Personalized English Language Learning For School Children: Theoretical Foundations, Pedagogical Frameworks, And Practical Effectiveness

Fatemeh Pordeli Fathabadi[1] and Dr. Geeta Shinde[2]

[1,2] Department of Education and Extension, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

The paper is a review of the theoretical and empirical foundations of developing a personalized English language learning programme of school children. Based on major theories illustrating individualized learning, like the theory of personalized instruction by Peura, the mastery learning theory of Bloom and the Personalized System of Instruction proposed by Keller, the study discusses the way individualized and adaptive learning environments can maximize linguistic and cognitive development. The review presents evidence-based results of various pedagogical settings and addresses the issues of learner autonomy, hybrid instruction and technology integration. According to the findings, individualized learning based on formative assessment and learner-centered design contributes to an improved level of engagement, motivation, and competence among young learners. The research ends with a conclusion which indicates implications of designing effective English learning programmes that balance between personalization and equity between the curriculum.

Keywords: Personalized Learning, English Language Education, Learner Autonomy, Mastery-Based Instruction

1. Introduction

Personalized learning is a new paradigm in contemporary education that is reshaping the nature of learning experiences in terms of structuring, delivery, and assessing learning processes. It reflects the transition to standardized and one-size-fits-all instruction to learner-centered paths, which take into consideration the cognitive abilities of learners, language backgrounds, interests, and emotional needs. As the world of digital technologies, artificial intelligence, and data analytics become increasingly transformative of the educational experience, personalized learning is likely to make learning more inclusive, flexible, and effective. Its strategy involves the personalization of pedagogy, content, and speed according to the needs of the learner and, therefore, achieving success in making sure that students will not only learn but also become agents and be motivated to engage in lifelong learning (Spector, 2015). It recognizes that every learner develops differently and meaningful learning takes place when education appeals to the personal abilities, interests and dreams (Chatti, 2010).

Although it has a pedagogic appeal, personalized learning is still conceptually challenging as researchers tend to use it interchangeably with the other concepts that relate to it, including differentiated, adaptive, and individualized learning (Stradling and Saunders, 1993; Tomlinson, 2003). Differentiation usually denotes the adaptation of content and activities to small groups according to general ability or readiness levels whereas personalization takes the concept further, focusing on the level of the learner, with emphasis on learner choice and agency (Tomlinson, 1999). In the same way, adaptive learning involves the use of algorithms to dynamically modify instruction, and personalization involves more social-emotional development and learner autonomy dimensions (FitzGerald et al., 2018). Such lack of definition can negatively affect theoretical development and consistency of implementation and thus it is important to revise the conceptualization and application of personalized learning in the English language learning situations.

The incorporation of personalized learning in English language learning has been on the rise, with lecturers acknowledging the fact that some students have different levels of linguistic competencies and learning speed. The traditional models of English language teaching (ELT), which is usually characterized by a teacher-centered approach, has been faulted in meeting the needs of heterogeneous learners (Dewey, 1907). Personalized learning, in turn, allows instructors to use diagnostic tools, formative assessments, and adaptive technologies to create an instruction that aligns with a student at their current level of proficiency (Hsieh and Chen, 2016). Personalized learning environments by use of customized content sequencing, differentiated assessment plans, and differentiated feedback enable high levels of engagement, motivation, and retention (Gomez, Zervas, Sampson, and Fabregat, 2014). Such programs not only make language acquisition easy by taking into account individual linguistic backgrounds and cognitive styles, but they also promote confidence and autonomy of learners.

In addition, studies show that personalization increases intrinsic motivation and deeper learning results, especially in the learning environment where students have the book of pace and goal-setting (Miliband, 2006; Truong, 2016). This is transferred into the English language classrooms where students become proud to belong to the learning process since materials can be directed to their own interests, language needs, and cultural backgrounds. Teachers, in turn, play the role of facilitators who offer scaffolding, feedback, and constant assistance, thus balancing authority and responsibility toward the instructor and the learner (Peura, 2012a). Such a change is in line with constructivist views that treat learning as a self-regulated process of active and socially mediated learning. Individualized strategies therefore, help in making the English classrooms interactive ecosystems that encourage collaboration, autonomy, and reflective learning.

