The Let Me Learn Process®: A Research-based Model of Learning which Provides A Metacognitive Platform for Instructor and Learner Growth and Development

■　　　The LML Process® is an advanced learning system that provides learners with the means to articulate who they are as a learner, and then guides teachers in developing the learning environment necessary for students to employ their personal learning strategies with intention. Learners who are a part of this advanced learning system learn to intensify, forge, and tether the use of their learning processes into a working partnership with their teachers and peers (Johnston, 2002).

■　　　The theoretical basis of the Let Me Learn Process is the Interactive Learning Model© Johnston, 1994. The Interactive Learning Model depicts the simultaneous interactions of cognition, conation, and affectation (Snow, 1992) within our mental processing as four synchronous patterns (Sequence, Precision, Technical reasoning, and Confluence). These patterns represent how the learner sees the world, takes in stimuli, integrates the stimuli and formulates a response to it. The Interactive Learning Model is based upon research conducted in cognitive science, brain science, and multiple intelligences (Allport, 1961; Bruer, 1997; Gardner, 1983; Johnston, 1996; Keefe & Ferrell, 1990; McClean, 1978; Pay, 1981; Perkins, 1993; Philip, 1936; Snow & Jackson, 1992; Sternberg, 1996).

■　　　The ILM represents the interaction of our mental processes as 12 intersecting circles and names each of the interactions using terminology understandable to children as young as six years of age. **The Sequential interaction** is that aspect of our learning which needs to follow step-by-step directions; organize and plan work carefully; and complete the assignment from beginning to end free from interruptions. **The Precise interaction** is that aspect of our learning which needs to process detailed information carefully and accurately; take detailed notes; ask questions; know *exact* answers; and write in a highly specific manner. **The Technical Reasoning interaction** is that aspect of our learning which requires practical application and relevance to any learning task. It is our non-verbal process which sees the mechanics of operations, the function of pieces; and needs to work "hands on," unencumbered by paper and pencil requirements. **The Confluent interaction is** that aspect of our learning which has us avoid conventional approaches; seek unique ways to completing any learning task; gives us permission to start before all directions are given; and permits us to take a risk, fail and start again Johnston, 1994; Johnston, 1996).

■ The Interactive Learning Model uses the Learning Connections Inventory (LCI) to empirically test its theoretical assumptions. The LCI is a 28 Likert item self-report instrument that allows individuals to report the degree to which they simultaneously use each of four learning processes. The unique format of the LCI includes three free responses which significantly enhance the instrument's validity and reliability as reported in the Learning Connections Inventory User's Manual (Johnston & Dainton, 1997; Learning Connections Inventory, 2005).

■ Over the past eleven years Christine Johnston of Rowan University, teachers and administrators at 19 national and international sites along with faculty at the University of Malta; Queens University Belfast; St. Johns York University, UK,; University of Tarragona, Spain; Hofstra University, NY; the University of South Florida; Adelphi University, NY have tested the reliability and validity of the instrument. Gathering results from over 15,000 6-18 year old students (including regular education, special education, dispraxic/ neurologically impaired students, and Westinghouse National Science scholars) and 7,000 adult professionals, these institutions have directed a research agenda which has linked pre-service teacher instruction to local school classroom practices, K-16 faculty and staff development, and corporate human resource training (Addy, 1996; Buchanan, Office of Education, DuPont, 2005; Calleja, 1998; Calleja & Borg, 2006; Campbell, Corporate DuPont, 2005; ; Johnston, 2005, 2006; Kottkamp & Silverberg, 2006; Marcellino, 2000; McSweeney, 2005; Osterman & Kottkamp, 2004; Silverberg, 2002).

■ The Let Me Learn Process is an advanced learning system which has formed as the natural outgrowth of the development of the ILM and LCI in tandem. The LML Process, as a system, builds upon the self-knowledge an individual gains through understanding his/her learning processes as revealed through the administration of the LCI.

■ The Let Me Learn Process is based on the assumption that taking control of how to make learning work is a powerful and positive learning experience (Flavell, 2000). The LML Process provides a lexicon of learning terms and teaches metacognitive/reflective skills (Osterman & Kottkamp, 2004; Johnston, 1998). The LML Process helps learners take responsibility for

making learning work for them by using carefully developed activities including a student designed, metacognitively-driven strategy card that guides the learner through various types of learning tasks.

