



THE IMPORTANCE OF GRAMMAR COMPETENCE IN THE EFL CLASSROOM

*Umarova Xurshida, Umarova Muhayyo, Qurbonov Nasibulloh
Fergana State University, teachers of Applied English department*

Introduction.

Most of the linguists claim that there is a big strength of the deductive instructional approach over the inductive instructional approach when we apply it at the beginning of the lesson. The deductive instructional approach shoots right into the main point of the grammar topic, which in turn will make the lesson less time-consuming and will help to switch to the practical part faster. Eisenstein (1987) claims that the deductive approach keeps students under control during learning and practicing. However, in the inductive instructional approach, the time used to work out the rule can be rather long depending on the students' receptive skills. This period of time can be utilized to put that rule into practice by training more and doing more exercises. Therefore, in some cases, it may be better to spend less time explaining the topic and more time doing exercises. As Pica (1994) asserts that students facilitate the appropriate influence of effective learning by forming a basis for their internal representation of the L2.

There is one more significant distinction between an inductive and deductive instructional approach that the deductive method implies more teacher-centered lessons, whereas the inductive instructional approach implies more student-centered lessons as a result. However, these two have strengths as well. For example, in deductive way learners can confirm and understand better during practicing with activities. Teacher also can clarify some features on the way, even if she/he forgets at start. It is suitable for all ages, level and other learners' group. Inductive way is also considered as very good. Since learners find out the rules themselves, it is memorable for longer period and it increases learners' logical and critical analyzing skills.

Teaching grammar effectively.

The most effective choice between the use of either inductive or deductive methods in teaching grammar has always been one of the most controversial topics in linguistics. While the inductive instructional approach utilizes specific ideas and details in order to arrive at an extensive and wide conclusion, the deductive instructional approach uses general ideas and rules to come to a more specific conclusion. Both methods have their advantages and disadvantages depending on the place and condition of use.

The choice of the deductive method at the initial stage of mastering the language is explained by the lack of time for using the inductive method (the inductive method involves the search and independent formulation of theoretical provisions, rules based on specific facts, examples, experiments, which stimulates the cognitive activity of students, but in this regard it is laborious, and means it takes more time). In addition, many students do not have a scientific apparatus of grammatical terminology, therefore, an independent formulation of a theoretical rule is useless at this stage. Most often, the inductive method is used at the stage of material consolidation in conjunction with the deductive method.



Pros and Cons of two approaches.

Thus, the deductive teaching method contributes to the derivation of private and specific knowledge from more generalized grammatical theories and concepts, the connection between theory and practice, the development of independent thinking, analysis, comparison (Ellis, 1994). The inductive teaching method contributes to the development of abstract thinking, the free operation of the categorical instrument of grammar (which implements the principle of scientific nature), the ability to inference, logical conclusions, systematization. Of course, instructor's choice of an approach should be based on the learner's needs first. If the learner does not have analytical thinking or is not mature enough to use his noticing skills, it is better to use a deductive approach.

If we take any modern English textbook, it gives a choice for a teacher and a learner which approach follow. We can notice that within a unit, grammar explanation is given inductively through texts where learners, for example, should underline/circle some grammatical endings. At the same time, the textbook has a deductive way of grammar explanation which is usually given at the end of the book with some tables/formulas and practicing tasks. Consequently, an instructor can choose the way he finds effective for his learner. Inductive approach purely based on communication and learners figure out grammar rules and structures from context without teacher's explicit explanation of those grammar patterns. Spada and Lightbown (1993) claimed that thinking skills developed effectively when students practice their analysis in the learning process. As it is said in the article deductive approach is a traditional way of teaching grammar, thus it is the most common approach used in the community I am working now. The role of the teacher is dominant in deductive approach, whilst, inductive approach follows student-centered learning. If the application of inductive approach multiples in near future, the number of independent learners and thinkers will multiply in the acquisition of language learning.

Conclusion.

