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1. INTRODUCTION

In this project I intend to explore, via research, the arguments in favour and against the use of translation\(^1\) at the various levels of English as a second language/foreign language\(^2\) teaching/learning\(^3\) and analyse its historical origins, so that I can investigate its recent rise in pedagogical interest as an English L2/FL teaching aid, and whether contemporary research has proven it to be a valued English L2/FL learning resource at all levels within the A1 – C2 linguistic competence range.\(^4\)

1.1 Methodology

As I set out on this exploration, I am conscious that translation in L2/FL teaching/learning, like most other things in life, does not exist in a vacuum, but rather is located in a historical ever-changing stream which often involves the re-emergence of thoughts and ideas of previous generations.\(^5\) Such is the situation with the role of translation in the L2/FL classroom, at least from the fourteenth century onwards, for as noted by Kelly (1969:137), “[t]he first clear indication that translation was used as a teaching method comes from fourteenth-century England”.\(^6\)

Keeping the above in mind, I shall set out in the first part of this project (section 2) by looking at the historical place of translation in L2/FL teaching in order to establish the background context of contemporary arguments for/against the use of translation as a teaching aid in the English L2/FL learning classroom. This initial historical exploration will involve my looking into L2/FL educational approaches/theories in terms of “the leading

---

\(^1\) The Oxford English Dictionary Online (1989), s.v. translation gives the following etymology: “Old French translation [...] or < Latin translātiōn-em a transporting, translation, noun of action < translāt-, participial stem of transferre to transfer v.” and gives the year 1340 for the first attested usage of the word in its usual current meaning (II.2.a: “The action or process of turning from one language into another; also, the product of this; a version in a different language.”). The equivalent words in Modern Romance languages are reflexes from “Latin traducere (“to lead across”) Latin trāducĕre to lead across, transport, transfer, derive; also, to lead along as a spectacle, to bring into disgrace; < trans across + dūcĕre to lead (OED 2014: s.v. traduce). Traduce, a 16th c. loan, competed with translate between the 16th and mid-19th cc.

\(^2\) Henceforth referred to as L2/FL.

\(^3\) As noted by Thornbury and Ball (n.d.: 46), “teachability is not the same as learnability” [since an] “item may be easy to teach, but difficult to learn.” Having noted this, we shall proceed in this essay by looking at translation in terms teaching/learning within the kaleidoscope of L2/FL teaching, unless otherwise stated.

\(^4\) See Appendix 1.

\(^5\) Indeed, Kelly (1969: ix) noted that “[n]obody really knows what is new or what is old in present-day language teaching procedures” [since an] “much that is being claimed as revolutionary in this century is merely a rethinking and renaming of early ideas and procedures”.

\(^6\) Kelly (1969: 137) also notes that, while “[p]arallel developments on the continent are not so easily documented [...] it seems that vernaculars […] entered the classroom, bringing translation with them, at about the beginning of the thirteenth century.”

---
movements which have determined many of the features of the major teaching methods” (Arzamendi, Ball, et al., n.d.: 1) within the field of English L2/FL teaching, as experienced in the fields of TEFL\textsuperscript{7}, TESL\textsuperscript{8}, TEAL\textsuperscript{9}, TESOL\textsuperscript{10} and ELT\textsuperscript{11}, with some reference to the teaching of other languages as an L2/FL, using their views on the use of translation/L1 within the L2/FL language learning process as the primary measuring tool, for the following parts of this project. However, unless a particular point requires specific identification within a particular field of L2/FL teaching I shall use the term ‘ELT’ as an umbrella term for the purposes of this project.

In the second part of this project (section 3), I intend to explore the recent rise of pedagogical interest in the value of translation as an English L2/FL teaching aid, and whether contemporary research has proven it to be a valuable English L2/FL teaching/learning resource at all levels within the A1 – C2 linguistic competence range.

In the final part of my project (section 4), I hope to outline what applied linguists and frontline practitioners in the field envision as the way forward in terms of translation and L2/FL teaching, as well as to make some informed suggestions myself as a result of participating in this MLAEILE course and project. As to the latter outcome, it will partly be in the shape of techniques/procedures\textsuperscript{12} for students within those levels where contemporary research indicates that a student’s L1 can be used to enhance his/her comprehension of the L2 (in this case English being the L2).

However, before I proceed further, I think it would be helpful to look at some potential misconceptions about its objectives.

\textsuperscript{7} “Teaching/Teachers of English as a Foreign Language” (Arzamendi, Ball, Gassó and Hockly. n.d.: 3).
\textsuperscript{8} “Teaching/Teachers of English as a Second Language” (Arzamendi, Ball et al. n.d.: 3).
\textsuperscript{9} “Teaching/Teachers of English as an Additional Language” (Arzamendi, Ball et al. n.d.: 4).
\textsuperscript{10} “Teaching/Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages” (Arzamendi, Ball et al. n.d.: 4).
\textsuperscript{11} “English Language Teaching” (Arzamendi, Ball et al. n.d.: 4).
\textsuperscript{12} As noted by Yu, Wehua (2001: 10-11), “[t]echniques or procedures refer to any of a wide variety of exercises, activities used in the language classroom for realising objectives (Brown, 1994).”
1.2 Some Potential Misconceptions Addressed

1.2.1 This is not a project about translation

According to Munday (2012: Locs 459,470), translation today can be understood in three different ways:

1. [It is] “the general subject field or phenomenon [as in] ‘I studied translation at university’.”

2. [It is] “the [end] product – that is, the text that has been translated [as in] ‘They published the Arabic translation of the report’.”

3. [It is] “the process of producing the translation, otherwise known as translating [as in a] (‘translation service’).”

This is not a project about translation from the point of view of any of the above three definitions. Rather, it is an exploration of the usefulness, or otherwise, of translation in the contemporary teaching of English as an L2/FL, as perceived by theoreticians and teaching professionals within the field of L2/FL teaching. However, the role of translation in L2/FL teaching is necessarily influenced by translation studies, especially in terms of “process” and, it must also be said, the ultimate translation product, and hence it must be considered under what Holmes (1988) helpfully described, as “Applied Translation”. As noted by Dahlgren and Sitwell (n.d.: 6), “[t]he notion of translation is used to refer to a variety of different phenomena, and no consensus exists – as yet – as to what existing definitions refer to”. In the light of this, I do think that Carreres makes an important observation when she notes that “[t]he desire of translator trainers to distance themselves from mere language teaching and the inclination on the part of some language teachers to regard translation merely as a pedagogical tool, have often prevented dialogue between these different areas” (Carreres, 2006: 3). However, on a more positive note, Munday

---

13 I have used the Kindle version of the book, where actual page numbers are unavailable. Note that the abbreviation “Loc” stands for “Location”.  
14 I should at this point highlight that I in no way intend to denigrate the area of translation studies per se, and am cognizant of the claim by its proponents as to its value in aiding its students acquire a foreign language. For example in the response section to an article by Scott Thornbury (2010) a contributor by the name of GB (Reply 1/06/2011 – GB Translation (16: 54: 12), notes that “In Austria, we’ve made the experience that students of translation (which is a separate course) actually end up speaking their respective foreign languages much, much better than those who study linguistics”, an area which would be interesting to explore in its own right.  
16 See Appendix 2.  
17 Carreres, 2006: 3 notes an exception to this trend in the work of Lavault (1985), which Carreres claims “represents a pioneering attempt to apply developments in the teaching of professional
(2012: Loc 721), in critiquing Holmes (1988) “‘map’ of translation studies,” observes that, while Holmes’ taxonomy could be seen as somewhat artificial, Holmes himself recognised that the “pure” and applied areas do influence each other. Munday (2012: Loc 721) goes on to note that the main benefit of such divisions is that they assist in the clarification and division of labour within translation studies which previously had been open to potential confusion, while still being flexible enough to embrace ongoing developments such as the rapid technological progress of recent years. This latter point, I believe, in terms of space for ongoing development, identifies the area wherein I hope to carry out my own explorations in this project.

1.2.2 - No professional L2/FL teacher would admit to using the L1 in monolingual English Language Teaching nowadays

While the use of the L1 in a monolingual class situation will be further explored in part 2, “Looking Around Today”, it seems clear that, as a result of the influence of the Direct Method on Community Language Teaching¹⁸, translation has been considered “for a long time […] as a ‘taboo’ subject, a source of embarrassment, and on the part of teachers, a recognition of their failure to teach properly, i.e., using ‘only English’,” as Vaezi and Mirzaei, (2007: Introduction) put it. Likewise, Prodromou (2001, in Vaezi and Mirzaei, 2007: Introduction), notes that this “skeleton in the cupboard has been there all the time, we just haven’t wanted to talk about it,” that is, “most non-native-speaker teachers of English have quietly been using the L1, to a lesser or greater extent” (Vaezi and Mirzaei, 2007: Introduction).¹⁹ Thus, while the veracity of this claim will be an important part of my research in part two of this essay, it has to be acknowledged that the L1 is present in at least some L2/FL classrooms, whether English language teaching (henceforth referred to as ELT) professionals are willing to admit to it or not. Interestingly, research carried out by Prodromou (British Council and BBC World Service, 2001) on 300 students suggests that, in relation to whether teachers should use the L1/mother tongue in class, “the figures for beginners and intermediate are quite high (66% and 58% respectively) but only a minority of advanced learners (29%) find the use of L1 in the classroom acceptable.” These

---

¹⁸ Henceforth referred to as CLT. This approach, like the Direct Method, argues that an “L1 should not be used at all in L2 teaching as it will promote interference between the two and is counterproductive” (Dahlgren and Sitwell, n.d.: 32). CLT is the L2/FL teaching approach generally advocated/practiced within the L2/FL classroom nowadays.

¹⁹ Lavault (1985: 24-25, in Carreres, 2006: 4), described how secondary school language teachers in France “routinely resorted to translation in the classroom to varying degrees, even where this procedure was discouraged by official guidelines.”
findings lie at the heart of this question and my project, and will be explored further in part two, "Looking Around Today."
2. Part 1: LOOKING BACK

Where to start? Munday (2012: Locs 578 and 586) shows that “[w]ritings on the subject of translating go far back in recorded history” and that “[t]he practice of translation was crucial for the early dissemination of key cultural and religious texts and concepts.”

However, as Dahlgren and Sitwell (n.d.: 3) observe, “[w]e know very little about what was translated and from/to which languages before the Romans.” Interestingly, Cohen (1986: 12., in Wikipedia, 2001: s.v. “Translation”) notes that, while writing is antedated by interpreting, written literature predated translation, and he mentions the existence of partial translations of the Sumerian Epic of Gilgamesh (ca. 2000 BC) into Southwest Asian languages of the second millennium BC as evidence of his claim. While an exploration of such ancient views/practices of translation are highly interesting in and of themselves, it seems apposite to recall Dahlgren and Sitwell’s (n.d.: 3) observation that it was the Romans that brought forward the concept that “translation is not carried out by finding equivalents between words [a discussion which] has gone through many phases: the idealist, the structuralist, the functionalist […], but is about] translating “sense for sense”, i.e. meaning for meaning’, a discussion which a reading of literature within the field of L2/FL teaching reveals is “still raging”. However, we should also note Kelly’s (1969: 136) observation at this point that translation from the L2 into Latin was the only form of translation that was seen as being of value and it “was a rhetorical exercise that was first attempted near the end of one’s studies and continued throughout one’s oratorical career.”

It was as a result of this need, as Kelly (1969: 137) notes, that apparently “the schoolmasters of the Greek communities of Egypt and Gaul […] introduced translation for the sake of learning […]”

20 The influence of religion on the world of translation cannot be overestimated with Munday (2012: Loc 585) noting that the translation of the Bible in Western Europe was to be a major source of ideological differences, particularly during the period of the Reformation, for well over a millennium, a process also witnessed in China from the first century CE as Buddhists engaged in a long period of discussion in relation to the translation of the Buddhist sutras. As someone who studied a BA in Theology and Philosophy as my primary degree I am tempted to explore the field of religion in translation, but again must restrain myself to the remit of this project.

21 According to Munday (2012: Loc 460), “oral translation […] is commonly known as interpreting or interpretation”.

22 “Ancient Greece transmitted to Rome a tradition of grammatical scholarship that was based on rhetoric […] which held a key place in Greek society […] a normative approach to grammar was inherent in the discipline [and] […] it was the Stoic rhetoricians who first taught grammar in Rome” (Kelly, 1969: 341-342). Interestingly, Kelly (1969: 343-344) goes on to note that “[t]o the classical teacher or grammarian, analysis was only the beginning of grammar […] As rhetoric was an expected sequel to grammar, a start had to be made in the arts of composition”. For this reason, Greek or Roman schoolboys were “introduced to stylistic criticism even before [their] own style was formed, in the hope that this forced growth would make good style instinctive” (Kelly, 1969: 344). It was a belief in this approach that lay behind Renaissance Humanism “as it gleefully overturned the bases of medieval scholarship, returning to the pagan [i.e. classical] sources that scholars regarded as regrettably indispensable but dangerous” (Kelly, 1969: 349). This Greco-Roman “Grammar-Rhetoric” process was also, to my mind at least, a forerunner of the communicative approach of the latter part of the 20th century.
into elementary teaching [together with] construing, translation was an established procedure in the Latin classrooms of the East." It is also around this time that we see the emergence of St Jerome (347-420 AD), one of the most famous early Western translators, who followed the Roman rhetorician and politician, Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BC), and rejected "the word-for-word approach because, by following so closely the form of the ST, it produced an absurd translation, cloaking the sense of the original [...] allowed the sense or content, of the ST to be translated" (Munday, 2012: Loc 962).

All of the above is important, for, as noted by Arzamendi, Ball, Gassó and Hockly, the study of L2/FLs in the western world from the Roman period onwards "was focused on only two languages, Latin and Greek" [and in] "medieval Europe these languages were learned for the written communication among scholars, and from the Renaissance on they were key to all learning, literature, and philosophy." L2/FL teaching during this period was generally rooted "in what Steiner (1998: 319) calls a 'sterile' debate over the 'triadic model' of 'literalism', 'paraphrase' and 'free imitation'" (Munday, 2012: Loc 923), or more concisely, in a debate divided along 'word-for-word' (i.e. 'literal'/'metaphrase'/'formal equivalence') and 'sense-for-sense' (i.e. 'free'/'dynamic or functional equivalence') lines.

23 The "dismembering [of a] sentence, describing the grammatical function of each of its parts [...] linking them with vernacular equivalents. This exercise had relevance in teaching the cultural facts of the foreign language, as some of the comments dealt with literary and social topics" (Kelly, 1969: 132).

24 "Priscianus Caesariensis (fl. 500 AD), commonly known as Priscian [...] a Latin grammarian [who] wrote the Institutiones grammaticae ("Grammatical Foundations") [... the standard textbook for the study of Latin during the Middle Ages [that] provided the raw material for the field of speculative grammar" (Wikipedia, 2002: s.v. "Priscian").

25 Source Text.

26 However, in order to avoid any misunderstanding on his position and to avoid any charges of heresies, St Jerome explicitly made a "distinction between different text types. While he translated Ephehenius’s letter [see Appendix 3] idiomatically ('sense for sense'), the Bible, he says, necessitated a literal method that paid close attention to the words, syntax and ideas of the original" (Munday, 2012: Loc 973). It should be noted that while "St Jerome’s statement is usually taken to be the clearest expression of the 'literal' and 'free' poles in translation [the same concerns have been represented in other rich and ancient traditions such as in China and the Arab world" (Munday, 2012: Loc 973).

27 Henceforth referred to as Arzamendi, Ball et al.

28 According to Kelly (1969: 2), this is not exactly true. He notes that students did learn languages apart from Greek and Latin, although not formally. For example, Kelly (1969: 137) notes that "[t]here was some dilettante interest in the vernaculars shown by the compilation of glossaries like those of Kassel and Reichenau [during the classical revival of Charlemagne (c742-814)] but what this implied in the classroom is hard to say." Yu, Weihua (2001: 12) notes that prior to “the Renaissance, teachers (for example, Guarino Guarini, 1374-1460) taught people to use foreign languages as lingua francas all over Europe and they used informal and direct teaching methods".

29 According to Kelly (1969: 137) “the scholars patronizing attitude to the vernaculars kept them out of the classroom.”
While, as noted previously, “[t]ranslation as a language-teaching tool had had a brief trial during the third century in Alexandria and Gaul,\textsuperscript{30} and then had been abandoned until the late Middle Ages” (Kelly, 1969: 51), Steiner’s (1998) claim to the ‘literal’ versus ‘free’ translation debate’s sterility is noted in the lack of any real development in the whole area of translation over the next 1,000 years or so up until the Renaissance,\textsuperscript{31} the Reformation and the invention of the printing press.\textsuperscript{32} This controversy was largely dominated in the West by the debate over biblical translation. While the reformist Martin Luther (1483-1546) followed St Jerome’s rejection of a ‘word-for-word’ translation approach, he went a step further and applied his ‘sense-for-sense’ approach to the Bible. Munday (2012: Loc 1135) claims that Luther’s “infusion of the Bible with the language of ordinary people and his consideration of translation in terms that focused on the TL and the TT reader were crucial” in the promotion of vernacular translations as against the ecclesial/academic lingua franca, Latin.\textsuperscript{33}

Arzamendi, Ball \textit{et al.} (n.d.: 18) observe that the 17th century saw modern languages being taught by oral methods while the study of Latin and Greek was relegated to an intellectual discipline.\textsuperscript{34} However, in terms of modern languages, one does need to bear in mind the fact that “[v]ernacular grammars first appeared in the fourteenth century” (Kelly, 1969: 348).\textsuperscript{35} And of course one should not forget the role, as well as the historical impact on translation and L2/FL learning, of bilingual lexicography, a language translation aid which, according to Kelly (1969: 24), is understood through Western eyes as having

\begin{footnotes}
\item [30] A period lasting until at least the 5th/6th centuries AD; see pp. 7-8 and footnote 24 on Priscianus Caesariensis.
\item [31] According to Kelly (1969: 138) “[m]ost of our information about the Renaissance comes from early seventeenth-century England. The first step was always construing […] then, after the "construe" had been judged perfect, it was worked over until the English was acceptable” (Kelly, 1969: 138). Interestingly, Kelly (1969: 138) notes that while “this approach was practically confined to classical languages, modern languages [were] taught by "direct" methods.” An observation of importance for this project.
\item [32] Which Munday (2012: Loc 1085) notes as being “in China in the eleventh century CE and in Europe in the fifteenth century CE”.
\item [33] According to Kelly (1969: 400) “Latin remained important until well into the seventeenth century. Its usefulness as an auxiliary language had been considerably lessened by the well-intentioned and successful efforts of the Renaissance [i.e. Humanism] to set aside medieval developments and restore it to its classical shape.” Yu, Weihua (2004b: 251) notes that “Latin and Greek dominated the school curriculum [in the Middle Ages] and this situation continued till the end of the eighteenth century. The actual purpose of language learning was to train the ‘faculties’ of the brain, and produce scholars.”
\item [34] Yu, Weihua (2001: 11) observes that this formal approach to the study of classical Greek and Latin texts, “ with an emphasis on the teaching of grammatical rules and translation only, has contributed as one of the factors of the demise of classical Latin and Greek being used as lingua franca of Europe at the time”.
\item [35] Examples of which are “the \textit{Donet francois} [by the Englishman John Barton] at the beginning of the [14th] century [and in] Provençal, the \textit{Donatz proensals} (Faidit) and the \textit{Razos de trobar} (de Bezalu)” (Kelly, 1969: 348).
\end{footnotes}
had its origin in ancient Rome, with glossaries such as Greek-Latin ones known to have been utilised in the schools of Alexandria and Gaul, and later being known to have been used in conjunction with Vernacular-Latin ones, although how they were actually used in language classrooms is not always clear. Kelly (1969: 25) also notes the Renaissance witnessed the emergence of full-scale, often multilingual, dictionaries, which used Latin as the intermediary language. It also saw the publication of dictionaries without the intermediary Latin, with bilingual vocabularies growing in popularity as grammar and reading aids from the 17th century onwards. Finally Kelly (1969: 25) notes that bilingual dictionaries became a standard teaching resource from the late 18th century onwards.

Moving back more directly towards the world of L2/FL teaching, Rogers (2004: 635) notes that “[t]ranslation and foreign language teaching are historically and conceptually linked through their common goal of communication, but also divided through the different perspectives which each brings to this goal.” In terms of L2/FL teaching, Rogers (2004: 635), goes on to note that L2/FL teaching “aims to bring about various degrees of proficiency in spoken and/or written language and is only implicitly concerned with mediation between languages and cultures in so far as the learner is already proficient in at least one natural language,” whereas translation explicitly mediates between two languages, chiefly in their written form, and demands a high degree of proficiency in both the source language and the target language, in terms of linguistics and culture. Rogers (2004: 635) interestingly also notes that using translation in the L2/FL classroom makes the implicit linguistic and cultural mediation relationship explicit, an activation which, along with Kelly (1969: 171), she claims “has been an aspect of FL pedagogy through the ages.” Thus, if we are to follow Rogers´ thinking, we can see that the remit of this project lies in Rogers´ understanding of foreign language teaching, and not in translation per se.

37 This is not too unlike the earlier Roman belief that translation was only important in terms of texts being translated into the L1 of the Roman Empire, i.e. Latin, in order to strengthen students´ skills of rhetoric; see page 7.
38 Henceforth referred to as SL.
39 Henceforth referred to as TL.
40 In relation to levels of proficiency required for translators Baker (in 2004: 82-83) makes an interesting note to the effect that “many bilinguals are not effective at [interpretation] and [translation, as] bilinguals rarely have identical lexical knowledge in both languages [with the] term ‘balanced bilinguals’ [being] more of an idealised concept, as dominance in languages varies according to the contexts in which those languages are used.”
41 A point which is supported by the concept of “construing” see footnote 23.
42 See 1.2.1, pp. 3-4.
At this point, it may be helpful to review how Kelly cyclically evaluates the period from the end of Classical Rome until the modern period of the 19th century in his 1969 work entitled *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*. He does this by dividing the period into two cycles as follows:

The difference in the length of the two cyclic phases is striking. From the final abandonment of classical methodology (in this we include the social teaching of language as well as the formal) to the Renaissance is more than a thousand years; from Comenius, who marks the end of the Renaissance, until the development of the Direct Method is about 300 years. This is doubtless due both to social forces and to the means of transmission available. (Kelly, 1969: 399-400)

In the conclusion to the above work, Kelly (1969: 396) notes: “While one can ascribe a linear development to sciences, the development of an art is cyclical. Old approaches return, but as their social and intellectual context are changed, they seem entirely new.” He also notes that unlike artists “teachers [are] cursed with the assumption that their discoveries are necessarily an improvement on what went on before [and hence] are reluctant to learn from history” (1969: 396). This, being a particular charge against teachers, it provides us with an interesting framework with which to look back at what has gone before in the area of L2/FL teaching, through the so called “developments” in the world of L2/FL in the 19\textsuperscript{th}/20\textsuperscript{th} century epoch of the late modern era.\textsuperscript{44}

2.1 The Grammar-Translation Method

As noted earlier, Kelly (1969: 137) documents “[t]he first clear indication that translation was used as a teaching method comes from fourteenth-century England”, but the first development which I would like to look at is a L2/FL method which “emerged in Prussia at the end of the 18th century and became firmly entrenched in the 19th century” (Arazamendi, Ball \textit{et al.} n.d.: 19). This method is commonly referred to as the ‘Grammar-

\textsuperscript{43} Comenius (1592 – 1670) “regarded it as a waste of time and energy to learn a language for its own sake, and assumed that at the same time he was acquiring Latin, a pupil would be forming new concepts and associations” (Kelly, 1969: 11). Yu Weihua (2001: 12-13) notes that Comenius emphasised “the use of imitation, repetition, practice and meaning instead of rules only. For Comenius, foreign language teaching must be meaningful and a foreign language can only be meaningful if it refers to reality and needs”. Comenius was an important bridging educator between the late Renaissance and what came to be known as ‘The Age of Reason’, an epoch expressed in “[t]he Cartesian spirit of the seventeenth and eighteen centuries [which] matched the zeal of the grammatical speculative for grammatical analysis” (Kelly, 1969: 399), as he “changed from a teacher favouring active teaching to one who expected his pupils to derive practice from theory” (Kelly, 1969: 399).

