THE DYNAMIC APPROACH IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Gulomova Dildora

A Master of Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

Abstract: *Current article is devoted to the problems of teaching methods of English as a foreign languages. In this article we look through different methods in this field. Methods of foreign language teaching and its relation to other sciences. Methods of foreign language teaching is understood here as a body of scientifically tested theory concerning the teaching of foreign languages in school and other educational institutions. Teaching a foreign language means first and foremost the formation and development of students' habits and skills in listening, speaking, writing, and reading.*

Keywords. *Method, other sciences, pedagogics, psychology, linguistics, didactics, effective learning, investigation, conclusion, repetition, determine, assimilate, instruction, presenting, theory, dynamic stereotype, quotation, laboratory, test.*

The origin of dynamic assessment can be traced back to intelligence test a century ago. In 1905, Alfred Binet and his colleagues published the world's first scale on children's intelligence level tests. But soon he realized that intelligence tests should not only look at the results, but also assess children's cognitive processes and learning processes (Haywood&Tzuriel, 2002). Although he was enthusiastic about the idea at the time, he never made a viable solution. The biggest problem on intelligence test is that it only reflects the results of individual development statically. In the 1950s, Piaget's perspective on children's cognitive development and the process of intellectual assessment provided theoretical preparation for dynamic assessment. What really promoted the development of dynamic assessment was the socio-cultural theory proposed by Vygotsky. Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory highlighted social, cultural and historical influence on children's psychological   development, and he also innovatively proposed the concept of "mediation", "scaffolding" and "zone of proximal development". These concepts have had an important impact on the development of dynamic evaluation, the most influential of which is the concept of "zone of proximal development". Zone of proximal development refers to the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more able peers (Vygotsky, 1978 :86). Vygotsky emphasized that children's response from the help of an adult or a partner can be used to understand the cognitive energy of children because it provides an insight into child's future development, that is, what children can do now with help, What can be done on his own in the future.   Therefore, if we want to comprehensively assess the development of an individual's ability, it is not enough to focus on the actual development zone. It is necessary to pay attention to the

zone of proximal development, that is, what can be formed and what can be done future. With this in mind, the assessment is as close as possible to the cognitive development process itself.   The zone of proximal development concept has laid a solid foundation for dynamic assessment theory and practice. Researches related to dynamic assessment began in the 1930s, but a large number of specialized studies emerged in the 1960s and 1970s and culminated in the late 1990s. The main representatives were Feuerstein, Budoff, Carlson, Campione, Brown, Stott, and Lidz et al.   Due to the different insights and focuses of different scholars, a series of different dynamic assessment methods have been proposed. Lantolf & Poehner (2004) argues that these patterns can be broadly divided into two categories: interventionist and interactionist. In the intervention model, the form of mediation is standardized. It focuses on the "quantitative" indicator of evaluation: index of speed of learning (Brown & Ferrara1985:300) and the amount of help a learner needs to reach the learning goals specified beforehand quickly and effectively. In the interactive mode, mediation appears in the interaction between the evaluator and the learner. Concerning on the definition of dynamic assessment, this study will adopt the one put forward by Lidz. He pointed that dynamic assessment (DA) is a general term for a series of assessment methods that explore and discover students' potential developmental abilities through the interaction of evaluators and students, especially with the help of experienced evaluators (Lidz, 2003: 337). First of all, the process of dynamic assessment is a process of combining evaluation and instruction. Some scholars even figured out the central feature that distinguished dynamic assessment from non-dynamic assessment is that DA does not separate instruction from assessment but instead considers them as two sides of the same coin (Lantolf&Thorne, 2012).   Teachers complete the assessment of students' potential abilities through interacting with students, and provide corresponding mediation according to their zone of proximal development to promote their actual development. In the whole process,instruction and assessment co-exist. However, in non-dynamic assessment, evaluation and instruction are separate. Non-dynamic assessment is a measurement to test the results of the teacher's instruction. In traditional teaching method, instruction and assessment are two independent steps and never take place meantime. The form of non-dynamic assessment is composed of a series of unified and standard tests. Teachers only play the role of tester in it and do not make any intervention and feedback on the test results of the students.   Secondly, the focus in dynamic assessment and non-dynamic assessment is totally different. The non-dynamic assessment test focuses on the learner's existing ability, which is designed to examine the students' learning results through a period of time.The major concern of it is learning result rather than process. In other words, it wants to test what learners can do and what they can't do. In addition, what is the rank of their ability compared to their peers. However, the dynamic assessment pays attention to the future and aims to

