The Impact of Lexical Chunks Instruction in Developing Iraqi Students' Writing Fluency

Husam Mohammed Kareem Al-Khazaali*

Imam Al-Kadhum University College

Corresponding Author: Husam Mohammed Kareem Al-Khazaali, E-mail: husammohammed@alkadhum-col.edu.iq

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The aim of the present study is to examine experimentally the influence of using lexical chunks on the achievement of second-year-university students of English in the writing fluency. Lexical chunks, as the composites of form, meaning and function, stored and retrieved as a whole in brain, can release the language processing burden and improve the fluency and idiomaticity of language output. To accomplish this aim, the current study attempts to provide a reply for the following question: does drawing students' attention to the lexical chunks frequently used in different positions help in better success in EFL descriptive essay writing lessons as contrasting to the presently applied method of teaching? Also two null hypotheses are planned. The first states that there will not be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and those of the control group in the writing performance pretest. While the second one is that there will not be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and those of the control group in the descriptive essay writing achievement posttest. The two groups pre-test post-test experimental design was adopted. After four weeks of instruction, the findings show that there is a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in the post-test on the side of the experimental group. Accordingly, the main findings authenticated the first hypothesis of the study, but cancelled the second one. The control group gets the mean score 71.89 while the experimental group gets 76.53. This certainly implies that the use of lexical chunks as a language learning strategy gets better in students' performance in writing fluency.

INTRODUCTION

Lexical chunks usually refer to frequently-occurred, fixed or semi-fixed multi-words or sentences formed by meanings rather than grammatical rules that are acquired as a whole automatically in the language acquisition (Thornbury, 2017: 44). Lexical chunks approach is based on the idea that language is made up of grammatical lexis instead of lexicalized grammar (Wang, 2017: 19). Many experts and educators have been doing research on lexical chunks, finding that chunks play an important role in our everyday communication, making contributions to the ease, accuracy and fluency in listening, speaking, reading and writing. What's more, lexical chunks are an effective way to improve students' English writing in the foreign language (henceforth FL) acquisition. (White and Delaney, 2018: 184)

The Statement of the Problem

Teaching English descriptive essay writing at the second year in the Department of English, University of Al-Imam Al-Kadhum is still structure-based approach. The students are required to use grammatical structures by means of a limited number of vocabulary items. In addition, while writing, they try to translate their mother tongue chunks literally into English. Consequently, their writings yield mostly to be unusual or rather unnatural if not grammatically wrong.

The Aim of the Study

The study aims at examining the effect of lexical chunks on the performance of second-year-university students of English in the writing fluency.

The Goal of the Study

The significance of the present study emerges from the belief that it hopefully provides experimental evidence and support to the proposition that lexical chunks learning may improve the EFL learners' speaking fluency through reading-speaking connection activities and help them overcome some of the difficulties they may face specifically when speaking fluency is emphasized.

Hypothesis

Two null hypotheses are planned. The first states that there will not be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and those of the

control group in the writing performance pretest. While the second one is that there will not be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and those of the control group in the descriptive essay writing achievement posttest.

The Questions of the Study

1. Does lexical chunks instruction have any significant on Iraqi EFL learners' writing fluency?
2. Is there any significant difference between experimental and control group mean scores on the post-test after the treatment?

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF CHUNKS

The concept of chunks was first proposed by Becker and Bolinger in the mid- 1970s. Chunks, different from the phrases, are loosely integrated blocks of functions and forms, with both vocabulary and grammatical features of language structure. Different English terms were used to indicate such concepts, such as formulaic sequences, chunks, unanalyzed chunks of speech, formulas, lexical phrases, lexicalized sentence stems, multi-word units and so on. Thus we can say chunks are usually fixed or semi-fixed pattern or structure of multi-word units. Multi-word directly linked the phenomenon to language teaching, emphasizing their cohesive function in discourse (Campoy-Cubillo, et al. 2010: 18).

An important part of language acquisition is the ability to understand and output blocks of the words as a whole. These language chunks form the original data of how people understand the pattern. Lexical approach emphasizes that language learners should learn and use the language in chunks, and language production process is not constrained by the rules of syntax, but a process of direct extraction of integrated word units from memory (McColl, 2013: 50).

