TRANSLATION AS A COGNITIVE STRATEGY FOR LIFELONG LEARNING

GALINA KAVALIAUSKIENĖ

Department of Foreign Languages
Mykolas Romeris University
Lithuania
Galina_Kavaliauskiene@yahoo.com

LIGIJA KAMINSKIENĖ

Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies
Vilnius University
Ligija.Kaminskiene@gmail.com

> Learning strategies are immensely ambiguous
> phenomena and nothing is clear-cut about them.
> ZOLTAN DŐRNYEI

> The object of education is to prepare the young
> to educate themselves throughout their lives.
> ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

The paper examines how the language learning strategies that learners prefer in learning professional language at tertiary level can be used for lifelong education. It is well known that in language learning students apply various learning strategies, yet not all learners are equally successful in their studies.

This research is based on the analysis of data obtained from two different surveys of learners' preferred language learning strategies. Respondents spread over two levels of English proficiency and their learning strategies are compared. Self-evaluation and reflections on learning outcomes reveal how important or unimportant various learning strategies are and which might be relevant to lifelong learning. The study found that students' preferred strategies can be an effective means to foster their motivation for self-development and, in the long run, lifelong learning.

INTRODUCTION

The important part of education is learning how to learn. One of the objectives of a language course is to teach students how to continue learning the language independently after the course has ended. The second valid point is the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of one's own performance in a foreign language, which is an important skill of critical thinking. The third valid point is the ability to use high-tech for the benefit of effective learning. Training learners in using strategies of effective learning such as self-monitoring and self-assessing is invaluable in attaining teaching goals. Fostering learner strategies of effective learning is a factor for successful lifelong self-development.

To ensure effective language learning, language teachers must make professional decisions about methodology and techniques to be used. Decisions made during language instruction depend on various factors, among which the most important are the needs of the individual learner, the goals of the course, learner preferences and attitudes to the importance of various language skills.

This paper addresses the issues of learners' preferred strategies for language learning. Research implications might be beneficial for fostering sustainable lifelong learning.

This article consists of literature review, which includes lifelong learning, learning strategies, and strategy training, the description of respondents and research methods, followed by the results, discussion, conclusions, and references.

LIFELONG LEARNING

Lifelong learning is a philosophy based on the claim that it is never too late for learning. The notion of learning through life is hardly new. The seven master keys formulated by Socrates are simple but immensely powerful: 1. Know Thyself, 2. Ask Great Questions, 3. Think for Yourself, 4. Free Your Mind, 5. Grow with Friends, 6. Speak the Truth, 7. Strengthen Your Soul. (Gross, online).

Lifelong learning encompasses learning for personal, civic and social purposes as well as for employment. It takes place in a variety of environments in and outside the formal education and training systems. Lifelong learning implies raising investment in people and knowledge; promoting the acquisition of basic skills, including digital literacy; and broadening opportunities for innovative,

more flexible forms of learning. Its aim is to provide people of all ages with equal and open access to high-quality learning opportunities, and to a variety of learning experiences. Institutions of higher education have a key role to play in making this vision a reality. The European Union Commission stresses the need for Member States to transform formal education and training systems in order to break down barriers between different forms of learning (http://europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/s19001.htm).

Language learning is a lifelong activity, for which the European Commission identifies the following specific objectives (http://europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c11068.htm): 1. learning of a mother tongue plus two other languages, 2. language learning in secondary education and training, 3. language learning in higher education, 4. language learning among adults, 5. encouragement for language learning by learners with special needs, 6. development of a wide range of languages. The action plan of language learning proposes teaching a subject through a foreign language, which would enable learners to use their language skills directly. Language learning in higher education envisages promoting multilingualism: all students should study abroad for at least one term and should gain an accepted language qualification as part of their degree course.

There is a variety of widely implemented methods that help people learn successfully such as accelerated learning techniques, assessment alternatives, cooperative learning, learning styles, multiple intelligences, application of technology, etc. The role of technology in lifelong learning has become particularly important. The e-learning initiative is part of the European Community's overall *e*Europe strategy, which was designed at the Lisbon European Council in March 2000. The overall strategy is based largely on the e-Europe communication. A definition of e-learning is an all-encompassing term generally used to refer to computer-enhanced learning, although it is often extended to include the use of mobile technologies such as MP3 players, web-based teaching materials, multimedia CD-ROMs or web sites, discussion boards, e-mail, weblogs, wikis, computer aided assessment, simulations, games, learning management software, etc. World's future economy and society are being formed in the classrooms of today. Students need to be both well educated in their chosen field and digitally literate if they are to take part effectively in tomorrow's knowledge society.