discover the potential development ability of the learners. It is concerned with how students learn under new conditions, how their learning and behavioral performance can be improved, how much can be improved, and what obstacles need to be overcome to achieve the desired level. The teacher's mediation during DA will help to promote the development of learners' potential. Only by dynamically assessing learners and accurately grasping the learner's recent development zone in real time can it effectively promote the development of its potential capabilities. The unified and static test results of non-dynamic assessment ignore the individual differences in capacity development, and it will lead to the learners'mechanical mastery of past knowledge.   Finally, the relationship between the evaluator and the examinee is different. In the non-dynamic assessment, in order to ensure the fairness and accuracy of the assessment, examinees are given little or no feedback on the quality of their performance until the assessment is complete. In dynamic assessment, the main form of assessment is the interaction between the examiner and the examinee, and the examiner will provide a specific form of feedback—mediated assistance which is the core of the assessment process. In the interaction, the evaluator plays the role of the mentor and facilitator of the examiner's learning. The two sides have a common goal in the assessment: that is to complete the potential development of the examinee.   Generally speaking, non-dynamic assessment is characterized by objectiveness and quantification, and the design is precise and structural. It focuses on the level that students have achieved so far, with a specific focus on learning results by only providing information on the success or failure of the student's learning, and centers on the evaluator. Dynamic Evaluation emphasizes the interaction between evaluators and students, stressing a combination between evaluation and teaching, highlighting the characteristics of students' cognitive processes and cognitive changes, and especially focuses on the potential cognitive development of students. Preventing Teachers from Underestimating Students' Abilities. Standardized non-dynamic assessment can only test whether a student has mastered a certain knowledge point, and not reflect the reasons why they fail in acquiring that knowledge point and the difficulties which they encountered in the learning process. Therefore, if we rely on the results of the non-dynamic assessment to test students' ability, we will tend to underestimate the ability of students. Budoff (1968) apparently stated that his research endeavored to uncover hidden potential among underprivileged learners, whose abilities were typically underestimated by non-dynamic tests.   In the study, it became clear that one of the learners, Amanda, used only the present tense and one of the past tense forms, the passé composé, avoiding the imparfait altogether when telling stories in French. The passé composé in French equals to present perfective aspect (PP) in English and emphasizes past actions, events, or states of being as completed at some point before the present time. In addition, the imparfait (present imperfective aspect) in French equals to past progressive tense and is used to express states of being in the past or the unfinished repetitive action. When telling story, Amanda used passé compose instead of imparfait in

the situation when it was needed. When the evaluator found this situation, he reminded Amanda that there were two tenses in French that express past actions. But the evaluator's reminder did not affect Amanda's expression, she still kept using present perfective aspect and avoiding the present imperfective aspect. Therefore, the evaluator once again interrupted Amanda, reminding her that there still exists a type of tense called present imperfective aspect and letting her pay attention to the difference between the present perfective aspect and present imperfective aspect. But he did not explain the difference between these two tenses, nor did he provide examples of tenses. When Amanda once again told the story, she could use both of these tenses to tell the story, although she sometimes made some mistakes. It is evident that without dialogic interaction between the evaluator and the learner it would have been difficult to discover that Amanda did indeed have some control over verbal aspect. A non-dynamic procedure would have more than likely underestimated Amanda's level of development. Revealing the Degree of Mistakes Made by Students. Non-dynamic assessments focus learning results and do not provide specific reasons analysis for different students who give the same wrong answers. Furthermore, it is found that in some cases two individuals whose performances bore striking phenotypic similarities were actually at different levels of development through interaction between mediator and learner. One learner, Nancy, performed in ways very similar to Amanda during her initial DA. However, through interaction mediator determined that the reasons for her problematic performance were different. When Nancy tried to tell the story in French, she didn't use the tense of present imperfective aspect. However, when the revaluator reminded her that she could consider using that tense, Nancy still did not use it. Through mediator's interaction with her, the mediator found that Nancy seldom used present imperfective aspect because she was not sure about the composition of the tense and how to use it properly. Unlike Amanda who forgot the tense for a while, Nancy didn't use the tense because she didn't know how to use it. Although the mistakes of different learners on the surface are similar, the reasons for the errors are not the same. But the reasons of mistakes can only be found through dynamic assessment. Tracking Student Development Changes in Real Time. As we all know, non-dynamic assessment methods can not evaluate the change of students' ability. It pays more attention to the overall difficulty of testing and the distribution of different difficulty test questions. Therefore, whether students consider tests simple or difficult, they all need to face the same test questions. However, in the dynamic assessment, the evaluator can grasp the change of the learner's ability at any time, and give the most appropriate help according to the learner's reaction. Because the development of human ability is a complex and unpredictable process, and only through interaction with learners can you understand the degree of their abilities development.

