JOURNAL OF EXERCISE PHYSIOLOGY
ISSN 1097-9751 SJIF Impact Factor 2022: 7,718 Date of Publication: 29-08-2022

LEARNING ENGLISH: HYPOTHESIS AND METHODS

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7095074

Gulkhayo Toshkhujaeva
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
Second year student , English faculty 2

Abstract: *Effective English language acquisition has been a topic of discussion for years. Similar difficulties arise for learners during the learning process. Learners must take into account the importance of establishing a happy and cozy environment. Therefore, it is unquestionably vital for English learners to use efficient learning tactics. This descriptive study serves two purposes: first, it introduces the classification and characterization of learning strategies used by students in the classroom, such as memory, cognitive, metacognitive, compensatory, social, and affective strategies. Second, it offers some questionnaire items based on the Strategy of Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) version 5.0 that can be used to assess the frequency of students' learning strategies in the learning process. The study's executive summary describes and examines the researchers' point of view about the relationship between learning outcomes and various learning tactics. Finally, employing effective learning techniques is undoubtedly advantageous for teachers and students to successfully meet the learning aim.*

Keywords: *ELLs, Language learning, learning strategies, language acquisition.*

Introduction

As stated by the passage of the Goals 2000: Educate American Act of 1994, schools all around the nation are now working to provide an acceptable and effective prospectus for every kid. In response to this issue, a number of professional organisations have called for curriculum change and created curriculum packages for all kids.

According to research, compared to their mainstream counterparts, CLD kids do poorly in academic areas, and many of them are at danger of failing out of school (Gonzales, Brusca-Vega, & Yawkey, 1997). Many children with CLD typically originate from lower-income homes with less-formal schooling.

As a result, these kids may lack the social and/or academic abilities necessary to succeed in school, and they are more likely to be identified as having a handicap (Gonzales et al., 1997). Identifying the most likely causes of CLD pupils' academic struggles is the first step in encouraging literacy in them. The next step is to apply this understanding to the instruction of ELLs in order to make the necessary adjustments. This article discusses how to adapt instruction to meet the academic needs of CLD students (with or without impairments) in inclusive classrooms. Additionally, an example lesson plan with specific recommendations and guidelines for changing instruction is provided.

Discussion

Teachers of content areas and scaffolding for English language learners

The incorporation of content into language instruction can provide learners with a real educational challenge by calling for higher-order thinking abilities, according to research on improving teaching of English language learners (ELLs).

The idea of scaffolding provides teachers with a practical way to integrate ELL education into subject-area instruction and to enable ELLs to demonstrate their understanding without relying solely on language.

Theoretical foundation

Scaffolding as practical knowledge for educators Shulman (1986, p. 9) defined teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) as the intersection of their subject-specific expertise and the strategies for presenting and preparing the material in a way that facilitates understanding by others. Scaffolding is a PCK educational component that also contributes to teachers' practical knowledge (TPK) of the teaching process.

According to Vygotsky (1978), "scaffolding" refers to the social interactions between experts and novices during which the former act in a supportive manner and create conditions that help novices acquire skills and information at an advanced competency stage. The concept of "scaffolding," however, has evolved from learning support and help at the interpersonal level to one that incorporates the use of a variety of tools, guides, and resources. Studies on the interpersonal level include those by Mohan and Beckett, Nassaji and Cumming, and Ulanoff and Pucci (2003).

Scaffolding research focused on interpersonal interactions also include peers and/or equal non-experts. Researchers contested the idea that peer connections would still make sense even in the absence of a high regular

grade (positive interdependence) to serve as motivation. Peer-to-peer scaffolding's flexibility and multidimensionality are related characteristics. For instance, Cumming-Potvin, Renshaw, and van Kraayenoord (2003) emphasize that scaffolding has been misrepresented as a one-dimensional method of providing and removing learning assistance for students. They disagree with a multi-tiered scaffolding concept where the boundaries between specialists and learners are ambiguous and interchangeable in the active interaction and interactions between group members (Cumming-Potvin et al, 2003).

Scholarly studies on "primary and secondary discourses" (Gee, 2000), "funds of knowledge" (Moll, 1994), and "culture responsive teaching" by Ladson-Billings from the early and middle 1990s are examples of cultural scaffolding (1994). According to this high opinion, current pedagogy struggles to connect students' experiences both inside and outside of the classroom so that they can form "an intellectual partnership" or at the very least be greatly aided by cultural artifacts in the form of tools and information resources" (Salomon & Perkins, 1998, p. 5) that are familiar to them both historically and culturally. According to Salomon and Perkins (1998), cultural scaffolding is a teaching strategy that includes managing "cultural instruments."

The authors provide information about how these tools range from information sources to widely used symbol systems that are rooted in ethnic and traditional cultures. The resources lay out the framework for action reform, learning systems, and what can be done with enough willpower (Salomon & Perkins, 1998, p. 5). This implies that, from the perspective of teaching, the employment of cultural meanings is essential in the dissemination of information, abilities, and attitudes. I believe that this pedagogical strategy will lead to "culturally responsive" instruction, in which students' culturally diverse backgrounds, knowledge bases, and experiences are channeled into more effective teaching methods.

