Masaryk University
Faculty of Arts

Department of English and American Studies

English Language and Literature

Barbora Kratochvílová

Use of Translation in Teaching English as a Second Language

Bachelor's Diploma Thesis

Supervisor: Nikola Fořtová, B.A.

2013

I declare that I have worked on this thesis independently,
using only the primary and secondary sources listed in the bibliography.

……..
Barbora Kratochvílová

I would like to thank my supervisor Mrs. Nikola Fořtová, B.A. for her kind help and support during the process of writing this thesis.

Table of Contents

Introduction

This thesis deals with the issues of using translation in second language teaching. The question of translation in language teaching (TILT) has been a very problematic one, as the recent teaching theories mostly support monolingual teaching and the use of translation is considered a breaking of rules and possibly even the teacher's fault. However, this does not mean that translation is not being used in foreign language classrooms anymore. Even though it has been outlawed from language teaching in theory, translation remains widely used in practice. The aim of this thesis is to try to show that there is a lack of sufficient evidence for the abandoning of translation and that the question of its use might need to be reviewed by language teachers and researchers.

The departure from translation began at the end of the 19th century when the Reform Movement and soon afterwards the Direct Method of teaching came to existence. The Reform Movement is the name used for a group of influential phoneticians and linguists of that time (Wilhelm Viëtor, Herman Klinghardt, Otto Jespersen and Henry Sweet), who published works suggesting a new approach to language teaching, rejecting the traditional grammar-translation method and criticising some of the aspects of the grammar-translation method. The ideas first presented by the Reform Movement were later developed into strictly monolingual teaching methodologies, enforced especially by the Berlitz language schools, which we today call the Direct Method.

Nevertheless, as I have mentioned above, it has been suggested by many researchers and teaching specialists that the rejection of translation has never been sufficiently justified. For example, Guy Cook (2010) in *Translation in Language Teaching* expresses his concern that the rise of monolingual teaching and abandonment of translation might be caused by economical reasons and Elsa Roberts Auerbach

(1993) even implies that the ban of translation from a language classroom is a political matter as well as pedagogical (p. 10).

It is important to explain, what should be imagined under the expression "translation". Although some authors strictly differentiate between translation from or into the first language, and the use of the students' first language for other reasons, such as classroom management or explanation of grammar rules, in this thesis "translation" is understood to mean any use of the first language (L1) in the classroom, including translation both from or into the first language. In this I follow Guy Cook's belief that bilingual teaching in general and translation itself "cannot and should not be treated separately" (Cook, 2010, p. xix). Cook, in his defence of referring to bilingual teaching and translation with a common term, points out that: ". . . while they may be distinguished in theory, [they] go naturally together and blend into one another in practice" (Cook, 2010, p. xix). Thus, in the course of this text, I also use the term translation in this broader sense.

This thesis is divided into 4 chapters. The first part of this thesis concentrates on the historical development of the use of translation in language teaching (TILT) and gives an outline of methods which were concerned with the problems of monolingual or bilingual teaching and were therefore crucial for the development of attitudes towards the use of translation in language teaching.

The second chapter deals with some of the arguments supporting or rejecting the use of translation and talks in detail about points which are important for this issue. In the third chapter some solutions of dealing with the problem of the use of translation in the foreign language classroom are suggested and some practical advice for language teachers is given. Finally, the last chapter is going to sum up what has been said in the previous text and give a final conclusion.

1. History of Language Teaching

The use of translation has been one of the main topics of discussion throughout the history of language teaching and the opinions on the use of monolingual and bilingual teaching methods have changed greatly over the course of time. This chapter discusses the main movements in the field of foreign language teaching since the 19th century which were concerned with the use of translation in language teaching, such as the grammar translation method, the Reform Movement and the Direct Method, followed by Communicative language teaching.

According to Howatt (1991) the 19th century meant a significant change for the practice of language teaching, because the teaching of foreign languages gradually became a part of the secondary school curriculum. Howatt compares the situation of language teaching in secondary schools at the beginning and the end of the 19th century:

> In 1800 very few schools taught foreign languages except as optional 'extras' to the principal work of the school, the teaching of classical languages. By 1900 most secondary schools of what could generically be called 'the grammar school type' had incorporated one or more of the major European languages into their core curriculum.
>
> (Howatt, 1991, p. 129)

Howatt (1991) also points out that the change did not only occur at secondary schools but there was also an "expansion of the market for utilitarian language learning related to practical needs and interests" (p. 129) thanks to the closer commercial connections of different countries of the world. The greatest demand for "utilitarian language teaching" was then in Germany, where the grammar translation method was also first established (Howatt, 1991, p. 130).

1.1 Grammar Translation Method

The beginnings of the grammar translation method can be found at the end of the 18th century in Prussia and it was used as a method for teaching modern foreign languages in secondary schools (Howatt, 1991, p. 131). The grammar translation method meant a significant change from the former ways of language learning, which were based on the study of classical grammar and reading of classical text. This way of learning was, however, highly inappropriate for school children, hence the grammar translation method was developed as a method for teaching of school pupils and one of its main features "was the replacement of the traditional texts by exemplificatory *sentences*" (Howatt, 1991, p. 131).

The first grammar translation course book was written in 1793 by Johann Christian Fick and its full title was *Praktische englische Sprachlehre für Deutsche beiderlei Geschlechts, nach der in Meidingers französische Grammatik befolgten Methode* (Practical English Course for Germans of both sexes, following the method of Meidinger's French Grammar) (Howatt, 1991, p. 132). Howatt points out the meaning of the word "practical" and explains that the word implies that the book "contained exercises of various kinds, typically sentences for translation into and out of the foreign language, which were another novel feature of the grammar-translation method" (Howatt, 1991, p. 132). The grammar-translation sentences then offered practice to the learners and they also "exemplified the grammar in a more concentrated and . . . clearer way than texts" (Howatt, 1991, p. 132).

The grammar translation method "had inherited from the teaching of Latin and Ancient Greek . . . an emphasis on writing, on grammar, on accuracy" (Cook, 2010, p. 9). As for the way the language is being taught by the principles of the grammar translation method, Cook (2010) explains that:

> The items which structure a Grammar translation course are discrete grammar rules graded for difficulty and presented a few at a time, starting with the 'easiest' and 'most important' first . . . Each lesson or unit of the course thus revolves around a few new rules, which are first explained to the student in their own language, learnt and committed to memory, and then practised and tested through exercises involving the translation of single invented sentences exemplifying the rules currently in focus . . . Grammar Translation revolves around grammar, its presentation of vocabulary is rather more haphazard. (p. 10)

However, although the grammar translation method started with the aim "to make language learning easier" (Howatt, 1991, p. 131) its original ideas were later driven into extremes, which led to excesses such as "the stress on accuracy. . . , the obsession with 'completeness', and the neglect of spoken language" (Howatt, 1991, p. 133). The later stages of the grammar translation method are thus mostly excesses of the original ideas. It is, certainly, difficult to find a particular reason for this twist, although Howatt (1991) points out that "The really bad grammar-translation books were . . . those specially designed for use in secondary schools by ambitious schoolmasters" (p. 136).

