EFFECTS OF TEACHING VOCABULARY AT ELEMENTARY LEVEL THROUGH THE ECLECTIC APPROACH

Najeebullah*, Irfan Ullah† & Muhammad Kaleem‡

Abstract

Vocabulary acquisition is vital to language learning. Vocabulary learning and grammar; vocabulary learning and communications skills; vocabulary learning and comprehension and retention are inseparably unified.A single teaching technique cannot meet the diverse, multifaceted, multilayered and multiplied needs of the learners. So, there is a need for a rich and varied diet. Thus, the current study intendedto measure the effect of teaching vocabulary at elementary level through eclectic approach in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The keypurposes of the study were: to look into the influence of Eclectic Approach on vocabulary building;to delve theconsequence of Eclectic Approach on pronunciation; andto delve the consequence of the Eclectic Approach on students' retention level.Three teaching techniques: Mother-tongue Equivalence; Repeat-after-me; and Gestures and Mimes were used for teaching vocabulary. The sample of the study consisted of 56schoolboys studying English in eighth Grade at Govt. High School, Timergara, KPK, Pakistan. Pre-test post-test equivalent group design was chosen for the conduction of this research. For formation of two groups, pair random sampling technique was applied. The group under investigation was subjected to the treatment of the Eclectic Approach, while in contrast the control group was taught through conventional lecture method. For the collection of data, teacher-made pretest, posttest and retention test were used. Independent samplet-test was used to analyze the collected data.Thestudy findingsexpounded that the Eclectic Approach of teaching proved far and much better than the traditional approaches for teaching vocabulary. Thus, for effective and productive teaching of

---

*   Associate Professor, Govt. College of Management Sciences, Timergara.
†   Senior Teacher National Special Education Complex Mardan.
‡   Assistant Professor Bacha Khan University Charsadda.

vocabulary at all levels of education, the Eclectic Approach of teaching is recommended.

Keywords: *Communication Skills, Eclectic Approach, Vocabulary*

Introduction

Bibi (2002) compared the controversy that has been raised in our country regarding the adoption of the appropriate medium of instructions. Some advocate in favor of Urdu as a medium of instructions (Haque, 2019; Ahmed, 2011; Halai &Durrani, 2020); others argue in favor of English (Marsh, 2006). Nevertheless, today, we all know that English Language has become the dominant language of all sciences, research, publication, trade, international relations, travelling, tourism, sports and computing (Kaplan, 2001). No sane person can deny its importance; its international charisma;its dominant stature; its fullness and lush; and its currency. According to Horny (2000), language study basically means the grammar study of that language. He adds that grammar and vocabulary are interrelated to each other. Grammar and grammar rules cannot be taught without vocabulary and vice-versa (Leonardi, 2009). Actually, the building of vocabulary is impossible without grammar rules (McCarten, 2007). So, grammar and vocabulary are attached and should be taught as an integrated whole (Larsen-Freeman, 2001). If language needs to be formed into meaningful utterances, expressions and sentences, one needs to put words into order according to grammar rules. Subon (2016) also endorses that vocabulary learning and teaching is very important for acquiring communications skills. Vocabulary increases comprehension (Duff, 2019). Those students who have low vocabulary scores, the usually have low comprehension level. Contrarily, students with high and rich vocabulary have high level of comprehension (Tozcu & Coady, 2004). Vocabulary, no doubt can be acquired indirectly as in the case of the children. Children copytheir elders and learn words. Then, the same words are used by them in their speaking (Brown, Waring & Donkaewbua, 2008). Nevertheless, direct (intentional) and explicit teaching of vocabulary is also badly required. Mellow (2002) says that language has grammar. Language is like a building. Words are its bricks. Grammar is the architect's plan. Now, millions of bricks cannot make a building if there is no architectural plan (Wen, 2018). Likewise, words without the knowledge of rules to put them together cannot enable one to communicate. According to Popova (2001), different approaches and methods are adopted in order to teach vocabulary. Nevertheless, because of the multiplicity of the needs of the learner, a single diet of teaching cannot meet all the learner's needs. The National panel (2000) also reached to a striking conclusion that a single method is not enough to teach vocabulary. It recommended using a variety of indirect (incidental) and direct (intentional) methods for vocabulary

teaching. Therefore, a varied and rich diet (Eclectic Approach) can guarantee the fulfillment of the learner's distinct, varied and multi-faceted needs. TheEclectic Approach is the preeminentinstructional approach which comprise on top of thetechniques from diverseinstructional approaches are scientifically united and implemented on need baseto fulfill the multidimensional and diverserequirements of the students (Kumar, 2013). Thus, vocabulary learning is important in itself and it is inseparably and importantly linked to other aspects of language (grammar, communications skills, retention and comprehension level etc.).

