

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
Department of English Language and Literature
MA Programme “Linguistics: Theory and Applications”

“Mr West said: I am tired. - Did he say he is tired or he was tired?”

**Grammar-Translation vs Communicative Method in Grammar
teaching”**

Antigone Gika

ID number: 217006

Supervisor: Dr. Michalis Georgiafentis

8/02/19

Athens

Declaration

This submission is my own work. Any quotation from, or description of, the work of others is acknowledged herein by reference to the sources, whether published or unpublished.

Υπογραφή

Acknowledgments

I would first and foremost like to thank my supervisor Dr. Michalis Georgiafentis, who supported my idea and contributed in the writing of this research work with appropriate guidance, supportive feedback and a lot of patience during this period. I would also like to give special thanks to Angelina Lada, (the teacher of the classes that I used for the purposes of the experiment) who truly helped me throughout this procedure by offering me great support at all levels. Finally, I would like to thank my parents and my best friends who boosted me when I was feeling overwhelmed and controlled their temper when I had extreme mood swings.

Abstract

The field of EFL has been occupied with discovering and creating methods of teaching that will prove effective and will lead teachers and learners to the desirable outcome which is proficient learning of English as a foreign language. The particular study intends to investigate two teaching methods of utmost importance in the framework of elementary level language teaching. For this reason, two groups of elementary school learners, all native Greek speakers, were selected and an experiment that lasted for six weeks approximately was conducted. For the purposes of the experiment, the Grammar-Translation method and the Communicative approach were implemented and the results indicate that Grammar-Translation method is in an advantageous position considering the successful answers of the students that were measured with the use of post-tests.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	6
2. Literature review	9
2.1. Grammar teaching	9
2.2. Grammar-translation Method	11
2.3. Communicative Approach	13
2.4. The use of L1 in L2 teaching	15
3. Methodology	18
3.1. Participants	18
3.2. Materials	19
3.3. Post-test	22
3.4. The Experiment	24
4. Data Analysis	26
5. Discussion	38
6. Conclusion	39
References	42
Appendix	44

1. Introduction

English nowadays enjoys a world-wide currency with 300 million native speakers and 250 million people who use English as a foreign language and these numbers are expected to increase if the fact that the expansion of the language use correlates with rapidly developing technology and scientific literature written in English are counted (Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill, Pincas, 2003). It goes without saying that the responsibility of teachers of English as a native or foreign language becomes greater than before since English language learners are probably going to be exposed to the target language much earlier than in the past. Since English is perceived as a “lingua franca”, or a universal code for communication, learners need to be fully prepared to utilize it under many different circumstances, and be able to conduct successful transactions, in the literal and metaphorical sense. The importance and the emphasis given on foreign language learning (in this case, English) is proven by the number of methods that have been developed throughout the years in order to assure the successful transmission of knowledge and achieve the ultimate goal of language learning. The purpose of the study is to investigate the effectiveness of two of the methods which have existed and occupied language teachers throughout the years; thus, the focus of the particular research is on the Grammar-Translation Method and the Communicative Approach. Their eligibility lies on the fact that both of them have existed and have been applied for a respectable time period, and despite the arguments raised against each one of them, they are still implemented today, modified or developed in form. As mentioned above, the two methods are contradictory in principle; in particular, according to linguists and language experts the Grammar-

Translation Method focuses on form, it is described as a deductive method of learning which means that the rule is presented to the learner and he is expected to practice through drilling exercises to succeed competence. It is mainly teacher-centered and emphasizes on accuracy, while little tolerance in learners' errors exists (Ellis, 2006). On the other hand lies the Communicative Approach which promotes communication as the most important goal -and need- for the learners and learning is an inductive process, meaning that the rule is contextualized in real life situations or educational materials (eg. texts) and the learner is expected to induce, or extract the rules. It also emphasizes on fluency and allows for more mistakes made on the side of the learners, on the presupposition that they do not impede communication (Ellis, 2006). The aim of this study is to examine students' grammatical performance with the use of the two methods. The second step is to compare the results in order to gain a more precise picture of the implementation of the methods and the effects of them in the English language teaching environment of native Greek learners. The reason for drawing the focus on grammar is because first of all it is an essential aspect of the foreign language. Grammar is not just a separate set of rules to be memorized, but a useful tool to facilitate communication and linguistic performance. Proper use of grammar can lead to successful communication, but it cannot be claimed that communicative competence does always entail grammatical competence. The focus on grammar is also justified by the fact that the results of the learners' performance can be easily measured. In both methods there is emphasis on the formation of grammatical structures, but a more tolerant assessment has to be made in the mistakes of the communicative approach group, provided that the meaning is delivered and perceived without struggle both on the side of the learner and on the side of the reader-researcher.

