
Cognitive Linguistics to Upskill English Survival Vocabulary to the Malayali Tribal Students Inhibited by Psychological and Environmental Factors

Ida Grace A.¹, Sneha Mishra^{2*}

Research Scholar¹, School of Social Sciences and Languages, Department of English, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore, India

Email: idagrace25@gmail.com

Assistant Professor^{*}, School of Social Sciences and Languages, Department of English, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore, India

*Corresponding Author Email: sneha.mishra@vit.ac.in

Received: 17-June-2023

Revised: 04-July-2023

Accepted: 02-August-2023

Abstract

English language teaching and learning at school is crucial for tribal students in this globalisation. This study aims to upskill the English survival vocabulary from A1 to A2 level according to the CERF vocabulary acquisition rubrics through Cognitive Linguistics (CL) to the upper primary tribal learners in Tamil Nadu, India. The paper expounds on two areas (1) the psychological and environmental factors that inhibit the learners to learn the English language, predominantly the tribal students of Tamil Nadu, India, and (2) CL concepts and the pedagogical characteristics that cover the methods and activities to inculcate English survival vocabulary in the language classroom effectively. CL concepts such as prototypes, schema, level of categorisation, and semantic mapping are applied to teach students to learn vocabulary. The study follows a quantitative experimental design, and the participants were selected through a convenient sampling method. The research experiment was conducted with experiment (N=50) and control groups (N=50). Activities were incorporated into the experimental group in the teaching and learning processes. The data for this study was procured through pre-test and post-test, and the result of both groups was juxtaposed through SPSS software. The data analysed with paired sample t-test revealed the effectiveness of CL in learning English survival vocabulary.

Keywords: Vocabulary adeptness, Malayali tribal learners, psychological and environmental factors, cognitive linguistic concepts, CERF

1. Introduction

This paper focuses on teaching English survival vocabulary to non-native speakers of English through Cognitive Linguistics. It assists the target audience in utilising cognitive linguistic concepts such as prototypes, semantic mapping, schema, etc., in learning vocabulary. The National Curriculum Framework of India (2005) stated, "English may be one of the languages for learning activities that create the child's awareness of the world." The significant problem in India is that a single teaching method is utilised to teach the English language to the audience with the same old material. The National Focus Group Position Paper on Teaching English (2005) expressed, "English in India today is a symbol of people's aspiration for quality in education and a fuller participation in national and international life." The pivotal role of quality education is dependent on English teachers who will construct the learners' future. Constructing facilitates an environment for learners to acquire English vocabulary through CL. Many decades have rolled by, but teaching the English language to the tribal community is considered to be a great challenge. The significant reason behind this challenge faced by the English language instructor is that they teach English to the target audience who knows no or little English. The tribal learners in most places are just taught to pass the English exam, so their interest in learning English gradually decreases. Emphasis has been given to the education of children from scheduled castes and scheduled tribes (Mehta & Kapur, 1998).

India is a salad bowl containing some of the largest tribal populations in the globe, who are called 'Adivasi'. They are economically disadvantaged people living in the mountains, hills, or remote areas. Tribal children are trapped for generation after generation in a cycle of poverty and illiteracy and are deprived by society because of their marginal life (Roy, 2012). There is an 8.6% population of tribal people and 645 tribal communities in India

according to the census 2001, wherein some of the tribal people choose to isolate themselves to conserve their culture, while the rest decide to accept technology and science and adopt quality education (Panda & Ojha, 2021). India's tribes are known to have occupied the fringe of Indian society (Rupavath, 2016), and they do not have an acute consciousness of the value of learning the English language. Despite numerous schemes initiated by the Government of India to address the challenges faced by tribal students, their English language learning outcomes have remained unsatisfactory. The existing literature reveals that various factors impact the learning of the English language by tribal students. Since the traditional English classes are inadequate for these learners to acquire survival vocabulary, this paper proposes to integrate CL to teach them tier-one survival vocabulary. Mastery of English vocabulary enables students to express their thoughts and ideas accurately. Tier-one vocabulary comprises over 8000 basic words with single meanings (Hutton, 2008). Therefore, the primary goal of this paper is to employ CL to teach English survival vocabulary to non-native speakers.

2. Literature Background

2.1 English Language to the Tribal Learners

Teaching and learning the English language differ according to the level of language learners and their medium of education. In India, there are two mediums of education, English and the native language medium. Not every tribal student can afford English medium education, so teaching the English language to tribal learners is achieved with great effort. There are various factors that affect tribal students in acquiring a second language, such as; illiteracy, lack of motivation, fear of an alien language, lack of suitable teachers, lack of facilities and inadequate educational institutions and systems. The tribes' socio-economic deprivation is mirrored in their educational slack though the government initiates numerous steps to outwit the educational deterioration in the tribal community. Still, the majority of them in India stay outside the educational system (Varghese & Nagaraj, 2012).

2.2 Psychological and Environment Factors that Impede the Tribal Learners' English Language Learning

English language learning is not a challenge when it is learnt with interest (Radhika & Nivedha, 2020). The tribal learners lack interest in learning the English language as they are hardly motivated by their parents. Their society also shuns the growth of English language learning as the students cannot practice it with their fellow members or family. The learners acquire their mother tongue naturally, but in second language acquisition, a natural way of learning is not found in their surroundings. According to Vygotsky (1962), language is developed from social and cultural activity. The influence of the mother tongue in an English language classroom hinders acquiring a new language.

