

Lexical Difficulties in University English Learning: Collocations, Word Forms, and the Receptive–Productive Gap

Nargiz Aliyeva

Lecturer, Nakhchivan State University, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan

Email: nergizeliyeva@ndu.edu.az

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0243-2535>

© 2026 Nargiz Aliyeva. This is an open-access article published in *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities (GSRH)*. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) — free to share, adapt and use commercially, with attribution.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69760/gsrh.0260304019>

Abstract

Lexical competence is a central component of communicative ability in a second language, yet learners may know a word's dictionary meaning without knowing how to use it accurately, idiomatically, and appropriately in context. This article examines major lexical difficulties described among university students learning English, focusing on precise word retrieval, collocations, first-language (L1) transfer, synonym differentiation, word forms, productive vocabulary use, and stylistic appropriateness. The article draws on theoretical literature on vocabulary knowledge and Error Analysis and discusses source-reported questionnaire responses from 65 participants, alongside illustrative learner errors such as “do a decision,” “I am interesting in history,” and “borrow me your pen.” These examples suggest possible difficulties with conventional word combinations, adjective forms, and semantic distinctions between related verbs. The discussion also considers the difference between receptive and productive vocabulary and the value of teaching lexical items in meaningful contexts. The article follows a descriptive, exploratory approach because the available source material does not provide complete participant demographics, sampling procedures, coding-reliability evidence, or inferential statistical analyses. The reported counts are therefore treated as source-reported figures rather than independently verified estimates. The article argues that contextualized vocabulary learning, explicit collocation instruction, spaced retrieval, and sustained opportunities for productive use may help strengthen lexical competence. It concludes with practical recommendations for university-level English teaching and identifies methodological information that should be clarified before publication.

Keywords: *lexical competence; lexical errors; English language learning; collocations; first-language transfer; Error Analysis; vocabulary teaching; productive vocabulary*

1. Introduction

English plays a major role in international academic exchange, professional communication, business, and intercultural interaction. In higher education, students are expected to participate in discussions, prepare written assignments, present arguments, and communicate with speakers from different linguistic backgrounds. These activities require more than grammatical accuracy: learners must select words that express their intended meanings precisely and combine them in ways that are conventional in English. A sentence

may be grammatically plausible but still sound unnatural or convey a different meaning if the learner lacks knowledge of collocations, semantic distinctions, or register.

Lexical competence therefore involves more than memorising translation equivalents. It includes knowledge of a word's form, meaning, grammatical behaviour, collocational patterns, pragmatic constraints, and stylistic range. A learner may recognise a word while reading but be unable to retrieve it quickly during conversation. Similarly, a student may know the individual meanings of two words yet be uncertain about which one fits a particular context. The difference between receptive and productive vocabulary is especially important in university settings, where students need to transform recognition into accurate and independent language use.

Lexical errors can arise for several reasons. Learners may transfer familiar patterns from their first language, learn words in isolation, overgeneralise a rule, confuse related forms, or have limited experience with authentic English usage. For example, the expression “do a decision” suggests uncertainty about the conventional collocation “make a decision.” The sentence “I am interesting in history” illustrates confusion between “interested,” which describes a person's feeling, and “interesting,” which describes something that causes interest. The expression “borrow me your pen” reflects a failure to distinguish the direction of the actions expressed by “borrow” and “lend.”

Error Analysis provides a useful framework for identifying recurring patterns in learner language and using them to inform instruction. Instead of treating every error as an isolated failure, teachers can examine whether an error reflects incomplete knowledge, first-language transfer, limited retrieval practice, or a temporary performance slip. Vocabulary-learning research likewise emphasizes that word knowledge includes form, meaning, and use, and that productive competence develops through repeated encounters and opportunities to use words meaningfully (Corder, 1967; Nation, 2001; Schmitt, 2000).

The present article organizes the source study into a journal-style research article. It considers the types of lexical difficulty described in the source material, discusses possible explanations, and outlines teaching practices that may support more accurate lexical use. Because several methodological details are not available in the source, the empirical discussion remains descriptive and exploratory rather than making claims about all university students.

