The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations
ISSN 2689-100X Volume 08 - 2026

# Application of Montessori Pedagogical Principles in Teaching English to Preschool Children Through a Sensory-Based Approach

**Yazmuradova Aygozel**
English teacher
Seattle, USA

Received: 12 Feb 2026 | Received Revised Version: 21 Mar 2026 | Accepted: 13 Apr 2026 | Published: 29 May 2026

Volume 08 Issue 05 2026 | DOI: 10.37547/tajssei/Volume08Issue05-06

## Abstract

*This review-based analytical article examines the use of Montessori pedagogical principles in English instruction for preschool children aged 3.5 to 6 through sensory-based learning. Early foreign language education at this age requires methods that respect bodily exploration, short attention cycles, emotional security, and the child's dependence on concrete experience. The article connects the prepared environment, self-directed activity, sensory materials, and teacher observation with preschool EFL practice. The aim is to develop an analytical model for integrating Montessori-oriented sensory work into English teaching without presenting unsupported empirical results. The source base consists of recent peer-reviewed studies on Montessori education, preschool EFL, multisensory word learning, embodied cognition, alphabet learning, digital play, and early literacy. The article uses comparative analysis, source analysis, conceptual synthesis, typologization, and analytical generalization. The resulting model gives practical guidance for classroom organization, teacher conduct, material choice, learning sequence, and non-experimental monitoring.*

Keywords: Montessori pedagogy, preschool education, English as a foreign language, sensory learning, prepared environment, early literacy, embodied cognition, language acquisition, learner autonomy, preschool EFL



**Cite This Article:** Aygozel, Y. (2026). Application of Montessori Pedagogical Principles in Teaching English to Preschool Children Through a Sensory-Based Approach. The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations, 8(05), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume08Issue05-06

## Introduction

Early English instruction for preschool children needs a pedagogical form that differs from language teaching for older learners. A child aged 3.5 to 6 does not usually enter a foreign language through grammar explanation, long verbal correction, formal rules, or abstract comparison between languages. English reaches the child through sound, touch, rhythm, naming, movement, imitation, repeated routines, and emotionally safe contact with adults and peers. Montessori pedagogy offers a productive basis for this age group because it treats learning as organized contact with a prepared environment, not as a shortened version of school instruction.

Many early English programs face the same methodological difficulty. Teachers introduce English at

younger ages, while classroom practice often borrows tools from primary school or from media-rich language immersion. Worksheets, screens, rapid questioning, flashcard races, and repeated choral answers can create visible activity, yet they do not always match the way preschool children concentrate, remember, and use language. A Montessori-oriented sensory approach gives another route. The child touches, sorts, traces, listens, moves, compares, names, and returns to the same material. English becomes part of an action that the child can repeat.

The aim of this article is to develop an analytical interpretation of how Montessori pedagogical principles can guide English teaching for preschool children through sensory-based practice. The first objective is to define the conceptual compatibility between Montessori pedagogy and early EFL through the prepared environment, self-directed activity, sensitive periods, and the teacher's observational function. The second objective is to identify how sensory materials and embodied tasks support phonological awareness, vocabulary acquisition, alphabet knowledge, and early communicative participation in English. The third objective is to formulate a practical model for implementation that avoids unsupported claims of effectiveness while offering classroom decisions, sequencing logic, and monitoring indicators.

The novelty of the article lies in treating Montessori-based preschool English teaching as a specific pedagogical configuration. The approach cannot be reduced to play, general multisensory instruction, or the decorative use of Montessori materials inside a conventional EFL lesson. The proposed interpretation links four layers: the organization of the learning environment, the sensory route to language, preschool learner autonomy, and the teacher's movement from instructor to observer-guide. This connection suits early English teaching because it gives the child access to language through objects, textures, sounds, gestures, spatial order, and purposeful routines.

The working hypothesis is that Montessori pedagogical principles can form a coherent basis for preschool English instruction when sensory materials, prepared space, self-directed work, and teacher observation operate as one instructional design. The value of this approach does not rest on invented quantitative gains. It rests on whether the classroom structure fits preschool development and whether English input becomes concrete, repeatable, meaningful, and physically accessible.