LEARNING STRATEGIES

The notion of learning strategies was intuitively appealing to researchers and it was embraced with enthusiasm by language teachers, although "there is a lack of an unambiguous theoretical definition of the learning strategy construct, and most of the relevant literature in the L2 field pretends that with regard of learning strategies everything is more or less okay" (Dőrnyei 2005). According to Z. Dőrnyei, the definitions of learning strategies offered in the L2 literature are rather inconsistent and elusive.

The initial research generated two well-known taxonomies of language learning strategies: the first one - by R. Oxford (1990), and the second one – by J.M. O'Malley and A. Chamot (1990). Oxford's taxonomy consisted of six strategies: cognitive, memory, metacognitive, compensation, affective, and social. Metacognition refers to thinking about cognition or reasoning about one's own thinking. Most definitions of metacognition include both knowledge and strategy components. Metacognition is often referred to as "thinking about thinking" and can be used to help students "learn how to learn". Metacognition has been linked with intelligence and it has been shown that those with greater metacognitive abilities tend to be more successful thinkers.

J. M O'Malley and A. Chamot (1990) carried out extensive research into learning strategies by means of the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach which is based on findings in cognitive psychology and is concerned with how knowledge is acquired, stored, and retrieved. L2 learners use three main types of strategy: 1. metacognitive strategy, which involves planning and thinking about learning, its monitoring, and evaluating learning outcomes; 2. cognitive strategy, which involves conscious ways of tackling learning, i.e. note-taking, resourcing (using various resources like books, dictionaries, etc.), and elaboration – relating new information to old; 3. social strategy, which means learning by interacting with other people. Interestingly, in their research, usage of metacognitive strategies accounted for 30% of the learners, cognitive strategy was used by 53% of the learners, and social strategy made up 17%. It should be noted that the type of strategy varies according to the task the students are engaged in and learners' language level. Learning strategies can be identified by administering scientifically sound surveys to learners, and learners should be taught to use different strategies, so that acquired strategies can be transferred to new tasks and subjects.

According to Z. Dőrnyei (2005), compensation strategy refers to communication, which is related to language *use* rather than language *learning*. Nevertheless, R. Oxford's strategy system (1990) is highly compatible with J. M. O'Malley and A. Chamot's system (1990), if communication strategies are excluded, and social / affective strategies are separated. The resulting typology comprises the following four main components (Dőrnyei 2005): 1) cognitive strategies, involving the manipulation and transformation of the learning materials; 2) metacognitive strategies, involving higher order strategies aimed at analyzing, monitoring, evaluating and organizing one's own learning process; 3) social strategies, involving interpersonal behaviors aimed at increasing the amount of L2 communication and practice interaction with native speakers, cooperating with peers; 4) affective strategies, involving control of the emotional conditions and experiences.

Research on language learning strategies investigates the feasibility of helping students become more effective language learners by teaching them learning strategies (Chamot 2004).

According to V. Cook (1996), good language learners are those who: 1. find a learning style that suits them; 2. involve themselves in the language learning process; 3. develop an awareness of language as a system and as a communication; 4. pay constant attention to expanding language knowledge; 5. take into account the demands that L2 learning imposes.

In the recent years there has been considerable interest in the role of reflection in higher education. The most valuable way to promote a change of attitude alongside the acquisition of skills is to encourage the learners to reflect on what they are doing and why. The promotion of learner reflection remains one of the main benefits of alternative assessment (Coombi and Barlow 2004). The ability to reflect, as well as learning strategies and learners' attitudes are important aspects of learner autonomy that can lay the foundations for lifelong learning (Tomlinson 1996).

Active learning in higher education presupposes the ability to think critically, analyze and solve problems, use Information and Communication Technology (ICT) competently. Critical thinking skills are not likely to develop spontaneously and need to be improved and trained in English classes (Ustunluoglu 2004). Language learners need to explore different learning strategies, experimenting and evaluating, and eventually choosing their own set of effective strategies.

The study of learner strategies (Griffiths and Parr 2001) indicates discrepancies between student and teacher perceptions of language learning strategy use.

