

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A SUGGESTED
PROGRAMME DELIVERED VIA COLLABORATIVE
TEAM TEACHING IN DEVELOPING LANGUAGE AND
TRANSLATION SKILLS AMONG EFL MAJORS**

Dr. Attia Es-sayed Attia

Lecturer of TEFL

Faculty of Education

Al-Azhar University

Dr Khalaf El-Deeb Othman

Lecturer of TAFL

Faculty of Education

Al-Azhar University

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A SUGGESTED PROGRAMME
DELIVERED VIA COLLABORATIVE TEAM TEACHING IN
DEVELOPING LANGUAGE AND TRANSLATION SKILLS AMONG
EFL MAJORS**

*Attia Es-Sayed Attia*¹

*Khalaf El-DeebOthman*²

Abstract:

The aim of this paper is to investigate the effectiveness of a suggested programme based on language skills in developing EFL majors' translation and language skills. Furthermore, and believing that teaching in general and translation in particular can no longer be viewed as an egg-box profession, where a teacher is kept separate from his fellow teachers, the study probes the effectiveness of team teaching as a collaborative teaching approach in delivering the programme on EFL majors' translation and language skills. To realize these targets a translation programme based on language skills was designed and implemented via two different delivery approaches, namely collaborative team teaching and lecturing. A pre / post design was used with 90 first grader EFL majors, Faculty of Education, Al-Azhar University, who participated in the one full semester training to compare and assess the effectiveness of the programme and delivery approaches on the dependent variables. Instruments developed for the study included a reading comprehension test in English, vocabulary & structure tests in Arabic and English, a composing skill test in Arabic, a translation test and translation scoring rubrics. Results of the study revealed not only significant differences in translation and language skills between the three groups of the study but also a large effect size (η^2). The suggested programme was shown to have an enhancing

¹*Attia Es-Sayed Attia, Lecturer of TEFL, Faculty of Education, Al-Azhar University. elhefnawy70@gmail.com*

²*Khalaf El-Deeb Othman Lecturer of TAFL Faculty of Education, Al-Azhar University. Yarbfrgk.khalaf@gmil.com*

effect on both promoting EFL majors' translation skills and overall language proficiency. Likewise, the collaborative team teaching used was more effective than the traditional method. The findings suggest that systematic training in translation skills that call for contrastive analysis between the two languages concerned is badly needed for EFL majors and that delivery approaches for such programmes should call for collaboration and interdisciplinary. The paper further discusses the theoretical and pedagogical implications of the findings obtained.

Keywords: Collaborative teaching approaches, teaching translation, translation skills, EFL majors, TAFL, TEFL. Reading Comprehension, Translation test, contrastive analysis

***THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A SUGGESTED PROGRAMME
DELIVERED VIA COLLABORATIVE TEAM TEACHING IN
DEVELOPING TRANSLATION SKILLS AMONG EFL LEARNERS***

Introduction:

With that overwhelming tide of globalization extending to seriously determine our present and future, no room is left for doubt that sound translation is vital so that communities as well as individuals might not find themselves left behind while the world is racing forward. In a world like our present one, which is so often described as a small village with no boundaries, no one can afford to live in isolation. People survive in the long run because of interdependence and communication. For people of different languages, this means reliable translation. Translation, in this sense, is the window through which we can have direct contact with other remote civilizations and cultures.

Translation is a real – life communicative activity which is essentially used everywhere nowadays and it is intrinsically and extrinsically linked to a communicative purpose (Carreres, 2006). People need translation everyday while following up both local and international news. People need translation at home, while using the audiovisual media for fun or for other serious interests. Translation is also needed at work, in offices, banks, organizations, shops, airports as well as in conferences and speeches. Steiner (1992: xii) succinctly signals this idea out stating that “*translation is formally and pragmatically implicit in every act of communication in the emission and reception of each and every mode of meaning, be it in the widest semiotic sense or in more specifically verbal exchange.*” Translation’s main aim is to serve as a cross-cultural bilingual communication vehicle among peoples. With this in mind, the translator plays an important role as a bilingual or multi-lingual cross-cultural transmitter of culture and truths by attempting to translate concepts and speech in a variety of texts as faithfully and accurately as possible (Gerding-Salas, 2000).

Apart from being a world-wide profession, translation is also at the heart of language learning and a legitimate pedagogical tool (Newmark, 1981; Lefavere, 1992; Richards and Rodgers, 1986; Ellis, 1992; Ur, 1996, Harmer, 1991; Atkinson, 1993). A translation class is basically an all-round language class, an exercise in all types of language skills of comprehension and production, in critical appreciation, in linguistics, in stylistic and cultural analysis (see Newmark, 1981; Denby, 1987; Brumfit, 1984; Silva, 1993; Stern, 1992). The learner is maximally exposed to a situation where these faculties are sharpened beyond the confines of any one language within the domain of comparative and contrastive work (see Newmark, 1981; Gass & Selinker, 2001; Ortega, 2009). According to Duff (1989: 7) if probably designed, translation activities can be employed to enhance the four skills and develop three qualities essential to all language learning: accuracy, clarity and flexibility. Newmark (1981:112) adds a more comprehensive benefit for translation which is promoting learners' meta-linguistic awareness stating: "... *the translator is continuously made aware of the functional and structural nature of language which appears to him in the common dynamic-functional simile of a game of chess and the static-structural simile of a crossword puzzle*".

Translation has always been a core subject in the undergraduate programmes of study in departments of English in Faculties of Education in Egypt, yet what is actually offered is quite arbitrary and depends largely on personal intuition of the tutor. Translation courses at this level are supposed to build and enhance EFL majors' translation competence in both concerned languages; the source and target language. Translation competence is a complex concept that entails *knowledge* (know-what), *skills* (know-how) and *ability to reflect* (know why) (see PACTE, 2000, 2002, 2005). The know-what and-how of translation entail promoting learners' linguistic knowledge of both the source language (SL) and the target languages (TL). The translator should have a perfect knowledge of the language from which he is translating and an equally excellent knowledge of the language into which he is translating. Basically,

there is more than having a deep and thorough linguistic knowledge in both foreign and native languages to train a good translator. Delisle (1980) depicts this point stating that linguistic competence is a necessary condition, but not yet sufficient for the professional practice of translation. The deep and heightened awareness of the culture of the target language is, indeed, a further essential condition for training a good translator.

In reality, teaching translation at faculties of education in Egypt unfold three main problems, namely, poorly designed translation courses with no well-graded skill building goals (see Gabr, 2000, 2001, Massoud, 1988, 1995; Abdel-Rahman, 1996; Abdel-Sadek, 1990, Abdallah, 2004; 2007, 2010), improper training methodology which cannot serve as reliable or sound bases for translation teaching (see Al-Maghraeby, 1995; Nodstoga, 1988; Attia, 1975, Abdallah, 2004, 2010) and impressionistic as well as subjective assessment techniques (see Abdel-Rehim, 1998; Abdallah, 2004; Gabr, 2000; Kamel, 1990; El-Sheikh, 1990; El-Banna, 1993).

Translation courses and textbooks are indeed poorly designed with neither clear workable scope and sequence for the subject over the four years of study, nor clear benchmarks or overall objectives for the training. Such courses are generally not well-constructed nor based on linguistic or learning theories. Texts are randomly selected with no underlining plan for teaching aims and with no reference to students' needs. Such texts toss at students questions beginning with "*translate the following text into English/Arabic*", yet the texts are often made up or chosen specifically for their 'language traps'. To merely hand out text to students once a week with the instruction: 'Translate!' is, in principal, a pointless teaching practice. In fact, that is a testing approach which serves little pedagogical purpose, if any. In such courses, the focus is mainly given to the product rather than the process and therefore the scoring is essentially impressionistic and does not follow any systematic scoring system or rubrics (for more on this see Gabr, 2000, 2001, Massoud, 1988, 1995; Abdel-Rahman, 1996; Abdul-Sadek, 1990, Abdallah, 2004, 2010).

Actual classroom practices in translation are not in fact any better. Translation classes, as a matter of fact, in most cases rarely include any type of analysis or help (at any level, be it, stylistic, pragmatic, semantic, or even syntactic) provided on a systematic basis as far as translation problems and ability are concerned (Abdel-Rehim, 1998). No systematic delivery approach is utilized and if any it can be best described as a sink or swim approach which is mainly more teacher-centered and text-centered rather than process-centered or student-centered (Abdellah, 2004). The teacher is the center of gravity in translation classes, who represents everything and does everything: he is the source, reference and dispenser of all knowledge. The interaction in the classroom is believed to be based on the tell – me – what this means. The students, on the other hand grapple with a trial and error task, trying to guess what the teacher has in mind. In the end, all they have to do is rather copy the model text translation proposed by the instructor. In short, the main focus in teaching translation in Egypt is given to vocabulary building and expanding where decontextualized word lists are extracted to be learnt by heart with little reference to the contextual usage of such vocabulary. Such a practice, in itself, creates a rigid and stereotype image of linguistic units particularly when it comes to equivalence. Highlighting how such a pedagogical practice kills students' creativity, Kamel (1990: 56) underscored that "... *the student's creativity is contained within the boundaries of the teacher's concept of correctness which is presented to the students in the form of model translation that s/he may admire with little or no affinity.*" What adds insult to injury is the fact that students are usually obliged to duplicate such a model in the final exams where some final exams are in most cases, come in the form of seen texts.