One other aspect which makes the two methods differing and even contrasting is the use of L1 in the foreign language teaching environment. There have been ample arguments developed equally defending and condemning the use of the native language in EFL classroom, so one of the purposes of the study is to elicit evidence for the facilitation or hindrance of learning as well as to deduce inferences out of students' attitude towards L1 use during the interaction throughout the experiment. It is expected that the results of the particular research will shed some light into the field of foreign language teaching in the Greek context and will reveal interesting findings for the experts of the field which will be exploited in the best possible way.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Grammar Teaching

Foreign language teaching is one of the most complex – in nature – and demanding professions if the innumerable factors that need to be taken into consideration are concerned. One of the issues which have kept language experts engaged is the teaching of grammar which is a core element in a language. The fact that grammar comprises an indispensable part of language creates questions regarding the nature and the way teaching of grammar should be conducted. Ellis (2006) in his article offers a broad definition of what grammar is: “Grammar teaching involves any instructional technique that draws learners’ attention to some specific grammatical form in such a way that it helps them either to understand it metalinguistically and/ or process it in comprehension and/or production so that they can internalize it”. From research conducted between instructed and naturalistic learners to investigate the effectiveness of instructional teaching of grammar it is concluded that higher levels of competence result from explicit grammar teaching (Long, 1983). A number of studies have also been conducted, the results of which are in favor of explicit grammar instruction and teaching. In particular, according to Schmidt (1990, 1993, 2001: 127-128 citing Nassaji, 2004) conscious attention to form is fundamental for second language learning as it contributes to students’ virtual conceptualization of the aspects of second language acquisition along with development of interlanguages and L2 fluency. Another significant finding highlights the importance of L2 grammar teaching regarding learners’ processing of language input. As Skehan (1989) and

Tomasello (1989) aptly point out, foreign language input cannot be processed both for meaning and form simultaneously. The necessity of grammar teaching is also supported from research examining approaches which focus on meaning-focused communication which prove to be inadequate according to Celce-Murcia, Dornyei & Thurrel (1997). The inadequacy of the communicative approach to language teaching lies on the fact that learners fail to achieve high levels of accuracy which is of great importance for foreign language learners especially when the ultimate goal is a descent level of language proficiency (Harley & Swain, 1984; Lapkin, Hart & Swain, 1991; Swain, 1985; Swain & Lapkin, 1989: 128-9 citing Nassaji, 2004). At this point it is necessary to be mentioned that the debate on whether accuracy or fluency should be emphasized in foreign language teaching is not a contemporary issue; on the contrary it is the outcome and –at the same time- the source of two conflicting theories, whose supporters bear the names formalists and activists (Rivers, 1981: 315 as cited in Eskey, 1981). According to the formalist approach the main focus is on forms and rules while the activist approach emphasizes on utterance and language learning is interpreted into an active process where people communicate their ideas. Thus, the focus of activist approach is on fluency, although it is questionable whether successful communication of ideas and feelings can be achieved when omission of rules or instructions is present. According to Krashen (1993: 598 cited in Hu, 2012) though, the focus on form impedes learners' competence in the manipulation of the acquired language. Eskey (1981) expresses a balanced argument according to which foreign language teachers should be equally concerned both with accuracy and fluency since high level of acquisition of the former does not guarantee equally high levels of the latter and vice versa. Consequently, his suggestion is the creation of a reasonable combination of the approaches where form will be incorporated to