Last, personalized learning in English education is in line with other educational reforms which characterize inclusivity, learner-centered teaching, and evidence-based pedagogy. Since the twenty-first-century skills gained in prominence in global education systems (critical thinking, communication, and problem-solving) are integrated into the language programs, personalized interventions can serve as the framework that facilitates the development of such skills in language programs (FitzGerald et al., 2018). The following review seeks to integrate theoretical background and empirical evidence useful in designing a personalized English language learning programme in school children. It discusses major theoretical frameworks, such as the ones of Peura, Bloom, and Keller, and explains how autonomy of learners, adaptive teaching, and technological utilization can be used together to facilitate the effectiveness of the English language teaching process.

2. The Concept of Personalized Learning

Personalized learning is inherently based on learner-centered paradigm where instructional approaches, content delivery sequence and time rate are intentionally adjusted to individual needs, interests, and the levels of readiness of a student. Instead of lumping learners and providing one-size-fits-all instruction, personalized learning provides more agency and control to the learners when it comes to their learning paths (Redding, 2019). The idea re-purposes the role of the teacher as one of a facilitator, co-designer, and guide, supporting differentiated supports, scaffold feedback and flexible pathways (Redding, 2019; Shemshack, 2020). UNESCO also describes personalized learning as the strategy that centers around the background of a learner, needs, potential, and perceptions (UNESCO, 2017).

Although differentiated and individualized instruction are also intended to help adapt teaching to the differences of students, personalized learning often goes even further by incorporating learner choice, ongoing fine-tuning and even predictive analytics. Differentiation typically serves small groups owing to preparation or interest, and individualized learning often implies giving permits to learners so they can advance at their speed. Conversely, personalized learning integrates these models but focuses on responsiveness to learners as individuals that are dynamic (Shemshack, 2020). The sheer number of terms in the field (e.g., differentiation, personalization, individualization) has produced conceptual ambiguity, which has complicated the achievement of theoretical coherence and generalization of findings in practice, as Shemshack (2020) argues.

Within the digital and technology-mediated setting, adaptive algorithms, data analytics and learner model often allow personalized learning, which dynamically adjusts content, feedback and pacing based on performance and preferences of students as they proceed through their course. With the help of AI-based systems, it will be possible to analyze data about learners in large quantities in real time and identify learning gaps, forecast the future performance, and provide a specific remedial or enrichment course (Vorobyeva et al., 2025; ResearchGate, 2025). The successful application of learning analytics, knowledge tracing, and recommendation systems enable systems to make the learning process constantly adaptable (Zhang et al., 2024; du Plooy, Casteleijn, and Franzsen, 2024). The objectives of these mechanisms are to maximize efficiency, i.e. make sure that learners do not waste time on what they have already mastered but spend more time on the areas where they require assistance.

Empirical studies indicate that personalization has the potential of enhancing the motivation of learners, their engagement and satisfaction as well as learning efficiency and effectiveness. Indeed, du Plooy et al. (2024) discovered that, in most of the studies, adaptive learning interventions deployed on a personal basis resulted in better academic outcomes and more engagement in higher education environments. It is also noted by Shemshack (2020) that the personalized models of learning may maximize the satisfaction of learners, their efficiency and effectiveness. Students who receive context-personalized tasks in AI-augmented environments also state a higher level of intrinsic motivation, interest, and even improved learning results than usual (Tasdelen et al., 2025). Such results highlight the opportunities of personalization to facilitate more serious, meaningful learning experiences as they are carefully planned.

The practical application of personalized learning in schools and the K-12 context, nonetheless, despite its potential, bears much criticism related to the infrastructure and the capacity of the teaching staff, equity, and pedagogical limitations. Numerous schools do not have hardware, links, or electronic spaces to be responsively personalized (FitzGerald et al., 2018). In addition, educators are also in need of professional growth, which is necessary to design, administer, and analyze adaptive systems, as well as ensure a balance of flexibility and curriculum fidelity (Turk, 2021). Other ethical issues are the privacy of data, bias in the algorithm, the possibility of isolating students by putting them on very individualized tracks (EdWeek, 2016; Personalized Learning Isn't About Isolation, 2016). Therefore, as the theoretical and empirical bases of personalized learning are becoming stronger, its sustainable and equitable implementation in the school-based English language programmes is still a challenge.

