

Anniken Sætre Ulvestad

Views on Translation in Language Teaching and Learning

Master's thesis in English Language and Literature

Supervisor: Annjo Klungervik Greenall

May 2020

NTNU
Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Faculty of Humanities
Department of Language and Literature

Anniken Sætre Ulvestad

Views on Translation in Language Teaching and Learning

Master's thesis in English Language and Literature
Supervisor: Annjo Klungervik Greenall
May 2020

Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Faculty of Humanities
Department of Language and Literature



Abstract

This literature review paper examines the field of translation in language teaching and learning. The paper presents and discusses existing theory and empirical research on using translation as a pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning. The aim of the paper is first, to find out why using translation as a tool in language teaching and learning has been frowned upon, and second, to find out what has been said and shown regarding the positive aspects of using translation as a pedagogical tool when learning a language that suggests a re-introduction is justified.

The paper shows that there is little empirical research to be found on the matter. Especially the amount of experimental empirical research is minimal. Hence, many of the objections against translation as a pedagogical tool are not rooted in empirical evidence. Further, the small amount of empirical research that can be found show more positive findings regarding translation as a pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning than negative findings. Based on this, the paper suggests that there might be some ground to claim that translation can serve as a beneficial tool in language teaching and learning. Nevertheless, the paper also suggests that there is a need for more empirical research before we can claim whether a re-introduction of translation in language teaching and learning is justified.

Acknowledgments

This spring – the spring of 2020 – will be remembered for a long time. For me, it will of course be remembered as the spring I finished my master's thesis. For everyone else, however, it will be remembered as the spring when the Covid-19 pandemic forced most of us to stay at home rather than going to work, university and, meeting friends and family. I do not think that anyone have experienced these restraints without challenges. I know many of my fellow students have struggled at times with motivation, efficiency, and structure in this last semester of their studies – me included. Social distancing and not having the opportunity to discuss with peers, teachers and professors at campus has been challenging not only for the work progress, but also for a quality of life. Despite the challenges, I am thrilled and proud to have finished my thesis and my education. In difficult times like these, the help and support I have received from various people have been crucial in my work with my thesis and they deserve a big thank you.

First, I would like to thank the person who has had to endure me day in and day out when we both have had to work from home. Håvard, thank you for being patient with me and my mood on bad days and for being supportive and motivating on days I have needed a push. Although I was the one who took care of you almost a year ago, I do not take your compassion and care for granted. Thank you!

To my family, thank you for encouraging me and caring for me. Thank you for giving me advice and being only a phone call or visit away when I feel the need to talk – whether it is just for complaining or inviting myself over for dinner.

To my friends, old and new, thank you for joining digital quizzes and talks. They have certainly kept my spirits up during this time of social distancing.

An extra thank you and a lot of admiration to Katarina who is currently in the biggest fight of her life. Your courage and positivity are truly inspiring. I know you will get through this.

Last, but certainly not least, a massive thank you to my supervisor Annjo Klungervik Greenall for your commitment, encouragement, comments, advice, and, knowledge. I am positive that my thesis would not have been the same without you. You have given me confidence in myself and my work and you are a big reason for the academic career I see myself pursuing.

Anniken Sætre Ulvestad
Trondheim, May 2020

Table of contents

Terms and acronyms.....	x
1.0 Introduction	11
1.1 The literature review paper	12
1.2 Historical overview of translation in language teaching and learning.....	12
1.3 Overview of the thesis.....	13
2.0 The Grammar-translation method and criticisms of it	15
2.1 The Grammar-translation method	15
2.2 Criticisms and abandonment.....	15
2.2.1 The Reform Movement	15
2.2.2 Private language schools: The Berlitz Schools	16
2.2.3 The Direct Method	17
2.2.4 Communicative language teaching	18
2.2.5 The abandonment of translation in language teaching.....	18
3.0 Arguments against and in favour of translation as a pedagogical tool.....	19
3.1 Overview: arguments against translation.....	19
3.1.1 The negative influence of L1 on L2 learning and acquisition.....	20
3.1.2 Translation: the fifth skill that harms the four other skills.....	21
3.1.3 Translation is unnatural.....	21
3.1.4 Other allegedly negative aspects of translation.....	22
3.2 Overview: arguments in favour of translation	22
3.2.1 The positive influence of the L1	22
3.2.2 Translation as the fifth skill that complements the other four skills	23
3.2.3 Translation is natural: students translating in their minds does not hinder L2 fluency	23
3.2.4 Other allegedly positive aspects of translation	24
3.2.4.1 Motivation: especially when it comes to AVT.....	24
3.2.4.2 Improvement of general language skills	25
3.3 Evidence from empirical research	25
3.3.1 Attitudinal studies.....	25
3.3.1.1 In favour of translation.....	25
3.3.1.2 In favour of oral translation: particularly the use of L1 in the classroom.....	26

3.3.1.3 In favour of audiovisual translation: subtitling	27
3.3.1.4 In favour of audiovisual translation: dubbing	27
3.3.1.5 Mostly in favour of translation with a few concerns.....	28
3.3.1.6 Against translation	29
3.3.2 Experimental studies	29
3.3.2.1 In favour of translation.....	29
3.3.2.2 Against translation	32
4.0 Discussion.....	34
4.1 Evaluating the arguments and research: the theoretical assumptions.....	36
4.1.1 CLT and the Direct Method: monolingualism.....	36
4.1.2 The Direct Method's belief in naturalism	36
4.1.3 The Reform Movement's emphasis on oral production of L2.....	37
4.1.4 The focus on communication.....	38
4.2 Evaluating the arguments and research: the empirical studies.....	38
4.2.1 The attitudinal studies	38
4.2.2 The experimental studies	40
5.0 Conclusion	42
Bibliography	45
Appendix.....	50
The relevance of my thesis in my profession as a teacher.....	50

Terms and acronyms

AVT	Audiovisual translation
CLT	Communicative language teaching
EFL	English as a foreign language
ESL	English as a second language
GTM	The Grammar-translation method
L1	The learner's first language or mother tongue
L2	The learner's second language
SLA	Second language acquisition
SL	Source language
TL	Target language
FL	Foreign language

In addition to these acronyms, I would like to clarify some terms that are important. These terms are often interpreted and defined in various ways by different authors. Therefore, these terms will be defined in the following way in this paper:

Direct Method	All language teaching that excludes use of the learners' L1.
Pedagogical tool	A task or activity used to learn and teach an L2.
Translation	The act of "converting the target language's expression into the native language (at various levels, from words and phrases all the way up to whole texts); or converting the native language into the target language" (Oxford, 1990, p. 46).

1.0 Introduction

Translation as a pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning has had a difficult and complicated journey through the history. Moving from being the very first method used in language teaching, and a respectable one at that (Cook, 2010), to being highly criticized and eventually ostracized (Colina, 2002, Cook, 2010, Howatt, 1984, Kupske, 2015, Malmkjær, 1998, Vermes, 2010). According to Cook (2010), translation has “been treated as a pariah in almost all fashionable high-profile language teaching theories of the 20th century” (Cook, 2010, p. xv). However, at the end of the 20th century, in the late 1980s, the use of translation in language teaching again entered the discussion among theorists (Kupske, 2015, Malmkjær, 1998). These discussions have eventually resulted in many researchers and theorists claiming that translation has a natural – and some even claim an important – role to play in the field of language teaching and learning and that it therefore should be re-introduced in the language learning classrooms (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, Carreres, 2006, Cook, 2010, Machida, 2011, Malmkjær, 1998, Kupske, 2015, Vermes, 2010, Zojer, 2009). Today, Cook (2010) claims that, despite its negative reputation, “translation persists with various degrees of legitimacy, still sanctioned in many contexts by educational authorities in syllabuses and examinations, and by publishers in dictionaries and self-study guides” (Cook, 2010, pp. 3-4).

In this literature review paper, I research the topic of translation as a pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning. More precisely, I give an overview of existing theory and research on the matter in order to answer this paper’s research questions: Why has using translation as a tool in language teaching and learning been frowned upon? What has been said and shown regarding the positive aspects of translation in language teaching and learning, suggesting that a re-introduction is justified?

The research question is divided into two parts in that it first requires answers on why translation as a tool in language teaching and learning has received a somewhat negative reputation. In finding answers to this problem, the paper first gives a historical overview of the development of language teaching methodologies. This overview includes a presentation of literature on the Grammar-translation method (GTM) versus Communicative language teaching (CLT) in general. These methods and approaches have played important roles in the shifting balance of power regarding how translation has been used in language teaching and learning on the one hand, and, how it has been overlooked on the other.

Further, the paper answers the second part of the research question by means of examining the theoretical arguments against, and the theoretical arguments in favour of, using translation as a pedagogical tool. Next, it discusses what empirical research is leaning towards in terms of a positive or negative view of the matter. Based on this discussion, the paper gives suggestions on what research needs to be carried out further to provide more knowledge and answers to the controversial issue of translation as a pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning.

1.1 The literature review paper

This paper about translation as a tool in language teaching and learning is a literature review paper as it gives “a comprehensive overview of the literature” (Van Wee & Banister, 2016, p. 279) of this specific field. This means that the paper provides a clear and structured overview of a wide selection of literature of, and empirical research done on, translation as a pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning. I have presented this overview of literature and research in a structured way to add value to the discussion of translation’s role in language teaching and learning, and, to make out some interesting conclusions. In addition, existing research gaps are the basis for further suggestions to the field. The focus of the paper’s selection of literature and empirical research are theoretical assumptions, attitudinal empirical research, and experimental empirical research.

1.2 Historical overview of translation in language teaching and learning

1.2.1 The origins of pedagogical translation

In the late 18th century, a language teaching method which focused on translation was developed and used in secondary schools for the first time. This was called the Grammar-translation method. According to Vermes (2010), the method “appeared as a reaction to a social need, as the teaching of modern languages to masses of learners required changes in earlier practices of language teaching” (Vermes, 2010, p. 85). The solution was to modify the Scholastic method used in the Middle Ages into a method specific for the use of translation in language teaching and learning. The result was GTM. The Scholastic method was traditionally used to study classical languages through analysing classical texts with a strict lexical and grammatical focus. Modifying it into GTM, the long classical texts were adapted into fabricated sentences that would illustrate different grammatical features. The idea was that this modification would help the language learners in learning the language better and quicker as it would minimize the difficulty of the task (ibid.).

The main goal of learning a new language with GTM was to be able to read the language’s literature (Colina, 2002). That meant neglecting the act of communication. Language skills like speaking and listening were not seen as important skills in language teaching at the time and were thus not taught in GTM (Colina, 2002, p. 2).

The classes were taught in the L1 and neither the teacher nor the learners actively used the oral TL (Cook, 2010, Vermes, 2010, Munday, 2016, Priya & Jayasridevi, 2018). The main activities of the method were reading and writing. These were performed through translation tasks which were used to “learn vocabulary and grammar points through reference to the student’s first language” (Richards & Rodgers, 1986, cited in Colina, 2002, p. 2). Little or no attention was given to the content of the text (or pieces of the text) in use or pronunciation of the TL (Priya & Jayasridevi, 2018, p. 119).

GTM since then became an established method in language teaching. In the late 19th century it was the leading method in teaching of modern languages in European secondary schools and it held its ground well into the 20th century (Cook, 2010).