Students rank social strategies as the most frequent, followed by metacognitive, compensation, cognitive, affective, and memory (the least frequent) strategies. Teachers' beliefs are different, i.e. memory strategies are the most frequent, followed by cognitive, social, metacognitive, compensation, and affective (the least frequent). According to C. Griffiths and M. Parr, it is possible that some of the discrepancies may be due to differing interpretations of the strategy groupings.

The possible implications of learning strategies for teaching are: language learners need to explore different learning strategies, experimenting and evaluating, and eventually choosing their own set of effective strategies.

It should be emphasized that learning strategies were never explicitly rejected and the concept is used in practical materials. However this concept is considered to be unfruitful for research purposes, and the notion of self-regulation is thought to be a more dynamic concept because it refers to multidimensional construct, including cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, behavioral and environmental processes (Dőrnyei 2005). Learning strategy is only one component of self-regulation which consists of a long list: goal setting, strategic planning, monitoring, metacognition, time management, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, intrinsic interest, evaluation and self-reflection, feedback, etc. This complex construct of self-regulation needs to be researched yet.

STRATEGY TRAINING

The notion of learning to learn in L2 studies has a history of over three decades. Strategy training is defined as the explicit teaching of how, when, and why students should employ language learning strategies to enhance their efforts at reaching language program goals (Chen 2007). Since the 1970s, researchers have addressed the need for strategy training in response to the lack of students' awareness of the cognitive tools and strategies available to them. Evaluation of strategy training concerns the changes in learner behavior from the perspectives of task improvement, strategy maintenance, and strategy transfer. The impact of strategy training on the learner not only leads to the improvement of language proficiency, but also engages with the learners' internal changes in the learning process. The theoretical model (Chen 2007) illustrates the relationship among the dimensions and categories of the changes in the participants' learning processes and emphasizes the need for balancing all the criteria that may contribute to successful learning. Strategy training frameworks aim to achieve the following

goals (Dőrnyei 2005): "to raise learners' awareness about learning strategies; to encourage strategy use; to offer a number of relevant strategies for learners to choose from; to offer controlled practice in the use of strategies; to provide an analysis for students' to reflect on their strategy use."

Assessing the need for strategy training, A. D. Cohen (1998) notes that 'the ultimate goal of strategy training is to empower students by allowing them to take control of the language learning process'.

Some researchers caution teachers against investing too much effort into strategy training as this is not likely to be cost-effective, while proponents of strategy training claim that there is enough positive evidence to justify further work in this area (Dőrnyei 2005).

Most studies evaluating the effectiveness of strategy training for second language learners have quantitatively measured improvements in their test scores following the completion of strategy training. Y. Chen (2007) argues that the evaluation methods must be supplemented by a qualitative analysis of the impact that strategy training has on the learning process; he contributes a theoretical model that illustrates the relationship among changes in participants learning processes and four dimensions for evaluation criteria, namely, the observable changes in learners' behavior, changes in their learning process, strategy changes in approach to the study of the foreign language, and general changes in attitudes towards language learning.

A number of models for teaching learning strategies agree on the importance of developing students' metacognitive understanding of the value of learning strategies. In A. D. Cohen's model (1998) teacher acts as a diagnostician, language learner, learner trainer, coordinator and coach. In the model suggested by M. Grenfell and V. Harris (1999) teacher raises awareness, discusses value of strategies, gives students practice, sets goals, chooses appropriate strategies to attain goals, and, finally, teacher and students evaluate success of action plan.

There are three current models for language learning strategy instruction: SSBI Model (Cohen 1998), CALLA Model (Chamot 2005), and Grenfell and Harris (1999). All models identify students' current learning strategies through activities such as completing questionnaires, engaging in discussions about familiar tasks, and reflecting on strategies used after performing a task. All models suggest that the teacher should demonstrate the new strategy. Moreover, current models are based on developing students' knowledge about their own thinking and strategies processes and encouraging them to adopt strategies that will improve their language learning and proficiency.

Students are often unable to transfer strategies to new tasks. Transfer of strategies can increase significantly if teachers help learners understand their own learning processes. The issue of transfer has not been sufficiently investigated. Differences were found between high attaining and low attaining students: high achievers used more metacognitive strategies and were making transfers while low achievers failed to use strategies (Harris 2004).

RESPONDENTS AND METHODS

The aim of the research is to identify what strategies of language learning can be beneficial to lifelong learning.

