

Lehrern und Schülern führten zu Schlussfolgerungen über die optimale und effektive Ausbildung eines Deutschlehrers.

BIBLIOGRAFIE

1. BENITO Juana. Spielend Deutsch lernen. Interaktive Arbeitsblätter für Anfänger und Fortgeschrittene. -Berlin:Langescheidt,1997.
2. BIMMEL Peter. Deutschunterricht planen NEU. – Berlin: Langescheidt,2011.
3. ESSELBORN Karl. Interkulturelle Literaturvermittlung Levischen didaktischer Theorie und Praxis.- München: Iudicium,2010.
4. CHISELIOV V., LIPCEANU Ala. Deutsch mit Geduld und Verstand.-Chisinau,2011.
5. GRAEFEN Gabrielle. Wissenschaftssprache Deutsch. Lesen, verstehen, schreiben. Frankfurt am Main, New York: Peter Lang,2011.
6. FISCHER Andreas. Deutsch lernen mit Rhythmis Methode und Material.-Leipzig,2007.
7. NEUER Gerhard. Methoden des Fremdsprachliches Deutschunterrichts.- München:Langenscheidt,1993.
8. ROCHE Jürg.Handbuch Mediendidaktik. Fremd-sprachen.- Ismaning: Hueber,2000.
9. SCHÄFER Susanne. Wissenschaftliches Arbeiten an deutschen Universitäten.- München: Iudicium,2010.
10. SCHELLER Ingo. Szenisches Spiel. Handbuch für die pädagogische Praxis.- Berlin:Cornelsen Scriitor,1998.
11. STEINIG Wolfgang, HUNEKE Hans-Werner. Sprachdidaktik Deutsch.-Berlin:Schmidt,2011.

THE ROLE OF ICT IN STUDENT CENTERED LEARNING

*Șchiopu Lucia, dr., lector univ.,
UPS „Ion Creangă” din Chișinău*

CZU: 37.04:004.9=111

Rezumat

Acest articol relevă aspectele pozitive și negative ale utilizării tehnologiilor informaționale și de comunicare în predarea centrată pe elev. Învățarea și predarea cu ajutorul TIC este un domeniu în evoluție rapidă pentru toți actorii educaționali: profesori, studenți, cercetători și părinți. Formarea oportunităților variate de practică lingvistică folosind tehnologiile informaționale și de comunicare îmbunătățește și sporește încrederea în sine a elevilor. Subiecții educaționali își schimbă receptivitatea față de inovația tehnologică, adoptă o atitudine față de dispozitivul care le este mai convenabil și care le oferă un acces mai liber la conținut. Aspectele negative ale utilizării TIC în abordarea centrată pe elev sunt: crearea dependenței de rețelele de socializare; reticența de a angaja efort cognitiv și metacognitiv în procesul de învățare cu ajutorul TIC; frustrarea și confuzia în momentul conectării la variate instrumente online cu parole și nume de utilizator cheltuind mai mult timp pentru probleme tehnice decât pentru implicarea în activități didactice.

Cuvinte-cheie: învățare centrată pe elev, tehnologii informaționale și de comunicare, responsabilitate academică.

Learning and teaching with technology is a fast-evolving domain for all educational stakeholders: teachers, students, researchers and parents. Student-centered learning is a wide variety of instructional approaches, learning experiences, constructivist strategies that address to different students' needs, abilities, aptitudes, cultural behaviors with the growing use of ICT. Immersing varied opportunities for language practice using technologies improves and enhances the students' self-confidence, increases the students' motivation in altering the school culture. At the same time, the use of ICT in student-centered learning must be shaped in correspondence with the students' needs, with the curriculum. It must be reconsidered the format of approaching the language skills giving an advantage to process rather than form, being aware of the negative side of the ICT use i.e. students' reluctance to engage in cognitive and metacognitive effort, addiction to social networking, spending more time on social media instead of studying academic courses.

Kim et al. (2013) found out that students change their receptivity to technological innovation they adopt a category towards the device they are most likely to work with, which is more convenient to them and give them more free constraint access to mobile content [10].

