

The Effect of Collaborative Translation Tasks (CTT) on Developing EFL Learners' Writing

Marzieh Farhangi^{1*}, Ali Asghar Kargar², Mohammad Amin Sorahi³

1. English Department, Abadeh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Abadeh, Iran.
Email: farhangi_mina@yahoo.com

2. English Department, Abadeh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Abadeh, Iran.
Email: Kargar928@gmail.com

3. English Department, Abadeh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Abadeh, Iran.
Email: Aminsorahi@hotmail.com

*Corresponding Author: Marzieh Farhangi

Abstract

There is a controversy on the use of L1 in second and foreign language classrooms, and language learners are usually recommended not to use their shared L1 in such situations. However, some researchers and methodologists have recently begun to have a different look at the use of L1 in language learning contexts. Many researchers suggest that translation can be a suitable activity to explore and develop aspects of foreign language students writing performance. In the current study, the participants are 40 female students divided into two groups (experimental and control groups) to know whether collaborative translation task can have any effect on their writing outcome. To do so, the researchers used a quantitative design. The first group received explicit instruction with translation, but the second group received explicit instruction without translation. In the experimental group the students had Persian texts to translate them into English. Before translating, the teacher explained the Persian and English connective devices of the passage then compared them with each other in each session. But in the control group the students learned writing through traditional writing techniques. Data analysis showed explicit instruction with translation resulting in significantly higher writing test scores.

Keywords: explicit teaching, collaborative translation task, textual competence, implicit instruction

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past there was a negative view towards the use of L1 in L2 classrooms. Many scholars felt that the use of L1 would interfere in the development of L2, but recent studies show the positive effect of using first language on developing L2. In other words, the role of

learners' first language has been a debatable topic in learning a new language. Nowadays more professionals believe in the facilitative role of learners' native language in language pedagogy.

Many researchers suggest that translation can be a suitable activity to explore and develop aspects of foreign language students' writing performance. Uzawa (1996) in a study showed that the students focus more on language in translation tasks and reduce their stress, because they write first in their L1, then write it down in the L2, so translation tasks are very viable means of developing writing abilities, not only in terms of organization and cohesion, but also language learning.

Developing bilinguals with full control on both languages is an ideal in all language contexts. Correspondingly, developing second language (L2) writing is an important goal of language learning contexts. However, there are controversies on the most effective ways of teaching learners how to write in their L2 effectively. Recent research, emphasizing on explicit language learning, suggests that direct instruction of L2 forms has the potential to enhance language learning (Schmidt, 1995). One option is to use Collaborative Translation Tasks (CTT) as suggested by Kargar (2012). Through Translation tasks in scaffolded environments, L2 learners may have the opportunity to meticulously compare textual elements of the target language with their own language with the hope of coming to a better understanding of how L2 system works.

Recent research indicates that bringing translation back to language classes in new language teaching frameworks like task-based language teaching (TBLT) may result in fruitful learning outcomes (House, 2011). Compared to the studies on the effect of translation tasks on vocabulary and grammar, few studies have been done on textual knowledge. The present study, hence, can be a response to the paucity of research on the effect of CTT on Iranian L2 learners' textual knowledge.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Collaborative Translation Tasks

In collaborative translation, learners in pairs or groups communicate in the target language to come to the mutual understanding of the text; meanwhile, they may incidentally focus on form, probably more than other communicative tasks. The focus on form is incidental, since linguistic structures may not be targeted (Ellis, 2003).

Collaborative tasks facilitate interaction and language acquisition (Johnson & Johnson 1999; Swain, 2000) and that translation has the potential to raise pragmatic and cross-cultural awareness (House, 2008).

Collaborative translation task is done as a pair or group work task in which learners collaboratively translate a piece of oral or written text from L1 to L2 or vice versa. Scholars like Nunan (2004) and Skehan (1998) reject to perceive collaborative translation as a task, while Ellis (2009) implies that translation task does exist. Cook (2001 cited in Scott, 2008, p, 100), without referring to translation task, sets forward that "L1 and L2 coexist collaboratively in the learner...and L2 learners should be viewed as multi-competent language users rather than deficient L2 users when compared to native speakers". He also

argues that in TBLT "through L1, the students may explain the task to each other, negotiate the roles they are going to take and check their understanding or production of language against their peers" (p.418).

