

To the loving memory of my dear father,

Dr. Nihat ERER,

this thesis is dedicated.

TRANSLATION
AS AN INTEGRATED APPROACH
IN ELT

Graduate School of Education
of
Education

by

Nadide Güher Erer

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

August 2006

BILKENT UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

June 28, 2006

The examining committee appointed by the Graduate School of Education for the
thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Nadide Güher Erer

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis title: Translation as an Integrated Approach in ELT

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. S. Charlotte Basham
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Engin Sezer
Bilkent University, Department of
Turkish Literature

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Demirezen
Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education
Department of Foreign Languages Teaching;
Division of English Language Teaching

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Second Language.

(Dr. Charlotte S. Basham)
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Second Language.

(Assoc. Prof.Dr. Engin Sezer)
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Second Language.

(Prof. Dr. Mehmet Demirezen)
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

(Visiting Prof. Dr. Margaret Sands)
Director

ABSTRACT

TRANSLATION AS AN INTEGRATED APPROACH IN ELT

Erer, Nadide Güher

M.A., Department of Teaching as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Charlotte S. Basham

August 2006

This study was designed to investigate the problematic areas in paragraph translation from Turkish into English and to examine the effect of interaction on group work while students translated from Turkish into English in translation courses at Hacettepe University, School of Foreign Languages, Department of Post-Preparatory English Courses, in which the final stage is a translation course. The translation course, which combines previously learned skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking, attempts to develop the awareness of differences between Turkish and English in grammar, semantics, and discourse.

In order to collect data, error analysis and interaction analysis were used. While the first stage of the study investigated translation as product in English, the second stage dealt with the process of translation as well as the analysis of students'

written translations. Observation of errors revealed that students produced errors in the areas grammar, semantics and discourse. Problems with grammar included the present perfect tense, past progressive tense, and the passive voice. Problems with semantics included issues such as collocations and deciding which terms to use when an L1 term had multiple equivalents. Students were also observed to perform translation work better when working in groups rather than when working individually.

Key Words: translation, individual translation, group translation, error analysis, interaction analysis.

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETİMİNDE BÜTÜNLEYİCİ BİR YAKLAŞIM OLARAK ÇEVİRİ

Erer, Nadide Güher

Yüksek Lisans, İkinci Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğrenimi

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Charlotte S. Basham

Ağustos 2006

Bu çalışma, öğrencilerin Türkçeden İngilizceye çeviri yaparken karşılaştıkları zorlukları tespit etmek ve grup çalışmasında iletişimin etkilerini araştırmak için, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu İngilizce Servis Dersleri Biriminde yapılmıştır. Daha önce okuma, yazma, dinleme ve konuşma becerileri çerçevesinde edinilen becerileri bütünleştirerek, Türkçe ve İngilizce arasındaki dilbilgisi, kelime bilgisi, ve söylem arasındaki farklılıklara dikkat çekmeyi hedeflemiştir.

Veri toplamak için hata analizi ve iletişim analizinden faydalanılmıştır. Çalışmanın birinci aşamasında, çeviri sonuç olarak ele alınırken, ikinci aşamada süreç ve sonuç birlikte incelenmiştir. Hata analizi öğrencilerin dilbilgisi, kelime bilgisi, söylem hataları yaptıklarını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Geçmişle şu an arasında bağlantı kuran “present perfect tense” ile geçmişte süreklilik anlatan “past progressive tense”, ve edilgen yapının yanısıra, özdizimlilik (collocation) ve Türkçe

bir kelimenin İngilizcede birden fazla karşılığı olduğu durumlar öğrencilerin en çok zorluk çektiği alanlar olarak tespit edilmiştir.

İletişim analizi yoluyla öğrencilerin grup olarak çalıştıklarında tek başına yapılan çeviriden daha fazla başarı gösterdikleri görülmüştür.

Anahtar kelimeler: çeviri, bireysel çeviri, grup çevirisi, hata analizi, iletişim analizi.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background of the Study.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	6
Research Questions.....	6
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
Introduction.....	7
Definitions.....	7
Historical Perspectives.....	8
The Grammar Translation Method.....	8
Current Views on Translation in Language Teaching.....	11
Teaching Vocabulary through Translation.....	13
Focus on Form through Translation.....	17
Translation as an Interactional Activity.....	21
Interaction Analysis.....	23

The Role of L1 in Foreign Language Classrooms.....	24
Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis, and Beyond.....	27
Conclusion.....	32
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	33
Introduction.....	33
Participants / Setting.....	33
Instruments / Materials.....	34
Translation Exams.....	34
Error Analysis.....	35
Group Interaction.....	36
Written Translation of Group.....	37
Procedure	37
Methods of Data Analysis.....	38
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS.....	41
Introduction.....	41
The First Stage of the Study.....	42
Grammar.....	46
Tense.....	46
Modal.....	47
Passive Voice.....	48
Usage of Comparatives.....	49
Prepositions.....	50
Agreement of Plurality.....	51
Semantics.....	53

Discourse.....	55
Linking Words.....	56
The Second Stage of the Study: Investigation of Translation as an	
Interactive Process.....	57
Analysis of Transcripts.....	58
Negotiation of Form.....	60
Repetition	63
Explanation.....	64
Correction/ Self Correction.....	66
Stating/ Asking for Opinion.....	67
Suggestion.....	67
Rejection/ Approval.....	68
Guessing Vocabulary.....	69
Consulting a Dictionary.....	71
Abandonment.....	73
Written Translations as Produced by Group A and B.....	74
Grammar.....	76
Semantics / Lexis.....	76
Discourse.....	77
Conclusion.....	77
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....	79
Introduction.....	79
Findings and Discussion.....	79
Types of Errors.....	79

Frequency of Errors.....	80
Grammar.....	80
Semantics / Lexis.....	81
Discourse.....	81
Translation in Group Work.....	82
Discussions.....	83
Use of Translation as Useful Resource.....	83
L1 as a Facilitator.....	83
Translation as an Awareness-raising Activity.....	84
Translation as an Activity to Increase Clarity, Accuracy and Flexibility.....	84
Limitations of the Study.....	85
Implications for Teaching.....	85
Strategy Training.....	86
Dictionary Use.....	87
Which Forms to Focus on.....	88
Group Work.....	90
In-class Discussion.....	91
Translation as the Fifth Skill.....	91
Implications for Further Research.....	92
Conclusion.....	93
REFERENCES.....	94
APPENDIX.....	99

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. General Results of Error Analysis	45
2. Results of Error Analysis of Grammatical Features in Student Translation of the text “Cigarette”	46
3. Analysis of Verb Tenses, Verb “to be” and Aspect.....	52
4. Plural/ Singular Agreement.....	53
5. Results of Error Analysis of Semantic/ Lexical Items.....	53
6. Results of Error Analysis Relating to two Lexical Items.....	55
7. Results of Error Analysis of Discursive Features.....	55
8. Errors on Linking Words.....	56
9. General Results of Error Analysis on Grammar, Lexis, Discourse.....	76
10. Results of Error Analysis of Grammatical Features in Group A and B’s Translation of the Text “Cigarette”	76
11. Results of Error Analysis of Semantic/ Lexical Items.....	76
12. Results of Error Analysis of Discursive Features.....	77

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figures</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. The Text as It was Presented to the Students' in Turkish.....	42
2. The Text as Translated into English by the Researcher.....	43
3. Written Translation of Group A.....	75
4. Written Translation of Group B.....	75

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Although the late twentieth century theories of language teaching and learning have ignored translation, it has recently re-entered into the arena of language teaching after a neglect of about thirty years. The main reason it fell out of favor lay in the fact that translation was thought to be a kind of tedious exercise which focused on grammar and did not foster communication. During the heyday of the method known as the Grammar Translation Method, languages were taught through the translation of independent sentences devoid of meaning and divorced from context for the sake of the practice of grammatical structures. However, while the dominant teaching models now focus on communication, in recent years scholars have begun to rethink the role of translation within this framework. For example, Duff (1989) points out that it is possible to make use of translation in a manner which would help students achieve proficiency in English by means of seeing differences between their native language and the target language.

As Duff (1989) further indicates, in an attempt to add diversity into the communicative language classrooms, there has been a revival of interest in translation. Now, translation is not regarded as an activity which is devoid of communicative purposes but as a tool in gaining accuracy, clarity, and flexibility. Accuracy, which means attending to form, is an area which is neglected by communicative approaches which focus on fluency. Clarity, the degree of effectiveness in conveying any given message, is an area which can be emphasized through translation. Flexibility, the ability to communicate the same message using

different forms, is also an aspect which comes to light when students recognise the translations that their peers produce. Through translation, students perceive the differences between the two languages on syntactic, semantic, discourse and pragmatic levels.

Background of the Study

Although there seems to be a reappraisal of the role translation plays in foreign language teaching, there is a scarcity of research conducted on translation in second language teaching. As the coordinator of translation courses at the Department of Post- Preparatory English Courses, I have observed that students experience difficulties in translating texts from Turkish to English and from English to Turkish. In order to improve the effectiveness of the translation courses I decided to carry out this research. In the first stage I conducted an error analysis to determine and to investigate how students deal with the task of translation through interaction working in groups.

As background to this study, translation's place in second language teaching in the past and in the present is reviewed. It is now realized that there was a confusion as to the usage of translation stemming from the reaction to the Grammar Translation Method. Translation in fact can be useful in teaching a second or foreign language as a means of focusing on form and enriching vocabulary.

Now the importance of form-focused instruction, which evolved as a reaction to negligence of linguistic forms by communicative language teaching, is realized, since many second language acquisition researchers such as Doughty (1998), Nassaji (1999), Hinkel and Fotos (2002), and Ellis (2006) believe that mere exposure to language is not enough. These researchers claim that in order for an accurate

knowledge of language to develop, instruction which focuses on form should be incorporated into the communicative approach. Newmark (1991) also suggests that translation can be employed at all levels of language teaching as a means of consolidating grammar and vocabulary. Furthermore, Schmitt (2000) emphasizes that both grammar and vocabulary have been neglected in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), since the assumption has been that learners would come up with adequate grammar and vocabulary as a result of communication in the target language in the classroom. However, there is now increasing evidence that their assumption rested on false premises. As the findings of Genesee (as cited in Ellis, 2006) revealed, mere exposure to communication did not result in adequate grammar. Nor did learners pick up vocabulary from context on their own, as Zimmerman (1997) and Schmitt (2000) stress.

In keeping with this renewed focus on grammar and vocabulary in second language teaching, Hacettepe University, School of Foreign Languages, Department of Post Preparatory English Courses, includes translation as the final step in many of the departments students encounter after they have received courses in Reading, Writing, Oral Communication Skills, and Business English. The general aim of the post-preparatory English courses is to help further their abilities in English. The aim of translation courses is not to train translators but to focus on form within a communicative framework and increase students' awareness of grammar as well as enrich their vocabulary.

Two years ago Hacettepe University witnessed a revolution in School of Foreign Languages, Department of Post Preparatory English Courses. In the translation courses exercises based on translating individual sentences into or from

Turkish to practice grammatical structures of English in contrast to Turkish were abandoned to be replaced by translation on paragraph-level. The reason for this innovation was to provide the students with a meaningful context in which students deal with discourse as well as grammar and vocabulary.

Another innovation that has been used by some teachers in translation courses at Hacettepe University in recent years is the use of group work. This follows the general tendency in the field of language teaching, as interaction has come to be considered an important element in the acquisition of the target language. Long's Interaction Hypothesis (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005) involves negotiation of meaning which can be carried out making use of group work. The assumption is that translation courses can be carried out making use of pair and group work, thus enabling students to interact in groups in order to accomplish the given translation task. Brooks and Donato (as cited in Storch and Wigglesworth, 2003), suggest that some teachers might be discouraged to use any kind of group work in their classroom since there is a risk that students may use their L1 in group work. However, in the case of translation, the use of the L1 has a facilitative role and while translating from Turkish to English in groups, students have to test options such as the use of correct tense, vocabulary and discursive devices in English, even though they are using their L1 for this purpose.

As the title of this research suggests, translation as a group task integrates the four skills. Therefore, they do not only employ reading and writing but also listening and speaking in carrying out the translation activity. Seen from this perspective translation can be regarded as a fifth skill, which enables moving between L1 and L2, as well as combining the four skills.

I decided to conduct this study in order to investigate whether translation can help emphasize form and enrich vocabulary, and whether group work is effective in accomplishing the task of translation.

Statement of the Problem

Although dealing with translation on paragraph level has increased the meaningfulness of the task for students in translation classes at Hacettepe University, the students come up with persistent errors. These errors exist on grammatical, semantic, and discursive levels. The currently used in-class translation activities do not seem to address these problematic areas. Therefore, there is a need to make a close investigation of the types of errors students make in their written translations and to observe classroom activities to be able to look into the ways they deal with the translation problems by means of interacting with their peers. The combination of these data would help bridge the gap between students' needs to overcome the problems they encounter while making translations and the way translation is taught.

Purpose of the Study

The first aim of this study is to investigate what kinds of errors students commit while they make translation from Turkish to English as well as to assess what kinds of errors most frequently occur. The second aim of this study is to observe the students in classroom in order to find out how the students interact to deal with the task of translating a text consisting of the features which are found to be problematic in the analysis of existing exam papers.

Significance of the Study

The study aims at observing the process of translation in classroom as well as understanding and categorizing the errors committed by students. The significance of the study is four-fold:

1. Being informed about the areas where students commit errors in translation.
2. Being informed about the problem-solving activities students use while translating in group work.
3. Demonstrating positive effects of using L1 in carrying out translation tasks in the second language classroom.
4. In general, the study will help maintain data for the problematic areas and will enable the translation courses to be more effective in helping students achieve proficiency in terms of using the target language with more accuracy, clarity and flexibility.

Research Questions

1. What kind of errors do students commit while translating from Turkish to English?
2. What kind of errors most frequently occur?
3. How do students deal with translation problems in group work?

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine the problems students encounter in translating from Turkish to English and the effects of group work on solving these problems. In this chapter, the relevant literature will be reviewed. First, various definitions of translation will be examined. Second, pedagogical issues related to translation will be discussed, including both a historical perspective and current efforts to revitalize this skill. Third, a brief review is made of changes over time in how the learner's first language (L1) is viewed in the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) literature. Fourth, as one of the aims of the study is to find out how students overcome the difficulties translation imposes on them in group work, interaction analysis and the place of group work within a communicative framework will be outlined. Finally, views about error analysis will also be reviewed, since the written outcomes of the students in both first and second stage of the study were examined through error analysis.

Definitions

In order to gain insights into translation, which has been a controversial issue in language teaching, it is crucially important to look at how it is generally defined. Not surprisingly, it is defined in various ways. Bell (1991) and Newmark (1988) specify some common characteristics about the nature of translation. Their definitions of translation indicate a motion between languages in an attempt to maintain a relationship between the source and translated text. According to Tudor

(as cited in Duff,1989), translation is a communicative activity with a rightful place in the framework of a communicative approach in foreign language teaching. In addition, Atkinson's (1993) definition of a good translation also includes context and meaning, including social meaning and idiomatic language.

Historical Perspectives

Although the above definitions of translation include the elements of communication, meaning, context and social varieties, it has been considered to be otherwise in the field of language teaching, mostly owing to the notoriety it gainedunfairly through the Grammar Translation Method.

As Richards and Rodgers (2001) point out, in the late 19th century, the works of linguists such as Henry Sweet, Wilhelm Vietor and Paul Passy, who set out to find a more efficient and easier way to teach languages, sparked a criticism against the Grammar Translation Method. These criticisms resulted in the Reform Movement, which prepared the scene for the demise of the Grammar Translation Method, the general principles of which I discuss below.

The Grammar Translation Method

As Howatt (1984) discusses, the Grammar Translation Method was originated in Prussia in the late eighteenth century. It spread in Europe quickly as a way of teaching modern languages in the same fashion as Greek and Latin were taught. It prevailed as a major method for teaching modern languages in Europe for about a century. It is still used today to teach foreign languages in some parts of the world. The main reason for its survival up to the present day is its suitability for even very large classes. Currently, this method is still used in some books which are prepared for self-study.

As Richards and Rodgers (2001) and Larsen-Freeman (2000) argue, when the Grammar Translation Method was widely used in Europe, the main aim was to enable students to read the literature of the target language. Therefore, attention was given to reading over speaking and listening. As the aim of this method was not to enable learners to use the language for communicative purposes, the students' mother tongue was used as the medium of instruction instead of the second language. In terms of language practice, the sentence was taken as the core unit of inspection, and accuracy was seen as an important element. In general, the study of a foreign language grammar was expected to serve as a mental exercise for students to help them develop intellectually.

Translation played an important role in this method, since the classroom activities largely depended on translating sentences from texts they were reading in class. Translation exercises were then followed by study of vocabulary and grammar from the given passage. Vocabulary was taught by means of memorising bilingual word lists. The Grammar Translation method, which was premised on focusing on form, dealt with grammar deductively. Thus, grammar rules were taught explicitly and students were expected to apply them in new sentences. (Richards & Rodgers, 2001)

There are many reasons which resulted in the displacement of the Grammar Translation Method. Generally, the Grammar Translation Method went out of favor as a result of political changes as well as theoretical claims against it.

The Reformists claimed that the use of translation led to the neglect of spoken language, created false notions of equivalence, and focused on isolated sentences rather than meaningful contexts. Nevertheless, as Richards and Rodgers (2001) point

out, the Grammar Translation Method was not as uninspiring as the criticisms against this method suggested. It partly came to earn a notorious reputation as a result of some of its applications, in which attempts were made to prove that the study of modern languages was no less demanding than the study of Greek or Latin.

As Cook (1996) points out, apart from the criticisms on theoretical grounds, political changes such as immigration into the United States, resulting in classes with students who had various L1s, made translation an impossible activity in many classroom settings.

The criticisms leveled against the Grammar Translation Method eventually resulted in the ‘Reform Movement’ in the late 19th century, which paved the way for the Direct Method (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). As a result, since the use of L1 was prohibited by the Reform Movement which was initiated by linguists such as Sweet, Vietor, and Passy (Howatt, 1984), translation was also ruled out of the classroom.

However, as Prator (1979) states, supporters of each approach or method reject the merits of what went before. Therefore, together with the Direct Method, which emphasized oral skills, the tenets of the Grammar Translation Method were rejected. This might be regarded as moving from one extreme to another instead of reaching a consensus, that is, involving translation, as well as the traditionally recognized four skills in language teaching. As a result of enhancing the oral skills in the target language, the use of the mother tongue and therefore translation, whose merits could have contributed to language teaching, were rejected. However, the Direct Method, which replaced the Grammar Translation Method, went through criticisms such as going to extremes to avoid recourse to students’ L1, where “translation would have been a much more efficient technique”, (Brown, 1973, p.5 as

cited in Richards and Rodgers, 2001). After the decline of the Direct Method around the 1920s, many other methods prevailed and vanished in the field of ELT, especially between the 1950 and the 1980s. None of these methods could address the diverse needs of learners in different parts of the world. Now, we are past the stage of monopoly of using single methods, the tendency being towards drawing on insights the variety of methods offer. Currently, while Communicative Language Teaching seems to dominate the language teaching field, creativity on the teacher's part is also sought after (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Teachers who can form their own prescriptions according to the needs of their students might be successful using any given method. In the hands of resourceful teachers any method can become effective as long as teachers can use their capacity to make use of existing methods in an eclectic way, guided by principles which address the needs of their students.

Having said that the key to addressing learners' needs is being eclectic rather than being monolithic, translation can play a role in an integrated way, where all the five skills, namely, reading, writing, listening, speaking, and translation, are dealt with. Translation can be especially beneficial in establishing a balance between accuracy and fluency in classroom activities. As Cook (1996) suggests, overemphasising communication through the use of communicative teaching models is dangerous, since it may lead to inaccuracy while attempting to gain fluency. In the following section, then, I will discuss the current views of some researchers about the role translation might play in the field of language teaching.

Current Views on Translation in Language Teaching

From the 1960s onwards, researchers have realized that translation activities have indeed merits which would contribute to language teaching, as discussed by

Widdowson (1979), Howatt (1984), Duff (1989), Cook (1991) and Stern (1992) (Duff, 1989, as cited in Cook, 1996). However, as Newmark (1991) points out, the literature on teaching translation is rather scarce, although translation has been in the heart of language teaching for centuries. He also mentions that its place in language teaching is closely linked with how the use of students' native language is viewed in the language classroom.

However, according to recent studies carried out on the use of translation as a means for teaching and learning foreign languages, it is shown that translation can be a valuable tool if used appropriately. For example, according to Newmark (1991), translation can contribute to language teaching regardless of the proficiency level of the students. In the early stages, it can be useful in terms of using class time economically, and of making explanations about grammar and vocabulary. In intermediate stages, it enables teachers to remediate student errors through translation activities. He stresses that at this stage translation might prove useful in terms of increasing students' vocabulary in the target language. Finally, in advanced levels, translation into and from the target language can be introduced as a 'fifth skill', in which students make use of the four skills in the final and the most challenging skill since it requires an understanding of two different linguistic systems. As Newmark (1991) suggests translation is the most distinguished skill since it fosters interaction between people from different cultures.