The respondents were the full-time students who study either psychology or social work at tertiary level. There were 90 participants altogether. The respondents were predominantly females between 19 and 22 years old. Students were spread over two English course levels: pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate according to their score on the Oxford Placement Test at the beginning of the course. The amount of time spent in L2 environment was 4 hours a week for 3 semesters.

The most frequent and efficient method for identifying students' learning strategies is through self-reported data like questionnaires, interviews or diaries. This research used a real classroom situation to study students' language learning strategy use. Two sets of the Strategy Inventory were used. The first questionnaire was based on the works of O'Maley and Chamot (1990) and McCoy (2006), who used a modified questionnaire which grouped language learning strategies (metacognitive, cognitive, joint social and affective ones). The obtained data are presented below. However, probably due to some uncertainty over strategy grouping, our results differ from similar research into strategies of learners at tertiary level (Suchanova, Šliogerienė 2006). For this reason, the different type of Strategy Inventory for language learning, which is based on students' opinions, has been used. First students worked through the above mentioned questionnaire, then - the Strategy Inventory version by R. L. Oxford (1990). Finally, following the brainstorming stage of language learning strategies, students contributed their own ideas on the most important learning strategies. As a result, a new questionnaire was designed. It contains 16 items and appears to be similar to reported by Griffiths (2007), although the latter is twice as long (32 items).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The basic instruments for the current study were the surveys on identifying students' strategies in learning English for Specific Purposes (ESP). The statements of the Strategy Inventory are presented in Table 1 and are taken after O'Maley and Chamot (1990), and McCoy (2006).

The questions of the first survey are reproduced in Appendix 1. This is self-scoring survey which consists of statements, to which students responded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The 12 items of the survey are divided into four groups: metacognitive strategies (relating to how learners manage their learning), cognitive strategies (relating to how students think about their learning), social strategies (involving learners by communication with peers), and affective strategies (relating to learners' emotions). Since social and affective strategies are often interrelated they are often combined (McCoy 2006).

Table 1. The results of the survey on metacognitive, cognitive, and social / affective strategies (after O'Maley and Chamot, 1990, and McCoy, 2006).

Metacognitive strategies	Positive responses	Negative responses	Uncertain responses
Advanced organizer	78%	12%	10%
Selective attention	75%	10%	15%
Self-management	80%	15%	5%
Self-monitoring and evaluation	70%	10%	20%
Delayed production	70%	10%	20%
Average	**75%**	**11%**	**14%**
Cognitive strategies	Positive responses	Negative responses	Uncertain responses
Repetition	75%	10%	15%
Resourcing	80%	10%	10%
Translation	80%	10%	10%
Inferencing	75%	10%	15%
Average	**78%**	**10%**	**12%**
Social / affective strategies	Positive responses	Negative responses	Uncertain responses
Clarification	75%	10%	15%
Cooperation (pair work)	80%	10%	10%
Participation (group discussions)	75%	5%	20%
Assistance	82%	8%	10%
Average	**78%**	**8%**	**14%**

The summing up the learners' positive, negative and uncertain responses (given in Table 1) shows quite an unexpected outcome, i.e. there are no significant preferences in learning strategies. In other words, positive, negative, and uncertain responses are almost the same within the error limits: social / affective strategies make 78%, cognitive - 78%, and metacognitive – 75%. Contrary to our data, in the earlier paper by C. Griffiths and M. Parr (2001) students rank metacognitive strategies as the most frequent language learning strategies (6 on a scale from 6 to1) while cognitive and affective strategies are less frequent (3 and 2, respectively). However, in the recent article C. Griffiths (2007) claims that many strategy items in Oxford's typology can be included in more than one group and, thus, the data might be inconclusive. Moreover, some items such as consulting a dictionary are not included in the previous studies of various authors (Griffiths 2007). For this reason it is expedient to find out what strategies learners prefer to use in mastering their language skills.