In a tribal classroom, the English teachers use their mother tongue to explain the foreign language. Thus, the students need more confidence while communicating in English (Sindkhedkar, 2012). Most of the tribal students are first-generation English learners, and the only place of access to learning the English language is at school (Kujur & Krishnan, 2019). The learners lack suitable teachers, English language teaching methods, facilities, amenities and resources, so their achievement level is low and thereby, negative attitudes and anxiety growths among students in learning the English language. The anxiety of acquiring a foreign language is the major factor that brings a halt to their education because the English language has become essential in the criteria to proceed with higher education like college (Varghese & Nagaraj, 2012).

The tribal students' achievement level is comparatively lower than the non-tribal students. This reveals that tribal learners do not have a proper motivating environment to learn the English language (Kujur & Krishnan, 2019). The low literacy rate within the tribal community is a massive threat to Indian education (Yasmeen, 2017). The tribal students, in most cases, do not have suitable teachers to teach the English language in a better way to clarify the students' doubts. The tribal language learners do not have proper language instructors or exposure to society. Poor English vocabulary knowledge depends on a person's external and internal factors (Paradis, 2011). One of the environmental factors depend on the quality and amount of English language exposure and psychological factors depend on the individual potential and interest in learning a language, i.e., language learning aptitude (Hjetland et al., 2021).

2.3 Significance of Learning Vocabulary

According to Wilkins (1972), "Without grammar, very little can be conveyed; without vocabulary, nothing can be conveyed" (p. 110-111). Vocabulary is the central part of language attainment, it is a pivotal part to know how well the learners speak, write, listen and read (Grace & Nageswari, 2020). Rivers (1981) states, "Vocabulary cannot be taught. It can be presented, explained, included in all kinds of activities, but it must be learnt by individuals" (p. 28). Vocabulary is a prominent ability that should be bestowed to English language learners, and it augments the learners to speak without any doubt or struggle. Learning vocabulary is like learning word definitions (Harmon et al., 2009). There are several types of English vocabulary they are academic vocabulary, content vocabulary, business vocabulary, professional vocabulary, technical vocabulary and survival vocabulary. The researcher in this research article has attempted to teach English survival vocabulary to the tribal students of Tamil Nadu.

2.4 Why English Survival Vocabulary?

The purpose of teaching English survival vocabulary is to help the tribal learners to learn basic vocabulary to survive the city culture, and it also gives confidence in them to get along with the other non-tribal students. Tribal learners must learn English survival vocabulary as they migrate from their tribal area to the city for their higher education. The significant vocabulary a learner should learn is survival vocabulary (Verawati et al., 2021). Survival vocabulary depends on the language use needs of a language user, the usage of vocabulary depends on the following, a. locality, b. environment, c. daily life conditions in the user's language. It also depends on the needs of the language-speaking group, both formal and informal situations (Mbete 2008). A basic survival vocabulary is necessary for trainable students to protect their dignity (Sheridan et al. 1997). Nation and Crabbe (1991) stated, "What is language knowledge that learners first need when they learn a language?" Much existing research focuses on grammatical structures rather than on survival vocabulary. The tribal learners need to know survival vocabulary to initiate social contact with other speakers.

When the researcher conceptualised teaching survival vocabulary, words were selected according to the need of the target audience based on the CERF A2 vocabulary level. The feature of context is survival vocabulary for everyday usage is tier one, academic vocabulary belongs to tier two, and subject-specific vocabulary is tier three (Beck et al. 2013). Words that are concrete, available to senses, and visually represented better than those of the abstract (Leacox & Jackson, 2014) are chosen to be taught to the tribal students.

3. Theoretical Framework

Cognitive linguistics (CL) is a branch of linguistics that amalgamates language and thought as the sides of the same coin. Langacker (1987), and his notable book "An Introduction to Cognitive Grammar" and Lakoff and Johnson (1987) and their popular book "Cognitive Semantics" are the three important linguists who grabbed the attention of this field of science in language. In addition to the three outstanding linguists, many linguists like Evans and Green (2006), Dirven and Verspoor (2004), Craft, Foucault, Johnson, Talmy and Turner have conducted and paved a better way for CL to grow and develop. Cognitive linguists reckon that language is a fundamental part of human cognition. Any study of linguistic qualities will need an analysis of human cognition and mental faculties. To study a language, mind and mental processes are involved (Cacioppo et al., 2002). Linguists view linguistic skills as a part of basic cognition and discerning. Linguistic behaviour is inseparable from the basic cognitive competencies that involve mental processes such as reasoning, memory, attention, problem-solving and learning (Vladimirovna, 2021). CL is an approach which is "based on our experience of the world and the way we perceive and conceptualise it" (Ungerer & Schmitt, 2013). CL widens the belief about the term 'cognition' and has a prominent effect on learning and teaching a second or foreign language (Chen, 2009). There are various theories in CL, but the current study utilises the concept of prototype, level of categorisations, semantic mapping, and schema in its analysis.

3.1 Prototype

The prototype is a concept which is already existing in mind or memory of an individual and by hearing a term, a concept immediately occurs in mind (Dehghan, 2021). Eleanor Rosch experimented with the category BIRD. They also found out that for a bird to be a bird, there are common attributes such as "a) laying eggs, b) having a

beak, c) having two wings and two legs, d) having feathers, e) being able to fly, f) being small and lightweight, g) chirps/sings, h) legs are thin/short, j) kept in a cage, k) has a long neck, l) has decorative feathers, and m) has exotic colours” (Ungerer & Schmid, 2013, p. 27). ROBIN had more resemblance with other family members, so they classified it to be the prototype of the category BIRD. Each and every family member have related attributes to the prototype. If someone speaks about BIRD, we first think about ROBIN and not OSTRICH or PENGUIN because ROBIN has more similarities with BIRD. There are four features of prototypicality (Carstairs, 1988), and they are,

1. Prototypical categories show that not every member has the equal representation in a category.
2. It has a family attribute its meaning structure has a set of grouped and interrelated readings.
3. Prototypical categories are indistinctive at the ends.
4. It cannot be described with a single criteria.

