# The Impact Of Action- Oriented Approach On Teaching English To Students With Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties[*]

## Şeyda SARI YILDIRIM[1]  İsmail Hakkı MİRİCİ[2]

[1]Asst. Prof. Dr., NEU University, School of Foreign Languages, Konya, Türkiye
seydasari@hotmail.co.uk (Sorumlu Yazar/Corresponding Author)
[2]Prof. Dr., Hacettepe University, Educatın Faculty, Ankara, Türkiye hakkimirici@gmail.com

| Article Info | ABSTRACT |
|---|---|

Students with mild specific language learning difficulties encounter numerous challenges when acquiring the English language, and require a significantly longer period of time to attain independent language proficiency compared to their non-disabled counterparts. The objective of this investigation is to analyze the impacts of implementing An Action-Oriented Approach in the instruction of English language to secondary school students who exhibit Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. In order to accomplish this objective, a training program utilizing the Action Oriented Approach was administered to a cohort of 15 students who exhibit Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties, as developed by a team of experts. The study employed quantitative data collection instruments, namely Unit-based Achievement Tests for four units and Classroom Observation Forms administered to students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties both prior to and following the training programme. The quantitative data were subjected to analysis using the SPSS 21 statistical software and R Program version 3.2.5. The findings of the study suggest that individuals with mild speech and language learning difficulties exhibit a delay in their learning progress. Nevertheless, employing suitable pedagogical approaches and methodologies can enable students with mild speech and language learning difficulties to achieve a level of learning commensurate with that of their peers. The results of Unit-based Achievement Tests indicate that students with Multiple Severe Learning and Language Disabilities (MSLLD) may exhibit greater progress in their academic development compared to their typically developing peers. Finally, the research findings suggest that the Action Oriented Approach is advantageous in instructing English language skills to students who experience minor challenges in learning the language.

## Eylem Odaklı Yaklaşımın Hafif Düzey Özel Dil Öğrenme Güçlüğü Olan Öğrencilere İngilizce Öğretimine Etkisi

| Makale Bilgileri | ÖZ |
|---|---|

Hafif düzeyde özel dil öğrenme güçlüğü çeken öğrenciler, İngilizce dil edinimi süresince çok sayıda zorlukla karşılaşmaktadırlar ve engelli olmayan akranlarına kıyasla bağımsız dil yeterliliği elde etmek için önemli ölçüde daha uzun bir süreye ihtiyaç duymaktadırlar. Bu araştırmanın amacı, Hafif düzeyde Özel Dil Öğrenme Güçlüklerine sahip ortaokul öğrencilerine İngilizce öğretiminde Eylem Odaklı Bir Yaklaşım uygulamanın etkilerini analiz etmektir. Bu amaca ulaşmak için, uzmanlardan oluşan bir ekip tarafından geliştirilen Hafif Özel Dil Öğrenme Güçlüğüne sahip 15 kişilik bir öğrenci grubuna Eylem Odaklı Yaklaşımdan yararlanan bir eğitim programı uygulanmıştır. Araştırmada nicel veri toplama araçları olan dört ünite için Ünite Tabanlı Başarı Testleri ve Hafif Özel Dil Öğrenme Güçlüğü olan öğrencilere eğitim programı öncesinde ve sonrasında uygulanan Sınıf Gözlem Formları kullanılmıştır. Nicel veriler, SPSS 21 istatistik yazılımı ve R Programı versiyon 3.2.5 kullanılarak analize tabi tutulmuştur. Çalışmanın bulguları, hafif düzeyde konuşma ve dil öğrenme güçlüğü çeken bireylerin öğrenme ve edinme süreçlerinde gecikme sergilediğini göstermektedir. Bununla birlikte, uygun pedagojik yaklaşımlar ve metodolojiler kullanmak, hafif düzeyde konuşma ve dil öğrenme güçlüğü çeken öğrencilerin akranlarıyla orantılı bir öğrenme düzeyine ulaşmalarını sağlayabilmektedir. Ünite Tabanlı Başarı Testlerinin sonuçları, Çoklu İleri Seviye Öğrenme ve Dil Yetersizliği (MSLLD) olan öğrencilerin, normal gelişim gösteren akranlarına kıyasla akademik gelişimlerinde daha fazla ilerleme gösterebileceğini göstermektedir. Son olarak, araştırma bulguları, Eylem Odaklı Yaklaşımın, dili öğrenmede hafif düzeyde güçlük yaşayan öğrencilere İngilizce dil becerilerini öğretmede avantajlı olduğunu göstermektedir.

**\*** This study was prepared from the thesis titles as' The Effects of Action-Oriented Approach on teaching English to students with 'Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties' Hacettepe University,2020.

**INTRODUCTION**

Knowledge and development of language mechanisms are required for intercultural communication and the formulation of authentic linguistic images of the world. It is indisputable that the significance of acquiring a foreign language has increased in tandem with global social, cultural, and technological transformations (Atay, Kurt, Camlibel..etc, 2009). Turkiye aspires to teach every student a foreign language, like the rest of Europe. According to Eurydice (2017), English has progressively supplanted other languages on nearly all levels over time. Turkiye now teaches the first foreign language from the second year of compulsory school (TEPAV Project Team, 2013). In Turkiye, as in other European countries, the most widespread method to learn a foreign language is by taking lessons at school (Eurydice, 2012c). However; not all students are still able to learn foreign language as at the same speed with their peers. That is why the term 'language learning difficulties'has been mentioned widely in studies in recent years. Without borders, "learning difficulties" is universally and generally defined. The definition and application of this term continue to be contentious. According to Westwood (2008), students who do not learn quickly, are less strategic, acquire less knowledge, and struggle to correlate tasks but do not have specific language learning difficulties are unable to transfer their learning strategies.

This lack of transmission may be due to these students' low levels of motivation, as suggested by Vianin (2011). Language acquisition is an ongoing process for all students. In addition, NCCA (2019) states that almost all students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (henceforth MSLLD) have delayed oral language development, and some may also exhibit distinct patterns in oral language development. Although the Secondary School Curriculum states that "the child comes to school with considerable foreign language verbal facility" (English Curriculum, 2013, as cited in NCCA, Communication and Language, 2019), this cannot be assumed to be the case for all students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. As NCCA (2019) reiterates, it is crucial to identify the specific communicative or oral challenges that students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties encounter when learning a foreign language at a young age due to the interconnectedness of oral language and literacy.

In addition, NCCA (2019) states that almost all students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (henceforth MSLLD) have delayed oral language development, and some may also exhibit distinct patterns in oral language development. Although the Secondary School Curriculum states that "the child comes to school with considerable foreign language verbal facility" (English Curriculum, 2013, as cited in NCCA, Communication and Language, 2019), this cannot be assumed to be the case for all students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. As NCCA (2019) reiterates, it is crucial to identify the specific communicative or oral challenges that students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties encounter when learning a foreign language at a young age due to the interconnectedness of oral language and literacy. For pupils with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties, the acquisition of literature becomes the primary concern. It is crucial to take into account the needs of students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties and adapt the secondary school curriculum to meet those needs, while ensuring that no student is left behind in terms of the curriculum's main goals, comprehensive objectives, and content.

Due to the numerous challenges faced by students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties, researchers have conducted studies with the aid of the aforementioned theories to identify appropriate teaching strategies for incorporating these students into the language learning process. The most inclusive technique or method for the learning process is presumed to be the most recent methods for Communicative Language Learning or Teaching. To be consistent with the 'Common European Framework' as a 'Action- Oriented Approach', however, all authorities involved in the instruction of students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties should adopt alternative methods or approaches. According to Wernicke (2014), the significance of transitioning from communicative to action-oriented language teaching entails creating concrete, meaningful, and relevant situations for students and imagining the L2 classroom as a social, collaborative, action-oriented linguistic environment. This is a relatively new approach that should be incorporated into the learning-teaching

process.

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

According to NCCA (2007), language enables the participation and contribution of individuals within the family, social life, and subsequently the perpetually expanding network of connections and cultural familiarities. These experiences generate a strong sense of belonging and improve the general well-being of the participants. There are no studies on the effects of Action-Oriented Approach on teaching English to students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties, despite the fact that there are numerous studies comparing Action-Oriented Approach to other methods and attempting to identify Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. Corresponding to all of these studies, the present study aimed to encourage learners to take action and deepen their understanding of their learning process, as well as investigate whether Action Oriented Approach is an effective method for teaching English as a foreign language in EFL classrooms to secondary school students with mild specific language learning difficulties.

## AIM AND SIGNIFICANCE

As per the report published by The Ministry of National Education (MONE), General Directorate of Special Education Guidance and Counselling Services (2014), it has been observed that a notable 5% (8871) of students in Turkey exhibit Learning Difficulties. Among this cohort, a significant proportion of 3.15% is attributed to Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. Henceforth, it behooves researchers, educators, family, supervisors, and other stakeholders to accord due consideration to these pupils by employing a diverse array of pedagogical methodologies, techniques, and approaches. The impetus for this investigation arises from the imperative to discern issues in the pedagogy of foreign languages, to address novel methodologies, and to enhance communicative proficiency for pupils with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. Given the lack of empirical research on the efficacy of the Action-Oriented Approach in the context of students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties, the present study aims to examine the potential impact of this approach on the acquisition of English as a foreign language among said student population.