As it has already been mentioned, we have conducted investigation into learners' preferred learning strategies by brainstorming the issue and generating a different type of survey. A newly designed questionnaire took into account students' reflections on their learning strategies. This Strategy Inventory consists of 15 items and is reproduced in Table 2. Students were asked how often they used the strategy items, using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (never) to 5 (always). This new Strategy Inventory was completed by 90 students who were spread over two basic English for Specific Purposes levels: Pre-Intermediate (PI, 50 students) and Upper-Intermediate (UI, 40 students). The results in Table 2 include the computed Mean values M of students' responses and the Standard Deviations SD. To determine a degree of freedom df, we subtract 40 minus 1 (39), and 50 minus 1 (49), and add these two results together, i.e. df = 39 + 49 = 88). So there are 88 degrees of freedom for these two samples. When we check the t-value in the theoretical statistics Table of Critical Values (e.g. Brown and Rodgers, 2002) for the t-test statistic, we have to check in the row which has 88 degrees of freedom to decide whether the difference between the means is significant or not. If the exact df is not shown in the Table of Critical Values, we take the closest value below it in order to be conservative. In our case it is 60, and in that row the critical value for t_c at the .01 level of significance (two-tailed) is 2.660 (or t = 2.000 at the .05 level of significance). If the calculated t-value is greater than the critical value t_c found in the Table of Critical Values at .01 or .05, it means that there is a significant difference between two groups. The last column of Table 2 displays

the values of computed *p* which indicates whether there is a significance difference between students' responses. Such *p* values are shown in bold fonts in Table 2. Therefore, in such cases it may be concluded that learners with higher value of Means are better at using a particular language learning strategy. However, the *p* values between 0.138 and 0.614 in Table 2 show that the Mean values for both groups can be interpreted as statistically close, i.e. there is no significant difference between groups in using these learning strategies.

Ta b l e 2 . Learners' Mean responses (columns 3 and 5), Standard Deviations (columns 4 and 6) to the newly designed Strategy Inventory and computed two-tailed significance levels *p* for each item (column 7).

No	Statement	PI level: 50 students, Mean values (M)	PI level: Standard Deviations (SD)	UI level: 40 students, Mean values (M)	UI level: Standard Deviations (SD)	Two-tailed significance level *p*
1	**Homework assignments**	3.62	0.75	3.92	0.76	**0.064**
2	Pair work in class	3.73	0.64	3.83	0.79	0.510
3	**Use of online/paper dictionary**	3.82	0.51	4.11	0.49	**0.008**
4	Listening practice in class	3.91	0.83	3.82	0.85	0.614
5	Revision of tenses	3.85	0.67	3.75	0.77	0.512
6	Learning ESP vocabulary	3.95	0.85	3.80	0.92	0.425
7	Doing linguistic computer tasks	3.27	0.80	3.04	0.85	0.191
8	Watching authentic TV films	3.23	0.92	3.51	0.83	0.138
9	Revision of ESP materials	3.11	0.80	3.36	0.75	0.134
10	**Talking to native English speakers**	3.24	0.75	3.67	0.76	**0.009**
11	**Listening to English podcasts**	3.85	0.62	4.12	0.78	**0.071**
12	**Writing entries to weblogs**	3.85	0.62	4.14	0.78	**0.053**
13	**Analyzing one's own mistakes**	3.63	0.75	3.95	0.76	**0.049**
14	Time spent on studying English	3.44	0.70	3.63	0.74	0.216
15	**Learning phrasal verbs**	3.82	0.50	4.12	0.48	**0.007**
16	**Translation from L1 to L2 and vice versa**	3.67	0.50	4.15	0.49	**0.005**

It is hardly expedient to rank these strategies into metacognitive, compensation, cognitive, affective, social, and memory groups, i.e. in the same way as many researchers have used before, basically because some of them overlap. The most important result is the types of strategies that learners find beneficial for mastering their language skills. Another important point is the comparison of strategy use at different levels of proficiency. Some strategies are more significant at either higher or lower level of proficiency as can be seen in Table 2. Students' individual differences outline the virtues and benefits of particular strategy use. The preferential use of certain strategies implies that learners might rely on them in the future, i.e. when the need for language refinement emerges.

Individual interviews with learners revealed that students believe in the importance of translation from L1 into L2 and vice versa, listening to authentic English and use of dictionary in order to keep learning language in the future.

As a matter of interest it is worth mentioning that the coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha, which is a coefficient of reliability or consistency of the data, has also been computed. The formula for the standardized Cronbach's Alpha is $\alpha = (N \cdot r) / (1 + (N-1) \cdot r$, here N is equal to the number of items and **r**-bar is the average inter-term correlation among the items. A reliability coefficient Alpha of .70 or higher is considered acceptable in most Social Science research situations. In our case, N = 90 and two variables (two groups of different proficiency levels) the value Alpha is equal to .87 and shows high reliability of the presented data.

