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The Strategic Self-Regulation ($S^2R$) Model of language learning
Chapter 1

Introducing the Strategic Self-Regulation (S²R) Model of language learning

You can’t cross the sea merely by standing and staring at the water.  Rabindranath Tagore

Preview questions

1. What are the dimensions in the Strategic Self-Regulation (S²R) Model of language learning?
2. How do “metastrategies” and other strategies differently contribute to strategic self-regulation?
3. What are the six types of metaknowledge, and why are they important for learning languages?
4. Why are tactics necessary in self-regulated learning?
5. In what ways do models of self-regulated learning differ?

Self-regulation is one of the most exciting developments in second or foreign language (L2) learning. Models of learner self-regulation applied to L2 learning have been called by many names, such as “learner-self-management” (Rubin, 2001), “learner self-direction” (Dickinson, 1987), “self-regulated or autonomous L2 learning” (Oxford, 1999a), and “mediated learning” (Scarcella and Oxford, 1992, based on Vygotsky, 1978). This book presents the Strategic Self-Regulation (S²R) Model of language learning. In this model, learners actively and constructively use strategies to manage their own learning.

Self-regulated L2 learning strategies are important throughout the world. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of
Europe, 2001) promotes “learning how to learn” and the use of learning strategies (Little, 2006; Mariani, 2004). Key research handbooks (e.g., Alexander and Winne, 2006; Flippo and Caverly, 2008; Hinkel, 2005; see also Chapter 9) discuss the significance of strategies in learners’ self-regulation in many fields, including L2 learning. In the last few years publishers have offered several important, edited volumes (e.g., Cohen and Macaro, 2007; Griffiths, 2008) focused wholly or largely on L2 learning strategies. Every year journals around the globe publish articles on topics such as learning strategies, metacognitive strategies, and strategies for various L2 areas (reading, writing, speaking, listening, pragmatics, grammar, and vocabulary). Many teachers attend conference sessions on how to help their students become more strategic, self-regulated, and successful. As important contributors to self-regulated learning, L2 learning strategies deserve attention. Table 1.1 provides a preview of this chapter.

### 1.1 Overview of the book

Figure 1.1 presents an overview of this book. **Section I**, consisting of the first four chapters, is devoted to the S'R Model of language learning and the factors and theories underlying the model. Chapter 1 introduces the model in terms of factors and integrated theories. Chapter 2 presents strategies...
and theories in the cognitive dimension for remembering and processing language. Chapters 3 and 4 offer strategies and theories in relation to two dimensions that have received inadequate attention from many strategy researchers: the affective dimension for emotion, beliefs, attitudes, and motivation and the sociocultural-interactive dimension for contexts, communication, and culture. Section II includes important practical applications within the S’R Model: strategy assessment (Chapter 5) and strategy assistance (Chapter 6). The two chapters in Section III deal with strategy research. Chapter 7 explores an array of research approaches that readers can use for investigating strategies for self-regulated L2 learning. Chapter 8 synthesizes existing L2 strategy research findings by language area, e.g., reading or vocabulary learning. Section IV contains Chapter 9, which reviews the landmarks of the S’R Model, maps self-regulated L2 learning strategies in relation to various disciplines, and offers further resources for exploration.
1.2 Why this book is needed now

In an advance review of this book, Gu (2010) summarized the state of the art in language learning strategies and explained why this book is needed now. See Concept 1.1.

Concept 1.1 State of the art in language learning strategies and why this book is needed now (from a review by a strategy research expert)

• State of the Art

After 30 years, language learning strategy (LLS) researchers have accumulated a critical mass of knowledge. It is now timely and critical to identify and reflect upon the various issues that have emerged across decades. We need systematic and coherent efforts to chart the field and map out the issues. Unfortunately, the intensity of interest in language learning strategies in the 1980s and the 1990s and the high expectations from theorists, researchers, teachers and learners have left many people frustrated, especially because of the conceptual fuzziness and elusiveness of the LLS construct. Classroom teachers are rightly concerned that LLS researchers have not provided enough applications for classroom teaching and learning. As those most concerned about strategic learning, learners and teachers cannot and should not have to wait. We do not need the same old research questions asked time and again; we need new, innovative research paths that lead to help for learners and teachers.

• Why This Book Is Needed Now

At this time, we urgently need this book’s conceptual cross-fertilization and its concerted effort in theory-building so that more useful research avenues can be explored and more practical findings can be made available to the language classroom. This book opens the way to more research on the self-regulated learner’s active involvement and the way strategies influence learning ability, proficiency, and the learner’s identity as a self-initiating, reflective, responsible social agent.

This book is therefore definitely coming out at the right time. In fact, few would be more suitable than Rebecca Oxford, who has inspired so many in the field, to write a book on teaching and researching language learning strategies at this point in time. This book is the best attempt in recent years to face the existing challenges and issues. For researchers and teachers alike, the book provides a feast of theoretical perspectives, smoothly integrated and clearly addressed, as well as practical suggestions. It also discusses criticisms, queries, and misconceptions of language learning strategies.

To me, the book points to a renewed agenda for LLS as a worthwhile line of research. This agenda involves: (a) closer integration of LLS research into the mainstream of applied linguistics and educational psychology in terms of
1.3 The S²R Model

This section highlights key aspects of the S²R Model. It begins with definition, terminology, and concepts, followed by key features of strategies in the model and a description of strategically self-regulated learners. It presents strategies, metastrategies, and the metaknowledge that underlies metastrategies; details the flexible use of strategies; and explains strategies in relation to three task-phases. Next it portrays mediated learning, deep processing strategies, double utility of strategies, and strategy orchestration. Finally, this section explains strategies and tactics and shows linkages among strategies, tactics, and learning styles.

1.3.1 Definitions, terminology, and concepts in the S²R Model

The quotation below defines self-regulation as applied to learning.

**Quote 1.1** Self-regulation in learning

Self-regulation comprises such processes as setting goals for learning, attending to and concentrating on instruction, using effective strategies to organize, code, and rehearse information to be remembered, establishing a productive work environment, using resources effectively, monitoring performance, managing time effectively, seeking assistance when needed, holding positive beliefs about one's capabilities, the value of learning, the factors influencing learning, and the anticipated outcomes of actions, and experiencing pride and satisfaction with one's efforts.


Concept 1.2 presents a definition of *self-regulated L2 learning strategies* in the S²R Model. These strategies help learners regulate or control their...
own learning, thus making it easier and more effective. Self-regulation, according to its Latin roots, involves not only self-management but also “self-righting,” i.e., self-adjustment or self-adaptation if something goes off track or needs improvement. See Concept 1.2 for an important distinction between skills and self-regulated L2 learning strategies, and look to Chapter 2 for information on how skills develop.

**Concept 1.2 Definition of self-regulated L2 learning strategies**

- In the S'R Model, self-regulated L2 learning strategies are defined as deliberate, goal-directed attempts to manage and control efforts to learn the L2 (based on Afflerbach, Pearson, and Paris, 2008). These strategies are broad, teachable actions that learners choose from among alternatives and employ for L2 learning purposes (e.g., constructing, internalizing, storing, retrieving, and using information; completing short-term tasks; and/or developing L2 proficiency and self-efficacy in the long term).

**Examples:** Planning, Evaluating, Obtaining and Using Resources, Reasoning, Going Beyond Existing Data, Generating and Maintaining Motivation, and Learning Despite Communicative Knowledge Gaps.

- **Learning strategies** are sometimes confused with **skills**. Skills are automatic and out of awareness, whereas strategies are intentional and deliberate.

