THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MODERN TEACHING METHODS IN EFL CLASSROOM AND SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION. (IN THE EXAMPLE OF FOCUS ON FORM AND FOCUS ON FORMS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS)

Abdulkhay Kosimov

EFL/ESL instructor at Fergana State University

Abstract.

Interlanguage is the concept denoting the language between our native and learning language, L2. I consider that the main reason of the emergence of the interlanguage is the lack of sufficient knowledge on our second language. When we are speaking, we try to express our opinion with the words we know in our mother tongue. We apply the words, word phrases, rules, principles of our 1st language to the second one in order to show our understanding. Every individual learner has particular similarities and differences in learning language. When it comes to regularities, learning grammar can be a good example, with the reason that the way of acquisition is the same in every learner, as they learn the rules and work on some exercises for comprehension. Learning all four language skills or vocabulary varies from person to person.

Introduction.

Today the globalization of foreign languages has taken its high peak and has led to comprehending both L1 and L2 simultaneously. This is interlanguage that is some connection helps to learn other languages. There are several factors that can be the reasons of interlanguage formation. One of the reasons is language transfer which involves using native language knowledge to produce the target language. The fixed word order in different languages could be an example of language transfer. Another reason is overgeneralization, which involves grouping similar items in L2 and trying to predict their future use. The example is the use of past tense when "drink" becomes "drinked." The third reason for interlanguage is the transfer of training which occurs while applying the rules learned from teachers and textbooks. The fourth reason is strategies of communication when a learner tries to find different ways to communicate not knowing the exact lexical item. Finally, the last reason for interlanguage occurrence is strategies of learning when a learner uses some strategies or techniques to memorize new vocabulary. You may use different teaching methods, some students will prosper, some will not. The reason for that individual learners choose for themselves how to process or learn language. Their mental and social life has been formed through their native language. This is exactly related to learners' variation. We should use good motivation in order not to meet such conditions. There is no doubt in my mind that motivation also plays the main role in this process.There are several reasons to the process of interlanguage fossilization. One of them is psychological base and cultural environment difference is also one of the main reason to it. Barriers in cognition process such as small quantity and poor quality of SLA input will cause interlanguage fossilization.

Methodology.

The term Interlanguage was first introduced by Selinker in 1969 to explain a

specific language system that is produced by a learner of a second or a foreign language when they try to construct meaningful content in their target language. According to Selinker (1972), interlanguage is a particular language system that contains features of language learners' native and target languages including all the language domains like morphology, syntax, discourse, and others. Selinker (1972) believes that interlanguage occurs when adult second language learners unconsciously express meaning using the language that they are in the process of learning. Moreover, not only does it involve phonology, morphology, syntax, but also lexis, discourse, semantics, and pragmatics.

As David Crystal declared interlanguage has an impact on a learner's system of rules and it can happen due to different reasons, such as L1 transfer, contrastive interference from the target language, and generalizing novel rules. Interlanguage is a language between the first language and the target language. Interlanguage is the concept denoting the language between our native and learning language, L2. According to Nemser, "Interlanguage is the learner`s "acquired" system." (Nemser, 1971). Nemser (1974) argues that learner language is a changeable system that involves developmental stages that are universal and predictable. Regularity is predictable, whilst, learner variation is unpredictable (Lenzing, 2008). Concerning the difference between a focus on form and a focus on forms, Long (1991) proposes the idea that the former emphasizes the meaning and the latter part is relevant to grammatical structures. It is a sentiment that is widely acclaimed that focus on form is leading the main role now in English teaching pedagogy due to fortifying the communicative ability of the students. As for learners' variations and regularities, Larsen-Freeman (2000) offered Hypothesis Space which outlines different stages in SLA. As individual learners get outcomes in SLA. Tarone (2006) defines it as an individual linguistic system distinct from L1 and L2 but involves features of both. In other words, Interlanguage serves as a bridge to connect L1 and L2.

Research and Discussion.

To understand the word interlanguage as a student I can remember that my English teacher used synchronic translation and silent way which we mustn't use any L1 words, we should have spoken only English and Suggestopedia also helped us to revise some materials, especially for visual learners. But my point of view as a teacher banning the usage of L1 during classes cannot provide acquiring target language well enough. As a teacher, I always give individual project home tasks to speak and write and this showed its results even the first-year young learners can use difficult classroom languages. We should focus on form not forms and this is essential to comprise language acquisition. Owing to aim learning languages the main goal is not to know forms fully, but to know interlanguage universals are essential. For the time being, focusing on form instruction is more beneficial rather than focusing on forms instruction. This approach is for all-level learners. Every learner improves their communicative skills. This approach encourages learners to enhance their speaking skills. In addition, this approach concentrates learners to be attentive to the communicative process. All learners focused on the meaning of words and vocabulary. They pay attention to more vocabulary, not grammar.

On the other hand, I think that teachers should focus on form rather than forms because we should not forget about learner variability notion. All the learners are different and acquire the language in their unique way and pace. A teacher cannot always predict whether a particular approach would be the perfect or the ideal for his or her students. There are several factors like learner's age, cognitive ability, learning style, motivation, and environment that affect language acquisition. Thus, I think that teachers' choice of an approach depends on these very factors. As every student is different, a teacher should always be ready to adopt the topic using these two approaches, using it appropriately shows the teacher's professionality. I guess that the learning process should focus on form and forms simultaneously which helps to improve the proficiency of learners faster. Besides, learners will have a deeper understanding of the language if they are taught all aspects of language at the same time.

Conclusion.