Contrary to common belief, translation can enhance focusing on meaning as well as raising the students' awareness in terms of similarities and differences between learners' L1 and L2. Atkinson (1993) claims that translation makes learners concentrate on meaning, as opposed to mechanical grammar exercises, which only

focus on form. Besides, when students carry out translation activities they have to compare their L1 with English. This can help them become more aware of the differences between the two languages.

Translation activities can be used to encourage students to take risks rather than avoid them. Translation rules out avoidance strategies as students have to take even the most difficult parts of a text into consideration while translating. And, finally, through translation students become aware of the fact that an exact equivalence should not always be expected.

In the light of the arguments for the use of translation in language teaching, I believe that translation would especially be beneficial in terms of vocabulary retention and focusing on forms, with which I deal in the following sections.

Teaching Vocabulary through Translation

As Schmitt (2000) puts forward, vocabulary teaching is an area which has been neglected to a large extent in the history of language teaching. Except for the Reading Method, in general, vocabulary acquisition has received scant attention in the methodologies of the recent past, as well as the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which ignored vocabulary, the assumption being that it would develop naturally, in the course of time, through communicative activities in the classroom settings.

In an attempt to compensate for the insufficiency of CLT in terms of dealing with the improvement of vocabulary acquisition, translation can be a very effective tool. In order to do that students should be provided with means to analyse the language themselves, since as Rivers (1983) states, it is not in teachers' power to teach vocabulary - teachers can only do as much as introduce vocabulary and

familiarize students with certain strategies for learning vocabulary. However, vocabulary retention is a personal process. Thus, teachers' role would be to create conditions in which students can learn vocabulary for themselves. As Jenkins (as cited in Rivers, 1983, p.126) points out, "the mind remembers what the mind does, not what the world does".

One of the attempts to deal with vocabulary has been to teach students how to make use of certain strategies to handle vocabulary (Schmitt, 2000). In fact, strategy training has received a boost in the field of language teaching, as Oxford's (1990) suggests. Yet, familiarizing students with the strategies to guess vocabulary from context could only ease the burden of constantly checking the dictionary for each and every unknown vocabulary word that comes up in a reading passage, and increase the speed of reading. However, as Folse (2004) claims, these strategies do not always result in vocabulary retention. According to research carried out by Nassaji (as cited in Folse, 2004), guessing vocabulary from context did not yield very satisfactory results, the success rate of correct guesses being as low as 26%. While using strategies may help a great deal, we have to be wary of them, as well. There is a body of research which shows that guessing vocabulary by means of using contextual clues is not as efficient as it is thought to be. Naggy and Herman (as cited in Folse, 2004) question the effectiveness of vocabulary guessing in the light of studies carried out by researchers such as Pressley, Levin, and Delaney (as cited in Folse) which revealed the inefficiency of guessing vocabulary from the context. In sum, as Nation (as cited in Folse, 2004) claims, guessing vocabulary may be an effective tool for the purposes of dealing with reading, yet it may not result in acquisition of vocabulary. As Folse (2004) discusses, incidental vocabulary learning

takes place if “noticing” comes into play through tasks which are designed to raise learners consciousness. Through such tasks, students are required to notice lexical items, the result of which might be retention of new vocabulary in long-term memory. In keeping with this view, students may learn many new vocabulary items if they are personally involved in meaningful activities. For instance, in the process of translating a text both from and into the target language, students’ attention would be on vocabulary as well as grammatical structures, since the task of translation requires attention to both elements in question. For instance, when you have to translate a certain text, you cannot depend on approximating the meaning of a word, since it is possible that you might end up with a wrong meaning through vocabulary guessing strategies. When you have to translate, you cannot make do with just guessing, you have to go beyond the level of approximating the message. The active involvement in the process of translation calls for “noticing”, which is claimed to be a condition for vocabulary retention by Folse (2004).

Group translation activity can help students enrich their vocabulary knowledge and raise their consciousness of the use of lexis through negotiation of meaning and form. As Long (1990) claims, negotiation of meaning promotes the acquisition of vocabulary.

Folse (2004) regards as myth the claim that the use of translation to acquire lexis should not be advised and cites some research as evidence that translation helps acquire new vocabulary. There is research which supports the idea that an L1 translation of a word is beneficial in vocabulary learning. For example, Grace (as cited in Folse 2004) investigated the role of L1 translation in computer-assisted language learning (CALL). She concluded that students who were provided with L1

translations performed better than those who did not have access to L1 translations. Her findings suggest that L1 translations enabled the students to be ensured about the correct meanings, and students who had L1 translations reached a higher retention rate.

Another issue in teaching vocabulary in foreign language classrooms is the use of dictionaries. As Folse (2004) stresses, contrary to common belief, most learners do not know how to make best use of dictionaries. Especially, they are at a loss with polysemous words. Furthermore, as Newmark (1991) stresses, translation is one of the fields in which the knowledge about how to use references is of crucial importance. He emphasizes the importance of using dictionaries, thesauruses, glossaries, books about translation and collocation dictionaries. Although Newmark regards monolingual dictionaries better than bilingual dictionaries for translation purposes, Atkinson (1993) suggests that both monolingual and bilingual dictionaries have certain advantages if they are used appropriately. He suggests that while monolingual dictionaries, prepared for learners, enables students to get definitions in English and see the lexical item used in context through example sentences, bilingual dictionaries enable learners to check whether their guesses about the possible equivalents of the item in question is right. However, he cautions against “pocket dictionaries”, which generally do not account for the whole possible usages of the lexical items, and therefore might lead students to form faulty assumptions about the usages of vocabulary in English. Since knowing how to use dictionaries and being aware of the restrictions of vocabulary usage form an essential part of successful translation, Atkinson (1993) suggests some references to use in translation activities as well. Among his suggestions, *Working with Words* by Ruth Gairns and Stuart

Redman (Cambridge 1986) would prove useful since it introduces awareness-raising activities on vocabulary , which could be incorporated into translation courses as well. The book also makes a point about translation as one of the effective ways of presenting new vocabulary alongside with visual techniques, mime and gesture, verbal techniques such as using synonyms or opposites.

Tudor (as cited in Şat, 1996) also reports that translation helped students to increase their vocabulary. According to him, translation operates in a way to raise consciousness, since students focus on forms more explicitly than is the case within communicative methods. In his study Tudor used a text in L1 which students translated into L2 with the help of additional texts in L2 about the same subject. As Tudor's study suggests, it is possible to regard translation as a task which helps direct students' attention on forms. In the remaining section of the review of the literature, then, I will move on to discuss focus on forms as I believe translation may be one way of focusing on forms without neglecting communication.

Focus on Form through Translation

For several decades, teaching of grammar has been an issue which causes argument and disagreement among teachers as well as SLA researchers. Studies that looked into naturalistic L2 acquisition resulted in discussions as to whether to teach or not to teach grammar.

The controversy has been mainly about whether or not to cover grammar, either explicitly or implicitly, and if it is to be covered, in what way it should be done in L2 teaching. In the 1960s, Corder (1967) claimed the existence of a grammatical syllabus inherent in language learners. In 1980s, Krashen (as cited in Ellis, 2006) held the view that teaching grammar had no effect, since it did not result in

acquisition. These discussions were followed by a number of studies. The results obtained through them on the order of acquisition among instructed and naturalistic learners, their success, and whether teaching grammar led to acquisition, (Pica, 1983), (Long, 1983), (White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta, 1991) (as cited in Ellis, 2006) indicates that grammar instruction resulted in attaining higher proficiency within a shorter time, compared to conditions in which no grammar instruction took place. In the light of these arguments, some conclusions for the inclusion of grammar instruction can be drawn. For instance, Long (as cited in Ellis, 2006) argues that emphasising grammar is useful as long as it is in keeping with the natural processes of acquisition. As a way of further response to this ongoing dispute concerning the efficiency of grammar instruction, Genesee (as cited in Ellis, 2006), Harley (1998) stress that the evidence obtained from the immersion programs and naturalistic acquisition research demonstrates that emphasising only meaning in classroom teaching results in an inadequate development of certain linguistic features. In conclusion, the data obtained from these studies suggest that focusing on form within a communicative framework has provided positive results in terms of L2 learning process.

There have been different labels used to address focusing on form, as opposed to teaching which is entirely focused on meaning. Norris and Ortega (2000), call these different terminologies Focus on Form (FonF) and Focus on Forms (FonFS); the first approach holds the premise that forms should be focused on together with meaning in an integrative manner, whereas the latter one involves focusing on form in an isolated way. Doughty and Williams (1988), who support using FonF in the classroom, defines this approach as combining meaning and form through providing

context within a communicative framework. Providing a context is of crucial importance, as Nassaji (1999) stresses the fact that learners tend to make a connection between the things learned and the context, in which they were presented. Furthermore, as Fotos (2002) points out, providing students with feedback after a completion of a task yields positive results in terms of maintaining a connection between the new and old information. In this vein, pure exposure to meaning-focused activities, would disregard an opportunity of embedding form instruction into communicative activities, which might help increase acquisition of linguistic forms. In keeping with this view, the aim of focus on form is not to divorce form from context so as to end up in discrete-point grammar teaching, as these researchers support the view that the ultimate aim of language teaching is being able to use it for communication. Hence, grammar instruction which falls short of addressing meaning is considered to be insufficient by Doughty and Williams (1988). Yet, although there have been different views on focusing on grammar, as the debates on FonF versus FonFS suggest, Norris and Ortega (2000) stress that emphasising form in general has yielded positive results.

However, irrespective of the arguments for the usefulness of grammar instruction, selecting grammatical structures still remains a controversial issue. Yet, Ellis's (2006) proposal that only the grammatical structures which are perceived to be difficult should be incorporated into the curriculum, rather than covering the whole, seems a reasonable solution to the problem. In terms of difficulty, however, it is essential to make a distinction between the difficulty students experience with regard to understanding as opposed to using a particular item actively. For instance, although Turkish learners of English do not experience difficulty in terms of

understanding the form of the present perfect tense, they cannot use the structure correctly in terms of the function it embodies. That is, although they do not have difficulty in learning the tense in question explicitly, they cannot transfer it into implicit knowledge.

Another decision entails which stance to take - reactive or proactive - both of which are regarded as reasonable by Doughty and Williams (1988). Reactive focus on form means being prepared to deal with certain language difficulties as they emerge in the classroom. Proactive focus on form, on the other hand, means to make a decision as to which forms to focus on beforehand.

In the case of maintaining a proactive focus on form, further decisions such as determining the level of explicitness of focus on form, whether to focus on forms in a sequential or integrated way, and finally, the role focus on form plays in the curriculum, should be made. The curricular decisions would include issues such as the kind of tasks and techniques to be used in focusing on forms that pose difficulties to learners and whether to focus on forms in an implicit or explicit manner.

As Schmitt (2000) points out, language teaching cannot be successful without dealing with vocabulary and grammar, which should be addressed to within a meaningful context. Therefore, in order for students to notice the usage of grammatical structures and vocabulary words, translation at paragraph level would help analyze the language within a meaningful context.

All in all, the task of translation might serve as a tool to focus on meaning as well as forms while embodying interaction in terms of group work, the merits of which I discuss below.

Translation as an Interactional Activity

One of the objections to translation directed by the Reformists was that it was an activity which did not foster communication since by its nature it was carried out individually. It is possible, however, to carry out translation within a communicative framework through maintaining interaction in the classroom.

As Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) emphasize, according to Long's interaction hypothesis, interaction facilitates language acquisition. In keeping with this hypothesis, the general tendency in the field of language teaching has been to use groups. Long and Porter (1985) claim that there are at least five pedagogical arguments for the use of group or pair work. First, group work gives students sufficient time to practice language. In contrast, teacher-centered classrooms have been observed to provide less time for student talk as the teacher's talking time is more than half of the total. Second, the quality of student talk is enhanced as students are provided with enough time to elaborate on the language as opposed to the hurried answers they are expected to give in teacher-centered classrooms. Third, group work helps reveal the individuality of each student since it is possible to assign different responsibilities to different students in accordance with their language abilities. Fourth, a positive learning environment can be established by means of freeing the shy and linguistically insecure students from the pressure of speaking in front of the whole class. Last, in the opinion of Long and Porter, it creates a feeling of positive learning experience.

Although translation is a kind of activity which is generally believed to be accomplished individually, this study focuses on translation through interaction. The existence of interaction in the process of translating a text is in keeping with

communicative teaching, which calls for small group work and interaction among students (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003) since it is acknowledged that a group is equipped with more resources than an individual. Earl Stevick (as cited in Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003) also points out that success is dependent more on interaction than on techniques, materials and linguistic analyses. Furthermore, interaction in the group helps individuals promote their own autonomy since being a member of a group requires taking certain responsibilities as they have to work cooperatively to accomplish a given task. All in all, as Rivers (1987) points out interaction has become a central element in foreign language teaching and learning and therefore, in keeping with this finding, this study attempts to justify the use of translation within a communicative framework making use of interaction as opposed to traditional beliefs about translation, which sees it as an activity done individually.

There is an example of application of group work in translation activity in a study carried out by House (1988). She conducted the study at the University of Hamburg to investigate the differences between individual translations and group translations. While the students who translated solo were asked to ‘think aloud’, the pairs were expected to interact in order to translate the given task. The results of the study indicate that students who worked alone felt under pressure to report what they were doing, so they commented on trivial actions as if compensating for the long periods of silence. The pairs on the other hand performed a more natural conversation, since it is normal to talk in a pair or group situation as opposed to the ‘think- aloud’ procedure in which participants are expected to talk to themselves. The researcher concluded that the pairs came up with a more interesting and natural data which was richer in translational strategies. She lists “cooperation” and

“negotiation strategies”, “division of labour”, “problematization”, “testing hypotheses”, “eliciting” and “giving input” among the strategy types she discovered.

Interaction Analysis

As discussed in the previous section, House (1988) made use of two methods to investigate the process of translation activity. One of the methods she used was analysing learners’ interaction during the group work. Irrespective of the positive views about the place interaction has in language learning, which is also suggested by House (1988) in her study, there is not one terminology which is agreed upon by researchers, since the studies carried out on interaction do not have a long history in the field, as Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) point out. The studies are carried out either in terms of data-driven or theory-driven format. In data-driven approach, researchers identify their categories for interaction according to the data they obtained. In theory-driven approach, on the other hand, the investigation is based on theories.

The other method she used, Think-Aloud Protocol (TAP), is a common instrument (Hölscher & Möhle 1988; Krings, 1988) used to analyse the strategies that translators use. As House (1988) comments in her conclusions, which are based on a comparison between using TAP and interaction analysis in translation, interaction analysis provides us with richer and more natural data in terms of hypothesis-testing than that of TAPs. One weakness of TAP is that, it is not natural to speak to yourself when you are performing a task on your own, because the verbalisations of participants run the risk of being artificial. As the human brain operates in a complicated way, expecting a participant to focus on a given activity and verbalise what happens in his mind would not reveal a real picture of the process a person goes through while completing a complex task. The periods of silence reported in

previous TAP studies (House, 1988) reveal that it is inevitable to remain silent when focusing on the task and for this reason the researchers have to keep reminding them that they have to verbalise their thoughts (Ünsalan, 1996). In short, since with the existing knowledge on the human brain we are still far from knowing what really happens in the human mind, Think-Aloud Protocols might not provide us with a full picture of what really goes in the mind. As opposed interaction analysis, on the other hand, not only a communicative situation is created but also more authenticity and less strain on the part of the participants is maintained by means of creating an atmosphere where the talk is a natural process as opposed to resulting as a response to the researchers' directions to keep talking on your own.

Although there is ample evidence that translation can be used within a communicative framework, the inclusion of translation in language classrooms is, as indicated, closely linked with how students' mother tongue is viewed - whether as a drawback or as a useful resource. Therefore, in the following section the current beliefs about the role L1 plays in language classroom is discussed.

The Role of L1 in Foreign Language Classrooms

The role of the students' L1 in translation tasks has witnessed violent swings of the pendulum; as Prator (1979, p.5) puts it, it has been 'emphasized, banned, required, and barely tolerated'. Although The Direct Method excluded the use of translation as a result of prohibiting the recourse to mother tongue, Cook (2001) argues that the avoidance of L1 in language classrooms has no theoretical basis other than its coming into existence out of a reaction to the Grammar Translation Method and some practical reasons such as multilingual classes which resulted from immigration into the English-speaking countries. In such classrooms,

the avoidance of students' L1 would be inevitable since students would have various mother tongues. Apart from lacking a theoretical base to reject mother tongue, the use of L1 is viewed as a useful compensation strategy. Oxford (1990) regards switching to the mother tongue as one of the compensation strategies which students make use of when they need to compensate for their shortcomings not only in understanding a new language item but also in the production stage. Thus, through making use of their mother tongue, learners go on producing the target language despite the shortcomings they experience in the target language. In this light, L1 serves as a facilitator in the process of becoming more proficient in the second language.

Therefore, in recent literature, there is increasing evidence that the use of the L1 has a facilitative role in the language classroom. For instance, Harbord (1992) supports the use of mother tongue on three grounds: it is a learner preferred strategy, a humanistic approach, and an efficient use of time.

First, as Danchev (as cited in Harbord 1992) argues, translation is a natural process even under circumstances where resort to L1 is prohibited. Students attempt to move between two languages in their process of acquiring a second language. Second, it is a humanistic approach which values students' mother tongue in letting students to make use of their mother tongue, to find out how to form an expression in L2. As Cook (2001) mentions there are alternative methods which undertake a humanistic view and make use of L1. The methods he mentions are New Concurrent Method, Community Language Learning, and Dodson's Bilingual Method, all of which make use of translation to facilitate the acquisition of the target language as opposed to the Direct Method, which rejected the use of L1 entirely in the classroom.

Third, it is a time saver as it enables teachers to conduct activities quickly which would consume more time if done in L2 due to students' inefficiency in the target language.

Finally, Atkinson (1993) suggests making use of L1 in various classroom activities such as lead-in, eliciting language, giving instructions and checking comprehension. The aim of using "lead in" is to check quickly whether students understand a situation. For example:

T: Who can tell me where dolphins live?

Can you tell me in Spanish?

S: "Dolphins live in the sea." (in L1)

(Atkinson,1993, p.26)

In terms of eliciting language, that is, extracting knowledge from students instead of spoon-feeding them, L1 might be more efficient than using a picture, realia drawing, and miming. For Example:

T: How do you say (word in L1) in English?

S: (word in English)

(Atkinson, 1993 p.27)

The success of an activity carried out in a classroom mostly would depend on clear instructions. However, it is pointless to try to give instructions for a five minute activity in half an hour in English in an attempt to avoid L1. Giving instructions calls for quickness as well as clarity. There are various techniques to check comprehension such as asking "Do you understand?"(Atkinson, 1993, p.30), using concept questions, and asking for definition. The first technique might not be very efficient as students' response to this question would not be very helpful in revealing

their understanding. It is possible that students might fake understanding simply by responding to the question positively. The other two techniques, that is, concept questions and asking for definition might be very time consuming although they may prove to be very useful. Furthermore, asking for a definition, might be very difficult for students. It might be that students cannot define a word although they grasp its meaning. In such cases recourse to L1, that is using translation, can be the easiest and quickest way to check comprehension, as Nation (2001) also suggests. Moreover, he emphasises that testing vocabulary through L1 eliminates other irrelevant factors which might affect the results under investigation. For instance, testing vocabulary through using L2 would inevitably involve some grammatical structures which might prove difficult for learners. Therefore, the use of L1 for testing vocabulary would eliminate this factor.

In conclusion, the efficiency of the classroom activities in question depends on quickness and linguistic easiness which can be achieved through the use of L1. Having discussed the merits of using L1 in foreign language classroom, I will deal with error analysis, which emerged after some doubts were raised as to the downplaying of students' mother tongue, which was claimed to be the main source of students' errors.

Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis, and Beyond

Error analysis (EA) emerged after the weaknesses of contrastive analysis (CA) were realized. As Schachter and Celce-Murcia (1983) point out, researchers such as Fries (1945), Lado (1957), and Di Pietro (1971), believed that through making comparisons between L1 and L2, the areas where students experience difficulty would be revealed. While attempting to track down the areas of

difficulties, they assumed that L1 was the main source of difficulty in acquiring a second language. Thus, as Gass and Selinker (1994) point out, the role of L1 in second language learning was downplayed as a result of CA which regarded L1 as one of the major drawbacks for learners to acquire the target language. Traditionally, it was believed that L1 led to language transfer, as a result of which errors emerged in the second language.

As Gass and Selinker (1994) point out, CA, which attempted to predict learner errors based on language transfer - students' attempts to apply L1 rules to the target language - failed, since it could not account for all of the errors students made, and some of their predictions as to the areas of difficulty did not occur at all in learners' language production. In addition, the reason for the failure of CA is that it focused on interlingual errors and neglected intralingual errors, which were found to constitute a larger portion of student errors.