The current study came as a reaction to some of the translation problems EFL majors encounter at faculty of education, Al-Azhar University. The study emanates with two assumptions in mind. Firstly, believing that translation is a science in the sense that it necessitates knowledge of the structure and make-up of the two languages concerned, we should help students make the appropriate

connections between the language system they do know and have already mastered (L1) and the language system they are trying to master (L2). Cook (1992: 584) succinctly depicts this assumption stating that “... *the L1 is present in the learners’ minds, whether the teacher wants it to be there or not. The L2 knowledge that is being created in them is connected in all sorts of ways with their L1 knowledge*”. With this in mind, the study proposes a programme based on contrastive analysis between the L1 and L2 to tackle the problems students encounter, namely, grammatical and lexical problems and how to relate them to their L1 (Arabic). Secondly, and closely related, the study proposes a collaborative teaching approach to the delivery of the programmewhere two instructors, one with a PhD in Teaching Arabic as a Foreign Language (henceforth TAFL) and the other with a PhD in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (henceforth TEFL), share the responsibility for planning, teaching and assessing the work of all students participating in the current study. This is based on the belief that teaching in general and teaching translation in particular can and should be a fundamentally collegial profession or a profession of collaboration that overcomes professional isolation. Such an approach assumes that teaching can no longer be viewed as an “egg-box profession” (Freeman, 1998) where a teacher is kept separate from his/her fellow teacher. Such an approach encourages the culture of collaboration and ends up benefiting all the parties concerned in the learning teaching process, namely, the learners, individual teachers concerned and institutes.

Team teaching is one of the different models of collaborative teaching which entails a group of two or more teachers working together to plan, deliver and evaluate the learning activities for the same group of learners (Richards & Farrell, 2005; Friend & Cook, 2007; Friend, 2008). Literature indicated that successful team teaching has a considerable potential to enhance the quality of the teaching learning processes (Davison, 2006; Burns & Richards, 2009; Johnston, 2009) at different levels. Team teaching, on the teachers’ level, can take teachers’ on-going professional development steps further (Johnston et. al, 1991; Robinson & Schaible, 1995; Freeman

& Johnson, 1998; Eisen, 2000; Bailey, et al., 2001; Benoit & Haugh, 2001; Field & Nagai, 2003; Stewart & Lokon, 2003; Johnston, 2009; Attia, 2011). Basically, in team-taught classes, teachers complement one another, they learn new insights, propose innovative practices, acquire new approaches and challenge deeply-rooted assumptions from watching or observing one another working. In a nutshell, team teachers report professional growth, personal support, enhanced motivation as well as increased job satisfaction which all leads to enhanced self-esteem (Hourcode & Bauwens, 2002; Bailey, 1992; Bailey et al., 2001; Richards & Farrell, 2005). In a nutshell, team teaching makesteachers more aware of different delivery methods and techniques, promotes the culture of shared, mutual responsibility and accountability as well as encourages creativity and reflective practices among teachers. More importantly, team teaching deepens collegiality and creates a community within the school, which, in turn, enhances teachers' motivation as well as job satisfaction (Attia, 2011)

Similarly, the literature on team teaching has confirmed the positive impact of team teaching on students' learning: it leads to better students' attitudes about themselves, their academic improvement and social skills (Anderson & Speck, 1998). It allows learners to acquire 'fact' and 'act' components of a foreign language (Jordon & Walton, 1987) more effectively since aspects of language learning are handled by teachers with special expertise. Furthermore, and because of the lower teacher-students ratio, team teaching can accommodate more immediate students' needs and provide opportunities for increased active participation and full engagement in a variety of learning situations (Benoit & Haugh, 2002; Richards & Farrell, 2005). In addition, team-taught students learn cooperation and collaboration from teachers. Villa et al., (2004: xiii) states that *"all students benefit when their teachers share ideas, work cooperatively and contribute to one another's learning"*.

With all these in mind and applying it to teaching translation, collaborative team teaching seems to have considerable potential for developing students' translation competence. In principal, team

teaching can improve students' ability to comprehend the source text by combining the expertise of the two instructors in classroom. Their combined degrees of knowledge and expertise in the two concerned languages are bound to lead to students' better comprehension of the source text and consequently to a more adequate translation to the target language. This is not confined to comprehension but it also applies to grammar, semantic and stylistic.

Unfortunately and given all these potentials team teaching have as a collaborative teaching approach, there is no one single study, to the best knowledge of the researcher, carried out to empirically probe the impact of team teaching on developing translation skills. The fact is since English and Arabic belong to two different and distant language families, namely, West Germanic and Semitic, their grammar and lexis are sharply different, and therefore, several grammatical and lexical features of English create variable problems when translation from English into Arabic. Experience shows that one of the primary mistakes committed by the students of translation is their presupposition that English grammar and lexis can translate into Arabic grammar and lexis in a straightforward manner. Therefore, having two instructors sharing the responsibility of planning together, simultaneously teaching and assessing can help engage students in contrastive analysis activities between the source language and the target language that help them to be more able to relate the two concerned languages and thus pay attention to the whats, hows, and whys of translation. In effect, the two instructors' work comes in an integrated fashion: they complement one another and therefore students learn to handle translation tasks more properly. This, in itself, helps attract students' attention not only to grammar differences but also and by greater reason to the lexical and stylistic problems.

Indeed, the majority of translation problems for the students are mostly lexical problems. Words are usually given the first importance in translation to the point of over-exaggeration. Moreover, most of the students' mistakes lies in their superficial word-for-word translations of the source language text, and

ignorance of the target language equivalents. More seriously, they understand translation as the translation of individual words only, which is very much to the contrast of reality in translation practice. With this in mind and as both teachers observe one another teaching, they can contribute constructive comments, feedback and relate or link the source to the target language and particularly when it comes to the different underlying rules which differ from one culture to another such as idioms, collocations and proverbs.

Furthermore, collaborative team teaching does provide an ideal and healthy environment for translation training where students are challenged to “grapple with ideas” and “rethink their assumptions (Plank, 2011). To illustrate, collaborative team teaching makes it impossible to stick with a teacher-centered classroom in which the teacher is the solo-authority delivering knowledge to students. The interaction of two teachers – both the intellectual interaction involved in the design of the programme and the pedagogical interaction in teaching the programme creates a dynamic environment that reflects the way scholars make meaning of the world; something badly needed in teaching translation. Basically, team teaching encourages students (and teachers) to view the translation from multiple perspectives. When both teachers represent multiple perspectives on a course content, they move students away from dualistic thinking towards higher (and deeper) stages of cognitive and ethical development. Students who enter a course wanting to see the teacher as the source of the “model” answers are now confronted with two teachers who have different views and sometimes completely different methodologies. While this may create some anxiety for students, it also models for them how different perspectives come together to construct meaning. This, in itself, helps students develop critical thinking skills by synthesizing multiple perspectives and relating the information to a larger conceptual framework (Davies, 1991).

In addition, collaborative team teaching provides an opportunity for students to witness the functionality of a collaborative team. This is very relevant for translation students who

are likely to be part of collaborative teams. The opportunity to observe how well faculty members interact in a team situation may provide students with a model for their own team endeavors and open their eyes to acting more cooperatively with others . An additional advantage is that students are exposed to a variety of teaching styles and approaches which increase the potential for the team to meet the various learning styles of students (Brandenburg, 1997; Goetz, 2000).

One further advantage of team teaching as a collaborative teaching approach for teaching translation is that more work can be achieved in less time and thus more opportunity for learner – teacher interaction as well as for guided and free practice. Collaborative team teaching thus facilitates individualized instruction because it creates learning environment involving closer personal contact between teacher and learner. Moreover, collaborative team teaching can help break the monotony of being exposed to the same teaching style in a solo-teaching environment. Taking turns between the TAFL and the TEFL instructors. Closely related and as a by-product, collaborative team teaching can help maintain students' motivation since students view the language, be it source or target, analytically contrasted and such contrastive analysis adds to the students' understanding not only to the foreign language but to his/her own native language. Thus, the opportunity for increased active participation is doubled in variety of learning situations be it concerned with the L1 or L2 or both. In a word, in translation team-taught classes students are given the double opportunity to learn, relate, link and contrast the source and target languages.

Given all these potentials collaborative team teaching has and that it is not without problems as well as no previous studies were undertaken in teaching translation to the best knowledge of the researcher, the researcher sought to take the initiative and propose a programme based on translation problems at both the grammatical and lexical levels as well as to probe its effectiveness in developing translation and language skills among EFL majors at Faculty of Education, Al-Azhar University.

Statement of the problem

A large number of EFL majors in the Faculty of Education, Al-Azhar University lack the basic translation skills needed for producing appropriate and acceptable translations. This may partly be due to the training courses they study which do not consider the similarities and differences between L1 and L2, nor do they try to build on the language systems those EFL majors have already mastered. Another possible reason may lie in the teaching methodology which does not provide students with systematic training that should enable them to make full use of the mastered L1 and relating it to the L2.

