

## TEACHING EXPLICIT VOCABULARY IN THE EFL CLASSROOM

**Abdulkhamid Abduvaliev**

**E-mail address: [abduvaliev@jspi.uz](mailto:abduvaliev@jspi.uz)**

**Ziyoda Abduvalieva**

**E-mail address: [abduvalievaziyoda@jspi.uz](mailto:abduvalievaziyoda@jspi.uz)**

**Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute**

**Abstract:** The purpose of this article is to determine whether there are specific ways to teach vocabulary in the Uzbek compulsory school system that can enhance the overall communicative ability of English learners from 7 to 9 years. So adding random phrases here may seem a little strange to the reader. However, in the search for relevant research for this article and in subsequent work with it, it became clear that the study of words by chance is a very large part of how students learn by simply using and influencing CLT language focusing on important aspects of target language communication. This has been demonstrated even more clearly on the basis of vocabulary teaching and in various studies. In addition, research on the study of word combinations is evolving, moving away from these two separate research subjects, namely, random study of words and precise study of words. As a result, the inclusion of this section is relevant in this article.

**Key words:** vocabulary; communicative vocabulary; explicitness; explicit vocabulary; teaching vocabulary; methods; methods of teaching vocabulary; pedagogical methods; compulsory education; CLT language learning.

### INTRODUCTION

Although this article does contain some pedagogical methods of teaching specific vocabularies related to EFL in the Uzbek context of education, it can be questioned what the direct word acquisition is. It is important to include some information about the meaning, learning new words and so on. This can be described as learning hidden phrases and learning without paying special attention

to phrases. This means that it is acquired accidentally during language exposure. The study of random combinations of words is defined as acquisition “not through self-study but through influencing attention to language use” [9, p. 16]. This fits well with the definition of the random word in the Longman Dictionary of Modern English (2003); “Something related or existing to something is more important” [8, p. 822]. In other words, in the process of teaching communicative language, the random acquisition of words, the acquisition of vocabulary can be learnt by the student only through the use and influence of language, and at the same time it focuses on important aspects of communicative language ability to give.

According to Nation (2001), randomized study of words by spelling or guessing their meanings in oral speech is more important than other sources for the study of vocabulary. But he goes on to say that many students “do not perceive the conditions necessary for the emergence of such education”. According to him, in order to guess the words in the text, at least 95% of the working words must already be familiar to the readers [7, p. 232]. Mohammad Mohseni-Far (2008) argues that in order for reading to be an effective source of random word combinations that can provide meaning, students need to be able to understand it for themselves they should be familiar with the many contextual texts they want [6, p. 130]. To bring this into perspective, Nation (2001) requires a second-language learner to read an appropriate level of reading per week for a second-language learner to learn words from a dictionary context [7, p. 238]. Assessed students are described as “books written with controlled vocabulary and limited grammatical structures” [10, p. 150]. In addition to reading one book a week, Nation (2001) states that “second language learners should not rely solely on learning phrases from context” and that reasonable attention should be paid to complementing and complementing decontextualized information" he writes to be supplemented by a study of the context. Direct vocabulary learning and casual learning are complementary activities [7, p. 238].

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

In the Longman Contemporary English (2003) dictionary, the exact term is defined as “very clearly and directly expressed” [8, p. 549]. The following definition of clear vocabulary acquisition is short and succinct; “Precise learning through careful study of words” [12, p. 116]. It can therefore be defined as a method of learning vocabulary through the explicit and intentional study of specific phrases, as opposed to obtaining nonverbal phrases that do not pay special attention to any specific words. This fits well with the definition of an intentional term in a dictionary read “intentionally” [10, p. 847]. Therefore, the explicit approach focuses on combinations such as the issue of engaging the student conscientiously and intentionally in different areas of classroom teaching, rather than assuming that vocabulary is the two products of language exposure and use. For example, it allows students to actively search for unintelligible words in a dictionary, or the teacher spends time in the classroom working with high-frequency words in a particular text, making students read, read, or can lead to what you read.

