

BRIDGING THE REAL WORLD ENGLISHES IN THE RURAL ESL CLASSROOM THROUGH TRANSLATION

Nik Zaitun Mohamed¹, Hamzah Md. Omar², Suhaida Omar³
^{1,2,3}Faculty of Psychology and Education, Universiti Malaysia Sabah
¹nzaitun@ums.edu.my, ²hamzahmo@ums.edu.my, ³suhaida@ums.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Translation can play a role in the development of communicative abilities since speakers are often engaged in the work of sharing and negotiating meaning. It fosters speculation and discussion, apart from developing abilities considered fundamental for communication, such as interpretation, negotiation, and expression of meaning. However, there are views against translation in the ESL classrooms even though the method has been applied in the pedagogical process. As a result, ESL students who are weak in English are not given the opportunity to excel in the second language from their own bilingual strength. This paper attempts to study and disclose in what ways pedagogical translation in rural ESL classrooms in Sabah is reflected into practice, thereby assessing whether the gap between pedagogical translation and translation pedagogy has been bridged. In this case study, five primary teachers were selected and their knowledge and practice of translation were assessed through qualitative content analysis in pre-teaching, while teaching and post-teaching activities. A translation framework has been designed and used in assessing the teachers' performances in using translation. This pilot study reveals that teachers have translated from the first language (L1) into the second language (L2) as a means to help students to understand the content of the English lesson. They did not have adequate knowledge on translation strategies. Thus, the designed translation framework may be used by teachers as a guide in using translation in the ESL context.

Keywords: Translation Pedagogy; Pedagogical Translation; ESL; World Englishes; Rural Education.

Throughout the years, several authors have been reflecting upon the use of translation in English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms from different perspectives (Duff, 1989; Malmkjær, 1998; Widdowson, 2003; Cook, 2010; House, 2013). They defend the practice of translation in the ESL and EFL contexts not as a means in itself, but as a strategy to help students become more independent and better equipped when using a second or foreign language. If one goes back to the many methods that permeated the teaching and learning of foreign languages from the early nineteenth century until the present moment (Cook, 2010), it can be verified that translation was part of it in one way or another. Unfortunately, it was always seen as a mere exercise of translating word by word, without any context.

Aim of the study

This study aims to disclose in what way pedagogical translation in rural ESL classroom is reflected into practice, thereby assessing whether the gap between pedagogical translation and translation pedagogy have been bridged. These are the research questions: Do teachers possess language competency in L1 and L2? What type of equivalence is evident in the pedagogical translation? What is the purpose of

using translation in teaching literature to ESL students? How do teachers assess the suitability of the selected text to be taught in ESL classroom? Which translation strategies are adopted in teaching ESL rural primary school students?

Translation and Language Teaching

Translation has been used as one of the methods in language teaching, apart from the reading, audiolingual and audiovisual methods. Stern (2001), for instance, has exposed and compared all these methods in terms of their features, sources, history, objectives, teaching method, theoretical assumptions and the assessment. He admitted that making such comparisons was not easy task, since “even the generic term ‘method’ is not unequivocal. Cook (2010), on the other hand, has argued on the importance of translation in language teaching and learning. Focusing solely on translation, he compares and assesses each translation method in language teaching from the 18th century until the present moment. His detailed argument and explanation on this issue has contributed to the area of language teaching, particularly to teachers who believe in using translation in their teaching. The availability of these separate writings by Stern (2001) and Cook (2010), no doubt, could enable language teachers to understand the development of language teaching and learning starting from the 18th century, apart from helping them to choose the most appropriate method or methods in their own teaching.

To Translate or Not To Translate

Even though translation has long been regarded as one of the methods on EFL and ESL teaching, the issue has been debated throughout the years. At times, the failure of the Grammar- Translation method used in the 18th century and the ardent Reform Movement in the 19th century have influenced scholars and teachers to shun the method from their pedagogical sphere (Widdowson, 2003; Vermes, 2010; Cook, 2010; and House, 2013). It has been belittled in various terms, such as “unhelpful to learning, unusable, dull, authoritarian, unpopular, artificial, and slows students down” (Cook, 2010, p. 125). Howatt (2000) considers translation as unsuitable in foreign language learning. Translation, thus, has been outlawed and considered a disgrace in both ESL and EFL classrooms for many years.

