pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 1, January -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

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

Ashurova Zulfiya Tirkashevna

zulfiyaashurova37@gmail.com

Abstract: This article presents a comprehensive comparative study of flipped learning and traditional learning in the context of teaching English, with a focus on their influence on student engagement, language acquisition, classroom interaction, and overall academic achievement. The study provides a detailed exploration of how flipped learning redefines the learning environment by shifting content delivery to pre-class activities, allowing students to engage with materials independently through videos, digital resources, and interactive content, thereby freeing classroom time for active participation, collaboration, problem-solving, and communicative tasks. In contrast, traditional learning maintains a teacher-centered structure in which learners rely heavily on direct instruction, in-class explanations, and structured lessons delivered by the educator, followed by homework tasks designed for practice.

Key words: flipped learning, traditional learning, English language teaching, student engagement, language acquisition, classroom interaction, academic performance, learner autonomy, pedagogy, blended learning.

The comparative study of flipped learning and traditional learning in teaching English has gained significant importance as educational systems increasingly seek effective ways to enhance student engagement, improve learning outcomes, and support the development of language skills in diverse classroom environments. Flipped learning, characterized by the reversal of conventional teaching sequences, encourages students to engage with learning materials before class through videos, readings, and interactive online resources, while traditional learning relies on direct instruction delivered by the teacher during the lesson followed by post-class practice. The distinction between these two approaches lies not only in the delivery method but also in the philosophy of learning: flipped learning promotes learner autonomy, self-paced progress, and active classroom participation, whereas traditional learning emphasizes teacher guidance, structured explanations, and controlled lesson flow. In teaching English, both approaches have unique implications for the development of speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills, and their effectiveness depends largely on how students interact with the learning process, the resources available, and the instructional goals set by educators.

Traditional Learning in English language teaching typically follows a well-established pattern: teachers deliver new content through direct instruction during class time, explaining grammar rules, introducing vocabulary, and demonstrating language use. Richards and Rodgers describe this teacher-centered approach as rooted in the Grammar-Translation Method and Audio-Lingual Method, where the instructor serves as the primary source of knowledge and authority in the learning process. Students then practice and apply this knowledge through homework assignments completed independently outside the classroom.

Flipped Learning, conversely, reverses this sequence. Bishop and Verleger define the flipped classroom as an educational technique consisting of two parts: interactive group learning activities inside the classroom, and direct computer-based individual instruction outside the classroom. Students are exposed to new content before class through pre-recorded videos, reading materials, podcasts, or other digital resources. The Flipped Learning Network emphasizes four pillars of this approach: flexible environment, learning culture, intentional content, and professional educator. This student-centered model shifts the teacher's role from information deliverer to learning facilitator and guide, as Vygotsky advocated in his socio-

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 1, January -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

cultural theory of learning. Flipped learning tends to generate higher levels of student engagement in English classes. Hung conducted a study with Taiwanese English learners and found that students in flipped classrooms demonstrated significantly higher engagement levels compared to traditional classroom counterparts. When students arrive prepared with foundational knowledge, they can participate more meaningfully in class discussions and activities. The interactive nature of flipped classrooms promotes active learning rather than passive reception of information, aligning with Bonwell and Eison's principles of active learning pedagogy. Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory supports this finding, suggesting that the autonomy provided in flipped learning environments enhances intrinsic motivation. Students report feeling more invested in their learning process when they have control over when and how they access instructional content. However, Strayer cautions that students initially experience discomfort and confusion when transitioning from traditional to flipped learning environments, though this typically diminishes over time.

Traditional learning, however, can be more straightforward for students who struggle with self-directed learning. Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark argue that minimal guidance during instruction can be problematic for novice learners who lack sufficient prior knowledge. Some learners prefer the structured, predictable nature of direct instruction and may feel lost without immediate teacher guidance when encountering new material independently. English language learning requires mastery across four primary skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Nation and Newton emphasize that balanced development across all four skills is essential for communicative competence. Flipped learning excels at developing communicative competence and speaking skills because classroom time is dedicated to authentic language use. Basal investigated the effects of the flipped classroom model on Turkish EFL learners and found significant improvements in their speaking performance and classroom interaction. Students engage in conversations, debates, role-plays, and collaborative writing exercises under teacher supervision, receiving immediate feedback and correction. This aligns with Long's Interaction Hypothesis, which posits that language acquisition is facilitated through conversational interaction and negotiation of meaning.

