

3. Чемоніна Л. В. «Мультфільми як мультимедійний засіб розвитку зв'язного мовлення учнів початкової школи» *Science, Research, Development: 28* : матеріали міжнарод. наук.-практ. конф., (Баку, 29–30 квітня 2020 р.). – Краків, 2020: 34–35.

Фаб'ян Н. Я.

група мСОАМ–11 (Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка)
Науковий керівник – канд. пед. наук, доцент Левчик Н. С.

AUTONOMOUS LEARNING AND THE METHODOLOGICAL BASIS FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT

In the field of foreign language learning and teaching the importance of supporting students in becoming more autonomous has become one of the most prominent issues. The majority of theorists, researchers and methodologists have been emphasizing the need for making learners capable of taking responsibility for their own learning. Autonomy is currently viewed as a prerequisite for success in language learning.

Moreover, the insights modern realises and system of school education are enhanced by the increasing use of distance learning alongside classroom-based language learning in so-called blended learning, together with growing opportunities for online language learning. Developments in new technologies and demand for flexible learning opportunities to suit changing social and economic circumstances have driven this shift in provision. As a result, divisions between distance learning and more traditional classroom based programmes are disappearing, but this change also brings with it the potential need for adjustments on the part of the learner in the process of developing a suitable mode of teaching meeting these environments of necessity that require learners to make choices and decisions, exercising their capacity for autonomy. It is natural that autonomy and L2 proficiency and digital literacy act as attractor states within modern learning system.

The learner autonomy in teaching foreign languages has been investigated in the works by native and foreign scholars, W. Littlewood, D. Nunan, A. Scharle and A. Szabó, P. Benson, H. Long, E. Park, R. Hiemstra, D. Little, H. Holec, O. Leontiev, E. Markova, O. Polat, G. Prigin, S. Bodnar, O. Gumankova, O. Mychailova, S. Lobachova, T. Tambovkin, O. Tarnopolsky, etc. However, despite the fact that in the last twenty years the topic of autonomous foreign language learning is in the centre of scientific research and discussion, many problems of forming the autonomy remain not fully explored. In the first place, recent advances in Internet and computer technology can no longer be ignored and they appear to be perfectly suited to promote learner independence.

In the process of analysing scientific sources we have defined that the widespread recognition of the importance of autonomy in language education has often concealed the fact that there is little consensus as to its definition found [3, p. 4]. Such terms as self-instruction, self-direction, self-directed learning or individualization are all found in the literature and, although they entail various degrees of autonomy, they are sometimes used in the same sense. One of the first and at the same time extremely influential and most frequently cited definitions was proposed by Henry Holec who describes it as “the ability to take charge of one’s own learning” [4, p. 3]. Even though this definition covers all the major aspects of language learning in which responsibility can be shifted from the teacher to the learner, other scholars are not completely in agreement with such an approach. D. Little’s definition [5, p. 4], for example, takes into consideration the role of control over the cognitive processes involved in effective self-management of the learning process and P. Benson defines autonomy as “the capacity to take control of one’s own learning” [2, p. 46]. The latter emphasizes another important component of autonomous learning which is giving students the opportunity to take control of their own learning and to determine the content of

learning as well as its goals and purposes. P. Benson also offers perhaps the most comprehensive definition of autonomy as “a multidimensional capacity that will take different forms for different individuals, and even for the same individual in different contexts or at different times” [2, p. 47].

In addition to the learning aspect, however, autonomy also includes a more political element, relating to the idea of individual freedom of choice. As applied to education, learners are unable to ‘take control’ or make choices about their learning, unless they are free to do so. At a practical level, this means that economic and other disadvantages of certain groups in the wider population, state-led education policies, school curricula and the prescribed use of textbooks, are all examples of ways in which the development of autonomy may be hindered. Sometimes individual teachers can overcome these constraints, but often they cannot [1, p. 77].

The studied literature offers several models of learner autonomy in language learning in which it is conceptualized as a succession from lower to higher level of autonomous actions and thoughts. In one such model, W. Littlewood describes three components of autonomy, such as autonomy as communicators, autonomy as learners and autonomy as persons, and suggests that there are different levels of autonomy in each domain [6, p. 80–81].

David Nunan, in turn, sets out a scheme in which he proposes five levels for encouraging learner autonomy, namely *awareness, involvement, intervention, creation, transcendence*. Each of the levels entails measurements of content and process [7, p. 195].

Another interpretation is offered by W. Littlewood [6, p. 75], who makes a distinction between proactive and reactive autonomy. While the former describes learners who are in charge of their own learning, select learning methods and techniques, set their learning goals and eventually self-assess their language performance, the latter “is the kind of autonomy which does not create its own direction but, once a direction has been initiated, enables learners to organize their resources autonomously in order to reach their goal” [6, p. 75].

A. Scharle and A. Szabó categorize activities aimed at developing learner autonomy into three types representing three phases of the developmental process, namely: 1) raising awareness, 2) changing attitudes, 3) transferring roles [8, p. 1].