- It is impossible to tell whether an action is a strategy or a skill without finding out whether it is under the learner’s automatic or deliberate control.

Strategic, self-regulated language learning is crucial, as explained below.

**Quote 1.2 The importance of strategic, self-regulated learning and of strategy instruction**

Strategic, self-regulated learning lies at the heart of second/foreign language acquisition. Over the decades, we have seen applied linguists suggesting the right amount of comprehensible input, opportunities for output, corrective feedback, task-based presentation, and contextual scaffolding in the classroom. But after all this, the only thing teachers can do is to wait and hope that learners will notice the patterns or automatically activate their implicit learning mechanisms. While this might happen, the central thesis behind language learning strategy research is that learners, supported by teachers and curricula, can play a much more active role in managing and controlling the learning process, thereby maximising the outcomes of learning. Instruction in strategic learning can result in better learners.

Yongqi Gu (2010, p. 1)
Gu (2010) defined strategic, self-regulated learning as “ways of tackling the learning task at hand and managing the self in overseeing the learning process . . . under the constraints of the learning situation and learning context for the purpose of learning success” (p. 2). In other words, the learner must not only effectively do the task and manage himself or herself but must also deal with (and make the most of) the learning environment.

When learning strategies became well known in the 1980’s and 1990’s, some people might have believed that strategies would remove all the hard work from language learning and teaching. However, “Strategies are not a ‘super-drug’” (Gu, 2010, p. 2). “A simplistic, static, and gimmick-oriented expectation,” as if strategies “could offer quick fixes . . ., is unrealistic” (Gu, 2010, p. 1). Though learning strategies do make learning easier in some senses, their purpose is much more significant: strategies make learning deeper, more productive, and more lasting (Cohen and Macaro, 2008; Holschuh and Altman, 2008; Winne and Perry, 2000).

This book uses the term learning strategies rather than the term learner strategies (see Wenden and Rubin, 1987; Cohen and Macaro, 2007) for two key reasons. First, the focus here is on strategies for learning, although communication often occurs at the same time. People often learn as they communicate and vice versa. Second, learning-focused researchers in virtually all other fields employ the term learning strategies. For discussions about the terminology of strategies, see Cohen (2007) and Oxford and Cohen (1992).

1.3.2 Key features of strategies in the $S^2R$ Model

Concept 1.3 describes the features of strategies in the $S^2R$ Model. In a nutshell, these strategies involve various types of consciousness, facilitate learning, involve the whole learner rather than just the cognitive side, and are used flexibly.
1.3.3 The learner in the S2R Model

The S2R Model draws upon research on strategically self-regulated learners (see Concept 1.4). The research is strikingly consistent on these learners’ active control of learning through the effective use of learning strategies. A key for such learners is choosing appropriate strategies for the purpose and situation and evaluating the success of these strategies. Learners can use strategies to regulate many aspects of their learning: their internal mental states, beliefs, observable behaviours, and the learning environment.

1.3.4 Strategies and metastrategies in the S2R Model

The S2R Model includes strategies for three major, mutually influential dimensions of L2 learning: cognitive, affective, and sociocultural-interactive. Cognitive strategies help the learner construct, transform, and apply L2 knowledge. An example of a cognitive strategy is Activating Knowledge (when needed for a language task). Affective strategies help the learner create positive emotions and attitudes and stay motivated. An example of an affective strategy is Generating and Maintaining Motivation. Sociocultural-interactive (SI) strategies help the learner with communication, sociocultural contexts, and identity. An example of an SI strategy is Interacting to Learn

---

Concept 1.3 Features of self-regulated L2 learning strategies

Self-regulated L2 learning strategies . . .

• are employed consciously, involving four elements of consciousness (awareness, attention, intention, and effort, Schmidt, 1995);
• make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, and more effective;
• are manifested through specific tactics in different contexts and for different purposes;
• reflect the whole, multidimensional learner, not just the learner’s cognitive or metacognitive aspects;
• are often combined into strategy chains, i.e., groups of strategies working together (see later in this chapter); and
• are applied in a given situation but can be transferred to other situations when relevant.
• Some strategies, such as Planning or Monitoring, are deployed for learning many subjects and for problem-solving in general throughout one’s life.
• Other strategies, such as Overcoming Knowledge Gaps in Communicating (e.g., through making up new words or switching back to the home language briefly), are tied to language learning.
Concept 1.4  **What we know about strategically self-regulated learners**

Strategically self-regulated learners . . .

- actively participate in their own learning (Griffiths, 2008; Malpass, O’Neil, and Hocevar, 1999; Pressley and Harris, 2006).
- use strategies to control their own beliefs about learning and themselves (Schunk and Zimmerman, 1998).
- cognitively move from declarative (conscious) knowledge to procedural (automatic) knowledge with the use of strategies (Anderson, 1976, 1985; O’Malley and Chamot, 1990).
- choose appropriate strategies for different conditions, purposes, situations, and settings (Ehrman, Leaver, and Oxford, 2003). An *appropriate strategy* is one that (a) addresses the learner’s goal or need, (b) fits the learning circumstances and the sociocultural context, (c) works well with the student’s learning styles, i.e., general learning preferences, or in some cases helps bring greater flexibility to those preferences; and (d) positively influences learning.
- understand that no strategy is necessarily appropriate under every circumstance or for every purpose (Hsiao and Oxford, 2002; Cohen and Macaro, 2007). For instance, a strategy that a learner uses effectively to read a airport timetable in Russian does necessarily not work when he or she is reading an editorial in the Russian newspaper *Izvestiya*.
- show awareness of the relationship between strategy use and learning outcomes; i.e., these learners consider whether a given strategy is associated with successful performance (Malpass, O’Neil, and Hocevar, 1999).

---

and Communicate. Pervading all three dimensions is a crucial dimension of mental processes or tools (*metastrategies*, such as Planning, Organizing, Monitoring, and Evaluating) that help the learner control and manage the use of strategies in the three other dimensions: cognitive, affective, and sociocultural-interactive. Concept 1.5 lists the strategies and metastrategies in the S²R Model. Metastrategies are shown first, because they powerfully influence the three other dimensions.

As shown in Concept 1.5, three types of metastrategies exist. *Meta-cognitive strategies* (the best known type of metastrategies, as described by O’Malley and Chamot, 1990 and Oxford, 1990) help the learner control cognitive strategy use, while *meta-affective strategies* facilitate learner control of affective strategy use, and *meta-SI strategies* enable the learner to
control SI strategy use. Why is it helpful to talk about metastrategies, a broader category, as opposed to only metacognitive strategies? Why should we think about meta-affective and meta-SI strategies in addition to meta-cognitive strategies? Here are the reasons.

**Metastrategies and strategies in the Strategic Self-Regulation (S2R) Model of L2 learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metastrategies and strategies</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paying Attention</td>
<td>Managing and controlling L2 learning in a general sense, with a focus on understanding one’s own needs and using and adjusting the other strategies to meet those needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining and Using Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestrating Strategy Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 metastrategies</strong> (metacognitive, meta-affective, and metasociocultural-interactive):**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 strategies in the cognitive dimension:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Senses to Understand and Remember</td>
<td>Remembering and processing the L2 (constructing, transforming, and applying L2 knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activating Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualizing with Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualizing Broadly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going Beyond the Existing Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 strategies in the affective dimension:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activating Supportive Emotions, Beliefs, and Attitudes</td>
<td>Handling emotions, beliefs, attitudes, and motivation in L2 learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating and Maintaining Motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 strategies in the sociocultural-interactive dimension:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting to Learn and Communicate</td>
<td>Dealing with issues of contexts, communication, and culture in L2 learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Despite Communicative Knowledge Gaps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with Sociocultural Contexts and Identities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concept 1.5**

Metastrategies are strategies that provide general management (control) of cognitive strategies. Unfortunately, prior taxonomies of strategies had no term to describe control of two other key dimensions of L2 learning.
strategies: (a) the affective dimension and (b) the social dimension. Hence, until now the term metacognitive was (confusingly, in my view) applied to the control of strategies in the affective and social realms, not just to the control of cognitive strategies. The S²R Model fills this major gap by including meta-affective strategies and meta-SI strategies, respectively. The importance of filling this gap is revealed especially in Chapters 3 and 4, which explore these strategies in detail. Many effective L2 learners have used such strategies for years, though there was no official name for them.