In teaching vocabulary, prototype is useful to comprehend and remember the meanings of vocabulary. Prototype concept easily links words into the external word and human cognition helping the learners to efficiently remember the words.

3.2 Levels of Categorisation

Categorisation is the basic cognitive process of arranging concepts into classes or categories, it is a mental process. More significantly, “categories and categorisations are existing everywhere, and are ways we perceive the world, otherwise we cannot know it in appropriate way” (Zhao, 2003). There are objects that can consecutively be a member of particular categories. For example, a wolfdog is grouped into categories of animals, dogs, puppy dogs etc. (Chen 2009). To explain this, CL posits levels of categorisation such as (1) superordinate category, (2) basic category and (3) subordinate category. The superordinate category stays at the top of the taxonomy. For example, VEHICLE, the basic category, has the classification of the superordinate category, for example, BUS, CAR, PLANE, TANK etc. The subordinate category further classifies the basic category, for example, MINIBUS, SPORTS CAR etc. In terms of levels of categorisation, this study has utilised semantic categories to group sets of vocabulary to be taught, enhancing the systematic learning of vocabulary.

3.3 Semantic Mapping

Barcroft (2004) describes semantic mapping as “the increased evaluation of an item with regard to its meaning”. It is the graphical representation of the meaning that relates various words. Semantic mapping is utilised as an instrument to find out the conceptual relationship between the vocabulary. It also extends and enhances vocabulary learning and memory retention through the learning process called integration (Shostak, 2002). Integration is an order perspective that occurs during learning, in which novel information should be embodied into what the learner knows already (Christen & Murphy, 1987). Semantic mapping leads the learners into deeper learning; therefore long-term memory retention is retained. Semantic mapping effectively affects the memory (i) of previously learnt vocabulary (Craik & Tulving, 1975); (ii) newly learnt words noted as known words (Beaton et al., 1995). The graphic designers have formulated graphic teaching methods which has helped the students to build a conceptual connection while learning a set of vocabulary. The semantic mapping helped the tribal students to learn different words effectively in a short span of time.

3.4 Schema

Schema was brought into usage by Frederic Bartlett, a British psychologist. It became one of the leading concepts in cognitivist learning. Later in the 1970s, Richard Anderson developed it. Although the notion of schema was already introduced in the 1920s, it extended its fame in between the 1970s and 1980s as a result of growth in CL and psychology. Rumelhart (2017) states that the concept of schemata is the unit where all understanding is embedded in it and is called ‘the schemata’, it is also the “building block of cognition”. There are four important elements of a schema they are,

1. An individual has the capacity to memorise and utilise schema without his/her knowledge.
2. If a schema is developed, it remains stable for a long period of time.
3. Schemata are used by the human mind to organise, retrieve and encode every important information that is learnt previously.
4. A schema is built up consequently through various experiences.

A schema is called a mental pattern to signify a generic concept which is stored in the memory and it also can be expressed as the previously procured knowledge that can help us to make predictions and expectations (Bilokcuoğlu, 2014). There are three types of schemata in the process of understanding they are (1) linguistics schema, (2) formal schema, and (3) content schema (Yang, 2010). Linguistics schema shows the linguistics knowledge of a student for example, in learning grammar, vocabulary, phonemes, phrases, paragraphs etc. The tribal learners utilised linguistics schema to learn English vocabulary. Formal schema is the knowledge of rhetorical structures in the discourse. It involves various genre patterns like fables, newspapers, articles, and scientific texts. Content schema is the foundational knowledge of a content area of a subject.

4. Research Problem and Research Questions

The target audience for this study is upper primary learners continuing their education in Tamil, their first language. Their curriculum includes English as a subject from the primary level, but the students struggle to speak, read or write basic words in English. The learners faced problems in learning English as their second language as they have two different environments (1) school environment and (2) home environment. At school, they do not have proper aids for learning English as they study in a Government school, there is no or little facility and suitable teacher to teach the students. Even if the students learn basic English at school, they lack the privilege of practising at home. It is essential for students to learn English survival vocabulary to continue their higher education. They are compelled to move to the cities as there are no institutions in the mountain except for some government schools. The major problems for the rural learners' poor English proficiency levels are a lack of a proper learning environment and a lack of suitable teachers, amenities and resources (Wreikat et al., 2014). The following research questions are investigated in this study,

1. What are the psychological and environmental factors that impede the tribal learners from acquiring the English language?
2. Is CL more effective in incorporating English survival vocabulary than the traditional method?

5. Materials, Methods and Procedures

This study used CL concepts to impart English survival vocabulary to the target audience. Activity-based language teaching enabled the students to augment the target language input with reliable activities that enhanced their language-acquiring motivation (Aliasin et al., 2019). An oral explanation of the activity was given by the researcher in their mother tongue, L1 = Tamil. The activities were framed based on the terms formulated by Prabhu (1987). The terms followed in formulating tasks in this study were,

1. Aim: The aim was to teach survival vocabulary through CL.
2. Input: The input medium was oral and visual
3. Instruction: There was two-way communication between the instructor and the students at every point.
4. Procedure: The concepts of CL were embedded in teaching the vocabulary.
5. Expected outcome: To learn the survival vocabulary, and it was evaluated through a post-test.

