FORM-FOCUSED INSTRUCTION VS. MEANING-FOCUSED INSTRUCTION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY ACROSS DIFFERENT STAGES OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING

Ismoilova Shakhzoda Shukhrat kizi
Student of the Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Ismonqulova Sevinchoy Elyorbek kizi
Student **of the Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages**

Annotation: This article examines the comparative effectiveness of form-focused instruction (FFI) and meaning-focused instruction (MFI) in English language teaching across different stages of the learning process. While FFI emphasizes grammatical accuracy and explicit language forms, MFI prioritizes communication and fluency through meaningful interaction. The study aims to analyze how these approaches contribute to language acquisition at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels. Drawing on theoretical frameworks and empirical studies, the research highlights the strengths and limitations of both approaches. The findings suggest that an integrated approach combining form and meaning yields the most effective results. The study concludes that the balance between FFI and MFI should be adapted to learners' developmental stages and instructional contexts.

Keywords: Form-focused instruction, meaning-focused instruction, English language teaching, grammar acquisition, communicative competence, language learning stages, fluency, accuracy, pedagogy, second language acquisition, classroom interaction, teaching methodology, learner development, language skills

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматривается сравнительная эффективность формоориентированного обучения (FFI) и смыслоориентированного обучения (MFI) в преподавании английского языка на разных этапах учебного процесса. В то время как FFI подчеркивает грамматическую точность и эксплицитные языковые формы, MFI отдает приоритет коммуникации и беглости через осмысленное взаимодействие. Исследование направлено на анализ того, как эти подходы способствуют овладению языком на первичном, вторичном и третичном уровнях. Опираясь на теоретические основы и эмпирические исследования, исследование подчеркивает сильные и слабые стороны обоих подходов. Результаты показывают, что комплексный подход, сочетающий форму и смысл, дает наиболее эффективные результаты. Исследование приходит к выводу, что баланс между ФФИ и МФИ должен быть адаптирован к этапам развития учащихся и учебным контекстам.

Ключевые слова: Формоориентированное обучение, смыслоориентированное обучение, преподавание английского языка, овладение грамматикой, коммуникативная компетентность, этапы изучения языка, беглость, точность, педагогика, овладение вторым языком, взаимодействие в классе, методика преподавания, развитие учащихся, языковые навыки

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ingliz tilini o‘qitishda shaklga yo‘naltirilgan ta’lim (FFI) va ma’noga yo‘naltirilgan ta’limning (MFI) o‘quv jarayonining turli bosqichlarida qiyosiy samaradorligi ko‘rib chiqiladi. FFI grammatik aniqlik va aniq til shakllariga urg‘u bersa, MFI mazmunli muloqot orqali muloqot va ravonlikka ustuvorlik beradi. Tadqiqotning maqsadi ushbu yondashuvlarning tilni boshlang‘ich, ikkinchi va uchinchi darajalarda o‘zlashtirishga qanday hissa

qo‘shishini tahlil qilishdan iborat. Nazariy asoslar va empirik tadqiqotlarga tayangan holda, tadqiqot har ikki yondashuvning kuchli tomonlari va cheklovlarini yoritib beradi. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, shakl va ma’noni birlashtirgan yaxlit yondashuv eng samarali natija beradi. Tadqiqot xulosasiga ko‘ra, FFI va MFI o‘rtasidagi muvozanat o‘quvchilarning rivojlanish bosqichlari va ta’lim sharoitlariga moslashtirilishi kerak.

Kalit so‘zlar: Shaklga yo‘naltirilgan ta’lim, ma’noga yo‘naltirilgan ta’lim, ingliz tilini o‘qitish, grammatikani o‘zlashtirish, kommunikativ kompetensiya, til o‘rganish bosqichlari, ravonlik, aniqlik, pedagogika, ikkinchi tilni o‘zlashtirish, sinfdagi o‘zaro ta’sir, o‘qitish metodikasi, o‘quvchilarni rivojlantirish, til ko‘nikmalari

INTRODUCTION

In the field of English language teaching, one of the most debated issues concerns the relative importance of form-focused instruction (FFI) and meaning-focused instruction (MFI). These two approaches represent different perspectives on how languages are best acquired. FFI emphasizes the explicit teaching of grammatical structures, vocabulary, and linguistic accuracy, whereas MFI focuses on communication, fluency, and the use of language in meaningful contexts. Over the years, researchers and educators have attempted to determine which approach is more effective, particularly across different stages of language learning.

According to Michael Long form-focused instruction involves drawing learners’ attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in communication[1]. This approach aims to integrate grammar instruction within communicative contexts rather than teaching it in isolation. On the other hand, meaning-focused instruction is closely associated with communicative language teaching, where the primary goal is to enable learners to convey meaning effectively. Stephen Krashen argues that language acquisition occurs when learners are exposed to comprehensible input in meaningful situations, suggesting that explicit grammar instruction may not be necessary for acquisition[2].

Despite these differing views, contemporary research indicates that both approaches play important roles in language learning. Rod Ellis emphasizes that while communicative exposure is essential for developing fluency, attention to form is necessary for achieving accuracy[3]. Therefore, the challenge for educators lies in finding an appropriate balance between these two approaches, particularly when teaching learners at different developmental stages.

This study aims to compare the effectiveness of FFI and MFI across primary, secondary, and tertiary levels of education. It seeks to explore how each approach contributes to language acquisition and to identify the conditions under which they are most effective.

MAIN PART

The distinction between form-focused instruction and meaning-focused instruction reflects two fundamental dimensions of language learning: accuracy and fluency. FFI is primarily concerned with helping learners master grammatical structures and linguistic rules, while MFI aims

[1] Long Michael. Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology // In: de Bot K., Ginsberg R., Kramsch C. (eds.). Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1991. – P. 39–52.

