

THE ROLE OF AFFECTIVE DOMAIN IN LEARNING ENGLISH AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL

Aravelly Aruna

M. A. (English), B. Ed, Lecturer in Leele College, Hyderabad.

ABSTRACT

English has become the de facto global standard language. Learning English language has become popular for business, commerce and cultural reasons and especially for internet communications throughout the world. The above paper explores the role of affective domain in learning English. The importance of the ability to speak or write English has recently increased significantly because English has become the de facto global standard language. Learning English language has become popular for business, commerce and cultural reasons and especially for internet communications throughout the world. Its functioning started in English language through affective domain. It is the basic punctuality of the learners training is increase through different activities in the secondary level.

Keywords: *Affective domain, Learning and English language.*

1. Introduction

Learning English has become a necessity for an individual's full development in today's complex society. Technological advances and the growing importance of the means of communication make it necessary for people to adapt to the new situations that are arising out of social change. Studies of the affective dimension in English are for a long time limited to investigating attitudes. In the last decades, however, the scope has broadened to include the study of beliefs and emotional reactions (McLeod, 1994). This new focus, led in great part by the work of McLeod (1988, 1992, 1994), has shown that affective questions not only play an essential role in the process of English teaching and learning, but that some of them are strongly ingrained and not easy to shift by instruction. We find that many pupils generate negative attitudes towards English in the course of their academic life, and on occasions present an authentic aversion to the discipline. For most pupils the subject is not a source of satisfaction, but rather one of frustration, discouragement, and anxiety. Many of them, even some of the most able, find English to be just a tiresome chore. It is thus necessary to understand and analyze how pupils, in learning English and interacting with their environment, interiorize certain beliefs and negative or positive valuations of the subject and of themselves which will lead to success or failure in attaining English goals. Indeed, many students, thinking that "they are not cut out for English" end up by rejecting the subject, which they consider a sort of "millstone" that they have to get rid of soon as they can by choosing the options offered them in intermediate or bachelor courses that involve little or no English.

In this sense, I believe that the high indices of academic failure in the area of English demand the study of the influence of affective and emotional factors on English learning. Such factors could well explain the anxiety pupils feel when faced with a problem to solve, their sensations of unease, of frustration, of insecurity, the low level of self-esteem that they experience, etc., which often prevent them from efficaciously and successfully tackling English tasks.

2. Importance of English Language

English Language Learners (ELLs) are a large and growing population in our country and physical education is in a unique position to help as it has characteristics that are supportive of these students, with conditions similar to those in which children acquire their first language (Clancy, M. & Hruska, B., 2005). These characteristics include:

Learning and Teaching Resources and Methodology In contexts with few resources, financial constraints, and a lack of infrastructure, the delivery of language programs and material promoted as “solutions” by major international publishing companies can be problematic. In addition, methodologies are filtered down through aid programs, nongovernmental organizations, and other state and nonstate sponsored agencies, advocating pedagogies and methods that are largely theorized and developed in the West and then exported without considering whether these pedagogies are appropriate or effective in other contexts. The development of language programs based on learning and teaching methodologies imported from developed countries is, therefore, an inadequate solution with which to equip teachers who face a variety of unique context-specific issues in their classrooms. The communicative approach, which has been marketed extensively throughout the world, is an example. The use of the communicative approach has been questioned for some time because it has “a sort of naive ethnocentricism prompted by the thought that what is good for Europe or the USA had to be good for KwaZulu” (Chick, 1996, p. 22). When faced with a variety of methodologies and material imported from Western contexts and promoted by international organizations, educational institutions and consultants, the local experts, policymakers, researchers, and teachers within these contexts must determine what is and is not suitable for use within their particular contexts and classrooms. In many cases, policies developed based on Western theories do not produce the desired effect because the teachers in these contexts do not see the relevance of the ideas and usually either reject them or adjust them to suit the needs of their classrooms. As Canagarajah (1999) and P. Martin (2005) demonstrate, effective teachers adjust practices that are handed down to them through policy and curriculum to serve the needs of their students. Other teachers who may not have appropriate expertise, training, time, or resources, might reject and ignore the policies and materials altogether. When such failures happen, experts and policymakers often jump to the conclusion that the local teachers or their students are lazy or no receptive, instead of reflecting on the nature of the material or the policymaking processes. As pointed out earlier, it is important to give teachers access to practices, through training and ongoing teacher development, that enable their students to achieve better proficiency rather than to focus on promoting a particular method (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). To ensure that policy is informed by effective practices, the knowledge teacher’s gain through their classroom experiences needs to be understood, theorized, and presented to policymakers so that decision making is based on evidence of local practices and to give teachers a stake and voice in the policymaking process.