Although GTM partly was inherited from the ancient teaching of Latin and Greek, which were regarded as respectable ways of teaching languages (Cook, 2010), the method has not been shielded of attacks and criticism as we will see in chapter 2.0. As the reasons

for learning a language shifted from reading literary works to communicating with speakers of the language, GTM fell out of favour (Colina, 2002, p. 2). Many believed that the method's little use of the oral TL hindered the language learners in expressing themselves freely in the L2 and that, therefore, they would not acquire the language properly (Carreres, 2006). This is one of the most important reasons why the Direct Method and CLT developed and eventually overshadowed GTM. The advocates of these approaches believe that the use of the L2 only in the classroom, is the singular most important factor when learning an L2 (Cook, 2010, p. 8) and that the use of GTM (and translation in general) would "do more damage than good" (Carreres, 2006, p. 1). Both the Direct Method and CLT in general emphasize the use of the L2 only in language teaching. While the Direct Method focuses on the development of oral skills (Cook, 2010, p. 6), CLT, as an umbrella term, focuses on the learners communicating real meaning whether it is oral or written, or, reading texts to reach the goal (Cook, 2010, p. 26). Both approaches being clear opposites of GTM.

1.2.2 Translation in language teaching today

Although translation has received a negative reputation and was overlooked in language teaching and learning for many decades, in the late 1980's, the status of translation started to be reviewed (Kupske, 2015, p. 52). According to Priya and Jayasridevi (2018, p. 118), today, translation is on its way back into the limelight as there is an increasing interest in translation practice in language teaching among researchers and teachers. This statement is based on Priya and Jayasridevi's study from 2017 where they found out that "translation as a method when applied to language teaching practice induced a deeper insight into achieving the desired outcome of teaching" (Priya & Jayasridevi, 2018, p. 118). The study claims that translation is not harmful for learner's L2 acquisition as several scholars have argued, but rather, a quite effective teaching tool. Despite this positive notion, it seems like translation still has a way to go in reclaiming its position in language teaching. Although Machida (2011) claims that the use of L1 in L2 teaching and learning is today seen as "potentially beneficial rather than harmful" (Machida, 2011, p. 742), Colina (2002) claims that many language teachers still banish translation completely from their classrooms as an "'evil' of the past" (Colina, 2002, p. 1) only considering GTM's inadequate reputation.

1.3 Overview of the thesis

In chapter 2.0 I present GTM and explain more of how this method was executed and how it eventually became a method that rather unwillingly contributed to the development of other language teaching methods. The appearance of other methods came as a result of GTM ultimately being strongly criticized. This led to translation being partly abandoned in the field of language teaching and learning. This is explained with the introduction of new ideas, methods and approaches, such as the ideas from the Reform Movement and the Berlitz Schools, and, approaches like the Direct Method and CLT and how they came to overtake the field of language teaching and learning.

In chapter 3.0 I give a detailed presentation of arguments against and in favour of the use of translation in language teaching and learning together with empirical research that has been done in the field of translation as a pedagogical tool. First, I present the many theoretical assumptions regarding how and why translation has a positive or negative effect on language learning before I go into detail on the attitudinal and experimental studies.

In chapter 4.0 I present a clear overview of the various assumptions against and in favour of the use of translation in language teaching and learning together with findings from empirical research. I discuss how the negative objections against using translation as a pedagogical tool are influenced by the ideas, methods and approaches presented in chapter 2.0 and the strong beliefs that stem from these. Discussing these objections, and the ideas and beliefs they are based on, against findings from empirical research in language teaching and learning, gives a clearer answer to the question of whether translation should be re-introduced in language teaching and learning. Last, a discussion and evaluation of the empirical research that has been done in the field of translation as a pedagogical tool, will be given in order to give further answers to this paper's research questions.

2.0 The Grammar-translation method and criticisms of it

2.1 The Grammar-translation method

As mentioned in the introduction, GTM was first applied to Classical Latin and Greek before it was used in teaching modern languages. The focus of the method was the study of the language's grammatical rules and structures. These rules were both practiced and tested by the translation of a series of usually unconnected and artificially constructed sentences exemplifying the structures being studied (Munday, 2016, p. 14).

In the introduction of her book *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation*, Malmkjær (1998) explains GTM more in detail from the first GTM-course in England in 1793:

“the method used translation into and out of the foreign language of individual sentences which were usually specially constructed to exemplify certain grammatical features. This meant that the examples could be graded for difficulty and that the grammar could be taught systematically. So the syllabus chose its units grammatical constructions, ordered them in terms of difficulty, and presented them in made up sentences. It was a typical structural syllabus, in fact. There was a great deal of emphasis on practice, with exercises of various kinds, but predominantly involving translation of sentences into and out of the foreign language.”

Malmkjær (1998, p. 3).

According to Cook (2010, p. 9), GTM had its glory days in the late 19th century as the leading method in language teaching in secondary schools in Europe. This dominance continued well into the 20th century. Today, GTM is generally ignored as a proper method for language teaching and learning (Cook, 2010, Duff, 1989).

An important point about GTM classes is that they were always organized for only one language at a time (Cook, 2010, p. 10). For instance, 'English for German speakers', 'English for Italian speakers' and so forth. This was due to the method's use of explanations in the L1. The use of L1 in language teaching and learning is something that will be addressed further in connection to the Direct Method in section 2.2.3.

Although GTM was one of the first methods used in language teaching and held its ground as the leading method for over a century, it has been severely attacked and criticized as we shall see in this chapter.

2.2 Criticisms and abandonment

2.2.1 The Reform Movement

The most influential academic reasons for abandoning GTM and translation in general, were the ideas formulated at the end of the 19th century by the self-styled 'Reform Movement' (Cook, 2010, Howatt, 1984, Malmkjær, 1998). The Reform Movement

consisted of linguists and phoneticians who had also practiced language teaching. The most famous of these so-called 'reformers' were Henry Sweet in Britain, Otto Jespersen in Denmark, and Hermann Klinghardt and Wilhelm Viëtor in Germany. One of their main ideas was the 'primacy of speech' which came from the then newly established science of phonetics (Cook, 2010, Howatt, 1984, Malmkjær, 1998). The primacy of speech described and emphasized the importance of the spoken language when learning it (Cook, 2010). Another important idea was the emphasis on using connected texts when learning a language; the information in connected texts is more likely to be retained than in isolated sentences (Cook, 2010, pp. 4-5) – they called this 'associationism' as memorization is aided by links made between texts and events (Cook, 2010, p. 5, Howatt, 1984, p. 173). Last, the priority of oral activity in the language learning classroom was the third idea the reformers emphasized (Cook, 2010, Howatt, 1984, Malmkjær, 1998, Vermes, 2010). These three main ideas resulted in the reformers proposing a radical shift in the practice of language teaching (Cook, 2010). They wanted to abandon the focus on written language and the analytical teaching of grammar rules artificially exemplified in made-up sentences with no context which was the main practice of GTM. Instead they wanted a shift towards an increasing emphasis on oral production of the TL and connected texts. The reformers argued that teaching language the way they proposed would not only be more successful, but it would also be more popular with learners (Cook, 2010, p. 5). These new ideas were put into practice in the so-called 'Klinghardt experiment', named after the reformer Hermann Klinghardt, with a beginners' class of fourteen-year-old boys, which according to Cook (2010) was successful.

Although one can criticize some of the reformers' assertions, for instance statements that some languages have 'defects' and are less 'logical' or 'simpler' than others (Cook, 2010, p. 5), the Reform Movement's ideas and suggestions on how to teach languages were by no means radical. Cook (2010) claims that they were a valid reaction against pedagogic excesses at the time: "There was unquestionably a sterile over-emphasis in secondary schools on grammatically accurate writing and a concomitant neglect of spoken language and fluency" (Cook, 2010, p. 5). Teachers who taught language did indeed neglect oral production and fluency due to the strong influence of GTM as both Vermes (2010) and Munday (2016) verify this. Also, the emphasis on the out-of-context sentences in written translation tasks in GTM was considered detrimental to the language learning process. This because it hindered the contextualised and impulsive use of language in spoken communication (Vermes, 2010, p. 86).

2.2.2 Private language schools: The Berlitz Schools

At the same time as the Reform Movement advocated their ideas and beliefs, English language teaching gradually expanded and eventually became a big commercial activity (Cook, 2010, Howatt, 1984, Pennycook, 2008). Now, learning the English language was not restricted to children and youth learning it in school but also to adults outside the education system: tourists, immigrants, and traders. Mostly in USA and Europe. This demand on English language learning resulted in the establishment of private language schools. These private schools were to cater to the new group of adult learners so they could learn English fast and functionally in order to "survive and prosper in their new homeland, or to do business and cope with the communicative demands of travel" (Cook, 2010, p. 6).

The Berlitz Schools, named after the founder Maximilian Berlitz, were the most notable among these newly established private language schools (Cook, 2010, p. 6). Like the

Reform Movement, the Berlitz Schools also rejected the use of translation in the classroom (Malmkjær, 1998, p. 4). The school followed the Reform Movement's ideas and insisted on a focus on speaking instead of writing. Further, all teachers who taught languages had to be native speakers of the language they taught. The teachers also had to follow rigorously the guidelines in the teachers' books that were organized and written especially for the Berlitz Schools (Cook, 2010, Malmkjær, 1998). The schools were so strict that they made the use of translation in the classrooms a dismissible offence. Microphones were used to monitor what teachers were doing and to make sure that they did not use translation as a learning tool (Cook, 2010, p. 7).

The ideas and beliefs put into practice in the Berlitz Schools, called the 'Berlitz Method', resulted in the first hard-line rejection of translation in language teaching (Cook, 2010, p. 6). The ideas and practices of the Reform Movement and the Berlitz Method were eventually merged together to become a new programme for language teaching: the Direct Method (Cook, 2010, p. 7).

2.2.3 The Direct Method

The 'Direct Method' is according to Cook (2010), a term used in both various and contradictive ways by different writers. This paper uses Cook's definition of the term: "any and all teaching which excludes use of the students' own language from the classroom, whether for translation or explanation and commentary" (Cook, 2010, p. 7).

The Direct Method is founded on several strong assumptions about language use, language learning, and language pedagogy. These assumptions are based on four pillars: 1) monolingualism, 2) naturalism, 3) native-speakerism, and 4) absolutism. The first, monolingualism, is a particularly important point in language use: the language teaching should only be in the TL. Both teachers and learners should use this language only in the language learning classroom. Switching between two languages (this includes using translation as a tool) is seen as peripheral (Cook, 2010, p. 8).

The second pillar, naturalism, concerns the specific act of learning language. The belief is that one learns language best if it "proceeds naturally" (Cook, 2010, p. 8). This means that a language learning classroom can recreate two different 'natural' situations. The first is the situation similar to what happens when the learner is immersed into a context where the language is being used and then "picks up" the language he or she is exposed to. The other is the situation infants are in when they acquire their first language (Cook, 2010, p. 8, Malmkjær, 1998, p. 5). Hence, these two situations can only happen if the classroom is monolingual, according to proponents of the Direct Method. In other words, the method disregards the knowledge infants growing up in a bilingual or multilingual home have of how and when to switch between languages (Cook, 2010).

The pillar of native-speakerism concerns the aim of language learning resulting in oral output as close to that of a native speaker as possible (Cook, 2010, p. 8). This notion comes with the beliefs that the native speakers of English are the best English language teachers, and, imitating native-speaker acquisition is the best path for the English learner (ibid.).

Absolutism, the fourth pillar of the Direct Method, is according to Cook "held with absolute confidence but no substantial evidence" (Cook, 2010, p. 9). This is the belief that the Direct Method is the only road to success in learning and acquiring language and that most language learners prefer it to various bilingual methods. In other words,

students will prefer using only the Direct Method instead of using translation, for instance, when learning language.