As a result of the perceived shortcomings, CA was questioned both theoretically and practically. The advocates of EA suggested that errors would provide a factual data as opposed to theoretical speculations of CA, which was also unpractical in terms of setting out to compare a vast number of languages. In short, as James (1980) claims, while CA remains predictive in nature, 'diagnosis' is one of the features of EA, which emerged as a reaction to CA, as Schachter and Celce-Murcia (1983) point out.

Corder (1967), the forerunner of Error Analysis (EA), claimed that learner error could be significant in determining how and how much learners learn the target language, and through errors we could shed light on how learners discover the rules of the target language. One of the earliest studies about error analysis of learner

language was carried out by Lee (as cited in Schachter and Celce-Murcia, 1983). He suggested collecting learner errors at all stages, from beginning to advanced level, to trace down the errors which endured even in the advanced levels.

In EA a distinction is made between errors of competence, which fall into three subgroups—transfer, intralingual, and unique mistakes in performance, which are subdivided as processing problems and communication strategies.

Within the frame of error analysis, competence errors, which have been considered central to L2 acquisition, have been identified to have different causes.

Richards (1971) divides them into three categories:

1. “Interference errors”, which result from the usage of elements from one language in another language.
2. “Intralingual errors”, that result from the failure to fully understand the system of the target language.
3. “Developmental errors”, which take place when learners try to make assumptions about the target language depending on their limited knowledge of L2 (as cited in Ellis, 1994).

According to Schachter and Celce-Murcia (1983), however, EA has certain shortcomings. For instance, the categorization of errors, as given above, might prove problematic as sometimes it is ambiguous whether the errors produced by students should be categorized as developmental or interlingual errors.

They also stress that, let alone making the distinction between interlingual and developmental errors, it is sometimes difficult to be sure whether the student’s language is deviant or not and if a decision is arrived at as to this point, deciding in which structure the identified error falls, is even a more problematic issue. They

point out that the findings of EA in terms of error frequency might not be generalized as the data used in research is inevitably limited. Furthermore, EA falls short of identifying the areas where students actually experience difficulty. For instance, Schachter (1983) supplies us with data that students avoid using structures when they have difficulty in terms of using those structures. In her study, she found out that Chinese and Japanese students avoided using relative clauses in English. As a result of their avoidance of the structure in question they came up with fewer errors compared to Arabic and Persian students, who produced many more errors with relative clauses since they did not avoid using the structure, however deviant their production might be. Therefore, as EA focuses only what students produce as deviant from the target model, it cannot account for areas of avoidance. Most importantly, while EA focuses on erroneous language, what students can actually produce is neglected.

Yet, although EA has its shortcomings, it provides us with valuable findings as well. One of the most striking findings of Error Analysis was that transfer was not the cause of most learner errors; the majority of errors were attributed to faulty inferences about the system of the target language. Transfer is now regarded as only one of the factors that play a role in L2 acquisition. Furthermore, transfer is seen as a communicative strategy (rather than a learning strategy to develop interlanguage) learners employ when they lack a certain L2 form Newmark (1966) and Krashen(1968) (as cited in Ellis, 1994).

Hence, although it has long been assumed that L1 has a negative impact in terms of causing transfer on learning the target language, the current findings in the field reveal that the effects of L1 appear mostly in terms of accent. The findings do

not suggest L1's negative effects on grammar or syntax. Through error analysis, it was revealed that errors attributed to L1 interference constituted only a small fraction of the total number of errors. (Dulay et al, 1982).

Since the conclusion of EA was that the majority of learner errors were not caused by the L1, this led researchers to ignore the L1 as a factor in second language acquisition and English language teachers to reject the use of L1 in the classroom. However, as discussed above, this view is now changing to accept that L1 can act to facilitate the acquisition of L2, the feature referred to as positive transfer. The facilitation aspect does not show itself in terms of non-existence of errors, in contrast to behaviorist view, but in terms of students' attempts to use the language form- even if it is erroneous in nature.

A study conducted by Mattr (1999) at the University of Bahrain, which makes use of translation as an elicitation technique, also shows that L1 does not have a negative effect on learners in terms of increasing interference.

The researcher carried out this study in order to find out whether Dulay, Burt and Krashen's (1982) hypothesis that "the use of translation as an elicitation technique in FL/SL research artificially increases the L2 learner's reliance on the mother tongue, and accordingly, the proportion of interference errors" (1982, p.258) is valid. The subjects were randomly chosen 60 Arabic-speaking university students who had fairly similar sociocultural and educational backgrounds. These students, however, were at different language levels; therefore they formed five different groups each consisting of twelve students.

In order to find out whether the use of translation as an elicitation technique increased the proportion of interference errors, the researchers chose the use of the

English definite article “the” by Arabic university students as the topic of their research. The reason why this topic was chosen is that the use of definite article poses enormous difficulties for Arabic-speaking students since Arabic has a different system for definiteness and indefiniteness.

As a result of the study, the researchers concluded that Dulay, Burt and Krashen’s hypothesis is not valid. Contrary to their claim, the study conducted with Arabic-speaking students showed that using translation did not increase students’ reliance on their mother tongue. Therefore, the objection that was leveled against translation that it increased the influence of mother tongue, a major drawback which prevented learners from learning new habits - is not a valid argument.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I reviewed the relevant literature on the use of translation in language teaching, both in the past and in the present. Since this issue is closely related to the use of the L1 and whether it has been valued or downplayed in second language teaching, I also briefly reviewed the literature on the role of L1. Now that there is increasing evidence that teachers should draw students’ attention to both grammatical structures and vocabulary words, and in light of the argument that translation can serve as an effective tool in this process, the relevant literature, about focusing on form and vocabulary acquisition is also reviewed. A point is also made about using group work, since it is argued that translation can be used in a communicative way, as well as in a way to enhance noticing. Finally, since an effective application of translation in language classrooms is sought after, error analysis and interaction analysis are discussed.

CHAPTER III : METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The main aim of this descriptive study was to determine the problems students encounter in translating from Turkish to English and the effects of group work on solving these problems.

This chapter includes a description of participants and research setting, a discussion of instruments, including error analysis and discourse analysis of classroom interaction, a description of research procedure and methods of data analysis.

Participants / Setting

The study was conducted at Hacettepe University, Department of Post Preparatory English Courses. In many of the departments whose students go through a preparatory year in English, students are enrolled in translation courses after taking courses in reading, oral skills, writing and business English. It is a two-hour course in which students are expected to translate short passages from Turkish to English and from English to Turkish. The students who take translation courses are generally at upper intermediate level.

The participants of this study were students of the Department of Nutrition at Hacettepe University. I chose this department to conduct my study because the time of the translation course suited my own schedule. The class chosen for the research was composed of ten students who were upper intermediate level. However, I administered my study with five students, the other five students being absent on the day of my data collection. At the time of classroom observation the students were in

their second week in the translation course. Data were collected from five students, who formed one pair and one group of three. In this study characteristics such as educational background, age, gender and so forth were not taken into consideration since they did not have any relation to the study.

Instruments / Materials

In this section I will describe the materials that were gathered for analysis.

Translation Exams

In translation exams administered at the Department of Post-Preparatory English Courses, there are two sections: a passage in English, which students are supposed to translate into Turkish, and a passage in Turkish to be translated into English. For this study a text in Turkish which was used in a previous translation exam was used. The texts used in the translation courses are intentionally written for the purpose of translation and include targeted grammatical items as well as lexical and discursive elements. The targeted grammatical structures in the text used for this study are tenses, passive voice, and modals. In the text there are 13 items including 6 instances of simple past verb tense, two past and three present forms of the verb 'to be', present perfect and past progressive. In the text there is one possibility of using simple past form of passive voice and five possible usages of modals, two past and three present forms. I also investigated the usage of comparatives, prepositions, and plural / singular agreement, which were not targeted items, although they exist in the text. Although students are permitted to use a dictionary during the translation exams, the number of unfamiliar words are limited to a few since looking up each and every word in a dictionary would be time-consuming. Eight lexical items were

identified by the researcher for analysis. In terms of discourse, two linking words were investigated.

For the current study, only 20 of the exam papers translating from Turkish into English were selected for detailed analysis. These 20 papers belonged to students who attended the summer school program last year. Since in the classrooms there are students from various departments in summer schools, the 20 papers I chose represent a heterogeneous selection of translation exam papers. These papers include a wide range of errors students make. The rationale for choosing the translations into English is the fact that they serve as samples for their production, in other words their output in the target language.

For the translation courses run by the Department of Post Preparatory English Courses, texts that are used both in exams and in class are modified texts. Since the aim of translation courses is not to train translators but to help students focus on form in a communicative way, modified texts instead of authentic ones are used, as translating authentic texts is viewed as too difficult for students who are not English majors. These texts are either prepared by teachers from scratch or some existing texts are simplified so as to meet the needs of the students.

The text that is used in this study is about smoking and was written by one of the teachers in the department, who is currently the coordinator of translation courses. The text in question was used in the first midterm exam in the summer school in 2005.

Error Analysis

This study makes use of Error Analysis (EA) to investigate students' errors. As Corder (1967) states, we can benefit from learners' errors in three ways. First,

they provide teachers with the knowledge of their students' degree of mastery in the target language. Second, through errors, researchers can gain insights into how languages are learned. Third, errors make it possible for learners to learn from their own errors by means of receiving feedback from their teachers. Although error analysis has been beneficial on these grounds, it has lost popularity if not completely faded away as a formal research method due to its shortcomings. However, conducting error analyses for diagnostic purposes may be helpful for teachers and may shed light on the process learners go through while they are acquiring English.

In relation to students' errors, it would be worthwhile to differentiate between errors and mistakes. While mistakes can be corrected by learners' themselves, errors are systematic in themselves. This systematicity is a sign that students have developed a system of rules on their own and producing the language in accordance with these rules. In the first stage of the study an error analysis was conducted using existing exam papers to establish the problematic areas in terms of grammar, semantics, and discourse.

Group Interaction

In the second stage of the study, the same text was used in the group work activity, in which students interacted to complete the given task- translating a Turkish text into English. This task enabled the researcher to compare the quality of the individual translations in the form of written exams with the second stage of the research in which interaction takes place in the form of pair and group work. The interactions were audiotaped, transcribed, and translated for analysis. The knowledge of the strategies students use while translating was one of the interests of this study since it would help gain more insights about the nature of translation.

Written Translations of Group

In the second stage of the study, in addition to investigating the interaction, the written translations produced in the groups were also examined.

As explained above, the same text used in the written exam papers was used in the group translation task. While recognizing that the settings were completely different, a comparison was made of the errors in grammar, semantics and discourse on both sets of written translations.

In the second stage of the study, the same text was used to make a comparison between individual work and group work possible. While it is only possible to see the production in the first stage of the study, in the second stage it is possible to see the process which the first stage as well as the production in the form of students' written translations of the Turkish text into English.

Procedure

On February 2006 I received permission from Hacettepe University, School of Foreign Languages to conduct the study. On 10-02-06 I carried out my study in the Department of Nutrition.

In the first stage of the study, 20 written exams from the previous year chosen randomly were analyzed to establish the problematic areas. In this analysis, students' performance was analyzed in terms of grammar, lexis, syntax and discourse. This was accomplished over a period of three months, beginning in December.

In the second stage of the study, a different group of students was given the same text as used in the first stage of the study and divided into groups to translate it. Since the study did not involve classroom observation, the teacher was not present

during the recording of the students' interaction in their groups. The two groups were placed into two different classrooms to avoid problems of recording. Students were tape-recorded while they were interacting about the form and meaning. In this study, tape recording is preferred although using it runs the risk of increasing anxiety on the part of participants. After the study students reported that they forgot the presence of tape-recorders completely. The recordings were then transcribed by the researcher. Before the recording, the researcher did not inform the students about whether to use Turkish or English during group interaction but told the students to do whatever is at their disposal to complete the given task. Since the students preferred Turkish to talk about the target language in terms of both form and meaning, the recordings were translated into English.

Methods of Data Analysis

In the study, two methods of analysis were used, namely, error analysis, and interaction analysis. While error analysis served to investigate the written products of students in both first and second stages of the study, interaction analysis was used to investigate students' interaction in the second stage of the study. Although error analysis provided us with information about the errors made by students, it did not account for the process learners go through in an attempt to produce the target language nor the instances when they avoid certain target language forms. To compensate for these limitations, the researcher made use of interaction analysis which would reveal the process they go through.

In the first stage of the study, existing exam papers were analysed for errors involving grammar, semantics, syntax and discourse. The error analysis was conducted in a data-driven way, that is categories were established according to the

errors that were found in the existing exam papers. In terms of categories, pragmatics and word order were left out the investigation. The reason for this choice was that errors could not be found relating to the first item owing to the fact that the text used in the study was a very controlled text, which did not allow for pragmatic error. The latter, that is, errors relating to word order, were found to be very highly insignificant. After identifying the error types as grammar, semantics, and discourse, the errors were discussed as to their causes. The reason for this is the fact that once the causes of errors were determined, it could be possible to find solutions to these problems.

In the second stage of the study, the recordings of the students were transcribed verbatim and translated into English since students preferred using Turkish to talk about the target language. In order to analyse the data researcher developed a coding scheme based on the strategies as revealed in the data gathered from the five students.

The researcher developed the following coding scheme in order to analyse the students' interaction in the group work. The coding scheme is data-based- that is, it is developed according to the data obtained through students' interaction.

1)Is there cooperation?

2)In what ways do they cooperate?

Negotiation of form (NOF): Negotiation of meaning and form in a combination.

Repetition (R): Instances when students repeat their peers' utterances.

Explanation (E): Instances when learners explain an item in question to their partners.

Correction (C): Students correct their peers' mistakes

Self-correction (SC): Students become aware of their own mistakes and correct them.

Asking for opinion (AFO): Getting peers' ideas when being unsure.

Stating opinion (SO): Students give their opinions either when their peers ask for opinion or on their own account.

Suggestion (S): Students provide alternative ways of translating an item in question

Approval (APP): Accepting a suggestion or opinion of a peer by other peer or peers.

Rejection (R): Not accepting a suggestion or opinion of a peer by other peer or peers.

Guessing vocabulary (GV): Making suggestions as to the equivalent of a lexical item in question without consulting a dictionary.

Consulting a dictionary (CAD): During group work, students discuss the translation of vocabulary items by means of consulting a dictionary.

Abandonment (A): Leaving an item which is found to be problematic to deal with later.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This study was designed to investigate the problems English language students encounter in translating from Turkish to English and the effects of group work on solving these problems.

In order to collect the necessary data for this study two methods were used: error analysis and interactional analysis. First, an error analysis was conducted which involved the investigation of 20 written exam papers. In this analysis students' translations from Turkish to English were investigated in terms of grammatical, semantic and discourse errors. This stage of the study was focused on product, that is, looking at a set of translated texts without reference to the learners who created them. The second stage focused on process by examining small group interaction as learners were engaged in jointly creating a translation. The second stage of the study focused on both the process of translation as a task which was expected to be accomplished through interaction in group work through interaction and the product in the form of written translations of the given Turkish text into English. The interaction that took place within the two groups was audiotaped and transcribed, and this transcription formed the basis of the analysis of the second stage of the study.

This chapter presents first the findings about what kinds of errors these students make while they translate from Turkish to English and what kind of errors most frequently occur. These findings were derived through error analysis. Second,

it presents a description of ways in which learners interact with each other in the process of solving problems of translation. Quantitative procedures were used to analyze the data gathered from the error analysis, and discourse analytic procedures were used in analyzing the group interaction data.

The First Stage of the Study: Error Analysis of 20 Exam Papers

In the first stage of this study, an error analysis was conducted using 20 exam papers to determine aspects of the text that were problematic for the learners, in comparison with a “target” translation. Categories were established and percentages of errors in each category were determined.

The Turkish paragraph, which is originally titled “Sigara” and translated as Cigarette, is composed of nine sentences as given below:

Figure 1: The text as it was presented to the students in Turkish.

Sigara

Sigarayı bıraktığımda çok kötü bir durumdaydım. Öncelikle çok kilo almıştım, çirkin görünüyordum ve kıyafetlerimi giyemiyordum. Daha da kötüsü çok sinirliydim ve herkese bağıryordum. İlk ay geceleri halüsinasyonlar görüyordum. Rüyalarımda hep sigara içiyordum ve bu rüyalardan çok olumsuz etkileniyordum. Sigarayı bıraktığımdan beri iki yıl geçti, şimdi daha iyiyim, sağlığım yerinde. Biraz kilo verebildim ama beş kilo daha vermem gerekiyor. İnsanlarla daha iyi iletişim kurabiliyorum. Gerçekten sigara sağlığa çok zararlı, herkes mutlaka sigarayı bırakmalı.

An acceptable translation can be seen in Figure 2 below. In translating the Turkish text into English more than one option is given since it is used as a key and prepared before the students sit the exam.

Figure 2: The text as translated into English by the researcher

Cigarette

When I stopped /gave up / quit smoking, I was in a terrible state. First, I put on a lot of weight, I looked ugly, and I could not get into / wear my clothes. Worse than that / Even worse, I was very tense / nervous / angry, and I shouted / was shouting at everyone. The first month I had hallucinations at night. I was always smoking in my dreams, and I was affected by the / those dreams very badly. It has been two years since I stopped / gave up / quit smoking, (now) I am / feel better now, and I am healthy / my health is good. I was able to lose a bit of weight, but I have to / need to lose five more kilos. I can communicate with people better. Smoking is / Cigarettes are really very harmful to the health: everybody should definitely stop smoking.

As a result of investigating the student-produced translation exam papers I arrived at the main categories under which I conducted the error analysis. These categories are Grammar, Semantics / Lexis, and Discourse. In terms of grammar, the first midterm exams, like the text I used for the study, focus on three grammatical structures: tense, modal and passive voice. However, as a result of my investigation, I concluded that it would be useful to investigate other grammatical items which are not focused on in the translation courses at the Department of Post Preparatory English Courses. Therefore, I included three more grammatical categories: comparatives, prepositions and agreement of plurality. Semantics is investigated

through the usage of certain vocabulary items as identified by the researcher in the given text. Discursive elements are identified as the linkers that students have to use in order to achieve cohesion within the paragraph.

Students' answers are investigated under six categories: correct, partly correct, incorrect, omission, avoidance, and no answer (NA). For an item to be considered correct, the targetlike structure is sought after. Being partly correct implies that students have developed an understanding of the item in question but have not yet mastered the limitations of the rules referring to the structure that is under investigation. Being incorrect refers to students' answers in which they show no sign of understanding the use of the structure in question. Omission stands for instances when students did not account for the item under investigation. For example, if the students left out the linking word 'even worse/ worse than that in producing "Even worse / Worse than that, I was very tense / nervous... ", it is considered to be omission. Avoidance is the case when students used other structures than the ones that are called for in the translation, such as using active voice instead of passive voice. "NA" (No Answer) is the category used for when students did not provide a translation for the sentence in question.

In the following tables the total number of items was determined according to the possible number of occurrences of each item in the text. This was done by counting the number of possible occurrences in the target text (Figure 2). Then this number was multiplied by 20, the number of the written translation exams that are used in this study for error analysis. The percentages relating to the error types are represented as well. The percentages were derived by means of using the following equation. The total number of any item equals 100%. The scores corresponding to

correct, partly correct, incorrect, omission, avoidance and NA (no answer) categories are equated in relation to the number of total items. For example, The total number of linking words is 40, which equals 100%. The number of correct items in terms of linking words is 17. The percentage of correct items is derived with regard to the following equation: If 40 equals 100%, then 17 equals 43%. (NB, percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.)

Before looking at the results of grammar, lexis, and discourse in isolation, it would be worthwhile to see these three categories together in relation to each other.

Table 1-General Results of Error Analysis on Grammar, Lexis and Discourse.

Error type	Total number of possible occurrences	% of correct items	% of partly correct items	% of incorrect items	% of omission	% of avoidance	% of NA (no answer)
Grammar	520	42	8	28	11	4	6
Lexis	160	59	4	30	-	6	-
Discourse	40	43	1	43	5	-	-

As can be seen in the above given table, the percentages relating to correct items reveal that students performed best in terms of lexis, which is closely followed by discourse and grammar. When the percentages of incorrect items are taken into consideration, they performed worst with discourse, whereas their performance was quite similar with grammar and lexis. The percentages referring to omission, avoidance and no answer constitute a minority, suggesting a low tendency of ignoring the translation of the items in question.

In order to draw conclusions as to the use of grammatical, lexical and discursive items, these three categories are represented in isolation together with their subcategories.

