

Problems of Language Education in Pre-School Children

Prof. As. Dr. Edlira Troplini (Abdurahmani)

“Aleksandër Moisiu”, University Durrës

Faculty of Education, Department of Albanian Language

Abstract

In Albania, work on shaping a good communicative competence is unfortunately not starting in the preschool cycle. Even the legal framework for this cycle leaves much to be desired. It gives more importance to other study cycles, such as primary, ninth grade, high school and university. In this paper we will first deal with the description of the real situation of language competence in the age group of pre-school children, to see then how much the so-called legal framework has been met for this cycle and how the objectives set up by it have been fulfilled. After that, we are going to set out some important milestones regarding the teaching of the Albanian language, which should be taken into account in the law on preschool education and then propose their implementation successfully based on strategies and methods practiced earlier from developed countries. All this will be done by taking into account some conclusions of certain language disciplines regarding the children's ability and language capacity, shaping the basics of their communicative competence which are very important for good language education in this age group.

Keywords: preschool cycle, real situation, legal framework, suggestions, improvements.

Introduction

A good language education should always take into account all kinds of linguistic variation. *Psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, ethnolinguistic, pragmatic or stylistic* aspects are very important aspects for the development of the language competence by children of different age groups. Although Chomsky's findings are already known, he, besides, as a common part of our biological heritage, rarely calls language as a unique human kind of property ... which interferes decisively with thought, action, and social links. (Chomsky, 2007, p. 2)

Sociolinguistics requires language recognition throughout its *diatomic, diastratic, diaphatic, diamatic* dimension. It is already known how rich and varied it appears in these perspectives ... Its "free" variation is conditioned by these important factors from which they originate and from diverse variations of language variants (Berruto, 1994). All of these should be taken into account in the didactics of a language.

Styles of use, variety of spoken registers, cultural differences by different communities, the role of all fluxes, visible or invisible, whether they are, require support from a good education and in our case from good teaching and learning of the Albanian language. On the other hand, to respond to these challenges, but also to problems with the standard languages today, where everything goes in the course of globalization, the didactic language models applied to both teachers and students should not be raised on the basis of what is included in the traditional linguistics, but in those must be felt the interaction of all the aforementioned disciplines.

Considering the sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, pragmatic view ... etc the language or the viewpoints of other disciplines, students understand that the greatness of what we call language goes beyond: it is not merely a part of human being, but it must serve this being throughout life.

As such, the language poses to the scholars and the people themselves difficult tasks related to maintenance, development, proper adaptation with generations, to the context in which they live (economic, political, social and cultural) etc. All of this is done so that in our everyday life, the language will represent us dignitously, adapting to our requirements, situations, circumstances, written and unwritten rules in order to properly cultivate its functions ...

All of this shows that language is one of the most important challenges of today's education. If it comes to developing countries, this challenge is many times more difficult because of the fact that these countries are still destabilized. So if we were to refer to Chomsky's assertion that "*ordinary discourse does not repeat the same things, but produces new language forms, so ordinary language use is free ...*" we would say that in these places, in accordance with their social contexts, with the phrase "ordinary discourse" are also implied unmanaged language uses which are difficult to respect a target or limit and go to an unusual linguistic anomaly. These are also part of the regular lecture too, but if language is subject to the pressure of language rules that derive from the precise policies a country designs, then they do not have longevity and pass on the wastage. For this reason, the alarm signal must be heard in the early stages of language preparation. That is why we started our research in the preschool cycle.

Objectives of the Paper

How and how much is the Albanian language learned in the preschool cycle? Did language preparation ever exceed linguistic knowledge? What is the result of the linguistic knowledge acquisition in increasing the language capacity and practical language skills?

All these are questions that rightly disturb every researcher. In Albania this concern is much greater, as the answers do not speak for satisfactory results in this regard. Below we will present facts and arguments that will first inform us of the real situation in which we are and then convince us of the reality in which our education system is located. It is obviously a matter of highlighting the unquestionable importance of a language learning base that should start with the pre-school cycle, which will follow, in coherence with the next cycles of study. Our primary objective is to improve the current results in the future.