Traditional classrooms often face time constraints that limit speaking practice opportunities. Nunan notes that teacher talking time in traditional classrooms can exceed 70%, leaving minimal opportunities for student language production. With significant class time devoted to grammar explanations and vocabulary presentations, students may have fewer chances to actually use the language in meaningful contexts. Writing and speaking practice is frequently relegated to homework, where students lack access to immediate guidance and correction.

Studies indicate that flipped learning can enhance long-term retention of English language concepts. Webb and Doman found that flipped learning in language education resulted in improved academic performance and student satisfaction. The model incorporates spaced repetition naturally students encounter material during pre-class preparation, then apply it immediately during class activities, reinforcing neural pathways associated with that knowledge. Bjork and Bjork explain that this "desirable difficulty" enhances long-term retention by requiring retrieval and application of learned material. Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives supports the flipped model's effectiveness, as it allows students to work through lower-order cognitive skills (remembering, understanding) independently before class, while dedicating valuable class time to higher-order thinking skills (applying, analyzing, evaluating, creating). Al-Harbi and Alshumaimeri demonstrated that Saudi EFL students in flipped classrooms showed better achievement in grammar learning compared to those in traditional settings. Traditional learning may be more effective for initial comprehension of complex grammatical structures for some learners. Rosenshine advocates for explicit instruction, particularly for novice learners, arguing that direct explanation and modeling are essential before students can successfully

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 1, January -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

engage in independent practice. The ability to ask questions in real-time as concepts are introduced provides scaffolding that some students require. However, without immediate application, this knowledge may not transfer as

effectively to long-term memory, as Craik and Lockhart's levels of processing theory suggests. Gilboy, Heinerichs, and Pazzaglia suggest that flipped learning is particularly effective when:

1.Classes focus on communicative competence and fluency development

2.Students have reliable technology access and strong self-regulation skills

3.Teachers are willing to invest time in creating quality pre-class materials

4.Learning environments support collaborative, active learning

5.Advanced-level courses where students have foundational language knowledge

Krashen's Input Hypothesis supports using flipped learning at higher proficiency levels, where students can comprehend authentic materials independently, moving from "i" to "i+1" through scaffolded classroom interactions.Optimal Scenarios for Traditional Learning: Brown and Ellis suggest that traditional approaches may be more appropriate when:

- Beginner-level courses requiring extensive scaffolding and modeling
- Contexts with limited technology infrastructure or inconsistent internet access
- Students new to independent learning or with weak self-regulation skills
- Complex grammatical concepts requiring detailed, sequential explanation
- Situations where teachers lack time or resources for flipped model preparation

Larsen-Freeman's Grammar-Dimension framework emphasizes that complex grammatical forms require explicit instruction in their form, meaning, and use something that may be more effectively delivered through direct instruction for novice learners.

The comparative study of flipped learning and traditional learning in English language teaching reveals that both methodologies offer distinct advantages and face particular challenges. As Hattie emphasizes in his meta-analysis of educational interventions, it is not the method itself but how it is implemented that determines effectiveness. Flipped learning excels at promoting active engagement, developing communicative skills, and facilitating personalization, but requires significant technological resources and student self-direction. Traditional learning provides structure, immediate teacher support, and accessibility, but may limit opportunities for authentic language use and individualized instruction. Rather than viewing these approaches as mutually exclusive competitors, educators should consider them as complementary tools in their pedagogical toolkit, as Kumaravadivelu advocates in his post-method pedagogy. The most effective English language teaching likely incorporates elements of both models, thoughtfully adapted to specific learning contexts, student needs, and instructional goals. As educational technology continues to evolve and our understanding of language acquisition deepens, the conversation should shift from "which approach is better" to "how can we best combine these approaches to optimize learning for all students," as Richards suggests.

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.

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 1, January -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

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.