



THE BUILDING OF A NEW LANGUAGE LEARNING MODEL BASED ON THE CHOMSKYAN CONCEPT

Mustapha Boughoulidⁱ

Cadi Ayyad University,
Faculty of Letters & Human Sciences,
Marrakech, Morocco

Abstract:

In the light of the wide spread variety of teaching and learning methods and approaches, the building of a new Language Learning Model rises as a serious contribution that aims to surmount the problem of learning acquisition among language learners. Hence, this study comes into existence to investigate some time in such a way as to come up with some solutions on the basis of the surveyed literature in this field, especially on the basis of the Chomskyan concept of learning. By a Language Learning Model, we mean a model of learning which is based on four meaningful and required dimensions. The first one is the cross-linguistic applicability of the model to all the existing natural languages. The second one is the covering of all the cognitive and non-cognitive factors. The third one is the contextualisation of the learning factors. The fourth one is related to the process of learning and how it should take into account the three learning components, input and its richness, the students' building competency, and communicative acts that lead to the students' performance, in accordance with four evaluative value, quantity, quality, manner, and relation. The new conceptualized Language Learning Model is a model that helps in the activation of the learners' expressivity in terms of creativity, adaptation, and engagement in the learning process through meaningful and comprehensible activities. A learning device that is comprehensive and instructional and that allows the learners to engage in a continuous dialogic context that enables them to learn a language by resolving the conflict between their expressivity and the limitations super-imposed by their brain.

Keywords: Language Learning Model (LLM), learning process, cognitive and non-cognitive dimensions of learning, expressivity, the structural linearity of language

1. Introduction

In order to build a new model of language learning where the students' expressivity is fully activated with creative interaction and engagement through conversations and

ⁱ Correspondence: email mustbough@gmail.com

group discussions, we need to question the meaning of learning and its comprehensive interpretation. Hence, what do we mean by a Language Learning Model (LLM)?

Surveying the literature, we conclude that a Language Learning Model must meet four standards:

- 1) The Cross-linguistic Applicability, which is about whether a Language Learning Model (LLM) is applicable to all the existing natural languages or not. For a LLM to be comprehensive, it must be universal (Chomsky, 1975; Evan & Livinson, 2009; Dabrowska, 2015). Hence, the concept of universality should be questioned.
- 2) Psychological Adequacy or cognitive adequacy), which is about whether a LLM covers all the cognitive and the non-cognitive factors, such as stimulus, response, recall, recognition, memory, high-order functions, perception, understanding, analysis, learning styles, adaptation, etc. It should be englobing enough in such a way as to bring together all the necessary cognitive and non-cognitive dimensions of learning (Pierre et al., 2014; Borghans et al., 2008; Burrus et al., 2011; Lipnevich et al., 2014, among others). Learning has been very often reduced to a purely cognitive process, which is, but not just that. The other factors such as the affective factors, the attitudinal factors, and the social factors are also relevant in the process of learning.
- 3) Contextual Variables, which state whether the contextual factors are taken into consideration or not. These variables include, but are not limited to, family income, students' health, classroom, school environment, IQ levels, what culture encourages or discourages in terms of creativity and innovation, does it encourage norms more than creativity, conventions, self-regulation, family life or history? This criterion should also see whether the family is patriarchal or matriarchal, investigate about the language(s) used, and whether the mother tongue is used in the class or not. It should also be integrational enough by defining learning as relevant to all aspects of life in the sense that learning is measurable in terms of what the learned language will be intended for (Scholtz, 2020; Widdowson, 1990).
- 4) The last criterion is related to the Learning Process. It means whether this LLM is taking into consideration the three language learning components, namely (a) the input that should be taught to students, (b) their Competency Building, and (c) the students' Engagement in communicative acts that leads to the output or performance. Hence, four values are associated with these three learning components, namely the values of (1) Quantity, (2) Quality, (3) Manner, and (4) Relevance (Grice, 1975). In fact, the LLM must be general enough by taking into consideration the learning process with a specifiable beginning and a specifiable end (Bloom and Lahey, 1978; Lahey, 1988; Johnson, 1996; Pierre et al., 2014; Lipnevich et al., 2014). It is about a learning process that starts from an input to an output and the LLM should be about all the components of this process without missing anyone of them.