2.2.4 Communicative language teaching

With the Direct Method as an approach leading language teaching away from GTM and translation, came a new umbrella-term into the field: communicative language teaching. CLT contains different methods and ideas which all have communication as their primary teaching technique and learning outcome (Howatt, 1984, p. 192). The Direct Method, Natural Method, Conversation Method, and Communicative Approach, all fall under this umbrella-term. To separate these approaches is hard as there are only small details in ideas that differ them (ibid.). Since the underlying philosophy of these approaches has remained constant, this paper will not go into each approach in detail. Instead, what is important to know is that all approaches emphasize that "learning how to speak a new language [...] is not a rational process which can be organized in a step-by-step manner [...] [with] exercises and explanations" (Howatt, 1984, p. 192). In other words, the approaches reject GTM's ideas of language teaching completely. The focal points of CLT's methods are that the students in learning the language have someone to practise the language with, something concrete to talk about in this practice, and, a personal will and desire to understand the language and make oneself understood (ibid.). Ultimately, it was not the Direct Method alone that resulted in translation's abandonment in language teaching. Rather, it was the umbrella-term of CLT and its strict focus on the students' oral production and avoidance of the L1 (Munday, 2016, p. 14).

2.2.5 The abandonment of translation in language teaching

As a result of the criticism of GTM and the use of L1 in language teaching, together with an increasing number of teachers gradually using the methods of CLT in their classrooms, the use of translation in language teaching and learning was abandoned in some parts of the western world. Especially in English-speaking countries (Munday, 2016, p. 14). Some countries and schools even took the drastic step of banning translation from language learning classrooms. France, for instance, banned translation from languages curriculums in secondary schools in 1950 by legislation (Carreres, 2006, p. 2). Western universities, however, were slower to react to this trend. Some of them never took the step fully to abandon translation even though translation as a teaching tool at the time was regarded unfashionable (Carreres, 2006, Munday, 2016).

3.0 Arguments against and in favour of translation as a pedagogical tool

Kupske (2015) refers to Randaccio (2012) when he claims that, “arguments against the use of translation in language teaching were initially raised in the nineteenth century and were largely reiterated in the 1960s and 1970s by those who admitted the direct, natural, and/or communicative methods of language teaching” (Kupske, 2015, pp. 57-58). The reason for the objections against translation was mostly because of GTM and its inadequateness (Cook, 2010, Carreres, 2006, Howatt, 1984, Kupske, 2015, Malmkjær, 1998) in addition to the growth of ideas how best to learn languages which were largely influenced by the advocates of CLT in general (Cook, 2010). In the late 1980s, however, the use of translation in language teaching came into discussion again among translation studies scholars (Kupske, 2015, p. 52). This eventually resulted in translation beginning to “regain respectability among language teaching professionals” (Malmkjær, 1998, p. 1).

In this chapter, I first give a presentation of the various arguments against and in favour of the use of translation as a pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning. Secondly, I present empirical research and their findings on using translation as a pedagogical tool.

3.1 Overview: arguments against translation

According to Cook (2010, p. xv), researchers have objected against translation as a pedagogic tool in language teaching and learning for three different types of reasons: pedagogical reasons, cognitive reasons, and practical reasons. The pedagogical reasons are based on a belief that language learners find translation activities dull and demotivating although Cook (2010) claims that there is little research and few arguments to support this. Therefore, this statement will not be given attention as one of the main arguments. It will instead be mentioned as one of the more rarely argued aspects in section 3.1.4 and 3.2.4. The cognitive reasons are generally based on the idea that translation hinders proper language acquisition (ibid.). Last, the practical reasons are mostly based on the opinion that translation is artificial and not an activity learners will need in the real world (ibid.). As we shall see in the first part of this chapter, the main arguments against using translation as a tool in language teaching and learning, where the first two are cognitive arguments, and the last is a practical argument, involve: 1) L1's negative influence on L2 learning and acquisition (Bloomfield, 1933, Carreres, 2006, Korošec, 2013, Lado, 1964, Malmkjær, 1998, Newson, 1998, Shiyab & Abdullateef, 2001, Vermes, 2010, Zojer, 2009), 2) translation is not directly linked to the four taught skills reading, writing, listening, and speaking, and is therefore regarded as a fifth skill, one which has a harmful effect on the other four language skills (Korošec, 2013, Malmkjær, 1998, Vermes, 2010, Zojer, 2009), and, 3) translation is unnatural (Carreres, 2006, Korošec, 2013, Malmkjær, 1998, Vermes, 2010).

3.1.1 The negative influence of L1 on L2 learning and acquisition

One of the most frequently argued points against the use of translation in language teaching and learning is that the use of L1 when learning an L2, will hinder the acquisition of the new language (Carreres, 2006, Korošec, 2013, 2015, Malmkjær, 1998, Newson, 1988, Vermes, 2010, Zojer, 2009). The notion that using L1 in learning a new language hinders the language acquisition, may mean several different things. Bloomfield (1933) for instance, argues that translation into L1 will *mislead* the learner "because the semantic units of different languages do not match" (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 505). Also, "the students, [being] under the practised stimulus of the native form" (ibid.) contributes to the possibility that the students may "forget the foreign" form (ibid.). Although Bloomfield's use of the words 'mislead' and 'forget' makes the argument seem somewhat unclear, I suspect that he means that the students' use and knowledge of the native form is so well practiced and possibly automated that it will always affect the learning and acquisition of the foreign form. Hence, the 'interference' of the L1 will make it more difficult to learn the new language. Because of this, the problem is twofold according to Vermes (2010, p. 86): 1) translation from one language to another partly conceals the differences between the systems of the L1 and the new language, resulting in the learner not acquiring the new language's semantic units, and, 2) that translation fails to reinforce correct foreign language behaviour due to it providing the wrong sort of stimulus. The wrong stimulus is here that the learner is 'too influenced' by the semantic units of the L1 and may therefore fail to recognize that the semantic units of the L1 and L2 do not match. Thus, the learner is not able to use the semantic units in the L2 in a correct way (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 505).

Translation is also perceived to hinder L2 acquisition in another way: "translation potentially provokes interference mistakes due to negative transfer from the mother tongue" (Zojer, 2009, p. 33). Lado (1964, p. 54) accentuate this claim by stating that a general objection to translation in language teaching and learning, is that translation 'tricks' the learner into believing that words and expressions in the L1 and L2 can be used in the same situations in both languages or a so-called one-to-one correspondence of meaning between the two languages (Malmkjær, 1998, Shiyab & Abdullateef, 2001, Vermes, 2010). Eventually, this will result in a word-for-word translation with incorrect sentence structures caused by the translation method (Lado, 1964, pp. 53-54).

Further, there is a belief that the students must learn to think in the L2 in order to acquire the language (Leffa, 2012, cited in Kupske, 2015, Malmkjær, 1998, Vermes, 2010). This ability is closely connected to L2 fluency as teachers are "trying to bring [...] pupils to use English without translating in their own minds, to say without hesitation the right thing on the right occasion" (Malmkjær, 1998, p. 5): if the students can think in the L2, without interference from L1, the language might turn into a habit and flow freely and naturally (Leffa, 2012, cited in Kupske, 2015, p. 56.). Hence, teachers should not only encourage students to avoid using their L1 in the classroom, they should also encourage direct and spontaneous use of the L2. This enables the students to acquire grammar rules in a more efficient way and it allows teachers and students to focus on correct pronunciation (ibid.) which will further lead to language acquisition. Using the L1 in translation activities will interfere with the students' accurate use of the L2 since it forces the students to view the L2 "through the prism of their mother tongue" (Carreres, 2006, p. 5). This interference has a detrimental effect on the long-term use of the L2 and prevents their ability to develop L2 fluency (ibid.).

According to Newson (1988, p. 6), translation deprives both teacher and learner of the advantage of working within only one language. The advantage being the students' exposure to the L2 only which will cause a more effective L2 acquisition and fluency. This is in accordance to the input hypothesis which emphasizes L2 input as the most important factor in language acquisition (Krashen, 1982), and the output hypothesis which emphasizes L2 output as an important factor (Swain, 1985, 1995, 2005). In addition, Newson (1988) claims that translation tasks neither emphasize the spoken language, language structures and lexical items, nor communicative language use, and, maybe most important, the use of situationalized and contextualized language (ibid.). All these aspects, one can claim, are important for L2 fluency.

3.1.2 Translation: the fifth skill that harms the four other skills

Malmkjær (1998, p. 8) and Zojer (2009, p. 33) state that translation is among the critics regarded as an independent skill and therefore not as one of the four skills that defines language competence: reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Lado (1964) explains this with translation being entirely different from the four other skills due to it being "a psychologically more complex skill" (Lado, 1964, p. 54).

The main objection regarding translation being a fifth skill that harms the other language skills, is that translation restricts practice of all four skills which will have a negative effect on the language acquisition altogether. Translation activities confine language practice to reading and writing only (Carreres, 2006, p. 5), excluding the skills speaking and listening. Zojer (2009) takes this argument further when he states that translation harms all four skills: translation is sometimes "used excessively which tends to have a rather detrimental effect on the teaching of the other four skills" (Zojer, 2009, p. 33). Thus, the time used on translation in the classroom will affect the language acquisition negatively as the time should be used to focus on all four skills instead. This especially concerns the skill of speaking as this is the skill translation impair the most (ibid.). This is the reason why both Newson (1988, p. 2) and Lado (1964, p. 54) claim that translation should only be used as a teaching tool *after* the learner has acquired the second language.

3.1.3 Translation is unnatural

According to Korošec (2013, pp. 65-66), one of the most basic arguments against using translation as a teaching tool, is the statement that the act of translation is unnatural. The critics claim that translation is "an artificial and stilted exercise that has no place in a communicative methodology" (Carreres, 2006, p. 5). This statement stems from how translation was taught during the period when GTM had the leading role in language teaching. As previously mentioned, the language was taught through decontextualized and made-up sentences with focus on structure and grammar (Korošec, 2013, p. 65). When learning a language, the main goal for the learner is the ability to communicate properly in the new language. Translation tasks and activities are therefore perceived as unnatural because they do not focus on the communicative aspect of the language (Newson, 1998, p. 64).

Furthermore, Carreres (2006, p. 5) claims that another common argument against using translation as a pedagogical tool, is that translation into L2 specifically has no application in the real world. This is justified by means of the argument that "translators normally operate into and not out of their mother tongue" (ibid.). Here, I suspect that Carreres

refers to the fact that translation can move the 'natural' way into the students' L1 in order to ensure comprehension, for instance.

3.1.4 Other allegedly negative aspects of translation

The arguments presented and explained above are not the only arguments against using translation as a tool in language teaching and learning. The arguments that are mentioned in this section are arguments that are not the most argued among the critics and are therefore not elaborated enough to be the main focus of this paper.

Carreres (2006, p. 5) mentions an additional negative aspect of using translation as a pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning which has to do with translation into L2 especially. Translating from L1 to L2 is perceived as a frustrating and demotivating activity as the students will never achieve the same level of accuracy or stylistic textual outcome as their teacher's version. Translation into L2 seems like an activity constructed to evoke mistakes instead of accurate language use. Zojer (2009, p. 33) also points this out by stating that a translation task will always involve more intricacies (and therefore also difficulty) in terms of lexis and grammar than other, more traditional language learning tasks the students will encounter in the classroom. The result is that the student will feel frustration and disappointment as (s)he cannot cope with the immense number of complex rules. Eventually, this will lead to a lack of systematic transfer and unsatisfying learning outcomes (ibid.).

3.2 Overview: arguments in favour of translation

Although the objections against using translation in language teaching and learning are, and have been, many, we now see an increasing shift in attitudes (Carreres, 2006, Cook, 2010, Malmkjær, 1998, Kupske, 2015, Zojer, 2009). Several authors, some of them being Brooks-Lewis (2009), Carreres (2006), Liao (2006), Machida (2011) and Vermes (2010), all present arguments in favour of using translation as a pedagogical tool. They believe that many of the objections against translation have either, not been researched thoroughly, or, are based on a limited view of how to use translation in a language learning situation. Also, the critics' assumptions of GTM being the only way to use translation is believed to be the reason why translation has received such a negative reputation. Hence, these authors and researchers are arguing for bringing translation back in language teaching by presenting several counterarguments against the critics' objections.