communicative tasks in order to achieve the best possible transition of the message. The importance of grammar teaching is indirectly illustrated in Roberts' statement of how grammar has been treated and how it should be treated in language learning. According to his argument (cited in Hu, 2012) "Traditional grammar has rarely, if ever, served as an object of study for its sake; rather, it has been used as a tool intended to facilitate practical but accurate mastery of the mother tongue and of foreign language". It is admittedly an accurate description of how grammar has been used in Greece in the context of foreign language teaching especially if the strongly utilitarian purpose for learning English is taken into account. These seemingly and essentially polarized arguments about foreign language grammar teaching naturally lead to the foundation of two dominant teaching methods, the Grammar Translation method and the Communicative Approach, both long-lived, which is evidence of their significance and their substantial contribution in the field of teaching. Before the introduction of those two, a brief clarification between the terms "approach" and method-which are usually interchangeably used- is necessary. The term "approach" "refers to the way(s) people acquire knowledge of language and makes statements about the conditions which will promote successful language learning" (Harmer, 2001). According to Harmer, the term "method" is defined as "the practical realization of the approach" since it is more concrete in terms of syllabus organization, materials and the roles of learners and teachers. Although the terms are clearly distinguished, it is not uncommon that language theorists and teaching experts replace the term Communicative Approach with Communicative Method.

2.2. Grammar-Translation Method

The Grammar- Translation method precedes the Communicative Approach chronologically, as it is one of the earliest methods used for foreign language

teaching. Agreeing with Benati (2018), the Grammar-Translation method bears the name “classical method” as the initial application of it was met in the 16th century for the teaching of the Latin and Ancient Greek languages. The main aim of the particular method -which flourished in the mid of the 19th century and endured up until the first half of the 20th century- is to enhance learners develop their ability of studying a foreign language through translation which can be achieved by memorization of rules and grammatical structures of the foreign language (Fazal, Majoka, Ahmad, 2016). According to the aforementioned researchers, foreign language is learnt deductively, which means that grammatical rules and vocabulary are presented to learners and they need to memorize and practice them in an authentic way, whereas in cases where texts in the foreign language are studied, direct translation to the native language is required. According to Cunningham (2000:123 citing Fazal, Majoka, Ahmad, 2016) Grammar-Translation is the only method which can be found useful by all levels of foreign language learners while it is strongly claimed that learners’ acquisition of the grammatical rules and vocabulary is unquestionable, thus rendered the safest choice on the side of teachers (Damiani, 2003: 123 cited by Fazal, Majoka, Ahmad, 2016). Benati (2018) in his article has precisely bullet-pointed the widely accepted principles that describe and constitute the method discussed. According to the researcher, Grammar –Translation is a teacher-centered method, which allows little interaction between teacher and learners. The teacher is described as the ‘authority’ whose main responsibility is knowledge transmission. The tool he is allowed to use is native language (or L1 in pedagogical terms) and the use of the target language is limited. Written language is considered to be superior to oral speech and thus, emphasis is given on literature and text translation. The natural consequence of this form-focused approach is that accuracy is of greater importance than fluency and that when students

have acquired the grammatical properties of the second language, the ability to produce meaningful sentences in L2 will follow (Benati, 2018). Another aspect which is highlighted in terms of language learning and intertwined with acquisition of accuracy is error correction. Advocates of the method are in favor of correcting students' errors in the form of corrective feedback as it is proven to contribute to attainment of accuracy (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Nassaji & Swain, 2000). The criticism towards the Grammar-Translation method was mainly made by supporters of communicative competence, arguing that through the Grammar-Translation method the language can wrongly be viewed as "a collection of words which are isolated and independent" (Benati, 2018). Richards and Rodgers (2001:3 cited in Benati, 2018) make an attempt to attack the method claiming that foreign language learners are subjected to learn endless lists of words and unusable rules in an attempt to produce perfect translations. This argument can be equally counter-attacked by the viewpoint that grammar learning helps learners have a better understanding of the language as well as it can result in more appropriate application of the language structure in language use, since, "the meaning of sentences is realized by the existing rules of grammar rather than mere interpretations of single words in the sentences" (Hu, 2012). The comment that is worthy to be mentioned as a closing remark is that despite any criticism or objections raised against Grammar-Translation method, the contribution of it in the world of foreign language teaching and education in the broader sense is evident if the sustainability of it (even having undergone modifications) is taken into account.

