THEORETICAL IDEAS OF CONTENT-BASED IN ENGLISH METHODOLOGY

Student: Quranbayev L.
Scientific supervisor: Sirojiddinova Sh.S.

Abstract: Teaching and learning English have already become of the top priority of each and every government. However, in the case of teaching English to the students of different fields, both teachers and students might face several calamities and this article examines the special features and possible hardships, and as a solution, the author suggests the implementation as well as advantages of Content-based instruction on the course of instructing legal terms in ESP (English for different purposes) classes. The author considerably investigates the researches carried out by other authors and compares the results and perceptions suggested by them.

Key words: Content based, learners,instructions, pedagogy, improvement, whole-class, proficiency, cognitively

Stryker and Leaver state that there may be a challenge for learners to participate in Content Based Instruction courses. Content Based Instruction is in the "learning by doing" school of pedagogy. Learners are expected to be active in different roles and cooperative with each other. In addition, they need a commitment to learn language in Content Based Instruction courses. This is an issue for students who are accustomed to whole-class, independent, and traditional learning and teaching models. Additionally, learners need to possess a minimum level of language proficiency so that they can understand the quantity of new information in Content Based Instruction courses. Stryker and Leaver suggest that students need to be prepared both psychologically and cognitively for v, and if they are not adequately prepared, then teachers should offer the missing schemata needs for students. Or students need to be kept from enrolling in Content Based Instruction courses until they are ready. In my opinion, I would suggest that teachers need to design a lesson that is intriguing and appealing enough to encourage students to participate in the lesson. Moreover, teachers must know how to shelter the content to make it accessible to students.

Another issue is that language teachers have been trained to teach linguistic knowledge rather than a content subject. Hence, language teachers "may be insufficiently grounded to teach subject matters." [1, 220]. Indeed, language teachers have not been trained to teach content subjects, and may be questioned about their credibility in CBI courses. From my perspective, I would say that language teachers can ask for assistance from content teachers. Additionally, language teache6rs can choose a content subject that they are familiar with to instruct. Do not try to teach all subject matters, that is, language teachers should start small. Finally, language teachers can attend professional development workshops to let themselves have second, third, or even fourth profession.

Another problem associated with CBI is that language teachers are too concerned with content area teaching and neglect teaching related language skills. Language teachers seem to forget the main purpose of CBI is to enhance language development though content areas rather than content learning per se. If language components are missing, it can not be called CBI. The language learning aspect should have equal priority with the content learning facet in CBI [2].

Howatt notes that there are two versions of the Communicative Approach: a strong version and a weak version. The weak version, which we illustrated in the previous chapter, recognizes the importance of providing learners with opportunities to practice English for communicative purposes. For instance, we saw in The Communicative Language Teaching lesson we observed that students were provided with a great deal of practice in learning the forms for a particular function, i.e. predicting. The strong version of the Communicative Approach goes beyond giving students opportunities to practice communication. The strong version asserts that language is acquired through communication. The weak version could be described as 'learning to use' English; the strong version entails 'using English to learn it'. Content- based instruction, which we explore in this chapter, and task-based and participatory approaches, which we will look at in the next two chapters, belong in the strong- version category. While the three may seem different at first glance, what they have in common is that they give priority to communicating, over predetermined linguistic content, teaching through communication rather than for it.

Before we examine the three approaches in detail, two points need to be made. First, some language educators might object to the inclusion of content-based, task- based, and participatory approaches in a methods book, for they might be more comfortable calling these 'syllabus types'. Nevertheless, others feel that a 'method' designation is very appropriate. Snow, for instance, characterizes content- based instruction as a 'method with many faces'—both to make the case for content- based instruction as a

method of language teaching and to portray the great variety of forms and settings in which it takes place. In addition, Kumaravadivelu observes that the term 'task' is often used with reference to both content and methodology of language teaching. Indeed, within the strong version of a communicative approach, the traditional separation of syllabus design and methodology is blurred. If students learn to communicate by communicating then the destination and the route become one and the same according to Nunan.

Second, some might question whether the three are different enough to be treated separately. For example, Skehan makes the point that one could regard much

Content-based instruction as well as project work, which we will briefly discuss in the next chapter as particular examples of a task-based approach. And others have suggested that task-based and participatory approaches are a form of content-based instruction. In any case, although it should be acknowledged that these methods are unified by the assumption that students learn to communicate by communicating, their scope and their particular foci seem distinctive enough to warrant independent treatment, which we do, starting in this chapter with content-based instruction.

