CHAPTER IV
THE PEDAGOGY OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE AND THE ROLE OF TRANSLATION

Historical Perspective

Translation in English Language Teaching in the West

Looking back, one finds that throughout history, foreign language teaching has continued to be an important concern. While English is the most widely studied foreign language in the present world, Latin used to be its counterpart five hundred years ago as the chief language of administration, education, commerce and religion. French, Italian and English, however, replaced it in the sixteenth century owing to changes in political conditions in Europe. The study of Latin was still pursued in schools nevertheless, as it was believed to develop mental discipline and intellectual abilities. Thus, Latin was taught through the classical works of Virgil, Ovid, and Cicero in Europe from the sixteenth to the end of the nineteenth century. The basic method was a rigorous study of Latin grammar, memorization of vocabulary items, study of declensions and conjugations, and writing sample sentences and translation. When the vernaculars entered the curriculum as foreign languages, even they were taught following the same pattern - analysis and memorization of grammatical rules, rote-learning of vocabulary, and translation.
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The Grammar/Translation Method: By the nineteenth century, this approach based on the study of Latin had become the standard way of teaching a foreign language, and had come to be known as the Grammar/Translation method. The chief characteristics of the method were the following:

1. Grammar rules were first explained and then exemplified; in other words, grammar was taught deductively.

2. Vocabulary was learned through bilingual word-lists and memorization.

3. Sentence was the basic unit of teaching and no attention was paid to context.

4. Accuracy was emphasized and high standards of precision were demanded of the student in translation.

5. Reading and writing were the major focus and little or no attention was paid to the spoken form, as the goal of foreign language study was held to be reading its literature in order to benefit from the intellectual discipline and mental exercise it offered.

6. Students' native language was the medium of instruction.

The Grammar/Translation method is remembered with distaste by all who had the bad luck of going through the ordeal of learning endless word-lists and unusable grammar.
rules, and trying to produce perfect translation of stilted and literary writing. The pressure of public examinations pushed the method towards extremes, resulting in a "tyrannical obsession with minutiae" (Howatt 1984). 1

However, in the words of Howatt (1984), "a total loss of genuine feeling for living language" was perhaps the chief drawback of the Grammar/Translation method, because it was based on the study of a dead language, and therefore, did not consider language as it is used in everyday situations (p.135). Catford (1965) believes, "The chief defect of the now almost universally condemned 'Grammar-Translation Method' was that it used bad grammar and bad translation - translation is not a dangerous technique in itself provided its nature is understood and its use is carefully controlled" (p.viii). Grammatical rules which were obscure and unusable, and translation (in which accuracy is pushed to extremes), of meaningless and decontextualized sentences are examples of "bad grammar and bad translation".

The Grammar/Translation method began to be questioned and rejected towards the end of the eighteenth century as a result of the circumstances. The expansion of railways provided a need of communication among different countries of Europe, and oral proficiency in a foreign language became important. Phrase-books and conversation books were prepared, but there was also a need for text books which
offered a more thorough grounding than these books could provide, at the same time catering to the practical needs of the adult learner, thus paving the way for a new approach to language learning.

Individual Innovations in Language Teaching in the Nineteenth Century

The public education system was not dealing adequately with the problems which arose with the increase in transport and communication. Hence, to meet the demands of the day, new approaches to language teaching were developed by individuals in Germany, England and France; each with a specific method for teaching the foreign language. Though these individual specialists among whom the chief names are Marcel, Prendergast and Gouin, were not taken seriously in their time, their ideas are of a historical importance. All these based their teaching approach on L1 acquisition. Of these, Prendergast's "Mastery system" was the first attempt to elaborate a psychological theory of child language acquisition and apply it to the teaching of foreign languages. Prendergast who paid attention to pronunciation and spoken English as well as reading and writing in his courses, also made considerable use of translation but insisted, however, that it should be cursory observation, not close study. Remarking on this Howatt (1984) says, "The practice of translation has been condemned so strenuously for so long, without any really convincing reasons, that it
is perhaps time the profession took another look at it. Was it really translation that the reformers objected to a hundred years ago, or as Prendergast suggests, the way in which it was used?" (p.161).

Reform Movement

It is seen that by the late nineteenth century speaking proficiency, rather than reading comprehension, grammar or writing ability were gradually becoming the goal of foreign language learning. The ideas of Marcel, Prendergast and Gouin could not receive widespread attention at the time, because of lack of organisational structure in the language teaching profession. From 1880, however, practically minded linguists like Henry Sweet of England, Paul Passy of France and Wilhelm Vietor of Germany began to express their ideas through pamphlets, books, speeches and articles, and their concerted effort became known as the Reform Movement. The movement gained impetus from the founding of the International Phonetic Association in 1986, which established the primacy of speech. The International Phonetic Association advocated the study of spoken language, phonetic training, use of conversational texts and dialogues, an inductive approach to the teaching of grammar as well as teaching new meaning through association, rather than the use of L1. It was believed by the Reformists that language teaching methodology should be based on a study of
linguistics and psychology. Henry Sweet proposed the ideas of selection and gradation in his book, "The Practical Study of Language" in 1989. Wilhelm Vietor in Germany also based his views on linguistic theory and stressed the primacy of oral proficiency. In his pamphlet, "Language Teaching Must Start Afresh", he strongly criticized the inadequacy of the Grammar/Translation method. In brief, the Reformists believed in the primacy of speech, an oral-proficiency based methodology, teaching of sentences in meaningful contexts, inductive teaching of grammar, and avoidance of translation, although the mother tongue could be used in order to explain new words or to check comprehension.

The Direct Method

The Reform Movement gave impetus to an interest in developing methods along the lines of L1 acquisition, which led eventually to the birth of the Direct Method. The Direct Method which is in most ways on the opposite pole to the Grammar/Translation method, advocated exclusive use of the target language, employment of everyday vocabulary and sentences, teaching of oral communication skills, inductive teaching of grammar and teaching of vocabulary through association, explanation of L2, or demonstration rather than translation. Though the Direct Method was quite successful in private language schools, it was difficult to implement in public secondary school education. Richards and Rodgers
(1986) remarks that, "It overemphasized and distorted the similarities between naturalistic first language learning and classroom language learning, and failed to consider its practical realities of the classroom" (p.10). It was also criticized because: (i) it required teachers of a native-like fluency which was not always feasible and, (ii) strict adherence to Direct Method principles could be counterproductive, since teachers wasted a lot of time and energy on explaining terms which could be taught effectively using the native tongue.

By 1920 the popularity of the Direct Method in non-commercial schools waned in Europe. In France and Germany, it was replaced by a modified version which combined some Direct Method techniques along with grammar-based activities. Also, though the Direct Method had become popular in the early part of the 20th century in America, a reading knowledge of the foreign language was considered there to be more practical at the time. In the 1920s and 1930s applied linguists systematized the principles proposed earlier by the Reform Movement, and so laid the foundation for the development of Audiolingualism in the US and the Oral Approach or Situational Language Teaching in Britain.
The Audiolingual Method

A method based on intensive oral activity to teach foreign language to the army personnel in a short time was devised and developed in America during the World War II, when it was in the need to know the language of both its allies and enemies. When this method was adopted by educational institutions, it came to be known as the Audiolingual Method. The ALM was firmly grounded in the structural linguistics and behaviouristic psychology of the time. Contrastive analysis was popular at the time, according to which mother tongue was believed to cause interference with L2 learning, and this resulted in an almost total elimination of the native tongue from the language teaching scene. Under the influence of behaviourist psychology, the important characteristics of this method were avoidance of error as far as possible, mimicry, memorization, pattern drill, stress on pronunciation and speech practice. ALM's popularity declined because of its ultimate failure to teach long term communicative proficiency.