However, research indicates that translation is not totally banned in teaching. House (2013), for instance, has presented the arguments against and for in pedagogical uses of translation. Among the objections are: translation into the foreign language interfered with the natural process of learning a foreign language and corrupted its use; translation from the foreign language was also rejected because it promotes passive knowledge about the foreign language; translation is misleading as it seduced learners into believing one-to-one correspondence of two languages; and translation *per se* was claimed an unnatural activity which could hinder the learning of four basic skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. These objections seem similar to the ones made earlier by Malmkjær (Cf. Vermes, 2010). To him, translation is independent of the four skills which define language competence; radically different from the four skills; takes up valuable time which could be used to teach these four skills; unnatural; misleads students into thinking that expressions in two languages correspond one-to-one; produces interference; and prevents students from thinking in the foreign language. Evidently, both of these objections are based on his beliefs that language learning are confined to the four

basic language skills, and translation is considered unnatural and detached from the actual language learning.

In two separate writings, Vermes (2010) and Leonardi (2010) have argued the objections made by Malmkjær. According to Vermes (2010), Malmkjær's objections are based on traditional assumptions in language learning, and they do not make sense," considering the fact that translation has been part of human life for millennia." (p. 88). He considers translation as a form of communication, which could be considered a useful device in foreign language teaching. Still in a similar vein, Leonardi (2010) states that there is a strong connection between translation and foreign language teaching, whereby translators are considered good bilinguals and life-long language learners. According to her, the use of translation in language classes "is not a means aimed at training professional translators but rather a means to help learners acquire, develop and further strengthening their knowledge and competence in a foreign language" (p. 17). She considers translation as the fifth skill in language learning. Thus, Malmkjær's objections seem baseless and unacceptable. Suffice to note that both Vermes (2010) and Leonardo (2010) consider translation as a useful pedagogic tool in the process of learning and teaching foreign languages. Stern (2001), Widdowson (2003) and Cook (2010) seem in line with their arguments. Stern (2001) and Cook (2010) outrightly mention that translation will take place in bilingual classrooms anyway, whether or not one likes it. All of them welcome translation into language classroom, particularly in ESL and EFL contexts.

Pedagogical Translation and Translation Pedagogy

In order to understand the connection between teaching and the use of translation, perhaps the terms of Pedagogical Translation and Translation Pedagogy should be explained and differentiated. Both "Pedagogy" and "Translation" have their distinct meanings. Pedagogy is connected to the process of teaching and learning, whereas translation is defined in various ways, such as transference from the source language/text (SL/ST) into source language (TL/TT) (Cook, 2010; Leonardi, 2010; House, 2013) and rewriting or reproduction (Nida, 1964; Bassnett, 1992; Toury, 1995, 2008, 2013). Vermes (2010) makes distinctions between pedagogical translation and real translation. He differentiates between pedagogical translation and real translation in three ways: function, object and addressee (p. 84). In terms of function, pedagogical translation is an instrumental kind of translation in order to improve learner's foreign language proficiency. It serves as a means to test language knowledge. In real translation, the translated text is the product, not a tool. The object of real translation is reality of the source text, whereas in pedagogical translation, it is the learner's level of language proficiency. In terms of addressee, the target reader of a real translation seeks for information about reality, whereas the addressee in pedagogical translation is the examiner who seeks for information about learner's level of proficiency.

Translation Pedagogy, on the other hand, deals with the knowledge about correct decoding of the source text (ST) and encoding into the target text. It is a tool or a set of guidelines for teachers to follow in using translation among bilingual students. The importance of this area in language teaching and learning is evident today. Baer & Koby (2003), for instance, offer critical discussion on translation pedagogy with theoretical consideration, sample lessons and plans for teachers to refer as guidelines. According to them, the development of foreign language pedagogy over the last

twenty-five years to bring the real world into the classrooms has shifted from the behaviouralist models (Skinner) to cognitive models (Bloom, Piaget, Vygotsky) of language acquisition. They suggested that teachers should refer to models of translation pedagogy, which are process-oriented and learner centered to translation. In addition, Leonardi (2010) and Rouhollah ((2013) have illustrated the application of translation pedagogy in ESL contexts. Indeed, these guidelines involve teachers and students throughout the lesson. Teachers should be able to use the model effectively, while students should be able to engage themselves in the learning process at the optimal level.

