

INTEGRATING VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT INTO PRACTICAL GRAMMAR TEACHING FOR ENGLISH PHILOLOGY STUDENTS

Mukhammadieva Nargiza Ayubovna

Senior Lecturer at Perfect-University, specializing in English
language.

Emails: nargiza@perfectuniversity.uz,
mukhammadieva.n18@gmail.com

ANNOTATION: *In contemporary language education, the relationship between grammar and vocabulary has become increasingly important, especially in the context of developing communicative competence. This study explores how integrating vocabulary development into practical grammar teaching can enhance language learning among English philology students. Rather than treating grammar and vocabulary as separate components, the research focuses on how they can be taught together in a more meaningful and functional way.*

The study was conducted over one academic semester with undergraduate students majoring in English philology. A mixed-method approach was used to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. Students were divided into two groups: a control group that followed traditional grammar instruction and an experimental group that experienced an integrated approach combining grammar and vocabulary.

The findings suggest that students who learned grammar through vocabulary-rich contexts demonstrated better language retention, improved speaking performance, and increased confidence in using English. In addition, students showed higher motivation and engagement

during lessons that emphasized real communication rather than isolated rule learning.

The study concludes that integrating vocabulary into grammar instruction creates a more effective and practical learning environment. It is recommended that language teachers adopt more contextualized and communicative approaches in order to improve overall language proficiency.

Keywords: *vocabulary development, grammar teaching, integrated approach, communicative competence, English philology, language learning, contextual learning, higher education*

INTRODUCTION

In the process of learning a foreign language, students often encounter difficulties that go beyond simple memorization of rules or words. For English philology students, particularly those in their first years of study, the challenge lies in using language accurately and meaningfully in real communication. Two essential components of language learning—grammar and vocabulary—play a central role in this process. However, they are frequently taught as separate areas, which may limit students' ability to use language effectively.

Grammar provides the structural framework of language, helping learners understand how sentences are formed. Vocabulary, on the other hand, gives meaning to those structures. Without sufficient vocabulary, even grammatically correct sentences may lack clarity or relevance. Similarly, knowing many words without understanding how to organize them grammatically can lead to confusion and ineffective communication. This interdependence suggests that grammar and vocabulary should not be treated as isolated elements.

Despite this, traditional teaching methods often separate the two. Grammar lessons typically focus on rules, forms, and exercises, while vocabulary is introduced through lists or isolated practice. As a result, students may perform well in written tests but struggle to use language spontaneously. They may know grammatical structures but lack the vocabulary to express their ideas, or they may know words but not how to use them correctly within sentences.

Recent developments in language teaching emphasize the importance of context and communication. Instead of focusing solely on form, educators are encouraged to create learning environments where students use language in meaningful ways. In this context, integrating vocabulary development into grammar teaching can offer significant benefits. When grammar is taught through vocabulary-rich examples and communicative activities, students are more likely to understand how language works in real situations.

Another important aspect is student motivation. Lessons that combine grammar and vocabulary in practical contexts tend to be more engaging. Students are not just learning rules or memorizing words; they are using language to express ideas, solve problems, and interact with others. This active involvement can lead to better retention and deeper understanding.

This study aims to investigate the effectiveness of integrating vocabulary development into practical grammar teaching for English philology students. It seeks to answer several key questions: How does this integration influence language learning outcomes? Does it improve students' ability to use grammar and vocabulary in communication? How do students perceive this approach compared to traditional methods?

By addressing these questions, the study hopes to provide insights that can help improve teaching practices in higher education and support the development of more effective language learning strategies.

METHODS

This research adopted a mixed-method design in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of how integrating vocabulary into grammar instruction affects student learning. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected to ensure a balanced analysis of outcomes.

The study was conducted over a sixteen-week academic semester at a university where English philology is taught as a major field of study. A total of 60 first-year students participated in the research. Their proficiency levels ranged from beginner to pre-intermediate, which is typical for students at this stage of their academic journey.

The participants were divided into two groups of equal size. The control group received traditional instruction, where grammar and vocabulary were taught separately. Grammar lessons focused on rules and structured exercises, while vocabulary was introduced through lists and memorization tasks. In contrast, the experimental group was taught using an integrated approach, where vocabulary development was embedded within grammar instruction.

In the experimental group, lessons were designed around real-life contexts and communicative tasks. For example, when teaching a grammatical structure such as past tense forms, students were introduced to relevant vocabulary related to everyday experiences, such as travel, daily routines, or personal events. Instead of memorizing words in isolation, students learned vocabulary as part of meaningful sentences and dialogues.