\textsuperscript{44} This period is noteworthy in terms of L2/FL teaching from the point of view that, according to Graddol (2006: 18), our modern/postmodern understanding of what constitutes a ‘foreign language’ did not exist prior to the 18th century and he notes that it was only with the dawning of the “Enlightenment and the industrial and urban age of the 19th century [that the subsequent] rise of modern languages brought with it modern concepts of the ‘native speaker’ and its counterpart: the notion of a ‘foreign language’.”
Translation Method’.\textsuperscript{45} It is a deductive-type method that followed the traditional Latin/Greek teaching methods of the Middle Ages, but broadened their base to include modern languages.\textsuperscript{46} As noted by Richards and Rodgers (2006: Loc 121), the main goal of the Grammar-Translation Method was not to teach oral communication but to enable students to read the literature of the TL or develop intellectually through its mental discipline. The L1 is the acquisitional reference system and medium of instruction, with grammar rules via the basic sentence, translating sentences and texts into and out of the TL, bilingual word lists, and reading and writing, being the main constituents of a Grammar-Translation shaped lesson, with accuracy in translating being emphasised both for academic and moral reasons (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Locs 121,126 and 132).

As noted by Arzamendi, Ball \textit{et al.} (n.d.: 19) the above Grammar-Translation techniques are still being used nowadays, usually in conjunction with other techniques, but they were ultimately deemed a failure.\textsuperscript{47} Yu, Weihua (2004b: 251) notes Stern’s (1984: 456) criticism via four defects as follows: 1 – overemphasis of grammar rules; 2 – limitation of practice techniques; 3 – sheer size of the memorization; and 4 – lack of coherence with language facts. Such defects and the lack of oral and listening practice opportunities were noted in the early days of this method. In fact, “Ticknor, a professor of modern languages at Harvard, USA […] observed [in 1832] that spoken and active methods were best: they should begin in early childhood; and grammar should not be introduced until age 13” (Hawkins, 1987:129, in Yu, Weihua, 2004: 251). Howatt (1984, in Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 137) observes that the Grammar-Translation Method\textsuperscript{48} was largely demonised by those who took it to extremes in their attempts to show that modern languages, such as French or German, were just as rigorous linguistic disciplines

\\textsuperscript{45} Interestingly, and of note for this project, “from the late eighteenth century to the 1960s and beyond, language learning in secondary schools in many countries had come to be dominated by what was known as grammar-translation (Cook, 2010: 9-15).” (Munday 2012: Loc 594).

\textsuperscript{46} Kelly (1969: 403) makes an interesting observation in relation to this period when he notes that ‘the remaining traces of the old rhetorical approach kept Latin and Greek free from this method now known as “Grammar-Translation”’. However, Kelly (1969: 403) goes on to note that this situation had changed by the beginning of the nineteenth century as Latin and Greek increasingly lost their social function and the Cartesian/Age of Reason philosophy increasingly gained influence and emphasised the science of grammar and logic. As all languages were related to the same ‘first cause’ according to these philosophical approaches foreign languages came to be taught via the mother tongue and “[t]ranslation, which had served as an introduction to the arts of literature during the Renaissance, became a general workhorse.”

\textsuperscript{47} Yu, Weihua (2001: 11-12) notes that the Grammar-Translation Method has remained in use in various parts of the world up to today due to the fact that it is a method that could easily be used by language teachers with different degrees of teaching proficiency as it required few specialised teaching skills and was compatible with teaching L2/FL classes of varying sizes, and with developing various types of language tests.

\textsuperscript{48} It is perhaps apposite to highlight here Richards and Rodgers (2006: Loc 143) observation that “[t]here is no literature that offers a rationale or justification for [the Grammar-Translation Method] or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology, or educational theory.”
as were the study of classical languages. However, for the purposes of this project, the negative impact of this method on language teaching in the 20th century, especially in the second half, cannot be overstated, as “[t]ranslation as a tool for learning English has had a very bad reputation since the days of the Grammar Translation Method” (Dahlgren and Sitwell, n.d.: 31).

2.2 The Reform Movement

Late 19th century innovative reactions to the Grammar-Translation Method included the ideas of people such as C. Marcel (1793-1896), T. Prendergast (1806-1886) and F. Gouin (1831-1896). Marcel highlighted meaning in learning, the teaching of reading before other skills and the location of language teaching within a broader educational setting. Prendergast proposed a structural approach, recommending that students be first introduced to the basic structural patterns of a language. Finally, Gouin used situations and themes to organize and present oral language along with gestures and actions in order to indicate and ensure clarity of meaning (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Locs 152 and 160).

All of the above reactions and innovations influenced the emergence of what came to be known as the ‘Reform Movement’, which was composed of reformed-minded language teachers and linguists. Towards the end of the 19th century, these reformers started to organize themselves better to further promote their ideas, especially the importance of speech over the written word in language learning, largely as the result of a growing demand for oral proficiency in modern languages due to increased opportunities for communication within Europe (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 147), and the dissatisfaction with traditional foreign language teaching methodology within formal educational settings. This period saw the emergence of linguists such as Willhelm Viёtor, who published his ideas in an influentially famous pamphlet in 1882 entitled “Language teaching must start afresh!” that forcefully criticized the Grammar-Translation Method and strongly recommended training teachers in the newly emerging science of phonetics (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 184).

The most well-known proposal in Viёtor’s pamphlet was the call for “a monolingual principle in foreign language teaching which led to the so-called Direct Method” (Schilder, 2004: 511). This monolingual principle advocated “the exclusion of the native language (or other, previously acquired languages) from the classroom, the target language being both

49 As noted by Kelly (1969: 398), Viёtor’s publishing of this pamphlet “definitely launched […] the modern period [which] had been in preparation since the beginning of the nineteenth century. Modern languages, but not classical, had once more asserted themselves as social tools.”
the object and the sole medium of teaching [because] we learn what we practise” (Butzkamm, 2004: 415). This principle was based on the belief that TL acquisition was similar to mother tongue acquisition and that using only the TL would “help pupils to associate words and structures with their meanings in a direct way” (Schilder, 2004: 511), that is, without interference from the mother tongue. Arzamendi, Ball et al.’s (n.d.: 24) observation about the Scottish teacher, J.S. Blackie, is of interest here. They note that in the 1850s Blackie was recommending the avoidance of students L1/mother tongue, the subordination of grammar, and the promotion of meaning through the direct association of word with object, thus leading them to crediting Blackie with “the origins of what would become the Direct Method”. While there were many other outcomes from the emergence of the Reform Movement, such as the founding of the International Phonetic Association (IPA) in 1886, the work of the Reform Movement also resulted in the monolingual principle being given its theoretical justification by F. Franke (1884), who outlined the psychological principles of connecting forms and meanings in the TL by direct association. Franke (1984, in Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 205), claimed that a L2/FL could best be taught inductively by teachers promoting direct and spontaneous use in the classroom rather than taking a deductive analytical, grammatical rule-focused approach that is, the approach favoured in the traditional Grammar-Translation Method.

2.3 The Direct Method

Since this project is about using translation in the L2/FL classroom, we must now turn to the Direct Method. This was a natural method that was influential from the nineteenth century up until World War II, whose proponents, such as L. Sauveur (1826-1907), are noted by Richards and Rodgers (2006: Loc 205) to have “argued that a foreign language could be taught without translation or the use of the learner’s native language if meaning

50 In support of this “we learn what we practise” maxim, Butzkamm (2004: 415-416) claims it “has always been understood [citing monastery schools where monks,] while using translation in the classrooms, stipulated that only Latin be used outside the classroom, and boys caught using the vernacular where punished.”

51 According to Butzkamm (2004: 416). “[e]ven today, in the teaching guidelines issued by education authorities of many countries, there is a clear taboo against using the mother tongue – evidently an echo of the Reform Movement of more than a hundred years ago.”

52 This association was subsequently responsible for the international phonetic alphabet that became an important tool for research purposes and the teaching of pronunciation in L2/FL classrooms.

53 Richards and Rodgers (2006: Loc 200) claim that the natural method of making L2/FL learning like first language learning has actually been tried intermittently throughout language teaching history. They cite the sixteenth century example of Montaigne who learnt Latin in the home of a guardian wherein he was completely immersed in same for the first few years of his life, thus reminding us of Kelly’s (1969: ix) claim that there is very little that is actually new in the world of language teaching; see footnote 5.

54 According to Kelly (1969: 51), “[t]hough the basis of [the Grammar-Translation Method] had existed during the Renaissance, it did not appear in the form so hated by the Direct Methodists until the end of the eighteenth century”; see footnote 46.
was conveyed directly through demonstration and action." Hence, as noted by Arzamendi, Ball et al. (n.d.: 25) students were expected to comprehend the L2/FL without translation or using their L1 as a medium of instruction, thus putting the emphasis on the teacher’s skills (e.g. using mime, sketches or explanations) to clarify and ensure meaning. Its emphasis "on oral and [listening] communicative skills […] had a great impact on the later ['Audiolingual' and 'Audio-Visual'] methods [and like the Grammar-Translation method, it] is still possible to find some of its traces in today’s foreign language teaching methods" (Yu, Wenhua, 2004a, 2004: 178).

While the Direct Method became very successful in private language schools, it did not enjoy the same level of success in public secondary education. According to Richards and Rodgers (2006: Locs 217 and 223) this was because it placed too much emphasis on the similarities between the L1 and L2/FL, thus distorting them. Besides, it did not consider the practical realities of the classroom, and was over-reliant on L2/FL native speaking teachers, since not all other non-native L2/FL teachers were suitably proficient in the L2/FL to fully follow the principles of the Direct Method. Hence, while the Direct Method and other proposals of the reformers had great influence in the L2/FL classroom of the 19th century, the ongoing professional debate between those for and against its methods were very pronounced. In Schilder’s words (2004: 512): “[I]t became evident in the first decade of the twentieth century that compromises had to be found. Finally a combination or a mixture of the direct approach and the traditional attitudes towards reading, learning grammar and translating developed.”

As the Direct Method declined in popularity as a result of the above Grammar-Translation versus Direct Method tensions, the 1920s and 1930s saw the inauguration of

---

55 In relation to the Audio-Visual method and the use of pictures (and objects) to convey meaning availed of by the Direct Method “many teachers were aware that a pupil would automatically work out his own translated equivalent of the native word denoting the object […] In Europe, consciousness of cultural-disparity caused some uneasiness over the validity of audio-visual methods” (Kelly, 1969: 23).

56 Thus, Elizabeth Murphy’s point should be noted here that “[w]hile the method enjoyed popularity in Europe in the early part of the [20th Century] it proved less effective in public education in North America where opportunities for oral practice and native-speaking teachers were less common” (2000, slide 11/30). It should also be noted that the Direct Method was promoted in the United States by Sauveur and Maximilian Berlitz (who used the title the Berlitz Method for his method) (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 209).

57 Interestingly, and appositely, Harvard psychologist Roger Brown (1973: 5, in Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 229) has described similar frustrations with a strict adherence to Direct Method principles in Japan where he observed a teacher doing verbal gymnastics trying explain the meaning of Japanese words when a more efficient technique would have been to use translation).

58 However, it has to be noted that ‘many Direct Methodists […] considered translation to be of considerable value [although unfortunately] for the Direct Method, rejection of translation became its trademark, Palmer [1917] even going so far as to describe this opinion as the “Fallacy of the Direct Method”’ (Kelly, 1969: 25-26).
the “methods era.” This era saw the systematisation and independent development of two similar strands within ELT of the tenets of the Reform Movement: the Reading Method, the Army Method, and Audiolingualism, used in the United States, and on the other hand, the Oral Approach, or Situational Language Teaching, applied in Britain; see Arzamendi, Ball et al., (n.d.: 26).

2.4 The United States

2.4.1 - The Reading Method

In the US the Reading Method saw students being “trained to read the foreign language with direct apprehension of meaning, but without conscious effort to translate [so that,] if there were any words the students did not understand, they would infer meaning from the context” (Arzamendi, Ball et al., n.d.: 27). Only secondary importance was given to speaking in the TL and “students were usually unable to comprehend and speak the language beyond the very simplest exchanges” (Arzamendi, Ball et al., n.d.: 27).

2.4.2 - The Army Method

While, in reality, as noted by Darian (1972, in Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 699) English L2 teachers in the United States between the two World Wars used “either a modified Direct Method approach, a reading-based approach, or a reading-oral approach.” the outbreak of World War II in 1939 and the US entry into same at the end of 1941 “made it imperative for the US military to teach foreign language learners to speak and understand a language quickly and efficiently” (Arzamendi, Ball et al., n.d.: 30). This new reality led to a communicative method known as the Army Method emerging via a 1942 programme known as ASTP (“Army Specialised Training Programme”) (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 703), which involved small classes of mature and highly motivated L2/FL learners being exposed to intensive contact with the TL (Arzamendi, Ball et al., n.d.: 31). In terms of L2/FL language teaching the lasting value of this method was

---

59 While “[T]hroughout the history of language teaching, reading has been approached as part of the other skills teachers were to impart […] from the Renaissance on, it was usually conflated with the art of translation, achieving complete independence only during the twentieth century”(Kelly, 1969: 128).

60 This method was introduced in the United States following the publication of the Coleman Report (1929) which indicated that no single method could ensure L2/FL success due to the limited time available, along with “the limited skills of teachers, and the perceived irrelevance of conversation skills in a foreign language for the average American college student” (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 231). It aimed to equip students with a reading knowledge of their chosen L2/FL through gradually increasing students exposure to words and grammatical structures through the medium of simple reading texts (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 231).

61 While rapid-silent reading was the goal of the Reading Method, teachers often introduced discussion of the particular passage’s contents in English thus leading to an ‘impure’ variant known as the Reading-Oral Method (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 699).

2.4.3 - Audiolingualism

While the ASTP approach was very successful in military circles, it was less so in the general school educational environment, and eventually was replaced in the US in the 1950s by a method known as Audiolingualism. This method was based on “structural linguistics theory, contrastive analysis, aural-oral procedures, and behaviourist psychology” (Arzamendi, Ball et al., n.d.: 31), and taught students largely through the medium of speaking, with written representations being introduced at later stages. It followed the order of listening (to train students in the aural discrimination of basic sound patterns), speaking, reading and writing (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 827). In Audiolingualism, one of the chief aims was to reduce the possibilities of student error in in the skills of speaking and writing by presenting new items of the TL via a tightly structured approach (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 832), an aim which is achieved through dialogues, repetitious drills and linguistically-patterned exercises. As noted by Arzamendi, Ball et al., (n.d.: 35) the L1 was avoided as far as was possible but, unlike the Direct Method, it was never prohibited.

It has to be noted that translation was used in structured-based L2/FL teaching programmes grounded on contrastive analysis/CA techniques, particularly in the United States, as part of L2/FL teaching programmes in the 1950s and 1960s. However, following academic criticism, such as that of “Noam Chomsky’s “Review of 'Verbal Behaviour' by B.F. Skinner” (1959), CA and translation, as key elements in this approach, were [...] abandoned by the EFL teaching world” (Owen, 2003: 7th paragraph).

While Audiolingualism reached its peak in the 1960s and was utilised both in the teaching of foreign languages in the United States and within ESL and EFL classrooms, later research, such as the ‘Pennsylvania Project’ led by Philip Smith from 1965-1969, “showed explicit grammatical instruction in the mother language to be more productive”

---

63 “Contrastive analysis (CA) is an area of comparative [linguistics] which is concerned with the comparison of two or more languages or subsystems of languages to determine the differences or similarities between them […] for theoretical purposes or for purposes external to the analysis itself” (Sajaavara, 2004: 140).
64 It is probably important to point out that my project is generally concerned with translation/student L1 use within the monolingual ELT classroom, wherein lies my ELT experience, and not with mainstream primary/secondary English language teaching, which seems to have followed the Grammar-Translation methodology well into the second part of the 20th century, and is an area of L2/FL teaching not within the scope of my teaching experience.
(Arzamendi, Ball et al., n.d.: 31-32), and was one of a number of developments which led to a rapid decrease in the popularity of Audiolingualism in the late 1960s/early 1970s.  

2.5 Great Britain

The British Oral Approach, a version of structuralism probably better described by the title “Situational Approach”, emerged in England between the 1930s and the 1960s and was led by linguists such as Harold Palmer (1877–1949) and A.S. Hornby (1898-1978). According to Richards and Rodgers (2006: Loc 522), the Oral Approach has greatly impacted EFL/ESL textbook and courses up to today, for example, Streamline English (Hartley and Viney,1978), which is still used today, although the current influence of this approach is not readily acknowledged. The main benefit of the Oral/Situational Approach over the Direct Method was that it offered L2/FL learners systematic principles of selection, gradation and presentation, whereas the Direct Method, as noted by Pattison (1964: 4, in Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 558) “was bewildered by a flow of ungraded speech, suffering all the difficulties [the L2/FL student] would have encountered in picking up the language in its normal environment and losing most of the compensating

---

65 One being Chomsky’s (b. 1928) (1966: 153, in Arzamendi, Ball et al., n.d.: 37) theoretical claim: “[L]anguage is not a habit structure. Ordinary linguistic behaviour characteristically involves innovation, formation of new sentences and patterns in accordance with rules of great abstractness and intricacy”. This, a criticism expanded upon in his theory of “Transformational Grammar”, wherein he claimed that “[s]entences are not learned by imitation and repetition but “generated” from the learner’s underlying “competence”” (Arzamendi, Ball et al., n.d.: 37). Thus, for Chomsky, “the fundamental properties of language derive from innate aspects of the mind and from how humans process experience through language” (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 908). However, in the context of this project, it should be noted that “Chomsky never reflected on the problems of any type of language teaching, and, on seeing the impact which his ideas made in this field, he even stressed that they were too abstract to be applied in a classroom” (Hüllen, 2004: 106).

66 Wherein linguists such as the Australian George Pittman (in Richards and Rodgers 1986: 38, in Arzamendi, Ball et al., n.d.: 29) defined “situation” as “the use of concrete objects, pictures, and realia, which together with actions and gestures can be used to demonstrate the meanings of new language items.”

67 Palmer (Buktzkamm, 2003: Maxim 3) also noted that there is a “distinction between a quick, initial grasp of meaning and the subsequent acquisition of fluency in using the new language items, the latter requiring considerable time and effort.” Buktzkamm (2003: Maxim 3) also notes Hawkins (1981: 133) observation in relation to Palmer’s distinction above being cast aside in the 1960s as “[i]nsecure teachers, anxious to be in the fashion, were to be seen going through every kind of contortion […] trying to get precise meaning across to their class without letting slip a word of English”. This is a situation not too unlike the CLT [neophyte] teacher situation in the latter part of the 20th century, and as my own CELTA teacher training also witnessed, in the 21st century.

68 A situation which, according to Richards and Rodgers (2006: Loc 673), is due to the Oral/Situational Approach “emphasis on oral practice, grammar, and sentence patterns, [which conforms] to the intuitions of many language teachers and [offers] a practical methodology suited to countries where national EFL/ESL syllabuses continue to be grammatically based”.

69 “[T]he procedures by which lexical and grammatical content was chosen” (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 554).

70 “Principles by which the organization and sequencing of content were determined” (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 554).

71 “[T]echniques used for presentation and practice of items in a course” (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 554).
benefits of better contextualization in those circumstances.” While the British Oral/Situational Approach and Audiolingualism, as mainstream teaching methods, are very similar the British Oral/Situational Approach was slightly more positive than Audiolingualism towards the use of the L1 in the classroom in that it “accepted the use of the native language when explaining the meaning of some words or some grammar point of a strictly functional kind [with the occasional translation being] allowed as a checking method on comprehension of precise details in reading” (Arzamendi, Ball et al., n.d.: 29).

2.6 A Paradigm Shift

Turning to the 1970s we see language teaching in the United States going down the psychological and psycholinguistic route while Europe was more concerned “with a new vision of language” (Arzamendi, Ball et al., n.d.: 45). However, while the Direct Method maintained its dominance in both the U.S and Europe, it had not eliminated the use of translation from all 20th century methodology. For example, the 1970s saw the emergence of innovative language teaching approaches, such as Giogi Lozanov’s “Suggestology/Suggestopedia” methodology being applied to L2/FL learning, a methodology wherein “[v]ocabulary was a central issue and [...] memorisation of vocabulary pairs and lexical translation rather than contextualisation” was stressed (Arzamendi, Ball et al.: 59). Having noted this apposite fact in relation to this project, the main observation to be taken on board from the 1970s through the 1980s was the emergence of the “communicative movement,” which attempted “to move the focus away from grammar as the core component of language [...] to language as communication and [to] making the classroom an environment for authentic communication” (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 965).

This “communicative movement” saw both the European and American strands of the Direct Method reconnecting in the late 1970s/1980s through the emergence of Communicative Language Teaching as a result of the above paradigm shift. As noted by Richards and Rodgers (2006: Locs 1978,1983,1989,1994), CLT was largely a British innovation challenging the Oral/Situational Approach arising out the writings of linguists

---

72 “Suggestology/Suggestopedia” received backing as a teaching method superior to many traditional methods from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization/UNESCO in a report presented “ by the Experts from the Working Group on Suggestology as a Learning Methodology Meeting in Sofia, December 11–17, 1978” (Wikipedia, 2005: s.v. “Suggestopedia”). However, like other approaches of the time, such as Total Physical Response, Silent Way, Counseling Learning, it has to be noted that Suggestology/Suggestopedia”, as an alternative non-mainstream approach, has declined in popularity and is now of little more than historical linguistic methodological interest (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 975).
such as D.A. Wilkins (1972) who promoted a notional functional approach, later promulgated in his 1976 work entitled *Notional Syllabuses*. This paradigm shift was also influenced by factors such as the spread of the European Community, the work of the Council of Europe, the ongoing increase in “[t]he number of secondary schools offering languages […] worldwide in the 1960s and 1970s as part of a general trend of curriculum-broadening and modernization [of] foreign-language study [ceasing] to be confined to the elite academies” (Wikipedia, 2004. s.v. “Communicative Language Teaching”), the increasing trend of progressivism in education, and the growing dissatisfaction among applied linguists as regards the benefits of the situational approach.