Problem Statement

The main aim of this experimental study was to investigate the comparative effectiveness of the Eclectic Approach of teaching on acquiring vocabulary at elementary level in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

Objectives of the Study

1. To look into the influence of Eclectic Approach on vocabulary building.
2. To investigatethe consequence of Eclectic Approach on pronunciation.
3. To delvedig into the effect of the Eclectic Approach on students' retention level.

Hypotheses of the Study

Three null hypotheses were developed to further proceed the study for testing the above objectives.

1. There is no significant differencebetween the mean scores of both groups in posttest after treatment in vocabulary building.
2. There is no significant influence noted on the consequences of Eclectic Approach on pronunciation after treatment.
3. The retention test scores of both the groups were the same after the treatment. There is no significant influence noted in retention level of both groups after treatment

Literature Review

According to Hornby (2000), vocabulary means the connotations and understanding of words. Vocabulary also means the words we generally use or words related to a specific trade, occupation or subject (Schwartz & Raphael, 1985). Generally, vocabulary is not officially counted as the language skill. Nevertheless, it must be included in the language skills because progress in language learning is impossible without vocabulary

building. There is an inseparable and integrated connection between vocabulary and grammar; vocabulary and communications skill; vocabulary and retention; and vocabulary and comprehension. Vocabulary is a complex subject to understand. It has different aspects connected to it. A word has a meaning, pronunciation, grammatical structure, spelling, register and collocation. Folse (2004) is of the view that the learning and teaching of vocabulary has always been a great problem in the teaching of English Language. It has been neglected, overlooked and has been left to take care of itself. According to Shoebottom (2007), the learning of vocabulary is central to language learning because the more words the students know; the more able and confident they are in understanding and communicating language.

Correct pronunciation is also very important for language learning. The articulation of sounds of words by native speakers is called pronunciation (Tang, Zhang, Li & Zhao, 2013). Dealing with pronunciation, we interact with phonology and theoretical context of phonetics (Machaekora, 2012).Correct pronunciation is highly stressed to learn because wrong pronunciation once developed cannot be rectified easily because bad pronunciation causes confusion, bad communication and even obstruction (Pourhossein, 2016). In available literature two assumptions prevails regarding learning pronunciation of second language. The one is "the critical period hypothesis" which advocates that that it is not possible for grown people to acquire pronunciation like native speakers. In contrast the other assumption advocates that pronunciation can be acquired like any skill and cannot be affected by focused instructions Krashen (1982). Hashemian and Fadaei, (2011) added that second language pronunciation affected by interaction with native speakers and motivation level of learner.

Many methodologies adapted to the developing of pronunciation in order to attainunderstandable pronunciation (Pourhossein,2016), among these approaches "*intuitive-imitative approach*", the "*analytic-linguistic approach*", and the "*integrative approach*" are commonly adopted for teaching pronunciation. These are the combination of modern and traditional methods (Hashemian & Fadaei, 2011). The "*intuitive-imitative approach*" depends on the student'scapability to listen and reproduce the sounds and rhythms of the language without the involvement of any obvious information (Hashemian & Fadaei, 2011; Roohani, 2013). The 'repeat-after-me' method is the good example of this approach.

Usually, at our educational institutions, translation method is used to teach vocabulary (Awan & Shafi, 2016). No doubt, using the translation method can improve students' translations skills; nevertheless, this method has some negative aspects too. For example, it does not lead to synonym and antonym building; it overlooks the different aspects of the word (structure of the word, formation of the word, context of the word, word-sketch relation, word-object relation etc); and it hinders fluency (Warsi, 2004). Nematollahi (2017) opines that it is not wise to use a single teaching technique for

teaching vocabulary because the problems and needs of the students have multiplied many times. A single diet cannot satiate their hunger. Furthermore, every word cannot be taught through a single teaching technique productively and effectively. Instead, a varied, rich, effective, productive and holistic approach (Eclectic Approach) is needed to meet their multi-faceted needs and make them well-versant and well fluent in vocabulary.