3. Adaptive and Individualized Learning Frameworks

Adaptive learning dynamically modifies the instructional paths by analyzing the performance of a student in real-time and modifying the contents, the pacing of the learning process, and the feedback. Such systems are based on the practices of individualized instruction and intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) that simulate the cognitive condition of learners and act in response (Guo et al., 2021; Liu, McKelroy, Corliss, and Carrigan, 2017). As an example, Liu et al. (2017) applied the adaptive intervention in multiple STEM subjects and found that the system contributed to lessening knowledge deficiencies in chemistry, but the outcomes varied depending on the subjects and design. The adaptive approaches have the potential to successfully respond to the actions of learners at all times; hence, the ability to support students with scaffolds where necessary and encourage increased independence where learners are prepared (Tan et al., 2025).

Adaptive learning is developed to transcend the conventional limitations of time and location through the capacity to learn beyond set time and classroom. It supports the different cognitive profiles, motivational states, and learning styles of learners by providing differentiated pathways- e.g. branching sequences, remediation or enrichment modules (Kabudi, 2021; Tan et al., 2025). The current adaptive systems apply methods, including the Bayesian knowledge tracing, student modeling, and machine learning, to predict what students need and provide the best way to proceed with the next step (Tan et al., 2025; Kabudi, 2021). Such systems allow the learners flexibility- therefore, the weaker learners can take more time to cover what they need to cover and the stronger learners may move forward thereby eliminating boredom or frustration (Kabudi, 2021).

Individualized instruction on the other hand entails one-on-one education experiences in terms of individual goals, speed, and content that is relevant to a particular learner. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2010), personalized learning involves the integration of differentiation and individualization, among other things. In individualized models, educators or programs establish objectives that are specific to a learner, track their progress, and modify the instructional content or supports (Gross, Tuchman, and Patrick, 2018). The aim is that every student has a track based on his or her preparedness and not a homogeneous track with the rest of the children. This is because this method focuses on expertise, instead of the number of hours spent on the road, as the determinant of advancement.

Studies indicate that personalized learning is able to enhance a deeper understanding and help in scaffolding self-regulated learning especially with teacher facilitation and scaffolding. According to Bahceci and Gurol (2016), the use of a personalized learning portal, where the cognitive level of a learner was adjusted, enhanced the level of engagement and conceptual knowledge. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the individualized model tends to be determined by the metacognitive and self-regulation abilities of the learners; otherwise, they may lack the means of controlling the pacing or choosing suitable strategies (Guo et al., 2021; Letourneau et al., 2025). Teachers would therefore continue playing a primary role in interpreting the learner data, modifying the instructional supports, and training the students to be self-regulating.

Two approaches to personalized learning are adaptive and individualized learning structures, which are complementary to each other. Adaptive systems automate responsiveness according to the real-time information, whereas individualized instruction is a process of planning and modifying the learning paths according to the needs of individual students. Collectively, they provide a strong paradigm of customizing English language learning programmes in case issues like systems design, teachers capacity and fair access can be dealt with. Further studies ought to examine hybrid designs in language instruction classrooms where human intuition and algorithmic adjustment are integrated in K-12 schools.

4. Self-Paced and Autonomous Learning

Learners are able to progress through learning materials at their own pace, which allows them to feel autonomous, motivated, and self-regulated. Based on the behaviorist ideas of programmed instruction by B. F. Skinner (1954), the model later appeared in more organized methods including the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI), that Keller (1968) suggested. The PSI framework focused on clear goals, content in modules, multiple formative evaluation and learners ability to control pacing. These concepts were later extended by instructional design theorists like Gagne and Briggs (1979) who incorporated self-paced learning into computer-assisted instruction (CAI), therefore combining behavioral reinforcement with the new educational technologies. The main principle is that students will get promoted on the basis of their acquired mastery, and not based on their years in school.

This is done in PSI and later computer assisted systems where learners move on to the next unit only after capturing the first. It has been shown that this method facilitates retention, as well as confidence in the learner. Reviewing PSI applications in higher education, Eyre (2007) discovered a consistent increase in academic performance, satisfaction and engagement when mastery and pacing were customized. Likewise, the recent research findings on digital self-paced classes validate the fact that adaptive sequencing and formative feedback enhance motivation and anxiety in students (Hammerschmidt-Snidarich, Rieth, and

Seifert, 2019). Such results indicate that under the condition of a properly organized feedback and goal-setting systems, self-paced education stimulates the constant activity and self-development.