However, in setting a context for the question of the comprehensive character of language that is based on the literature survey, we find that scholars address the question of comprehensiveness of language in fragmental ways. The problem is that they do not

deal with it in its totality (Chomsky, 1975). Some of them focus on the cognitive factors (Pierre et al., 2014), and others focus on the non-cognitive aspects of language learning (Burrus et al., 2011). It is relevant in the sense that we need to make sure that all the aspects of learning are taken into consideration. The main objective of the study is to build a Language Learning Model which is comprehensive enough and instructional, and that does not miss out on any component, which is relevant to what the students are intended to learn.

2. The Chomskyan conceptualisation of the theory of learning

In order to find a concrete answer to the question concerning the LLM to be comprehensive and instructional, we can start with Chomsky's (1975) reflections on language learning when he tried to question the existence of a learning theory. In one of his famous citations, Chomsky (1975) started by asking himself

"What is a theory of learning? Is there a theory as the theory of learning, waiting to be discovered? Let us try to sharpen and perhaps take some steps towards answering these questions" (p. 14).

On the basis of Chomsky's statement, we can state that he adopts a complete denial of the existence of anything called theory of learning. Chomsky continued his inquiry by wondering,

"Why has it been so casually assumed that there exists a 'learning theory' that can account for the acquisition of cognitive structures through experience? Is there some body of evidence, established through scientific inquiry, or observation, or introspection, that leads us to regard mental and physical development in such different ways? Surely the answer is that there is not" (Chomsky, 1975, p. 11).

In relation to these two citations, we can assume, according to Chomsky (1975), that there is probably no "learning theory", so called. As an alternative, Chomsky (1975) is suggesting a model for a possible theory of learning through a scientifically based investigation process of the question. He started by selecting an organism "O" and a cognitive domain "D" of learning. He then proposed a model of learning that is similar to the following one:

LT (O, D): EXP (O, D)OUTP (O, D).

However, the LT for a learning theory has a mechanism that has an input EXP for experience or stimulus, and an output OUTP for performance. In this new model, in the domain of learning, there is an "O" for human "H" and "D" for language "L". It will then become the learning theory for human beings in the domain of language. In fact, one needs to specify this organism (learning), the domain of learning (or kind of learning)

and the type of experience to which this organism is exposed, and the type of performance we expect this organism to produce. Hence, the model will be developed in the following way:

LT (H, L): EXP (H, L)OUTP (H, L).

Actually, Chomsky (1975) does not assume that there is an existing model for learning, but he is just trying to suggest or design what might look like a possible theory of learning.

However, many theorists were in the quest for a unified theory of learning such as Seels (1995), Jonassen (2003), Reigeluth (1999), and Lewis & Grimes (1999), among others. Thus, the intrinsic complexity of the domain of education made them feel frustrated and then lost faith in the quest of finding a coherent theory of learning due to the fact that any theory of learning is considered a model of a natural phenomenon that is built as a subjective process that is based on various personal perspectives (Duchastel and Molz, 2004). For instance, behaviourism deals with learning from a motivational perspective by providing the learner with an adequate repertoire of behavioural responses to particular stimuli and to reinforcing those responses (Skinner, 1976). Without this reinforcement through motivation, we will not be able to talk about the learners' learning accomplishments. In fact, while designing a theory of learning, theorists should base their research upon the domain within which this theory is going to be operational as well as the learners' characteristics that may be very specific. They *"must strive to match their interventions with the particular learning requirements of the situation"* (Duchastel and Molz, 2004, p. 46).

3. Chomsky's criticism of Behaviourism and Constructivism

3.1. Behaviourism

Watson (1913) argued that psychology should be revisited in such a way as to be linked to the study of all behaviours, which are required via conditioning in terms of stimulus, response, and repetition during one's close contact with the environment. In fact, Behaviourism established a worldwide identity after the publication of Watson's (1913) book, *Psychology as a Behaviourist views it*, where he coined the word "Behaviourism" for the first time. Since then, this theory has been criticised, especially in the period between the 1950s and 1970s. Among the major linguists who led this campaign, we can name Noam Chomsky's review in his book, *Review of B. F. Skinner's Verbal Behavior*, in 1959.