**Materials and Methods**

The source base for the article was formed through a targeted literature search in Scopus-indexed publisher platforms, Taylor & Francis Online, SpringerLink, ScienceDirect, MDPI, PubMed Central, ERIC-linked records, journal websites, and open academic repositories. The search combined several groups of terms: "Montessori education," "Montessori preschool," "prepared environment," "self-regulated learning," "early childhood EFL," "preschool English," "young language learners," "multisensory learning," "embodied cognition," "sensory word learning," "alphabet instruction," and "digital play in early years." The initial screening covered 38 records published mainly from 2021 to 2025. Twenty-three works were removed from the corpus because they focused on older schoolchildren, general educational technology, unrelated special education settings, non-peer-reviewed commentary, or empirical outcomes that could not be transferred to preschool EFL without distortion. The final corpus contains 18 sources: reviews and meta-analyses on Montessori education, studies on preschool English and early foreign language learning, research on multisensory word and alphabet learning, work on embodied cognition, studies on digital play, and one prior published article by the author used to separate screen-based immersive learning from sensory preschool practice. The thematic map of the literature covers Montessori principles in early childhood, preschool EFL conditions, sensory and embodied mechanisms of language learning, early literacy and alphabet work, and the limits of digital play for the target age group.

The article uses methods that fit an analytical review design. Source analysis identifies how recent studies describe Montessori pedagogy, preschool EFL, sensory learning, and embodied cognition. Comparative analysis separates Montessori-based sensory language work from digital immersion and conventional teacher-led EFL practice. Conceptual synthesis connects the prepared environment, learner autonomy, material design, and teacher observation into one pedagogical model. Typologization classifies sensory English activities by function: phonetic, lexical, alphabetic, communicative, and self-regulatory. Analytical generalization supports practical recommendations without presenting them as experimental results.

**Results**

Recent research on Montessori education gives the first basis for applying this pedagogy to preschool English teaching. Systematic and review-based studies describe Montessori classrooms through prepared space, purposeful materials, child choice, sensory experience, and indirect teacher guidance (Kıran et al., 2021). These elements matter for early EFL because language learning at preschool age begins with contact, orientation, repetition, and emotional safety. A conventional language lesson often starts from the teacher's verbal input. A Montessori-oriented lesson starts from the child's encounter with an object, a sound, a movement, or a classified set of materials. English words then name things and actions that the child can handle, compare, move, arrange, and return to the shelf.

The evidence base on Montessori education requires careful interpretation. A meta-analysis reported effects across several areas of development and learning, yet the authors treated the field as heterogeneous because Montessori programs differ in fidelity, duration, teacher preparation, and implementation conditions (Demangeon et al., 2023). A review of behavioral effects reached a similar conclusion: Montessori pedagogy has promising links with school learning and psychological development, but available quantitative studies do not support simple causal claims across all settings (Gentaz & Richard, 2022). For the present article, this means that Montessori principles should not appear as a guaranteed route to measurable EFL improvement. Their value lies in the fit between preschool development and sensory, ordered, self-directed work.

The prepared environment forms the central bridge between Montessori pedagogy and preschool EFL. In early childhood classrooms, the environment organizes attention, movement, choice, repetition, and peer contact. Montessori education treats the environment as a didactic structure where material placement, sequence, accessibility, and order help the child work with limited adult intervention (Kıran et al., 2021). Applied to English teaching, this principle turns the classroom into a language field where words attach to objects and actions. A basket with miniature animals, a tray with textured letter forms, a sound-matching box, a color-grading activity, or a set of real objects for naming gives the child a concrete reason to hear and use English.

Self-directed activity gives the second conceptual bridge. Montessori classrooms support the child's capacity to select work, repeat it, correct mistakes through material control, and regulate attention step by step. Recent research on self-regulated learning within Montessori-oriented settings treats autonomy as a trained capacity that grows from the structure of activity, not as choice without limits (Kersna et al., 2025). This distinction matters for preschool EFL. Young children rarely benefit from unstructured exposure alone. They need a prepared range of language-rich tasks where the available choices are limited, visible, and developmentally suitable. The child chooses among possible English activities, while the teacher has already shaped the room so that each choice contains vocabulary, sound discrimination, sequencing, categorization, or social language.

