

# MODERN APPROACHES AND PRINCIPLES IN DEFINING THE GRAMMATICAL MINIMUM

**Madina Akhmadjanova**

Doctoral (PhD) student. Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named  
after Alisher Navoi

[sadiya170420@gmail.com](mailto:sadiya170420@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** this article analyzes modern approaches and fundamental principles for defining the grammatical minimum. The grammatical minimum serves to simplify the teaching process by identifying and highlighting the most essential rules in language instruction. The author explores linguistic, psychological, and didactic foundations while evaluating the significance of functional, competence-based, and reflective approaches. The competence-based approach aims to develop learners' communicative and grammatical competencies, whereas the functional approach emphasizes the practical significance of grammatical structures in real-life contexts.

Additionally, the article examines the role of the principles of minimalism, relevance, and progression from simplicity to complexity in defining the grammatical minimum. According to the minimalism principle, only the most necessary grammatical rules are selected, while the relevance principle focuses on choosing materials that align with learners' needs. The corpus linguistics-based approach enables the study of language materials through authentic communication. The author provides recommendations on implementing the grammatical minimum in the educational process and suggests strategies for enhancing teaching effectiveness.

**Keywords:** grammatical minimum, language education, linguistic approach, psychological approach, didactic foundations, competence-based approach, functional approach, reflective approach, corpus linguistics, minimalism principle, relevance principle, progression from simplicity to complexity, grammatical competence, communicative competence, language system, interactive methods, learner needs, language learning process, pedagogical strategies, metalinguistic awareness.

## INTRODUCTION

The issue of defining the grammatical minimum, particularly concerning morphology, holds significant importance in both native language education and foreign language instruction. A solid understanding of grammatical rules is fundamental for learners to develop communication skills, effectively use the language, and gain a deep comprehension of its systematic characteristics. The establishment of a grammatical minimum aims to streamline the language learning process, ensuring that learners acquire relevant and functional knowledge tailored to their needs.

In modern educational processes, approaches to defining the grammatical minimum are enriched with linguistic, psychological, and didactic foundations, taking into account not only the scientific characteristics of the language system but also students' cognitive abilities in processing language. The process of determining the grammatical minimum is based on linguistic principles, focusing on the structure of language and the comprehension of grammatical rules. Chomsky, in his research, emphasizes the intrinsic connection between



morphology and syntax, highlighting the importance of understanding the internal structure of words and their syntactic functions for an accurate grasp of the language system. Linguistic approaches provide students with the opportunity to comprehend the scientific foundations of the language system, facilitating the acquisition of grammatical rules.

## MAIN PART

Psychological foundations are aimed at gaining a deeper understanding of students' perception and learning processes in language acquisition. Psychological factors directly influence learners' motivation and their level of engagement in the learning process. Masna and others highlight the crucial role of the situational language teaching method in enhancing students' motivation, noting that this approach fosters active participation in the language learning process [1.283]. Psychological approaches primarily focus on increasing students' interest in learning and strengthening their intrinsic motivation for language acquisition.

Didactic foundations encompass methods for effectively organizing the educational process and delivering knowledge in a clear and comprehensible manner through instructional techniques. Rauf underscores the importance of using inductive and deductive approaches in teaching grammatical rules, stating that these methods facilitate students' rapid and effective mastery of grammar [2.212]. Didactic approaches ensure students' active involvement in the learning process, enhancing their ability to consolidate acquired knowledge and apply it in practice.

The following section will delve into modern approaches and key principles concerning this issue.

**Competency-based approach:** the competency-based approach in defining the grammatical minimum is a crucial pedagogical strategy aimed at developing students' practical language application skills. This approach enhances learners' communicative competencies and strengthens their ability to use language effectively. It can be categorized into several types:

**Communicative competence:** the competency-based approach focuses on improving students' communicative competence by ensuring their active participation in the learning process and preparing them for real-life situations [3]. This approach emphasizes the development of students' ability to interact effectively in various communicative contexts.

**Grammatical competence:** grammatical competence refers to the ability to understand and apply grammatical structures correctly. Students learn to use *grammatical rules in practice*, which enhances their comprehension and expression skills [4.9]. As highlighted, grammatical competence encompasses phonetic, lexical, grammatical, and stylistic aspects of the language, enabling students to use language accurately and effectively.

**Functional approach:** the functional approach in defining the grammatical minimum emphasizes how language serves as a means of communication and how grammatical structures contribute to achieving specific communicative goals. This approach highlights the practical application and contextual significance of grammatical rules.

