

UNVEILING THE DYNAMICS OF LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION: NAVIGATING METHODOLOGIES AND APPROACHES FOR SUCCESSFUL L2 ACQUISITION.

Mamadaliyeva Madinabonu Jaxongir qizi

Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

The department of the practise of English language

Annotation. This article delves into the nuanced understanding of instructional methodologies and approaches in language education, highlighting the distinctions between 'method' and 'approach' as articulated by scholars. Through the lens of Tavokoli & Jones (2018), the distinction is clarified: 'method' pertains to specific procedures and techniques employed by teachers, while 'approach' encompasses broader principles guiding their selection. Emphasizing the pivotal role of effective instructional practices in fostering L2 mastery, the article advocates for a comprehensive approach that prioritizes communication skills. It explores the efficacy of Communicative Language Teaching and Cooperative Language Learning approaches, aligning them with the diverse needs of learners. Furthermore, it delves into the application of Krashen's Hypotheses, particularly the Natural Order, Input, and Effective Filter hypotheses, in informing instructional strategies. By fostering an environment conducive to meaningful interaction and minimizing emotional barriers, educators can facilitate a dynamic and effective language learning process.

Keywords: language instruction, methodologies, approaches, l2 acquisition, communicative language teaching, cooperative language learning, krashen's hypotheses, natural order hypothesis, input hypothesis, effective filter hypothesis, instructional strategies, communication skills, language learning environment, emotional barriers

Linguistic terms including instructional 'method' and 'approach' are used differently by various scholars and educators over the few decades. Method is basically used as a concept to the procedures and techniques that teacher implements in teaching a language, whereas approach refers to the broader principles which can guide the choice of techniques and procedures as per Tavokoli & Jones (2018) observations. It is important to acknowledge the effectiveness of various instructional practices in teaching a language and to employ them into classroom procedures, which plays a vital role in forming students with successful mastery of L2. We, language teachers can help our students to successfully achieve foreign language learning only when teaching is supported with suitable and carefully considered instructional methods or approaches to address the language learning needs of the target learners.

The primary purpose of learning a foreign language for anyone, who is in the process of L2 acquisition is to be able to apply the language in communication, either while talking to people around him in the frame of speaking or to read and write texts for professional and individual matters in the form of reading and writing. I will consider and refer to Communicative Language Teaching Approach as one of the effective instructional approaches, which I believe



would be appropriate for my selected target learners and makes the learning smooth and easy to acquire for them. According to Savignon (1991), the focus of the Communicative language teaching has been the elaboration and implementation of programs and methodologies that promote the development of functional language ability through learner participation in communicative events. To make it explicit, the aim of learning is not to ‘learn language’ but to ‘learn how to communicate’ as explained by Littlewood (1981). Noteworthy, students will be unable to achieve learning objectives if instructions are associated only with rules and theories of language rather than using it to communicate both in and out of the classroom. So instructional consideration with the emphasis on instructional methodologies are at place to help students to reach successful mastery of foreign language. The implementation of this teaching approach into classroom activities would be done through role-plays, problem solving activities, the usage of visual stimulation and actual material.

Another instructional approach I will adapt in the classroom procedures is Cooperative Language Learning Approach which would suit my profiled learners in order to achieve higher outcomes in language learning. Olsen and Kagan (1992) defined cooperative learning as group learning activity organized so that learning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and is motivated to increase the learning of others. I will address this teaching approach in the classroom by engaging and involving students into group work activities, where learners collaborate with each other, share ideas, motivate one another and then produce the language at the same time being responsible for his/her own learning. I will implement this approach with writing activities to help students improve writing skills as learners will exchange their thoughts and come up with some ideas to produce a language by collaborating with one another.

Instructional considerations on the basis of Krashen’s Hypothesis.