1.1. Aim and research questions

The aim of the article is to examine the principal lexical difficulties described in the source study and to consider how these difficulties can inform vocabulary teaching in higher education. The analysis is guided by three research questions:

- *RQ1.* What types of lexical errors and vocabulary-learning difficulties are illustrated in the reported student English use?
- *RQ2.* What linguistic and learning-related factors may contribute to these difficulties, particularly first-language transfer, limited collocational knowledge, and confusion between related word forms or meanings?
- *RQ3.* Which teaching practices may help learners develop more accurate, productive, and context-sensitive lexical competence?

The questions connect the descriptive analysis of learner examples with the theoretical discussion and pedagogical implications. RQ1 concerns the classification of lexical difficulties; RQ2 considers possible contributing factors without assuming that a single cause explains

every error; and RQ3 focuses on teaching responses that can be implemented and evaluated in university-level English courses.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The nature of lexical competence

Lexical competence is multidimensional. Nation (2001) describes word knowledge in terms of form, meaning, and use. Form includes spelling, pronunciation, and word parts; meaning includes a word's concepts, associations, and relationships with other words; and use includes grammatical functions, collocations, register, and constraints on where a word is appropriate. Weakness in any of these dimensions may lead to lexical errors even when a learner can provide a basic translation.

A distinction is commonly made between receptive and productive vocabulary. Receptive knowledge enables learners to recognise and interpret words while listening or reading. Productive knowledge requires learners to retrieve a word, select an appropriate form, and integrate it into speech or writing. The transition from recognition to accurate production is not automatic. It requires repeated encounters, attention to context, and opportunities to use vocabulary for meaningful communicative purposes.

Vocabulary breadth refers broadly to the number of words a learner knows, whereas vocabulary depth concerns how well those words are known, including their associations, grammatical behaviour, typical combinations, and contextual restrictions. In academic communication, depth is particularly important because learners must select precise terms and use them appropriately in formal writing, presentations, and discussion. Assessment that tests only word recognition may therefore overlook difficulties in productive use, a concern central to systematic approaches to vocabulary assessment (Read, 2000).

2.2. Error Analysis and interlanguage

Error Analysis provides a framework for examining learner language systematically. Corder (1967) argued that learner errors can reveal information about the developing language system. A distinction is often made between systematic errors, which reflect incomplete or developing knowledge, and occasional mistakes associated with inattention, fatigue, or the pressure of spontaneous communication. James (1998) further discusses error analysis as a means of investigating language learning and use.

This distinction has pedagogical value. A recurring expression such as “do a decision” may indicate incomplete knowledge of a conventional collocation, while a single occurrence may be a performance slip. Teachers can use recurring patterns to determine whether learners need additional practice with collocations, semantic contrasts, word forms, or register. However, the cause of an error should not be inferred from the surface form alone; learner interviews, repeated samples, and contextual information may be needed to establish why it occurred.

Error categories can overlap. A collocation error may also reflect first-language transfer, while a word-form error may involve both morphology and meaning. Classification is therefore best treated as an analytical aid rather than as an assumption that every error belongs to only one category.

2.3. Vocabulary learning, collocations, and the Lexical Approach

Vocabulary-learning research emphasizes that knowing a word involves more than knowing one meaning. Schmitt (2000) discusses vocabulary-learning strategies, while Laufer and Nation (1999) examine controlled productive vocabulary. Nation and Webb (2011), and Webb and Nation (2017), address approaches to researching and developing vocabulary knowledge. Taken together, this work supports attention to the relationship between vocabulary recognition, retrieval, and use.