Even though there has been a lot of critic of the grammar translation method, it should not be viewed only negatively and its rejection should definitely not mean a rejection of translation, its flaws in the later stages were highly criticised. Its critics usually argued that: ". . . it is exclusively focused upon grammatical accuracy with no attention to fluency, and exclusively on writing with no practice of speech. It uses isolated invented sentences rather than authentic connected texts. It teaches knowledge about a language rather than an ability to use it, and is in general – it has been claimed – unnatural, authoritarian, and dull" (Cook, 2010, p. 14).

1.2 Reform Movement

Among the critics of the grammar translation method were influential phoneticians and linguists "Wilhelm Viëtor and Hermann Klinghardt in Germany, Otto Jespersen in Denmark, and Henry Sweet in Britain" (Cook, 2010, p. 4). These were all members of the Reform Movement, which was founded at the end of the 19th century and played an important role in the development of language teaching as well as phonetics.

The Reform Movement started suddenly in 1882 when Wilhelm Viëtor published his pamphlet *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren!* (Language teaching must start afresh!), which he, however, originally published under the pseudonym Quousque Tandem and only acknowledged his authorship in 1886 (Howatt, 1991, p. 170). In 1888 Hermann Klinghardt published a pamphlet called *Ein Jahr Erfahrungen mit der neuen Methode* (A Year's Experiences with the New Method), which was based on his experiences with teaching in Silesia for which he "chose Sweet's *Elementarbuch* as the basic textbook for his trial of the new methods" (Howatt, 1991, p. 170). The pamphlet was follow by publication of "a further study of the following three years' teaching (*Drei weitere Jahre Erfahrungen mit der imitativen Methode*) in 1892" (Howatt, 1991, p. 170).

At the end of the 19th century Henry Sweet published his book *The Practical Study of Languages* (1899), which was followed by Otto Jespersen's *How to Teach a Foreign Language* (1904). According to Howatt (1991) the Reform Movement "reached its climax" with the publication of these works, which "provide a definitive statement of its aims, principles and practical classroom methods" (p. 171).

"The Reform Movement was founded on three basic principles: the primacy of speech, the centrality of the connected text as the kernel of the teaching-learning

process, and the absolute priority of an oral methodology in the classroom" (Howatt, 1991, p. 171). These basic pillars of the Reform Movement were, naturally, a reaction to the weak points of the grammar translation method. The primacy of speech stood in opposition to the emphasis on writing of the grammar translation method, where, "If speech was taught at all, it was badly done by teachers whose own pronunciation was inadequate" (Howatt, 1991, p. 172).

The reformers focused a lot on the teaching of phonetic transcription as a basis for correct pronunciation and some of them "(especially Sweet) tended to exaggerate the pedagogical value of transcription" (Howatt, 1991, p. 172). Klinghardt tried out the method in his school in Silesia, in an experiment referred to as "Klinghardt experiment" which started in 1887. He started the teaching according to Sweet's book *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen English*, first introduced the students to the phonetic transcription and then practised the transcription according to Sweet's book. Later, however, Klinghardt decided to abandon the textbook, as its overemphasis on transcription proved problematic (Howatt, 1991, p. 174). As Howatt (1991) claims, "the transcription issue . . . , may have done more harm than good, and it distracted attention away from the broader aspects of reform" (p. 172).

As for the emphasis which was put on the use of connected texts rather than "absurd example sentences of the grammar translation method" (Howatt, 1991, p. 172), according to Howatt (1991) this was an issue based on the questions which the psychology of that time dealt with (p. 172). As Cook (2010) puts it, "From psychology they drew upon 'associationism', a theory of memory current at the time, which claimed that information in connected texts is more likely to be retained than that in isolated sentences . . ." (p. 4-5).

Another important change which occurred in the classes which were taught according to the Reform Movement ideas was that the students "were actually *speaking* a foreign language" (Howatt, 1991, p. 175). The class was held mainly in L2, although interruptions in L1 were allowed. As Howatt (1991) explains:

> The last major Reform Movement principle was the importance of oral methods in the classroom, especially in the early stages of learning. . . . The teacher was expected to speak the foreign language as the normal means of classroom communication, retaining the mother tongue only for glossing new words and explaining new grammar points. Most of the fuss about 'no translation' came from the Direct Method, particularly as interpreted by Berlitz, where the teachers were native speakers. The Reform Movement consisted of non-native teachers who accepted the basic sense of the monolingual principle, but did not see any advantage in an extremist view. (p. 173)

1.3 Direct Method

The Reform Movement was accompanied by the emergence of monolingual teaching methods which, according to Howatt (1991), "have been known by a variety of labels" (p. 192) such as the Natural Method or the Direct Method. Howatt (1991) also claims that "the underlying philosophy" of these methods is that: "Learning how to speak a new language is not a rational process which can be organized in a step-by-step manner . . . It is an intuitive process for which human beings have a natural capacity that can be awakened provided only that the proper conditions exist" (p. 192).

Among the first, who contributed to the development of the Direct Methods was Lambert Sauveur, a Frenchman and author of *An Introduction to the Teaching of Living Languages without Grammar and Dictionary* (1874), which was "intended as a kind of 'teacher's manual' " (Howatt, 1991, p. 198). Sauveur ran his monolingual French courses together with Gottlieb Heness, a teacher of German, in the Sauveur-Heness School of Modern Languages. According to Howatt (1991) the school "caused a great deal of interest" and Sauveur's teaching method became to be known as the Natural Method (p. 201). The Natural Method classes took place entirely in L2 and "the most significant feature" was "student interaction" (Howatt, 1991, p. 202).

However, as Howatt (1991) believes, "The ordinary schools . . . would never have adopted 'natural methods'. . . . Natural methods required schools of their own and someone with the feel for business to see and grasp the opportunity that was on offer" (p. 202). Howatt (1991) then claims the man who "grasped the opportunity" was Maximilian Berlitz (p. 205), the founder of the famous international chain of the Berlitz language schools. The Berlitz Schools, which were "Established in the USA in 1882, . . . rapidly expanded both there and in Europe" (Cook, 2010, p. 6) and have been successfully attracting students till today.