The experimental group was treated with CL and the no treatment was given to the control group. A diagnostic test was conducted to both the groups to test their vocabulary level. The questions were adapted from Key English Test A1 and A2 vocabulary level. The results revealed that the tribal students performed well in A1 vocabulary level. Thus, A2 vocabulary was taught to the tribal audience. The target audience for this study belongs to a Malayali tribal community in Aranoothumalai, Salem, India. The students who are studying from standard six to

eight, were exposed to English language learning from their primary levels. The researcher divided the students into two groups, experimental group N=50 and control group N=50. Thirty hours of English classes were conducted for the experimental group. Activities were implemented in the teaching and learning process.

The term 'Malayali' is derived from the Tamil language, 'Malai' means hill, and 'Yali' means residing people who reside on the hill. The Malayali tribe is considered to be the largest tribal community in Tamil Nadu. The tools utilised on the samples were questionnaire, common visual aids, i.e., charts and pictures and classroom observations, pre-test and post-test to evaluate the results. The researcher performed Cronbach's Alpha test to analyse the reliability of the questionnaire that was used to collect data. The score of .705 was obtained, this score indicated the internal consistency of the questionnaire. Hence, the researcher proceeded the study further. Arikunto (2010) stated, "Test is used to measure skill or ability of the observed object." It was found that all the participants were exposed to English language learning, but none of them had an opportunity to bring the English language into use. All the learners were found to be first-generation English language learners, so they hardly had a learning environment to speak or ask doubts in the English language.

This study attempts to improve the students' vocabulary level from A1 to A2 based on the classification of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) through CL. The CEFR has different levels, the lowest level of the hierarchy is A1 or A2, B1 or B2 belongs to the intermediate and C1 or C2 is the advanced level (Milton & Alexiou, 2009). The purpose of CEFR, based on various empirical research is mentioned in a nutshell,

- To set up learning and teaching objectives
- To evaluate curricula
- To sketch the teaching and learning materials
- To offer a source for distinguishing language qualifications by enabling education and job-related mobility.

CEFR is a benchmark to describe the English proficiency level of second or foreign-language learners. It is broadly employed in English language teaching both by the public and private educational sectors. The researcher taught English survival words taken from the Cambridge A2 vocabulary list. A2 level is a pre-intermediate level where the researcher taught simple and routine vocabulary that helped the students to handle very short sentences on familiar topics.

6. Activities

Conventional teaching and learning encourage the students to be engaged with the exhausting procedures of taking notes and memorising the words even without understanding or using it in a sentence. According to Scrivener (2009), "the significant rundown of words and their interpretation appears to excite memory, notwithstanding when we can recollect the word we need, it doesn't appear to fit easily into our sentences"(p. 241). The activity of taking notes does not help the students to remember the words, but conducting activities in language class enables the learners to learn vocabulary under stressless situations and also helps them to remember. The researcher implemented several activities in the process of teaching survival vocabulary to the tribal learners. The activities are explained below.

6.1 Picture Bingo

An adaptation of the traditional game, Picture Bingo fosters attentiveness and participation in the language class. The instructor announces the vocabulary, and students mark the corresponding picture on their Bingo sheet, stimulating their cognitive links between the words and their visual representations.

Steps:

- Distribute the bingo sheets to the students
- The instructor tells the vocabulary
- The students should mark

- The student who finishes marking first yells BINGO

6.2 Identify the vocabulary from the pictures

A picture depicts a thousand words. The visual aids like pictures help the learners in developing English vocabulary. It is a visual treat to the learners. Dolati & Richards (2011) stated, "In the language learning of young children, pictures are often used to provide associations for the learning of new words." (p. 9). Though this activity is old, it stimulates the students' understanding. This activity aims to make the students remember and learn words concerning the right picture. It helps the students to perceive. Perception is one of the cognitive systems that intertwine language learning and mental development.

Steps:

- Ask the learners about all the things that are in their school
- Show more than two pictures
- Ask the students to identify a particular vocabulary from the pictures
- Investigate the responses

6.3 Draw the pictures

Drawing is fun and the students draw the pictures as the researcher dictated the words. Drawing pictures for vocabulary is a way of helping the students to remember it. Making the students draw a picture in the language classroom reinforces their understanding of the vocabulary (Mothe, 2000). For several learners it is simple to recollect a word's meaning in a specific context by making a quick sketch that connects the word to something personally meaningful to the student.

Steps:

- Ask the students to draw as many pictures as possible under a title, i.e., Things at home.
- Ask the students to tell the vocabulary, i.e., vessel, table and so on.
- The instructor corrects it.

6.4 Pictionary

It was founded by Robert Angel in 1985. In recent times this game has been inculcated to make the learners learn vocabulary easily. It is a classical game of drawing and guessing pictures. The students will have a chance to visualise the concept (a word) and recall the vocabulary for retention with connection to the other vocabulary. This triggers the students to remember most of the words connected to one vocabulary, for example, school, board, drawer, chalk etc. The schema reduces ambiguity and fills the gaps with information for memory reconstruction.

Steps:

- Divide the class into two groups
- Whisper a word to a student and make him/her draw the picture
- The group that finds the word gains a point
- Repeat

6.5 Vocabulary picture album

Creating a vocabulary picture album allowed students to visually connect the learnt vocabulary and refer back to it whenever necessary. This activity catered to the diverse learning styles in the classroom, especially benefiting visual learners.

Steps:

- The students draw the pictures and write the vocabulary
- The students make it into a picture album
- The instructor corrects the picture album
- The students will refer to it when they have doubts

6.6 Flashcards

It makes learning vocabulary fun-filled and exciting, the students encourage each other, and they try to find out the words correctly. Flashcards break the monotonous way of teaching and decrease boredom in English classrooms. The cards were first used in the 19th century by Favell Lee Mortimer, an English instructor and author of educational textbooks for children. Today, it is used in the language classrooms by students to memorise vocabulary easily (Javorcik, 2021). Human cognition is evoked to identify and creates a link between the stimuli and to respond with an arbitrary object, event or complex idea.