3.2.1 The positive influence of the L1

According to Malmkjær (1998), it is true that translation produces interference. However, an important effect of translating is that it encourages awareness and control of this interference (Malmkjær, 1998, p. 8). When translation is used as a cognitive tool in order to raise awareness of language contrast, it helps the learners to identify different structures in the two languages (Zojer, 2009, p. 34) which, according to Shiyab and Abdullateef (2001, p. 4), reduces long term negative language interference. Randaccio (2012, p. 82) supports the claim that translation can help raise awareness of language contrasts when she refers to Danchev (1983) who explains that empirical observations show that L2 learners commonly make the same errors when they produce free compositions in their L2 as when they translate. If helped, however, by applying translation in a systematic and conscious way, the L2 learners can be scaffolded to

monitor their code switching from one language to the other when they translate (Danchev, 1983, cited in Randaccio, 2012, p. 82). The raised awareness of contrasts between the L1 and L2 will cause the learners to strengthen their general language consciousness, Zojer (2009, p. 35) states. As a result, this greater awareness of the L1 in relation to the L2, enables the learner's communicative and productive use of the L2 to become more effective (Danchev, 1983, cited in Randaccio, 2012, p. 82).

3.2.2 Translation as the fifth skill that complements the other four skills

Malmkjær (1998) denies that translation harms the four language competence skills, reading, writing, speaking, and listening. In fact, she claims that translation is impossible without all four skills. Translation is both dependent on, and inclusive of them, and "language students who are translating will be forced to practice them" (Malmkjær, 1998, p. 8). Although Malmkjær does not propose exactly how translation can be implemented to practice for instance listening and speaking, dubbing tasks as performed by Danan (2010) in her study, are tasks that will make the students practice both of these language skills.

Translation does not only support the four language competence skills. It also serves several purposes outside these skills allowing the students to learn, practice, and reflect on aspects "ranging from linguistic problems to more cultural, semantic and pragmatic concerns" (Leonardi, 2010, pp. 81-82) in addition to strengthening the learners' analytical and problem-solving skills. This, for Leonardi (2011), makes translation the fifth skill that complements the other four skills which, if applied in language teaching, is a good way to cultivate bilingualism.

3.2.3 Translation is natural: students translating in their minds does not hinder L2 fluency

In this section, the two arguments of translation's unnaturalness and translation's hindrance of the students' thinking in L2 and thus also L2 fluency, will be combined as the arguments against these objections are closely connected. This connection is rooted in the fact that students translate in their minds sub-consciously and that translation therefore is a natural occurrence (Kupske, 2015, Leonardi, 2011, Priya & Jayasridevi, 2018, Randaccio, 2012, Shiyab & Abdullateef, 2001).

Classroom observations have shown that many L2 learners translate from the L2 to their L1 even when they have not been given a specific translation task or activity (Danchev, 1983, pp. 37-38, cited in Randaccio, 2012, p. 82). Priya and Jayasridevi (2018) support the statement that many learners translate without being asked to, by stating that L2 learners find translation helpful as it helps them relate their L1 to the L2: it is "a mental process that takes place in their minds on an unconscious level, every time they speak the other language" (Priya & Jayasridevi, 2018, p. 123). Translation is therefore a naturally occurring activity (Leonardi, 2011, p. 3). Many learners use translation in this way to check their comprehension (Kupske, 2015, p. 60, Liao, 2006, p. 192) which may cause their L1 to reinforce the L2 learning process (Kupske, 2015, p. 60). This naturally occurring translation may be called 'silent translation' (Titford, 1985, p. 78), 'natural translation' (Shiyab & Abdullateef, 2001, p. 4) or the 'natural process' (Weller, 1989, cited in Randaccio, 2012, p. 82). In addition, Duff (1989, p. 6) states that translation happens naturally everywhere so why should it not be used in the classroom as well?

After all, translation, as it takes place in the real world, is certainly connected to communicative purposes (Kupske, 2015, p. 58).

Malmkjær (2010, p. 187) is also of the opinion that translation is natural. She claims that since translation is a skill deep-seated in bilinguals, and since there are more bilingual people than monolingual in the world, such an innate skill cannot be unnatural. Moreover, translation is perceived as an integrative activity as it "integrates different difficulties in various ways. It is, therefore, closer to real life language use" (Zojer, 2009, p. 35) than other pedagogical tools used in language teaching.

When it comes to the argument that translation and the use of L1 in general hinders L2 fluency, Vermes (2010, p. 87) states that this objection only stands if we think of translation as a written task. Translation tasks can also be performed orally, he claims, which can then "in principle, be used to develop spoken language fluency" (ibid.). In addition, translation activities, whether they are written or oral, can also be used to introduce or revise grammar, structures, and lexical items (ibid.) which may be argued to further develop L2 fluency.

3.2.4 Other allegedly positive aspects of translation

The positive aspects presented and explained above are not the only arguments in favour of using translation as a pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning. The aspects that are mentioned in this section are arguments that are not the most argued among the supporters of translation and are therefore not elaborated enough to be the main focus of this paper.

3.2.4.1 Motivation: especially when it comes to AVT

According to Liao (2006), translation activities can improve motivation to learn the L2 in that the activities "can help reduce learning anxiety" (Liao, 2006, p. 201). Although Liao does not explicitly state why such activities can reduce learning anxiety, one possible answer might be that some translation activities facilitate for a higher degree of self-initiated task-based learning (Danan, 2010, Sokoli, 2006). Also, due to the negative reputation translation has had for years, one may assume that many teachers have not presented translation as an activity in their classrooms. Hence, many students may experience translation as a new "refreshing and entertaining" activity (Danan, 2010, p. 452).

AVT, for instance subtitling and dubbing, are two activities that not only differ from the 'traditional' classroom activities, but also from 'traditional' translation tasks students may be confronted with in the classroom and they may therefore improve motivation (McLoughlin & Lertola, 2014). While Danan (2010, p. 441) claims that dubbing tasks as those the participants performed in her study, increase learner motivation as the students move from teacher-directed instruction to self-initiated task-based learning, Sokoli (2006, p. 1) says that subtitling tasks may have the same effect. The increased motivation among the participants in Danan's (2010) study seemed to have much to do with the fact that the participants could choose which sections of the visual media they wanted to dub. Hence, allowing the students to have freedom of choice in performing a task without them being "quizzed or drilled" (Danan, 2010, p. 452) will make the task feel more self-initiated. In addition, AVT tasks, both dubbing and subtitling, include cultural elements and multimedia which create "a valid real-world engaging task" (Sokoli, 2006, p. 1.) which may increase the motivation further.

3.2.4.2 Improvement of general language skills

Kupske (2015, p. 59) refers to Liao (2006) when he lists several positive outcomes translation has on language skills. As students actively translate a text and research unknown words or other lexical items and repeat these through the process of writing the text, the students remember new items, idioms, grammar, and syntactic structure more easily and effectively. This results in both an expanded L2 vocabulary, and verbal agility, at the same time as it “help students to develop and express ideas in the L2” (Kupske, 2015, p. 59).

Due to translation activities making the students become more aware and conscious of contrasts between languages, as mentioned in section 3.2.1, they also slowly build up a reflective language consciousness, according to Zojer (2009, p. 35). This reflective consciousness does not only regard language in general, but also, the relationship between language and thought, and language and culture (ibid.). Further, this consciousness is linked to acquiring transferable skills between languages (Zojer, 2009, p. 36) which also may result in what Zojer calls a “huge bonus that should not be underestimated (Zojer, 2009, p. 35): improvement of the L1.

3.3 Evidence from empirical research

The arguments for and against translation as a pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning presented in section 3.2 above, are mostly general assertions – some more empirically supported than others. In this section, however, the paper presents specific empirical research results of studies where translation was used as a tool in language teaching and learning.

The section is divided into attitudinal studies and experimental studies with further differentiation between results showing positive outcomes and results showing negative outcomes of using translation as a tool when learning a language.

3.3.1 Attitudinal studies

3.3.1.1 In favour of translation

Scheffler (2013) performed a small-scale study where the participants were 45 Polish secondary school students learning English. The study consisted of three parts: a grammar-translation task from L1 to L2 with an evaluation questionnaire after, a communicative language exchange (translation was not a part of the exchange) with a questionnaire after, and finally, both the grammar-translation task and the communicative language exchange with spontaneous, oral comments after (Scheffler, 2013, p. 255, 260). The translation task used in the study was based on GTM to “determine whether translating disconnected sentences can be perceived by learners as a useful means of illustrating grammatical phenomena” (Scheffler, 2013, p. 260).

In the first activity, the grammar-translation task, the participants were to translate the sentences in a ‘form-focused close translation’. This means that the translated sentences were supposed to be as close to the original as possible (Scheffler, 2013, p. 260). Instantly after this activity was completed, the participants answered a questionnaire about the task. Four weeks later, the same arrangement was used to perform the communicative activity. And four weeks after that, the participants, again, did both the grammar-translation task and the communicative activity. However, this time the

participant gave spontaneous comments about the activity immediately after finishing it (Scheffler, 2013).

Overall, the study showed that the participants were positive to the use of both activities. Both in general terms and in terms of utility (Scheffler, 2013, p. 262). The majority of the feedback from the participants referred to the notion that translation is a good activity for understanding the difference between the two languages and that translation is a welcomed activity in the classroom as it is not something they do regularly (Scheffler, 2013, p. 264). Also, the participants reported on the grammar-translation task helping them notice and understand which words were correct to use and appropriate in different situations and contexts. Some reported that translating helped them transfer their own thoughts into English and to understand how English people think. Last, but not least, both activities were helpful because they showed the participants directly how to use tenses in English (ibid.). Based on these findings, Scheffler (2013, p. 266) claims that translation activities help learners of English understand aspects of the language's grammar and that it therefore should occasionally be applied by teachers in the classroom.

3.3.1.2 In favour of oral translation: particularly the use of L1 in the classroom
Brooks-Lewis (2009) performed classroom-based research at two universities in Mexico where one of the universities was a State university and the other was dedicated to teacher education. The participants were 256 literate Spanish-speaking adults ranging from the age of 19 to 72 with English as the TL. Brooks-Lewis held a 30-hour course during the timespan of three semesters which was the 'medium' of the research (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 222). The participants were to anonymously write an essay at the end of the course together with answering a questionnaire and maintaining a diary reflecting on their experience with the course and the use of L1 in learning English (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, pp. 221-223). This written feedback mainly focused on the general question "What do you think of the inclusion of Spanish in the class and of its comparison with English?" (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, pp. 221-222). Brooks-Lewis' course "had been intended as an introduction to the study of EFL" (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 222), and she therefore started the course in the participants' L1, Spanish, slowly moving into English, with constant comparisons and contrasts between the two languages and cultures. When asking questions or entering discussions, the participants could use the L1 if they wished (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 223).

First, Brooks-Lewis found some general perceptions among the data collected. She explains that overall, the participants' perceptions and experience of the EFL course with use of the L1, was "overwhelmingly positive" (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 225). More specifically, participants reported that the use of L1 helped them with comprehension in the classroom. Both in discussions and instructions. Also, it became evident that the incorporation of L1 relieved stress brought upon the participants in both entering the strange territory being the classroom, and, the exposure of a foreign language (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 224). However, Brooks-Lewis also concludes that "what works for some learners does not for others" (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 225).

Second, the inclusion of the L1 in the classroom "allows for its comparison and contrast with the target language and thereby the incorporation of the learner's prior knowledge" (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 228), which the data from her research also shows. Some participants reported that discovering the similarities between their L1 and English

resulted in the English learning experience becoming more practical, motivating, and even easier. Others reported that realizing that their prior knowledge of their L1 could be used to understand and acquire the new language was a new experience which made them more conscious of the learning process (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, pp. 228-230). Based on these findings, Brooks-Lewis concludes that the inclusion of L1 in language teaching and learning "would be applicable in EFL teaching situations with learners of different backgrounds and/or with different L1s, and in the teaching of other target languages" (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 216).