The concept of metastrategies – more than just that of metacognitive strategies alone – reflects the multidimensional reality of the L2 learner. Support for more than just one category of metastrategy comes from Alexander, Graham, and Harris (1998), who stated that self-regulation pertains not just to the learner’s management of cognition but also to regulation of affective states and the social environment, in which communication occurs. Additional support comes from Wolters (2003), who highlighted the need for strategies to manage affect (emotions, motivation, etc.) at the “meta” or general level.

Figure 1.2 shows cognitive, affective, and sociocultural-interactive strategies as interlocking cogs and depicts metastrategies as the arrows that surround

Figure 1.2 Dynamic interaction of strategies and metastrategies for L2 learning (cogs and arrows metaphor) in the S²R Model

Note 1: Metastrategies include metacognitive, meta-affective, and metasocial strategies.

Note 2: Certain strategies are more important than others in various situations. The size of a strategy type in this figure does not indicate importance in all situations.
the cogs. Of course, actual L2 learning is not as mechanistic as cogs in a wheel, but Figure 1.2 is a useful metaphor of (a) multiple, interrelated aspects of learning and (b) the way metastrategies (metacognitive, meta-affective, and meta-SI) control the use of cognitive, affective, and SI strategies. Figure 1.3 shows the same idea in a different way. The metastrategies (metacognitive, meta-affective, and meta-SI) serve as the orchestra conductor, and various sections of the orchestra (wind, string, and percussion instruments) are cognitive, affective, and SI strategies, guided by the conductor.

Metastrategies, by virtue of their executive-control and management function, help the learner know whether and how to deploy a given strategy and aid in determining whether the strategy is working or has worked as intended. Strategies and metastrategies in the model are highly dynamic, because they respond to changing needs of the learner for varying strategies.
purposes in different sociocultural contexts. Metastrategic regulation is the learner’s use of metastrategies of any kind (metacognitive, meta-affective, and/or meta-SI) the purpose of self-regulated learning. This is an expansion of Flavell’s (1978, 1979) term metacognitive regulation to identify the use of metacognitive strategies.

1.3.5 Metaknowledge underlying metastrategies in the S²R Model

Underlying the use of metastrategies in the S²R Model are six types of metaknowledge, defined in Concept 1.6: person knowledge, which is contrasted with broader knowledge of cultural or group norms (group/culture knowledge); task knowledge, which is contrasted with broader, whole-process knowledge; strategy knowledge; and conditional knowledge, which draws on any of the other types of knowledge. In an earlier theory, Wenden (1991), building on Flavell (1978, 1979), mentioned only three types of metaknowledge (person, task, and strategy knowledge) and called all three metacognitive knowledge.

Concept 1.6  Six types of metaknowledge

- **Person knowledge** concerns learning styles, goals, strengths, and weaknesses of the learner (or someone else). Focus is on the individual.
- **Group or culture knowledge** deals with norms and expectations in the group/culture – either the home group/culture or the “target” group/culture to which the learner wants to gain entry. Focus is on the collective group, not on a single individual.
- **Task knowledge** relates largely to the characteristics and requirements of the immediate L2 learning task.
- In contrast, **whole-process knowledge** goes beyond task knowledge to embrace the characteristics and requirements of the long-term process of learning the language. Whole-process knowledge is often necessary for learners who seek to develop high proficiency and who have a “future orientation” to learning (Simons, Vansteenkiste, Lens, and Lacante, 2004).
- **Strategy knowledge** is knowledge of available learning strategies and metastrategies and how they work. Strategy knowledge can be examined in terms of strategies for “doing” and metastrategies for executive control and management.
- **Conditional knowledge** is knowledge of when and why to use a given learning strategy. Conditional knowledge can draw on any or all of the other five types of metaknowledge.
  ○ For example, knowing when and why to use a given strategy is facilitated by being aware of: (a) personal knowledge about oneself, e.g., one’s learning style, goals, strengths, and weaknesses; (b) group or culture
I argue that *metacognitive knowledge*, as applied by prior researchers to encompass person, task, and strategy knowledge, is far too restricted a term. The term *metacognitive knowledge* points only to knowledge helpful for controlling the cognitive dimension of learning, but in actuality the learner’s *metaknowledge* must include but go beyond the cognitive arena. Such knowledge must also address the affective and sociocultural-interactive dimensions of L2 learning. Therefore, it is more accurate to speak of *metaknowledge* rather than just metacognitive knowledge when considering the knowledge types that underlie metastrategies in general.

Wenden’s and Flavell’s knowledge types – person, task, and strategy knowledge – are necessary but not sufficient for explaining the learner’s control and management of L2 learning. For instance, person knowledge does not imply knowledge of expectations of the group or culture in which the learner is located or which the learner wishes to enter, though such knowledge is needed for self-regulated L2 learning. Task knowledge refers to understanding the demands and features of the immediate task but does not imply long-term, whole-process knowledge, which is especially valuable for learners who hope to reach distinguished levels of proficiency and/or whose self-regulation involves taking a “long view” or future-time perspective. Knowledge of strategies does not necessarily indicate that the learner knows how, when, or why to use a particular strategy to fulfill a specific purpose in the flux and complexity of a given sociocultural setting (conditional knowledge). Therefore it was necessary for me to create names for two heretofore missing types of metaknowledge, group/culture knowledge and whole-process knowledge, and to include conditional knowledge (Pintrich, 2002) as the sixth type of metaknowledge. See Figure 1.4.

Concept 1.7F shows how each type of metaknowledge (person knowledge, group/culture knowledge, task knowledge, whole-process knowledge, strategy knowledge, and conditional knowledge) is applied in more concrete detail to cognitive, affective, and sociocultural-interactive dimensions.
Figure 1.5 outlines in brief the structure of the S²R Model, emphasizing strategies and metastrategies. These elements interact to improve L2 learning and move students to higher levels of proficiency.