Results

The real situation of language competence in pre-school children.

Before explaining the real situation of language competence in the pre-school cycle, let us first recall some data regarding competence. The term *competence* in language literature was introduced by Chomsky (Chomsky, 1965; according to Robins, 1997). Specifically, he shares in *competence* and *performance*. Of course, this division has been done either in continuity or as a response to Saussure's earlier division (Saussure, 1916), in *inner and outer linguistics*. The division of *competence* and *performance* will advance further with the division, *microlinguistic* and *macrolinguistics* from Lyons (Lyons, 1977) and so on... (Hernandez Campoi, www.ja.scribd.com) .

For speech psychology, when talking about good language competence we mean a phonological competence, morphological competence, syntax competence, semantic competence, pragmatic competence, textual, lexical, discourse, etc. (Marini, 2001).

Language competence models expanded due to the basic assumptions of transformational generational linguistics (Chomsky, 1957) which insisted that:

- discourse is a competence, a system of rules and mechanisms in the mind of the one speaking and the one who understands
- there are some universal linguistic principles rooted in the genetic inheritance of our beings.
- The linguistic task is to build formal models that can describe these rules, mechanisms or principles

Language competence models conceptualized the syntax as the basic mechanism of speech and attributed each phrase or sentence to two syntax structures: one superficial (directly accessible) and the other deep (which is more abstractly explained by transformation rules)(www.treccani.it)

In sociolinguistics the term *linguistic competence* corresponds to the term *communicative competence* (Hymes, 1966; according to Shkurtaj, 2009, p. 269), and sociolinguists go even further by calling it the lecturing competence or sociolinguistic competence. (Holmes, 2015, p. 516)

For the sake of truth in this paper, we have always had this example of competency-forming because having the skills and the linguistic capacity means first of all having a good communicative competence.

To Shkurtaj having language competence means having a knowledge and practical use, having creative skills through language units both in spoken and written form; knowing and using language codes and sub-codes; to have good linguistic and non linguistic communication; your written and spoken discourse is up to you. (Shkurtaj, 2009, p. 269-271).

Naturally, to achieve all this, work should start from the preschool cycle. But, what is the real state of communicating competence of children of this age group and what is specifically observed at this stage?

If we describe their competence, we will certainly describe their unformed competence and, for the sake of truth, in this paper we are seriously considering such a thing, since we think this is the time to put it in the right way, in order to model it best for the future.

First, at this stage, it is noticed that the greatest contribution to the modeling of competence is provided by the child himself, as he feels deeply within himself the need for accurate communication and argument for this is the fact that whenever we speak to children with the language babies, they get angry. The child feels and suffers the lack of a full vocabulary like the one of the most adults. At this point, the so-called *baby-talk* phenomenon helps us to somehow shape the children's language properly and enrich it.

Baby-talk tells how we should behave linguistically with young children, as their speech is not only modeled, but also needs to be modeled. It is unconsciously modeled, so naturally and must be thoroughly modeled by adults in a professional way. For the latter, parents together with pre-school teachers should be the first providers in this regard, thus the first contributors to the formation of the basis of their communicative competence, but unfortunately, this does not happen properly either in our kindergartens, neither with parents, nor with adults (Troplini, 2017).

In the language of children is also evident linguistic variation by social class. From our observations, it is clear what Chomsky claims, (...) *the difference between a rich and stimulating environment and a poor environment can be essential both in language acquisition and physical growth, or more precisely in some aspects of physical growth, being capturing the language, just one of these aspects. Skills that are part of our common genetic wealth can flourish or be restricted and suppressed under the conditions they have for their growth* (Chomsky, 2007, p. 135).

Children's language is also influenced by another important factor such as *imitation*. Regarding this feature, in their spoken language is evident the dialect variation.

