

items the teacher makes the students aware of the importance of using metacognitive strategies in combination with vocabulary learning strategies. Students can do this by asking questions about the strategies they use to learn new vocabulary items.

The presented VLSs and activities rely on contextualized learning of new vocabulary. In order to enhance the retention of the new vocabulary items, VLSs for decontextualized consolidation of vocabulary could be applied, thus generating a combined approach. Examples of VLSs used for decontextualized consolidation of vocabulary are grouping, placing new words in a context, translating, using imagery, using keywords, using mechanical techniques, and so forth.

Conclusion

The present paper focused on language learning strategies (VLSs) in general and on vocabulary learning strategies in particular. The first part was dedicated to the definition of and classification of vocabulary learning strategies. The final section of the paper dealt with vocabulary learning strategy instruction presented in a practical model of strategy instruction that can be implemented in class as an attempt to enhance the vocabulary acquisition process. The model of language learning strategy instruction consisting of five steps (preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion) was presented in detail. The implications for teaching that can be derived from the present paper are that:

- Explicit vocabulary strategy instruction should be embedded into regular

course activities,

- Students should be informed of a whole array of strategies in order to enable them to choose the most effective ones for themselves,
- Teachers themselves should have a good command of language and vocabulary learning strategies, and
- Focus should be on both contextualized and decontextualized vocabulary learning in consistency with the task objectives and language competence of the students.

References

- Anderson, J. R. (1985). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. New York: Freeman.
- Atay, D. and Ozbulgan, C. (2006). Memory strategy instruction, contextual learning and ESP Vocabulary Recall. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 39-51.
- Catalan, R. M. J. (2003). Sex Difference in L2 Vocabulary Learning Strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(10), 54-72.
- Cohen, A. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Ehrman, M., and Leaver, B. L. (2003). Cognitive styles in the service of language learning. *System*, 31, 393-415.
- Gu, P.Y. and Johnson, R. K. (1996). Vocabulary learning strategies and language outcomes. *Language learning*, 46, 643-679.
- Lawson, M. J. & Hogben, D. (1998). Learning and recall of foreign language vocabulary: effects of a keyword strategy for immediate and delayed recall. *Learning and Instruction*, 8/2, 179-194.
- Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach*. England: Language Teaching Publications.
- Nassaji, H. (2003). L2 vocabulary learning through context. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 645-70.
- Nation, I.S.P.(2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Nielsen, B. (2002). *A review of research into vocabulary learning and acquisition*. Available: <http://www.kushiroct.ac.jp/library/kiyo/kiyo36/Brian>.
- O'Malley, M. J. Chamot, and A. U. (1994). *The CALLA handbook. Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. London and New York: Longman.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House/ Harper & Row.
- Ruutemets, K. (2005). *Vocabulary learning strategies in studying English as a foreign language. M. A thesis*. Available: <http://www.utlib.ee/ekollekt/diss/mag/2005/b17557100/ruutemets>.
- Segler, T.M. et al. (2001) *Second language vocabulary acquisition and LS in CALL environments*. Available: <http://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/s9808690/finalpaper2>.
- Segler, T. M. (2001). *Ph.D research proposal: second language vocabulary acquisition and learning*. Available: <http://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/s9808690/newprop>.

in every case. For example, word analysis strategy (dividing the word into its component morphemes) may work with some words but not with others. Using contextual cues for guessing the meaning of unknown words may be effective in some rich-context cases but not in context-reduced texts. The preparation and planning, the selection of vocabulary learning strategies, monitoring of strategy selection and use, orchestrated use of several strategies, and evaluation of effectiveness of metacognitive strategies for vocabulary learning are illustrated through several examples.

Practice:

In this phase, students have the opportunity of practicing the learning strategies with an authentic learning task. They are asked to make conscious efforts using metacognitive strategies in combination with vocabulary learning strategies. The students, by the teacher's assistance, practice monitoring while using multiple strategies available to them. The students become aware of multiple strategies available to them by teaching them, for example, how to use both word analysis and contextual clues to determine the meaning of an unfamiliar word. Students are shown how to recognize when one strategy is not working and how to move on to another. For example, a student may try to use a word cognate to determine the meaning of the word *football*. But that strategy won't work in this instance. The cognate in Persian is equivalent to *soccer* in English. The students need to be able to turn to other strategies like using contextual clues to help them understand the meaning of the word.

Evaluation:

The main purpose of this phase is to provide students with opportunities to evaluate their own success in using learning strategies, thus developing their metacognitive awareness of their own learning processes. Activities are used to develop students' self-evaluation insights including self-questioning, debriefing discussions after strategy practice, learning logs in which students record the results of their learning strategy applications, checklists of strategies used, and open-ended questionnaires in which students express their opinions about the usefulness of particular strategies.

Expansion:

In this final phase students are encouraged to: a) use the strategies that they found most effective, b) apply these strategies to new contexts, and c) devise their own individual combinations and interpretations of metacognitive learning strategies. They are asked to consider not only vocabulary learning but also other domains of language learning.