Related local scholarship can complement this framework, although the focus of each study should be represented accurately. Nuri's work on productive word formation in English (Nuri, 2023) is relevant to learners' awareness of word structure and lexical patterns. Ashrafova's research on newly emerging English words and their semantic features (Ashrafova, 2026) offers an adjacent lexical-semantic perspective. These studies do not directly measure the learner errors reported in the present article, but they help situate lexical competence within broader research on English vocabulary. Türkan İsmaylova's work on Latin- and Greek-origin words in English (İsmaylova, n.d.) also offers a related perspective on lexical structure and the historical sources of English vocabulary; it is contextual background rather than direct evidence about the learner errors in this study.

The Lexical Approach associated with Lewis (1993) gives particular attention to multiword units, collocations, and prefabricated chunks. From this perspective, learners benefit from noticing and practising conventional combinations rather than constructing every expression by translating individual words. English uses combinations such as “make a decision,” “heavy rain,” and “take medicine.” The words within these combinations are familiar individually, but their conventional pairing may not be predictable from direct translation.

Collocation notebooks can help learners record vocabulary as usable units. Instead of writing only “decision — qərar,” students can record “make a decision,” “reach a decision,” and “a difficult decision,” accompanied by example sentences. This supports lexical depth by drawing attention to the ways a word behaves in context. It may also help learners recognize that near-synonyms are not always interchangeable and that register affects lexical choice.

2.4. First-language transfer and lexical choice

First-language transfer occurs when learners draw on patterns from a language they already know while processing or producing the target language. Transfer can support learning when the languages share a structure, but it can also lead to non-target-like expressions when conventional word partnerships or semantic boundaries differ. A learner who translates an expression word for word may produce an understandable but unnatural combination.

The wider pedagogical context is also addressed in local research. Nağıyeva's work on preventing student errors in English (Nağıyeva, 2025) is directly relevant to the instructional focus of this article, while her study of methods for developing speaking skills (Nağıyeva, 2024) provides a related perspective on communicative practice. Babayev's discussion of communicative language teaching (Babayev, 2023) supports the emphasis on meaningful language use. These publications are cited as pedagogical context, not as evidence for the numerical results reported in the source questionnaire.

Transfer should not, however, be treated as the sole explanation for lexical errors. Limited exposure to authentic language, insufficient practice, overgeneralisation, incomplete knowledge of a word's grammatical behaviour, and time pressure may also contribute. Teachers can help learners compare languages selectively while encouraging them to notice and practise

English expressions as meaningful units. Contrastive work is most useful when it is linked to examples and productive tasks rather than limited to lists of translation equivalents.

2.5. Word forms, semantic distinctions, and register

Lexical accuracy also depends on recognizing differences between related word forms. The contrast between “interested” and “interesting” illustrates how an adjective's form is connected to its meaning and grammatical role. Learners need examples that show who experiences a feeling and what causes that feeling. Similar attention is required for verbs such as “borrow” and “lend,” whose meanings describe different directions of transfer.

Register is another dimension of lexical competence. A word or expression suitable in informal conversation may be inappropriate in an academic essay or professional email. Near-synonyms may differ in formality, intensity, collocational preferences, and pragmatic effect. Learners should therefore be encouraged to consult dictionary examples, usage labels, grammatical information, and authentic contexts rather than selecting the first translation offered.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research design

The source study describes a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative and qualitative procedures. The proposed data sources include analysis of student essays and spoken-language samples, a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire about lexical difficulties, and an error-recording table. In principle, this combination can help identify recurring patterns in learner production while also documenting students' perceptions of their own vocabulary-learning challenges.

The present article uses a descriptive and exploratory approach to the information available in the source document. It summarizes the reported questionnaire counts and examines the supplied examples of learner language in relation to lexical competence and Error Analysis. It does not claim to have independently collected or reanalysed a separate dataset.

3.2. Participants and instruments

The questionnaire table in the source material is labelled N = 65 and presents responses for eight statements. The available document does not specify participants' ages, English proficiency levels, fields of study, recruitment procedures, or the distribution of participants across groups. These details should be added to the final manuscript if they are available.