Grammar

Table 2 - Results of Error Analysis of Grammatical Features in Student Translation of the Text “Cigarette”

	Total number of possible occurrences	% of correct items	% of partly correct items	% of incorrect items	% of omission	% of avoidance	% of NA
<u>Grammar</u>							
Tense	260	63	6	28	-	-	3
Modal	100	40	29	5	23	1	2
Passive voice	20	35	15	20	-	20	10
Comparatives	40	30	15	5	-	43	8
Prepositions	60	28	-	27	42	-	3
Plural/singular agreement	40	55	-	30	-	3	8

a) Tense

According to the scheme mentioned above, in order for an item to be marked as correct, the item has to be free of errors in such features as tense and aspect markers. The items were marked as partly correct if the student displayed a knowledge of the tense through the use of helping verbs, or tense markers with a deviation from the targetlike form. For example, when the translation called for the usage of simple past tense, the use of a structure such as “When I was abandon the cigarette”, was marked as partly correct, since the student showed an awareness of the necessity to use past but could not employ the target form in a targetlike manner. “When I leaved cigarette...” was also considered partly correct due to the error in terms of morphology. In this case, the student conjugated the verb “to leave” as if it were regular. Since I dealt with the errors in morphology under the category of “partly correct”, I did not include a separate category for morphology. Students’ answers were marked as incorrect if the students employed a different tense than the one in question. For instance, “When I had given up cigarette, ...” or “When I give up cigarette” were considered incorrect since the students used past perfect and

simple present tense instead of simple past. If there is no answer, that is, if the student did not provide a translation for the sentence in question, then it is categorized as “NA”.

In using tense correctly, students showed some success, as the percentage of correct items is 63. However, in analysing tense it becomes obvious that students confuse structures of different tenses, and use them in a unique combination that result in idiosyncratic structures. For example: “I have been lose weights”, was used in one of the student’s exam papers. This structure might be interpreted as a confusion of present perfect and present perfect continuous tense as a result of inadequate learning or insufficient focus on form.

b) Modal

In investigation of modals the phrases kıyafetlerini giyememek, kilo verebilmek, kilo vermesi gerekmek, iletişim kurabilmek, sigarayı bırakması gerekmek are taken into consideration. In the text there are five possible occurrences of mode, two of which refer to past, and the remaining three to present aspect. In the original Turkish text, kıyafetlerimi giyemiyordum (I could not wear my clothes) and biraz kilo verebildim (I could lose weight a bit) refer to past, beş kilo daha vermem gerekiyor (I have to lose five more kilos), insanlarla daha iyi iletişim kurabiliyorum (I can communicate with people better), herkes mutlaka sigarayı bırakmalı (everybody should definitely stop smoking) refer to the present.

In analysing mode, where the correct usage of modals is dealt with, in order for an item to be considered as correct, it had to fulfill the following requisites.

- 1) the correct choice of modals
- 2) the correct usage, e.g., can + infinitive

3) the correct tense, e.g., could (if it is past)

If these requisites were not fulfilled, then it was categorized as “partly correct”, and if there were no modals used, it was categorized as ‘omission’. The category of avoidance is applied if the students recognized the function of modals but did not supply the form. For example: “I am feeling the necessity of losing five kilos”.

In terms of modals, students’ success remained below 50 %, which was brought about by their partly correct answers, constituting 29%, rather than the incorrect usages, which accounted for only 5 %. In terms of partly correct items students use forms such as “I could lost” ignoring the rule which is could + infinitive and applying simple past conjugation of the verb after “could”. As mentioned above, partly correct items referred to students’ inability to employ the tense as well as choosing the correct modal. Omission was also one of the strategies students used in terms of modals. While there was only one case of avoidance as mentioned above, there were two cases in which students did not account for the sentence in question.

In sum, through the partly correct items we realize that employing the tense aspect together with modals is an issue which has to be taken into consideration. The findings about incorrect usage are inconclusive since they were in minority as students preferred omitting, avoiding and not translating the sentence in question, the rate relating to these three categories being 26% if put together.

c) Passive Voice

For an item to be considered correct, students should account for the correct tense as well as the passive structure. If the students used the correct structure but failed to employ the correct tense, it is considered partly correct. For example: “I

am being affected by these dream”. In this sentence, student was able to use the passive structure but failed to provide for the past aspect. Deviant structures are considered incorrect and if the students used active voice so as to avoid passive voice it is marked as avoidance. Therefore, “I was affecting very negatively” was considered incorrect and “This dreams had influenced the negative to me” is marked as avoidance. If the student left out the part of the sentence referring to passive voice, it is marked as omission.

Passive voice is one of the items which students preferred avoiding, the percentage reaching 20%. In the case of passive voice, students’ avoidance meant their preference to use active voice, ignoring the passive construction. The percentage of “NA” for passive voice was also the highest in the category of grammar in general.

The findings relating to the first three subcategories, which were forms focused on in the translation courses, reveal that while students came up with the highest rate in terms of the correct usage of tense, they also had the highest rate with the incorrect usage of the same subcategory. With modals, the rate of omission, the tendency not to account for the structure in question, was the highest, reaching 23%. Passive voice was the subcategory in which students made use of avoidance by means of using active voice instead.

d) Usage of Comparatives

In the Turkish text two instances of the usage of comparatives are şimdi daha iyiyim(I am / feel better now), and insanlarla daha iyi iletişim kurabiliyorum (I can communicate with people better now). The instances when students produced utterances such as “I can communicate with people more good” are considered partly

correct, since students showed an understanding of comparison, yet failed to apply the rules fully relating to the construction of comparatives. Utterances such as “I get on well with people” are considered to be avoidance. It is a difficult decision to categorize them as avoidance errors since it is also possible that students might not be aware of the difference between the form they use and comparatives.

Nevertheless, since there is no chance of looking into the process students went through in the first stage of the study, I categorized them as avoidance.

Although students learn comparatives in the very initial stages of their English learning, most probably in elementary levels, the error analysis has shown that they perform very poorly with the usage of comparatives, as the majority of students failed to apply the rules of comparative forms of adjectives even though the comparative form of the adjective “well”, which students encounter very frequently, is sought after two times in the text. The students preferred avoiding comparatives as the high percentage 43% referring to avoidance suggests.

e) Prepositions

As for the prepositions, the correct usage of prepositions in time expressions “since”, “for” and “at” and the usage of “to shout at” is investigated. The prepositions of time appear in the translated text as “It has been two years since I stopped / gave up / quit smoking...” or “I have not smoked for two years...” and “The first month I had hallucinations at night”. As to the usage of “to shout at”, it is marked as incorrect if another item is used instead of the particle “at”. If the particle is omitted, it is marked as “omission”.

The results obtained about prepositions reveal that students performed rather poorly in terms of applying the correct usage of prepositions, as the percentage is

28%. However, the percentage of incorrect usage equals 27 %, which is only one point below the percentage of correct items. The reason of low percentages in applying prepositions either correctly or incorrectly rests on the fact that the rate referring to omission is 42%.

g) Agreement of Plurality

In this text the agreement within the phrases “those dreams” and two years is investigated. However ‘these dreams’ is considered as correct (none of the students could come up with “those”) for the sake of only focusing on the agreement within the phrases in terms of agreement of plurality.

In sum, if the subcategories - comparatives, prepositions and plural/ singular agreement - are taken into consideration, we find out that the highest rates of omission and avoidance take place with these subcategories. Thus, students preferred omitting or avoiding the structures, which were not focused on within the course, much more than the structures under focus.

In terms of tense, the percentages in the table above, do not reveal enough to determine which aspects of tense students has difficulty with. Therefore, it would be worthwhile to investigate the items further. To this end, in Table 3 the subcategories are analysed in terms of verb tenses, present and past form of verb to be and aspect-perfective and progressive. In terms of simple present form of verb “to be”, two students used simple present verb tense, that is, they translated the item in question as “I feel well” instead of “I am well”. However, it did not affect the results for the usage of verb “to be”.

Table 3- Analysis of Verb Tenses, Verb “to be” and Aspect

Error type	Total number of items	% of correct items	% of partly correct items	% of incorrect items	% of omission	% of avoidance	% of NA
<u>Verb tenses</u>							
Spast	120	55	11	33	-	-	2
<u>Verb ‘to be’</u>							
Spresent	60	85	-	8	-	-	7
Spast	40	83	-	18	-	-	-
<u>Aspect</u>							
Pperfect	20	35	5	50	-	-	10
Pprogressive	20	40	-	60	-	-	-

Spast: simple past, spresent: simple present, pperfect: present perfect, pprogressive: past progressive

As can be seen in Table 3 above, students achieved a considerable success in terms of using both present and past forms of verb “to be”, as the success rate is 85% with the present, and 83% with the past form of verb “to be”. They also showed some considerable success with simple past, as the rate referring to correct items is 55%. However, in terms of using past progressive and present perfect correctly, the students performed poorly, since the rate of incorrect items referring to present perfect equal 50%, and past progressive 60%.

Finally, as displayed in Table 4 students reached an average success in terms of agreement of plurality. However, if the items investigated under this category are displayed separately, as in Table 4, it is revealed that while students performed quite well in one of the items, they did very poorly in the other.

Table 4 - Plural /Singular Agreement

Error type	Total	% of	% of	% of	% of	% of	% of
	number	correct	partly	incorrect	omission	avoidance	NA
	of items	items	correct	items			
			items				
Plural/singular agreement							
'those dreams'	20	20	-	50	15	-	15
'two years'	20	85	-	5	-	-	10

Maintaining an agreement of plurality is not sought after in Turkish. That is, as long as plurality is indicated, through the use of numbers, there is no need to make the noun that goes with the number plural. For example, the literal translation of 'two years' is "two year" in Turkish. In general, students transfer this feature into English. However, although students achieved fairly well in producing "two years", they had more difficulty in the construction of demonstrative adjective+ noun "those dreams". While achieving success with one of the items, they failed with the latter, in using demonstrative adjectives, in which agreement with their nouns in number is sought after.

Semantics / Lexis

Table 5- Results of Error Analysis of Semantic/ Lexical Items

Error type	Total	% of	% of	% of	% of	% of	% of NA
	number of	correct	partly	incorrect	omission	avoidance	
	items	items	correct	items			
			items				
Semantics	160	59	4	30	-	6	-

In this section, usage of tense is left out of the investigation. Semantic errors are dealt with in terms of correct usage of vocabulary items. The researcher identified the following lexical items in the Turkish test: sigarayı bırakmak (stop/ give up/ quit smoking), kötü bir durumda olmak (to be in a terrible state), kilo almak (to put on weight), çirkin görünmek (to look ugly), kıyafetlerini giymek (get into / wear one's clothes), çok sinirli olmak (to be very angry), halüsinasyon görmek (to have hallucinations), and kilo kaybetmek, (to lose weight). The reason for this choice is the assumption that these items in the text created semantic difficulty for the subjects in this study. For the first item of investigation “to stop / give up / quit smoking”, expressions like stop / drop using cigarette is considered to be incorrect. In the second item of investigation “to be in a terrible state”, the instances when “situation” , “position”and “condition” are used instead of “state” are considered to be incorrect. Student answers such as “I was very bad” instead of “I was in a terrible state” are considered to be avoidance, since students paraphrase, rather than using the structure in question.

In the case of vocabulary, since the students are permitted to use dictionaries during the exam, my assumption was that they would achieve better results than on other items. However, the results proved otherwise.

For this reason, it would be worthwhile to focus on two items of vocabulary, as they might reveal important implications for teaching. In the following table, the percentages belonging to “to be in a terrible state” and “to have hallucinations” are given.

Table 6- Results of Error Analysis Relating to Two Lexical Items

Lexical errors	Total number of items	% of correct items	% of partly correct items	% of incorrect items	% of avoidance
'To be in a terrible state'	20	-	5	50	45
'To have hallucinations'	20	10	-	90	-

As can be derived from the percentages, students performed very poorly on these items. None of the students could use “to be in a terrible state” correctly and only two out of twenty students could use “to have hallucinations” correctly. In terms of using “to be in a terrible state”, students did poorly since they preferred using “situation”, “condition”, and “position”, instead of “state”. In Turkish all four words can be translated as durum. The rate of avoidance reached 45% as students translated the lexical item using structures such as “I was very bad”. Although, they are categorized as avoidance, they also suggest flexibility, the ability to maintain the same meaning using different structures.

Discourse

Table 7- Results of Error Analysis of Discursive Features

Error type	Total number of items	% of correct items	% of partly correct items	% of incorrect items	% of omission
Discourse	40	43	1	43	5

a) Linking Words

Since this is not a translation on sentence level, the elements of discourse are also taken into consideration. However, since this is a very short and controlled paragraph, the only discursive elements under investigation are linkers which are Öncelikle(first/firstly/ first of all) and daha da kötüsü (worse/ even worse).

The coherence within the paragraph is maintained through the use of linkers. The results show that the students performed very poorly in using linkers accurately. However, although they fall short of using the necessary linkers, they try to produce linkers by means of literally translating Turkish linking words into English. This can be interpreted as their awareness of the necessity of maintaining cohesion within the paragraph. For example, students produced utterances such as “before all else” instead of “first”, “firstly” or “first of all”, which reflects L1 influence, and idiosyncratic utterances like “more bad”, “most badly”, and “moreover than worst”. The table given below shows the percentages of the usage of the linkers separately.

Table 8- Errors on linking words

Discourse errors	Total number of items	% of correct items	% of partly correct items	% of incorrect items	% of omission
First/	20	80	-	20	-
Firstly					
Worse/	20	5	20	65	10
even worse					

In Table 8, students' use of linking words suggests that while they reached a

very high rate with the usage of “First/ firstly/ first of all”, they did very poorly with the next item, “Worse/ even worse”. The discrepancy between the rates relating to the linkers in question might suggest that students experienced difficulty with regards to the latter. However, the nature of analysing written texts for errors does not reveal what led the creators of the texts to perform very differently with these two linkers.

In the first stage of the study, I presented and analysed the findings relating to the student- produced English texts translated from Turkish. However, since I did not have the possibility of looking into the process students go through while creating the texts, the findings of the first stage does not allow me to draw strong conclusions as to the reasons of the deviant structures and instances of avoidance or omission. Therefore, in order to compensate for these shortcomings of analysing written texts, I conducted an interaction analysis, which provided me with the insights into the process students go through in producing the texts in English. In the following section, I relate the findings of interaction analysis on students’ translation of the Turkish text into English as opposed to individual translations, which was the focus of the first stage of the study.

Second Stage of the Study: Investigation of Translation as an Interactive Process

In the second stage of the study the process of translation was analysed. In order to achieve this, students were recorded while they were working on the task of translation. In this way, the findings of this second stage of the study have provided us with information about the process of translation which could not be observed in the first stage due to the nature of written exams which focus on the product. In this stage students also produced written translation as a result of their interaction in their

pair or group work. Their written texts were also analysed for errors and compared with the results obtained in the first stage of the study through error analysis.

Analysis of Transcripts

In order to analyse the transcripts, the researcher has developed a coding scheme rather than using ready-made schemes (see Appendix). Therefore, the analysis is not theory-driven but data-driven as the coding scheme is prepared according to the data obtained through the analysis of student interaction in the second stage of this study. The coding scheme that is used in this study is as follows:

- 1) Is there cooperation?
- 2) In what ways do they cooperate?
 - a) negotiation of form
 - b) repetition
 - c) explanation
 - d) correction
 - e) self-correction
 - f) asking for opinion
 - g) stating opinion
 - h) suggestion
 - i) approval
 - j) rejection
 - k) guessing vocabulary
 - l) consulting a dictionary
 - m) abandonment

In the data obtained through the recording of student interaction, the students have made use of the above given 13-fold interaction types. As Barkhuizen and Ellis (2005) define, negotiation of form is a combination of “negotiation of meaning” and “focus on form”. That is, whether students focus on form through interaction. During the group work, students ask for their partners’ opinion as a way of interacting with their partners. It might lead one of the partners to state their opinion. Students explain an item in question to their partners by elaboration when the item poses difficulty on their peers. One other way is to restate an item, which was produced erroneously by a peer, with correction. In this case, students do not provide an explanation for their partners. It is also possible that students correct their own mistakes while they are interacting with their peers, which is coded as “self-correction”. In the case of not being clear about how to solve the given task, they refer to their partners’ opinion and as a result one of the partners can make a suggestion which might be accepted or rejected. During their interaction, they also try to guess vocabulary, as well as consulting their dictionaries, bilingual ones and machine translators. As the dictionaries they used in this study did not provide them with much information as to the usage of the vocabulary words in context, they had to make do with guessing words to a some extent. When students find an item difficult, they leave or abandon that item to return to later.

1) Is there cooperation?

From the beginning to end students work on the task together as the recorded dialogue of both Group A and B suggest. Although one of the students in Group A seems to be more dominant (probably because of her better mastery over the target language), she asks her friend’s opinions. Therefore, the difference between their

level of mastery does not hinder interaction between the two students in their process of completing the given task.

2) In what ways do they cooperate?

The data obtained through Group A and B's interaction to complete the given translation suggests the existence of cooperation since they continuously interact in terms of the above given coding scheme. Both group A and B manifest cooperative learner behavior in terms of asking and sharing each other ideas in order to reach a consensus.

(In the transcriptions below, the following distinctions are made: The font type Lucida console is used to indicate that the students are reading the given text. In the rest of the text Times New Roman is used. The majority of the dialogue is in Turkish. Therefore, translation of the researcher is given in parentheses. Boldface and italics are used to indicate when students speak in English. In cases where it is clear that students are writing, they are underlined.)

Negotiation of Form

Example 1 (Group A)

- A: `sigarayı bıraktığımda çok kötü bir durumdaydım`
(when I gave up smoking I was in a terrible state)
left mi diyeceğiz burda?
(shall we say *left* here?)
- B: hmm...
- A: ***give up***
- B: ***when I...***
- A: ***give up...***
- B: hmm
- A: bir şeyi bırakmak (to give up something)
- B: sigarayı bıraktığımda...***when...***
(when I gave up smoking.. ***when.....***)
- A: bıraktığımda... (when I gave up...)
- B: bıraktığım zaman anlamında değil mi?
(it means at the time I gave up...isn't it?)
- A: ha ha..(yeah) ***when I give up ci...garette***

- A/B: *cigarette*
 A: *I was in a* nokta nokta nokta *situation* mı?
 (*I was in* dot dot dot is it *situation?*)
 B: *I was very terrible*
 A: dur...*when I gived... give up?... GAVE up*
 (wait...*when I gived... give up?... GAVE up*)
 B: *gave up*

The first thing Group A does when they set out to translate the given text is to search for the equivalent for sigarayı bırakmak in English which could be expressed using give up / stop / quit smoking. However the first hypothesis of Student A is to use “left”, the past form of the verb “leave” as in Turkish the idea of giving up, quitting or stopping is expressed using the term bırakmak which is in the intransitive form, at least, would translate as “to leave” in English. First student A asks her partner’s opinion, and after 15 turns they are able to come up with the correct expression as well as the correct morphological structure.

Although they have found “gave up” through negotiation of form, they revert to “left” again when their attention is on another form, as shown in example 2 below. However, through interaction they come up with the correct solution, as seen in the last line of the example. This might suggest that focusing on the forms within group work is more effective than it would be in a teacher-fronted classroom since students are involved in the process actively.

Example 2 (Group A)

- A: ya da sigarayı bıraktığımdan beri
 (or since I gave up smoking)
two years passed after I left... sigara..sigaraa (laughs)
 B: *since* kullanırız (we use *since*)
 A: hmmm
 B: *past... past* olur... Beri iki yıl *for* olur
 (*past...*it would be *past...* since two years it would be *for*)
 A: ya da iki yıldır sigara içmiyorum
 (or I have not smoked for two years)
 A/B: (laugh)

- B: napalım yaa?
(what shall we do?)
- A: şimdi daha iyiyim sağlığım yerinde
(Now I feel better and my health is fine)
- B: geldik buraya kadar burada kaldık yani
(we have come so far and now we are stuck here,you know!)
- A: **give up** kullanacağız yine, di mi?
(we shall use **give up** anyway right?)
- B: evet...BIRAKTIĞIMDAN BERİ (yes... SINCE I GAVE UP)
- A: bakıyorum.... dününden beri... **since yesterday..since I left cigarette** diyeceğiz
(I am looking it up... since yesterday...**since yesterday**...We shall say **since I left cigarette**)
- B: tamam...**since** demiştim ben zaten
(ok... I already said “**since**”)
- A: (checks dictionary)Tamam da bak dört aydan beri var **for four month** var
(ok but look there is **for four months** here)
- B: **for four month...**
- A: yok (no)
- B: **since** olur ama bu (“but it would be **since**”)
- A: o zaman şey ama iki yıldan beri sigarayı bıraktım olur o aman...**since I left... since I give up** aman **since two years I give up** öf **I gave up cigarette since two years** mi diyeceğiz o zaman ?... iki yıldan beri sigarayı bıraktım
(then er but it would be I gave up cigarette for two years. Then shall we say
► **since I left... since I give up** er **since two years I give up** aargh **I gave up cigarette since two years?**)

Example 3 (Group B)

- A: insanlarla daha iyi iletişim kurabiliyorum
(I can communicate with people better)
- B: iletişim **communication**
- A: kurmak ? (to establish?)
- B: eee?
- A: (pressing the buttons of the machine translator)
direk iletişim yazsak iletişim iletişim (shall we write communication communication)
- B: kurmak ne? (what is to establish?)
- A: yazmıyor (it is not here)
- C: **I have communication** diyelim direk (let's say **I have communication**)
- A: ya da **I can communiCATE**..evet **I can** kurabiliyorum ebilmek **can** mi diyeyim oraya **I can communicate** mi diyeyim kurabilirim oldu ama **can..communicate people with peoples** aman **people**
- B: **with peoples** aman **people**
- A: **I can communicate** DAHA İYİ DAHA İYİ (BETTER BETTER)
- B: **with people very well** daha iyi (better)
- A: hayır çok iyi oluyor (laughs)(no it isn't it is very well)
- B: **so good** falan olur mu?