Steps:

- Make the students sit in a circle
- Spin the bottle
- The student who happens to sit facing the bottleneck shows the flashcard
- Other students are made to identify what's in the flashcard
- The student who says the answer is allowed to spin the bottle.

7. Findings, Results and Discussions

Teaching vocabulary through CL concepts enables the students to remember the vocabulary in collocations. The data procured from the questionnaire revealed that CL paved a better way for a productive teaching-learning experience possible. According to the research findings, most of the participants mentioned they gained new vocabulary in a short period, and they also understood it is essential for them to learn English vocabulary. The existing studies (Andreani & Ying, 2019; Peters & Higbea, 2014) clinched that the learners' vocabulary learning is affected by various psychological and environmental factors. Rote learning hinders the learners' cognitive abilities, such as; perceiving, reasoning, thinking critically, and creating concepts. Thus, the learner finds learning vocabulary to be a herculean task.

The researcher identified different psychological and environmental factors that hinder the tribal learners to learn the English language, such as given in Table 1. (1) constraints at home, the eagerness to use the second language outside the classroom is low, which leads to underdeveloped language skills. (2) Illiteracy, most of the tribal students belong to the first generational learners. (3) Lack of motivation, the tribal students lack motivation as their parents neither encourage the students nor know the importance of learning the English language (Edelman, 2013). (4) Fear of foreign language, the tribal learners experience a kind of hesitation along with fear of learning the English language. Fear wastes the energy that should be utilised for memory and processing cognitive ability to learn a language (Saklofske et al., 1979). (5) Lack of suitable teachers, the existing research articles state that Government Tribal residential schools do not have 100% teacher strength. In some cases, the tribal teachers' educational qualification is below the 10th standard, which also stands as a stumbling block in the students' English language achievement (Jayashree, 1989). (6) Lack of facilities and amenities, the promise of proper language learning facility is still continued to be a distant dream for the tribal learners as they do not have facilities that urban government schools have, such as internet, digital board facility and proper learning environment. (7) Alien language, English language appears to be a foreign or alien language to the tribal learners as it is taught once in a blue moon, and it is hardly used to communicate. The students have no chance of practising the English language with their family or friends. (8) Inadequate educational institutions and their system, the government

understanding the importance of education, established various community-based schools for the tribal students. Most of the community schools are located in remote areas where there are no frequent commuting facilities. A descriptive questionnaire was used to collect the data. As the questions were in English, the researcher read and translated the questions to the students in their mother tongue L1 (Tamil).

Table 1. Factors that affect the learners' English language learning

Sl. No	Constraints at home	Strongly Disagree %	Disagree %	Agree %	Strongly agree %
1.	My parents encourage me to learn the English language.	58	6	8	28
2.	I have a conducive environment to study the English language at home.	100	0	0	0
3.	My parents know the importance of learning the English language.	64	22	14	0
4.	I have a chance to practise the English language at home.	100	0	0	0
5.	I can ask my doubts regarding the English language to my parents.	100	0	0	0
	Illiteracy				
1.	Learning English is essential for me	0	0	0	100
2.	My parent(s) are aware of the importance of learning the English language	66	0	14	20
3.	My neighbours/relatives/friends have encouraged me to learn English.	86	8	6	0
4.	I wish I had learned parents to help me learn English better at home.	0	34	54	12
5.	If my parents have counselling on the importance of the English language, they will support me	0	0	16	84
	Lack of motivation				
1.	I'm interested to learn the English language	0	0	6	94
2.	I will be motivated if someone encourages me to learn the English language.	0	0	0	100
3.	I feel humiliated to clear my doubts or ask before learned people.	26	0	20	54
4.	I feel non-tribal students feel comfortable learning English with me because they consider me as capable as they are.	34	0	0	66
5.	I feel neglected to talk its non-tribal people	76	12	12	0
	Lack of suitable teachers				
1.	I can understand the English language used by the teacher.	56	12	24	8
2.	I can speak confidently with the English syllabus taught in school.	86	14	0	0
3.	Do you think you need a better teacher to teach you English?	0	0	6	94
4.	If I have a teacher to explain English words in my mother tongue, I will be encouraged to learn the English language.	0	0	0	100
5.	Do you find it difficult when your teacher talks in English to you?	54	0	0	46
	Lack of facilities and amenities				
1.	There are enough English teachers in your school to teach you the English language.	94	0	6	0
2.	Does the teacher use model to teach you English?	88	6	6	0
3.	Does your teacher explain new vocabulary that comes across in the text?	34	14	6	46
4.	You feel comfortable with the curriculum that is taught to non-tribal students.	100	0	0	0
5.	Your teacher doesn't feel irritated to clarify your doubts.	58	0	18	24
	Alien language				

1.	You can communicate in English easily with your teacher and fellow members.	68	26	6	0
2.	You can't understand when non-tribal people communicate with you.	88	0	4	0
3.	I don't hesitate to speak in English with the higher officials when there is a need.	100		0	0
4.	I feel confident speaking in English in any group discussion.	84	12	4	0
5.	I feel I can do better in learning the English language if I'm not discriminated when I talk in class.	0	0	0	100
Inadequate educational Institutions and their system					
1.	I have good teachers to teach English at school.	96	0	0	4
2.	My English syllabus helps me to improve my English vocabulary	76	0	24	0
3.	If I don't understand the meaning of vocabulary my teacher explains it in my mother tongue.	14	0	20	66
4.	Do you need extra English classes to improve your vocabulary?	0	0	0	100
5.	Your school has an educated tribal teacher to teach you English.	100	0	0	0
Fear of foreign language					
1.	I'm afraid to speak in English.	0	4	10	86
2.	It embarrasses me to volunteer to answer in my English class.	0	6	16	78
3.	I panic about speaking in English without preparation.	0	4	0	96
4.	I think other students in the class do better than me in English.	38	0	20	42
5.	I feel more tense in English class than other classes.	0	8	0	92

