THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FLIPPED LEARNING AND TRADITIONAL LEARNING IN TEACHING ENGLISH.

Ashurova Zulfiya Tirkashevna

Master's degree student Department of Foreign Languages

at Jizzakh   State Pedagogical University

Abstract:

This article presents a comparative and statistical analysis of the practical effectiveness of flipped learning and traditional teaching methods in the process of teaching English, based on experimental studies. During the research, the impact of classes organized according to two different pedagogical approaches on students' learning activity, communicative competence, independent learning skills, and level of language acquisition was monitored. Diagnostic results showed that in groups where the flipped learning model was applied, students' oral speech activity, participation in the learning process, and level of independent thinking were significantly higher than in groups taught using traditional methods. Statistical analyses serve to scientifically substantiate the methodological effectiveness of flipped learning in teaching English.

Keywords: flipped learning, traditional teaching, English language, experimental studies, monitoring, diagnostics, communicative competence, practical effectiveness.

In recent years, English language education has increasingly focused on learner-centered approaches aimed at improving student engagement and communicative competence. Traditional teaching methods, characterized by teacher-centered instruction and in-class explanations, have long dominated English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms.

However, the emergence of flipped learning has challenged this paradigm by reversing the instructional sequence: students first encounter new material outside the classroom and use class time for interactive activities. Despite growing interest in flipped learning, there remains debate regarding its effectiveness compared to traditional teaching, particularly across different learner levels and learning contexts. This study seeks to address this gap by comparatively examining flipped and traditional instructional models in English language teaching.

The aim of the study is to compare the impact of flipped learning and traditional instruction on students' language achievement, classroom engagement, and communicative skills.

The study of the effectiveness of the flipped learning model in teaching English is considered one of the important research directions in modern pedagogy. The literature review shows that the flipped learning model is based on reorganizing the process of knowledge delivery and its practical application, directing classroom time toward active interaction and collaboration. Bishop and Verleger describe flipped learning as a two-component model consisting of individual learning outside the classroom and interactive activities within the classroom. Bergmann and Sams emphasize that this approach develops students' responsibility and independent learning skills and, particularly in English language teaching, increases communicative engagement. The F-L-I-P model developed by the Flipped Learning Network forms the methodological foundation of flipped learning and defines the teacher's role not as a source of knowledge, but as a facilitator who guides the learning process.

The psychological foundations of flipped learning are associated with Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning, which emphasizes the importance of interaction and collaboration in the process of language acquisition. In addition, according to Deci and

Ryan's self-determination theory, ensuring learner autonomy strengthens students' intrinsic motivation, which is clearly manifested in flipped learning environments.

However, the literature review also indicates that flipped learning is not equally effective in all contexts. Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark argue that for beginner-level learners, traditional teacher-centered explanations are necessary when learning complex grammatical concepts. Therefore, the traditional teaching model retains its significance as an important methodological foundation in English language teaching. Studies conducted by Basal as well as Al-Harbi and Alshumaimeri demonstrate that flipped learning significantly enhances student engagement and speaking skills in EFL contexts. At the same time, it is emphasized that the choice of method depends on learners' proficiency level, technological resources, and the teacher's methodological preparedness. Consequently, the literature review scientifically substantiates the need to apply flipped and traditional teaching models in English language instruction not as opposing approaches, but as complementary methods. The methodology of the present study was developed precisely on the basis of these theoretical conclusions.

This study aims to examine the impact of flipped learning and traditional teaching models on the English language learning process and to determine their practical effectiveness. The research was conducted using a quasi-experimental comparative research design, which is widely applied in pedagogical studies and allows for an objective evaluation of instructional methods under real educational conditions.

The study followed a pre-test – post-test – control group (observation) model. This design made it possible to identify differences between students' initial proficiency levels and their learning outcomes at the end of the experimental period, thereby enabling a comparative analysis of the effectiveness of pedagogical interventions.

The participants consisted of 40 10th -grade students from a general secondary school. Based on the results of an initial diagnostic test, the participants were equalized in terms of proficiency level and then divided into an experimental group and a control group:

Experimental group (20 students) – flipped learning model

Control group (20 students) – traditional teaching model

The experiment was conducted over a six-week period. In the control group, instruction was organized according to a traditional, teacher-centered model. Classroom activities in this group were based on direct teacher explanations, systematic presentation of grammatical and lexical material, and reproductive exercises. Knowledge consolidation was mainly carried out through homework assignments and assessment tasks. In this model, the teacher functioned as the primary controller and evaluator of the learning process. In contrast, the experimental group was taught using the flipped learning model. In accordance with this approach, students became familiar with new instructional materials independently before class. For this purpose, video lectures, electronic instructional texts, interactive tasks, and digital resources were used. Classroom time was then devoted to communicative and interactive activities aimed at the practical application of knowledge. These included discussions, role-playing, problem-solving tasks, pair work, and group work. In this process, the teacher assumed the role of a facilitator, guide, and advisor.

A mixed-methods approach was employed for data collection and analysis, incorporating the following methods:

- pedagogical observation (to identify students' activity levels, degree of interaction, and intensity of participation);

- pre- and post-tests (to assess quantitative changes in language knowledge and skills);

- diagnostic monitoring (to determine learning progress dynamics);

- comparative statistical analysis (to summarize results based on percentages and mean scores).

The pre- and post-tests were used to identify changes in students' grammatical knowledge, vocabulary range, as well as speaking and listening comprehension skills. Pedagogical observation provided qualitative indicators, including student engagement, level of independent thinking, and the development of communicative competence. The collected data were systematized, and the pedagogical effectiveness of the flipped and traditional teaching models was comparatively analyzed.