LEARNERS' REFLECTIONS

Initially, many students found the request to reflect on their learning to be a novel experience. Moreover, some of them did not feel that self-evaluation is supportive to their learning.

It should be emphasized that reflections are difficult for students and may be even superficial because they include the ability to evaluate oneself critically. Nevertheless, impartial reflections usually lead to self-knowledge, which is fundamental to learner development, and serves as a means of monitoring one's own learning.

Some researchers (Kuit, et.al. 2001) claim that reflection works best in collaboration with others, which is true for the academic staff, but questionable for students, who are very sensitive about losing face.

Our research into learners' reflections included an open-ended survey on their achievements in various class activities including tests and written work (Kavaliauskienė, Kaminskienė, Anusienė 2007). The quality of students' reflections can be summarized as follows:

1) students seem to find it easy to carry out reflections on what they did and how they did it, i.e. the difficulty or ease in their performance; 2) students assess their own strengths and weaknesses realistically by exploring experiences and formulating ways for improvement; 3) students are open about preferences, abilities, awareness of achievements, willingness to perfect knowledge and skills.

The effectiveness of reflective strategy depends on the reflective activities and the commitment of the individuals who carry them out. For teachers, students' reflective responses are challenging because they stimulate staff to re-evaluate their teaching.

CONCLUSIONS

Learners believe in the importance of such learning strategies as translation from L1 into L2 and vice versa, listening to authentic English and use of dictionary in order to improve their language skills in the future. Students' attitudes to various learning strategies differ due to their individual differences.

Learning strategies constitute a useful tool for active learning, promote learner autonomy and prompt proficiency. Due to the benefits and virtues of learning strategies learners increase the effectiveness of learning and extend their knowledge of "know how to learn", thus laying down foundations to lifelong learning.

REFERENCES

Gross, R. *Socrates' Way*.
URL: http://adulted.about.com/gi/dynamic/offsite.htm?site=http://socratesway.com/ [15/01/08].

Lifelong learning. URL: http://europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/s19001.htm [15/01/08].

Language Learning. URL: http://europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c11068.htm [15/01/08].

Chamot, A. U. 2004. *Issues in Language Learning Strategy Research and Teaching*. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching. 1(1), 14–26.

Oxford, R. L. 1990. *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: Newbury House.

Cohen, A.D. 1998. *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. New York: Longman.

Grenfell, M., Harris, V. 1999. *Modern Languages and Learning Strategies. Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Brown, J.D., Rodgers, T. 2002. *Doing Second Language Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Griffiths, C., Parr, M. 2001. *Language-Learning Strategies: Theory and Perception*. ELT Journal, 55 (3), 247–254.

Griffiths, C. 2007. *Language Learning Strategies: Students' and Teachers' Perceptions*. ELT Journal 61(2), 91–99.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. 1990. *Strategies Used by Second Language Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. 1996. *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold.

McCoy, D. 2006. *Utilizing Students' Preferred Language Learning Strategies for IELTS Test Preparation.* EA Journal, 23(1), 3–13.

URL: http://www.englishaustralia.com.au [10/12/07].

Chen, Y. 2007. Learning to Learn: the Impact of Strategy Training. *ELT Journal,* 61(1), 20–29.

Tomlinson, B. 1996. *Materials Development in Language Learning*.

Ustunluoglu, E. 2004. *Language Teaching Through Critical Thinking and Self-Awareness*. English Teaching Forum. 42(3), 2–7.

Coombi, Ch., Barlow, L. 2004. *The Reflective Portfolio*. English Teaching Forum, 42(1), 18–23.

Kuit, J.A., Reay, G., Freeman, R. 2001. *Experiences of Reflective Teaching*. Active Learning in Higher Education. 2(2), 128–142.

Kavaliauskienė, G., Kaminskienė, L., Anusienė, L. 2007. *Reflective Practice: Assessment of Assignments in English for Specific Purposes*. Iberica. Journal of the European Association of languages for Specific Purposes, 14, 149–166.

Cohen, A.D. 1998. *Strategy in Learning and Using a Second Language*. London: Longman.

Chamot, A.U. 2005. *The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA).* Academic Success for Language Learners. Eds. P.A. Richard Amato and M.A.Snow. White Plains. NY: Longman. 87–101.