The researcher imparted English survival vocabulary (At school, at home, at birthday party and at the market) to the tribal students through CL concepts. The taught survival vocabulary helps the students when to talk about what (Croydon, 2007). The collected empirical data has been coded, tabulated and analysed through appropriate statistical techniques using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) 20th version. SPSS software is utilised by many researchers for their qualitative and quantitative data analysis mostly, in the field of social sciences and humanities (Van Truong & Huyen, 202). The formulated hypothesis for the experiment study has been tested by appropriate statistical tests such as paired sample 't-test', and a meaningful inference has been drawn, which is presented in the form of tables as well graphs. The experimental group learnt the English vocabulary through activities, but no treatment was given to the control group, in order to cull out the efficacy of CL, the results of both groups were juxtaposed, and it was found that teaching through CL is more effective than the conventional method of teaching.

Table 2. Mean difference between the pre-test and the post-test from the Control Group

Research Participants - Control Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical Inference
Pre-test Analysis of Control Group	50	16.93	3.216	t=10.537 df=49 p<0.01
Post-test Analysis of Control Group	50	19.90	3.144	

The paired sample 't' statistical test analysis in Table 2. shows that the post-test value of the control group has a higher mean score (19.90). when compared to the mean score (16.93) of the pre-test in the control group. On average, the post-test score is 2.967 points higher than the pre-test [t49=10.537, p<0.01].

Table 3. Mean difference between Experimental group the pre-test and the post-test

Research Participants of Experimental Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical Inference
Pre-test Analysis of Experimental Group	50	17.87	3.785	t=8.853 df=49 p<0.01 Highly significant
Post-test Analysis of Experimental Group	50	23.13	3.126	

The paired sample ‘t’ statistical test analysis in Table 3. illustrates that the post-test value of the experimental group has a higher mean score (23.13). When compared to the mean score (17.87) of the pre-test in the experimental group, on average, the post-test score is 5.26 points higher than that of the pre-test, which resulted a high level of statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group [t49=8.853, p<0.01]. It has been inferred that the post-test of the experimental group have reported to being highly significant.

Table 4. Mean Difference Between Control and Experimental Group in Post-test

Research Participants of Control and Experimental Group	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Statistical Inference
Post-test Analysis of Control Group	50	19.90	3.144	t=8.137 df=49 p<0.01 Highly significant
Post-test Analysis of Experimental Group	50	23.13	3.126	

The paired sample ‘t’ statistical test analysis in Table 4. revealed that the post-test value of the experimental group had higher mean score (23.13). When compared to the mean score (19.90) of the post-test in the control group. On average, the post-test score of the experimental group was 3.233 points higher than the post-test score of the control group, which resulted in a high level of statistically significant difference between the post-test of the experimental group and the post-test of the control group [t49=8.137, p<0.01]. It has been inferred that the post-test of the experimental group is highly significant. The result proves that teaching English survival vocabulary through CL is more effective than the traditional method.

By collecting the survey questionnaire, it is found that the tribal students are hindered by eight internal and external factors. The activities implemented in the study to inculcate English survival vocabulary motivated the students to perform better in learning the vocabulary. Cognitive linguistic learning is unlike rote learning, which is rooted in memorising without understanding the concept. CL enabled the students to reason, think and perceive. Thus, the study reports the effectiveness between the experimental and control group. The researcher collected feedback that is shown in Table 5. from the tribal students to understand them better. Feedback is essential in language teaching and learning classrooms. It is an effective way of helping a teacher to teach better (Sakiroglu, 2020). The researcher encouraged the target audience with real life motivational stories, this helped them to gain interest in learning English vocabulary.

Table 5. Feedback

Sl. No	Feedback	Percentage
1.	I liked the English class.	100
2.	I was comfortable when the teacher asked me to answer the question.	86
3.	I learnt English survival vocabulary more than I expected.	90
4.	I received individual attention from the teacher.	84
5.	I was interested in doing the assignments given by the teacher.	96
6.	I enjoyed the English class.	87
7.	The teacher motivated and stimulated interest in the subject.	94

8.	The teacher had a good rapport in the class.	86
9.	I understood what the teacher taught me in the class.	96
10.	My interest in acquiring the English language has grown now.	88
11.	I wish to continue learning English language vocabulary.	90
12.	I will take steps and use the available English language learning facilities.	68
13.	I feel motivated, and I'm looking forward to learning more.	100
14.	I volunteer to answer during English class discussion.	80
15.	I do not feel inferior in the English language classroom.	90
16.	I am not tensed when the teacher starts asking the question.	76
17.	I can easily understand the meaning of words as the teacher explains in my mother tongue.	100
18.	My teacher used pictures to make us understand English vocabulary.	100
19.	I feel I can do better in learning the English language.	84
20.	I can use the learnt English vocabulary in my daily life.	66
21.	I have never learnt many words in a short span of time.	100
22.	I feel the learning was not burdensome for me.	94
23.	I felt happy when the teacher asked me to draw a picture in class.	100

- 45 participants strongly agreed with 'I learnt English survival vocabulary more than I expected'.
- 38 participants strongly agreed with 'I am not tensed when the teacher starts asking question'.
- 42 participants strongly agreed with 'I feel I can do better in learning the English language'.
- 33 participants strongly agreed with 'I can use the learnt English vocabulary in my daily life'.
- 50 participants strongly agreed with 'I have never learnt many words in a short span of time'.