According to Cook (2010) the Berlitz Method meant "the first true hard-line rejection of translation" (p. 6). The Berlitz language schools ran the same courses all over the world and the teachers, all of them being native speakers, were asked to follow these basic rules: "no translation under any circumstances . . . , a strong emphasis on oral work, avoidance of grammatical explanations until late in the course, and the maximum use of question-and-answer techniques" (Howatt, 1991, p. 205).

The method of teaching used in Berlitz schools is nowadays referred to as the Direct Method, which is a term used as a "description of these practices, initiated by Berlitz and rapidly taken up elsewhere" (Cook, 2010, p. 7). As Howatt (1991) puts it "nobody invented the term, but . . . it 'emerged' . . . as a generic label to refer to all methods of language teaching which adopted the monolingual principle as a cornerstone of their beliefs" (p. 207-208).

Today the main pillars of the Direct Method, according to Cook (2010), are monolingualism (absolute rejection of L1 in the classroom), native-speakerism (the teachers are asked to be native teachers) and naturalism. The pillar of naturalism represents the belief of today's Direct Method schools that "the classroom can in some way reproduce what happens to the infant during their acquisition of a first language" (Cook, 2010, p. 8). Although this claim is connected with the Direct Method schools of today and is usually taken as synonymous with the Natural Method approach, it is not what Sauveur, as the father of the Natural Method, believed. Howatt explains that the Natural Method was originally not believed to be "the process by which children learn from their mothers. It is, or ought to be, a great deal better than that, though based upon it. It is natural in its basis; but highly artificial in its development" (as cited in Howatt, 1991, p. 202). Nevertheless, the three basic pillars are followed by many Direct Method

language schools of today such as those using the Berlitz Method, the Callan Method or the Effective English method.

The ideas of the Direct Method later served as a basis for the development of new monolingual teaching methods. One of them is the Communicative language teaching, a monolingual teaching method, which developed in the second half of the 20th century and puts emphasis on communicative activities and group or pair work tasks. According to Howatt (1991) a "weak" or a "strong" version of the communicative approach exists. The "weak" version "stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for communicative purposes and, characteristically, attempts to integrate such activities into a wider programme of language teaching", while the "strong" version "advances the claim that language is acquired through communication, so that it is not merely a question of activating an existing but inert knowledge of the language, but of stimulating the development of the language system itself" (p. 279). Thus in the case of the "weak" version students are " 'learning to use' English", but with the "strong" version they are "using English to learn it" (Howatt, 1991, p. 279).

However, for the sake of this thesis the Communicative language teaching is not going to be referred to in the arguments below, but rather the term Direct Method is going to be used as a general term for monolingual teaching methods. This is done to point out that although the Communicative language teaching is a commonly used method, peoples' attitudes towards the use of translation in language teaching are still fixed in the attitudes which accompanied the earlier Direct Method methodology. In this approach I follow the example of Cook (2010), who also uses the term Direct Method "to refer to any approach which eschews the use of students' own languages. . . . as a deliberate way of highlighting the continuity of the belief throughout the 20th and into the 21st century, that the students' own languages should be ignored" (p. xxiii)

2. Arguments Supporting the Use of Translation

As it has been shown in the last chapter, the ideas of the Direct Method have persisted till today and monolingual teaching is still considered a desirable standard used in a great number of modern language schools. However, the aim of this chapter is to have a closer look at the arguments against translation and discuss their weight.

It has been suggested by many researchers and language teachers that the rejection of translation from foreign language teaching has not been sufficiently justified by research and also that there have been other than pedagogical reasons for outlawing the students' first language (L1) from language classrooms.

Among those concerned about the non-pedagogical reasons for the expansion of monolingual teaching are Elsa Roberts Auerbach and Guy Cook. Auerbach argues that the reason for the support for English-only teaching in the US is a political matter (Auerbach, 1993, p. 10). Cook, on the other hand, is more concerned about the commercial reasons for adopting the Direct Method at the end of the 19th century. He points out that the birth of the Direct Method ". . . appeared as English language teaching embarked on an unprecedented expansion and rapidly became a major commercial activity" (Cook, 2010, p. 6) and goes on to claim that the Reform Movement developed "out of academic and pedagogic concerns" while the Berlitz School developed "out of commercial imperatives" (p. 7). These observations suggest that the spread and financial success of the Berlitz School came from the fact, that monolingual teaching enabled the school to offer identical courses all over the world and thus save money by publishing the students' books in one version only instead of translating it into different languages, which is a model that other language schools and publishers later followed.

Furthermore, there are other reasons for criticism of the beginnings of the Direct Method, such as the discrepancies between the ideas of the Reform Movement and the later Direct Method schools. Although, as Cook (2010) explains, the concept of the Reform Movement and the Berlitz Method merge to become known as the Direct Method, it is important to realize, that the ideas presented by the Reform Movement do not correspond with Berlitz's complete rejection of the students' L1.

In Henry Sweet's *The Practical Study of Languages* there is "a whole chapter on translation advocating judicious use of translation for both beginner and advanced learners" (Cook, 2010, p. 5). Indeed, Sweet (1938) argues more for a reasonable usage of translation in language teaching, rather than for its complete abandonment and gives a number of arguments supporting the use of translation, some of which I am going to draw upon later in this text.

The Reform Movement, in its attempt to overthrow the grammar-translation method and present new teaching methodology, was "a valid reaction against pedagogic excesses" (Cook, 2010, p. 5) of the grammar-translation method and the reformers criticised "an exclusive emphasis on written language and the deductive teaching of grammar rules artificially embodied in invented sentences" (Cook, 2010, p. 5). However, they did not argue for an absolute outlawing of translation from language teaching, but they were ". . . acknowledging a role for [translation], and allowing for its judicious use" (Cook, 2010, p. 5). It seems more that the members of the Reform Movement shared a similar belief on translation as Angeles Carreres (2006) who argues that:

> . . . translation, misconceived and overused, could be seen as a victim of the grammar-translation method, rather than the source of its evils. The problem [of the grammar-translation method] was not translation as such, but a

> teaching methodology that abstracted language from its communicative function. (p. 5)

Thus the later development of the Direct Method can in fact be seen as a violation and exaggeration of the concept of the Reform Movement.

Surprisingly, even for all these critical and contradictory ideas regarding the concept of the Direct Method, its ideas have not only "persisted without challenge" (Cook, 2010, p. 5), but they were given such a level of support, that in France in 1950 translation was "banned by legislation" from secondary school teaching (Carreres, 2006, p. 2). Although, as Malcolm Harvey explains, the enforcement of this law failed and the ban was lifted some years later (as cited in Carreres, 2006, p. 2), its existence shows, that there has been a lot of effort put into the establishment of monolingual teaching and yet it did not really succeed in classrooms.