The main pedagogical direction of teaching English in the compulsory school system in Uzbekistan is the study of functional and communicative languages. Indeed, the explanatory materials of the English curriculum show that research shows that we learn languages most effectively through the study of individual building blocks in a language, rather than through the pursuit of self-expression and understanding and communication we learn. However, vocabulary-oriented teaching or explicit teaching of vocabulary is one of these building blocks, and as Ruzmetova points out, teaching and learning words is not part of any language course is a part of it and it is important that it is preserved. Therefore, the purpose of this article to remind the reader in a timely manner is only if there are specific pedagogical methods of teaching clear vocabulary within the CLT for EHL teaching and as a result can increase overall communicativeness. Compliance of English language students from 7 to 9 years with the English language curriculum is seen in the compulsory school system of Uzbekistan [9, p. 25].

After reading through the searches, it became clear how often vocabulary appears through reading. Even in studies that do not necessarily focus on the interrelationship of reading and vocabulary, researchers have often cited examples of other research in this field and used them as examples in their work. At the same time, we expand our vocabulary by talking and / or listening to other people directly or through various means such as television, movies, and the Internet. Therefore, it was surprising that the area of vocabulary acquisition through speaking and listening in research was very small. Despite this obvious disparity, the studies are divided into different categories in the results and discussion section of this article in order to make the task of comparing and contrasting them more practical and easier to break down.

It has also become clear that some research can be categorized into several categories. As a result, they are used and discussed under different categories of headings as needed. For example, de la Fuentes, the study of vocabulary in the L2 class: the study of the role of pedagogical tasks and form-oriented guideline (2006) covers the effect of attention on form, but this is done on the basis of pedagogical tasks. As a result, this study was recorded not only in the Form Focus category, but also in the Training Tasks + Specific categories listed below in the main part section [4, p. 27].

Because there has been so much research on vocabulary research, search parameters have been reduced from the early 2000s to recent research. Schmitt (2000) and Nation (2001) provided a springboard for further reading at the beginning of this article, as they themselves are leaders in the field of vocabulary acquisition in foreign and second languages. They also refer to other research in the field of vocabulary study and acquisition. So I found this to be a very good starting point for this research. The choice of sources used is based on the relevance of each study to the research question. The following search terms were used; Learning vocabulary in a second language, teaching vocabulary in a second language, teaching random vocabulary, learning vocabulary, learning vocabulary

learning, mastering clear words, teaching definite words, learning definite words, speaking a second language.

Apart from the link between reading and vocabulary study, not much research has been done in specific areas or because the search parameters used in this article were not sufficient to find them. At a glance, this seems to be confirmed in a study that acknowledged that the bulk of previous random dictionary collection research was based on input, at least through texts [2, p. 228]. This is reflected in the results and discussion section below, where Studying Reading + Explicit are the largest area, while other areas are displayed less. The categories are:

1. Studying Reading + Explicit
2. Training Tasks + Explicit
3. Accidental Vocabulary Study
4. Shape Focus Vocabulary
5. Explicit focus

This section includes research on vocabulary learned through reading, which is complemented by clear instruction and study by teachers and students. The various studies conducted here focus on the importance of word repetition, how many classes a student can attend per week, the requirements for subsequent students to take on extracurricular responsibilities, the role of the teacher, and the role of students in clearly teaching their needs for vocabulary.

Research comparing random reading of a dictionary with the study of speech is supported only by the precise teaching of the meaning of a word, while random lexical gains are achieved only by reading although achieved, teaching clear vocabulary after reading is more effective than the “Read-Plus”, “Read Only” approach to word enrichment [11, p. 257]. This can be compared to other studies on reading and explicit vocabulary learning, with the result that students are forced to learn and test on target words while reading. Informing has led to an increase in the learning of word forms in relation to students read only for meaning [1, p. 97].

A study of meaning recognition found that students who were supported by clear vocabulary teaching after reading scored 52 percent on the meaning memorization test a week later, 38 percent. However, in order to maintain the level of income, it is important for the authors to have a repeated exposure to the vocabulary, otherwise “initial study may be useless” [11, p. 257].

The above idea is also highlighted in another article that reviews and evaluates research on a second language reading dictionary. The authors note that students with only one or two English lessons per week should wait between the first contact with the new dictionary and its revision, indicating that it will limit retention by students. As a result, they believe that students should take more responsibility for considering new vocabularies outside the classroom environment. This is similar to my current teaching situation where my students only take one English lesson per week. While the idea of students taking on more responsibility outside the classroom is appealing, we recognize that less enthusiastic individuals of different backgrounds and levels of support can achieve nothing at all. In fact, the authors argue that word enrichment is “the most effective of the short and frequent training sessions that spread over time,” and that two-and-a-half-hour sessions consist of six ten-minute sessions. They cite the example of saying that it is more inefficient than the clouds [6, p.31]. Again, this seems like an attractive idea for vocabulary processing, but the curriculum itself makes the practical pressure of the time and interval of classes in Swedish schools making it difficult to implement.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