For centuries, Language Teaching has been approached in a gradual way, focusing on some of the most relevant linguistic components of the TL: grammar, vocabulary and phonetics. But many theorists have opposed to the partial and incomplete view that language courses have offered, arguing that it is unnatural to study any language by focusing only on its discrete elements. In contrast, they propose a global approach such as that which takes place in natural environments without formal tuition. As we have highlighted in Madrid, Oller has argued that the nature of second language proficiency is unitary and depends on the learner's pragmatic expectancy grammar. Communicative interaction is a process in which the speaker or reader and listener anticipate part of the information and then they compare the message received with the information expected and react according to the feedback received: "Whenever we say anything at all we leave a great deal more unsaid. We depend largely for the effect of our communication not only on what we say but also on the creative ability of our listener to fill in what we have left unsaid,... a normal listener... is always anticipating what the speaker will say next. Similarly, the speaker is always anticipating what the listener will infer and is correcting his output on the basis of feedback received from the listener" said Oller. So expectancy is the key concept for Oller's unitary proficiency theory. In order to develop the learner's capacity to interpret, understand and produce messages, Oller proposes the use of pragmatic or integrative procedures, which focus on the learner's pragmatic competence. The most common procedures are: oral and written texts, oral interviews, composition or essay writing, narrations and even translation. The main characteristics associated with the two opposed movements we are describing in this section are summarised in the following table: Analytic techniques Global and experiential techniques - Objective - Focus on code and the L2 system Grammar - Medium centred - Language practice with emphasis on usage rules and their application - Focus on Language forms - Formal teaching - Often decontextualized - Skill-getting receptive skills and procedures - Controlled activities and restricted language forms - Deliberate, systematic, graded and structured - Emphasis on graded linguistic exercises - Subjective: connected with the learners' experience, life and interests - Focus on communicative situations pragmatics - Language use with emphasis on discourse - Focus on topic and content - Informal teaching - Always contextualized - Skill-using (productive skills and procedures - Unrestricted and natural language forms - Emphasis on fluency - Realistic, authentic, genuine - Emphasis on tasks and project work

These can be summarized as follows. I strongly believe that CBI can be both challenging and rewarding. If students, the administration, and professors are positively involved in the process, this approach could be successful. Personally, I would join CBI with other CLT approach like task-based teaching (in order to provide more meaning) as part of the curriculum in order to help learners to acquire the target language. Then CBI has become a popular approach in ESL and EFL classrooms basically because learners' motivation seems to increase when students learn about something that interests them, rather than just studying the language.

Used literature:
1.   Nunan D. Designing tasks for the communicative classroom. –Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. – 211 p.
2.   O'Malley J. Michael & Anna Uhl Chamot. Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. – 280 p.
3.   Parrot Martin. Tasks for Language Teachers: A resource book for training and development. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. – 490 p.
4.   Rebecca Oxford. Integrated Skills in the ESL/EFL Classroom. – New York: University of Maryland, 2001. – 219 p.

5.   Rebecca Oxford Language Learning Strategies. What every teacher should know. – New York: Newbury House, 1990. – 250 p.

6.   Rogova G. Methods of teaching English. – Leningrad: Просвешение, 1975. – 312 p.

7.   Savignon S.J. & Berns M.S. Communicative language teaching: Where are we going? – Chicago: University of Illinois, 1991. – 213 p.

8.   Wallace Michael J. Training Foreign Language Teachers: A reflective approach. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. – 220 p.

9.   Watkins. Learning to Teach English. – Essex: Delta Publishing, 2005. – 144 p.

10. Wenden Anita L & Joan Rubin. Learner Strategies in Language Learning. UK: Prentice Hall, 1987. – 329 p.

11. Woodward T. Planning Lessons and Courses: Designing Sequences of Work for the Language Classroom. Cambridge University Press 2001 – 266 p.

INGLIZ TILI GRAMMATIKASIDA GENDER TUSHUNCHASINING YARATILISH TARIXI

S.A.Nishanova
SamDCHTI, magistrant

Annotatsiya: Bu maqolada ingliz grammatikasida qo`llaniladigan gender tushunchasining kelib chiqish tarixi va xususiyatlari,hamda olimlar tomonidan olib borilgan tadqiqotlar borasida qisqacha ma`lumotlar izohlar bilan ko`rsatilgan.