3.3.1.3 In favour of audiovisual translation: subtitling

McLoughlin and Lertola (2014) researched students' opinions about subtitling as a tool in language learning at National University of Ireland, Galway, between 2009-2012. The university had through this period held an annual 24-week subtitling module for undergraduate students enrolled in an Italian language course. All students attending the module in this period were contacted in 2012 and asked to complete an online evaluation questionnaire. 40 out of 49 students (82%) completed the questionnaire. The age of the participants ranged from 18-58 with a mean age of 24.3 (McLoughlin & Lertola, 2014, p. 76). The participants' nationalities were British (1), German (1), Irish (30), Italian (2), Spanish (2), Polish (1) and Portuguese (1). Two participants did not state their nationality (ibid.).

The first finding McLoughlin and Lertola (2014, p. 77) point out is that 91% of the participants answered that they enjoyed the subtitling tasks. In addition, 80% of the participants reported that they had experienced translation in other language courses and out of these, 68% of them said that they enjoyed translation tasks (ibid.).

When it comes to the language competence skills, through the work done in the subtitling module, 85% said they had improved their listening skills, 65% felt their reading skills were improved, 49% recognized improvement on their writing skills, while only 23% reported improvement in their oral language skills (McLoughlin & Lertola, 2014, p. 78). The researchers argue that the low percentage in improvement of oral language skills is most likely because subtitling does not involve practicing speaking (ibid.).

In the open-ended question some students wrote that they "found subtitling a 'very good way of learning' since 'it is a challenging and immersion task which creates an atmosphere that promotes learning'" (McLoughlin & Lertola, 2014, p. 79).

To conclude, McLoughlin and Lertola (2014, p. 79) state that the students' feedback shows that students enjoy subtitling activities as they represent an additional and alternative method of learning language compared to those activities students are usually confronted with in the classroom. The students enjoying subtitling is connected to motivation, the researchers claim (ibid.). This is emphasized as an important finding as motivation is paramount in "determining the rate and success of language learning" (ibid.).

3.3.1.4 In favour of audiovisual translation: dubbing

Between 2007-2010, Danan (2010) performed a dubbing experiment in the US military where 82 participants studying Dari, Pashto, or Farsi were involved in the experiment. Altogether, the group of participants completed 15 different dubbing projects which involved dubbing excerpts from their L1 to the FL. The excerpts were from the American

tv series *24* and various English-speaking films and animated cartoons (such as *South Park*) (Danan, 2010, p. 447). All dubbing projects started as a teacher-initiated task – the teacher chose the specific scene to dub and provided the participant with an English language transcript of the scene. Eventually, however, the projects became increasingly more student run (Danan, 2010, pp. 447-448).

Danan (2010, p. 452) reports that the necessity to synchronize the oral speech with the visual frame when dubbing, forces the participants to deliver their lines quickly with almost no time to think. This will eventually result in developing the fluency of speech (ibid.). In the post-experience questionnaire, about half of the participants reported on improvement of their spoken language. More specifically, improvement of fluency, delivery, and pronunciation (ibid.). The participants' teachers also commented on this saying that the amount of oral repetitions the participants performed causes this kind of project to be a "huge fluency booster" (ibid.).

Further, the questionnaire showed that the participants found dubbing a highly motivating task as it was "a refreshing and entertaining group activity that allowed them to have fun with the target language" (Danan, 2010, p. 452). Adding to this, the researcher claims that the use of well-known American material (*24*, *South Park*, various films) resulted in higher interest from the participants. It facilitated identification with the characters as well as promoting comprehension and awareness of cultural nuances (Danan, 2010, p. 447). In addition, one of the teachers stated that he had never witnessed his students so excited when working on a project (Danan, 2010, p. 452). Danan explains this as a result of the projects eventually becoming more self-initiated: making the projects to become more student run, allowing the students to choose how to approach the dubbing task, promoted creativity, initiative, and motivation (ibid.).

To conclude, Danan (2010, p. 454) claims that dubbing first and foremost improves vocabulary and oral skills in addition to motivating the students to learn due to the project enabling the students to be highly involved in a unique and high-level task. Hence, even though dubbing projects may be time-consuming, "dubbing deserves further attention in foreign language instruction" (ibid.).

3.3.1.5 Mostly in favour of translation with a few concerns

In his study of EFL learners' beliefs about and strategy use of translation (for instance using translation to comprehend or remember), Liao (2006) found both positive and negative views on using translation as a pedagogical tool in English learning. From the questionnaires 351 fourth and fifth-year students in Taiwan answered, Liao found that most of the participants considered translation as a positive tool in their process of learning English (Liao, 2006, p. 208). However, he also found that the more proficient learners were generally more negative towards the use of translation in language learning (ibid.). In addition, the learners "showed a medium to high level use of translation as a learning strategy" (ibid.) (when translation was used impulsively and not as a teacher-initiated task), but also, that the "learners' beliefs about translation generally affected the translation strategies they chose to use in learning English" (ibid.).

Liao (2006, p. 201) explains that regarding the four language competence skills reading, writing, listening, and speaking, the study shows that the participants overall, believed that translation helps them acquire these skills. Further, the participants reported that they use translation most regularly "to learn English vocabulary words, idioms, phrases,

and grammar, to read, write, and speak English, and to check their reading and listening comprehension" (Liao, 2006, p. 203).

Liao (2006, p. 209) does not give one single conclusion based on his findings. Rather, he states that even though the participants generally expressed that they believed that translation was essential for their present phase in learning English and that translation helped them to "comprehend, memorize, and produce better English, to acquire English skills, and to complete various English tasks" (ibid.), the participants also expressed contradicting reactions toward translation. These contradicting reactions were mostly concerns about whether translation activities would cause interference between their L1 and English, that it would inhibit their thought process in English, and, that translation would "trick" learners into believing that there is a corresponding one-to-one meaning of words and expressions in the two languages (ibid.). Due to this, the participants claimed that they felt they had to resist using translation as they gradually made progress in learning English (ibid.).

3.3.1.6 Against translation

Tavakoli, Ghadiri and Zabihi's (2014) study on direct writing versus translated writing will be further presented in section 3.3.2.2 as it is mainly an experimental study. This means that this study will be regarded as an experimental study in the discussion in chapter 4.0. However, there was one part of the study that examined the participants' feelings and attitudes towards translation. This part will therefore be explained here.

The participants in Tavakoli, Ghadiri and Zabihi's (2014) study were given a post-test in order to investigate the participants' attitudes towards the two kinds of writing tasks (direct writing versus translated writing) they performed (Tavakoli et al., 2014, p. 64). The questions ranged from evaluating translation strategies and the level of difficulty, to their own feelings about translation and their preference between translation or writing directly into English.

The most notable finding from this post-test was that, in sum, 85% of the participants said they preferred to write directly in English, while only 15% answered that they preferred to translate from L1 to L2 (Tavakoli et al., 2014, p. 69). Other results also pointed toward the preference of writing directly into English. For instance, the statements "I feel that writing directly in English helps to focus on English expressions" and "I feel that writing directly into English helps you to learn the language" both scored the highest among the participant with an average of 3.9 (5.0 was maximum) (Tavakoli et al., 2014, p. 68). The statement "I found it [more] difficult to write directly in English than to translate" scored the lowest among the participant with an average of 2.7 (ibid.).

3.3.2 Experimental studies

3.3.2.1 In favour of translation

In their study on acquiring new vocabulary, Laufer and Girsai (2008) investigated the "effect of explicit contrastive analysis and translation activities on the incidental acquisition of single words and collocations" (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, p. 694). The participants were 75 10th graders in Israel (Hebrew as L1) learning English as an FL. The participants were divided into three groups which each represented one instructional condition: meaning-focused instruction (MFI), non-contrastive form-focused instruction (FFI), and contrastive analysis and translation (CAT) (ibid.). The CAT-group was the only group to perform translation tasks.

The target items of the study were pre-tested. 10 single words and 10 collocations were shown to be unknown to all participants. These were embedded in the different tasks the three groups were to complete in the experiment. The first phase of the experiment was identical in the three groups as each group were separately asked to read a text where the target items were integrated in the text, before answering true-or-false statements about the text. The answers were revised in each group with a teacher (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, pp. 703-704).

In the next phase of the experiment, each group was assigned with two different tasks in accordance with the instructional condition they were assigned. The MFI group received two communicative tasks: reading comprehension and a discussion task in pairs or groups. The FFI group received form-focused tasks: meaning recognition of the target items (multiple choice) and a text fill-in task with the target words presented at the end of the text (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, p. 704). The CAT group's tasks were both translation tasks (L1 to L2 and L2 to L1) with brief contrastive instruction (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, p. 705).

The day after the three groups had completed their two tasks, all the participants were tested again. This time unexpectedly with two different tests on the target items. First, they were tested on active recall, that is, "their ability to provide the words in response to their Hebrew [L1] translations" (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, p. 705). Second, they were tested on passive recall: the target items were now given in a different order than in the first test and the participants were to give meaning of the words in the L1 or the FL (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, p. 706).

A week later, the participants completed the post-test which was the same active recall test and the same passive recall test. The intention with the post-test was for the researchers to find out how many of the target items the participants still remembered (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, p. 706).

The results show that in both the different group tests, and the test of passive and active recall of the target items immediately after the experiment, the CAT group, which was the only group that performed translation, had overall the highest score. The MFI group had overall the lowest score. This was evident on both the single words and the collocations (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, pp. 706-709). In fact, the researchers state that the CAT group "scored significantly higher than the two other groups on all [...] tests" (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, p. 709). For instance, the CAT group learnt around 72% of passive and 51% of active vocabulary which is significantly more than the other groups, Laufer and Girsai (2008, p. 710) claim. Among the other two groups, the MFI group "learnt hardly any vocabulary at all" (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, p. 712) and the FFI group were somewhere in between MFI and CAT. The researchers point out that the high scores the CAT group achieved are nothing but remarkable when recall of word form and word meaning is the most difficult aspects of form-meaning knowledge (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, p. 710).

Laufer and Girsai (2008, pp. 711-712) conclude with the nature of the tasks given to the CAT group as the reason for the group's high scores. More specifically, the tasks the group received contained a high level of evaluation forcing the participants to evaluate between several alternatives before making a choice of translation strategy (Laufer & Girsai, 2008, p. 712). Thus, there was a bigger 'involvement load' in the CAT group's tasks than in the other groups' tasks (ibid.).

Hummel (2010) executed a somewhat similar experiment to that of Laufer and Girsai (2008) when she examined the role of active translation in L2 vocabulary learning. Here, active translation means finding the unknown TL equivalent of an SL word without being helped or presented with the TL equivalent.

The participants in Hummel's study were 191 students enrolled in a Teaching English as a Second Language program with French as their L1. The participants were divided into three groups with a different task in each group: 1) L1 to L2 active translation, 2) L2 to L1 active translation, and, 3) an exposure and copy task (Hummel, 2010, p. 61).

The participants were tested on 15 nouns the researchers had found in a pre-test to be unfamiliar to the participants. The nouns' equivalents were provided in the main test.

Example as follows:

English to French translation group:

'The girl fell into the brambles.'

Brambles = *ronces*

Sentence translation (into French): _____

French to English translation group:

'La fille est tombée dans les ronces.'

ronces = brambles

Sentence translation (into English): _____

(Hummel, 2010, pp. 66-67)

Half of the exposure and copy task group (year 1 students) were to copy the translated sentences both in the L1 and in the L2. The other half of the exposure and copy task group (year 2 students) were to copy only the sentences translated into L2:

Exposure and copy group (year 1):

Brambles = *ronces*

'The girl fell into the brambles.'