Over the past 25 years, corpora, corpus tools and corpus evidence have not only been used as a basis for linguistic research but also in the teaching and learning of languages. Computer-aided discourse and language acquisition research also proves that chunks can be used as an ideal unit in language teaching. This is because: First, the speed of processing for the information stored in the human brain is limited, thus, shortcuts must be found to improve the efficiency of information processing in the brain. In Chinese college writing test, within 30 minutes time, students are required to write an article with no less than 120 words, the average length usually exceeds 150 words (Campoy-Cubillo, et al. 2010: 18).

In a way, writing can be a slow, painful process even in our mother tongue, but when it is in a FL the problems can be magnified. So students usually have no time for careful thinking, and direct retrieval of chunks could save them much time. If the word block is taken as a memory unit, the sentence creation process can greatly reduce the psychological burden and improve the efficiency of the sentence output, which enhances language fluency. Second, the word block, as a combination of form and meaning, can greatly minimize the number of syntactic and semantic mistakes, because the fewer language components in sentence-making leads to a higher quality of sentence output. Third, because the word block is stored and extracted as an integral part, students with poor language level will confront less tension, and accordingly build up their self-confidence in FL expression. Fourth, cognitive learning of chunks conforms to the law of language acquisition. Chunk input as a whole can greatly increase the memory capacity with an ideal effect. Finally, word chunk is a combination of form and pragmatic function. In language output, learners do not have to consciously resort to the relevant context, which effectively avoids pragmatic failure in communication.

THE LEXICAL APPROACH

The lexical method is a method of teaching a FL developed by Michael Lewis in the 1990s. This approach has received interest in recent years as an alternative to form-based approaches. It concentrates on developing learners' proficiency through lexis, words and word combinations. It is based on the assumption that an important part of language acquisition involves the ability to comprehend and produce lexical phrases as unanalyzed wholes, or chunks and that these chunks become the raw data by which learners perceive patterns of language traditionally thought of as grammar (Lewis (2002), as cited from Abdulqader et al. (2017: 132).

Principles of the LA

Lewis (2002: vi-vii) identifies the following principles of the LA:

1. Language consists of grammatical lexis, not lexicalized grammar. i.e., the building blocks of language are lexis, not grammar.
2. Instructions need to ensure that learners focus predominantly on meaning. When we learn a language naturalistically, we do so by focusing primarily on what we want to say (i.e., meaning) rather than on how we say it (i.e., form).
3. The grammar/vocabulary dichotomy is invalid; much language consists of multi-word 'chunks'.
4. A central element of language teaching is raising students' awareness of, and developing their ability to 'chunk' language successfully.
5. Collocation is integrated as an organizing principle within syllabuses.
6. Evidence from computational linguistics and discourse analysis influence syllabus content and sequence.
7. Successful language is a wider concept than accurate language.
8. The primacy of speech over writing is recognized and writing is acknowledged as a secondary encodement, with a radically different grammar from that of the spoken language.
9. Task and process, rather than exercise and product are emphasized.
10. Receptive skills, particularly listening, are given enhanced status.

Classification of Lexical Chunks

Allison et al. (1998: 81) argue that chunks are divided into four types:

Polywords

Fixed phrases composed by more than one word may be either a typical structure of the English-type specification, such as by the way, a piece of a cake etc., or an atypical form like as it were, all in all etc.

Institutionalized expressions

It can be expression in the form of a sentence type in spoken language, fixed or semi-fixed form, fixed combination of pragmatic functions of words, or complete sentences; it can also be fixed form at the beginning of the sentence, including proverbs, aphorisms and social formula language, like How do you do? Where there is will there is a way, once upon a time, to begin with, and so on.

Phrasal constraints

It refers to a phrase framework constituted by certain fixed words. You can fill in the appropriate word or phrase as needed. Such as, a. ago, which can generate the phrase a couple of days ago/a long time ago; the.-er structure that can generate the sooner, the better.

Sentence builders

As a means of discourse organization, it is used mainly in written language. It is in the form of fixed or semi-fixed phrases with syntactic features, appropriate words or clauses can be added as needed, for example, "It is universally acknowledged that …", "There is no doubt that..."