The maintenance of conceptual and intellectual support in academic work as well as the usage of pupils' "first language at least through the primary school years" are academic and cognitive variables, on the other hand. p. 43; Thomas & Collier, 2002). The ability provided to kids to combine their past, present, and future experiences at home, in school, in their neighborhood, and in larger society are the last sociocultural variables (Thomas & Collier, 2002).

Theory of Humanistic Learning

ISSN 1097-9751 SJIF Impact Factor 2022: 7,718 Date of Publication: 29-08-2022

The humanistic approach in language education, according to Stevick (1980), is a strategy that emphasizes humanity as the key component of the instructional process. Stevick, a prominent proponent of the humanistic method, stressed that "in a language course, success rests more on what goes on within and among the individuals in the classroom than on materials, procedures, and linguistic analyses" (Stevick, 1980, p 61). The humanistic approach gave rise to the quiet way, suggestopedia, and community language learning, three well-known approaches. Gattengo (1972) popularized the silent method, in which the teacher remains mostly silent while the students are actively engaged in learning. The class is still firmly under the teacher's supervision, though.

The motivations of their pupils, such as the necessity for certain students to learn English in order to find job, are important for the humanistic teacher to understand. Others are merely curious and adventurous and want to learn. The first is known as "extrinsic motivation," and the second is known as "intrinsic motivation." Students that are intrinsically driven are more focused on their goals and frequently need to take exams and mastery tests. Students who are organically driven, however, find satisfaction in resolving language-related issues since the answer serves as its own reward. However, if students are studying English for a specific goal and delighting in the learning process, they can be both intrinsically and extrinsically driven.

The link between interactional skills and second language

In order to acquire a second language, interaction is thought to be crucial. While input is the outcome of this encounter, interaction is the discourse that the learner and his interlocutors produce (Ellis, 1994). Language learning is seen by interactionists as an acquisition that results from the interaction of the learner's mental resources and the linguistic environment. Ellis (1994) asserted that interaction is crucial for learning a second language. He identified input, production, and feedback as the three components of linguistic interaction. As opposed to feedback, which is the conversation partners' reactions to the learner's production, input refers to the language that native speakers and other students in the environment give to the learner. Production, or output, refers to the language that language learners themselves speak.

The student has to acquire the language while simultaneously communicating in order to learn in a natural environment, like that of a migrant in a foreign country. In this case, the second language is picked up through intermittent and ad hoc social engagement with the group he has

joined. The student uses the target language in his everyday interactions and communication in the foreign setting. The learner's task is to extract meaning from this data and decide on the norms for language usage from the sounds and context of the language, which are entrenched in a pertinent situational process. The interaction process aids in the individual's beginning of learning. His success in the communication process is afterwards aided by teaching.

Theory of Cognitive Learning

The ideas of Krashen and Cummins provide a look into the complexity of SLA as a cognitive task. Therefore, while creating an ESL teaching approach, the concepts of cognitive learning theory should be used. According to basic cognitive learning theory, the cognitive stage, which begins with an instructional or study phase, is the first step in the development of L2. Here, the learner progressively creates a mental image of the work specifications. The learner enhances and improves this representation throughout the second associative stage while continuing to consult with rules. Other students need assistance from outsiders in order to complete the work.

The independent stage is the third phase of learning. The task representation is improved at this level so that they can carry out the work autonomously and independently. According to cognitive learning theory, different learning tactics should include teaching, lots of practice, and feedback in order for pupils to go through these phases. When these requirements are accomplished, learners develop the necessary competency to operate independently in the learning environment.

Possible causes of CLD students' difficulties

A student who is ethnically and linguistically diverse must learn a second language and second culture, claim Baca and Cervantes (1998). Learning a second language is a challenging and gradual process that entails picking up new speaking, listening, and interactional strategies. There are linguistic, cognitive, social, and emotional exercises in this course. The acquisition of a second language and acculturation are thought to frequently result in stress-related behaviors in students, including memory loss, feelings of failure, and weariness (Baca & Cervantes, 1998).

Along with the difficulties of daily living, these mental side effects might occur, putting the CLD student at risk for poor academic achievement (Baca & Cervantes, 1998). Thus, educators must recognize the discrepancy between task stress and student competencies and then alter lesson plans

to meet their requirements. This gives educators a better understanding of how they educate (Echevarria et al., 2000).

Planning lessons

Teachers must carefully select the concepts to teach due to the variety of factors that affect CLD pupils' learning. Teachers can consider the needs of their other students as well as the requirements of CLD kids by using what is known as the Planning Pyramid (Schumm, Vaughn, & Leavell, 1994). Concepts may be picked and organized by teachers based on the various learning levels. The Planning Pyramid's core concept is the amount of learning, and it is based on the premise that all students are capable of learning, even if they do not learn all the material covered in a lesson. While all students have equal access to information, the information is arranged differently depending on the needs of each student (Schumm et al, 1994).