By using the functional approach, students perceive grammar not just as a set of rules but as an essential tool for communication [5.470]. In this context, **Consciousness-Raising Activities** play a crucial role in teaching the grammatical minimum. These activities provide learners with linguistic input and encourage them to reconstruct their knowledge, facilitating a deeper understanding of grammatical rules [6].



Through this process, students analyze their existing grammatical knowledge and integrate new rules, which helps develop their **metalinguistic awareness** and reinforces their grammatical skills [7].

**Correspondence method:** the correspondence method in language learning takes into account students' age characteristics, cognitive abilities, and individual needs. This approach aligns the content of education with learners' prior knowledge and language acquisition goals. In other words, it corresponds with conceptual approaches by determining how students process linguistic concepts and rules during their learning journey.

For instance, identifying which grammatical rules students need to acquire depends on their initial proficiency level and interest in the language [8]. This method also fosters **self-assessment and analytical skills**, allowing students to evaluate and analyze their knowledge independently [9].

When applying the grammatical minimum, teachers must consider students' **individual needs**. Introducing the grammatical minimum should encourage students' active participation in the learning process and provide opportunities for **independent knowledge expansion** [10.985].

**Corpus linguistics-based approach:** the corpus linguistics-based approach to defining the grammatical minimum involves utilizing modern technologies for language learning and teaching. By employing linguistic corpora, it becomes possible to **identify, analyze, and systematically study** grammatical rules effectively.

Corpus linguistics focuses on collecting and analyzing large-scale **written and spoken texts** to study real-life language usage [11.6]. This scientific approach to defining the grammatical minimum is based on the following principles:

**Analysis based on authentic communication:** the data collected in corpus linguistics reflect the actual use of language in daily life. This helps students gain a better understanding of how grammatical rules function in practice [12.45].

**Statistical approach:** the statistical approach uses linguistic corpora to study grammatical structures quantitatively, identifying trends in the application of grammatical rules and their frequencies [13.778]. This approach enables a systematic analysis of the patterns of grammar in real-world contexts, helping educators and learners understand which grammatical constructions are most commonly used and under what circumstances.

**Contextual approach:** the contextual approach emphasizes the importance of context when learning grammatical rules. In this approach, students observe how grammatical structures function in different situations, which helps them grasp the meaning and significance of these structures more clearly [14.23]. This approach underscores the need for grammar to be taught within real-life contexts, enabling students to see how grammar is applied effectively in communication.

**Impact of corpus linguistics on teaching:** the corpus linguistics-based approach is significant in boosting students' interest in language learning and enhancing their communicative skills. It allows learners to actively participate in the learning process by seeing how grammatical rules are used in authentic communication, providing them with practical opportunities to apply their knowledge [15.161].

**Reflective approach:** reflective approaches in defining the grammatical minimum focus on developing students' self-awareness and analytical abilities. Through this approach, students are encouraged to critically evaluate their language learning process, independently master grammatical rules, and apply them in real communicative contexts [16]. The reflective



approach aims to foster independence, logical thinking, and deep analysis, which are essential skills for mastering grammar.

Students can use reflective approaches to reinforce their grammatical skills and internalize new rules. For example, the project method proposed by Prystai [17.9] allows the use of reflective approaches to develop students' communicative competence. In this method, students learn grammatical rules, structures, and patterns based on their needs and experiences. This approach promotes individualized learning and helps students actively shape their own knowledge. Therefore, the reflective approach is one of the effective tools in modern pedagogy for defining the grammatical minimum.

**Cognitive approach:** in the context of defining the grammatical minimum, the cognitive approach focuses on developing students' cognitive processes during language learning, such as thinking, memory, attention, and problem-solving abilities. This approach emphasizes that grammar learning is not just about memorizing rules but also about applying them practically and understanding their underlying principles. The cognitive model proposed by Millrood helps in understanding students' grammatical competence and identifies the components necessary for mastering grammatical rules. This approach helps in understanding the cognitive processes involved in grammar acquisition [18.259].

## DISCUSSION

### *Key principles for defining the grammatical minimum*

**Minimalism principle:** the minimalism principle in defining the grammatical minimum aims to present only the most essential and basic grammatical rules to students during the language learning process. This principle is intended to simplify language learning and make grammar application more effective, reducing the cognitive load on learners and enhancing their learning efficiency. The key ideas of this principle include:

**Selection of essential rules:** It is important to identify the types of communication where students will most commonly use the language, such as greetings, asking for directions, or expressing opinions. According to the minimalism principle, only the most essential grammatical rules are selected, which helps students focus on key structures and reduces complexity [19].

**Simplification:** Complex grammatical rules that are not appropriate for the students' level or needs are excluded from the grammatical minimum. For example, complex verb tenses might not be introduced to beginner learners at first. This principle encourages simplifying grammar learning by focusing on straightforward and comprehensible rules, which facilitates easier learning for students [20.638]. This approach ensures that students are not overwhelmed with unnecessary information and can develop the necessary skills without confusion.