B. Implicit and Explicit Instruction

Instruction is explicit or implicit when learners do or do not receive information concerning rules underlying the input, respectively (Ellis, 1994, p. 642; Norris & Ortega, 2000).

According to Ellis (2004), explicit teaching involves explicit information about the target feature during the performance of the task. In other words, the students are taught rules and given specific information about a language involving conscious operation as hypothesis formation and testing (Richards & Schmidts, 2002, p. 193).

Thorough explicit instruction, the students are taught rules and given specific information about a language involving conscious operations as hypothesis formation and testing (Richards & Schmidts, 2002, p. 193). They also define "implicit teaching" through implicit learning, calling it as non-conscious process of learning through which the students are not aware of what is being taught and learned at the same time (Richards & Schmidts, 2002, p. 250).

Explicit information is focused on one linguistic form or structure at a time, and it informs learners about how the form or the structure works. EI tells learners what they like, what its location is in the sentence, and when it is used. The "Be careful!" section also includes information to alert learners about a faulty input processing strategy—in this case, the strategy described in the lexical preference principle (VanPatten, 2002; 2004).

C. The Role of Collaborative Tasks in Language Learning

Researchers and practitioners have already established the theoretical relevance of CL in the ESL/EFL classroom (Kagan, 1996). The researcher, among others, has maintained that CL is an important factor in promoting the linguistic and paralinguistic competencies of learners given that it provides opportunities for extended and frequent interaction in the target language in a supportive, motivating, and stress-reduced classroom environment.

Generally, collaborative tasks are associated with peer work, either in pairs or groups. In current communicative methodology, peer work is considered beneficial not only because it encourages students to work together, but also because the interaction can prompt the negotiation of both meaning and form (Bruton, 2002), which in turn can contribute to language development (Long & Robinson, 1998). However, the evidence for this outcome has actually not been very encouraging (Bruton, 2005a), and most of the attention has been on the procedural outcomes of performing peer-interaction tasks, rather than the language learning gains (Bruton, 2005b).

D. Studies on the Role of Explicit Instruction in Learners' Writing Performance

Most of the studies on the effect of different types of instruction in EFL and ESL

contexts usually focus on implicit and explicit types of instruction. There is a significant difference between them. Scott (1989), for example, taught two university-level classes, French relative clauses and the subjunctive using alternately an explicit method or an implicit method, and tested them using aural and written gap-filling exercises. The post-tests suggested that both classes made more progress when taught explicitly, but only in the written exercises.

The study of Day and Shapson (1991) produced desirable results from explicit instruction. Day and Shapson (1991) investigated the effect of explicit instruction designed to provide opportunities for immersion learners of L2 French to note the target structure, the conditional, in input, and produce it in meaningful situations. The results showed that the effectiveness was maintained in the explicit group in a follow-up test, 11 weeks after the treatment.

Several evaluation studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of processing instruction in the development of L2 comprehension and production (VanPatten, 2002). More broadly, a meta-analysis of 25 explicit form-focused treatments from a wide variety of studies with interventions, including consciousness raising, input processing, compound focus on form, meta-linguistic task essentialness, and rule-oriented focus on form, demonstrated an average effect size of these various treatments in excess of 1.2 (Norris & Ortega, 2000).

Fotos and Ellis (1991) compared the effectiveness of the teacher-led grammar teaching with grammar promotion of indirect C-R in two groups of Japanese EFL learners. The results showed significant improvement in both groups. In another study, Carroll and Swain (1993) observed that the group which received explicit feedback in the form of meta-linguistic information, significantly performed better than the group with implicit feedback and the control group. Samuda (2001) also came to the same results. She found that explicit feedback with meta-linguistic information could prompt learners into using the target features.