## METHODOLOGY

### Setting and Participants

For the first step, fifteen educators who were actively instructing secondary school pupils with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties were chosen through a method known as Purposeful sampling, also referred to as judgement or purposive sampling, for the purpose of examining the Settings and Participants. Upon determining the parameters of the study, the researcher proceeds to identify suitable subjects in accordance with the methodology outlined by Bernard (2000). The selection of cases, encompassing individuals, institutions, cultures, and situations, is a crucial aspect of research as they offer practical insights into the phenomenon being studied, rather than relying solely on generalisations derived from empirical analysis of a sample population (Patton, 2002). In this study, semi-structured interviews were employed to elicit information from participants regarding the challenges encountered by their students in inclusive classrooms during the teaching and learning process.

In the subsequent phase of the investigation, a cohort of 30 pupils at the secondary level who exhibit Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties and are currently enrolled in the second grade were carefully chosen. In this study, a cohort of 30 students was divided into two groups. The experimental group, comprising 50% of the cohort, was subjected to an Action-Oriented Approach, while the remaining students were designated as the control group and continued their education as per standard protocol, with the caveat that their attendance was monitored throughout the study period.

In the third phase of this study, Unit-based Achievement tests comprising of 12 questions pertaining to each unit were administered to a cohort of 15 students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties and an equivalent number of typically developing students. These tests were developed and presented by The Ministry of National Education and served as pre and post assessments to ascertain the

efficacy of pedagogical interventions implemented through an Action Oriented Approach. The students continued their regular coursework alongside their peers.

In the final phase of the investigation, a Pre-Classroom Observation Form (Bratton, 2015) and a Post-Classroom Observation Form (Bratton, 2015) were administered to a cohort of 15 students who exhibit Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties and are currently enrolled in educational institutions, receiving supplementary educational assistance. The objective of this exercise was to discern any discernible disparities between the pre and post outcomes of the Classroom Observation forms.

### Data Collection

Regarding the data acquisition process of the study, the researcher devised a plan to construct and refine a semi-structured interview protocol for the educators subsequent to the completion of a comprehensive review of the relevant literature. The participants were subjected to interview forms, which were meticulously transcribed subsequent to the completion of the interviewing procedure. Subsequent to the culmination of the transcription procedure, a meticulous examination of the interview documents was conducted, employing the method of content analysis. Following a thorough examination of the participants' interviews, a series of Unit Based Achievement Tests, devised by the Ministry of National Education, were administered to two groups of students. The first group consisted of 15 individuals with mild specific language learning difficulties, while the second group comprised 15 students who were receiving English language education in regular classes alongside their peers. It is worth noting that achievement tests are highly pertinent to language teachers and are therefore frequently employed in language teaching and learning programmes. Intermittently, it assumes a pivotal role in the assessment of students' academic progress within the curriculum, and the outcomes thereof are likely to exert an influence on their drive to pursue further knowledge acquisition.

In light of the curriculum development process, it is worth noting that the outcomes of achievement tests hold significant sway over curriculum evaluation, particularly when needs analysis is conducted in a systematic manner (Brown, 1995).  Hence, it is imperative that the examination is impartial to the greatest extent feasible in all its facets, encompassing the test queries, administrative protocols, evaluation techniques, and communication regulations (Brown, 1995). The unit-based English teaching activities were developed utilising an Action Oriented Approach, while concurrently demonstrating the soundness and dependability of the achievement tests. During the training process utilising an Action Oriented Approach, Unit Based Achievement tests were administered to a cohort of 15 students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. Classroom Observation Forms, as outlined by Bratton (2015), were employed, consisting of 19 questions. These forms were exclusively utilised during the implementation process for the experimental group students while they were present in the classroom.

The researcher and teacher conducted Classroom Observation forms both prior to and subsequent to the instruction of the units. The latter observation was conducted after 15 students, who exhibit Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties, had become acquainted with the units. This observation was conducted following the instruction of each individual unit. Consequently, a Classroom Observation Form (COF) was administered both prior to and subsequent to the intervention.

### Data Analysis

Upon completion of data collection via the utilisation of a semi-structured interview format, the researcher proceeded to engage in data analysis. The captured data were transcribed onto physical documents, whereupon each individual line was subjected to a coding process. Subsequent to a thorough perusal of the text, the researcher meticulously transcribed the salient terms onto the right-hand margin of the document, utilising the Content Analysis Technique to effectively categorise the data into subgroups that corresponded to the inquiries outlined in the semi-structured interview templates.   An investigation was undertaken to assess the efficacy of the Action Oriented Approach in promoting academic achievement and behavioural growth among students. The analysis was carried out using R Programme version 3.2.5 and IBM SPSS 21. In the initial phase of quantitative data analysis, the pre and

post achievement tests, along with the pre and post classroom observation forms, underwent multiple tests utilising R Programme version 3.2.5 and IBM SPSS 21. In the subsequent phase of quantitative data analysis, the objective was to ascertain whether a correlation exists between the augmentation of achievement test outcomes and the enhancement of the behavioural and academic accomplishments of pupils with particular Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. The process of Regression Analysis was once again executed utilising the R Programme version 3.2.5 and IBM SPSS 21. Following the preparation of all necessary materials and instruments, the researcher proceeded to conduct activities with a cohort of 15 students enrolled in the second grade of secondary school. The sessions were conducted on a weekly basis for a duration of three hours, resulting in a total of 30 hours of instruction. The experimental and control groups underwent Unit Based Achievement tests before and after each unit, and the experimental group was also subject to Classroom Observation Form (COF) assessments prior to and following the completion of the units, as administered by the researcher and teachers. Upon administering unit tests to both the experimental and control groups, and subsequently subjecting the experimental group to a COF analysis, the impact of the Action Oriented Approach was uncovered. Upon completion of data collection through the utilisation of a semi-structured interview format, the researcher proceeded to analyse the gathered data. The data that was collected was transcribed onto physical documents, after which each individual line was assigned a code. Subsequently, the researcher meticulously scrutinised each line of the data and identified the key terms, which were then recorded on the right-hand side of the paper. This process was conducted in accordance with the Content Analysis Technique, which enabled the researcher to categorise the data into subcategories that corresponded to the questions outlined in the semi-structured interview forms.

An investigation was carried out utilising R Programme version 3.2.5 and IBM SPSS 21 to evaluate the impact of the Action Oriented Approach on the academic achievement and behavioural progress of students. In the initial phase of quantitative data analysis, the pre and post achievement tests and pre and post classroom observation forms underwent multiple tests utilising R Programme version 3.2.5 and IBM SPSS 21. In the subsequent phase of quantitative data analysis, the objective was to determine whether a correlation exists between the enhancement of achievement test outcomes and the augmentation of the behavioural and academic accomplishments of pupils with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. The statistical technique of Regression Analysis was performed using R Programme version 3.2.5 and IBM SPSS 21 software.

**FINDINGS**

This chapter aims to investigate the effectiveness of educational training utilising an Action-Oriented Approach for students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. The primary research question addressed is whether this approach is effective in teaching English to secondary school students with such difficulties. To answer this question, various statistical analyses were conducted on quantitative data, including Unit-based Achievement tests and Observation Results.

The results obtained from the qualitative data analysis, which involved conducting semi-structured interviews with 15 teachers of students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties, are presented and examined in relation to the challenges faced by these students in the classroom and the progress observed during the implementation of the training programme using the Action Oriented Approach. These findings are discussed in accordance with the sub-research questions.

**Findings based on The Quantitative Data Analysis**

For the first step, fifteen educators who were actively instructing secondary school pupils with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties were chosen through a method known as Purposeful sampling

***Results of the First Research Question***

**1) Is there a significant difference between the Pre- Post Achievement Test Scores of the experimental group's Unit based Achievement Test Scores of all units?**

**Table 1:** Pre and Post-Achievement Tests Scores of the experimental group for All Units

| Themes (Units ) | Pre -Achievement Test Scores | | | Post -Achievement Test Scores | | | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Mean* | *SD* | *Median* | *Mean* | *SD* | *Median* | |
| Total | 4.62 | 1.18 | 4.75 | 7.92 | 1.38 | 8 | 0.001* |

Note. n = 15. p was considered statistically significant for Wilcoxon test, *p<0.05

Following an 8-week training period, during which students with MSLLD were instructed using an Action-Oriented Approach for approximately 30 to 45 minutes per class, all four units were taught. Upon completion of the training process, the Pre-Achievement Test results were compared and contrasted with the Post-Achievement Test results. Moreover, the Wilcoxon test was employed to assess the efficacy of training utilising an Action-Oriented Approach. The pre-training mean score of the Action-Oriented Approach based training was determined to be 4.62. Following the training, the mean score was found to be 7.92, indicating the effectiveness of Unit-based education and training utilising an Action-Oriented Approach. The study reveals a noticeable rise in the results of Unit Based Achievement Tests pre and post assessments, which is statistically significant.

### Results of the Second Research Question

**2) Is there a significant difference between the Pre-Post Achievement Test Scores of the experimental group's Unit based Achievement Test Scores of each Unit?**

According to the Wilcoxon test conducted to reveal whether there are significant differences between pre-Unit based Achievement tests of 15 Students who have learning difficulties and post Unit based Achievement tests of these students, significant differences for each four units are determined as follows;

**2.a) Is there a significant difference between the Pre-Post Achievement Test scores of the experimental group's Unit based Achievement Test Scores for the unit 1 (Television)?**

**Table 2:** Pre and Post-Achievement Tests Scores of the experimental group for Unit Television

| Themes (Units) | Pre -Achievement Test Scores | | Post -Achievement Test Scores | | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Mean* | *Median* | *Mean* | *Median* | |
| | 4.87 | | 7.60 | | |
| | SD | | SD | | |
| Television | 1.85 | 5 | 1.88 | 8 | 0.001* |

*Note. n = 15. p was considered statistically significant for Wilcoxon test, *p<0.05*

Based on the findings presented, the average score of Unit television's Pre-Achievement Test Result was calculated to be 4.87. Following a two-week training programme consisting of 30-40 minute classes, the same unit's Post-Achievement Test Result was determined to be 7.60, indicating a statistically significant difference (p=0.001). The observed rise in the average scores of students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) from 4.87 to 7.60 indicates notable advancements subsequent to their participation in the Action-Oriented Approach training.