2.3. Communicative Approach

The Communicative Approach emerged in late 1960s as a reaction to the formalist method of Grammar-Translation by supporters of the naturalistic approach of

language teaching who claimed that a foreign language can be learnt without the interference of the native language, but through demonstration and use of the meaning to be conveyed (Richards & Rodgers, 2001 cited in Brandl, 2008). According to Krashen (1983), who is considered the originator of the communicative method, the purpose of language is to lead learners to “understand language outside the classroom”, thus being able to transact negotiations in natural communicative environment using adequate vocabulary and structures for standard simple conversations at the earlier possible age. According to the approach, the ultimate goal for learners is -and should be- communicative proficiency (Canale & Swain, 1980; Benson & Voller, 1997: 4 as cited in Fazal, 2016) and thus spontaneous use of language is strongly promoted. Rivers (1981) has labeled the advocates of this method “activists” since their main concern is language as an activity, or, something that people do, rather than something they know (as cited in Eskey, 1983). The particular theory can be linked to sociolinguistic competence which comprises an important element of communicative approach along with grammatical competence as mentioned by Canale & Swain (1980). The focus of this method is shifted from accuracy to fluency as well as students’ ability to produce meaningful, consistent sentences (Larsen & Freeman, 2000). Among the suggested activities that can be used for language teaching in the communicative framework are properly designed language games, problem solving tasks, picture stories and role play methods. In contrast to the Grammar-Translation Method, the Communicative Approach is described as highly student-centered as it promotes learners’ autonomy and helps them develop self-confidence through real-life communication (Ellis, 2006; Demirezen, 2011). However, one of the drawbacks traced by researchers is the focus on oral competency which reasonably leads to the conclusion that writing and reading

skills are neglected (Norland & Pruett, 2006). Depending on the teaching and learning context as well as considering the purposes of learning a foreign language, it can be a significant disadvantage of the approach, especially if exam-centered learners are taken into account. Another important deficit which can be detected in learners is accuracy which may affect students' performance in examinations for language certification and which results from the emphasis given from the approach on fluency.

2.4. The use of L1 in L2 teaching

Among the issues about which foreign language teachers have been mainly preoccupied is whether the use of the native language (L1) should be considered acceptable in the foreign language (L2) classroom. Especially if the two methods discussed (Grammar-Translation and Communicative) are taken into consideration, it can be easily inferred that the use of L1 in the first method, and the -almost- exclusive use of L2 in the second respectively, is one of the sharpest contrasts between them. According to Carless (2001), the use of L1 can contribute to the learning process, provided that it is used judiciously (as cited in Sharma, 2006). According to the research conducted by Sharma which was based on classroom observation and the distribution of questionnaires to 100 students of high school level and 20 teachers, the positive impact of the use of L1 is verified. The results also indicate a number of cases where L1 is used in a meaningful way, among which defining new vocabulary, explaining grammar points and complex ideas, giving instructions and motivating learners were the most prominent ones. These results are consistent with the findings that originate from the study conducted by Nation (2001), who investigates the role of the first language in foreign language teaching. According to Nation (2001), the most effective method for conveying the meaning of an unknown word is backward translation of it in L1. This practice makes the new concept fully comprehensible to

the learners, making them feel more confident in L2 acquisition, while many times it can prove a time saving strategy.

The fact that L1 is used not only for learning purposes, but for social reasons as well is investigated in the research conducted by De la Campa and Nassaji (2009). Their research reveals that L1 serves different purposes such as teachers' desire to create an enjoyable environment in order to motivate their students to engage with L2 or when they make personal comments and jokes to create a comfortable atmosphere. It is reasonable that students' performance can be positively affected by such a supportive and friendly environment during the learning procedure and the use of L1 by the teacher can enhance the sense of affiliation between him and the learners. This is supported from evidence of research in university level learners in China, where students are found to prefer the use of L1 in cases where a feeling of being criticized for lack of knowledge or lack of comprehension is present (Jingxia, 2010). The particular study can be used in defense of L1 use in elementary and beginner levels of students, considering the fact that it was conducted in university level population and their acceptance of the efficiency of the native language. Macaro (2009) reports that the strategy of code-switching is applied when the teacher wants to build rapport with his learners. He also claims that code-switching on the side of the teachers has a neutral impact on the learners and, that "expert" code-switching may have a positive effect on students' L2 production. Although it can be induced that the use of L1 in the foreign teaching is supported by advocates of the teacher-centered Grammar-Translation method (where L1 is an inseparable part of the method), Cook (2001) describes the use of L1 as a learner-preferred strategy as it permits students to express themselves exactly as they want to.