From the collected data on the ground it is noticed that their language is initially modeled according to dialect models with which the child is in constant contact. Wilkins does not question the pedagogical importance of language varieties (Wilkins, 1983, p.147). A factor that significantly affects children's speech is the life experience they have. For example, dialect variation is more apparent in children of rural origin and less visible in children of the same origin but living in urban areas. The most noticeable this variation is in children belonging to the top dialect of Geg and less visible is in the children of the Tosk top dialect (for the fact that the latter was lucky to choose and get the size of a prestigious speech). The same logic is followed if we do an analysis that goes even further into the dialectal subdivisions.

Of course, the model that your child lends faster is that of the family. We think this is quite apparent in our social and family context (we do not exclude other similar family contexts in the world, but are not motivated equally). Regarding this, our children, in addition to their family language, maternal dialect, or grandparents (if the mother works and lives in the community) are good simulators of the friend's or companion dialect if he is a guest of host community, teacher's dialect also, in case of trainee teachers who do not speak the standard well, but also vice versa. There are children who, although originally from the country's most remote rural areas, are able to speak the standard language standard due to the hard work of the teacher to promote awareness of the correct and accurate mother language or the fact that the teacher himself speaks the exact standard. These are the phenomena we face in our context.

Another example of imitation is the imitation of sophisticated adult language. In our everyday language there is the phrase "this child speaks great words". Thus, in the kindergartens, children who speak with "great words" like their parents or adults surrounding them. It is understood that such a luck is a favor that have only children whose parents are educated and enjoy some status in society. However, an ordinary child in the impossibility of such imitation (of sophisticated words) mimics words and common expressions from adults.

Another model that we can see through examples is the imitation of the media language, mostly of cartoons, not excluding advertising, various advertising slogans, special musical refrain for the child's ear ... etc. Of course, it is another matter if

we need to measure how much the degree of these imitations reaches. For now, we can only be satisfied with the fact that imitations are greater in children spending more time in front of the television, the computers and the phones.

After dealing with these examples, it is clear that the child to reach his goal becomes more and more conformist with the group or adult person. A typical example embodied in this age is *the field of abnormal morphology* addressed by many sociolinguists. We must say that in all the examples discussed above, the phenomenon of socialization is evident.

Regarding children's speech there are some issues that need to be taken seriously in our context, such as the phenomenon of discrimination or linguistic prejudice.

In our kindergartens we have children who do not speak properly, babies who stutter, children who do not know well Albanian, children who come from the most remote variations, children from uneducated parents, and so on ...; children with poor material well-being, children from divorced parents etc. Nevertheless, all adults need to understand well that the child is the wisest being of this world. Here we are faced with a phenomenon that we have often called linguistic discrimination, but we all know it derives from the social phenomenon of discrimination. Thus, in the struggle against linguistic prejudice, unwilling to contribute to the prevention of racial, ethnic prejudices, etc., and vice versa, through linguistic prejudice, we may unintentionally encourage the opposite. It is unforgivable when the teacher even unpremeditated, become the source of these discriminations. The teacher should be very attentive to how he or she behaves with the children, even when he does a compliment to dress (which has recently become fashionable to us), because unwittingly he insults what is not so beautiful for certain reasons. But this is just an example ... Teachers should be attentive to the gender differences we have noted in this age group, perhaps through the selection of colors, dress, selection of same sex partners to play etc. All of these are also reflected in the language, because language is also an activity, even a specialized activity (Malinowski, 1923; according to Hudson, 2002, p. 127).

All of these have serious consequences that affect the child's growth. Sometimes they have become a cause for the appearance of pathological diseases. Thus, we have discovered some instances of stuttering just because of the psychological violence exercised by the teachers or by the presence of a sister or brother of the family better than oneself.

The teacher should be very attentive in identifying pathological diseases such as aphasia, dyslexia, dysgraphia, etc.(Cacciari, 2011, p. 278-293). These and other phenomena are easy to avoid with professionalism, but in order to achieve professionalism, work has to be done in many ways, which we will consider a little bit.