(can it be something like *so good*)

A: *more*

B: *more*

A: ya da *beTTER* direk *people better* daha iyi
(or *beTTER people better* is better)

In the above given excerpt, students better their utterances through negotiation. First Student C suggests using “I have communication”. While all the group members were reflecting on how to convey “I can communicate with people better”, student A derives the verb “to communicate” out of “communication” without consulting to dictionary. At that stage what they were able to produce was “I can communicate with people very well”. Then Student A rejects and explains that what is conveyed is not “to communicate better” but ‘to communicate very well’. In the end, what they reach is “I can communicate with people better” which might not have been reached if these students were doing individual translation since all three of the group members poured their knowledge in to be able to come up with this statement.

Repetition

Example 4 (Group A)

A: bıraktığımda... (when I gave up...)

B: bıraktığım zaman anlamında oluyor değil mi?
(it means at the time I gave up...isn't it?)

A: ha ha..(yeah) *when I give up ci...cigarette*

A/B: *cigarette*

A: *I was in a ...is it situation?*

B: *I was very terrible*

A: dur...(wait)...*when I gived... give up?... GAVE up*

B: *gave up*

A: *gave up ...cigarette I was in a bad ...*

B: *situation*

A: *and shouting... everybody*

B: and

A: *shouting AT everybody*

B: bağıryordum (I was shouting) *I was shouting*

A: *I was shouting*

- B: *I was so angry and I was shouting a everybody*
A: niye tekrar *I was* diyorsun ki gerek yok ki *I was so angry and shouting ...*
(why do you say *I was* again there is no need *I was so angry and shouting...*)
B: nerden anlaşılacak orda onu kullandığın çünkü *was* dan sonra *so angry*
kullanmışsın bir kere... değil mi?
(how would it be clear that you used it there because you said *so angry* after
was ...am I right?)
A: bilmiyorum...(I do not know) *shouting at...*

Above, there is an instance of repetition. Here the repetition takes place right after student A has come up with the correct form of “gave up”. When Student A comes up with the correct structure, her partner repeats what Student A has found out as well as finishing the sentence for her. Since this activity calls for interaction within group work as opposed to traditional translation activities which are carried out solo, students make oral translations. While making these oral translations, they become aware of the language as well. Student A not only comes up with “gave up” but also she betters her first utterance which was “and shouting...everbody” as “shouting at everybody” by means of focusing on form under the environment which is created through group work. Student A objects to her peers repeating “I was” since she think there is no need to do that. She tries to explain the rationale for her repeating the form. I think what is more important is not whether their argument is justifiable or not, but they are focusing on whether what they translate has clarity or not.

Explanation

Example 5 (Group A)

- B: *put on weight*...put on weight kullanmayalım ama böyle tam
bir kalıp gibi
(*put on weight*... let's not use *put on weight*, it sounds like a
fixed expression)
A: ama niye ki başka nasıl söyleyeceğiz?
(but...why? ...but how else can we express put on weight?)
B: ama çok kilo aldım diyor

- (it says I put on LOT OF weight)
- A: e tamam?
(so?)
- B: ama kilo aldım diyor ÇOK nasıl dersin?
(but it is I put on weight, how would you use LOT OF)
- A: ÇOK da eklersin
(you would add LOT OF)

In group A , Student B suggests not using “put on weight”, as she thinks it might not be the correct expression. She is not sure how to express “ to put on a lot of weight” in English. Her partner, on the other hand, explains to her that they could simply add “lot of” to “put on weight”. Here the interaction between the students enables Student B to overcome a difficulty she experiences through her partner’s explanation.

Example 6 (Group A)

- A: ilk ay geceleri halüsinasyonlar görüyordum
(First month I had hallucinations at nights)
first month (laughs) I was dreaming mi olur ya da *seeing hallucinations in my dream dream* olmaz rüya gibi bir şey yok
(will it be *first month (laughs) I was dreaming or seeing hallucinations in my dream dream* no there is nothing like dreaming)
- B: ama gece rüyasında mı görüyor?
(but does she have hallucinations in her dream?)
- A: *first night* aman *first month I was seeing hallucinations at nights*...olur mu?
(can it be first night er first month I was seeing hallucinations at nights?)
- B: evet (yes)
- A: *first month I was.. see* mi olur?
(will it be *first month I was.. see*?)
- B: *seeing* olur
(it would be *seeing*)
- A: *seeing hallucinations*... herhalde böyle yazılıyordur
(I guess it would be written like this)
- B: hummm
- A: *at my dream ya da at nights* olur
(it would be at my dream or at nights olur)
- B: *at night* olur
(it would be *at night*)
- A: *nights... nights*... rüyalarım da hep sigara içiyordum ve bu rüyalardan çok olumsuz etkileniyordum
(I was always smoking in my dreams and I was badly affected by these dreams)

- B: ama ilkay gece halüsinasyonlar görüyordum da rüya anlamında mı diyor acaba?
(but does she mean dreams when she says I had hallucinations ?)
- A: hayır, rüya rüya değil...halüsinasyon rüya da mı görülür?
(no dream it is not dream... do you have hallucinations in dream?)
- B: yoo hayır rüyalarımnda hep sigara içiyordum...*in my dreams*...
(no I was always smoking in my dreams...*in my dreams*)

In the above given excerpt, Student A clarifies the confusion student B has about ‘having hallucinations’ by asking questions which leads Student B to reflect on this item. Student B consults her friend in order to get the meaning of “hallucinations” before going on with the translation. Student A makes it clear for her peer by means of asking whether you have hallucinations in dreams as a means of explanation.

Correction / Self-correction

Example 7 (Group A)

- B: olumsuz etkilemek (to negatively affect)
- A: ETKİLENMEK (TO BE AFFECTED)
- B: rüyalar beni olumsuz...
(these dreamsvery negatively)
- A: *to be influenced to be affected to be impressed by*
- B: etkilenmek
(to be affected)

In the above given excerpt student B helps her partner when Student A cannot differentiate between active and passive, that is etkilemek, (to affect) and etkilenmek, (to be affected).

Example 8 (Group A)

- A: o zaman şey ama iki yıldan beri sigarayı bıraktım olur o zaman...*since I left.... since I give up* aman *since two years I give up* öff *I gave up cigarette since two years* mi diyeceğiz o zaman?... iki yıldan beri sigarayı bıraktım (then er but it would be I gave up cigarette for two years. Then shall we say *since I left... since I give up* er since two years I give up aargh I gave up cigarette since two years?)

In the above given excerpt student A becomes aware of her own erroneous language and while verbalising the English translation of the Turkish statement, she corrects her own utterance.

Stating / Asking for Opinion

Example 9 (Group A)

- B: Ne kullanalım?
(what shall we use?)
A: **shouting...shout** olur
(it would be **shout**)
B: **shout** olur

Above, student B asks her partner's opinion about what to use. In return, student A states her opinion that it would be "shout". The statement of opinion is approved by her partner as Student B repeats her friend's utterance.

Example 10 (Group B)

- A: **in fact smoking....harmful..is very harmful to health** diyorum
(I say **in fact smoking....harmful..is very harmful to health**)
C: çok garip oldu
(it sounds very strange)
A: ne diyeyim? siz söyleyin
(what shall I say you two tell me)
B: yaz yaz (in a low voice) sen karışma (go on writing)(you don't interfere)

While Student A is writing the statement in question, student C gives her opinion that it sounds very strange. On this, student A asks her friends to supply her with an alternative. However, Student B wants student A to continue without student C interfering. In this case, student C's objection is ignored by Student B.

Suggestion

Example11 (Group B)

- A: tamam o zaman yazıyorum... o zaman **when I gave up smoking** diyorum...
B: **when I gave up smoking**
A: böyleydi değil mi?

- (it was like this wasn't it?)
- B: hı hı
(ok then I write I say *when I gave up smoking...*)
- B: *I was very bad*
- A: *I was...so bad very bad* yazdım
(*so bad ...I've written very bad*)
- C: *I was in a very bad condition* falan olmaz mı?
(isn't it something like *I was in a very bad condition*)
- A: aa kötü durumdaydım daha güzel
(“I was in a terrible state” is more beautiful)
- B: evet
- A: silgi? (eraser?)
- A: *I was?*
- B/C: *in a bad condition*

In group B, students are able to find a better solution through negotiation of form although the answer they came up with is not exactly the correct answer. First Student A suggests using “I was very bad”. After her suggestion, Student C suggests “I was in a very bad condition” which is accepted as a better option by all the group members. What is important here is not whether students are able to produce error-free utterances but the fact that they consult each other and make judgements about each others' suggestions. After all, “was in a very bad condition” is a better option than the initial suggestion.

Rejection / Approval

Example 11 (Group A)

- B: *put on more weight... I had...I have... put...*
- A: *had*
- B: *have* de kullanılıyormuş demin de hoca dedi ya
(We can use *have* too... teacher said so)
- A: hayır (no) *had*
- B: ay tamam tamam be öff (oh...ok..ok)

Example 12 (Group B)

- C: *firstly I put*
- B: *I put*
- C: *put* zaten gene aynı *put on*
(*put* remains the same *put on*)

- B: **very**
 C: hayır **very weight** olmaz
 (no you can't say **very weight**)
 A: **very weight** olmaz
 (**very weight** is not possible)
 A: o zaman **I put on weight** diyorum sadece **I put on weight**
 (then let's say only **I put on weight I put on weight**)

In the above given excerpts, their interaction goes on in the form of rejecting and approving each others' hypothesis. In Group A, Student B's suggestion is rejected by Student A whereas she accepts Student A's option. In Group B, Student B suggests 'very weight' which is rejected by the other two members of the group.

Guessing Vocabulary

Example 13 (Group B)

- A: öncelikle çok kilo almıştım
 (first I put on a lot of weight)
 C: çirkin görünüyordum...
 (I seemed ugly...)
 B: **firstly**
 A: (**firstly**) evet kilo almak?
 (to put on weight?)
 C: çok güzel ben bilmiyorum onu
 (fine I do not know that)
 B: hı?
 C: ben bilmiyorum onu
 B: ben de bilmiyorum bakıyorum şimdi
 (I do not know either I am looking it up now)
 A: kilo almak kilogram çıkıyor kilo vermek neymiş? **to lose weight** o zaman almak
 (here there is kilogram what is to lose weight? **to lose weight** then to put on weight ..)
 C: **to get weight** dir belki
 (may be it is **to get weight**)
 A: ha kilo almak **to put on weight**
 C: hah

In the above given excerpt student C tries to find a solution as to how to translate kilo almak (to put on weight) into English. She forms her hypothesis through the opposite of "to put on weight" which is "to lose weight". As a result, she

comes up with the term “to get weight”. Although this is not the correct solution, it is a very sophisticated guess and it is important in terms of how student work together to find a better solution.

Example 14 (Group B)

- C: halüsinasyon görmek... sanal da denebilir aslında
(in fact we can say virtual reality too)
- B: hı?...
A: orda da mı yok?...peki bir şey soracağım mesela *see*'nin '*ing*'sini biz ne yapıyorduk?
(it isn't there either? what were we doing with the *ing* of *see*?)
- C: *seeing* yok ki
(there is not *seeing*)
- A: tamam işte ne yapıyorduk?
(ok what were we doing?)
- C: aynen yazıyorduk
(we were writing it as it is)
- A: mesela görüyordum de .. ciddi söylüyorum
(for example say I was seeing ...I am serious)
- B: *looking* olabilir mi?
(can it be *looking*?)
- A: *looking* bakmak ama
(but *looking* means looking)
- C: hayır *I am looking* denilince görünüyorum da denir
(no *I am looking* can mean I was seeming too)
- A: öyle mi (really?)
- C: hı hı halüsinasyona sanal manal mı diyelim ne diyelim?
(shall we say something like virtual reality for hallucination?)
- A: *I was looking*
- C: *hallucination* 'ın İngilizcesini söylüyorum
(I am talking about the English version of hallucination)
- A: *I was looking hallucination* yazıyorum
(I am writing *I was looking hallucination*.)

Above the students' interaction goes on to overcome the translation of “I was having hallucinations”, which poses both grammatical and lexical difficulties on the students. Student C suggests using “virtual reality” for “hallucination”.

Student A is not sure whether “see” takes “ing”, so in order to clarify her confusion she asks the other members of the group to tell her their ideas. Student A asks her

friends to give her the English equivalent of görüyordum. The problem here arises from the fact that translating it would not solve the problem since when regarded out of its context, görüyordum would be translated as ‘I was seeing’ which would not collocate with “hallucination”. While Student A was concentrating on how to express the act of having hallucinations, Student C is thinking about “hallucination” in terms of lexis.

Example 15 (Group B)

- B: daha iyi **be better of** demiş
(for better it says **be better of**)
- A: ne demiş onun işte tersini yazalım
(what is it let’s write the opposite)
- C: **be worse off** yaz o zaman
(then write **be worse off**)
- A. devamında da başka bir şey yok zaten
(there is not anything else)
- A: daha da kötüsü orda daha da iyisi mi vardı neydi o?
(even worse was there better there what was it?)
- B/C: **be better off**
- A: o zaman biz de **be more bad ..off** diyelim...tamam belki de olur
- B: şuraya da bakayım da ben... **be better off** da o zaman **be worse off** mu olacak?
- A: **more bad**
- B: **bad worse** oluyor **more** olmuyor
- A: öyle mi iyi o zaman
(ok fine)

Consulting a Dictionary

In the group work students used bilingual dictionaries and machine translators. While the bilingual dictionaries provided them with the equivalents of Turkish words in question, they did not find these words’ usage in context in the dictionaries and machine translators they used. The absence of example sentences caused some problems.

Example 16 (Group A)

- A/B: (they check machine dictionary) **put on weight**
- A: **first of all...** almıştım...

(***first of all...*** I put on ...)

- B: ***put on weight...*** ***put on weight*** anlamında kullanmayalım ama tam böyle bir kalıp oluyor (S)
(let's not use ***put on weight***, it sounds like a fixed expression)
- A: ama niye ki kilo almayı başka nasıl kullanacağız?
(but...why? ...but how else can we express put on weight?)

In the above given excerpt, although the students found put on weight in the dictionary, Student B hesitates to use it. If the dictionary they used had provided an example sentence to highlight the usage of the lexical item in question, she probably would have been clearer about it.

Example 17 (Group A)

- A: ilk ay geceleri halüsinasyonlar görüyordum
(***first month I had hallucinations at night***)
- A: ***first month*** (laughs) ***I was dreaming*** mi olur ya da ***seeing hallucinations in my dream dream*** olmaz rüya gibi bir şey yok
(will it be ***first month*** (laughs) ***I was dreaming*** or ***seeing hallucinations in my dream dream*** no there is nothing like dreaming)
- B: ama gece rüyasında mı görüyor?
(but does she have hallucinations in her dream?)
- A: ***first night*** aman ***first month I was seeing hallucinations at nights...*** olur mu?
(can it be ***first night*** er ***first month I was seeing hallucinations at nights?***)
- B: evet (yes)
- A: ***first month I was.. see*** mi olur?
(will it be ***first month I was ..see?***)
- B: ***seeing*** olur (SO)
(it would be ***seeing***)
- A: ***seeing hallucinations...*** herhalde böyle yazılıyordur
(I guess it would be written like this)
- B: hmmm

Example 18 (Group B)

- A: peki halüsinasyon görmek ***see*** ile mi kullanılıyor?
(does hallucination collocates with ***see?***)
- C: galiba öyledir (I think so)

Above, students could not find “to have hallucinations” in their Turkish-English dictionaries. Since the use of collocations do not match each other in Turkish and English, they had to make use of their L1 translating the phrase word by

word. In this situation, using a dictionary of collocations would have been of great help.

The following example also shows that the dictionaries the students used did not meet their needs.

Example 19 (Group B)

A: daha da kötüsü nasıl deriz ki..kötü daha da kötüsü (checks)..niye yazmıyor?
(how can we say even worse ...worse.. even worse why isn't it in the dictionary?)

Abandonment

Example 20 (Group B)

- A: *I was looking hallucination* yazıyorum
(I am writing *I was looking hallucination*.)
- B: tamam (ok)
- C: ya burda ama *I was looking* olmaz ki ama
(but here *I was looking* is not possible)
- A: tamam işte onu de görüyordum de nasıl diyeceksin deyin o zaman soruyorum işte
(ok I say that say I was seeing how will you say that I am asking you)
- C: ya yor deme gör
(do not use I was doing see/)
- B: neyse geçelim orayı en son döneriz
(whatever let's skip it we will come back to it later)
- C: (in a low voice) her yeri öyle yaptın zaten (laughs)
(you did so all the time)

Above, student A and B seem to be in agreement to use “I was looking hallucination” when Student C objects to this. To this objection, Student A’s reaction to Student C is to ask her how she would produce the utterance in question. It appears that Student C is concentrating on not using past progressive aspect. As a disagreement emerges, student B suggests leaving that part to return later.

Overall, students manifested cooperation in completing the task of translation which is traditionally believed to be an activity which is carried out in isolation.

Furthermore, through translation, students' awareness of the fact that there is not one to one equivalence between the two languages increases. They become aware of the fact that it is not possible to translate word by word. The following excerpt from the interaction of Group B reveals the fact that translation can be used as a task to raise consciousness.

Example 21 (Group B)

- A: sağlığım iyi bire bir vermek zorunda mıyız ki?
(do we have to translate "I am healthy" word by word?)
C: veremiyoruz ki (laughs)
(we can't do it)

After the groups completed translating the Turkish text into English, we held a discussion session, in which the two groups presented their translations to the whole class, which was followed by suggestions both from the students and the researcher. In the discussion session, the fact that there is not only one correct translation, but that it is possible to convey the same message using different forms was emphasized. Students especially paid attention to the feedback which involved areas that they had difficulty with, such as when the use of present perfect was needed, as well as the use of collocation and the Turkish word, durum, which has more than one equivalents in English. In general, students' reaction to the translation activity through group work was very positive.

Written Translations as Produced by Group A and B

Below are the written translations of Group A and Group B as a result of their interaction that took place during the in-class translation task. I examined these two translated texts by means of applying the same categories as in the first stage of the study.

Figure: 3 Written Translation of Group A (2 Students)

When I gave up cigarette I was in a bad situation. First of all I had put on more weight, looked ugly and I couldn't wear my clothes. Worsen than this I wa so angry and I was shouting at everybody. First month I was seeing halusinations at nights. I was always smoking at my dreams and I was negatively affected by this dreams. Two years passed since I gave up cigarette; now I'm better and healthier. I could loose a little weight but I must loose still 5 kilos. I can better communicate with people. Infact cigarette is so harmful for health and everybody must give up cigarette.

Figure 4: Written Translation of Group B (3 Students)

When I gave up smoking, I was in a bad condition. Firstly, I put on weight, I seemed ugly and I wasn't wearing my clothes. Be worse off I was very nervous and I was shouting everybody. The first month's I was looking halucination at night. I was always smoking in my dreams and I was affected by these dreams. Two years passed since I gave up smoking, now I am so good, my healt is well. I might loose some weight but I should loose five kilos. I can communicate with people better. In fact smoking is very harmful to health, everybody must give up smoking.

Table 9 below shows that the groups' performance was best in terms of lexis, which is closely followed by grammar. However, the groups' performance did not exceed 50% in terms of discourse. Each of these categories is discussed below.

Table 9- General Results of Error Analysis on Grammar, Lexis and Discourse.

Error type	Total number of possible occurrences	% of correct items	% of partly correct items	% of incorrect items	% of omission	% of avoidance
Grammar	52	78	-	17	3	2
Lexis	16	82	-	19	-	-
Discourse	4	50	25	25	-	-

Grammar

Table 10 - Results of Error Analysis of Grammatical Features in Group A and B's

Translation of the Text 'Cigarette'

	Total number of possible occurrences	% of correct items	% of partly correct items	% of incorrect items	% of omission	% of avoidance
<u>Grammar</u>						
Tense	26	81	-	19	-	-
Modal	10	60	-	30	-	10
Passive voice	2	100	-	-	-	-
Comparatives	4	75	-	25	-	-
Prepositions	6	83	-	-	17	-
Plural/singular agreement	4	75	-	25	-	-

The above-given table reveals that students experienced the most difficulty in terms of modals. While the percentage referring to correct items is the lowest, incorrect items is the highest. Furthermore, 10% is the rate of avoidance.