Purpose of the Study

The overall aim of the current study was to help EFL majors with their problems in translation. Thus operationally speaking, the study sought to examine and compare the effectiveness of the suggested programme, regardless of the delivery approach, in developing translation and language skills among EFL majors. Furthermore, the study considered exploring the effectiveness of the team teaching as a collaborative teaching approach in developing translation and language skills among EFL majors. This, the current study was carried out with five purposes in mind:

1. to empower first year English majors' with necessary translation skills to translate from English into Arabic;
2. to assess the effectiveness of the suggested programme in developing EFL majors' translation skills;
3. to explore the potential of collaborative team teaching between TAFL and TEFL instructors in teaching translation by exploring the effectiveness of the delivery of the suggested programme via team teaching versus the traditional method on developing EFL majors' translation and language skills;

4. to generate pedagogical suggestions to introduce and improve the quality of using collaborative team teaching as a collaborative teaching approach in EFL settings;
5. to set a model for further research in this particular untrodden research area in the Middle East.

Research Questions

The current study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the effectiveness of a suggested programme based on language skills in the two concerned languages (Arabic & English) regardless of the delivery approach used in developing reading comprehension skills in English, vocabulary and structure in English, vocabulary and structure in Arabic, composing skills in Arabic and translation skills from English into Arabic?
2. What is the effectiveness of teaching the suggested programme via team teaching as a collaborative teaching approach in developing reading comprehension skills in English, vocabulary and structure in English, vocabulary and structure in Arabic, composing skills in Arabic and translation skills from English into Arabic?
3. To what extent does identifying language proficiency level (vocabulary & structure, reading comprehension skills, composing skills) help predict translation skills level?

Hypotheses of the study

To answer the research questions posited above, the following null hypotheses were established:

1. There is no statistically significant difference at .05 level in English reading comprehension between the mean scores of the second experimental group students (taught the suggested

programme via lecturing) and those of the control group as measured by the reading comprehension test.

2. There is no statistically significant difference at .05 level in English vocabulary and structure between the mean scores of the second experimental groupstudents (taught the suggested programme via lecturing) and those of the control group as measured by the vocabulary and structure test.
3. There is no statistically significant difference at .05 level in Arabic vocabulary and structure between the mean scores of the second experimental groupstudents (taught the suggested programme via lecturing) and those of the control group as measured by the vocabulary and structure test.
4. There is no statistically significant difference at .05 level in Arabic composing skills between the mean scores of the second experimental groupstudents (taught the suggested programme via lecturing) and those of the control group as measured by the composing test.
5. There is no statistically significant difference at .05 level in translation skills from English into Arabic between the mean scores of the second experimental groupstudents (taught the suggested programme via lecturing) and those of the control group as measured by the translation test.
6. There is no statistically significant difference at .05 level between the mean scores of the three study groups (first experimental taught the suggested programme via collaborative team teaching, second experimental taught the suggested programme via lecturing and the control group) in English reading comprehension as measured by the reading comprehension test.
7. There is no statistically significant difference at .05 level between the mean scores of the three study groups (first experimental taught the suggested programme via team teaching, second experimental taught the suggested

programme via lecturing and the control group) in English vocabulary and structure as measured by the vocabulary and structure test.

8. There is no statistically significant difference at .05 level between the mean scores of the three study groups (first experimental taught the suggested programme via team teaching, second experimental taught the suggested programme via lecturing and the control group) in Arabic vocabulary and structure as measured by the vocabulary and structure test.
9. There is no statistically significant difference at .05 level between the mean scores of the three study groups (first experimental taught the suggested programme via team teaching, second experimental taught the suggested programme via lecturing and the control group) in Arabic composing skills as measured by the composing skills test.
10. There is no statistically significant difference at .05 level between the mean scores of the three study groups (first experimental taught the suggested programme via team teaching, second experimental taught the suggested programme via lecturing and the control group) in translation from English into Arabic as measured by the translation test.
11. There is no statistically significant predictive correlation between the level of students in reading comprehension skills and translation from English into Arabic.
12. There is no statistically significant predictive correlation between the level of students in English vocabulary & structure and translation from English into Arabic
13. There is no statistically significant predictive correlation between the level of students in Arabic vocabulary & structure and translation from English into Arabic

14. There is no statistically significant predictive correlation between the level of students in composing skills and translation from English into Arabic

Method

Research design

The design of this study is primarily quantitative which is a means for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables. The study used a pre-post design with three groups, namely, experimental group 1 (taught the proposed programmed delivered via the collaborative team teaching approach), experimental group 2 (taught the suggested programme via lecturing) and a control group (received the prescribed text via lecturing) to assess and compare the effectiveness of the suggested programme and the delivery technique on EFL majors' translation and language skills. The dependent variable was treatment which had three levels, namely, the suggested programme plus the delivery approach, the suggested programme only and the prescribed text delivered via lecturing, whereas the independent variables were reading comprehension skills in English, vocabulary and structure in both languages, composing skills in Arabic translation skills from English into Arabic.

Participants

A total of 90 students of the first EFL majors at the faculty of Education, Al-Azhar University participated in the study. First year was chosen as it is the best stage for developing communicative translation skills in students as they need to build and enhance their translation skills. Furthermore, they have enough opportunity ahead of them to make full use of what they have learned and trained on.

Instruments

The study comprised six main instruments, namely, a translation test, a reading comprehension test (English), a vocabulary & structure test (English), translation scoring rubrics, vocabulary &

structure test (Arabic), composing skills test (Arabic). Detailed description of the instruments used in the current study are given in the following subsections below.

1. Translation Test

The Translation test (appendix 1) was developed to measure the students' performance in translation from English into Arabic before and after the treatment. The test comprised two main sections, namely, sentence translation and passage translation. The sentence translation section was devoted to assess how the students would deal with some translation difficulties which students might encounter, namely, grammatical, lexical, cultural, idiomatic and technical difficulties. There were 5 sentences devoted to each of these difficulties totaling 25 sentences with overall score 75 marks; three marks for each sentence according to the scoring rubric (3, 2.5, 2, 1.5, and 1/0) developed for the sentence scoring in this study.

To assess the participants' ability to translate beyond the sentence level, the researcher selected two texts for the passage translation section. Operationally, the passage translation section tries to assess the participants' ability to:

- 1- transfer the intended meaning to the target language clearly (Semantic);
- 2- use well-built sentence structure in the target language (Syntactic);
- 3- select accurate and appropriate vocabulary (Appropriacy);
- 4- reformulate ideas accurately; (Ideas transfer);
- 5- deviate not from the ideas in the source text (Accuracy); and
- 6- use cohesive devices and establish intrasentential ties (Cohesion).

The overall score allocated for this section was 60 marks, 30 marks for each passage. This was done according to the rubric developed for the passage scoring for the purpose of the study. The rubric was based on 5-point scale (5, 4, 3, 2, 1/0).

Table 1: Sample of the Passage Translation Scoring Rubric Scheme

Criteria	5	4	3	2	1/0
Transfer ring Meaning to the Target Languag e	Represent ation of the overall meaning in good Arabic	Representation of the overall meaning in good Arabic, but with a few mistakes in the formulation of ideas	Representation of the overall meaning in Arabic is understood with difficulty.	Overall meaning is misunderstood & misinterpreted	Too little written to be evaluated or the passage is left untranslated
Syntax	Well-built sentence structure in the target language	Well-built sentence structure in the target language, minor mistakes in the verb agreement or case marking with verbs like 'كان' or particles like 'ان'.	Sentence structure in the target language deviates from most regular rules; major mistakes in the verb agreement or case marking with verbs like 'كان' or particles like 'ان'.	Structure in Arabic is disfigured	Too little written to be evaluated or the passage is left untranslated

Test Validity

Content validity refers to how well a test measures what it purports to test. Copies of the test in its initial form were given to a jury of four ELT experts to get their feedback as for:

- the readability and suitability of the translation sentences and passages;
- the accuracy, suitability and comprehensibility of the scoring rubric; and

The jury members were asked to give their suggestions regarding any amendments they might feel pertinent. The four members of the jury gave positive feedback regarding the division of the test into sentence

and passage translation and asked for some changes. The researchers modified the test in the light of the feedback received and the overall number of the test items in its final version was 25 sentences translation and 2 passages. It might be worth mentioning here that two of the jury members asked to change the translation scoring rubric to exclude the zero score so as to avoid the impact of the zero on the variance of students' scores in the data analysis.

Test Reliability

The reliability of the translation test was calculated by Holsti's coefficient reliability. The tests of five students were marked and scored by two coders to calculate the extent to which the two coders, each coding the same content, come to the same coding decisions. The coefficient reliability was 0.79 which indicates that the test was of acceptable reliability making it ready for administration in the final experimentation.

2. Translation Scoring Rubrics (English)

A rubric according to Stevens and Levi (2004: 3) is, at its most basic, a scoring tool that lays out the specific expectations for an assignment. Rubrics provide detailed descriptions for what constitute acceptable and unacceptable levels of performance. In essence, a rubric provides a means to score student performance vis-à-vis the learning and development objective and provides rich feedback on the level and characteristics of students' present learning relative to that objective. With this in mind, two rubrics in English were designed, namely, one for sentence translation scoring and the other for passage translation scoring (see appendix 2). The sentence translation scoring rubric was based on a 5-point scale (3, 2.5, 2, 1.5, 1/0) and the passage translation (see above) was built around 5 main generic concepts, namely, accuracy, appropriacy, meaning transfer, syntax and coherence.