According to Behaviourism, the fact of learning a language requires interaction with the environment through a conditioning process, which is based on a stimulus and a response. That is to say, some context in which one is involved in order to use this language. Then, one will have to do some drills in order to fix the habit he/she learned so far. The drilling should be processed adequately by using the correct language. Then, one will be rewarded for that effort. The next step is the reinforcement of the habit as a

performance. This is how the process of learning takes place for Behaviourism (Watson, 1913; Skinner, 1953).

However, Chomsky (1959) expressed his objection to this theory on several occasions, especially when it has to do with studying the human language. Chomsky's (1959) objection in his review focused mainly on the Behaviourists' emphasis on the observation of the phenomenon and their ignorance of the human mental structure that is scientifically-based. He claimed that,

"...since this system is based on the notions stimulus, response, and reinforcement, we can conclude [...] that it will be vague and arbitrary" (Chomsky, 1959, p. 14).

Hence, the exclusion of the human internal aspect in favour of the observation of superficial behaviour is considered incomplete. Chomsky (1959) added that this process can succeed while testing animal behaviour, but cannot be used to test and analyse the complex human behaviour because the Behaviourists' focus is only on the external factors that are analysed through basic concepts such as stimulus, response, and reinforcement. Skinner (1953), on the other hand, justified the Behaviourists' attitude by claiming that,

"If we are to use the methods of science in the field of human affairs, we must assume that behaviour is lawful and determined. We must expect to discover that what a man does is the result of specifiable conditions and that once these conditions have been discovered, we can anticipate and to some extent determine his actions" (p.6).

However, from Chomsky's (1959) viewpoint, we can say that his claims concerning the validity of Behaviourism as a learning theory are based mainly on the fact that this theory is missing something crucial that is related to the wired-in cognitive structures in the human brain. In order for Chomsky (1959) to discover what the problem is, we can give some examples based on the remarks he stated. Let us then consider the following sentences:

a. *Jane is eating an apple.*

In fact, if we would like to ask a question in English using sentence (a), what we need to do is to move the auxiliary "is" from its canonical position to the initial position of the sentence, as it is shown in the sentence (b):

b. *Is Jane ----- eating an apple?*

Actually, this is the habit that we need to fix in order for the students to learn how to ask a question in English. Hence, we should formulate the first hypothesis in the following way:

Hypothesis 1: Move the auxiliary one word backward, counting from the left to the right of the sentence.

“This hypothesis works quite well. It is also extremely simple. The scientist has every right to be satisfied, and will be able to find a great deal of evidence to support his tentative hypothesis. Of course, the hypothesis is false” (Chomsky, 1959, p. 31).

Let us then consider another example, which is related to the relevance of the wired-in element to the learning of a language:

c. *The woman in red is eating an apple.*

If we would like to form an interrogative question in English by applying the first hypothesis, the sentence will be transformed as follows:

d. **The woman in is red ----- eating an apple?*

This sentence is then ungrammatical in English, “for it shows that this simple hypothesis 1 is false, and that he [the scientist] must construct a far more complex hypothesis to deal with the facts” (Chomsky, 1959, pp. 31-32). Thus, according to Chomsky (1959), the second hypothesis should be put in the new following form:

Hypothesis 2: The building of an interrogative sentence in English occurs by moving one structure noun phrase backward, counting from the left to the right of the sentence.

However, the grammatical interrogative sentence should take the following form:

e. *Is the woman in red ----- eating an apple?*

In fact, we must include a learning mechanism that informs the learner that the auxiliary movement must be “structure dependent”. This structure in English is the noun phrase, which means that there is an underlying mechanism of learning that Chomsky (1959) calls “*structure dependence*”, which pre-exists the movement of the auxiliary. Actually, the problem of Behaviourism overlooks the role of this blueprint.

According to Chomsky (1959),

“Hypothesis 1 holds that the child is employing a ‘structure-independent rule’ [and] hypothesis 2 holds that the child is employing a ‘structure-dependent rule’” (p. 32).