Let's go back to the linguistic aspect again. How should we strive for laying the first bases of a good communicative competence in coherence with the following education, in view of its continuous improvement?

Unfortunately, as we will see below in the discussion phase, strategies, programs, methods and objectives have not helped us so far; the teachers themselves should do so, but they not having a properly guide, surely have failed in many aspects that are very important. Consequently, the child has come to primary school with a lingering language deficit. The first grade of the elementary school where the rigorous learning of the ABC book begins and then reading, continues to be a major disaster for children and in their mind is compared to a kind of drudgery where all that starts is experienced with many difficulties.

How can the teaching of Albanian language in our kindergartens be improved?

It has long been confirmed that in order to satisfactorily develop the expressive and linguistic capacities of students in schools, it is important for teachers and people of culture to summon together and unite to this goal all their knowledge about linguistic reality, it is understood for the useful part that serves the didactic goals (Soravia, 1980).

Positive attitudes during the learning process should be a priority of the teacher so that student outcomes serve the future and challenge any need to communicate.

In this age group, during the design of the curriculum, when designing the methods to be used for their implementation, when designing the daily objectives to be achieved during the Albanian language classes, planning this lesson, and to provide coherence with other lines of study, teachers should consider:

Language act factors that are very important at this stage of development. The child should not know the theoretical factors, but must practically understand when this act is accomplished and when it is not. The child at this stage needs to understand

whether the message of what he says is realized or not; the linguistic act remains as such or is carried out in a communication act. The child should select the right situation or context to say something. He should be able to connect through a chain of coherence several communication acts. But first of all, the teacher at this stage needs to have clear the method he should use in order to achieve this goal. He has to understand how successful a student is to successfully engage in a discourse, who is more capable and who does not. How can they work to improve them in this regard? If we have done so, we have achieved two of the most important goals such as *"To get a student to hear stories and to participate in conversations with ever-growing attention"* or *"To participate and to have an initiative to discuss in the learning environment not only with peers, but also with older adults "* but above all, the teacher has contributed to the teaching of conversational rules.

Every teacher should ask himself to the very questions that Chomsky had about the cognitive ability of language such as: What is the system of recognition of every child within this age group? What's in their mind? (Such questions are raised by having the fact that some of the knowledge and the way of understanding is genetically born.) We must understand, "says Chomsky, how and how much children understand, how they hear, read, interpret, produce ... etc. (Chomsky, 2007, p. 3).

In this way the teacher connects very well the *psychological* aspect with the *linguistic* one, so the line of thinking with the communication line.

So some data in the field of psycholinguistics are quite valuable. Some Chomsky values regarding language acquisition in children would help many specialists and drafters of the methods to be used.

Learning the language, he says, is not exactly what the child does; it is something that happens to the child who is placed in a suitable environment, much as the baby's body grows and breeds in a predetermined way, when provided with adequate nutrition and influence of the environment. This does not mean that the nature of the environment is not about this issue. The environment defines the way in which the parameters of universal grammar are configured, thus giving different languages... (Chomsky, 2007, p. 134).

Psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics - ethnolinguistics, pragmalinguistics, etc., come to the aid of didactics. To avoid problems related to these areas, we should orient our children towards a common Albanian. As we pointed out above, children are in constant socialization process. This means that they are confronted with ready-made models, family and society around them, in neighborhoods, villages, cities, kindergartens, etc. These models can be even quadrupled wrong. So it is necessary to work hard with the children of this age group to inject love for mother language and to form the responsibility to speak and write as accurately as possible.

Teachers need to work hard on this cycle with some typical orthography rules. Mainly with rules related to the words they have chosen to write or read. But first, it is required to increase the teacher's responsibility to themselves to properly learn some orthography rules. Teachers are therefore not allowed to write spelling mistakes that children will write while learning languages such as: Shqipëri (Albania), atdhe (homeland), shqiptar (Albanian), flamur (flag) etc.