The teacher's position changes under this logic. In many EFL classrooms the teacher speaks, models, corrects, asks questions, and evaluates. In a Montessori-based preschool English environment the teacher observes first, then intervenes with restraint. Studies of early childhood educators as language teachers show that teachers' beliefs and professional identities affect the way they interpret language support in multilingual classrooms (Cichocka, 2024). This finding has direct relevance for Montessori-oriented EFL. The teacher needs linguistic awareness, but language knowledge alone does not carry the lesson. The teacher has to read concentration, hand movement, fatigue, hesitation, repetition, and readiness to name. English input enters through the child's work cycle.

The preschool age ranges from 3.5 to 6 demands a material path to language because young children learn words in dense sensory situations. Research on multisensory word learning reports that young children's lexical processing receives support when words connect with perceptual contact, including touch and object exploration (Seidl et al., 2024). This does not mean that every English word needs a separate object. Early vocabulary should first be anchored in concrete categories: color, shape, texture, movement, size, sound, body action, food, clothing, classroom routine, and familiar animals. Sensory contact narrows the distance between sound and meaning. The child hears "rough," touches rough material, compares it with "smooth," and repeats the distinction through physical contrast.

Embodied cognition strengthens this position. A review of embodied approaches in language education reported

that language learning draws on bodily movement, gesture, perception, and situated action across first, second, and foreign language learning (Jusslin et al., 2022). Broader work on embodied cognition in learning and instruction supports the view that cognitive processing is linked with bodily activity and environmental interaction (Castro-Alonso et al., 2024). For preschool English teaching, this evidence moves attention away from verbal repetition as the main unit of instruction. A child who walks to a shelf, selects a sound object, matches it, hears the English label, places it back, and repeats the activity organizes perception, motor planning, attention, memory, and sound meaning within one learning act.

Second language research on embodiment adds a needed caution. Studies of embodied cognition in L2 processing indicate that second language comprehension can involve mental representations connected with action and sensorimotor experience, yet the strength of such links depends on exposure, proficiency, task type, and linguistic form (Bai, 2021). For preschool EFL, sensory-based work should not be romanticized as automatic acquisition. It gains pedagogical value when the teacher repeats language across activities, controls lexical load, and connects the same word with sound, object, gesture, and routine. The word "open" can appear in opening a box, opening a door in a miniature house, opening a book, and opening a hand. The child meets a stable sound pattern through varied bodily experience.

Research on early foreign language programs in preschool settings gives another boundary. A systematic review of foreign language programs in early childhood education and care found varied program types and outcomes, with a continuing need for stronger evidence and careful interpretation of effects (Thieme et al., 2022). This point protects the proposed article from overstatement. A Montessori sensory approach should be described as a coherent pedagogical design, not as proof of superior learning results. Its strength lies in aligning instruction with the way preschool children attend, move, imitate, and remember.

Early EFL scholarship emphasizes that young learners need age-sensitive pedagogy, teacher preparation, and materials suited to preschool development (Prošić-Santovac et al., 2022). This literature supports the first objective by showing that preschool English cannot function as a reduced primary school program. The Montessori principle of the prepared environment responds to this problem through spatial, sensory, and procedural design. Instead of asking children to sit through a sequence of verbal drills, the teacher arranges language materials that invite short, repeatable cycles of contact. The child's attention moves from object to word, from word to action, and from action to choose.

A scoping review of EFL education in East-Asian early childhood settings described a growing body of work on early English learning, including curriculum, teacher practices, family expectations, and classroom approaches (Liang & Chik, 2024). The relevance for Montessori-based sensory teaching lies in the fact that preschool English is shaped by institutional expectations, parental demand, material availability, teacher competence, and local views of childhood. A Montessori approach cannot be imported as a set of isolated objects. It needs a classroom culture in which silence, concentration, hand work, repetition, and self-paced activity are accepted as legitimate forms of language learning.

