



**EFFECTIVENESS OF CONTENT–BASED INSTRUCTION IN
TEACHING READING**

Saidova Surayyo Yarkulovna

Teacher of Foreign Languages Department Navoi State Pedagogical Institute

E-mail: Saidova.surayoo@mail.ru

A B S T R A C T	K E Y W O R D S
<p>The effectiveness of content-based instruction in teaching reading is examined in this article. The article's goal is to determine if content-based training is effective at teaching reading. The action research was to evaluate the benefits and drawbacks of content-based reading instruction. A post-test was given after the lesson had been finished. To ascertain if content-based instruction is effective in teaching reading, the outcomes of the two exams were compared. Reading instruction has been proven to be most successful when using content-based instruction.</p>	<p>content, progressive test, pre and post-tests, teaching method, effective reading, theme based model</p>

Introduction

Teaching languages entails instructing in both native and foreign languages. To enable students to communicate in the target language is the goal of language instruction. Many universities of thought have come and gone in the field of language acquisition and teaching, and methods for teaching languages have also altered.

Teaching methodology is described by Brown (1994, p. 140) as "the application of theoretical findings and positions." They could be described as "theory and practice." There have been numerous such uses, some of which are in complete philosophical conflict with others. In spite of the fact that there are currently more than 5,000 languages in use, English has risen to the top since it is the language spoken on a global scale. Because it is used to communicate with those who speak languages other than English as their native tongues, it serves as a link language. In practically every field, including business, education, the media, international diplomacy, science and technology, economics, politics, medical, international marketing, law, and so forth, English is the most widely used language. It is rich in its vocabulary, in its use, structure and literature. Content- Based Instruction (CBI) or Content Based Language Teaching (CBLT) is a communicative approach to second language teaching in which teaching program is organized, around content rather than a linguistic syllabus. Classroom should focus on real communication about the subject matter from outside the domain of language. The subject matter was not grammar, function or some other language -based unit of organization but content.

Materials and Methods

One must be aware of the material in order to comprehend content-based training. It also includes suggestions for using demonstration, imitation, miming, objects, photographs, and audiovisual presentations, as well as translation, explanation, and definition as tools to help students acquire meaning in language instruction. Because language acquisition in CBI is proportionate to content learning, the course's objectives for language learning are also listed:

1. To activate and develop existing language skills.
2. To acquire learning skills and strategies that could be applied in future language development opportunities.
3. To develop academic skills applicable to university study in all subject areas.
4. To broaden students understanding of English speaking people.

The CBI is opposed to the conventional methods of language instruction. Its main emphasis in terms of curriculum and classroom instruction is language. CBI's main tenet is that people learn a second language most effectively when they are interested in doing so. The principles of CBI are as follows:

1. The subject matter content is used for language teaching purpose.
2. Teacher should build on students' previous experience.
3. When learners perceive the relevance of their language use they are motivated to learn. They know that it is a means to an end rather than an end in itself.
4. The teacher 'scaffolds' the linguistic content, i.e. helps learners say what it is they want to say by building together with the students complete utterance.
5. Language is learned effectively when it is used as a medium to convey informational content of interest to the students.
6. Vocabulary is easier to acquire when there are contextual clues to help convey meaning.
7. When they work with authentic subject matter, students need language support. For instance, the teacher may provide a number of examples, build in some redundancy, use comprehension checks, etc,
8. Learners work with meaningful, cognitively demanding language and content within the context of authentic material and tasks.
9. Communicative competence involves more than using language conversationally. It also includes the ability to read discuss and write about content from other fields.

Teaching Learning Activities of CBI

They focus on teaching content and language together. The Language skills development, vocabulary building, communicative interaction etc are used in it. It also deals on study skills and synthesis of materials and grammar. And the different models of CBI are used in secondary level are:

1. Theme-based model
2. Adjunct model
3. Sheltered model

Theme-based Model

Theme-based Model focuses on learning strategies, concepts, tasks and skills that are needed in subject areas in the mainstream curriculum, grouped around topics and themes such as consumer, education map skills, foods and nutrition. Success for this model rests on co-

operative learning in heterogeneous small group settings. Themes of specific interest, relevance, or both to the learner provide the organizing principle for the course. The theme of each unit serves to contextualize new language that is presented and provides the point of departure for skill- and language-based instruction and practice. Typically, a theme extends over several days or even weeks, providing rich linguistic input and creating the necessary conditions for learners to acquire new language.