Semantics / Lexis

Table 11- Results of Error Analysis of Semantic/ Lexical Items

<u>Error type</u>	Total number of items	% of correct items	% of partly correct items	% of incorrect items
Semantics	16	82	-	19

Semantics was the area in which students performed best. The instances when they experienced difficulty was when the use of collocations were called for and when the L1 item had multiple equivalents in the target language.

Discourse

Table 12- Results of Error Analysis of Discursive Features

<u>Error type</u>	Total number of items	% of correct items	% of partly correct items	% of incorrect items
Discourse	4	50	25	25

Students achieved the lowest success in terms of using linking words correctly. However, there is no instance of omission in this category. Although students did not reach a high success in terms of producing correct linking devices, their interaction in their groups revealed that they were aware of the need of using them, although they could not use them properly owing to their lack of knowledge as to the linking words, and inefficient dictionary-use skills.

Conclusion

In this chapter I presented the findings about what kinds of errors students made while they translated from Turkish to English and what kind of errors most frequently occurred. Secondly, I presented a description of ways in which learners interacted with each other in the process of overcoming problems of translation.

Although it is not valid to make a comparison between the first and second stages of the study, since the circumstances under which translations produced were different, as well as the fact that the participants of the two stages were different students, the ranking of the error types is the same with first stage of the study.

There was a significant difference in the outcomes when translations were produced singly in the first stage of the study and when produced in group work. Both Group A and B maintained a considerable success in terms of grammar, semantics and discourse. They did not avoid using passive voice and modals, which were the items students tended to avoid in solo translation in the first stage of the study.

All in all, although students in the second stage of the study experienced similar difficulties as in the students in the first stage, they were able to overcome a considerable amount of the problems they encountered while translating the given Turkish text.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study was intended to examine the problems English language students experience in translating from Turkish to English and the impact of group work on solving these problems.

Data consisted of 20 pre-existing written translation exams, recorded interaction in groups working on translating the same text, and the written translations produced by the groups. Analyses included error analysis, to determine the kinds of errors students make in translating, and interaction analysis, to determine how students interacted to complete the task of translation.

Findings and Discussion

In this section the results of the study are discussed in response to each of the three research questions posed.

Types of Errors

Before I started with this research, my assumption was that students would encounter difficulties in grammar, vocabulary, discourse, word order, and pragmatics. However, through my initial investigation of the student-produced translations, I was not able to find errors in pragmatics, for example errors related to style or register. And the few errors referring to word order were of no significance. The students did not have many problems with the word order of the target language although English and Turkish have completely different structures. However, the absence of these types of errors can be related to the fact that the text used in this

study was highly controlled and did not pose difficulties in either word order or pragmatics. In sum, the findings of this study suggest that students made errors on grammar, vocabulary and discourse. Each of these types of errors were then subcategorized according to data. These categories, along with the frequencies of occurrence are discussed in the next section.

Frequency of Errors

The error analysis was conducted under three main categories: grammar, semantics and discourse. Under the category of grammar there were six subheadings: tense, modals, passive voice, comparatives, prepositions, and plural / singular agreement. Semantics was dealt with in terms of the correct usage of lexical items. Discourse was dealt with in terms of correct usage of linking words. In the first stage of the study, the analysis of 20 existing exam papers revealed the following results.

Grammar

Although the results show that the least amount of errors were made with modals and comparatives, the results of the analysis showed that students did not produce incorrect items relating to these structures since they did not use them. In the first stage of the study, students avoided using passive voice, as well, 20%, by means of using active voice. Therefore, there were only a few instances of erroneous formation of passive voice. These findings relating to producing fewer errors by means of avoiding certain structures are in keeping with the results of Schachter's (1974) study, in which one of the groups of the study avoided using structures they found difficult, therefore, they produced less errors than the other group. I believe that instances when students avoid certain structures are worth taking into

consideration probably more than when they produce imperfect language- that is erroneous language. That the students produce imperfect utterances may suggest that they are trying to use the structures which might improve in the course of time. Therefore, erroneous language indicates that students are in a developmental stage which might eventually lead to mastery of the language. However, the avoidance of certain structures might imply that they cannot link the structures in question to their existing language abilities and therefore they are unable to produce them even erroneously.

As to tense, in both stages of the study, while students performed quite well in terms of using simple past, past and present forms of verb 'to be', they could not employ present perfect and past progressive in terms of their function.

Semantics

As to semantics, although the percentages displayed that the students achieved a high performance in terms of using lexical items, the evidence gathered through student interaction suggests that students do not possess enough dictionary - use skills. The most frequent errors occurred in terms of collocations and when an L1 word had more than one equivalent in the target language.

Discourse

Although students came up with deviant forms, they tried to use linkers which might suggest that they felt it necessary to have cohesion in the paragraph through the use of linking words. The reason why the students performed quite well with one of the two linking words, whereas very poorly with the other was not obvious in the first stage of the study, due to the fact that we were not in a position to investigate the reasons of the discrepancy between these two items. However, in the second

stage of the study, the written group outcomes reflected a similar problem in terms of the use of the linking words. However, this time, through students' interaction it was revealed that the low performance was brought about either by students' inefficient dictionary-use or the dictionaries they used, which did not provide them with enough information.

Translation in Group Work

Students dealt with translation problems in group work through interaction. Based on the data gathered through student interaction, a coding scheme was developed which showed in what ways students interacted with each other. According to this coding scheme students interacted in terms of negotiation of form, repetition, explanation, correction, self-correction, asking for opinion, stating opinion, suggestion, approval, rejection, guessing vocabulary, consulting a dictionary and abandonment. The data showed that although they experienced similar problems to the students whose papers were used in the first stage of the study, they were able to interact within their groups, which resulted in a better performance, although they could not find solutions to each and every problem. However, as Corder (1967) suggests, students can learn from their own errors if they are provided with feedback by the teacher. In the second stage of the study, the students had a chance to receive feedback from their group members which resulted in reflecting on language in terms of both form and meaning. What they produced in the end was not free of errors. However, since they were actively involved in the activity, a classroom discussion, which was held after the completion of group translation activity, highlighted those erroneous parts of their outcome more effectively than would be the case in a

teacher-fronted classroom in which translation activity carried out as individual outcomes.

Discussion

Use of Translation as Useful Resource

In the second stage of the study the data gathered through students' interaction within their groups yielded the fact that translation can be used as useful resource with a communicative focus rather than being a crutch, that is, something that beginning learners use when they do not quite function on their own in the L2. In this study, translating a text provided the students with a meaningful task in which they had to communicate to find solutions to the problems they encountered. During the process of translating the given Turkish text into English, the students produced the target language through interacting which led to conscious reflection on the target language.

L1 as a Facilitator

The second stage of the study also provided insights into the importance of students' L1 in a foreign language classroom. In the second stage of the study, it was observed that students preferred using their L1 in order to complete the given task. Before the students started with the given task, they were not informed about whether to use English or Turkish. The reason was to find out whether the students would prefer using their L1 or the target language. The results show that students made use of their mother tongue to talk about the meaning and form of the target language. In other words, through Turkish they were able to accomplish the given task. This finding is in keeping with Harbord's (1992) claim that the L1 use is a learner preferred strategy, as stated in the literature review. If the challenge of the

task is taken into consideration, it might be concluded that students may not have been able to accomplish the given task if asked not to make use of their mother tongue. Therefore, it might be concluded that students' L1 had a facilitative role in the task.

Translation as an Awareness- raising Activity

As discussed in the literature review, the rejection of translation in language teaching rested on the assumption that translation leads students to expect a one-to-one equivalence between languages. However, the data gathered through student interaction show that students became aware of the fact that there is not a one-to-one correspondence. Students' reflections on the forms of Turkish and English suggest that they were aware of the differences between the languages. Therefore, in contrast to the belief mentioned above, translation can be used as a means to raise students' awareness that languages are different and that one-to-one equivalence is not always possible.

Translation as an Activity to Increase Clarity, Accuracy, Flexibility

In the second stage of the study in which students' interaction was analysed, students worked on accuracy. Throughout their interaction, they searched for the correct form. They also reflected on whether the utterances they produced had clarity- that is whether their translations were effective in terms of conveying the intended message. As to the last item- flexibility- to communicate the same message using different forms-they searched for alternative ways of uttering the same message.

Limitations of the Study

Time constraint was one of the factors which had an effect on the study. The existing 20 exams which had been analysed were given to students about a month and a half after the translation courses started. However, due to time limitations the data in the second stage of the study was collected from students who were only in their second week in the translation courses.

Error analysis in the first stage of the study was employed with only 20 exam papers to be able to do an in-depth analysis. In the second stage of the study, the data was collected with a limited number of participants. It was not possible to conduct the second stage of the study in various departments of Hacettepe University. Furthermore, the students' output in the first stage of the study and the second stage of the study were produced in very different circumstances. That is, in the first stage of the study, the data were existing exam papers, not specifically collected for purposes of this research, whereas the second set of data were collected as part of an in-class group work activity, not an exam. Therefore, it is not really valid to compare the results formally.

In conclusion, time constraints and the small amount of data used in the first stage and the small number of the participants in the second stage were the main limitations of the study.

Implications for Teaching

This study shows that translation can be used within a communicative framework in terms of having students translate in groups as opposed to individual translation. In general, in contrast to general negative feelings held against translation in ELT, translation can be used as a resource. Translation courses can

provide an opportunity to hold meaningful discussions about form - function relations, as well as vocabulary usage.

Teaching translation courses is a very demanding job on the part of the teacher. Generally speaking, being able to translate calls for competence in both languages. Apart from the proficiency in both languages and the ability to move between them with ease, which are the main requirements of successful translation, in order for translation activities to be successfully employed in language classrooms, certain demands are placed on teachers.

Above all else, teachers in translation classes are expected to create a friendly and supportive environment, in which making mistakes is regarded as natural, and taking risks in terms of using the language is encouraged. It would be the teachers' responsibility to make errors work for their students' advantage. In terms of giving feedback, highlighting the strong points rather than weak ones would be beneficial since it would encourage students to carry on taking risks, that is, experimenting with the language.

Following are some suggestions, based on the findings of the study, for using translation in English courses.

Strategy Training

As is the case with the other four skills, there are some strategies for the 'fifth' skill: translation. Some able students may be able to discover and use such strategies by themselves, but more often than not it would be teachers' responsibility to familiarize their students with these strategies. My observation in translation classes has been that students tend to start translating without reading the text first, which often results in an unsuccessful translation, since the overall meaning of the

text is neglected. Getting the gist of the text before starting to translate is of crucial importance. Once the meaning is perceived, then the form to be used can be determined more effectively. The same procedure is needed after the translation is completed. It helps to see whether cohesion is preserved within the translated text. Within the compass of this study, elements such as style and tone, which would be the concerns of literary translation, are left out, since those elements are beyond the boundaries of the translation courses under focus in this study. Chunking is another helpful strategy to deal with long sentences. Teachers can translate a sentence that students experience difficulty by means of “thinking aloud” for them.

Dictionary Use

Teachers have to familiarize students with the dictionary-use skills. The findings also suggest that students should be trained to use monolingual dictionaries as well as bilingual dictionaries. In teaching translation for three years I have observed that students prefer using bilingual dictionaries to monolingual dictionaries. The main drawback in using bilingual dictionaries is that they list different meanings of a certain word without providing the learners with a sentence in which they can see how the word in question is used in context. Atkinson (1993) points out that learners of English should be trained on using monolingual dictionaries as well as bilingual dictionaries. In this way translation may become an important resource in developing both receptive and productive vocabulary.

When the aim is vocabulary retention, students might be provided with a text in L2, which is similar to their text in L1 they are working with, so as to familiarize the students with topic vocabulary and their usage in context. It can also be used to emphasize instances when an L1 word has more than one equivalent. The fact that

students experienced difficulty with regard to collocations might call for some emphasis on the study of collocations, as well. To do this, using a collocations dictionary might be helpful. Some activities could be prepared which calls for the use of a dictionary of collocations. Teachers can provide students with passages in L1 and L2 in which there are instances of usage of collocations. The focus of a lesson might be translating a text which consists of collocations. In fact, an authentic text can be used to this end as well. However, given the level of students' mastery in English and time constraints, only some parts of the text might be translated to focus on areas which teachers find necessary.

Which Forms to Focus on

Another example of how this study can contribute to teaching is an example of focus on both meaning and form.

The findings relating to grammar reveal striking results in terms of which items were focused on. The text used in this study was the first midterm used for summer school last year. In this exam, the structures under focus were the usage of tenses, passive voice, and modals. However, while I was conducting error analysis, I also investigated items which were not focused on, namely, comparatives, prepositions, and plural/singular agreement. The results obtained through error analysis in terms of grammatical structures reveal that forms which were not focused on constituted the higher rates of omission and avoidance than the focused items. This finding might suggest that focusing on forms might be helpful in terms of creating conditions in which students become aware of the structures in question.

As stated by researchers such as Doughty and Williams (1998), and Ellis (2006), one of the decisions is to make which forms to focus and how to focus on

them. According to the results of the error analysis, present perfect and past perfect, passive voice and the use of linking words could be among the areas to focus on. As to tenses, the usage of verb to be is not an area in which focus is needed since the rates of correct usage relating to verb to be is very high. On the other hand, it is revealed that students experience difficulty in using present perfect and past progressive within context. In terms of present perfect and past progressive, that the form did not cause difficulty was evident in that students employed the forms in their outputs. However, when they were expected to use them in their outcomes, they could not make the distinction between simple past and present perfect or past progressive in terms of their functions. It can be concluded that the decision as to when to use present perfect or past progressive was what caused difficulty. These results suggest that the best way to focus on present perfect and past progressive is in a meaningful context in which students are able to see how they contrast with simple past tense.

Second, the results revealed that, students avoided using passive voice to a certain degree, by means of using active voice. Controlled texts could be prepared which would deal with the usage of active and passive voice in contrast to each other so as to trigger noticing on students' part. Third, in terms of using linking words, the results revealed that students were aware of the need of establishing cohesion within the paragraph, however, as the high rates of incorrect usage in both stages of the study reveal they did not possess the necessary means to do so. It might be helpful working with a text in L2 in which the use of linking words are highlighted so as to draw students' attention to devices of cohesion.

In general, translation activities would enable students to encounter various structures together in a given context, which calls for using the language at production level. While students enrolled in translation courses are already familiar with the structures in question, translation can serve as a means to focus on grammar implicitly within a communicative framework. For this end, authentic texts as well as controlled texts could be used. In the case of using authentic texts, only the structures to be focused on could be translated, without translating the whole text. The translation activity, then should be followed by a discussion session.

In conclusion, focusing on problematic structures in general within a meaningful context would help students understand how those structures function.

Group Work

The result of this study shows that while group work is effective in producing translations. Therefore, teachers should prepare the conditions for group work. The teachers' role would be to monitor students in group work. After the groups have completed the task of translation, it is advisable to hold an in-class discussion, in which groups share their version of the translated text. The discussion about the translated text is essential as students are provided with alternative ways of translating the same text both from the teacher and the peers who formed different groups. Teachers should caution against creating an impression the translation he or she suggests is the only correct way. It must be emphasised that translation offers by nature flexibility in terms of expressing the same function using different forms.

Group work places certain demands on students as well, since working in a group has certain norms of its own. In group work, students are expected to respect their peers suggestions, be open to peer-correction, take responsibility in the

completion of the task, be the evaluators of their own work and work with their peers with a cooperative manner.

In-class Discussion

After the group translation session, a follow-up in the form of discussion should follow. In the discussion session, students would be provided with an opportunity to share their version of the translated text with the whole class. The discussion period would also enable teachers to make any comments they find useful. However, teachers should be careful not to create an impression that the version of the translated text they provide is the only way of correct translation. It is always possible that students might come up with a better translation.

Translation as the Fifth Skill

In the translation courses, students are expected to make use of their abilities with regard to the four skills in an integrated way in order to achieve the task of translation - which constitutes the fifth skill. Students are required to read the text they are supposed to translate. In order to be able to carry out the task of translation, they have to be able to get the gist of the text, which is a vital part in successful translation. While translating, they have to take the elements of writing into consideration, in terms of maintaining cohesion within the text in question. Since the task of translation is carried out within group work, their oral abilities, listening and speaking would also aid the completion of the task.

In the light of the arguments for the translation, it can be used as an activity which embraces both form and meaning through communication.

Implications for Further Research

One of the drawbacks I had during this study was the lack of studies that were carried out which focus on translation as a tool in teaching English, let alone studies investigating translation as a task which could be carried out through interaction in English language classrooms. Most of the studies in existence about translation was conducted on literary aspects of translation. Therefore, based on the fact that there is a scarcity of research about translation as an interactive task in teaching and learning English, the findings of the study could serve as a basis for further research. As the time was limited, collecting more data was not possible. In future research, the study can be carried out by means of involving more participants from different departments of Hacettepe University. Another limitation was the fact that only one text is used in this study. In future research, the error analysis and the interaction analysis could be carried out using more than one text, which would provide the researchers with a richer data. For instance, in terms of lexis, in the text I used there was only one collocation, and one L1 word which had more than one equivalents in L2. The results I obtained revealed the fact that these were among the problematic areas. In future research, texts which specifically address these issues could be used to collect data. The participants in the first and second stage of the study were different learners in this study. It would be interesting, however, to conduct a study involving the same participants in both first and second stage of the study. As it was indicated in the limitations of the study, since students' translations were produced in different circumstances in the first and second stage of the study, a comparison between them was not possible. In future, another research can be

carried out which compares the results of individual and group translation which are carried out in more similar circumstances.

Conclusion

This study investigated the problems English language students encounter in translating from Turkish to English and the effects of group work on solving these problems. The results show that translation can be used in an interactive way in teaching English. In the second stage of the study, it was revealed that translation served as a meaningful task since students had to focus not only on form but meaning as well. The results also show that the use of L1 is inevitable since it is the only resource students fall back on as they have not mastered the target language yet. Therefore, it would be unrealistic to expect students to function only in the target language under EFL settings. The findings gathered through recording student interaction show that L1 has a facilitative role as it enables students to complete the given task. All in all, the findings of this study suggest that translation may serve an important function in language classrooms as a way of combining form and function within a communicative framework.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, D.(1993). *Teaching monolingual classes: Using L1 in the classroom*.
Routledge.
- Bell, R.T.(1991). *Translation and translating*. London: Longman.
- Cook, G.(1996). *Translation in foreign language teaching*. In M.Baker (Ed.),
Encyclopedia of translation studies. (pp. 117-120). London: Routledge.
- Cook, V.(2001). *Using the first language in the classroom*. The Canadian Modern
Language Review. (57),3, 402-423
- Corder (1967). *The significance of learners' errors*. In International Review of
Applied Linguistics 5, 161-170.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). *Pedagogical choices in focus on form*. In C.
Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), Focus on form in classroom second language
acquisition. (197-261). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z.& Murphey,T. (2003) *Group dynamics in the language classroom*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, A. (1989). *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dulay, H.&Burt, M.&Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford: Oxford University
Press.
- Ellis, R.(1995). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford
University Press.
- Ellis, R.(2002). The place of grammar instruction in the second / foreign language
classroom. In Hinkel, E.&Fotos, S.(Eds.), New perspectives on grammar
teaching in second language classrooms.(pp. 17-34).Lawrence Erlbaum
Associates, Publishers: Mahwah, New Jersey.

- Ellis, R.(2006). *Current issues in the teaching of grammar*. TESOL Quarterly,40(1) 83-107.
- Ellis, R.& Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fotos, S.(2002). *Structure-based interactive tasks for the EFL grammar learner*. In Hinkel, E.&Fotos, S.(Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms*.(pp. 135-154). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers: Mahwah, New Jersey.
- Folse, Keith.S. (2004). *Vocabulary myths*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Gairns, R.& Redman, S. (1986). *Working with words: A guide to teaching and learning vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gass, S.M.& Selinker, L. (1994). *Second Language Acquisition: An introductory course*. Hillsdale: New Jersey
- Harbord, J. (1992). *The use of the mother tongue in the classroom*. ELT Journal, 46(4), pp.350-355
- Harley, B. (1998). *The role of focus-on-form tasks in promoting child L2 acquisition*. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*.(pp.156-174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinkel, E.& Fotos, S.(2002). *From theory to practice: A teacher's view*. In Hinkel, E.& Fotos, S.(Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms*.(pp.1-12).Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers: Mahwah, New Jersey.
- House, J. (1988). *Talking to oneself or thinking with others: On using different*

thinking aloud methods in translation. FluL: Fremdsprachen Lernen und Lehren, (17), 84-98

Howatt, A.P.R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hölscher, A.& Möhle, D.(1988). *Cognitive plans in translation.* In Faerch, C.&Kasper, G.(Eds), *Introspection in second language research.*Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Krings, H.P. (1988).*The use of introspective data in translation.* In Faerch,C.&Kasper,G.(Eds.), *Introspection in second language research.*Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Long, M. H.& Porter, P.A.(1985) *Group Work, Interlanguage Talk, and Second Language acquisition.* *Tesol Quarterly.* 19(2) pp.207-228.