1.3.6 Flexible use of strategies in the S²R Model

Not every learner needs to use every type of strategy at all times. For instance, if a learner, Brian, is demotivated, stressed, or feeling overly challenged, he might need affective strategies, but at other times, when he feels motivated, calm, and sufficiently but not overly challenged, such strategies might be unnecessary. Highly advanced L2 learners who have reached distinguished levels of proficiency tend not to need affective strategies any longer, according to Leaver (2003a), though this might depend somewhat on the learner’s personality or general (non-L2) level of anxiety.
### Concept 1.7 Types of metaknowledge as applied to cognitive, affective, and sociocultura-interactive dimensions of L2 learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of L2 learning in which metaknowledge operates</th>
<th>Types of metaknowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE 1: Person knowledge</strong>&lt;br&gt;(can refer to knowledge of self or of another person) (Narrower)</td>
<td><strong>TYPE 2: Group or culture knowledge</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Broader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE 3: Task knowledge</strong>&lt;br&gt;(immediate L2 learning task) (Narrower)</td>
<td><strong>TYPE 4: Whole-process knowledge</strong>&lt;br&gt;(longer-term, future-time orientation) (Broader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE 5: Strategy knowledge</strong>&lt;br&gt;Knowledge of learning strategies and metastrategies (cognitive, affective, and SI strategies and metacognitive, meta-affective, and meta-SI strategies)</td>
<td><strong>TYPE 6: Conditional knowledge</strong>&lt;br&gt;Knowledge of how, when, and why to use a given strategy, drawing on the other types of metaknowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Cognitive dimension**: Knowledge of one’s own or another’s cognitive level, cognitive learning style, goals, and related strengths and weaknesses
- **Knowledge of group/cultural norms and expectations in relation to cognitive elements of L2 learning**
- **Knowledge of the cognitive demands of the immediate L2 learning task**
- **Knowledge of longer-term cognitive demands of learning the L2**
- **Knowledge of cognitive strategies**
- **Knowledge of meta-cognitive strategies**
- **Knowledge of how, when and why to use a cognitive strategy or a metacognitive strategy for a given purpose in a specific setting**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective dimension</th>
<th>Knowledge of one's own or another's emotions, motivations, and related strengths and weaknesses</th>
<th>Knowledge of group/cultural norms and expectations in relation to affective elements of L2 learning</th>
<th>Knowledge of affective (emotional or motivational) demands of the immediate L2 learning task</th>
<th>Knowledge of longer-term affective demands of learning the L2</th>
<th>Knowledge of affective Strategies</th>
<th>Knowledge of meta-affective strategies</th>
<th>Knowledge of how, when and why to use an affective strategy or a meta-affective strategy for a given purpose in a specific setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural-interactive dimension</td>
<td>Knowledge of one's own or another's social interaction patterns, social learning style, related strengths and weaknesses, and the sociocultural setting</td>
<td>Knowledge of group/cultural norms and expectations in relation to interaction and sociocultural elements of L2 learning</td>
<td>Knowledge of sociocultural-interactive demands of the immediate L2 learning task</td>
<td>Knowledge of longer-term sociocultural-interactive demands of learning the L2</td>
<td>Knowledge of sociocultural-interactive (SI) strategies</td>
<td>Knowledge of meta-SI strategies</td>
<td>Knowledge of how, when and why to use a sociocultural-interactive strategy or a meta-SI strategy for a given purpose in a specific setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learners are not likely to “grow out of” their need for metacognitive strategies and sociocultural-interactive strategies. No matter what the level of L2 proficiency, if a learner is losing concentration, he or she might need to employ the metacognitive strategy of Paying Attention, or if the learner wants to build a significant, long-term relationship with someone in the L2, he or she might need to employ a sociocultural-interactive strategy, such as Dealing with Sociocultural Contexts and Identities.

Certain cognitive strategies, such as Conceptualizing with Details and Reasoning, are valuable for multiple purposes at all proficiency levels, but these strategies must be applied in ways that fit the situation. If a native
English speaker is listening to a lecture in Romanian and trying to pick out the key content points, it would not help him or her to analyze the structure of every sentence and all the word endings.

1.3.7 Task-phases in the S2R Model

The S'2R Model includes a sequence of phases for doing a task or solving a problem (Figure 1.6). The sequence is as follows:

- **Task-phase 1 is strategic forethought.** In Phase 1, the learner pays attention to the demands of the task, sets goals, plans how to address them, and activates existing knowledge.

- **Task-phase 2 is strategic performance** (sometimes called strategic implementation, monitoring, and control). In this task-phase, the learner (a) implements the plan, (b) monitors how well the plan is working, and (c) decides whether to continue the task as it is going, stop entirely, or make changes in the approach to the task. The aspect labeled (c) in the prior sentence is the “control” or “regulation” part of Task-phase 2. Some theorists of self-regulated learning have tried to split this phase into distinct phases of monitoring and control, yet the same theorists have stated, “empirical work on monitoring . . . and control/regulation . . . does not find much separation of these processes in terms of people’s experiences” (Wolters, Pintrich, and Karabenick, 2003, p. 6).

- **Task-phase 3 is strategic reflection and evaluation** and includes making judgments of value about outcomes, effectiveness of strategies, and self (e.g., self-efficacy, which is the learner’s belief he or she can meet a given goal).

---

**Figure 1.6** Task-phases in the S2R Model

*Note: Learners do not always follow this linear order.*

*Source: Adapted from Zimmerman, Bonner, and Kovacs (1996).*
In social-cognitive research on self-regulated learning, Zimmerman et al. (1996) showed that learners used a cycle similar to the one in Figure 1.6 for comprehending and summarizing texts, taking classroom notes, planning and managing time, and preparing for tests, resulting in increases in learning and self-efficacy. Other names are sometimes used for the task-phases (Bandura, 1997; Eisenberg and Berkowitz, 1988; Winne and Hadwin, 1998).

The S’R Model employs these task-phases because they suggest approximately when certain learning strategies or metastrategies are likely to be useful. For example, the strategies of Planning and of Activating Knowledge occur primarily in Task-phase 1, strategic forethought. The metastrategy of Monitoring naturally occurs in Task-phase 2, strategic performance (strategic implementation, monitoring, and control). Task-phase 2 is the natural home for strategies such as Conceptualizing Broadly, Conceptualizing with Details, Going Beyond the Immediate Data, and Overcoming Gaps in Communicating. The metastrategy of Evaluating emerges mostly in Task-phase 3, strategic reflection and evaluation.

However, the task-phases are not always neatly linear; some learners use the phases in a different order. For example, although one learner, Mark, uses the Task-phase 1 – 2 – 3 order as shown, a different learner, Alexander, jumps directly into task performance (Task-phase 2) without any planning and then, when he feels lost, he goes back and plans (ordinarily Task-phase 1, but not for him). In addition, the phases are not always strategically distinct, because some strategies can appear in multiple phases. For instance, the strategy of Activating Knowledge logically occurs as part of strategic forethought (Task-phase 1), but knowledge can be reactivated in Task-phase 2. The metastrategy of Planning is obviously necessary for Task-phase 1, but the learner can re-plan during Task-phase 2 if the original plan goes awry. In fact, this type of strategic adjustment is exactly what self-regulation is all about. The metastrategy of Evaluating can occur at any time during learning, even though it is most predominant in Task-phase 3, strategic reflection and evaluation.

Although task-phases have heuristic value for considering how and when strategies are used, L2 tasks offer just one way of looking at strategic learning. Another viewpoint on strategies, as mentioned earlier, is the
future-time perspective, which considers the longer-term strategic process of learning a language. For instance, the learner might ask, “What does it take to reach professional proficiency in Chinese? What strategies do I want to use to achieve that goal? Is strategy X still helping me, as it did before, or does it get in my way now? Should I drop this strategy as I move up the proficiency scale?”

1.3.8 Mediated learning in the S²R Model

Two strong assumptions of the S²R Model are: (a) Almost everyone can learn an additional language effectively by employing appropriate strategies, assuming some basic interest in learning the language and sufficient time. (b) Strategies can be learned through mediation or assistance. Not every student has strategic expertise at the outset. Expertise in employing language learning strategies “is not present in every learner; it . . . needs to be developed” (Gu, 2010, p. 1) with help or mediation from others.

