Teaching Behdini Kurdish to Non-Native Learners through TV Lexical Chunks: An Experimental Study

Lect. Mr. Hassan Basil Abdulqader
Prof. Dr. Hussein Ali Ahmed
Department of English/ College of Basic Education/ University of Zakho
hassan.basil@uoz.edu.krd
haa_1957@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study aims at investigating the effectiveness of teaching lexical chunks, extracted from Behdini Kurdish TV series, in improving the spoken fluency of non-native learners of Behdini Kurdish. It seeks to explore whether exposure to frequently used lexical chunks can significantly enhance learners' spoken competence. A one-group pre-test/post-test experimental design has been employed, focusing on a number of non-native learners at an intermediate school. The instructional material included a number of common lexical chunks derived from two Behdini Kurdish TV series: Shash Rang (comedy) and Ax u Tax (drama). During four weeks period, learners received explicit chunks instruction through contextualized dialogues and communicative tasks based on the extracted TV content. The data analysis of pre- and post-test recordings has revealed significant improvement in participants' spoken fluency, including increased use and variety of lexical chunks, reduced pauses, and more natural-sounding speech. These results indicate that incorporating authentic lexical chunks supported by audiovisual material can significantly help in developing Kurdish spoken proficiency among non-native speakers. On this basis, the study concludes that TV-based lexical chunk instruction offers a valuable and effective method for teaching Kurdish as a second language, particularly in contextualized settings where the authentic language is used.

Keywords: (Behdini Kurdish, lexical chunks, TV series).

تعليم اللهجة البهدينية الكردية للمتعلمين غير الناطقين بها من خلال العبارات التلفزيونية الجاهزة: دراسة تجريبية

م. حسان باسل عبد القادر

أ.د. حسين علي احمد

قسم اللغة الإنكليزية / كلية التربية الاساسية / جامعة زاخو

Hassan.basil@uoz.edu.krd

haa_1957@yahoo.com

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التحقق من فعالية تعليم العبارات الجاهزة، المستخلصة من مسلسلات تلفزيونية باللهجة البهدينية الكردية، في تحسين الطلاقة الكلامية لمتعلمي اللهجة البهدينية لغير الناطقين بها. وتسعى إلى استكشاف ما إذا كان التعرض لهذه العبارات شائعة الاستخدام يمكن أن يعزز بشكل ملحوظ الكفاءة الكلامية للمتعلمين. تم استخدام تصميم تجريبي ذي مجموعة واحدة وباختبار قبلي وبعدي، مع التركيز على مجموعة من المتعلمين غير الناطقين باللغة الكردية في احدى المدارس المتوسطة. اشتملت المواد التعليمية على مجموعة من العبارات الشائعة المستمدة من مسلسلين كرديين بهدينيين: "شاش رانغ" (كوميدي) وتعني ستة الوان و"آخ وتاخ" (درامي) وتعني تراب و حي . خلال فترة أربعة أسابيع، تلقى المتعلمون تعليمًا صريحًا للعبارات الجاهزة من خلال حوارات سياقية ومهام تواصلية قائمة على المحتوى التلفزيوني المستخلص. أظهر تحليل البيانات للتسجيلات القبلية والبعدية تحسنًا ملحوظًا في الطلاقة الكلامية للمشاركين، بما في ذلك زيادة استخدام وتنوع، وانخفاض في التوقفات، وكلام أكثر طبيعية. تشير هذه النتائج إلى أن تدريس هذه العبارات المستعملة في الحياة اليومية يمكن أن يساعد بشكل كبير في تطوير الكفاءة الكلامية الكردية لغير الناطقين بها. على هذا الأساس، وهكذا، تخلص الدراسة إلى أن تعليم العبارات الجاهزة القائمة على المحتوى التلفزيوني يعتبر طريقة قيمة وفعالة لتعليم اللغة الكردية كلغة ثانية، خاصة في السياقات التي يتم فيها استخدام اللغة الأصلية.

الكلمات المفتاحية :(الكردية البهدينية، العبارات الجاهزة ، المسلسلات التلفزيونية).