Mattr, H. (1999). *Translation elicitation techniques and mother-tongue interference: Any significant connection?* *Iral: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching,* 37 (4), 307-321

Nassaji, H. (1999) *Towards integrating form-focused instruction and communicative instruction and communicative interaction in the second language classroom: Some pedagogical possibilities.* *Canadian Modern Language Review.* 55(3).

Nation, I.S.P.(2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newmark, P.(1988). *A textbook of translation.* London: Prentice Hall.

Newmark, P. (1991). *About translation.* Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Norris, J.& Ortega, L.(2000). *Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis*

and quantitative meta-analysis. Language Learning, 50, 417-528

Oxford, R.(1990). *Language learning strategies:What every teacher should know.*

New York: Newbury House.

Prator, C.H.(1979). *The cornerstones of method.* In Celce- Murcia & McIntosh, L.

(Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language.* USA: Newbury house.

Richards, J.C & Rodgers, T.S.(2001). *Approaches and methods in language*

teaching. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W.M. (1983). *Communicating naturally in a second language.* Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W.M.(1987). *Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication.*

In Rivers (Ed.), *Interactive language teaching.* (pp. 3-16).Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Schachter, J.(1983). *An error in error analysis.* In Robinett, B. W.& Schachter,

J.(Eds.) *Second language learning: Contrastive analysis,error analysis, and related aspects.*(pp. 354-362). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Schachter, J.& Celce-Murcia, M. (1983). *Some reservations concerning error*

analysis. In Robinett, B. W.& Schachter, J.(Eds.) *Second language learning:*

Contrastive analysis,error analysis, and related aspects.(272-284). Michigan:

The University of Michigan Press.

Schmitt, N.(2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Storch, N. & Wigglesworth, G.(2003) *Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting?* *Tesol Quarterly* 37(4),760-770

Şat, F. (1996). *Rethinking translation in language teaching: A needs assessment to prepare curriculum guidelines specific for the translation course at YADIM, Çukurova University*. Unpublished master's thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

Ünsalan; G. (1996). *A case study of translation strategies among three Turkish students using think-aloud protocols*. Unpublished master's thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

Zimmerman,C.B.(1997). *Historical trends in second language vocabulary instruction*. In Coady, J.& Huckin,T. (Eds.) *Second language vocabulary acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix
Transcripts

Negotiation of form:	NOF
Repetition:	R
Explanation:	E
Correction:	C
Self-correction:	SC
Asking for opinion:	AFO
Stating opinion:	SO
Suggestion:	S
Approval:	APP
Rejection:	REJ
Guessing Vocabulary:	GV
Consulting a Dicitonary:	CAD
Abandonment:	A

Group A

- A: sigarayı bıraktığımda çok kötü bir durumdaydım...
(when I gave up smoking I was in a terrible state...)
left mi diyeceğiz burda? (AFO)
(shall we say *left* here?)
- B: hmm...
- A: *give up*
- B: *when I...*
- A: *give up...*
- B: hmmm
- A: bir şeyi bırakmak...
(to give up something...)
- B: sigarayı bıraktığımda...*when...*
(when I gave up smoking...*when...*)
- A: bıraktığımda...(when I gave up...)
- B: bıraktığım zaman anlamında oluyor değil mi? (AFO)
(it means at the time I gave up...isn't it?)
- A: ha ha (yeah...) (APP) *when I give up ci...garette*
- A/B: *cigarette*
- A: *I was in a* nokta nokta nokta *situation* mı? (AFO)
(is it *I was in a* dot dot dot *situation*?)
- B: *I was very terrible*
- A: dur (wait) *when I gived...* *give up?... GAVE up* (NOF)
- B: *gave up* (R)
- A: *gave up ...cigarette I was in a bad ...*
- B: *situation*
- A: *situation...* ya da (or)
- B: *in a bad situation*
- A: *situation* ama burdaki durum o durum mu? (AFO)
(but is this situation that *situation*?)
- B: o durum durum hal öyle işte (E)

- A: herneyse **(AB)** öncelikle çok kilo almıştım
(whatever...first I put on a lot of weight...)
first of all... take...take up mıydı? . (was it *take....take up*?)
- B: *take up* **(R)**
- A: hayır (sighs) **(REJ)** ay KİLO ALMAK neydi?
(no... what did PUT ON WEIGHT mean?) *take on...take on*
- A/B: (they check machine dictionary) *put on weight* **(CAD)**
- A: *first of all...* almıştım...
(*first of all...*I put on ...)
- B: *put on weight... put on weight* anlamında kullanmayalım ama tam böyle bir kalıp oluyor **(S)**
(let's not use *put on weight*, it sounds like a fixed expression)
- A: ama niye ki kilo almayı başka nasıl kullanacağız
(but...why? ...but how else can we express put on weight?) **(AFO)**
- A: ama çok kilo almıştım diyor (it says I put on LOT OF weight.)
- A: e tamam? (so?)
- B: ama kilo almıştım oluyor ÇOĞU nasıl kullanacaksın? **(AFO)**
(but it is I put on weight, how would you use LOT OF?)
- A: e ÇOK da koyarsın **(E)**
(you would add LOT OF too)
- B: *put on very weight* mi? **(AFO)**
(is it *put on very weight*?)
- A: *more*
- A/B: *more weight* (laughs)
- A: *very more*
- B: *put on more weight... I had...I have... put...*
- A: *had* **(C)**
- B: *have* de kullanılıyormuş demin de hoca dedi ya **(S)**
(we can use *have* too... teacher said so)
- A: hayır (no) *had* **(R)** / **(C)**
- B: ay tamam tamam be öff (oh...ok..ok) **(APP)**
- A: ...*put on weight* ya *put on weight* zaten kilo almak **(E)**
(*put on weight* means put on weight)
- B: ama çok kilo aldım diyor
(but it says I put on LOT OF weight...)
- A: (sighs) ... *more weight... and I could not wear my clothes.*
- B: hayır “çirkin görünüyordum”
(no “I looked ugly”)
- A: kıyafetlerimi ha “çirkin görünüyordum”u görmedim
(my clothes oh I did not see I was looking ugly)
I look ugly looked
- A/B: *looked ugly*
- A: *and* giyemiyordum
(*and* I could not wear)
- A/B: *I could not wear*
- A: *my clothes*
- B: daha da kötüsü (worse)

- A: İlkay...a *daha da kötüsü çok sinirliydim ve herkese bağırıyordum*
(first month... oh worse than this I was very angry and I was shouting at everyone)
more than this bundan daha fazla anlamında
(**more than this** means more than this)
- A: **worser** hani **worst ... bad. Worse. Worst**
- A: ha ha (yeah) (APP)
- A: **worser than this** böyle bir şey olabilir mi? (AFO)
(**worser than this** can it be such a thing?)
- B: **worser than this...** olur mu? (R)
(I wonder whether **worser than this** can be?)
(A / B laugh)
- A: hatırlamıyorsun değil mi?
(You do not remember do you?)
- B: hayır...daha kötü...evet
(worse....yes)
- A: böyle işte İlkay (It is like this İlkay)... **I was so angry and laughing at**
- B: **laughing** değil mi? (AFO)
(it is **laughing** isn't it?)
- A: **laughing** evet (APP) **laughing** (A/B laugh) çok güzel (very good) **laughing**
- B: shut shutter...
- A/B: (laughs)
- A: bağırma (to shout)
- B: shut shout shout shout
- A: shout shout (R)
- B: bir de **yell** vardı
(there was also **yell**)
- A: **yell** evet (yes) **yelling** (reads from the dictionary) (CAD)
- B: ama **yell** haykırmak anlamında değil mi? (AFO)
(but doesn't **yell** mean yell?)
- A: **cry out**
- B: bağırma seslenme çığlık
(shouting calling out scream)
- A: cry out ne demek ona bir baksana
(check what **cry out** means)
- B: **shout** da seslenmek anlamında
(**shout** means 'to call out' too)
- A: **cry out**
- B: zırlamak mı?
(is it to chatter or clatter continuously?)
- A: ağlamak mı (is it to cry?)
- B: ağlama bağırma feryat
(crying shouting screaming)
- B: ne kullanalım? (AFO)
(what shall we use?)
- A: **shouting...shout** olur (SO)

- (it would be *shout*)
- B: *shout* olur (APP/R)
- A: ama *shout* öyle bağırarak
(but *shout* is shouting like that)
- A: ama *yell* de olabilir
(but it can be *yell* too)
- B: bağırarak, haykırmak
(to shout to cry out)
- A: o zaman *shout*
(then it is *shout*)
- B: o zaman *shout* (R) / (APP)
(then it is *shout*)
- A: *and shouting... everybody*
- B: *and*
- A: *shouting AT everybody* (SC)
- B: bağırıyordum *I was shouting*
- A: *I was shouting* (R)
- B: *I was so angry and I was shouting a everybody*
- A: niye tekrar *I was* diyorsun ki gerek yok ki (REJ) *I was so angry and shouting ...*
(why do you say *I was* again there is no need *I was so angry and shouting*)
- B: nerden anlaşılacak orda onu kullandığın çünkü *was* dan sonra *so angry* kullanmışsın bir kere... değil mi? (E)
(how would it be clear that you used it there because you said *so angry* after *was ...* am I right?)
- A: bilmiyorum...(I do not know) *shouting at*
- B: *everybody*
- A: ilkay...(first month)
- B: *everyone* yok yok (no no)
- B: *everybody*
- A: İlk ay geceleri halüsinasyonlar görüyordum
(first month I had hallucinations at night)
- A: *first month* (laughs) *I was dreaming* mi olur ya da *seeing hallucinations in my dream dream* olmaz rüya gibi bir şey yok
(will it be *first month* (laughs) *I was dreaming* or *seeing hallucinations in my dream dream* no there is nothing like dreaming)
- B: ama gece rüyasında mı görüyor?
(but does she have hallucinations in her dream?)
- A: *first night* aman *first month I was seeing hallucinations at nights...* olur mu?
(can it be *first night* er *first month I was seeing hallucinations at nights*?)
- B: evet (yes) (APP)
- A: *First month I was.. see* mi olur?
(will it be *first month I was ..see*?)
- B: *seeing* olur (SO)
(it would be *seeing*)
- A: *seeing hallucinations...* herhalde böyle yazılıyordur
(*seeing hallucinations...* I guess it would be written like this)
- B: hummm

- A: *at my dream ya da at nights* pardon (SO)
(*at my dream* or sorry *at nights*)
- B: *at night* olur (SO)
(it would be *at night*)
- A: *nights... nights...* rüyalarım da hep sigara içiyordum ve bu rüyalardan çok olumsuz etkileniyordum
(I was always smoking in my dreams and I was badly affected by these dreams)
- B: ama ilkay gece halüsinasyonlar görüyordum da rüya anlamında mı diyor acaba? (AFO)
(but does she mean dreams when she says I had hallucinations?)
- A: hayır, rüya rüya değil (REJ)...halüsinasyon rüya da mı görülür?
(no it is not dream...do you have hallucinations in dreams?)
- B: Yoo, hayır rüyalarım da hep sigara içiyordum...*in my dreams*
(no I was always smoking in my dreams...*in my derams*)
- A: *I was smoking in my dreams and*
- B: *I always*
- A: ama içiyordum *I was always smoking in my dreams and* bu rüyalardan çok olumsuz etkileniyordum... çok olumsuz
(but I was smoking *I was always smoking in my dreams* and I was affected very negatively by these dreams... very negatively)
- B: dur şurayı bir yapalım da
(wait let's finish this)
- A: *I was always smoking at my dreams and*
- B: *dreams and*
- B: ve bu rüyalardan olumsuz etkilenmek ...
(and to be very negatively affected by these dreams)
- A: dur (wait)
- B: olumsuz etkilemek (to negatively affect)
- A: ETKİLENMEK (TO BE AFFECTED) (C)
- B: rüyalar beni olumsuz...
(these dreamsvery negatively)
- A. *to be influenced to be affected* (reads from the dictionary) (CAD)
- B: *to be affected* (R)
- A: *to be impressed by*
- B: etkilenmek
(to be affected)
- A: *badly affected* olabilir ya da *badly impressed* (SO)
(it could be *badly affected* or *badly impressed*)
- B: *negative... negative*
- A: o zaman *I was negatively impressed* by olur mu *this dreams*
(then can it be *I was negatively impressed by this dreams?*)
- B: şey pasif falan yapamaz mıyız biz bunu? (AFO)
(can' we do it passive?)
- A: bu rüyalardan etkileniyordum diyor ama bu rüyalar beni etkiliyordu demiyor
(E)
(it says I was being affected not these dreams were affecting me)
- B: hımm

- A: o yüzden normal, işte olmaz mı işte (SO / AFO) *I was negatively impressed by this dreams* ya da *impressed by to be affected by* da.....olabilir (SO) (that's why it is normal... can't it be? I was negatively impressed by this dreams or it can be *impressed by to be affected by*, too)
- B: *to be affected by* yapalım (S)
(let's use *to be affected by*)
- A: *to be negatively affected by this dreams*....(writes) ama *affect...*
(*to be negatively affected by this dreams*....(writes) but *affect...*)
- B: sigarayı bıraktığımdan beri iki yıl geçti
- A: şimdi daha iyiyim sağlığım yerinde
(It has been two years since I stopped smoking, (now) I am better now, and I am healthy)
- B: hımmm
- A: ya da sigarayı bırakalı iki yıl oldu gibi de çevirebiliriz (SO)
(or we can translate it as it has been two years since I stopped smoking)
- B: tabii canım yani Türkçe de zaten değişiyor
(sure it is possible in Turkish)
- A: tamam....eee
- B: sigarayı bıraktığımdan beri
(since I gave up smoking)
- A: ya da sigarayı bıraktığımdan beri(S)
(or since I gave up smoking)
two years passed after I left... olmaz ki sigara..sigaraa (laughs)
- B: *since* kullanırız (SO)
(we use *since*)
- A: hımmm
- B: *past... past* olur... beri iki yıl *for* olur (SO)
(*past*...it would be *past*...since two years it would be *for*)
- A: ya da iki yıldır sigara içmiyorum
(or I have not smoked for two years)
- A/B: (laughs)
- B: napalım yaa? (AFO)
(what shall we do?)
- A: şimdi daha iyiyim sağlığım yerinde
(now I feel better and my health is fine)
- B: geldik buraya kadar burada kaldık yani
(we have come so far and now we are stuck here!)
- A: *give up* kullanacağız yine, di mi? (AFO)
(we shall use *give up* anyway right ?)
- B: evet...(yes) (APP) BIRAKTIĞIMDAN BERİ
(yes...SINCE I GAVE UP)
- A: bakıyorum...dünden beri... *since yesterday*...*since I left cigarette* diyeceğiz
(I am looking it up...since yesterday ... *since yesterday*... we shall say *since I left cigarette*)
- B: tamam...*since* demiştim ben zaten
(ok... I already said *since*)
- A: (checks dictionary) (CAD) tamam da bak dört aydan beri var *for four month*
var
(ok but look there *is for four months* here)

- B: *for four month...*
- A: yok (no) (REJ)
- B: *since* olur ama bu (SO)
(it would be *since*)
- A: o zaman şey ama iki yıldan beri sigarayı bıraktım olur o zaman...*since I left.... since I give up* aman *since two years I give up* öf *I gave up cigarette since two years* mi diyeceğiz o zaman... (AFO) iki yıldan beri sigarayı bıraktım
- B: *for* mu diyeceğiz (AFO)
(is it *for*?)
- A: ya da iki yıldan beri sigara içmiyorum (SO)
(or I have not smoked for two years)
- B: hayır canım iki yıldan beri sigara içmiyorum tamam içmiyorum aynı *give up* diyeceğiz de
(no “I have not smoked for two years” is ok “I have not smoked” is the same)
- A: geçti diyor geçti...*two years passed* diyeceğiz o zaman...*two years passed (E) / (SO)*
(it says “passed passed”... then we shall say *two years passed ... two years passed*)
- B: ama beri de var (SO)
(but there is also “since”)
- A: aa *since I give up cigarette two years passed since I give up cigarette*
- B: hmmm evet (yes) (APP)
- A: evet... *gave up* değil mi?...*had give up* mı yoksa (NOF)/ (AFO)
- B: *gave up* canım... evet evet (yes yes) *gave up (SO) / (APP)*
- A: şimdi *now... now I am fine*
- B: daha iyiyim ama (SO)
(but it is “I am better”)
- A: *and healthier* sağlığım yerinde...*I am better*
- B: *I am better*
- A: *my health is*
- B: sağlıklıyım anlamında
(it means “I am healthy”)
- A: *I am healthier and healthier* diyelim *better and healthier*
(let’s say *I am healthier and healthier better and healthier*)
- B: *I was healthier*
- A: ier olması lazım...*healthi-e-r*
(it must be ier ...*healthi-e-r*)
- B: tamam böyle böyle *healthy healthier*
(ok it is like this *healthy healthier*)
- A: öyle mi y var mı ee diğer cümleye bak
(is it? is there y check the other sentence)
- B: biraz kilo verebildim ama beş kilo daha vermem gerekiyordu
(I could lose weight a bit but I had to lose five more kilos)
- A: sağlıklı *in good health healthy*(checks dictionary) (CAD)
- B: sağlıklıyım *healthy* işte (E)
- A: ya da *I am healthy* diyebiliriz (S)

- (or we can say *I am healthy*)
- B: *healthier* hmm sağlığım yerinde...biraz kilo verdim *lose weight I...*
- A: **vereBİLDİM**
(I COULD lose)
- B: haa
- A: verebildim diyor İlkay ne diyelim? (AFO)
(it says I could lose what shall we use?)
- A/B: (laughs)
- B: *healthier* yok *healthy* var....yok İlkay *healthier* oluyor herhalde (SO)
- A: ama beş kilo daha vermem gerekiyor *I could give up*
(but I have to lose five more *I could give up*)
- B: *lose weight* (C)
- A: haa... *give up....give up* olmaz (APP)
(*give up....* it is not *give up*)
- B: *I could lose weight a little*
- A: *lose a little weight* olur... (C) *but I must lose* ...Beş kilo DAHA
(it is *lose a little weight but I must lose* five MORE kilos) *five kilos* (SO)
- B: beş kilo daha diyor
(it says five more kilos)
- A: ya da hala beş kilo fazlam var da olabilir (SO)
- B: ama farklı şeydir İlkay
(but they might be different İlkay)
- A: şu h olmayacak arada *-ier* geliyor direk (E)
(there is not 'h' there there is *-ier*)
- B: hı hı ...tamam (APP) beş kilo daha
- A: ya da den olur mu ya da *five kilos to lose* ama olmaz... beş kilo daha kaybetmeliyim (I must lose five more kilos)
- B: beş kilo daha...yok mu...*More than five* beş kilodan fazla oluyor (SO)
- A: *more five kilo* ya da *I have 5 kilos to give* de diyebiliriz *to lose* (SO)
- B: hımm evet ama *I must* ama gerekiyor diyor
- A: evet (yes) (APP)
- B: gerekiyor diyor
- A: beş kilo vermeliyim
- B: *to* desek sonuna...(SO) *but anyway I must five kilo, I must lose five kilo anyway?*
- A: *anyway?*
- B: yine de...yine de yine de tabi tabi daha var orda.. *I must*
- A: *moreover... moreover* neydi? (AFO)
(what was *moreover?*).....bununla birlikte gibi birşeydi galiba
- B: evet (APP) bundan başka evet ayrıca (E)
- A: ayrıca ayrıca
(besides besides)
- B: daha (more)
- A: hala beş kilom var diyelim (S)
(let's say I have still five more kilos)
- B: hala beş kilom var nasıl dersin ya (REJ)
(how can you say I have still five more kilos) *must lose 5 kilos*
(checks dictionary) (CAD)

- A: versene bir sözlüğü (give me the dictionary) *still* hala beş kilo vermem gerek...tamam işte... *I must still lose five kilos (SO)*
- B: eveet (yees) (APP)
- A: oh be (good heavens)
- A: insanlarla daha iyi iletişim kurabiliyorum (I can communicate with people better)
I can ... get in a relationship mi olur bu? (AFO)
(can it be *I can ... get in a relationship?*)
- B: ha ha (APP) *get in a relationship* ilişki kurmak İletişim kurmak *connection* bağlanmak (to communicate) (E)
- A: *I can communicate with peoples better* yada *my communication is better...is better*
- B: yok (no) (R)
- A: *I can communicate with peoples better*
- B: hı hı
- A: *I can better communicate*
- B: evet (yes)
(A writes down) *with.. peoples*
- A: gerçekten sigara sağlığa çok zararlı (Smoking is are really very harmful to the health)
- B: *in fact*
- A: *in fact...(R)*
- B: *in fact* olur (R)
(it would be *in fact*)
- B: *in fact (R)*
- A: bundan iyisi can sağlığı valla (it cannot be better than this)
- B: *in fact* olur ya
(it would be *in fact*)
- A: tamam(ok)
- B: di mi?(am I right?)
- A: di...dur zararlı başka bir şekilde var mı...*harmful*
- B: *harmful*
- A: haaa *in fact* sigara *is harmful for human health* insan sağlığı ya da *for health so harmful* diyelim (S)
- B: *in fact cigarette*
- A: *is so harmful for*
- B: *for health*
- A: *for health and* diyebiliriz orda *and everybody must give up cigarette* (writes) bu kadar (that's all)
(one of the students reads what they have written after they finish the task)
- A: şurda bir şey sanki *seeing hallucination* biraz kulağı tırmalıyor gibi başka bir şey olabilir mi (SO/ASO)
- B: *seeing hallucinations*...halusinasyon görmek işte (E)
- A: *dreaming...dreaming hallucination* mı olacak
- B: yok be salladım ben
(no I just made it up)
- A: (checks dictionary) yazmıyor yok burda öyle bir şey (CAD)