### 2.7 Communicative Language Teaching

Basically, Communicative Language Teaching, or CLT for short, is an approach which ranges from strong to weak varieties that have at their core *communicative competence*, a concept “introduced into discussions of language use and second/foreign language learning in the early 1970s” and “defined in terms of the expression, [interpretation] and negotiation of meaning [, with the identification] of learner communicative needs [providing] a basis for curriculum design” (Savignon, 1972/1997/2004:124). According to Liao (2006: 192), the L1/Mother Tongue of students’ has no role to play in the CLT approach, with many teachers arguing that if students wish to achieve native-like control of the TL, then it is necessary for them to think in the TL rather than to engage in translation, or in a reprocessing of the TL into their L1/Mother Tongue. However, it would be untrue to state that all proponents of CLT rule out any use whatsoever of the students L1/Mother Tongue, as is seen in the work of Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983: 91-93, in Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Locs 2005, 2010). These authors contrast the major distinctive features of the Communicative Approach with the Audiolingual Method and

---

73 “Notions” referring to concepts such as location, time, frequency, quantity, sequence, etc and “functions” referring to requests, complaints, threats, denials, offers, etc (Arzamendi *et al*, n.d.: 78, and Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 1983).

74 A very influential document to eventually emerge from this European body was the *Common European Framework Of Reference For Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment/CEFR* or *CEF* (2001) which seeks, among other aims, “[t]o promote, encourage and support the efforts of teachers and learners at all levels to apply in their own situation the principles of the construction of language-learning systems […] within the Council of Europe ‘Modern languages’ programme” (*CEFR*, 2001: 3, section 1.2).

75 For example, “[i]n Britain, the introduction of comprehensive schools meant that almost all children had the opportunity to study foreign languages” (Mitchell, 1994: 33-35, in Wikipedia, 2004: s.v. “Communicative Language Teaching”).


77 “This was partly in response to Chomsky’s insights into the nature of language. Chomsky had shown that the structural theories of language prevalent at the time could not explain the creativity and variety evident in real communication” (Wikipedia, 2004: s.v. “Communicative Language Teaching”), as referred to in footnote 65.

78 See footnote 18.
note that, while in Audiolingualism “the students native language is forbidden”, and “[t]ranslation is forbidden at early levels”, in CLT, a “[j]udicious use of native language is accepted where feasible”, and “[t]ranslation may be used where students need or benefit from it” (Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Locs 2005, 2010).

Having said the above, Rodríguez Juárez and Oxbrow´s (2007: 94) observation is probably more representative of CLT. They mention Ferrer´s (2005: 1) claim that any use of the mother tongue in the L2/FL CLT classroom has “excited rather negative attitudes in the SLA literature as well as a certain amount of guilt on the part of practising teachers.” However, the fact that activities in CLT “typically involve students in real or realistic communication, where the accuracy of the language they use is less important than successful achievement of the communicative task they are performing” (Harmer, 2001: 85), does not necessarily rule out L1/Mother Tongue use and/or the judicious use of translation. Also, one point which I hope to explore in part 2 of this project, is Liao’s (2006: 192) observation that “[w]hile many [CLT] foreign language educators may have ignored the role of translation in language teaching, from the learners’ perspective, translation is still widely used in their learning.”

Lennon and Ball (n.d.: 15) note that while CLT is still the dominant English language teaching model/movement, its original meaning has somehow metamorphosed into being a protective umbrella term for new movements and methods. Indeed it is under this protective shade that we now turn to in the second part of this project, “Looking Around Today”, in order to explore how translation as a [potential] language teaching tool, is being viewed, especially as “there has been a definite move away from communication per se to a new, more pragmatic view of language learning that views the language as an instrument to do something else” (Lennon and Ball, n.d.: 15),79 with linguists such as Graddol going so far as stating that “English is no longer a language but a core skill” (Lennon and Ball, n.d.: 16).

79 Motivation in L2 is identified as being “perhaps the only intake variable that has been consistently found, in various contexts and at various levels of L2 development, to correlate positively with successful learning outcome” (Kumaravadivelu, 2006: 39). Social psychologists Gardner and Lambert (1972, in Kumaravadivelu, 2006: 39), made a binary distinction within motivation between “integrative motivation” and “instrumental motivation” with Kumaravadivelu, (2006: 39) defining the latter as being “an interest in learning an L2 for functional purposes such as getting a job or passing an exam.” This is the type of motivation that drives the vast majority of the business English students that I encounter in my professional teaching.
3. Part 2: LOOKING AROUND TODAY

In Part 1, ‘Looking Back’, we saw that translation and the use of the L1/Mother Tongue have always been somehow present in the world of L2/FL teaching in some shape or form. However, Kelly (1969: 24) notes that the *avant-garde* of L2/FL teachers throughout the 20th century refused to acknowledge translation or the use of the L1/MT as a valid teaching approach in order to convey meaning. This view was well expressed by West’s (1941, in Kelly, 1969: 24), statement that “[e]very time a child refers to an English-Vernacular dictionary his mind is switched out of English and he is encouraged to translate instead of thinking in English.” Indeed, the negative attitude to the L1/MT is well described by Butzkamm (2003: 12th paragraph): “[f]oreign language teachers build islands that are in constant danger of being flooded by the sea of the mother tongue. They have to fight back this sea, build dams against it, stem its tide.” This refusal to consider any benefit in using translation in the classroom is a view that is in conflict with the Grammar-Translation method and its roots in traditional translation/language teaching approaches, either implicitly or explicitly, with Prodromou’s acknowledgement (2001, in Vaezi and Mirzaei, 2007: Introduction, 5th paragraph), that the L1/MT has always been present, since most English non-native teachers have used it in some shape or form in their classes, and with my own L2/FL teaching experience, at least in terms of teaching A1 – A2 English L2/FL students.

I believe it is apposite now to introduce my own professional language teaching background. I am an eight-year TEFL/CELTA qualified native speaker of English, who has come from a background identified by Owen (2003: 9th paragraph). That is, I belong to a large group of inexperienced teachers who have been dissuaded from using the L1/MT of their students, and, indeed, actively encouraged to avoid its use, without any serious thought being given to why its use was a taboo subject. It is only as a result of reflecting upon my own experience, wherein I too have encountered the need within the monolingual classroom to use the students L1/MT on occasion, that I have become interested in the potential value of using translation or the students’ L1 as an L2/FL promoting tool.

---

80 Henceforth referred to as MT.
81 By “implicitly”, I am here thinking of Kumaravadivelu’s (2006: 45) definition that “[i]mplicit knowledge refers to information learners intuit about the TL., even though they cannot articulate that information in the form of rules or principles.”
82 By “explicitly”, I am here thinking of Kumaravadivelu’s (2006: 45) definition that “[e]xplicit knowledge refers to the learners’ knowledge about the TL, their L1, and their knowledge of the world.”
83 An experience reinforced by Lavault’s (1985, in Mogahed, 2011: 11th paragraph) observation “that one of the reasons quoted by teachers to explain their use of translation in the classroom was that students asked for this exercise and enjoyed it, too.”
Therefore the question that now arises, and that part 1 of this project demonstrates, is a historically important question within L2/FL teaching. Are my non-native L1-using colleagues and myself doing our students a disservice, or are we, as I believe we are when we use their L1/MT within the classroom, doing them a L2/FL advancement service? In other words, is “translation in L2/foreign language teaching: an aid or a hindrance?” Owen (2003: penultimate paragraph), asks a similar question in his definition of translation. He states that translation is a “process involving at least one mediator with certain bilingual abilities, in which an attempt is made to transfer the meanings established in one language into an oral or written expression, which conveys an equivalent message, framed within a second language”. This leads him to stating that, as L2/FL teachers, we are merely trying to help our students to get their meaning across the barrier of incomprehension that all language users face, and in doing so Owen (2003: final paragraph) asks “Can that really be described as failing to address our students’ needs? Where’s the treason in that?”

At this point I would like to recall Rogers’ (2004: 635) observation that the aim of L2/FL teaching is to develop students’ oral and written proficiency skills, with the use of translation making the implicit nature of mediation between the languages and cultures explicit.\textsuperscript{84} It is with Rogers’ understanding of L2/FL teaching in mind, along with the recent re-emergence of linguistic pedagogical interest in the value of translation as an English L2/FL teaching aid, that I now wish to explore whether contemporary research on translation as an English L2/FL teaching aid is a valued English L2/FL learning resource at all levels within the A1 – C2 linguistic range. In order to achieve this daunting task I will now set out to explore contemporary and relevant literature within the fields of TEFL / TESL / TEAL / TESOL, under the umbrella of ELT, with some reference to the teaching of other languages as an L2/FL.

However, before doing this I would now like to refer the reader to Appendix 2. In his 1988 diagram, Holmes divides Applied Translation into three sections: Translator Training / Translator Aids / Translator Criticism. Munday (2012: Loc 724), suggests that a quick glance at this diagram indicates that the applied side has not been fully developed and perhaps is nowadays a little dated. However, Munday (2012: Loc 731) also indicates that it “is still often employed as a point of departure.”\textsuperscript{85} Hence, in order to keep my research into the current theories within bounds, I will base my research on an adapted version of Holmes ‘Map of Translation Studies’, shown in figure 1:

\textsuperscript{84} See page 10.
\textsuperscript{85} Azizinezhad (2011, 1st paragraph) refers to this post-point of departure in terms of “the ‘missing link’ of Holmes’ map of translation studies.”
3.1 Contemporary L2/FL Arguments Against L1 Use In The L2/FL Classroom

In an article entitled “T is for Translation” Thornbury (2010a: 4th paragraph) sums up the main reasons put forward for not using translation in teaching via six main arguments, as follows:

- Translation encourages a dependence on the L1, at the expense of the learner constructing an independent L2 system.\(^{87}\)

---

\(^{86}\) See Appendix 2 for the original version.
\(^{87}\) Swift (2006: 2nd paragraph), claims that the main concern of those against using the L1 in language teaching is “that students will become dependent on it, and not even try to understand
Translation encourages the notion of equivalence between languages, yet no two languages are exactly alike (although languages from the same language family may be similar in lots of respects).\textsuperscript{88}

The L1 system interferes with the development of the L2 system.\textsuperscript{89}

Translation is the “easy” approach to conveying meaning, and is therefore less memorable than approaches that require more mental effort, such as working out meaning from the context.\textsuperscript{90}

The “natural” way of acquiring a language is through direct experience and exposure, not through translation.\textsuperscript{91}

Translation is simply not feasible in classes of mixed nationalities, or where the teacher does not speak the learners’ L1.\textsuperscript{92}

meaning from context and explanation, or express what they want to say within their limited command of the target language (L2)”, two important real world communication skills.\textsuperscript{88}

Newson (1988: 6) included this point among the main disadvantages of translation as a teaching and testing tool in an EFL situation, noting that translation gives false credence to the idea that there is a perfect one-to-one correspondence between languages, a view shared throughout the history of language, as part 1 of this project demonstrates.\textsuperscript{89}

Swift (2006: 3rd paragraph) notes that the Direct Method/Audiolingualism approach advocated the avoidance of the L1 because linguistic habits were already ingrained therein, a set of habits which it was believed would interfere with the process of establishing a new set of linguistic habits within the developing TL. This point is supported by Mahboob (2011: 4th paragraph), who notes that English language teacher training in the 20th century was rooted in the Direct Approach in which local native languages were viewed as a threat to students acquiring the TL and hence were not taken into consideration when pedagogical material was being developed or in the training of TL teachers. However, Owen (2003: 8th paragraph) notes that “[i]n 1982, Heidi Dulay, Mariana Burt and Stephen D. Krashen asserted that L1 errors in L2 accounted for a mere 5% of errors produced overall”, and that “the influence of L1 on L2 was almost irrelevant (!).” But having said that, Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982, in Owen, 2003: 8th paragraph) still opposed the use of translation in the L2/FL classroom claiming that it introduced transference errors to language production and thus complicated the student learning process. This point was also argued by Newson (1988: 6) when he states that translation promotes thinking in one language and subsequent transference of same into the TL, with all the associated interference such transference entails.\textsuperscript{90}

According to Owen (2003: 20th paragraph), one of the essential components of communicative competence is the area of learning strategies, which he sees as the learned ability/skill "to negotiate meaning […] that has to be developed from the earliest stages. He believes that "[t]ranslation simply 'provides' meaning: students who have not had to develop coping strategies will be seriously disadvantaged when translation aid is not on hand" (Owen, 2003: 20th paragraph). The validity of this claim could be challenged by Richards and Rodgers (2006: Loc 903) observation in relation to the decline of Audiolingualism, namely, they note that students “were often found to be unable to transfer skills acquired through Audiolingualism to real communication outside the classroom”. That is, the problem of not being able to transfer meaning, etc. could have something to do with poor learning strategies, rather than the presence/absence of translation within the L2/FL learning environment.\textsuperscript{91}

The most obvious parallel example that comes to mind here is the 20th century “learning versus acquisition debate, or the role of conscious contemplation of grammatical structures as opposed to informal learning. (e.g. Krashen, 1988)” (Rodríguez Juarez and Oxbrow, 2008: 93).\textsuperscript{92}

My English language teaching experience to date has been in a monolingual L1/MT student setting (i.e. Spanish), and hence I have chosen to limit my project to exploring translation/the use of students L1 within the L2/FL classroom to the monolingual setting, but I do see space in a multi-lingual classroom setting for translation in terms of building up student autonomy, and moving student L2/FL learning forward, through availing of their L1 in appropriately designed tasks, and I thus agree with Owen (2003: 28th paragraph) when he notes that in such multilingual settings the role of the teacher, especially as arbiter, is likely to be very dissimilar to, and perhaps even nullified, when compared to the monolingual group/class teacher, which may not necessarily be a
According to Owen (2003: 13th paragraph), another argument against using translation is that forcing students to share some of their limited L2/FL use time with their L1 will reduce L2/FL acquisition opportunities, and hence is not an efficient use of class resources. This argument is reinforced by Jones´ (2010: 7) observation on Duff and Polio´s (1990) belief that students need as much exposure to the TL as possible in order to reach the level they desire, with L2/FL instructors thus offering such students the only L2/FL input accessible. As an L2/FL teacher who mainly teaches Business English, this is an important argument for any Business English language course. A teacher should be very careful to assess students´ perceptions, and explain the rationale behind any potential L1 use within the Business English language classroom, before introducing it, if he/she wishes to avoid unnecessary problems during the course, both with the students and with the school´s academic authorities.

In the introduction we saw that the use of the L1 in the L2/FL classroom partly went out of fashion, in theory at least, as a reaction to the development of Grammar-Translation in the 19th and early 20th centuries, a method “which saw language learning as a means towards intellectual development rather than as being for utilitarian, communicative purposes” (Swift, 2006: 3rd paragraph). Nowadays, in the 21st century, what seems to matter more and more is an English speaker’s “functional nativeness’ regardless of how they learned or use the language” (Graddol, 2006: 110). Such negative consequence. In some web blog post replies to Thornbury’s (2010: responses, 23/04/2010 – steph (17: 12: 56) and 17/01/2011 – Wolfgang Butzkamm (18: 08: 30), ) article entitled “T is for Translation”, managing/clarification of instructional techniques/grammar points, for when a teacher does not know the students L1, are discussed which are quite useful, such as using peer translation as a classroom resource, which I think could also be used even if the teacher does speak the students L1. In terms of multilingual groups, Owen (2003: 28th paragraph) notes that translation can be used effectively at all L2/FL levels by placing students into similar linguistic-family groupings, plenary class oral activities around L1 pragmatics and its L2 similarities/differences, and in “various types of dictionary work and in multi-task activities in which, for example, a range of different L1 texts on a monographic issue (or news event, etc.) are taken from the net, translated and compared through class discussion.” Areas I hope to explore further in part 3 of this project.  

An important argument in terms of promoting the rate of acquisition, wherein the sole, intensive exposure to TL within the classroom is argued as being the primary means of speeding up the acquisitional process, within a TL challenged/lacking environment. As we are now well and truly into the 21st century, Graddol (2006) suggests a new “paradigm shift” is required due to the effects of ‘globalisation’. Globalisation means that the world has become a smaller place in terms of the demographic movements of people, economy, technology, society and languages. It also means that the world is emerging from its ‘modern’ beginnings in terms of ‘English as a foreign language’ towards a world in which the sociolinguist Braj Kacru’s 1985 ‘tri-circular model of English’ (see Graddol, 2006: 110) has somehow metamorphosed so that the ‘inner circle’, which was traditionally inhabited by native English speakers, has now swallowed up the inhabitants of all three circles, via pro/anti – linguistic imperialistic/genocidal globalised tentacles, and has begun to give birth to a new linguistic “world”, a “world” in which English as an international language (EIL) or what is known nowadays as “intelligible English” is starting to challenge native English models. A “world” which, as we shall see in the next section, may benefit from the inclusion of translation/students’ L1, as an additional L2/FL acquiring tool.
“functional nativeness” in terms of “instrumental English”\textsuperscript{95} and L2/TL students’ needs is clearly evident in the world of Business English, which is largely the context in which I teach.

The ongoing popularity of the Natural/Direct Method, largely under the umbrella of CLT methodology, as seen in part one of this project, indicates that the use of the L1/MT in the English L2/FL classroom is still not favoured by the vast majority of English L2/FL teachers/linguists, a concern which cannot be lightly ignored by L1/MT professional proponents. However, while most, if not all, English language teachers would identify with the above concerns in terms of any L1/MT use within the English language classroom, some teachers/linguists are increasingly coming to openly admit the possibility of there being a place for translation/L1 use, albeit a ‘judicious use’, a point that is borne out by Prodromou’s (2001, in Vaezi and Mirzaei, 2007: Introduction, 5th paragraph) claim that the L1 skeleton has always been present within the L2/FL pedagogical world. The concern of such teachers is, in my opinion, poignantly expressed by Villas Boas (2013, final paragraph) acknowledgement that, while she has undergone a conversion process in relation to the judicious use of L1 in the English language classroom, her fear of a teacher/student overgeneralized use of the pro-L1/translation arguments, and her position as a teacher trainer/developer within a large LT Institute, prevents her from openly advocating its use within the L2/FL classroom.

It is such concerns/issues that lead me to realise that it is now time to move into exploring the arguments in favour of the use of translation/students L1 in the L2/FL classroom, given the recent rise in linguistic pedagogical interest in the value of translation as an English L2/FL teaching aid, as it is surely there that the case has to be fought and won. In particular, I wish to explore statements such as that by Marsh (1987, in Mogahed, 2011: 4th paragraph): “[T]ranslation is not a suitable exercise in the initial stages of learning.” Supporters of Marsh´s position argue that before L2/FL students can benefit properly from the use of translation they need to have reached a significant L2/FL level of proficiency, certainly beyond the level of the beginner. While this statement does highlight the belief of translation within the L2/FL at a certain level, it is in conflict with Prodromou’s (2001: 4th section, 2nd paragraph) findings as regards the students perceptions of whether teachers should use the L1/MT in class, “the figures for beginners and intermediate are quite high (66% and 58% respectively) but only a minority of advanced learners (29%) find the use of L1 in the classroom acceptable.” Given the importance attached to student-centred teaching within the world of ELT nowadays, along with

\textsuperscript{95} See footnote 79.
observations such as Newson’s (1988: 7) about the importance of educators taking students’ perceptions of studying on board, findings such as those revealed in Prodromou’s (2001) survey cannot be ignored. Indeed, they may prove pivotal as to whether contemporary research has proven translation/L1 use within the L2/FL classroom to be a valued English L2/FL teaching/learning resource at all levels within the A1 – C2 linguistic range.

3.2 Contemporary L2/FL Arguments in Favour of L1 Use in the L2/FL Classroom

In the article entitled “T is for Translation” Thornbury (2010a: 5th paragraph) sums up the main reasons for using translation in teaching via six main arguments:

- new knowledge (e.g. of the L2) is constructed on the basis of existing knowledge (e.g. of the L1), and to ignore that is to deny learners a valuable resource
- languages have more similarities than differences, and translation encourages the positive transfer of the similarities, [and alerts] learners to significant differences
- translation is a time-efficient means of conveying meaning, compared, say, to demonstration, explanation, or working out meaning from context

96 According to Butzkamm (2003: 3rd paragraph) it is through L1/MT that people have “(1) learnt to think, (2) learnt to communicate and (3) acquired an intuitive understanding of grammar” and the “mother tongue is therefore the greatest asset people bring to the task of foreign language learning and provides a Language Acquisition Support System.” According to Gass (1997: 17, in Kumaravadivelu, 2006: 41), such “prior linguistic knowledge functions as ‘some sort of anchor with which to ground new knowledge’.” Kumaravadivelu (2006: 41) supports this view and claims that all adult L2/FL students have implicit and explicit knowledge/ability of varying degrees in their L1/MT. In this respect, Kumaravadivelu (2006: 23) defines language knowledge/ability as being “the level of overall language know-how that a competent language user has, or a language learner seeks to have.” Storch and Wiggleswort (2003: 768) note the need for further research in this field, since L2/FL students always “approach learning an L2 with expertise in their L1.”

97 According to Kumaravadivelu (2006: 42), the process of psycholinguistic language transfer is brought about by the ability of students to compare their L1 and L2, and comes under the umbrella of ‘metalanguage knowledge/metalinguistic awareness’, an area I intend to look at later in this project in relation to translation and learning strategies.