1-**Introduction**

Kurdish is an Indo-European language of approximately 30 million citizens of various nations with the majority being found in Iraq, Syria, Turkey, Iran, Armenia, and Azerbaijan. It has many dialects (e.g. Behdini, Sorani, Zazaki, and Pehlewani), different scripts, its own grammatical system and rich vocabulary (Hassanpour, 1992; Matras, 2009). Kurdish has recently become a topic of study and has received more and more attention as a second or foreign language, which also explains why there is a severe need in effective teaching materials that are context relevant. Behdini dialect especially has experienced an increased number of learners particularly in the schools and other learning institutions. Nevertheless, the problem of limited materials and resources to be used in the second language learning remains in teaching this dialect. Although there are certain materials available on isolated vocabulary and grammar rules, they tend to contain inauthentic language and contextual information that helps in building spoken competency (Ellis, 2008; Nation, 2013). It is a very big deficiency in the teaching of Behdini Kurdish that should be abridged by introducing more authentic language in the curriculum.

The integration of the teaching of lexical chunks as multi-word units that are stored and recalled in memory as a fixed expression could be another possible remedy to this issue. The research on the acquisition of the second language has revealed that lexical chunks are critical in enhancing fluency when interacting through conversations (Wray, 2002; Schmitt, 2004). The reason behind this is that communicative competence relies to a significant degree on the repertoire of prefabricated chunks as opposed to the grammatical rules (Lewis, 1993). By being exposed to these chunks, learners are able to generate more natural speech and understand discourse better when they are

communicating (Pawley and Syder, 1983; Boers and Lindstromberg, 2012). Thus, the application of this method should be effective in enhancing the oral performances of L2 learners.

Television series provide a good source of natural language input. Based on this, two Behdini Kurdish series that represent the various registers, namely, Shash Rang (comedy) and Ax u Tax (drama), were chosen. Such series will expose the learners to real language and common lexical chunks in normal communication. The language within these series is representative of real-life use which helps in extraction of high frequency lexical chunks necessary to the communicative prowess (Webb and Rogers, 2009; Gilmore, 2011).

The lack of experimental studies on instruction of lexical chunks in Kurdish language teaching is however a problem. The research on other languages is prevalent, and the Kurdish language is not studied, in particular, Behdini dialect (Amir and Sheykhani, 2018; Karimi, 2020). This is the gap which has promoted the use of lexical chunk-based instruction in order to determine its effects on the communicative skills of the learners.

Accordingly, this study employs a one-group pre-test/post-test quasi-experimental design to examine whether high-frequency lexical chunks can improve learners' spoken skills in Behdini Kurdish communication.

Research Questions

1. What is the role of lexical chunks in developing spoken Kurdish proficiency among non-native intermediate school students?

2. Does instruction based on TV-derived lexical chunks lead to significant improvements in fluency, accuracy, and chunk use in spoken Kurdish?

2.LiteratureReview
2.1. Lexical Chunks

Lexical chunks are "sequences of word forms that usually go together in natural discourse" (Biber et al., 1999, p. 990). Corpus-based research shows that natural language comprises these chunks—also known as lexical bundles, formulaic language, or formulaic sequences. Studies by Altenberg (1998), Biber et al. (1999), Erman and Warren (2000), and Wray (2002), among others, indicate that much spoken and written discourse consists not only of isolated words but also of frequently recurring multi-word combinations. Becker (1975) first defined lexical chunks as multi-word expressions that can be fixed or semi-fixed in structure. Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) note that these chunks vary in length and form, such as on the other hand or day and night. Wray (2002) states that lexical chunks are pre-assembled strings of words, whether structurally complete or incomplete, that carry meaning.

Lexical chunks are frequently used within a speech community and contribute to the semantic and pragmatic stability of the language. Although some are grammatically incomplete, they function as coherent units of meaning essential for fluent speech (Wray, 2002).

According to Altenberg (1998), lexical chunks have three main features: semantic transparency, fragmentary grammatical structure, and pragmatic specialization. He adds that highly frequent recurring patterns, such as I don't think, do you know, and on the other hand, are often transparent in meaning but may be grammatically incomplete.

Lexical chunks vary significantly across registers. In spoken conversation, they tend to be verbal or clausal (e.g., I don't know why, I thought that was) and account for a substantial portion of speech. In

contrast, in academic writing, nominal chunks, especially prepositional and noun phrases like the size of the, are more frequent (Biber et al., 1999).