The ability to be in charge of your own learning the ability to be an autonomous learner is the core to effective self-paced learning. According to Holec (1979), the concept of autonomy was defined as the possibility to choose learning objectives, the choice of materials, and the assessment of the results. This was further extended by Dickinson (1994) in order to highlight that autonomy is part of the process and result of successful language acquisition. When learners have a sense of choice and control, they are more likely to become more intrinsically motivated and persistent. To this end, autonomy augments self-paced instruction by altering the learning decision-making process to the student so that the role of the teacher changes to that of an instructor instead of a recipient.

Autonomy is highly appreciated in language teaching. By means of Benson (2010), it was proved that independent learners have more chances to practice self-reflection, to pursue authentic communication opportunities, and remain in the process of language development in the long term. Empirical research also indicates that students who engage in practice of goal setting, self-monitoring and self-evaluation build stronger metacognition awareness and outperform in a second language situation (Zimmerman, 2002). The self-paced English language learning programs, including units of modular grammar and reading, also enable the learners to learn at their own time, revise on areas where they lack and track their progress, which enhances confidence and proficiency.

Self-directed and independent learning models strengthen one another. Self-pacing brings the structure and freedom required by learners as they go at their own pace and autonomy makes the learners have ownership of their goals and plans. The two of them facilitate lifelong learning skills, which are; discipline, introspection, and motivation, and they are not restricted to the classroom. Integration of technology of self-paced modules with self-directional tools can produce personalized English language learning experiences and influence increased levels of learner interest as technology continues to evolve.

5. Theoretical Foundations of Personalized Learning

Theoretical backgrounds of personalized learning can be traced to the wider trends of mastery learning, self-directed learning and learner-centered learning. The three models have similarities, in that, all three theories hold the belief that learners are able to attain very high levels of success when they are taught at the pace, at their readiness, and in a manner that allows them to feel motivated. All these theories are united in the idea that the process of learning must be adaptive and iterative, based on the feedback and supported by the agency of the learner. Today, their joint concepts constitute the foundation of efficient design of personalized learning, particularly in the settings, which focus on inclusivity, formative assessment, and learner agency.

The concept of personalized learning is one of the most advanced frameworks of pedagogy suggested by Peura. Created in the Finnish educational system, Peura approach reforms classroom learning and makes it based on individualized paths, whereby students can progress at their own speed and through collaborative and self-driven methods. Instead of continuing in a linear, teacher-directed progression, the learners participate in conceptualized mastery loops where they engage in peer discussion and reflection (Peura, 2012a). This model is focused on the implementation of formative assessment and self-evaluation as the means of maintaining an intrinsic motivation and academic development (Everhard, 2015). To redefine the role of the teacher as a coach or facilitator guiding students, Peura (2012c) proposes the idea of personalized objectives and reflective conversations in which the teacher does not dominate the process of delivering instructions to the students. Empirical studies by Toivola (2015) and Maenpaa (2016) have proven that the model promotes equality and compassion in the classroom and encourages students to become accountable to their learning without leaving any learner behind in the process of mastering it.

The mastery learning theory found in Bloom gives a more powerful ground on personalization that is earlier and more influential. The instructional variables (quality of instruction, available time, and corrective feedback) had to be optimized according to the condition of Bloom (1968, 1984), who suggested that virtually any student could reach the level of mastery of the material. The key idea in this theory is the fact

that the differences in the success of learners are not mainly due to ability but rather due to the differences in the conditions of learning. Bloom was correct about the fact that mastery learning can have a substantial positive effect on the academic result and decrease the variability among the groups of students (Anderson, Evertson, and Brophy, 1992; Guskey, 2007). Teaching, assessment and corrective feedback is a cyclical process that ensures that the learner is given specific help until they master. This iterative model is directly informative of current personalized learning systems that make use of data-informed formative evaluation to adjust instructional pacing and scaffolded help to learners.

The Personalized System of Instruction (PSI) of Keller is a continuation of the principles of Bloom in which mastery and self-pacing become embedded in the mastery-based instruction design on a modular basis. Keller (1968) in his masterpiece work, Goodbye, Teacher, expressed a model where learners move forward through units of the course after passing formative assessment. The PSI method focuses on five elements, i.e., self-pacing, mastery learning, written materials, application of proctors, and motivational lectures. In contrast to the teacher-centered system outlined by Bloom, PSI places the learners in the center of the learning process and leaves them in charge of their learning by control of the teaching content. Later, Reiser (1984) and Eyre (2007) showed that PSI can significantly enhance retention, satisfaction and understanding given favourable feedback and progression instructions. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of PSI on developing learner autonomy, self-efficacy, and engagement in the long run.