Despite these considerations about the practical feasibility of optimizing lesson schedules and the fact that students take more responsibility outside the classroom, Feezell (2012) found it useful in his article on robust vocabulary in his student workshop offers some positive points that can be made. The article discusses the idea of removing newly encountered words from the classroom by actively searching for texts that are read and used in a variety of activities in areas

where students are outside the school environment. He also argues that "Student choice is probably the only defining feature of workshop teaching", where students have autonomy in choosing which books to read, as well as which words to learn, and so on adds that it creates a "sense of ownership" while helping students develop methane in the process [3, p. 234]. Teaching this in this way can mean that it has a positive effect on students 'motivation levels, and as a result, allows students to do what is required outside the classroom environment.

A brief explanation of what metacognitive reading strategies are given in a study that examines the pedagogical impact of EFL teachers. The author's metacognitive reading strategy can be divided into three distinct groups, namely planning (pre-reading), monitoring (during reading), and evaluation (post-reading) strategies. An example of a planning strategy is "activating students' basic knowledge in preparation for reading". Monitoring strategies emerge during the reading process and include an understanding of vocabulary comprehension and / or whether students understood what they have read so far [5, p. 2]. Finally, a third strategy involves assessment after reading the text, where students can identify the author, narrator, or main character and see the situation in the book better than the previous ones [5, p. 3]. These ideas emphasize the need for teachers to not only plan relevant and effective tasks, but also to be able to read, but also to manage them in a way that leads to students 'effective mastery of vocabulary. Hopefully, this will allow students to achieve a higher level of variability, accuracy, consistency, and descriptiveness of the language that is completely lacking in what was mentioned earlier in this article.

## **CONCLUSION**

The synthesis of this research is aimed at identifying what practical pedagogical methods of teaching specific vocabulary for teaching EFL in the context of Uzbek education in the context of communicative language teaching are related. What affects how students in the EFL class acquire vocabulary is that it is very difficult to pinpoint any specific theory or method that can be used to

determine how we acquire vocabulary in a foreign language, and therefore which methods each which class may be appropriate. Research on the interrelationship of reading and vocabulary appears to be much more extensive than research on the interrelationship of vocabulary with other means.

This article shows that while a certain level of clear vocabulary lessons seems to be effective in language development as a complement to CLT, it also greatly enhances teachers vocabulary emphasizes the importance of being aware of unit hazards. the more the student deals with words, the less likely he or she is to have a small number of phrases using different tasks, as it takes a long time to focus on specific areas of words. It takes less time to complete tasks like this and therefore will not be important for teaching the EFL in a Swedish educational setting.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- [1].Barcroft, J. (2009). Effects of synonym generation on incidental and intentional L2 vocabulary learning during reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(1), 79-103. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/85706663?accountid=12249>
- [2]. 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), 227-252. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1449083914?accountid=12249>
- [3]. Feezell, G. (2012). Robust vocabulary instruction in a readers' workshop. *The Reading Teacher*, 66(3),233-237. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1417554754?accountid=12249>
- [4]. Fuente, M. J. d. I. (2006). Classroom L2 vocabulary acquisition: Investigating the role of pedagogical tasks and form-focused instruction. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(3), 263-295. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/85635990?accountid=12249>
- [5]. Iwai, Y. (2011). The effects of metacognitive reading strategies: pedagogical implications for EFL/ESL teachers. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online*



- Journal, 11(2), 150-159. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1030894062?accountid=12249>
- [6]. Mohseni-Far, M. (2008). In search of the best technique for vocabulary acquisition. *Eesti Rakenduslingvistika Uingu Aastaraamat*, 4, 121-138. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/85659272?accountid=12249>
- [7]. Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- [8]. Pearson Education Limited. (2003). *Longman dictionary of contemporary English*. Harlow: Longman.
- [9]. Ruzmetova, M., Orazova, F., & Kayumova, G. (2020). The Role of Teaching Vocabulary Competence in English. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, (3).
- [10]. Schmitt, Norbert. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- [11]. Sonbul, S., & Schmitt, N. (2010). Direct teaching of vocabulary after reading: Is it worth the effort? *ELT Journal*, 64(3), 253-260. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/758115421?accountid=12249>