As can be seen from the above classification, the form of chunks, different from the idioms, is relatively free. In contrast, idiomatic structures are fixed expressions, whose forms seldom change, and the meaning can hardly be guessed from the separate words. In college textbooks, English idioms or phrases are usually listed as fixed expressions for students to learn, while the chunks, because of the loose combination and the large numbers, are never given proper attention to. In addition, the lexical chunks show a notable dual-feature: lexical and sentential. On the one hand, discontinuous building components are flexible in meaning expression; on the other hand, the flexibility increases the difficulty of pragmatic mastery. Just because of this, the learning of chunks leaves a big space for teachers to explore for learners' fluency.

According to Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992: 37), the lexical chunks could be classified into five types as follows:

(1) Collocations: they refer to those lexical chunks whose components always occur recurrently in contexts and the most representative examples of collocation are adjective-noun, verb-noun and noun-verb.
(2) Discourse markers: they are lexical chunks concerning the structure of the discourse e.g. in addition, for example;
(3) Sentence builders: it is believed that., it is easy for me to do……
(4) Fixed lexical chunks and idioms: better late than never,
(5) Preposition phrases: the lexical chunks consist of substantives and prepositions, e.g. to some extent, of my own.

Functions of Lexical Chunks

Concerning the functions of lexical chunks, different professors have different views. According to Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992: 59), lexical chunks have three kinds of functions: social interactions, necessary topics and discourse device.

(1) Social interactions: we use the lexical phrases to perform various kinds of social functions and to express functional meaning that is related to the purpose of conversational.
(2) Necessary topics: these necessary lexical phrases in daily conversations mark topics about which learners are often asked.
(3) Discourse devices: lexical chunks' function as discourse devices refer to their function of connecting the meaning and structure of the discourse.

The Teaching of Lexical Chunks

The lexical approach emphasizes the teaching of lexical chunks. These chunks have a significant role in developing L2 writing proficiency (Cowie and Howarth, 1996). Granger (1998: 151) found out that lower and intermediate learners catch and use fewer lexical chunks than native speakers. A good explanation for native speakers fluency is that they use much of the same language over and over rather than structuring new sentences each time they write (Pawley and Syder, 1983: 208). In other words, they keep on using frequently used lexical chunks. For this reason, the teachers can follow four main stages in essay writing classes. The first stage is to help their students identify, organize and use lexical chunks appropriately. The students must also be presented with activities that raise their consciousness that any language in the world consists basically of ready-made chunks. The second stage can start with text analysis. The students are presented with essay samples to read. Then they are asked to identify the different types of lexical chunks. In the third stage, the students are asked to write an essay using similar chunks. In the fourth stage, the students' performance is marked and evaluated.

Advantages of lexical chunks in English writing:
A. Strengthen the fluency of English writing
B. Improve the authenticity of English writing
C. Strengthen the organizational capacity of discourse

Swain Output Hypothesis

In college English teaching, output has always been put in the first place. Last year, paragraph translation was introduced into the national CET (college English test) Band-IV examination, replacing the long-existing "Cloze" item.

Together with part of writing, written output account for 30% of the total score. From this, we can see language output is further emphasized in college English teaching. As to the output theory, Swain asserts if learners want to express themselves fluently and accurately, they need to have both comprehensible input and output, for the process of output also serves as an opportunity for learners to reflect how well they have mastered the target language. Besides, the output feedback can test their own hypotheses and in turn consolidate their knowledge. The comprehensible output (CO) hypothesis states that learning takes place when a learner encounters a gap in his or her linguistic knowledge of the second language.

By noticing this gap, the learner becomes aware of it and may be able to modify his output so that he learns something new about the language. Although Swain does not claim that comprehensible output is solely responsible for all or even most language acquisition, she does claim that, under some conditions, CO facilitates second language learning in ways that differ from input and enhance input due to the mental processes connected with the production of language.