Language competence models conceptualized the syntax as the basic mechanism of discourse and attributed every phrase or sentence two syntax structures: one superficial (directly accessible) and the other deep (which is more abstractly explained by transformation rules), (www.treccani.it),

So, teachers should practice their children in formulating sentences, expanding them, or simplifying them. This would greatly help them properly appropriate their mother language.

Teachers should work with children during Albanian language classes, especially for distinguishing between two language codes: restricted code and extended code. Children always tend to speak with a truncated code, while teachers should contribute to a more elaborate language code. In this way, teachers contribute to enriching the vocabulary of children and not only, but they also increase their agility of speaking (this is not the only way).

Bernstein clearly recognized that children from rich layers have a richer syntax and semantic vocabulary than poorer children. Then with the children of these layers, more work should be done to fulfill this linguistic deficit.

With the child, work must be done in all respects. The teacher should also intervene when the child fills his sentences without criteria. He needs to understand the right lines of good communication. So it's a norm for all the kids. Those who do not meet this norm, without doubt, will carry this deficit even in the future.

Teachers should apply the *baby-talk* method to children. *Baby-talk* is able to control the behavior of children and maintain interaction with them (Wells and Robinson, 1982; according to Shkurtaj, 2009, p. 95). We are facing a "*special registry*" that an adult is best to use deliberately, adapting to a small interlocutor, or more specifically to adequately respond to the child's immaturity (Shkurtaj, 2009, p. 95).

The method we must pursue is well expressed through Cross's citation that *such a speaker has two levels of complexity, much closer to that of the child so that he can process and understand the meaning; the other, something in advance in its syntactic features, so that the child can understand the message, as well as gather the reactions between his specific mode of expression and the most elaborate version proposed to him* (Cross, 1977; according to Shkurtaj, 2009, p. 96).

Parents, teachers or "adults" contribute occasionally to improve all levels of language in the child's speech, but this is always done to the appropriate extent according to their age, intellect ... etc. After this day-to-day use of language, children undoubtedly earn from most adults, a great deal of linguistic wealth at the syntax and semantic level, and are therefore more likely to develop speech quickly and properly shape the communicative competence.

Teachers should instill children of the value of their mother language. Indeed, language is a means of communication that serves people, but through language we are identified. Language is part of our national identity. So let's not just teach children the rules, but teach them the value of language; not to teach the children only the presence of two top dialects (or sub-divisions), but to teach them the value of the dialect of origin. By doing this, by learning everything from the base, it is difficult for them to move towards the pre-integration of the host communities by deliberately abandoning the values of the country they are coming from, as is commonly the case with immigrants.

Teachers should teach children the rules of good behaviour. During this process, the child needs to separate two different realities, standard language and dialect of origin. Children need to learn to have respect for both of these varieties by cultivating the basics of bilingualism early on. This issue should be treated with great care and in the same way even if we are dealing with minority children.

The teacher should make it possible for the child to understand the infinitely creative aspect of the language. The cognitive system of language in young children is incomplete and consequently it needs to be modeled properly. Chomsky says *learning (something of a person) should not be compared to bottled water, but rather to the process of helping a flower to grow in its own way* (Chomsky, 2007, p.173).

We have come to the conclusion following the observations we have made mainly in the city of Durrës (a city very close to the capital and considered a center of development), and then, following Shkodra (a developed city that belongs to the north of Albania) , and finally Vlora (one of the developed southern cities of Albania) (it is understood that the term development here is used based on the comparison we make with other cities). During this process we have reviewed their annual work and focused mainly on teaching Albanian language.

If all these points are not taken into account in the design of language methods and moreover, if the latter did not exist, then teachers would find it difficult to properly form the children's communication competence. This is also why we find today a superficial work in our kindergartens, where the mechanical teaching of knowledge is prevalent rather than logical. Learning through the practice or the slogan of the Ministry responsible for education "Learn by doing" so far has not been achieved.