- (there is not such a thing here)
- B: halüsinasyon diye bir şey yazmıyor mu
(isn't there anything like hallucination?)
- A: hayır şuna bakalım...halis var
- A/B: (laughs)
- B: halisinasyon değil ki **(REJ)** halüsinasyonben de diyorum niye yok
(it is not "halisinasyon" it is "halüsinasyon" I was wondering why we could not find it!)
- A: ben de diyorum niye yok! **(R)**
(I was wondering why we could not find it!)
- B: o da mı yok?
(you could not find that one either?)
- A: o da yok (not that either)
- B: Allah Allah...
- A: yok (no)
- B: ben şuna bakayım(CAD)
(let me check this one)
- A: yok İlkay
- B: tamam o belli de yani ...*seeing* güzel gözüküyor ama **(SO)**
(ok that is obvious... but *seeing* looks fine)
- A: öyle olsun **(APP)**
(let it be like that)
- B: tamam öyle olsun **(APP)**
(ok let it be like that)
- A: göresi gelmek
- A/B: (laughs)
- A: tamam bu kadar mı
(ok is that all?)
- B: bu kadar
(that is all)

Group B

- A: tamam o zaman yazıyorum... o zaman *when I gave up smoking* diyorum...
(ok then I am writing I say *when I gave up smoking*)
- B: *when I gave up smoking* (R)
- A: böyleydi değil mi? (AFO)
(it was like this wasn't it?)
- B: hı hı (yeah)(APP)
- B: *I was very bad*
- A: *I was...so bad very bad* yazdım
(*so bad ...I've written very bad*)
- C: *I was in a very bad condition* falan olmaz mı? (S)/(GV)
(isn't it something like *I was in a very bad condition*)
- A: aa kötü durumdaydım daha güzel (APP)
(‘I was in a terrible state’ is more beautiful)
- B: evet (yes) (APP)
- A: silgi? (eraser?)
- A: *I was?*
- B/C: *in a bad condition*
- A: öncelikle çok kilo almıştım
(first I put on a lot of weight)
- C: çirkin görünüyordum...
(I seemed ugly...)
- B: *firstly*
- A: *firstly* (R) evet kilo almak?
(yes to put on weight?)
- C: çok güzel ben bilmiyorum onu
(fine I do not know that)
- B: hı?
- C: ben bilmiyorum onu
(I do not know that)
- B: ben de bilmiyorum bakıyorum şimdi (CAD)
(I do not know either I am looking it up now)
- A: kilo almak kilogram çıkıyor kilo vermek neymiş? *to lose weight*
o zaman almak (CAD)
(here there is kilogram what is to lose weight? *to lose weight* then to put on
weight ..)
- C: *to get weight* dir belki (GV)
(may be it is *to get weight*)
- A: ha kilo almak *to put on weight*
- C: hah
- A: *..firstly*
- B: çok ve *I ee...*(a lot and *I err..*)
- C: *firstly I put*
- B: *I put* (R)
- C: *put* zaten gene aynı *put on*
(*put* remains the same *put on*)
- B: *very*

- C: hayır *very weight* olmaz (REJ)
(no you can't say *very weight*)
- A: *very weight* olmaz
(*very weight* is not possible)
- A: o zaman *I put on weight* diyorum sadece *I put on weight*
(then let's say only *I put on weight I put on weight*)
- B: *I seem ve.. seem seemed* ya da
- A: *seem* görünmek de
- B: *seem* görünmek ya
- B: görünmek *very ugly ugly* çirkin
- A: ama görünüyordum hani yordum diyor yani *I seemed* olduğu zaman öyle bir çeviri var
(it says I wasing)
I was seeming (laughs) olmaz (it can't be)
- C: görünüyordum
(I was seeming)
- A: aa şey *perfect* yapıcaz bunu (SO)
(we shall use *perfect*)
- B: *I have been*
- A: *I have been seemed*
- B: öyle mi *appear* da olabilir görünmek ...ama olmaz
- C: **görünüş demiyor değil mi görünüyordum diyor**
(it doesn't say appearance it says I was looking right?)
- A: yordum olduğu zaman *present perfect progressive* yapıyorduk hani *I have* kitapta vardı
(when it is I was doing we were using *present perfect progressive* it was in the book)
- C: bakayım mı?
(shall I have a look?)
- A: ing getiriyoruz. *I have been seemed* diyorum
(we add ing I say *I have been seemed*)
- B: *ed* hali (*ed* form)
- A: baksana sözlükten var mı (CAD) (check if it is in the dictionary) *ugly* diyorum and
(I say *ugly*) giyemiyordum (I could not wear)
- A: *I haven't*
- B: *I haven't wear*
- A: (in a low voice) giyemiyordum... giyemiyordum *past progressive* herhalde
(I could not wear... I think it is *past progressive*)
I wasn't wearing my clothes
- B: *I wasn't wearing my clothes*
- C: kıyafetlerimi giyemiyordum
(I could not wear my clothes)
- A/B: *wearing my clothes*
- A: çok sinirliydim ve herkese bağırdım
(I was very nervous and I was shouting at everybody)
- B: daha da kötüsü diyoruz şimdi

- (now we say even worse)
(checks dictionary) (CAD) daha da...(even worse...)
- A: daha da kötüsü yazıyor mu sözlükte? Burayı boş bırakıyorum
(is there even worse in the dictionary? I leave this part blank)
- B: ***I was very nervous and***
- A: (writes down) ***I was very nervous*** and bağırma neydi?
(what was to shout?)
- C: dur dur (wait wait)
- B: ***shout shut***
- A: ama o şey değil miydi ***shut up*** kapa çeneni (AFO)
(but wasn't it ***shut up*** shut up?)
- B: bağırma ta da öyle yazıyor ama bir de ***yell*** yazıyor bir de (CAD)
(it says the same for shout but there is also ***yell*** and..)
- C: ne yazıyor?
(what ?)
- B: ***yell***
- C: hayır o ***shut*** değil ***shout*** gibi bir şey yazmış (REJ)
(no it is not ***shut*** there it is written something like ***shout***)
- A: o zaman ne diyorum bağırıyordum ***I was shutting everyone*** mı diyorum?
(AFO)
(then what shall I write? I was shouting do I say ***I was shutting everyone?***)
I was shutting diyorum ***everybody***...hatta şurası da öyle olacak işte (erases)
(I say ***I was shutting everybody***...and this here will be like this)
çok kilo almıştım ve çirkin görünüyordum...burayı bırakıyorum (AB)
(I put on a lot of weight and I looked ugly... I leave this part blank)
- C: (laughs) heryeri bıraktın yalnız
(you have left everything blank)
- A: tamam herkese bağırıyordum geçti neyse boşver şurayı yapalım
(ok I was shouting at everybody whatever we skipped that let's do this)
- A/B: ilk ay geceleri halüsinasyonlar görüyordum
(first months I had hallucinations)
- C: ilk ay geceleri...
- B: ***first month...***
- C: ***I see hallucinations (laughs) at night (laughs)*** hayır ***at night*** en sona yazarsın ***first month*** de cümleye devam et en son geceleri dersin (SO)
(no write ***at night*** at the end say ***first month*** and go on with the rest of the sentence in the end you say ***at night***)
- A: öyle olur mu? (AFO)
(will it be ok?)
- B: hı hı (yeah) (APP)
- C: niye olmasın
(why not?)
- A: İlk ay cümle cümle cümle geceleri
(first month sentence sentence sentence at nights)
- C: e tamam (ok)
- A: peki halüsinasyon görmek ***see*** ile mi kullanılıyor? (AFO)
(does hallucination collocates with ***see***?)
- C: galiba öyledir (SO)

- (I think so)
- B: Bulabilirsem söyleyeceğim...halüsinasyon görmek burda da yok (CAD)
(I'll tell if I can find... to have hallucinations it isn't here either)
- C: halüsinasyon görmek... sanal da denebilir aslında (GV)
(**to have hallucinations...in fact we can say virtual reality too**)
- B: hı?...
A: orda da mı yok?...peki bir şey sorucam mesela *see*'nin '*ing*'sini biz ne yapıyorduk? (AFO)
(it isn't there either? What were we doing with the *ing* of *see*?)
- C: *seeing* yok ki (E)
(there is not seeing)
- A: tamam işte ne yapıyorduk? (AFO)
(ok what were we doing?)
- C: aynen yazıyorduk (SO)
(we were writing it as it is)
- A: mesela görüyordum de .. ciddi söylüyorum
(for example say I was seeing ...I am serious)
- B: *looking* olabilir mi? (AFO)
(can it be *looking*?)
- A: *looking* bakmak ama (E)
(but *looking* means looking)
- C: hayır *I am looking* denilince görünüyorum da denir
(no *I am looking* can mean I was seeming too)
- A: öyle mi (really?)
- C: hı hı halüsinasyona sanal manal mı diyelim ne diyelim?
(shall we say something like virtual reality for hallucination?)
- A: *I was looking*
- C: halüsinasyonun İngilizcesini söylüyorum
(I am talking about the English version of hallucination)
- A: *I was looking hallucination* yazıyorum
(I am writing *I was looking hallucination*)
- B: tamam (ok)
- C: ya burda ama *I was looking* olmaz ki ama
(here *I was looking* is not possible)
- A: tamam işte onu de görüyordum de nasıl diyeceksin deyin o zaman soruyorum işte (AFO)
(ok I say that say I was seeing how will you say that I am asking you)
- C: ya yor deme gör... (SO)
(do not use I was doing see...)
- B: neyse geçelim orayı en son döneriz (AB)
(whatever let's skip it we will come back to it later)
- C: (in a low voice) her yeri öyle yaptın zaten (laughs)
(you did so all the time)
- A: rüyalarım da hep sigara içiyordum
(I was always smoking in my dreams)
- B: *in my dreams*
- C: *I always smoking in my dreams*

- A: (whispers) içiyordum oluyor
(It is I was smoking)
- C: ***I was always*** de (S)
(say ***I was always***)
- A: ***in my dreams***
- C: ***and*** bu rüyalardan çok olumsuz etkileniyordum
(I was affected by these dreams very negatively)
- A: hissetmek mi etkilenmek mi? (AFO)
(is it to feel or to be affected?)
- C: ***I feel bad*** olabilir (GV) / (SO)
(it can be ***I feel bad***)
- A: (checks dictionary) (CAD) Etkilenmek etkili etkilemek...etkilemek ***affect*** haa şey pasif yapıcaz etkilemek şey diycez o zaman nasıldı? ***was affected*** mi oluyordu böyle miydi? ***I was affected***
(to be affected effective to affect we will use passive to affect then we shall say er was it ***was affected?***)
- B: hı hı
- A: ***I was affected by*** mı diyorduk sonra (AFO)
(do we say ***I was affected by?***)
- C: etkilemek ***influence***
- A: by these dreams mi oluyordu?(AFO)
tamam... sigarayı bıraktığımdan beri iki yıl geçti
(ok it has been two years since I gave up smoking)
- B: ***two years*** iki yıl geçti ***by since*** miydi ya da ***by***
- A: aa şey diyebilir miyiz mesela anlam değişir mi iki yıldır sigara içmiyorum dersek olmaz mı öyle ***since two years*** veya ***for two years*** (AFO)
(We can say err for example does the meaning change then isn't it possible to say I have not been smoking for two years ***since two years*** or ***for two years***)
- B: ***since I give up ci..smoking***
- C: ama o zaman...(but then...)
- A: nasıl diyeceğim tam cümleyi söyle
(how shall I say it tell me the complete sentence)
- B: iki yıl geçti'yi söyleyebilsem söyleyeceğim
(I will if I can say it has been two years)
(laughs) bir saniye yeniden bakalım
(just a moment let's look at it again)
- C: ***two year went*** (laughs)
- A: şimdi daha iyiyim sağlığım yerinde sigarayı bıraktığımdan beri iki yıl geçti...
(now I am better my health is fine It has been two years since I gave up smoking)
- B: ***two years passing***
- A: olmaz ki
(but it is not possible)
- C: niye ***pass*** geçmek değil mi
(why not isn't ***to pass*** to pass?)
- B: tamam iki yıl geçti ***two years passing since*** ya da ***by*** mı kullanılır? ***give up smoking*** falan

- (ok two years passed is it *two years passing since* or *by* mı kullanılır?
something like *give up smoking*)
- A: acaba farklı anlamını versek olur mu ki... (laughs) (AFO)
hani iki yıldır sigara içmiyorum gibi...aman öyle yazalım bence ne
diyorsunuz tamam söyleyin fikrinizi tamam yazıyorum
(I wonder if we can use another meaning... I mean something like I haven't
smoked for two years let's write like that if you ask me... ok then tell me what
you think I'll write what you say)
- B: *two years passing*
- A: hı hı
- B: *passed* ya da geçti *two years passed*
- A: *since I gave up smoking*
- B: hı hı evet (yes)
- A: (in a low voice) çok gramer hatamız oldu gibi
(it seems as if we have a lot of grammatical mistakes)
- C: Türkçeden İngilizceye olmuyor
(it is inevitable from Turkish to English)
- B: şimdi daha iyiyim *now* (now I am better)
- A: *now... I feel* mi diyeceğim? (AFO)
(shall I say *I feel*?)
- B: *I feel* (R)
- A: yoksa *I am good* mu diyeyim *I am so good* daha iyiyim öyle diyorum *I am so
good* sağlığım yerinde *my health is...*
(or shall I say *I am good I am so good* I say I am better *I am so good* my
health is *my health is...*)
- B: yerinde (laughs)(it is in its place!!!)
- C: *my health is*
- A: *my health is* (R)
- B: *good* diyelim *well* diyelim(S)
(let's say *good* let's say *well*)
- A: sağlığım iyi bire bir vermek zorunda mıyız ki (AFO)
(I am healthy do we have to translate word by word?)
- C: veremiyoruz ki (laughs)
(we can't do it)
- A/C: biraz kilo verebildim
(I could lose a bit of weight)
- A: ama beş kilo daha vermem gerekiyor... kilo vermeye bakmıştık
değil mi neydi?
(I have to lose five more kilos... we looked up lose weight what was it?)
- B: ha *lose*
- C: *I lose... lose weight lost*
- A: verebildim ama ebildim diyor
(but it says I could lose..I could..)
- B: *may might...* but I must lose
- A: ama vermem gerekiyor... (REJ)
(but it is I have to lose)
- B: *must* ya da *should* kullanabilirsin (S)
(you can use *must* or *should*)

- A: vermeliyim diyelim *I should lose* (S)
(let's say I have to lose)
- B: *five*
- A: daha..(more) *I might*
şey mi diyorum *I might lose some* mı diyeceğim *weight*' e (AFO)
(shall I say *I might lose some* for *weight*?)
a little çünkü biraz var
(*a little* because there is a little)
- B: *some*
- A: *but I should lose* daha dedik
(we said *But I should lose* more)
- A: insanlarla daha iyi iletişim kurabiliyorum
(I can communicate with people better)
- B: iletişim *communication* (GV)
- A: kurmak ? (to establish?)
- B: eee
- A: (pressing the buttons of the machine translator) (CAD)
direk iletişim yazsak iletişim iletişim
(shall we write communication communication communication)
- B: kurmak ne? (AFO)
(what is to establish?)
- A: yazmıyor
(it is not here)
- C: *I have communication* diyelim direk (S)
(let's say *I have communication directly*)
- A: ya da *I can communiCATE*..evet *I can* kurabiliyorum ebilmek *can* mi
diyeyim oraya *I can communicate* mi diyeyim kurabilirim oldu ama
can..communicate people
- B: *with peoples* aman *people*
- A: DAHA İYİ DAHA İYİ
(*I can communicate* BETTER BETTER)
- B: *with people very well* daha iyi (better)
- A: hayır çok iyi oluyor (laughs) (REJ)
(no it isn't it is very well)
- B: *so good* falan olur mu? (AFO)
(can it be something like *so good* ?)
- A: *more*
- B: *more*
- A: ya da *beTTER* direk *people better* daha iyi
(or *beTTER people better* is better)
- C: ha ha (APP)
- B: evet (APP) (yes)
- C: gerçekten sigara sağlığa çok zararlı herkes mutlaka sigarayı bırakmalı
(cigarettes are really very harmful to the health: everybody should definitely
stop smoking)
- A: *really* mi diyelim *really* (AFO)
- B: *really* ya da *in fact* diyelim (APP)

- A: hı?
- B: **really** ya da **in fact** de olabilir (SO)
(**really** or it can be **in fact** too)
- A: **in fact smoking....Harmful..is very harmful to health** diyorum
(I say **in fact smoking....Harmful..is very harmful to health**)
- C: çok garip oldu
(it sounds very strange)
- A: ne diyeyim? siz söyleyin (AFO)
(what shall I say you tell me)
- B: yaz yaz (in a low voice) sen karışma (go on writing)(you don't interfere)
- B: **everybody**
- C: **must**
- B: **give up smoking**
- A: tamam şurda eksiklerimiz var
(ok we have some missing parts)
- B: başa dönelim en baştan bakalım
(ok let's check from the beginning)
- A: sigarayı bıraktığımda çok kötü bir durumdaydım **smoking I was in a bad condition** bu iyi (this is fine)
- B: öncelikle çok kilo almıştım kıyafetlerimi giyemiyordum
- A: mesela direk **put on weight** demişim **I put on weight I**
- B: neydi çirkin görünmek
(what was to look ugly?)
- B: **I seemed** diyelim (S)
(let's say **I seemed**)
- A: tamam... (ok) **I seemed ugly and I wasn't wearing my clothes**
- B: ondan sonra daha da kötüsü diyeceğiz
(then we shall say worse)
- A: **I was very nervous**
- C: daha da kötüsü
(worse)
- B: onun yerine ne kullanabiliriz daha da kötüsü (AFO)
(what can we use...worse)
- A: daha da kötüsü nasıl deriz ki..kötü daha da kötüsü (checks)..niye yazmıyor?
(how can we say even worse ...worse.. even worse why it is not in the dictionary?)
(reads the translated text in a low voice)
- B: **more bad**
- C: bence en iyisi o (SO)
(if you ask me that is the best one)
- A: öyle mi yazayım? (AFO)
(shall write that one?)
- C: yani daha kötü
(I mean even worse)
- A: daha da kötüsü..yazayım mı(AFO)
(even worse shall I write that?)
- B: ya da **more more badly** falan
(or something like **more more badly**)

- C: **most bad**
- A: **worse** diyordu (it was **worse**)
- C: deyimler İngilizce oldukları için...
(since the idioms are English...)
- A: telefon hakkımı kullanabilir miyim?
(can I use my right to make phone call?)
- C: kimi aramak istersiniz?
(who would you like to call?)
- A: ev arkadaşımı onun İngilizcesi çok iyi
(my room mate her English is very well)
- B: daha iyi **be better of** demiş (CAD)
(for better it says **be better of**)
- A: ne demiş onun işte tersini yazalım
(what is it let's write the opposite)
- C: **be worse off** yaz o zaman (GV)
(then write **be worse off**)
- A: devamında da başka bir şey yok zaten
(there is not anything else)
- A: daha da kötüsü orda daha da iyisi mi vardı neydi o? (AFO)
(even worse was there better there what was it?)
- B/C: **be better off**
- A: o zaman biz de **be more bad ..off** diyelim...tamam belki de olur (SO)
(then let's say **be more bad ..off** ... ok may be that's it)
- B: şuraya da bakayım da ben... **be better off** da o zaman **be worse off** mu olacak?
(let me check this one...is **be better off** will **be worse off** become **be worse off** then? (AFO)
- A: **more bad**
- B: **bad worse** oluyor **more** olmuyor (E)
(**bad** becomes **worse** not **more**)
- A: öyle mi iyi zaman (is that so? ok then) (APP)
- C: **be worse off** iki f'liydi bir f b daha koy(S)
(there were two f's in **be worse off** put another f)
(they check dictionary) (CAD)
hey yarabbim (my god)
- A: bitti değil mi?
(it is finished isn't it?)
- B: ha ha