Mobile technologies increase the students' motivation and contribute to assertive changes in school culture. Ushioda (2013) considers motivation as a matter of choice and autonomy and differentiates two types of motivation while learning with the help of technology: the natural interest to use technology and a very strong desire to learn a foreign language with all possible means to master it. Ushioda (2013) states that the teacher must give students freedom of choice, autonomy when integrating technology into the curriculum [19, p.1].

There is a demand for educators all around the world to make the right decisions about the technologies to be used in the classrooms. However, in today's world what is needed is knowledge and experience that goes beyond being able to make informed decisions about new options in instructional technology.

Chapelle and Hegelheimer in 2004 in their article "Language teachers in the 21st century" have stressed the importance of teachers to be familiarized with "basic understanding of webpage design and creation" [2, p. 308], communication tools, understanding the nature of mobile apps, mobile-friendly access to resources. A challenge for the teachers is to use technology in particular learning contexts, with the students' needs, with the curriculum, and within the boundaries of the educational and cultural background. Fortunately, the student-centered curriculum enhances and fosters the use of technology in the educational framework and does not constrain the use of particular technologies making stress on a digital product.

Teaching in a student-centered environment means the creation of the teacher-generated curriculum process by matching students' needs to the context and coursebooks. To ensure the match between the perceived needs of our students and the coursebook content with the help of technology Butler, Heslop, and Kurth (2014) have elaborated a ten-step process consisting of: 1. Student needs, 2. Goals and objectives, 3. Test tasks, 4. Language and skills, 5. Sequence, 6. Materials, 7. Teaching, 8. Reflection, 9. Evaluation, 10. Revisions [1, pp.3-9].

A basic element in technology integration in the curriculum is the teachers' collaboration. Wang and Cheng (2005) have conducted the research that has shown that curriculum reform can fail without collaboration and discussion among teachers [20, p. 8].

Student-centered learning means developing reading, writing, grammar in a new perspective. Writing should be seen as a process, not as a product. The process of writing deals with prewriting, editing and grammar, word processing research and applications. Wresch (1984) states that using technology for writing helps students to see writing as an ongoing and dynamic process focusing more on the meaning rather than form [21].

Kessler, Bikowski, & Boggs (2012) have found out that to conduct collaborative writing engages students to take part in discussion boards, online chats, email communication, blogs, to search wikis [9]. Writing must be approached as a collaborative activity. A word document can be written by one student, then distributed to another student, and then returned to the original student for review. The idea is that the word document is shared among the students with new technologies like Google Docs that gives the opportunity to work together within a web-based document. Collaborative writing contributes to:

1. improve writing competencies [16];
2. a better sense of audience [12];

3. ameliorate the understanding and importance of knowledge in writing [3] and stress the pivotal aspect of the writer [16] in the writing process;
4. increase student motivation [11];
5. focus on discourse structures, grammar, and vocabulary usage [17].

Teachers must be trained to use in a flexible way digital tools, mobile learning applications, and learning materials and resources. One of the goals of ICT is to help the learners become informed and engaged global citizens, reflect on their own culture and foreign cultures, to live in a multicultural world.

The awareness of the necessity to adopt a critical view on past and present learning experiences initiates a behavioral change that consists of a strong and **increasing feeling of academic responsibility on the student's learning process**. The responsibility of the learning process is pivotal, it is an internal force that keeps the student motivated and on the assigned task. There are a lot of distractions in the virtual world but only the inner force of the student can keep him focused on the prescribed platform. The students perceive the teacher more as an advisor and guide, they must be conscious of the fact that they are the **doers** of their knowledge and expertise.

The constructivist strategies give advantage to process rather than form and grammar, however, these strategies keep the form and fluency on target. The focus on grammar is made later, the process over product paradigm is more important [7].

Li and Hegelheimer focused on learning grammar using a web-based mobile application, Grammar Clinic, conducting the activities that implied cognitive effort. Grammar Clinic was regarded as beneficial in helping learners raise their metalinguistic awareness and improve their self-editing ability in English writing [13, p. 149]. The research findings were striking as language learners in this study did not use mobile devices as a learning platform but for texting friends or using chatting tools (82%), making phone calls (71%), using social networks (65%), listening to music (65%), and sending or receiving emails (53%), and only 41% reported using course management system such as Blackboard/WebCT/Moodle and 24% reported learning foreign languages (including English) on their mobile devices [13, p.146]. 59% of the students agreed that they needed more instruction on grammar points in this English academic writing class [13, p. 147].