Copy sentence: _____

'La fille est tombée dans les ronces.'

Copy sentence: _____

Exposure and copy group (year 2):

Brambles = *ronces*

'The girls fell into the brambles.'

Copy sentence: _____

(Hummel, 2010, p. 67)

After the three groups completed their tasks, the participants were provided with a distractor task. This task was administered "to help prevent participants from suspecting that target items would be retested, which might lead them to mentally rehearse items" (Hummel, 2010, p. 67). Then, the same list of nouns – with the nouns in a different order than on the first sheet – were handed out to the participants asking to recall the L1 equivalent (ibid.).

Results from the study show that, in general, all three tasks resulted in short-term increase in vocabulary recall (Hummel, 2010, p. 68). However, the copy group outperformed the two other groups in the statistical analyses with a 49% increase in

recall of nouns in comparison to the other groups' 35% (L1 to L2) and 37% (L2 to L1) increase (ibid.). This was, according to the researcher, in contrast to her hypothesis before the test. As a matter of fact, Hummel (2010, p. 68) believed that the groups that were to perform active translation would score better than the copy group. Due to the strong performance of the copy group, Hummel (2010, p. 68) claims that exposure to L1 and L2 sentence equivalents may be a more effective way of learning vocabulary than active translation tasks.

Hummel (2010, p. 71) concludes that even though the study showed that active translation produce recall of new L2 vocabulary, it seems like students benefit more from copy tasks with focus on translation equivalents. However, Hummel states that since the students participating in this study are intermediate level L2 students, it would be interesting to examine whether more advanced L2 students would benefit more from performing active translation tasks (ibid.).

3.3.2.2 Against translation

Tavakoli, Ghadiri and Zabihi (2014, p. 65) argue that findings from their study suggest that translating from L1 into L2 is not the best writing strategy when the goal is to learn a language. This is based on their "comparative research designed study investigating the effect of translation (from L1) on L2 learners' writing ability" (Tavakoli, et al., 2014, p. 63). The participants were selected after a pre-test which was based on the Oxford Placement Test consisting of 60 multiple choice questions where grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension were tested in 20 questions each. Translation tasks were not included. The pre-test was completed by the participants mainly for the researchers to control that the participants' language proficiency was good enough to complete the writing section in which the researchers would find their empirical evidence on the effect of translation. After the participants were selected, they were to complete two writing tasks: one translation task where the participants were to translate a text from the L1 (Persian) to English, and one task where they were to write directly into English. The participants were "60 elementary-level Iranian learners of English as a Foreign Language" (Tavakoli, et al., 2014, p. 63). All participants were "either undergraduate or graduate-level university students with a variety of majors" (ibid.).

The results showed that the learners' performance was slightly better in the direct writing task than in the translation task in terms of grammar, expression, and transition (Tavakoli et al., 2014, p. 65). In terms of language, more precisely knowledge and usage of native-like expressions, the learners also showed somewhat better performance in the direct writing task than in the translation task. Because of this lower performance in the translation task in general, the researchers claim that translating from L1 into L2 is not a satisfactory way to learn how to use expressions in the L2 (ibid.). Further, the results show that the learners also scored slightly higher in the direct writing task when it comes to the "overall organizational structure, clarity of points, and smoothness of the writing" (Tavakoli et al., 2014, p. 66) with the means of 3.85, 3.9 and 4.05 compared to 3.05, 3.05 and 3.15 in the translated writing task (ibid.).

Although findings from Tavakoli, Ghadiri and Zabihi's (2014) study were mostly negative, they also found that the translation aspect of the translated writing task "brought better organization (i.e. cohesion and coherence)" (Tavakoli et al., 2014, p. 67) to the writing process than the direct writing task did. Because of this, and the fact that the participants' performance on the direct writing task was not overwhelmingly higher than the translated writing task, the researchers propose future pedagogical implications for

L2 writing in the classroom and possibly, the use of translation in L2 writing. Since the participants in the study had used their L1 while they wrote freely in L2, the researchers suggest that teachers should explicitly incorporate and teach translation strategies so that students can learn how and why to employ different and appropriate strategies in various contexts and situations (Tavakoli et al., 2014, p. 70).

4.0 Discussion

This paper's research questions are: why has using translation as a tool in language teaching and learning been frowned upon? What has been said and shown regarding the positive aspects of translation in language teaching and learning, suggesting that a re-introduction is justified?

As we have seen, there are three main objections from the critics on the use of translation as a tool when learning a language. According to Cook's (2010, p. xv) categories, two of these are cognitive arguments which are based on the idea that translation hinders proper language acquisition. The third and last objection is a practical objection which is based on the belief that translation is artificial and not an activity language learners will need in the real world.

Table 1 The main objections

	Cognitive objections	Practical objections
1)	L1's negative influence on L2 learning and acquisition.	
2)	Translation is not directly linked to the four language competence skills and is therefore regarded as a fifth skill which has a harmful effect on the other four skills.	
3)		Translation is unnatural.

We will now look at the arguments for and against the use of translation in more detail. The following table first gives an overview of the objections against translation as a pedagogical tool together with findings from empirical research. Secondly, the table gives an overview of the arguments in favour of the use of translation together with the most common or notable findings from empirical research.

Table 2 The theoretical assumptions and empirical research

	Theoretical assumptions	Attitudinal empirical research	Experimental empirical research
	Negative		
1)	Use of L1 misleads to a belief of a corresponding one-to-one equivalent of words and meaning in both languages	More proficient L2 learners may be negative towards the use of translation activities due to fear of negative interference from L1.	L2 learners perform slightly better when writing directly into L2 than translating from L1 to L2.
2)	Use of L1 hinders thinking in L2 which is necessary to acquire the language and provide language fluency.	L2 learners may feel that translating is more difficult than writing directly into L2.	
3)	Translation excludes the skills listening and speaking.		

4)	Excessive time used on translation should be used on teaching and practicing all four language skills.		
5)	Translation activities are stilted and artificial.		
6)	Translation activities do not focus on the communicative aspect of language.		
	Theoretical assumptions	Attitudinal empirical research	Experimental empirical research
	Positive		
1)	Translation to compare and identify different structures in the two languages which encourages awareness and control of the interference from the L1.	Translation helps understand and identify aspects of the language's grammar.	Translation activities are effective in learning and acquiring new vocabulary.
2)	Translation integrates and is dependent on all four language skills.	Translation facilitates awareness of the languages' similarities and differences.	
3)	Translation to learn, practice, and reflect on aspects of linguistics, culture, semantics, and pragmatics.	Translation activities to improve language competence skills.	
4)	Sub-conscious translation between L1 and L2 to check comprehension.	Translation as a learning strategy in the mind and to check comprehension.	
5)		Translation to transfer thoughts into L2.	
6)		Translation tasks are enjoyable.	

Of the research that could be found, there are in general more theoretical assumptions than findings from empirical research as we see in the table. When it comes to the divide between the negative and positive effects of translation, there are more negative theoretical assumptions than positive theoretical assumptions. However, there are more empirical findings that support the positive assumptions than the negative assumptions. The most notable finding from the table, is the minimal amount of experimental empirical research.

In the following I will examine the negative views of translation in connection to: 1) where they stem from and what they are rooted in, and, 2) their durability if we discuss them in light of what we now know about translation as a pedagogical tool due to empirical research.

4.1 Evaluating the arguments and research: the theoretical assumptions

4.1.1 CLT and the Direct Method: monolingualism

I want to argue that the three main objections against the use of translation in language teaching and learning, all stem from the Direct Method's belief in monolingualism and the CLT's belief that the avoidance of the L1 is the most efficient way of learning a language (Cook, 2010, p. 8). This is explicitly evident in the first of the three main arguments where L1 is argued to be a negative influence. The other two arguments, translation as a fifth skill and that translation is unnatural, do not explicitly revolve around the influence of L1. Rather, the nature of translation as an activity – how translation tasks are structured and executed – seem to be perceived as the main problem here. In defining the nature of translation as an activity, we must also define the term translation. If we define translation as "converting the native language into the target language" (Oxford, 1990, p. 46), there is no doubt that one cannot perform a translation activity without using the L1. The use of L1 is, therefore, inevitable in translation activities. Thus, when the critics question the nature of translation as an activity, one can argue that they also question the way translation activities cannot be performed without switching between two languages which is seen as peripheral according to the advocates of the Direct Method (Cook, 2010, p. 8).

In addition, when we consider that CLT emphasizes the avoidance of L1 use in language teaching and learning, and that monolingualism is the first pillar of the Direct Method and particularly important in language use in general (Cook, 2010, p. 8), it becomes clear that the three main objections against translation stem from the influence CLT and the Direct Method has had on language teaching and learning for decades.

When CLT claims that the avoidance of the L1 is the most efficient way of learning a language (ibid.) and that the Direct Method is perceived to be the only road to success in learning languages (Cook, 2010, p. 9), monolingualism's importance becomes reinforced. However, when Cook states that these claims are "held with absolute confidence but no substantial evidence" (ibid.), they become mere assumptions. Also, when we now know that translation activities help students to recognize, understand and to become aware of the different languages' aspects, similarities, and differences (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, Scheffler, 2013), the objections against translation may not seem very well founded.

It is also worth mentioning that CLT in general has a strict focus on the students' oral production. As we know, the 'traditional' translation activities, mainly dealing with reading and writing, in which the arguments imply the critics have had in mind when arguing against translation, exclude oral production. Thus, this is also an example of how strong influence CLT has had for decades. However, as we have seen from empirical research, it is possible to successfully implement oral translation activities in the classroom (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, Danan, 2010). This evidence weakens the statement of translation harming the other four language skills and the importance of monolingualism when learning an L2.

4.1.2 The Direct Method's belief in naturalism

Naturalism is the second pillar of the Direct Method which regards the belief that the best way to learn a language is in 'natural situations' (Cook, 2010). It is not difficult to see that the practical objection against translation – translation being unnatural – is a clear result of this pillar. In these natural situations monolingualism is again highly valued. Of

course, if we think of a natural situation being an L2 learner having a long stay in a monolingual country where they speak the L2, the learner will indeed be exposed to monolingualism and input. In such a situation, it is argued that learners of the country's language will "pick up" the specific language quicker and more efficiently and, especially, improve their oral and fluency skills (Llanes, 2011, p. 191). The aim for the advocates of the Direct Method is therefore to create a classroom environment that is as similar as possible to such a situation. Hence, it seems natural to focus on monolingualism to achieve this similarity and therefore abandon the use of translation as the use of L1 is inevitable when translating.

However, one can argue that this focus on monolingualism may affect the students' comprehension and therefore, also their learning outcome in various ways. For learning and language acquisition to take place, it has been argued that the students are dependent on comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982). Stephen Krashen argues this through his input hypothesis, claiming that language learning is mainly driven by the comprehensible input the learner is exposed to (Kavanagh, 2006, p. 241). As we know, it is common for students to be at different language competence levels which means that some students may not have the same knowledge of vocabulary, for instance, as other students. If these students then are not allowed to use their L1 to check their comprehension, for instance in asking the teacher what the L1 equivalent is, how will the teacher ensure that they comprehend and develop their language skills? Here, oral translation, not as an organized activity, but as a pedagogical tool used in dialogue between teacher and students, can be used to provide this comprehension. In this way, translation may be used as a natural part of language teaching and learning scaffolding the students in achieving L2 language skills.

Based on the belief that students learn the language more efficiently in a so-called 'natural situation', the importance of naturalism may sound reasonable enough. However, the strong emphasis on monolingualism does not seem to ensure the students' comprehension or consider that students' different language competence levels. This means that naturalism and monolingualism may work well for some students but not for all.