■ Let Me Learn Process does not categorize or place a learner into a single quadrant but instead emphasizes that every learner uses each of these interactive processes in concert to varying degrees (Johnston & Dainton, 1997).

■ Unlike measures of personality, multiple intelligences, or learning styles which leave the learner informed but unequipped to use the information, the LML Process uses the Learning Connections Inventory to reveal the learner's interactive processes and then invites the learner to use these processes with intention. This is what makes the LMLP a truly advanced learning system.

■ The Let Me Learn Process is intended to be used with both the student-learner and the instructor because how learning works within the adult-instructor strongly affects the instructor's ability to understand how learning occurs in others.

■ It is the convergence of the teacher's personal awareness of how he/she learns along with his/her awareness of how individuals approach and carry out learning that makes the Let Me Learn Process a powerful process for change within any instructional setting (Henry, 2003; McLaughlin, 1998; Nichols, 2002).

■ The Let Me Learn Process provides opportunities for dialogue between student and teacher and student and student resulting in the development of a very powerful learning community in which each learner feels he/she is a contributing member within a collaborative environment (Johnston & Johnston, 1998). Silverberg (2002) refers to this as developing relational space.

■ Teachers and faculty who have participated in The Let Me Learn Process report that they have become models of reflective learning for their students, as they as faculty members, share their own thoughts about learning with their students.

■ Let Me Learn changes the dynamics of the discourse within the classroom; changes the climate of the classroom; creates partnerships between teacher

and learner; and provides various approaches to learning experiences for students. The Let Me Learn Process shifts the responsibility of learning to the learner, leaving the teacher free to engage in developing a learning environment in which individual learners thrive and succeed because they are using their learning processes most effectively (Ihunnah, 2003; Pearle, 2001).

■　　Individuals and organizations engaged in the use of this learning technology within K-16 education and corporate human resource managers report a decrease in negative behaviors and unproductive outcomes and a heightened sense of grounded-confidence and persistence to achieve (Buchanan, 2005; Campbell, 2005; Zammit, 2002).

Let Me Learn Process Theoretical Base References

Allport, G. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Bruer, J. (1997). Schools for thought. A Science of learning in the classroom. Cambridge, MA:MIT Press.

Curry, L. (1990). A critique of the research on learning styles. *Educational Leadership, 8* (2), 50–56.

Flavell, J., Green, F., & Flavell, E. (2000). Development of Children's Awareness of Their Own Thoughts. *Journal of Cognition and Development*. 1,1,97-113.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Keefe, J. & Ferrell, B. (1990). Developing a defensible style paradigm. *Educational Leadership*, 48(2), 57-61.

Keefe, J. & Languis, M. (1983). *Operational Definitions.* A paper presented to the NASSP Learning Styles Task Force, April, Reston, VA.
MacLean, P. (1978). A mind of three minds: Educating the triune brain. *In The 77th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pay, R. (1981). Control of complex conation and emotion in the neocortex by the limbic entorhinal, subicular, and cingulate cortexes and the hypothalamus, mammillary body, and thalamus. *International Journal of Neuroscience, 15*, 1–30.

Perkins, D. (l993). "Teaching & learning for understanding." NJEA Review. October.

Philip, H. (1936). *An experimental study of the frustration of will-acts and conation.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Snow, R., & Jackson, D. (1992). *Assessment of conative constructs for educational research and evaluation: A catalogue*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Sternberg, R. (1996). Myths, countermyths, and truths about intelligence. *Educational Researcher, 25*(2), 11–16.

Let Me Learn Process Works Cited*

Addy, L. (1996). *Challenging the assumptions: The motivation and learning of*

children who have developmental coordination disorder. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Borg, C. & C.Calleja.(2006). Using Technical and Confluent Patterns first: A recipe for Underachievement? In *Understanding Children and Youth at Risk*. Ed. By C. Borg and C.Calleja. Media Centre Publications, Mlt.

Buchanan, P. (2005). "Leadership and Learning," Annual Conference of the Society of Women Engineers, Los Angeles, CA, November 11.

Calleja, N.(1998). Listening to the Learner: Learner's Characteristics to Shape Whole School Reform. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Malta.