The direct link between Montessori and foreign language learning appears in recent work on early foreign language learning in a Montessori environment. Research on linguistic landscape tasks in a Montessori setting describes the prepared environment as a place that can support enthusiasm, language awareness, and hands-on language exploration (Kletzenbauer & Fürstenberg, 2025). This source matters for the second objective because it moves language learning beyond teacher speech and textbook sequence. Labels, objects, movement routes, classroom signs, and material categories can become part of the language environment, provided that they remain connected with purposeful activity. A sign on a shelf has limited value. A child who selects, names, sorts, returns, and hears the same word within a stable routine receives a richer form of input.

Alphabet learning requires separate treatment because preschool EFL often moves too quickly from oral exposure to letters and worksheets. A study of multisensory alphabet instruction for English monolingual and emergent bilingual children aged 3.5 to 5 found that alphabet learning can benefit from multisensory instruction beyond visual-auditory exposure alone (Park et al., 2025). In Montessori terms, this supports tactile letters, sandpaper letters, tracing trays, movable alphabets, and sound-object matching. For EFL preschoolers, alphabet work should begin with sound, touch, movement, and visual form before formal

writing tasks. The child traces the letter, hears the sound, finds an object beginning with that sound, and repeats the sequence with concrete material.

Phonological awareness can develop through sensory classification. Sound boxes, rhyming baskets, initial-sound objects, and oral games invite children to discriminate and compare sounds without abstract explanation. Research on dramatic storytelling in EFL kindergarten settings suggests that embodied narrative experiences can support emergent literacy because children participate through voice, gesture, sequence, and meaning (Alkilani, 2025). This source belongs to a different methodological tradition from Montessori, yet it reinforces the same pedagogical direction: preschool language learning deepens when children act, hear, sequence, and share words in social interaction. A Montessori-based classroom can use short story baskets with real objects and controlled language while preserving material order and child participation.

The comparison of sensory-based and digital immersive resources clarifies the boundary of the proposed model. A systematic review of digital play in early years describes digital play as interactive and potentially meaningful, while recording concerns linked with physical activity and addictive patterns (Chu et al., 2024). Montessori preschool teachers in a recent study viewed technology-supported play-based literacy development with caution, often seeing it as misaligned with Montessori hands-on philosophy, while acknowledging possible use in resource-constrained settings (Omidire, 2025). Previous work on authentic materials and immersive language environments examined films, podcasts, and articles as resources for language exposure, while drawing a boundary between media-based immersion and the needs of the youngest learners (Yazmuradova, 2025). For preschool English, a sensory Montessori-oriented model offers a non-screen route through touch, sound, movement, object naming, and prepared routines. The relationship between these positions can be represented as a pedagogical sequence.

**Table 1. Sensory-based Montessori sequence for preschool EFL learning (adapted from Kıran et al., 2021, Seidl et al., 2024, Park et al., 2025, and Kletzenbauer & Fürstenberg, 2025)**

| Montessori principle | Classroom organization | Sensory language action | EFL learning function |
|---|---|---|---|
| Prepared environment | Accessible trays, baskets, classified objects | Child selects, touches, sorts, returns | Stable contact with lexical categories |
| Sensitive attention to language | Short sound-rich routines | Child hears, repeats, discriminates | Phonological awareness and sound mapping |
| Sensorial material | Tactile letters, textured cards, sound boxes | Child traces, matches, compares | Alphabet knowledge and sound-symbol contact |
| Free choice within limits | Limited set of purposeful tasks | Child repeats selected work | Motivation, attention, self-regulation |
| Teacher as observer-guide | Minimal intervention, precise naming | Teacher names at the moment of action | Timely input and reduced verbal load |

Table 1 presents sensory-based English teaching as a sequence that begins with prepared action. The task gives the child a reason to perceive, move, and name. The learning function emerges from the structure of the material and the teacher's timing. Vocabulary grows through classified contact. Phonology develops through sound comparison. Alphabet knowledge appears through tracing and matching. Motivation depends on the child's ability to return to the material without waiting for constant adult direction.