Repeat-after me

Repetition is considered as an effective strategy and it has a long and varied history. Crevecoeur (2011) discovers that 100 percent English teachers at secondary level use repetition in their classes. Suwannarat and Tangkiengsirisin, (2012) report that English teachers commonly use repetition drills in their classrooms in Thailand. Similarly, Liu (2010) reports that 80 % of students who learn English in Chinese independent colleges use oral repetition. It is considered a very effective learning strategy for learning vocabulary. Oberge (2012) cites a variety of studies that repetition drill can increase vocabulary acquisition and retention and rote learning. According to Amir and Noor (2012), 'repeat-after-me' is a productive, effective and time-tested teaching techniquewhich has time and again shown and proven its utility for correcting pronunciation; building and enriching vocabulary; sharpening intellect; strengthening retention; improving skills (listening/ reading); expand and strengthen rote learning and helping in the acquiring of the second language. It is also very helpful for students with "learning disabilities". 'Repeat-after-me' can be used in different ways. It can be used for learning words, phrases, phonic patterns and sentence drills. This technique can be used with individual students, group of students or the whole class. Peer tutoring is one of the effective strategies for this technique (Ullah, Tabassum & Kaleem, 2018). The following are the various examples of 'repeat-after-me'.

Words/Phonic Pattern/Phrases/Sentences or Statements

Teacher:	normal	Teacher:	particular
Students:	normal	Students:	particular
Teacher:	take care of	Teacher:	Take care of your teeth/hair/car…health.
Students:	take care of	Students:	Take care of your teeth/hair/car…health.
Teacher:	I am glade to	Teacher:	I am glade to meet/help/teach… you.
Students:	I am glad to	Students:	I am glad to meet/help/teach…you.

Mother Tongue Equivalence

Koucka (2007) argues that 'Mother Tongue Equivalence' teaching technique can prove very effective for making the input easy and

comprehensible for learners. Furthermore, it can greatly help the learners to pick the target grammar; to build their fluency; to mitigate their anxiety, fear and discouragement; to help the shy, weak, withdrawing, morbid, less active and less promising learner to get rid of these evils; to know the tasks and the activities very well; to ensure independent learning; to boost up self-confidence; to comprehend and grasp the meaning of the grammar and vocabulary of that language; to guarantee super fluency; and to provide opportunities to use 'scaffolding' between students. The importance of mother tongue or mother-tongue equivalence technique to build vocabulary and to promote learning proficiency has also been supported by other researches (Klein, 2003; Makalela, 2005 and Prinsloo, 2007). Itcan be used for different purposes and in different creative ways. It helps in building listening, speaking, pronunciation, vocabulary, translation, retention and communication skills. The weak, shy and withdrawing students find this activity very encouraging and useful (Kavaliauskienė, 2009). The following is an example of learning, practicing and mastering the phrase 'don't forget to…' with mother-tongue equivalence. The teacher gives an example. Then, the students do practice in pairs.

Teacher: Che darwaza bandawal darna heer nashee.
Teacher: Don't forget to close the door.

Now, the students start doing practice in pairs. One student in the pair makes a mother tongue phrase or sentence; while the second student in the pair listens, retains, translates and communicates. The teacher walks around and helps the students. For example:

A: Che light on kawal darna heer nashee.
B: Don't forget to <u>turn on</u> the light.
A: Che light off kawal darna heer nashee.
B: Don't forget to <u>turn off</u> the light.
A: Che kapre istree kawal darna heer nashee.
B: Don't forget to <u>iron</u> the clothes.

Useful vocabulary
Turn on, turn off, iron, pack, put away' lock, unlock, blow out, complete, forget, bring, buy, call, post etc**.**

Furthermore, 'mother tongue equivalence' can also be used in pair to pair practice. One pair makes a mother tongue 'phrase or sentence'; the other pair listens carefully and attentively, retains, translates and communicates. The 'target grammar' is to practice modal helping verb 'can' with the meaning 'ability'. For example:

A: tha English waileshee?
B: aw, khokha ye nashumwaile.
Now, the next pair translates.
C: Can you speak English?
D: Yes, I can, but not very well.