**2.b) Is there a significant difference between the Pre-Post Achievement Test scores of the experimental group's Unit based Achievement Test Scores for the unit 2 (Superstition)?**

**Table 3:** Pre and Post-Achievement Tests Scores of the experimental group for Unit Superstition

| Themes (Units ) | Pre -Achievement Test Scores | | Post -Achievement Test Scores | | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Mean* | *Median* | *Mean* | *Median* | |
| | 4.27 | | 7.20 | | |
| | *SD* | | *SD* | | |
| Superstition | 1.53 | 5 | 1.61 | 7 | 0.001* |

*Note. N = 15. P was considered statistically significant for Wilcoxon test, *p<0.05*

Based on the findings presented, the average score for Unit Superstition's Pre-Achievement Test Result was calculated to be 4.27. Following a two-week training programme consisting of 30-40 minute classes, the Post-Achievement Test Result for the same unit was determined to be 7.20, with a statistically significant difference (p=0.001) observed between the two scores. The observed rise in the average scores of students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) from 4.27 to 7.20 is indicative of their advancement subsequent to the implementation of the Action-Oriented Approach as the initial unit of training.

**2.c) Is there a significant difference between the Pre-Post Achievement Test scores of the experimental group's Unit based Achievement Test Scores for the unit 3 (Environment)?**

**Table 4:** Pre and Post-Achievement Tests Scores of the experimental group for Unit Environment

| Themes (Units ) | Pre -Achievement Test Scores | | Post -Achievement Test Scores | | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Mean* | *Median* | *Mean* | *Median* | |
| | 4.67 | | 8.20 | | |
| | *SD* | | *SD* | | |
| Environment | 2.02 | 5 | 2.48 | 8 | 0.001* |

*Note. n = 15. p was considered statistically significant for Wilcoxon test, *p<0.05*

Based on the findings presented, the average score for Unit Environment's Pre-Achievement Test Result was calculated to be 4.67. Following a two-week training programme consisting of 30-40 minute classes, the same unit's Post-Achievement Test Result was determined to be 8.20, exhibiting a statistically significant difference (p=0.001). The observed rise in students' academic performance, from an initial score of 4.67 to a final score of 8.20, is indicative of the notable progress made by students diagnosed with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) subsequent to their participation in training sessions utilising the Action-Oriented Approach as the primary instructional modality during the first and second units.

**2.d) Is there a significant difference between the Pre-Post Achievement Test scores of the experimental group's Unit based Achievement Test Scores for the unit 4 (Planet)?**

**Table 5:** Pre and Post-Achievement Tests Scores of the experimental group for Unit Planet

| Themes (Units ) | Pre -Achievement Test Scores | | Post -Achievement Test scores | | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Mean* | *Median* | *Mean* | *Median* | |
| | 4.67 | | 8.67 | | |
| | *SD* | | *SD* | | |
| Planet | 1.54 | 5 | 2.16 | 8 | 0.001* |

*Note. n = 15. p was considered statistically significant for Wilcoxon test, *p<0.05*

Based on the findings presented, the average score for Unit Planet's Pre-Achievement Test Result was calculated to be 4.67. Following a two-week training programme consisting of 30-40 minute classes, the same unit's Post-Achievement Test Result was determined to be 8.67, indicating a statistically significant difference (p=0.001). The observed rise in the academic performance of students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) from a mean score of 4.67 to 8.67 following their participation in training sessions utilising the Action-Oriented Approach is indicative of notable progress. This progress is consistent with the outcomes of previous instructional units.

### Results of the Third Research Question

**3) Is there a significant difference between the progress of the control group's and experimental group's Pre- Achievement Test Scores and Post -Achievement Test Scores for all Units?**

**Table 6:** Comparison Of The Progress Of The Study Groups' Achievement Test Results With AOA

| | Achievement Test Scores, Mean ± SD (median) | | | Difference[t] (Post – Pre) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre Test Scores | Post Test Scores | *p*-value [†] | |
| Study Groups | | | | |
| Experimental (*n*=15) | 4.62 ± 1.18 (4.75) | 7.92 ± 1.38 (8) | 0.001* | 3.30 ± 0.41 (3.25) |
| Control (*n*=15) | 6.65 ± 1.41 (6.50) | 9.40 ± 1.13 (9.25) | 0.001* | 2.75 ± 0.71 (2.75) |
| *p*-value[#] | 0.001* | 0.003* | | 0.016* |

Data are presented as mean ± standard deviation (median)

ŧ Differences value were calculated as difference between post achievement test scores and preachievement test scores

p-value# was calculated by Mann-Whitney U test p-value† was calculated by Wilcoxon test

*p<0.05 was considered as statistically significant

The findings indicate that students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) had lower pre-unit based achievement test results (4.62 ± 1.18) compared to their normally developing peers who received English language education in their own classrooms with their peers and teachers (6.65 ± 1.41). However, after undergoing training with an Action-Oriented Approach, the MSLLD students demonstrated improvement in their test scores.Prior to the training process, a notable distinction was observed in the achievement test outcomes of the experimental group (MSLLD) and the control group (typical students) in the pre-unit based assessment (p=0.001).

Based on the pre-unit achievement test results, it has been observed that students with Mild Specific

Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) have shown progress after undergoing training with the Action-Oriented Approach. The post-unit based achievement test results of normal students who continued their English language education in their own classrooms with their own teachers and peers have also indicated progress, as evidenced by statistical data (9.40 ± 1.13). The study revealed a noteworthy distinction in the post-unit-based achievement test outcomes between the experimental group (MSLLD) and the control group (typical students) subsequent to the training intervention (p=0.003). This indicates that both groups made substantial advancements during the process.

The statistical analysis of the pre-post tests of MSLLD students and normal students revealed a greater than anticipated outcome in comparison to the previous unit, with regards to the overall benefit of the Action-Oriented Approach. Additionally, there was a statistically significant difference (0.016) observed between the scores of the experimental groups and the control group. Remarkably, the progress of students with Multiple Specific Learning Disabilities (MSLLD) (mean = 3.30, SD = 0.41) was found to be significantly greater than that of typically developing students (mean = 2.75, SD = 0.71) during the training process, despite there being no significant difference between the two groups prior to the intervention. In summary, these students did not have the advantage of being born into a privileged background to access such training. However, this study reveals that this circumstance is not an uncommon occurrence.

### Results of the First Research Question

**4.Is there a significant difference between the difference of the differences of the experimental group's and the control group's Pre- Achievement Test Scores and Post -Achievement Test Scores for each Unit?**

**4.a) Is there a significant difference between the progress of control group's and experimental group's Pre- Achievement Test Scores and Post Achievement Test Scores for Unit 1 Television?**

**Table 7:** Comparison of the progress of the study groups' Achievement test Scores in Unit 1 (television)

| | Achievement Test Scores, Mean ± SD (median) | | | Difference[t] (Post – Pre) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre Test  Scores | Post Test Scores | *p*-value [†] | |
| Study Groups | | | | |
| Experimental (*n*=15) | 4.87 ± 1.85 (5) | 7.60 ± 1.88 (8) | 0.001* | 2.73 ± 0.88 (3) |
| Control (*n*=15) | 6.93 ± 2.87 (6) | 9.93 ± 1.91 (11) | 0.001* | 3 ± 1.60 (3) |
| *p*-value[#] | 0.051 | 0.004* | | 0.305 |

Data are presented as mean ± standard deviation (median)

ŧ Differences value were calculated as difference between post achievement test scores and preachievement test scores

p-value# was calculated by Mann-Whitney U test p-value† was calculated by Wilcoxon test

*p<0.05 was considered as statistically significant

The findings indicate that students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) had lower pre-unit based achievement test results (4.87 ± 1.85) compared to normally developing students who received English language education in their own classrooms with their peers and teachers (6.93 ± 2.87) prior to undergoing training in unit television with Action-Oriented Approach.The pre-unit based achievement test results of the experimental group (MSLLD) and the control group (normally developing students) exhibited a statistically significant difference prior to the training process (p=0.049).

Based on the post-unit based achievement test results, it was observed that students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) made progress (7.60 ± 1.88) after undergoing training with the Action-Oriented Approach. Additionally, statistical analysis revealed that normal students who received English language education in their own classrooms with their peers and teachers also demonstrated progress (9.93 ± 1.91) in their post-unit based achievement test results. The study revealed a noteworthy distinction in the post-unit based achievement test outcomes between the experimental group (MSLLD) and the control group (typical students) subsequent to the training procedure (p=0.004). This indicates that both groups demonstrated significant advancement throughout the process.

Based on the observed variations and contrasts between the experimental and control groups subsequent to the training, the outcomes of MSLLD students do not exhibit any statistically significant difference in comparison to those of typically developing students (p=0.305). Despite the initial disparity in education and training between the two groups, the implementation of the Action-Oriented Approach resulted in no significant statistical difference between them. This suggests that the MSLLD students who received training with this approach achieved a similar level of proficiency as the typically developing students who received standard classroom education. The statistical findings indicate that utilising an Action-Oriented Approach in training MSLLD students, particularly for unit television, yields advantageous outcomes.