2.2 Identification of Lexical Chunks

Identifying lexical chunks in discourse requires multiple criteria. The inclusion of function words such as conjunctions, prepositions, and discourse markers (e.g., up the creek without a paddle) is one indicator (Wray, 2002, p. 33).

Fixedness is a criterion which refers to how rigid or flexible a chunk is in form. Chunks like Ladies and Gentlemen are fixed, unlike chunks with fillable slots (e.g., it goes without saying that...), which allow for variation (Wray, 2002, p. 34).

Phonological coherence is a further indicator in spoken discourse (Peters, 1983). These sequences are produced with smooth, uninterrupted intonation and no pauses for word retrieval, a phenomenon observed in both child and adult language (Peters, 1977).

Nevertheless, the possibility to determine lexical chunks cannot rely on one indicator. It involves a set of structural, semantic, pragmatic and phonological features (Wray, 2002, p. 43). Identification is also facilitated by function and frequency. In the form of a case in point, per the framework presented by Biber and Conrad (1999, pp. 181-189), the lexical chunks are the repeated word groups that are presented over 20 times per million words, as determined by frequency and structure continuity. These chunks can be identified using computational corpus methods of analyzing commonly co-occurring words in real-life discourse.

2.3 Functions of Lexical Chunks

Lexical chunks undertake several cognitive, communicative and social roles in the use of language. Their mastering is a basic step to become a

fluent and native speaker (Paquot and Granger, 2012). The various types of chunks are common in both spoken and written discourse and have crucial functions in discourse communication, discourse organisation, fluency, discourse accuracy, and social interaction.

Cognitively, lexical chunks are less demanding to process because they are kept in the long-term memory in whole units (Wood, 2002; Zhang and Lu, 2017). Their retrieval lessens the cognitive load of utterance construction enabling speakers to cover a wider discourse and sustain a flowing conversation, which makes them more fluent and communicatively competent (Wray, 1999; Schmitt, 2010).

Language is also accurate in lexical chunks. These chunks allow the native speakers to be more specific. Learning a language is not just about obtaining word meanings and grammar but it is also about understanding how words normally co-occur in a natural speech (Lewis, 1993). The major difficulty facing the learners is that it is necessary to choose not only grammatically correct, but also idiomatic expressions. This is important in order to internalize a broad scope of grammatical chunks (Pawley and Syder, 1983).

In addition, lexical chunks constitute regular communicative behaviors. The speech acts like apologies, requests, greetings, and thanks are generally articulated in a preset chunk (e.g., I am sorry, Could you please, Thank you very much). These assist in controlling the interactions, being fluent, and prevent miscommunication. Conversations are also logically structured (e.g., you know, I mean, on the other hand) and speech becomes coherent with the help of discourse markers (Hatami, 2015).

Lexical chunks, morally and culturally, are indicators of group membership and identification. Such language assists learners to become a part of a speech community and to speak more naturally with native speakers.

Also, lexical chunks have the ability to give a learner more motivation. They are stored in a whole form, thus helping the learners to convey sophisticated meanings which are beyond his or her current linguistic competence, and in the process alleviates frustration, instills confidence and is motivating (Nattinger and De Carlo 1992; Hakuta 1976). Successful second language learning is closely associated with the motivation and the ability to express oneself with the help of chunks contributes significantly to the success (Lightbown and Spada, 2006). According to Lewis (1997), lexical chunks perform three significant roles, including: the facilitation of fluency, enhancement of understanding, and cultural identity.

2.4 Classification of Lexical Chunks

Due to their important role in language production, several scholars have classified lexical chunks based on structure, function, or frequency. Three prominent classifications—Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992), Lewis (1997), and Biber et al. (2004)—are reviewed to adopt a framework aligning with the current research on spoken Behdini Kurdish in TV series.

2.4.1 Nattinger and DeCarrico's (1992) Functional Classification

Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) emphasize functional aspects, proposing four primary types:

- **Polywords:** Short, fixed chunks functioning as single units with idiomatic meaning (e.g., by the way, in fact).

- **Institutionalized Expressions:** Longer chunks used in social interactions (e.g., greetings, invitations).
- **Phrasal Constraints:** Relatively fixed expressions with modifiable slots (e.g., see you later, a week ago).
- **Sentence Builders:** Frames with slots for variable words to perform discourse roles (e.g., My point is that...).