Useful vocabulary
Speak, fly, play, cook, bake, make, sew, ride, swim, dance, ski, skate, drive, fix, draw, sing, milk, write, teach, knead, paint, build, babysit, cut etc.

Gestures and Mimes

Wickham (2012) explains that gestures and mimes are useful and humorous activities and vocabulary builders. Gestures and mimes mean acting out. Gesture is a single step acting out; while in mimes, more than one step-acting-out takes place. Gestures and mimes are used in a variety of situations and for multifaceted purposes. They prove very handy to both teachers and students in making the class instructions and class activities easy, comprehensible and enjoyable (Alibali & Kita, 2010). Gestures and mimes offerdifferent prospects for learners to actively and happily contribute in class activities. Gestures and mimes can be very handy for giving class instructions and especially in those classrooms where the settings are crowded and noisy. Gestures and mimes can also be used for vocabulary teaching, pronunciation correction, practicing dialogues and above all as gaming activity (Tellier, 2008). Gestures and mimes are also helpful in creating fun and interest in the class. The teacher writes a few words or phrases on the board or demonstrates them through flash cards or word strips. Then, he tells the students to form pairs or groups and act out the words or phrases through gestures or mimes. After this, he calls the students in front of the class to select a word or phrase and to act out through gestures or mimes (Macedonia & Kriegstein, 2012). For example, the following words or phrases can be used as a model activity

wink	bark	apply brake
weep	wave hand	back up from the parking lot
comb hair	pat on shoulder	change tire
put on socks	climb up wall	fasten seat belt
laugh	glance into the mirror	clap hands etc.

Research Methodology

Population
The population of this experimental study consisted of all students studying English in eighthclass in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (EMIS, 2015).

Sample
Male students, 56 in number, learning the language of English in eighthGrade at Government High School Timergara, KPK, Pakistan, were taken as a sample of the study through random technique.

Study Design

Pretest Posttest Equivalent Group Design was adopted for conducting this study. (Farooq, 2001). Both the pre-test and post-test had equal difficulty level. Both the tests included items to test the vocabulary and pronunciation level and competency of the students. For example, students were taught the past forms of regular verbs (worked, called and added). In the pre-test and post-test, they were given ten words ending with 'ed' and they were asked to tell the final sound.

Tools for Data Collection

Pretest, posttest and retention test were chosen as data collection tools.In order to ensure the content validity of these instruments, some important steps − making specification chart, consulting the subject teacher and seeking the critical guidance of the research supervisor − were taken. For testing the reliability of the instruments, they passed through test retest technique. Malestudents (56), who were not a part of the experiment, took the test. Total time given to the students was one hour and the test carried 75 marks. The reliability coefficient of the test was 0.99.

Study procedure

a) The sample students took pretest. Two groups of students were formed on the basis ofpretestresults using the procedure of pair random. The contents from the English grammar of eighth grade were selected and taught to both groups. The researcher developed fourteen lesson plans (based on the principles of the Eclectic Approach) for the investigational group and at the same time the control group received routine treatment. The time of the treatment was six weeks.
b) The students took post-test after the experiment ended.
c) After four weeks of the treatment, they took retention test.

Collection of Data

Pre-test, post-test and retention tests were used to collect the data from sample participants.

Data Analysis

After finding and calculating the mean values of the scores obtained from the two groups, the inferential statistics, t-test for independent sample was applied to decidewhether the difference between the mean score of both groups is significant or not. For testing the null hypothesis, 0.05 was set as significance level.

Results of the Study

Table 1:   Significant difference in vocabulary on pretest

Group	N	Mean	S.D	SE_D	t-value	p-value
Experimental Group	28	11.41	2.45			
				0.47	0.03	0.48
Control Group	28	10.93	1.46			
Df=54				Table value at 0.05= 2.015		

Table No.1 reveals that each group had28 students. The experimental and control groups showed 11.41 and 10.93 means scores respectively. The standard deviation scores of both groups were 2.45 and 1.46 respectively. The result of t-value is 0.03is smaller than t-table value, 2.015 and further the elevated p-value than 0.05 fall in favors of the null hypothesis and hence no significant difference existed between the two groups on pre-test. As a result, both groups were declared equalin vocabulary on pre-test on the basis of this result.