The described instruments are: (1) analysis of student essays and spoken output; (2) a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree); and (3) an error-recording table documenting learner examples, error categories, suggested target forms, possible causes, and reported frequencies. The source also gives counts for three illustrative expressions: “do a decision” (12), “I am interesting in history” (8), and “borrow me your pen” (15).

3.3. Data analysis

The source material presents descriptive questionnaire counts and a small set of illustrative lexical errors. Accordingly, the analysis focuses on response patterns and qualitative interpretation rather than inferential statistics. No inferential tests, coding-reliability measures, or interview findings are reported in the available material. The error frequencies are treated as counts reported by the source, not as independently verified estimates of error prevalence.

For a fully reproducible empirical report, the author should clarify the coding criteria, the unit counted (individual students or total error occurrences), the denominator for each frequency, and whether the same student could contribute more than one example. The procedure should also explain how the written and spoken samples were selected and how consistency in error classification was checked.

3.4. Methodological limitations

Several details needed for a reproducible empirical article are absent from the source: sampling strategy, participant profile, timing and procedure of data collection, the full questionnaire, the criteria used to code each error, and evidence of inter-rater reliability. The source also alternates between describing parts of the research as planned and presenting questionnaire results. Before submission, the author should confirm that data collection was completed and report only analyses that were actually conducted.

These limitations restrict the strength and generalisability of the conclusions. The reported data can support a cautious description of the examples and questionnaire responses, but they cannot establish that the same patterns occur among all university students or demonstrate that a particular teaching method causes a reduction in lexical errors.

4. Results and Analysis

4.1. Learners' self-reported lexical difficulties

The source questionnaire includes statements about finding precise words, distinguishing synonyms, using collocations, translating directly from Azerbaijani, learning words through example sentences, retaining and using new vocabulary, selecting an appropriate register, and relying on the first dictionary translation. Each item has 65 responses in the table. These statements cover several dimensions of lexical competence, including retrieval, semantic precision, contextual use, and learning strategy.

For the statement that learners have difficulty finding the precise word needed to express an idea in English, 28 of 65 respondents selected either “agree” or “strongly agree” (13 and 15, respectively). For the statement about difficulty distinguishing synonyms, 27 respondents selected one of these two categories (14 and 13). These counts suggest that a notable portion of respondents perceived challenges in lexical retrieval and semantic differentiation, although the figures should be interpreted in light of the unknown sampling procedure.

For the statement about difficulty using newly learned words regularly in speaking and writing, 38 respondents selected “agree” or “strongly agree” (36 and 2). This pattern highlights the potential gap between learning or recognizing a word and being able to use it productively. Because these responses are self-reported, they should be complemented by analysis of actual student writing and speech before drawing conclusions about proficiency.

Responses concerning collocations were mixed: 25 respondents selected “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement about difficulty combining words correctly, while 34 selected “disagree” or “strongly disagree.” This distribution cautions against assuming that all participants experienced collocational difficulty to the same degree. Further analysis by proficiency level, educational background, and actual learner output could clarify this pattern.

4.2. Examples of lexical errors

Table 1. Illustrative lexical errors reported in the source material

Learner expression	Target expression	Error category	Possible explanation
do a decision	make a decision	Collocation error	Direct translation or incomplete knowledge of conventional word combinations
I am interesting in history	I am interested in history	Word-form error	Confusion between -ing and -ed adjective forms
borrow me your pen	lend me your pen	Word-choice error	Insufficient differentiation between “borrow” and “lend”

The first example, “do a decision,” demonstrates that lexical knowledge involves conventional word combinations. Although “do” and “decision” are familiar items, standard English uses “make a decision.” A learner may produce the incorrect combination when the words have been learned separately or when a first-language pattern is transferred directly. Instruction can address this difficulty by teaching the noun together with its typical verbs and by revisiting the collocation in different contexts.

The second example, “I am interesting in history,” concerns the difference between “interested” and “interesting.” The form “interested” describes the person who experiences interest, while “interesting” generally describes something that causes interest. The problem therefore involves both word form and semantic interpretation. Contrastive examples — such as “I am interested in history” and “History is interesting” — can help learners notice the distinction.