This is noticed in how it works to increase the level of conversation; in how it works to strengthen awareness of mother language; in working on fixing some typical spelling rules (for example in important words that teachers and students use everyday, such as: *Albania, homeland, carrot, beetroot*, etc.). It is noticed that teachers do not possess the right knowledge about how to work for the daily enrichment of the child's vocabulary; how can they work to introduce new concepts every day; how to proceed in formulating sentences by passing from simple sentences into extended sentences and vice versa; or in the proper imprint of ethical rules of conduct, etc. (it is noticed that the teachers have focused solely on the embedding of some "*magical words*" such as: *good morning, goodbye, thank you* etc. and this results in a mechanical one, because from a test that was made to children during summer holidays, in most cases, they are not used by them). The letter can not be taught without learning its value, or the word without learning the meaning further, the sentence without understanding and constructing it nicely, the rules of conversation without understanding the essence of the conversation ... etc.

Discussions

Other factors responsible for the real state of competence

Despite the slogans of the ministry responsible for education which have always been present and persisted in the practical training of the individual, and consequently in the formation of a good communicative competence, in reality, this effort has remained simply in letters and resembles drafted laws quite straightforward, but never implemented.

As for language education, attention has been focused more than ever on acquiring knowledge rather than on their practical training. In the 9-year cycle, much is done in terms of language knowledge and the learning outcomes have been relatively good in this regard. But on the other hand, the fruits of a tedious job for both teachers and students are likely to be seen only for a short period of time, specifically during the time of acquisition of the knowledge of that cycle and this is done only in certain angles that are directly related to the assimilation of language knowledge. Their language competence has no strength to be transformed into capacity and communicative competence. This work crowned with this cycle of studies is very tedious and hard-pressed for the fact that its beginnings are in the primary cycle (Troplini, 2015, p. 99, 171).

However, to reach a conclusion on the causes of the real situation of the language competence of children in the pre-school cycle, it is quite difficult to take into account many other factors such as:

Differences in the individual language behavior of each child, depend among other things, on the social variability of each of the parents or other family members with whom the child lives. This includes parents age, education, ethnicity, economic background, religious differences, family, etc.

Another important factor is the early development of the child as a process, so the physical development, motor development, emotional development, social development, the ability of each child to write, read, speak, listen, cognitive development the development of a learning mechanism, etc.

Another factor can be related to the kindergartens and programs they follow. State kindergartens are unified in this regard (although this does not mean that everything is correct), while private kindergartens often come out of state programs by introducing second language acquisition or by using more sophisticated methods in order to increase interest.

The difference can also be seen between rural and urban kindergartens of the same city or between the kindergartens of urban areas of different cities and so on. So the unification of programs cannot avoid differences as these factors obviously find their reflection in the language of children. Even if we borrow similar programs from developed countries, they could fail if they don't fit the context, as countries do not enjoy the same development and, consequently, the same cultural and mental emancipation.

Panorama of Albanian education in pre-school and language learning

As mentioned above, the way of caring for a child after childbirth varies depending on many factors, both on an individual and social level. This means that even though the child's healthy growth is in the center of attention in all respects, certain contexts that are inextricably linked to economic development or emancipation of societies, significantly affect the way children grow within these communities.

And if we were to deepen this argument, the development and emancipation of a society reflects on the development of relevant institutions such as nursery, kindergartens or schools with which the child faces immediately after the family. The latter have a great responsibility because they must adhere to a common pattern that children have to follow to practice, but in these circumstances, this is a tough job. However, we have referred to a general average by describing those phenomena and concerns that are observed in all our kindergartens, referring to the Albanian context described above, and subsequently to generalizations regarding the linguistic development of this age group.

Pre-school education programs have been developed by the Education Development Institute (IZHA). Although there are some attempts to change with the new Albanian Law on Education (2015), which is published in the official journal only in 2018, the pre-school curriculum has so far implemented the long-standing program designed by IZHA. We briefly summarize what this program is, and then analyze the changes that are expected to take place in the future.