**Relevance Principle:** the relevance principle stresses the importance of aligning the presented grammatical rules and materials with the practical needs of students in their language learning process. This principle aims to increase students' motivation and help them develop effective communication skills. The main aspects of this principle include:

**Selection of relevant grammatical rules:** Only rules that support the primary communicative functions of the language are chosen. For example, simple verb tenses and basic adjectives or adverbs might be prioritized.

**Inclusion of useful and frequently used elements:** Rules and structures that are commonly encountered in everyday communication are prioritized, such as common word forms and sentence structures.



**Adaptation to conversational needs:** The grammatical minimum aims to prepare students for real-life communicative situations, ensuring that they are equipped to interact effectively in everyday conversations [21.415].

***Principle of progression from simplicity to complexity***

This principle emphasizes a step-by-step approach to grammar learning, where students start with simple, easy-to-understand grammatical structures and gradually progress to more complex rules. This pedagogical strategy helps prevent overwhelming students and boosts their learning efficiency. By starting with simple concepts, students are better prepared to tackle more advanced structures later on, improving both comprehension and retention of grammatical rules [22.279].

The main principles of the approach from simplicity to complexity are as follows:

**Step-by-step learning:** Rules are introduced in a sequence throughout the curriculum, which improves students' ability to assimilate them. Initially, students learn simple and easy grammatical rules. This ensures their active participation in the learning process and helps them be prepared for more complex rules later on [23.103].

**Preparation exercises:** In the process of moving from simplicity to complexity, students are given preparatory exercises. These exercises help students reinforce the rules they have learned and create an opportunity to prepare for more complex rules [24.13].

**Conceptual integrity principle:** Conceptual integrity means that, in the process of language learning, students understand grammatical rules in relation to one another. This helps students understand the interconnections and overall context of grammatical structures. During the process of learning grammatical rules, students should consider them as a whole, which enhances their ability to apply language effectively. In defining the grammatical minimum, it should be integrated with other components of language learning such as phonetics, lexicon, and pragmatics.

**CONCLUSION**

This article deeply analyzes the scientific-theoretical and practical aspects of defining the grammatical minimum and its effective application. Modern approaches studied show that defining the grammatical minimum enables more efficient and systematic organization of the language teaching process. Specifically, the synergy between linguistic, psychological, and didactic approaches serves to simplify the language learning process for students and deepen their grammatical knowledge.

The competence-based approach contributes to the development of communicative skills in learners, while the functional approach connects grammatical knowledge with practice. Additionally, the reflexive approach aids students in independently assessing their knowledge and developing their learning strategies. Corpus linguistics and technological approaches allow for shaping the grammatical minimum based on real language materials.

When defining the grammatical minimum, the principle of minimalism simplifies the language learning process by avoiding unnecessary complexity and highlighting the most essential grammatical rules. The relevance principle enhances the effectiveness of education by selecting grammatical knowledge that meets students' needs. The principle of moving from simplicity to complexity assists students in gradually mastering grammatical knowledge, which is crucial for developing long-term language teaching strategies.

As emphasized in the article, defining the grammatical minimum and applying it to the teaching process requires an individual and contextual approach, based on modern technologies and





linguistic research. Future research in this field could further refine methods by testing the grammatical minimum in various educational systems. Additionally, adapting teaching methodologies to students' needs and enhancing their active participation in the language learning process through interactive methods remains a crucial issue.

### REFERENCES:

1. Rauf A. Effect of inductive and deductive teaching on learning english grammar for undergraduate students // Journal of Education and Educational Development. – 2023). – Vol. 10(2). P. 212-228. <https://doi.org/10.22555/joeed.v10i2.836>
2. Xudayberdiyeva M. Bo'lajak o'qituvchilarda kommunikativ yondashuv asosida kasbiy sifatlarini rivojlantirishning pedagogik shart-sharoitlari va innovatsion metodlari // Ижтимоий-гуманитар фанларнинг долзарб муаммолари. – 2024. – Vol. 4(1). – <https://doi.org/10.47390/spr1342v4i1y2024n56>
3. Prystai H. Development of English grammatical competence through the use of the project method // Pedagogy and Psychology. – 2022. – Vol. 8(2). – P.9-19. <https://doi.org/10.52534/msu>
4. Croft, W. (2015). Functional approaches to grammar., 470-475. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-097086-8.53009-8>
5. Fatemipour H., Hemmati S. Impact of consciousness-raising activities on young English language learners' grammar performance // English Language Teaching. – 2015. – Vol. 8(9). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n9p1>.
6. Amirian S., Sadeghi F., The effect of grammar consciousness-raising tasks on efl learners performance // International Journal of Linguistics. – 2012. – Vol. 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i3.2392>
7. Consciousness raising-based grammar teaching: empowering learner's metalinguistic awareness in second language acquisition. 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210914.047>
8. Moghtadi L., Koosha M., & Lotfi A. Second language grammatical proficiency and third language acquisition // International Education Studies. – 2014. – Vol. 7(11). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n11p19>
9. <sup>1</sup> Fatemipour H., Hemmati S. Impact of consciousness-raising activities on young english language learners' grammar performance // English Language Teaching. – 2015. – Vol. 8(9). – <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n9p1>
10. Du H. Grammatical and lexical development during study abroad: research on a corpus of spoken 12 chinese // Foreign Language Annals – 2022. – Vol. 55(4). P.985-1005. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12631>