What it means is that a sentence is a structure. It has a hierarchy, which means that Behaviourism is not correct according to Chomsky (1959). In other words, we can say that the Behaviourists missed something between the experience EXP in the model of learning, and the output OUTP. That is to say, between competence and performance. It

is the structural mechanism. Hence, the model of learning should be rectified by adding this notion of mechanism MC, as the following model shows:

LT (H, L): EXP (H, L)..... MC (H, L) OUTP (H, L).

By adding this MC for mechanism, we can assume that between the linguistic experience that the learner is exposed to and the performance, there is a mechanism that is used by human beings in the domain of learning which is that of language. Hence, the movement must be “structure-dependent” as part of this mechanism MC. This is then how Chomsky (1959) criticized Behaviourism.

3.2. Constructivism

According to Piaget (1971), human beings’ knowledge is constructed through a process in which they merge their old and new experiences. Dewey (1938) defined learning as a social activity, the idea on which Piaget built his theoretical vision by considering the Constructivism Theory as a theory of knowledge that focuses mainly on how learning takes place. It is a model of cognition and cognitive development where teachers create a learning experience through which they challenge their students. Piaget (1971) offers a framework for learning “how to learn” and how this learning evolves over time through continuous interaction with the external world. Piaget’s focus was on the...

“...design of a viable model of how we manage to construct a relatively stable, orderly picture from the flow of our experience” (Glaserfeld, 1995, p. 57).

However, in one of the famous controversial debates on language acquisition between Piaget and Chomsky who are representing the two most dominant learning theories in the cognitive linguistic domain, and while defending their theoretical viewpoints, they resulted in fact that language for the former follows a construct process, whereas language for the latter depends on innate knowledge (Piatelli-Palmarini, 1979).

According to Piaget (1971),

“... no behavior, even if it is new to the individual, constitutes an absolute beginning. It is always grafted onto previous schemes and therefore amounts to assimilating new elements to already constructed structures (innate, as reflexes are, or previously acquired)” (p. 17).

We can then deduce that when we learn new information, what we actually do is that we assimilate it in the biological sense of the word. This assimilation means that we make part of the construct that we learned, which is a schematic representation of that construct. That is to say, assimilation is the fact of making an element that is not part of the body an organic part of it. This is, in fact, what happens in the case of learning. When we learn a new knowledge, we assimilate it by making it part of our brain, and then it becomes an organic structure of the brain. This is then the model of learning that Piaget (1967) was talking about. What exists between the experience EXP of the stimulus and

the output OUTF of the performance is two things: (1) the process of assimilation, and (2) the action schema that one constructs. Actually, we need to reinterpret the model of learning by moving from the following model:

LT (H, L): EXP (H, L).....OUTF (H, L)

To this new model of learning:

LT (H, L): EXP (H, L).....ASSML (H, L)SCHM (H, L)OUTF (H, L)

On the basis of this new model of learning, we can say that in any learning theory (LT) for human beings in the domain of learning (HL), the learners should be exposed to a linguistic experience EXP, and then they will assimilate ASSML by converting data into a schema SCHM on which their performance depends. This is how the model of constructivism is built.

In fact, Inhelder (1978) tried to scrutinize the difference between the theoretical views of Chomsky and Piaget in the terms of learning by claiming that,

“The basic difference between Piaget and Chomsky is that Piaget considers all cognitive acquisitions, including language, to be the outcome of the gradual process of construction [whereas] Chomsky seems to be assuming when he asserts that ‘it is inconceivable that complex syntactic principles have been learned or derived from a sensorimotor construction or any other type of equivalent’” (p. 264).

Hence, the difference between the two views is that Piaget is talking about construction. On the other hand, Chomsky claims that there is something innate about the schema that Piaget talked about. Thus, there is an innate general ability which Chomsky calls Universal grammar (UG). In order to formulate a new model of learning, Chomsky (1975) claims that there must be a UG, something innate, that enables us to interpret everything we have learned and shaped up in the form of linguistic competence. For us to build that linguistic competence, we should assume that we are born with what Chomsky calls Language Acquisition Device (LAD) through which we convert data into a competence that he calls UG. The difference between them is that for Chomsky, there is no assimilation process. What we have is a UG. What Piaget takes to be an action schema is his linguistic competence.