4.1.3 The Reform Movement's emphasis on oral production of L2

As we saw in chapter 2.2, the Reform Movement and their ideas were the main influence in changing the practice of language teaching from GTM and translation to CLT in the 19th century. Since two of their three main ideas involve the importance of oral production – the primacy of speech and the priority of oral activity in the classroom – it does not seem strange that they criticized translation as 'traditional' translation activities would normally mean excluding the speaking skill. However, as we have seen, translation can also be performed orally which means that this criticism does not seem valid today.

Nevertheless, to claim that the Reform Movement were wrong when they emphasized oral production when learning an L2 so strongly, does not seem reasonable as we have seen that producing L2 output is important for developing speaking skills such as fluency and pronunciation (Danan, 2010). The question is, however, whether oral production and monolingualism are the only aspects one should focus on in the language learning classroom to ensure the students learning and acquiring the L2. As mentioned, Krashen advocated the input hypothesis claiming that comprehensible input is the most important factor in L2 learning (Kavanagh, 2006, Krashen, 1982). Swain (1985, 1995, 2005) on the other hand, argues through her output hypothesis that input alone is not enough when

learning a language and explains that output also has a significant role. When Long (1996) contributes to this discussion, claiming that conversational interaction will facilitate L2 learning because it “connects input [...] and output in productive ways” (Long, 1996, pp. 451-452), together with the consideration of all four language competence skills and their importance for L2 learning, it may seem like teachers should consider input and output as equally important in the classroom. Plausibly, the attention should then be on how one can facilitate for both input and output through the use of translation instead of excluding translation altogether.

4.1.4 The focus on communication

Before CLT came into the field of language teaching and learning, both the Reform Movement and the Berlitz Schools based their ideas on the act of communication. While the Reform Movement disregarded GTM because it hindered the contextualised and impulsive use of language in spoken communication (Vermes, 2010, p. 86), the Berlitz Schools catered to adult learners so they could learn English functionally and “cope with the communicative demands” (Cook, 2010, p. 6) they were to encounter. And, as we know, CLT, with the Direct Method as a part of this umbrella-term, has interaction and communication as its primary teaching techniques and learning outcomes (Howatt, 1984, p. 192). If the critics who claim that translation is an unnatural and stilted activity assume that GTM is the model on which all translation activities are built, it is no wonder the critics dislike translation. The way translation was used in GTM may well be argued to not focus on the communicative aspect of the language which is what the argument of translation being unnatural is based on.

Nonetheless, is it fair to claim that translation does not promote communication skills at all? First, we have seen that translation, if used in a systematic and effective way, may enhance all four language skills. The development and improvement of these skills, one can argue, will at least create a good starting point for having the tools to communicate. Second, if we think of the argument that translation activities are complex in that they integrate language aspects such as for instance grammar, structures, and lexical items (Leonardi, 2010, Vermes, 2010), which will lead to fluency, and that this means that translation involves the students in evaluation and strategy use, as we saw in Laufer and Girsai’s (2008) study, will not this be to the advantage of the students when they are to choose the correct way to communicate in various contexts and situations?

Again, it seems likely that the focus should be on how teachers organize and plan translation activities to facilitate various aspects of learning a language – including skills that are needed to be able to communicate – instead of claiming that translation is unnatural and does not promote communication.

4.2 Evaluating the arguments and research: the empirical studies

4.2.1 The attitudinal studies

Of the five attitudinal studies presented in chapter 3.3, four found that the participants were positive to the use of translation in language learning. The last also showed somewhat positive attitudes except from some participants who expressed concerns about whether the use of L1 in translation activities would cause interference with their L2. More precisely, the concerns included that the use of L1 would inhibit their thought process in L2 and that translation would “trick” learners into believing that there is a

corresponding one-to-one meaning of words and expressions in the two languages (Liao, 2006, p. 209). Interestingly, these concerns are similar to those objections of the critics of translation. This suggests that there might be some basis for these assumptions. However, what is important to note here, is that these concerns were self-reported by the participants themselves which means that they were not tested empirically in the mentioned study and not in the other studies mentioned in this paper either. Because of this lack of testing, we cannot state whether these are, in fact, real negative effects of translation. The concern that translation and the use of L1 might inhibit the learners' thought process in the L2 may, perhaps, be a more reasonable claim if the researchers' assertion regarding many learners using their L1 sub-consciously in their mind to check their comprehension (Kupske, 2015, Leonardi, 2011, Priya & Jayasridevi, 2018, Randaccio, 2012, Shiyab & Abdullateef, 2001) is accurate. If this is a bad thing, however, is yet to be explored.

If we examine the studies' methods for gathering data, we see that this has been done in different ways. For instance, Scheffler (2013) provided the participants with both questionnaires and the opportunity to give feedback with spontaneous oral comments after the test. Although the questionnaires Scheffler used were not presented in the presentation of the study, arguably, the spontaneous comments from the participants may be a good way to cover issues that the questionnaires were unable to. Also, such comments may shed light on issues the researcher has not thought about himself. Hence, a broader set of attitudes may be collected when questionnaires are combined with spontaneous oral comments.

While Brooks-Lewis (2009) gathered a broad collection of data through several methods (diary, essay, and questionnaire), McLoughlin and Lertola (2014) and Danan (2010) used a questionnaire only. Relying on one method only, can be argued as shown above, to be a weakness of the studies. Combining the questionnaire with one or two other methods would most likely cover, strengthen, and clarify a broader set of attitudes and significant findings.

Finally, regarding data gathering, Liao (2006) used both questionnaires and interviews. Using interviews may allow the researcher to clarify points or findings from the questionnaires. In addition, much in the same way as the spontaneous oral comments in Scheffler's (2013) study, it allows the interviewee to speak freely and, therefore, issues that the questionnaire did not cover, may be exposed. The weakness of interviews, however, is that the researcher may ask leading questions either consciously or sub-consciously. According to Liao's interview guide, a question that may be characterized as leading is asked: "What proficiency level can benefit most from using translation? Why?" (Liao, 2006, p. 215). This question suggests that there, in fact, *is* a proficiency level that can benefit more from using translation than others. A more open question could instead be "do you think there is a proficiency level that can benefit more from using translation? Why/why not?". Of course, the interviewee can deny that there are some people benefiting more from the use of translation than others. However, one may claim that denying this might be easier if the question is asked in a way that promotes the interviewee's opinions.

Considering that one of Liao's findings was that the more proficient learners generally were more negative towards the use of translation in language learning than the less proficient learners (Liao, 2006, p. 208), one cannot help but wonder if his leading question contributed to this finding. Also, according to the interview guide, in four out of

the nine questions, Liao gives additional information before asking the actual question. This additional information given in all four questions may be characterized as assumptions about the use of translation in language learning. For instance, question 8 which says "Some people say that English learners can eliminate their habit of using translation gradually as their learning goes on? What are your ideas about how to change this habit?" (ibid.), implies that using translation is a bad habit that should be eliminated. Asking questions in a biased way, as we can claim Liao partly did, may have influenced the interviewees' answers. Hence, the credibility of his findings is weakened.

When it comes to the scope of the studies, in two of the attitudinal studies the number of participants were over 200 (256 and 351). In the remaining three, the number of participants were under 90 (82, 45 and 40). Even though two of the studies had a large number of participants, the low numbers in the remaining three (especially the two with 45 and 40) may suggest that the studies are not generalizable to language learners as a group. Therefore, to find out what effect translation has on language learning – if it actually do produce the perceived learning outcomes researchers argue – and if it, based on this, should be used in the language learning classroom, both more attitudinal studies in general, more studies using mixed methods (e.g. surveys and interviews), and, more studies with higher numbers of participants are needed.

4.2.2 The experimental studies

Of the few experimental studies that could be found and presented in this paper, two have yielded results that are positive to translation while the last one shows negative results. One can argue that, since these studies are experimental and not attitudinal, these studies, in contrast to attitudinal studies which say something about perceived learning, give more precise evidence about the learning outcomes. Hence, more experimental studies are needed in general to determine the actual learning outcomes of using translation in language teaching and learning.

Only one of the studies involved a relatively large number of participants. Hummel's (2010) study on active translation vs. copy tasks, had 191 participants. The participants were divided into two active translation groups where one group actively translated sentences from L1 to L2 and the other groups translated sentences from L2 to L1. The copy task group were provided with the same sentences in both the L1 and L2 and were asked to copy the L1 and L2 sentences they just read straight after reading them. Although the findings show that all three groups improved their vocabulary on a general basis, it is interesting that the copy task group scored higher than the active translation groups. Although Hummel (2010) states that the study in general yielded positive results of using translation as a pedagogical tool, the activity of copying translated sentences resulted in even better vocabulary recall than the active translation activity. Comparing results from active translation with results from a type of 'passive translation' activity in such a way, was not done in the other studies presented in this paper. Hence, it would be interesting to see more similar studies in order to find out how much students benefit from the use of active translation when learning an L2 or if passive translation activities have larger benefits.

While the second positive experimental study involved 75 participants (Laufer and Girsai, 2008), the negative experimental study involved 60 participants (Tavakoli et al., 2014). These small groups of participants in each study may suggest that the results are not generalizable to language learners as a group. This means that more studies with larger numbers of participants are needed before we can validate the effects translation has on

language learning and state if translation should be re-introduced as an activity in language teaching and learning.

In addition to the experimental studies being few and involving a rather small number of participants, they also were rather limited regarding what aspects of language learning they examined. While two of the studies investigated the participants' ability to acquire new vocabulary through translation, the last study examined writing strategy as a way to learn a new language. Hence, experimental studies that examine the other language competence skills reading, listening, and speaking, are needed. As we have seen, audiovisual translation such as dubbing and subtitling are activities that can provide practice of various language skills. Thus, experimental studies which examine such activities would be highly interesting.

5.0 Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to find out why using translation as a tool in language teaching and learning has been frowned upon, and, to find out what has been said and shown regarding the positive aspects of translation used in this way, suggesting that a re-introduction of translation in language teaching and learning is justified. In fulfilment of this aim, the paper has presented existing theoretical assumptions and empirical research on the use of translation in language teaching and learning. This presentation has shown that the main objections against translation when learning a language has either been cognitive – translation hinders proper language acquisition – or practical – translation is artificial and not needed in the real world.

Much of the reason why translation as a tool in language teaching and learning has been frowned upon stems from the fact that many researchers, theorists, and teachers still think of translation in connection to GTM which 1) neglects the language competence skills speaking and listening, and 2) does not focus on the communicative aspect of language. The singular most important reason is, however, the belief that the use of L1 has a negative influence on L2 learning in that it leads the learners to make language errors and hinders language fluency. This eventually results in inadequate L2 acquisition and a lack of ability to communicate properly in the L2, according to the critics.

When it comes to the question of whether a re-introduction of translation in language teaching and learning is justified, the answer is not a simple one. First, there is no doubt that many of the objections against translation are strongly rooted in beliefs from the advocates of CLT and the Direct Method, in addition to the Berlitz Schools and the Reform Movement, who initially were the reasons for the abandonment of GTM and translation in general. What is interesting is that, when we discuss these objections and ideas considering existing arguments and empirical research on translation as a pedagogical tool, many of the objections do not seem valid today. For instance, the obvious recognition that translation activities can also be performed orally, seems to be an aspect the critics have not considered at all. Thus, the argument that translation neglects the skills speaking and listening is wrong. Also, the critics' strict focus on monolingualism when learning an L2 seems devoid of consideration regarding the role L1 plays in learners' comprehension. Moreover, the critics seem more determined to demonize translation altogether instead of considering how translation activities can be organized and modified to enhance language teaching and learning.