10. Conclusion

Teaching vocabulary to the largest population of underprivileged tribal students has become a pressing need of the hour. Decades have passed by since the arrival of English language to India, but still, the indigenous people are unaware of the importance of English, the global language. Through this study, it is found that the tribal learners were affected by several factors that affect their English language learning. Through experimental analysis, it is found that the tribal learners are given a comfortable English learning classroom without any barriers to interrupt their vocabulary learning. The very word 'English' panics the tribal learners, but as the learning environment has been stress-free, the students gained interest and participated in the activities actively that were incorporated to teach vocabulary effectively. Implying CL concepts assisted the learners in learning the vocabulary in collocations and it also helped them to remember the words. Through the procured results, it is proved that the CL technique is more effective than the traditional approaches based on translation and memorisation utilised in teaching survival words. Csábi (2004) and Touplikioti (2007) found out that cognitive linguistics-based teaching helped their experimental participants to assimilate survival words better than their control peers. Though teaching the English language to the tribal students was challenging, it was not impossible. The result assured the efficiency of CL in learning English survival vocabulary.

Limitations of the study

The current study was restricted to one tribal community learners, a specific research design and theory is implemented while teaching English vocabulary to the students. Furthermore, it was limited to only teaching A2 English survival vocabulary.

Scope for further study

Further studies should use other theories and different target audience, as well as enhancing learners' LSRW skills, grammar and vocabulary dexterity in different levels.

References

1. Aliasin, S. H., Saeedi, Z., & Pineh, A. J. (2019). The relationship between EFL teachers' perception of task-based language teaching and their dominant teaching style. *Cogent Education*, 6(1), 1589413.
2. Andreani, W., & Ying, Y. (2019). " PowPow" interactive game in supporting English vocabulary learning for elementary students. *Procedia Computer Science*, 157, pp. 473-478.
3. Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian*, Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

4. Barcroft, J. (2004). Second language vocabulary acquisition: A lexical input processing approach. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(2), pp. 200-208.
5. Beaton, A., Gruneberg, M., & Ellis, N. (1995). Retention of foreign vocabulary learned using the keyword method: A ten-year follow-up. *Second Language Research*, 11(2), pp. 112-120.
6. Beck IL, McKeown MG, Kucan L. (2013). *Bringing Words to Life: Robust Vocabulary Development*. 2 edition. New York (NY): Guilford Press.
7. Bilokcuoğlu, H. (2014). A Schematic Approach To Teaching Listening Comprehension 76. *LAÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(1), pp. 76-87.
8. Cacioppo, J. T., Berntson, G. G., Adolphs, R., Carter, C. S., McClintock, M. K., Meaney, M. J., ... & Taylor, S. E. (Eds.). (2002). *Foundations in social neuroscience*. MIT press.
9. Carstairs, A. (1988). Colette Craig, ed. Noun Classes and Categorization. Proceedings of a Symposium on Categorization and Noun Classification, Eugene, Oregon, October 1983. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique*, 33(2), pp. 173-176.
10. Chen, Y. (2009). A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to Classroom English Vocabulary Instruction for EFL Learners in Mainland China. *English Language Teaching*, 2(1), pp. 95-100.
11. Christen, W. L., & Murphy, T. J. (1981). Inservice training and peer evaluation: An integrated program for faculty development. *NASSP Bulletin*, 71(500), pp. 10-18.
12. Craik, F. I., & Tulving, E. (1975). Depth of processing and the retention of words in episodic memory. *Journal of experimental Psychology: general*, 104(3), 268.
13. Croydon A. (2007). *Teaching Survival Vocabulary*. Verizon Foundation.
14. Csábi, S. (2004). A cognitive linguistics view of polysemy in English and its implications for teaching. In M. Achard, & S. Niemeier (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics, second language acquisition, and foreign language teaching* (pp. 233-256). Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
15. Dehghan, M., & Soleimani, H. (2021). A Cognitive Representation of Semantic Problems in Teaching English Vocabulary. *Two Quarterly Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning University of Tabriz*, 13(27).
16. Dirven, R. & Verspoor, M. (2004). *Cognitive Exploration of Language and Linguistics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia
17. Dolati, R., & Richards, C. (2010). Harnessing the Use of Visual Learning Aids in the English Language Classroom. *Arab World English Journal*, 2(1), pp. 3-17.
18. Edelman, D. V. (2013). Genesis: A Composition for Construing a Homeland of the Imagination for Elite Scribal Circles or for Educating the Illiterate?. *Writing the Bible: Scribes, Scribalism and Script*, pp. 47-66.
19. Evans, V. & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ and Edinburgh: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates/Edinburgh University Press.
20. Grace, I. A., & Nageswari, R. (2020). Graphical Arts to Teach Emotional Vocabulary. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(7), pp. 14743-14750.
21. Hanks, E., & Eckstein, G. (2019). Increasing English Learners' Positive Emotional Response to Learning Through Dance. *TESL Reporter*, 52, pp. 22-22.
22. Harmon, J. M., Wood, K. D., Hedrick, W. B., Vintinner, J., & Willeford, T. (2009). Interactive Word Walls: More Than Just Reading the Writing on the Walls. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(5), pp. 398-408.
23. Hjetland, H.N., Hofslundsen, H., Klem, M., Karlsen, J., Hagen, Å. M., Engevil, L. I., ... & Næss, K. A. B. (2021). Vocabulary Interventions for Second Language (L2) Learners up to Six Years. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (9).
24. Hutton, T. L. (2008). Three tiers of vocabulary and education. *Super Duper Handy Handouts*, 182.
25. Javorcik, T. (2021). Flashcards as a Microlearning Tool in English Language Teaching. In *WorldCIST* (3) (pp. 113-122).
26. Jayashree. (1986). Identification of the difficulties in teaching and learning English as a second language among the high school students. In *Buch, M.B. (Ed.), Fifth Survey of Educational Research 1988*, 2, 752, New Delhi: NCERT.
27. Kujur, P. K., & Krishnan, D. (2019). Analysis of English Language Learning Outcome among Tribal Students of Class VIII of Government Schools of Gumla District, Jharkhand. *Pedagogy of Learning*, 5(2), pp. 25-36.

28. Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundation of Cognitive Grammar*. vol.1, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.1
29. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1987). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
30. Leacox L, Wood Jackson C. (2014). Spanish vocabulary-bridging technology-enhanced instruction for young English language learners' word learning. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* 2014;14(2): pp. 175-97.
31. Mbete, A. M. (2008). Ekolinguistik: Perspektif Kelinguistikan yang Prospektif. Bahan Matrikulasi Program Magister dan Doktor Linguistik Program Pascasarjana Universitas Udayana.
32. Mehta, B.C. & Kapoor, Kranti. (1998) 'Caste, Education and Class Relationship in India', *Journal of Higher Education*, 21(1)(Spring): pp. 269–81.
33. Milton, J., & Alexiou, T. (2009). Vocabulary size and the common European framework of reference for languages. In *Vocabulary studies in first and second language acquisition* (pp. 194-211). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
34. Mothe, P. S. (2000). Innovative techniques of teaching vocabulary at the intermediate level in the second language classroom. *India:Adarsh Senior College*. Retrieved November, 10, 2013.
35. Nation, P., & Crabbe, D. (1991). A survival language learning syllabus for foreign travel. *System*, 19(3).
36. NCERT. (2005). *National Curriculum Framework*. NCERT: New Delhi
37. NCERT. (2006). *Position paper, National Focus Group on Teaching of English*. NCERT: New Delhi.
38. Panda, A., & Ojha, L. (2021). 'Wastage'is A Challenge Of Tribal Education-A Review Based Study. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)*, 34.
39. Paradis J. (2011). Individual differences in child English second language acquisition: comparing child-internal and child-external factors. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*; 1(3): pp. 213-37.
40. Peters, R. A., & Higbea, R. J. (2014). Measuring Student Preferences for Stimulus-Response (Rote) Learning. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 3(2), 92-107.
41. Prabhu, N.S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
42. Radhika, S., & Nivedha, M. S. (2020). Research on Effects of Demographic Factors on the English Language Learning Among Tribal High School Students. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, 15(2).
43. Rivers, W. M. (1981). *Foreign language skills*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
44. Roy, D. (2012). Socio-economic status of Scheduled Tribes in Jharkhand, *Indian Journal of Spatial Science*, 3(2).
45. Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemata: the building blocks of cognition. In: R.J. Spiro etal. (eds) *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
46. Rupavath, Ramdas. (2016)."Tribal education: A perspective from below." *South Asia Research* 36(2): pp. 206-228.
47. Sakiroglu, H. Ü. (2020). Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences of University Students in English Communication Classes. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 6(1), pp. 172-178.
48. Saklofske, D. H., McKerracher, D. W., & Eysenck, S. B. (1978). Eysenck's theory of criminality: a scale of criminal propensity as a measure of antisocial behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 43(3), pp. 683-686.
49. Scrivener, J. (2009). *Learning teaching*. *Great Britain: Macmillan*.
50. Sheridan, S. J., Lanasa, P. J. (1977). *A Criterion-Referenced Assessment of Survival Words for Non-Academic Adolescents*.
51. Shostak, J. (2003). The Value of Direct and Systematic Vocabulary Instruction. *Sadlier-Oxford Professional Development Series*, 7(1), 1–11.
52. Sindkhedkar, S.D. (2012).Objectives of Teaching and Learning English in India, *Researchers World Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce*, 3(1), 191-194.
53. Touplikioti, S. (2007). The teaching of the polysemous words 'make' and 'do' to Greek learners of English: *A cognitive linguistic approach*.
54. Ungerer, F. & Schmid, H. J. (2013). *An Introduction to Cognitive Stylistics*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
55. Van Truong, Doan, and Thi Vu Huyen. (2021). "How to use SPSS software to help students in scientific research." *IJER-International Journal of Educational Research* 4(5) : pp. 83-89.
56. Varghese, A.,&Nagaraj, P. (2012). English language teaching and tribal Learners, *MJAL*, 5(1).
57. Vladimirovna, S. V. (2021). Cognitive Analysis Of Verbs In English And Russian Languages In The Context Of Idioms And Polysemantic Verbs. pp. 298-318.

58. Vygotsky, L. (1962) *Language and Thought*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
59. Wilkins, D.A. (1972). *Linguistics in Language Teaching*; MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA.
60. Wreikat, Y. A., Kabilan, M. K., & Abdullah, A. C. (2014). The Rural Learning Environment and Pupils' Learning of the English Language. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 22(1), pp. 35 – 56.
61. Yang, (2010). The Influence of Schema & Cultural Difference on L1 and L2 Reading. *English Language Teaching*, vol.3, No: 4.
62. Yasmeen, S. (2017), A Study of English language Teaching in Tribal Areas of Poonch District in Jammu and Kashmir.
63. Zhao, Yanchun. (2003). *Cognitive Exploration of Lexicography*. Shanghai: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.