In his research, Lantolf (2010) documented the development of a Spanish learner, Vicente. Vicente's development process is not gradual. Begin with making mistakes, he

experienced the teacher's frequent prompts and he can correct the mistakes spontaneously after three days. His progress speed is very amazing because not all learners can have such a fast progress.   Undoubtedly, his progress is mainly due to the evaluator's help. In dynamic assessment, mediator can trace learner's present development level through dialoguing with him or her in real time and provide proper mediation to promote their potential ability development, which is not available in non-dynamic assessments.   Promoting Learners' Development. Gibbons (2003) proposed that teacher's mediation in the dynamic assessment would promote learners' development through the teacher's successfully co-constructing the zone of proximal development with his or her learners. He observed classrooms interaction between teachers and students when students attempted to report the results of physics experiments in the group discussion. The teacher asked students to do group discussion with a simple hint that the students should describe what happened during the experiment. The common problem made by students was that they tend to use everyday language, such as "stick" "hold" and "push", to describe physics experiment of magnetism. At first, the teacher just pointed out that students' answers were not proper by asking them to try again. This form of mediation is clearly quite implicit, as the teacher didn't give any feedback on what students should do to improve their descriptions. After trying, students found them struggling to use the appropriate scientific discourse to express herself. When the teacher found the implicit prompt fail, she moved to a more explicit prompt and asked students to start using the scientific language. In this time, one learner succeeded using the terms attract and repel to describe the behavior of the magnets. Lantolf and Poehner (2004, 65), analyzed this same episode in Gibbons's study and argued that the learners' actual level of development was based on a concrete understanding of the experiment, so they described it by using everyday language. A more generalized description relied on the use of scientific terminology lay within their zone of proximal development because they were able to perform appropriately when offered mediation help from the teacher. That is, the students observed in this study were not able to use the terms independently, but they also did not need the teacher to provide the scientific discourses meanwhile. From the case in this study, we found that students' language use transformed from everyday language into the specialist discourse through the mediation provided by the teacher. During the dynamic assessment process, the teacher successfully co-constructed a ZPD with her learners and learners achieved their potential level of development.

Based on literature review on teaching application dynamic assessment, this study summarized the functions of dynamic assessment in foreign languages teaching. It will help teacher to assess learners' actual level of development in real time and analyze their learning problem. With aid of it, teacher can promote learners potential level of development. Compared to non-dynamic assessment, dynamic assessment has so many advantages. Therefore, we should promote dynamic assessment to foreign languages

teaching so that more teachers can use it and it will benefit more students. Since dynamic assessment become more acceptable nowadays, it is necessary for us to look into the direction and trend of the future development of dynamic assessment research. With the rapid development of wireless communication technology, blended learning based on information learning resources and online learning platforms becomes an effective way of learning compared with traditional classroom teaching and remote online learning. This kind of learning method combines classroom face-to-face learning and various forms of online learning to meet the learner-led and fragmentation learning requirements of the information age. From the Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) model to today's combination of online learning and flipped classroom model, blended learning will be one of the main ways to improve teaching efficiency in the future. We need to try to apply dynamic assessment into this blended learning and find out the suitable model of dynamic assessment for it.

In addition, Computer-based testing is another tendency in the field of testing. There are many advantages of online dynamic assessment. For example, it can manage many learners at the same time, independent individuals can be evaluated repeatedly; and evaluation reports can be automatically generated. Therefore, online dynamic assessments are less restrictive than dynamic assessments in actual classrooms. In the future, we may replace the classroom dynamic assessment with on assessment. In this way, the efficiency of assessment will be badly improved. At the same time, some researcher proposed a new model of peer's assessment instead of teacher's assessment. However, some people may question the feasibility of peer review, and research shows that peer review is feasible. Swain (2001) pointed out that even in the small talk, students may use the various psychological strategies (such as reference, clarification) when trying to express their ideas. These strategies could help them to form and externalize learners' assumptions, which they will jointly evaluate, and finally give appropriate responses.