3. Reading Comprehension Test

The reading comprehension test(see appendix 3) was designed to measure students' performance in reading before and after the treatment in English. More specifically, it attempted to measure the EFL majors' ability to:

- 1- read for gist and main ideas;
- 2- read for details;
- 3- identify the meaning of new words and expressions using one or more of the structural analysis clues;
- 4- identify the meaning of new words and expressions using one or more of the contextual analysis devices;
- 5- identify the style of the writer;
- 6- Identify cultural references in the choice of words in the texts; and
- 7- draw conclusions

The test comprised three reading passages followed by open-ended questions and multiple-choice questions with four distractors each. The test was used as a pre and post tests to measure students' performance in reading. The overall number of questions in the test was 26 questions with one mark allocated to each question totaling 26 marks. The questions were distributed at the three levels of comprehension, namely, literal, interpretive and evaluative.

Reading Comprehension Test Validity

Again, the same procedure with the translation test was followed with the reading comprehension test to verify its validity. Copies of the test in its initial form were given to the same four experts in ELT to get their feedback and opinion as for the following:

- how well the test measures what it purports to test;

- the readability and suitability of the reading passages used for the test;
- the sufficiency and accuracy of number of items to measure the skills concerned;

The jury members were asked to give their suggestions regarding any amendments they might feel pertinent. The feedback given by the four experts were incorporated into the final version of the reading comprehension test which comprised 26 items in its final form.

Reading Comprehension Test Reliability

The reliability of the reading comprehension test was calculated using half-split method. The test was piloted with a sample of 30 of the EFL majors. The correlation between the two halves of the test was 0.79 which is reasonable at 0.05 level. Using Spearman coefficient, the correlation coefficient came up to 0.88 which indicates that the reading comprehension test is of a high reliability making it ready for final experimentation administration.

4. Vocabulary & Structure Test (English)

The vocabulary and structure test (see appendix 4) was designed as a measure of students' language performance before and after the treatment in language use. The test comprised three parts totaling 26 questions with overall score 52. A detailed description of the test is given below.

Part One: Multiple Choice Cloze Test (10 questions)

In this part, two paragraphs with blanks are provided. The students are expected to fill in the blanks with the best choices.

Part Two: Word Formation (6 questions)

In this part, a paragraph with blanks is provided and the students are expected to fill in the blanks with the correct form of the word given in parentheses.

Part Four: Open Cloze Test (10 questions)

In this part, two paragraphs with blanks are provided. The students are expected to fill in the blanks with the most appropriate word. The student is allowed to use ONE word only.

Vocabulary and Structure Test Validity

Copies of the test in its initial form were given to the same four experts in ELT to get their feedback and opinion as for the following:

- how well the test measures what it purports to test;
- the readability and suitability of the questions and formats used for the test; and
- the sufficiency and accuracy of number of items to measure the skills concerned.

The jury members were asked to give their suggestions regarding any amendments they might feel pertinent. The feedback given by the four experts were incorporated into the final version of the vocabulary and structure test which comprised 26 items in its final form.

Vocabulary and Structure Test Reliability

The reliability of the vocabulary and structure test was calculated using half-split method. The test was piloted with a sample of 30 of the EFL majors. The correlation between the two halves of the test was 0.83 and using Spearman coefficient, the correlation coefficient came up to 0.91 which indicates that the test is of a high reliability making it ready for final experimentation administration.

5. Vocabulary and structure test (Arabic)

The vocabulary & structure test (Arabic) measures a number of language skills in Arabic among which are:

- identifying word meaning, synonyms and antonyms ;

- using active and passive;
- forming abstract noun;
- forming present and past participles
- using Arabic proverbs

The test comprised 26 items in multiple-choice question, completion and matching formats with overall score 84 mark (see appendix 5).

Validity of the Vocabulary and structure test (Arabic)

Copies of the test in its initial form were submitted to two assistant professors of TAFL to get their feedback on the following:

- the validity of the test;
- the readability and suitability of the items allocated to measure intended skills;
- the suitability of instruction language.

The jury members were asked to give their suggestions regarding any amendments they might feel pertinent. The two assistant professors' feedback were incorporated into the final form of the test.

Test reliability

The reliability of the vocabulary and structure test (Arabic version) was calculated using half-split method. The test was piloted to a sample of 30 of the EFL majors. The correlation between the two halves of the test was 0.76 which is significant at 0.01 level. Using Spearman coefficient, the correlation coefficient was 0.87 which indicates that the test is of a high reliability making it ready for final experimentation administration.

6. Composing Skills Test (Arabic)

The test assesses EFL majors' ability to compose in Arabic at three main writing processes, namely, planning, writing and editing (see appendix 6). The test comprised 3 questions; the first of which was mainly concerned with the writing and revision process, whereas the second focused on some editing skills such as the use of punctuation and finally the third question targeted the assessment of the integrated skills of writing via composing an integrated topic.

It might be worth mentioning here that the researchers developed a scoring rubric of five points scale (see sample Table below).

Table: Sample for the Scoring Rubric in Arabic

المستوى الخامس	المستوى الرابع	المستوى الثالث	المستوى الثاني	المستوى الأول	المهارة
1	2	3	4	5	
لا يستطيع تحديد أفكاراً للموضوع الذي يكتب فيه	يحدد أفكاراً غير صحيحة منطقياً وغير مناسبة للموضوع الذي يكتب فيه	يحدد أفكاراً ولكن بعضها غير صحيح منطقياً وغير متناسب مع الموضوع	يحدد أفكاراً صحيحة ولكن بعضها لا تناسب مع الموضوع الذي يكتب فيها	يحدد أفكاراً صحيحة ومناسبة للموضوع الذي يكتبه، ومعبرة عن الفكرة الأساسية له	تحديد أفكار مناسبة لما يكتب

Test validity

The test was submitted to two assistant professors of TAFL to verify its validity. They were asked to give their opinions as for:

- the validity of the test; does it measure what it purports?;
- the readability and suitability of the items allocated to measure the intended skills;
- the suitability of instruction language; and
- The suitability of the scoring rubric and its descriptors

The jury members were asked to give their suggestions regarding any amendments they might feel pertinent. The two assistant professors' feedback was incorporated into the final form of the test.

Test reliability

The reliability of the translation test was calculated by Holsti's coefficient reliability (1969). The tests of five students were marked and scored by two coders to calculate the extent to which the two coders, each coding the same content, come to the same coding decisions. The coefficient reliability was 0.87 which indicates that the test of acceptable reliability making it ready for administration in the final experimentation.

The translation programme

The programme was largely based on the assumption that if the L1 is dominant in the mind of EFL majors, then forcing our students to go against their natural tendency to use it is not only unreasonable, but also impossible. With this in mind, the programme tried to channel the EFL majors' tendency to make connections and to build knowledge of the L2 on the basis of L1. The design of the programme was mainly based on a practical approach to translation and considered the whole subject in terms of problems and solutions. In this sense, translation is perceived as a subject that poses problems of different types, yet the programme concentrated on the

grammatical and lexical problems arising from the differences between L1 and L2.

The programme aimed at:

- 1- Helping students to overcome the grammatical difficulties arising from the differences between the source language and the target language;
- 2- Helping students to overcome the lexical difficulties (polysemy, synonyms, antonyms, idioms, collocations, proverbs);
- 3- Helping students to understand the linguistic difficulties from a contrastive analysis perspective to reveal the similarities and differences between the two concerned languages;
- 4- Enhancing students' knowledge and use of vocabulary at different levels (i.e., single-word level and multi-word level)
- 5- Developing students' reading comprehension skills;
- 6- Developing students overall linguistic and translation competencies that should enable them to convey the meaning of a text from the source language to the target language.

In a nutshell, the suggested programme is basically oriented towards knowledge and use of grammar and vocabulary. It emanates from the fact that proper word choice and adequate structure in the two languages concerned are at the heart of any act of translation. Therefore, the programme was built around grammatical and lexical difficulties students might encounter due to the sharp contrast between the two concerned languages. Among the grammatical problems, the programme included were the translation of verb to be/have/do, present participle and gerund, absence of English tense system from the Arabic language, word order, nominal and verbal sentence, modals, passive and active style, and word classes. As for

the lexical problems, the programme attended to themes such as translation of collocations, idioms, proverbs, special and fixed phrases and the translation of synonyms. Finally, the reading comprehension component catered for issues such as reading for the gist, text organization and identifying writer's style and cultural reference in the choice of words in the text. It might be worth mentioning here that emphasis is placed on contrastive grammar of English and Arabic in general and particularly on those areas posing translation problems. Put differently, the programme is designed to provide a good foundation in the similarities and differences which exist between English and Arabic. With this in mind, contrastive analysis was the main prominent approach in team teaching.

The programme lasted for one full semester where both instructors met the EFL majors twice a week, 2 hours each. The two instructors used to meet regularly before the experiment started so as to plan the programme content and the delivery approaches. During the planning phase, the two instructors thought over how they would complement one another, maintain a professional and mutual respect, develop a code for communication and a team spirit. In a word, they planned what they are going to teach, how and when before they stepped into the classroom.

