

LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODOLOGIES THROUGH THE AGES

Buronova Nafosat Davronovna

Master degree student of SamSIFL

Annotation. There is a strange absence in the curriculum of lots of MA TESOL programs and similar courses of study for foreign and second language teachers. Although such courses of study naturally involve required study courses on grammar, phonology, and discourse analysis, vocabulary is often react to just incidentally in the language teachers' preparation. As the scientists present in this bright and engrossing account of the vocabulary's role in foreign language teaching and learning, lexical knowledge is principal to the competence of communication and to a foreign language's acquisition. Lexical units and vocabulary are at the base of studying and speaking skill. No amount of grammatical knowledge or another kind of linguistic knowledge can be engaged in communication or discourse without the intervention of words. Indeed, vocabulary and word expressions can continue a large amount of elementary speaking skill without –lots of support from other features of the system of language. Comprehending of the character and importance of lexical knowledge in a foreign language for that reason needs to play a much more principal role in the knowledge core of language teachers. This article convincingly asserts again the importance of words within applied linguistics.

Key words: vocabulary, methodology, method, Grammar-Translation, Direct Method, Reading Method, Direct Method, Audiolingualism, Situational Approach, Communicative Language Teaching.

Investigations of foreign language studying extend back at least to the second century B.C, where Roman young learners learned Greek. In elementary schools, learners learned to read by first studying the alphabet, then developing through syllables, words, and linked discourse. An amount of the texts gave learners lexical

help by supplying vocabulary that was either arranged alphabetically or grouped under different topic fields [1]. We are just able to suppose that lexis was known significant at this point in time, as the art of rhetoric was highly respected, and wouldn't have been possible with absence of a highly progressed vocabulary.

Later, in the middle ages, the grammar studying became dominant, like learners learned Latin. Language teaching at the period of the Renaissance continued to focus on a grammar, even though some reforming teachers rebelled against the overemphasis on syntax. In 1611 William of Bath wrote a text that concentrated on vocabulary studying through contextualized presentation, presenting 1,200 proverbs that exemplified common Latin vocabulary and presenting homonyms in the context of sentences.

John Amos Comenius generated a textbook based on this idea of contextualized vocabulary. An approach to language learning was suggested by him in 1659 [2], with a limited vocabulary of eight thousand ordinary Latin words, that were grouped in accordance with topics and illustrated with labeled images. The concept of a limited vocabulary was significant and would be progressed further in the early 20th century as part of the "Vocabulary Control Movement." Academics such as William and Comenius tried to increase the reputation of vocabulary, while promoting translation as a resource of directly using the target language, escape from rote memorization, and avoiding such strongly focus on grammar. Worse luck, the emphasis of language instruction stayed firmly on deductive-[3], the rule-oriented treatments of Latin grammar. This concern filtered over to English too. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries brought the Reason's Age where people trusted that there were natural laws for all things and that these laws could be emanated from logic. Language was the same. Latin was held up like the language least corrupted by human usage, so many grammars were written with the purpose of purifying English on the basis of Latin models. It was a time of recommendation, when grammar books' authors took it upon themselves to decide right usage and to criticize what seemed to them to be not proper. Generally they had no competences to do so, other than being significant men in the globe. It [4] was one of the most

effective of the recommendation grammars, outlawing features in natural use, like twice negatives (I don't want to study no more grammar rules!). These grammars got general acceptance, which helped continue the grammar domination over vocabulary.

Attempts were also create to standardize vocabulary, which resulted in dictionaries being processed. The first was Robert Cawdrey's A Table Alphabetical [5]. Kelley [6] notes that the first bilingual dictionary making dates from around 2500 B.C. A lot of others followed until Samuel Johnson presented his Dictionary of the English Language in 1755[7], which soon became the standard reference. With the exception of printing in common, his dictionary did more to fix standard pronouncing and lexical utilization than any other single thing in the English history. Johnson's genius lay in his usage of modern pronunciation and utilization to lead his spellings and definitions. Just in ambiguous positions did he resort to arbitrary decisions based on logic, analogy, or personal taste? The consequence was a dictionary that would remain unquestioned in influence until Noah Webster published an American version in the next century.

The principal language teaching methodology from the early of the nineteenth century was Grammar-Translation. Each lesson would naturally have one or more than one new grammar rules, a list of vocabulary things, and several practice samples to translate from first language into second language or vice versa. The approach was reformist in nature from the first instance, an effort to make language studying easier through the use of sample sentences instead of whole texts [8]. Although, the technique grew into a very controlled system, with paying much attention on accuracy and explicit grammar rules, many of which were quite unclear. The content paying attention on reading and writing literary information, which highlighted the outdated vocabulary of the classics. According to fact, the principal criterion for vocabulary choice was often its ability to illustrate a grammar rule [9]. Students were largely expected to study the necessary vocabulary themselves by bilingual word lists, which made the bilingual dictionary a significant reference tool.