98 L1 advocates such as Swift (2006: 6th paragraph) note that using the L1 “can prevent time being wasted on tortuous explanations and instructions, when it could be better spent on language practice” and with “beginners, it may even allow the teacher to use activities which would be impossible to explain otherwise.” Butzkamm (2003: Maxim 1, 3rd paragraph) puts this point even more strongly by stating that translation “is a vital stage for the beginner [for] without it there would be blank comprehension [for] the beginner.” He adds [sic.] that, “becoming aware of meanings automatically involves connecting them with the MT – until the FL has established an ever-more complex network for itself.” This, view directly challenges Marsh’s 1987 claim that translation is not “a suitable exercise in the initial stages of learning” (in Mogahed, 2011: 4th paragraph). Indeed, Butzkamm (2003: Maxim 2, 2nd paragraph) makes an interesting observation in relation to the monolingual L2/FL classroom. He notes that studies reveal that teachers do not appreciate the extent to which students misunderstand what teachers have carefully tried to teach during a lesson in terms of meaning, especially in relation to new expressions. For this reason, teachers often make wrong assumptions about what the students have actually understood. This demonstrates the need for clarifying tools/techniques to avoid misunderstandings, such as a judicious use of
learners will use translation, even if covertly, as a strategy for making sense of the L2, so it may [just] as well be used as an overt tool.\(^9\)

- the skill of translation is an integral part of being a proficient L2 user, and contributes to overall plurilingualism.\(^{10}\)

- translation is a natural way of exploiting the inherent bilingualism of language classes, especially where the teacher is herself bilingual.\(^{11}\)

As a native English speaking English language teacher, I believe that Swift (2006: 4th paragraph) has a serious point to make when she notes that the “theoretical opposition to the use of the L1 was compounded by the development of the TEFL “industry”, where

---

\(^9\) According to Harbord, (1992: 351, in Butzkamm, 2003: Maxim 1, 2nd paragraph) “[t]ranslation/transfer is a natural phenomenon and an inevitable part of a second language acquisition [...] regardless of whether or not the teacher offers or ‘permits’ translation.” Indeed, the whole theoretical area of mental grammar/’interlanguage’ (Selinker, 1972) is based on a covert interchange between a student’s L1 and the TL, although a unique linguistic system is created as a result. Indeed, “one of the central issues in the different views of interlanguage and the respective theories is the nature and extent of L1 influence on a learner’s interlanguage (Ellis, 1994, in Gabrielatos, 2001: paragraph 14). According to Swain (1985: 249) “producing the target language may be the trigger that forces the learner to pay attention to the means of expression needed in order to successfully convey his or her own intended meaning.” In encouraging such ‘paying attention’/’noticing’, we are helping the student not only to reorganize/restructure their interlanguage but also to acquire the TL in a more accurate fashion. Admittedly, another approach could be “letting students demonstrate receptive competence [...] by allowing them to respond using the L1” (Swift, 2006: 6th paragraph), an approach that Swift acknowledges using frequently with her beginner classes. What is more, for Cook (1992: 571, in Kumaravadivelu, 2006: 41), “[e]mpirical studies show that L2 learners do not “effectively switch off the L1 while processing the L2, but has it constantly available”.

\(^{10}\) This point is similar to that defended by those advocating the importance of students studying the classical languages of Latin and Greek; see the first part of this project and footnote 37. This point is also in line with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment/CEFR or CEF (2001) efforts to promote plurilingualism by leaving “it to teachers and the learners themselves to reintegrate the many parts [of language learning] into a healthy whole” (CEFR, 2001: 1, 1.1). This is the case because the framework seeks to be “non-dogmatic: not irrevocably and exclusively attached to any one of a number of competing linguistic or educational theories or practices” (CEFR, 2001: 8, 1.6).

\(^{11}\) See footnote 40 regarding further definitions of bilingualism. I would like to acknowledge here that Janulevičienė and Kavaliauskienė, (2002: Introduction, 1st paragraph) I see translation as a fifth skill. However, while these authors appear to see translation bilingually, describing it as being the “ability to function fluently in two languages alternatively,” which implies “an ability to switch from one language to another at [a moment's] notice, without any preparation or thinking time”, I would not see it as always requiring such bilingual fluency, as desirable as such fluency may be. Rather, I favour the CERF (2001: 168, 8.1) definition of plurilingualism as “the ability to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural interaction, where a person, viewed as a social agent has proficiency, of varying degrees, in several languages and experience of several cultures.” The growth in Spain, and other countries, of bilingual education and of Content and Language Integrated Learning/CLIL, within mainstream education, is further evidence of the growing pedagogic appreciation of the value of some use of L1 in a L2/FL-promoting setting. However, this is not an area within which I work as a professional L2/FL teacher, and, for this reason I shall not explore it within this project. However, my growing knowledge of Spanish has certainly proved a useful resource in my A1-A2, and indeed, my B1 classrooms.
there are now many situations in which the teacher simply doesn’t speak or even understand the students’ language”. This had already been argued by West (1962: 48, in Butzkamm, 2003: 11th paragraph) who observed that the rigid avoidance of the L1/MT by teachers does create the strong suspicion it may be motivated by the English L2/FL teacher’s lack of knowledge of their student’s L1/MT. Likewise, Auerbach (1993:13, in Butzkamm, 2003: 11th paragraph) notes that the “English-only” policy has lately been classified as being “neocolonialistic.” Owen (2003: 9th paragraph) also notes that the “[e]xclusive class use of L2 (in this case, English) obviously favours the ‘linguistic imperialism’ both of commercial EFL interests and of many native-speaking teachers’ attitudes”. Tang (2002: 37) similarly observes that such imperialistic excluding attitudes give the L1/MT a ‘second-class language status’, and notes that for Nation (1990) such degradation has destructive psychological effects on L2/FL students. This view was re-taken in Mahboob (2011: 5th paragraph) for whom many non-native English-speaking English language teachers have in fact taken teacher-training in native English speaking countries, and have therefore adapted their teaching methodologies to those practised in those countries.102 For this reason, when they returned to their home countries, these teachers were highly respected due to their “foreign” training, and this, in turn, further reinforced the devaluation of local languages as a resource in ESL and other forms of English–based education. However, even if Gabrielatos (2001: 12th paragraph), argues that “the issue of empowerment of non-native ELT professionals is independent of the issue of whether and how L1 should be used in ELT,” in my opinion, it does indicate that there is a large potential resource available, should a particular educational system choose to utilize translation, and that it has a place in this project’s explorations.

3.3 A Judicious Use of L1 and what we mean by ‘Translation’

Gabrielatos (2001: 2nd paragraph), supports the use of L1 in ELT methodology, and notes that teachers and students need to be made cognizant of the long-term negative consequences of an injudicious use of the students L1/MT in terms of the students’ overall awareness and production of the TL. Gabrielatos makes an important point here: he does promote the use of translation/L1 in the classroom but does not defend its indiscriminate use. It is rather a judicious use of the L1 that is defended. This is a concept that Villas Boas (2013: 3rd paragraph) first encountered in Brown (2007) and was in line with what linguists such as Mogahed (2011: 7th paragraph) propounded. For them, the 20th century’s disapproval of using translation in the L2/FL classroom could have arisen

---

102 That is, methodologies that were rooted in the Direct Approach in which “the role of local languages was not really considered as a factor in the development of pedagogical material or training of teachers [with local languages] seen as a potential threat to the development of the target language” (Mahboob, 2011: 4th paragraph).
as a result of a bad use of Grammar-Translation methodology, rather than as a result of
the methodology itself. This is an important observation when looking at arguments in
favour of translation/L1 use within an ELT classroom. According to Mogahed (2011: 7th
paragraph), the Grammar-Translation problem lay in “a teaching methodology that
separated language from its communicative function [since] translation itself as it takes
place in the real world is essentially linked to a communicative purpose.” Even Atkinson
gap in the literature concerning the use of the mother tongue and argues a case in favour
of its restricted and principled use in accuracy-oriented tasks.” Butzkamm (2003: Maxim 3,
2nd paragraph) insists on this “judicious use of the L1” in his exploration of a three-step
problem-solving via translation procedure known as the “sandwich technique” (Dodson,
1967/1972), in which “[t]he teacher, on the spot, inserts a translation between repetitions
of an unknown phrase, almost as an aside, spoken in a different voice or with a slight
break in the flow of speech to mark it as an “intruder.””

According to Butzkamm (2003: Maxim 4, 2nd paragraph), the demand for “real”
communication and the prohibition of the use of the L1/MT creates a conflict. He outlines
several scenarios within a classroom, (e.g., activity instruction, light teacher-pupil warmth-
and-acceptance-creating banter, and unforeseen problematic situations), in which the
L1/MT can be positively utilized. He notes that the teacher’s response to unforeseen
problematic situations, could be one of three possible approaches: The teacher can, “(1)
use the MT; (2) ignore the whole business, suppressing remarks or comments they
would normally make; [or] (3) simplify as best they can and use the sandwich-technique.”

Of the three possible options, Butzkamm (2003: Maxim 4) notes that only the third one
can maintain a FL/TL atmosphere throughout the lesson while breathing a communicative
life into same. He goes on to note that there are many real-life communicative
opportunities within the classroom environment, even if “[m]any situations and issues that
crop up are simply left unexploited, because MT short-cuts to meanings are frowned
upon”. However, “when used properly, short MT insertions can function as a

\footnote{103}{For example: “Teacher: “You´ve skipped a line. Du hast eine Zeile übersprungen. You’ve skipped a line.” ‘Teacher: “I mean the last word but one. Das vorletzte Wort. The last word but one.”’ (Butzkamm, 2003: Maxim 3, 1st paragraph).}

\footnote{104}{In a sobering warning to those teachers whose use of the L1/MT is due to a teacher’s needs/lack of teaching skills, Bukzkamm (2003: Maxim 9, 1st paragraph) notes that “[l]ess skilled and less proficient teachers can have problems maintaining an officially monolingual teaching paradigm”. When this is the case, [r]ather than being used, therefore, the mother tongue is misused” and [t]eachers simply succumb to the ease of conducting the class in the MT.” It is important to re-emphasise that, in advocating for a judicious use of the students’ L1/MT, such an unprofessional indiscriminate use of the L1/MT in the L2/FL classroom is not being advocated in this project.}
“conversational lubricant’ [...] and communication is no longer paid mere lip-service” (Butzkamm (2003: Maxim 4).

Interestingly, Thornbury and Ball (n.d.: 46) also note that nowadays “[i]f a teacher uses translation, many items would be more teachable than if translation were not encouraged, or not possible”. This same view had been proposed by Widdowson (1979, in Brumfit and Johnson, 1979: 61) at the end of the 1970s: “translation [...] can be a very useful pedagogic device and indeed in some circumstances [it] may provide the most effective means of learning.” This, once unfashionable view, is again becoming a topical area in L2 teaching, especially when it is seen as another process which can help students to attain an even greater understanding of both their L2/TL, and their own, language and culture (Dahlgren and Sitwell, n.d.: 39). This view is supported by Mogahed (2011: 11th paragraph). He notes that translation is seen by many researchers as being an important student ‘motivating activity’ and mentions by way of example Carreres (2006), who introduced more substantial translation into her language lessons as a result of a questionnaire she carried out with students (they overwhelmingly viewed translation exercises as being a useful L2/FL learning aid). Rodríguez Juárez and Oxbrow (2008: 94) make an equally important observation: “an L1-based methodological approach is principally promoted by practising teachers rather than supported by empirically based studies of linguistic achievement.” However, while not wanting to overgeneralise, it may be apposite to note that in the ESP research carried out by Janulevičienė and Kavaliauskienė (2002), students and teachers were found to believe that, in a 90-minute class, the students’ L1/MT should be used as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (in minutes)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (in %)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (in %)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. How often should the L1/MT be used in a 90-minute L2/FL class? (Janulevičienė and Kavaliauskienė 2002).

105 For example, Giles and Byrne’s 1982 Accommodation Theory, and Gardner and Lambert (1972) see motivation as the primary proficiency L2/FL determinant (Arzamendi, Palacios, Ball, n.d.: 52). Butzkamm (2003: Maxim 5) also notes that “[t]he measured and well calculated contribution of the mother tongue can allow pupils to tackle more difficult texts sooner” while “[b]anal texts without educational value, on the other hand, jeopardise FL lessons, particularly those that have been started late”. He also claims that the above approach leads to greater comprehensible input along with a faster rate of acquisition, qualities which are vital in motivating L2/FL students. (sic.).

106 A claim reinforced by Mogahed (2011) and Lavault (1985); cf. footnote 83.
While this chart does not answer the question as to how much time within a class is a judicious use of students’ L1/MT, it does highlight that there is a difference between what teachers and students think in relation to L1/MT use in terms of class time, as there is a wide difference between what the majority of teachers think is a judicious use (9 minutes, i.e. 10%), and what the majority of students think (18 – 27 minutes, that is between 20% and almost a third of class time). Such findings, though valuable, once again suggest that further research is needed, with practising teachers, who are in favour of some L1/MT use, having to fall back on their own judgement, based on experience and, hopefully, on an accurate judgement of their particular L2/FL course students´ needs.

In discussing translation, I would like to start by recalling Dahlgren and Sitwell’s (n.d.: 6) statement that no consensus exists as to exactly what we mean by the term “translation” and that this is not a project about translation per se.\(^{107}\) However, in terms of L2/FL teaching, Carreres (2006: 6th paragraph) makes, to my mind, a very helpful suggestion: she prefers to view translation activities within a continuum-type model in which hyper-literal explicative translation forms one extreme and professional real-world communicative translation forms the other extreme.\(^{108}\)

According to Liao (2006: 201) translation can be viewed positively for several reasons:

- It can help L2/FL learners understand their L2/TL.
- It can help L2/FL learners verify if they have correctly understood.
- It assists L2/FL learners to memorize vocabulary, idioms, grammar and sentence units.
- It can assist learners to communicate in their L2/TL by enabling them to develop and express their ideas more fluently.

\(^{107}\) Although, it is helpful to remember Rogers (2004: 635) observation that translation and foreign language teaching have the historical and conceptual common goal of promoting communication.

\(^{108}\) This “continuum” type model is a useful one in L2 theoretical discussions and has been used in a variety of settings:

- as a “mental grammar-based” continuum as intended by Rod Ellis (1997: 33-34) in his reflection on interlanguage in terms of an “interlanguage continuum.”
- as a “stylistic continuum” (ranging from a “careful style” to a “vernacular style”) as used by Elaine Tarone (1983, Ellis, 1997: 37) in her treatment of variability in learner language.
- as a “continuum of discourse types ranging from entirely unplanned (spontaneous, lacks preparation) to entirely planned (carefully thought out)” (Arzamendi, Palacios, Ball, n.d.: 54) within the “product” distinction of the “process/product” variable competence model of L2 acquisition.
It can promote L2/TL motivation by reducing learning anxiety/frustration.

In relation to this last point Villas Boas (2013: 4th paragraph) reflects on her increasing appreciation, of the benefit of giving children a few minutes at the start of a lesson to share whatever they wished in their L1/MT, and of using the students L1/MT in other situations as a ‘signalling springboard’ and/or ‘key to understanding’. Villas Boas saw such benefit in terms of emotional bond-building among the children, which ties in with Krashen’s (1981) “Affective Filter Hypothesis”, which Arzamendi, Ball et al (n.d.: 66) believe to mean that “[t]he acquisition process of the L2 is constrained by an ‘affective filter’, a set of variables [Motivation, Self-confidence and Anxiety,] that allow or block the acquisition process.” Auerbach (1993: 19, in Schweers, 1999, 1st paragraph) also emphasises the ‘affective filter’ reduction capacity of translation. She notes that “[s]tarting with the L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learners’ lived experiences, allowing them to express themselves [and to be] willing to experiment and take risks with English.”

According to Bhooth et al. (2013: 78), this L2-promoting influence of L1/MT use in nurturing a positive affective learning environment, particularly in beginning and intermediate L2/FL classes, is also supported by research carried out by Wells (1999) and Tang (2002). However, while my teaching experience with A1 – B1 students also leads me to subscribe to the above view, research carried out by Carson at Hiroshima City University, Japan, (2013: 209) has found that “[d]espite teacher beliefs that students need emotional L1 support, most students do not prefer such L1 support”. This highlights, perhaps, that L2/FL teachers need to assess their students’ beliefs on a class by class basis rather than making any general assumptions.

The above views of translation lead me to think that the prevailing negative opinion on using translation in the L2/FL classroom may stem from having a too narrow view of translation. Perhaps, as suggested by Butzkamm (2003: Maxim 1, 3rd paragraph), we need to reconceptualise and extend our concepts of the world, making whatever cultural adaptations are deemed necessary. For this reason, in reviewing contemporary arguments in favour of L1 use in the L2/FL classroom, it would perhaps be helpful if we looked at how translation is defined by a number of contemporary professionals. For Chamot (1987: 77, in Liao, 2006: 194) translation strategy is “using the first language as a

---

109 Auerbach (1993, in Tang, 2002: 37) also acknowledges the following uses of the L1/MT in the language classroom: “classroom management, language analysis, presenting rules that govern grammar, discussing cross-cultural issues, giving instructions or prompts, explaining errors, and checking for comprehension.”

110 I would like to point out that both the MLAEILE course “Teaching English Through Translation” and my own language teaching experience, as well as working on this project, have, to use Villas Boas’ (2013: 5th paragraph) words, “enhanced my understanding that there [exists] a difference between using translation as a method and using the L1 system as a reference for students, a facilitator.”
base for understanding and/or producing the second language.” For Deller and Rinvolucri (2002: 4, in Rodriguez Juárez and Oxbrow, 2008: 94) “the mother tongue is the womb from which the second language is born.” This is, to my mind, a more positive interpretation of the role of the L1 than Carreres’ (2006: 14, footnote 19) observation that “the L1 text is simply a means of getting to the L2 and has no particular value of its own.” I believe this is especially the case if we consider the role of “contrastive analysis techniques [CA] and cross-linguistic comparison” (Rodríguez Juárez and Oxbrow, 2008: 95), as well as the concept of using the L1 as a scaffolding tool in empowering the L2/FL student to progress in his/her TL acquisition. I think these two concepts are worth exploring at greater depth at this stage of this project.

However, we should first look at the area of learning strategies, because ‘metalanguage knowledge/metalinguistic awareness’ performs an important role in helping students to see the value of a judicious use of L1/translation within their L2/FL classroom.

3.4 Learning Strategies, learning Styles and L1/Translation use within the L2/FL Classroom

It is important to clarify what a strategy is, for it is a much used term in the literature. According to Oxford (1990a:17, in Madrid et al. n.d.: 27), there is no clear agreement as to what constitutes a strategy. However, Madrid et al.’s, (n.d.: 26) observation on the work of Faerch and Kasper (1980) can be helpful here. They note that “a process implies a sequence of operations in the development of a plan, as in reception or production processes, and a strategy is defined as a single operation or feature of that process”. According to Ellis (1997: 76-77), learning strategies are the approaches or techniques used by L2/FL students in order to achieve their aim of learning their L2/TL. Such strategies may be behavioural 112 or mental 113 and are usually problem-oriented, which means that students make use of learning strategies when they encounter a problem. 114

The categorization of strategies in second language learning is complex. Rubin (1975), Naiman et al., (1978), O’Malley and Chamot (1990), Oxford (1990a) and Valcárcel

111 Contrastive Analysis/CA was a very popular method in the ELT world of the 1960s and early 1970s and was based on the behaviourist belief that learning a L2/FL was the result of a habit formation process that could be promoted or inhibited by one’s own habits. This method/theory held that any difficulties experienced by the students were due to the differences between their L1/MT and the TL/FL they were attempting to learn (Wikipedia, 2006: s.v. “Contrastive Analysis”).

112 For example, “repeating new words aloud to help you remember them” (Ellis, 1997: 77).

113 For example, “using the linguistic or situational context to infer the meaning of a new word” (Ellis, 1997: 77).

114 Madrid et al., (n.d.: 51) are helpful here as they note that “[w]hile the processes involved in learning are invisible and as such are difficult to evaluate and train, the strategies which activate them are more visible and susceptible to teaching and training.”
et al., (1996), among others, have all come up with different taxonomies. While there is something to be gained from each approach, insofar as they provide an overview of the territory and a baseline for pedagogical intervention, these different categorizations can misleadingly imply that there are clear-cut demarcation lines. However, as noted by Little (2004: 579), this is not often the case. Madrid et al., (n.d.: 34) note that Oxford’s (1990a) taxonomy, one of the most well-known, contains two broad levels, direct strategies (memory\textsuperscript{115} /cognitive\textsuperscript{116} /compensation\textsuperscript{117} strategies) and indirect strategies (social\textsuperscript{118} /affective\textsuperscript{119}/metacognitive strategies\textsuperscript{120}). Each group of strategies not only supports each other, but also has the capability of connecting with and helping every other strategy,\textsuperscript{121} and all of them are ultimately able to be located within a typology of procedural knowledge such as that outlined in Appendix 6.

According to Ellis (1997: 77), students are normally aware of, and able to explain, the strategies they use to learn. This is important in terms of strategy instruction, as the learners’ potential awareness of what learning strategy they are using may help them to “know more about themselves, so they can try out, test, and become expert in using the strategies that help them the most” (Oxford and Leaver, 1996:228).\textsuperscript{122} Oxford and Leaver (1996: 230) also note that such strategy instruction encompasses Schmidt’s (1994: 11)

\textsuperscript{115} “Memory strategies correspond to the specific techniques which help the learner to store, and, when necessary, retrieve the stored information” (Palacios et al., n.d.: 17).

\textsuperscript{116} “Cognitive strategies are those that are involved in the analysis, synthesis, or transformation of learning materials. An example is “recombination””(Ellis, 1997: 77). Other examples are “[g]eneralising, making comparisons between languages, note-taking, practising, analysing and reasoning” (Palacios et al.: 17). Valcárcel et al., (1996, in Madrid et al., n.d.: 38) criticised Oxford’s work claiming it lacked clarity in terms of “cognitive strategies [in that] the cognitive component of procedural knowledge in SLA included mental processes such as hypothesis formation through reception of new L2 knowledge (internalizing input), hypothesis formation through production (interaction) and automatization through language use (output”).

\textsuperscript{117} “Compensation strategies are behaviours adopted by students to compensate for missing knowledge, such as circumlocution, avoidance, guessing while listening or reading, etc” (Palacios et al., n.d.: 18).

\textsuperscript{118} “Social strategies […] are associated with the social behaviours involving other people in the language learning process [and examples] are counting on friends for help, participating in group conversations, pretending real understanding, questioning and cooperating with peers”(Palacios et al., n.d.: 18).

\textsuperscript{119} “Affective strategies are techniques which help learners achieve better control over their emotions and attitudes towards the language learning process. Self-reinforcement and positive self-talk can be grouped here” (Palacios et al., n.d.: 18).

\textsuperscript{120}“Metacognitive strategies have to do with “how to learn or with learning to learn [and] involve being aware and reflecting upon the learning process together with planning, arranging, and evaluating one’s language” (Palacios et al., n.d.: 18). And for advance “organisers, directed attention and self-management are generally considered strategies belonging to this group.” (ibid).

\textsuperscript{121} See Appendix 5.

\textsuperscript{122} An approach not too unlike the selection/gradation/presentation benefits outlined in the British Oral/Situational Approach; see pp. 18-19 of this project.
four aspects of consciousness: “awareness,” attention, intentionality, and control [with a lack] of any consciousness of strategies” being noted as a fifth aspect.

However, if language teachers are to help their students explore learning strategies via Oxford and Leaver’s (1996) ‘continuum of consciousness’, I feel that it is also vital for them to become familiar with the students’ preferred learning style(s). The reason is that learning strategies “do not operate by themselves, but rather are directly tied to the learner’s underlying styles (i.e. their general approach to learning) and other personality-related variables (such as anxiety and self-concept) in the learner” (Cohen 1998: 15, in Madrid et al.: 41). The importance of this potential learner awareness of preferred learning styles, and appropriate learning strategies, is also noted by Cohen

---

123 According to Oxford and Leaver (1996: 232), “awareness” of language learning strategies is often brought about “merely by taking part in a strategy assessment.” For example, they note that “[s]ome strategy assessments, such as surveys, think-alouds, and diaries, help students reflect on their strategy use and therefore spark strategic awareness”.