Theoretical Foundation

Research in the area of Translation Studies has shown that there are two schools of thoughts in dealing with translation: Prescriptive and Descriptive methods. The Prescriptive group deals with the products of translation that is the translated texts, whereas the Descriptive group will study the processes of translation and factors affecting the production of the translated texts. For the sake of this research, the Descriptive group's theories and approaches will be employed. The use of historical and descriptive theoretical frame-work, as opposed to a normative and prescriptive approach in analysing the relationship between various types of translated texts within the target culture has been employed by a number of translation scholars (Even-Zohar, 1976; Toury, 1995, 2013). Toury (1995, 2013), for instance, has introduced the concept of translational norms. These norms which are designed to explain the translation process at every level within the target literary system are divided into two parts: preliminary and operational norms. The preliminary norms are connected to the translation policy and the directness of the translation activity. The operational norms may be related to the decisions made during the act of translation itself. These norms may affect the matrix of the text in terms of what goes on between the source and target texts. Indeed, the blend of these theories is able to reveal and explain what has happened in the process of translation from the Source Text /Source Language (ST/SL) into the Target Text/Target Language (TT/TL).

Theoretical Foundation

Research in the area of Translation Studies has shown that there are two schools of thoughts in dealing with translation: Prescriptive and Descriptive methods. The Prescriptive group deals with the products of translation that is the translated texts, whereas the Descriptive group will study the processes of translation and factors affecting the production of the translated texts. For the sake of this research, the Descriptive group's theories and approaches will be employed. The use of historical and descriptive theoretical frame-work, as opposed to a normative and prescriptive approach in analysing the relationship between various types of translated texts within the target culture has been employed by a number of translation scholars (Even-Zohar, 1976; Toury, 1995, 2013). Toury (1995, 2013), for instance, has introduced the concept of translational norms. These norms which are designed to explain the translation process at every level within the target literary system are divided into two parts: preliminary and operational norms. The preliminary norms are connected to the translation policy and the directness of the translation activity. The operational norms may be related to the decisions made during the act of translation itself. These norms may affect the matrix of the text in terms of what goes

on between the source and target texts. Indeed, the blend of these theories is able to reveal and explain what has happened in the process of translation from the Source Text /Source Language (ST/SL) into the Target Text/Target Language (TT/TL).

METHOD

Research Paradigm

In order to obtain an in-depth understanding of the intercept between translation pedagogy and pedagogical translation in teaching literature to rural primary school students in Sabah, this study was built on the paradigm of qualitative inquiry (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Creswell, 2009; Kincheloe et. al, 2013).

A Case Study

A case study was employed in this research as it has merits in qualitative research (Denzine and Lincoln, 1994; Yin, 2003; Cohen et al, 2001; Zaidah, 2007). It would describe and explain the boundary of ‘how’ and ‘why’ embedded in this study. In fact, Yin (2003, pp. 78-80) recommends a pilot case study to be conducted prior to the actual data collection in order to refine and improve data collection plan.

Participants

Based on the purposive sampling, a total of 5 primary school teachers, who are enrolled in the education degree programme known as Program Pensiswazahan Guru (PPG) in the School of Education and Social Development, University Malaysia Sabah, were selected. They are teaching in various rural primary schools throughout Sabah. The pilot study has taken place for three months, from September-November 2013.

Procedure

The participants were required to go through these procedures:

- 1) Responding to seven pre-teaching structured questions:
(Aim: To identify preliminary views on pedagogical translation)
 - i. Do you translate in teaching literature to your students?
 - ii. How frequent do you translate in teaching literature to your students?
 - iii. How do you translate? Are you using any particular model?
 - iv. Why do you translate?
 - v. Is it necessary to translate?
 - vi. Do you consider translation as a tool or a goal in your teaching?
 - vii. Does translation enhance your teaching or detriment it?
- 2) Preparing a lesson plan and conduct a lesson based on the given literary text:
(Aim: To study pedagogical translation in ESL classroom)
Task: Prepare a literature lesson plan for level 2 students (Primary Year 4-6) based on Shakespeare’s revised tale, “A Midsummer Night’s Dream,” and conduct a lesson. You may adopt translation in your teaching and learning activities.
- 3) Giving feedback on pedagogical translation employed during teaching:
(Aim: To allow the participants to reflect on their practices in pedagogical translation)

Task: Reflect on your translation strategies used during your literature lesson on ‘A Midsummer Night’s Dream.’