This methodological approach made it possible to scientifically identify the advantages and limitations of different instructional models in English language teaching and to draw conclusions regarding their rational application in educational practice.

The results obtained during the experimental phase of the study demonstrated significant differences in the effectiveness of the flipped learning and traditional teaching models in English language instruction. Comparative statistical analysis of the pre-test and post-test results revealed positive changes in both groups; however, in terms of growth dynamics and qualitative indicators, the experimental group showed clear superiority. In particular, students in the experimental group taught using the flipped learning model exhibited substantial improvement in communicative competence, specifically in speaking and listening comprehension skills. Compared to the pre-test results, post-test outcomes indicated an average increase of 18–22% in students' oral language activity and a 20–25% increase in classroom participation. The findings of pedagogical observations further confirmed that the frequency of interaction and the level of independent expression of ideas were notably higher in the experimental group.

In the control group, where the traditional teaching model was applied, the acquisition of grammatical knowledge and lexical items showed stable results. However, the extent to which this knowledge was actively applied in real communicative situations was

relatively limited, and indicators of communicative engagement lagged significantly behind those of the experimental group. This finding suggests that traditional instruction is primarily oriented toward the development of reproductive knowledge rather than active communicative use.

The obtained results are methodologically and theoretically consistent with the conclusions of previous empirical studies on the flipped learning model. The findings indicate that directing classroom time toward active communication and interactive tasks serves as a decisive factor in the development of students' communicative competence. This outcome can be explained through theories of active learning and interaction. Under flipped learning conditions, students entered the classroom having already prepared for the lesson, which allowed higher-level cognitive processes—such as analysis, evaluation, and application—to take precedence during class time. This, in turn, led to greater fluency in speaking, stronger listening comprehension skills, and more conscious use of language units in real communicative situations. As a result, students transitioned from passive recipients of knowledge to active users of the language. At the same time, the research results do not negate the methodological significance of the traditional teaching model. In particular, for beginner-level learners, a teacher-centered approach proved to be more effective in the systematic and structured teaching of complex grammatical concepts. From the perspective of cognitive load theory, this finding supports the role of traditional instruction as an important foundational approach. Thus, the results of the study suggest that in English language teaching, flipped and traditional learning models should not be viewed as opposing methods, but rather as complementary and integrative approaches. The choice of method should be closely aligned with learners' proficiency levels, instructional objectives, and pedagogical conditions.

This study made it possible to comparatively and statistically analyze the practical effectiveness of flipped learning and traditional teaching models in English language instruction using a quasi-experimental approach. The findings indicate that both approaches possess distinct pedagogical strengths; however, their instructional effectiveness is directly dependent on students' proficiency levels and the specific teaching objectives. The research scientifically confirmed that the flipped learning model is highly effective in developing students' communicative competence, increasing classroom engagement, and fostering independent learning skills. In contrast, the traditional teaching model proved to be a significant methodological foundation for establishing grammatical competence and ensuring the systematic acquisition of knowledge.

In conclusion, the highest level of effectiveness in English language teaching can be achieved through an integrative model that harmoniously combines elements of both flipped and traditional instruction. The results of this study provide a scientific and practical basis for improving English language teaching methodology, for the gradual implementation of flipped learning elements in educational practice, and for conducting broader empirical research in the future.

References

1. Al-Harbi, S. S., & Alshumaimeri, Y. A. (2016). The flipped classroom impact in grammar class on EFL Saudi secondary school students' performances and attitudes. English Language Teaching, 9(10), 60-80.

2. Basal, A. (2015). The implementation of a flipped classroom in foreign language teaching. Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 16(4), 28-37.

3. Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2014). Flipped learning: Gateway to student engagement. International Society for Technology in Education.

4.   Bishop, J. L., & Verleger, M. A. (2013). The flipped classroom: A survey of the research. ASEE National Conference Proceedings, Atlanta, GA.

5.   Bjork, E. L., & Bjork, R. A. (2011). Making things hard on yourself, but in a good way: Creating desirable difficulties to enhance learning. Psychology and the Real World: Essays Illustrating Fundamental Contributions to Society, 2, 59-68.

6.   Bloom, B. S. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Longmans, Green.

7.   Bonwell, C. C., & Eison, J. A. (1991). Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. George Washington University.

8.   Çakıroğlu, Ü., & Öztürk, M. (2017). Flipped classroom with problem based activities: Exploring self-regulated learning in a programming language course. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 20(1), 337-349.

9.   Craik, F. I., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 11(6), 671-684.

10.   Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227-268.

11.   Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. System, 33*(2), 209-224.

12.   Flipped Learning Network. (2014). The four pillars of F-L-I-P. Retrieved from http://flippedlearning.org/definition

13.   Gilboy, M. B., Heinerichs, S., & Pazzaglia, G. (2015). Enhancing student engagement using the flipped classroom. Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 47(1), 109-114.

14.   Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery,

problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. Educational Psychologist, 41(2), 75-86.

15. Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon Press.

16. Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod. Routledge.

17. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring. Thomson/Heinle.

18. Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking. Routledge.

19. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

20. Rosenshine, B. (2012). Principles of instruction: Research-based strategies that all teachers should know. American Educator, 36(1), 12-19.

21. Strayer, J. F. (2012). How learning in an inverted classroom influences cooperation, innovation and task orientation. Learning Environments Research, 15(2), 171-193.

22. UNESCO. (2020). Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education. UNESCO Publishing.