Grunwald and Heinrichs (2015: 78) note that there are three functions of the output hypothesis:

1) Noticing functions: The learner realizes what they do not know or only partially know. They know what they want to write but are unable to communicate it. This is done through practice, verbally communicating in the second language.
2) Hypothesis-testing function: It is when the learners provide statement realizing that the grammar is not always correct and they receive feedback in order to improve. This enables the learners to reformulate their statements. Interaction within the classroom with teacher and peers can assist the learners to improve their grammar.
3) Metalinguistic function: The learners reflect upon the language learned and this enables them to control their output and internalize their linguistic knowledge. After the first two functions, the students should be able to internally reflect on what they have learned.

Under this theory, we find that corpus serves as a good source for learners to practice their output. The fact that most educational institutions have access to the internet has promoted the use of the web as corpus, and large corpora such as the British National Corpus and the COBUILD Corpus and Collocations Sampler are now accessible, free of charge, online and can be usefully incorporated into a process writing approach to help develop students' writing skills. Compared with the conventional teaching mode, the corpus-based teaching mode enables students to find the underused and overused phrases or words, or even the misused grammatical structure. The findings strengthen the understanding of self-testing hypotheses, and knowledge of their own language gap pushes them to recognize and consolidate the inherent language knowledge and skills.

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Method

This study was an effort to decide the possible effects of teaching lexical chunks on the writing of EFL Iraqi students and at the same time taking into concern the examining participants' use of lexical chunks and their knowledge in them. The research design was experimental. To achieve this procedure, two groups (control and experimental) design was employed for the current investigational study. A typical experimental study usually uses comparison or control groups to investigate research questions. This is known as a between – groups design (Mackey and Gass, 2005: 146). Using Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) as a measure for their proficiency in English writing, the subjects were randomly assigned into two groups (experimental and control) in random. The experimental group was given the treatment. During the treatment the experimental group utilized lexical chunks and wrote so many unified paragraphs about different topics and then they presented them in the class and discussed them. They were questioned to take advantage of lexical chunks in their writings in the form of essay compositions or paragraphs. The learners in the control group did not receive any instruction on lexical chunks. They just received the instruction provided in the prescribed textbook.

Participants

In the present study the second year participants of Al-Imam Al-Kadhum University College in Misan were selected. Then 120 participants out of 140 were chosen through random selection in order to participate in the study. The selected participants were divided into two groups of 60 students. They shared the characteristics below:

1. The majority of them studied at public schools before attending the college. They were all Iraqi learners with intermediate non-native English levels.
2. All the selected learners were of the same gender.
3. Both groups of the students were studying College Writing as the college textbook with the same instructor and also the same class time on different days.
4. Their ages ranged from 20 to 22.

Instrumentation

The instruments of the present study were QPT (Quick Proficiency Test), a test of collocations and a collocation interview. The first instrument of the present study was QPT (Quick Proficiency Test), version 1, consisting of two parts, which was used to homogenize the participants and be assured of their level. The first part included 40 questions while in the second one there were 20 questions. It was necessary for the participants to get a score between one standard deviation above and below the mean in order to take part in the study.

The second instrument was a test of lexical chunks which was s used as the pre-test and post-test. It involved 30 multiple choice items and was administrated to all sixty participants in the study with the scores from 0 to 30. The lexical chunks had been selected from "English Collocations in Use" book, written by Michael McCarthy and Felicity O'Dell. They had been selected according to 18 units of the mentioned book. The reliability of lexical chunks test was already calculated and it was 0.82, acceptable for such a study.

Procedure

The aim of the present research was to determine the possible effects of lexical chunks instruction on second year students of EFL college students in Ai-Imam Al-Kadhum University College. To this aim, all the 120 available EFL learners in Al-Imam Al-Kadhum University College were given QPT (Quick Placement Test) which was consisted of 30 vocabulary items. This test was given to 120 participants. They had 60 minutes time to answer the questions. The researchers carried out this test to determine the level of the learners and homogenize them. Then, 60 students were selected out of 120 participants. They were divided into two groups of control and experimental, each consisted of 60 participants. The researcher pre-tested the selected subjects in both groups (control and experimental). To do so, all the participants were fallen through two pre-tests, including a test of collocation and interview. A 30-item collocation test was given to all the participants. The participants had twenty minutes time to answer questions. They had to fill in the gaps with the correct given collocations. After that all of the participants took part in a interview of 10 questions. The questions took each participant 10 minutes to answer them. After the pre-test, the students in the experimental group were given a treatment. They were taught the collocations in use with some famous lexical chunks on different topics along a period of six weeks that extended from the 1st of September to the 5th of November in 2016. They studied lexical chunks and collocations three sessions of 90 minutes a week.