**4.Is there a significant difference between the difference of the differences of the experimental group's and the control group's Pre- Achievement Test Scores and Post -Achievement Test Scores for each Unit?**

**Table 8:** Comparison of the progress of the study groups' Achievement test Scores in Unit 2 (superstition)

| | Achievement Test Scores, Mean ± SD (median) | | | Difference[t] (Post – Pre) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre Test Scores | Post Test Scores | *p*-value [†] | |
| Study Groups | | | | |
| Experimental (*n*=15) | 4.27 ± 1.53 (5) | 7.20 ± 1.61 (7) | 0.001* | 2.93 ± 0.96 (3) |
| Control (*n*=15) | 6.27 ± 2.58 (6) | 8.73 ± 2.02 (9) | 0.001* | 2.47 ± 1.36 (3) |
| *p*-value[#] | 0.023* | 0.026* | | 0.486 |

Data are presented as mean ± standard deviation (median)

[t] Differences value were calculated as difference between post achievement test Scores and preachievement test Scores
*p*-value[#] was calculated by Mann-Whitney U test *p*-value[†] was calculated by Wilcoxon test
*p<0.05 was considered as statistically significant

The findings indicate that prior to the implementation of the Unit Superstition with Action-Oriented Approach, students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) obtained comparatively lower scores (4.27 ± 1.53) on the pre-unit based achievement test in contrast to their typically developing peers who received English language education in their regular classrooms with their peers and instructors (6.27 ± 2.58).Prior to the training process, a notable distinction was observed in the achievement test outcomes of the experimental group (MSLLD) and the control group (typical students) based on the pre-unit evaluation results (p=0.023).

Following the implementation of the Action-Oriented Approach training, the post-unit based achievement test results indicate that students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) have demonstrated improvement (7.20 ± 1.61). Additionally, statistical analysis has revealed that normally developing students who received English language education in their respective classrooms with their peers and teachers have also exhibited progress in their post-unit based achievement test results (8.73 ± 2.02). The results of the achievement test conducted after the training process indicate

a significant difference between the experimental group (MSLLD) and the control group (typical students) in terms of post-unit performance (p=0.026). This suggests that both groups made significant progress during the training process.

The study findings indicate that there was no statistically significant difference between the results of MSLLD and normal students, based on the changes and differences observed in the experimental group and control group following the training (p=0.486). Despite the initial disparity in educational and training backgrounds between the two groups, the implementation of an Action-Oriented Approach resulted in no significant statistical difference between them. This suggests that the MSLLD students who received training with this approach achieved a comparable level to that of typically developing students who received education in their regular classrooms. The statistical findings indicate that utilising an Action Oriented Approach in training MSLLD students yields benefits in the realm of unit superstition.

**4.c) Is there a significant difference between the progress of the experimental group's and control group's Pre- Achievement Test Scores and Post Achievement Test Scores for Unit 3 Environment?**

**Table 9:** Comparison of the progress of the study groups' Achievement test Scores in Unit 3 (environment)

| | Achievement Test Scores, Mean ± SD (median) | | | Difference[t] (Post – Pre) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Pre Test R Scores | Post Test Scores | $p$-value [†] | |
| Study Groups | | | | |
| Experimental ($n$=15) | 4.67 ± 2.02 (5) | 8.20 ± 2.48 (8) | 0.001* | 3.53 ± 1.13 (3) |
| Control ($n$=15) | 6.80 ± 2.14 (7) | 9.60 ± 1.88 (10) | 0.001* | 2.80 ± 1.26 (3) |
| $p$-value[#] | 0.009* | 0.106 | | 0.217 |

Data are presented as mean ± standard deviation (median)

[t] Differences value were calculated as difference between post achievement test scores and preachievement test scores
$p$-value[#] was calculated by Mann-Whitney U test $p$-value[†] was calculated by
Wilcoxon test
*$p$<0.05 was considered as statistically significant

The findings indicate that prior to undergoing training in Unit Environment with Action-Oriented Approach, students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) obtained comparatively lower scores (4.67 ± 2.02) on the pre-unit based achievement test in comparison to their typically developing peers who received English language education in their respective classrooms with their peers and teachers (6.80 ± 2.14). Prior to the training process, a noteworthy dissimilarity was observed in the achievement test outcomes of the experimental group (MSLLD) and the control group (typical students) based on the pre-unit evaluation (p=0.009).

After the training with Action- Oriented Approach according to the post-unit based achievement test results, students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) have shown progress (8.20 ± 2.48) and statistics have indicated that also post-unit based achievement test results of normal students who continued their English language education in their own classrooms with their own teachers and friends have shown progress (9.60 ± 1.88). Even though there has been a progress in both groups no statistically difference has been calculated between the post test results of these groups (p=0.106). This result was the expected result for each unit. This meant that the difference in levels have decreased after the training programme even the trained students had Mild Language Learning Difficulties.

Despite the initial discrepancy in the educational and training backgrounds of the two groups, there

is no significant statistical difference between them (p=0.217). Moreover, the advancement of MSLLD students who received training through the Action-Oriented Approach during this crucial process has exhibited greater progress compared to the control group who underwent conventional classroom education. Following the anticipated post-test outcomes, this finding has brought significant relief to the researcher, students, and their respective families. Furthermore, the absence of a statistically significant difference between the two groups in the post-test phase serves to underscore this outcome.

**4.d) Is there a significant difference between the progress of the experimental group's and the control group's Pre- Achievement Test Scores and Post Achievement Test Scores for Unit 4 Planet?**

**Table 10:** Comparison of the progress of the study groups' Achievement test scores in Unit 4 (planet)

| | Achievement Test Scores, Mean ± SD (median) | | | Difference[t] (Post – Pre) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Pre Test Scores | Post Test Scores | $p$-value [†] | |
| Study Groups | | | | |
| Experimental ($n$=15) | 4.67 ± 1.54 (5) | 8.67 ± 2.16 (8) | 0.001* | 4 ± 0.93 (4) |
| Control ($n$=15) | 6.60 ± 1.80 (6) | 9.33 ± 1.84 (9) | 0.001* | 2.73 ± 1.44 (3) |
| $p$-value[#] | 0.006* | 0.345 | | 0.015* |

Data are presented as mean ± standard deviation (median)

[t] Differences value were calculated as difference between post achievement test Scores and preachievement test Scores

$p$-value[#] was calculated by Mann-Whitney U test $p$-value[†] was calculated by Wilcoxon test
*$p$<0.05 was considered as statistically significant

The findings indicate that students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) scored lower (4.67 ± 1.54) on the pre-unit based achievement test compared to their typically developing peers who received English language instruction in their regular classrooms with their peers and teachers (6.60 ± 1.80) prior to the implementation of the Unit Planet with Action-Oriented Approach training. Prior to the training process, a noteworthy dissimilarity was observed in the achievement test outcomes of the experimental group (MSLLD) and the control group (typically developing students) based on the pre-unit evaluation (p=0.006). Following the implementation of the Action-Oriented Approach training, the post-unit based achievement test results indicate that students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD) have demonstrated improvement (8.67 ± 2.16). Additionally, statistical analysis reveals that normally developing students who received English language education in their respective classrooms with their peers and teachers have also exhibited progress (9.33 ± 1.84).

Even though there has been progress in both groups no statistical difference has been calculated between the post test results of these groups (p=0.345). This outcome has been the anticipated outcome for every individual component. This meant that the difference in levels decreased after the training programme even the trained students had Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties (MSLLD). More than expected occurred in the pre-post assessments for MSLLD students and typically developing students, and the scores of the experimental and control groups differed in a statistically significant way (p=0.015). Surprisingly, despite the considerable difference existing prior to the training procedure, the progress of MSLLD students (4 0.93) was higher than that of typically developing students (2.73 1.44) during the process.

*Results of the Fifth Research Question*

**5) What are the observations like during the implementations in the experimental group?**

**Table 11:** Pre and Post-Observation Scores

| Themes (Units) | Pre -Observation Scores | | | Post -Observation Scores | | | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Mean* | *SD* | *Median* | *Mean* | *SD* | *Median* | |
| Television | 3.64 | 1.13 | 3.68 | 5.92 | 0.71 | 6.00 | 0.001* |
| Superstition | 3.40 | 1.01 | 3.58 | 5.68 | 0.75 | 5.84 | 0.001* |
| Environment | 3.46 | 1.28 | 3.47 | 6.05 | 1.31 | 5.74 | 0.001* |
| Planet | 3.80 | 1.00 | 3.47 | 6.29 | 1.29 | 6.05 | 0.001* |
| Total | 14.29 | 2.53 | 14.05 | 23.95 | 2.44 | 23.89 | 0.001* |

Note. n = 15. p was considered statistically significant for Wilcoxon test, *p<0.05

Using the observation form created by Bratton (2015), the results based on the research question stated above are gathered. We observed the students both before and after the units. Table 11 presents some of the results pertaining to the experimental group's involvement in academic activities.

The findings are as follows;

The Classroom Observation Form (Bratton, 2015) was used before the exposure to the 4 units and after the exposure to the same 4 units, according to the Wilcoxon test conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference between pre classroom observation results and post classroom observation results of 15 students who have Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. As it is evident from the table above, statistically significant differences have been found for the four units of television, superstition, environment, and planet, as well as for the overall Action-Oriented Approach Benefit.

It is assessed whether there are Action-Oriented Approach Benefit Statistically Significant Differences by taking into account the mean scores of the four units. For Unit Television, the post-classroom observation mean score was 5,92, compared to the control group's pre-classroom observation mean score of 3,64. While the mean score for the control group's pre-classroom observation results was 3,40, the mean score for the post-classroom observation results was 5,68. While the control group's pre-classroom observation result's mean score was 3,46, the post-classroom observation result's mean score was 6,05 for Unit Environment. While the pre-classroom observation result's mean score for the control group was 3,80, the post-classroom observation result's mean score was 6,29 for Unit Planet. The control group's pre-classroom observation results show a mean score of 14,29 for overall Action-Oriented Approach Benefit. The mean score for the Post Classroom Observation Results is calculated to be 23,89.