Sheltered model. Students for whom the language of instruction is a second or additional language (L2) are separated or “sheltered” from their first language (L1) (i.e., mainstream) peers for the purpose of content area instruction. In most versions of this model, the content instructors who teach the sheltered section of the course receive specialized training in techniques to help students access the content material and to provide a nurturing atmosphere for the learning of both language and content. In theory, students’ exposure to the rich academic language and complex concepts presented in the sheltered class provides the necessary conditions for L2 acquisition to occur.

Adjunct Model

This model is similar to the theme based component. In it, the language teachers should be familiar with the content material. There should be coordination between language teacher and content teacher. Two classes are adjusted together to make it effective. One or more content area course is paired with a language course. At the outset of the course, as well as on an ongoing basis, the instructors negotiate their syllabuses to coordinate their instructional objectives. Typically, the objectives of the language course are identified with respect to students’ linguistic needs in the content course, though adjustments in the content course objectives may also occur. L2 acquisition occurs (a) through students’ exposure to the academically challenging language of the content course and (b) through the systematic linguistic guidance provided in the language course.

Language learning Skills

Language learning skill means able to communicate in that language in which s\he is exposed to. The choice of language depends upon the channel of communication. A language is basically used in the real life situation in order to receive information. Language exists in two forms, the spoken and written. Speaking and writing themselves are the encoding process whereby we communicate our ideas, thoughts and feelings through one or the other form of the language: and listening and reading are the parallel decoding process by which we understand either a spoken or written message. To grasp information, we have to listen to someone or something or read a written text. Therefore, these different activities are called language skills.

The teaching of reading is a crucial component of teaching and learning a foreign language. One of the receptive language abilities is reading. It typically refers to comprehending or making meaning of a specific text. It entails as effectively as possible removing the necessary information from the text. The doors of knowledge are opened by reading. The reader must take an active role and complete the exercises in order to understand the material. Reading is not a passive skill, therefore. Understanding involves reading. Reading has little meaning if you can't understand what you're reading. Though many claim that the terms "reading" and "a reading comprehension" are interchangeable, reading also refers to reading that is done for informational purposes. In language learning receptive skills precede

productive skills. The above picture displays listening and reading skills. To get master of language skills first the learners should listen to that language then slowly he starts to speak then he starts to read in that language at last he can write in that language in which he is exposed to. These are not only integrated in language teaching and learning, this comes true in real life situation using language for various purposes.

In proposing these three models, the authors caution that they are intended as prototypes only, and as such are meant to allow “consideration of other content-based variations which combine features of the three” Ostensibly, these authors foresee innovations in CBI models as combining features of the existing prototypes but differing in some significant way—that is, arising out of the varied instructional settings in which the model is to be implemented and the specific needs of the students in that setting.

Result and Discussion

In the intervening years since the initial publication of Content-Based Second Language Instruction in 1989, numerous innovations in CBI models have arrived on the scene. These innovations have been well documented in the CBI literature. Figure 4 presents an updated map of CBI, as proposed by Brinton (2007). As represented in this diagram, the three original prototype models continue to flourish. However, they have continued to adapt to Theme-based Sheltered CBI Adjunct Figure 3 Three prototype models of CBI as proposed by Brinton, Snow, and Wesche (1989) content-based instruction in English for specific purposes the settings in which they are used, causing the creation of several subbranches and even other new “hybrids.”

The early 1990s witnessed a great deal of discussion of both the common ground shared by ESP and CBI and their essential differences. Agreed-upon similarities include the following (Johns, 1992, 1997; Brinton, 1993):

1. ESP and CBI share a dissatisfaction with the traditional abstraction of language from its natural environment and real language use.
2. They share a concern that general purpose English courses cannot prepare students for the demanding linguistic, rhetorical, and contextual challenges of the real world.
3. They use genuine discourse from the real world to ensure that classroom content reflects the target situation.
4. They engage students in meaningful use of language rather than in activities that focus on the language itself.
5. They expand the definition of language teaching to include cognitive skills and critical thinking.
6. Finally, both ESP and CBI have as their goal the transfer of language skills and content to real life.