In each session the subjects were taught a lesson of Collocations in Use and also ten lexical chunks, mainly fixed expressions and idioms. The experimental group members were acquired to underline the lexical chunks and use them in their own sentences in order to learn them. Each lesson of the book (Collocations in Use, written by Michael McCarthy and Felicity O'Dell) contains some lexical chunks mainly two word verb phrases, adjective plus noun combinations and most common idioms by which the subjects could improve the number of their words in the T-units. Each session the participants were taught a unit and then they were asked to practice the lexical chunks exercises by making example sentences and paragraphs in advance in which those chunks were used. They also had to do the exercises which were the following pages of the same unit. After being taught each lesson, they were asked

to read the lessons and underline the collocations and idioms and use them in their own sentences. In the next sessions the instructor would go through the new unit. He used to ask some questions of the previous lessons, too. The instructor would select the units according to their importance and the units including more useful lexical chunks in written English were often chosen for teaching. On the other hand the subjects in the control group were only asked to study the course required passages, College Writing, without being asked to study any further extracurricular assignments. After the end of six weeks, the subjects in both groups were post-tested in writing. In the process of the testing, the participants were required to write their ideas about ten main issues they may face in their life. While analysing the participants' post-test transcriptions, the researcher focused on their improvement in terms of writing through focusing on the number of words in the T-units.

FINDINGS

Results and Discussions of the Pre-test

As illustrated in Table 1, the mean score of EG is 70.04, while the mean score of the CG is 70.80. The calculated t-value is found to be 1.20 at 98 degrees of freedom and 0.05 level of significance, which indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the achievements of the two groups in the pre-test. This confirmed that the participants assigned to EG and CG are not initially different but homogeneous in writing fluency.

Results and Discussions of the Post-test

At the end of the term, the researcher carried out a post-test to check whether significant differences exist between the EC and CC. The following table shows the significant differences between the two groups in their writing achievement.

It can be told, according to data from Table 2, that the difference appeared in the students' post-test. In order to validate the test, with their S.D. as 10.31 (EG) and 9.53 (CG) respectively, the EG gets the mean of 76.53 points more than that (70.89) of the CG. From this Table 2 above, it can be established that it was clear that in the post-test both of the CG and EC groups have acquired the higher mean than that in the pretest, which means that both groups made an improvement

Table 1. The Writing Performance of students on the Pre-test

Group	No. of students	Mean score	Standard Deviation	DF	t-value		Level of significance
					Calculated	Tabulated	
CG	60	70.80	10.598				
EG	60	70.04	11.684	98	1.20	1.987	0.05

Table 2. Comparison between the Writing Fluency of EG and CG on the Post-test

Group	No. of students	Mean	Standard Deviation	DF	t-value		Level of significance
					Calculated	Tabulated	
CG	60	71.89	9.53	98			0.05
EG	60	76.53	10.31		5.8	2.6	

in their writings fluency. However, the students in the CG improved not so much as the students in the EC group. The students in EG, after a term practice of English writing under the guidance of the lexical chunks teaching, improved the most by increasing 10.125 points. In the post-test, the mean scores in the EG are much higher than those of CG, which means that the former improved a lot more than the latter. The result shows that in the post-test, the performance of the test in EG is better than that in CG.

According to the T-test for comparison in post-test is shown in Table 2, there exists a significant difference between CG and EG. Consequently, it can be decided that there exists a significant difference between two groups.

This result verified the fact that the lexical chunk teaching and learning approach plays a positive part in improving the college students' English writing. This further demonstrates that the experimental treatment play a vital role in the development of writing performance of the EG. That is to say, the application of chunks helps to improve students' writing performance.

So we can make a conclusion that students' writing proficiency can be improved by the application of Lexical Chunk Approach to EFL teaching in Iraqi instruction contexts.