2.4.2 Lewis's (1997) Lexical Classification

Lewis's lexical approach shifts focus from grammar to vocabulary and chunks:

- **Individual Words:** Content and function words as building blocks.
- **Collocations:** Frequent word combinations (e.g., strong coffee, make a decision).
- **Fixed Expressions:** Conventional wholes (e.g., idioms, greetings).
- **Semi-fixed Expressions:** Expressions with optional slots for routine situations.

2.4.3 Biber et al.'s (2004) Corpus-Based Classification

This corpus-based framework identifies chunks by function:

- **Stance Bundles:** Express attitudes (e.g., I think that, it is important to).
- **Discourse Organizers:** Structure information (e.g., on the other hand).
- **Referential Bundles:** Refer to entities, quantities, time, or place (e.g., a lot of, at the same time).

Each classification offers a distinct perspective: Nattinger and DeCarrico focus on function, Lewis on lexical combinations, and Biber et al. on frequency and usage.

2.4.4 The Classification of the Study

This research paper assumes an eclectic classification based on the above frameworks, but two more types are used, which put more emphasis on the functionality, frequency, and pedagogical significance. Table 1 illustrates the categories.

Table 1: Adapted Classification of Lexical Chunks for the Study

Categories	Sub-categories	Examples (Behdini Kurdish/English)
1.Fixed Expressions	Social Greetings	Roj baş (Good day)
	Politeness Phrases	Spas dikim (Thank you)
	Idioms	Çav sor (to get tough with someone)
	Polywords	Bi rastî (Actually)
2. Semi-fixed Expressions	–	Tu dikarî ... biðom? (Can you pass ...?)
3.Stance Chunks	Epistemic	Ez bejm... (I think that...)
	Desire	Te çi dvet? (What do you want?)
4. Referential Chunks	Identification/Focus	Yek ji... (One of the...)
	Quantity	Gelek kes (A lot of people)
	Time Reference	Di heman demê de (At the same time)
5. Compound Words	–	Ser u Cav (Face)
6. Conditional Sentences	–	eger baran hat, es na Cim jderve.(If rains, I will not go out)

1.5 Overview of Series in Kurdish TV Channels

The Kurdish television has been very instrumental in maintaining and enhancing Kurdish language, culture and identity. Kurdish media has played a major role in linguistic development since the late 20 th century

(Sheyholislami, 2011; Hassanpour, 1992). One of the turning points was the creation of Kurdistan TV and Kurdsat in 1999 that increased the broadcasting in Kurdish language. Nowadays, Kurdish television has been relaying news, entertainment, and education information in different dialects. Much-publicized shows such as Mem u Zin and Berivan have increased awareness of Kurdish stories around the globe (Caha, 2013).

Media and education have contributed to the further standardization of the Behdini dialect, which has been prioritized by such scholars as Hassanpour (1992), Blau (2000), and Sheyholislami (2011). The Kurdish TV series may also be used as a language-learning instrument because it can expose learners to the natural dialectal language that is not often available in textbooks (Akin, 2015).

1.6 The Role of TV Series in Language Learning

The relevance of television series in the language learning process is immense because television series involves authentic and real-life language usage (Hafez, 2007). The researchers have focused on their impact on the enhancement of conversational and pronunciation abilities (Goctu, 2017; Kalra, 2017). TV dialogue will be an effective resource because of its natural occurrence in communicative situations making it authentic (Rogers and Medley, 1988). Natural speech that can be similar to a conversation in real life is usually reflected in scripted dialogue (Bjornsson and Andersson, 2019).

In the corpus-based analysis of Friends, Quaglio (2009) discovered that TV conversation has such features as real speech and is applicable in teaching the linguistic elements of natural conversation. Here, this can be applied to Behdini Kurdish. Rather than artificial language, real TV

language that portrays conversational norms ought to be incorporated in the classrooms (Grant and Starks, 2001). TV series, therefore, are considered as a powerful source of learning the lexical chunks and acquiring fluency.