Analysis Instrument

The collected data were in the forms of interviews (individual and focus group) and visual data (lesson plan and teaching video). Data were analysed through content analyses, a strategy used in qualitative research (Miles and Huberman, 1994; Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). As coding was prepared in line with a proposed translation framework, known as Za’ba’s Translation Framework (ZTF), the analysis is known as a directed content analysis (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). The codes used in the ZTF are competency, suitability, strategy, purpose and equivalence. The ZTF is constructed based on the Descriptive Theoretical framework and Polysystem Hypothesis alongside the case study of Za’ba’s translation of Shakespeare’s works from English into Bahasa Melayu in the early 1930s. The aim of the ZTF is to ascertain pedagogical translation performance among ESL primary school teachers in rural Sabah.

RESULT

Using the Language Proficiency Descriptor adapted from the MUET scale (2006), the participants’ levels of competency in L2 fall within bands 3-6, which are mediocre and good. The data indicate that the participants have some problems with their writing skill, particularly pertaining to subject-verb agreement. As listed below:

Problems in subject-verb agreement

“Pupils were enjoy (were enjoying) the poem.” (Participant 3)

“Teacher give (gives) out the simplified text...” (Participant 4)

Teacher read (reads) the text first...” (Participant 4)

However, the overall scales indicate that the selected participants are competent communicators in both Bahasa Malaysia and English languages for pedagogical purposes. This is proven when they were able to conduct their lessons to ESL students, despite the fact that they were not familiar with the assigned literary text.

Table 1. The Participants’ Language Competency

Participant	Reading Skill	Listening Skill	Speaking Skill	Writing Skill
1	Good	Good	Good	Good
2	Good	Good	Good	Good
3	Good	Good	Good	Mediocre
4	Good	Good	Good	Mediocre
5	Good	Good	Good	Good

Coding 2: EQUIVALENCE

It is found that four participants have translated, instead of rewrite. This situation has occurred because the translation task involved was not connected to a translation product, but a translation process. Thus, they translated orally in their attempts to

help students to understand the lesson better. Translation has occurred in both form and meaning. As shown below:

1) Form

Converting the tale into a drama script, translation involved during the activity

Oberon: Hey, Puck! Puck: Yes master!

Oberon: You know my plan! Go to and find me the little purple flower! Puck: Right away master!

(Extracted from the student’s lesson plan)

2) Meaning

Evidently, the process of rewriting has taken place as one subject tried to simplify the tale. As shown below:

“The fairies that live in the woods are also having problems. Oberon, the king of fairies, is angry at his queen, Titania. She is taking care of a little human boy and Oberon is jealous. He wants to take the boy to be his servant. Titania won’t let him so Oberon decides to play a trick on her. He asks his helper, Puck, to find a magical flower. The flower’s juice is supposed to make someone fall in love with the first thing they see. Oberon wants puck to use the flower on Titania.” (Extracted from the student’s lesson plan).

Based on a competency scale, the participants’ levels of competency in translating/rewriting from L1 to L2 range from mediocre to good.

Table 2. Translation Process Competency

Participants	Translating Competency	Rewriting Competency
1	Good	Mediocre
2	Good	Mediocre
3	Good	Mediocre
4	Good	Mediocre
5	Good	Mediocre

Coding 3: PURPOSE

For the participants, the purposes of translation are to enable students to understand the lesson. As noted below:

“To enable students to understand the lesson. Translation is very useful because it provides the learners with a ‘safe feeling, knowing that they are not forced to use the language in a way that they are not yet ready.” (Sample response for Pre-teaching Question no. 4).

“I do translation because I want my pupils to learn something in my lesson. As I mentioned, most of my pupils are not fluent in English because of their FL is Sungai or Dusun. Imagine if I use English in my lesson, pupils definitely will feel bored.” (Sample response for Pre-teaching Question no. 4).

Based on these responses, the participants have translated in order to help their students to understand the content of the story and to enhance their language proficiency. As shown in the following table, all of the participants (5/5) translated to help students to understand the content, whereas only 2 of them (2/5) translated for the purpose of language enhancement. In terms of knowing the purpose of translation, their awareness ranges from poor to mediocre. As shown in the following tables:

Table 3. A Descriptor of Translation Purpose

Item	Understand the content	Impart moral values	Enrich cultural dimension	Enhance language learning
Purpose	YES (5/5)	NO	NO	YES (2/5)

Table 4. Scale of Performance

Process	Good	Mediocre	Poor
Purpose of Translation	Able to identify fully the actual purpose of using translation in teaching the text in ESL setting.	Able to identify partially the actual purpose of using translation in teaching the text in ESL setting.	Not able to identify the actual purpose of using translation in teaching the text in ESL setting.