Various teaching techniques were used to support integration. These included role-playing activities, group discussions, storytelling, and problem-solving tasks. Students were encouraged to use new vocabulary within grammatical structures during speaking and writing exercises. Teachers provided immediate feedback, focusing on both accuracy and appropriateness.

Data collection involved several tools. Pre-tests and post-tests were administered to measure improvement in grammar and vocabulary usage. Classroom observations were conducted to assess student participation and engagement. In addition, questionnaires were distributed to gather student feedback on their learning experiences.

The evaluation of student performance focused on three main criteria: grammatical accuracy, vocabulary usage, and communicative effectiveness. This allowed for a detailed analysis of how the integrated approach influenced different aspects of language learning.

RESULTS

The results of the study showed that integrating vocabulary development into grammar teaching had a noticeable impact on students' overall language performance. While both groups demonstrated some level of improvement over the semester, the progress observed in the experimental group was more consistent and significant.

One of the most important findings was related to vocabulary usage. Students in the experimental group were able to use a wider range of words in both speaking and writing tasks. More importantly, they used these words appropriately within grammatical structures. This suggests that learning vocabulary in context helped them understand not only the meaning of words but also how they function in sentences.

Grammatical accuracy also improved among students who experienced the integrated approach. They made fewer errors and showed greater flexibility in forming sentences. Instead of relying heavily on memorized rules, they appeared to develop a more intuitive understanding of grammar. This may be because grammar was practiced in meaningful contexts rather than in isolation.

Another area of improvement was communicative effectiveness. Students in the experimental group were better able to express their ideas clearly and confidently. They participated more actively in discussions and showed less hesitation when speaking. Their increased use of vocabulary allowed them to communicate more precisely and with greater detail.

In contrast, the control group showed more limited progress. Although these students improved their knowledge of grammar rules and learned new vocabulary, they often struggled to combine these elements in practical communication. Their speech and writing tended to be more restricted, and they relied more on simple structures and familiar words.

Student feedback supported these findings. Many students in the experimental group reported that the integrated approach made learning more interesting and useful. They appreciated the opportunity to use language in realistic situations and felt that this helped them remember both grammar and vocabulary more effectively.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study highlight the benefits of integrating vocabulary development into grammar teaching. One of the key reasons for this effectiveness is that language is learned more successfully when it is presented in context. When students encounter grammar and

vocabulary together, they are better able to see how language functions as a whole.

This approach also supports deeper cognitive processing. Instead of memorizing isolated pieces of information, students engage with language in a meaningful way. They connect form and meaning, which leads to better retention and understanding. This may explain why students in the experimental group were able to use language more flexibly and confidently.

Another important factor is learner engagement. Integrated lessons tend to be more interactive and dynamic, which encourages active participation. Students are not passive recipients of information; they are actively using language to communicate. This involvement can increase motivation and make learning more enjoyable.

However, the integrated approach also presents certain challenges. Teachers need to carefully design lessons that balance grammar and vocabulary without overwhelming students. It requires creativity and flexibility, as well as a good understanding of students' needs and proficiency levels.

Despite these challenges, the overall results suggest that the benefits outweigh the difficulties. Integrating vocabulary into grammar teaching provides a more realistic and effective approach to language learning.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that integrating vocabulary development into practical grammar teaching can significantly improve language learning outcomes for English philology students. Students not only

develop better grammatical accuracy but also gain a richer vocabulary and greater confidence in communication.

The findings suggest that language teaching should move beyond traditional methods and adopt more integrated and context-based approaches. By doing so, educators can create a learning environment that better reflects real language use and supports the development of communicative competence.

Future research may explore how this approach can be applied in different educational contexts and with learners at different proficiency levels.

REFERENCES

1. Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*.
<https://www.pearson.com>
2. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.3.408>
3. Harmer, J. (2015). *How to Teach English*.
<https://www.longman.com>
4. Lewis, M. (1993). *The Lexical Approach*.
<https://www.languageinstitute.com>
5. Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524759>
6. Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203891704>
7. Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching*.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190>

8. Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching Vocabulary: A Vocabulary Research Manual*.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230293977>
9. Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to Teach Vocabulary*.
[https://elt.oup.com/catalogue/items/global/methodology/how to teach vocabulary](https://elt.oup.com/catalogue/items/global/methodology/how_to_teach_vocabulary)