Methods of foreign language teaching are closely related to other sciences such as pedagogics, psychology, linguistics and some others. Pedagogics is the science concerned with the teaching and education of the younger generation. Since methods also deal with the problems of teaching and education, it is most closely related to Pedagogics. One branch of Pedagogics is called Didactics. Didactics studies general ways of teaching in schools. Methods, compared to Didactics, studies the specific ways of teaching a definite subject. Thus, it may be considered special didactics. In the foreign language teaching, as well as in the teaching of Mathematics, History and other subject taught in schools, general principles of Didactics are applied and, in their turn, in influence and general principles of Didactics are applied and , in their turn, in influence and enrich Didactics. For example, the so – called "principle of visualization" was first introduced in teaching foreign languages. Now it has become one of the first introduced in teaching foreign languages. Now it has become one of the fundamental principles of Didactics and is used in teaching all school subjects without exception. Programmed instruction was

first applied to teaching Mathematics. Now through Didactics it is used in teaching many subjects, including foreign languages. Teaching a foreign language means first and foremost the formation and development of students' habits and skills in auding, speaking, writing and reading. We can't except to develop such habits and skills of our students effectively if we do not know and take into account the Psychology of forming them, the influence of formerly acquired habits on the formation of new ones and many other necessary factors that Psychology which can be applied to teaching a foreign language. For example, N.I.Zhinkin, a prominent Russian Psychologist in his investigation of the mechanisms of speech came to the conclusion that words and rules of combining them are most probably dormant conclusion that words and rules of combining them are most probably dormant in the kinetic center of the brain. When the ear receives a signal it reaches the brain, it's haring center and then passes to the kinetic center. Thus, if a teacher wants his students to speak English he must use all the opportunities he has to make them hear and speak it.

Furthermore, to master a second language is to acquire another code, another way of receiving and transmission information to create this new code in the most effective way one must take into consideration certain psychological factors. Effective learning of foreign language depends to a great extent on the students' memory. That is why a teacher must know how he can't help his students to successfully memorize and retain in memory the language material they learn. Here again psychologically investigations are significant. For example, the psychologist P.K.Zinchenko proved that in learning a subject bot voluntary and Involuntary memory is of great importance. In his investigation of involuntary memory P.K.Zinchenko came to the conclusion that this memory. Consequently, in teaching a foreign language we should create favorable condition for involuntary memorizing. P.K.Zinchenko showed that involuntary memorizing is possible only when pupils attention is concentrated not on fixing the material in their memory through numerous repetitions, but on solving some mental problems which deal with this material. To prove this the following experiment was carried out. Students of group A were given a list of words to memorize (voluntary memorizing). Students of group B did not receive a list of words to memorize. Instead they got an English text and some assignments which made them work with these words, use them is answering various question. During the next lesson a vocabulary test was given to the students of both groups. The results were approximately the same. A test given a fortnight later proved, how ewer, that students of group B retained words in their memory much better than the student of group A. This shows that involuntary memorizing may be more retentive under certain circumstances. Experiment's by prominent scientist show that Psychology helps methods to determine the role of the mother tongue in different stages of teaching; the amount of material for students to assimilate at every stage of instruction; the sequence and ways in which are more suitable for presenting the material and for ensuring its retention by the pupils and so

on.   Methods foreign language teaching has a definite relation to Physiology of the higher nervous system. Pavlov's theories of "conditioned reflexes", of the "second signaling system" and of "dynamic stereotype" are xamples. Each of these interrelated theories bears a direct relation to the teaching of a foreign language.   According to Pavlov habits are conditioned reflexes and a conditioned reflex is an action performed automatically in response to a definite stimulus as a result of previous frequent repetitions of the same action. If we thoroughly study the theory of conditioned reflexes we shall see that it explains and confirms the necessity for frequent repetitions and revision of material students study as one of the means of inculcation habits. Pavlov showed that man's higher nervous activities –speaking and thinking – are the functions of a special system of organic structures within the nervous system. This system is developed only in men. It enables the brain to respond to inner stimuli as it responds to outer stimuli or signals perceived through the sense organs. Pavlov named this the second signaling system. Consequently one of the forms of human behavior is language behavior, i.e., speech response to different communication situations. Pavlov's theory of "dynamic stereotype" also furnishes the Physiological base for many important principles of language teaching, e. g. for the topical vocabulary arrangement. Methods of foreign language teaching is most closely related to linguistics, since linguistics deals with the problems which are of paramount importance to methods with language and thinking, grammar and vocabulary, the relationship between grammar and vocabulary, and many others. Methods successfully use, for example, the results of linguistic material for teaching. It is known that structural linguistics has had a great impact on language teaching. Teaching materials have been prepared by linguistic and methodologists of the structural schools. Many prominent linguists have not only developed theory of linguistics, but tried to apply it to language teaching, The following quotation may serve as a proof of this: "It has occurred to the linguist as well as to the Psychologist that the foreign language classroom should be an excellent laboratory in which to test new theories of language acquisition".Language consists of four modalities –listening, reading, writing and speaking. They are interrelated. Learners increase their ability to listen, speak, read & write by becoming involved with language. Among language teacher these modalities are known as the four "skills". The term "skill" simply means ability of expertness.Judging the roles of the four skills we may say that listening is that component of language with which every living being begins the learning process and we depend on throughout our life.Listening is important in 2nd language pedagogy as one of the methods by which humans attempt to make sense of the surrounding world. An experienced school teacher defines listening as one of the learning "subjects" not only in middle schools but, probably in our society as well1. Another specialist asserts "that listening skills can and should be taught"2 Listening status as a separate subject has gradually given teachers the opportunity to focus on particular activities in all language components, i.e. be able to produce a FL sounds and prosodic units in phonetics &