Regarding the delivery, the TEFL instructor would posit a sentence for translation which essentially typified a structural or lexical problem which would call for the TAFL instructor's input. The TAFL instructor would attract students' attention to the similarity/difference of the problem with their mother tongue and would offer a solution to the problem. In doing so and while explaining or presenting the concept, he uses Arabic as a medium of instruction. Then, the TEFL instructor would get involved and contribute his own input giving a hand to students showing them how to say that in English. To illustrate, the TEFL instructor, for instance, posited the following sentence for the students to translate: *"A cat has nine lives. I think my cat used up one of her nine lives when she survived being hit by that car"*. The sentence has got a lexical and a cultural problem, that is, a cat in Arabic culture has got only seven lives, how they would relate it, then, to their native language. Here the TAFL instructor would explain how to deal with such a problem and the TEFL will reinforce what has been explained. In doing so, both instructors adopted an apprenticeship approach which is founded upon the apprentice gradually taking over responsibility for

a translation task, the aims and nature of which had been clearly demonstrated, as well as how to approach it.

Final Experimentation

The procedures of the study went as follows:

- 1. Sample Selection:** the sample of the study was selected from the first year students at Faculty of Education, English Department, Al-Azhar University. Students, all male, were randomly assigned to the three groups of the study from the name lists. Randomization ensures compatibility in achievement and intelligence.
- 2. Compatibility and homogeneity of the study groups in the tested skills:** to verify the compatibility and homogeneity of the study groups, the five tests developed for the study were administered to them. The differences between the scores were calculated and One-way ANOVA (see Table 1 below) was used to verify that there were no significant differences between the study groups in the skills under study.

Table 1: One-way ANOVA between the study groups (pre-tests) in the Tested Skills

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Translation Skills Test (Pre)	Between Groups	36.013	2	18.007	.530
	Within Groups	3092.923	91	33.988	
	Total	3128.936	93		
Reading Comprehension Skills Test (Pre)	Between Groups	16.300	2	8.150	.906
	Within Groups	818.434	91	8.994	
	Total	834.734	93		
Vocabulary & Structure (English) (Pre)	Between Groups	2.705	2	1.352	.233
	Within Groups	527.253	91	5.794	
	Total	529.957	93		
Composing Skills Test (Pre)	Between Groups	1.946	2	.973	.258
	Within Groups	343.033	91	3.770	
	Total	344.979	93		
Vocabulary & Structure Arabic (Pre)	Between Groups	1.238	2	.619	.063
	Within Groups	888.135	91	9.760	
	Total	889.372	93		

The table above indicates that all the f values for the differences between students' scores in the five tests were not statistically significant at 0.05 level. This means that the students' actual level in the skills under study, as measured by the study tests, were more or less comparable and they were starting at the same level.

It might be worth mentioning here that the three groups received their instruction at the same place, namely, the language laboratory which ensures some privacy for the students and the flexibility of movement for instructors. The final experimentation lasted for one full semester including the testing sessions.

Treatment

What follows is a description of the treatment received by each of the three study groups:

1. Control group

The content the control group received was a selection of translation passages selected randomly to represent different genera. Students were handed a text to translate over the week and at the lecture next week, the instructor would ask for students output, comment on word and expressions choice, grammar and give a model answer for the translation. It is worth mentioning, here, that students at the first year usually receive a course in Arabic language taught by a professor from the Faculty of Arabic Language with the aim to develop students' competence in the first language as part of enhancing their ability in translation. Unfortunately, such a course never creates links or integrates with the L2, rather the delivery is usually done in a discrete fashion with no compare and contrast endeavors between the L1 and L2. This is partially due to the fact that the instructor of such a course has always nothing to do with the L2 and generally has a poor L2 command. With this in mind, the course content basically concentrated on teaching some grammar and morphology of the L1 delivered via the lecturing method. The instructor would present a given structure and then support it with examples. In a word, the control group, though, studied a course in L1, they had no direct or indirect instruction in how to relate or create a connection between the two concerned languages.

2. Second experimental group (suggested programme + lecturing)

The second experimental group was a mid-way between the control group discussed above and the first experimental group. They received the suggested programme but was delivered via the lecturing method. The main difference between this group and the first experimental group was the delivery method.

3. The first experimental group (suggested programme + team teaching)

It might be worth mentioning at the onset that team teaching for both the TEFL and TAFL instructors was much like a joint project where two professionals share the responsibility of every involved act and they both left no stone unturned to ensure the success of the programme. In this group, the TEFL and TAFL instructors shared the responsibility of planning, delivery and evaluation of instruction for the same group of EFL majors primarily in the language laboratory to teach translation skills utilizing contrastive analysis between the source language and the target language. They talked things through at planning, delivery and evaluation phases, which facilitated the processes of defining roles, responsibilities and expectations within the team. They planned together what, how, when and if in a way that would make full use of each instructor's strength and ensured more creative and innovative lessons. The shared planning, delivery and evaluation served as a powerful medium of collaborative teaching which resulted in a complementary rather than a contradictory approach. They worked simultaneously side by side with the help of a communication code they agreed on to help them decide when and how to take turns in leading, assisting and monitoring activities in classroom which ensured smooth transitions to a new activity or bring an activity to a close.

The TEFL instructor used to take the lead in presenting a structure or lexical problem and the TAFL instructor would raise students' awareness about the similarities and differences with the L1. They would take turns in presenting the solution to the problem and provide students with guided and free practice so as to reinforce what they learnt.

Results

Data Analysis

To answer the questions and test the hypotheses of the study, the researchers made use of the following statistical analyses:

- t-test to find the effect of the suggested programme regardless of the delivery approach on reading comprehension skills in English, vocabulary & structure in both languages, composing skills in Arabic and basic translation skills from English into Arabic;
- Eta Square to find the effect size of the suggested programme on reading comprehension skills in English, vocabulary & structure in both languages, composing skills in Arabic and basic translation skills from English into Arabic;
- One-way ANOVA to explore the effectiveness of the delivery approaches;
- Scheffe post hoc comparisons test to establish where the significance lay;
- Eta Square to find the effect size of the suggested programme delivered via different teaching approaches on reading comprehension skills in English, vocabulary & structure in both languages, composing skills in Arabic and basic translation skills from English into Arabic;
- Regression coefficient to test the predictability of translation skills given the language proficiency level.

Effect of the Suggested Programme on Language and Translation Skills

To answer the first research question, which stated that "What is the effectiveness of a suggested programme based on language skills in the two concerned languages regardless of the delivery approach in developing reading comprehension skills in English, vocabulary and structure in Arabic, vocabulary and structure in English, composing skills in Arabic and translation skills from English into Arabic?", t-test was conducted (see Table 2 below). It might be worth mentioning at the onset that the comparison between the mean scores, here, was confined to the second experimental and the control group to reveal the effectiveness of the programme alone regardless of the delivery approach. The first experimental group was excluded, though it studied the suggested programme, lest the other independent variable might interfere with the results.

Table 2: Results of t-test of the Second Experimental Group and the Control Group in Translation and Language Skills

Skills	Group	Means	Standard Deviation	t	df	Sig
Reading comprehension skills (English)	Ex 2	31.0333	2.14127	7.603	61	0.05
	Cont.	26.6364	2.42149			
Vocabulary & structure (English)	Ex 2	16.4667	1.79527	5.351	61	0.05
	Cont.	12.6364	3.52507			
Composing skills (Arabic)	Ex 2	28.5000	3.45164	5.534	61	0.05
	Cont.	23.9697	3.04636			
Vocabulary & structure (English)	Ex 2	64.9667	4.08093	4.141	61	0.05
	Cont.	57.9394	8.43704			
Translation skills from English into Arabic	Ex 2	103.7333	10.90692	9.050	61	0.05
	Cont.	72.2121	15.98780			

Inspection of the above table reveals that the calculated – t values for the differences between the means of the second

experimental group and those of the control group in reading comprehension, vocabulary and structure in both concerned languages, composing and translation skills are all significant at 0.05 level in favour of the second experimental group which has the higher mean scores. This means all the null hypotheses one to five were rejected. Put differently, the suggested programme based on language skills, regardless of the delivery approach used, had an enhancing effect on EFL majors' reading comprehension, vocabulary and structure, composing and translation skills.

Effect Size of the Suggested Programme

The researchers were interested in uncovering the effect size: how much variance in the dependent variable was a result of independent variable. Since t-test does only provide the statistical significance and its direction, the researchers used Eta Square (η^2) – a measure that describes the proportion of variance associated with or accounted for by each of the main effect, interaction and error in an ANOVA study (see Thompson, 2006: 317). Put simply, it looks at how much variance in the dependent variable was a result of the independent variable. Table 3 below shows the value of (η^2) in all the tested skills.

Table 3: Results of Eta Square (η^2) of the Programme on Translation and Language Skills

Skills	Eta	Eta Square
Reading Comprehension test (English	.670	.449
Vocabulary and Structure Test (English)	.692	.478
Composing Skills Test (Arabic)	.700	.490
Vocabulary and Structure Test (Arabic)	.619	.384
Translation Skills from English into Arabic	.815	.664

Inspection of the table above reveals that the calculated value of (η^2) surpassed the tabulated one for the large effect size (0.14). This

means that there is a large effect size to the effect of the suggested programme on language and translation skills. This means that the change in the EFL majors' performance on the skills under study can be, by large, attributed to the effect of the suggested programme in translation, which proves the effectiveness of the suggested programme regardless of the delivery approach.

Effectiveness of the Collaborative Teaching Approach

The results of this dimension is related to the second research question which sought to substantiate if there were significant differences between students of the three groups of the study due to the delivery approach. The question stated that” *What is the effectiveness of teaching the suggested programme via team teaching as a collaborative teaching approach in developing reading comprehension skills in English, vocabulary and structure in both concerned languages, composing skills in Arabic and translation skills from English into Arabic?*” To answer this question and find the differences between the mean scores of the three groups in the skills under study, One-way ANOVA was used (see Table 4 below).

