILD project in lexical computing.* London: Collins COBUILD.

Sinclair, J. M., &Renouf, A. (Eds.).(1988). A lexical syllabus for language learning.In R. Carter & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary and language teaching* (pp. 140-158). Harlow: Longman.

Skinner, B. F. 1957. Verbal Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Stein, M.J. (1993). The healthy inadequacy of contextual definition. In J. Coady &T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition* (pp .203-214).New York, NY: Cambridge University Press

Swan, M. 1985. A critical look at the communicative approach. English language Teaching Journal, pt. 1,39(1): 2—12.

Terrell, T. D. 1977. A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning.Modern Language Journal 61: 325—36.

Terrell, T. D. 1981. The natural approach in bilingual education.Ms. California Office of Bilingual Education.

Terrell, T. D. 1982. The natural approach to language teaching: an update. Modern Language Journal 66: 121—32.

Vidal, K. (2003). Academic listening: A source of vocabulary acquisition? *Applied Linguistics.* .24, 56-89.

Waring, R., & Takaki, M. (2003). At what rate do learners learn and retain new vocabulary from reading a graded reader? *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 15(2)130 –163 . .

Widdowson, H. G. 1978. Teaching Language as Communication. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willis, J., & Willis, D. (1989).*Collins COBUILD English course.* London: Collins COBUILD.

Yousefi, M, H. & Biria, R. (2015). Incidental L2 vocabulary learning and retention; types of glossing: marginal glosses vs. endnotes. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World.* Volume 9 (1), 49-56.

Zahar, R., Cobb, T., & Spada, N. (2001). Acquiring vocabulary through reading: Effects of frequency and contextual richness. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 541–72.