Minor Methods of the 1970's

Many minor methods became popular in language teaching during the 1970's, which exploited the advances made chiefly in psychology, and translation figured as an important aspect of them.
Community language learning recognized the affective and interpersonal nature of all learning. In order for learning to take place, students and teachers join together in an interpersonal relationship to facilitate learning in a context of valuing and prizing each individual in the group. The communication at the early stages between learners takes place in their native language and the counsellor/teacher keeps translating the utterance back to the learner in the L2, which the learner repeats. Gradually, the learners are able to speak directly in the foreign language, without translation. Because of the teachers' role being too non-directive, and the method's total reliance on an inductive strategy of learning, it has not proved to be very effective. Still, its use of L1, to alleviate the threatening affective factor from the classroom is a lesson to be learnt from the method.

Suggestopaedia lays stress on a relaxed state of mind, and giving over of control to the teacher. It also makes significant use of the mother tongue. The proposed classroom technique is that while the teacher reads the book loudly with music in the background, the students follow the teacher in their own text where each lesson is translated into the L1.
The Natural Approach is based on the hotly debated theories of language acquisition propounded by Stephen Krashen (1982). Krashen feels that language acquisition takes place only in a natural environment where spontaneous conversation takes place. According to him, formal classroom instruction contributes little to language acquisition. He believes in the learner being provided only comprehensible input, delay of production until speech emerges, a relaxed atmosphere in the classroom, and a great deal of oral communication as opposed to the analysis of grammatical rules. As the approach seeks to simulate L1 acquisition in teaching L2, the role of learner's native language and hence, translation is completely ruled out. But as Douglas Brown (1987) says, "There are a number of possible long-range goals of language instruction. In some cases second languages are learned for oral communication, in other cases for written communication, and in still others there may be an academic emphasis on, say listening to lectures, speaking in a classroom context, or writing a research paper. The Natural Approach is aimed at the goals of basic personal communication skills, that is, everyday language situations - conversation, shopping, listening to the radio and the like" (p.164). The above comment is sufficient to show the limitation of the approach. Though it might be good for the beginning level of students, or those who need only an oral proficiency in the given language, it does not cater to
other needs of language learners which might be just as important.

**Communicative Language Teaching:** The modern era of language teaching is chiefly involved in what has been called "a push towards communication" (Higgs and Clifford 1982), through the means of the Communicative Language Teaching approach which is a rather difficult construct to define, because of the various interpretations of it by different language teaching specialists. Some of the important characteristics based on these definitions can be cited as the following:

i) It claims to emphasize all the components of communicative competence.

ii) "Function" instead of "form" is the organisational unit of syllabus design.

iii) Fluency rather than accuracy is emphasized. In other words, transmission of message is more important than the way it is put into words.

iv) Use of language by the learner is encouraged in unrehearsed situations.

v) It advocates exposure to authentic materials in language teaching.

Communicative language teaching has been in vogue since the mid 70's and is still the most widely accepted method of
language teaching. Lately, however, it has come in for severe criticism (Swan 1985). The reasons are the following:

i) The dichotomy between "function" versus "form" or "use" versus "usage" proposed by it has been exaggerated, since a word or structure almost always requires its meaning from the context in which it appears and there is no point in adopting a whole new approach for the exclusive teaching of "use" or "function".

ii) It overemphasizes oral interaction in language teaching, neglecting the skills of reading and writing.

iii) It is biased towards fluency activities, ignoring accuracy in communication, though in most situations students have a need for accuracy. Activities such as grammar-based tasks as well.

iv) It underscores language use in real-life settings, which are not always amenable to teaching by non-native teachers.

v) It takes a "tabula rasa" view of the learner and does not assign the mother tongue its proper role. A look at the current handbook for teachers is enough to show that it is neglected almost entirely and L1 resources are not exploited. The students are taught the second language as if they are learning a language for the first time and the
possible transfer of language content and skills is totally overlooked.

Communicative language teaching has contributed a great deal to the field of language teaching, by looking at the functional side of language, and incorporating it into the curriculum. By introducing motivating classroom techniques such as pair-work, group work, role-play, simulation and use of authentic material, the language classroom has become much more purposeful and lively than ever before. The shortcomings of the CLT, however, have made people take a second look at it, and the use of traditional time-tested techniques like memorization and translation is considered again to complement the existing techniques. A new interest in the use of translation in L2 teaching is evident and the following statements by professionals in the field bear testimony to the fact:

"... translation, conceived of in a certain way can be a very useful pedagogic device and indeed in some circumstances specially those, where a foreign language is being learned for special purposes as a service subject, translation of a kind may provide the most effective means of learning" (Widdowson 1979).

"... translation can be a very useful method of implementing a syllabus, whether this is communicatively oriented or not, in the teaching of advanced learners"
"I contend that the potential of the mother tongue as a classroom resource is so great that its role should merit considerable attention and discussion in any attempt to develop a 'post-communicative' approach to TEFL for adolescents and adults" (Atkinson 1987).

The advocates of translation, however, do not wish to bring it back by excluding the existing techniques of the Communicative Approach, but wish to incorporate it within the broader framework of the Communicative Methodology, judiciously and appropriately, where the situation demands. Such eclecticism helps in avoiding extremes and evolving a more balanced and successful approach to language teaching.

The Use of Translation in English Language Teaching in India

In the absence of any reference source which gives a systematic account of the teaching of English in India, one can base one's study of ELT methods in India on three things:

i) Government reports, reflecting the policy decisions and the state of affairs in the teaching of English in India.

ii) Text books used for the teaching of English in India.
iii) Personal experience of the earlier generation and the present generation.

A methodology of teaching is always connected to its objectives. The aim of teaching English in India was originally to create an elite which could adopt and inherit Western language, culture, and knowledge, resulting in the teaching of English as an aesthetic and humanistic discipline, and not necessarily as a means of communication or a "window upon the world". The attitude prevailed for about a century and resulted in a general neglect of methodology of language teaching in India and an indifference towards the development of language skills.

When the teaching of English started in India, it was through the Grammar/Translation method which happened to be the popular method of the time in the West. The first syllabus (1874) of the Mohomedan Anglo-Oriental College also specified translation from L1 to L2 as one of its important components, in classes ranging from the first to ninth. However, when at the beginning of the twentieth century, the Direct Method replaced the Grammar/Translation method in the West, it did not make much of an appeal in India. As has already been noted, the Direct Method laid stress on oral work and complete elimination of the mother tongue. Its successful implementation required teachers who had a perfect command of both the written and the spoken forms of
English, which was not always feasible. Thus, though the Direct Method was the officially recognised method of teaching in teacher training courses, the Grammar/Translation method continued to be used in various forms and ways, throughout India. In keeping with the times, the AMU also eliminated translation from its syllabus of 1926, when it was converted from a college to a university. However, it is unlikely that it resulted in the complete elimination of translation from the classroom also. In fact, personal experience of students bears testimony to the fact that the mother tongue has always been in copious use in the classroom because of the inability of either the students or the teacher, or both.

