

# Personalized Learning In English Language Teaching: Theory, Implementation, And Challenges

Hojiyeva Maftuna Ulug‘bekovna

Independent Researcher (PhD candidate),

A. Avloniy National Institute of Pedagogical Mastery

Email: hojiyevamaftuna011@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

Personalized learning has gained prominence as a learner-centered approach that adapts goals, pathways, pacing, and supports to individual needs while sustaining high expectations. This article traces the historical development of personalized learning and examines its theoretical roots in John Dewey's learner-centered pragmatism, Lev Vygotsky's sociocultural theory and zone of proximal development, and Carl Rogers' humanistic, person-centered education. Building on these foundations, the paper explains why personalized learning is expanding in contemporary schooling: learner diversity, competency-oriented curricula, digital learning ecosystems, and renewed emphasis on agency and lifelong learning. The article then outlines practical methods for implementation in English language teaching, including differentiated instruction, mastery-based learning, blended and flipped models, station rotation, project-based learning, learning contracts, formative assessment cycles, and portfolio-based reflection. Finally, it synthesizes major pedagogical challenges that frequently appear during implementation—role transition for teachers, classroom management of multiple pathways, assessment alignment, equity and access, workload and time constraints, and responsible use of learning data—and proposes design principles to mitigate these risks.

Keywords: personalized learning; learner agency; English language teaching; Dewey; Vygotsky; Rogers; mastery learning; formative assessment; differentiated instruction.

## ANNOTATSIYA

Shaxsga yo‘naltirilgan ta’lim o‘quvchining ehtiyojlari, qiziqishlari, tayyorgarlik darajasi va o‘rganish sur’atini hisobga olgan holda ta’lim maqsadi, yo‘li va qo‘llab-quvvatlash mexanizmlarini moslashtirishga qaratilgan o‘quvchi markazli yondashuvdir. Ushbu maqola shaxsga yo‘naltirilgan ta’limning rivojlanish tarixini yoritib, uning nazariy ildizlarini J.Dewey (tajriba va ijtimoiy muloqot asosidagi ta’lim), L.Vigotskiy (sotsiokultural nazariya va yaqin rivojlanish zonasi), K.Rogers (insonparvar, shaxsga yo‘naltirilgan pedagogika) g‘oyalari orqali tahlil qiladi. Shuningdek, hozirgi ta’limda ushbu yondashuvning ommalashish sabablari (o‘quvchilar xilma-xilligi, kompetensiyaga yo‘naltirilgan o‘quv dasturlari, raqamli ta’lim muhiti, o‘quvchi faolligi va avtonomiysi) asoslanadi. Ingliz tili ta’limida amaliy joriy etish metodlari—farqlangan (differensial) o‘qitish, o‘zlashtirishga asoslangan ta’lim, aralash va “teskari sinf” modellari, stansiyalar bo‘yicha ishlash, loyiha asosida o‘qitish, o‘quv shartnomalari, jarayon davomida baholash va portfel—tavsiflanadi. Bundan tashqari maqolada shaxsga yo‘naltirilgan ta’limni joriy etishda uchraydigan pedagogik muammolar va ularni kamaytirish yo‘llari bayon etiladi.

## АННОТАЦИЯ

Персонализированное обучение рассматривается как ученико-центрированный подход, который адаптирует цели, траекторию, темп и поддержку к индивидуальным потребностям при сохранении высоких ожиданий. В статье прослеживается историческое развитие персонализированного обучения и анализируются его теоретические основания в идеях Дж. Дьюи (обучение через опыт и социальное взаимодействие), Л. Выготского (социокультурная теория и зона ближайшего развития) и К. Роджерса (гуманистическая, личностно-ориентированная педагогика). Показано, почему подход становится всё более востребованным в современном образовании: разнообразие учащихся, компетентностные программы, цифровые образовательные экосистемы, рост внимания к агентности и самостоятельности учащихся. Предложены практические методы реализации в преподавании английского языка (дифференциация, обучение на основе мастерства, смешанное и перевёрнутое обучение, ротация станций, проектное обучение, учебные контракты, формативное оценивание и портфолио). Обобщены типичные педагогические проблемы внедрения и предложены принципы их профилактики.