According to the grading criteria of EFL writing, the scores should be marked based on the expressions of main elements, application of the lexical chunks to express the ideas accurately and appropriately. Therefore, the use of the vocabulary and phrases is fundamental to the marking of the writing. The presentation of Lexical Chunk Approach to EFL teaching supports to store the ready-made lexical components into the students' memory, which benefits the suitable language creativity for a specific task.

Along with the score analysis, the researcher pays more attention to the students' lexical use in their expressions. It is found that lexical chunks help students to use English fluently and appropriately. Besides, the input of lexical chunks as a whole can avoid errors resulting from vocabulary selection and cultural differences, thus improving the accuracy of language. With lexical chunks in students' mind, students can write more smoothly and fittingly, which minimizes their anxiety during the process of writing and increases their self-confidence. After the application of lexical chunk for one term, it is observed that students' EFL writing fluency has improved a lot.

DISCUSSION

The present study aims to investigate two research questions: (1) whether lexical chunks instruction had any significant on Iraqi EFL learners' writing; and (2) whether there is any significant difference between experimental and control group mean scores on the post-test after the treatment. In light of the research questions, the most important finding of this study is that lexical chunks instruction could bring a significant change in the fluency of the learners in the experimental group since they worked on lexical chunks in different contexts of role play, discussion, paragraph writing and conversation. During the treatment the experimental group utilized lexical chunks and wrote so many unified paragraphs about different topics.

Then, they presented them in the class and discussed them. Also, they made use of lexical chunks and wrote conversation around the topics mentioned in their text-book. Finally they played the role of the provided conversations and text-book conversations, too. All these contexts and the received instruction helped learners promote their speaking fluency on the post test. This, in turn, developed the experimental students' paragraph writing fluency which is not discussed in the present paper. This development was due to the instruction and learning large amount of lexical chunks and automatically retrieving them in their paragraph writing and later on in their oral communication. Therefore, instructing Iraqi EFL learners in lexical chunks and using them in different contexts promoted their linguistic production fluency. So, the lexical chunks instruction was considered as an influential method.

With regard to the participants in the control group, they did not receive any instruction on lexical chunks. They studied the same text-book (college writing) through the conventional method of language teaching, grammar translation method. They received no instruction on lexical chunks. Since they did not work on lexical chunks in different contexts as the experimental group did, their performance on the post-test did not change much in comparison to their pretest mean score. Thus, the reason why the experimental and control group participants' performance on the post test was significantly different was due to instruction.

The results of the inferential statistics related to the second question also revealed that the experimental and control group performed significantly different on the post-test. That is to say, the experimental group participants who received instruction on lexical chunks did much better than the control group students who did not receive instruction in the writing skill. This stated that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of experimental and control groups. In other words, this difference was due to the improvement of experimental group learners' writing. This improvement, in turn, was merely due to the instruction. Also, as regards the participants in the control group, they did not do well on the post test in comparison to the experimental group participants. So, they did not show any significant improvement in their writing. This lack of enhancement was due to the fact that they did not receive tuition on lexical chunks. They just received traditional instruction and did not work on chunks in different contexts. So, the results of the inferential statistics revealed that control group participants did not show any improvement on the post test. Thus, the difference between the two groups' mean scores on the post-test proved to be significant as the result of lexical chunks teaching.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to adopt the Lexical chunks, the following recommendations are sound:

a) Teachers should integrate different types of lexical units instruction into the writing activities.

b) They should also raise students' awareness of these lexical units.

c) They should not overload students but search for usefulness.

d) Students are advised to keep written records of the different types of lexical units whenever they listen to native speakers, such as listen to the radio, watch TV, read books or magazines…etc.

CONCLUSION

The present study aims at developing of writing fluency in EFL learners through the use of collocation method via exposure to extracurricular lexical chunks. It examines variations in the learners' writing performance in term of fluency, which can be one other indications of effective writing. The results suggest that the collocation method or exposure to extensive lexical chunks reading and learning had a positive impact on the writing fluency development of these learners, who are lower and average intermediate EFL learners. Writing of the experimental group was higher than that of the control group. A possible reason for this might be that the learners had more chance of reading and working with lexical chunks in various texts.