In India, the use of translation in practical classroom teaching had some peculiar characteristics of its own, which require a brief mention.

1. In regional medium schools, most teachers considered it their duty to translate the textbook from beginning to end in the L1.

2. Interaction between the students and the teacher was mostly in the L1, thus providing very little opportunity for L2 exposure.

3. There seemed to be an expectation for one-to-one relationships between the L1 and the L2 at all the levels of language, i.e., phonological, lexical and structural, which
was fostered by the practice of the teacher. At the level of phonology, the pronunciation of the word "ghost" can be cited as an example, which is frequently pronounced as beginning with the Urdu sound "gha" as in "ghar". The student does not suspect the teacher because of the addition of the letter "h" after "g". Hence, there is a need to discourage this tendency to equate letters with sounds and also to equate all L1 sounds to L2 sounds. At the level of lexis and structure also, the teacher failed to respect the context in translation and instead of seeking a functional adequacy, he almost always aimed at the faithful literal translation. Thus in the sentence, "There is a boy sitting in the room", the teacher would provide "wahan" as the Urdu equivalent of the form word "there".

After independence, when the country faced a changed context, the need was felt to improve methods and materials at all the levels of ELT, and it was subsequently expressed through the establishment of the Central Institute of English at Hyderabad. As a result of the efforts of the CIE, the 50s and 60s saw large scale acceptance of the Structural Approach, embodying the principles of selection of vocabulary, gradation of structures, situational presentation, and controlled practice for consolidation. The CIE also advocated a very limited and judicious use of the mother tongue.
While concluding the section, it seems pertinent to briefly mention the experiments conducted in India in the seventies, with Dodson's (1972) Bilingual Method. In his Bilingual Method Dodson emphasized the following:

1. A balance between spoken and written work in the classroom.

2. A new approach to translation in language teaching.

3. Opportunity for copious contact with the target language.

The method aimed to achieve this by,

1. Controlled and systematic use of the L1,
2. Introduction of reading and writing early in the course of learning and,
3. Integration of writing and speaking skills.

Three experiments were carried out with Bilingualism in India during the seventies by H.N.L. Sastri, R.V.S. Murthy and Nalini Nagarajan in CIEFL, separately. The results of the experiments supported the conclusions made by Dodson that L1, when used as a meaning conveyor, facilitates rather than hinders foreign language learning. The sparing use of L1, also allows more time for practice in the L2, crucial at the early stages for acquiring correct language habits. The Bilingual Method which proved to be an improvement upon both the Grammar/Translation and the Direct Method, was an
attempt to integrate both the writing and the speaking skills, fluency and accuracy.  

Afterwards, the seventies and eighties saw again a changed context of teaching with the advent of the Communication Language teaching. At present, however, a preference for a certain eclecticism, and for selection of methods and techniques based on the needs analysis of the students is discernible everywhere. It has been found at last, that no single method is a panacea for all the ills, and this attitude is all the more appropriate for the Indian situation, where the needs of the learners are entirely different from those of the learners in the West.

The Revival of Translation in Second Language and Foreign Language Teaching

As mentioned already, even the CLT was found to suffer from many defects and so, inspite of the initial enthusiasm for the approach, and its adoption by different language teaching curricula across the world, it was soon discovered that the CLT or any single teaching method for that matter was not a panacea for all ills.

A "post-communicative" approach emerged subsequently which was ready to embrace the useful and desirable aspects of diverse teaching methods and incorporate them within it. Thus, at least for the time-being, eclecticism seems to be
the best way to choose, and within this eclectic, post-
communicative approach, the merit of a limited use of the
time-tested traditional methods such as memorization, and
translation is being recognized and they have begun finding
a place, though on an experimental basis, in many an ELT
curriculum and classroom.

For some time now, researchers have also started taking
a fresh interest in finding empirically the role of L1 in
SLA. In the main, however, an interest in translation in
second/foreign language teaching and particularly in ELT was
revived by language teaching professionals on a heuristic
basis who found from their experience that the mother tongue
could and did make an important contribution to the teaching
of English as a second language by creating motivation in
the students, sharpening the awareness of differences
between the languages and enhancing the quality of teaching
in many other ways. Around the world, the teachers engaged
in ELT have started voicing their views about the usefulness
of L1 in the ELT classroom, and have also tried to explain
intuitively why the use of L1 does have an impact from the
learners' point of view. It should be noted that this
revival is poles apart from the basic assumptions of the
Grammar/Translation method on the one hand and the
principles on which CA was initially based on the other.
Rather, it rests on the firm footing of the new developments
made in SLA research and cognitive psychology and directly
bears upon how a learner cognitively processes a second language.

Some Theoretical Problems

In view of the modern developments in second language teaching the use of translation raises certain theoretical questions. Two most important questions are:

i) consideration of translation with respect to the acquisition vs. learning controversy, and

ii) viewing translation with regard to the dichotomy between accuracy and fluency.

Both these are dealt with briefly in this section.

Translation vis-a-vis Acquisition vs. Learning

Krashen (1977a) made the well-known distinction between acquisition and learning. Acquisition arises as the result of the processes of creative construction by which the learner internalizes the rules of the second language subconsciously. It takes place naturally and is not amenable to instruction; though acquisition can be imparted in the classroom too, by creating opportunities for natural and spontaneous communication. In contrast, learning is a conscious process that results from formal study and which can be influenced, therefore, by formal instruction. The
knowledge that is derived from acquisition is used differently from that derived from learning: all the learners' use of the second language - spoken or written - is initiated by means of acquired knowledge, but in some contexts, learnt knowledge may be call upon to 'monitor' the utterances that are initiated from the store of acquired knowledge.

In the light of the above, the following questions can be raised with respect to translation:

i) Does translation cater to learning or to acquisition?

ii) If translation caters only to learning, can learning be transformed to acquisition?

iii) What is the validity of the acquisition learning dichotomy?

iv) Do learners make recourse to their L1 consciously or unconsciously?

To deal with the first question, since translation is supposed to focus the learners' attention on the differences in form between the L1 and the L1, it might be said to cater to learning rather than acquisition. Also, Krashen has made it explicit in his model that L1 transfer has a peripheral role to play in acquisition, which is that of only a monitor. Thus strict adherents of Krashen's model of
learning would dismiss translation as having a negligible role in L2 acquisition. However, if learning could be transformed to acquisition, then translation could be claimed to have an important role. This brings us to the second question and a consideration of interface and non-interface positions of Krashen's model. While few people support a strict non-interface position now, most researchers in SLA hold either a strong or a weak interface position, implying that there is a flow from learning to acquisition and vice-versa. (McLaughlin, 1978b; Rivers, 1980; Stevick, 1980; Gregg, 1984). "Metalinguistic knowledge" and "consciousness-raising" in "acquisition-poor environments" have been found to be beneficial, in that they may lead to subsequent spontaneous communication when there is an opportunity (Sharwood-Smith 1981, p.6).