However, the model of learning should be reconstructed in the following way:

LT (H, L): EXP (H, L).....UG (H, L)COMP (H, L)OUTF (H, L).

In fact, the learning of human beings in the domain of learning consists of the following elements: first, we have an experience to which we are exposed, and then there is an underlying blueprint that enables us to assimilate the stimulus into a competence,

which is the UG. In addition, we have a competence COMP that we built up, and then an output OUP.

4. Universal Grammar (UG)

According to Chomsky (1975; 1979; 1981; 2000; 2006), the existence of a Universal Grammar (UG) is based on two types of evidence. The first one is this claim that says that there are abstract linguistic patterns that are shared by all the existing natural languages of the world. The second type is related to the acquisition of learning among children who are able to learn their mother tongue before the age of five even if the stimulus is very poor. Hence, modern linguists such as Evan & Livinson (2009) and Dabrowska (2015) who demonstrated through concrete analysis that there is no such thing as what Chomsky calls UG have challenged these two types of evidence.

4.1. Is there any alternatives to UG?

4.1.1. Energeia

Humboldt (1988) claimed that language itself is a form of what he calls "Ergon" and "Energeia". Energeia is defined in terms of learning as the learners' capacity to engage in a dialogic context that enables them to learn a language by resolving the conflict between their expressivity and the limitations super-imposed by their brain. An example of these limitations is the structural linearity of language. In order to use language, we should put words together in a consecutive way. Thus, the conflict between the two is part of the Energeia, which is the individual's endeavour to overcome these limitations.

4.1.2. The Energeia hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Language is learned in a dialogic way.

Hypothesis 2: The learning of language takes place when the learner invests a dialogic effort to overcome the cognitive failures of communication.

4.1.3. The new model of learning based on the Energeia hypotheses

LT (H, L): EXP (H, L)ENRG (H,L)COMP (H, L)OUP (H, L)

In this model, we have the learning theory LT in which we identify the target organ, which is human being H, and the domain, which is that of language L. The EXP is the linguistic stimulus. Then, there is "Energeia" ENRG, which is taken as a universal element in the dialogic endeavour. This "Energeia" is taken for a conversational engagement as an attempt to resolve the conflict between the limitations of the brain and expressivity. This "Energeia" will end up by becoming a linguistic competence COMP, which will end up having the linguistic output OUP that is performance.

5. The quantification of the components of learning

In fact, the model of learning consists of three different components. There is (1) the linguistic experience of stimulus EXP, (2) Energeia ENRG, and (3) the competence COMP that we build. The output OUP is not part of the learning process, but the outcome of it. In order to quantify these three elements, there is a need for the use of Grice's (1975) four maxims. These four aspects are the following: Quantity, Quality, Manner, and Relation.

a. Quantity

By Quantity, we mean how much information is processed and the amount of time, which is devoted to performing the tasks. Generally, it is about numbers. It means, for example, the number of texts that are used or read, the number of videos the learners were able to watch, the number of audios to which the learners were exposed, etc.

b. Quality

By Quality, we mean content. This learning aspect is mainly related to linking, pattern recognition, metacognition, etc. For instance, it is the fact of linking something that we are learning now with something we have already experienced.

c. Manner

By Manner, we mean the clarity of the material used, the explicitness of the blueprint, and the unambiguity of the task. For instance, if we are given audio to listen to as part of a task and the quality of its sound is not clear enough, we can say that there is a Manner problem in the stimulus.

d. Relation

By Relation, we mean the meaningfulness of the content, its importance for the learners, and the relevance and the relatedness of the task. For instance, if our students are taught some content about something that is irrelevant to them, then their learning will be impacted and will be so low in terms of acquisition.