Table 2: Significant difference in vocabulary on posttest

Group	N	Mean	S.D	SE_D	t-value	p-value
Experimental Group	28	14	3.20			
				1.06	*4.15*	0.00
Control group	28	10.61	4.13			
Df=54				Table valueat 0.05= 2.015		

Table No. 2 shows that each grouphad 28 students. The experimental and control groups achieved 14 and 10.61 mean scores respectively. The standard deviation scores of experimental group was 3.20, which was lower than the control group, 4.13 which shows that experimental group was less diverse from the mean value than the control group in the score obtained in vocabulary after posttest. The obtained t-value is 4.15, which is greater than table value, 2.015and further low p-value than 0.05 rejects the null hypothesis andshowing that a significant difference existed between the two groups on post-test. The experimental group outscored the control group.

Table 3: Significant difference in pronunciation on posttest

Group	N	Mean	S.D	SE_D	t-value	p-value
Experimental Group	28	10.79	3.36			
				0.95	*2.52*	0.007
Control Group	28	8.5	2.94			
Df=54			Table value at 0.05 =2.015			

Table No.3 reveals that each group had 28 students. The experimental and control groups got 10.79 and 8.5 means scores respectively. The standard deviation score of experimental score was 3.36, which was lower than the standard deviation score 2.94 which indicates more dispersion from mean score in experimental group in the posttest of pronunciation as compared to control group. The value, 2.52 achieved from t-test was greater than 2.05, the table valueand further low p-value than 0.05 rejects the null hypothesis and leads to the decision that the difference in mean scores existed between the two groups is substantial on post-test in pronunciation. The results proved the effectiveness of the Eclectic Approach.

Table 4: Significant difference in retention scores after four weeks

Group	N	Mean	S.D	SE_D	t-value	p-value
Experimental Group	28	13.07	3.71			
				1.03	*2.37*	0.010
Control Group	28	10.54	3.89			

Df=54   Table value at 0.05= 2.015

Table No.4 exhibits each group had 28 student. The experimental and control groups achieved 13.07 and 10.54 mean value in retention scores respectively. The standard deviation scores were 3.71 and 3.89 which were almost same. The value, 2.37 achieved from t test was lower than 2.05, the table value and further low p-value than 0.05 rejects the claim of null hypothesis which leads to the decision that the difference in mean scores existed between the two groups is substantial on retention test. The experimental group retained more of the materials and for a longer time.

Discussion

The analysis of the pretest showed that both the groups were almost equal as for as their vocabulary level was concerned. The difference between the two groups at 0.05 level was insignificantbefore treatment. The null hypothesis No.1 received acceptancebecause of t-value 0.03 > 2.015 (t table value). Thus, both the groups could be considered equivalent before the treatment. After equating the groups, the treatment of the Eclectic Approach was provided to the investigational group while the control group was left to its routine treatment. Fourteen lesson plans (based on the Eclectic Approach principles) were developed and taught to the experimental group. The experiment time was six weeks. The group which was instructed by Electric Approach outperformed the control group on post-test in English vocabulary. The two means revealed significant difference at 0.05 level which caused the denial of the null hypotheses is No.1 because of t-value 4.15

> 2.015 (t table value). The difference was in favor of the Eclectic Approach. Sultana (2014) conducted a similar study and came up with similar results. Her research results also revealed that the Eclectic Approach has proved more effective than the other traditional methods. Further the same findings reveled by Suleman and Hussain (2016) that electic approach of teaching has significant effect on academic performance in language learning. The comparison of mean post-test scores of experimental and control groups showed significant difference in pronunciation. The approach of eclectic strategies in the instructional process was equally effective on pronunciation. The difference was significant at 0.05 level. Resultantly, the null hypothesis No.2 faced rejection because of t-value 2.52> 2.015 (t table value). The results of this study mirror the views of Hussain (2005) andTabassum, (2018) that Eclectic Approach in teaching second language plays an important role in enhancing students learning and communication abilities. When mean retention scores of both the groups were compared, it was found out that significant difference existed between them at 0.05 level. The results helped to determine the effectiveness of the Eclectic Approach. Thus, the null hypothesis No.3 got rejected because of t-value 2.37 > 2.015 (t table value). The results of the present study and the ones reached at by Chen (2012) are almost the same. Both studies revealed that when students were instructed using the Eclectic approach, they exhibited superior results than their counterparts and retained the taught materials well and for longer time.