As time goes by less time is spent on checking since it is believed that the use of strategies change from factual knowledge to procedural and as a result it becomes automatic. According to Nassaji (2003: 650), "A skilled student uses strategies, and with practice the strategies become nearly automatic". However, throughout the semester, in order to sustain students' awareness, they are periodically asked whether they use the strategies and whether they find them useful. The use of strategies is also systematically reinforced by the teacher. Moreover, in teaching new vocabulary

be divided into two categories: direct strategy training and embedded strategy training. In direct (or explicit) strategy training students are informed about the value and purpose of strategies while in embedded training the strategies are embedded into learning materials but not explicitly discussed. Another option is separate strategy training organized in the form of a language-independent module (O'Malley and Chamot, 1994). While several strategy instruction models have been proposed (Oxford, 1990; O'Malley and Chamot, 1994; Cohen, 1998), all researchers agree that to be effective strategy instruction has to be explicit to the learners, as already mentioned in this paper.

CALLA (The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach) model of Chamot and O'Malley (1994) relies on Anderson's (1985) distinction between declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge. Declarative knowledge is defined as "A special type of information in long term memory that consists of knowledge about the facts and things that we know. This type of information is stored in terms of propositions, schemata, and propositional networks. It may also be stored in terms of isolated pieces of information temporal strings, and images", whereas, procedural knowledge is the "Knowledge that consists of the things that we know how to do. It underlies the execution of all complex cognitive skills and includes mental activities such as problem solving, language reception and production, and using learning strategies". They also suggested that all the three main categories of learning strategies could be taught through the CALLA approach.

Based on CALLA model of teaching learning strategies, five steps are discernible as follow:

Preparation:

The purpose of this phase is to help students identify the strategies they are already using and to develop their metacognitive awareness of the relationship between their own mental processes and effective learning. In this step the teacher explains the importance of metacognitive learning strategies and a handout including different metacognitive strategies is distributed among the students. In relation to vocabulary learning, which is the subject of this study, students with the help and guidance of the teacher set specific goals for mastering the vocabulary from certain chapters in the textbook within a certain time frame, and they plan their time in order to accomplish the task (time-management).

Presentation:

This phase focuses on modeling the learning strategy. The teacher talks about the characteristics, usefulness, and applications of the strategy explicitly and through examples and illustrations models the use of strategies in relation to unknown vocabulary items. Learners are explicitly taught about the variety of strategies to use when they do not know a vocabulary item they encounter in a text and they judge the word to be important to the overall meaning of the text. But more importantly, they receive explicit instruction on how to use these strategies. They are told that no single vocabulary learning strategy would work

good interpersonal relationships, while deep strategies make elaborations and associate between previous and new knowledge, most directly resulting in long-term retention of information.

One of the shortcomings of all VLSs taxonomies as identified by Segler et al. (2001) is that none of the proposed taxonomies includes the depth-of-processing (DOP) factor. Although the DOP hypothesis proposed by Craik and Lockhart (1972, in Segler et al., 2001) as a whole remains controversial, its central idea is generally agreed upon – that deeper analysis (involving more cognitive effort or semantic involvement) leads to a more persistent memory trace.

In addition, several studies have confirmed that among language learners low DOP strategies prevail, for example as reported by Lawson and Hogben (1998), 75% of the reported strategies in their study did not involve any elaboration that could anchor knowledge into existing schemata. This result is particularly interesting in the light of the fact that Gu and Johnson (1996) and Segler, (2001) found out that the ‘shallow’ (also surface or mechanical) strategy of visual repetition was the strongest negative predictor of learning outcome, as opposed to deeper strategies.

Let us have a look at the results of some research studies examining other aspects inherent to VLSs. In order to be effective, strategy use has to be conscious and language users should be active processors of information. According to Gu (2005, in Atay and Ozbulgan, 2006) successful learners intentionally select, consciously monitor and evaluate the strategy while less successful learners employ similar

strategies yet are not aware of them and do not have a learning aim. The implication for VLSs (and language learning strategy in general) training is that making the learners aware of the strategies they might employ is not enough. Instruction has to be explicit and students should be informed of the value and purpose of learning strategies as well as their potential use, as restated and emphasized by researchers.

While according to the lexical approach (Lewis, 1993) contextualized learning is preferable because learning vocabulary means more than memorization of lexical phrases, other authors claim that greater amounts of decontextualized vocabulary instruction should be given to beginner-level learners, gradually increasing toward more context-based vocabulary learning as their language ability develops (e.g., Meara 1997 in Nielsen, 2002). The third approach combines decontextualized vocabulary discovery and consolidation through contextualized activities, or vice versa.

Vocabulary learning strategy instruction models

Based on the premise that vocabulary learning strategies are teachable and that they can have a significant impact on the development of linguistic and specifically lexical competence in the examined case, the following section concentrates on the theoretical presentation of language learning strategy instruction models followed by the presentation of the VLSs instruction model as a form of classroom intervention.