1.7 The Role of Lexical Chunks in Language Learning and Speech Fluency

Lexical chunks play a critical role in second language learning in enhancing communication competence. Chunks play an important role in enabling the fluent speakers to include smooth speech (Pawley and Syder, 1983; Wood, 2010). Due to the fact that chunks are attached to certain situations, they are easier to recall. Their utilization saves on cognitive burden, since they are not built word-by-word, but are presented as single units, which results in an increased processing speed and more fluent speech (Boers et al., 2006), which, after all, becomes automatized (Segalowitz, 2003). Besides, chunks are used to pass pragmatic and cultural meanings outside grammatical rules.

Therefore, chunk-based learning is a potential teaching strategy among the Behdini Kurdish. TV series, being good sources of authentic language offer the best candidates in the extraction of such chunks. They can be integrated into teaching and can assist the learners in the development of vocabulary, pragmatics, and cultural knowledge to increase confidence in spontaneous communication.

3. Research Design

The study was carried out using a one- group pre-test/ post-test quasi-experimental design to examine how lexical instruction using chunk was able to influence the spoken Kurdish proficiency of non-native learners.

The changes in the performance were measured by evaluating the participants prior to and after the instruction. It is admitted that the lack of the control group is a limitation, yet the design permits comparisons within groups to be measured. The pre-test provided baseline information on fluency, accuracy and spontaneous use of chunks. The frequent lexical chunks that were drawn out of the series Shash Rang and Ax u Tax were used to provide instruction to the learners after the pre-test. Improvements were measured as a post-test.

3.1 Participants

The participants were 40 males, non-native, learners of Kurdish, eleventh-grade students at Alsaddeeq Secondary School in Mosul, Iraq, who were between 16-19 years old. They were of Arabic origin and had very little exposure to Kurdish and therefore any enhancement could be linked to the teaching. Sampling was not biased as participants were chosen randomly.

The real contents of two Kurdish TV series - Shash Rang (comedy) and Ax u Tax (drama) were used. They have been chosen to be used in these series on the basis of their natural dialogue and depiction of the common spoken Kurdish. A corpus of dialogues was compiled, from which high-frequency lexical chunks were manually identified and categorized using an eclectic framework based on Lewis (1993), Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992), Biber et al. (2004). Chunks were classified into six types: fixed expressions, semi-fixed expressions, referential chunks, stance chunks, compound words, and conditional sentences. Chunk-focused exercises and communicative tasks were designed to reinforce meaning and usage. Supplementary tools included guided video viewing assignments.

3.2 Procedure

Instruction occurred over four weeks (three 50-minute lessons per week). Each lesson included explicit chunk instruction followed by structured

speaking practice. Chunks were selected based on high frequency in the TV series. Instruction involved explanations, examples, and controlled practice (substitution drills, matching tasks). Guided speaking tasks (pair dialogues, role-plays, group discussions) encouraged spontaneous chunk use. As a supplementary exposure, students watched episodes at home (available on YouTube), reinforcing chunk recognition in natural contexts.

3.3 Research Instruments

3.3.1 The Pre-Test and Post-Test

A one-group pre-test/post-test design was used to measure the impact of instruction. The pre-test, administered one week before instruction, assessed spoken Kurdish in terms of fluency, accuracy, and chunk use via individual interviews (15–20 minutes each) recorded in a quiet classroom.

After four weeks of instruction, an identical post-test was administered. Both tests evaluated mastery of target chunks in terms of accuracy, fluency, and contextual appropriateness. Tasks included describing visual prompts and retelling short dialogues related to series scenarios, stimulating spontaneous chunk use. Thirty lexical chunks were selected from the six classified types and integrated evenly into test tasks.

3.3.2 Scoring Criteria for Oral Production Tasks

Oral responses were evaluated on three aspects using a 4-point scale (0–3). The total maximum score per response was 9.

A. Fluency (0–3 points)

- 0: Largely incoherent, frequent pauses/restarts.
- 1: Halting, frequent pauses, difficult to follow.
- 2: Moderately fluent, some hesitation but understandable.
- 3: Fluent, natural, smooth delivery with connected ideas.

B. Accuracy (0–3 points)

- 0: Frequent grammatical/pronunciation errors, speech mostly unintelligible.
- 1: Many errors, some phrases comprehensible but meaning often distorted.
- 2: Mostly correct grammar/pronunciation, minor errors don't impede understanding.
- 3: Accurate, consistent grammar and clear, near-native pronunciation.