This fact proves the point that the question of the use of translation in language teaching needs to be thoroughly researched and reviewed, because in spite of strong evidence for bi-lingual teaching, the Direct Method is still widely supported. According to Auerbach (1993), "The enigma is that inclusion of L1 has been theoretically justified, verified by research, and pedagogically accepted, while its exclusion has been based on unexamined assumptions" (as cited in Brook-Lewis, 2009, p. 217) She also argues that: ". . . the rationale used to justify English only in the classroom is neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound" (Auerbach, 1993, p. 15).

Nevertheless, even the supporters of bilingual teaching do not call for a restoration of the grammar-translation method. They rather ask for a moderation of the Direct Method ideas and re-acceptance of translation into language classes, provided that it is used judiciously. The way suggested is to leave the "all-or-nothing view" (Auerbach, 1993, p. 15) of the current teaching theories and follow a "common-sense

approach where exploitation of L1 is counterbalanced with efforts to teach communicative functions in L2" (Sampson, 2011, p. 293).

Luckily, there has recently been some progress in the teaching theory and the students' L1 has gradually become more accepted in teaching practice, as Fatih Yavuz (2012) claims:

> . . . strictness against the use of L1 is decreasing in the classroom. Many course books today have included the use of L1 in their syllabus. This theory is also more humanistic accepting that L1 brings some wealth and richness in thinking and acquiring the other language. "Always English" has become "Teach English in English but do not ignore the native language." (p. 4340)

However, accepting the fact that the use of L1 in the language classroom can be beneficial and thus L1 should not be rejected from language teaching is an important step in the discussion, but not yet its solution. Sampson (2011), believes that: ". . . the focus of the debate now tends to be not if, but how, when, how much learner L1 should be encouraged" (p. 294). The question of how the L1 should be employed in the class is to be talked over in the text below, where I am going to concentrate on various points of the monolingual vs. bilingual language teaching debate.

2.1 Students' Proficiency Level

One of the most important questions of the debate about translation in language teaching is the connection between the use of translation and the students' level of proficiency. According to Liao (2006) "researchers have varied opinions at which stage the use of translation is most beneficial for the learner" (p. 196). There seem to be contradictory opinions as well as research results on this problem, which might be confusing, and without a proper consideration, it could be said, that the researchers simply cannot agree on this and therefore this question stays unanswered.

This divergence of attitudes is also pointed out by Liao, who mentions both these contradictory opinions. First he cites Husain's research, which "suggested that using translation had highly positive effects on the low and intermediate proficiency learners, but it did not benefit higher level students" (as cited in Liao, 2006, p. 196), then he contrasts this by saying that: ". . . other researchers advocate the use of translation at the advanced level," because, "advanced learners may have already developed a somewhat solid foundation of the target language" (Liao, 2006, p. 197). Liao, however, does not speak about the types of research which led to these contradictory statements and, more importantly, what translation activities the researchers dealt with.

In my opinion, the first step in understanding this problem is to realise what "translation" actually represents for students with different levels of proficiency. Although, as I have explained in the introduction, I use the term translation "as both an inevitable feature of any bilingual teaching, and as a specific activity in itself" (Cook, 2010, p. 129) I consider it useful to try to distinguish between these two aspects of translation in this chapter. That is because translation is perceived differently by beginners and high proficiency learners and it is used for different types of activities.

As Liao claims, ". . . both groups of learners [low and high proficiency] recognized that translation played a vital role in their English learning. Nonetheless, they have different understandings of translation and how it should be used in learning English" (Liao, 2006, p. 208). For students with a low level of proficiency translation mostly means bilingual language classes, where they use L1 when they need. According to Calis (2012), they use their L1 as a "life jacket" (p. 5081) which they put on when their knowledge of L2 is insufficient. On the other hand, higher proficiency students can rely more on their L2 knowledge and do not need to use the L1 to help them in the way that beginners use it. Contrary to low proficiency students, students with a higher level of proficiency can make use of translation activities as such, for example translating devised sentences. That is why Liao (2006), who acknowledges the different usage of translation by low or high proficiency students, can say that in his study "did not find a statistically significant relationship" (Liao, 2006, p. 207) between the students' proficiency level and their beliefs about translation.

The discrepancies between the studies of the connection between the students' level of proficiency and the use of translation for them are caused by the fact that their authors do not deal with the same type of translation activities. Those who encourage the use of translation for beginners and students with a low level of proficiency (and its total abandonment or only occasional use in higher proficiency classes) are usually concerned with bilingual teaching and the employment of students' L1, rather than with the activity of translating itself.

This is the case of studies done by Eda Calis (2012) or David Carless (2008), who support the use of translation in low proficiency classes, but not with high proficiency students. Carless studied the situation from the point of view of teachers or teacher educators and says that: "with higher achieving learners, teachers should not permit 'too

much L1' " (Carless, 2008, p. 334). Calis (2012), who did research among Turkish learners of English, stresses the importance of students' level, because high proficiency learners "prefer to learn through L2" (Calis, 2012, p. 5082)

On the other hand, the participants in Pekkanli's study agreed "that translation should be restricted to students who have foreign language proficiency above beginner's level" (Pekkanli, 2012, p. 958). Pekkanli also cites Carreres as a confirmation of his results:

> It is argued that, before they can tackle translation productively, learners need to have acquired a significant level of proficiency in the language. It is no doubt the case that in order to extract the full pedagogic potential from translation, students need to have moved beyond beginners level and, where their linguistic competence allows it, we should be aiming at exploiting translation for all it can offer beyond the acquisition of certain structures or lexical items. . . (Carreres, 2006, p. 14)

From Carreres's quote it is, however, apparent that both Carreres and Pekkanli deal with translation activities in the narrow sense of translating devised sentences, which is why their attitudes are quite the contrary to Calis and Carless.

To sum up what has been said about the link between the students' level of proficiency and the use of translation in language teaching, I would like to point out that the factor of students' proficiency is certainly important and it influences the use of translation a great amount. As Cook says: "The function of TILT with beginners will be very different form its function with advanced learners" (Cook, 2010, p. 129). Nevertheless, this does not mean that translation should only be restricted to a certain level of proficiency, but rather that the teachers should include the L2 judiciously and use different translation activities according to the students' level.

2.2 Translation as a Natural Way of Learning

As Duff says, “Translation happens everywhere, all the time, so why not in the classroom?” (as cited in Carreres, 2006, p. 6) Not only Duff, but other authors as well believe that translation is a natural activity, which cannot be avoided in the classroom, because “students avail themselves of translation whether teachers like it or not” (Carreres, 2006, p. 13). However hard the teachers might try to discourage students from drawing from their L1 knowledge when learning L2, “It seems that learners connect knowledge of foreign language to that of their L1 through comparison and contrast, which is inevitable” (Calis, 2012, p. 5079).