Table 5. The Sample's Awareness of Translation Purpose

Participant	Content Understanding	Language Enhancement
1	Good	Good
2	Good	Good
3	Good	Good
4	Good	Poor
5	Good	Poor

Coding 4: SUITABILITY

The following responses suggest that the assigned text is suitable both in terms of content and value. As noted below:

“Teaching a Shakespeare masterpiece to rural school pupils is certainly a near-impossible task had not I changed the whole play into a story. At this point, there were many elements in the play that I had to omit in order for the play to be transformed into a form of story similar to fairy tales so loved by children especially in level one. Of course, I could have modified the entire structure and retain the play as it is but the whole idea has to depend on the feasibility of the environment and the level of the pupils’ reception of the play or story. In this case, ‘A midsummer Night’s Dream’ while being a fairy story loved by children is built on heavy and complicated theme of love coupled with intrigue. Shakespeare meant the play for adult audiences and that is why to make it work for primary school children especially Malaysians who have been long exposed to simplistic stories is a demanding task indeed. Nevertheless, it is an equally satisfying effort if it yields the effect we expect e.g. the

reception of the pupils of the story.” (Extracted from the student’s lesson plan, unedited)

“The Midsummer night’s dream is a difficult fiction to be used for pupils with poor to mediocre proficiency level pupils’. The classic language needs a lot of explaining to the pupils as of the unseen nature in the curriculum. However, being it a linguistic and magical storyline and plot, it can be used as a great play for pupils.” (Extracted from the student’s lesson plan, unedited.)

This information is transferred into the following table:

Table 6. Descriptor for Translation Suitability

Text	Speaking Skill	Writing Skill
Content:		
Form	+	+
Plot	+	+
Characters	+	+
Theme		
Values	+	+
Readability:		
Length	-	-
Word Choice	-/+	-/+
Sentence structures	-	-
Use of punctuations/Markers	-	-

Based on the lesson plans prepared by the participants, the assigned text seemed suitable for teaching content and values in teaching and writing skills. The teaching of content involves form, plot, characters and values. In terms of readability of the text, three participants considered the text long and difficult, thus simplifying it before beginning their lessons. They have different opinions regarding the word choice. Two of them considered the words manageable, whereas the rest considered the text as difficult and needed translation. Thus, in translation competency, the participants’ levels of competency range between mediocre to good, as illustrated by the following descriptor.

Table 7. A Scale of Performance

SKILLS	Good	Mediocre	Poor
SPEAKING	Able to translate words, phrases or sentences orally from English (L1) to Bahasa Malaysia (L2) 100% as a tool of enhancing comprehension in L2.	Able to translate words, phrases or sentences orally from English (L1) to Bahasa Malaysia (L2) 50- 80% as a tool of enhancing comprehension in L2.	Able to translate words, phrases or sentences orally from English (L1) to Bahasa Malaysia (L2) 10-50% as a tool of enhancing comprehension in L2.

WRITING	Able to translate or rewrite words, phrases or sentences from English (L1) to Bahasa Malaysia (L2) 80-100% as a tool of enhancing comprehension in L2.	Able to translate or rewrite words, phrases or sentences from English (L1) to Bahasa Malaysia (L2) 50-80% as an easy way out to teach bilingual students, partly concentrating on enhancing proficiency in L2.	Able to translate words, phrases or sentences from English (L1) to Bahasa Malaysia (L2) 10-50% as an easy way out in teaching bilingual students, without enhancing proficiency in L2.
----------------	--	--	--

Table 8. The Participants' Opinions on Text Suitability

Participant	Speaking	Writing
1	Good	Good
2	Good	Good
3	Mediocre	Mediocre
4	Mediocre	Mediocre
5	Mediocre	Mediocre

Coding 5: TRANSLATION STRATEGIES

These are some of the translation strategies adopted by the participants:

(Delete/Explain/Rephrase/Replace)

“The story has some new and difficult words, are difficult words. The movie also contains words that students cannot understand. **I did not use the difficult words. I explain new words in L1 if students still cannot understand the meaning.**” (Reflection on 27th October 2013)

Word level: New/Cutural-bound/

“**I explain** new words if students cannot understand.”(Reflection on 27th October 2013)

Sensitive/Taboo

“..Going out with a boyfriend into the wood in the middle of the night is a sensitive issue. **I don’t really focus on this part.**” (Reflection on 27th October 2013)

Sentence Level: Lengthy/Complex/Ambiguous.