Such theories like Peura, Bloom, and Keller share a common vision of learning: learning must be flexible, student-centered, and take into account the individual rate of development. The combination of collaboration and reflection by Peura and systematic feedback approach by Bloom and structural flexibility by Keller are the elements of a multifaceted personalization framework. Their focus on formative assessment, learner agency, and balanced learning settings has been a cornerstone to the models of education of the twenty-first century combining both conventional pedagogy and adaptive technologies. These theoretical legacies are still evident in the design of personalized learning ecosystems in modern classrooms, as more and more of them incorporate data analytics and artificial intelligence, making sure that education is rigorous and human-centered.

6. Pedagogical Context: Hybrid Teaching and School Culture

The combination of hybrid teaching and the supportive school culture forms the pedagogical environment that the effective personalized learning implementation requires. Blended learning or hybrid learning integrates the offline and online delivery systems to enhance flexibility, enhance engagement of the learners, and maximize interaction (Garrison and Kanuka, 2004). The blended strategy is consistent with the constructivist and connectivist theories that focus on engaging the learners in the process of learning and building knowledge in digital networks. Hybrid learning, according to Garrison and Vaughan (2008), is not a technological change, but a pedagogical change and thus an instructor is obliged to restructure learning experiences that enable learners to be independent and collaborative at the same time. Differentiation of pacing and multi-pathways to mastery: Hybrid models, because of a combination of synchronous in-person and asynchronous online aspects, can offer differentiated pacing as well as multiple pathways to mastery, both of which are characteristic of personalized learning.

Digital technologies are vital towards maintaining hybrid teaching through maintaining communication, collaboration, and ongoing evaluation. Learning management systems (LMS), interactive discussion boards, and real-time feedback tools enable teachers to track the progress and modify teaching depending on the needs of learners. According to Hrastinski (2019), the ability to learn improves with the use of technology in online engagement to establish the meaningful social presence and authentic dialogue instead of an instrument of content delivery. On the same note, a meta-analysis conducted by Bernard et al. (2014) established that blended learning, compared to the fully-online and traditional models, has a higher achievement and satisfaction due to its flexibility and interpersonal interaction. Within the framework of teaching English language, mixed methods allow variousiated tasks, multimedia presentation of material and personalized feedback, which is invaluable in personalized education.

Nevertheless, effective adoption of hybrid teaching cannot be set outside of cultural and organizational climate at the school. School culture is the set of beliefs and practices, as well as relationship processes that influence the interaction between teachers and students in the learning process (Deal and Peterson, 2016). Coburn (2003) maintains that profound educational transformation requires the development of professional cultures that cherish collaboration, experimentation and reflective practice. A positive school culture will motivate instructors to modify the curriculum, be creative with the use of digital resources, and offer approaches that support personalized learning. On the other hand, hierarchy, low level of trust, and rejection of innovation may hinder the process of adopting the hybrid approach despite availability of technology and infrastructure. Therefore, cultural preparedness and leadership should also come with pedagogical transformation.

The key components of a culture to support hybrid learning are teacher collaboration and professional development. Stoll et al. (2006) argue that learning communities comprising of professionals develop a sense of shared responsibility and group problem solving that are essential in maintaining instructional innovation. The teachers in hybrid situations should be provided with a chance to co-design the lessons, analyze the analytics related to learning, and test pedagogical practices based on a digital and face-to-face interaction. The study by Trust and Whalen (2020) of teachers in the COVID-19 pandemic has found that peer mentoring and institutional collaboration were key contributors to the effectiveness of hybrid lessons by teachers. This observation highlights the importance of collegial networks and administrative support in the development of adaptive learning culture in teaching that is responsive to needs of different learners.

Finally, institutional preparedness, digital literacy, and the mutual commitment to student-centered pedagogy are the determinants of the practicing success of hybrid teaching through the institutions of personalized learning. Continuous learning and innovation have best been applied in a hybrid model whereby the school ecosystem includes the teachers, administrators, learners, and parents. Cultural flexibility and systemic coherence are the conditions of the sustainable educational reform as Fullan and Quinn (2016) accentuate. In a situation where hybrid teaching is backed with a robust culture of collaboration, it does not only increase the level of engagement and achievement, but access to learning opportunities is also democratized. Accordingly, the interaction of the hybrid pedagogy and school culture is the foundation of the successful and scalable personalized learning program.