However, the objective of this research is to demonstrate how these four factors can be used in the evaluation of the three components in the following model of learning:

LT (H, L): EXP (H, L)ENRG (H, L)COMP (H, L)OUP (H, L)

5.1. The quantification of the input EXP

a. Quantity

When we want to evaluate the quantity aspect of EXP, we need to ask questions such as, how many experience resources are offered to the learners? How many audios or videos the learners are exposed to? How many visuals do they use? How many texts do they read? How many dialogues do they perform? etc.

b. Quality

We can evaluate the quality aspect of EXP by checking to what extent the learners are provided with ample background materials to make the content clear for them. It is the content of the experience that they are having.

c. Manner

In order to check the manner aspect of EXP, we need to ask pertinent questions having logical relevance to the quality of the hand-outs and see whether it is good and understood by students or not. We need also to question the quality of the pictures exposed to the students, the teachers' handwriting, the flashcards for enhancing vocabulary, etc. All these elements, and others, should be taken into consideration while proceeding with the evaluation.

d. Relation

In order to evaluate the relationship aspect of EXP of the learners, we have to check whether the content they are learning is meaningful and relevant for them or not and whether they can apply this content in their daily life or not, etc.

5.2. The quantification of Energeia ENRG

a. Quantity

In order to evaluate the quantity aspect of ENRG, we need to ask questions that are related to the number of conversations in which the teachers are putting their students, the amount of time that is devoted to each conversation or communicative act in which they are involved, etc.

b. Quality

For the quality aspect of ENRG, we need to check to what extent the learned patterns are correctly processed, and whether the learners are appropriately mentored or not. Do they know what they are supposed to do before they engage in any task or not? etc.

c. Manner

For the manner aspect of ENRG, we need to check the students' engagement, the teachers' modelling, error correction, adaptation, etc.

d. Relation

To look at the Energeia aspect from the relation point of view, we need to ask questions related to the authenticity of the content and whether it is relevant and contentful enough to the learners or not, etc.

5.3. The quantification of the component of Competency COMP

a. Quantity

If we look at COMP from a quantity point of view, we need to check the number of words the learners are able to use, the number of topics they are able to talk about, the number of structures they are able to interiorize, the number of activities they are supposed to do, etc.

b. Quality

In order to evaluate the quality aspect of COMP, we need to ask questions about the exactitude of the lexicon the students are learning and the quality of their pronunciation. There is also a need to test the learners' intonation while expressing themselves using the English language, etc.

c. Manner

For the manner aspect of COMP, we need to check the clarity of the learners' articulation and the appropriateness of their delivery, etc.

c. Relation

If we look at COMP from the relation viewpoint, we need to ask questions about topicality and the learners' ability to raise subjects relevant to their context. There is also a need to ask pertinent questions that have to do with sociolinguistic appropriateness such as the use of politeness cues, etc.

6. The Learning Evaluation Matrix (LEM)

Name: Language:
Level: Score from 1 to 5:

Table 1: The Learning Evaluation Matrix

Components Factors	Quantity	Quality	Manner	Relation
Input (EXP)	Experience resources <input type="text"/>	Background texts <input type="text"/>	Clarity of print <input type="text"/>	Relatable content <input type="text"/>
Competency Building (CMOP)	How many words <input type="text"/>	Quality of pronunciation <input type="text"/>	Ideational presentation <input type="text"/>	Felicitous implicature <input type="text"/>
Energeia or Communicative Acts (ENRG)	How many dialogic situations <input type="text"/>	Quality of modelling <input type="text"/>	Explicitness of instruction <input type="text"/>	Contentfulness <input type="text"/>

The above Learning Evaluation Matrix (LEM) comprises two different dimensions. The first dimension comprises three comprehensive components of learning: (1) the Input (or the stimulus), (2), Competency Building (or the building of knowledge), and (3) Energeia (or the engagement in Communicative Acts). The second dimension comprises four evaluation factors, Quantity, Quality, Manner, and Relation.