On the other side, there have been studies that question the effectiveness of L1 in L2 teaching based on the behaviorist approach that L2 learning should happen in a similar way as L1. As Alseweed (2012) states based on his research findings, the use of L1 has no positive effect on L2 grammar teaching. However, the findings are based on the study of a small sample of students as well as the observation of only one grammar subject being taught. Advocates of the Direct Method suggest teaching happen exclusively in L2 as students should be exposed to as many functions of the target language as possible (Ellis, 2006). However, the classroom environment which is created can be considered artificial, especially in cases such as Greece, because outside this students are not offered the opportunity to contact the foreign language in a natural-like manner since it is not prominent.

In the following sections, there is an attempt to investigate the application of the methods discussed and the contribution of them in elementary students' acquisition of English as a foreign language, as well as a qualitative analysis of the results in order to extract meaningful inferences for FLT in the Greek educational framework.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

For the purposes of the study, two classrooms of “Ralleio” experimental public school in Athens were selected. Two groups of sixth grade primary school students were selected in order to test the effectiveness of grammar translation method and communicative method on the level of students’ production. The classroom in which the grammar translation method was applied bears the name “Group 1” and the classroom entailing the communicative method bears the name “Group 2”. Each classroom comprised 26 students and their level of English language was A2 as defined by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). All of them were native Greek speakers and the majority of them attended English language lessons in private institutions for foreign languages (frontistiria). The classes contained equal number of males and females and their age was 11 years old. In group 1 there were two students who had been diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder which affects communication and behaviour and thus, their results did not contribute to the experiment. To be precise, one of them refused to participate in the overall procedure and during the experiment he was occupied by his teacher who was offering special education. The other student did not abstain from the whole process but his results were not taken into consideration. It should also be mentioned that one of the limitations of the experimental procedure related to the participants was their inconsistent presence. This was unavoidable since not always predictable, because of the lengthy duration of the experiment. In particular, the exact number of participants in the first week, when the pre-test and the multiple intelligence tests took place was 19 in each group. In the second week when passive voice in present simple was

presented there were 15 participants in each group while in the third week the number of participants in the two groups was uneven. More specifically group 1 comprised 13 participants while in group 2 there were 15 participants. In the fourth week there was noticed a coincidental balance with 17 participants in each group whereas the same phenomenon was observed during the last week, but with lack of 5 participants (12 in each group). The last situation can be justified by the fact that it was the week before Christmas holidays, so many of the students probably decided to lengthen the holiday period.

3.2.Materials

Multiple intelligences test and pre-test

The main research question to be investigated was the effectiveness of the Grammar-Translation Method and the Communicative Method on Greek EFL students in terms of acquisition and performance. In order to compare the two methods, the homogeneity between the participants from the two classrooms should be assured. For this reason, the students were distributed two types of tests in the first session; a multiple intelligences test and a pre-test on the grammatical phenomenon to be taught and examined. The results of the test revealed that the prominent intelligence that described the striking majority of the students in both classes was the interpersonal. Interpersonal intelligence indicates higher sensitivity and capacity to understand and respond to others' moods, motivations and desires (Gardner, 1987). Thus, the possibility of successful answers on the part of students (in case they were in an advantageous position due to high linguistic and/or logico-mathematical intelligences) can be minimized because of this information. The multiple intelligences test was

based on Howard Gardner's MI test, taken from an internet source and translated in Greek.