The mediated ability of people to learn even very difficult things is the foundation of Reuven Feuerstein's Instrumental Enrichment (IE) Program, which has been successfully used with learners of English as a foreign language, disadvantaged students, and many others (Burden and Williams, 1998; Garb and Kozulin, 1998; International Center for Enhancement of Learning Potential, 2007). The IE Program was designed to help modify mental structures (schemata) and teach operations (i.e., strategies) through mediation by a skilled teacher (Feuerstein, Falik, Rand, and Feuerstein, 2006; Feuerstein, Rand, Hoffman, and Miller, 1997). The IE Program's mediated learning experiences help learners draw out general rules and principles (the “abstraction” process) from tasks and then bridge to other tasks and applications. One of the most fascinating aspects of IE's mediated learning is the use of dynamic assessment, which is a “test-teach-test” mode involving a dialogue between the learner and a more competent person, who first tests the learner's performance, then teaches operations or strategies for improving performance, and finally retests the strategy-enhanced performance (Feuerstein, Rand, and Hoffman, 1979; Kozulin and Garb, 2001). Tested performance is consistently better after students have had the opportunity to learn and use strategies.

In Vygotsky’s sociocultural model, as well as in the S²R Model, all learning is assumed to be assisted (mediated) performance. Vygotsky stated that the “more capable other” leads the actively engaged student, by means of mediation (various kinds of assistance and scaffolding), through that student’s “zone of proximal development,” or ZPD (the area of learning that a particular student can optimally traverse with assistance). The teacher or other person helps the learner by modelling “higher mental functions,” such as Conceptualizing with Details or Conceptualizing Broadly, which the S²R Model calls strategies. Even if the student is learning outside of a
classroom, learning is always mediated by interaction with cultural tools, such as books, media, technology, and language itself. See Concept 1.8 for Vygotsky's model of self-regulated learning.

Concept 1.8  Vygotsky’s model of dialogic, self-regulated learning

- Vygotsky’s model of self-regulated learning states that learning is mediated through language and especially through dialogues with a more capable person (or through books, technology, or other means).
- The learner appropriates (actively internalizes and transforms) essential features of the dialogues by means of three stages: social speech (other-regulation), egocentric speech (the learner subvocalizes but does not fully self-regulate), and inner speech (self-regulation).
- To facilitate internalization of the dialogues and help the learner traverse the zone of proximal development, the more knowledgeable individual offers scaffolding (assistance), such as modelling or providing materials and explanations. Scaffolding is withdrawn when no longer needed.
- Building on Oxford (1999a), it is possible to identify the following self-regulated learning strategies in Vygotsky’s work: Planning, Conceptualizing with Details (especially analyzing), Conceptualizing Broadly (especially synthesizing), Monitoring, and Evaluating, all of which Vygotsky (1981) called higher-order mental functions.
- In the dialogic relationship between the learner and the more capable person, the strategy of Interacting to Learn and Communicate is also evident.
- Inner speech can be used for metastrategic, self-management purposes.
- Cognition is distributed. This means that learning, knowledge, and even intelligence are distributed across people and across social practices and cultural tools (symbols, technologies, artifacts, and language) used by communities (Gee, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978).


Related to the idea of mediation in the S’R Model is the concept of situated cognition or situated learning. Sociocultural theories suggest that all learning is embedded or situated in particular sociocultural settings (Brown, Collins, and Duguid, 1989; Greeno, 1998), which offer properties (called affordances) that either encourage or constrain learning (Van Lier, 1997). In situated cognition, learners are viewed as active agents, whose choice of strategies is influenced but not determined by the sociocultural context (Oxford, 2003).

The S’R Model agrees with several sociocultural models, which state that learners are part of communities of practice. A community of practice is an
authentic, meaningful group centred on specific practices, goals, beliefs, and areas of learning within an environment, which can be local or electronically networked (Fine, 1987; Lave and Wenger, 1991, Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder 2002). Newcomers or apprentices at first “participate peripherally” in the community and observe strategies used by those who have been in the group longer, especially central people known as “old-timers” or experts (Lave and Wenger, 1991; Levine, Reves, and Leaver, 1996). Gradually newcomers move closer to the center of the community of practice if the circumstances are welcoming.

In a community of practice, a learner ideally participates in what is called cognitive apprenticeship, i.e., a strategic, practical learning-based relationship with a more capable other (Collins, 1988). Cognitive apprenticeship helps students to acquire, develop, and use learning strategies in authentic activities via interaction, social construction of knowledge, scaffolding, modelling, goal-setting, peer sharing, and learner reflection (Brown, Collins, and Duguid, 1989). Learners’ strategy use can be similar for cognitive apprenticeships in literacy in the native language (L1) and the L2 (Lee, 2007) if the languages are relatively similar, but their strategy use can differ dramatically across the L1 and the L2 if one is an alphabetic language and the other language involves characters. An example of cognitive apprenticeship is the Reciprocal Teaching Approach to reading (Palincsar and Brown, 1984). In this approach, the teacher first models and scaffolds expert reading strategies, such as summarizing (part of Conceptualizing Broadly in the S2R Model) or inferring and predicting (both are aspects of Going Beyond the Immediate Data in the S2R Model), and then “fades” the scaffolding gradually when it is no longer needed. Students share their summaries, inferences, and predictions and receive feedback from other students in groups within the classroom. Graham and Harris’ (1996) model, Self-Regulation Strategy Development (SRSD), involves both group and individual writing strategies. Research shows that strategically self-regulated learning in classroom communities of practice is useful for all students, from the most expert learners to those who have serious linguistic or cognitive disabilities (Harris and Graham, 2005).

Learners need to know and use strategies to get the most out of mediated learning, whether in the classroom, in informal learning, or at a distance (Kozulin, Gindis, Ageyev, and Miller, 2003; Vygotsky, 1986; White, 1995). Metastrategies such as Planning or Paying Attention, affective strategies such as Generating and Maintaining Motivation, and sociocultural-interactive strategies such as Interacting to Learn and Communicate can all enable learners to expand the fruitful interactions with teachers or other mediators.

1.3.9 Deep processing strategies in the S2R Model

The cognitive and metacognitive strategies in the S2R Model are deep processing strategies, which facilitate understanding, increase meaningful mental
associations, and are the most useful strategies for long-term retention of information. For example, cognitive strategies of Reasoning, Conceptualizing with Details, and Conceptualizing Broadly and metacognitive strategies of Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluating can contribute to deep processing. The students who regularly use deep processing strategies are often intrinsically motivated for learning or personal growth, and they show task persistence, good performance, and ability to regulate their own learning (Vansteenkiste, Simons, Lens, Sheldon, and Deci, 2004; Alexander, 1997).

In contrast, surface strategies help learners memorize material in order to repeat it when necessary, but without a goal of learning. Students who adopt surface strategies, such as rote memorization, as their only strategies are typically poor in test grades, task persistence, and long-term retention of information (Schmeck, 1988; Vansteenkiste et al., 2004). “. . . [S]tudents who adopt surface approaches begin a task with the sole purpose of task completion rather than learning, which leads to verbatim recall or the use of rote memorization strategies” (Holschuh and Aultman, 2008, p. 123). Vansteenkiste et al. (2004, p. 246) argued that the use of surface strategies is related to having unstable self-esteem, making “excessive social comparisons,” or being in a situation that discourages self-regulation. This does not mean that rote memorization strategies are a total waste of effort; Chapter 2 explores the potential value of rote strategies. However, if such strategies are the only ones a learner uses for L2 learning, the results can be negative. Too much use of surface strategies “can impair students’ ability to interrelate concepts . . . [and cause learners to] reach a point where they are unable to grasp new material” (Holschuh and Aultman, p. 123).