phonology, develop a whole vocabulary of a text, establish sentence patterns and follow directions – all essential for developing speaking, reading and writing. Be allowing us to hear and interpret environmental sounds listening ser   ves as an aural vehicle for comprehension development3.

To our mind there must be lessons in listening need to involve students as active listeners: for example, discussing a book the have readm plays, films and art shows they have seen-give the learners a purpose for listening . A dynamic-usage based approach is a blend of Dynamic System Theory (DST) as it applies to language development in the field of applied linguistics, and usage-based theory in theoretical linguistics, mainly as proposed by Langacker (2000).   After a short discussion of DST, the connection with a usage-based approach willbe explained.In applied linguistics, language has recently come to be seen as a dynamic system and language development as a dynamic process (cf. Larsen-Freeman, 1997; de Bot, Lowie, and Verspoor, 2005). In de Bot et al (2005), DST is argued to be in line with sociocultural theory, in that development or learning should be seen as emergent: individuals change and transform through interaction with their social and material environments. Language, both at the social and indivi-dual level, is a dynamic system because all of its subsystems that have to do with form and meaning continually interact with each other over time. Therefore, at the individual level, learning in general and learning a language specifically are dynamic processes. We will highlight several aspects that are especially relevant to language development and point to their pedagogical implications.   First of all, language development depends critically on initial conditions. Initial conditions are the state at which the learner is at the moment the teaching begins. The state of the learner at this point will be the combined result of all previous states and experiences in L1 learning, L2 learning, aptitude, context and so on. For example, in the present study, the learners' L1 (Vietnamese) and L2 (English) are grammatically very different, and the learners have had very little exposure to the L2. After seven years of learning the L2 at high school through mainly a grammar-translation method, taught by teachers who are not very proficient themselves, the learners can be considered false beginners. Keeping these initial conditions in mind, the teacher needs to make sure the learners' habits are not further entrenched and first expose the learners to enough authentic input that enables them to establish as many new form-meaning pairs of expressions as possible and activate their fragmented knowledge of the language. Both internal and external resources are involved in the learning of an L2. Internal resources are those within the individual learner, such as the capacity to learn, prior conceptual knowledge, aptitude, learning style, motivation, anxiety, attitude, self-confidence and willingness to communicate. External resources are those outside the learning individual. They can be linguistic input the learner is exposed to in and outside class (teacher talk, textbooks, movies, music, TV, etc.), job-market orientations, teacher personalities, peer proficiency, types of exam, and school facilities. These resources not only have an impact on the ways a learner learns an L2, but also interact with each other

over time, keep the process going, and may change over time. Because resources are limited, they may compete; for example, at early stages, paying attention to what an L1 speaker says may compete with trying to produce language in the L2. In the present study, we therefore first of all make sure that the learner pays attention to authentic input, which is made meaningful with the help of the teacher, and output should occur naturally when the learners ask questions or react to the content. There should be no forced output and practice at the early stages, which is very much in line with Postovsky (1974), who found positive effects when output was delayed. Language is a complex system consisting of many different sub-systems and seen from a usage-based perspective, it is not a set of rules but a vast array of shorter and longer units whose forms and meanings are intrinsically interconnected. The units may be either totally conventionalized (e.g. at school) or more or less schematized (e.g. Someone gives something to somebody where the underlined parts may be seen as "slots" in a schematic construction that may be filled in with various other words or phrases). The form-meaning pairs (words, chunks, short phrases, clauses, and even certain discourse patterns) are also associated with uses and contexts. A change in one particular sub-system might cause a change in another one, which in turn causes another change, resulting in continuous change. For example, new words in the lexicon such as decide may make new syntactic constructions such as finite nominal clauses or to infinitive complements possible. All sub-systems develop over time, but they may not all develop at the same rate. For example, Caspi (2010) shows that even advanced learners will first improve in vocabulary and then syntax. However, we believe the teacher should still present the whole system with all its sub-systems of form and meaning together, but not expect that learners will be able to process them all equally at one time. Similar to the differential effect of input at different moments in time, the same type, whether aural or written, and amount of input is likely to have significantly different effects for different learners, not only because those learners have different initial conditions when taking on the task of learning a language, but also because the way in which the different resources will interact over time will be variable. Considering this view, it may be better to replace the concept of input with that of processing and see processing as acquiring or learning. In the past, applied linguistis tended to think about input in language development in terms of a one-way stream of information from the outside to the inside of a system that it is in itself stable and not influenced by the fact that is in interaction with other systems, be they cognitive or social. But following VanPatten (2002), it is likely that the input a student receives while interacting with the environment may be processed differently at different times, going from meaning to form. In other words, the learner may first attend to what the input means and then later be able to pay attention to the grammatical form aspects. After the learner has processed some input for meaning and has been able to make form meaning connections for the content words, he or she will have more resources available to process the same input (or very similar input) for less meaningful