A comparison of four research lines sharpens this interpretation. Montessori reviews emphasize prepared environments, autonomy, and concrete materials (Kıran et al., 2021, Gentaz & Richard, 2022). Early EFL reviews warn that preschool English teaching needs

developmental adjustment and should not imitate later schooling (Prošić-Santovac et al., 2022, Thieme et al., 2022). Multisensory and embodied research explains why contact, movement, and perception support word learning and language processing (Jusslin et al., 2022, Seidl et al., 2024, Castro-Alonso et al., 2024). Studies on Montessori foreign language practice and alphabet instruction show how these principles can enter language-specific tasks (Kletzenbauer & Fürstenberg, 2025, Park et al., 2025). These sources support the first objective: Montessori-based preschool EFL has a defensible conceptual foundation when the method works as an integrated environment, not as a collection of attractive materials.

The same comparison identifies a risk. Sensory activities can become superficial if the teacher adds them to a conventional lesson without changing classroom behavior. A teacher may use tactile letters and still dominate the lesson through long explanation, rapid correction, and whole-group pressure. In that case, Montessori materials lose their methodological meaning. The child handles the object, yet the sequence remains adult-controlled. Literature on teacher beliefs in early language classrooms indicates that teachers' interpretations shape language support in practice (Cichocka, 2024). For this reason, teacher preparation needs to cover observation, timing of input, and restraint, not only material selection.

Another group of sources helps define what sensory-based English learning can support with the greatest credibility. Word learning research supports object-based vocabulary, tactile exploration, and perceptual richness (Seidl et al., 2024). Alphabet instruction research supports multisensory work with letter forms for children in the preschool age range (Park et al., 2025). Dramatic storytelling research supports embodied participation in emergent literacy (Alkilani, 2025). Early foreign language program reviews support cautious expectations and developmental alignment (Thieme et al., 2022). These findings indicate that the strongest target areas for Montessori-based preschool EFL are receptive and productive vocabulary, sound discrimination, early phonological awareness, initial sound-symbol contact, classroom phrases, and positive participation in English routines. Grammar explanation, written accuracy, test preparation, and decontextualized vocabulary lists sit outside the natural strength of the approach.

The proposed model also requires a distinction between sensory exposure and language input. Sensory activity alone does not teach English. A child can sort colors silently without acquiring English labels. The teacher's linguistic contribution remains necessary. The timing and density of input change. In a Montessori-oriented sequence, the teacher names the object at the moment of attention, repeats the word during the child's action, and avoids excessive verbal framing. "Blue," "rough," "big," "roll," "open," "close," "same," and "different" become language tied to sensory judgment. The material organizes the child's attention. The teacher supplies concise English input.

The sensory approach works best when the same language item travels across modalities. A child hears the sound /m/, traces the letter m, matches it with a miniature mouse, says "mouse," places it in a basket, and later meets the same word in a story object sequence. This movement across sound, touch, object, and narrative reduces fragmentation. It respects the preschool child's need for repetition without turning repetition into mechanical drilling. The child repeats because the material invites return.

A final result concerns the boundary between authenticity and suitability. Authentic materials such as films, podcasts, and articles can build immersive language exposure for older learners when cognitive maturity, attention span, and media literacy are present (Yazmuradova, 2025). For preschoolers, authenticity takes another form. A real spoon, a wooden animal, a textured fabric card, a classroom plant, or a child's own movement belongs to the child's perceptual world more directly than a digital video. This distinction prevents overlap with screen-based language immersion. The Montessori sensory approach has its own age-specific route grounded in physical experience, order, and self-directed repetition.

**Discussion**

The application of Montessori principles to preschool English teaching begins with the environment. The teacher first decides what kind of language the room will make possible. If the room contains only general toys, the English lesson depends almost entirely on the teacher's speech. If the room contains ordered sensory trays, classified objects, tactile letters, sound baskets, action cards, and child-accessible labels, English can enter the child's independent work. The teacher remains

essential, but space, material, sequence, and routine carry part of the instructional load.

