



ON FACTORS INFLUENCING THE RIGHT APPROACH TO GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION

Toshmatov Alimardon, Latipov Sherzod, Mansurjonova Gulbaxor
Fergana State University, teachers of Applied English department

Introduction.

Today the field of language learning and teaching has been enlarged with full of research, approaches and methods, techniques. Linguists suggest that teaching grammar and vocabulary is subskill teaching among other main skills. However, grammar teaching is challenging in simultaneous way with other communicative skills as reading, listening, writing, speaking. There are different methods on grammar teaching as famous one deductive and inductive teaching methods.

It is a huge problem all the teachers face when their students expect that grammar should be taught deductively. They expect that a teacher should give the list of formulas and tables with all the exceptions that they will learn by heart. However, when a teacher starts with the inductive approach, some learners think that a teacher is not ready for the class and is just wasting their time. Thus, it is important to feel your learners and know their needs in order to find a better way of teaching grammar for them. Also, it may be good to explain that noticing and identifying grammar rules on their own can also be very successful.

Improving grammatic competence of students.

Lee and VanPatten (1995) argue that although language classrooms are becoming more communicative, instructors still are insisting on teaching grammar explicitly. Although myriad changes have been made in teaching foreign languages in Uzbekistan since it became independent, most teachers have been giving high priority to teaching grammar at school. For a long time, the teaching grammar is debatable issue since some people accept it as an important factor in learning foreign language effectively and efficiently while other do not find grammar crucial in second and foreign language acquisition. Learning grammar is fundamentally significant to acquire a new language since it is the most important factor to give an opportunity to ameliorate productive and receptive skills and to be good at integrate all abilities. There are several approaches such as inductive and deductive ones. Harmer (1989) points out that with the deductive approach, learners can be monitored well during practice and have less fear of drawing an incorrect conclusion related to how the target language is functioning. However, there are several disadvantages of using deductive approach. As can be claimed in the article, overusing deductive approach seems very boring for language learners, especially for young learners since listening explanations of grammar rules cannot motivate them to continue learning although it can be appropriate for older ones. Additionally, students are not likely to participate the lesson actively as this approach is teacher-centered. On the other hand, there are many advantages of utilizing deductive approach. For instance, it is time-saving to utilize this approach as grammar rules are explained quickly and conducting lesson by using this approach is very suitable for adults and the learners who have an analytical learning style.



Inductive or Deductive method?

Both deductive and inductive approaches have benefits and drawbacks. As for deductive approach, it is effective to achieve short term goals which allows monitoring learners' progress but starting from explanations of grammar rules may demotivate learners and they may easily forget.

The deductive method is time-saving (Chalipa, 2013). It is true that it does not take much time for a teacher to illustrate the rule and ask the students to follow it without any other effort. However, when students do not use their noticing and detecting skills along with analytical thinking, they will not memorize the rule unconsciously and will have to look back at their notes with formulas again and again. Also, as an instructor presents the rule first, the lesson becomes teacher-centered which is obviously not a feature of a communicative way of conducting a class.

The inductive approach requires more careful attention from teachers to design lesson plan and organize the classes. Furthermore, learners can be able to discover rules according to their experiences of using language. In terms of inductive approach, Felder & Henriques (1995) claimed that when we use induction, we observe a number of specific instances and from them infer a general principle or concept. Using this approach demands on instructors in planning a lesson carefully in advance which means that a lesson can be more effective. Moreover, this approach requires learners to be involved into the lesson actively. However, sometimes, it takes much time to explain one thing with activities and exercises. Additionally, this approach is likely to frustrate students who have their own learning style and prefer to stay silent.

Although language classrooms are becoming more communicative, instructors still are insisting on teaching grammar explicitly. In addition, according to Hasanova, although instructors know the effectiveness of the communicative language teaching, they are accustomed to using grammar translation method during the lesson. It is real fact, the benefits of the grammar translation method for the learners are problematic question.

Conclusion.

All in all, with the inductive method of the presentation of linguistic material, students get acquainted with the phenomenon and its use in speech, which contributes to communication, but makes it difficult to clearly understand the mechanism of structure and use interferes with self-control. The deductive method is more time-saving, it helps to overcome the interference of the native language, promotes awareness of the structure and form of linguistic phenomena, but there is always a danger that memorizing the rules will become the only goal in learning process and will not lead to the formation of communication skills. The teacher needs to decide for himself which method will be most effective in specific conditions, depending on the level of students and the goals and objectives of the lesson.

References.

1. Abduolimova, M., & Ibrokhimova, M. (2022, February). EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES OF LEARNING INDEPENDENTLY. In *International journal of conference series on education and social sciences (Online)* (Vol. 2, No. 2).
2. Abdulkhay, K., Shaxriyor, X., & Nasibullo, Q. (2022, December). LISTENING AND NOTE TAKING SKILLS IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 38-40).
3. Alimardon, T., Sherzod, L., & Umida, H. (2022, December). UTILIZING DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 45-47).