forms. This clearly indicates the dynamically changing nature of input processing. In DST iteration of simple procedures may lead to the emergence of complex patterns. Larsen-Freeman (2012) points out the connection between iteration in DST and pedagogical repetition. She argues that repetition should not be seen as exact replication, but as revisiting the same territory with a slightly different stance, every time resulting in another mutable state. As far as pedagogy is concerned this means that iterating a particular language event (e.g. showing the same movie scene several times in a row) does not mean that the learner sees the same thing every time. Because of limited resources, the learner may first only be able to get the gist of the general event, the second time the learner revisits the scene s/he may note some of the expressions used, the third time s/he may begin to really understand what some of the expressions mean in the context, and not until later will the learner be able to focus clearly on each of the form-meaning use mappings. We should also keep in mind that at the production level, iteration or repetition plays a role in internalizing expressions. Lantolf (2006) points out that through imitation, especially as it occurs in private speech, the learner internalizes features of the L2. In sociocultural theory, imitation is seen as an intentional and potentially transformative process rather than as rote mimicking. Therefore, in our approach, we consider repeating lines as helpful in internalizing expressions.The idea of iteration is related to self-organization. Iterating simple procedures may lead to complex patterns through self-organization. The system (in our case the student's L2) undergoes phase shifts (transitions) in which the cognitive system self-organizes and new patterns of understanding emerge. This means that a language teacher cannot really "teach" language, but can only create conditions and interactions in which the learner recurrently visits and engages with the language so that self-organization will develop spontaneously in th learner's mind in its own way. A linguistic theory that is very much in line with a DST view of complex systems is usage-based linguistics. It holds that language structure emerges through repeated language use (Langacker 2000; Tomasello 2003). In line with Langacker (2000), we have called it a dynamic usage-based (DUB) approach to emphasize the link between DST and usage-based linguistics. Unlike traditional Chomskian linguistics, which views language as a top-down system with a set of syntactic rules that drives it, DUB linguistics sees language as a bottom-up system consisting of a large array of conventional, meaningful units in which schematic patterns have emerged through use. In other words, the dynamic language system has self-organized into form-meaning pairs at many different levels (word, phrase, clause, sentence, discourse) and new pairs have emerged in use through humans' general learning mechanisms such as association, categorization and abstraction. Because words are probably the most meaningful elements in a language, language is driven lexically rather than syntactically. Therefore, in our approach we focus mainly on exposing the learners to whole conventional meaningful units, which can be learned as wholes given enough exposure to tokens of these units, or which can be used to infer schematic patterns given enough exposure to