These findings demonstrate the value of an action-oriented approach for students who struggle to comprehend English classes, particularly for the four modules listed above, in terms of classroom behavior and academic performance. In conclusion, Table 11 shows that the students have been engaged and eager to participate in class activities. Although some students initially resisted, they later felt sufficiently motivated to answer some of the questions, raise their hands, and engage in some of the activities. During the training process, their level of focus on the instructor and their capacity to follow oral instructions improved. They also showed an increase in their ability to participate in class discussions, give prompt and accurate responses, work well in teams, be social with their classmates, and communicate effectively on a variety of topics. Their self-confidence to meet their demands, their difficulty paying attention for long stretches of time, which was a challenging problem to tackle, and their difficulty with vocabulary have all improved visibly.  As a result, by the end of the day, nearly all of the pupils were taking part in the lessons. Everyone seemed content and eager to participate in certain activities, both individually and in groups.

### Results of the Sixth Research Question

**6) Do the data obtained via observation forms and unit based achievement tests coincide with each other?**

**Table 12:** Spearman's Rho Correlation for Experimental Groups' Achievement Scores and Observations

| | | Themes (Units) (Achievement Test Results) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Television | Superstition | Environment | Planet | Total |
| Themes (Units) Observation | Television | **0.644\*** | 0.123 | -0.398 | -0.296 | -0.019 |
| | Superstition | -0.135 | 0.083 | -0.214 | -0.435 | -0.282 |
| | Environment | -0.062 | -0.089 | **0.550\*** | 0.516 | **0.584\*** |
| | Planet | -0.418 | 0.073 | 0.109 | **0.553\*** | 0.150 |
| | Total | 0.189 | 0.100 | -0.030 | 0.251 | 0.334 |

Note. n = 15. p was considered statistically significant for Spearman's Rho Correlation Coefficient, $*p<0.05$

The post-achievement tests and observations on unit television had a positive association (r=0.644), according to Spearman's Rho association Analysis for Experimental Groups' Achievement Results and Observations. The outcomes of the observation reveal the attitudes of the students during their typical lessons with their typical teachers. A positive association showed that MSLLD students were more at ease in class the more training they had on Unit Television. Unit Environment and Unit Planet have the same positive correlation (r=0.550 and r=0.553, respectively). The overall action-oriented approach benefit and unit environment have the same positive connection (r=0.584).

**Findings based on The Qualitative Data Analysis**

### Results of the Seventh Research Question

**7. What are the teachers' viewpoints about students learning difficulties?**

The findings from the analysis of the qualitative data are presented below;

**7.1.As an English teacher, according to your opinion, what kind of difficulties the students face while learning English Language (grammar, reading skills, writing skills, speaking skills, pronunciation)**

**7.1.1. What kind of difficulties do students face while learning grammar in English?**

Most of the teachers interviewed (12: 80%) stated that there were no students with a high level of grammar in their classes, so the teacher didn't spend much time teaching English grammar in many classes. Teachers indicated that generally, students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties had difficulty in understanding the words, that's why they generally had to explain in Turkish or told them to use the dictionary. Although all this effort, because these students had difficulty in memorising they always dropped back. According to the teachers, the students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties had difficulty in learning grammar rules and had difficulty remembering what they have learnt.

Since English is a language that should be remembered, teachers indicated that students may experience many difficulties, especially in learning grammar rules. Teachers also indicated that sometimes they did more activities to teach grammar rules to enable the understanding of students with

MSLLD. Teachers stated that they could not give separate support for the teaching of English grammar rules for such students, however, they prepared a different exam which is at a lower level including picture matching, placing words in sentences, etc.. instead of supportive education. They reported that if they conduct the same exam with their normally developing students, students with MSLLD may not overcome.

One of the teachers (1:6%) stated that three students were known to have an individualized education programme in his class, however, the teacher thought that they maybe didn't even have learning difficulties but they need appropriate teaching styles, instead. Lastly, teachers stated that when they conducted the mini-exams that they conducted to normally developing students, students with MSLLD may have difficulties.

Some quotes taken from the teachers are presented below;

"Since English is a language that requires memorising, our students with MSLLD experience difficulties in grammar, writing, or reading. We give easier writing homeworks separately. A's writings are good. However, we cannot provide a supportive education in English. We do the writing at a simple level. I include picture matching and placing words exercises in a sentence, not higher than the 5th-grade level". (T4)

"We do the writing exams of these students in separate settings, but some of these students' scores are very low, and a few score well. We cannot provide a separate supportive education in English". (T6)

"Since they forget everything, they are not able to answer correctly to the questions. There is no focus on teaching English grammar rules, either". (T17)

### 7.1.2. What kind of difficulties do students face while learning reading skills in English?

Almost all of the interviewed teachers (12: 87%) stated that most of the students who have MSLLD in their classrooms couldn't read and teachers tried to create short and simple paragraphs to make the readings easier. Teachers also stated that they tried to teach reading skills by supporting them. These teachers said that they did not think that this process would be successful unless there were extra material and appropriate support rooms. However, teachers indicated that there was no opportunity to provide these rooms. Teachers reported that they try to educate and train their students with MSLLD as their own children and very sensitively.

One of the teachers (1:6%) indicated that some of their colleagues thought about only the salary, not the student. The salary teachers earn who teaches students with MSLDD is 25% higher than the other teachers who don't deal with students with MSLLD. So instead of focusing on the student's success, some teachers focus only on the payment they get. However, some of the teachers reported that they spend more money on special and specific materials while teaching students with MSLDD.

Some teachers (2:12%) on the other hand, stated that they paired some normally developing students with MSLLD. These teachers stated that normally developing children were firstly taught and then through the peer-mediated teaching model normally developing students taught what they have learnt to their friends who have MSLLD.

Some quotes taken from the teachers are presented below;

"We hold an exam for each student and we make a programme accordingly. Although we prepare a plan according to their levels, it is often not possible to follow it. It differs from student to student because it is individualized. Tho principles talk about supportive education-training rooms however these rooms generally don't have any equipment, No material, and no technology". (T14)

"The fee for these children corresponds to 25% more than the regular salary. I spent 2 times more

of the salary than I earnt on these students' specifically designed materials. I aimed to pair seven (7) normally developing students and seven (7) students with MSLLD with each other. I paired the students. I taught to normally developing students first, then normally developing students helped their friends with MSLLD. Via little inclusion and group work and pair works success in the classroom has increased". (T15)

"Although we prepare a general plan for students with MSLLS according to their levels, it is often not possible to follow that plan. Because the plan should be individualized, development varies from student to student". (T9)

7.1.3. What kind of difficulties do students face while learning writing skills in English?

Most of the teachers (13: 87%) stated that the writing sections in the English books were generally left blank by their students with MSLLD, if they were written on the board, these students managed only to copy in their notebooks in general, Teachers said that this was the case in all the writing exercises. The biggest disadvantage for these students is that they are either exempted from English lessons or cannot be in a separate English class with individualized education and training programmes. They also stated that in general, they fall behind the class in these lessons because they attend lessons with their normally developing peers in the same way. They reported that special education supportive classes should be opened for students who need extra support with learning difficulties, especially in English.

Some quotes taken from the teachers are presented below;

"For example, S often leaves the writing sections in our books empty. In general, she does this in all his writing exercises. The biggest disadvantage for her is not to be in a separate English class". (T3)

"Because they take supportive education during the normal lesson times, they fall behind the class in general.  I think that a supportive education and training should be there for students who have Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties in English or for students who need extra support in learning English".  (T2)

"I try to make them write in English but they generally write as they read".  (T7)

## 7.1.4. What kind of difficulties do students face while learning speaking skills in English?

More than half of the teachers (11: 67%) stated that speaking skill is the most important skill however it is the last developing skill for students with MSLLD. Teachers stated that students with MSLLD mostly needed speaking skills to understand what is done in the classroom. However, as in general less importance was given to speaking skills and still less importance is given. Teachers also reported that these students are given little opportunity to practice speaking. This absence of opportunity negatively affected the development of other areas. Therefore, more than half of the teachers agreed that the development of the speaking skills of students with MSLLD should be included in the classroom and out-of-class activities.

Some quotes taken from the teachers are presented below;

"We generally don't have big expectations on the development of speaking skills especially for our students with MSLLD". (T8)

"The development of speaking skills is very important. Listening is the first step in speaking. However, unfortunately, our students with MSLLD  are quite a lack of opportunities to improve their speaking skills". (T2)

## 7.1.5. What kind of difficulties do students face while learning listening skills in English?

Two-thirds of the teachers (12: 80%) stated that they could not practice listening skills with

students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties and that as teachers they weren't provided with enough material to practice in the classroom. According to teachers, the development of listening skills in English teaching also indicated that they developed both reading comprehension and fluent and accurate reading skills. According to most of the teachers the most important reason for falling back for these students that they generally forget everything they learn even two hours ago. Therefore, teachers reported that these students inside the classroom felt embarrassed when they cannot remember the words, grammar rules, exercises. Etc.. which they covered even two hours ago so the students with MSLLD often felt different when they come to the classroom. They indicated what different meant as 'feeling embarrassed, coming into the classroom with prejudices, having low energy and therefore unable to do everything even they can do with a little motivation'. Lastly, teachers stated that lessons were for three (3) hours however in a normal class they could only do exercise for two (2) hours mostly, so maybe the rest 1 hour could be only for the student with MSLLD to cover that 2 hours lesson.