124 Defined by Schmidt (1994: 11) as being “focal attention and “noticing” vs. peripheral attention”. Oxford and Leaver (1996: 233-234) note that strategy instruction normally promotes the former – focal attention/noticing. They also note that such focal attention can include small group/individual activities such as: (1) - Planning which learning strategies to use in a task; (2) - Identifying learning strategies that are best suited to particular learning styles; (3) - Examining personal “strategy databases”; and (4) - Reviewing L2/FL textbooks; see footnote 99 for the concept of ‘paying attention/noticing’.

125 According to Oxford and Leaver (1996: 234-235) intentionality can be defined as a commitment or decision to do something, and is a vital characteristic of motivation. They note that L2/FL learners who wish to improve their strategy-using skills have to learn to recognize and deal with any negative beliefs/attitudes via the use of strategies such as maintaining dialogue journals, participating in counselling sessions and/or group discussions. Schmidt (1994: 11) defines ‘consciousness as intentionality’ as being in the area of “the intentional/incidental learning contrast.”

126 Defined by Schmidt (1994: 11) as being “controlled vs. automatic processing, automaticity, explicit/implicit memory.” According to Oxford and Leaver (1996: 236) a language learner who wishes to master the use of learning strategies needs not only awareness, attention and intentionality, but also the ability to control their strategies through being able to evaluate their use and then being able to transfer such skilled-based knowledge to other tasks and situations, as appropriate.

127 Summarised by Oxford (1990b, based on Cohen 1998: 15 -16, in Madrid et al., n.d.: 41-42.) into five areas as follows: (1) – the use of physical senses for study and work: visual v. auditory v.hands-on; (2) – dealing with other people: extroversion v. introversion; (3) – handling possibilities: intuitive-random v. concrete-sequential; (4) – approaching tasks: closure-oriented v. open; and (5) – dealing with ideas: global v. analytic. For example, according to Smolinski (1993, in Kavaliauskienė, Užpalienė, 2002: 16th paragraph) “it is well known that some individuals learn more by memorizing, others by analogy, others by rules, systems and systematic cataloguing”. This point regarding the value of considering learning styles is supported by the Council of Europe’s CEFR (2001: 159, 7.2.3,) wherein it is stated, in relation to task performance and strategies, that the “user or learner naturally adapts, adjusts and filters task inputs, goals, conditions and constraints to fit his or her own resources, purposes and (in a language learning context) particular learning style.” Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences Theory [MI], in which he talks about eight types of intelligences, is also worth bearing in mind when considering students’ preferred learning styles, as he reminds us that students are not composed of a single intelligence type, but that all “of us have the full range of intelligences; that is what makes us human beings, cognitively speaking” (Gardner, 2012: 29). It is also important to bear in mind, as pointed out by Gardner (2012: 28 -30) himself, that we do have a “main-tendency cluster of intelligences” and/or “intellectual profile.”
(1998: 15–16, in Madrid et al., n.d.: 42): “Once learners have a sense of their style preferences, it may be easier for them to see why it is they prefer using certain strategies and not others”. Madrid et al., (n.d.: 42) suggest that a language teacher needs to find out as early as possible in the L2/FL course what students preferred learning styles are, via such methods/approaches as questionnaires and/or plenary class discussions.

Thus, in recommending L2/FL students to use their L1/MT judiciously, it occurs to me that the best way to do so is by introducing them to the importance of learning strategies and how their L1/MT and/or translation can be one of those resources. However, if an L2/FL teacher is to introduce some kind of learning strategy training, it is important that he/she is aware of the role of the immediate short-term versus long-term use of language. This is important in the exploration of memory: linguistic, and other information is stored for use, or discarded if no longer required. This is acknowledged by Madrid et al., (n.d.: 6-8) in their cognitive exploration of Short-Term Memory/STM.\footnote{Defined by the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (according to Madrid et al., n.d.: 6) as “that part of the memory where information which is received is stored for short periods of time while it is being analysed and interpreted.”\cite{stm} The term ‘working memory’ is used to refer to whatever one has in mind at any particular time(Williams and Burden 1997: 16, in Madrid et al., n.d.: 6). It “is often used interchangeably with short-term memory, although technically working memory refers more to the whole theoretical framework of structures and processes used for the temporary storage and manipulation of information, of which short-term memory is just one component” (Mastin,2010: 4th paragraph).}{128} STM can evolve out of, but not be equated with, ‘working memory’.\footnote{“Long-term memory” is the final part of Atkinson and Shiffrin’s (1968) dual-memory model, “in which data can be stored for long periods of time. While short-term and working memory persists for only about 20 to 30 seconds, information can remain in long term memory indefinitely” (in Wikipedia, 2001: s.v. “Long-term memory”). The importance of the LTM for language learning can be seen in the observation of Palais and Linan-Thompson (n.d.: 9), that “[l]earning and using words involves storing and retrieving information from our long-term memories about how they sound (phonology), how the look (orthography) and their meanings (semantics).”}{130} In the latter, ‘input information’ is sorted, and, if deemed appropriate in terms of ‘making sense’, is passed on to the Long-Term Memory/LTM\footnote{Hence a teacher’s role now is largely seen in terms ‘constructivism’, wherein their role is no longer to simply provide knowledge via information, but to empower the student to become a co-constructor of knowledge by motivating him/her to become actively involved in the process of knowledge formation. Thus knowledge “is constructed and shared […] actively and meaningfully through the activation of mental processes” (Madrid et al., n.d: 22).}{131} for further processing and storage. The former STM processing stage is of vital importance, and it is there that the L2/FL teacher can make an impact and equip the student, or rather, given the recent shift towards cognitive psychology to explain the SLA processes” (Madrid et al, n.d.: 5), help the student to equip him/herself for a lifetime of being able to efficiently digest, and hence truly own, their chosen/required learning.\footnote{Hence a teacher’s role now is largely seen in terms ‘constructivism’, wherein their role is no longer to simply provide knowledge via information, but to empower the student to become a co-constructor of knowledge by motivating him/her to become actively involved in the process of知识形成。由此知识“是通过激活心理过程而构建和共享的 [...] 通过有意义的主动参与来构建知识的形成过程”（Madrid et al., n.d: 22）。}
As Madrid et al. (n.d.: 7) note, this STM “process of structuring new information takes time; but it is time well spent, because students find it almost impossible to remember something that they do not properly understand.” However, this journey of structuring/restructuring is not confined to the STM, but leads us into the learner’s LTM domain, where it can become an appropriately integral part of the learner’s active long-term memory (via automatic remembering/recall, as a result of rehearsal-influenced, structural repetition and practice), or be automatically lost via forgetting, as a result of a lack of such structural use.

The important question seems to be, how can we, as L2/FL teachers, help our students to understand what goes into their STM through their working memory, in such a way that, if they so require, the input information that they select may take on a structural/restructuring dynamic life of its own, and reach its LTM destination (full acquisition/availability)? Given the importance of both STM and LTM, as outlined above, along with the statement by Madrid et al. (n.d.: 52) that “[i]t is important to realise that strategy instruction does not necessarily mean teaching all students to use exactly the same learning strategies,” it seems pointless to direct students to any one particular strategy to aid either their STM or their LTM. Indeed, such an approach could be, at best, a waste of student time, and, at worse, detrimental to the learning process.

So, is the language teacher to do nothing in terms of LS and student progression? I think the answer lies in the whole metacognitive area of helping the student to ‘learn how to learn,’ so that as he/she grows in autonomy in relation to their own learning. Through exposure to the skillful use of a wide range of strategies, he/she can pick and choose for themselves, as their needs dictate, a position which surely dictates that strategy instruction has to be an ongoing-resource, to be used as and when required by the student(s). It is here where I see the L2/FL teacher helping the student to draw on their L1/translating skills, as part of their overall language learning plan/strategy, in a way that does not lead to the kind of dependency identified by Swift (2006:2nd paragraph). Thus the aim of learning strategy instruction as regards L1/translation use, is to equip students

knowledge formation. Thus knowledge “is constructed and shared […] actively and meaningfully through the activation of mental processes” (Madrid et al., n.d: 22).

According to Swift (2006: 2nd paragraph) the principle argument by those opposed to the use of students’ L1/MT in teaching is that it will result in students becoming dependent on the L1/MT within the L2/FL classroom so that they will “not even try to understand meaning from context and explanation, or express what they want to say within their limited command of the target language (L2)”.
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with a further resource to facilitate their “noticing”. Once they have “noticed”, they then have the strategies to process what they themselves, and their teacher, identify as being important enough to be processed from their working memory / STM, into their LTM. This will help them further along their interlanguage journey towards their self-identified L2/TL goal.134

3.5 Contrastive Analysis / Cross-linguistic Comparison

Contrastive Analysis/CA, was initially formulated by Lado (1957) in his work entitled *Linguistics Across Culture*. According to Gass and Selinker (2008: 89), the motivation behind Lado’s work and many of his contemporaries was the pedagogical need for relevant native-language-based materials. This need resulted in the necessity to carry out detailed comparisons in search of similarities and differences between the students L1/MT and their L2/TL, via a comparative system that came to be known as *Contrastive Analysis*. Arzamendi, Palacios and Ball (n.d.: 24) note that if one identifies the differences between the TL and the students L1/MT, then potential L2 errors can be predicted. In ‘Error Analysis’, the behaviourist learning theory that arose out of CA, transfer from the L1/MT to the L2/TL does take place, so that, as noted by Arzamendi, Palacios and Ball (n.d.: 25), if any proactive inhibition is present, such transfer will be negative and lead to errors. However, as noted by Ellis (1997: 51), “in some cases, the learner’s L1 can facilitate L2 acquisition [via] positive transfer.” To illustrate this point, this author gives an example of how French students of English are less likely to make positive transfer errors such as “The man whom I spoke to him is a millionaire” than are Arabic students, simply because resumptive pronouns are not allowed in French relative clauses while they are in Arabic *(ibid.: 51).*

CA was “strongly criticised in the 1970s because of a series of empirical, theoretical and practical considerations [and because] many of the predicted errors did not arise” (Arzamendi, Palacios and Ball, n.d.: 24).135 In this context, a questionnaire survey (Rodríguez Juárez and Oxbrow, 2008: 98) was carried out on a group of students, largely composed of late elementary or low intermediate ability (A2/B1) English language students, at the end of the 2005-2006 academic year. They found that “students feel in 88% of the cases (56% strongly agree, 32% agree) that it is necessary for their language learning process to be aware of the differences and similarities between the mother

---

134 See footnote 99.
135 We previously mentioned a similar type of criticism; see p.17 of Noam Chomsky's by Skinner” (1959). Swan (2008: section 3) notes that “learners’ errors [came to be] seen as falling into two possible categories: ‘interlingual’ confusions, caused by interference or transfer from the mother tongue, and ‘intralingual’ confusions, caused by complexities in the second language itself.”
Interestingly, this questionnaire survey also found that "only 48% of the students (16% strongly agree, 32% agree) claim that contrastive analysis between the two languages helps them avoid making errors which could be derived from the transfer of their mother tongue" (ibid: 98), thus reinforcing some of the criticism of the 1970’s, indicating the need for more comprehensive research in the field, and highlighting a L2/FL teacher’s responsibility while helping students to avail of translation as an effective and efficient L2/FL promoting tool, to educate their students in “the possible pitfalls of L1 interference and word-for-word translations” (Liao, 2006: 211).

Swift (2006: 6th paragraph) notes that the L1 “can be used contrastively to point out problem areas of grammar, false cognates etc.” and that some coursebooks (e.g. Headway), “now encourage students to translate model sentences into their own language in order to compare and contrast the grammar.” Villas Boas (2013: 7th paragraph) notes Seligson’s (2013) point that the “L1 is a tool to be used appropriately like any other, and its use needn’t be verbal”, and she sees his argument that such a non-verbal use is possible in terms of parallel processing, or, systematic contrastive reflection, as reasonable, thus demonstrating that she is in agreement with Swift, as is Auerbach (1993). Thus, for example, in relation to teaching English to students whose L1/mother tongue is Portuguese, Villas Boas (2013: 7th paragraph) observes that “we can capitalize on the fact that Portuguese is a Romance language, that as much as 60% of English is Latin-based, and that there are more cognates than false cognates between Portuguese and English.” This point was also mentioned by Mogahed (2011: 9th paragraph) who notes that L2/FL students draw upon their L1 “to aid the process of acquisition of L2 or, in other words they ‘translate silently’ (Titford, 1985: 78) […] an activity that shows that translation into L2 can help them systematize and rationalize a learning mechanism that is taking place anyway.”

3.6 Scaffolding

According to Antón and DiCamilla (1998: 318), the conceptual origin of ‘scaffolding’ is found in Wood et al. (1976) and is deployed as an interactive metaphor between someone deemed to be an expert and a novice working together on a problem-solving task. Foley (1994: 101) also locates its origins partly in the work of Vygotsky 1896-1934) and notes

---

136 However, what the students involved in this survey actually mean by contrastive analysis awareness is not clear, as “almost half of the students either disagree or do not have an opinion as to whether contrastive analysis will help them in their comprehension of the structures under concern […] or in the grammatical formation of such constructions” (Rodríguez Juárez and Oxbrow, 2008: 98).
137 See footnote 109.
138 See footnote 99 on mental grammar/interlanguage.
Bruner’s (1978) belief “that for learning to take place, appropriate social interactional frameworks must be provided.” Scrivener (2005: 162), notes that “[s]caffolding’ refers to the way a competent language speaker helps a less competent one to communicate by both encouraging and providing possible elements of the conversation,” that is, a process in which the “listener offers support – like scaffolding round a building – to help the speaker create his own spoken structure.” Ellis (1997: 48) sees scaffolding as being a useful discourse skill-building technique when the student is in a discourse environment which is outside their communicative range. He notes that it “is common in the early stages of L2 acquisition and may account for some of the early transitional structures that have been observed in interlanguage” (ibid: 48). According to Bhooth et al (2013: 77), scaffolding refers to the assistance that others offer a L2/FL student so that he/she may achieve more than he/she would be independently able to achieve in what Vygotsky has described as being his/her zone of proximal development. Bhooth et al. (2013: 77) also report on a study by Antón and DiCamilla (1998) on collaborative writing tasks: they found that the use of the L1 empowered L2/FL students to journey through their zone of proximal development at a greater rate than if it were not permitted and that L1 also played a highly important role in scaffolding. Thus, empowering the student through scaffolding can help them to progress through, and perhaps even speed up their interlanguage journey through their ‘i + 1’ territory (see Krashen, 1981) territory.

Applebee and Langer (1983, in Foley, 1994: 101) see this L2/FL progress taking place via what they term ‘instructional scaffolding’, wherein the L2/FL student is helped in a new task by a more skilled TL user who verbally, and/or in writing, models what is expected of the student. The student is also helped to extend his/her language knowledge through leading/probing questions and, instead of focusing on evaluating the student’s responses, the teacher adopts a supportive and encouraging approach, and provides any additional assistance required. Then, in parallel with the student’s growing linguistic competence, “the scaffolding provided is gradually reduced until the learner is able to function autonomously in that task and generalize to similar circumstances” (ibid.: 101).

Interestingly for the purposes of this project, Storch and Wigglesworth (2003: 760) also report research findings that suggest the use of the L1 within the classroom may give

---

139 The “zone of proximal development” (ZPD) is defined by Vygotsky (1978: 86 in Antón and DiCamilla, 1998: 316) as “the difference between the child’s developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the higher level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers.”

140 According to Damaris Escobar (2012: slide 8/23), “i represents previously acquired linguistic competence and extra-linguistic knowledge, [and] the hypothesis claims that we move from i to i + 1 by understanding input that contains i + 1.” The ‘+1’ represents new linguistic information, such as language structures, that a student should be open to acquiring, at a particular stage in his/her L2/FL development.
students greater cognitive support because it enables them to analyse language and work at a cognitively higher level than if they had only used the L2/TL. Jones (2010: 3) also notes that using one’s native language can have cognitive, psychological and linguistic functions, and that by permitting the L1 as a resource the student is empowered to use the L1 as a scaffolding tool.

3.7 Is the case for L1 use within the class as a positive resource tool thus proven?

All of the above arguments, against, and for the use of translation/L1 within the L2/FL classroom, are valid arguments, and it is difficult to unambiguously declare one side as having more weight than the other, especially if we recall Rodríguez Juárez and Oxbrow’s (2008: 94) observation that “it should be taken into account that […] an L1-based methodological approach is principally promoted by practising teachers rather than supported by empirically based studies of linguistic achievement.” However, until future empirically based studies clarify the terrain in one direction or the other, I would think that the voice of teacher-practitioners, because they are the L2/FL promoting professionals closest to students within the classroom, is an important one, as is the voice of students themselves.

The fact is that there has been an ongoing, if limited, use of the L1/MT over generations of students, despite the Natural/Direct Method’s ascendancy in the 20th c., by an “invisible” group of teaching practitioners, and its advocates. This was revealed in the scant research done in the twenty-first century, e.g. Tang (2002),¹⁴¹ which showed that 72% of the teachers favoured the use of the students´ L1/MT (Chinese) in the classroom. The opinions or voices of students has also been studied, e.g. by Prodromou (2001), who justifies a judicious use of translation. Atkinson (1993: 2, in Bhooth et al., 2013: 77) explains what judicious means: “at appropriate times and in appropriate ways” or, better still, in the words of Jadallah and Hasan (2011, in Bhooth et al., 2013: 77):“in a purposive manner, at appropriate times and in appropriate places.” These views are in line with Graddol’s (2006: 110) idea of ‘functional nativeness’,¹⁴² and the importance of instrumental English, within the Business English world of ESP.¹⁴³ It is with these particular “voices” in mind that I would now like to explore, specifically, contemporary thinking in relation to translation/L1 use within the framework of the different L2/FL language levels outlined in appendix 1.

¹⁴¹ Outlined in Appendix 4 of this project.
¹⁴² See pp. 27 - 28 of this project, including footnote 94.
¹⁴³ See footnote 79.
According to Butzkamm (2003: Maxim 10,1st paragraph) “with growing proficiency in the foreign language, the use of the MT becomes largely redundant and the TL/FL will stand on its own two feet [so that the MT] simply gets practised away.” This is an instance of Brown’s (1972) “cognitive pruning”. This view is also supported by Kharma and Hajjaj (1989, in Bhooth et al., 2013: 77) who concluded that “the use of L1 should not be overused, and that it should decrease with the increase of the students’ experience with the target language.” Likewise, in his discussion of the L1-L2 question Kumaravadivelu (2006: 188) observes that Stern (1992) uses an ‘intralingual-crosslingual continuum’ strategy, and recommends establishing comparisons between L1 and L2 in the early stages of L2/FL learning and explaining of L2 in L1 terms, though he does defend intralingual techniques at the more intermediate and advanced stages. This argument is in line with Prodromou’s (2001) survey results: that further clarity is required at the intermediate level. This view is challenged by Marsh (1987, in Mogahed, 2011: 4th paragraph), for whom translation, as a L2/FL resource tool, is not an appropriate “exercise in the initial stages of learning” because students have not yet reached “a significant level of proficiency in the L2 language.” However, Stern’s (1992: 286, in Kumaravadivelu’s 206: 188) observations on the use of intralingual/crosslingual strategies contradict Marsh’s (1987) objections: what is more important are “the goals of the learners, their previous experience in the L2, the context in which the programme takes place, and the ability of the teacher to function intralingually or crosslingually.” Villas Boas (2013: 5th paragraph) is also of the same view: “there [is] a difference between using translation as a method and using the L1 system as a reference for students, a facilitator.” While this part of my project is limited by the scarcity of research on the use of the L1/MT at different L2/FL language levels, my own explorations suggest that using crosslingual methods or resorting to the L1 as a reference or facilitator for students, could perhaps be appropriate for A1 – B1 students, while using intralingual or translation methods may work for B2

---

144 In discussing this continuum Kumaravadivelu (2006: 187) notes that the intralingual strategy is in line with coordinate bilingualism, in which the L1 and L2 “are kept completely separate from one another, whereas the crosslingual strategy believes in compound bilingualism, where the L2 is acquired and known through the use of L1”; see footnote 135 for Swan’s view on the interlingual/intralingual confusion, and footnotes 96 - 99.

145 A clarification which I feel Tang’s (2002) research study, summarised in Appendix 4 of this project, goes some way to addressing, as its sample population were in the Intermediate range.

146 From my teaching experience, I would add students’ views on L1 use in the classroom here. This would ensure that they understand and agree to its use. In other words, I would encourage students to become partners in, and co-creators of, their own learning. I am here thinking of adult students, the group of students wherein my L2/FL teaching largely lies. However, it is important to take on board the fact that the L2/FL teacher can make an impact and equip or, help the student to equip him/herself for a lifelong capacity to digest, and hence to own, their chosen/required learning. Students must be helped to understand how their L1/MT and translation, can be harnessed to further their L2/FL learning.

147 See footnote 110.
students and above, provided appropriate learning strategies are employed and provided they are selected ultimately by the students in accordance with their learning style preferences. This is in line with the judicious understanding of L1/MT as propounded earlier by Gabrielatos (2001) and Butzkamm (2003), among others, see pp. 33 and ff, of this project.

We have shown in part one of the project that the L1 has historically always been present as a L2/FL resource (albeit at varying degrees of “hiddenness/obscurity”). In part two, we have seen that the use of translation/L1 is once again emerging to the forefront as a potential L2/FL teaching resource. Now, in part three, I wish to explore the way in which the L1/MT may actually help adult L2/FL students, in the fields of Business English and General English.