## Introduction

Personalized learning (PL) is widely discussed as schools seek to respond to learner diversity, improve engagement, and develop competencies required for the twenty-first century. Although PL is sometimes reduced to the use of educational software, it is more accurately understood as a pedagogical design orientation: learning goals, tasks, supports, and feedback are deliberately adapted to learners' needs while maintaining clear standards. In English language teaching (ELT), PL is particularly relevant because language classrooms typically include substantial differences in proficiency, exposure, motivation, and learning strategies. This article offers a conceptually grounded synthesis of PL: it traces historical development, explains key theoretical foundations, outlines implementable methods for ELT, and summarizes common pedagogical challenges that must be addressed for quality implementation (OECD, 2019; Murphy, Redding, & Twyman, 2016).

### Historical development of personalized learning

Elements of personalization have appeared in education under different labels, including individualized instruction, continuous progress education, adaptive instruction, and learner-centered pedagogy. Early approaches emphasized flexible progression and targeted support, especially when class structures allowed monitoring of individual progress. During the twentieth century, progressive education and humanistic psychology strengthened attention to the learner's experience, motivation, and agency. In the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, standards-based reform and accountability pressures expanded measurement of outcomes, while technology increased the feasibility of tracking progress and offering differentiated resources at scale. As a result, contemporary PL has evolved as an attempt to reconcile learner-centered design with rigorous expectations and systematic evidence of learning (Murphy, Redding, & Twyman, 2016; OECD, 2019).

Modern PL is also shaped by competency-based education, which emphasizes mastery of learning outcomes rather than time spent in a course. This view aligns with language learning research that highlights the need for repeated practice, feedback, and opportunities to use language meaningfully—conditions that often require flexibility in pacing and task selection. The historical trajectory suggests that PL is not a single method but a family of practices that gain coherence when grounded in clear theory and strong pedagogy (Bloom, 1968; Guskey, 2010).

### Theoretical foundations: Dewey, Vygotsky, and Rogers

#### John Dewey: learning through experience and interaction

John Dewey's pragmatist philosophy places experience at the center of education. For Dewey, learning is not passive reception of facts but active inquiry shaped by interaction with the environment and with other people. Learners construct meaning through purposeful activity, reflection, and problem-solving. In PL, Dewey's legacy is visible in the emphasis on authentic tasks, learner choice, and the idea that curriculum should connect to learners' interests and lived experiences. In ELT, Deweyan principles support communicative language teaching: learners develop proficiency by using language in meaningful contexts, collaborating, and reflecting on how communication can be improved (Dewey, 1916, 1938).

#### Lev Vygotsky: sociocultural learning and the zone of proximal development

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory explains learning as a socially mediated process. Development is supported through interaction with more capable peers or teachers, language as a cultural tool, and scaffolding that enables learners to accomplish tasks slightly beyond their independent ability. The zone of proximal development (ZPD) captures the instructional space where support is most productive. PL aligns with this framework when teachers diagnose learners' readiness, provide targeted scaffolds, and organize flexible grouping to match learners with appropriate support. In ELT, ZPD-informed PL can guide how teachers sequence tasks, differentiate prompts, and facilitate peer collaboration so that learners gradually internalize language structures and strategies (Vygotsky, 1978).

#### Carl Rogers: humanistic, person-centered education

Carl Rogers' humanistic theory emphasizes the whole person and the conditions that foster growth: psychological safety, empathy, authenticity, and respect. In education, a person-centered approach supports learner autonomy, self-direction, and intrinsic motivation. PL draws from Rogers by prioritizing meaningful learner voice, reflective goal-setting, and relationships that build trust. For language learning, such conditions

are critical: learners take communicative risks only when they feel safe from ridicule, and they persist when they see personal meaning in tasks. Rogers' perspective also clarifies that personalization is ethical as well as instructional; it should empower learners rather than label or track them in limiting ways (Rogers, 1969).

