MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODS

Kubaeva Nafisa,
researcher of Samarkand branch of ISFT Institute, Uzbekistan

Ulmasova Dinara,
researcher of Samarkand branch of ISFT Institute, Uzbekistan

Djanzakova Matluba,
researcher of SamSU academic lyceum, Uzbekistan

Abstract

The article examines the key differences between traditional and modern methods of teaching English, as well as their impact on language acquisition. Traditional methods, such as the grammar-translation method and the audio-linguistic approach, emphasize grammar accuracy, vocabulary memorization, and repetitive exercises. At the same time, modern techniques, including communicative learning (CLT) and task-based learning (TBL), focus on developing fluency, communication, and the practical application of language skills.

Keywords: teaching methods, traditional methods, modern methods, communicative approach, language competence, technologies in teaching.

Language teaching methods have changed significantly in recent decades under the influence of educational trends, technological progress and linguistic theories [10]. Traditional teaching methods were mainly based on structured learning, in which students memorized grammatical rules, translated texts, and repeated phrases without much emphasis on independent language use. These methods have been used for centuries and have proven themselves well in developing reading and writing skills. However, they often did not pay enough attention to the development of oral speech and listening, which made it difficult to practice the language in real life [1].

With the development of pedagogy, modern approaches began to appear that focus on interactive and communicative learning. The CLT method, for example, focuses on student interaction, discussion, and role-playing, which promotes natural language acquisition. This approach makes learning more dynamic and effective in terms of developing conversational skills. However, these methods also have their drawbacks: some students have difficulty with grammar and formal aspects of the language because the learning structure is less rigorous than in traditional methods [2].

The purpose of this study is to conduct a comparative analysis of traditional and modern teaching methods, evaluate their effectiveness in various learning environments and determine the optimal approach. Aspects such as the role of teacher and student, engagement strategies, skill development, assessment methods, and the use of technology are considered [9].

A mixed analysis method was used to conduct the study, including both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. The study included an analysis of scientific literature, observations of English lessons conducted using different methods, as well as interviews with teachers with experience in both systems. In addition, data on student academic performance was analyzed in order to assess progress in the development of basic language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) [3].

The analysis of the data revealed a number of key differences between traditional and modern teaching methods. One of the most significant aspects turned out to be classroom interaction. Traditional methods create a well-structured learning environment where the teacher is in full control of the process and the students follow strict instructions. This contributes to the development of a strong grammatical base, but limits the ability of students to express their thoughts independently in English [4]. Modern methods, on the contrary, promote active interaction in the classroom, allowing students to participate in discussions, debates and role-playing games. This helps them to develop confidence in speaking and listening faster. However, the lack of strict grammar control can lead to the formation of language errors.

The difference in the role of the teacher was also noted. In the traditional system, the teacher acts as the main source of knowledge, explaining the material and correcting mistakes [5]. In modern methods, teachers play more of a mentor role, guiding students to learn the language independently. This approach promotes the development of critical thinking, but requires teachers to be flexible in adapting teaching methods.

Technology has also had a significant impact on the language learning process. In modern methods, digital tools help to increase engagement and accelerate feedback. However, excessive use of technology sometimes distracts students and reduces attention to the main aspects of writing and reading [6].

Knowledge assessment methods also differ: traditional exams measure a student's ability to apply grammatical rules, whereas modern methods focus on general language competence, including creativity and fluency. Although traditional tests provide clear criteria for measuring progress, they do not always reflect actual communication skills [7].

As a result of the analysis, it can be concluded that each method of teaching English has its advantages and disadvantages. Traditional methods based on the grammar-translation approach form a solid language base and contribute to the development of academic skills. However, their limited practical use of language makes the learning process less flexible and less focused on real communication situations.

Modern methods such as communicative and project-based approaches make language learning more interactive and effective, contributing to the development of spontaneous speech and improved communication skills [8]. Nevertheless, they require more active student participation, as well as highly qualified teachers who are able to adapt the learning process to the individual needs of students.

The most optimal solution is to integrate various techniques, which allows you to create a balanced learning system. This approach combines the structure of traditional education with the practical focus of modern technology. The inclusion of digital resources, interactive platforms, and active learning methods makes the language learning process more effective and motivating.

With the development of technology and changing educational standards, English language teaching methods will continue to evolve. The future of language education is likely to combine artificial intelligence, virtual reality and personalized learning programs, which will achieve even better results in mastering the English language.

References:

1. Tasheva, Dilorom. "The Methodology for The Development of Unconventional Russian Language Lessons." Archive of Conferences. Vol. 11. No. 1. 2020.
2. Tasheva, Dilorom. "Interactive Learning Forms In Russian Lessons." Zbiór artykułów naukowych recenzowanych 211.
3. Nafisa, K., & Kamola, A. (2024). The Problem Of Teaching Students Lexical And Phraseological Features In Translation Studies Of Phrasal Verbs In English And Uzbek Languages. Eurasian Journal Of Academic Research, 4(10), 39-42.
4. Nafisa, K., & Matluba, D. (2023). Psychological And Pedagogical Aspects Of Research Into The Problem Of Bilingual Foreign Language Teaching. Conferencea, 31-34.
5. Tasheva, D. S., & Kubaeva, N. A. (2022). Modern educational technologies in the aspect of a student-centered approach in teaching foreign languages. Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching, 12, 35.
6. Tasheva Dilorom, Djanzakova Matluba. The role of literary text in teaching the Russian language. International Multidisciplinary Conference. Manchester, England. 25th December 2023. -p.19. https://conferencea.org
7. Mukhtarovna, K. D. (2023). A Cycle of Integrated Lessons of Literature and World Art Culture Dedicated to The Work of SA Yesenin. Periodica Journal of Modern Philosophy, Social Sciences and Humanities, 18, 106-108.
8. Mukhtarovna, K. D. (2022). Yesenin-A Poet Who Rose to The Heights Of His Skill From The Depths Of Folk Life. World Bulletin of Management And Law, 16, 122-124.

9. Mukhtarovna, K. D. (2022). The theme of motherland in yesenin's poetry. In E Conference Zone (pp. 35-37).

10. Mukhtarovna, K. D. (2022). Reflection of elements of Yesenin's poetic world in the lyrics of Uzbek poets. Current Research Journal Of Philological Sciences, 3(03), 84-91.