Alexander’s research (1997) shows that at the acclimation or novice stage of learning in a given domain (field), the learner has low knowledge, is situationally interested rather than personally engaged with the material, and uses only surface strategies. However, other studies (Ehrman, Romanova, Braun, and Wei, 2004; Oxford, Lavine, Felkins, Hollaway, and Saleh, 1996) show that even when learning an additional language for the very first

---

**Quote 1.4** Why a deep approach is necessary

...[S]tudents who adopt deep approaches to learning tend to personalize academic tasks and integrate information so that they can see relationships among ideas. . . . Deep approaches . . . allow the learner to build on previous knowledge in a meaningful way that facilitates long-term learning. . . . Students who use deep approaches have been shown to be more successful at both selecting strategies and monitoring when comprehension breaks down. . . .

time, some talented, creative learners develop or apply deep processing strategies rather than surface strategies right away and are personally, intrinsically interested from the outset. Teachers can help other learners to employ deep processing strategies at a relatively early stage if the learners believe these strategies can help them (Lee and Oxford, 2008). Thus, the fact that a learner has only a very limited amount of L2 knowledge does not prevent the use of deep processing strategies for gaining more L2 knowledge. Quote 1.4 from Holschuh and Aultman (2008) explains why a deep approach is essential.

1.3.10 Inclusion of tactics in the S²R Model

The S²R Model includes tactics as well as strategies. Tactics are the specific manifestations of a strategy or metastrategy by a particular learner in a given setting for a certain purpose. Stated another way, tactics are the highly specific, “ground-level” applications of strategies or metastrategies in real-life situations for specific purposes and needs. In comparison, strategies are broad and general, and many possible tactics can relate to a given strategy (Winne and Perry, 2000). Inclusion of tactics is a very important feature of the S²R Model. The conceptual distinction between strategies and tactics helps reduce the imprecision that has dogged prior strategy models (see Stevick, 1989, and Oxford and Cohen, 1992, for comments). Concept 1.9 contrasts strategies and tactics in a theoretical sense, while Table 1.2 gives practical examples of strategies and tactics. Later chapters provide many more examples of strategies and associated tactics.

Concept 1.9 About strategies and tactics

• The term strategy comes from the Greek stratēgía, meaning the command of a general in an attempt to win a war. Aside from military parlance, the term strategy has come to mean a general plan of action used to meet a goal. Tactic, also based on ancient Greek usage, are ways to win battles, but the term tactic has also evolved to denote the specific, applied way or ways in which a strategy is being used to meet a goal in a particular situation and instance (Oxford, 1990).

• Schmeck (1988) and Wade, Trathen, and Schraw (1990) suggested that a learning strategy is “composed” of a set of learning tactics. However, in my view, self-regulated L2 learning tactics are specific, goal-directed actions that a given learner employs in a particular sociocultural setting for particular learning-related purposes and needs. Tactics are the way or ways the learner applies the strategy at a specific level in a given situation to meet immediate requirements.

• Winne and Perry (2000) included knowledge of tactics and strategies as one of several “cognitive conditions” for learning.
The number of tactics employed for a given strategy depends on the learner, the need, and the circumstances. For instance, many tactics (e.g., setting goals, determining the study schedule, deciding on steps to take, and so on) can reflect the strategy of Planning, and different learners use varied numbers of Planning-related tactics. Milli, a very deliberate, systematic learner, uses all the Planning-related tactics just listed when preparing for the task of writing a short L2 article for the class newspaper, while Becca, a more spontaneous learner, only sets a vague goal for writing a newspaper article in the L2 and uses no other tactics for the Planning strategy. Milli
Table 1.2  Examples of strategies, metastrategies, and tactics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY OR METASTRATEGY</th>
<th>TACTIC REPRESENTING THE STRATEGY OR METASTRATEGY IN ACTION FOR A GIVEN LEARNER IN A GIVEN SITUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going Beyond the Immediate Data</td>
<td>Quang guesses English meanings from the context of the reading. Specifically, he uses headings, familiar vocabulary, and topic sentences to guess the meaning from the context. (Each of these – using headings, familiar vocabulary, and topic sentences – can be considered a tactic.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining and Using Resources</td>
<td>If Quang still does not understand a given structure that is essential for understanding the reading, he goes to the online dictionary or the pocket dictionary for help. Seven-year-old Sunitha practices her English using CALLA’s (Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach, Chamot and O’Malley, 1996) strategic stuffed animals, like Planning Panda, Monitoring Monkey, Checking Chick, and Researching Raccoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>To help her rebuild schools in the war zone, Betty Lou plans to review her knowledge of Arabic dialects and grammar at night so she can know exactly what to say and how to say it. Mark plans his schedule carefully so he has time for distance university French lessons, despite his hectic job and raising two children. Ileana decides to review her new Slovak vocabulary in carefully spaced intervals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualizing Broadly</td>
<td>Ashraf draws “semantic maps” with lines and arrows pictorially showing the linkages between words or concepts while learning Portuguese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualizing with Details</td>
<td>Yoshinori learns Albanian words by breaking them down into their components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying Attention</td>
<td>Amy pays close attention to the Korean language’s politeness features so she can appropriately address Koreans of different ages. Vicky listens attentively to the speech of Bantu speakers so that she can use the correct expressions in ceremonial situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting to Learn and Communicate</td>
<td>Omneya and Maia study German together, particularly before a major test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activating Supportive Emotions, Beliefs, and Attitudes</td>
<td>Charles gives himself encouragement through positive self-talk while preparing to give a presentation in Swahili about Tanzanian education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>Marco makes deductions about English based on grammar rules he already knows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activating Knowledge</td>
<td>Jing and Irina brainstorm the technical English vocabulary and the examples they need when making a presentation on international conflict resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming Knowledge Gaps in Communicating</td>
<td>While Irina presents what she is supposed to say, she cannot remember the term bilateral negotiation, so she “talks around” it, saying, “Both sides come together to talk about what they want,” and thus she continues gaining speaking practice instead of stopping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also checks her work extensively, using a variety of tactics associated with
the metastrategies of Monitoring and Evaluating, while Becca does not
take the time. Becca’s written work is not as polished as Milli’s because of
the limited Planning-, Monitoring-, and Evaluating-related tactics she uses,
but, on the other hand, her pervasive spontaneity is sometimes helpful for
L2 speaking.

Self-regulated L2 learners frequently use a strategy-tactic chain,
which is a set of organized, sequential or interlocking strategies (Oxford, 1990,
2001), manifested in a given situation by specific tactics.

Table 1.3 contains detailed examples of four different L2 learning strategy-
tactic chains.

Chamot et al. (1996) presented a generic L2 learning strategy chain
called the Problem-Solving Process Model: (a) Planning, (b) Monitoring,
(c) Solving Problems (i.e., finding solutions to problems just identified),
and (d) Evaluating. Rubin’s (2001) Interactive Model of [L2] Learner Self-
Management included the following strategy chain: Planning, Monitoring,
Evaluating, Problem-Identification/Problem-Solution, and Implementation
of Problem-Solution. This model integrates expert learners’ knowledge base
with strategies needed to manage and control learning. Weak L2 learners
do not use effective learning strategy chains and often do not select appro-
priate strategies in the first place (Reiss, 1981, 1983; Vann and Abraham,
1989, 1990). Well-known strategy chains outside of the L2 field are found in
Schoenfield’s (1985) problem-solving process (Analyze, Explore, i.e., con-
sider equivalent problems and break the problem into subgoals, and Verify)
and DeCorte, Verschaffel, and Op’T Eynde’s (2000) cognitive-metacognitive
performance framework (Orient, Organize, Execute, and Verify).