A practical implementation model can follow five decisions. The teacher selects a narrow lexical or phonological field appropriate for preschool children, such as colors, textures, classroom actions, animals, food, body movement, or initial sounds. The teacher then prepares tangible materials that make the target language perceptible. The child receives a brief presentation with precise naming. After that, the child can repeat the activity independently or with a peer. The teacher observes concentration, hesitation, spontaneous naming, and transfer to another routine. This sequence protects the sensory approach from becoming a set of unrelated games. Table 2 compares the main components of the proposed model. The table shows how Montessori principles can enter EFL decisions without turning the classroom into a conventional language lesson with Montessori-style decoration.

**Table 2. Translation of Montessori principles into preschool EFL practice (compiled by the author based on works by Kıran et al., 2021, Gentaz and Richard, 2022, Kletzenbauer and Fürstenberg, 2025, and Park et al., 2025)**

| Montessori principle | EFL interpretation | Classroom material | Teacher action | Expected pedagogical value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Prepared environment | English appears in ordered, accessible, repeatable work | Classified object baskets, tactile letters, sound boxes | Arrange materials by language function and level of difficulty | Reduces dependence on whole-group instruction |
| Sensory exploration | Meaning is attached to touch, sound, sight, and movement | Textured cards, real objects, movement paths, matching trays | Name the quality or action during the child's contact with material | Makes vocabulary concrete and memorable |
| Free choice within limits | The child chooses among prepared English tasks | Three to five available language trays | Offer limited options and observe choice patterns | Supports attention and internal motivation |
| Control of error | The material guides correction without constant adult judgment | Matching pairs, graded sets, sound-object correspondence | Intervene only when confusion blocks the task | Lowers anxiety and supports independent repetition |
| Teacher as observer-guide | Input is brief, timed, and linked to action | Any selected material | Observe before speaking, then give concise language | Prevents verbal overload and preserves concentration |

The table shows that the proposed model does not require a large quantity of materials. It requires coherence between material, language aim, teacher conduct, and the child's work cycle. A tactile letter becomes useful when it connects sound, hand movement, object naming, and repetition. A basket of animals becomes a language material when classification, naming, sound play, and communicative use are built into the presentation. The practical criterion is alignment. Each object in the classroom needs a clear language function.

The teacher's professional shift creates the greatest implementation difficulty. Many EFL teachers learn to create energy through speech, praise, correction, songs, and visible group response. In a Montessori-based preschool classroom, the teacher works through a quieter form of expertise. The teacher observes whether the child

returns to the material, whether the word appears without prompting, whether the child uses the same language in another activity, and whether confusion comes from the object, the sound, or the task sequence. The teacher performs less and diagnoses more.

Activity selection should follow the child's age and readiness. For children aged 3.5 to 4.5, English work should be grounded in object naming, sound imitation, body actions, color and texture contrast, and short routines. For children aged 4.5 to 5.5, the teacher can add initial sound sorting, tactile letters, simple phrase patterns, story baskets, and peer-based matching. For children aged 5.5 to 6, sound-symbol correspondence, movable alphabet work, classified vocabulary cards, and short oral production tasks become more suitable. This sequence protects the child from premature abstraction while leaving room for individual pace.

Monitoring in a Review+ article cannot imitate experimental measurement. Unsupported claims about percentage growth or test score gains would distort the nature of the article. Practical monitoring remains possible. The teacher can observe whether the child chooses English materials voluntarily, repeats the same task across days, responds to spoken labels, names objects without immediate modeling, transfers words into routines, and maintains concentration during sensory language work. These indicators are pedagogical, not statistical. Table 3 presents a monitoring framework that can guide practice without converting the article into empirical research. The table compares observable indicators, their meaning, and possible teacher responses.