Kalit so`zlar: Gender, lingvokulturoligiya, gipoteza, psixolingvistik

Vaqt o'tishi bilan insonning jinsi biologik xususiyatdan xarakterli ijtimoiy-psixologik xususiyatga aylandi. Shunday qilib, "gender" tushunchasi mavjud bo'lib, jamiyat odamlarga ularning biologik qavatiga qarab amalga oshirishni buyuradigan ijtimoiy va madaniy me'yorlar to'plamini anglatadi. "Gender" tushunchasi uzoq vaqt davomida grammatikadan tashqarida edi. Bu hodisa keng tarqalgan ijtimoiy-madaniy, psixolingvistik hodisa sifatida qaraladi. Til bilan bog'liq zamin omili birinchi marta antik davrda grammatik jins toifasini baholashda paydo bo'lgan.

Eng qadimiy va uzoq vaqt davomida turkum turkumining paydo bo'lishi va faoliyatining sabablari to'g'risidagi yagona gipoteza grammatik turkumdan jinsning tabiiy biologik kategoriyasi o'zaro bog'lanishiga asoslanib, ramziy va semantik xususiyatga ega bo'lgan. Ushbu gipoteza tarafdorlari grammatik jins tabiiy voqelik - boshqa qavatdagi odamlarning (Herder, Gumboldt, Grimm va boshqalar) mavjudligi ta'siri ostida paydo bo'lgan deb hisoblashadi, bir vaqtning o'zida tadqiqotchilar tushuntirish uchun til bo'lmagan tajribadan foydalanganlar. bir turdagi toifaning ekstralingvistik motivatsiyasi. Bu turkum turkumlarini talqin qilishda baholashning paydo bo'lishiga olib keldi: ismlarda erkak jinsi kuch, faollik, energiya semantikasi, unga taalluqliligi sababli paydo bo'ldi. Ayol jinsining nomlari, aksincha, passivlik, bo'ysunish bilan ajralib turardi. Shunday qilib, ijtimoiy voqelik shartlari tilning rivojlanish qonuniyatlariga ekstrapolyatsiya qilindi, bu E. Bornemanning asosiy gender tadqiqotlari tomonidan tasdiqlangan, bunda tahlil fanlararo yondashuv nuqtai nazaridan olib boriladi. Ramziy va semantik gipotezaga zarba turkumi mavjud bo'lmagan tillarning ochilishi bilan bo'ldi. Tildagi gender omilini o'rganishda saksoninchi yillarning oxirida e'lon qilingan rus maktabining ko'plab tilshunoslari (Haleeva I.I., Kirilina A.V., Malishevskoy D.Ch. va boshqalar) jasorat va ayollikni o'rganishni asosiy deb hisoblaydigan lingvokulturologik yondashuv deb ataladi. madaniy tushunchalar. "Gender" toifasining ijtimoiy ahamiyati uning zamin muammolari bilan bog'liq barcha til hodisalariga qo'llanilishini asoslaydi. "Qavat va uning ko'rinishlari nafaqat til "ro'yxatga olingan", balki aksiologiyaga ega bo'lib, dunyoning sodda tasviri nuqtai nazaridan baholanadi [3,110-114].

1970-yillardagi tadqiqotlar ularda mavjud bo'lgan lingvistik fan muammosini "e'tirof etish" ni ko'rsatadigan xulosalarning nopokligi bilan ajralib turadi. Til (nutq) xulq-atvorida «ayollar hamkorligi»ning «erkaklar raqobati»ga qarama-qarshi qo'yish nazariyasi gender tilshunosligining aspektlaridan biriga aylandi. Deyl Spender ("Odam tomonidan yaratilgan til", Spender, 1986) ta'kidlashicha, til dastlab jamiyatda erkaklar ustunligini o'rnatishga moyildir. Ushbu bayonot bir muammo bo'yicha qo'pol munozaraga sabab bo'ldi: haqiqatan ham shunga o'xshash hodisalar tilning voqelikni yaratishi bilan bog'liqmi yoki odamlarning tartibdagi so'zlari fikrlash jarayonlariga aloqador emasmi? Atrofdagi dunyodan bilish jarayonida ob'ektlar, xususiyatlar, jarayonlar nafaqat real, balki ichki dunyolar ham ajratiladi va chaqiriladi. Madaniyatning tasvirlari, ramzlari, standartlari va stereotiplarini oxirigacha etkazish mumkin, shuningdek, qadriyatlar jamiyati sifatida tan olingan axloqiy me'yorlar. Biologik - jinsiy voqelikdan kelib chiqadigan gender stereotiplari ushbu madaniyat doirasida ushbu qavat vakillariga xos bo'lgan biologik belgilar, ijtimoiy rollar, mentalitet va xatti-harakatlarning xususiyatlarini aks ettiradi. Erkaklik va ayollik atamalari gender