This, in turn brings us to the third question, that is, about the very validity of the acquisition-learning split. Many researchers wonder whether there is a need at all to maintain this dichotomy when learning changes into acquisition and acquisition into learning.

Lastly, translation is perceived as catering to conscious learning, that is, a conscious focus on the forms of the two languages. However, there is no evidence to demonstrate that learners do not make recourse to their L1 even unconsciously in the process of learning an L2. In fact,
strategy research showing the preference of learners at early levels for L1 based strategies bears testimony to the fact that they might be doing it unconsciously (O'Malley et al., 1985b).

Translation vis-a-vis Accuracy vs. Fluency

It seems here necessary to deal briefly with the accuracy/fluency controversy, as it is closely related to the use of translation in CLT, which is mainly an accuracy activity.

Accuracy: In terms of language teaching, accuracy means a stress on "usage" than "use" of language. Accuracy can refer to the receptive skills of listening and reading just as it refers to the productive skills of speaking and writing, eg., extensive reading is a fluency task, but intensive reading is aimed at accuracy; while free writing exercises are aimed at fluency, all controlled and guided writing is aimed at accuracy. In a fluency task the quality of language is not important as the emphasis is on the message, but when the focus is on how this message is conveyed in terms of language used, it becomes an accuracy task.

Fluency: In the context of language teaching, fluency is to be regarded as natural language use; whether or not it results in real native-speaker-like language in comprehension or production, is not important. Fluency work
in language classroom, however, aims at emulating native-speaker use of language in similar settings. In fluency, the task is marked by processes of adjustment and negotiation of meaning, a minor role for correction and the teacher acting as a participant rather than a "knower". In short, fluency can be seen as the "maximally effective operation of the language system so far acquired by the student" (Brumfit, 1984). Communicative language teaching leans heavily towards fluency rather than accuracy. However, shifts of opinion as regards the relative importance of the two, and the stages at which one should replace the other are discernible even among the noted proponents of the CLT.

Brumfit believes that there is a definite role for accuracy work in language teaching, but its function is entirely different from that of fluency work, and its overuse impedes successful language development. It should be noted though, that Brumfit does not consider the adverse results of overuse of fluency work. Brumfit (1978) has argued that fluency can best be fostered by a methodology in which pupils first communicate as far as possible with all available resources, followed by accuracy work, if a need is perceived.\textsuperscript{11}

Widdowson (1978) bases his model of teaching on a description of language "use" rather than "usage". But according to R. Ellis (1982), any description of language
for teaching purposes which ignores the inbuilt, individual syllabus of the learner, which he uses in natural language acquisition, caters to learning rather than acquisition. Widdowson has presented the language items in his syllabus in terms of functions instead of structures. Also, in Widdowson's model, "... the learner needs to be aware of how specific types of discourse can be encoded in English; he needs to learn by careful and deliberate study of discourse, how linguistic forms of English realize textual meanings" (p.792). Thus, the learner is to be conscious of the kinds of strategies and structures that contribute to a study of discourse. In this sense, Widdowson's model of teaching seems to cater chiefly to accuracy and learning rather than fluency and acquisition.

The model that Krashen (1976, 1981) propounds has acquisition as its goal, according to which learning has a very minor role in language development. Krashen's model is based on fluency activities in natural settings which are designed to engage the learner in the process of actual communication. Such an approach requires the teacher to abandon his traditional role as the "knower" and assume the role of the "onlooker". The input is determined by the natural processes of adaptation and negotiation that are generated by all communicative enterprises. On the basis of the foregoing, R. Ellis (1982) has classified communicative language teaching into two major types: formal and informal.
Formal CLT approaches have learning as their target and operate chiefly through accuracy activities, and gradation of language items in terms of either structures or functions. The informal approaches operate through fluency activities without resorting to any deliberately planned syllabus.

Translation, which is chiefly an accuracy activity catering to learning, fits into the formal communicative approach quite neatly. But as regards the informal communicative approach which caters to acquisition through stress on fluency, the question which requires answering is, "Does learning lead to acquisition?". According to Krashen there is no transfer from the learned to the acquired store of language, since both derive from different experiences involving different inputs. This is, however, against the experience of language learners who are able to put learned knowledge to rapid use in spontaneous conversation when the need arises (Stevick 1976). Antonella Sorace (Sorace 1985) reports on the basis of her research work on the use of metalinguistic knowledge by second language learners, that there is a "slow but constant improvement in the subjects' ability to apply this knowledge in different situations which is reflected by a higher degree of consistency between language and use. This seems to suggest that despite the lack of spontaneous practice of the language, formal mastery
of linguistic structures leads to their systematic application in a limited range of functions (p.239).^{15}

There is in fact, no strong support for the rejection of formal teaching. On the basis of a survey of thirteen studies relating language acquisition to exposure or instruction, Long (1982) found that instruction is beneficial at beginning intermediate and advanced levels, on integrative as well as discrete-point tests and in acquisition-rich as well as acquisition-poor environments.^{16}

On the other hand, Annie David (1989) has argued that accuracy activities should in fact play a major role in the syllabus for English language learners in India, because of the lack of enough exposure to English, and because of the teachers often processing very little of the language to be of any use to monitor unrehearsed communicative situations. She contends that with a basic understanding of what is grammatical and/or appropriate or not, the learner is better equipped for exposure to the use of English in communication afterwards. She says, "I would rather go from accuracy to fluency because I have never seen it work the other way, unless of course, there is adequate exposure to standard forms, which is hard to come by in a country like India (p.13).^{17}
All this means that learning and accuracy activities also have a role to play in language acquisition. It will be seen later, however, that translation can also play a role in fluency activities to some extent.

Translation in the Classroom

Translation at the Early Levels

Translation can be a useful device often at the earliest levels of teaching. For example, at the early levels of L2 learning, when the child comes with the knowledge of his own language but hardly any L2, words and structures can be taught more profitably if L1 equivalents are used along with explanation in L2. If a teacher glosses words like "change" into "transform" and "laugh" into "to be amused", what can the child be expected to make out of it, where the meaning is even more difficult than the original word itself? This applies to structures as well. For instance, in the teaching of tenses at early levels, the teachers might make use of different time references and provide sentences such as:

He came yesterday.
He will come tomorrow.
He comes everyday.

Still, the point may not become clear to the student; but as soon as the difference is made clear through
reference to L1 equivalents, the structures are brought home precisely. Whether the student is able or not to use this knowledge immediately, is another matter and depends largely on practice in communicative situations.

Translation at the earliest levels seems to be contradictory to what the exponents of the communicative approach generally advocate that natural language learning or 'acquisition' should take place in natural settings, at the earliest stages of L2 learning. However, Wong-Fillmore's (1976) study of the speech of Mexican immigrant children showed that in the absence of any formal instruction of L2 rules, the children picked up whole phrases which were not the result of the learner's developing grammatical competence. The learners did not grasp the underlying meanings of these formulas or "prefabricated patterns" and thus frequently used them in structural combinations which were ungrammatical.