1.3.11 Double utility of strategies in the S’R Model

The S’R Model asserts that learning strategies are useful for “ordinary”
and “severe” L2 learning problems (double utility of strategies). Ordinary
and severe problems are not dichotomous but are instead on a continuum.
Relatively straightforward, expected, ordinary L2-learning problems are
generally not fraught with emotional difficulties, but more complex,
unexpected, severe L2-learning problems often involve or generate anxiety
and have multiple cognitive issues that must be addressed. While both
types of problems benefit from using multiple strategies, the second type
often requires more strategies and more concerted effort. Let us consider
examples involving two learners: José and Mari. José has a rather ordinary
learning problem, while Mari has a more severe one.

José’s L2 assigned learning task is to prepare for a discussion in English,
his L2; and carry out that discussion with another learner. He does not feel
overly stressed, because his problem is straightforward: how to prepare,
how to maintain motivation, and how to speak and listen as effectively as
## Table 1.3 Strategy-tactic chains showing tactics and associated strategies or metastrategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN A</th>
<th>COLUMN B</th>
<th>COLUMN C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHOSE CHAIN</td>
<td>WHAT THE LEARNER DOES (TACTICS) IN THE PARTICULAR SITUATION AND FOR A SPECIFIC GOAL</td>
<td>STRATEGY OR METASTRATEGY ASSOCIATED WITH THE TACTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis’ Chain</td>
<td>To improve his English speaking, Luis seeks out a native English speaker, Tom, to be a conversation partner after class. He practices his English with Tom several times a week. While in a conversation with Tom, Luis monitors his understanding of what Tom is saying. After a month, Luis evaluates whether he is now more comfortable than before when speaking English.</td>
<td>Obtaining and Using Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline’s Chain</td>
<td>Madeline sets the goal of reading a new geopolitics book in Russian. First she plans to get familiar with the book before going into the book deeply. In familiarizing herself with the book, she skims the table of contents and the index to find the main ideas contained in the book. She also uses the skimming to help her evaluate what she already knows in terms of content and vocabulary. She uses this information to decide how much time to allow for studying the content as she reads the book.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelia’s Chain</td>
<td>Aurelia’s task is to read a lengthy news article in English, her second language, and to write a summary of it in English. She starts with thinking about the steps she must take. She skims the article for the main idea. She scans the article for specific examples or evaluative words. She takes notes verbatim for a little while. She considers whether taking notes verbatim is helping. Actually, it seems to be taking too long and does not appear to be a good way to proceed right now.</td>
<td>Conceptualizing Broadly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN A</td>
<td>COLUMN B</td>
<td>COLUMN C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AURELIA’S CHAIN (Continued)</td>
<td>WHAT THE LEARNER DOES (TACTICS) IN THE PARTICULAR SITUATION AND FOR A SPECIFIC GOAL</td>
<td>STRATEGY OR METASTRATEGY ASSOCIATED WITH THE TACTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an instant, she plans a better way: prioritizing the most important things to focus on as she takes notes.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In her new note-taking, she focuses on (a) who, what, when, and why and (b) the topic sentence in each paragraph.</td>
<td>Conceptualizing with Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She then summarizes what she has learned in the prior steps and puts it into the best summary form she knows.</td>
<td>Conceptualizing Broadly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She evaluates the summary against expected standards.</td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELMUT’S CHAIN</td>
<td>Helmut has a writing task that involves looking up new words in an L1–L2 dictionary. He first evaluates prior strategies he used in doing this, considering which of these strategies worked and which caused problems.</td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He considers any problems he might have this time and plans how to handle them.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He thinks about the parts of speech and recognizes the one he needs to seek when looking up a particular word.</td>
<td>Conceptualizing with Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He compares all the definitions given for that particular word.</td>
<td>Conceptualizing with Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He compares collocations (words that generally go along with the target word) in the L1 and the L2.</td>
<td>Conceptualizing with Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He predicts the definition that might be the most useful and the collocations he might need.</td>
<td>Going Beyond the Immediate Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As he copies the word, he checks to make sure he is doing it correctly.</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He checks his predictions (see above) during the task.</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He checks to make sure that the word makes sense in the sentence generated.</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of the writing task, he evaluates how well he has done.</td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Macaro termed the actions in Example 4, Column B strategies, but in the current system they are highly specific tactics reflecting strategies or metastrategies (Column C).

possible. He employs the metacognitive strategy of Planning, using this tactic: “I plan to review relevant vocabulary one hour before and then 15 minutes before the discussion.” He also uses the metacognitive strategy of Paying Attention by means of the tactic, “I pay very close attention to my discussion partner’s main points, so I can understand and respond well.” He deploys the affective strategy of Generating and Maintaining Motivation by using the tactic, “I pretend I am having a chat with my best friend.”

In Mari’s case, the task is more difficult, and the problem is experienced as much more severe. Mari, a native English speaker, is studying advanced German and political science in a German university. To prepare a very important paper in German on the topic of immigration reform in the European Union, her task is to synthesize information from many different, conflicting sources written in German. She feels cognitively overwhelmed and confused, as well as fearful. She thinks she cannot do the work and is thinking of giving up on the paper, although that would be a disastrous step academically. She is in a crisis mode, but she believes that she can help herself by means of strategies and tactics. Mari first turns the situation around with the strategy of Activating Supportive Emotions, Beliefs, and Attitudes, specifically with this tactic: “I act as though the contradictions are my favorite part of the research, and I decide to highlight them in the paper.” After this, she is able to employ the metacognitive strategy of Paying Attention, applying it by means of the tactic, “I pay close attention to the conflicting information in order to find the main contrasting viewpoints.” Keeping in mind the cognitive strategy of Going Beyond the Immediate Data, she uses the tactic, “I speculate on the possible reasons why the various experts have reached widely different conclusions.” She also asks for help by means of the tactic, “I ask Horst, my German boyfriend, to verify my speculations and to help me express my ideas more clearly,” which reflects the SI strategy of Interacting to Learn and Communicate. By using these tools, Mari regulates her own learning. She learns much more, experiences far greater control over the research and writing process, and regains confidence. Because of these steps, she performs excellently on the paper. Thus, strategies and tactics can help with very serious learning situations, as well as with less difficult ones, such as José’s.