### **Why personalized learning is growing in contemporary education**

Several forces explain the growing popularity of PL. First, learner diversity has become more visible: classrooms increasingly include wide proficiency ranges, multilingual backgrounds, and varied access to learning opportunities outside school. PL promises a structured way to address these differences through differentiated pathways. Second, many systems have shifted toward competency-oriented curricula, emphasizing what learners can do with knowledge. PL aligns with this shift by emphasizing mastery, growth, and evidence of learning. Third, digital ecosystems have expanded access to resources and enable more frequent feedback, documentation of progress, and flexible learning routes. Fourth, research and policy discourse increasingly value learner agency, self-regulation, and lifelong learning—outcomes that PL explicitly targets (OECD, 2019; Horn & Staker, 2015).

At the same time, PL's popularity also reflects dissatisfaction with one-size-fits-all instruction and the limitations of purely test-driven improvement strategies. When PL is implemented thoughtfully, it can make instruction more responsive and can strengthen motivation by connecting learning to student goals and interests. However, popularity does not guarantee quality: PL requires strong pedagogy, careful assessment design, and realistic attention to constraints.

### **Implementing personalized learning in English language teaching**

In ELT, PL should be operationalized through practical routines rather than ambitious promises. A workable model integrates four design moves: diagnostic insight, differentiated learning tasks, feedback and reflection cycles, and coherent evidence of progress. Implementation does not require sophisticated technology; it requires clarity about outcomes and well-designed learning experiences (Murphy, Redding, & Twyman, 2016).

Differentiated instruction adapts content, process, and product according to learners' readiness, interests, and learning profiles. In ELT, teachers can differentiate reading texts by complexity, provide tiered writing prompts, offer choice boards for speaking topics, and adjust scaffolding (sentence starters, vocabulary banks, planning time). Flexible grouping allows targeted mini-lessons: for example, one group practices pronunciation contrasts, another develops inference skills in reading, and a third refines cohesion in writing (Tomlinson, 2014).

Mastery-based learning organizes progression around demonstrated competence. For ELT, this can be implemented through clear rubrics for speaking and writing, short formative checks, and opportunities for revision. Formative assessment cycles (task → feedback → revision → reflection) make learning visible and guide instructional decisions. This approach supports equity because learners are not penalized for needing more time; instead, they are supported until they reach the standard (Bloom, 1968; Guskey, 2010; Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

Blended learning combines face-to-face instruction with purposeful online components. In a flipped model, learners access input (video, reading, vocabulary previews) outside class and use class time for interaction, coaching, and performance. Station rotation structures class time into activity stations (reading, listening, vocabulary, writing, speaking) with differentiated tasks. These models can increase teacher time for small-group support and individualized conferencing (Horn & Staker, 2015).

Project-based learning (PBL) supports personalization by enabling choice, authentic communication, and integrated skill development. Learners can investigate locally relevant questions and present products such as posters, podcasts, presentations, or reports. Learning contracts clarify individualized goals, deadlines, and success criteria, strengthening self-regulation. Portfolios collect evidence over time—drafts, reflections, recordings—so learners and teachers can track growth and plan next steps (Murphy, Redding, & Twyman, 2016).

### **Pedagogical challenges in implementing personalized learning**

Schools often encounter predictable challenges when implementing PL. Recognizing these challenges early helps prevent superficial or inequitable personalization (Murphy, Redding, & Twyman, 2016).

PL requires teachers to shift from delivering uniform lessons to facilitating diverse learning pathways. This role shift demands strong skills in task design, facilitation, feedback, and assessment literacy. Without

sustained professional learning and collaborative planning time, teachers may experience overload or revert to traditional routines (Murphy, Redding, & Twyman, 2016).

Managing multiple activities and pacing within one classroom can be difficult, especially in large classes. Learners may progress at different speeds, creating challenges for noise control, monitoring, and maintaining a shared learning community. Clear routines, visible success criteria, timeboxing, and structured choice can improve coherence.