Gok (2016) has emphasized the negative side of ICT use i.e. the students are reluctant to engage cognitive and metacognitive effort in mobile learning because they prefer to deal with quick and easy tools and the content of these digital platforms is not challenging to them. It also evoked that the majority of students spend more time on social media instead of studying academic courses. The findings are rather sad because many students have an interest in social networking sites that leads students to addiction and social networking sites negatively influence students' habits, grades, socialization. Also, 60% of students do not have enough time for reading books, course materials or even doing physical exercise [6]. Besides that, Kim et al (2013) state that online collaboration through discussion boards may generate the students' frustration and confusion with logging in to the various online tools with different passwords and permissions expressing complex ideas, spending more time on technical issues on their mobile devices rather than on learning practices [10].

The success in the classroom depends on the joint activity of the teacher and the students who form a classroom community. The teacher is to create an effective community ("the educational community") where all participants could benefit from each other previous

experiences and knowledge; they all should be taught and guided through collaborative joint teaching-learning activities constructed and reconstructed on the cultural background of each student. This is the goal of each educator as a future perspective to strengthen the sense of his/her “educational community”, “professional community” considering the components of culture, cultural awareness, and cultural sensitivity [15].

Education today needs teachers capable of providing students with quality education. Students' needs, which can be extremely diverse, are the driving force of continuous training designed as human, individual, or collective exigencies; they must be satisfied in time and space to ensure the normal development of the life and activity of the educational institutions. The fundamental change of conception of the "philosophy of education" and vision of the human being as a supreme value will bring more respect for the social reality, the mechanisms of real life, of the micro-cultures and personalities to whom the system and the organization are intended for.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BUTLER, G., S. HESLUP, L. KURTH. Development of a teacher generated curriculum at a Korean university. *KOTESOL proceedings 2013: Exploring the road less traveled—from practice to theory*, ed. D. Shaffer and M. Pinto. Seoul: Korea TESOL. 2014, ISSN: 1598-0472.
2. CHAPELLE, C., HEGELHEIMER, V. The English language teacher in the 21st century. S. Fotos & C. Browne (eds.), *New Perspectives in CALL for Second Language Classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. 2004, 299–316. ISBN-10: 0805844058.
3. DONATO, R.. Collective scaffolding in second language learning. J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* Norwood, NJ: Ablex. 1994, (pp. 33–56). ISBN: 10: 1567500250.
- GODWIN-JONES, R. Emerging technologies focusing on form: Tools and Strategies. *Language Learning & Technology*. 2009, 13(1), 5-12. ISSN: 1094-3501.
4. GODWIN-JONES, R. The evolving roles of language teachers: Trained coders, local researchers, global citizens. *Language Learning & Technology*. 2015, 19(1), 10-22. ISSN: 10943501. Retrieved from <http://lt.msu.edu/issues/february2015/emerging.pdf> (vizitat 10.03.20).
5. GOK, T. The effects of social networking sites on students' studying and habits. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*. 2016, 2(1), 85- 93. ISSN: 21489955.
6. GUGIN, D. A Paragraph-First Approach to the Teaching of Academic Writing. *English Teaching Forum*. 2014, 52(3), 24-29. ISSN: 0425- 0656.
7. HAINES, K. J. Learning to identify and actualize affordances in a new tool. *Language Learning & Technology*. 2015, 19(1), 165-180. ISSN: 10943501.
8. KESSLER, G., BIKOWSKI, D., BOGGS, J. Collaborative writing among second language learners in academic web-based projects. *Language Learning & Technology*. 2012, 16(1), 91-109. ISSN: 10943501. Retrieved from <http://lt.msu.edu/issues/february2012/kesslerbikowskiboggs.pdf>
9. KIM, D., RUECKERT, D., KIM, D.-J., SEO, D. Students' perceptions and experiences of mobile learning. *Language Learning & Technology*. 2013, 17(3), 52-73. ISSN: 10943501.
10. KOWAL, M., SWAIN, M. Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness*. 1994, 3(2), 73–93. ISSN: 0965-8416. Retrieved from <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/0965-8416>.
11. LEKI, I. Reciprocal themes in reading and writing. J. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle. 1993, pp. 9–33. ISBN: 10: 0838439721.
12. LI, Z., HEGELHEIMER, V. (2013). Mobile-assisted grammar exercises: Effects on self-editing in L2 writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 17(3), 135–156. <http://dx.doi.org/10125/44343> ISSN: 1094-3501.
13. PORCARO, J. Teaching English for Science and Technology: An Approach for Reading with Engineering English. *English Teaching Forum*. 2013, 51(2), 32-39. ISSN: 0425-0656.
14. SCHIOPU, L. Integrating metacognition and critical thinking skills in the exploration of culture in EFL classroom. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*. 2018, 2(3), 181-191. ISSN: 2602-3717.