E. Studies on the Role of Collaborative Tasks (CT) in Language Learning

The literature includes strong evidence regarding the relative superiority of cooperative learning in promoting greater social support in comparison with competitive and individualistic forms of instruction. For instance, Johnson and Johnson (1989) reported, based on evidence from 106 studies, that cooperative learning promotes social support more than competitive instruction (effect size=0.62) and individualistic instruction (effect size 0.70). Furthermore, these researchers reported that stronger effects were found for peer support than for superior (teacher) support in promoting achievement and psychosocial adjustment. Along similar lines, Tinto (1975; 1987) concluded that social support and bonding with classmates are strong determinants of higher rates of successful completion of program requirements. Likewise, Wales and Stager (1978), and Astin (1985) have all reported that student persistence and achievement depend on social involvement in a very major way. Similarly, Zamel (1983) have maintained that social support is positively related to academic achievement and persistence on challenging tasks.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. The Scope of the Study

The present study was conducted to seek answers to the following questions:

1. Does CTT have any impact on developing students' writing ability with respect to textual knowledge?
2. What are the learners' ideas about using CTT in writing classes?

B. Participants

The participants in this study were 40 female language institute students that were divided into two groups (experimental and control groups) to know whether explicit teaching and translation can have any effect on their writing outcome. All participants ranged between 17-25 years in age. Each group contained 20 participants. They all were Persian-speaking students that were learning English. The first group received explicit comparative instruction of L1 and L2 textual knowledge through translation tasks, while the other group received the explicit instruction on L2 textual knowledge without translation. Their proficiency level was confirmed as pre-intermediate by a test. They formed two groups of the study and were randomly assigned to a control and an experimental group.

C. Instrumental Treatment

To collect the necessary data for the study three instruments were utilized. First, learners were asked to write two paragraphs as a pre-test. The first paragraph was narrative, and the second paragraph was a process paragraph. In treatment sessions, one group was taught to write a narrative and a process paragraph based on the textual structures of the paragraphs in Arnaudet and Barrett (1990). The second group learned L2 textual knowledge through translation and explicit comparative instruction of L1 and L2 textual structures. Eight passages were analyzed for both groups in this study. The passages were the same, but the way of teaching was different. One group received explicit textual instruction with translation, but the other group received explicit teaching without translation. The post-test contained the same paragraphs of the pre-test. The final instrument of the study was a semi-structured interview. During the interview the students were asked to give their ideas about using translation in writing classes.

D. Procedure

First, the participants of the two groups wrote one narrative and one process paragraph as a pre-test. Then each group received a different instruction type. Both groups received explicit instruction, but one (experimental group) with translation, and the other (control group) without translation. In the experimental group, the students had Persian texts to translate into English. Before translating, they got instruction on Persian and English textual structures. The teacher explained the Persian and English connective devices then compared them with each other in each session. But in the control group, the students were taught through traditional writing procedures including instruction on topic sentence, supporting

sentences and cohesive devices without translation. After each session, the teacher asked them to write an English story for next session. At next session, the teacher asked three of students in each group to write their English paragraphs on the board, and explained the structure of their writing. After the treatment sessions which took eight sessions, the participants wrote a process and a narrative paragraph as the post-test. Finally, the students participated in an interview during which the teacher asked them some questions about their feeling of different teaching strategies. The interview was conducted in Persian so that the learners could feel free to talk about their feeling on writing.

E. Data Analysis

When all of the necessary information was collected, the researchers started to compare the results of the writing tests and students' interview from the two classes. The major statistical procedures to be used were independent and paired samples t-tests, because the researchers wanted to know whether there was any difference between the two groups or not. T-test is usually used to compare the mean score on some continuous variable for two different groups of subjects, and they collected data from the subjects on two different tests (pre and post-tests) or under two different conditions.

IV. RESULTS

A. Result of Process Writing Test

In table 1, the means, standard deviations, and the number of participants of each group are presented. In the control group, no significant difference was found in process writing test when measured at the beginning of the term ($M = 11.0875$) and at the end of the term ($M = 12.3125$); however, in the experimental group there was a significant difference in process writing test when measured at the beginning of the term ($M=12.2000$) and at the end of the term ($M = 15.3375$).