Defending the use of translation at early levels, Butzkamm (1985) argues on the basis of Wong-Fillmore's research that the use of translation makes the internal structure of the sentence patterns apparent to the learner, otherwise they remain for the learner a "memorized chunk" or unanalyzed whole. He is not able to make use of the generative power of language and use them in completely new situations.
Atkinson (1987) also advocates the use of translation from the earliest levels for different sorts of pre-communicative, communicative and post-communicative activities. According to him, translation can be an invaluable help to the teacher in giving instructions, for discussing classroom methodology, or checking comprehension at the earlier levels. It can be used in communicative activities like role-play and discussions, and in post-communicative activities of teaching lexis and structures too. Atkinson criticizes "the tendency in EFL to opt for methods and techniques which are 'exotic' and 'modern' or which demonstrate specialized knowledge possessed by the teacher" (p.242). He says that prejudice is not a satisfactory reason for prohibiting what seems to be one of the "preferred learning strategies" of the students.

Translation can be successfully employed in the classroom for the following activities with beginners:

**Eliciting Language:** Language can be elicited at all levels from students by making a reference to the L1, for example, "How do you say X in English"? Atkinson argues that this is less time consuming and involves less potential ambiguity than other methods of eliciting such as visuals, mime and 'creating a need'.
Checking Comprehension: The L1 can also be employed to check comprehension of a concept behind a structure by making recourse to the mother tongue. Atkinson believes that comprehension tasks involving production, when presented in L1 can sometimes probe comprehension more effectively than many types of non-linguistic tasks designed to avoid the problem of producing in the target language. Obviously, Atkinson is referring to discrete point objective tests.

Giving Instructions: At the early levels, giving instructions regarding an activity in the classroom entirely in the L2 may not be very helpful. If the teacher uses translation of the whole instruction, or parts of it, after delivering it in English first, it would be easier for the students to understand it, and also relate the forms and functions in the L2 to equivalent forms and functions in the L1, and hence increasing their L2 repertoire too.

Discussion of Classroom Methodology: The above mentioned procedure can be beneficial with classroom methodology too, where translation can be employed at different points (according to difficulty) leading to a better understanding on the part of the students and a more fruitful discussion. This activity is useful for learners at the early and intermediate stages of L2 learning where the students are adults or adolescents, and have the equivalent concepts in their L1.
Presentation and Reinforcement of Language: Atkinson remarks that for most students of English, there are some aspects of the language which are difficult because of the manner in which they differ structurally from the mother tongue. An example in our context can be the following two sentences in English and Urdu respectively:

He asked them to help him. (Subject+Verb+Object+Infinitive) and,
Usne unse madad karne ko kaha. (Subject+Object+Infinitive+Verb).

In such cases the most efficient approach according to Atkinson can be a simple explanation or demonstration of the rule, followed by a translation exercise.

Butzkamm (1985) also advocates the teaching of structure at early levels through an appeal to the mother tongue. He suggests the use of literal translation as a teaching device at early levels in those cases where he suspects that the internal structure of the new sentence remains unclear to the students. The translation provided by the teacher has to be from L2 to L1, so that the foreign structure is mirrored in the native language. In the words of Butzkamm, by doing this, "The foreign language is mapped onto the native language so as to make the learner recognize the foreign pattern and identify its component parts"
(p.91). For example, the English sentence, 'There was nobody at his house', will be translated according to Butzkamm's suggestion as, "Wahan tha koi nahin uske ghar par".

The position of "at" has been slightly changed to avoid incomprehension. The Urdu equivalent will sound odd to Indian ears but the learners will have no problem working out how the English sentence operates. It should be noted that such a translation has not to be used throughout a text, but only at points where the given structure is not clear to the students. This literal translation does not have to be a word-for-word imitation, as the teacher can build upon the learners' previously acquired knowledge and only make transparent the syntactic or other data that he still needs. Butzkamm points out that this device is not limited to syntax, but can be used for various lexical phenomena, in particular collocations, fixed idioms, and compound words.

The following language items can be taught through translation:

Teaching of Lexis at Early Levels

It is recognized by many ELT professionals that instead of the teacher getting involved in verbal gymnastics, and sometimes even physical gymnastics, in a desperate attempt to simply avoid the L1 while trying to convey the meaning of
an L2 word, the teacher can more sensibly and economically resort to an L1 equivalent which would immediately render the meaning of the lexical item in a much more clear and precise way. For example, if the meaning of the word "clove" has to be taught to the learner, the teacher might say by way of explanation in English that it is an aromatic spice, black in colour, club-shaped, and many other things, and yet the meaning will not be as clear to the learners as when he would just give them the mother tongue equivalent "laung" in Urdu. A teacher comes across such words frequently in his day-to-day experience for which an L1 translation is the best and the easiest thing to resort to. Of course, this technique is not to be applied to each and every word, and use of definition, explanation, L2 synonym, mime and gesture too should be considered for teaching tenses. It is in fact for the teacher to decide about the best way of teaching a particular item.

Teaching of Phrases, Idioms and Proverbs

As phrases, idioms and proverbs do not derive their meaning from the meanings of the separate lexical items in them, use of an L1 equivalent if it exists, can make the meaning clearer to the students than if it is explained only through the L2. For example, the proverb, "Birds of the same feather flock together" can be taught through the equivalent expression in Urdu, "chore, chore mauserey bhai", Proverbs
having a symbolic meaning, express concepts in a more precise and picturesque manner and are easier to retain than a mere explanation in the L2. However, sometimes a need might also be felt to give a simultaneous literal translation of the original L2 idiom, so that the concrete imagery is enjoyed and subsequently retained by the student.

Help in Fluency Activities

It is found that learners are often at a loss for appropriate words when engaged in oral communicative activities like role-play and simulation and even in writing dialogues they produce language which is unnatural and stilted. By making an appeal to a similar situation in the L1, and providing the literal equivalent of their stilted utterances, the teacher can make their unnaturalness apparent.

As Atkinson (1987) suggests, that even in fluency activities students tend to think in terms of word-for-word translation of L1 equivalents, if at a loss for the proper expression. This tendency should be taught to think not in terms of, "How does one say X in English?", but rather "How can I express X in English?". In other words the focus should be on the meaning rather than the accuracy of the form.

In conclusion, two things should be noted about the
above-mentioned translation activities at the beginning level. First, that some of the activities mentioned here such as use of translation in fluency tasks, elicitation of language, checking of comprehension and teaching of tenses, and structure which are considered difficult are applicable to higher levels too. Second, the learner generally plays a passive role in the use of translation at the early levels, that is, most of the translation is done by the teacher in order to aid the learner. In this sense, all the above activities can be called teacher-oriented translation activities.

Translation at Advanced Levels

Most advocates of translation feel that it can be used most profitably in SL/FL teaching at the advanced level where the learner already has developed a "feel" for the foreign language and can discern more properly the subtle differences of lexical meaning and structural pattern between the two languages. Titford (1983) is a strong proponent of translation to be incorporated at the advanced levels. The main reason for his recommending translation at this level is that it is only at an advanced level that the student is keen to know the underlying rule behind a particular language item and tends to operate along the lines of "how" and "why", i.e., he constantly asks the question how an expression is realized in the L2 and what the involved rule
is. He also justifies using translation at the advanced level on the following grounds: according to Titford (1983); i) It can help to pre-empt many of the potential interference problems by allowing the learner explicit reference to his L1. In this, translation has a facilitative role to play in language learning.

ii) It also plays a consolidatory role, since it helps in the retention of what has already been learnt.

iii) Thinking about meaning, even in advanced learners, as long as they are still in the foreign language context, and not living and learning in the total immersion situation, tends to be referenced in some way to the L1.