“The assigned play is long. I read it through, **tried to make sense of it through interpretation and prepare a simplified one, shorter with simple words.**”(Reflection on 27th October 2013)

Interpretation/Meaning level:

Interlingua/Intralingua/Intersemiotic

“..I read the assigned tale and watched the movie before starting the lesson. **I tried to understand the content and the meaning of the tale in terms of moral values and theme.**” (Reflection on 27th October 2013)

“I believe that **if I can understand the story, I can use it effectively in my literature class.**”(Reflection on 27th October 2013)

These responses are grouped into the following table:

Table 9. ZTF Translation Strategies

Items	Translation Strategies: Delete/Explain/Rephrase/Replace
Word Level:	Delete
New	Explain
Cultural-bound	Rephrase
Sensitive/Taboo	Replace
Sentence Level:	Delete
Lengthy	Explain
Complex	Rephrase
Ambiguous	Replace
Interpretation:	Delete
Interlingua	Explain
Intralingua	Rephrase
Intersemiotic	Replace

Evidently, all of the participants have used the strategies suggested by Za’ba in translating the assigned text. The strategies are delete, explain, rephrase and replace. The participants resorted to deletion and explaining as the popular strategies if they cannot understand the content, words or sentences, apart from avoiding from dealing with certain parts which contradict local values.

Table 10. A Scale of Performance

Component	Good	Mediocre	Poor
Za’ba’s Translation Strategies	Able to use any one of/ several Za’ba’s translation strategies between 80-100% during the lesson.	Able to use any one of/ several Za’ba’s translation strategies between 50-80% during the lesson.	Able to use any one of/ several Za’ba’s translation strategies between 10-50% during the lesson.

Table 11: The Sample's Awareness on Translation Strategy

Participant	Knowledge on Translation Strategies
1	Poor
2	Poor
3	Poor
4	Poor
5	Poor

Thus, based on both of the descriptors above, the participants' levels of competency in selecting translation strategies are considered poor, since they are not aware of the strategies used by Za'ba in translation.

DISCUSSION

After going through the three research procedures, these are some of the responses:

Preliminary views on Pedagogical Translation

Question 1: Do you translate in teaching literature to your students?

"Yes. I do."

"Sometimes."

"Always."

Question 2: How frequent do you translate in teaching English to your students?

"I translate most of the time. I am teaching in Salinatan, Pensiangan. When I teach English to years 4, 5 and 6, students hardly understand. So, I translate from English into Malay word by word. Sometimes I repeat the words or translate whole sentences especially during class activities."

"I've been teaching English language since I was posted in the interior area of my hometown, Keningau. All these years I teach English language, I ALWAYS do translation. Most of the time, I did try not to translate from Bahasa Melayu to English, but I found it was rather difficult to make my pupils understand the lesson or meaning that I tried to deliver."

"To make literature more interesting and meaningful, I translate it most of the time either in English, Sungai or Dusun languages. At the same time, I taught them to speak in English in a simple way."

Question 3: How do you translate? Are you using any particular model?

“Using thought-for thought method rather than direct translation. This technique is based on a model employed by modern Bible translators.”

“Word by word. I would only have to translate a few words in the passages as well as in comprehension questions. Weaker students are not able to find the meanings of words in their dictionary as they don’t understand how to use a dictionary. No model”

“Translating word in a context is more effective than direct translation of an English to Bahasa Malaysia or Dusun. The pupils will be able to understand the usage of the words better by recalling the context of where the word is used. Gestures and visual aids should also be used. No particular model”

Question 4: Why do you translate?

“I have to translate because I want students to understand the passages. Without translation, they would not look for the answers for the comprehension questions. When I do translation, the pupils will be drilled with the same word again and again and they will memories it. This is how pupils learn English in rural area.”

“The rationale is when we teach English, we found that our students don’t understand the language properly. We need to explain to them clearly even if we need to use their local or mother tongue to make it clear to them. It is unfair for the pupils if the teacher explains in English but they don’t understand. That means the teacher’s objectives of using English during the lesson was achieved but the lesson objectives were not achieved.”

“I do translation because I want my pupils to learn something in my lesson. As I mentioned, most of my pupils are not fluent in English because of their FL is Sungai or Dusun. Imagine if I use English in my lesson, pupils definitely will feel bored.”