There are different ways in which vocabulary learning strategy training can be conducted that can generally

Introduction

Given the multitude of competing terms found in the literature, the concept of vocabulary learning strategies (VLSs) should be defined first.

VLSs are a subcategory of language learning strategies which in turn are a subcategory of learning strategies in general. If language learning strategies can be defined as “specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations.” (Oxford, 1990: 8), VLSs constitute knowledge about what students do to find out the meaning of new words, retain them in long-term memory, recall them when needed in comprehension, and use them in language production (Catalan 2003, Ruutemets, 2005).

To date, several VLS taxonomies have been proposed (Gu and Johnson, 1996; Nation, 2001; Segler et al., 2001). Several advantages of Schmitt's taxonomy over others have been mentioned by researchers. The claim is that it can be standardized as a test, can be used to collect the answers from

students easily, is based on the theory of learning strategies as well as on theories of memory, is technologically simple, can be used with learners of different educational backgrounds and target languages, is rich and sensitive to the variety of learning strategies, and allows comparison with other studies, among them Schmitt's own survey (Catalan 2003, Ruutemets, 2005). The most important advantage for the purpose of

this paper is that it is organized around an established (Oxford's) scheme of language learning strategies (Segler et al., 2001).

As mentioned earlier, Schmitt's (1997, in Segler, 2001) taxonomy of VLSs is based on Oxford's (1990) division of language learning strategies into direct (memory, cognitive, and compensation) and indirect (metacognitive, affective, and social) strategies. In order to cover cases where meanings of new words are discovered without other people's assistance, Schmitt introduced another category – determination strategies. Schmitt's taxonomy is two-dimensional. The second dimension, reflecting the different processes necessary for working out a new word's usage and meaning (discovery strategies) and for consolidating it in memory for future use (consolidation strategies), was borrowed from Nation (1990, in Segler, 2001). Schmitt's taxonomy (1997) with sample VLSs is presented as follows:

	<u>Discovery</u>	<u>Consolidation</u>
Determination	guesses from textual context	
Social	ask classmates for meaning	interact with native speakers
Memory		use semantic maps
Cognitive		keep vocabulary notebook
Metacognitive		use L2 media

Before proceeding to a shortcoming of VLS taxonomies as identified by Segler et al. (2001), it is necessary to mention that in relation to language learning strategies in general Ehrman and Leaver (2003) talked about surface, achievement, and deep strategies. Surface strategies are used for a specific task and entail minimum cognitive or emotional investment, the aim of achievement strategies is



Classroom
Techniques

On Applicability of Vocabulary Learning Strategies in Classroom Contexts

Parviz Ahmadi Darani, M.A in TEFL
Sheikhbahaee University of Isfahan
email: pahmadi05@gmail.com

چکیده

بدون تردید یکی از چالش‌های پیش روی زبان‌آموزان زبان خارجی، یادگیری واژگان آن زبان است. یکی از راه‌حل‌های برخورد با این چالش، کمک به فراگیران به منظور مستقل شدن در فرایند یادگیری واژگان است. یقیناً نیل به این هدف از طریق آموزش زبان‌آموزان در جهت به کار بردن هر چه موثرتر راهبردهای یادگیری واژگان می‌شود. هدف اصلی مقاله حاضر پیشنهاد یک چارچوب کلی برای آموزش راهکارهای یادگیری واژگان به زبان‌آموزان در محیط کلاس می‌باشد. در این راستا، در ابتدا این مقاله به تعریف راهکارهای یادگیری واژگان پرداخته و سپس طبقه‌بندی‌های مربوطه را مفصلاً توضیح می‌دهد. در بخش بعدی، مدلی برای آموزش واژگان شامل پنج مرحله آماده‌سازی، ارائه، تمرین، ارزیابی، و بسط جهت اجرا در کلاس ارائه می‌گردد. در بخش پایانی مقاله به برخی ملاحظات مهم که باید مدرسین به آنها توجه داشته باشند اشاره می‌کند.

کلیدواژه‌ها: راهکارهای یادگیری واژگان، طبقه‌بندی، مدل، فرآیندی

Abstract

Undoubtedly, one of the significant challenges that foreign language learners experience during the process of learning a language is vocabulary. One way to deal with this challenge is to help students become independent learners during the process of L2 vocabulary learning. Definitely, this can be achieved through instructing learners to apply vocabulary learning strategies (VLSs) as efficiently as possible. The major premise of this article is to propose a framework for training EFL learners in vocabulary learning strategies in classroom context. In so doing, vocabulary learning strategies (VLSs) are defined and then demarcated, and then several existing taxonomies are elaborated on. The next section of the paper deals with vocabulary learning strategy instruction via a practical five-step model of strategy instruction, a model of strategy instruction that can be implemented as an attempt to enhance the vocabulary acquisition process. The present article concludes with some implications for teaching vocabulary.

Key Words: vocabulary learning strategies (VLSs), taxonomy, model, process