As the technique became progressively pedantic, a new pedagogical direction was needed. One of the important issues with Grammar-Translation was that it paid attention the knowledge to analyze language, and not the ability to utilize it. Furthermore, the emphasis on reading and writing did little to promote a knowledge to communicate orally in the target language. By the end of the 19th century, new use-based notions had coalesced into what became known as the Direct Method. It stressed exposure to oral language, with listening as the basic skill. Meaning was connected directly to the target language without the step of translation, and explicit grammar teaching was downplayed. It emulated how a native language is naturally learned, with listening' first, then speaking, and only later reading and writing.

This was reviewed the most helpful skill that might be taken from schooling, especially as relatively few people traveled internationally in the early 20th century. Simultaneously, in Britain, Michael West was emphasizing the need to facilitate reading skills by improving words learning. The outcome was an approach called the Reading Method, and it held sway, along with Grammar-Translation and the Direct Method, until World War II.

The weaknesses of all of the above approaches became obvious during the war, as the military of American found itself short of people who were conversationally fluent in foreign languages. It needed a means to fast train its soldiers in oral/aural skills. American structural linguists stepped into the gap and improved a program that borrowed from the Direct Method, especially its, stress on listening and speaking. It drew its rationale from behaviorism, which in essence mentioned that language learning was an outcome of habit formation. Thus the way contained activities that were believed to reinforce "perfect" language habits, like close attention to pronunciation, intensive oral drilling, an attention sentence patterns, and memorization. This accomplishment meant that the way naturally continued on after the war, and it came to be known as Audiolingualism. Because the stress in Audiolingualism was on teaching structural patterns, the vocabulary needed to be relatively easy, and so was chosen according to its simplicity and similarity [9].

A familiar approach was current In Britain from the 1940s to the 1960s. It was named the Situational Approach, from its grouping of lexical and grammatical items according to what would be claimed in different situations (e.g., at the post office, at the store, at the dinner table) [10]. In last result, the Situational Approach treated word in a more principled way than Audiolingualism.

Noam Chomsky's assault the behaviorist underpinnings of Audiolingualism in the late 1950s proved decisive, and it started to fall out of favor. Supplanting the behaviorist idea of habit construction, cognitive factors saw language now as governed, particularly a set of abstract rules that were assumed to be inborn. In 1972, the notion of communicative competence was added by Hymes, which stressed sociolinguistic and pragmatic factors [11]. This helped to swing the attention from language "correctness" (accuracy) to how appropriate language was for a particular context (appropriateness). The approach that improved from these concepts stressed using language for meaningful communication - Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The attention was on the message and fluency rather than grammatical accuracy.

There have been numerous methodologies in the more than two thousand years of 2nd language instruction. Recent ones have consisted on Grammar-Translation (with explicit grammar teaching and translation as language practice), the Direct Method (stressing oral skills), the Reading Method (stressing reading and vocabulary control), Audiolingualism (forming good language habits through drills), and Communicative Language Teaching (with an attention fluency over accuracy). A general feature of these methodologies, with the exception of the Reading Method, is that they did not address words in any principled way.

To sum up, Indeed, learning language is maybe the most cognitively (mentally) challenging task a person goes through. But whereas the grammar of a language is mainly in place by the time a child is 10 years old [12], vocabulary goes on to be learned throughout one's lifetime. This is because the grammar of a language is made up of a limited set of rules, but an individual is unlikely to ever run out of words to

learn. When I used these vocabulary teaching techniques with SamSIFL students in Uzbekistan, I observed a huge change in their learning process. It was obviously seen that especially using Communicative Language Teaching and Audiolingualism in teaching English with students could increase positively their vocabulary knowledge during short time. So that I can recommend using this methods for teachers in their teaching process.

Used literature.

1. Bowen, Madsen, & Hilferty, “TESOL techniques and procedures” 1985.
2. John Amos Comenius “Vocabulary in teaching language” 2000.
3. Naming classes of prokaryotes based on the rules of Latin grammar (pages 112).
4. Robert Lowth “A Short Introduction to English Grammar” 1762.
5. Robert Cawdrey “A Table Alphabetical” 1604.
6. A. Kelly “Humanistic methodology in psychological research” 1969.
7. Samuel Johnson “Dictionary of the English Language” 1755.
8. Howatt “A history of English language teaching” 1984.
9. CB Zimmerman “Second language vocabulary acquisition” 1997.
10. Celce-Murcia “Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language” 1991.
11. Hell Hymes “The notion of communicative competence” 1972.
12. D. Crystal “English as a global language” 1987.