**Table 3. Monitoring indicators for sensory-based Montessori EFL practice (compiled by the author based on works by Thieme et al., 2022, Seidl et al., 2024, Castro-Alonso et al., 2024, and Omidire, 2025)**

| Indicator | What the teacher observes | Pedagogical interpretation | Possible adjustment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Voluntary selection | Child independently chooses an English-related tray or object set | The material has entered the child's field of interest | Keep the task available and avoid unnecessary replacement |
| Repetition | Child repeats the same material across several work periods | The task supports concentration and consolidation | Add one small language variation only after stable repetition |
| Sound response | Child reacts to a sound, word, or phrase through pointing, matching, or movement | Receptive understanding is forming before verbal production | Continue concise naming linked with action |
| Spontaneous naming | Child says a word without direct prompting | Productive vocabulary begins to emerge from the work cycle | Extend the word into a short phrase or related object |
| Cross-activity transfer | Child uses the same English word in a story, routine, or peer interaction | The word is no longer tied to one material only | Place the word in another sensory or social task |
| Loss of concentration | Child leaves the task, misuses material, or waits for adult direction | The task may be too abstract, too long, or poorly sequenced | Simplify the material, reduce lexical load, or re-present slowly |
| Screen dependence | Child engages more with digital display than with language action | Attention may shift from sensory language work to stimulus consumption | Replace screen input with object-based or movement-based material |

The monitoring framework gives the teacher a practical form of accountability. It does not ask the teacher to prove that a Montessori-based lesson produced a quantified gain. It asks whether the environment, material, and input generate observable language-related behavior. Such monitoring fits preschool education because language development emerges gradually. A child may understand before speaking. A child may repeat a material before naming it. A child may name an object in play before using it in a phrase. These changes deserve attention because preschool language learning rarely follows a linear classroom sequence.

The distinction between sensory-based and digital immersion requires careful handling. Digital resources can support language exposure for some learners, and early childhood studies do not justify a blanket rejection of technology. The issue is developmental fit. Preschool children need bodily action, concrete manipulation, and social contact. In a Montessori-oriented EFL classroom, a screen can capture attention and reduce contact with material. For that reason, digital input should remain peripheral for the 3.5 to 6 age group. If the teacher uses it, a physical follow-up activity should carry the learning task.

The practical model proposed here fits small-group or prepared-room settings where the teacher can observe individual work. Large classes, rigid schedules, limited materials, and institutional expectations of whole-group performance complicate implementation. These limits define the conditions of use. A preschool EFL teacher can still apply the same logic on a smaller scale by creating a language shelf, rotating sensory trays, using real objects for vocabulary, and observing children's voluntary return to materials.

The author's position is that Montessori-based preschool EFL should be presented as a disciplined pedagogical design. Its value lies in restraint. Excessive materials fragment attention. Excessive vocabulary overloads memory. Excessive teacher talk turns sensory work into a conventional lesson. Excessive freedom removes the didactic structure. The strongest classroom design is narrow, ordered, repeatable, and closely observed. English enters as a living part of the child's contact with the world.

**Conclusion**

Montessori pedagogy and preschool EFL are conceptually compatible when English teaching is organized through prepared space, sensory material, self-directed repetition, and teacher observation. The strongest link appears in the treatment of language as something first encountered through sound, touch, movement, object contact, and routine. For children aged 3.5 to 6, this route corresponds more closely to developmental needs than abstract explanation, worksheet-based instruction, or extended teacher-led correction.

Sensory materials support preschool English learning when they connect perception with language function. Tactile letters, sound boxes, classified object baskets, story materials, movement tasks, and real objects can support vocabulary, phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, and early communicative participation. Their pedagogical value depends on sequence and teacher conduct. A material becomes language-rich only when the teacher links it with concise input, repetition, self-correction, and transfer into another activity.

The proposed implementation model confirms the working hypothesis. Montessori principles can provide a coherent basis for preschool English instruction if sensory materials, prepared environment, autonomy, and observation operate within one classroom design. The confirmation is analytical, not experimental. It rests on conceptual convergence across Montessori research, early EFL studies, multisensory learning, embodied cognition, and preschool literacy. The approach should be applied with cautious expectations, developmental precision, and monitoring based on observable learning behavior instead of unsupported numerical outcomes.