Hence, the use of translation at the advanced level in the teaching of L2, helps to extend and deepen the learners' knowledge by reference to L1 and clarify the points of contact and divergences. It does away with the learner's muddledness about L2 lexis. At the syntactic level, translation helps in making an appeal to the textual situation or illocutionary force, thus making an appeal to the textual situation or illocutionary force, and rendering the functional or rhetorical meanings of the sentences clear. It also helps in teaching the deep-structure meaning of the sentences through a semantic translation in L1.
Hence, the use of translation is evident at both the early and the advanced levels. As the intermediate level is a flexible, transitional period, it has not been dealt with separately, and it will be seen below that many of the early level and advanced level activities overlap with each other.

Perkins's Translation Activities for Remedial Grammar and Syntax

Perkins (1985) suggests many motivating exercises to teach remedial grammar to students at an advanced level:

Partial Translation from L1 to L2: In this activity, the learners are expected to translate only some of the parts of the texts which the teacher wishes to concentrate upon. This sort of an exercise is more practical as it does not require a full translation, which may be unnecessary. It can be used to teach conditionals, modals, tenses, concord and preposition etc.

For example in the following Urdu sentences:

- Usne Qalam se khat likha.
- Woh hawai jahaz se gaya.
- Woh Bombay se kal aya.

Students can be made to translate the underlined portions, where the same preposition "se" has been used in all the three sentences. In English, this preposition will be realized differently in all the three sentences as...
"with", "by" and "from" respectively, which can be highlighted by the translated exercise.

Translation in Terms of Units of Meaning: Literal translation of word-for-word translation can be employed by the teacher in order to make apparent the syntactic rendering of the L2 sentence clear to the learners, as has been shown above in the exercise suggested by Butzkamm. Literal translation, however, is faulty translation, and the student must be discouraged from engaging in it always. What he should be encouraged to engage in, is translating in terms of units of meaning. In another exercise suggested by Perkins, the learners may be given a passage in L2 along with its translation in L1. The students are asked to match the units of meaning underlined in the L2 passage to the corresponding units of meaning in the given L1 passage, e.g.:

**L2 Passage:** Satan passed all the other horses in less than five minutes and was soon close to the dogs who were following the fox. It was impossible for Travers to hold the horse back.

**L1 Passage:** Satan paanch minut se kum mein doosre sare ghoron se aage nikal gaya aur jald hi kutton ke qareeb pahunch gaya jo lomri ka peecha kar rahe the. Travers ke liye ghoron ko rokna namumkin tha.
To make the exercise easier, the corresponding units of meaning in the L1 passage can also be underlined, in which case the learner has only to match the equivalent units.

**Hieke's Transliteration**

Hieke (1985) suggests "transliteration" as a more realistic form of translation, which does not aim at the complete translation of a text, but attempts to achieve an "accomplished version of restricted portions of a text" (p.99).\(^{20}\) Transliteration according to Hieke, is thus a selective form of translation with less global goals and a strictly pedagogical orientation. It does not refer only to spot translation of whatever might be considered difficult or critical by the teacher, but implies that the teacher is free to edit passages of a text, which are too demanding or which blur the necessary focus on the primary learning goal. An important pre-requisite for this type of translation is, however, that the selected focus points remain within and as part of the running text from which the portions have been taken.

**Teaching Tenses Through Transliteration:** A translation exercise is given here, based on Hieke. A passage is given to the students for practice in simple past and past perfect tenses. The students are required to translate all the verbs in these two tenses in their L1. The verbs have been
David had slept only a short time when a rich-looking carriage, drawn by two fine horses, stopped directly in front of where he slept. One of the horses had injured his leg and the driver wished to let the horse rest for a while. An elderly businessman and his wife got out of the carriage and decided to rest during this time under the shade of the trees. There they noticed the spring and David asleep alongside of it. They tried to walk lightly and to make as little noise as possible in order not to wake him. [From Complete Course in English, ed. R.J. Dixson (New Delhi: Prentice Hall International Inc., 1987), p.130].

Collocational Cloze: Another type of translation exercise suggested by Hieke (1985) is collocational cloze. The above passage can also lend itself to a cloze exercise for the teaching of prepositions, e.g., the following phrases from the passage will be taken out from the passage and replaced by their L1 equivalents and the students will be required to provide their L2 equivalents:
drawn by, in front of, for a while, got out of, to rest, under the shade, alongside of it, in order not to.

Though the above exercises have been suggested by Hieke only for the advanced levels, they may be used profitably with the intermediate levels too. The choice of text will vary in terms of difficulty for the different levels.
Translation for Developing the Stylistic and Lexical Awareness of Advanced Students

Helen Thomas (1984) suggests a translation activity for the development of stylistic and lexical awareness of advanced level students. The exercises are based on texts produced in English by non-native speakers. First, the non-native version is compared stylistically with the native version in terms of appropriacy and correctness of lexis, syntax and collocation. The second stage consists of a translation by students of a similar text, to what was given previously for study, from L1 to L2.

A variation on the first stage can be to use a translated L2 text by a student for stylistic study, and then compare it with the original.

Parallel Text Production

Gisela Thiel (1985) suggests an activity which she considers integral to FL teaching of advanced learners. It aims at text comprehension, the acquisition of lexical and grammatical structures and the application of the acquired knowledge to the production of "intention adequate" texts (p.117).

The language peculiarities of a foreign language and a native language text are to be observed, described and their functions explained. Then the findings of the foreign
language and the native language text study are to be compared and the conclusions evaluated. At the third and last step, a translation is produced using these findings as guidelines. The focus in this sort of activity is on the three levels of text constitution: context, expression and intentional effect. The final translated text is different from traditional translation in the sense that instead of focussing on the working of the original, it focusses on the effect that the text will produce on the reader.

Titford's Spoof and Back Translation

Spoof-Translation: As word-for-word translation is an obviously faulty translation of the L1 into the L2, it can be presented as a means of provoking insight into syntagmatically-bound elements ranging in length from clauses to sentences, i.e., phrases, collocations and idioms. In such a translation, the individual lexical item will be correct, but the syntax will be un-English, e.g.: "Meri madad keejiye" can be translated as, "Do my help" or more literally, "My help do".

The above L2 translation can be used to provoke students' correct response. At other times, in literal translation provided by the teacher, the lexical item itself may be inappropriate collocationally, e.g.:

Use halki chot ke saath aspatial le jaya gaya.
She was taken to the hospital with light injuries.

Back-Translation: Another teacher-oriented activity mentioned by Titford for advanced levels is back-translation. The activity consists of three stages:

i) The students translate an L1 text into an L2 version.

ii) The teacher translates the students' version back into an L1 version.

iii) This L1 version provided by the teacher is again translated by the students into L2.

Back-translation which involves comparing of the original version with the back-translated text, provides the students with a yardstick to identify the quality and type of stylistic error, and is useful as an exercise for advanced learners in terms of syntax and pragmatics. Such an exercise sharpens the learner's awareness about language contrasts and is also motivating.