Accordingly learning lexical chunks had a major impact on the participants' writing fluency in the experimental group. Moreover, exposing EFL learners to a quantity of reading texts of different lexical chunks may contribute in reducing the anxiety of confronting the task of writing which is considered as the most difficult experience in producing L2. Similarly, learning lexical chunks through reading can decrease the degree of stress during writing because it offers the L2 students the bulk repertoire of vocabulary, structures, idioms, discourse connectors, multi words, verb phrases, stylistic devices, etc. Learners will deal with writing in a less confused manner due to the fact that they are ready to produce and express their thoughts and feelings through exploiting familiar and relevant vocabulary and grammars derived from the rich source, which is lexical chunk. The study not only indicates the importance of lexical chunks to writing fluency upgrading, but also brings some pedagogical suggestions to English instruction.

The goal of the study has been achieved thoroughly. The results will contribute to our understanding of writing and the adaptation of lexical chunks instruction in Iraqi EFL writing contexts. They may be useful for the development of writing fluency teaching activities that are directed to lower and average intermediate learners or even lower and average level learners in EFL contexts. More specifically, this kind of research may help teachers who teach writing skill in Iraqi schools to recognize the importance of lexical chunks directed writing tasks in the EFL writing classroom, as the results point to the positive impact of lexical chunks on the development of students' writing.

Consequently we can make a conclusion that learners' writing fluency can be improved by the application of Lexical Chunk Approach to EFL teaching. According to the grading criteria of EFL writing fluency, the scores should be marked based on the expressions of the number of words per T-units. Therefore, the use of the vocabulary and phrases is fundamental to the marking of the writing fluency. The application of Lexical Chunk Approach to EFL teaching helps to store the ready-made lexical units into the learners' mind,

which benefits the appropriate language production for a particular situation.

Furthermore to the score analysis, teachers pay more attention to the students' lexical use in their expressions. It is found that lexical chunks help students to use English fluently and properly. Besides, the input of lexical chunks as a whole can avoid errors resulting from vocabulary selection and cultural differences, thus improving the accuracy of language. With lexical chunks in mind, students can write more fluently, which reduces their anxiety during the process of writing and increases their confidence. After the application of lexical chunk for one term, it is observed that students' EFL writing fluency has improved a lot.

REFERENCES

Abdulqader, H. B., Murad, I. H. and Abdulghani, M. I. (2017). The Impact of the Application of Lexical Approach on Developing Students' Writing Skills at a University Level. *European Scientific Journal, 13(*32), PP: 130-141.

Allison, D., Wee, L., Zhiming, B., and Abraham, S. A. (Eds.). (1998). *Text in Education and Society.* Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Campoy-Cubillo, M. C., Belles-Fortuno, B, and Gea-Valor, M. L. (Eds.). (2010*). Corpus-based Approaches to English Language Teaching.* London: The Tower Building.

Cowie A. and Howarth P. (1996). Phraseological competence and written proficiency". G. M. Blue and R. Mitchell (eds.), *Language and Education* (British Studies in Applied Linguistics 11). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Granger, S. (1998) 'Prefabricated patterns in advanced EFL writing: collocations and formulae'. A. P. Cowie (eds.), Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications. Oxford: Clarendon Press.145-160.

Grunwald, N. and Heinrichs, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Education, Innovation and Economic Society Development.* Bremen: EHV Academicpress.

Lewis, M. (2002). *The Lexical Approach: The State of ELT and a way Forward*. London: Heinle.

Mackey, A. and Gass, S.M. (2005). *Second Language Research, Methodology and Design*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

McColl, H. (2013). *Modern Languages for All.* London: Routledge.

Nattinger, J. and DeCarrico, J. (1992). *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching.* Oxford: OUP.

Pawley, A. and Syder, F. H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency". Richards, J. C. and Schmidt, R. W. (eds.), *Language and communication*. London: Longman.

Thornbury, S. (2017). *Scott Thornbury's 30 Language Teaching Methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wang, C. (2017). *Patterns and Meanings on Intensifiers of Chinese Learner Corpora.* London: Routledge.

White, E. and Delaney, T. (2018*). Handbook of Research on Assessment Literacy and Teacher-Made Testing in the Language Classroom.* New York: IGI Global.