TEACHING VOCABULARY USING CONCORDANCE LINES

Dawletova Manzura
a second year master student of NSPI,
foreign language and literature

Abstract: *The article deals with the general interpretation of corpus and corpora and its investigation by diverse famous scholars and investigators. It also shows the importance of corpus-based learning in language learning.*

Key words: *concordance, corpus and corpora, concordance, direct application, corpus-based study, Brown Corpus.*

In this digital period, the process of teaching is incredibly becoming unstable due to technological advancement and the Internet and every field is encountering with completely new pace. In terms of advanced technology teaching lexical skill with concordance lines is absolutely vital for today's teaching process.

After 1960's, when the structural linguistics was substituted by the generative linguistics, the first computer corpus, also known as Brown Corpus, was created by Brown Corpus, W. Nelson Francis and Henry Kucera. But it did not galvanize linguists or teachers; in contrast, made them think the pioneering study as "a useless and foolhardy enterprise" [1:9].

Mainly, there are two popular pedagogical applications of corpora in EFL teaching and learning: indirect and direct applications. Indirect applications consist of scholars and teachers consulting corpora to inform curriculum and materials development, and may lead to authentic examples of language for textbooks rather than invented examples. Direct applications of corpora in language teaching and learning, on the other hand, typically involve learners accessing a corpus directly [2:89].

Corpora may differ in a number of ways, depending on the purpose for which

they have been compiled (general and specialized corpora), the procedure for highlighting their text (sample or full-text corpus), their medium (written, oral or mixed corpus), representativeness of the language (mono-lingual vs. multi-lingual/parallel corpora), time (synchronous, diachronic and historical corpora), format (simple or conventional), annotated corpora), organization (closed/static/reference or

open/dynamic/monitor corpus) and the type of speaker (native speakers or student corpus) [3:28].

You can use corpus and matching tools to define collocations and relationships between words. In addition, corpus-based studies can represent more reliable and quantitative data compared to individual studies [4:87].

Sun and Wang conducted a study in the online environment in Taiwan. With a group of 81 elementary school students. The researchers focused on how vocabulary the acquisition was influenced by three different online matching sites. They focused about verb and prepositional phrases.

The research results showed that the indicator significantly higher in the experimental group than in the control group, high-frequency words; however, when low-frequency words were considered there was no difference between the two groups.

Cobb tried to figure out how to get measurable results from vocabulary acquisition using concordance inference software. He discussed why the matching software was based on offline vocabulary learning. At Qaboos University in Omman Koosha explored the influence of the corpus on the study of phrases by Iranian learners L2. Area of the study was collocations of prepositions. The results of the study were quite positive compared to traditional methods.

What constitutes a "word" varies greatly in the literature [3:67].

The terms word, vocabulary item, and lexical item are used interchangeably. When it comes to how learn these words, the literature says that conceptually difficult words require a different teaching method with their many but more student-friendly meanings [5:66].

The students' use of corpus is based on the fact that familiarity with the word in different contexts helps students better understand the meaning and better memorization of vocabulary items through repeated exposure. So it can be argued that modern corpus linguistics has had a great influence on definition of lexical phenomena with the help of electronic screen learning tools language. As a tool, the concordancer allows you to check a keyword in multiple contexts, eliminating spatial and temporal delays between encounters of words that commonly found in actual speech or writing [6:28].

Certainly, Frankenberg-Garcia found that multiple examples are more effective than the only one that helps students understand new words. More than one required matching line to help understand what the word means on behalf of students because according to the observational hypothesis,

language input does not become consumption unless it is consciously registered. These are two separate processes here: first, notice, and second, convert the noticed input to reception. So, the corpus approach does the same by providing authentic learning environment based on discovery as opposed to more traditional deductive way of teaching and learning, in which students act as "linguistic researchers" or "language detectives", actively analyzing and discovering lexical and grammatical usage on their own. Corpus-based promotes student-centeredness.

Similarly, Halstin and Laufer's Involvement Load Hypothesis suggests that if engagement load is high, students are more likely to learn and retain lexicon. However, the need for certain items should be determined student, not teacher. Thus, in the current design of this study, not only vocabulary learning is facilitated by repeated exposure to words, but also justified the principles of teaching vocabulary and testing [6:54].

In conclusion, corpus-based learning is extremely important for language learners in order to analyse words in real context in terms of communicative language teaching and modern methodology.

REFERENCES:

1.Kazaz.,I. (2020). Alternative vocabulary assessment: Using concordance line activities for testing lexical knowledge. International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET), 7(3).1221-1237.

2. Francis, W. N. (1992). Language corpora B.C. In J. Svartvik (Ed.), Directions in corpus linguistics: proceedings of Nobel symposium, 82 (pp. 17–32). Stockholm.

3. Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11, 129–58.

4.Scott, M., & Tribble, C. (2006). Textual patterns: Key words and corpus analysis in language education. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

5. Stahl, G. (2005). Group cognition in computer-assisted collaborative learning. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 21(2), 79–90.

6.Taylor, R. P. (1980a). The computer in school: Tutor, tool, tutee. New York : Teachers College Press.