**Communicative Activities for Intermediate and Advanced Levels**

In communicative activities the learner is called upon to practise the total skill of communication. Here, he has to activate and integrate his pre-communicative knowledge and skills in order to use them for the communication of meanings.
Rod Ellis (1982) has laid down the following important criteria for an activity to be called communicative:

1. Focus is on the message - on "what to say" rather than "how to say".

2. Information gap exists between two speakers.

3. Communication is negotiated, rather than pre-determined.

4. Speakers, are allowed to use whatever resources verbal or non-verbal they have, without bothering to conform to native-speaker behaviour.

With the exception of probably the first criterion all the above criteria seem to cater only to an oral interaction activity. However, a communicative activity can either be oral or written, where the learner is required to use his total repertoire of linguistic knowledge and skills. Translation can be usefully employed for both kinds of communicative activity, i.e., oral and written.
Oral Presentation

This oral presentation exercise for ESP learners, suggested by Ian Tudor (1987), is designed to improve a learner's ability to communicate in his own areas of specialization. The individual learner in this task, was given an oral presentation task on a specific aspect of his professional activity on the basis of relevant L1 material. In the exercise mentioned by Tudor, the 15-minute oral presentation was accompanied by appropriate back-up material in English in the form of transparencies and handouts, and was followed by a group discussion. The preparation for the presentation was carried out by the student chiefly at home, and a considerable time was given to him for this. The student also had a consultancy session with the teacher a week before the presentation was due. The student was not required to make a detailed translation of the L1 base text. Instead, he was encouraged to make a summary translation (rendering into the L2 in a shortened form, of the content of longer L1 text segments) and occasional detailed translation of key terms and phrases.

Group Discussion

This activity, also recommended by Tudor (1987), was based on journalistic material and was designed to develop discussion skills in a more general way. Learners were given
two similar texts on the same topic, respectively in their L1 and L2, and were asked to perform three tasks on their basis:

i) Make a rough oral translation of the L1 text, and the end product not being a written translation, but rather a set of notes on areas of difficulty.

ii) Make a written summary translation of the text.

iii) Prepare for a class discussion on the basis of the text.

The class discussion began with the difficulties the learners had faced during their rough translation of the L1 text. Students were encouraged to propose their ideas and discuss possible solutions, while the teacher avoided being a "knower". Attention was focussed on re-expression of the message rather than a detailed translation of single items.

The value of these activities lies in the fact that the use of L1 input provided students with very precise communicative goals for their L2 production, these goals being defined by the message and form of L1 input materials. The setting of precise communicative goals led students to employ 'achievement' or "risk-taking strategies", thus stimulating the productive abilities of the learners. On the other hand, students who worked without L1 base materials showed a lesser degree of precision and clarity, because
they were working within their existing L2 competence.

**Oral Communicative Activity with L1 Stimulus Materials**

A related activity is mentioned by Tudor (1989) in another article, which recommends the use of L1 materials as stimulus.\(^\text{24}\) Here, the overall task structure was drawn from a text book, which consisted of exercises in vocabulary and functions, to provide input and controlled practice in the elements required in the practice of the simulation proper. The next stage of this activity was a simulation task built around a brief introduction of the topic. The class was divided into two groups and each group was provided confidential information sheets regarding the topic, it being here a business negotiation in the L2.

After the first stage of vocabulary and functional practice from the book was over, the confidential information sheets were replaced by letters and memos written either in the students' L1 or in the L2. No written translation task was set, but each negotiator (representing one of the groups) had to formulate and express his ideas from an information base, made primarily of materials in their L1, the target negotiation being in English. Thus, we can say that oral rather than written translation is employed in this activity.
It was found at the end of the activity, that the learners who were given L1 base materials, were experiencing a greater degree of communicative stress than the group who worked from L2 base material. The L1 group also used the communication strategies of circumlocution and paraphrase. Use of L1 base materials made their task more stimulating and challenging. However, negatively, a feeling of unease could also be perceived among this group.

**Translation in Communicative Writing Skills**

If a communicative activity is that in which the learner is required to use the total repertoire of his linguistic and strategic resources, then free writing exercises can also be called to fall in this category. Mike Baynham (1983) suggests some composition exercises which are free, however, they can also be called guided and controlled in that they make use of L1 stimulus material as a frame of reference.\(^\text{25}\)

**Activity A:** In this activity used by Mike Baynham, the learner was provided with L1 material in order to induce motivation.

**Stage I:** In the first stage of the activity, the learner was required to answer comprehension questions in the L2 on the basis of this L1 text.
Stage II: In the second stage, he was required to produce an oral summary of the L1 passage into English.

Stage III: The next phase involved translating a small section of the text into English.

Stage IV: Finally, the learner was asked to produce a summary in writing. He was asked to make the summary first in his L1 and then into English. He was also encouraged to look for equivalences of meaning and saying things in the English way, rather than translating the L1 text literally.

Stage V: This consisted of a free writing exercise in which the learner was asked to write something from his memory about his personal experience. The aim of this exercise was to compare other types of written production by the learner, with the one using L1 base materials, and to see whether use of L1 materials had caused interference problem. Baynham reached the following conclusions regarding the use of mother tongue materials in the activity:

i) The incidence of grammatical errors in the summary translation was higher than in the free writing production. He argues that this is chiefly so, because the learner was dealing in the summary writing exercises with language of greater intrinsic complexity.
To check this with greater certainty, Baynham gave the learner an exercise based on English language materials and discovered that the same type of errors were made as those when the input material was in L1.

ii) It was also felt that mother tongue materials can facilitate discourse organisation; translation activities had led to the learner's dealing with more complex and abstract kinds of writing. The original L1 text provided him with a model of well-formedness to which he could aspire in his English translation.

Activity B: Using Bilingual Folk Stories in the ESL Classroom

Writing Activity for Intermediate Learners: Though Baynham (1986) suggests the use of this activity for intermediate learners, it can easily be used with the advanced levels also.26

Stage I: In this exercise, first of all the learner was asked to write a story from her L1 culture into the L2.

Stage II: In the second stage, the story was corrected with the whole class together regarding grammar, punctuation, spelling and organization.

Stage III: Stage III involved a translation of this story into the L1.
stage IV: The last stage consisted of translation of the final version of the L1 story into the L2.

The exercise can be modified by asking a student to write in his L1 first; then translating it into the L2 and finally correcting it in group. The activity proved to be a very motivating one because:

i) it sought to work through a story, which is intrinsically interesting;

ii) instead of the teacher correcting the story personally, the whole group was invited to work on it and;

iii) the story came from the learners' native culture.

Activity C: Communicative Writing Activity Involving Group Work and Pair Work

Julian Edge (1986) finds "no obvious reasons why an ability to translate should not be seen as a type of communicative competence, or why a translation class should not benefit from a communicative and interactive approach." He suggests a translation of two short texts (not necessarily similar) of the same length, for pair and group work and peer discussion, thus eliminating the boredom of traditional classes and encouraging motivation. The activity consisted of the following stages:
Stage I: The class was divided into two halves and each half was divided into pairs. Each half was given one text (in separate copies to each pair). A time limit was set and the teacher made rounds to help with comprehension, without actually translating the text. The students were asked to produce a legible L1 translation of the text.

Stage II: The original texts were collected and pairs of students exchanged the L1 texts that they had produced. A time limit was set for each pair to produce a legible L2 translation. The teacher again helped with problems of comprehension, but not of translation.