15. STORCH, N. Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 2005, 14, 153–173. ISSN: 1060-3743 .doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002.
16. SWAIN, M., LAPKIN, S. Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*. 1998, 82, 320–337. ISSN: 1540-4781. Retrieved from <http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=0026-7902>.
17. THOMAS, C. Meeting EFL Learners Halfway by Using Locally Relevant Authentic Materials. *English Teaching Forum*. 2014, 52(3), 14-23. ISSN: 0425-0656.
18. USHIODA, E. Motivation matters in mobile language learning: A brief commentary. *Language Learning & Technology*. 2013, 17(3), 1-5. ISSN: 10943501. Retrieved from <http://ilt.msu.edu/issues/october2013/commentary.pdf>.
19. WANG, H., CHENG, L. The impact of curriculum innovation on the cultures of teaching. *Asian EFL Journal*. 2005, 7(4), 7-32. ISSN : 1738-1460.
20. WRESCH, W. *The computer in composition instruction: A writer's tool*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. 1984. ISBN: 0-8141-0615-6.

THE MODEL AND STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS OF A TRANSLATOR'S PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

*Golubovschi Oxana, dr., lector univ.,
UPS „Ion Creangă” din Chişinău*

CZU: 811.111'25

Rezumat

Materialul prezentului articol, abordează o problemă semnificativă ce ține de calitatea în educație, și anume, dezvoltarea competențelor profesionale ale traducătorilor, deci a competențelor de traducere (CT). În acest sens, este sugerată tehnologia pedagogică pentru dezvoltarea competențelor de traducere ale studenților-traducători, totodată sunt menționate competențele de traducere relevante profesiei de traducător. Lucrarea conține o succintă descriere a modelului competențelor de traducere și a tehnologiei de dezvoltare a competențelor de traducere ale studenților-traducători, la fel, în acest articol sunt menționate și unele succese obținute ca rezultat a cercetării academice a problemei vizate.

Cuvinte-cheie: competențe de traducere (CT), competența strategică (CS), competența comunicativă (CC), competența instrumental-profesională (CIP), competența socio-culturală (CSC).

There are many translator training institutions all over the world, and even in the ordinary language classroom students are demanding some sort of basic training in translation. But what about professional translation training? The issue is: who is going to do the teaching in such translation training? So far, there is no institutional training for translator trainers, they have to face the problem and deal with preparing their discipline curriculars on their own. Teachers of many disciplines, such as Mathematics or Biology, are trained in their respective Faculties, Language Teachers are trained in Modern Language Departments or Faculties of Second Language Acquisition, but those who apply for a position as translator trainer in a Faculty of Translation and Interpreting need no particular formal qualification, and if they needed one, they would not know where to get it. This does not mean that they are all bad translator trainers, but maybe life would be a little easier for them if they “had had some kind of special instruction and were not forced to re-invent the wheel of translation pedagogy over and over again” [6, p. 209].

This is basically the main concern of this article: designing an appropriate pedagogical methodology as to train translators and that is developing their professional competences or as some researchers call them skills, translation competences model and pedagogical methodology design are our issues of interest and concern in this paper.

The methodology of teaching translation and developing of the translation competences is a field of pedagogical science that is not very developed. Pedagogical methodologies on developing translation competences, which are necessary in all types of translation: oral and