The pre-test which was distributed was self-designed and the main aim of it was to extract results based on which the participants for the experimental procedure would be selected. The handout included three exercises different in form, one of them being multiple choice answers, the second asking to fill in the gaps with the verb given in the correct form and the third which asked them to transform active sentences into passive. From the overall number of 52 students, 38 were those that seemed to hold no prior knowledge of the passive voice (19 in each classroom). Students whose answers indicated acquisition of the phenomenon as well as autistic students were considered to be outliers of the overall population although they were present and participating throughout the experimental procedure. In a rating scale from 0 to 100, students whose answers ranged from 0-20% were selected as the participants since the possibility that even students with no prior knowledge could have given correct answers (at least in multiple choice questions) out of luck cannot be excluded.

Lesson plans, teaching materials

For each experimental session two lesson plans – which are of essential importance to the teacher for the facilitation of the teaching process – were carefully designed. In the first one the aims and objectives of the lesson were clarified while at the same time anticipated problems and offered solutions to them were included. The second one entailed the steps of the teaching process in a descriptive manner and its usefulness lies in time management issues as well as the fact that it allows the teacher to evaluate the lesson – both on the aspect of teaching and learning – after it has been completed.

For the purposes of the experiment two handouts were designed per week, one for each different classroom as well as a powerpoint presentation in which the printed material as well as some activities for oral practice were included.

The handouts for Group 1 were designed to study the application and effectiveness of the grammar translation method and it followed a particular pattern: Presentation (of examples and rules) – (oral) Practice – Production (or post-test). They offered an example of the grammatical phenomenon (passive voice-present simple tense) in English, while before that, the same example was presented in Greek. The display of the examples was followed by the presentation of the rules in Greek (which were found in the powerpoint presentation), focusing on formation of the phenomenon. The third part of the handouts included rules related to the use of the phenomenon which revealed its pragmatic function. After the presentation of the rules, an oral activity took place according to which students were asked to apply them and produce meaningful sentences with the elements given in a substitution drill table which was found in the ppt presentation. The last part of the handouts contained the post-test material which was presented to the students as a transformation exercise. Students were given a number of sentences in active voice and direct speech and they were asked to transform them into passive voice and indirect speech respectively. The instructions on the handouts as well as the whole experimental session were conducted in L1 and their results were scored in percentages.

The handouts for Group 2 (as well as the whole lesson) were designed based on the principles of communicative approach of teaching. Since the main aim of the approach is communicative competence of students, authentic and semi-authentic texts were used which included the rules that the researcher intended to induce by students. The selected texts were of various genres (information from a website, diary

pages of a book, narration) and they were all edited in terms of vocabulary or difficult syntactic structures according to the level of students. The first step was the presentation and reading of the text and immediately after this a few comprehension questions were asked. The next step was to draw students' attention to the phenomena investigated and this was succeeded through questions that superficially zoomed in information found in the texts. The students were guided to induce the rules and when this process was successfully completed the rule was noted down in the form of a "Fill-in the gaps" note. After the brief metalinguistic rule presentation, a short guided exercise followed in order for the students to apply and practise the rule before they used it in a free -production of speech- task. In the last part of the handouts, students were asked to produce short texts in the context of real life situations or events. The types of texts they were asked to compose were all different in context. The first one was a short paragraph for the school magazine where they were asked to refer to the Christmas customs in Greece in order to produce present simple tense in passive voice. The second was an email to an English speaking friend where they had to offer information regarding ancient Greek myths in order to practice past simple tense in passive voice. For the third one they were mentally role-playing; in particular, according to the instruction, they were supposed to be Santa's elves and they had to check the list with their tasks before Christmas. The aim of this task was to test the present perfect tense in passive voice. The last text asked for their collaborative spirit. According to the instructions they had to interview the fellow student sitting next to each one, ask him/her a few questions they were given and finally, transform the words of the "interviewee" into indirect speech. During the lessons the target language was highly used without, however, omitting the contribution of the native

language as a means of clarifications, metalinguistic information, and instruction as well as a useful time saving tool.

3.3. Post-tests

Group 1

The post- test tasks comprised of a number of sentences (from five to six) and the scores were ranking from 0 to 100. Each sentence was scored based on whether the parts of it had been transformed correctly. In the cases where passive voice was tested it was expected that the order of subject and object had been reversed, the verb had been transformed into the appropriate passive form of the tense, subject pronouns had shifted into object pronouns and any time expressions had been added. Omissions of the last point would not support negative marking. In reported speech, quotation marks should be omitted, and the respective changes should be made in pronouns as well as backshift of tenses and appropriate time expressions.