Table 1: Groups Statistics in Process Analysis Paragraph Writing Test

| Groups | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---------------|--------------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Pre-test | Control | 20 | 11.0875 | 1.48518 | .33210 |
| | Experimental | 20 | 12.2000 | 2.54641 | .56939 |
| Post-test | Control | 20 | 12.3125 | 2.05336 | .45915 |
| | Experimental | 20 | 15.3375 | 2.81008 | .62835 |

B. Result of Narrative Writing Test

Table 2 shows that there was a slight but not significant difference between pre- and post-test results in the control group, but the difference in the experimental group is significant. The significant value is less than .0005, so CTT seems to have a positive effect on the students' writing performance. In narrative writing, the minimum score in the pre-test for the control group was 10, and the maximum score in the post-test was 17, while in the

experimental group, the minimum score in the pre-test was 10, and the maximum score in the post-test was 20, so the difference in the experimental group's performance is significant.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics in Narrative Analysis Paragraph Writing Test

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|-------------------------------|----|---------|---------|---------|----------------|----------|
| Control pre-test | 20 | 10.00 | 15.00 | 11.7750 | 1.55153 | 2.407 |
| Experimental pre-test | 20 | 10.00 | 16.00 | 12.5500 | 2.67985 | 7.182 |
| Control post-test | 20 | 10.00 | 17.00 | 12.8750 | 1.82544 | 3.332 |
| Experimental post-test | 20 | 11.00 | 20.00 | 15.7000 | 2.65890 | 7.070 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 20 | | | | | |

C. Results of Independent Samples T-Test in Process Writing

In table 3, the independent-sample t-test was conducted to compare the pre- and post-test scores. Results of the analysis indicated that there was a slight but not significant difference in the scores of the pre-test ($M=11.0875$, $SD=1.48518$) and the post-test ($M=12.3125$, $SD=2.05336$) for the control group; however, the difference in the scores between the pre-test ($M=12.2000$, $SD=2.54641$) and the post-test ($M=15.3375$, $SD=2.81008$; $t(38)$) for the experimental group is significant. The magnitude of the differences in the means in the pre-tests (mean difference= -1.11250, 95% CI: -2.44691 to .22191) was very small, while it was moderate (mean difference= -3.02500, 95% CI: -4.60044 to -1.44956) in the post-tests. The value in the sig. (2-tailed) column in the pre-tests is above .05 (.10), so there was no significant difference between the pre-test results in process writing test, while it is less than .05 in the post-tests, so there was a significant difference between the post-test results in process writing test.

Table 3: The Analysis of Independent Samples Test for Process Test

| | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---|--|------------------------------|------|--------|--------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------|
| | | | F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. (2- tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Differen- ce | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Pre CE | Equal variances assumed | | 7.970 | .008 | -1.688 | 38 | .100 | -1.11250 | .65916 | -2.44691 | .22191 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | | -1.688 | 30.586 | .102 | -1.11250 | .65916 | -2.45761 | .23261 |
| Post CE | Equal variances assumed | | 1.442 | .237 | -3.887 | 38 | .000 | -3.02500 | .77823 | -4.60044 | -1.44956 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | | -3.887 | 34.789 | .000 | -3.02500 | .77823 | -4.60523 | -1.44477 |

* CE = Control Group and Experimental Group

D. Result of Independent Samples T-Test in Narrative Writing

The independent-sample t-test was conducted to compare the pre-test and post-test scores. According to table 4, there was a slight difference in the pre-test scores ($M=11/7750$, $SD=1/55153$) and the post-test scores ($M=12/8750$, $SD=1/82544$) of the control group, but there was a significant difference in the scores of the pre-test ($M=12/5500$, $SD=2/67985$) and the post-test ($M=15/7000$, $SD=2/65890$) of the experimental group. The magnitude of differences in the means in the pre-test, and in the post-test of the control group was small, but the difference between the results of the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group was significant. The magnitude of the differences in the means in the pre-tests (mean difference= -.77500, 95% CI: 2.17672 to .62672) was very small, while it was moderate in the post-tests (mean difference= -2.82500, 95% CI: -4. 28495 to -1.36505). The value in the sig. (2-tailed) column in the pre-tests was above .05 (.10), so there was no significant difference between the pre-tests in process narrative test, while it was less than .05 in the post-tests, so there was a significant difference between the post-tests in narrative writing test. In pair1 the Eta squared was 0.03, so the effect size was almost moderate, while the Eta squared in pair2 was 0.28, so the effect size was very large.