C. Appropriate Use of Lexical Chunks (0–3 points)

- 0: No chunk use; only isolated words.
- 1: Few attempts, inaccurate or contextually irrelevant.
- 2: Some correct chunks, but occasional misuse.
- 3: Several chunks used accurately, fluently, and naturally integrated.

Inter-Rater Reliability

Two raters independently evaluated recordings. Discrepancies exceeding 2 points in total scores were resolved through discussion. Cohen's Kappa was used for categorical agreement, and Pearson correlation for score alignment.

4. Data Collection and Analysis

Quantitative and qualitative techniques measured the impact of instruction. Data from pre- and post-test speaking tasks (three prompts per participant, 1–2 minutes each) were audio-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed using AntConc for chunk identification and counting.

In the case of quantitative analysis, the recordings were rated on fluency, accuracy and chunk integration through the use of the 4-point rubrics. The scale was rated by two raters, which is the guarantee of inter-rater reliability (Cohen Kappa = 0.82). paired t-tests were used to compare the mean pre- and post-test scores.

Qualitative analysis of the sampled transcripts involved the manner in which the learners integrated the chunks based on the variety, frequency, contextual suitability, and pragmatic role.

5. **Results**

The outcome of pre- and post-test evaluations indicate that the participants are more fluent with better accuracy and more lexical chunks. Quantitative and qualitative results are provided.

5.1 Quantitative Results

Scores were compared in three standards namely fluency, accuracy, and use of lexical chunks on the 4-point scale (0-3). The findings are found in Table 2.

Table 2: Pre-test and Post-test Performance Comparison (N=40)

Assessment Criterion	Pre-test Mean (SD)	Post-test Mean (SD)	Mean Difference	t-value (df=39)	p-value
Fluency (0–3 scale)	1.8 (0.52)	3.1 (0.48)	+1.3	t = 11.87	< 0.001
Accuracy (0–3 scale)	2.0 (0.49)	3.3 (0.45)	+1.3	t = 13.42	< 0.001
Lexical Chunk Use (0–3)	1.5 (0.54)	3.0 (0.51)	+1.5	t = 14.56	< 0.001
SD = Standard Deviation. All improvements are statistically significant at p < 0.001.					

5.1.1 Fluency

Pre-test fluency mean was 1.8 (SD = 0.52), indicating moderate fluency with noticeable hesitation. The post-test mean increased to 3.1 (SD = 0.48), showing smoother, faster speech with fewer pauses. The paired t-test confirmed significant improvement (t(39) = 11.87, p < 0.001).

5.1.2 Accuracy

Pre-test accuracy mean was 2.0 (SD = 0.49), with errors in grammar and lexicon. Post-test mean rose to 3.3 (SD = 0.45), reflecting fewer mistakes. The improvement was statistically significant (t(39) = 13.42, p < 0.001).

5.1.3 Lexical Chunk Usage

Pre-test chunk use mean was 1.5 (SD = 0.54), with limited, often distorted phrases. Post-test mean increased to 3.0 (SD = 0.51), showing natural and appropriate incorporation of various chunks. The improvement was significant (t(39) = 14.56, p < 0.001).

5.2 Qualitative Results

The analysis of 25 randomly chosen post-test responses showed that their content was analyzed:

1. Increased Variety: There was a broader variety of chunk types used by the participants (idioms, collocations, referential expressions). The mean distinct chunks per participant increased in the pre-test (3) and post-test (8) stages.
2. Contextual Appropriateness: Specific pragmatic functions (e.g., greetings, politeness) were done correctly and naturally using chunks.
3. Enhanced Fluency: Chunks were used to sustain a conversational flow and change of topics.

Such results confirm the quantitative outcomes, that is, the more formulaic, fluent and natural the speech, the more was taught through the instruction of the chunk.

5.3 Discussion of Results

The results point to the effectiveness of instruction in lexical chunks in enhancing accuracy and fluency in the spoken Behdini Kurdish. Results as predicted were that the participants achieved a high degree of gains in

fluency, accuracy, and chunk usage accompanied by more natural language production and decreased hesitations. This is in line with the fact that lexical chunks are necessary component building blocks of the second language learning, which enables cognitive processing and the production of speech.