---

148 See Appendix 7.
4. Part 3: LOOKING FORWARD

In this section of this project, I would like to start by recalling the final part of Figure 1, wherein I introduced an adapted version of Holmes 1988 ‘Map of Translation Studies’, as I now wish to explore the additional section entitled ‘Possible Ways Forward’. In reflecting on parts one and two of this project I am struck by the veracity of Mackey’s (1965: 138 in Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 28) words that “while sciences have advanced by approximations in which each new stage results from an improvement, not rejection, of what has gone before, language-teaching methods have followed the pendulum of fashion from one extreme to the other”, and yet, in relation to the use of the students’ L1/MT in the L2/FL classroom, such fashions, especially those of the Natural/Direct Method of the late nineteenth/twentieth centuries, have never succeeded, in completely silencing the use of language students’ L1/MT. This reality, I believe, is one of several areas where Kumaravadivelu’s (1994: 28-29) argument that applied linguists have been the power-brokers in L2/FL pedagogy at the expense of the coal-face practitioners, i.e. L2/FL teachers, and ultimately, in my view, of their students, is seen. Given, as mentioned in part two of this project, that a survey by Tang (2002) reveals that 72% of teachers feel that the L1/MT should be used in the classroom, the growth of bilingual/CLIL educational programmes in countries such as Spain, and student surveys such as those by Prodomou (2001), Tang (2002) and Liao (2006) which reveal a sizeable portion of their sample study groups in favour of “some”/a judicious use of the L1 in the L2/FL classroom, it is I believe, incumbent upon contemporary L2/FL pedagogic researchers, as noted by Liao (2006: 211-212), to conduct further research to explore the thinking of L2/FL teachers in relation to the use of the students’ L1/MT and/or translation within the L2/FL classroom, and how same compares with students’ views. At this point I believe it is apposite to turn to the ESP research of Janulevičienė and Kavaliauskienė’s (2002) ESP research survey wherein the first question asked: Should the native language be used in a foreign language class at university? The survey findings report that 86% of university teachers felt that it should either “a little” or “sometimes”, with 93% of tertiary students surveyed in the research in agreement. Thus further reinforcing my belief that if the L2/FL students so

---

149 See p. 25.

150 A statement which reiterates, but not in as positive a manner, Kelly’s (1969: 396) claim in part one, page 11, wherein he stated that “[w]hile one can ascribe a linear development to sciences, the development of an art is cyclical. Old approaches return, but as their social and intellectual context are changed, they seem entirely new.”

151 One example of such growth can be seen in the fact that, according to Ms Gillian Flaxman (Head of the British Council school in Madrid, speaking at the British Council Conference on 26th Sept 2014 to mark the European Day of Languages entitled “Every learner a language learner, every teacher a language teacher”), in the province of Madrid alone there are about 200,000 students in bilingual education.
desire, then there is a place for a judicious use of same, albeit that further research is needed.

In the meantime, those teachers who are not tied by school district and departmental policies (Jones, 2010: 23) or academy policy (Villas Boas, 2013: final paragraph),\textsuperscript{152} and who see a value in the judicious use of students’ L1/MT, could ensure student agreement to its use by introducing relevant questions in students’ needs analyses carried out at the beginning of the language course.\textsuperscript{153} If students agree to its use, a contractual agreement could also be introduced outlining the situations when the L1/MT can be used, with inbuilt procedures for ongoing measurement/review of L1/MT use throughout the L2/FL course programme.\textsuperscript{154}

This type of collaborative approach is, to my mind, very important when working with adults, and it is with these latter two important provisions in mind, that I will be moving forward in this part of my project, as I believe they enable the L2/FL reflective practitioner/teacher to ethically and judiciously avail of students’ L1/MT, along with other pedagogic resources, in order to assist the L2/FL student to arrive at his/her desired goal.\textsuperscript{155} That is, as Kumaravadivelu (1994: 27) notes, I am promoting the concept in this part of the project of L2/FL pedagogic practitioners being “strategic teachers as well as strategic researchers.”

Given that my L2/FL teaching experience is overwhelmingly with adult students, both in the area of general English L2/FL teaching and in the ESP area of Business English, it is with these types of students in mind that I know wish to explore possible ways forward in my world of teaching English as an L2/FL, as outlined diagrammatically in Appendix 7.

In thus setting out, the one possible approach forward that comes to mind, based on the fact that many of the methods/approaches of the past have had various strengths and weaknesses in terms of assisting students to attain success in their L2/FL endeavours, is an eclectic approach wherein the strengths of all such methods/approaches are drawn upon, and those weaknesses which have been found to

\textsuperscript{152} See page. 28.
\textsuperscript{153} See Appendices 8 (q. 11) and 9 (q.13).
\textsuperscript{154} Again, I am here thinking of adult students, who are generally able to voice their opinions, as I realise that working with young learners brings with it many complexities in relation to student awareness, curriculum and other stakeholder demands.
\textsuperscript{155} Please also note that I am aware of classroom/lesson management issues, such as a difference of opinion among students in relation to L1/MT use, etc, but do not feel the need to address such issues in this particular project, as I do not see same as being any different to managing the use of different methodological approaches which may not meet every student’s preferred learning style.
not assist students, are left behind. This understanding is well expressed by Hammerly (1991: 18, in Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 30) when he notes that eclecticism endeavours to promote “the careful, principled combination of sound ideas from sound sources into a harmonious whole that yields the best results”. However, in trying to discern what are sound ideas and sound sources, we cannot forget Mogahed’s (2011: 7th paragraph) earlier claim in part two, pp. 31-32 of this project, in relation to the 20th century’s disapproval of using translation in the L2/FL classroom, in that such a disapproval could have arisen as a result of poor grammar-translation methodology practitioner use rather than translation as a methodology per se.\footnote{Linder (2002: 39, in Janulevičienė and Kavaliauskienė, 2002: Discussion, 3rd paragraph) also appears in agreement with this idea that EL teachers are often against the use of translation in their classrooms because they see translation in terms of the historical grammar-translation method, which they judge as having been a non-communicative method.} It is thus incumbent upon us as L2/FL teachers not to “build on sand” but rather to demonstrate that we are reflective practitioners who can put what we have learnt/researched into practice for the benefit of our students.

Kumaravadivelu (1994: 30) observes that the problem with the eclectic approach at classroom level is that teachers who have not been adequately prepared to implement a principled eclectic approach invariably end up providing their students with an unsystematic, unprincipled, and uncritical pedagogy”, with Stern (1992: 11, in Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 30) noting that such consequences are because we have no criteria for identifying/eliminating theories/principles, that is, we have no criteria for identifying ‘sound ideas and sound sources’. According to Prabhu (1990: 172-173, in Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 31), the subjectivity of an approach wherein eclecticism has evolved into ‘principled pragmatism’, in seeking to escape being enslaved within any particular method, needs to contain ‘a sense of plausibility’ which is professionally valid and capable of being judged not on “whether it implies a good or bad method, but more basically, whether it is active, alive, or operational enough to create a sense of involvement for both the teacher and the student”, an approach which I believe, is particularly apposite in relation to using the students L1/translation in the classroom, and once again highlights the importance of a judicious use of same, with a clear understanding and agreement of all stakeholders (teachers, students, etc.) as to when the L1/translation may be used and the objectives for doing so, if the inevitable subjectivity of an inappropriately prepared/trained L2/FL teacher’s eclectic approach, albeit well intentioned, is not to result in the claims of those linguists/teachers who oppose any use of the students’ L1/MT, being fulfilled.
According to Richards and Rodgers (2006: Loc 3157) a method is “often linked to very specific claims and to prescribed practices”, e.g. Grammar-Translation, Audiolingualism, Situational Language Teaching, Suggestopedia, etc., whereas an approach is “a set of beliefs and principles that can be used as the basis for teaching a language” (ibid., Loc 3147), e.g. CLT, The Natural approach, Task-Based Language Teaching, etc. The post-1980s collapse/metamorphosis of CLT into being a protective umbrella term for new movements and methods (Lennon and Ball, n.d.: 15) offers the strategic ‘judicious L1/MT use’ favouring L2/FL teacher, I would like to suggest, the space to develop a “smart toolbox” of resources within the post-method condition based upon what Kumaravadivelu (1994: 29-30) describes as a post-method “alternative to method rather than an alternative method” wherein the teacher’s classroom autonomy, based upon appropriately recognized training within a framework of ‘principled pragmatism’, is respected and allowed to be used for the students’ benefit.157 If such teacher informed autonomy can be nurtured to empower L2/FL students to take full ‘ownership’ of their own language learning, and nurture their “ability to learn” (savoir-apprendre),158 then surely we have arrived at a ‘win-win’ solution.

In this project, I believe we have identified some of the potential tools which may be used as an aid to the L2/FL teacher, such as myself, who is open to using the students L1/MT, as and when appropriate, and I would now like to demonstrate how I feel such tools could be used. In doing so I feel it is important to look first at what I mean by “translation methods” in appendix 7 wherein “Intralingual/Translation Methods” were identified as the way forward for B2-C2 L2/FL students, and so I will first look the B2 – C2 L2/FL student group and what is possible, before looking at the A1 – B1 L2/FL student group, wherein most of the evidence available seems to imply there is a value in using the L1/MT, judiciously, to help students progress in their L2 learning.

---

157 At this point I have to acknowledge the value my TEFL training (General English, Business English and Young Learners), and CELTA training, have giving me in terms of training in areas such as PPP (Presentation, Practice, Production, see Harmer, 2001: 82-83), Pre-/While/Post activity (Underwood, 1989: 112-114, in Harris and Ball, n.d.: 43), etc, even though any use of the students’ L1 in the L2/FL would have been anathema within these training courses. I would thus prefer to think of my emerging approach as being a type of ‘Beyond Method Eclectic Principled Pragmatism’, which I feel does not suggest a discarding of method in the same way as the title ‘Post-method’ does, but does make room for non-mainstream approaches/methods/techniques, etc such as the use of translation and/or L1/MT within the ELT classroom, when students needs/wishes dictate that same would be beneficial, within a clearly defined and agreed objective framework approach.

158 According to Council of Europe’s CEFR (2001: 106-108, 5.1.4,) “savoir-apprendre is the ability to observe and participate in new experiences and to incorporate new knowledge into existing knowledge, modifying the latter where necessary. Language learning abilities are developed in the course of the experience of learning.”
4.1 B2 – C2 L2/FL Students

As noted in part 2 of this project, the overwhelming evidence seems to favour a “cognitive pruning” (Brown, 1972) type of approach which assists the L2/FL student to move into a fully intralingual type of learning environment, wherein the student’s L1 is no longer explicitly needed as an L2 promoting aid, which my teaching experience to date suggests should be well in place by the B2 stage of L2/FL learning in order to offset the negative dependency type situations feared by many language teaching professionals. However, it strikes me that to suggest that B2 – C2 students could not benefit from their metalanguage knowledge/metalinguistic awareness, as a result of having achieved a B2-C2 level of a L2/FL, in a manner similar to students of formal translation studies, to be questionable, especially as noted in the introduction to this project in footnote 14, p. 3, that research in Austria has discovered that students of translation studies achieve higher L2/FL oral skills than do students of linguistics. Such metalanguage knowledge/metalinguistic awareness as an argument for a judicious use of the L1 among B2 – C2 students is also reinforced by Cook’s (2002: 5, in Janulevičienė and Kavaliauskienė, 2002: Discussion, 4th paragraph) observation that “for the majority of the world’s population switching and negotiating between languages is part and parcel of everyday use”, with Janulevičienė and Kavaliauskienė (2002: Discussion, 7th paragraph) noting that such code-switching between the L2/FL and the L1/MT, “even for a short time allows learners to preserve face, get rid of anxiety, build confidence and feel independent in their choice of expression”, and eventually to develop bilingualism.

Thus, if a L2/FL teacher is able to help students to further draw upon their previous language knowledge (which would include their L1/MT knowledge) in order, for example, “to match, intuitively, spoken and written utterances with his/her knowledge of a language” (Masny and d’Anglejan, 1985: 176 in Kumaravadivelu, 2006: 42), and to further enable the students, as noted again by Kumaravadivelu (2006: 42), to grow in language learning

---

159 A view that is reinforced by the fact that the authors of the *Headway series*, John and Liz Soars, are reported by Dahlgren and Sitwell (n.d.: 32) to limit translation to elementary - intermediate levels, indicating that they do not consider translation as being essential at higher language learning levels. Please note that in promoting L1 use/translation for L2/FL students, this project does not present L1 use/translation as an essential, as the Soars seem to do for lower levels, but merely as being a useful additional tool for those teachers and students open to its judicious use by an appropriately skilled teacher.

160 According to Gass and Selinker, (2001: 302, in Kumaravadivelu, 2006: 42) metalanguage knowledge / metalanguage awareness refers to “one’s ability to consider language not just as a means of expressing ideas or communicating with others, but also as an object of inquiry”; see footnote 97.

161 See footnote 40 in part one of this project, and footnote 101 in part two, regarding bilingualism.
awareness, and indeed, understanding of language teaching, is such a teacher not helping his/her students on the road towards complete autonomous language learning?\textsuperscript{162}

This type of collaborative approach is very important when working with adults, as such collaborative teacher/student work, wherein the teacher draws upon the student’s prior language knowledge, as a result of, for example, his/her “utterances”, or indeed his/her writing, lead to what Rommetveit (1985, in Antón and DiCamilla, 1998: 319) defines as “intersubjectivity”, a situation which not only affords the adult student the respect to which his/her life experience, and any possible formal education deserve, but can also initiate L2 progress, via teaching/learning techniques such as translation and cross-lingual analysis.

While further research is needed in this area, the “success”\textsuperscript{163} of educational establishments availing of the traditional translation type approaches to foreign language teaching from the Greco-Roman period onwards, especially from the fourteenth century to the advent of the Direct Method in the latter 19th century, suggests to me that if the learning style/preference\textsuperscript{164} of some B2 – C2 students dictate that they would like to engage in some type of translation-type exercises in order to build up, for example, their professionally specific L2/TL vocabulary skills, then if the L2/FL teacher is sufficiently qualified in terms of the students’ L1 knowledge and skills,\textsuperscript{165} then translation of texts as a L2/FL teaching/learning/acquiring tool, along ‘sense-for-sense’ (i.e. ‘free’/dynamic or

\textsuperscript{162}However, in terms of working with adults, research by Kavaliauskienė and Užpaliienė, (2002: Conclusions) has concluded that for “adult learners progress was hindered by a negative attitude to autonomous learning.” This research finding at first seems to be contrary to what theorists in general in recent years have been telling us is the way forward, and makes me wonder if students perceive such an approach as lacking in social and/or teacher/student interactive benefits, or other aspects, of the learning process? An area, perhaps which is in danger of being overemphasised in an increasingly competitive and ever-changing world, and which would be interesting to research further at a later date. However, having made this observation, I do agree with writers such as Ur (1996: 20) who see autonomy in the area of skill learning as being beneficial for students, leading students to become more proficient and creative learners. Perhaps students such as those in Kavaliauskienė and Užpaliienė’s research need to be helped grow in awareness, especially in L2/FL learning, that it is not possible to teach everything in class (Nunan 1988: 3 in Harmer 2001: 335), and even if it was possible to do so, a teacher will not always be available when the student wishes to use their FL/L2 in real life (Cotterall, 1995: 220, in Harmer, 2001; 335), and in fact, such dependency would be counterproductive in FL/L2 learning. However, one would expect adult learners to be aware of these realities, thus suggesting further research into Kavaliauskienė and Užpaliienė’s (2002) research findings are required.

\textsuperscript{163}I am here conscious of the subjectivity of this claim, but feel justified in making it due to the fact that people did learn their targeted L2/FL prior to the late nineteenth/twentieth century, with some L1/translation use, as explored in part one of this project.

\textsuperscript{164}See pp. 38-39 and footnote 127 of this project.

\textsuperscript{165}I must here acknowledge that my level of Spanish, being in the intermediate range, would exclude me from engaging in these types of activities with B2 – C2 students, but is an area of strength for bilingual teachers and/or non-native English language teachers.
functional equivalence') lines, \textsuperscript{166} could be availed of, particularly via out-of-class homework tasks.\textsuperscript{167}

For example, having worked on an English text during their English lesson, and thus negotiated the meaning from context within the L2/TL (e.g. English), the danger that students who have not developed coping strategies being disadvantaged by translation being thus pre-empted,\textsuperscript{168} students could be asked to translate the given English text into their native L1/MT, thus providing them with a further opportunity to notice\textsuperscript{169} and acquire the L2 vocabulary/phrases via working/STM movement towards LTM storage,\textsuperscript{170} while enabling the teacher to check that the students have understood the text and are gaining

\textsuperscript{166}While, as noted by Dahlgren and Sitwell (n.d.: 31), both students (especially in the B2 – C2 range in my opinion) and teachers are aware that perfect word-for-word equivalence does not exist, we often behave as if it does. An exercise in text translating along sense-for-sense lines, is a useful reminder of this reality. Again please note I am here thinking of adult students. I am also encouraged in my thinking here by Kavaliauskiené and Užpalienė (2002: 25th paragraph), who note that translation can help promote student L2/FL proficiency as it permits students to engage in lexical and structural property comparison and analysis, as they claim that “appropriate exercises can consolidate the L2 constructions for active use and expand vocabulary.” Bearing this in mind, they “encouraged learners to examine formal texts thoroughly and seek comprehension of the meaning, not word-for-word.” One technique I perceive as helping students to avoid this danger is to ask students to read the text and then discuss their opinions of the ideas expressed therein before they engage in any detailed text analysis. Like Grellet (1981, in Harris and Ball, n.d.: 13), it is my opinion that reading tasks are best approached using a “Top-down” strategy approach, and that “it is always preferable to start with overall meaning of text, its function and aim, and move towards a more detailed analysis” Kavaliauskiené and Užpalienė (2002: 26th paragraph) go on to note that it was difficult to get students to seek comprehension of meaning at first, as students tried to engage in word for word translations, an exercise which interfered with their comprehension, but through “[e]ncouraging them to identify a main idea in the sentence or paragraph [the students were] helped to grasp the content points and make the activities more lively”, thus resulting in students developing a much better command of their TL/FL in those activating tasks which sought to reinforce ESP lexis and speech pattern.

\textsuperscript{167}By offering translation tasks as homework the teacher is able to stress the voluntary nature of same when given homework within a group environment, stressing to his/her students that if they do not value translation as a language learning tool, they are free to ignore this particular task, with the teacher perhaps asking such students to summarise the class text, in English, in their own words. However, I must be honest as my professional teaching experience with adult learners has been similar to Kavaliauskiené, and Užpaliené’s (2002: Learners likes and dislikes), who note that “adult learners avoided doing homework or any other additional tasks that would have helped them to consolidate structures and vocabulary.” But having said this, I do, on occasion, encounter adult students “hungry” to progress, usually, but not always, for professional utilitarian reasons, and who are not only willing, but highly appreciative of, the opportunity to engage in homework activities. One way to try and overcome any negative attitudes towards homework (and I am here cognizant of Harmer’s (2001: 338) observation in relation to other professional and non-professional demands on adult students’ time), is to ensure that in general, any translation homework agreed to, is student-driven (Painter, 1999: 42, in Harmer, 2001: 338-339) by, for example, encouraging students to research and suggest texts, etc for translation.

\textsuperscript{168}An important point that has to be considered; see footnotes 88, 89 and 90.

\textsuperscript{169}In terms of increasing students’ awareness via such noticing, as a result of engaging in translating tasks, Soars and Soars (1987: iv, in Dahlgren and Sitwell, n.d: 31) observe that such tasks cause students to “develop a cognitive awareness of [the L2/TL’s] form and function, and of its place within the language system. Areas of potential confusion are confronted, thus drawing students’ attention to main problems.” See also footnote 123, and footnote 99.

\textsuperscript{170}See pp. 39 – 40 of part two of this project.
the desired proficiency in the L2/TL. Translation processing systems such as Nida´s three-stage system of translation: Analysis, transfer and restructuring (Nida and Taber, 1969: 33, in Munday, 2012: Locs 1630, and 1642), also comes to mind here in terms of helping students to make the covert interchange between their L1, (and/or any other acquired languages) and the L2/TL more overt,\(^{171}\) thus helping both the teacher and the student to confirm through the student´s output that the student has correctly acquired that which the teacher intended.\(^{172}\)

However, if B2-C2 students exhibit a strong interest in judiciously availing of their L1/MT to promote their L2/FL learning, the teacher could introduce a form of contrastive/cross-lingual analysis via parallel text exercises, which Thiel (1985: 132) sees as being possible in foreign language classes which are pragmatically-oriented.\(^{173}\) According to Nerbonne (n.d.: 3) “parallel texts together with glosses lay bare the grammatical patterns of a language in a way which is valuable to adult language learners.” While a L2/FL teacher would need to have a high level of proficiency in both the languages in question, if he/she did not, he/she could promote student autonomy by encouraging students to set up out-of-class peer-review support groups to work with parallel texts, an approach which might be appreciated by students of ESP, who could be encouraged to work on in-company business documents.\(^{174}\)

The teacher’s role in this type of scenario, as in the scenario where the teacher is sufficiently proficient in both languages involved in the parallel text production, would be to help the students draw upon their metacognitive knowledge/awareness in order to develop/utilise the relevant learning strategies, especially those of a direct cognitive,\(^{175}\) and indirect metacognitive nature,\(^{176}\) required to complete the task within a

\(^{171}\) See Rogers (2004: 635), on p. 10 regarding making the implicit linguistic and cultural mediation relationship explicit, and footnote 99.

\(^{172}\) See footnote 98.

\(^{173}\) According to Thiel (1985: 132, in Dahlgren and Sitwell, n.d.: Required Reading 3), such courses are “those which aim at language usage in a correspondingly natural communicative situation.”

\(^{174}\) According to Gass and Selinker (2008: 369-370) while learner talk among students is limited and often composed of errors, the question as to whether “these errors are picked up or ignored in the classroom is unclear. Perhaps surprisingly, there is evidence that learners do not pick up errors from one another.” However, the possibility does need to be taken into account and a teacher could try to address any linguistic questions/differences of opinion that arose among students during any peer-work, in in-class post-task reflection/evaluation.

\(^{175}\) Listed by Zaro and Truman (1999: 46-50, in Dahlgren and Sitwell, n.d.: Required Reading 2) as including Repetition / Grouping / Resourcing / Summarization / Substitution / Elaboration / Note-taking / Inferencing / Transfer / Translation; see also footnote 116.

\(^{176}\) Listed by Zaro and Truman (1999: 43-46, in Dahlgren and Sitwell, n.d.: Required Reading 2) as including; Planning / Self-management / Self-monitoring; see also footnote 120.
pair/groupwork environment. If the teacher is working with a multi-lingual group such work could be carried out in linguistic-family groupings, as previously suggested by Owen (2003: 28th paragraph) in footnote 92, in part two of this project. The groups/pairs in any of the above scenarios, having done their research in their L1, could then be encouraged to do a presentation in English of their findings in class, in terms of equivalences (e.g. cognates), false cognates, etc., which would further enrich students’ linguistic awareness, while enabling them to develop their professional presentation skills. Such presentations could culminate in class discussion, especially if, as noted by Owen (2003: 28th paragraph), the different groups of students are provided with/asked to choose “a range of different L1 texts on a monographic issue (or news event, etc.) [which] are taken from the net, translated and compared through class discussion”, as according to Thornbury (07:31:54, 7/04/2010b, in reply to a commentator, Nick, in 2010, Responses) “[r]esearch suggests that the topics that the learners initiate are more memorable than the teacher and/or coursebook generated ones”.