7. The intrinsic values of the model of learning

What we mean by the intrinsic values of a Language Learning Model that should be comprehensive and instructional is that each one of the three components of this model should be associated with a value “V” that is represented in the model as a subscript (v). Thus, the new model is stated in the following form:

$$LT (H, L): EXP (H, L) v_1 \dots ENRG (H, L) v_2 \dots COMP (H, L) v_3 \dots OUTP (H, L)$$

- **V1:** This value that is associated with experience EXP means how entertaining is the stimulus that is given to the students. It is about the affective dimension. It is related to the importance of the stimulus.
- **V2:** The second value is concerned with the students’ interpersonal relations because ENRG is about their engagement in conversations and to what extent they are engaged in the process of learning.
- **V3:** The third value that is associated with the COMP is about the competence that one is learning and whether his/her attitude towards this competence is positive or not.

Thus, the equation that is built on this model of learning is the following:

$$LT (H, L): EXP (H, L) v_1 \dots ENRG (H, L) v_2 \dots COMP (H, L) v_3 \dots OUTP (H, L).$$

In order to evaluate the learning of language, we should take into consideration the explanation of the numerical factors of the new model of learning in the following way:

If the evaluation of the stimulus EXP that is offered to students is A, what one needs to do is to multiply it with the first value ($A \times v_1$), and if the value (v_1) is zero, then the stimulus is of no quality. The evaluation of the stimulus is done by using the four factors by scoring them from 1 to 5 and the number we get is multiplied by the value (v). For example, if the score of ENRG is B, then one multiplies it by its value (v_2) as ($B \times v_2$). The same thing is done for COMP where the score is C that one divides by (t) and multiplies by (v_3) ($C/t \times v_3$). One divides C/t because (t) stands for the time factor that indicates whether learning took place in a short or a long span of time.

However, the final equation of the new Language Learning Model (LLM) will be defined in the following form:

$$LT (H, L) = (A \times v_1) + (B \times v_2) + (C/t \times v_3)$$

This equation concerns the learning theory of a human individual in the domain of language (H, L). It can be redefined as followings:

The A is the score for EXP that is multiplied by the value (v_1) plus the B score for ENRG that is multiplied by (v_2) plus the C score for COMP that is divided by (t) for time and multiplied by (v_3). This model is then a qualifiable, comprehensive learning model of language or anything else that is exposed to learning.

8. Conclusion

Therefore, the learning process is a controversial issue that remains undefined and ambiguous instead of all the different attempts to establish a unified and common background that determines how people learn and under which circumstances. In fact, our schools have witnessed various reforms by adopting various theories of learning. Hence, our anxiety about the quality of learning continues because it does not touch the learner's new millennium educational needs as much as it should be. Actually, what we are looking forward to is "*a theory which will guide the teaching-learning process and which will be consistent with the aims of education*" (Denton, 1966, p. 382). It is then an urgent need for the building of a Language Learning Theory (LLM) which empowers the learners in order to take advantage of the available opportunities where they act as "*active producer[s] of meaning*" (Hughes, 2004, p.395). The new designed LLM has two functions. The first function is to detect problems that may delay the progress of learning in any language learning theory. The second function is to solve these problems by optimizing this theory.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

About the Author

Mustapha Boughoulid is an EFL/ESL teacher and a researcher in the field of Linguistics and English Language Teaching Theory (ELTT). He taught English as a foreign language for more than twenty-four years. He is the co-author of the book '*How was Moroccan Darija one century ago?*' He is also the author of many articles in the field of teaching and learning. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4477-3318>.

References

- Bloom, L, and Lahey, M. (1978). Language development and language disorders. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Borghans, L., Duckworth, A. L., Heckman, J. J., and Ter Weel, B. (2008). The economics and psychology of personality traits. *Journal of Human Resources*, 43(4), 972-1059.
- Burrus, J., MacCann, C., Kyllonen, P., & Roberts, R. D. (2011). Non-cognitive constructs in K-16: Assessments, interventions, educational and policy implications. In P. J. Bowman & E. P. St John (Eds.), *Diversity, merit, and higher education: Toward a*