When external assessments emphasize narrow skills, teachers may struggle to preserve communicative, personalized tasks. PL can become “worksheet personalization” if assessment systems do not value performance tasks. A balanced approach requires aligning PL routines with standards while maintaining rich speaking and writing assessment (OECD, 2019).

Personalization can widen gaps if it depends on technology that some learners cannot access. It can also become inequitable if low-performing learners receive only remedial drills while others receive enriched tasks. Ethical PL requires transparent criteria, high expectations for all learners, and careful handling of learner data to protect privacy and dignity (Murphy, Redding, & Twyman, 2016).

PL can increase planning and feedback demands. Sustainable implementation requires reusable task banks, shared rubrics, peer feedback routines, and realistic pacing. Small starting steps—such as one personalized cycle per week—often produce better long-term results than rapid, large-scale adoption (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

## Conclusion

Personalized learning is most effective when treated as a coherent pedagogical approach grounded in learner-centered theory. Dewey, Vygotsky, and Rogers provide complementary foundations for PL: experiential inquiry and social interaction, scaffolded development within the ZPD, and person-centered relationships that support autonomy and motivation. In ELT, PL can be implemented through differentiated instruction, mastery-based progression, blended and station-rotation models, project-based learning, learning contracts, portfolios, and formative feedback cycles. Yet implementation is challenging; teacher role transitions, management of multiple pathways, assessment misalignment, equity risks, and workload constraints must be addressed through design discipline and professional learning. Future work should focus on context-sensitive models that preserve communicative language learning while enabling individualized growth (Dewey, 1916, 1938; Vygotsky, 1978; Rogers, 1969).

## REFERENCES

1. Benjamin S. Bloom (1968). *Learning for mastery*. *Evaluation Comment*, 1(2). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED053419.pdf> (files.eric.ed.gov)
2. John Dewey (1916). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: Macmillan. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/852/852-h/852-h.htm> (Project Gutenberg)
3. John Dewey (1938). *Experience and Education*. New York: Macmillan. [https://archive.org/download/experienceeducat00dewe\\_0/experienceeducat00dewe\\_0.pdf](https://archive.org/download/experienceeducat00dewe_0/experienceeducat00dewe_0.pdf) (Архив Интернета)
4. Thomas R. Guskey (2010). Lessons of mastery learning. *Educational Leadership*, 68(2), 52–57. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/lessons-of-mastery-learning> (files.eric.ed.gov)
5. John Hattie & Helen Timperley (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/003465430298487> (SAGE Journals)
6. Michael B. Horn & Heather Staker (2015). *Blended: Using Disruptive Innovation to Improve Schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Blended%3A%2BUsing%2BDisruptive%2BInnovation%2Bto%2BImprove%2BSchools-p-9781118955154> (wiley.com)
7. M. Murphy, S. Redding, & J. Twyman (2016). *Handbook on Personalized Learning for States, Districts, and Schools*. Center on Innovations in Learning. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED568173.pdf> (files.eric.ed.gov)
8. OECD (2019). *Future of Education and Skills 2030: OECD Learning Compass 2030*. OECD. <https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/> (files.eric.ed.gov)

9. J. F. Pane, E. D. Steiner, M. D. Baird, & L. S. Hamilton (2015). *Continued Progress: Promising Evidence on Personalized Learning*. RAND Corporation.  
[https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research\\_reports/RR1300/RR1365/RAND\\_RR1365.pdf](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR1300/RR1365/RAND_RR1365.pdf)
10. Carl R. Rogers (1969). *Freedom to Learn*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.  
<https://archive.org/details/freedomtolearnv000roge> (Архив Интернета)
11. Carol A. Tomlinson (2014). *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCD. <https://www.ascd.org/books/the-differentiated-classroom/files.eric.ed.gov>
12. Lev S. Vygotsky (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.  
<https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674576292/mind-in-society> (Архив Интернета)