3. Language Testing and Evaluation

In addition to identifying practices that are more suited to the local classrooms, it is also important to ensure that the goals of language programs are assessed through monitoring and evaluation of classroom practices and student achievement. The monitoring and evaluation of language proficiency within the classroom must be carefully aligned with the

4. The Proficiency Level Descriptors

(PLDs) provide an overview of the stages of English language development through which English learners (ELs) are expected to progress as they gain increasing proficiency in English as a new language. The PLDs depict student knowledge, skills, and abilities across a continuum, identifying what ELs know and can do at early stages and upon exit from each of three proficiency levels: Emerging, Expanding, and Bridging.¹ These descriptors are intended to be used as a guide for teachers and curriculum developers to provide ELs with targeted instruction in English language development as well as differentiated instruction in academic content areas. It is important to note that while the PLDs describe an aligned set of knowledge, skills, and abilities at each proficiency level that reflect a linear progression across the levels, this is done for purposes of presentation and understanding. Actual second language acquisition does not necessarily occur in a linear fashion within or across proficiency levels. An EL, at any given point along his or her trajectory of English learning, may exhibit some abilities (e.g., speaking skills) at a higher proficiency level, while at the same time exhibiting other abilities (e.g., writing skills) at a lower proficiency level. Additionally, a student may successfully perform a particular skill at a lower proficiency level (such as reading and analyzing an informational text) and, at the next higher proficiency level, need review in the same reading and analysis skills when presented with a new or more complex type of informational text. Thus, while a student may be identified—based on state assessment results and other state and local criteria—as being eligible for English language services appropriate to a particular proficiency level, the student’s actual abilities may vary by language domain (e.g., listening, speaking, reading, and writing). For the same reason, a proficiency level does not

identify a student (e.g., “Emerging student”), but rather identifies what a student knows and can do at a particular stage of English language development—for example, “a student at the Emerging level” or “a student whose listening comprehension ability is at the Emerging level.”

It describe the knowledge, skills, and abilities that students who are learning English as a new language are expected to exhibit upon exit from each proficiency level, with the highest level, Bridging, corresponding with the English language is a Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects (CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy). These exit descriptors signal high expectations for ELs to progress through all levels and to attain the academic English necessary to access and engage with grade-level content in all subject areas. Note also that the PLDs include specifications at “early stages” and upon “exit” for each of the three levels, providing valuable information that can be used for determining meaningful performance level distinctions based on assessment results.

Organization of the Proficiency Level Descriptors The organization of the PLDs represents English language development as a continuum of increasing proficiency in language learning and use, starting with native language competencies that students possess when they enter school, and concluding (though not ending) with lifelong language learning that all language users engage in.³ The three levels represent the stages of English language development, describing expectations for how well students can understand and use the English language at each level as they continue to build on existing language skills and knowledge.

Emerging: Students at this level typically progress very quickly, learning to use English for immediate needs as well as beginning to understand and use academic vocabulary and other features of academic language.

Expanding: Students at this level are challenged to increase their English skills in more contexts and learn a greater variety of vocabulary and linguistic structures, applying their growing language skills in more sophisticated ways that are appropriate to their age and grade level.

Bridging: Students at this level continue to learn and apply a range of high-level English language skills in a wide variety of contexts, including comprehension and production of highly technical texts. The “bridge” alluded to is the transition to full engagement in grade-level academic tasks and activities in a variety of content areas without the need for specialized ELD instruction. However, ELs at all levels of English language proficiency fully participate in grade-level tasks in all content areas with varying degrees of scaffolding in order to develop both content knowledge and English.

The PLDs emphasize that ELs at all proficiency levels are capable of high-level thinking and can engage in complex, cognitively demanding social and academic activities requiring language, as long as they are provided appropriate linguistic support. The extent of support needed varies depending on the familiarity and complexity of the task and topic, as well as on the student’s English language proficiency level. Within the PLDs, three general levels of support are identified: Substantial, Moderate, and Light. The descriptors for these general levels of support are intended to signal the extent of linguistic scaffolding most likely needed for appropriately implementing the CA ELD Standards at each proficiency level; however, the descriptors are not intended to explain how to provide support or differentiate instruction for ELs at each level.

Each PLD includes the following:

5. Overall Proficiency

A general descriptor of ELs’ abilities at entry to, progress through, and exit from the level

6. Early Stages

Descriptors of abilities in English language that ELs have at the early stages of the level

7. Exit Stages

Descriptors of abilities in English language students have at exit from the level

The descriptors for early and exit stages of each proficiency level are detailed across three modes of communication:

A. Collaborative: Engagement in dialogue with others

B. Interpretive: Comprehension and analysis of written and spoken texts

C. Productive: Creation of oral presentations and written texts

Two dimensions of knowledge of language are described:

Metalinguistic Awareness

The extent of language awareness and self-monitoring that students have at the level

Accuracy of Production

The extent of accuracy in production ELs can be expected to exhibit at the level; ELs increase in accuracy of linguistic production as they develop proficiency in English. Accuracy may vary within a level depending on context, such as extent of cognitive demand or familiarity of a task.

References

1. Patel, R.S. (2010.) Fundamental Concepts of Teacher. Ahmedabad: Jay Publication.
2. Prakash, R. (Editor) (2006). Teaching in primary schools. New Delhi: alfa publication.
3. Sharma, V (1950). Bachchon ki siksha. Banaras: nandkishor & bros.,
4. Uchat, D. A. (2009) Research Methodology in Education and Social science. Rajkot: publication
5. Zimmerman, C.B. (2007). Vocabulary learning methods. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
6. Zwiers .J. (2008). Building academic language. Newark International Reading Association.
7. Enhancing Content Literacy in Physical Education. Buell, C., & Whittaker, A. (2001).
8. Developing Language Objectives for English Language Learners in Physical Education Lessons. Clancy, M. & Hruska, B. (2005).
9. Teaching Secondary Physical Education to ESL Students. Glakas, B. A. (1993).
10. Instructional Models and Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners. Center on Instruction. Moughamian et al. (2009).
11. English Language Learners: A Policy Research Brief produced by the National Council of Teachers of English. NCTE. (2008).
12. Effective Instruction for English-Language Learners. Protheroe, N. (2011).