1. *The Natural Order Hypothesis.* The order of language acquisition is a natural process of a human brain according to Krashen (1985), students master specific aspects of grammar in a predictable order which means some structures come early and others late. In my view, the order of acquiring language rules can not be changed or effected by teaching strategies. According to Mitchell et al. (2013), every learner has a different level of language acquisition. I will implement the natural order hypothesis to my target learners with different level of language acquisition through language instruction. So, I will give my students the opportunity to make progression at their own pace. To apply this instruction into practice, free voluntary reading activity would be a productive way to achieve this. Another instruction to keep in mind is differentiating the input by not trying to imitate it exactly according to the syllabus. Instead, I will vary the input for my students. As a result, both of my profiled learners will catch and understand what language rules they need and develop through the input at their own pace.

2. *The Input Hypothesis.*

The input hypothesis developed by Krashen (1985) explains that learners of a language improve when they receive linguistic input that is just a bit advanced than their current level. This hypothesis is elicited from a simple formula which is $i + 1$, where i means level of acquisition of a learner. In this framework, input is learners current understanding level from linguistic point of view in 2nd language. The $+1$ is teaching materials, that is one level higher than student’s current understanding. This concludes that students should slowly be proposed to more complex language concepts. According to Kinginger (2009), the best way to get comprehensible input is to interact with another speaker who speaks the language. Moreover,



children of most of the nationalities gain the initial speech input from children around them. This is why, the main task of input seems to be to give meaningful utterances in communicative situations, where there is no need for explicit instruction or guidance from adult speaker, or in our case from an instructor as Slobin (1975) notes. Similarly, speech of other acquirers plays a vital role in comprehensible input. Some methods encourage this kind of input, emphasizing problem solving and role-playing activities as mentioned by Krashen (1985). Taking this into consideration, I will address this hypothesis to my profiled learners' language acquisition by the help of role-playing classroom activity, where they will take part and listen to each other a lot during the activity. By applying this activity, I will be able to implement the theory of input hypothesis into practice for my selected learners by encouraging them to take active part in the activity and being unconsciously diving into it. Consequently, I will encourage my learners to make output, but will not force them to do so.. Moreover, I will provide them with tools and situations to be able to express themselves. So, the main goal I believe in input hypothesis is communication, but not language teaching.

3. Effective Filter Hypothesis.

To briefly outline what is effective filter hypothesis, it is important to note that learning is drained through emotions. Krashen (1986) suggests that language learning could be distracted by psychological factors in language learning process. Negative emotions of learners like demotivation, lack of confidence, fear of learning or making mistakes may block language learning. I will practice implementing this hypothesis by the help of whole group activity where they share ideas freely by having their own voice in instructions. Even some of students make a few grammar mistakes in speech, I will not concentrate on error correction which might cause embarrassment in front of her schoolmate and may stop making more effort which results student's ability to learn. By providing a relaxed learning atmosphere for her she will be dived into journey of learning and it will help her to build self confidence. So, classroom talk will be balanced with some teacher talk and some student talk. By applying effective filter hypothesis with the help of this activity to my profiled learners, I found out that it would create an opportunity to build a friendly relationship with his partner and the language barrier which might be affected by the formality of the instructor that will be somehow become invisible for learners to feel comfortable and to explore themselves more. Thus, resulting effective language learning process on second language acquisition.

References

1. Kinginger, C. (2009). $i+1 = ZPD$. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(5), 417-423.
2. Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis. Issues and Implications*. ISBN: 0582553814. Longman Group UK Ltd. 1-32 Mitchell, R., Myles, F., & Marsden, E. (2013). *Second language learning theories*. Routledge. 145-148
3. Olsen, R., & Kagan, S. (1992). *About cooperative learning*. In C. Kessler (Ed.), *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book* (pp. 1–30). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
4. Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 261. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587463>
5. Slobin, D. I. (1975). *Language change in childhood and in history*. University of California.
6. Tavakoli, P. and Jones, R. (2018). *An overview of approaches to second language acquisition and instructional practices*. Cardiff. 2-37. <http://gov.wales/statistics-and-research/overview-approaches-second-language-acquisition-instructional-practices/?lang=en>