***References***

1. Alkilani, G. Y., & Zhang, Q. (2025). Effect of dramatic storytelling on emergent literacy in EFL: Evidence from the UAE kindergartens. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 64*(3), 322–340. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2024.2329877
2. Bai, Y., & He, W. (2021). The embodied cognition effect of the second language: Automatic activation or native language mediation? *Advances in Psychological Science, 29*(11), 1970–1978. https://doi.org/10.3724/SP.J.1042.2021.01970
3. Castro-Alonso, J. C., Ayres, P., Zhang, S., De Koning, B. B., & Paas, F. (2024). Research avenues supporting embodied cognition in learning and instruction. *Educational Psychology Review, 36*(1),

Article 10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09847-4

4. Chu, C., Paatsch, L., Kervin, L., & Edwards, S. (2024). Digital play in the early years: A systematic review. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction, 40*, Article 100652. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2024.100652
5. Cichocka, J. (2024). Early childhood educators as language teachers: Preschool teachers' understanding of language learning and language use. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 24*(4), 948–969. https://doi.org/10.1177/14687984221098353
6. Demangeon, A., Claudel-Valentin, S., Aubry, A., & Tazouti, Y. (2023). A meta-analysis of the effects of Montessori education on five fields of development and learning in preschool and school-age children. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 73*, Article 102182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2023.102182
7. Gentaz, E., & Richard, S. (2022). The behavioral effects of Montessori pedagogy on children's psychological development and school learning. *Children, 9*(2), Article 133. https://doi.org/10.3390/children9020133
8. Jusslin, S., Korpinen, K., Lilja, N., Martin, R., Lehtinen-Schnabel, J., & Anttila, E. (2022). Embodied learning and teaching approaches in language education: A mixed studies review. *Educational Research Review, 37*, Article 100480. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100480
9. Kersna, L., Lepp, L., Pedaste, M., & Laak, K.-J. (2025). Supporting self-regulated learning in primary education: Insights from a Montessori classroom. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, Article 1594556. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1594556
10. Kiran, I., Macun, B., Argin, Y., & Ulutaş, İ. (2021). Montessori method in early childhood education: A systematic review. *Cukurova University Faculty of Education Journal, 50*(2), 1154–1183. https://doi.org/10.14812/cuefd.873573
11. Kletzenbauer, P., & Fürstenberg, U. (2025). Early foreign language learning in a Montessori context: Fostering enthusiasm, language awareness and language learning through linguistic landscape tasks. *Focus on ELT Journal*, 54–67. https://doi.org/10.14744/felt.7.1.4
12. Liang, L., Chik, A., & Li, H. (2025). English as a foreign language education in East Asian early childhood education settings: A scoping review. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 53*(3), 835–850. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-024-01646-4
13. Omidire, M., Aung, S., Izevbigie, E., & Shai, S. (2025). Perception of Montessori preschool teachers regarding literacy development through technology-supported play-based activities. *Reading & Writing, 16*(1), Article a543. https://doi.org/10.4102/rw.v16i1.543
14. Park, S., Piasta, S. B., & Sayer, P. M. (2025). An initial yet rigorous test of multisensory alphabet instruction for English monolingual and emergent bilingual children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 72*, 328–338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2025.04.008
15. Prošić-Santovac, D., & Savić, V. (2022). English as a foreign language in early language education. In M. Schwartz (Ed.), *Handbook of early language education* (pp. 1–26). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47073-9_13-2
16. Seidl, A. H., Indarjit, M., & Borovsky, A. (2024). Touch to learn: Multisensory input supports word learning and processing. *Developmental Science, 27*(1), Article e13419. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.13419
17. Thieme, A.-M. M. M., Hanekamp, K., Andringa, S., Verhagen, J., & Kuiken, F. (2022). The effects of foreign language programmes in early childhood education and care: A systematic review. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 35*(3), 334–351. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2021.1984498
18. Yazmuradova, A. (2025). The role of authentic materials (films, podcasts, articles) in creating an immersive language environment. *International Journal of All Research Education and Scientific Methods, 13*(12). https://doi.org/10.56025/IJARESM.2025.1307251025