177 While it is tempting to draw up a more specific list of learning strategies for L2 students in the B2 – C2 language range, according to Rees-Miller (1993, in Madrid et al., n.d.: 55), [more] longitudinal research is required to measure “whether the effects of strategy instruction, if there were any, were long-term”, thus causing me to hesitate in recommending, until further scientific evidence emerges in the field of learning strategies, whether a teacher should “try to cover a comprehensive list of different strategies, or should the focus be on a limited number of strategies”, especially in the B2-C2 language range. The reality is that the answer depends on the student/group of students in front of him/her, bearing in mind also “that it is not a question of learners successfully using a specific strategy [of which translation is one] but rather that learners effectively manage to deploy a repertoire, or combination, of strategies which are relevant to the task at hand” (Chamot and Rubin, 1994, in Madrid et al., n.d.: 55). Whether this repertoire should be broad/narrow, only the student(s) need(s) can tell us, albeit that the teacher’s experience is important in the interpretation/judging process.

178 A format suggested by Prodromou (2001: 15th paragraph).

179 According to Pallais and Linan-Thompson (n.d.: 11) “[m]any studies [...] confirm the benefit of using cognates to develop the vocabulary of English learners.” However they also caution against over-generalization in this area, and in the context of Spanish-speaking students of English, they note “that previous exposure to Spanish can impact the ability to learn from cognates.” Prodromou (2001: 14th paragraph) also recommends proverbs and idioms as also being useful areas in which to carry out cross-linguistic analysis, and goes on to note that “[c]omparing proverbs gives an insight into cultural as well as linguistic differences” (ibid., 14th paragraph), which I believe would be a very useful springboard into a discussion for B2-C2 students in their L2/TL, which would be English in the classrooms where I teach.

180 Pallais and Linan (n.d.: 11) note that in drawing upon false cognates in cross-lingual analysis the possibility of same causing confusion in students’ needs to be borne in mind [...] and they cite examples such as: exit – éxito (exit – success); lecture – lectura (lecture – reading); and once – once (once – eleven).

181 See footnote 92.

182 Please note that I am presuming, based upon my English language teaching to date, that students who have arrived at a B2 – C2 L2/FL have developed efficient social/affective interpersonal strategies (noted by Kumaravadivelu, 2006: 36), to be “interpersonal strategies that are consistent with the learners’ psychological and emotional conditions and experiences. They include cooperative learning, peer group discussion, and interacting with competent speakers.”). If such skills are lacking, students would of course need training in same.
4.2 A1 – B1 L2/FL Students

In contrast to the promotion of translation activities for B2 – C2 students via drawing on their metalanguage knowledge/metalinguistic awareness, I would now like to look at the research work of Storch and Wigglesworth (2003: 765) whose research interviews on twenty-four university intermediate ESL students noted that students claimed their L1 was a valuable resource tool in sharing information around grammar and vocabulary, especially when they did not have the required L2/FL metalanguage. This observation is reinforced by Brooks and Donato (1994: 266, in Antón and DiCamilla, 1998: 320) who discovered that their study participants also needed to avail of their L1/MT in terms of “metatalk…talk by the participants about the task at hand and the discourse that constitutes the task”. Unfortunately I am unable to access the background linguistic profile of the students in Brooks and Donato’s (1994: 266, in Antón and DiCamilla, 1998: 320) study, but their findings, along with those of Storch and Wigglesworth (2003: 765), are in line with what I have observed in my L2/FL classroom teaching of A1 – B1 students, and to be honest, on a less frequent basis with B2 students. According to Donato and Lantolf (1990: 268, in Antón and DiCamilla, 1998: 320) this should not surprise us as they note that L1/MT use is “a normal psycholinguistic process that facilitates L2 production and allows the learners both to initiate and sustain verbal interaction with one another”.

At this point I would like to ask the reader to recall footnote 98 wherein L1 advocates such as Swift (2006: 6th paragraph) note using the L1 for explanations and instructions that are beyond the students’ ‘i + 1’ (Krashen, 1981) range of understanding, a technique which may even permit beginners to engage in activities which might otherwise be too difficult to explain, and hence, set up. It was also observed in this footnote that Butzkamm (2003: Maxim 1,3rd paragraph) notes that translation is vital for the beginner L2/FL student, who requires access to his/her L1/MT in order to become aware of meaning in his/her L2/FL, until the L2/FL has become established.183 In relation to A1 – B1 L2/FL students I would thus like to reiterate Villas Boas’ (2013:5th paragraph) point referred to in footnote 110, that I now have a wider vision of what we mean by translation when working with these levels than with B2- C2 L2/FL students, that is, for A1 – B1 students, I see translation in terms of it being an L1 reference / facilitator / catalyst for L2/FL learning/acquisition. Thus, as I try as an English L2/FL reflective practitioner/teacher to move beyond method, at least when student needs dictate that I should do so, I also see, in terms of potential L1 use within the A1 – B1 classrooms, that a principled eclectic pragmatic approach which can draw upon a teacher’s “smart-toolbox” of resources, while still maintaining a communicative ethos within the L2/FL classroom,

183 See also Auerbach’s claims on p. 35 and in footnote 109 of this project.
suggests the best way forward. I would thus now like to draw upon various techniques suggested in part two of this assignment, and review how same could be applied by myself in my A1 – B1 ELT classrooms.

The first technique I would like to look at is Seligson’s (2013) idea in Villas Boas (2013: 7th paragraph) wherein he suggests that the use of L1 as a tool need not be verbal. As noted by Thornbury (2010a: 5th paragraph) in part two of this project at the outset of “Contemporary L2/FL Arguments In Favour of L1 Use In The L2/FL Classroom”, L2/FL students will covertly avail of their L1/MT as a learning strategy, so why not overtly acknowledge this linguistic resource and help students to manipulate this tool? As noted in part two, Seligson (2013, in Villas Boas, 2013: 7th paragraph) suggests awareness-raising activities such as parallel processing or systematic contrastive reflection, which would help students’ to notice and hopefully speed up the learning/acquisitional process. According to Villas Boas (2013: 7th paragraph) this Seligson’ awareness-raising technique simply involves asking students to think about the language topic being discussed, in their L1/MT, in order, hopefully, to increase their noticing, a process which affirms them as “insiders”/knowers, rather than as “empty vessels”. This technique, like the 1970s method known as the “Silent Way” (Caleb Gattegno) subordinates, albeit briefly, teaching to learning, in which it seems to be trying “to foster learners’ self-monitoring and self-correction of their own language learning process” (Arzamendi, Ball et al, n.d.: 52).

A second technique I would like to explore is Villas Boas´ (2013: 4th paragraph) practice of giving children a few minutes at the start of a lesson to share whatever they wished to in their L1/MT. While children are obviously different to adults, there are, in my experience, certain personality types, who need to “talk/chatter” as they settle into a lesson, and this technique could be a very useful classroom management technique, if it was “shaped” appropriately by the teacher. For example, students could be asked to get into pairs and allowed to talk about whatever they liked, in whatever language they liked, for three minutes. At the end of the three minutes they have to briefly report back, in

---

184 See p. 42.
185 A technique which, to my mind, is not too unlike the Situational Approach’s use of concrete objects (e.g. pictures, realia, etc.) and actions and gestures; see pp. 18 - 19 and footnote 66.
186 If the teacher is concerned at any point when using this technique as to whether the students have understood, he/she can adapt a verbal form of this technique in order to ask check questions, either in English and/or in the students’ L1/MT, possibly using Dodson’s (1967/1972) three-step sandwich technique; see p. 32 and footnote 103 of this project. A better approach, if the teacher wishes to maintain the authenticity of the exercise and overcome what Widdowson (1978: 96, in Harris and Ball, n.d.: 10) describes as “the artificiality of the exercise” in asking what might be/be perceived as being display questions, might also be to adapt “Sidney Whitaker’s idea (cf. Lynch, 1996: 133, in Harris and Ball, n.d.: 11) of having learners, and not teachers, think up and ask the questions.”
English, on something that their partner has told them. This technique could help students to orient themselves into their language lesson, and possibly reduce any pre-lesson anxiety they may be feeling, especially if they are A1 students. It might also lead into a brief plenary discussion/material for a future lesson, on some language point that students found difficult to express in English.

A third technique that was commented upon in part two was Atkinson’s (1987 and 1993, in Ferrer, 2005: Introduction, 3rd paragraph) proposal for a restricted and principled L1 use in accuracy-oriented tasks. One way of doing this was suggested by Butzkamm’s (2003: Maxim 3, 2nd paragraph) when he outlined Dodson’s (1967/1972) three-step sandwich technique wherein “[t]he teacher, on the spot, inserts a translation between repetitions of an unknown phrase, almost as an aside, spoken in a different voice or with a slight break in the flow of speech to mark it as an “intruder”’. This is a technique which I think could prove quite useful for students in the A1 – A2, and possibly the B1 range, especially if students were trained in this technique and expected to imitate the final word/phrase/sentence in English in a drill-like manner. While the teacher’s use of a different voice tone and/or break in speech flow are two ways to signal the L1/MT interaction, a different signal could also be agreed by the teacher and students to signal, within pre-agreed boundaries, the need for the L1/MT. This technique could also prove very valuable as an instruction technique, with the teacher gradually withdrawing the students’ L1 (in this case Spanish) as the students grow in confidence and in their English linguistic skills, thus providing the teacher with a cognitive-pruning (Brown, 1972) technique.

The fourth technique I would like to explore in relation to A1 – B1 students is the technique of scaffolding. While Long and Sato (1984, in Foley, 1994: 101) “see conversational scaffolding, in particular, as the crucible of language acquisition”, according to Thornbury (2010b) the term “scaffolding” has become too wide a definition in classroom discourse, being difficult to differentiate from question-response sequences in the traditional IRF format (initiate—respond—follow-up), and he reminds us of Bruner’s (1978) definition of scaffolding as “the steps taken to reduce the degree of freedom in carrying out some tasks so that the child can concentrate on the difficult skill [he/she] is in the process of acquiring” (in Gibbons, 2002, in Ellis, 2003: 181, in Thornbury, 2010b). It would thus seem that both the teacher, and the students, need to be very clear as to why, when and how the L1 may be used in the L2 classroom. My own teaching experience, and research, would see the occasional judicious need for L1 within the A1-B1 range in the

---

187 See p. 32.
areas of instruction and explanation (either of the task and/or a complex grammar issue),
depending on the students level and linguistic needs.

Thornbury provides us with a helpful six-stepped example of the type of
“scaffolding steps” mentioned above from Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976), outlined as
follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>recruiting interest in the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>simplifying the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>maintaining pursuit of the goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>marking critical features and discrepancies between what has been produced and the ideal solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>controlling frustration during problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>demonstrating an idealized version of the act to be performed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Ellis (2003: 181, in Thornbury, S. 2010b).

In the above six-stepped example, I would see the possibility of the students L1/MT being
used by the teacher, possibly via the sandwich technique (Dodson 1967/1972) outlined
above, in steps 1 – 5, as required.\(^\text{188}\) However, I agree with Thornbury (2010b) when he
notes that the above model leaves out a structure whereby the teacher can gradually and
appropriately relinquish his/her role as students grow in L2/FL oral competence by
engaging in a “‘transfer of control’” (Applebee, 1986 in Thornbury, 2010b),\(^\text{189}\) which any
“by using contexts that are extremely familiar and routinized the caregiver can facilitate
the child's learning”. Based on my English language teaching experience to date, I would
see controlled role-play, based on real-life functions such as asking directions, buying a
train ticket, etc., as being able to be used as framework within which to frame the L1/MT
use,\(^\text{190}\) gradually withdrawing its support as students successfully progress through a “Can
Do” continuum.\(^\text{191}\) See Appendix 10 for an example of such an L1/L2 “Can Do” continuum.

\(^\text{188}\) Thus maintaining a FL/TL atmosphere throughout the lesson while breathing a communicative
life into same, as noted by Butzkamm (2003: Maxim 4) and previously referred to on p. 32.
\(^\text{189}\) That is, “[a]s students internalize new procedures and routines, they should take a greater
responsibility for controlling the progress of the task such that the amount of interaction may
actually increase as the student becomes more competent” (Foley 1994: 101).
\(^\text{190}\) Section 4.4.3 – Interactive activities and strategies, pp. 73 – 87, of the Council of Europe’s (2001) CEFRL
publication provides a valuable source of interactive activities for different levels of
proficiency whereby “the language user acts alternatively as speaker and listener with one or more
interlocutors so as to construct jointly, through the negotiation of meaning following the co-
operative principle, conversational discourse” (Council of Europe, 2001: 73).
\(^\text{191}\) The idea for same came from the Council of Europe’s CEFRL, appendix D: The ALTE
[Association of Language Testers in Europe] ‘Can Do’ statements (2001: 244-257). These ‘Can Do’
statements are comprised of about 400 statements divided into three general areas: Social
and Tourist, Work, and Study. The Council of Europe CEFRL (2001: 244) report sees the ‘Can Do’
format as being a user-friendly “tool for those involved in teaching and testing language students.
measuring tool. In my experience, such ‘Can Do’ continuums need to be developed by a language teacher within the context of their language course, intended student group, and intended lesson objectives. While if students are studying for an external exam, such as the Cambridge KET\textsuperscript{192}/PET\textsuperscript{193}/BEC Preliminary\textsuperscript{194} exams, a ‘Can Do’ model can be very helpful in marking milestones/levels of L2 competence achieved, in the particular context of adult students availing of L1/MT use, it is not meant to indicate a model where one size fits all, but needs to be a pragmatic, student-centred measuring tool, if the teacher is going to be able to judge when the L1/MT scaffolding needs to be removed in the particular context he/she is teaching, in order to ensure the students ability/skill to negotiate meaning in the L2 is not impaired in any way.\textsuperscript{195}

The fifth technique I would like to look at in relation to using the students’ L1/MT is the area of learning strategies as I think this is an area that could really help A1-B1 students. The first point we need to recall from part two of this project is Ellis’ (1997: 77) point that students are normally aware of, and able to explain the strategies they use to learn.\textsuperscript{196} In order to tap into this student knowledge I would provide the students with a copy of a suitably adapted learning strategies taxonomy such as the one by Oxford (1990).\textsuperscript{197} Having divided the direct/indirect strategy sections into three pairs of a direct and an indirect strategy, I would then ask students to work in small groups/pairs to discuss same in the light of their learning experience, and ask them to prepare a short presentation in relation to which ones they have used, providing examples. They would then give their presentation to the plenary class group, followed by a discussion. Depending on class size (business classes are usually anywhere between 5 – 9 students, unless they are 1:1s), I would see this exercise as taking place over one to two classes.\textsuperscript{198} The objective of this lesson(s) would be to raise students’ awareness as to their own, and their classmates learning strategy use, with the hope of increasing their attention

They can be used as a checklist of what language users can do and thus define the stage they are at”; see also footnote 108 regarding the use of continuums in L2/FL research.
\textsuperscript{192} “Key, also known as Key English Test (KET), is a basic level qualification that shows you can use English to communicate in simple situations. It shows you have made a good start in learning English” (Cambridge English, 2014: Key (KET)).
\textsuperscript{193} “Preliminary, also known as Preliminary English Test (PET), is an intermediate level qualification. It shows you are able to use your English language skills for work, study and travel” (Cambridge English, 2014: Preliminary (PET)).
\textsuperscript{194} “Business Preliminary, also known as Business English Certificate (BEC) Preliminary, is the first of the three certificates. It is an intermediate level exam” (Cambridge English, 2014: (BEC)Preliminary).
\textsuperscript{195} See footnote 90.
\textsuperscript{196} See p. 37.
\textsuperscript{197} See Appendix 11. The adaptation of same would depend on the level, and the particular needs (e.g. particular ESP needs) of the student/student group being taught.
\textsuperscript{198} However, the task format I am presenting here is only of a variety of types possible, as a whole ELT module could be built around student training in learning strategies.
to/noticing of same, so that as they progress through their language course they will intentionally avail of learning strategies and thus increase their skilled use/control of same. As my adult students are generally professional people from a good educational background, I would foresee that this exercise would build on their previous knowledge, and increase motivation as a result of peer shared experience and knowledge. While this exercise would be of overall benefit to helping students look globally at how they learn, if during this exercise students’ recognition of how their L1/MT has helped their L2/FL learning did not emerge, I would try and elicit student opinion in this area, and if students were open to the value of their L1/MT as a means to progress towards increasing their L2 proficiency, I would endeavour to build on this, as appropriate.

The sixth technique I would like to look at in relation to using the students’ L1/MT is in the area of lexis. This is an area where some L2 teacher-training material writers, such as Scrivener (2005: 414), avail of translation/the students’ L1, as a means of promoting lexis learning among L2/FL students, and is also a technique whereby teacher concerns can be addressed around psycholinguistic language transfer and the earlier expressed idea that “translation gives false credence to the idea that there is a perfect one-to-one correspondence between languages” (Newson (1988: 6). That is, if the particular L2/FL students are not already aware of cross-lingual analysis issues such as false, cognates, etc., (and we must never underestimate adult students’ prior knowledge), then the teacher can provide examples of false cognates, etc., or, for example, direct students to engage in some bilingual dictionary work to raise their awareness. L1 lexis, including language chunks, can also be introduced in memory

---

199 See Appendix 12.
200 See footnote 97.
201 See footnote 88. Scrivener’s (2005: 414) “Learner’s word list” is easily adapted for any specific L2/FL group, and can be used to reinforce students’ implicit or explicit learning as per the first technique outlined in this section.
202 See footnote 179. Prodromou (2001: 14th paragraph), suggests comparing verb-noun collocations, noting that such cross-lingual analysis “helps students understand how L1 interference can often give them problems.”
203 A technique, Kelly (1969: 25) reminds us has been available since at least the 17th century, although Kelly (1969: 25) notes that “[o]nly from the late eighteenth century did the bilingual dictionary become a standard part of the teacher’s arsenal.” See page 10.
204 I would see such language chunks as being very usefully introduced via a notional functional framework, an approach which would appeal to A1-B1 students, but would need to be introduced via scaffolding if it is to be truly beneficial in the A1-A2 range. This process could be speeded up, as argued by Antón and DiCamilla’s (1998) study (see p.43), to my mind, by availing of the students’ L1. Students could be introduced to the required language chunks via, for example, a pre-task L1-L2 matching exercise. Another technique could be to introduce the idea/notion and then brainstorm via students L1 and L2 and then use the material that has emerged to organize a competition by dividing the class into groups for a plenary competition where the teacher provides the L2 translation for a phrase on the board and students have to guess which L1 phrase it is referring to. Students could then go on to practise the given phrases/language chunks via L2 role play.
strategy\textsuperscript{205} training techniques such as semantic mapping, if students see such aids as useful techniques in promoting the transition of vocabulary from their working memory/STM to their LTM.

In looking at lexis I would like to recall Gardner’s \textit{Multiple Intelligences}\textsuperscript{206} and refer the reader to Appendix 13 in which Yücel has applied Gardner’s eight intelligences to the classroom situation and developed a checklist for \textit{Multiple Intelligences} integrated materials.\textsuperscript{207} To my mind, Yücel has provided teachers with a useful background framework of ideas for all L2/FL teachers as they go about their work. However, I see her checklist as being particularly valuable to the L2/FL teacher who wishes to judiciously draw upon students L1/MT to promote L2/TL lexis learning/acquisition when appropriate and when students have agreed to its use, as such a teacher merely has to ask him/herself: Can I use the students’ L1/MT to promote lexis when engaging in any of the activities suggested by Yücel? In using this checklist, the teachers can adapt the ideas therein to his/her particular students’ activities by working via their identified preferred learning styles. For example, in the Verbal-Linguistic section, Yücel suggests word games. With A1 Beginner L2/FL students, a game such as “Password” might facilitate their learning of lexis. As their knowledge of the L2/TL would be very limited, the teacher could organize the students into a circle. The teacher then whispers a word/short phrase to the student in English. The student then gives an explanation of the word in his/her L1/MT (without using the L1/MT equivalent) and the other students must provide the answer in English. The student who provides the correct answer receives one point. This game can be adapted as students L2/FL skill’s develop, in order to promote the L2/TL, by introducing the rule that if the student providing the explanation can do so in English rather than in his/her L1/MT, he/she also receives an extra point. Such activities need not take up much lesson time and can be a fun way of motivating even adult students to learn. This type of activity can easily be adapted for use in ESP, as well as general English, classes. I would see it being used as a lesson warmer, perhaps as an alternative to the activity suggested by Villas Boas (2013: 4th paragraph), as outlined in technique 2 of this section on A1-B1 students.\textsuperscript{208}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{205} See Appendix 11.
\textsuperscript{206} See footnote 127.
\textsuperscript{207} The main reasons I am choosing this approach is because I believe Yücel’s eight “smarts” ensure that each learner’s preferred learning style is catered for, while also ensuring a balance within class material, between the four primary language learning skill areas of (i) Reading, (ii) Listening, (iii) Speaking, and (iv) Writing. Yücel’s checklist questions also open up the possibility of lesson innovation, so that, for example, L1/MT activities may be judiciously incorporated, if the teacher and students deem them appropriate.
\textsuperscript{208} See also page 35.
\end{footnotesize}
The final technique I would like to look at in relation to A1-B1 students and the possible use of their L1/MT is the area of grammar. Like the previous area of lexis the area of L2 grammar acquisition/learning and turning to the students’ L1 for possible support brings us into contact with psycholinguistic language transfer and equivalency. Some might be surprised that I chose not to look at this area first, but the truth is that I do believe in the CLT communicative approach, and share the concern of those in relation to any potential return to the Grammar-Translation approach, at least in how it was generally applied in what was a non-communicative, “passive”, \(^{209}\) “banking” (Freire, 1993: chap. 2) kind of approach to L2/FL teaching. \(^{210}\) However, my experience of L2 teaching to date, has caused me to realise that students in the A1-B1 L2/FL range, although to a decreasing degree as one journeys through these levels, on occasion, appreciate a signalling of equivalency when being introduced to a new grammatical concept. This realisation is supported by Bowen (n.d.: 6th paragraph) who notes that some: “learners need the security of the mother tongue and the opportunity to relate grammatical structures to mother tongue equivalents.” It is thus with the needs of such students in mind that I believe that the L2/FL teacher needs to have some appropriate techniques available to him/her as a resource within his/her “smart-toolbox”, for when a judicious availing of the L1/MT is judged as being advantageous to the learning objective during a grammar-based lesson.

For example, if the teacher is introducing Spanish A1 students to the present perfect in English, and if students were having difficulty comprehending the concept, they could be provided, with an equivalent sentence in their L1/MT, which would likely enable the students to immediately understand what the activity was intending to accomplish. This is a practice which I have regularly observed A1 – B1 students doing to assist a colleague who was having difficulty understanding a concept during a grammar-based lesson and resulted in speeding up the particular activity. It is also something which I have

\(^{209}\) See “Progressivism” in footnote 76.