7. Implications for Designing a Personalized English Learning Programme

Designing a personalized English learning programme requires the integration of theoretical, pedagogical, and technological principles that align with learner diversity and individual progression. The foundation lies in developing comprehensive learner profiles that assess linguistic competence, cognitive style, motivation, and emotional factors (Bower, 2019). These profiles inform adaptive learning pathways that respond dynamically to each student's needs. Central to this process is formative assessment, which functions as a continuous feedback mechanism rather than a terminal evaluation. According to Black and Wiliam (2018), formative assessment promotes deeper learning by helping learners recognize their progress and identify areas for improvement. Mastery-based feedback, as proposed in Bloom's (1968) model, ensures that students attain proficiency before moving to more complex linguistic tasks. In the context of English language learning, formative assessment not only enhances accuracy and fluency but also cultivates metacognitive awareness and learner autonomy.

The theoretical, pedagogical, and technological principles must be combined to design a unique English learning programme that meets the needs of the diverse learners and their personal development. It is built on the improvement of the complete profiles of learners that determine linguistic competence, cognitive style, motivation, and emotional aspects (Bower, 2019). These profiles drive the adaptive learning mechanisms that react dynamically to the needs of the individual students. The key to this process is formative assessment, which is an ongoing process of feedback and not final. Black and Wiliam (2018) state that formative assessment encourages learners to learn more, as they can see the progress they have made and understand what they are doing wrong. The mastery-based feedback, which is advanced in the model by Bloom (1968), will make sure that students are proficient before they proceed with the more complicated linguistic activities. Formative assessment is suggested to improve accuracy and fluency in English language learning, in addition to developing metacognitive awareness and learner autonomy.

The personalized English learning programme should be properly designed as well, and the hybrid infrastructure, which combines face-to-face interaction with digital tools, is necessary. It has been found that blended or hybrid learning environment promotes flexibility and long-term engagement in that it can help accommodate the schedules and preferences of learners with different schedules (Garrison and Vaughan, 2008). Adaptive platforms and learning management systems (LMS) allow customizing the pace of learning, providing immediate feedback, and working together in groups, all of which are more motivating and performance-boosting (Hrastinski, 2019). The role of teachers in this model is a shifting one, as the knowledge givers transform into facilitators and coaches who help the learners set goals, reflect and self evaluate. The human insight and subsequent adaptation to digital technology can only be facilitated by the expertise of the teacher to interpret the learning analytics and give individual feedback, as Spector (2015) highlights. Thus, technology-enhanced instructional training of teachers becomes crucial to achieve the maximum possible efficacy of the personalized instruction.

A personalized learning design should always be based on equity and accessibility. Although adaptive systems provide customized routes, they can increase educational disparities in case the access to digital resources, access to the internet, or language assistance is not distributed equally (Reich, 2020). A comprehensive English learning programme should, hence, take into consideration social-economic inequalities and make sure that all of the learners, irrespective of their background, enjoy the advantages of being personalized. Learning environments can be made more fair and accessible to diverse learners with the help of universal design principles and culturally responsive materials (Meyer, Rose, and Gordon, 2014). When the spheres of learner profiling, formative assessment, hybrid teaching, and equity-based policies overlap, it forms the ecosystem of the processes in which every student can advance to the English language proficiency at the most favorable and individual rate.

8. Conclusion

As has been determined in the review, the individualized approach to teaching English language changes the conventional paradigm of English language instruction since it puts the learner at the center of the educational process. It points out that when teaching is designed to meet the needs of learners individually, their abilities, and learning styles, this will result in increased motivation, more engagement, and long-term academic development. The combination of mastery-based progression will make sure that mastery in the foundation skills is attained before moving to another level, and autonomy-based strategies will facilitate ownership, confidence, and self-directed learning. Moreover, adaptive and hybrid instructional models were identified as having a beneficial effect on accessibility and flexibility, where students were able to learn at their own speed, but they still were able to engage meaningfully with the teachers and fellow students.

In the studies reviewed, there is a strong trend: personalization is most efficient when it is backed by a well-developed system of assessment and the institutional culture of collaboration, innovation, and reflective teaching. The key to effective personalised programmes does not necessarily lie in technology, but it flourishes in a climate where teachers are facilitators, learners are empowered to become responsible for their own progress, and schools are open to continuous professional development. The accumulation of evidence also shows that individualized learning does not merely lead to linguistic proficiency but also to the development of critical thinking, creativity and emotional well-being- competencies that are vital in comprehensive education.