Question 5: Is it necessary to translate?

“Yes, for me it is necessary to translate every time I teach. However, before I began to translate, I would ask pupils what they understand about the story or the passage so it will be easier for me to translate only the parts that pupils do not understand.”

“In my opinion, it is easier for the pupils to understand English by translating some words into Malay, but not necessarily we have to translate all the time.”

“Translation is a useful tool as long as we are careful with it and check understanding afterwards. Translation as a teaching technique can be used to help pupils learn English thoroughly and effectively.”

Question 6: Do you consider translation as a tool or a goal in your teaching?

“I consider translation as a tool rather than goal.”

“No, I don’t think so.”

“As a tool.”

Question 7: Does translation enhance your teaching or detriment it?

“I feel that translation enhances if used sparingly. But if I had to translate most of the time, it is a detriment because in the end, it no longer yields the results of learning English but rather a session of listening a foreign language being translated into the students’ native tongues.”

“Yes of course, it helps. When students do not understand, I explain in Bahasa Malaysia. So, my students understand the lesson.”

“Yes. Translation enhances my teaching.”

Second procedure: During Teaching Activity:

Based on the lesson plans prepared by the participants, they have used the text in teaching listening, speaking, reading and writing, apart from literary appreciation. Generally, the text were considered difficult at the beginning, but the participants have exhibited their creative abilities in manipulating, summarising and using it to teach in a variety of ways, following their students’ levels of English language proficiency. The activities range from character identification, dramatization to poem recitation and vocabulary building. Thus, even though the text was considered a barrier in the beginning, it has been used successfully in their class activities.

Third Procedure: Post-Teaching Activity: Focus Group Interview

These are some of the participant’ reflections in teaching “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”: “The story is long and contains difficult words. Hmm...I prepared a summary of the tale, simpler and shorter. I also showed them the animated tale. **I used translation** to explain new words, concepts and sentences during class activities. I think the lesson went well.” (Reflection on 27th November 2013).

“My students liked the tale and the class performance. They also liked the animated movie of the tale. Before performing the play, I gave them a simplified script. **I translated** and explain a few words in L1 while watching them practicing their performance. ” (Reflection on 27th November 2013).

“I ask my students to do role play by wearing animal masks. In the process, **they translated into Dusun or Bahasa Malaysia if they forgot certain words.** I gave the English translation. Through this method, I think my students learn new words and concepts better” (Reflection on 27th November 2013).

Based on these reflections, the text has been used in various ways. It has been summarised for easy understanding, simplified through animated audio-visual version, role-play through dramatisation and mask-wearing. During the focus groups reflection, all of the participants mentioned that they have used translation during their teaching activities, particularly in giving instruction and explaining parts of the play, which students could not understand. Next, The ZTF will be used to analyse

the collected data based on the three procedures above. The data will be organised and discussed accordingly following the coding in the framework.

Coding 1: COMPETENCY IN L2

The findings seem to indicate that the participants have demonstrated both written and spoken proficiency in responding to the pre-teaching questions and reflection activity. As indicated below:

Written

“I used to translate new English vocabulary for my students into their first language, if they had difficulty understanding what the word meant.” (Sample response for Pre-teaching Question no. 1).

“If I have the time, I will translate word by word or else I will just a picture of a sentence or story...” (Sample response for Pre-teaching Question no. 2).

“Translation is vital as the pupils will understand better and proceed to activities conducted without greater obstacles.” (Sample response for Pre-teaching Question no. 3)

“We as English teachers in a non-English speaking country think that translation work while teaching in primary schools is inevitable as majority of them do not make English as L1 at home. (Sample response for Pre-teaching Question no. 4).

“Teacher distributes a line of “A Midsummer Night’s Dream” script to each pupil.” (Sample response from a Daily Lesson Plan on “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”).

“Teacher explains the antagonist, protagonist and natural characters.” (Sample response from a Daily Lesson Plan on “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”).

Speaking:

“The story is long and contains difficult words. Hmm...I prepared a summary of the tale, simpler and shorter. I also showed them the animated tale. **I used translation** to explain new words, concepts and sentences during class activities. I think the lesson went well.” (Reflection on 27th November 2013).

“My students liked the tale and the class performance. They also liked the animated movie of the tale. Before performing the play, I gave them a simplified script. **I translated** and explain a few words in L1 while watching them practicing their performance.” (Reflection on 27th November 2013).