4. Ellis, N. C. (1994). *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*. London: Academic Press/Harcourt Brace.
5. Gafforov, I., & Kosimov, A. (2022, September). LANGUAGE ENVIRONMENT, LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY AND PREJUDICE IN UZBEKISTAN. In *INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE" THE TIME OF SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS"* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 82-86).
6. Gafforov, I., & Abdulkhay, K. (2022). The Role of Assessment in Language Teaching. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION*, 1(4), 31-34.
7. Haydarova, U. (2022). THE TRANSLATIONS AND MEANINGS OF METAPHORS THAT USED IN "HOJOKI". *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 2(Special Issue 22), 54-57.
8. Haydarova, U., & Umarova, M. (2022). YAPON MUTOZ MANBALARIDA QO'LLANGAN METAFORALARNING TURLARI TASNIFI. *Science and innovation*, 1(B3), 599-603.
9. Igamberdieva, S. (2022, September). PRINCIPLES FOR TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES. In *INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE" INNOVATIVE TRENDS IN SCIENCE, PRACTICE AND EDUCATION"* (Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 212-216).
10. J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL: a book of readings* (pp. 282–292). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
11. Jurayeva, K., & Shakhnoza, I. (2022). IMPLICATIONS OF MACRO AND MICRO LANGUAGE PLANNING IN UZBEKISTAN. *BARQARORLIK VA YETAKCHI TADQIQOTLAR ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 2(12), 330-333.
12. Kholmatov, S. Z. O., & Mushtariybegim, Y. M. Q. (2022). IMPORTANCE OF WORDPLAY IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE (IN THE EXAMPLE OF PUN). *Academic research in educational sciences*, 3(6), 869-873.
13. Kholmatov, S., & Yuldosheva, M. (2022). HOMONYMY IN ITS STYLISTIC USE: ANALYSIS OF PUNS. *Involta Scientific Journal*, 1(7), 178-181.
14. Kosimov, A., & Latipov, S. (2022). THE IMPORTANCE OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION POLICY AND PRACTICE IN STATE EDUCATION SYSTEMS. *Involta Scientific Journal*, 1(9), 23-27.
15. Latipov, S. (2022, February). TEACHING ENGLISH IN A NATURAL WAY. In *Multidiscipline Proceedings of Digital Fashion Conference* (Vol. 2, No. 1).
16. Foziljon o'g'li, L. S. (2022). LAKUNALAR–MILLIY-O'ZIGA XOS ELEMENTLAR TIZIMI.
17. Mashrabovna, U. M., & Mohlaroyim, E. (2022). Individual differences in foreign language learning. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(5), 751-757.
18. Mansurjonova, G. (2020). The Main Notions Of Linguoculturology. *Интернаука*, (27), 85-86.
19. Pica, T. (1994) Questions from the Language Classroom: Research Perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1): 49-79.
20. Ravshanovna, T. M., & Abdulakhatovna, K. R. (2022). Typology. *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, 3(12), 101-107.



21. Sotvoldievich, T. A. (2022). Linguistic and Didactic Factors of Improving the Writing Competence of Future English Language Teachers. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS*, 1(3), 1-9.
22. Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (1993). Instruction and Development of Questions in the L2 Classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15:205-224.
23. Sevara, S., Shakhriyor, K., & Kosimov, A. (2022, December). IMPLEMENTATION OF DIGITAL TOOLS IN THE EFL CLASSROOM. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 34-37).
24. Sevara, U., Muhayyo, U., & Maftuna, A. (2022, December). THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DIGITAL LITERACY IN THE EFL CLASSROOM. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 41-44).
25. Shokirova, M. (2021). Paragraph-syntactic compositional unit. In *НАУКА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ, ИННОВАЦИИ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ И СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ* (pp. 124-126).
26. Munajat, U., Xurshida, U., & Sevara, S. (2022, December). CHALLENGES IN USING MODERN TECHNOLOGIES IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 30-33).
27. Sevara, U., & Jurayeva, K. (2022). LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY AND LANGUAGE PREJUDICE IN UZBEKISTAN. *BOSHQARUV VA ETIKA QOIDALARI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 2(12), 16-18.
28. Shavkatovna, A. N., & Sharifovna, S. M. (2022). The Role of Electronic Resources in English Language Teaching. *International Journal of Discoveries and Innovations in Applied Sciences*, 2(4), 79-83.
29. Turdimatova, M. (2021). SEMANTIC NOTION OF DIMINUTIVES IN THE FORMATION OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH. *Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики*, 2(2).
30. Ugli, Q. N. K., Qizi, D. U. B., & Ugli, K. S. Z. (2020, August). Teaching vocabulary to high-level students. In *Archive of Conferences* (Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 9-12).
31. Umarova, M. (2021). THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT. *Frontline Social Sciences and History Journal*, 1(08), 90-99.
32. Umarova, X. (2020, December). A WORK OF ART IN OKTAM USMANOV'S NOVEL "GIRDOB" EXPRESSION OF LANGUAGE FEATURES. In *Конференции*