Some quotes taken from the teachers are presented below;

"We cannot practice listening because we have no material. It can be very useful if we do more listening practices. But we shouldn't forget that the child is sometimes embarrassed and when this is the case, he can forget all he knows". (T6)

"When he enters the class, he realizes that he is different. He cannot do even the things he can. So, we shouldn't express this as a teacher. Normally we can teach three hours however after two hours we cannot keep normally developing students in the classroom so we can make use of an opportunity by teaching our student with MSLLD in that one hour".  (T9)

### 7.1.6. What kind of difficulties do students face while learning pronunciation skills in English?

The majority of the interviewed teachers (11: 73%) stated that students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties did not improve their pronunciation skills or focus on their pronunciation skills. They indicated that they cannot even practice reading skills or speaking skills to move over to pronunciation skills. Teachers reported that they could only test their pronunciation skills while these students are reading which is not a usual situation. Therefore, teachers said that focusing on pronunciation skills is the last stage that we should focus on. Lastly, teachers indicated that they focused on reading correctly.

Some quotes taken from the teachers are presented below;

"I cannot know if our student's pronunciation with MSLLD is correct or not because I only listen to them when they are reading which happens 2-3 times in a term".  (T1)

"I do not know if they pronounce well or bad because there are no readings for students with MSLLD. There is also no compulsion to read".  (T12)

"I focus more on reading. I have never checked their pronunciation many times.".

(T9).

### 7.2. Have you observed any changes in your students during and after conducting the Action-Oriented Approach method?

The vast majority of teachers (13: 87%) stated that there was a multidimensional change in students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties after the training via an Action-Oriented Approach. They stated that they have observed incredible changes in students' academic success and psychology and attitude towards the lesson and their friends. Teachers reported that they observed more Self-Confidence more Willingness to learn English in students with MSLLD. Teachers stated that students used their in-class time to do their tasks and assignments more effectively, they also reported that they observed more Participation in-class activities and surprisingly even more effort to practice what they learnt outside the classroom.  In addition to these, teachers said that they evaluated these students with a minus or plus

related to their participation in activities and correct answers. After the implementation students made an intense effort to answer the questions correctly and to participate in-class activities. They stated that they cannot observe what they have learnt outside the classroom even it is difficult because of the educational system and settings however after the training students tried to use the vocabulary they have learnt outside the classroom. Some quotes taken from the teachers are presented below;

"There was an increase in motivation. Their self-confidence increased. The students started saying "Good morning" outside the classroom". (T12)

"We observed an increase in their willingness to the lesson. Their ability to use time effectively has increased. They try to do the homework on time". (T3).

"Their participation in classroom activities has increased. Our students started to use the everyday language after the pieces of training as 'good morning' and 'good afternoon' outside the classroom" (T14).

## 7.3. Did your students reflect their thoughts on the supportive education they received?

The majority of teachers (14: 93%) reported that they were very happy that students with MSLLD reflected their views on the support education they received, they also reported that this happiness was observed in their families and in other teachers. They stated that their students were very happy in this process because of the increase in their self-confidence and therefore; academic successes. Teachers also reported that there was a great willingness in students because they observed that students were asking questions to get help from their family or teachers even while they were doing homework outside the classroom. The success in their Unit Based Achievement tests was a prove of their development in English. Some quotes taken from the teachers are presented below;

"I got positive feedback from his own English teacher. When I called to ask if he did his homework with his family, he said yes. They are all very happy". (T7)

"As far as I have observed, their self-confidence, success, and participation in classroom activities have increased, thanks to the training via Action-Oriented Approach with you". (T11)

## 7.4. As an English teacher, according to your opinion, what kind of supportive activities can be done with your students except the supportive education to decrease the difficulties they face?

The vast majority of teachers (14: 94%) stated that in order to eliminate the difficulties that their students with MSLLD encounter while learning English it is not always necessary to focus only on lessons but to focus on learning experiences with visual materials. According to the teachers, appropriate teaching styles, Appropriate teaching strategies, setting, and appropriate motivation for their students provided by teachers their own, students' families, principles, education system, policy, and practices are the most important issue that everybody should discuss. Teachers also reported that because of the lack of appropriate materials and generally visual materials the biggest difficulty emerged. Furthermore; teachers stated that supportive education was not provided as it should be at schools. They reported that they had sessions in supportive education with students with MSLLD however they couldn't benefit much from these lessons because teachers generally didn't have supportive education rooms designed appropriately including appropriate materials and technology. For this reason, they stated that the lessons were monotonous and that they could only teach two numbers instead of four because the possibilities were limited. In other words, they stated that they were able to teach half of the determined outcomes, whereas they could teach all of the determined outcomes if suitable rooms including materials and technology was provided. Lastly, they stated that each child's learning level was different.

Some quotes taken from the teachers are presented below;

"The lesson hours are not enough and it is necessary to focus on visual materials. The biggest

problem in schools is the lack of these visual materials. If I prepare and bring it by myself from home, I can offer this opportunity. We don't have a special class".  (T9)

"If I really need to get efficiency, if these children need to be supported, I underline that these facilities should be provided by using this high-tech separate room, that is, as a support training room. And every child's learning level is different". (T1)

"We do supportive education-training at the library, but there is no smartboard there. So, the lessons are monotonous. Since the possibilities are limited, we can teach two numbers instead of four numbers. Each school needs to have a separate room or classroom for support education. No matter which class is empty, we try to teach there". (T3)



**Figure 7:** WordCloud the thoughts of teachers

**CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Conclusion of the Study**

The idea that pupils should learn a language whenever they require information and that language instruction shouldn't focus solely on knowledge. The persistence and applicability of action-oriented learning are emphasized by this material. Even if they are exceptional students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties, actions enable students to think about how they conduct actions in order to comprehend their learning processes (Bento, 2013: 5). Teaching and learning are understood as social action, and students are seen as social actors, according to the concept of action, which is defined as a human alteration or description of reality (Springer, 2009). Within this context, the current study consists of four Units that are included in the Ministry of National Education with the assistance of numerous experts and is intended to determine whether the ActionOriented Approach will be effective to teach English to secondary school students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties in a condensed period of time via specifically prepared training program. Unit-based Achievement tests were administered before and after each unit's 8-week training program by the researcher and specialists, who also created a training curriculum for the four units. In the meantime, children who were progressing normally were given Unit-Based Achievement assessments in their regular classes. The researcher spent that time observing the pupils who typically don't take English classes in their regular courses but have

mild specific language learning challenges. However, students continued to attend their regular classes throughout the research period so the researcher could observe them once more before and after each unit. Additionally, the researcher systematically administered a semi-structured interview form to the teachers of students with MSLLD to understand the challenges that these students face during the English language learning process. The researcher also asked the teachers if they had noticed any changes, such as increased motivation for English lessons in the classroom, increased self-confidence, a willingness to learn English, an increase in the efficient use of time for tasks and assignments, and more effort put into in-class activities. In the next paragraphs, the conclusions derived from the findings and recommendations for additional research are explored.

First and foremost, the experimental group's Pre and Post Achievement Test Results were remarkably flawless. When the pre- and post-test results (correct answers) of the experimental group students with mild specific language learning difficulties were compared, it was clear that the correct answers on the unit-based achievement tests taken before and after the training program had improved. The increase in their correct answers was reportedly observed in every unit, without exception, as well as across the board in Action-Oriented Benefit. Students in the experimental group responded to the instruction and sought the researcher's assistance to learn.

Second, the findings on the students' improvement in the experimental group and control group, as well as the comparison of the advancement of each group, were incredibly intriguing and fantastic. Each unit showed a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group, and once more as predicted, the control group's ratings were higher than those of the experimental group.

Between their Pre and Post Achievement Tests for each unit, both the experimental group and the control group had clearly made progress. The experimental group's growth following the Action-Oriented Approach training program and the control group's progress following their education in regular classrooms were both worth observing. The successful advancement of the control group was initially anticipated more than that of the experimental group. The experimental group and the control group continued to progress differently, as was expected, and there was a meaningful difference between the two groups when the results were analyzed, despite the expectation. This was seen in the first unit (television), as was previously mentioned.

Even though there was a significant difference between the study groups' starting points and the results of their post-achievement tests, the study groups' growth was practically identical and there wasn't a significant difference between their pre-achievement test scores. The experimental group made more progress than the control group in the third unit, which is notable because there was a significant discrepancy between the study groups' pre- and post-Achievement Test results in Unit 3 (Environment). This outcome was intended but unanticipated.

As usual, there was a significant discrepancy between the research groups' pre-training accomplishment test scores for the fourth and final unit (Planet) and their post-training achievement test results. Even yet, the experimental group's post-test results were lower than those of the control group. Fortunately, the differences between the pre- and post-test results of the study groups were analyzed as previously mentioned, and the experimental group had made more progress than the control group in the previous unit but that difference had grown to such a size that a significant difference had been detected in the final unit. It was observed that the experimental group's overall improvement was much higher than the control group's progress for both the experimental and control groups.

The psychology of these students and their openness to participating in the lessons were crucial factors throughout this procedure. While the students were excused from their regular classes, the researcher and one expert concurrently and methodically examined the students before and after each unit in those classrooms. The findings of the observation forms demonstrated how these kids' interest and willingness gradually grew as a result of learning more each week and receiving information about the modules. The experimental groups demonstrated increased attention to the teacher during each unit, quicker and more accurate responses to the teachers, effective participation in group projects and

classroom activities, effective communication with classmates about anything and everything, and a striking increase in self-assurance. Some of the usual traits of students with minor language acquisition difficulties are distractibility and attention deficiency. During the observations made in each unit following the therapy, this characteristic also decreased. Naturally, the researcher, the families of the students with mild specific language learning difficulties, and their teachers were all taken aback by these findings.