\(^{210}\) Although I have not forgotten the observation regarding the Greco-Roman “Grammar-Rhetoric” process in footnote 22 in relation to Kelly’s (1969: 343-344) point that “[t]o the classical teacher or grammarian, analysis was only the beginning of grammar […] As rhetoric was an expected sequel to grammar, a start had to be made in the arts of composition.” This approach also had an influence on Renaissance humanists, and may be a closer to the understanding of those original proponents of Grammar-Translation who did not fall into the extremist camp referred to earlier by Howatt (1984, in Richards and Rodgers, 2006: Loc 137), who observed that the Grammar-Translation Method was largely demonised by those who took it to extremes; see pp. 12-13. Nor, indeed, have I forgotten the arguments (outlined in footnote 96) of Butzkamm (2003), Gass (1997) and Kumaravadivelu (2006) regarding the L1 being a valuable “Language Acquisition Support System”, but am in agreement with Storch and Wigglesworth’s (2003: 768) observation of the need for further research in this field.
used on occasion, although I was left internally with a lingering feeling of guilt as to whether I needed to improve my explanation skills.  

Another technique could be to avail of short parallel texts using the L2/TL and the L1/MT, not for in-depth analysis, but via a top-down technique which aims to promote student noticing.

In concluding part three of this project, it is important to reiterate that the techniques from this part of my project are a demonstration of how I would use my “smart-toolbox”, if the need arose to do so judiciously within my English L2/FL classroom, and if I was certain that students were open to same. They are not techniques I would apply across the board in my teaching praxis.

211 Although the fact that the majority of the class understood the explanation given in English went some way to counteract this feeling.
5. CONCLUSION

In coming to the end of this project I feel that I have in fact arrived at a new beginning. In order to explain what I mean by this statement, I would first like to briefly summarise what my explorations in this project have helped me as an English L2/FL teacher to understand:

- The students’ L1/MT has always been present, in some shape and form, and to varying degrees, throughout the history of ELT. As the historical cyclical/’pendulum swinging’ debate as to the potential role of the L1/MT demonstrates, the fate of the L1/MT in an individual classroom depended upon the vested interests of various stakeholders. I thus find myself in agreement with Gabrielatos (2001: 6th paragraph) when he notes that “it seems that the L1 has never been ‘a skeleton in the cupboard’ […] rather it has been a bone of contention for more than two centuries.” The current status of L1/MT use within ELT would seem to depend upon the extent to which the individual teacher buys into the various methods he/she has been exposed to, and whether he/she is willing, for whatever reason, to step out of/beyond the particular pedagogical constraints a particular method.212 See parts one and two.

- As stated in footnote 110, both the MLAEILE course “Teaching English Through Translation” and my own language teaching experience, as well as working on this project, have, to use Villas Boas’ (2013: 5th paragraph) words, “enhanced my understanding that there [exists] a difference between using translation as a method and using the L1 system as a reference for students, a facilitator.”

- As demonstrated in part two of this project, contemporary research that favours the use of L1/translation within the L2/FL classroom overwhelmingly favours its use in the early stages of L2 development, that is, in the A1-B1 range. My explorations have convinced me that this can best take place via crosslingual methods/the L1 system acting as a reference for students, a facilitator, if students are in agreement. (See Appendix 7).

- For those B2-C2 students open to drawing upon their L1, within what should normally be an intralingual methodology/approach, there could be benefits to their progress in L2/FL proficiency via utilising translation methods.

212 Please note that I am excluding the type of less skilled and less proficient L2/FL teacher, referred to in footnote 104, from this debate.
Whenever it is agreed by L2/FL teachers, and their students, to utilize the students’ L1/MT within a lesson, such use should be within the judicious understanding of L1/MT use, as reviewed during this project by authors such as Gabrielatos (2001), Butzkamm (2003), and others, on pp. 31 and ff. As the research of Janulevičienė and Kavaliauskienė (2002) demonstrate, the question of what is a judicious use of students’ L1/MT has still to be resolved, with further research being required. In the meantime it would seem that the responsibility for deciding this question lies largely within the L2/FL teacher’s remit, based upon a close collaborative teacher-student relationship.

Having stated the above, my exploration, in part three, of the potential use of students’ L1/MT via a principled eclectic pragmatic approach which can draw upon a teacher’s “smart-toolbox” of resources, has helped me to realise that appropriate teacher training, in the area of techniques drawing upon students’ L1/MT, and of teaching students how to learn via learning strategies, and matching same to their preferred learning styles, etc., is of vital importance if L1/MT use and/or translation is indeed to be an aid rather than a hindrance. For this to happen, the world of ELT needs teacher educators such as Villas Boas (2013) to step up to the plinth and have confidence in their own teaching abilities, and that of their trainee teachers, to understand that a judicious use of students’ L1/MT, means just that, and should never be overgeneralised or used indiscriminately.

In a globalised era when, as noted by Graddol, the world of ELT is experiencing a paradigm shift which has begun to give birth to a new linguistic “world”, in which “intelligible English”/EIL is starting to challenge native English models, it seems to me, that for those students whose needs indicate that they may benefit from the inclusion of translation/students’ L1, as an additional L2/FL acquiring tool, such students must be helped to understand how their L1/MT and translation, can be harnessed to further their L2/FL learning, that is, they must be empowered and educated into becoming co-constructors, partners and co-creators of their own learning. Not to offer them such an opportunity, seems both unethical, and cowardly.

It is this new understanding of what a student-centred approach means, along with my appreciation of how the students’ L1/MT can be effectively utilised within the L2/FL

---

213 For example, techniques in relation to promoting student noticing in terms of the L1/L2 and how same can help students to discriminate what has been taken into their working memory/STM, in order to decide that which they wish to convert into input to be stored in their LTM for future recall and appropriate linguistic use.

214 See footnote 94.

215 See footnote 131.

216 See footnote 146.
classroom, and the move towards “intelligible English/EIL within certain sections of the ELT world, that suggests to me that I have arrived at a new beginning in my L2/FL teaching career. Perhaps what the world of ELT needs is a new Viëtor, the 1882 author of “Language teaching must start afresh”, but a Viëtor who is able to take a wider view, and see the value of including, but not imposing, L2/FL tools based on the students’ L1/MT, within the L2/FL teaching smart tool-box., to be used, as required by appropriately trained L2/FL teaching professionals.

217 See p. 13 and footnote 49.
6. PROJECT EVALUATION

6.1 Lack of access to original text sources and reliance on secondary/indirect texts

In evaluating this project, I would like to highlight my awareness of the limitations in relation to the works consulted. Unfortunately, I have not been able to read all the works cited directly and I therefore use many indirect citations. This is not what I would have liked, but the alternative would have been to not include or cite many works which I consider are relevant to the topic of this thesis.

6.2 Project Limitations

I would also like to acknowledge that, in my opinion, Villas Boas (2013) is rightly concerned about potential overgeneralization of the value of a judicious use of the L1/MT in the L2/FL classroom. Also, Liao (2006: 211), commenting on the findings and the sample population of his study, stated that “the generalization of the findings may be limited to populations with similar nature and may not be applicable so well for other learner groups with different native languages, educational settings, or cultural backgrounds.” This warning must always be borne in mind, when exploring this, or any other topic within the world of research.

6.3 Learning Curve

Completing this project as part of my MLAEILE course has enabled me to review all that I have learned on this course and, consequently, I have been able to consolidate my learning and to become aware that such learning can, and will, have an impact on my L2/FL classroom teaching.
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Appendix 1

Table 1. Common Reference Levels: global scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proficient User</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent User</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes and ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic User</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2

Translation Studies

“Pure”
- Theoretical
  - General
    - Medium Restricted
  - Partial
    - Area Restricted

Descriptive
- Product Oriented
  - Rank Restricted
  - Text-Type Restricted
- Process Oriented
  - Time Restricted
- Function Oriented
  - Problem Restricted

Applied
- Translator Training
- Translation Aids
- Translation Criticism

Source: Holmes 1988 ‘map’ of translation studies (in Toury (1995:10) and in Dahlgren and Sitwell, n.d.: 9)).
Appendix 3

St Jerome’s translation of a letter from Pope Epiphenius to John, the Bishop of Jerusalem:

Ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera voce profiteer, me in interpretation Graecorum, absque scripturis sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo et mysterium est, non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu.

(St Jerome Epistolae Vol. II (395 CE/1565:287).

Now I not only admit but freely announce that in translating from the Greek – except of course in the case of the Holy Scripture, where even the syntax contains a mystery – I render not word-for-word, but sense-for-sense.

Appendix 4

Results of the questionnaires on the use of Chinese in the English classroom

1. Should Chinese be used in the classroom?
Students: yes 70%  no 30%
Teachers: yes 72%  no 28%

2. Do you like your teacher to use Chinese in the class? (students only)
not at all 3%  a little 45%
sometimes 50%  a lot  2%

3. When do you think it is necessary to use Chinese in the English classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. to explain complex grammar points</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. to help define some new vocabulary items</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. to explain difficult concepts or ideas</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. to practice the use of some phrases and expressions</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. to give instructions</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. to give suggestions on how to learn more effectively</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If you think the use of Chinese is necessary in the classroom, why?

Students
a. It helps me to understand the difficult concepts better.  69%
b. It helps me to understand the new vocabulary items better. 42%
c. It makes me feel at ease, comfortable and less stressed. 8%
d. I feel less lost. 6%

Teachers
a. It aids comprehension greatly. 39%
b. It is more effective. 44%
c. It is less time-consuming. 28%

5. Do you think the use of Chinese in the classroom helps you learn this language? (students only)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairly much</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>a lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How often do you think Chinese should be used in the classroom? (students only)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What percentage of time do you think Chinese should be used in the class? (students only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 30%  | 10%      (No students answered higher than 30%.)

---

Participants could choose more than one answer to a question (items 3 and 4). Totals add up to more than 100 percent; Tang (2002: 40).
Appendix 5

Appendix 6

Typology of procedural knowledge according to Ellis 1985:165 (in Madrid et al.; n.d.: 21)

Social processes/strategies
(i.e. devices for managing Interaction in L2)

Procedural knowledge

Cognitive strategies / processes

For learning L2
(i.e. devices for internalising or automatizing L2 knowledge)

For using L2

Production/reception process and strategies
(i.e. devices for using resources automatically)

Communication strategies
(i.e. devices for compensating for inadequate resources)
Appendix 7

Translation Studies

“Pure”

Contemporary L2/FL
Arguments Against
L1 use in the L2/FL
Classroom.

Arguments In Favour Of
L1 use in the L2/FL
Classroom.

Possible Ways Forward

A1 – B1
‘crosslingual methods/the L1 system as a reference for students, a facilitator’

B2 – C2
‘intralingual/translation methods’

Source: Adapted from Holmes 1988 ‘map’ of translation studies (in Toury (1995:10) and in Dahlgren and Sitwell, n.d.: 9).
Appendix 8

Needs Analysis for A1 – B1 students

NEEDS ANALYSIS

Student:

Date of birth:

Contact details:

Work Tel. No:

Mobile/Cell (If you are willing to give this):

Email Address:

Please take your time and think about the questions on this form. If you do not understand anything please ask your teacher to explain.

Interests:

1) What are your interests and hobbies (e.g., football)?

Academic/Educational History:

2) What are your educational qualifications?
3) Have you any English language qualifications (e.g. Cambridge exams qualifications)?:

Attitudes to Learning:

4) What makes a good English teacher?
5) What makes a bad English teacher?
6) What helps you to learn English?
7) Think about some of the coursebooks you have used to help you learn English.
   (a) What were their names?
   (b) Tell me something good about these books.
   (c) Tell me something negative about these books.
   (d) Would you like to continue using the same book?

---

219 Adapted from Barnet (n.d., section Powerful Positive Peer Pressure, 2nd paragraph).
8) Write five things you would like to be able to do better in English (e.g. write a letter to a friend).  

A _________________________  
B _________________________  
C _________________________  
D _________________________  
E _________________________

9) Why do you want to continue learning English?

10) Tick the box in the correct places to show your opinion. Write a comment to explain why you chose that answer.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I need to study more of this</th>
<th>I don’t mind</th>
<th>I don’t want much of this</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary / phrases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scrivener (2005: 408). Permission to photocopy and use in class given by author.
11) **Using Spanish during your English lesson**

Please place an x next to your opinion. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should your teacher use Spanish during an English lesson?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image of a table with options Yes, Sometimes, and Never]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If you answered ‘Never’, go to question 12. If you answered ‘Yes’ or ‘Sometimes’, go to question 11.2 below.**

2 - When do you think it is necessary to use Spanish in the English classroom?

- a – To explain some new vocabulary
- b – To explain some grammar
- c – To explain difficult ideas.
- d – To give instructions
- e – To ask a difficult question.
- f – Other, please explain. ________________________________

3 – Why is Spanish necessary in the classroom?

- a – To understand difficult ideas.
- b – To understand new vocabulary.
- c – To help me feel relaxed, comfortable and less stressed.
- d – To ask a question when I don’t understand.
- e – Other, please explain ________________________________

---

222 Adapted from Tang (2002: 42).
12) Please help me to discover how you like to learn.

Put an ‘x’ in the correct box.\(^{223}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I like…</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>just a little</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- working in pairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- working in small groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- class discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- teacher explanations to help students complete class tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- when the teacher asks questions when all the students are together in the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- when the teacher asks me individual questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- when the teacher asks me to repeat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to see things (pictures, words written down, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to hear things (examples of language, recordings, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to touch and hold things (e.g. models, pictures, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the class to move very fast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- doing exercises on my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- doing exercises with other students’ help and ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- listening to the teacher telling stories, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- speaking without being corrected constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- most work to come from the coursebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the teacher to explain/simplify coursebook material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- when the teacher explains every new point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- when the teacher helps us to understand things for ourselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- language games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- getting a lot of chances to use the language myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{223}\) Adapted from Scrivener (2005: 405). Permission to photocopy and use in class given by author.
Needs Analysis for B2 – C2 Students

NEEDS ANALYSIS

Student:

Date of birth:

Contact details:

Work Tel. No:

Mobile/Cell (If you are willing to give this):

Email Address:

Please take your time and think about the questions on this form as they will help me to make your English class more interesting and relevant to your needs.

Interests:

1) Please, write a short paragraph outlining your interests and hobbies.

Academic/Educational History:

2) Please, give a brief description of your final educational qualification and where you obtained it:

3) Have you obtained any qualifications in English language learning (e.g. Cambridge exam qualifications)?

Attitudes to Learning:

4) Think about your best English teacher and tell me why he/she was your best English teacher:

5) Think about your worst English teacher and tell me why he/she was your worst English teacher:

---

224 Please note that spaces for answers in Appendices 8 and 9 have been reduced for inclusion in this project.
6) In your previous English language classes, what impeded/prevented your learning?\footnote{Adapted from Barnet (n.d., section Powerful Positive Peer Pressure, 2nd paragraph).}

7) In your previous English language classes, what helped your learning?\footnote{Adapted from Barnet (n.d., section Powerful Positive Peer Pressure, 2nd paragraph).}

8) Think about some of the coursebooks you have used to help you learn English.

9) 
   (a) What were their titles?

   (b) Tell me something good about these books.

   (c) Tell me something negative about these books.

   (d) Would you like to continue using the same book?

10) Write five things you would like to be able to do better in English (e.g. write a letter to a friend).\footnote{Scrivener (2005: 408). Permission to photocopy and use in class given by author.}

    A _________________________  D _________________________

    B _________________________  E _________________________

    C _________________________

11) Why do you want to continue learning English?

12) Which of the following do you want or need to study more? Mark the box in the correct places to show your opinion and then add a comment to explain why you chose that answer.\footnote{Scrivener (2005: 408). Permission to photocopy and use in class given by author.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I need to study more of this</th>
<th>I don’t mind</th>
<th>I don’t want much of this</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13) This question aims to find out your attitude to using Spanish during your English lesson. Please place an x next to your opinion.\textsuperscript{229}

1 – Should your teacher use Spanish during an English lesson?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you answered ‘Never’, go to question 13.1, you are finished with question 13 and can go straight to question 14 below. If you answered ‘Yes’ or ‘Sometimes’, please continue to 13.2 below.

2 - When do you think it is necessary to use Spanish in the English classroom?

   a – To help define some new vocabulary items (e.g., some abstract words).
   b – To practice the use of some phrases and expressions (e.g. doing translation exercises).
   c – To explain complex grammar points.
   d – To explain difficult concepts or ideas.
   e – To give instructions.
   f – To give suggestions on how to learn more effectively.
   g – Other; please specify________________________________

3 – If you think the use of Spanish is necessary in the classroom, say why.

   a – It helps me to understand difficult concepts better.
   b – It helps me to understand new vocabulary items better.
   c – It makes me feel at ease, comfortable and less stressed.
   d – I feel less lost.
   e – Other; please specify________________________________

\textsuperscript{229} Adapted from Tang (2002: 42).
14) Please complete the following table to help me discover your individual learning preferences by marking the box in the correct place.\textsuperscript{230}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I like…</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>just a little</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- working in pairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- working in small groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- whole-class discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- whole-class teacher explanations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- when the teacher asks the whole class questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- when the teacher asks me individual questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- when the teacher asks me to repeat language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to see things (pictures, words written down, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to hear things (examples of language, recordings, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to touch and hold things (e.g. models, pictures, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the class to move very fast.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- doing exercises on my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- doing exercises with other students’ help and ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- listening to the teacher telling stories, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- speaking without being interrupted by corrections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- most work to come from the coursebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the teacher to adapt coursebook material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- when the teacher explains every new point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- when the teacher helps us to work things out for ourselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- language games.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- having a lot of chances to use the language myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- homework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions/doubts while completing this needs analysis you can contact me at the following email address: joebloggs@bolmail.com

\textsuperscript{230} Source: Scrivener (2005: 405).
Appendix 10

An Example of an L1/L2 ‘Can Do’ Task Measuring Tool

Definitions for the above L1/L2 ‘Can Do’ Measuring Tool:

Instruction: The basic information a student needs on how to start and complete a task.

Explanation: The minimal information that a student needs to understand a language point or the meaning of lexis.

Continuous / Frequent / Occasional: These adverbs of frequency need to be defined by the teacher before each task.
## DIRECT STRATEGIES (Oxford, 1990)

*(Memory, cognitive, compensation strategies)*

### Group I: MEMORY STRATEGIES

A. Creating mental linkages:
   - 1. Grouping
   - 2. Associating/elaborating
   - 3. Placing new words into a context

B. Applying images and sounds:
   - 1. Using imagery
   - 2. Semantic mapping
   - 3. Using keywords
   - 4. Representing sounds in memory

C. Reviewing well:
   - 1. Structured reviewing

D. Employing action:
   - 1. Using physical response or sensation
   - 2. Using mechanical techniques

### Group II: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES

A. Practising:
   - 1. Repeating
   - 2. Formally practising with sounds and writing systems
   - 3. Recognizing and using formulas and patterns
   - 4. Recombining
   - 5. Practising naturalistically

B. Receiving and sending messages:
   - 1. Getting the idea quickly
   - 2. Using resources for receiving and sending messages

C. Analysing and reasoning:
   - 1. Reasoning deductively
   - 2. Analysing expressions
   - 3. *Analysing contrastively (across languages)*
   - 4. Translating
   - 5. Transferring

D. Creating structure for input and output:
   - 1. Taking notes
   - 2. Summarizing

---

**Source:** Detailed direct/indirect LS taxonomy (Oxford 1990, in Madrid *et al*., n.d.: 36-37)
### Group III: COMPENSATION STRATEGIES

**A. Guessing Intelligently:**
1. Using linguistic clues
2. Using other clues

**B. Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing:**
1. **Switching to the mother tongue**
2. Getting help
3. Using mime or gesture
4. Avoiding communication partially or totally
5. Selecting the topic
6. Adjusting or approximating the message
7. Coining words
8. Using a circumlocution or synonym

### INDIRECT STRATEGIES

*(Metacognitive, affective and social strategies)*

**Group I: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES**

A. Centring your learning:
1. Overviewing and linking with already known material
2. Paying attention
3. Delaying speech production to focus on listening

B. Arranging and planning your learning:
1. Finding out about language learning
2. Organizing
3. Setting goals and objectives
4. Identifying the purpose of a language task
5. Planning for a language task
6. Seeking practice opportunities

C. Evaluating your learning:
1. Self-monitoring
2. Self-evaluating

**Group II: AFFECTIVE STRATEGIES**
A. Lowering your anxiety:
   1. Using progressive relaxation, deep breathing or meditation
   2. Using music
   3. Using laughter
B. Encouraging yourself:
   1. Making positive statements
   2. Taking risks wisely
   3. Rewarding yourself
C. Taking your emotional temperature:
   1. Listening to your body
   2. Using a checklist
   3. Writing a language learning diary
   4. Discussing your feelings with someone else

Group III: SOCIAL STRATEGIES
A. Asking questions:
   1. Asking for clarification
   2. Asking for correction
B. Cooperating with others:
   1. Cooperating with peers
   2. Cooperating with proficiency users of the new language
C. Empathizing with others:
   1. Developing cultural understanding
   2. Becoming aware of others thoughts and feelings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lexical Item</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pronunciation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Translation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Grammar</strong></th>
<th><strong>Collocations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Example</strong></th>
<th><strong>Idea</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>motorcycle</strong></td>
<td>/ˈmɒtəsaɪkəl/</td>
<td><strong>Motocicleta</strong>*</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>Ride a…</td>
<td>She’s just</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Get on my…</td>
<td>bought a…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…maintenance,</td>
<td>600cc Suzuki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…race,</td>
<td>motorcycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…courier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted for a Spanish-speaking L1/MT audience from © Jim Scrivener and Macmillan Publishers Limited, 2005. This page may be photocopied for use in class.
Appendix 13:

8 Smarts in ELT Materials by Beril Ayman Yücel

"Each student is unique and all in individual ways offer valuable contributions to human culture."
(Campbell, L., Campbell B. and Dickinson, D.1996)

IV. CHECKLIST FOR MI INTEGRATED MATERIALS

| LOGICAL-MATHEMATICAL INTELLIGENCE | • What kinds of critical thinking or problem-solving activities can I integrate into my material?  
| | • Would it be possible to put some puzzles, charts, mind maps into the material? How?  
| VISUAL-SPATIAL | • What kind of visual aids (pictures, OHTs, word flashcards, etc.), visualisation and colour can I use?  
| | • Where can I locate these visuals on my material?  
| MUSICAL | • What kind of music, songs, environmental sounds, rythmical patterns can I use?  
| | • At what stage of the material can music/songs or poetry be used?  
| VERBAL-LINGUISTIC | • What kind of stories, poems, short plays, word games, lectures, etc can I use?  
| | • How can I include note-taking and presentation skills in my material?  
| BODILY-KINESTHETIC | • What kind of role-play cards, puzzle cards can I prepare?  
| | • What kind of hands-on materials can I prepare?  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATURALIST</td>
<td>- What kind of category charts and diagrams can I use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How can I encourage students to describe or observe the environment and relate it to the subject in my material?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL</td>
<td>- What kind of pair work/group work activities can I integrate into my material?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What kind of peer sharing or co-operative learning materials can I use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRAPERSONAL</td>
<td>- What kind of activities can I cover in my material which would evoke personal feelings or values?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Would it be possible to put a journal component in my material?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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