different types of these units. Words are used in combination with other words to form collocations, formulaic sequences and conventionalized patterns, many of which are schematic clause constructions, but others in turn may become so conventionalized that they become rather fixed and become a "conventionalized way of saying things" (CWOST) (Smiskova et al. 2012). The more a linguistic pattern is used to convey a certain concept, the more likely it becomes a conventional unit. Particularly longer conventional units are difficult for the L2 learner to acquire as the learner may not be exposed to them frequently enough; moreover, they are often not entirely predictable, nor translatable. Therefore, rather than focusing on grammatical forms, the approach focusses almost entirely on the use of lexical items and "the company they keep" (Firth 1957), an approach very much in line with the lexical approach as advocated by Lewis (1993). Along these lines Langacker (2008) argues that especially the very specific word combinations used by the speakers of a target language are difficult to learn for the L2 learner: A substantial proportion of what is needed to speak a language fluently tends to be ignored because it is part of neither lexicon nor grammar as these are traditionally conceived. What I have in mind are the countless units representing normal ways of saying things. Native speakers control an immense inventory of conventional expressions and patterns of expression enabling them to handle a continuous flow of rapid speech. While they can certainly be included, I am not referring to lexical items of the sort found in dictionaries, nor even to recognized idioms. At issue instead are particular ways of phrasing certain notions out of all the ways they could in principle be expressed in accordance with the lexicon and grammar of the language. These units can be of any size, ranging from standard collocations to large chunks of boilerplate language. These can be fully specific or partially schematic, allowing options in certain positions. (Langacker 2008: 84) In usage-based approaches to L1 acquisition, there is strong evidence that what children produce is very much in line with what they have heard. Data from Tomasello (2000), and Diessel and Tomasello (2001) show that there is a rather close relation between the child's language production and the ambient language. For example, Diessel and Tomasello (2001) show that there are several interacting factors that can explain the acquisition order of relative clauses by English children, but one of the main factors is the ambient language. Detailed studies that focus on the relation between L2 development and the frequency and type of input are rare, but, for example, Larsen-Freeman's (1976) account of the morpheme order studies in terms of their frequency of occurrence and a whole issue in Studies in Second Language Acquisition (2002: 24[2]) on frequency effects in language processing shows that many aspects of a second language can be accounted for in terms of their relation to frequency of occurrence. In that same issue, Ellis (2002) gives an extensive and convincing review of the literature concerning frequency effects in all components of language learning, from word segmentation and word recognition to formulaic utterances and syntax.   Translating DUB principles to second language teaching, we will assume that language is mainly lexically driven, that meaning is central,

that lexicon and grammar form a continuum, and that grammar is only a very small part of language that subserves meaning. Therefore, we argue that the approach should focus on the meaning of all forms in the continuum: words, phrases, chunks, clauses, sentences, discourse patterns and the way they are pronounced, and all preferably in pragmatically appropriate, meaningful context exchanges, approximating socially and culturally normal usage events. We will also assume that one of the absolute prerequisites for internalizing the form-meaning mappings will be frequency of exposure of both types and tokens.   Of course, mere exposure may not be enough. As VanPatten & Cadierno (1993) point out, the more linguistic forms are noticed, the better the chance to establish the form-meaning connections, thus developing the learners' ability to comprehend the meaning in spoken or written messages (Schmidt 1990). In the current approach, listening repeatedly to the same scene is in line with narrow stening as advocated by Krashen (1996). Dupuy (1999), who investigated the effects of Narrow Listening on 255 participants through questionnaires found dramatic results; large majority of the participants who were interviewed found it to be helpful in language acquisition. The few who did not found authentic, natural speech too difficult to understand.   Studies on vocabulary acquisition show that virtually anything that leads to more exposure, attention, manipulation, or time spent on lexical items adds to vocabulary gains. Schmitt (2008) suggests the term engagement to encompass all of these involvement possibilities, and concludes that essentially anything that leads to more and better engagement should improve vocabulary learning. There- fore promoting engagement is the most fundamental task for teachers and materials writers, and indeed, learners themselves.   Taking the theoretical insights provided just now, we conclude that an effective CLT approach should include a great amount of authentic input, preferably in the form of naturally occurring usage events, where utterances can be understood within their social, cultural and pragmatic context. The language should be within the learners' zone of proximal development (the Vygotskian concept of that which can be learned by a learner at a given point in time with the help of an "expert") and through the interaction with the learners, the teacher should scaffold the text until the learner can understand it independently. The linguistic focus should be on form-meaning pairs at all levels (word, phrase, chunk, clause, sentence, and discourse).

Based on a review of the vocabulary acquisition literature, Schmitt (2010) estimates that 8–10 exposures to a word should lead to a reasonable chance that a word is remembered. Therefore, the learner needs to be exposed to these form- meaning pairs repeatedly and the goal should be to revisit them at least eight times. Finally, the learner needs to be engaged with the language; in other words, the language the learner is exposed to should be of inherent interest to the student. Especially because of the last requirement, the authentic input in our approach is provided by means of a popular movie, one that appeals to our students.   The movie needs to be selected based on content (whether it interests the students) and language use (whether it is appropriate,