The curriculum area for the language is the same for three age groups (3-4 years, 4-5 years, 5-6 years). It consists of:

1. Language Development, 2. Mathematical Development, 3. Social and Personal Development, 4. Artistic Education, 5. Physical and Health Education.

Linguistic development curricula are also the same, with only one distinction in the age group 5-6, including handwriting. They consist of: Language for communication, Thinking language, The bound between sound and letters, Reading, Writing, handwriting (only for 5-6 years), (IZHA, 2007).

Although attempting to change objectives is noticed, it is also apparent that this program is not different for different age groups. The curriculum area is the same, the curriculum lines are the same, with a change for the age group 5-6 who should start practicing in writing.

To understand more, follow the program in more detail (IZHA, 2015-2018), so, with the linguistic formation by lines, objectives and concepts.

Here too we see the same thing: the difference between objectives by age groups is small. The objectives are almost the same, with only some changes in the elaboration (so in form and not in content). In the age group 5-6, it is noticed that just a point on the lines is added, such as intonation to the communication line (*Uses the intonation, clear communication rhythm, which is understandable to others or Use different intonation, structuring his sentences and ideas when he speaks.*) The concept of the Intonation has also been added, which is the *Intonation*, although it should be said that there are many flaws in this, both in the definition of concepts and in the way the difference between age groups is make it negligible.

To be clear, we take as an example only the first objective and the concept in the first line (communication) according to three age groups. Thus we have:

3-4 years old

Ask simple questions- The objective (the goal);

Question - Concept.

4-5 years old

Use and guide simple questions- Objective;

Question - Concept.

5-6 years old:

Use often sentences and simple questions through gestures- Objective;

Question - Concept.

In order not to extend too much, the same thing happens with other points according to the lines or the other lines as a whole.

Problems also arise in how are designed the objectives that, among other things, have to be achieved during linguistic development. So ambiguous appear to be objectives such as: The student *should answer with simple sentences when asked, Speak in short sentences, Keep a written material in hands pretending to read it*, etc. (3-4 years). And, for the sake of truth, every objective needs to be improved, since specifically these examples we have just quoted (that are few, but we are not quoting other examples) are not goals as the child at the age of 3-4 years has opted for the tendency to speak in short and incomplete sentences, while we must find a way to help those to form clear and complete sentences contributing to the enrichment of their vocabulary. The child at this age if he is read regularly by the parent and the teacher, keeps the book in hand and pretends to be reading, but to do so we must contribute to the reading to the children, because they can do so even mechanically and that's invalid.

All these phenomena and other things (mentioned but not being detailed) come as a result of the fact that teachers prepare the lesson based solely on the objectives of the programs, lesson plans, above all, to the respective lesson planning diaries designed by the teachers themselves, as all that is offered above for this stage of teaching is inadequate and sometimes quite unclear.

Conclusions

After these analyzes, we have come to the conclusion that this stage of schooling has not been taken so seriously as to the learning of children for the following reasons:

There are no proper methods that help teachers achieve the goals for this age group. Even though some kind of mock-up from a foreign project or a current publishing house has been made to improve any program or publication of any method, it should be said that nothing has been implemented.

Language development is not seen enough in harmony with other lines. Such a thing is mentioned, but the concept of interaction that is undisputable is understood by the template and fails to be decoded properly by teachers. Whether it comes to race, religious beliefs or ethnic groups, it is understood that all these are reflected in language, so there is linguistic diversity, but we can also fight the phenomenon through the struggle we make against language peculiarities or some kind of discrimination. The texts of this cycle should be designed as such in order to be coherent with each other but also with the programs or standards to be achieved.

The new changes expected to be implemented are inadequate. In 2015, were published the *Development and Learning Standards for Children of 3-6 years* (IZHA, 2015), where awareness of learning in this cycle is discussed, a new approach to competency learning, models and incentives that serve to encourage children to achieve these standards for the role of the game in promoting and gaining new knowledge or exploration through it; for developing skills that show curiosity and creativity; for the great expectations of children and the high potential that they have.