Anyway, why should the teachers even try to deprive students from using their L1 knowledge when learning L2? As Henry Sweet says in his influential book *The Practical Study of Languages*, “The first preparation for the study of a foreign language is the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of the peculiarities of one’s own language” (Sweet, 1938, p. 194). This is to suggest that a learner’s L1 is a foundation for the study of any L2 and the students can rely on their L1 knowledge and thus make the learning easier. As the participants in Brooks-Lewis’s study said about the use of L1 in the classroom, “It made me realize that I do not have to relearn everything, I just have to relate what I know and use it” (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 230) or similarly “. . . we do not have to relearn everything but must practice and be conscious of what we already know” (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 228).

A person’s L1 represents a basis for his knowledge of the world, as Piasecka argues, bilingual teaching means “a standpoint which accepts that the thinking, feeling and artistic life of a person is very much rooted in their mother tongue” (as cited in Auerbach, 1993, p. 20). Thus it is natural for the learners to draw upon their L1 when learning L2 and make associations between the new L2 and their L1, the L2 being the

main linguistic experience they have, and thus naturally build the new information on the knowledge they already have.

2.3 Ban of First Language Use as a Cause of Stress

Not only is the use of L1 natural for students, but its rejection from the class causes a great amount of stress to the students. This is one of the main arguments discussed by Brooks-Lewis, who shares her learner's experience with attending a Spanish-only class, and strongly criticises monolingual teaching:

> I learned no reasonable Spanish, and worse yet, I came to doubt my ability to learn at all. This began the very first day of class when the teacher spoke only Spanish. I felt I had . . . gone into the wrong classroom. I had enrolled in a beginning class because I wanted to learn the language, so of course I could not understand anything the teacher was saying, and wondering why she acted as if I should was worrisome, making an already stressful situation even more so. (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 217)

From my experience as a teacher I know that the first class is stressful for the beginner students, especially adults, even if the teacher speaks their L1. Adult learners have troubles with entering a language class for the first time. Not only are they not accustomed to the situation of being in the position of students, but they are also asked to cope with a great amount of completely new information and they are often worried about their ability of being able to learn everything they are asked to. I thus consider it an important task for the teacher to try to lower the pressure put on the students as much as possible. I believe this is a good reason to use a bilingual teaching method and avoid putting the students into a situation when they cannot even understand what the teacher is saying. The students' preference for incorporation of their L1 into the classroom is expressed by one of the participants of Brooks-Lewis's study: "When I saw that the teacher was American I felt a little worried because I thought that she was going to

speak only English and I wouldn´t understand anything, but it was pleasant to hear her speak good Spanish" (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 225).

However, not only beginners might feel pressured by L2-only classes, but also higher proficiency students appreciate the possibility to use their L1 to help them when needed. The problem which arises if the L1 is banished from the classroom is that the students keep their ideas for themselves and, rather than commenting on something in L2, they stay quiet, because they fear they would not be able to express themselves in L2. As it sometimes happens with my own English students, they start saying something in Czech and if interrupted and asked to speak in English, they fall silent and answer that it was not important. This is confirmed by Carless (2008) who says "if you force them to use English, no one will speak" (p. 333) or Sampson (2012) "any attempt to ban L1 use in the classroom would be detrimental to the amount of communication and learning taking place" (p. 302).

I therefore argue that it is better to let the students make a comment in their L1 and then help them translate the utterance into L2 together with the rest of the class. In my experience, this is the best way of encouraging students to try to communicate in English and become more confident about their language abilities, as they finally see, that with only a bit of support they are able to express themselves in L2. Furthermore, this method makes the students feel more comfortable and less afraid to enter the discussion, because they can rely on their L1 where their L2 knowledge is insufficient.

2.4 Use of Translation Makes the Class More Effective

As Carreres (2006) says, "offering students a literal, even awkward-sounding, translation solves in two seconds a problem that longwinded explanations in the foreign language would probably not clarify half as effectively" (p. 14) Anyone who has ever attended a monolingual class understands what Carreres (2006) means by the "longwinded explanations" (p. 14) – learning vocabulary in a monolingual class where translation into L1 is not allowed is an arduous task, which is, moreover, not always successful.

Cook (2010) tells his readers an entertaining story form his younger years, when he worked as an English teacher in Egypt and therefore attended an intensive Egyptian Arabic language course before his departure. However, the course was taught by native speakers and strictly monolingual, so the students were forced to understand the meaning of new vocabulary from context and L2 explanation. This resulted in their misunderstanding of a word, which later got Cook into an embarrassing situation during his stay in Egypt. In connection with this story, Cook suggests that it would have been "easier and more instructive" (Cook, 2010, p. xii) if the students were explained the meaning of the word in English together with its connotations.

Although the teacher tries very hard to explain the new vocabulary in the L2, the complicated monolingual explanation might sometimes only be a waste of effort and time. Even after the monolingual explanation, the students are merely able to guess a rough meaning of the word and they usually still feel a need to check its meaning in a bilingual dictionary. Moreover, the students might easily get bored if the monolingual explanations take up a considerable part of the class, as they often find it difficult to concentrate on an explanation which is not going to fully solve their problem anyway.

I believe that the students should be allowed to employ their L1 in order to check the meaning of a word, whether they use a dictionary or their classmates' help to do that. For one thing, the monolingual explanations obviously take a long time, which makes the class slower and less effective. Not only the amount of learning in the class is reduced, but the students might easily get bored. For another thing, this tedious task of explaining is often not enough for the students to be sure about the meaning. As Cook (2010) says, ". . . why should students be refused translation in class if they feel it might be helpful?" (p. xii)

The usefulness of employing translation in language teaching is also argued for by Henry Sweet, who believes translation into L1 to be "the most obvious and convenient way of explaining . . . meaning" (Sweet, 1938, p. 199) and argues that "definitions, like pictures, can be ambiguous" (Sweet, 1938, p. 200). This corresponds with my previous claim that L2 explanation is often insufficient for the students to be certain about the meaning of a word and a translation is needed. The role of translation in the class is therefore to enable the students to check their comprehension and also to make the class more effective.

2.5 Translation of Devised sentences

As we already know, translation can be understood as a means used for communication in the classroom, but also as a specific exercise. This sub-chapter discusses the use of translation exercises in language teaching, specifically the translation of devised sentences into L2, which is an activity often criticised by opponents of translation in language teaching. Some of the most common and powerful arguments against the use of translation into L2 is that it prevents the students from thinking directly in the L2, thus slowing down their learning progress and that the students then tend to produce incorrect sentences caused by word-for-word translation from their L1.