“I ask my students to do role play by wearing animal masks. In the process, **they translated into Dusun or Bahasa Malaysia if they forgot certain words.** I gave the English translation. Through this method, I think my students learn new words and concepts better” (Reflection on 27th November 2013).

CONCLUSION

The Feasibility of ZTF Model

The pilot study, conducted from September-November 2013, has demonstrated the feasibility of the ZTF model to be used as a framework in assessing the participants’ abilities to perform pedagogical translation in teaching literature to ESL

primary school students in rural Sabah. The preliminary findings have paved a horizon in answering the research questions posed earlier.

Thus, The ZTF Model has enabled the teachers' application of translation in classroom to be assessed. Viewing the act of pedagogical translation as one of the systems out of other systems, the use of this framework allows us to see the use and feasibility of translation in teaching literature to ESL students. The notion of "feasibility" of this framework, perhaps could be attributed to the acceptance of translation as natural and functional teaching techniques in ESL context, as implied by Stern (2001), Leonardi (2010) and Cook (2010), and thus can be used as a tool in L2 learning. To summarise, the framework is considered feasible if it shows the following functions:

1. Translation as a tool of teaching in ESL context;
2. Translation as a natural teaching process in ESL context;
3. Translation as a functional teaching process in ESL context;
4. Translation as a means of improving accuracy and fluency.

Therefore, the findings of the pilot study suggest that the framework is feasible to be used in assessing teachers' pedagogical translation ability in teaching literature to their ESL students in rural areas.

REFERENCES

- Baer, B. J., & Koby, G. S. (Eds.). (2003). *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking Translation Pedagogy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bassnett, S. (1992). *Translation Studies*. Revised edition. London: Routledge.
- Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, L, Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2001). *Research Methods in Education*. 5th edition. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, John W. (2009). *Research Design*. 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Denzine, N. K and Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2013). *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. 4th edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Duff, A. (1989). *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Even-Zohar, I. (1978). The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem. In Holmes, J, Lambert, H., and van den Broeck, R. (Eds). *Literature and Translations: New Perspectives in Literary Studies with a*

basic bibliography of books on translation studies. Leuven: Acco, pp. 117-127.

Even-Zohar, I. (1978). *Papers in Historical Poetics*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Even-Zohar, I. (1990). Polysystem Studies. In Even-Zohar, I. *Poetics today*. Vol. II (91). Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kincheloe, J. L., McLaren, P. and Steinberg, S. R. (2013). Critical Pedagogy and Qualitative Research: Moving on to the Bricolage. In Denzine, N. K and Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. 4th edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 339-370.

House, J. (2013). *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howatt, A. P. R. (2000). *A History of English Language Teaching*. 7th impression. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.

Malmkjær, K. (1998). Introduction: Translation and Language Teaching. In Malmkjær, K. (Ed.). *Translation and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, pp. 1-11.

Miles B. M. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, London & New Delhi: Sage Publications Ltd.

Nida, E. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translation, with Special reference to principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Stern, H. H. (2001). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. 11th impression. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Toury, G. (1980). *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv University: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Toury, G. (2013). *Pengajian Penerjemahan Deskriptif dan jangkauannya*. Terj. Kuala Lumpur: ITBM.

Leonardi, V. (2010). *The Role of Pedagogical Translation in Second Language Acquisition: from Theory to Practice*: Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang AG.

Vermes, A. (2010). Translation in Foreign Language Teaching: A Brief Overview of Pros and cons. *Eger Journal of English Studies (X)*, 83-93.

Widdowson, H.G. (2003). *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. Vol. 5. London & New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Website Sources

Majlis Peperiksaan Malaysia. (2006). Malaysian University English Test (MUET), in www.mpm.edu.my/documents/10156/c5c33ab-3d97-4959-83c0-09866eea0774. Retrieved 13th March 2014.

Rouhollah Askari Bigdelli. (2012). A New Direction in Translation Pedagogy: Task-based Translation Teaching, Published in the proceedings of the first national conference on issues in English literature and language teaching: New trends and criticisms, 2 May 2012, Lorestan, Iran, pp. 638-643, in www.academia.edu/3210272/A_NewDirection_in_Translation_Pedagogy_Task-based_Translation_Teaching. Retrieved 10th June 2013.

Zaidah, Zainal. (2007). Case Study as a Research Method. *Jurnal Kemanusiaan* 9(Jun), in www.scribd.com/doc/118632777/zzainal. Retrieved 15 November 2013.