- comprehensive agenda for the twenty-first century (pp. 233–274). Ann Arbor, MI: AMS Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2015). *The Minimalist Program*. Vol. 20th anniversary edition, The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and mind*. 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press. eBook., Base de données: eBook Academic Collection Trial.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). *New horizons in the study of language and mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures in Government and Binding Theory*. (Studies in general grammar 9). Dordrecht Foris Publication.
- Chomsky, N. (1979). *On language: Chomsky's classic works, language and responsibility and reflections on language*. The New Press, New York.
- Chomsky, N. (1975). *Reflections on language*. Pantheon Books, a division of Random House, Inc., New York.
- Chomsky, N. (1959). Review of B. F. Skinner's verbal behavior. *Language*, 35, 26–58.
- Dąbrowska, E. (2015). What exactly is Universal Grammar, and has anyone seen it? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00852. Retrieved from www.scihub.tw/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00852
- Denton, W. H. (1966). Problem-solving as a theory of learning and teaching. *The High School Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 8 (May, 1966), pp. 382-390. University of North Carolina Press. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40366239>
- Dewey, J. (1938) *Experience and Education*. New York: Collier Books.
- Duchastel, P., and Molz, M. (2004). Learning and design: The quest for a theory of learning. *Educational Technology*, Vol. 44, No. 1 (January-February 2004), pp. 45-48.
- Evans, N., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32(05), 429. doi:10.1017/s0140525x0999094x. Retrieved from www.sci-hub.tw/10.1017/S0140525X0999094X
- Glaserfeld, E.V. (1995). *Radical constructivism: A way of knowing and learning*. Studies in Mathematics Education Series: 6. Routledge and Falmer, Taylor & Francis Group: New York.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Hughes, A. (2004). New Times? New Learners? New Voices? Towards a Contemporary Social Theory of Learning. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Jul., 2004), pp. 395-408. Taylor & Francis, Ltd. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4128697>
- Humboldt, W. V. (1988). *On language: The diversity of human-language structure and its influence on the mental development of mankind*. Cambridge University Press: New York.
- Inhelder, B. (1978). Language and thought: Some remarks on Chomsky and Piaget. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 7(4), 263–268. Plenum Publishing

- Corporation. Doi:10.1007/bf01068109. Retrieved from www.sci-hub.tw/10.1007/BF01068109
- Johnson, B. A. (1996). *Language disorders in children: An introductory clinical perspective*. New York, NY: Delmar Publishers.
- Jonassen, D. (2003, July-August). The vain quest for a unified theory of learning. *Educational Technology*, 43(4), 5-8.
- Lahey, M. (Ed.). (1988). *Language disorders and language development*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Lipnevich, A. A., Krumm, & Roberts, R. D. (2014). Noncognitive skills in education: Emerging research and applications in a variety of international contexts. *Learning and Individual Differences* 22 (2014) 173–177.
- Lewis, M. W., & Grimes, A. J. (1999). Metatriangulation: Building theory from multiple paradigms. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 672-690.
- Pierre, G., Sanchez Puerta, M. L., Valerio, A., and Rajadel, T. (2014). STEP skills measurement surveys: innovative tools for assessing skills.
- Piaget, J. (1971). *Biology and knowledge: An essay on the relations between organic regulations and cognitive processes*; [translated by Beatrix Walsh] Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chicago and The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh.
- Piaget, J. (1967). *Biologie et connaissance*. Collection Idées (n° 288), Gallimard. Paris.
- Piatelli-Palmarini, M. (Ed.) (1979). *Language and learning: The debate between Jean Piaget and Noam Chomsky*. New York: Routledge
- Reigeluth C. (1999). (Ed.). *Instructional design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory*. Volume II. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Association.
- Scholtz, D. (2020). Assessing workplace-based learning. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, 2020, 21(1), 25-35. ResearchGate. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339612946_Assessing_workplace-based_learning/link/5e5c0a9d4585152ce8ff1352/download
- Seels, B. B. (Ed.). (1995). *Instructional design fundamentals: A reconsideration*. Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications.
- Skinner, B. F. (1976). *About Behaviorism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Macmillan. [Harvard University. Cambridge, MA.
- Watson, J. B. (1913). Psychology as the behaviorist views it. *Psychological Review*, 20(2), 158–177. doi:10.1037/h0074428. Retrieved from <https://booksc.xyz/book/53521936/cc2ca8>
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford New York: Oxford University Press.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).