As for the first argument, that the students should not translate and should be encouraged to think directly in the L2, it has already been proven in previous chapters that translation is a natural tool for language learning and cannot be avoided. Sweet (1938) comments on this matter saying: "we cannot think in a foreign language till we have a thorough and ready knowledge of it" (p. 198) and goes on to claim that: "We find as a matter of fact that cross-associations cannot be got rid of by ignoring them: on the contrary, they have an awkward habit of cropping up when we least expect them. We cannot get rid of them for the simple reason that every idea is indissolubly associated with some word or phrase in our own language" (Sweet, 1938, p. 200).

Although the followers of the Natural Method believe that it is possible to learn a language in strictly monolingual environment in the way children acquire their L1, Sweet and Carreres strongly criticise their ideas. Sweet (1938) points out that: "These enthusiasts forget that the process of learning one's native language is carried on under peculiarly favourable circumstances, which cannot be even approximately reproduced in the later study of foreign languages" (p. 75) which corresponds with Carreres's

belief, “It is naïve and simply inaccurate to imagine that learners who only have one or two contact hours of language teaching per week can learn a language by immersion in the same way as children learn their mother tongue” (Carreres, 2006, p. 6).

Concerning the argument of students’ over-reliance on L1 causing them to produce incorrect sentences, it is, certainly, true that learners often wrongly expect “a feature of the new language to be the same as in their own” (Cook, 2010, p. 88) which is called “negative transfer” (Cook, 2010, p. 88). On the other hand, in some instances the learners can rely on their L1, because “the assumption of similarity works” (Cook, 210, p. 88) and in that case we talk about “positive transfer” (Cook, 2010, p. 88).

“Negative transfer” is something all language learners have been forced to deal with during their L2 learning and they usually learn by experience to avoid certain mistakes which the “negative transfer” causes. However, I believe that, by using contrastive analysis and pointing out the problematic points, where students often make mistakes, teachers can help the students avoid these mistakes, “by focusing on the differences between the learners’ own language and the new one, the teacher could tackle the majority of their difficulties” (Cook, 2010, p. 88). Why should teachers let their students struggle with mistakes caused by “negative transfer” when these can easily be avoided by pointing out the differences between the L1 and L2?

Furthermore, by translation of devised sentences, not only do the students learn how not to make errors caused by “negative transfer”, but the exercise also helps them reinforce the knowledge of pre-taught grammar. As Salem puts it, “. . . brief translation tasks serve as an awareness-raising eye opener to L1-L2 differences and are generally appreciated by learners” and also “Beginners or weak learners respond well to translation test items restricted to specifically pre-taught forms” (Salem, 2011, p. 153). Also in my experience, translation into L2 is appreciated by learners as one of the most

useful exercises and the students sometimes even ask for it themselves when they feel a need to practise certain grammar, which is confirmed by the results of Carreres's (2006) research, "learners overwhelmingly perceive translation exercises as useful for language learning" (p. 7).

Yet, it is of course important that the translation tasks are chosen appropriately to the students' knowledge and devised to practise grammar and vocabulary they have learned before. Even then it needs to be realised that there is not only one correct solution to the translation and the teacher should discuss with the students all their suggested solutions. As Carreres observes, translation "invites discussion and . . . students are only too happy to contribute to it, often defending their version with remarkable passion and persuasiveness" (Carreres, 2006, p. 7). I would add that thanks to translation tasks the students unconsciously practice various grammar problems learned in the course of their studies and not only one specific grammar item. Thus translation serves as a useful revision and students often find out about their weak points when solving translation tasks.

Another thing that makes translation useful is the fact that devised sentences often stick in the students' memory as models which they can use later. Although Sweet (1938) criticises the grammar-translation method for its artificial devised sentences, Cook (2010) points out some discrepancies in Sweet's criticism, "First the invented sentences are criticized for being 'colourless combinations, which do not stamp themselves on the memory'. Then, only a few lines later, we are given an example a 'sentence which I remembered long after I had forgotten all the rest of my Greek' " (Cook, 2010, p. 16).

Indeed, the aim of grammar translation is often to give the students an example of a certain grammar form to remember, rather than to make a sentence useful in a real-

world situation, and I strongly believe that ridiculous sentences stick in the memory more easily than ordinary ones. As Cook (2010) puts it, ". . . the fact that a sentence is funny does not mean it is ineffective. Quite the opposite may be true." (Cook, 2010, p. 17).

Sweet unconsciously proves this by giving an example of a nonsensical Greek sentence, which he "remembered long after [he] had forgotten all the rest of [his] Greek" (Sweet, 1938, p. 74) and I would like to reinforce the idea by my own experience from Italian classes; even now after I have forgotten virtually all my Italian, I can still remember one sentence which I found funny. It was a final sentence of a discussion between a man and a woman, the woman rejecting the man's invitation for a date by saying: 'Ha raggione signore, non ho tempo per Lei', meaning 'You are right, sir, I never have time for you'.

3. Suggested Use of Translation

In the previous chapters there has been said a lot about the positive or negative effects of the use of translation in foreign language classes and in this chapter some practical advice about how the L1 can be used in the classroom is going to be suggested. To avoid misapprehension, I would like to emphasise that the aim of this thesis is to show how L1 can serve an important function in the language classroom and therefore should not be completely rejected. However, the teacher should encourage communication in L2 and speak it as much as possible, while the L1 should be used judiciously where it is needed. In other words, the L1 is there to help, not to dominate the classroom.

It has already been discussed in previous chapters that the use of L1 for communication in the classroom is mainly important for low proficiency students while students with a higher level of proficiency prefer a predominant use of L2. Therefore the teacher should slowly reduce the amount of L1 in the classroom according to the students' progress. This method is also encouraged by Brooks-Lewis (2009), whose ". . . course began entirely in Spanish and moved slowly into English, with constant comparison and contrast of the target language" (p. 222), and Auerbach (1993), who argues that: ". . . since students don´t start by thinking in the second language, allowing for the exploration of ideas in the L1 supports a gradual, developmental process in which use of the L1 drops off naturally as it becomes less necessary" (p. 20).

The most difficult task for the teacher is then to estimate what amount of L2 use is appropriate to avoid the "dangers of overuse" (Carless, 2007, p. 333), which, certainly, depends on the teacher's judgement. In my experience it is useful to check the students' comprehension if the teacher is not sure the L2 instructions were thoroughly understood, for example by asking one of the students to try to translate what has been

said into L1. Another efficient way to help with the transition from L1 to L2 is to immediately repeat the instructions given in L2 in L1. This way, even beginners naturally learn to respond to simple L2 instructions and the L1 repetition gradually becomes unnecessary.