As we have seen from the theoretical assumptions in favour of translation, one of the main arguments has been that the use of L1 in translation activities does not have a negative influence on L2 learning. On the contrary, the use of L1 in translation activities are argued to facilitate language awareness in that the learners become able to compare and identify language contrasts, and, control the L1 interference. Further, when we now know that translation activities also can be performed orally – and are not restricted to reading and writing only – we can understand and appreciate that translation integrates and is dependent on all four language competence skills. Practicing all four skills with the use of translation, may then lead to improved fluency together with the possibility of reflecting on aspects regarding linguistics, semantics, pragmatics, and culture, which also

are important perceived learning outcomes the researchers emphasize. In addition, if the notion that translation is a 'natural process' in the learners' minds to check comprehension is correct, it would not be fair to claim that translation 1) hinders proper language acquisition, 2) neglects the skills reading and writing, 3) is artificial, and 4) does not focus on the communicative aspect of language.

In finding a persuasive answer to whether a re-introduction of translation in language teaching and learning is justified, we must also consider the existing empirical research. Among the studies presented in this paper, only one of eight studies showed results that were exclusively negative towards the use of translation. This means that the general response to the use of translation in language teaching and learning is overwhelmingly positive. However, the fact that there has been performed more attitudinal than experimental studies, indicates that more experimental studies must be executed in order to obtain valid and generalizable answers to what effect translation has on language learning and whether translation should be re-introduced as a pedagogical tool in language teaching. The low number of participants in most of the studies together with some biased questions and the use of only one data collection method in some attitudinal studies, and, a rather limited set of language skills and -aspects examined, also indicate the need for more research in general – both attitudinal and experimental.

The groups of participants that were involved in the presented studies, included L1 users of Hebrew, French, Persian, Spanish, Polish, Irish, American and Chinese with mostly English as their L2/FL, except from the Americans who learnt Dari, Pashto or Farsi as L2/FL and the Irish participants who learnt Italian as L2/FL. Although this is a fairly good spread in terms of L1 languages, it is important to remember that each of the L1 groups only took part in one study each. It would be preferable if speakers of the same L1 performed various studies. In this way we could have the possibility to understand what effect culture, for instance, might have on the language learning situation and whether there is an atmosphere for reintroducing translation in language teaching and learning in various cultures. If such an atmosphere exists, we would have the possibility to gain further knowledge of how teachers can implement translation in classrooms all over the world.

So, in moving forward in the field of translation in language teaching and learning, I suggest that more research in general is needed. Especially experimental studies but also, attitudinal studies. Although I will claim that the results of existing research make the objections against translation seem weaker, and thus, provide us with an insight in the positive learning outcomes translation can facilitate, the existing research are too few in number to answer whether a re-introduction of translation as a pedagogical tool is justified. As mentioned, the existing research is also rather narrow in terms of examined language skills and language aspects. Hence, before we can claim that translation should be re-introduced in language teaching and learning, large-scale studies with focus on a broad spectrum of language skills and language aspects, should be performed.

Despite the need for more research, it seems reasonable to assume that translation can serve as a beneficial pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning if the activities and tasks are well organized and structured. This means that the planning and organization of such tasks also must be considered and examined in future research.

Bibliography

- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt and Co.
- Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult Learners' Perception of the Incorporation of their L1 in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(2), 216-235. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn051>
- Carreres, A. (2006). Strange bedfellows: translation and language teaching. The teaching of translation into L2 in modern languages degrees; uses and limitations. University of Cambridge, UK. Retrieved from: <http://www.cttic.org/ACTI/2006/papers/Carreres.pdf>
- Colina, S. (2002). Second Language Acquisition, Language Teaching and Translation Studies. *The Translator*, 8(1), 1-24. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2002.10799114>
- Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Danan, M. (2010). Dubbing projects for the language learner: a framework for integrating audiovisual translation into task-based instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(5), 441-456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2010.522528>
- Danchev, A. (1983). The Controversy over Translation in Foreign Language Teaching. In *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching* (pp. 35-56). Paris: Round Table FIT-UNESCO.
- Duff, A. (1989). *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hummel, K., M. (2010). Translation and short-term L2 vocabulary retention: Hindrance or help? *Language Teaching Research*, 14(1), 61-74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168809346497>
- Kavanagh, B. (2006) The Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982, 1985) An Evaluation of its Contributions to our Understanding of Second language Acquisition Phenomena. *Journal of Aomori University of Health and Welfare*, 7(2), 241-248. <https://doi.org/10.24552/00001762>
- Korošec, M. K. (2013). Translation in Foreign Language Teaching. In N. K. Pokorn & K. Koskinen (Eds.), *New Horizons in Translation Research and Education 1*, (pp. 61-74). University of Eastern Finland. Retrieved from https://epublications.uef.fi/pub/urn_isbn_978-952-61-1288-6/urn_isbn_978-952-61-1288-6.pdf#page=61
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. University of South California: Pergamonn Press Inc.

- Kupske, F. F. (2015). Second Language Pedagogy and Translation: The Role of Learner's Own-language and Explicit Instruction Revisited. *Brazilian English Language Teaching Journal*, 6(1), 51-65. <https://doi.org/10.15448/2178-3640.2015.1.20201>
- Lado, R. (1964). *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Laufer, B. & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused Instruction in Second Language Vocabulary Learning: A Case for Contrastive Analysis and Translation. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 694-716. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn018>
- Leffa, V. (2012). Ensino de línguas: passado, presente e futuro. *Revista de Estudos da Linguagem*, 20(2), 389-411.
- Liao, P. (2006). EFL Learners' Belief about and Strategy Use of Translation in English Learning. *RELC Journals*, 37(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206067428>
- Leonardi, V. (2011). Pedagogical Translation as a Naturally-Occurring Cognitive and Linguistic Activity in Foreign Language Learning. *Annali Online di Lettere-Ferrara*, 1(2), 17-28. Retrieved from <http://annali.unife.it/lettere/article/viewFile/234/183>
- Leonardi, V. (2010). *The Role of Pedagogical Translation in Second Language Acquisition: From Theory to Practice*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Llanes, A. (2011). The many faces of study abroad: an update on the research on L2 gains emerged during a study abroad experience. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 8(3), 189-215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2010.550297>
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie, T. Bathia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Machida, S. (2011). Translation in Teaching a Foreign (Second) Language: A Methodological Perspective. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(4), 740-746. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.4.740-746>
- Malmkjær, K. (1998). *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- McLoughlin, L. I. & Lertola, J. (2014). Audiovisual translation in second language acquisition. Integrating subtitling in the foreign-language curriculum. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8(1), 70-83. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2014.908558>
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Newson, D. (1988). Making the Best of a Bad Job: The Teaching and Testing of Translation. *Annual Meeting of the International Association for Teachers of English as a Foreign Language* (pp. 1-13). Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Newson, D. (1998). Translation and Foreign Language Learning. In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation* (pp. 63-68). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Pennycook, A. (2008). English as a Language Always in Translation. *European Journal of English Studies*, 12(1), 33-47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13825570801900521>
- Priya, T. A. & Jayasridevi, B. (2018). Integrating Translation in Classroom: Facilitating Language Skills. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 10(1), 118-127. <https://doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v10n1.13>
- Randaccio, M. (2012). Translation and Language Teaching: Translation as a useful teaching Resource. Università di Trieste. Retrieved from https://www.openstarts.units.it/bitstream/10077/7277/1/Randaccio_AspettiDidattica_Gori_Taylor.pdf
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scheffler, P. (2013). Learners' perceptions of grammar-translation as consciousness raising. *Language Awareness*, 22(3), 255-269. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2012.703673>
- Shiyab, S. & Abdullateef, M. (2001). Translation and Foreign Language Teaching. *Journal of King Saud University – Language & Translation*, 13, 1-9. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/698366/Translation_and_Foreign_Language_Teaching
- Sokoli, S. (2006). Learning via Subtitling (LvS): A tool for the creation of foreign language learning activities based on film subtitling. *MuTra – Audiovisual Translation Scenarios: Conference Proceedings*. Retrieved from http://www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/2006_Proceedings/2006_Sokoli_Stravoula.pdf
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley: Newbury.
- Swain, M. (2005). The Output Hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook on research in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 471-483). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tavakoli, M., Ghadiri, M. & Zabihi, R. (2014). Direct versus Translated Writing: The Effect of Translation on Learners' Second Language Writing Ability. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 14(2), 61-74. <http://doi.org/10.17576/GEMA-2014-1402-05>
- Titford, C. (1985). Translation – a Post-communicative Activity for Advanced Learners. In C. Titford & A. E. Hieke (Eds.), *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching and Testing* (pp. 73-86). Tübingen: Narr.
- Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2019). *Kompetansemål og vurdering* (ENG01-04). Retrieved from <https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/kompetansemaal-og-vurdering/kv6>

- Van Wee, B. & Banister, D. (2016). How to Write a Literature Review Paper? *Transport Reviews*, 36(2), 278-288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2015.1065456>
- Vermes, A. P. (2010). Translation in Foreign Language Teaching: A Brief Overview of Pros and Cons. *Eger Journal of English Studies X*, 83-93. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Translation-in-Foreign-Language-Teaching%3A-A-Brief-Vermes/502bd83fce3a126aabb5d7e5dae17b5025b43171>
- Weller, G. (1989). Some Polemic Aspects of Translation in Foreign Language Pedagogy Revised. In P. W. Krwutschke (Ed.), *Translator and Interpreter Training and Foreign Language Pedagogy* (pp. 39-50). New York American Translators Association Series, v.iii.
- Zojer, H. (2009). The Methodological Potential of Translation in Second Language Acquisition: Re-evaluating Translation as a Teaching Tool. In A. Witte, T. Harden & A. Harden (Eds.), *Translation in Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 31-51). Bern: Peter Lang.

Appendix

The relevance of my thesis in my profession as a teacher

In my profession as a teacher in the Norwegian educational system I am obliged to follow various guidelines and regulations. These guidelines and regulations both concern the students' educational rights and the schools' overall aim of contributing to the welfare state. The most important responsibility I have as a teacher, however, is to make sure that the students' educational rights are being followed and fulfilled and that every student has the opportunity to complete their education in a satisfactory way by facilitating for an optimal learning atmosphere. This includes for instance my responsibility to plan my teaching in such a way that the competence aims of the subject curriculum are implemented in the students' learning process. In the English subject, these competence aims regard for instance the students learning about various aspects of the English language, that they learn how to use the language in a proper way in various contexts and situations, and, that they learn about English speaking countries and their cultures and accents. Nevertheless, most of the competence aims regard the English language itself and the use of it.

In finishing my thesis, I see that there are certain competence aims in the English subject that directly deals with some of the language aspects translation activities facilitate, as presented and discussed in this paper. For instance, in the new revised edition of the curriculum (LK20), one of the competence aims after year one at upper secondary school is to "use knowledge of connections between English and other languages the student knows from his/her own language learning" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2019). As shown in this paper, using translation as an activity when learning English may help the students to become aware of similarities and differences between languages. Hence, using translation as a pedagogical tool may help the students to achieve this specific competence aim.

Other competence aims that translation may help the students to achieve are for instance: "read, discuss and reflect on content and devices in various types of texts, including self-selected texts", "use appropriate strategies in language learning, text production, and communication", and, "use knowledge of grammar and textual structure in working with self-produced oral and written texts" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2019).

In general, most of the competence aims in the English subject, whether they concern elementary school, lower secondary, or upper secondary, focus on being able to understand and communicate in English. Whether the competence aims describe the ability to read, speak, listen, write, or use different sources, I argue that all these skills may be achieved by using translation as a pedagogical tool. Hence, in working with, and finishing my thesis, I have not only gained knowledge about translation as a pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning, but also, valuable knowledge of how translation can be implemented to cater for specific language skills and helping students to achieve the competence aims for the English subject in general.