Grenfeld, M., Harris, V. 1999. *Modern Language and Learning Strategies: In Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Harris, V. 2003. *Adapting Classroom-based Strategy Instruction to a Distance Learning Context*. TESL-EJ, 7(2).

http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej26/a1.html [18/02/08].

Suchanova, J., Šliogerienė, J. 2006. *Metakognityvinės taktikos ir strategijos įtaka užsienio kalbos mokymosi rezultatams*. Santalka, 14(2), Vilnius: Technika, 45–53.

Dőrnyei, Z. 2005. *The Psychology of the Language Learner. Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

APPENDIX 1. Survey of students' metacognitive, cognitive and social / affective strategies (after O'Maley and Chamot (1990), and McCoy (2006)).

No	Specification	Metacognitive strategies
1	Advanced organizer	Review materials and prepare for classes
2	Selective attention	Focus on a specific language point at a time
3	Self- management	Arrange the best learning environment
4	Self-monitoring& evaluation	Correction and identification of one's errors
5	Delayed production	Learn by listening, reluctant to talk
		Cognitive strategies
6	Repetition	Imitation of other people's speech
7	Resourcing	Use of dictionary or reference books
8	Translation	Use of translation in learning
9	Inference	Guess the meaning from context
		Social /affective strategies
10	Clarification	Ask for clarification of unknown words
11	Cooperation (pair work)	Active in pair work
12	Participation	Active in group discussions
13	Assistance	Help others and their help in learning

VERTIMAS KAIP KOGNITYVIOJI MOKYMOSI VISĄ GYVENIMĄ STRATEGIJA

GALINA KAVALIAUSKIENĖ, LIGIJA KAMINSKIENĖ

S a n t r a u k a

Straipsnyje atskleidžiama, kaip mokymosi visą gyvenimą strategijos gali būti sėkmingai taikomos užsienio kalbų mokymesi universiteto lygmenyje. Skirtingi tyrinėtojai skirtingai aprašo strategijas, kurios gali būti taikomos tam, kad mokymosi procesas būtų kiek įmanoma našesnis, tačiau labiausiai žinoma J. M. O'Malley ir A. Chamot'o systema (1990), taip pat gerai su ja deranti R. Oxford'o (1990) strategijų sistema. Abi sistemos iškelia būtinybę suvokti ir tikslingai ugdyti 1. metakognityviąją strategiją, kuri apima planavimą ir mąstymą apie mokymąsi, jo organizavimą ir siekiamų tikslų vertinimą; 2) kognityviąją strategiją, kuri tiesiogiai susijusi su mokymosi procesu, pvz. užrašų vedimu ir tvarkymu, naudojimusi mokymosi resursais (knygomis, žodynais ir pan.), vertimo metodu, ir padeda atkreipti dėmesį į naujus ir reikšmingus informacijos elementus; 3) socialiąją strategiją, kuri akcentuoja bendravimą su kitais mokymosi proceso dalyviais ir žinių įtvirtinimą jų dėka. Šių strategijų ugdymas pasiekiamas per artimą dėstytojo ir studento ryšį, per dėstytojo ir studento mokymosi tikslų derinimą ir mokymuisi svarbių akcentų sudėliojimą. Tai įgyvendinama gerai parengtų anketų pagalba, refleksijos – dienoraščių, „blogų", aptarimų būdu. Duomenys, pateikti dviejose lentelėse, rodo, visų pirma, jog studentai neteikia pirmenybės vienai kuriai mokymosi strategijų kategorijai (1 lentelė), tačiau analizuojant mokymosi metodus (jie dažnai apima kelias strategijas) paaiškėja, jog studentai didelę reikšmę teikia autentiškos kalbos mokymuisi, jos leksikos įsisavinimui ir

ypač vertimo aspektui (2 lentelė), tuo tarpu savęs vertinimo (refleksijos) aspektai yra sunkiau įveikiami, nors jų reikšmę mokymosi proceso skatinimui supranta visi mokymosi dalyviai. Tarp kitų išvadų vertėtų atkreipti dėmesį į tą aplinkybę, jog iš dėstytojų pozicijos vertimo užduočių reikšmė kito priklausomai nuo kalbos dėstymo teorijų, tačiau ji buvo ir yra pastoviai reikšminga studentams. Tai vienas iš svarbių įrodymų, jog kalbos mokymasis ir jo skatinimas turi remtis gimtąja kalba.