As a result of this laborious yet perfect process, it is important to realize that these students are capable of being just as successful as their peers who are typically developing, if not even more so, if they are given the right support, training, and environments along with the right methods and techniques. The most significant issues, according to Sari (2017), are the students' lack of effective instruction and their lack of linguistic resources, as well as their lack of the many abilities required in an academic setting. Additionally, as Sin and Fong (2008) state, it is crucial and advantageous to ensure that students with mild specific language learning difficulties have access to the proper support and training in learning strategies. Students will be able to show off their knowledge and abilities in this way, lowering the possibility of stagnation. Students with MSLLD should not have their competence pre-judged. Additionally, Marks (2007) asserts that the availability of accommodations—rather than the kind or degree of difficulty—is a key factor in a student's performance. These students shouldn't be excused from English classes as a result.

### Discussion of the Study

Peculea (2015) highlights the significance of students' engagement in coherent pedagogical interventions that encompass diverse learning scenarios and facilitate cognitive and metacognitive experiences. These experiences equip students with the ability to overcome their learning challenges and effectively apply their knowledge to novel learning situations.

Based on the results of this study, 15 students were selected for the experimental group who had mild specific language learning difficulties. They received training using an action-oriented approach for eight weeks, averaging 30 to 45 minutes per week, allowing students to participate in the learning process and developing their metacognitive skills by incorporating authentic tasks and situations. There were four lessons: Unit 1 on television, Unit 2 on superstition, Unit 3 on the environment, and Unit 4 on the planet. Pre-Post Achievement Tests were given to students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties and to students who continued their education in their regular courses with their English teachers, as was previously described. Each unit was taught over the course of two weeks. The analysis's most significant finding was that these students can learn and have learned using a variety of teaching and learning methods. The Action-Oriented Approach, which is listed in the CEFR and is a significant candidate to be employed as a method in language learning processes, was included in this study.

Results indicated that even for individuals with mild specific language learning difficulties, it is a successful strategy when used appropriately. When the pre- and post-assessment exams for the MSLLD students were administered, each unit's progress between the two assessments could be viewed graphically, and the overall Action-Oriented Approach Benefit and significant process were identified in the analysis. As was previously noted, pupils' progress can be witnessed when teachers help to create a new environment, particularly while teaching a foreign language. Peculea (2015) emphasizes the need for these training environments to develop educational interventions that are formative learning opportunities, practice reflective and strategic capacities, direct their own learning, knowledge, and understanding of learning strategies, and make decisions about their use. Additionally, Peculea (2015) emphasizes the importance of assisting these students in their inquiries into how to work, solve problems, use learning strategies, and interact with others by providing them with opportunities to do so. A learner-oriented approach that enables the student to utilize the target language effectively should be adopted in both the learning, teaching, and evaluation phases, as discussed by Mirici (2017). This strategy calls for general practices that involve the application of action-oriented, metacognitive skills, self-assessment exercises, and the recording and declaration of the entire growth process based on a common system. As

seen by the training's outcomes, participants were given the motivation, interaction, metacognition, and sense of wonder they required to engage in the activities and find solutions to their challenges.

The most important part of the training was keeping track of how the students with mild specific language learning difficulties were progressing. A comparison of the development of the experimental group and control group revealed the effort put forth by the students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties to learn English, pass the tests, and participate in the activities throughout the process. The experimental group initially outperformed the control group by a substantial margin, but over time that gap shrank. The experimental group's growth was noticeably and intriguingly higher than the progress made by the control group throughout the method, which was difficult for the students and the researcher to understand.

According to the findings, the students in the experimental group did not consistently engage in studying, but they received adequate instruction and consistently demonstrated perseverance. This commendable process should be observed and emulated by educators. Upon conclusion of the study, it was determined that students who exhibit Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties are not disruptive elements within the educational system. Rather, they demonstrate adaptability and patience in navigating their challenges.

In order to employ efficacious learning methodologies, students must possess metacognitive awareness, comprehending which strategies are appropriate for implementation in diverse learning activities and under what conditions. The promotion of metacognition is evident in the selection and design of educational activities that encourage and facilitate inquiry, such as tasks that involve open-ended exploration, problem-solving, and challenges. These activities provide students, particularly those with learning challenges, with opportunities to critically reflect on their own actions and thought processes. The aforementioned activities, which encourage introspection, afford students with learning challenges the chance to develop strategic problem-solving skills. Additionally, these activities provide opportunities to evaluate the effectiveness of their work, the degree of cognitive engagement, the extent to which proposed tasks were completed, and the potential for further optimization and improvement of problem-solving strategies necessary for future tasks. It is imperative for students to engage in reflective practices and meditation in order to gain a deeper understanding of their potential within the realm of the learning process.

Attaining a heightened level of reflection, questioning, and metacognition can prove to be a challenging feat for students, particularly those with learning disabilities, in the absence of a clear and explicit model. Consequently, it is imperative for teachers to not only lead and guide student learning activities, but also to develop new competencies in the form of reflective teaching. It is imperative for the instructor to furnish the learner with a framework for contemplation and implementation of assignments. Grangeat (1999) asserts that the effectiveness of an individual's performance in a particular task is primarily attributed to the utilization of their metacognitive abilities, in addition to their cognitive skills. Frequently, the acquisition of these skills distinguishes students who attain academic achievement from those who do not. According to Delvolvé (2006), success often stems from the ability to exercise control and make adjustments to one's own activities. Hence, this research incorporates genuine scenarios and practical assignments. Throughout the training procedure, participants in the experimental cohort were cognizant of their actions and employed judicious clauses and sentences to effectively communicate their ideas.

Thus, they possessed the requisite knowledge. Metacognition plays a crucial role in the learning process by enabling learners to analyze and interpret information in terms of its efficiency and proficiency for a given task, as well as for future tasks. This cognitive ability is commonly defined as the knowledge of one's own knowledge. Hence, metacognition encompasses not only the cognitive awareness that a student attains about their own mental processes, but also encompasses the utilization of specific self-regulatory and self-control mechanisms. As a result of metacognition, the individual gains consciousness of their own cognitive processes.

Peculea (2015) highlights the importance of teachers prioritizing the enhancement of their teaching through the acquisition of learning management competencies, including but not limited to learning autonomy, decision-making skills, and information processing capacity. The aforementioned findings highlight the pressing necessity to formulate an educational approach that serves a compensatory function. This approach should specifically target the areas mentioned earlier, namely the implementation of educational intervention programs that foster the development of self-regulation skills among students. These programs should encourage and facilitate students' awareness and metacognitive regulation of their learning processes, as well as the cultivation of planning metacognitive strategies, the establishment of personal learning objectives, and the utilization of self-monitoring and self-evaluation techniques.

An additional salient aspect to consider pertains to the inclination and readiness of experimental groups to engage in classroom activities, as well as their psychological mechanisms. The researcher conducted two observations per unit to assess the compatibility of the students' academic achievement and psychological processes during the qualified learning processes. The students exhibited a gradual increase in relaxation over time within their typical classroom setting, even in instances where they were excused from participating in English language instruction. Furthermore, the findings indicated that all units exhibited progress in their engagement with classroom activities. The subjects' psychological well-being and academic performance exhibited significant improvement, as evidenced by heightened attentiveness to the instructor, improved ability to comprehend and execute oral instructions, active participation in classroom discussions, prompt and accurate responses, effective collaboration in group projects, enhanced social interactions with peers, proficient communication skills in both academic and non-academic contexts, increased self-confidence in meeting personal needs, and a notable reduction in attention deficits and vocabulary-related difficulties. The findings indicate that there is a positive correlation between a comprehensive understanding of the four units and psychological comfort in the classroom. As an anticipated outcome, akin to the general student population, students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties exhibited improved cognitive and psychological functioning when provided with an appropriate training regimen.

The fundamental motor behavior exhibited by individuals is the act of assuming an upright posture and ambulating through bipedal locomotion. Infants are anticipated to exhibit the ability to coordinate their forefinger and thumb as a means of comprehending their cognitive and motor development. This behavior distinguishes humans from other species. As Homo sapiens, we possess the capability to grasp objects using a pincer grip involving two digits, whereas other organisms exhibit distinct modes of grasping. This study is based on the premise that students with developmental differences can achieve comparable levels of learning to typically developing students, given appropriate duration of time, effective instructional methods, and a conducive learning environment. The objective of this study is to demonstrate the individuality of each brain. According to Koksal and Atalay's (2016) assertion, the primary objective of brain-based learning is to enable learners to acquire knowledge in a meaningful manner, as opposed to simply memorizing or learning it. This scenario guarantees that the individual's cognitive faculties remain constantly alert, enabling them to meticulously process information and engage in active learning. According to Jensen's (1994) findings, it is imperative to offer learners with the necessary support to facilitate their ongoing development and enable them to renew their objectives. This can be achieved by maintaining a balance between high levels of challenge and low levels of stress, while also providing learners with the autonomy to organize their steps.

The cognitive systems that facilitate learning can be likened to the operating systems of the brain. To date, the intricate interplay between neurons remains a challenge yet to be fully resolved. The human brain is known to possess distinct channels or pathways, which may be likened to individual doors. Thus, if a child with learning difficulties is proficient in the Turkish language and an English-speaking child is fluent in English, they can communicate with ease in each other's language. The ability to use language is not impeded by cognitive disabilities. Based on this premise, the present investigation was formulated, executed, and accomplished.