There is some kind of improvement in the standards to be achieved, especially in the indicators that help in achieving these many standards, and we can say that they also help to improve the respective objectives, but everything is expected so that the teacher can do it on his own initiative, as long as the methods or texts are missing; as long as the educational level has dropped in recent decades (it is in critical condition); or the teacher's deficit is deepening.

There is no clarity of what is required in the programs, and above all, there is no unique method which can explain to the teacher how to break down each point and implement them.

In the *Curriculum framework of pre-school education* (IZHA, 2015), although such concepts as *open society, globalization, or the concept of lifelong learning competences, or the socio-cultural context*, have been introduced etc (which obviously must be included), all others do not have any noticeable difference to what was previously drafted. For this reason, I think the problem does not lie in the proper design of strategies, standards, curricula, programs etc. but in ensuring the ways for their implementation. It's just like discovering the disease and not knowing how to determine the right course of treatment.

Another factor why this schooling stage is not taken seriously, we think it has to do with the fact that this stage of education is not legally required to attend.

However, something is moving (2015-2018), and such a thing belongs to the future, but the problem is the same: if everything written is not accompanied by specific trainings and clear methods for the teacher, it is difficult to apply by them (as has happened in these 27 years of post-dictatorship) and then we will go back to the start, as we discover and discover that we always have started the wrong way.

References

- [1] Berruto, G. (1994). *La sociolinguistica*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
- [2] Cacciari, C. (2011). *Psicologia del linguaggio*. (p. 278-293). Bologna: Il Mulino.
- [3] Chomsky, N. (2007). *Gjuha dhe problemet e njohjes* (translated by Blerta Topalli). (p. 2, 135, 3, 134). Tiranë: Toena.
- [4] Cross, (1977); according to Shkurtaj, Gj. (2009). *Sociolinguistikë e shqipës*. (p. 96). Tiranë: SHBLU
- [5] Saussure, F. D. (2002). *Kurs i gjuhësisë së përgjithshme*. (translated by Rexhep Ismajli). Tiranw: Dituria
- [6] Education Development Institute, (IZHA). (2006-2018). *Pre-school education programs 2006, 2007, 2015, 2018; Development and Learning Standards for Children of 3-6 years 2015, Curriculum framework of pre-school education* (2015). Tiranw.
- [7] Herculandez Campoi. <http://www.ja.scribd.com>. *sociolinguistics*
- [8] Holmes, J. (2015). *Hyrje në Sociolinguistikë*. (translated by Kristina Jorgaqi). (p. 516). Tiranw: Pegi

- [9] Hudson, A. R. (2002). *Sociolinguistika* (translated by Mariana Omeri). Tiranë: Dituria
- [10] Lyons, J. (2010). *Hyrje në gjuhësinë teorike* (translated by Ethem Likaj). Tiranë: Dituria
- [11] Malinowski, (1923); according to Hudson, A. R. (2002). *Sociolinguistika* (translated by Mariana Omeri). (p.127). Tiranë: Dituria
- [12] Marini, A. (2001). *Elementi di psicolinguisticagenerale*. Milano:Springer-verlag.
- [13] Soravia, G. (1980). *Prima lingua*. Milano: G. Principato S.P.A.
- [14] Shkurtaj, Gj. (2009). *Sociolinguistikë e shqipes*. (p. 269-271, 95). Tiranë: Shblu.
- [15] Troplini, E. (2017). *Thelbi i sociolinguistikës*. (p.99, 171). Durrës: 2M Printing.
- [16] Wells and Robinson. (1982); according to Shkurtaj, Gj. (2009). *Sociolinguistikë e shqipes*. (p. 95). Tiranw: Shblu.
- [17] Wilkins, D.A. (1983). *Linguistica e insegnamento delle lingue* (translated by Anna Checchia). Bologna:Zanichelli
- [18] Enciclopedia Treccani. www.treccani.it. *Psicolinguistica nell' Enciclopedia Treccani*.