The third example, “borrow me your pen,” involves the direction of an exchange. “Borrow” means to receive something temporarily from another person, whereas “lend” means to give something temporarily to another person. Learners need to understand the participant roles associated with each verb and practise them in contextualized dialogues.

The source table reports frequencies of 12 for “do a decision,” 8 for “I am interesting in history,” and 15 for “borrow me your pen.” The document does not explain whether these figures represent unique learners, total occurrences, or a subset of coded examples. They are reproduced as reported counts and should be clarified before publication.

4.3. Summary of observed patterns

The examples point to three distinct but related dimensions of lexical competence: knowledge of conventional word combinations, knowledge of word forms and grammatical patterns, and semantic differentiation between related verbs. They illustrate why lexical errors cannot be explained simply as a lack of vocabulary. A learner may know the component words but still lack the knowledge required to combine them appropriately or select the correct form for a particular meaning.

In relation to RQ1, the source examples illustrate collocational, word-form, and word-choice errors, while the questionnaire addresses broader difficulties in retrieval, synonym differentiation, register, and productive use. In relation to RQ2, possible contributing factors include first-language transfer, insufficient knowledge of collocations, incomplete semantic distinctions, and limited opportunities for active retrieval. These are plausible interpretations rather than confirmed causal findings. RQ3 is addressed in the pedagogical implications section through strategies designed to strengthen contextual and productive vocabulary knowledge.

5. Discussion

The descriptive evidence highlights a potential gap between receptive knowledge and productive use. Respondents' reported difficulty using newly learned words in speaking and writing suggests that vocabulary instruction should provide regular opportunities for retrieval

and application rather than relying primarily on recognition exercises or isolated word lists. Because the questionnaire is self-reported, however, it should be complemented by direct analysis of student work.

The learner examples also illustrate why collocations should be taught explicitly. A learner who knows the meanings of “make,” “do,” and “decision” may still produce “do a decision” if the conventional combination has not been sufficiently noticed and practised. Teaching vocabulary in chunks, using dictionary or concordance examples, maintaining collocation notebooks, and revisiting expressions in varied contexts may help learners build stronger associations between words. This is consistent with the Lexical Approach, which emphasizes multiword units and recurring patterns (Lewis, 1993).

L1 transfer is another plausible contributor. Learners may map familiar Azerbaijani structures onto English and translate expressions word for word. Such transfer should not be treated as the sole explanation for every error: limited exposure, incomplete knowledge, overgeneralisation, and the pressure of spontaneous communication may also contribute. Instruction can help learners compare languages selectively while encouraging them to process and practise English expressions in meaningful contexts.

The adjective example indicates a different learning need from the collocation example. Learners must recognize how suffixes and grammatical patterns are related to meaning. Focused contrastive examples and sentence-level practice can make the distinction more accessible. Similarly, “borrow” and “lend” should be taught through clear situations that show who gives an item and who receives it, not merely as two translation equivalents.

The questionnaire results should be interpreted cautiously. Self-assessment does not always correspond to observed performance, and the available data do not establish causal relationships between teaching methods and error rates. Future research should combine questionnaire responses with a clearly described learner corpus, proficiency-level comparisons, transparent coding procedures, and, where possible, follow-up interviews to understand learners' reasoning.

Other related publications offer broader perspectives on lexical choice in context. Elisoy's work on neologism, intertextuality, and political discourse (Elisoy, 2026) illustrates the importance of contextual interpretation of lexical items, while İbrahim's study of neologism formation in contemporary French periodicals (İbrahim, 2020) provides a cross-linguistic perspective on lexical development. These topics differ from English learner-error analysis and are therefore included only as adjacent linguistic context, not as direct support for the present empirical findings.