has enough language, enough every day conversations, and so on). There are several good reasons for the choice of a movie rather than any other video material. (1) In a good movie, actors will act as naturally as possible, coming as close as foreign language learners can get to "real life". (2) The language of movies is usually very close to everyday, natural language (Tatsuki, 2006; Schmitt, 2010) and therefore provides authentic models. (3) The characters have natural conversations in meaningful context exchanges, approximating socially and cul-turally normal usage events. (4) By including the context, the visuals, facial expressions and so on, the learners will have clues that will aid in their understanding. Also, these extra clues will form associations, and as Anderson and Reder (1979) point out, the more associations there are to something to remembered, the easier it is to remember. (5) The movie will provide examples of cultural, social or pragmatic issues that can be elaborated upon by the teacher. (6) The scenes can be repeated as often as needed, giving learners the benefit of exact repetitions. (7) Cut up in two-to-three minute scenes, the whole movie works as a "soap opera" in that the learners are curious about what happens next. (8) The movie often provides a natural context for conversations to emerge among the students and teacher in class because students really want to know or share their opinions about the characters or events in the movie. The movie approach is very much in line with early communicative approaches in the use of input and authenticity (Abbs, Cook and Underwood 1980), in the focus on meaning and communication such as in the natural approach (Krashen and Terrell 1983), TPR (Asher 1965) and use of dialogues to develop strategic competence (Roberts 1986). Our view of language acquisition is very much in line with Krashen's views, but as we will point out, there are also some important differences: What current theory implies, quite simply, is that language acquisition, first or second, occurs when comprehension of real messages occurs, and when the acquirer is not "on the defensive"… Language acquisition does not require extensive use of conscious grammatical rules, and does not require tedious drill. It does not occur overnight, however. Real language acquisition develops slowly, and speaking skills emerge significantly later than listening skills, even when conditions are perfect. The best methods are therefore those that supply "comprehensible input" in low anxiety situations, containing messages that students really want to hear. These methods do not force early production in the second language, but allow students to produce when they are 'ready', recognizing that improvement comes from supplying communicative and comprehensible input, and not from forcing and correcting production. (Krashen 1982: 6–7). There are three main differences between Krashen's views and ours. The first difference is the recognition that language is not rule driven. Language is seen as an array of conventionalized patterns so if we see form as only the few grammar rules that can be explained then we miss most of the language. In our approach there is focus on form, but then defined as any form-meaning pair, and all given implicitly. The second difference is also inspired by a usage-based view: the main factor in language development is

frequency of exposure, so the goal is to revisit form-meaning pairs in different ways by engaging with the text in different ways.

REFERENCES:

[1] A.Brown, R.Ferrara, Diagnosing Zones of Proximal Development, In J. Wertsch(ed.) Culture, Communication and Cognition, Vygotskian Perspectives.Cambridge: CUP, 1985:273-305.

[2] H.Haywood , D.Tzuriel, Applications and challenges in dynamic assessment, Peabody Journal of Education, Vol.77 (2002)No.2,p.40-63 .

[3] L.Vygotsky, Mind in Society:The Development of Higher Psychological Processes (Harvard University Press，U.S.1978).

[4] J .Lantolf, M.Poehner, Dynamic assessment:Bringing the past into the future, Journal of Applied Linguistics.Vol.34 (2004)No.1,p.49-74.

[5] C.Lidz, Dynamic assessment (Learning potential testing, testing the limits), In R.Fernndez- Ballesteros(ed.). Encyclopedia of Psychological Assessment ,London :SAGE .2003,337-343.

[6] M.Budoff, Learning potential as a supplementary testing procedure, in Learning Disorders. Hellmuth (Ed.). J. Seattle, WA: Special Child, Vol. 3(1968) .

[7] J.Lantolf, M.Poehner, Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotskian praxis for L2 development, Language Teaching Research.Vol.15(2011) No.1, p.11-33.

[8] M.Swain, Examining dialogue: another approach to content specification and to validating inferences drawn from test scores, Language Testing. Vol.18(2001) No.2, p.275-302.

[9] P.Gibbons, Mediating language learning: teacher interactions with ESL students in a content-based classroom, TESOL Quarterly .Vol.37(2003) No.2, p.247-273.

[10] J.Lantolf, S.Thorne, Sociocultural Theory and the Genesis of Second Language Development (Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, China2012).dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2007.00636.x.

[11] Goldin-Meadow, S., Nusbaum, H., Kelly, S. D., & Wagner, S. (2001). Explaining math: Ges- turing lightens the load. Psychological Science, 12, 516–522. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ 1467-9280.00395.

[12]Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007). On the complementarity of Chaos/Complexity theory and dynamic systems theory in understanding the second language acquisition process. Bilingualism-Language and Cognition, 10, 35–37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/ S136672890600277X. Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008).

[13] Research methodology on language development from a complex systems perspective. Modern Language Journal, 92, 200–213. Li, W. (2013). When should a child start to learn English? The approaches to get interest- ed in a foreign language. Sanlian Life Weekly, 44, 46–82. Marwan, N. (2009).