In general, the results confirm the personalized learning of English as one of the most important pedagogical solutions and the strategic approach to addressing the needs of the diverse learners in the classroom. It can work across equity disparities, foster lifelong learning practices, and create learning environments that are inclusive ecosystems, where all learners have opportunities to achieve their fullest potential, when it is designed well. The review concludes that the further implementations should still perfect the structures that will allow personalizing and be culturally sensitive, so that the innovation should still be consistent with human values and the goal of education.

References

1. Anderson, L. W., Evertson, C. M., & Brophy, J. E. (1992). *Classroom research: The study of teachers and teaching*. Lexington Books.

2. Bahçeci, F., & Gürol, M. (2016). The development of a personalized learning portal based on learners' cognitive levels. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64(4), 621–637.

3. Benson, P. (2010). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

4. Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Tamim, R. M., & Abrami, P. C. (2014). A meta-analysis of blended learning and technology use in higher education: From the general to the applied. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 26*(1), 87–122. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-013-9077-3

5. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). *Classroom assessment and pedagogy*. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 25(6), 551–575. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807

6. Bloom, B. S. (1968). *Learning for mastery*. Evaluation Comment, 1(2), 1–12. University of California, Los Angeles, Center for the Study of Evaluation.

7. Bloom, B. S. (1984). *The 2 sigma problem: The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring. Educational Researcher*, 13(6), 4–16.

8. Bower, M. (2019). *Design of technology-enhanced learning: Integrating research and practice*. Emerald Publishing.

9. Carlo, M., Dressler, C., & Snow, C. (2005). Developing vocabulary in English language learners. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 20(1), 50–57.

10. Chatti, M. A. (2010). Personalization in technology-enhanced learning: A social software perspective. *Educational Technology & Society*, 13(3), 1–12.

11. Coburn, C. (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change. *Educational Researcher*, 32(6), 3–12.

12. Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (2016). *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

13. Dewey, J. (1907). *The school and society*. University of Chicago Press.

14. Dickinson, L. (1994). Learner autonomy: What, why and how. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 1–12). Oxford University Press.

15. du Plooy, E., Casteleijn, D., & Franzsen, D. (2024). *Personalized adaptive learning in higher education: A scoping review of key characteristics and impact on academic performance and engagement*. Heliyon.

16. Everhard, C. (2015). *Assessment and autonomy in language learning*. Palgrave Macmillan.

17. Eyre, H. A. (2007). Keller's Personalized System of Instruction: Was it a success? *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 40*(3), 401–404. https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.2007.40-401

18. FitzGerald, E., et al. (2018). The future of personalized learning: Big data and analytics in education. *Computers & Education*, 126, 236–248.

19. FitzGerald, E., Ferguson, R., Adams, A., Gaved, M., Mor, Y., & Thomas, R. (2018). Augmenting the MOOC experience: Study support for MOOC learners. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 14(1), 1–18.

20. Fullan, M., & Quinn, J. (2016). *Coherence: The right drivers in action for schools, districts, and systems*. Corwin Press.

21. Gagné, R. M., & Briggs, L. J. (1979). *Principles of instructional design*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

22. Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2), 95–105.

23. Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines*. Jossey-Bass.

24. Gómez, S., Zervas, P., Sampson, D., & Fabregat, R. (2014). Towards a conceptualization of personalized learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 17(2), 1–13.

25. Guo, L., Zhang, X., Zhao, R., Zheng, S., & Li, Q. (2021). Evolution and trends in intelligent tutoring systems research: A scientometric study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.721453

26. Guskey, T. R. (2007). Closing achievement gaps: Revisiting Benjamin S. Bloom's "Learning for Mastery." *Journal of Advanced Academics, 19*(1), 8–31. https://doi.org/10.4219/jaa-2007-704

27. Hammerschmidt-Snidarich, S. M., Rieth, H. J., & Seifert, K. L. (2019). Technology-based personalized learning: Effects on student achievement and engagement. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 9*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2019.09.1.01

28. Holec, H. (1979). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Pergamon.

29. Hooshyar, D., Ahmad, R., Yousefi, M., Yusop, F. D., & Horng, S. J. (2015). Intelligent tutoring systems: A comprehensive survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 45(1), 89–140.

30. Hrastinski, S. (2019). What do we mean by blended learning? *TechTrends, 63*(5), 564–569. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-019-00375-5

31. Hsieh, T., & Chen, S. (2016). The effectiveness of adaptive learning systems on students' learning outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64(6), 1283–1308.