Local scholarship on speaking-skill development, error prevention, and communicative language teaching can provide a pedagogical context for this discussion. Nağıyeva's work on methods for developing speaking skills and preventing student errors, as well as Babayev's discussion of communicative language teaching, may be relevant to the instructional implications. Such studies should be cited within their actual scope and should not be treated as direct empirical evidence for the questionnaire figures in this article.

6. Pedagogical Implications

6.1. Teach vocabulary in context

New words should be presented in meaningful sentences, short texts, dialogues, and communicative tasks. Context helps learners understand not only a word's basic meaning but

also its grammatical patterns, collocations, register, and pragmatic use. Teachers can ask learners to identify the situation in which an expression is appropriate and to compare it with a less suitable alternative. A language-centred approach that connects course content with participation and reflective learning is also discussed by Aliyeva and Naghiyeva (2026), although their study focuses on patriotic education rather than lexical errors.

6.2. Prioritise collocations and lexical chunks

Teachers can present combinations such as “make a decision,” “take medicine,” and “heavy rain” as meaningful units. Students can record each combination with an example sentence, a translation where helpful, and one or two related expressions. Short matching tasks, gap-fills, and sentence-building activities can reinforce the combinations, but learners should also use them in speaking and writing.

6.3. Use spaced retrieval and active recall

Vocabulary should be revisited over time rather than taught once and then left unused. Spaced retrieval activities can ask students to recall a collocation, complete a sentence without looking at notes, explain the difference between two verbs, or use a target expression in a new context. Such tasks help teachers identify whether learners can retrieve and apply vocabulary independently.

Additional local work may inform the broader teaching context. İsmayılova's study of the psycholinguistic features of reading in English (İsmayılova, 2023) is relevant to the processing demands involved in recognizing and interpreting vocabulary during reading. Mammadova's work on content and language integrated learning (Mammadova, 2022) provides a possible framework for teaching vocabulary through meaningful subject content. Their relevance is pedagogical and contextual; neither source is treated as direct empirical evidence about the error counts in this study. Aliyeva and Naghiyeva's (2026) discussion of language-centred and participatory practices provides an additional, adjacent pedagogical perspective; it is not treated as empirical evidence for the lexical-error results.

6.4. Move from receptive to productive practice

After learners recognize a word in reading or listening, they should have opportunities to use it in short spoken responses, paragraphs, discussions, presentations, and later writing tasks. Role-play and problem-solving tasks can make vocabulary use purposeful. For example, students can practise “borrow” and “lend” in a classroom dialogue or use “interested” and “interesting” to describe their preferences and experiences.

6.5. Provide focused feedback on recurring errors

Teachers can maintain an error log that records the original expression, the corrected form, the error category, and whether the same pattern reappears. Feedback should prioritize errors that affect meaning or recur frequently. Rather than simply supplying the correction, the teacher can ask learners to explain the difference and then reformulate the expression in a new context. Occasional slips should be distinguished from persistent patterns.

6.6. Develop awareness of register and semantic precision

Near-synonyms and formal/informal alternatives should be compared in authentic contexts. Learners can consult learner dictionaries and examine example sentences, collocations, grammatical information, and usage labels. This practice discourages reliance on the first translation equivalent and helps students select vocabulary appropriate to academic, professional, and everyday communication.

7. Conclusion

This article has examined lexical errors and major difficulties described in a source study of students learning English. The reported categories include problems with precise word retrieval, productive use of new vocabulary, collocations, word forms, semantic distinctions, and register. The examples “do a decision,” “I am interesting in history,” and “borrow me your pen” demonstrate how lexical errors may reflect incomplete knowledge of conventional combinations, grammatical forms, and the semantic relationships between words.

The three research questions have been addressed at a descriptive level. First, the examples illustrate collocational, word-form, and word-choice errors, while the questionnaire addresses broader vocabulary-learning challenges. Second, possible contributing factors include first-language transfer, incomplete collocational knowledge, semantic confusion, and limited opportunities for productive retrieval. Third, contextualized vocabulary instruction, explicit teaching of collocations, spaced retrieval, repeated productive practice, and focused feedback are practical strategies that may support lexical competence.