One of the most problematic issues the teachers encounter is how to encourage students to use the L2. It has already been argued above (see chapter 2.3) that it is better to let the students speak in their L1 and then help them translate the utterance into L2, rather than ban every L1 usage, which is "detrimental to the amount of communication . . . taking place" (Sampson, 2012, p. 302). However, overuse of L1 might also be harmful to the students' learning and thus the use of L2 needs to be encouraged. It is the most problematic when the students work in pairs or groups, because in that case the teacher does not have a full control of the communication going on.

Carless (2007) talks about this problem and gives examples of recommendations of teacher educators. One of the suggestions is to appoint " 'language monitors', individual students whose role was to try to remind their classmates to use English" (p. 334). This can be developed by having a student note down what the students have said in L1 and the class should then elaborate on translating the L1 utterances into L2 (Carless, 2007, p. 334). Deller and Rinvolucri call the student who writes down the utterances a "mother tongue scribe" (as cited in Carless, 2007, p. 334). Another suggested way is to develop a "reward system" (Carless, 2007, p. 334) to appreciate L2 use. However, the most important for encouraging L2 use is to give the students work not only appropriate to their abilities but also with clear task where the students are asked to use "a particular linguistic feature", because "the more ambitious or open-ended the task, the more likelihood of MT [L1] use" (Carless, 2007, p. 337).

On the other hand, translation is recommended for some other activities in the class. Some of the uses of translation regarded useful by teachers are listed by Yavuz, one of the suggestions is to use L1 “to energize the students” when they lose interest in the course, another support use of L1 “when the students seem to lose their self-confidence”, “in teaching of the abstract vocabulary”, “to check for comprehension and to explain the activity” (Yavuz, 2012, p. 4343). I believe that the arguments that translation is convenient for the checking of comprehension, and also good to give the students confidence in their attempts to speak L2 or to reduce the amount of stress students might feel in the class have already been sufficiently discussed in the previous chapters. However, in the following chapters I would like to deal with the advantages or disadvantages of a practical use of translation in some class activities like explaining grammar, writing and also learning vocabulary.

3.1 Explanation of Grammar

In this sub-chapter it is going to be argued that the explanation of grammar is one of the activities which should take place in the students' L1, with the exception of advanced level students who are able to understand the explanation in L2, although even in their case a check of comprehension or contrastive analysis might prove useful. However, the function of contrastive analysis in language teaching has already been talked about (see chapter 2.5), hence this chapter is going to discuss the explanation of grammar without focusing on the contrastive analysis of L1 and L2.

Brooks-Lewis comments on her experience from a monolingual Spanish class saying, "I could not understand anything the teacher was saying" (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 217). How could the beginner level students learn any new grammar if it is explained to them entirely in L2 and they cannot understand anything from what the teacher is saying? This is why to students with a low level of proficiency grammar should be explained in their L1. High proficiency students might be able to understand an explanation in L2, however, even in high proficiency classes contrastive analysis of the items taught should be offered and I believe that L1 might be used in cases where the students are not confident enough about their proper understanding of the grammar. Brooks-Lewis herself explains grammar in English, which is the students' L2, "other than the Spanish comparisons this was entirely in English" (Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 223). However, she also uses contrastive analysis and asks the students to compare the newly taught items with their L1. Thus even though she talks to them in the L2, there is all the time a close link between the L2 and L1, and thanks to this the students' comprehension is secured.

Henry Sweet claims that: "The main argument against explaining in the foreign language is that as long as we are learning the foreign language it is our first business to

have it explained to us as clearly and unambiguously as possible. Therefore all explanations ought to be in the language we know – that is our own – not in the one we do not know" (Sweet, 1938, p. 200). However, I would like to moderate this statement on the basis of Brooks-Lewis's example of explaining grammar. I believe that the students' thorough understanding is a primary issue when explaining grammar and that is why their L1 may be employed in the explanation. On the other hand, there are certainly more than one way of beneficial use of the L1, such as the one proposed by Brooks-Lewis.

3.2 Writing

Production of a written text in the L2 is certainly one of the basic language skills the students need to learn in their classes as it is necessary for their real life as well as a skill commonly tested in language exams. However, all of the students encounter the question if they should produce their writings directly in the L2 or whether it is possible to start with composing the text in their L1 which is then translated into L2.

In Auerbach's text a citation copied from a study by Osburne and Harss-Covaleski can be found, claiming that translation of the written text from L1 into L2 causes the students "to make more errors, result in rhetorically inappropriate texts, and distract them from thinking in English – and that all these factors would negatively affect the quality of their writing" (as cited in Auerbach, 1993, p. 21). This is a belief shared by many teachers and even language learners, as a study of ". . . students' perceptions about L2 writing through translation versus writing directly in the L2, Kobayashi and Rinnert (1992) reported that 88% of the higher proficiency Japanese participants . . . [and] 53% of lower proficiency students . . . favored direct composition" (Liao, 2006, p. 195).

On the other hand, results of the above mentioned research of Osburne and Harss-Covaleski "suggests that the widely frowned upon practice of writing first in the L1 and then translation into L2 is not detrimental to the quality of the written product" (Auerbach, 1993, p. 21) and they also claim that: "It seems then that there is no need for teachers to become overly anxious if students choose to employ translation as a composing strategy at times" (as cited in Auerbach, 1993, p. 21).

However, I believe that most teachers have experience with L2 texts of students who translated their writings from the L1 without taking into consideration the differences of the L1 and L2, thus producing an incoherent text or syntactically

incorrect sentences. The problem of this negative transfer has, nevertheless, already been studied (see chapter 2.5) and it has been claimed that the students should be made aware of the problems caused by the negative transfer and they should learn how to avoid them. As it has also been said that translation is a natural way of learning and the students cannot be forced into thinking straight in L2, at least until they reach an appropriate proficiency level (see chapter 2.2). Therefore I believe that if the students feel a need to first write the text in L1 they should be aware that it is not correct to try to translate the text word for word into L2, but they need to translate their ideas freely to avoid mistakes caused by negative transfer.

Yet, I also regard the practice of writing texts in the students' L1 and subsequently translating them into L2 as an undesirable practice, which might cause considerable troubles to some students. Discouraging students from rewriting L1 texts into L2, however, does not mean discouraging them from any use of L1 when writing. In Liao's study among Taiwanese language learners over half of the participants claimed that: "To write in English, I first brainstorm about the topic in Chinese" and also that: "When I write in English, I first think in Chinese and then translate my ideas into English" (Liao, 2006, p. 202). Certainly, many students have difficulties producing a text directly in L2, as they are unable to develop an idea when having to concentrate on the L2. Therefore I believe that brainstorming and developing the ideas in L1 before they begin to write, as Liao's students suggested, might be a good way to produce a piece of writing in L2, in cases where the students find developing the idea directly in the L2 impossible. This way they avoid the difficulties of translating the whole text into L2, but they can make a beneficial use of their L1 when it is needed.