Stage III: In the next stage, the students were put into groups of four, so that the pairs who had been working on each other's translation now came together. The original texts were given again and the groups were asked to compare the original L2 version with the translated L2 version. Questions regarding changes in meanings, structures, cohesion and coherence were asked, and their effects considered.

Stage IV: The whole class was called back together and each group which worked together was invited to raise the most interesting translation point that it had come across.

The activity is reported to have been received enthusiastically both by students and teachers. Follow-up
dictionary and grammar work can be done based on the text.

Types of Translation Required in the Activities and the Translation Texts

It seems pertinent to comment briefly at the end of this section on the kinds of translation and translation texts generally recommended for the above activities. A considerable change is perceived in attitudes towards translation in recent times, with a pragmatically - oriented translation coming in vogue, which stresses on the communicative function of a text rather than on individual words and structures, which in turn, is a reflection of advances made in linguistics - the study of discourse and the importance of context in language use. Thus, instead of traditional translation, one hears now of cueing and interpreting, constituent, rather than word-for-word translation, and parallel text production which aims at "intention-adequate" texts. "Functional adequacy" is the key word with most of the advocates of translation in language teaching. When vocabulary or structure is to be highlighted an "accomplished version" is aimed at, but this accomplished translation is restricted to portions of text which need to be highlighted, as one finds in the translation activity suggested by Hieke (1985). However, while concentrating on particular lexical or structural portions, the portions are not severed from the text; rather they remain within the context of the original running text.
Butzkamm (1985) suggests literal translation or loan syntax as a teaching device - an ancient practice coming down through ages in the form of interlinear translation of scriptures and classics. But his approach is different from that of interlinear translation, because he does not believe in a word-for-word equivalence throughout the text. According to him, "A complete re-arrangement of the mother tongue sentence is often not necessary, and might even be counter-productive because we need to, and want to, concentrate on a specific teaching item. Interlinear versions which stick to the principle of word-for-word equivalence throughout, are unpedagogic because they simply do not accomodate the fact that learners make progress" (p.95).

As regards the text types recommended for translation in language teaching, one finds a general preference for texts which are familiar and relevant to the students. Stilted and artificial prose passages of the Grammar/Translation method are ruled out, and texts which are "within both the semantico-grammatical and stylistic capabilities of the students" are recommended (Perkins 1985, p.52). Thus, expository texts in a practical vein, such as articles from newspapers and magazines, extracts from socio-political or cultural texts can be considered appropriate for the selection of texts for translation. Hieke (1985)
suggests editing of a given piece of text by the teacher in order to confine his focus to a particular item. In his view, texts available for translation are either natural or contrived. The natural texts fail to offer enough opportunities to concentrate on specific teaching items, while the contrived ones are too contrived and artificial to generate interest. In such a condition the aim of translation activities should be either to concentrate on particular items in a given text by editing it, or to attempt to provide the overall message or general import of some restricted piece of writing rather than dealing with the whole text. Baynham (1983) and Tudor (1987) also speak of summary translation of the whole text. Hence, the preference for a sensible and pragmatic approach towards the use of translation in SL/FL teaching is evident.

Conclusion

Though translation has a useful role in second/foreign language teaching it is necessary to consider in conclusion, the constraints under which translation operates in a L2 teaching situation. They can be envisaged to be the following:

Linguistic Homogeneity of the Class: The most important pre-requisite for the use of translation is the linguistic homogeneity of the class, i.e. all the students should have
the same L1. This situation is frequently found in the SL classroom in India. But, in a university of a national or international character like the Aligarh Muslim University, one often finds a minority language group in a class, belonging to different language backgrounds of different states, or even of different countries. Even if there are two or three students of a different L1 in a class of fifty, the use of the common L1 is justified in certain circumstances for the benefit of the majority, and the teacher may find alternative ways for teaching the minority group learners.

A Bilingual Teacher: Another desirable requirement in an ideal situation is for the teacher to have an equally good command of both the L1 and the L2, which is not always possible to find. However, some translation activities have been pursued successfully even by teachers with a very limited proficiency of the students' L1. Ian Tudor and Mike Baynham engaged students in oral and written communicative activities respectively, based on L1 stimulus materials. In these activities, the teacher had an almost passive role, i.e. the translation task was carried out almost independently by the students. Later, the whole class worked together in a follow-up activity, and the group arrived collectively at the appropriate L2 equivalents, thus minimising or eliminating the chance of error, and also ensuring motivation by giving students an opportunity to
work on their own. This proves that though a good command of the students' L1 is a very desirable requirement for the teacher, it should not be considered indispensable.

**Status of L1 and L2:** Consideration of the relative status of L1 and L2 is also necessary to determine the extent of the use of translation activities. Evidently, in a second language situation, translation should be assigned a more significant role than in a foreign language situation, because the ties between the L1 and L2 are bound to be greater in the former.

**Consideration of Accuracy vs. Fluency:** Another important factor is the consideration of the accuracy/fluency distinction. Translation is basically an accuracy-oriented activity, which seeks to teach formal items through conscious rule-forming. Communicative approaches lay greater emphasis on fluency-oriented activities which are carried out in natural-like settings and encourage spontaneous and subconscious acquisition of "communicative competence" chiefly in an interactive situation. In fact, a balanced curriculum should have a place for both accuracy and fluency, as both are necessary for building communicative competence, if we take it in its comprehensive sense. Also, it should be recognized that learner groups vary in their needs as regards accuracy or fluency. Hence, the relative weight to either in the curriculum should be assigned only
on the basis of a needs analysis.

Dangers of L1 Overdependence: It is also very important to consider the dangers of overuse of translation, and history bears testimony to this. It should be recognized that the introduction of the L1 is always at the expense of L2 exposure. Thus, the pros and cons of using the L1 should be weighed carefully, and only as much of L1 input should be used, as is considered to be more beneficial than similar L2 input. Excessive dependence on the mother tongue might also develop in the learners a tendency to feel that they have not understood an item properly, unless it has been translated. The students should be discouraged from using their mother tongue unless, either they are quite incapable of expressing themselves in English, or they are engaged in a translation activity.

Intranslatability: Though it is wise to use translation in many circumstances, one must realize that there are many items and concepts in a language which cannot exactly be translated, especially those which are intrinsically bound to a culture. Even if near equivalents to these terms can be given in the L1, explanation must be provided of the contrastive differences between L1 use and L2 use or L1 culture and L2 culture, and such items should be taught specifically as a separate entity. For example, on the level of concept, the idea of 'chivalry' is almost intranslatable.
in the Indian culture, and a considerable amount of explanation of the medieval custom of chivalry and knighthood will become necessary to make the term clear in the context.

To sum up, it is obvious that translation has a limited but useful role to play in second/foreign language teaching. Considering the facts that the L2 learner is not a "tabula rasa", and comes already equipped with the knowledge of one language and its skills and strategies, which have to be usefully exploited in the teaching of the second language; that the L1 provides him with a frame of reference through which he can express himself more precisely than he would otherwise; that translation is one of the preferred learning strategies of language learners; and that it increases motivation and helps in saving time and energy; one has strong reasons to recommend translation as a technique in the current methodology of language teaching, as a contributing factor towards communicative competence.
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