Finally, Phil Benson’s model entails dimensions of control over language learning and teaching processes that can be designated as control over learning management, control over cognitive processes and control over learning content [2, p. 76–103]. As these models demonstrate, the concept of autonomy is extremely complex, multidimensional and dynamic, which makes it difficult to incorporate into language instruction. Moreover, it has to be remembered that learners in the same class may display various levels of autonomous behaviours and that fostering learner autonomy simply takes time.

Definitely, there are many challenges that both the teacher and students will have to deal with, but the determination to attain the set goals should prevail. Learner autonomy should be acquired step by step. Thus the teacher should be very patient and gradually diminish his / her presence in the students’ learning process. Certainly, teacher’s impact is still significant as the teacher is the first to set an example to follow. He / She may influence the students’ behaviour and inspire him to learn.

Enabling students to become more aware of their own strengths seems a useful track towards fostering students' empowerment. Whether through soliciting written or verbal commentary, in class or through individual interviews, an enhanced awareness of the dynamic interplay between these factors could help teachers to become better coaches and advisors and aid students in building positive attitudes about their own L2 achievements as well as their learner and L2 autonomy. In the same way, reinforced acknowledgement of autonomy issues and how to support them is necessary on the teachers' side. Creating an informed and open space for dialogue with students allows teachers to develop a coherent posture offering both learner guidance and more specific L2 counselling or instruction, dependent on the individual needs of students.

REFERENCES

1. Резнік В. Г., Лобачова С. В. Проблеми організації автономного навчання іноземних мов студентів вищої школи: сучасні методи та стратегії. Молодий вчений. № 12.1 (52.1) грудень, 2017. С. 76–79.
2. Benson P. Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2001. 296 p.
3. Finch A. “Autonomy: Where are we? Where are we going?”, in: S. Alan Mackenzie et al. (eds.), 2002. P. 15–42. (дата звернення: 10.04.2021).
4. Holec H. Autonomy in foreign language learning. Oxford: Pergamon, 1981. 232 p.
5. Little D. Why focus on learning rather than teaching? Focus on Learning Rather than Teaching: Why and How? Papers from the International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (IATEFL) Conference (Krakow, Poland, May 14-16, 1998). Dublin, Ireland: Centre for Language and Communication Studies. Trinity College. 2000, P. 3–17.
6. Littlewood W. Defining and developing autonomy in East Asian contexts. Applied Linguistics. 1999. Vol. 20. P. 71–94.
7. Nunan D. “Designing and adapting materials to encourage learner autonomy”, in: Phil Benson – Peter Voller (eds.), 1997. P. 192–203.
8. Reinders H., Balcikanli C. Learning to Foster Autonomy: The Role of Teacher Education Material. Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 2011. 2 (1). P. 15–25.

Федик Н. І.

група АМ–42 (Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка)
Науковий керівник – канд. пед. наук, викладач Гупка-Макогін Н. І.

РОЛЬ ДИДАКТИЧНОЇ ГРИ В ПРОЦЕСІ НАВЧАННЯ ІНОЗЕМНОЇ МОВИ

Процес швидкого та ефективного засвоєння навчального матеріалу учнями на уроці іноземної мови є серйозною проблемою, про що свідчить досвід викладання багатьох педагогів. Для вирішення цієї проблеми вчителі почали активний пошук шляхів і засобів для посилення мотивації та стимуляції навчально-пізнавального процесу учнів. Одним із таких інтерактивних методів стала дидактична гра.

Проблему дидактичних ігор у своїх працях досліджували Ю. Арутюнов, М. Бірштейн, В. Бурков, С. Колесниченко, Н. Бібік, Н. Максименко, Я. Коломинський та інші. Таким чином, будучи лише допоміжним прийомом, у 60–70-х роках ХХ ст. даний вид навчально-педагогічних ігор набув значного поширення та перетворився у справжню навчальну модель.

Серед науковців існує багато думок щодо визначення терміну «дидактична гра». Наприклад, П. Підкасистий зазначає, що «Дидактична гра – це така колективна, цілеспрямована навчальна діяльність, коли кожен учасник і команда в цілому об'єднані виконанням одного завдання і орієнтують свою поведінку на позитивний успішний результат» [3, с. 169].

І. Підласий розглядає дидактичну гру на основі технології проблемного навчання та у своїй праці пропонує концептуальні підходи до організації та застосування гри у навчальному процесі. Він визначає даний вид гри як «активна навчальна діяльність з імітаційного моделювання систем, явищ, процесів, які вивчаються» [5, с. 207]. На думку науковця, дидактичні ігри допомагають учням вирішувати конкретні навчальні завдання та одночасно містять елементи виховного та розвивального впливу, які особливо важливі для успішного навчання в школі. Такі ігри сприяють формуванню мислення, вміння зосередити увагу, спонукають самостверджуватися, вчать підпорядковуватися правилам гри та розвивають необхідні для успішного навчання якості та здібності [4].

На підставі вищезазначеного можна стверджувати, що дидактична гра є важливим елементом організації навчально-виховного процесу, який базується на психолого-фізіологічних особливостях учнів. Вимушене запам'ятовування учнями лексичного матеріалу