1.3.12 Relationship of styles and strategies in the S²R Model

Learning styles are the learner’s general, preferred, or habitual approach to learning. A learning style is often expressed by an adjective (e.g., visual style or extroverted style), while a learning strategy is an action and should always be expressed using some form of a verb, e.g., Planning, and a tactic is a specific action in a highly particular situation for a given need and (at least in this book) is expressed by a longer description (see Concept 1.10). The learner can become conscious of his or her own present
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style domains</th>
<th>Style aspects in each domain</th>
<th>Definitions and comments</th>
<th>Examples of a relevant tactic and an associated strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensory-style domain</td>
<td>Visual style</td>
<td>Prefers to take in (perceive) information through sight. “I see what you mean.”</td>
<td>I remember the Arabic words about diplomacy by creating mental pictures to represent them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditory style</td>
<td>Prefers to take in information through sound. “I hear what you’re saying.”</td>
<td>I use tapes to compare my pronunciation of the Federico García Lorca poem to that of a native Spanish speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hands-on (kinesthetic-tactile) style</td>
<td>Prefers to take in information through touch or movement. “I grasp it,” “I get it,” “This moves me” or even (humorously) “This tickles me.”</td>
<td>I practice my Russian vocabulary for Unit 9 while working out on the treadmill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-style domain</td>
<td>Extroverted style</td>
<td>Prefers to energy from people and activities; likes to work with others.</td>
<td>I meet with Laura and Roberto to study German this Tuesday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introverted style</td>
<td>Gets energy from inner thoughts and feelings; likes to work alone or with one other person.</td>
<td>I work alone to study the seven Khmer infixes, because being alone allows me to think more deeply and reason things out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Processing-style domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic style</th>
<th>Systematically breaks information down into parts to understand or show relationship among the parts</th>
<th>I analyze the essay by Montaigne to determine the main argument and the evidence he gives.</th>
<th>Conceptualizing with Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combinatory (synthesis-oriented) style</td>
<td>Systematically brings parts together in a combination or synthesis to understand or reveal the big picture</td>
<td>I skim the Czech story very quickly to get the main idea before reading it more carefully.</td>
<td>Conceptualizing Broadly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete-sequential style</td>
<td>Prefers concrete facts, other-directed, step-by-step; does not want too many choices; likes to have an authority figure</td>
<td>I closely follow the steps in the Japanese assignment and the specific grading criteria the teacher provides.</td>
<td>Paying Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract-intuitive style</td>
<td>Prefers abstract theories and multiple possibilities; often non-sequential; prefers to make own rules; does not want authority figures</td>
<td>Based on many examples of a given structure that I encounter, I figure out the grammar rule in Hungarian. It’s not as interesting when someone else tells me the rules.</td>
<td>Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure-oriented style</td>
<td>Needs quick decisions; prefers to work toward specific deadlines; more serious than playful</td>
<td>I set clear goals for studying Dari during this week, April 4–10, and check how well I fulfill them.</td>
<td>(a) Planning and (b) Evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open style</td>
<td>Prefers to keep decisions open and continue taking in information; dislikes deadlines; more playful than serious</td>
<td>I care more about enjoying the Hebrew lesson with my pal Andrew than about meeting any artificial deadlines.</td>
<td>Interacting to Learn and Communicate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: An immature version of the analytic style is the hyperfocused style, which likes small pieces of information, is hyperfocused on details but not relationships between details, and avoids systematic analysis, while an immature version of the combinatory style is the overly fuzzy style, which prefers no analysis and few details, accepts only highly general information, and ignores any need for accuracy (Oxford, Massey, and Anand, 2005).
cluster of learning styles by means of general self-reflection or by taking a learning style survey. Some aspects of a given learner's styles – especially introverted/extroverted, concrete-sequential/abstract-intuitive, and closure-oriented/open – can be influenced by the sociocultural context, the subject area, and the learner's level of expertise and are therefore not fixed throughout the lifespan. A welcoming sociocultural context might cause a learner to prefer lots of interaction, while a rejecting or indifferent sociocultural context might influence the same learner to prefer to work alone and be silent (Norton, 2010). A learner might prefer deadlines in courses in international relations but, in another field, like learning French, want to keep taking in information for much longer. In other words, although the learner might have some strong style tendencies, they are not set in stone and are influenced by the sociocultural context.

1.4 Nine ways the S2R Model is different

In this chapter we have discussed many aspects of the S2R Model of L2 learning, and subsequent chapters offer still more aspects. In comparison to other strategy-related models of L2 learning, this model opens up new doors in nine ways. The S2R Model systematically integrates three major traditions of learning theory and research: psychological, social-cognitive, and sociocultural. The psychological tradition of strategies is very diverse, including strategies as related to schema (mental structure) development, comprehension, cognitive information-processing, metacognition, motivation, emotion, and beliefs (this chapter and Chapters 2 and 3). The social-cognitive strand deals with strategies as associated with task-phases, self-efficacy, and social comparisons (this chapter). The sociocultural tradition involves strategies (often called “higher mental functions” or “operations”) as linked with mediated learning, instrumental enrichment, the ZPD, communities of practice, and cognitive apprenticeship (this chapter and Chapter 4).

Second, the S2R Model provides a better balance of dimensions than many prior learning strategy models. This model overtly recognizes that L2 learning is not just a cognitive/metacognitive process but is also influenced by a complex web of beliefs, emotional associations, attitudes, motivations, sociocultural relationships, personal interactions, and power dynamics. Therefore, sufficient attention must be paid to affective strategies and meta-affective strategies (Chapter 3) and socio-interactive strategies and meta-SI strategies (Chapter 4), as well as cognitive and metacognitive strategies, which often garner the most attention (Chapter 2).

Third, the S2R Model introduces not just metacognitive but also meta-affective and meta-SI strategies as part of a new and important concept,
metastrategies, discussed earlier in this chapter. The use of metastrategies, which include but are not limited to metacognitive strategies, makes good sense semantically, logically, and theoretically.

Fourth, the S2R Model states that metastrategies, such as Planning, Organizing, Monitoring, and Evaluating, are naturally usable at either the task level or the whole-process level. Several social-cognitive models of self-regulated learning view these as only related to a particular task-phase (e.g., strategies used before, during, and after the task), but the current chapter says otherwise.

Fifth, the S2R Model underscores the importance of deep processing strategies, as opposed to surface strategies, as noted in this chapter. Other models do not necessarily discuss the difference between deep processing strategies and surface strategies.

Sixth, the S2R Model mentions “double utility” of strategies and metastrategies. Double utility means that they can be used in situations involving ordinary learning problems or circumstances marked by severe or crisis-like learning problems.

Seventh, the S2R Model includes the fewest strategies and metastrategies (a total of 19) needed for self-regulated L2 learning; therefore, the model can be viewed as scientifically elegant. At the same time, the model’s inclusion of tactics allows for tremendous flexibility and adaptability. As explained in this chapter, tactics are the very particular applications of strategies or metastrategies in real-life situations for specific purposes and needs. Tactics can often be “chained” or smoothly interlocked for best effect, building on my concept of strategy chains (Oxford, 1990). The way tactics fit into activity theory is portrayed in Chapter 2.

Eighth, the S2R Model pays close attention to the neurological elements of L2 learning and to cognitive load, which most L2 strategy models do not adequately discuss. Chapter 2 shows why these elements are important and how they relate to strategies.

Finally, the S2R Model embraces a large number of valuable techniques for assessing L2 learning strategies and assisting learners in expanding their strategy repertoire. Some of these techniques have not been included in prior published discussions of L2 learning strategies. All of these aspects make the S2R Model different from other strategy models and an enhancement to the field of L2 learning strategies.

1.5 Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the Strategic Self-Regulation (S2R) Model of L2 learning. This model, with its rich interdisciplinarity, echoes Bakhtin’s (1998) concept of heteroglossia, which is defined as a multiplicity of voices,
dialects, styles, vocabularies, and idioms shared among people. The model is intentionally heteroglossic, echoing the voices and vocabularies of different viewpoints, such as psychological, social-cognitive, and sociocultural. At the same time it is a unified, logically coherent system. I have used and tested the evolving S’R Model in my teaching of international graduate students for the last six years.

The S’R Model deserves further empirical testing in sociocultural contexts around the world, although most of its component theories and aspects have been widely researched and accepted within educational psychology, as shown in Chapters 2 through 4. Each of those chapters examines one dimension of L2 learning and of self-regulated L2 learning strategies, reveals many examples of relevant strategies and tactics in action, and presents supporting theories and research. All the strategies and tactics included in this book come from actual learners.
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