The results of the one-way ANOVA Table 4 below revealed that all the F values for the differences between the mean scores of the students in all the skills under study, namely, reading comprehension (F (2, 91 = 444.951, P = .000), English Vocabulary & Structure (F (2, 91 = 170.521, P = .000), Arabic Composing Skills (F (2, 91 = 131.909, P = .000), Arabic Vocabulary & Structure (F (2, 91) = 64.746, P = .000) and Translation Skills (F (2, 91 = 167.735), P = .000) were statistically significant at 0.05 level. This means that there are significant differences between the mean scores of the students in all the skills under study.

Table 4: Results of One-way ANOVA between Study Groups in Language Skills & Translation

Skills	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Reading comprehension skills (English)	Between Groups	5460.134	2	2730.067	444.951	.000
	Within Groups	558.345	91	6.136		
	Total	6018.479	93			
Vocabulary & structure (English)	Between Groups	1958.753	2	979.376	170.521	.000
	Within Groups	522.651	91	5.743		
	Total	2481.404	93			
Composing skills (Arabic)	Between Groups	2079.362	2	1039.681	131.909	.000
	Within Groups	717.244	91	7.882		
	Total	2796.606	93			
Vocabulary & structure (Arabic)	Between Groups	5137.352	2	2568.676	64.746	.000
	Within Groups	3610.265	91	39.673		
	Total	8747.617	93			
Translation skills	Between Groups	45824.681	2	22912.340	167.735	.000
	Within Groups	12430.479	91	136.599		
	Total	58255.160	93			

Given that there were significant differences in all the skills tested due to the delivery approach used, Scheffe post hoc comparisons

test was used to establish where the significance lay. Table 5 below shows the results of the multiple comparisons.

The results of these multiple comparisons demonstrated that there is a significant difference at 0.05 level between the means attained by the first experimental group taught via team teaching, the second experimental group taught the programme via the traditional method and those of the control group received the prescribed content taught by the traditional method in all the skills under study in favour of the team-taught group which has the highest means. This means that hypotheses six to ten were rejected and therefore six other directed hypotheses were formulated.

Table 5 Scheffe Test for the Study Groups in the Tested skills

Skills	Groups	Means	1 st Ex.	2 nd Ex.
Reading comprehension skills (English)	Ex 1	44.4839		
	Ex 2	31.0333	13.45054*	
	Cont.	26.6364	17.84751*	4.39697*
Vocabulary & structure skills (English)	Ex 1	23.5806		
	Ex 2	16.4667	7.11398*	
	Cont.	12.6364	10.94428*	3.83030*
Composing skills (Arabic)	Ex 1	35.3226		
	Ex 2	28.5000	6.82258*	
	Cont.	23.9697	11.35288*	4.53030*
Vocabulary & structure skills (Arabic)	Ex 1	75.7742		
	Ex 2	64.9667	10.80753*	
	Cont.	57.9394	17.83480*	7.02727*
Translation skills from English into Arabic	Ex 1	125.3548		
	Ex 2	103.7333	21.62151*	
	Cont.	72.2121	53.14272*	31.52121*

In a nutshell, the results provided a positive answer to the second research question demonstrating that the suggested programme when taught via the collaborative teaching approach was more effective in developing all the skills tested

Eta Square (η^2) was also used to find how much variance in the dependent variable (i.e., reading comprehension skills, vocabulary & structure in both languages, composing skills in Arabic and translation skills from English into Arabic) was a result of the independent variable (see Table 6 below).

Table 6: Results of Eta Square (η^2) of the Delivery Approach on Translation and Language Skills

Skills	Eta	Eta Square
Reading comprehension skills (English)	.952	.907
Vocabulary & structure skills (English)	.888	.789
Composing skills (Arabic)	.862	.744
Vocabulary & structure skills (Arabic)	.766	.587
Translation skills from English into Arabic	.887	.787

Inspection of the table above reveals that the calculated value of (η^2) surpassed the tabulated one for the large effect size (0.14). This means that there is a large effect size on translation and language skills development. This large effect is, by large, attributed to the delivery approach, namely collaborative team teaching.

The findings of the effectiveness of the collaborative teaching approach as a delivery approach, though there is no one study to the best knowledge of the researcher in translation, are consistent with some studies undertaken but not in the field of translation (Jordon & Walton, 1987; Anderson & Speck, 1998; Benoit & Haugh, 2002; Richards & Farrell, 2005).

Predictability of Translation Ability Given the Language Skills Level

To answer the third main research question, which stated: "Does knowing language proficiency level (structure/vocabulary and reading comprehension skills in English) help predict translation skills level?" the researchers used regression coefficient. Regression is a statistical technique to determine the linear relationship between two or more variables. Table 7 below shows the results of regression coefficient between language skills in both concerned languages and translation skills from English into Arabic.

Table 7: Simple Regression Coefficient between Language Skills and Translation Skills

Skills	β	Beta	t	Sig.
Reading comprehension Skills (English)	4.574	.944	751.996	0.01
Vocabulary & structure (English)	4.277	.937	662.154	0.01
Composing Skills (Arabic)	2.358	.914	464.838	0.01
Vocabulary & structure (Arabic)	2.744	.882	322.196	0.01

The results of the regression above demonstrated that language level in both languages is a good predictor of translation ability. Put differently, there was a correlation between the language skills in both languages and the translation skill from English into Arabic. This means that null hypotheses 11 to 14 were rejected. This indicates that there is a prediction relationship between the dependent and independent variables and that you can predict EFL majors' translation ability given their language proficiency. This seems understandable for a successful translation is one that conveys the explicit and implicit meaning of the source language into the target language as fully and accurately as possible. With this in mind, the translator must be able to read and comprehend the source

language, write comprehensibly in the target language and must be able to choose the equivalent expressions in the target language that both fully conveys and best matches the meaning intended in the source language. Thus, a possible interpretation of this finding may lie in the fact that reading in the source language, composing in the target language and having massive word store are prerequisite language skills for translation. In short, language proficiency in the two concerned languages has a screening potential and provide a preliminary indication of individual's ability as a translator.

Discussion

The driving aim of this study was to seek ways of helping EFL majors to overcome their problems in translation from English into Arabic. The study sought to examine the effectiveness of a suggested programme based on language skills and taught via different delivery approaches in developing EFL majors' language and translation skills. The study was mainly quantitative in nature; it focused mainly on examining the effectiveness of the suggested programme from a quantifiable perspective. The data analyses indicated that the suggested programme, regardless of the delivery approach, had an enhancing impact on EFL majors' language and translation skills. Furthermore, the large effect size obtained via eta square (η^2) pinpointed that the change in the EFL majors' performance on language and translation skills is, by large, attributed to the effect of the suggested programme.

As for the delivery approach, the results of One-way ANOVA and the post-hoc test demonstrated that the suggested programme when taught via the collaborative teaching approach was more effective in developing all the dependent variables involved in the current study. Again, the large effect size obtained via eta square is attributed to the delivery approach, namely collaborative team teaching. Put differently, variance in the dependent variables (i.e., reading comprehension skills, vocabulary & structure in both languages, composing skills in Arabic and translation skills from English into Arabic) was, by large, the result of the independent

variable, namely, the delivery approach. Finally, the findings of the regression coefficient also revealed that language level in both languages is a good predictor of translation ability. This indicates that there is a prediction relationship between the dependent and independent variables and that you can predict EFL majors' translation ability given their language proficiency.

Such a significant result in case of the suggested programme, regardless of the delivery approach, might be attributed to the fact that the programme provided EFL majors with the opportunity to be able to relate the unknown/unfamiliar (target language) to the known/familiar (native language) which, in turn, facilitated consciousness raising about L1 and L2 similarities and differences. In fact, the programme was largely based on the assumption that if the L1 is dominant in the mind of EFL majors, then forcing our students to go against their natural tendency to use it is not only unreasonable, but also impossible. With this in mind, the researchers thought to channel the EFL majors' tendency to make connections and to build knowledge of the L2 on the basis of L1. In effect, they provided those students with the opportunity and activities that forced them to make the appropriate and guided connections between a valuable resource, namely, the language system they do know, their native language and the partially mastered one, the target language.

In fact and on the contrary to the deeply-rooted assumption that using mother tongue interferes with the target language and may promote semantic interference, the compare and contrast processes between L1/L2 EFL majors went through in the programme facilitated consciousness raising about differences and similarities between L1 and L2. Simply put, such comparisons between L1/L2 did not only enhance EFL majors' knowledge of the target language, but, it, by large, deepened their understanding and sharpened their metalinguistic awareness of the L1 (see Cook, 1992; Cummins and Swain, 1986). In a nutshell and eminent from the fact that contrast makes it clearer, those EFL majors, via the comparisons and contrasts with L2 they went through, came to realize and deeply understand their L1. Such thorough understanding of both source

and target languages was reflected in the EFL majors' translation performance from English into Arabic.