Group 2

The post-test tasks of Group 2 were marked based on communicative effect and grammaticality of the produced text. In other words, although the main aim of the particular approach is successful communication, grammatical mistakes may well hinder the process, creating serious breakdowns in communication. For this reason, grammatical mistakes were given emphasis and obviously they were negatively marked, whereas in cases where different grammatical forms -from those which had been taught-were chosen that could equivalently contribute in conveying the message were accepted as correct. The main part of the post –test tasks that were scored

comprised of sentences the elements of which were given to students. This means that although the texts expected to be produced should satisfy a communicative purpose, possible omissions (eg. lack of introduction when they were asked to compose an email) would not affect negatively their scoring because limitation of time had to be taken into consideration as well. The scoring scale in this group was exactly the same as in group 1, which means percentage based.

3.4. The Experiment

The overall experimental procedure lasted approximately five weeks and each week one visit was paid by the researcher. The grammatical phenomena investigated were: passive voice in present simple, in past simple and in present perfect tenses as well as reported speech. There was also an attempt to include relative clauses in the phenomena to be investigated but the pre-tests given on this phenomenon revealed that the striking majority of the participants had successfully acquired the rules and were capable of applying them in producing meaningful sentences that were also grammatically correct. According to the book syllabus, the passive voice is taught in unit 10 only in present simple while the reported speech is absent on this level, justifying the choice of these elements. However, it cannot be ignored that a number of students may have been taught any of these forms in private lessons even if they did not remember them or they failed to recognize them metalinguistically. This could be considered as a limitation of the experiment since, ideally, students should be lacking knowledge of the subject(s) of research. For this reason, in the pre-test session, they were asked to note down such information in a descriptive manner (“I’ve been taught it but I don’t remember it”) which, along with the results of the test, was

taken into consideration in the composition of the participants' group. Each session lasted 45 minutes and the whole experimental process was conducted by the researcher. The English teacher of the two classrooms was always present and she contributed in cases where the students were distracted or the classroom was disrupted and difficult to handle. In each session, handout distribution and powerpoint presentation were the first steps. The second step was presentation of the rules in a deductive way for Group 1 and through deductive method for Group 2. The last part was the post-test task for which 15-20 minutes were offered to the students. During this procedure, they were not allowed to talk or exchange information among them or with the researcher and the teacher that were present.

4. Data Analysis

The present study aimed at comparing two different teaching approaches in order to test their effectiveness in grammar teaching, comprehension and production. The post- test tasks attached on the last step of the experiment were used as a tool for measuring the effect of the methods. The comparison was quantitatively represented (in order to be easily understood) through extraction of the means from the performance of the two groups in each procedure. However, the variation of answers among students within and between groups in combination with the main differences of the two approaches, underlined the need for qualitative analysis of the results.

The results of the study reveal interesting points worthy to be discussed in relation to Greek EFL students and the ways they process language on the level of grammar. From a superficial comparison of the results of the two groups, it is obvious that the Grammar Translation Method appears to be in a more favorable position than the Communicative Method and this is illustrated in the table below. The percentages of each week have been formed from the means of the scores in each post-test. However, since the numbers cannot be isolated in order to extract generalized results, it is necessary to observe and interpret them both over time and between the two groups.

Groups	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Overall
	(P.V. present	(P.V. past	(P.V. present	(Reported	Average

	simple)	simple)	perfect)	speech)	
Group 1 (Gr.-Tr. Mtd)	56%	67.7%	63.3%	30.8%	54.5%
Group 2 (Com. Mtd)	43%	48.2%	60%	25%	44%

Table 1.