11. Urazalieva M. Uzbekcorpus.uz platormasida morfologik tahlil interfeysi va dasturiy ta'minoti // Ижтимоий-гуманитар фанларнинг долзарб муаммолари. – 2023. – № 3. – В.6. <https://doi.org/10.47390/sp1342v3i6/sy2023n23>
12. Abdurahmanova M., Rayimjonova M. Korpus lingvistikasida tarjimashunoslik masalasi // Computer Linguistics Problems Solutions Prospect. – 2021. Vol. 1(1). P. 45-50. [https://doi.org/10.52773/cl:psp/vol\\_1\\_issue\\_1/a10](https://doi.org/10.52773/cl:psp/vol_1_issue_1/a10)
13. G'ayratovna R. Grammatik bog'lanishlar va sintaktik-ierarxik tahlil jarayoni (parser) o'zbek tili misolida // Международная научная конференция современные филологические парадигмы взаимодействие традиций и инноваций II. – 2022. – № 2(18.03). – В.778-184. <https://doi.org/10.47100/nuu.v2i18.03.151>
14. Jo'rayev J. O'zbek tili korpusini yaratish: muammolar halqasi va yechimlar // Computer Linguistics Problems Solutions Prospect. – 2021. – № 1(1). В.23-26. [https://doi.org/10.52773/cl:psp/vol\\_1\\_issue\\_1/a5](https://doi.org/10.52773/cl:psp/vol_1_issue_1/a5)
15. Xolmatova, M. Ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi adjektiv komponentli komparativ frazeologik birliklarning qiyosiy tahlili // Ижтимоий-гуманитар фанларнинг долзарб муаммолари. – 2023. – № 3(5). – В.161-166. <https://doi.org/10.47390/sp1342v3i5/sy2023n19>
16. Nikolaus M. Automatic annotation of grammaticality in child-caregiver conversations– 2024. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/r49ew>
17. Prystai H. Development of english grammatical competence through the use of the project method // Scientific Bulletin of Mukachevo State University Series “Pedagogy and Psychology. – 2022. Vol. 8(2). –P.9-19. [https://doi.org/10.52534/msu-pp.8\(2\).2022.9-17](https://doi.org/10.52534/msu-pp.8(2).2022.9-17)
18. Millrood R. Cognitive models of grammatical competence of students // Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. – 2014. – Vol. 154. – P.259-262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.147>
19. Sun Q. and Wu X. A deep learning-based approach for emotional analysis of sports dance // Peerj Computer Science. – 2023. – Vol. 9. – P.1441. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.1441>
20. Alió J., Radner W., Plaza-Puche A., Ortiz D., Neipp M., Quiles M., ... & Marín J. Design of short spanish sentences for measuring reading performance: radner-vissum test // Journal of Cataract & Refractive Surgery. – 2008. – Vol. 34(4). P. 638-642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrs.2007.11.046>
21. Alhasani M. Improving emi through the visegrad clil-het project // Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes. – 2023. – P.415. <https://doi.org/10.22190/jtesap230509031a>



22. Enesi M., Strati E., & Trifoni, A. Alternative grammar teaching vs. traditional grammar teaching in albanian tertiary education // International Journal of Education and Practice. – 2023. – Vol.11(2). P.279-294. <https://doi.org/10.18488/61.v11i2.3337>
23. Myhill D., Jones S., Watson A., & Lines H. Playful explicitness with grammar: a pedagogy for writing // Literacy. – 2012. – Vol. 47(2). P.103-111. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4369.2012.00674.x>
24. Lin, H. The influence mechanism of high school english grammar science, technology, engineering, art, and mathematics teaching model on high school students' learning psychological motivation // Frontiers in Psychology. – 2022. – P. 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.917167>