Without "watering down" the subject, teachers can use a variety of instructional tactics to differentiate their education (Boudah, Lenz, Bulgren, Schumaker, & Deshler, 2000). Contextualization is the process of teaching a new scientific subject by using the students' own experiences and prior knowledge (Boudah et al, 2000). Teachers can "group individualize" the process by setting up questions that encourage each student to consider his or her own personal experiences in relation to the subject or content to be learned (for example, "Think of a time when you or someone you know..." "What part of the earth are you from") and/or by giving all students access to shared experiences (for example, books, videos, and field trips) (Boudah et al, 2000).

Choosing instructional strategies

The instructor may employ thematic units (i.e., the planning and connection of teaching where each control/subject is interrelated) in evaluating the requirements of CLD pupils. By allowing CLD students to build on their previously acquired language and concepts, these modules enable the linguistic and cognitive demands of studying science in a second language to be met. In order to enhance academic learning, the instructor should also employ instructional conversations that combine the cultural and language resources of the pupils. Reviewing and activating students' prior knowledge is necessary (e.g., "What do you know about the world? "; "What region of the earth are you from? Tell me whether you live somewhere with trees," and this will help the teacher determine the extent of a student's prior knowledge (Echevarria et al., 2000). By connecting new material to students' existing knowledge, the instructor helps them to retain it. For instance, "If where we live, there are trees, weeds, flowers, and grass,

then we live on the earth's crust" (Echevarria & Graves, 1998). Education may be made more essential by employing theme units and activating prior knowledge because all pupils can remember pertinent information better than immaterial information (Echevarria et al, 2000).

To help students grasp concepts, teachers may also use culturally relevant analogies and examples. Analogies highlight the similarities between a novel notion and an established concept, making the novel concept more meaningful to the learner. Additionally, the teacher should step-by-step demonstrate systematic concepts and processing abilities. With various sorts of learners, some researchers have successfully employed modeling and "think aloud" strategies (Echevarria et al., 2000). For CLD children, cognitive modeling and expression are especially helpful because they make learning easier by outlining practical, step-by-step procedures that lessen the cognitive, verbal, and social demands of the activity (Echevarria & Graves, 1998).

Conclusion

Research findings on second-language acquisition, bilingual learning, special education, cognitive approach, and successful teaching are used to support a number of instructional techniques and adaptations that are recommended for teaching CLD kids. Additionally, many of the teaching strategies, modifications, and adaptations discussed in this article may benefit kids who have mild to moderate impairments. According to the research, straightforward instruction, cognitive strategies, expressions, practical exercises, visual organizers, theme units, and the development of background information have all been utilized successfully with students who have impairments (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2000).

Despite the fact that they might benefit from comparable strategies, teachers must be aware that the nature of their pupils' issues varies. The difficulties that children with disabilities have using language, processing, classifying, and retrieving information, as well as learning and implementing tactics, are addressed in many of these instructional strategies. By finding instructional techniques and resources that emphasize learning for all students, the most effective instructors are able to successfully incorporate students with disabilities and students from varied backgrounds (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2000).

REFERENCES:

1. Baca, L. M., & Cervantes, H. T. (1998). *The bilingual special education interface* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

2. Boudah, D. J., Lenz, B. K., Bulgren, J. A., Schumaker, J. B., & Deshler, D. D. (2000). Don't water down! Enhance content learning through the unit organizer routine. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 32(3), 48-56.

3. Cumming-Potvin, W., Renshaw, P., & van Kraayenoord, C. E. (2003). Scaffolding and bilingual shared readings experience: Promoting primary school students' learning and development. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 26(2), 54–68.

4. Echevarria, L., & Graves, A. (1998). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English-language learners with diverse abilities*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

5. Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. J. (2000). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP Model*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

6. Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc.

7. Gonzales, V, Brusca-Vega, R., & Yawkey, T. (1997). *Assessment and instruction of culturally and linguistically diverse students with or at-risk of learning problems: From research to practice*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

8. Krashen, S. (1985). *Input hypothesis: Issues and Implication*. New York: Longman

9. Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2000). *The inclusive classroom: Strategies for effective instruction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

10. Salomon, G., & Perkins, D. N. (1998). Individual and social aspects of learning. *Review of Research in Education*, 23, 1–24.

11. Schumm, J. C., Vaughn, S., & Leavell, A. G. (1994). Planning pyramid: A framework for planning for diverse students' needs during content area instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 47, 608-615.

12. Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: A conception of teacher knowledge. *American Educator*, 10(1) 9–15, 43–44.

13. Stevick, E. *Teaching Language: A Way and Ways* [M]. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House. 1980.

14. Thomas, W., Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, DC: Centre for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.