[2] Krashen Stephen. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. – Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. – 202 p.

[3] Ellis Rod. Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. – 387 p.

to develop the ability to use language for communication. Both dimensions are essential for achieving communicative competence, as defined by Dell Hymes who emphasized that knowing a language involves not only grammatical knowledge but also the ability to use it appropriately in different contexts[4].

At the primary level, learners are in the early stages of cognitive and linguistic development. Research suggests that young learners benefit more from meaning-focused instruction, as they acquire language naturally through interaction and exposure. Stephen Krashen supports this view by proposing the Input Hypothesis, which states that language acquisition occurs when learners are exposed to input that is slightly above their current level of competence (i+1)[5]. In this context, activities such as storytelling, songs, and games are particularly effective in promoting language acquisition without overwhelming learners with explicit grammar rules.

However, this does not mean that form-focused instruction should be completely excluded at the primary level. Michael Long argues that brief and implicit attention to form can enhance language acquisition by helping learners notice linguistic patterns[6]. For example, teachers can provide corrective feedback during communicative activities, thereby integrating form and meaning in a natural way.

At the secondary level, learners develop greater cognitive abilities and are better equipped to understand abstract concepts. As a result, form-focused instruction becomes more relevant, particularly for developing grammatical accuracy. Rod Ellis notes that explicit grammar instruction can facilitate language learning by providing learners with a clear understanding of linguistic rules[7]. At the same time, meaning-focused activities remain essential for maintaining learner motivation and ensuring that language is used in meaningful contexts.

In secondary classrooms, a combination of FFI and MFI is often the most effective approach. For instance, teachers can introduce grammatical structures through explicit instruction and then reinforce them through communicative tasks such as discussions, role-plays, and problem-solving activities. This integrated approach helps learners develop both accuracy and fluency, which are essential for effective communication.

At the tertiary level, learners are expected to achieve a high level of proficiency and independence. At this stage, the balance between FFI and MFI shifts towards more advanced and specialized language use. Meaning-focused instruction plays a crucial role in developing academic and professional communication skills, while form-focused instruction is necessary for refining accuracy and addressing persistent errors.

[4] Hymes Dell. On Communicative Competence // In: Pride J. B., Holmes J. (eds.). Sociolinguistics. – Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972. – P. 269–293.
[5] Krashen Stephen. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. – Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. – 202 p.
[6] Long Michael. Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology // In: de Bot K., Ginsberg R., Kramsch C. (eds.). Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1991. – P. 39–52.
[7] Ellis Rod. Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. – 387 p.

According to Diane Larsen-Freeman grammar should be viewed not as a set of static rules but as a dynamic resource for communication[8]. This perspective highlights the importance of integrating form and meaning in advanced language learning. For example, university students can engage in tasks such as academic writing, presentations, and research projects, where both grammatical accuracy and communicative effectiveness are essential.

Despite the benefits of both approaches, several challenges arise in their implementation. One major issue is the tendency to prioritize one approach over the other, depending on institutional policies or teacher preferences. In some contexts, excessive focus on grammar may lead to reduced opportunities for communication, while an exclusive emphasis on meaning may result in fossilized errors. Rod Ellis warns that neglecting either dimension can hinder overall language development[9].

Another challenge is the need to adapt instruction to learners' individual differences, such as proficiency level, learning style, and motivation. Effective language teaching requires flexibility and the ability to adjust instructional strategies based on learners' needs. Therefore, teachers should adopt a balanced and context-sensitive approach that integrates both form-focused and meaning-focused instruction.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the comparative analysis of form-focused instruction and meaning-focused instruction demonstrates that both approaches play essential roles in English language teaching. While FFI contributes to the development of grammatical accuracy, MFI promotes fluency and communicative competence. The effectiveness of each approach varies depending on the stage of language learning and the characteristics of learners.

At the primary level, meaning-focused instruction is more effective in fostering natural language acquisition, while at the secondary level, a balanced integration of form and meaning is necessary. At the tertiary level, both approaches should be combined in a way that supports advanced language use and academic communication.

The study suggests that the most effective teaching strategy is not to choose between FFI and MFI but to integrate them in a complementary manner. As emphasized by Michael Long attention to form within meaningful communication provides optimal conditions for language learning. Therefore, educators should strive to create learning environments that balance accuracy and fluency, thereby enabling learners to achieve full communicative competence.

Future research should focus on empirical studies that investigate how different combinations of FFI and MFI affect language learning outcomes in specific educational contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Long Michael. Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology // In: de Bot K., Ginsberg R., Kramsch C. (eds.). Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1991. – P. 39–52.
2. Krashen Stephen. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. – Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982. – 202 p.

[8] Larsen-Freeman Diane. Teaching Language: From Grammar to Grammaring. – Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 2003. – 256 p.
[9] Ellis Rod. Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. – 387 p.

3. Ellis Rod. Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. – 387 p.
4. Hymes Dell. On Communicative Competence // In: Pride J. B., Holmes J. (eds.). Sociolinguistics. – Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972. – P. 269–293.
5. Larsen-Freeman Diane. Teaching Language: From Grammar to Grammaring. – Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 2003. – 256 p.
6. Солиева, З. Б. ПРОБЛЕМА ЛЕКСИКОГРАФИЧЕСКОЙ ОБРАБОТКИ СЛОВА И СПОСОБЫ ЕЕ РЕШЕНИЯ. УЧЕНЫЙ XXI ВЕКА, 27
7. Solieva, Z.B., & Javburieva, R. USE OF GAMES IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS.УЧЕНЫЙ XXI ВЕКА, 18.