The enhanced fluency can be explained by the ability of the participants to retrieve the chunks as fixed units in the memory. The more frequent use of greetings, idioms, and talk expressions decreased the load to psychology thus enabling more attention to be paid to communication instead of sentence structure as postulated by Lewis (1993) and Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992).

The natural language used in TV series presented contextual exposure to the learners, where they get to experience chunks in actual life situations and how they can be used in real-life situations. This is in line with the noticing hypothesis by Schmidt (1990), where it would be important to have meaningful contexts in learning. Graphical and auditory stimuli were probably useful in cognitive processing, and boosted fluency and accuracy.

In the study, there was also a difference in the acquisition of chunks as fixed expressions (e.g., Roj bas) were acquired more easily because they are predictable, and figurative idioms (e.g., Cav sor) more difficult--this is in line with Zhang and Lu (2017) observation that idioms are more difficult to learn in general.

Such findings support the literature regarding lexical chunks (Lewis, 1993; Biber et al., 2004) and the application of the media in language acquisition (Sheyholislami, 2011), but to an experimental setting in the context of Behdini Kurdish.

6. **Conclusion**

The findings of the current study are that the lexical chunk teaching with real TV materials has a positive influence on spoken proficiency of non-native Behdini Kurdish students. The mix of natural input and systematic training resulted in the tremendous growth in fluency, accuracy and chunk application. The findings are significant to add to the body of knowledge on lexical chunks in language acquisition, particularly of the under-resourced language Behdini Kurdish.

6.1 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The single group design of the study makes it difficult to generalize. A control group should be used in future research. Other suggestions include:

a. Expanding to learners of different proficiency levels.
b. Investigating the acquisition of specific chunk types (e.g., idioms vs. collocations).
c. Conducting longitudinal studies to assess retention.
d. Comparing different authentic sources (e.g., news, podcasts, novels) for teaching spoken Kurdish.

References

1. Akın, S. (2015). Kurdish as a linguistic minority in Turkey. Language Policy, 14(2), 135-152.

2. Albiladi, W. S., Abdeen, F. H., & Lincoln, F. (2018). Learning English through movies: Adult English language learners' perceptions. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 8(12), 1567-1574.

3. Altenberg, B. (1998). On the phraseology of spoken English: The evidence of recurrent word-combinations. In A. P. Cowie

(Ed.), Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications (pp. 101–122). Oxford University Press.

4. Amir, A., & Sheykhani, M. (2018). Kurdish language education: Challenges and opportunities. International Journal of Kurdish Studies, 4(1), 1-15.

5. Becker, J. D. (1975). The phrasal lexicon. In R. Shank & B. L. Nash-Webber (Eds.), Theoretical issues in natural language processing (pp. 60–63). Association for Computational Linguistics.

6. Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (1999). Lexical bundles in conversation and academic prose. In H. Hasselgård & S. Oksefjell (Eds.), Out of corpora: Studies in honour of Stig Johansson (pp. 181–190). Rodopi.

7. Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004). If you look at…: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks. Applied Linguistics, 25(3), 371–405.

8. Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). Longman grammar of spoken and written English. Longman.

9. Björnsson, C. H., & Andersson, S. (2019). The language of television: A corpus-based analysis of dialogue in TV series. Journal of Pragmatics, 141, 1-15.

10. Blau, J. (2000). Méthode de kurde sorani. L'Harmattan.

11. Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (2012). Experimental and intervention studies on formulaic sequences in a second language. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 32, 83–110.

12. Boers, F., Eyckmans, J., Kappel, J., Stengers, H., & Demecheleer, M. (2006). Formulaic sequences and perceived oral proficiency: Putting a lexical approach to the test. Language Teaching Research, 10(3), 245–261.

13. Bulut, C. (2018). Kurdish dialects in media. Journal of Kurdish Studies, 6(1), 1-20.

14. Çaha, Ö. (2013). Kurdish women in Turkish media. Middle East Journal, 67(2), 211-225.

15. Ellis, N. C. (2008). The dynamics of second language emergence: Cycles of language use, language change, and language acquisition. The Modern Language Journal, 92(2), 232–249.

16. Erman, B., & Warren, B. (2000). The idiom principle and the open choice principle. Text & Talk, 20(1), 29–62.

17. Gilmore, A. (2011). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. Language Teaching, 44(2), 97–118.

18. Goctu, R. (2017). Using movies in EFL classrooms. European Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 3(2), 121-124.