Even while the aforementioned discussions have some historical value, they primarily center on defining the distinction between CBI and ESP and don't provide a satisfying resolution. The most important question may perhaps be where CBI fits into ESP, as suggested by the heading of this entry. Having now established that CBI is a type of syllabus, we are in a better position to pinpoint its relation to ESP. Master (1997/8) concurs with Eskey, noting that CBI has the same status as the grammatical, notional/functional, situational, rhetorical, and task-based syllabi. Further, he argues, in terms of Wilkins's (1976) distinction between synthetic and analytic syllabi, CBI constitutes an analytic syllabus, since “significant linguistic forms can be isolated from the . . . context in which they occur [and] learning can be focussed on important aspects of the language structure” (p. 2). ESP, on the

other hand, is simply one of two main divisions of ELT, the other being EGP (i.e., as previously pointed out by Hutchinson and Waters, 1987). According to Master, a CBI syllabus can be used in both EGP courses (in which case the theme-based model would pertain) and in ESP courses (in which case either the sheltered, adjunct, or other hybrid models would pertain). He concludes by noting that ESP is simply a domain of ELT that makes substantial use of the CBI syllabus. In our opinion, CBI is a form of syllabus, which is the foundational structuring idea for a curriculum. It joins the other recognized syllabi in the discipline, including grammatical, notional-functional, rhetorical, and task-based syllabi. The organizing concept is the information or topic on which any application of CBI is founded.

On the other hand, English for general purposes (EGP), a subset of ELT, is the sole other component of ESP. The task-based and content-based syllabi are heavily utilized by ESP. In other words, since both ESP and EGP may use any of the syllabi, there is no "boundary" between ESP and CBI; rather, they function independently.

Conclusion

This article has examined the role of CBI in ESP. While early debates focused on delineating the boundaries between the two, later works more accurately analyze their symbiotic nature, stressing the role that a CBI syllabus plays in ESP course design. To conclude, CBI can not only be a highly effective way of delivering EGP courses but can serve as an equally efficient organizing principle for EAP and ESP courses (Brinton & Holten, 2001). Ultimately, an ESP course developer may choose to use a CBI syllabus as an organizing principle; she or he may also select another syllabus type (e.g., grammatical, notional/functional, genre-based, or task-based). In summary, within literature there exist a wide range of differing conceptions vis-a-vis the nature and scope of CBI.

However, it is generally agreed that the integrative approach provides a meaningful basis for language teaching and speeds up the process of L2 mainstream success. Sheltered subject-matter teaching, which he calls SSMT (and we are calling CBI), is the most effective way to teach a foreign language. As a matter of fact, the development of CBI in —immersion bilingual programs and in programs for English as a Second Language has had a significant impact on CBI in foreign language education.

REFERENCES

1. Adhikari, M. (2007). Methods of Teaching Reading. Young voices in ELT. Vol.6:74-75.
2. Benson, M. J. (2002). University ESL Reading: A Content Analysis; English for Specific Purposes, Pages 75-88.
3. Bhatpara, A. (2005). Action Research. Journal of NELTA .Vol.1:1-2.
4. Bhatpara, J. R. (2009). Effectiveness of CL in developing vocabulary. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis T.U. Kathmandu.
5. Bhattarai, T. (2008). Reading comprehension ability of the Bible colleges. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis T.U. Kathmandu.
6. Bitchener, J. (2010). Writing an applied linguistics thesis or dissertation, Palgrave: Macmillan.
7. Brown, H.D. (1994). Principles of language learning and teaching. London: Prentice Hall.
8. Cross, D. (1992). A practical handbook of language teaching. London: Prentice Hall.
9. Crystal, D. (2003). A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics. UK: Blackwell.

10. Doff, A. (2003). *Teach English*. Cambridge: CUP.
11. Garretson, K. (2010), Being allowing and yet directive: Mindfulness Meditation in the Teaching of developmental Reading and Writing. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2010: 51–64. doi: 10.1002/cc.15.
12. *Grellet*, F. (1981). *Developing reading skill*. Cambridge: CUP.
13. Harmer, J. (1991). *The practices of English language teaching*. London: Longman.
14. Harmer, J.(2002). *The practices of English language teaching (fourth Edition)*. London: Longman.