As a result, individuals classified as students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties

are not inherently incapable of learning. Rather, the crucial factor lies in the ability of educators to effectively instruct these students. Research indicates that with appropriate teaching methods, these students are capable of achieving superior learning outcomes compared to their typically developing peers. Children who exhibit Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties may possess unique learning styles and characteristics that distinguish them from their peers. These children may encounter challenges within the educational system, as conventional teaching methods and techniques may not be optimally suited to their needs. Moreover, the terminology of Specific Learning Difficulties may suggest that individuals with MSLLD do not encounter any challenges, but rather acquire knowledge through unconventional means (Pollak, 2009). Dyslexic students who experienced persistent difficulties in learning have faced the same issue for an extended period of time. Initially, these students were perceived as incapable of learning. However, it was later realized that they possessed unique learning styles. By incorporating these distinct learning styles into their educational sessions, it was observed that these students were able to learn with ease and achieve success comparable to that of renowned individuals such as Einstein. The primary objective of this study was not to draw a comparison between students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties and typically developing students in terms of their performance in achievement tests. Rather, the study aimed to ascertain which group of students demonstrated greater success, with success being defined not solely in terms of outcomes, but also in terms of the process involved. The culmination of the process can prove to be a challenging experience for students who have Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties, as well as for their families, educators, managers, and the system that grants them exemption from English lessons. Nonetheless, the insights gained from this experience are highly valuable.

### Recommendations for Further Researches

This part of the research deals with several suggestions based on the conclusions drawn from the application of multiple data sources to enlighten the future studies on an Action-Oriented Approach and teaching English process to students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. Based on all the findings, discussion and conclusion generated from qualitative and quantitative analysis some suggestions for further studies are as follows,

Early identification of students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties is crucial, as it allows for timely implementation of educational interventions to prevent academic failure and associated emotional or behavioral issues. The initial measure that educators ought to undertake in order to administer suitable treatments and training, particularly for the acquisition of language, is early intervention.

Subsequently, providing instruction to teaching assistants or educators on effective strategies for instructing students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties is a crucial measure. Hence, it is imperative for English teachers and special education teachers to engage in active collaboration and cooperation to ensure that the child receives suitable education and training at the appropriate juncture. In addition, it is imperative to cultivate a scholastic environment that facilitates constructive communication among all faculty members and parents, while also promoting the recognition of the diverse talents exhibited by the students. It is imperative to establish a consensus regarding the terminology employed to portray students' accomplishments in a favorable light, particularly with regard to communications disseminated to parents and faculty.

Thirdly, the provision of resources and materials is a crucial component of the appropriate training process. As previously stated, the training programs utilized an Action-Oriented Approach that aimed to enhance the cognitive and metacognitive skills of students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties. The materials were thoughtfully selected to cater to the unique needs of these students. Hence, it may be advisable to incorporate tailored computer software, augmented visual aids, and student-directed activities into the Ministry of National Education's curriculum.

A potential recommendation is to conduct a speech and language assessment in cases where there

exists a prior history of language delay. It is not advisable to exempt students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties from their regular classrooms. This is supported by the findings, discussion, and conclusion sections of relevant literature, which suggest that these students can effectively learn with appropriate educational interventions. Therefore, it is recommended that these students receive minimal support while participating in standard English lessons alongside their typically developing peers. Providing additional assistance within or beyond the classroom during pre or post-lesson hours can potentially serve as a beneficial intervention. The present study demonstrates that the metacognitive skills of these students can be stimulated through a suitable training program. Students who require individual and/or small-group support to develop basic language education should be granted full access to the curriculum. It is important to note that experiencing difficulty in this area does not necessarily equate to a mental disability, particularly in cases of Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties.

This study demonstrates that the Action-Oriented Approach can serve as an effective pedagogical method and strategy for instructing students who experience challenges in acquiring language proficiency. Incorporating training or educational examples utilizing an action-oriented approach into the curriculum of the Ministry of National Education for every unit and class level would prove advantageous. It is recommended that in-service training be incorporated to tailor training programs to both students and teachers who possess the necessary qualifications to instruct using the Action-Oriented Approach. Furthermore, it is suggested that teachers who are qualified to teach via the Action-Oriented Approach, even to students with MSLLD, be recognized with an award.

An additional concern pertains to policies and regulations. The integration of Policies and Regulations into the curriculum of the Ministry of National Education is imperative, and their effective implementation necessitates the involvement of adequately trained teachers. Kane and Gooding (2009) contend that there is insufficient evidence to determine the degree to which policies and practices concerning the provision of support and reasonable accommodations have been executed in academic and practical environments.

As per the findings and subsequent discussion, it has been observed that certain students with MSLLD are provided with educational support by a teacher within the school. On occasion, the educator may serve as their own instructor, while in other instances, a fellow faculty member within the same institution may assume this role. The proficiency level of these students is below the expected standard. Supportive Education rooms are designated spaces that typically contain a solitary chair and table. However, it is worth noting that certain educational institutions may not possess such private areas. Incorporating regulations into the policy and implementing precautions can enhance the quality of supportive rooms where private lessons are conducted for students with MSLLD. This can be achieved through appropriate environmental arrangements and provision of suitable materials, which can facilitate the teaching process of English for these students.

The present investigation employed an Action-Oriented Approach, a methodology that has been incorporated in numerous academic inquiries and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Special education instructors may engage in collaboration and cooperation with language educators, as well as employ various methods and techniques to optimize the teaching experience. Special educators have the potential to conduct research on the efficacy of various learning models in facilitating the adaptation of children to English language instruction. Such research may yield insights into how these children can optimize their learning outcomes.

Moreover, the pedagogy of teaching, particularly language instruction, has long been an enigma in need of unraveling. The present study employed an Action-Oriented Approach to instruct students with Mild Specific Language Learning Difficulties, a challenging endeavor. Throughout this critical process, both students and educators require assistance from their educational institutions, the families of the students, school administrators, as well as academic professionals and other personnel such as policymakers, principals, and ministers. Maintaining a high level of cooperation and collaboration is crucial during this process to ensure the academic achievement and psychological well-being of students.

Finally, it is advantageous to note that these instructional practices can be extended to a wider range of students who may encounter various challenges in the learning process. The levels of the individuals may vary. Future research may consider increasing the number of units, extending the implementation process, and expanding the sample of teachers included in the study.

**REFERENCES**

Atay, D., Kurt G., Çamlibel, Z., Ersin, P., Kaslioglu Ö., (2009). The Role Of Intercultural Competence In Foreign Language Teaching: Inonu University Journal Of The Faculty Of Education

Bento, M. (2013). Pour une définition de l'action dans la perspective actionnelle en France. Synergie Canada, (5), 1-9.

Bernard, H.R. (2000) Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Bratton, I. (2015). Multi- Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Response to Intervention: Wakulla County Schools, UK.

Brown, J. D. (1995). The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Delvolvé, N. (2006). Métacognition et réussite des élèves. Retrieved from http://www.cahierspedagogiques. com/article.php3?id_article=2767.

TEPAV Project Team. (2013). Turkey national needs assessment of state school English language teaching. Ankara: Mattek Publication.

Eurydice. (2012c). Developing key competences at school in Europe: Challenges and opportunities for policy. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Eurydice. (2017). Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Grangeat, M. (1999). La métacognition, une clé pour des apprentissages scolaires réussis. In Grangeat (coord.), La métacognition, une aide au travail des élèves (pp. 153–172). Paris: ESF éditeur.

Jensen, E. (1994). The learning brain, USA: Turning Point Publishing.

Koksal, O. and Atalay, B. (2016). Teaching Principles And Method: Contemporary Practices, Methods And Techniques: Egitim Publishing.

Marks, B., (2007). Cultural competence revisited: nursing students with disabilities. Journal of Nursing Education 46 (2), 70–74.

[Ministry of National Education] (2017) [General Directorate of Special Education, Guidance and Advisory Services] (n.d.) Ankara, TURKIYE

Mirici, H. (2017). European policies and practices in training foreign language teachers: Hacettepe University Journal of Education Faculty

NCCA, National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (2019). Communication andLanguage, guidelines for Teachers of Students with Mild Language Difficulties, General Learning Difficulties (Accessed at 29.12.2019)

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods. 3rd edition. Sage Publications, Inc.

Peculea, L. (2014). Investigating learning difficulties at Romanian language and literature subject in perspective of learning to learn competence development, ScienceDirect Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 180 ( 2015 ) 666 – 673.

Pollak, D., (2009). Neurodiversity in Higher Education. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Hoboken.

Sari, H. (2017). The influence of an in-service teacher training (INSET) programme on attitudes towards inclusion by regular classroom teachers who teach deaf students in primary schools in Turkey : Deafness & Education International

Sin, C.H., Fong, J. (2008). Do no harm? Professional regulation of disabled nursing students in Great Britain. Journal of Advanced Nursing 62 (6), 642–652.

Springer, C. (2009). La dimension sociale dans le CECR: pistes pour scénariser, evaluer et valoriser l'apprentissage collaboratif, Le Français dans le Monde/ Recherches et Applications, 66(4), 511-523.

TEPAV Project Team. (2013). Turkey national needs assessment of state school English language teaching. Ankara: Mattek Publication.

Vianin, P. (2011). Ajutorul strategic pentru elevii cu dificultăți școlare, Editura ASCR, Cluj-Napoca

Wernicke, M (2014). Action-oriented language teaching – „Ja genau!" Forum Deutsch: Forschungsforum.

Westwood, P. (2008). What teachers need to know about learning difficulties, ACER Press, Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.