Campbell, N. (2005). "Putting Learning to Work," Annual Conference of the Society of Women Engineers, Los Angeles, CA, November 3.

Dainton, G., & Rusu, A. (2006). *Automatic generation of sequence style notes from a live lecture.* Paper presented at the International Conference of Engineering Education, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Henry, J. (2003). Learning to modify teaching strategies to better meet needs of student learning patterns. Action Research. Shawnee Mission East, Overland Park, KS.

Ihunnah, D. (2003). Promoting the Integration of Vocational and Academic Skills Using the Principles of the Let Me Learn Model: A Case Study of Transformational Leadership (Non-published dissertation http://www.letmelearn.org/research).

Johnston, C. (1994b, September). *The interactive learning model*. Paper presented at the meeting of the British Education Research Association, Oxford University, Queen Anne's College, Oxford, UK.

Johnston, C. (1996). *Unlocking the will to learn.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Johnston, C. (1997). Using the Learning Combination Inventory. *Educational Leadership, 55*(4), 78–82.

Johnston, C., & Dainton, G. (1997). *The learning connections inventory (Manual).* Learning Connections Resources:Turnersville, NJ

Johnston,C., & Dainton, G. (2005) *The learning connections inventory (Manual).* Turnersville, NJ: Learning Connections Resources.

Johnston, C., & Johnston, J. (1997). *Understanding and using the child's will to learn: A longitudinal study*. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Frankfurt, Germany.

Johnston, C. and Johnston, J., (1998). Achieving staff development through understanding the learner. British Journal of In-service Education, 24, 1.

Johnston, C. (1998). *Let me learn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Johnston,C. (2002) Implementing the Let Me Learn Process in K-12. Learning Connections Resources: Turnersville, NJ.

Johnston, C. (2005). Keynote:"Communicating from the inside out." National Writing Conference, Malta, September 16.

Johnston, C. (2006). "The Educational Maze." In *Understanding Children and Youth at Risk. In Understanding Children and Youth at Risk*.Ed. By C. Borg and C.Calleja. Media Centre Publications, Mlt.

Kottkamp, R. & R.Silverberg. (2006).Reconceptualizing Students At Risk: Teacher Assumptions about the Problematic Learning. *In Understanding Children and Youth at Risk.* Ed. By C. Borg and C. Calleja. Media Centre Publications, Mlt.

Marcellino, P. (2000). Learning to become a team: A case study of action research in a graduate business management course. Unpublished dissertation. Hofstra University. http:www.letmelearn.org/research.

Marcellino, P.A., Eichenholtz, S., & Sosin, A.A. (2006 November). *Faculty Action-Research: Applying Learning Pattern Theory to an E-folio Initiative.* National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) Connexions: http://cnx.org/content/m14115/latest/

Marcellino, P.A. (2005 May). Bridging disciplines and setting up diverse teams. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management 6* (3) 167-210.

McLaughlin, J. (1998). "Applying the Let Me Learn Process: An Administrator's Experience." In Let me learn. Thousand Oaks:Corwin Press.

McSweeney, R. T. (2005). Merging cognitive and instructional theories: Implementation of an advanced learning system in secondary mathematics. Unpublished dissertation. Hofstra University**.** http://www.letmelearn.org/research.

Nelson, C. (2006). If you let them build, they will learn. *NJEA Review.* April, 10-12.

Nichols, J. (2002). "Using the LCI to Connect Teaching Methods with Student Learning Strategies". Action Research. Shawnee Mission East, Overland Park, KS.

Osterman, K. & Kottkamp, R.(2004). *Reflective practice for educators*: Professional development to improve student learning. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Pearle, K. (2001). "Metacognition as vehicle for organizational change: How 'thinking about thinking' and intentional learning break the mold of 'heroic' teaching in higher education." http://www.letmelearn.org/research).

Silverberg, R. (2002). From marginalization to relational space: A descriptive phenomenological study of teachers who changed their assumptions and beliefs about problematic students. Unpublished dissertation. Hofstra University**.** http://www.letmelearn.org/research).

Zammit, P.(2001). Building Supervisory Capital through Understanding Your Personnel's Learning Processes. St. Paul's Bay, Malta, July 21-23.

*Dissertations, keynotes, action research, and paper presentations cited above will be available on-line at www.letmelearn.org/research September 1, 2006.