A further plausible interpretation is related to the design of the programme which was mainly based on a practical approach to translation and considered the whole subject in terms of problems and solutions. In this sense, translation is perceived as a subject that poses problems of different types, yet the programme concentrated on the grammatical and lexical problems arising from the differences between L1 and L2. As a matter of fact, English and Arabic belong to two different and distant language families: West-Germanic and Semitic. With this in mind, their grammar are sharply different and the English grammar and Arabic grammar cannot by any means translate each other in a straightforward way. Several grammatical features of English create variable problems of translation into Arabic which make word-by-word translation inaccurate. Therefore, the programme cared to highlight some of the sharp grammatical differences between the source and target language and their potential solutions so that EFL majors should be aware of them while translating. In doing this, the problems of translating the most prominent points of English grammar into Arabic were discussed and thoroughly studied. The problem solution approach was used in a way to arouse students' interest and demonstrate how to handle such problems strategically. By the same token and believing that the greater number of problems for the students are lexical problems, the programme provided a detailed, exemplified survey of the fundamental lexical problems of translating from English into Arabic and how to handle such problems strategically.

The results of the current study with regard to the suggested programme and its impact on language and translation skills were in line with those studies that showed the positive impact of suggested programmes on enhancing language proficiency and translation skills (see Abdel Rehim, 1998; Abdel Rahman, 1996; Abdul Sadek, 1990; Abdellah, 2004). The findings of the current study gave evidence for positive effects of the suggested programme on developing language and translation skills.

On the other hand and regarding the outperformance of the collaborative teaching approach, a primarily plausible interpretation can be traced back in a statement by Sawyer (2002) who underscored the fact that the most powerful collaborative efforts for teachers are those initiated by teachers themselves rather than those forced by outside reinforcement. The two instructors, who taught the programme, the researchers themselves, had a long team-training experience which ensured high personal, pedagogical and professional compatibility that contributed to the effectiveness of the approach. They had developed a code of communication to signal when one can lead the class while the other help, and when and how to give and take turns smoothly without giving the feeling of a sharp transition. It will not escape the reader that this, in itself, ensured a better, healthy and supportive language learning environment via combined expertise at different phases of teaching. Basically, having two instructors with such substantial experience and compatible pedagogical knowledge, sharing ideas and approaches must have led to more creative, innovative and learner-centered lessons and in turn, helped better and improve learners' language skills and translation. In effect, the TEFL instructor and the TAFL instructor complemented one another, which contributed to the effectiveness of the collaborative teaching approach in the delivery of the suggested programme.

One might consider the long- team training experience of the two instructors as a limitation of this study which might mar the generalization of the findings related to the delivery approach. Such an assumption might not be true as the long-team training experience of the two instructors, here, underscores one crucial issue and a pre-requisite for collaborative teaching approach to be effective and to bring its pay-off, that is, the team members should have personal, pedagogical and professional compatibility. They should know how to give and take turns smoothly without giving the feeling of a disturbing transition.

A further closely related possible interpretation is that such healthy, positive environment created by those two collaborating

instructors encouraged students to be more active and fully involved in a variety of learning activities targeted the source and target language which must have increased students' understanding and their ability to create adequate connections between the L1 and L2. Furthermore, the presence of a TAFL instructor side by side with a TEFL instructor must have assured students and helped them see in action how to sort out grammatical and lexical problems. Put differently, the TAFL instructor using the source language and the TEFL instructor using the target language must have waded off the anxiety level of those students, cleared their memory resources and enabled them to be more attentive and mentally alert to the input given by both instructors. Moreover, it allowed students to see English and Arabic at work in a realistic situation which must have contributed to their learning and ability to translate. In a word, the combined expertise of the two instructors ensured that the content covered is more comprehensible and meaningful. The presence of the two instructors at the same time also offered students more attention and accumulated more immediate students' needs which must have opened students' eyes to accepting more than one opinion as well as to acting more cooperatively with others. In effect, it allowed students to experience two diverse language families and how to relate them to one another.

One final interpretation is translation-team-taught classes provided students with a better quality and a more holistic teaching and learning experience that attended to students of different learning styles and, in turn, could have enabled them to gain a mature level of knowledge and understanding where joint efforts is put into exploiting the strengths of each individual teacher. The collaborative and competitive nature of the two instructors must have inspired students to exert efforts to leave a good impression.

Conclusion

The current study has provided useful quantitatively-oriented data that demonstrated the considerable potential collaborative teaching approach has in terms of developing EFL majors' language

and translation skills. The study showed that collaborative teaching can be extremely beneficial if all goes well and appropriately planned and implemented. The study offered counter-evidence to the strongly-held belief among some practitioners and theorists that the use of students' mother tongue should be banned in EFL setting. It convincingly demonstrated that using the contrastive analysis between the source language and the target language to facilitate the process of translation is to some extent successful in developing language and translation skills. This implies that we should, by no means, ignore a very valuable resource students have already had, namely, their mother tongue. We should therefore try to help students make the adequate connections between their L1 and L2 and to relate the unknown, the L2, to the known, L1 while teaching translation as this will be more meaningful and beneficial.

Implications of the study

The overall findings of the current study have pedagogical and future research implications. A general implication of the findings obtained in this study is that it sets and initiates a new line of research in teaching translation in two senses. Firstly, it introduced the concept of collaborative team teaching as a translation teaching approach that holds considerable potential for not only developing students' language and translation skills but also as a means of continuous teacher professional development. The significant gains made by students taught via team teaching provided evidence that team teaching is more effective in developing translation and language skills than the two other approaches. A crucial implication of this for classroom translation instruction is that translation is best learnt through team teaching as a collaborative teaching approach. This may be due to the nature of translation which requires the translator to be a bilingual and a bicultural, such issues were attended to by having two teachers teaching the same group of students simultaneously at the same place. Therefore, translation instructors' first responsibility is to demonstrate and train students on how to create adequate and proper connections between L1 and

L2, which is best realized via team teaching between TEFL and TAFL instructors.

In a word, the study contributed to the growing database in collaborative teaching approaches research that is still however in its embryonic stage. It adds to the studies that indicated that such approaches have considerable potential for teaching skill-subject particularly translation in our case.

A final important implication for teaching translation is that the study offered counter-evidence to the strongly-held belief among some practitioners and theorists that the use of students' mother tongue should be banned. The results of the study demonstrated that using the contrastive analysis between the source language and the target language to facilitate the process of translation is to some extent successful in developing language and translation skills. This is perhaps contradictory and goes in sharp contrast with such an assumption. Indeed, such an assumption might be valid in case of writing and speaking but not in translation for the results demonstrated that discussing and thoroughly studying the problems of translating the most prominent points of English grammar and vocabulary into Arabic from a contrastive analysis approach helped better and improve students' language and translation skills. In effect and though the two languages belong to two different and distant language families, equipping students with a solid foundation in the similarities and differences between English and Arabic facilitated the process of translation. This implies that we should, by no means, ignore a very valuable resource students have already had, namely, their mother tongue. We should therefore try to help students make the adequate connections between their L1 and L2 and to help them relate the unknown, the L2, to the known, L1 while teaching translation as this will be more meaningful and beneficial.

Suggestions for Future Research

- **The current study was mainly quantitative in nature; it focused mainly on probing the effectiveness of the suggested programme and the delivery approach on developing language and translation skills from a quantifiable perspective. Future research might consider using the mixed approach; a complementary method of data collection, which refers to looking at a research issue from more than one perspective (quantitative and qualitative) to map up or explain more fully the richness and complexity of human behavior.**
- **The current study targeted first year EFL majors and proposed the programme to suit their level, future studies might consider designing a comprehensive programme with workable scope and sequence for translation as a subject for the four years of study at English departments and empirically probe its effectiveness. In doing so such studies should utilize longitudinal research, a type of research method which involves studying the same group of individuals over an extended period of time.**
- **The suggested programme in the current study focused mainly on the grammatical and lexical problems. One more crucial issue which should be attended to in any programme in the future is research tools and dictionary skills for translators. The research tools and dictionary skills components should be devoted to introducing the basics of library and internet research with an emphasis on cross-cultural translation problems. This is based on the assumption that in a fast-developing information-driven world, translators need instant access to background information, specialist terminology and stylistic peculiarities in relation to both concerned language texts. Such research activities that go beyond the basic linguistic competence required of translators necessitate familiarity with print and on-line resources as well as**

awareness of available means to resolve translation difficulties.

- The focus of the suggested programme in this current study was mainly on translating from English into Arabic and giving that direction of translation demands different set of skills, a further study is needed to propose and design a programme for enhancing translation skills from Arabic into English. Such a study can adopt the collaborative teaching approach used in the current study and assess its impact on developing translation skills from Arabic into English among different levels of proficiency or students of different learning styles.
- The results of the current study which were mainly quantitatively-oriented indicated that team teaching was more effective in developing language and translation skills. The data gathered in the study was quantitatively-oriented and collected from the students only. Future research should be extended to elicit data from the instructors too. More importantly, future research should consider using qualitative data from both students and instructors. It should, for instance, incorporate the use of classroom observations which are considered essential to learn the complex patterns of people's beliefs, attitudes and behaviours and to explore whether participants' perceptions and conceptualizations correspond to their actions.
- Results of the current study need to be validated in different context with other groups at different educational levels. If future research provides further support for team teaching as an effective collaborative teaching approach, its potential in teaching translation, then the implications for team teaching would be of high significance.
- The current study used team teaching as one of so many different models of collaborative teaching approach, future research might explore whether different models of it (e.g., one teach one assist, parallel teaching, station teaching etc.)

can have different effects on students' language and translation skills.