The findings must remain exploratory because important methodological details are not available. Before submission, the author should clarify the status of data collection, provide participant and sampling information, explain the coding procedure, define the denominator for the reported error counts, and complete the ethics and data-availability statements as appropriate. Future research could compare questionnaire responses with a systematically collected learner corpus and examine whether targeted vocabulary instruction leads to measurable improvements in lexical accuracy.

The article's discussion is further contextualized by relevant work from the local academic community: Nağıyeva (2024, 2025) on speaking development and error prevention; Babayev (2023) on communicative language teaching; Nuri (2023) and Ashrafova (2026) on English word formation and lexical semantics; İsmayılova (2023) on the psycholinguistic dimensions of reading; Mammadova (2022) on content and language integrated learning; and İbrahim (2020) and Elisoy (2026) on lexical innovation and contextual meaning. These sources are used according to their documented subject areas and are not presented as proof of the questionnaire results.

Declarations

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Use of Generative AI: Generative AI assisted with structural organization, language editing, and reference formatting; all content was reviewed and verified by the author.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, analysis, drafting, and revision: N.A.

How to Cite:

Aliyeva, N. (2026). Lexical difficulties in university English learning: Collocations, word forms, and the receptive-productive gap. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities*, 3(4), 193-204. <https://doi.org/10.69760/gsrh.0260304019>

References

- Aliyeva, N., & Naghiyeva, G. (2026). Patriotic education in higher education: Student perceptions and language-centred practices. *Euro-Global Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*, 3(4), 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.69760/egjle.2604004>
- Ashrafova, I. A. (2026). *İngilis dilində yeni yaranan sözlər və onların semantik xüsusiyyətləri* [Newly emerging words in English and their semantic features] [Research work]. Nakhchivan State University.
- Babayev, J. (2023). *Characteristics of the CLT*.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(4), 161–170.
- Elisoy, H. (2026). The “Tech-Industrial Complex” and the “Oligarchy” warning: Neologism, intertextuality, and prophetic rhetoric in Biden's 2025 farewell address. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum*.
- İbrahim, U. Z. (2020). The ways of appearance and formation of neologisms in the modern French periodicals. *Elmi Xəbərlər, Western Caspian University*, (2), 134.
- İsmayılova, T. (n.d.). *The usage of Latin and Greek-origin words in the English language*. Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities. <https://gsrh.net/index.php/home/index>
- İsmayılova, T. (2023). *İngilis dilində oxunun psixolinqvistik xüsusiyyətlərinə dair* [On the psycholinguistic features of reading in English] [Conference proceedings] (pp. 78–79). Nakhchivan State University.
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Longman.
- Laufer, B., & Nation, P. (1999). A vocabulary-size test of controlled productive ability. *Language Testing*, 16(1), 33–51.
- Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and a way forward*. Language Teaching Publications.
- Mammadova, X. (2022). *Məzmun və dil integrasiyalı tədrisin əsasları* [The foundations of content and language integrated learning] [Conference proceedings] (p. 101). Nakhchivan State University.
- Nağıyeva, G. (2024). Choosing the right methods during the formation of speaking skills. *Euro-Global Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*.
- Nağıyeva, G. (2025). *İngilis dilində tələbə səhvlərinin qarşısının alınmasında müəllimin istifadə etdiyi üsullar* [Methods used by the teacher to prevent student errors in English].
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Webb, S. (2011). *Researching and analyzing vocabulary*. Heinle, Cengage Learning.
- Nuri, A. (2023). *İngilis dilində məhsuldar söz yaradıcılığı* [Productive word formation in English]. *Filologiya Məsələləri*, (9), 165–173.
- Read, J. (2000). *Assessing vocabulary*. Cambridge University Press.

Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
Webb, S., & Nation, P. (2017). *How vocabulary is learned*. Oxford University Press.

Received: 3 September 2026

Accepted: 16 October 2026

Published: 18 October 2026