32. Kabudi, T. (2021). AI-enabled adaptive learning systems: A systematic review. *Journal of Learning Analytics and Artificial Intelligence*.

33. Kagan, S. (1995). Cooperative learning in the ESL classroom. *ERIC Digest*, ED382035.

34. Keller, F. S. (1968). "Goodbye teacher…" *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 1(1), 79–89.

35. Kulkarni, K. (2005). Developing and evaluating a curriculum for enhancing writing skills of Marathi-speaking students. *Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis*, University of Pune.

36. Létourneau, A., et al. (2025). A systematic review of AI-driven intelligent tutoring systems. *PMC*.

37. Liu, M., McKelroy, E., Corliss, S., & Carrigan, J. (2017). Investigating the effect of an adaptive learning intervention on students' learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 65*(3), 631–654. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-017-9542-1

38. Mäenpää, K. (2016). *The humanity of learning: Exploring Peura's personalized learning model*. University of Helsinki.

39. Mäenpää, K. (2016). *The humanity of learning: Exploring Peura's personalized learning model* [Master's thesis, University of Helsinki].

40. Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). *Universal design for learning: Theory and practice*. CAST Professional Publishing.

41. Miliband, D. (2006). *Choice and voice in personalized learning*. Department for Education and Skills.

42. Peura, P. (2012a). *Personalized learning and mastery education*. Helsinki: Maot.fi.

43. Peura, P. (2012a). *Personalized learning and mastery education*. Maot.fi Educational Blog.

44. Peura, P. (2012c). *Assessment for learning in personalized classrooms*. Maot.fi Educational Blog.

45. Pontual Falco, A., Peres, S., Sales de Morais, R., & da Silva Oliveira, T. (2018). Personalized learning in digital education: A review. *International Journal of Educational Technology*, 12(4), 233–246.

46. Redding, S. (2019). *Getting personal: The promise of personalized learning*. Center on Innovations in Learning / Information Age Publishing.

47. Reich, J. (2020). *Failure to disrupt: Why technology alone can't transform education.* Harvard University Press.

48. Reiser, R. A. (1984). Instructional design: A historical analysis. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 32*(2), 11–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02768839

49. Shemshack, A. (2020). A systematic literature review of personalized learning terms. *Smart Learning Environments*, 7(1).

50. Skinner, B. F. (1954). The science of learning and the art of teaching. *Harvard Educational Review, 24*(2), 86–97.

51. Spector, J. M. (2015). Foundations of educational technology: Integrative approaches and interdisciplinary perspectives. Routledge.

52. Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change, 7*(4), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-0001-8

53. Stradling, R., & Saunders, L. (1993). Differentiation in action. *Educational Research*, 35(2), 127–137.

54. Tan, L. Y., et al. (2025). Artificial intelligence–enabled adaptive learning platforms. *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence*.

55. Tasdelen, O., et al. (2025). Generative AI in the classroom: Effects of context-personalized educational material on intrinsic motivation and learning performance. *Journal of Educational Data Mining / relevant journal*.

56. Toivola, M. (2015). *A learner-centered approach to mathematics education: Reflections on Peura's method* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki].

57. Tomlinson, C. A. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners.* ASCD.

58. Tomlinson, C. A. (2003). *Fulfilling the promise of the differentiated classroom: Strategies and tools for responsive teaching.* ASCD.

59. Truong, H. M. (2016). Integrating learning styles and adaptive e-learning system: Current developments, problems, and opportunities. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 55, 1185–1193.

60. Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Should teachers be trained in emergency remote teaching? Lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 28*(2), 189–199.

61. Turk, A. R. (2021). Stimulating a gradual and progressive shift to personalize teaching. *ERIC / Education Journal*.

62. U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *Transforming American education: Learning powered by technology.*

63. UNESCO. (2017). *Personalized learning*. UNESCO documentation.

64. Vorobyeva, K. I., et al. (2025). Personalized learning through AI: Pedagogical approaches and critical insights. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 17(2).

65. Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. MIT Press.

66. Walberg, H. J. (1986). Synthesis of research on teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 43(7), 71–79.

67. Zhang, X., Li, H., Liu, Z., Chen, Z., Zhou, H., Rong, W., & Ouyang, Y. (2024). A review of data mining in personalized education: Current trends and future prospects. *arXiv preprint*.

68. Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2