19. Grant, L., & Starks, D. (2001). Screening appropriate teaching materials: Closings from textbooks and television soap operas. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 39(1), 39–50.

20. Hafez, K. (2007). The myth of media globalization. Polity Press. Where? City!!!

21. Hakuta, K. (1976). A case study of a Japanese child learning English as a second language. Language Learning, 26(2), 321–351.

22. Hassanpour, A. (1992). *Nationalism and language in Kurdistan, 1918-1985*. Mellen Research University Press.

23. Hatami, S. (2015). Lexical chunks and the role of them in language learning and teaching. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 4(6), 220–225.

24. Ismaili, M. (2013). The effectiveness of using movies in the EFL classroom – A study conducted at South East European University. Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 2(4), 121–132.

25. Kabooah, R. H. (2016). Using English movies during the lessons to promote English language acquisition among EFL students at the University of Tabuk. British Journal of Education, 4(10), 13–26.

26. Kalra, R. (2017). The effectiveness of using films in the EFL classroom: A case study conducted at an International University in Thailand. Arab World English Journal, 8(3), 289–301.

27. Karimi, L. (2020). Teaching Kurdish as a second language: A review of current practices. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 11(5), 787.

28. Lewis, M. (1993). The lexical approach: The state of ELT and a way forward. Language Teaching Publications.City?

29. Lewis, M. (1997). Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice. Language Teaching Publications.City?

30. Liando, N. V. F., Sahetapy, R. J., & Maru, M. G. (2018). English major students' perceptions towards watching English movies in listening and speaking skills development. Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal, 5(6), 1–16.

31. Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). How languages are learned (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

32. Martinez, R., & Schmitt, N. (2012). A phrasal expressions list. Applied Linguistics, 33(3), 299–320.

33. Matras, Y. (2009). Language contact. ????Cambridge University Press.

34. Nation, I. S. P. (2013). Learning vocabulary in another language (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. City?

35. Nattinger, J. R., & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). Lexical phrases and language teaching. Oxford University Press.City?

36. Paquot, M., & Granger, S. (2012). Formulaic language in learner corpora. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 32, 130–149.

37. Pawley, A., & Syder, F. H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and communication (pp. 191–226). Longman. City!

38. Peters, A. M. (1977). Language learning strategies: Does the whole equal the sum of the parts? Language, 53(3), 560–573.

39. Peters, A. M. (1983). The units of language acquisition. Cambridge University Press.

40. Quaglio, P. (2009). Television dialogue: The sitcom Friends vs. natural conversation. John Benjamins.City

41. Rogers, C. V., & Medley, F. W., Jr. (1988). Language with a purpose: Using authentic materials in the foreign language classroom. Foreign Language Annals, 21(5), 467–478.

42. Scalbert-Yücel, C. (2009). Media and minorities in Turkey. Ethnopolitics, 8(2), 255-270.

43. Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11(2), 129–158.

44. Schmitt, N. (2004). Formulaic sequences: Acquisition, processing, and use. John Benjamins.

45. Schmitt, N. (2010). Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual. Palgrave Macmillan. City

46. Segalowitz, N. (2003). Automaticity and second languages. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), The handbook of second language acquisition (pp. 382–408). Blackwell. City

47. Sheyholislami, J. (2011). Kurdish identity, discourse, and new media. Palgrave Macmillan. City

48. Webb, S., & Rodgers, M. P. H. (2009). Vocabulary demands of television programs. Language Learning, 59(2), 335–366.

49. Wood, D. (2002). Formulaic language in acquisition and production: Implications for teaching. TESL Canada Journal, 20(1), 1–15.

50. Wood, D. (2010). Formulaic language and second language speech fluency: Background, evidence and classroom applications. Continuum. City

51. Wray, A. (2002). Formulaic language and the lexicon. Cambridge University Press. City

52. Yaseen, B. H., & Shakir, H. (2015). The impact of teaching English by using television commercials on EFL students' speaking skill. Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6(5), 216–229.

53. Zhang, X., & Lu, X. (2017). A longitudinal study of receptive vocabulary breadth knowledge growth and vocabulary fluency development. Applied Linguistics, 38(3), 365–388.