Table 4: The analysis of independent Samples Test for narrative test)

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|------------|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|----------|
| | | F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Pre CE | Equal variances assumed | 23.357 | .000 | -1.119 | 38 | .270 | -.77500 | .69242 | -2.17672 | .62672 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.119 | 30.451 | .272 | -.77500 | .69242 | -2.18823 | .63823 |
| Post CE | Equal variances assumed | 3.084 | .087 | -3.917 | 38 | .000 | -2.82500 | .72118 | -4.28495 | -1.36505 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -3.917 | 33.655 | .000 | -2.82500 | .72118 | -4.29116 | -1.35884 |

* CE = Control Group and Experimental Group

E. Results of Analysis of Paired Samples T-Test in Process Writing

Table 5 indicated that there was not a statistically significant improvement in pair1 performance between pre ($M = 11.0875$) and the post-test ($M = 12.3125$), while there was a statistically significant improvement in pair2 performance between pre ($M = 12.2000$) and the post-test ($M = 15.3375$).

Table 5: The analysis of paired Samples Statistics for process test

| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------|------|---------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 | preC | 11.0875 | 20 | 1.48518 | .33210 |
| | posC | 12.3125 | 20 | 2.05336 | .45915 |
| Pair 2 | preE | 12.2000 | 20 | 2.54641 | .56939 |
| | posE | 15.3375 | 20 | 2.81008 | .62835 |

preC = Control group's pre-test results

posC = Control group's post-test results

preE = Experimental Group's pre-test results

posE = Experimental Group's post-test results

F. Result of Paired Samples T-Test in Process Writing

The paired-sample t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the collaborative translation task on the students' scores in process writing test. In table 6 a slight difference is seen in pair one between the pre-test result (11.0875) and post-test result (12.3125) of the control group, but the difference in pair 2 between the pre-test result (12.2000) and the post-test result (15.3375) of the experimental group was significant. The significance (two-tailed) value is less than .0005, so it was concluded that there was a significant difference in scores. The eta squared statistic in pair 1 (0.48) indicated a large effect size, but it indicated a very large effect size in pair 2 (0.74). In pair 1 $t = -4.273$ and the degree of freedom ($df=19$), the mean was 1.28222, with a 95 percent confidence interval from -1.82510 to -.62490, and in pair 2 $t = -7.532$, the mean was 1.86286 with a 95 percent confidence interval from -4.00934 to -2.26566.

Table 6: The analysis of paired Samples Test for process test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|---|----------|--------|----|-----------------|--|--|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | | | |
| | | | | Mean | Lower | Upper | | | | |
| Pair 1 preC - posC | -1.22500 | 1.28222 | .28671 | -1.82510 | -.62490 | -4.273 | 19 | .000 | | |
| Pair 2 preE - posE | -3.13750 | 1.86286 | .41655 | -4.00934 | -2.26566 | -7.532 | 19 | .000 | | |

G. Result of Paired Sample T-Test in Narrative Writing

The paired-sample t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the collaborative translation task on the students' scores in narrative writing test. Table 7 indicated that there was a slight difference in pair 1 between the pre-test result (11.7750) & the post-test result (12.8750) of the control group, but the difference in pair 2 between the pre-test result

(12.5500) and the post-test result (15.7000) of the experimental group was significant. The eta squared statistic in pair 1 (0.71) indicated there was a large effect size, but it indicated a very large effect size in pair 2 (0.80). The significance (two-tailed) value was less than .0005, so it was concluded that there was a significant difference in scores. In pair1 $t=-6.939$ and the degree of freedom (df=19), the mean was -1.10000, with a 95 percent confidence interval from -1.43181 to -.76819, and in pair2 $t=-8.847$, the mean was -3.15000 with a 95 percent confidence interval from -3.89524 to -2.40476.

Table 7: the analysis of Paired Samples Test for narrative test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | t | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | | | |
|--------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|---|----------|----------|--------|-----------------|------|--|--|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | | | | |
| Pair 1 | preC – postC | -1.10000 | .70897 | .15853 | -1.43181 | -.76819 | -6.939 | 19 | .000 | | |
| Pair 2 | preE – postE | -3.15000 | 1.59233 | .35606 | -3.89524 | -2.40476 | -8.847 | 19 | .000 | | |

H. Result of Analysis of Pair Sampled in Narrative Writing

Table 8 showed the mean, standard deviation and the number of people. In pair 1, there was a difference between the two scores, in the pre-test (11.7750) and in the post-test (12.8750). In pair 2, there was also a difference between the two scores, but in a larger size, in the pre-test (12.5500) and in the post-test (15.7000).

