AIFU

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODOLOGY

Zulfizar Karimova
Senior lecturer
Tashkent branch of MSU named after M.V. Lomonosov
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article is devoted to the methodology of teaching foreign languages. The article describes two ways of teaching dialogic speech, namely deductive and inductive: the "top-down" way and the "bottom-up" way, their effectiveness, as well as benefits and drawbacks.

Key words: Teaching foreign language, dialogue, deductive and inductive approach, intonation-syntactic blocks, role play, speech functions.

In foreign language teaching methodology there are two ways of teaching dialogical speech - deductive and inductive: the top-down way (deductive approach) and the bottom-up way (inductive approach).

The 'top-down' way of teaching starts with a single dialogue sample. The dialogue is listened to, reported on, memorized, then its lexical content is varied, elements are practiced and the students are led to independent dialogues on the same topic. Starting from the sample dialogue, the students go through the following steps:

- listening to, and then graphically supporting, the ready-made dialogue in order to understand its meaning in general and identify the actors and their positions;

- identifying and appropriating specific features of the dialogue (speech clichés, emotional-modal replicas, appeals, etc.)

- role-playing dramatization, which implies a complete appropriation of the dialogue.

Here the work on the given dialogue ends and dialogue communication is stimulated on the basis of a similar but new situation. The disadvantage of this approach is that this way does not develop the ability to independently use dialogical unities in speech. It leads to premature automation of elements in the sequence in which they are in the speech pattern. And when it is forgotten, the student is not able to recover and even more freely use its individual elements [1].

In the deductive approach, learning begins with a whole dialogue pattern, which is seen as a structural and intonational benchmark for the construction of similar ones. The sample dialogue is a dialogical complex, it consists of several dialogical unities. The disadvantage of this approach is that it does not develop the ability to use the material independently in speech, focusing on the formal side of speech. The path from the whole dialogue to the learning of its elements leads to a premature automatisation of the elements in the relationship in which they are used

in the whole dialogue. This leads to its mechanical memorization and limits the possibilities of free conversation in new conditions [2].

Support for composing one's own dialogues in this case can be:

- the texts of the dialogues themselves - models;
- the content of the teacher's speech attitude towards composing modelled dialogues;
- descriptions of the roles received separately by each of the participants in the dialogue;
- pictures or videos played without sound [3].

The second approach - inductive - suggests a path from learning the elements of dialogue to conducting it independently on the basis of a learning and speech situation. It is a bottom-up way from a dialogical unity to a whole dialogue. A dialogical unity is two or more adjacent lines interconnected by meaning, and sometimes with the help of lexico-grammatical and rhythmic-intonational means [4].

Using this way, it is more convenient to teach the unfolding of lines, the embedding of micro-monologues. In this kind of dialogical unity the stimulus line is constructed in such a way that it provokes an extended response. In order for the learners to give an extended response, the nature of the stimulus should be appropriate. The 'bottom-up' approach also implies performing tasks to recover one of the lines. According to this approach, the following stages are distinguished in the acquisition of dialogical speech:

- formation of the skills to use the language material;
- mastering the skill of interacting with a partner;
- illustrations.

The stages of mastering dialogical speech suggested by R.K. Minyar-Beloruchev, who believes that dialogical speech training consists of 2 stages, can serve this approach:

- The initial stage in which pronunciation and elementary grammatical and lexical skills are formed;
- the stage of formation of reactive connections specific to dialogue.

This approach is the most predominant at the final stage of learning, as it implies the development of students' skills of independent generation of dialogical units and their use in speech in accordance with the situation of communication [5].

The bottom-up approach is gaining more and more support due to the fact that, from the very first steps, it focuses on teaching the interaction underlying dialogic speech; the development of speech skills in this approach takes place in the process of communication. Reliance on analogy plays a big role at the lower level of skill development, in the formation of primary skills, and here the reference dialogue can play its role, not for memorisation, but as a model to be emulated. At a higher level, the task of teaching students to independently plan speech actions "through awareness of motives, goals and possible outcomes of the action", as well as to "develop the content and form of speech meanings adequate to the meaning" comes to the fore.

According to E.N. Solovova, teaching dialogue "from the bottom up" implies that learners do not have the original sample dialogue for whatever reason. There can be several options here:

- learners are not able to read and cannot use the given sample;

- the level of speech development is high enough that a single sample is no longer needed;

- the intended dialogue belongs to a kind of free dialogue and the sample will only restrict students' initiative and creativity.

What needs to be improved in this case? Let us define just some of the basic speech skills:

- the ability to ask questions of different types;

- being able to answer questions logically, coherently and understandably;

- Use different reactions in the communication process, showing interest, attention and active participation in the conversation;

- use different introductory structures and clichéd expressions;

- use different ways of realising speech functions, such as expressing agreement or disagreement, doubt, satisfaction, dissatisfaction, request, etc. [6].

As practice shows, the most difficult in this regard seems to be teaching the technique of using questions. Moreover, it is not only because students cannot remember the peculiarities of word order or adequate use of auxiliary verbs, although these problems can be considered relevant up to the advanced stage of higher education. In purely linguistic terms, there are also frequent difficulties with the use of indirect questions.

Participation in linguistic Olympiads, competitions convince us that the biggest difficulties in this connection are presented by the following points:

- The ability to formulate a meaningful-valuable question;

- the ability to logically plan a series of questions aimed at getting the required information even if the partner is not very talkative and evidently not inclined to communicate.

Thus, foreign language teaching methodology distinguishes two ways of teaching dialogic speech - deductive and inductive: top-down and bottom-up.

References:

1. Holloway I., Todres L. (2003). The status of method: Flexibility, consistency and coherence. *Qualitative Research*, 3, 345–357. doi:10.1177/1468794103033004

2. Jack C. Richards Willy A. Renandya, Methodology in Language Teaching, Cambridge University Press 2002

3. Mohammed Iqram Hossain, Teaching Productive Skills to the Students: A Secondary Level Scenario, December, 2015

4. Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova, Renata Jančaříková, Gabriela Miššíková, Renata Povolná, Coherence and Cohesion in English Discourse, Published by Masaryk University, Žerotínovo nám. 617/9, 601 77 Brno, CZ, First electronic edition, 2017

5. Natalya V. Klimovich, Intertextual Element as a Unit of Translation, Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences 4 (2012 5) 500-505 Siberian Federal University,2011

6. John Fredy Gil Bonilla, Interpretations, feelings and reactions of the figurative B-term in behavioural multimodal metaphors in different cultures: A comparative study, 2015