3.3 Learning Vocabulary

Although the supporters of the Direct Method believe in teaching of vocabulary by explanation in L2, so that no connection with the students' is made, there seems to be overwhelming evidence supporting the use of translation for learning vocabulary. Cook (2010) presents results of a study done by Laufer and Girsai, who:

> Keeping variables as constant as possible, they taught the same vocabulary to three groups using three different types of instruction – meaning-focused, form focused without translation, and through contrastive analysis and translation. They then tested the groups for both active and passive recall of the words encountered. Their results were that 'The CAT (contrastive analysis and translation) group significantly outperformed the other two groups on all tests'. (p. 91)

Not only the use of translation enables the teacher to avoid long-winded explanations of a particular word but it also makes the class faster and more effective (see chapter 2.4). To demonstrate "the foolishness of monolingual vocabulary teaching, and the inevitability of students translating anyway" (Cook, 2010, p. 140) Swan claims that: "teachers would go through contortions to explain and demonstrate the meaning of words without translation. What often happened, of course, was that after the teacher had spent ten minutes miming, say, *curtain* to a class of baffled French students, one of them would break into a relieved smile and say 'Ah *rideau*' " (as cited in Cook, 2010, p. 140).

Apparently, even if the claim that the translation of vocabulary is inevitable for the students is left out, the students themselves prefer the use of translation for the learning of vocabulary. A vast majority of the participants in Liao's research claim: "I memorize the meaning of new English vocabulary words by remembering their Chinese

translation" (Liao, 2006, p. 202), which is an attitude supported by research done by Prince, the results of which "reveal the superiority of using translation in learning vocabulary in terms of quantity of words learned" (Liao, 2006, p. 196).

Although, there is also a danger of "false equivalents" (Cook, 2010, p. 140) if the translation of a word is considered an exact equivalent, this trouble can easily be overcome by an "explicit discussion of the degree of equivalence in different translations" (Cook, 2010, p. 141). In my opinion, the creation of "false equivalents" is also not easily avoided by a monolingual explanation, which forces the students to guess the meaning of a word and therefore the translation may easily be completely incorrect (see chapter 2.4).

All this evidence proves the inevitability and naturalness of translation, which have been argued for earlier in the text, as well as the positive effect it has on the learning of vocabulary. As Cromley points out: "It is impossible to remember without associating new information with what you already know" (as cited in Brooks-Lewis, 2009, p. 228), which is a true statement applicable to the learning of vocabulary as well as other uses of translation.

4. Conclusion

To sum up what has been said about the use of translation in language teaching, the reasons for its abandonment and arguments supporting its use, translation has proved to be a beneficial resource for foreign language learning, although it is only a means to support the learning and even when it is used the L1 should not dominate the class. As one of the participants of Carreres's study claims, "translation classes are definitely an important tool, but can not stand alone" (Carreres, 2006, p. 11).

The use of translation is partly dependent on the students' proficiency level, as low proficiency students compared to high proficiency students perceive translation differently and use it in different ways. However, translation is profitable for students with all levels of proficiency supposing that it is used in a way appropriate for their level.

It has been argued that translation is a natural way of dealing with the L2 and it cannot be avoided as well as the students cannot be forced into thinking in the L2. An unconditional rejection of L1 might also make the students feel stressed and be harmful to the communication in the classroom as students sometimes prefer not speaking at all to struggling to express their idea in L2. Moreover, the use of translation makes the class more effective both by not wasting time with complicated, and often unsuccessful, monolingual explanations and by ensuring the students thorough comprehension. It has also been claimed that the L1 can prove helpful in the explanation of new grammar points, explaining vocabulary and as a help to develop ideas when writing texts in L2.

The move away from translation began at the end of the 19th century with the development of ideas of the Reform Movement, later strengthened by the Direct Method. However, it has been shown in the text of this thesis that the Direct Method shifted the original Reform Movement's concepts and took it to extremes by the

complete rejection of translation, which was not even supported by the Reform Movement representatives. Although monolingual teaching has become a generally acknowledged, desirable standard, the abandonment of translation has not been pedagogically justified and according to the findings detailed in this work its use in the classroom should be reconsidered.

5. Bibliography

Auerbach, E. R (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL Classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 27 (1), 9-32. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3586949

Brook-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult Learners' Perceptions of the Incorporation of their L1 in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. Applied Linguistics, 30 (2), 216-235. doi:10.1093/applin/amn051

Calis, E. & Dikilas, K. (2012). The use of translation in EFL classes as L2 learning practice. Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences, Volume 46, 5079-5084.

Carless, D. (2008). Student use of the mother tongue in the task-based classroom. English Language Teaching Journal,62 (4), 331-338. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccm090

Carreres, A. (December 2006). Strange bedfellows: Translation and language teaching, the teaching of translation into L2 in in modern languages degree; Uses and limitations. In Sixth Symposium on Translation, Terminology and Interpretation in Cuba and Canada. Retrieved from http://www.cttic.org/ACTI/2006/papers/Carreres.pdf

Cook, Guy. (2010). *Translation in language teaching*. Oxford, NY: OUP.

Howatt, A. P. R. (1991). *A history of English language teaching.* Oxford: OUP.

Liao, P. (2006). EFL Learners' beliefs about and strategy use of translation in English learning. RELC Journal, 37 (2), 191-215. doi: 10.1177/0033688206067428

Pekkanli, I. (2012). Translation and the contemporary language teacher. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, Volume 46, 955-959.

Salem, I. (2012). L1-L2 sentence translation in classroom grammar tests. English Language Teaching Journal,66(2), 147-155. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccr044

Sampson, A. (2012). Learner code-switching versus English only. English Language Teaching Journal, 66 (3), 293-303. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccr067

Sweet, H. (1938). *A practical study of languages.* London: J. M. Dent.

Yavuz, F. (2012). The attitudes of English teachers about the use of L1 in the teaching of L2. Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences, Volume 46,4339-4344.

Summary

The aim of this thesis is to show that the rejection of translation from the foreign language classrooms is not pedagogically justifiable and its use needs to be reconsidered. The thesis offers a number of arguments supporting the use of translation in language teaching and tries to prove its usefulness for the students. It is argued that translation is a beneficial resource for students of all levels of proficiency, provided its judicious use.

Resumé

Cílem této práce je poukázat na to, že odklon od použití překladu při výuce cizích jazyků je pedagogicky neopodstatněný, a proto by mělo být jeho užití znovu zváženo. Tato práce obsahuje mnoho argumentů podporujících užití překladu ve výuce a snaží se prokázat jeho prospěšnost pro studenty. Tato práce také ukazuje, že překlad je vhodný pro studenty s jakoukoliv úrovní znalostí druhého jazyka, pokud je použit s ohledem na jejich znalosti.