Table 8: Paired Samples Statistics (narrative test)

| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------|--------|---------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 | Pre C | 11.7750 | 20 | 1.55153 | .34693 |
| | Post C | 12.8750 | 20 | 1.82544 | .40818 |
| Pair 2 | Pre E | 12.5500 | 20 | 2.67985 | .59923 |
| | Post E | 15.7000 | 20 | 2.65890 | .59455 |

I. Results of Interview Sessions

The analysis of the results of interviewing showed that the students have a positive view toward using translation in their English class. After the post-test, the majority of them explained that they could develop their writing ability during the term because they learned necessary cohesive devices which were crucial to write fluency, and also got familiar with some necessary grammar points. Finally as a whole, they learned how to write English. In

their opinion, it can also help them to increase their motivation, and decrease their stress because in CTT class the atmosphere is comfortable, cooperative and non-threatening. Consequently, less confident students benefit from the core activity so much that all the psychological barriers such as stress, anxiety and fear are put away. Furthermore, the students can improve their speaking ability.

According to Karimi and Talebinejad's study (2012), the language learners used a wide variety of learning strategies concerning their mother tongue to comprehend and remember as well as produce English, and they have positive view toward the use of L1 in their classroom because in their opinion it will increase the development of L2 gradually and enable them to compare the new language knowledge with the existing knowledge of their L1.

V. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of CTT on EFL learners' writing performance, and students' attitude towards its using in their English class. For this purpose, the researchers conducted the current study on a sample of two groups: an experimental group taught by explicit teaching with translation, and a control group taught by explicit teaching but without translation. According to the results, there were some differences in both groups, but the difference in the experimental group was significant. The overall results of the study suggest the effectiveness of translation on developing the learners' writing ability.

The discussion of the findings is presented according to the questions of the study. In what follows, the research questions are answered in light of the findings of the study:

The first question tried to examine the effect of the Collaborative Translation Task (CTT) on developing EFL learners' writing performance. The related hypothesis claimed that there is no statistically significant difference among the students' mean scores in experimental and control groups, but the analysis of the results of the first research question indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the two adjusted means of the students' scores due to the teaching procedure in the experimental group. This difference also exists in the control group, but it was insignificant.

The second question tried to ask students about their attitude toward using this method in their English class. The analysis of the results of the second research question their class showed that the students had a positive view toward using translation in. After the post-test, the majority of them explained that they could develop their writing ability during the term because they learned necessary cohesive devices which were crucial to write fluency, and also got familiar with some necessary grammar points. Finally as a whole, they learned how to write English. In their opinion, it can also help them to increase their motivation, and decrease their stress. In CTT class, the atmosphere is comfortable, cooperative and non-threatening. Consequently, less confident students benefit from the core activity so much that all the psychological barriers such as stress, anxiety and fear are put away. Furthermore, the students can improve their speaking ability.

VI. CONCLUSION

This research study was designed to determine whether explicit teaching with translation in English class for EFL students would promote writing performance, and whether students have a positive or negative attitude toward using that. The main focus of the present study was to introduce and evaluate the effect of Collaborative Translation Task (CTT) on developing EFL learners' writing ability. Regarding the need for more principle-based approaches in language teaching, Collaborative Translation Task (CTT), recognized as a C-R task, was designed and used. The results of the study confirmed the effectiveness of translation task, as suggested by House (2008) & Cook (2010), in developing writing performance, and pragmatic knowledge. For students in the translation group, the use of translation appeared to influence these affective and cognitive conditions in their writing performance. Similarly students in the Non-translation group did associate improvements in their writing without using translation, only by explicit teaching, but it was insignificant. The difference between scores in pre and post-test in experimental group was significant, because they used their mother tongue in their English class. The majority of them had a positive view toward using that in their English class because they got familiar with necessary cohesive devices, and grammar points, which are necessary in writing, so they first write in their mother tongue, then change it into English in their mind, and next write it down. While these findings are true for this study, they are not intended to be generalized. However, it is suggested that using translation in EFL class remains promising as an educational tool that might enhance the academic writing of foreign language international students as well as facilitate the instruction of academic writing.