To reach the conclusion, we should consider all the factors that create convivial atmosphere for students in the EFL classroom. We should conduct the lesson with the help of professional teachers, as they have enough experience to teach students in the EFL classroom. From my perspective, learning the language only through target forms without interaction or communication in that language may cause the learners to feel bored and uninspired by the learning process. Contrarily, the emphasis should be given to the meaning and fluency of the language in order to make learners to communicate genuinely and meaningfully in the second language.

Almost all English teachers at local schools utilized the approach called focus on forms since it was traditional way of teaching, we only focused on grammar rules or forms of language items. The reason why they used is that it is the easiest way to conduct a lesson. Although some teachers were not good at explaining rules orally, they taught every theme in NL. However, it was not an effective way for students to improve their level. All the teachers in public schools find it more accessible to conduct their classes grammar-based because they themselves were taught through a focus on forms approach. They cannot change it, they do not have ideas about different ways of teaching, plus, they do not have resources to enrich their lessons with listening and video materials. Of course, it reflects on the students' results. Because of some problems in teaching process, language learners make the system for themselves which has been called interlanguage. The reason for that learner language varies much more than native-speaker language. Social and Affective factors also play an important role in SLA and Interlanguage. Prevention of interlanguage is an important requirement for language teachers. Another factor which has led to Interlanguage is teacher because sometimes they use improper teaching methods. Being a knowledgeable and qualified teacher is the most important factor in preventing in negative consequences.

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.   Abdullaeva, N. (2019). Various levels creative self-development listeners informed increase training. Современные научные исследования и разработки, (1), 18-20.

3.   Gulnorakhon Muminova. (2022). AN INVESTIGATION INTO VOCABULARY LEARNING STRATEGIES OF KOREAN AND UZBEK LEARNERS OF ENGLISH. Frontline Social Sciences and History Journal, 2(02), 39–46. https://doi.org/10.37547/social-fsshj-02-02-06

4.   Kosimov, A. (2022, February). THE ROLE OF CRITICAL READING STRATEGIES ON READING COMPREHENSION IN EFL STUDENTS AND ITS IMPACT TO SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION. In International journal of conference series on education and social sciences (Online) (Vol. 2, No. 2).

5.   Kosimov, A. (2022). THE IMPORTANCE OF CHOOSING APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT TOOLS IN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND ITS IMPACT TO SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION. British View, 7(1).

6.   Kosimov, A. (2021). THE IMPACT OF SELF-EFFICACY IN ENHANCING ENGLISH PROFICIENCY AMONG UZBEK HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS. British View, 6(1).

7.   Kosimov, A. (2022, January). THE ROLE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE ECONOMY OF UZBEKISTAN. In *International journal of conference series on education and social sciences (Online)* (Vol. 2, No. 1).

8.   Kosimov, A. A. (2021). The importance of needs analysis in teaching and enhancing english language proficiency among uzbek efl learners. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, *11*(11), 616-623.

9. Krashen, S. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use: The Taipei lectures*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

10. Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research.* London: Longman.

11. Larsen-Freeman, D. E. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston: Heinle.

12. Nemser, W. (1971). Approximative systems of foreign language learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 9*(2), 115-123.

13. Nemser, W. (1974). Approximative systems of foreign language learners. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 55-63). London: Longman

14. Qizi, R. K. M., & Igamberdieva, S. H. (2021). Boshlang'ich Sinf O'quvchilarining Diqqatini Rivojlantirishning Samarali Yo'llari. Таълим ва Ривожланиш Таҳлили онлайн илмий журнали, 1(1).

15. Qizi, R. K. M., & Igamberdieva, S. H. (2021). Boshlang'ich Ta'limda Interaktiv Metodlardan Foydalanish. Бошқарув ва Этика Қоидалари онлайн илмий журнали, 1(1), 74-78.

16. Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 10*(3), 219-231.

17. Selinker, L. (1974). Error analysis: Source, cause, and significance. In J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Error analysis:*

Perspective on second language acquisition. London: Longman.

18. Shokirova M. PARAGRAPH-SYNTACTIC COMPOSITIONAL UNIT //НАУКА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ, ИННОВАЦИИ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ И СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ. – 2021. – С. 124-126.

19. Sultanovna, U. S. (2020). Social and philosophical foundations of the Uzbek and English enlightenment movement in literature. Проблемы современной науки и образования, (3 (148)).

20.   Sultanovna, U. S. (2020). ARTISTIC PSYCHOLOGISM IN THE WORK OF S. RICHARDSON "PAMELA OR THE REWARDED VIRTUE".

21.   Sultonova O'g'ilshod (2020) "Ilm sarchashmalari", Urganch davlat universitetining ilmiy-metodik jurnali - Urganch, 2020-yil 8-son 190-193 betlar

22.   Tarone, E. (1988). *Variation in interlanguage*. London: Edward Arnold.

23.   Turdimatova, M. (2021). SEMANTIC NOTION OF DIMINUTIVES IN THE FORMATION OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH . Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики, 2(2). извлечено от https://science.jspi.uz/index.php/fll/article/view/612

24.   Ugilshod Saitmuradovna Sultonova. (2022). COGNITOLOGY - ANALYSIS OF LINGUISTICS AS AN INTERDISCIPLINARY NETWORK. CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (2767-3758), 3(02), 25–29. https://doi.org/10.37547/philological-crjps-03-02-06

25.   Галимуллина, Л. (2021). Некоторые особенности в переводе фразеологических единиц с английского языка на узбекский язык. Общество и инновации, 2(8/S), 205-213.