- Translation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions. As this statement implies, translators are permanently faced with the problem of how to treat the cultural aspects implicit in a source text and of finding the most appropriate technique of successfully conveying these aspects in the target language (TL). A variety of different approaches have been examined in relation to the cultural implications for translation. Collaborative team teaching holds considerable potential in this sense, therefore, there is a need for study to be undertaken to investigate the effect of this approach on culture-bound issues in translation, bearing in mind the inevitability of translation loss when the text is, as here, culture bound.

References

- Abdel Rahim, A. S. (1998). Assessing the effectiveness of using problem-solving in enhancing translation ability. *Proceedings of the 18th CDEL T symposium on English Language Teaching in Egypt, March 24 – 26, CDEL T, Ain Shams University, Cairo.*
- Abdel Rahman, H. M. (1996). *The effect of a communicative translation programme on developing communicative translation skills and general linguistic proficiency of first year students of the English department.* (Unpublished master's thesis), Minia University, Faculty of Education. Egypt.
- Abdellah, A. S. (2004). *A suggested programme for developing English majors' basic translation skills and its effect on their attitude towards translation.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), South Valley University, Faculty of Education, Qena, Egypt.
- Abdellah, A. S. (2007). Exploring the practices of learning and teaching translation in faculties of education in South Valley University, Egypt. *Proceedings of Qena, Faculty of Education, 4th international conference.* <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED536730.pdf>.
- Abdellah, A. S. (2010). *Pedagogies of translation: Exploring the teaching, testing and course design processes in translation.* VDM Verlag Dr. Müller
- Abdul Sadek M. A. (1990) *A Suggested translation Course for English Majors.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Zagazig University, Benha, Faculty of Education. Egypt.
- Al Maghreby, F. A. (1995). Towards a Communicative Use of Translation in a Global Age". English Language In 2000, Proceedings of the CDEL T 14th National Symposium on English Language Teaching April 9-11, 1994, Cairo: Ain Shams University.

- Al Maghreby, F. A. (1995) Towards a communicative use of translation in a global age. *Proceedings of the 14th Symposium on English Language Teaching, April 9-11, 1994, CDELT, Cairo: Ain Shams University*
- Anderson, R., & Speck, B. (1998). Oh what a difference a team makes: Why team teaching makes a difference. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14 (7), 671- 686.
- Atkinson, D. (1993) *Teaching monolingual classes*. London: Longman.
- Attia, A. (2011). Team teaching: Getting the best of native English speaking teachers and Non-native English speaking teachers in EFL classrooms. *Journal of Education*, 11 (1), 512-602, Faculty of Education, Alexandria University.
- Attia, I. M. (1975) *A classification of some common errors involved in the process of written translation from Arabic into English and some suggestions for remedial measures.*(Unpublished master's thesis), Faculty of Education, Al Azhar University, Egypt.
- Bailey, K. (1992). The processes of innovation in language teacher development: What, why and how teachers change. In J. Flowerdew, M. Brock, & S. Hsia (Eds.), *Perspectives on second language teacher education* (pp. 253-282). Hong Kong: City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.
- Bailey, K. (2001). Teacher preparation and development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35 (4), 609-611.
- Bailey, K., Curtis, A. & Nunan, D. (2001). *Pursuing professional development: The self as source* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Benoit, R. & Haugh, B. (2001). Team teaching tips for foreign language teachers. *The InternetTESL Journal* 10, 2-4.

- Brandenburg, R. (1997). Team Wise School of Knowledge: An online resource about team teaching. <http://www.uwf.edu/coehelp/teachingapproaches/team/>
- Brumfit, C.J. (1984). *Communicative methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, A. & Richards, J. (2009). *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carreres, A. (2006). Strange bedfellows: Translation and language teaching. The teaching of translation into L2 in modern languages degrees: Uses and limitations. In *Sixth Symposium on Translation, Terminology and Interpretation in Cuba and Canada. Canadian Translators, Terminologists and Interpreters Council*. http://www.cttic.org/publications_06Symposium.asp.
- Cook, V. J. (1992). Evidence for multi-competence. *Language Learning*42(4):557-591
- Cummins, J. & Swain, M. (1986) *Bilingualism in education*. London: Longman.
- Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Davison, C. (2006). Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: How do we know when we are doing it right? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 9, (4), 454 – 475.
- Delisle, J. & Woodsworth, J. (1980). *Translators through history*. Amsterdam: Philadelphia.
- Denby, D.J. (1987). Teaching professional translation as a language-development exercise. In Keith and I. Mason (Eds), *Translation in the modern languages Degrees*. London: CILT.
- Duff, A. (1989) *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Eisen, M (2000). The many faces of team teaching and learning: An overview. *New directions for adult and continuing education*, 87, 5-14.
- El Sheikh. A. A. (1990). Towards a systematic approach to evaluation of translation examinations. Teaching English: The Decade Ahead, *Proceedings of the Tenth Symposium of English Language Teaching in Egypt, CDELTA*, Ain Shams University, Cairo.
- El-Banna. A. (1993). The development and validation of a multiple-choice translation test for ESL college freshmen. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED374661.pdf>
- Ellis, R. (1992). *Second language acquisition and language pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Field, M. & Nagai, N. (2003). The 'Dead Hand' project: Intercultural collaboration and professional development. In T, Murphy (ed.). *Extending professional contributions* (pp. 11 – 18). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Freeman, D. & Johnson, K. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 397 – 417.
- Freeman, D. (1998). *Doing teacher-research: From inquiry to understanding*. Boston:
- Heinle & Heinle.
- Friend, M. (2007). The co-teaching partnership. *Educational Leadership*, 64(5), 58–62
- Friend, M. (2008). Co-teaching: A simple solution that isn't simple after all. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 2(2), 9-19.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2007). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*(5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Gabr. M. (2000). *Reassessing translation programs in Egyptian national universities: Towards a model translation program*. (Unpublished master's thesis), Washington International University, Pennsylvania, USA.
- Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. (2nded). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Kimberly L. Geeslin, Indiana University
- Gerding-Salas, C. (2000). Teaching translation: problems and solutions. *Translation Journal* 4, (3), 1-11. www.translationjournal.net/journal/13educ.htm.
- Goetz, K. (2000). Perspectives on Team Teaching. *E Gallery*, 1-12. www.ucalgary.ca/~egallery/goetz.html
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hourcade, J. & Bauwens, J. (2002). *Cooperative Teaching: Re-gilding and sharing the schoolhouse*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Johnston, B. (2009). Collaborative teacher development. In A., Burns & J., Richards (eds.) *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 241 – 249). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnston, B., Gwozdinska, M., Halucha, A., Madogski, B. & Zamarska, M. (1991). *Team teaching for teacher development*. MS.
- Jordon, E. & Walton, A. (1987). Truly foreign language: Instructional challenges. *The Annals of the American Academy*, 490, 110 – 124.
- Kamel. S. A. (1990). Teaching Translation: a Problem-Solving Technique. *Teaching English : The Decade Ahead, Proceedings of the Tenth National Symposium of English Language Teaching in Egypt, CDELT, Ain Shams University, Cairo*

- Lefevere. A. (Ed.) (1992) *Translation/History/Culture*. London: Routledge
- Massoud. M. F. (1988) *Translate to Communicate, A Guide for Translators*. New York: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
- Massoud. M. (1995). Producing realizable translations in a culturally-globalized world. *English Language in 2000, Proceedings of the 14th National Symposium of English Language Teaching, CDELT, Ain Shams University, Cairo*.
- Nadstoga. Z. (1988). A Communicative use of translation in the classroom. *English Teaching Forum, XXVI/4*.
- Newmark, P.P. (1981) *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London: Hodder Education.
- PACTE (2000). Acquiring translation competence: Hypotheses and methodological problems in a research project. In A. Beeby, D. Ensinger, M. Presas (eds.) *Investigating Translation* (pp. 99-106). Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- PACTE (2002). Exploratory tests in a study of translation competence. *Conference Interpretation and Translation, 4(2), 41-69*.
- PACT (2005). Investigating translation competence: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Meta Journal, 50, (2)609-619*. <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/011004ar>
- Plank, K. M. (Ed.) (2011). *Team teaching: Across the disciplines, across the academy*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Richards, J. & Farrell, T. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Richards, J.&Rodgers T. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, B. & Schaible, R. (1995). Collaborative teaching: Reaping the benefits. *College Teaching*, 43, 57-59.
- Silva. T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly* 27(4):657-677.
- Steiner. G. (1992). *After Babel: Aspects of language and translation* (2nded). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Stern. H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stevens, D.D. & Levi, A.J. (2004). Introduction to Rubrics: An Assessment Tool to Save Grading Time, Convey Effective Feedback and Promote Student Learning. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Stewart, T. & Lokon, E. (2003). Professional development through student and teacher reflection journal. In T, Murphy (ed.) *Extending professional contributions* (pp. 19 – 27). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Thompson, B. (2006). *Foundations of behavioral statistics: An insight-based approach*. New York: Guilford.
- Thousand, J., Nevin, A., & Fox, W. (1987). In-service training to support education of learners with severe handicaps in their local schools. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 10(1), 4-14.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Villa, R., Thousand, S. & Nevins. A. (2004). *A guide to co-teaching: Practical tips for facilitating student learning*. Thousand Oaks CA: Corwin. Press: California.