All in all, it is clear that learning grammar is a difficult process for elementary English learners. Any learners can be boring at the beginning of the learning grammar process. However, we have some interesting methods for improving grammar, which are deductive and inductive approaches for learners. They have advantages and disadvantages sides as well. The inductive method is not suitable for all level learners. It was appropriate for only intermediate or advanced level learners. Because this approach can improve learners' critical thinking skills effectively during the lesson. On the other hand, the deductive approach is appropriate for beginners to enhance their grammar ability efficiently. Overall, both approaches are equally essential for teachers and learners during 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. Akhadalievich, A. K., & Nozimakhon, G. (2022, November). The role of needs analysis in language teaching. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 67-71).
4. Alimardon, T., Sherzod, L., & Umida, H. (2022, December). UTILIZING DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 45-47).



5. Ellis, N. C. (1994). *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*. London: Academic Press/Harcourt Brace.
6. Eisenstein, M. R. (1987). Grammatical explanations in ESL: teach the student, not the method. In M. H. Long & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL: a book of readings* (pp. 282–292). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
7. 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).
8. Gafforov, I., & Abdulkhay, K. (2022). The Role of Assessment in Language Teaching. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION*, 1(4), 31-34.
9. 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.
10. Haydarova, U., & Umarova, M. (2022). YAPON MUTOZ MANBALARIDA QO'LLANGAN METAFORALARNING TURLARI TASNIFI. *Science and innovation*, 1(B3), 599-603.
11. 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).
12. J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL: a book of readings* (pp. 282–292). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
13. 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.
14. 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.
15. Kholmatov, S., & Yuldosheva, M. (2022). HOMONYMY IN ITS STYLISTIC USE: ANALYSIS OF PUNS. *Involta Scientific Journal*, 1(7), 178-181.
16. Kosimov, A., & Latipov, S. (2022). THE IMPORTANCE OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION POLICY AND PRACTICE IN STATE EDUCATION SYSTEMS. *Involta Scientific Journal*, 1(9), 23-27.
17. Latipov, S. (2022, February). TEACHING ENGLISH IN A NATURAL WAY. In *Multidiscipline Proceedings of Digital Fashion Conference* (Vol. 2, No. 1).
18. Foziljon o'g'li, L. S. (2022). LAKUNALAR–MILLIY-O'ZIGA XOS ELEMENTLAR TIZIMI.
19. Mashrabovna, U. M., & Mohlaroyim, E. (2022). Individual differences in foreign language learning. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(5), 751-757.
20. Pica, T. (1994) Questions from the Language Classroom: Research Perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1): 49-79.
21. Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (1993). Instruction and Development of Questions in the L2 Classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15:205-224.



22. Sevara, S., Shakhriyor, K., & Kosimov, A. (2022, December). IMPLEMENTATION OF DIGITAL TOOLS IN THE EFL CLASSROOM. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 34-37).
23. Sevara, U., Muhayyo, U., & Maftuna, A. (2022, December). THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DIGITAL LITERACY IN THE EFL CLASSROOM. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 41-44).
24. Shokirova, M. (2021). Paragraph-syntactic compositional unit. In *НАУКА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ, ИННОВАЦИИ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ И СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ* (pp. 124-126).
25. Munajat, U., Xurshida, U., & Sevara, S. (2022, December). CHALLENGES IN USING MODERN TECHNOLOGIES IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 30-33).
26. Sevara, U., & Jurayeva, K. (2022). LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY AND LANGUAGE PREJUDICE IN UZBEKISTAN. *BOSHQARUV VA ETIKA QOIDALARI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 2(12), 16-18.
27. 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.
28. 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).
29. Umarova, M. (2021). THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT. *Frontline Social Sciences and History Journal*, 1(08), 90-99.
30. Umarova, X. (2020, December). A WORK OF ART IN OKTAM USMANOV'S NOVEL" GIRDOB" EXPRESSION OF LANGUAGE FEATURES. In *Конференции*.