Conclusion

On the whole, the results of the study show that the Eclectic Approach is more successful for teaching vocabulary as compared to the traditional teaching approaches. When students received the treatment of the Eclectic Approach, they outscored and outperformed their counterparts taught through the conventional approaches in vocabulary and pronunciation. Furthermore, the experimental group outdid its counterpart in retention test and retained more of the materials and for a longer time.

Recommendations

The results show that if proper teaching method is applied; if the textbooks are written on the lines of Eclectic Approach; if the teacher is properly and intensively trained; if the classrooms are equipped with language teaching materials, such as dictionaries, flash cards, audio-video aids, multi-media, recording devices, toy objects and real life objects, etc.; and if the classroom is converted into activity-based classroom; if the students are given some autonomy to handle their activities and to actively participate in the class, it can yield outstanding outcomes. Therefore, it is

recommended that the policy makers should give a due weightage to the applicability of the Eclectic Approach at different levels of education. Further it is also recommended to run some more studies on diverse sample students at all levels and in various contexts of educationin order to fully explore the effectiveness of electric approach of teaching.

References

Ahmed, S.I. (2011). Issue of medium of instruction in Pakistan. *International journal of social sciences and education*, *1*(1), 66-82.

Alibali, M.W., & Kita, S. (2010). Gesture highlights perceptually present information for speakers. *Gesture*, *10*(1), 3-28.

Amir, Z., & Noor, N.M. (2009). Explaining the vocabulary learning strategies of English as a foreign language learners. Retrieved from http://www.languageswithoutlimits.co.uk./SBremmer.pdf.

Awan, A.G., & Shafi, M. (2016). Analysis of Teaching Methods of English Language at Government Secondary School Level in DG Khan City-Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management and Social Sciences ISSN*, *2519*, 0091.

Brown, R., Waring, R., & Donkaewbua, S. (2008). Incidental vocabulary acquisition from reading, reading-while-listening, and listening to stories. *Reading in a foreign language*, *20*(2), 136-163.

Duff, D. (2019). The effect of vocabulary intervention on text comprehension: Who benefits?. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *50*(4), 562-578.

EMIS, (2015). Educational Management Information System. Khyber Pakhtoonkhwa education statistics 2014-15. Retrieved June 24, 2016, from www.kpese.gov.pk/EMIS.html.

Farooq, R.A. (2001). *Understanding research in education*. Rawalpindi, University Institute of Education: University of Arid Agriculture.

Folse, K.S. (2004). *Vocabulary myths: Applying second language research to classroom teaching.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Halai, A., & Durrani, N. (2020). School Education System in Pakistan: Expansion, Access, and Equity. *Handbook of Education Systems in South Asia*, 1-30.

Haque, A.U. (2019). Urdu as Medium of Instruction in Professional Institutions. *International Journal of Pathology*, 48-49.

Hashemian, M., & Fadaei, B. (2011). A Comparative Study of Intuitive-imitative and Analytic-linguistic Approaches towards Teaching English Vowels to L2 Learners. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, *2*(5).

Hornby, A.S. (2000). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary.* Oxford University Press, ISBN 0-19-431585-1.

Hussain, I. (2005). Teaching English through Direct and Traditional Methods. *(Doctoral Dissertation).* Arid Agriculture Unversity, Pakistan. pp.76-94.

Kaplan, R.B. (2001). English–the accidental language of science. *The dominance of English as a language of science: Effects on other languages and language communities*, 3-26.

Kavaliauskienė, G. (2009). Role of mother tongue in learning English for specific purposes. *ESP world*, *8*(1), 1-12.

Klein, W. (2003). *Second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koucka, A. (2007). *The role of mother tongue in English Language teaching.* Pardubric University ,Czech Rupublic. pp.17-20.

Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition.

Kumar, C.P. (2013). The eclectic method-theory and its application to the learning of English. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, *3*(6), 1-4.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Teaching grammar. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, *3*, 251-266.

Leonardi, V. (2009). Teaching business English through translation. *Journal of Universal Language*, *10*(1), 139-153.

Liu, Z. (2010). *A Study of english voabulary learning strategies for non-English majors in Independent Colleg.* Cross-Cultural Communication, 6: pp.152-164.

Macedonia, M., & von Kriegstein, K. (2012). Gestures enhance foreign language learning.

iReteslaw Macháčková, E. (2012). *Teaching English pronunciation to secondary school students with focus on TH consonants* (Doctoral dissertation, Masarykovauniverzita, Pedagogickáfakulta).