REFERENCES

- Arnaudet, L. A. & Barrett, M. E. (1990). The use of L1 in discourse and writing of L2 learners. *Canadian Modern Language Journal*, 32, 250-229.
- Astin, A. (1985). *Achieving Educational Excellence*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Bruton, A. (2002). From tasking purposes to purposing tasks. *ELT Journal* 56, 280–288.
- Bruton, A. (2005a). Process writing and communicative-task-based instruction: Many common features, but more common limitations? *TESL-EJ* 9/3, 1–28.
- Bruton, A. (2005b). Task-based language teaching: for the state secondary FL classroom? *Language Learning Journal* 31, 55–68.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 357-366.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*(57), 100-123.
- Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Day, E.M. and Shapson, S.M. (1991): Integrating formal and functional approaches to language teaching in French immersion: an experimental study. *Language Learning* 41: 25–58.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2004). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based Language Teaching: Sorting out the Misunderstanding. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(19), 221-246.
- Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 605-628.
- House, J. (2008). Using translation to improve pragmatic competence. In E. Alcon, & A. Martinez-Flor (Eds.). *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning and teaching* (pp. 135-153). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- House, J. (2011). The crucial role of translation on the development of textual competence. *Investigation Textual Competence in Foreign and Second Language Learning and Teaching*. (pp. 214-287).
- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R.. (1989). Cooperation and Competition: *Theory and Research*. Interaction Book Co, Edina, MN.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1999). What makes cooperative learning work? In D. Kluge, S. McGuire, D. Johnson, & R. Johnson (Eds.).*Cooperative Learning* (pp. 23-38). Tokyo: JALT.
- Kagan, S. (1996). We can talk—cooperative learning in the elementary ESL classroom. *Newsletter English as a Foreign Language* 16 (Serial No. 1 and 2).
- Kargar, A. A. (2012 December). The Effect of Collaborative Translation Task on Development of Pragmatic Knowledge. *Unpublished P.H.D Dissertation*. Shiraz: Shiraz University.
- Karimi, Z. & Talebnejad, R. (2012). The Effect of Using Mother Tongue in Developing the L2. *Unpublished M.A. Dissertation*. Shiraz: Shiraz University.
- Lightbown, P. (2000). Classroom SLA research and second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 4, 431-462.
- Long, M. and Robinson, P. (1998): Focus on form: theory, research and practice. In Doughty, C. and Williams, J., editors, *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 15–41.
- Norris, J. M. & Ortega, L. (2000): Effectiveness of L2 instruction: a research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 50: 417–528.

- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. & Schmidts, v. (2002). The role of explicit teaching in language learning. *Modern Language Journal* 51: 12-30.
- Samuda, V. (2001). Guiding relationships between form and meaning during task performance: the role of the teacher. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain, *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 119-140). Essex: Longman.
- Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 1-63). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Scott, V. (1989): An empirical study of explicit and implicit teaching strategies in French. *Modern Language Journal* 72: 14-22.
- Scott, V. (2008): Learning the second language in collaborative conditions. *Journal of Second Language Learning*, 9, 120-312.
- Scott, V. M., & Jose de la Fuente, M. (2008). What's the Problem? L2 Learners' Use of L1 During Consciousness-Raising Form-Focused Tasks. *Modern Language Journal*(92), 100-113.
- Skehan, P. (1998). Task-based Instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*(18), 268-86.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J.P. Lantolf (Ed.). *Sociocultural theory and second language*.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89-125.
- Tinto, V. (1987). Leaving College: *Rethinking the Causes for Student Attrition*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Uzawa, K. (1996). Second language learners' process of L1 writing, L2 writing, and translation from L1 to L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5, 271-294.
- VanPatten, B. (2002). Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning*, 52, 755-804.
- VanPatten, B. (2004). Input processing in SLA. In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary* (Pp. 5-31). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wales, C.& Stager, R. (1978). *The Guided Design Approach*. Educational Technology Publications, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Zamel, V. (1983). In search of the key: research and practice in composition. In: Hand-scombe, J., Orem, R.A., Taylor, B.P. (Eds.), *On TESOL '83: The Question of Control*. TESOL, Washington, DC, pp. 195-207.