Makalela, L. (2005). *We speak eleven tongues. Reconstructing multilingualism in South*

Africa. In B. Brock-Utne & R. Kofi Hopson (Eds.), Language of instruction for African emancipation: Focus on postcolonial contexts and considerations (p.p 147-175) Cape Town: CASAS

Marsh, D. (2006, March). English as medium of instruction in the new global linguistic order: Global characteristics, local consequences. In *Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference for Middle East Teachers of Science, Mathematics and Computing. Abu Dhabi: METSMaC* (pp. 29-38).

McCarten, J. (2007). Teaching vocabulary. *Lessons from the Corpus. Lessons from the Classroom*.

Mellow, J.D. (2002). Towards principled eclecticism in language teaching: The two-dimensional model and the centering principle.*TESL-EJ*, 5(4), 1-1.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching Children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769), Washington, DC:U.S. Government Pinting Office, pp.13-14.

Nematollhi, B. (2017). A Meta-Analysis of vocabulary learning strategies of EFL learners.

English Language Teaching, vol.8 (5), 1-3.

Oberg, A. (2012). Receptive and Productive Vocabulary Acquisition: Examining Processing Time and Memory Threshold.*Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 2, pp.23-40.

Popova, D. (2001). *Eclecticism in foreign language teaching.* Bourgas Free University, Bulgaria. pp. 1-4.

Pourhossein Gilakjani, A. (2016). English pronunciation instruction: A literature review. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, *1*(1), 1-6.

Prinsloo, D. (2007). The right to mother tongue education: A multidisciplinary, normative perspective. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 25, 27-43.

Roohani, A. (2013). A comparative study of intuitive-imitative and analytic-linguistic approaches to teaching pronunciation: does age play a role. *The Asian EFL Journal* , *15*(1), 87-127.

Schwartz, R.M., & Raphael, T.E. (1985). Concept of definition: A key to improving students' vocabulary. *The reading teacher*, 198-205.

Shoebottom, P. (2007). *General academic vocabulary. A Guide to Learning English.* Franfurt International School.

Subon, F. (2015). Direct vocabulary instruction: The effects of contextualized word families on learners' vocabulary acquisition, *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, Vol 224), 284-291.

Suleman, Q., & Hussain, I. (2016). Effects of Eclectic Learning Approach on Students' Academic Achievement and Retention in English at Elementary Level. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(16), 32-37.

Sultana, S.A. (2014). Developing the technical writing skills of professional learners- An Eclectic Approach. B.S. Abur Rahman University, Vadular, Tamil Nado, India: *Journal of Research and Humanities, Arts and Literature,* 2 (8), 45-85.

Suwannarat, P., & Tangkiengsirisin. (2012). A study of teaching memory vocabulary learning strategies on the retention of vocabulary by Thai learners. *Conference Proceedings of the LITU International Graduate Conference*, Bankok. pp. 98-114.

Tabassum, P. (2018). Effect of the Eclectic Approach of Teaching on English communication skills at Elementary Level. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods (MJLTM)*, *8*(6), 138-146.

Tang, X., Zhang, S., Li, Y., & Zhao, M. (2013). Study on Correlation of English Pronunciation Self-Concept to English Learning. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(4), 74-79.

Tellier, M. (2008). The effect of gestures on second language memorisation by young children. *Gesture*, *8*(2), 219-235.

Tozcu, A., & Coady, J. (2004). Successful learning of frequent vocabulary through CALL also benefits reading comprehension and speed. *Computer assisted language learning*, *17*(5), 473-495.

Warsi, J. (2004). Conditions under which English is taught in Pakistan: An applied linguistic perspective. *Sarid Journal*, *1*(1), 1-9.

Wen, Y. (2018). On English Grammar Teaching with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). *Case Studies Journal, 7(10)*. 66-69.

Wickham, R. (2012). *Role play, dance, mime as language arts - for DPLI*. Brighton Education Learning Service. Retrieved from htpp://www.ktf 2012.weebly.com. pp.1-19.

Ullah, I., Tabassum, R., & Kaleem, M. (2018). Effects of peer tutoring on the academic achievement of students in the subject of biology at secondary level. *Education Sciences*, *8*(3), 112.