Although the percentages of Group 1 seem to be higher in comparison with those of Group 2, there is a decline in week 3, and it becomes even more noticeable in the last week. A possible explanation of the difference between weeks 1, 2 and 3 could be the fact that although for the first three weeks the grammatical phenomenon was the same, passive voice in present perfect simple follows a more complex structure regarding the students' level of language. Week 2 may bear higher percentages of scoring because of the fact that students had already become familiar with passive voice structure, along with the fact that the verbs that needed to be transformed were known to them or were carefully selected so that they would not confuse them and make the procedure more complicated for them. The noticeable decline in week 4 may be due to the fact that reported speech is a phenomenon quite different from passive voice (in which they were exposed for three sessions). The mistakes found in the students' answers in week 4 are worthy to be discussed since confusion between the native and the foreign language is observed. Generally, one of the mistakes that was more frequently met in post-test 4 was the absence of backshift in tenses; in many cases the verbs were kept in the tenses they were given in direct speech, which is common in the Greek language, especially in oral speech, while it is also acceptable in written speech as the grammatical rule in Greek is not so strict regarding verb transformation.

As far as the results of the communicative approach group are concerned, they appear to follow an upward trend up until week 3, which may be the effect of frequent exposure to the phenomenon. Although the method is more tolerant towards grammatical mistakes, students' answers demonstrate comprehension of the rules even if it is not always applied in a completely correct manner. For example, referring to passive voice, in most of the cases there was a subject-object reverse, while in some cases confusion in syntax was noticed in relation to subject and verb agreement in number. The decline noticed in week 4 may be due to the fact that the activity in the post-test was highly interactive as students had to "interview" their fellow partners and transfer the answers of the latter in indirect speech. This task comprised two parts. In the first part there were the questions to be asked for the interview and in the second part the "interviewees" were asked to transform the answers in a short text in indirect speech. Although everyone noted down the answers to the questions of the first part, in the second part there were instances of handouts where they were left blank; there were also noticed "mixtures of the parts". By the latter, it is meant that many students attempted to transfer their partners' answers in reported speech directly in the first part. This can be interpreted either as misunderstanding on the side of students, even though clear instructions in both L1 and L2 were given, or as an effort on their side to save time and finish the task earlier. It is understood that classroom tasks and activities which reinforce the communication between students especially of young age, run the risk of causing disruption among students. Young students tend to activate and make use of L1 when the task appears to be more "student friendly", while sometimes the use of L1 is allowed by the teacher when the aim is to create a more relaxing atmosphere for the benefit of students and their performance. However, excessive or uncontrolled use of L1 can transform the classroom task into an

opportunity for children to interact in a non-productive and non-educational framework, thus, stressing the importance of limits set by the teacher.

The results of the two groups from week 1 seem to be unquestionably in favor of the Grammar Translation method. However, they cannot be considered to be absolutely representative of the overall performance of the students since there were interesting differentiations among them both within and between the groups. In table 2 that follows below, there is an arithmetic representation of the findings which illustrated their performance as well as students' declination from the means.

Scores (week 1)	Number of students (group 1)	Number of students (group 2)
0-10%	3	3
11-20%	0	3
21-30%	1	2
31-40%	1	0
41-50%	3	3
51-60%	0	1
61-70%	1	0
71-80%	1	0
81-90%	1	0
91-100%	4	3

Table 2.

It can be easily inferred from the percentages depiction that half of the population of students in group 1 are higher than the mean while in group two the situation is reversed. To be accurate in relation to the extreme values 0 and 100 that appear to bear high concentration, in group 1 there were two instances of participants that scored 0 in the test and an equivalent number of participants that scored 100. Yet, in the case of group 2, there was only one participant scoring 0 while 3 students scored 100. Regarding the most frequent or striking mistakes that are worthy to be mentioned is syntactic confusion. As mentioned earlier, group 1 students seem to have difficulty in subject –verb agreement as there were many cases where a singular subject was followed by a plural verb (eg. They paint the school. → School are painted by them). There are also instances of omission of the auxiliary verb “to be” in passive voice transformation and many times, passive voice is confused or combined with transformation of tense (eg. “School was painted”, “They painted the school”). This might be explained by the fact that students in their L1 are familiar with language tasks in which they are asked to perform sentence transformations focused on tense; so again, there may be an issue of language interference. As far as the mistakes noticed by group 2 in week 1, the most common lies in syntax. The majority of the answers are introduced in a rather weird manner; a big number of students have started their sentences with the term “Christmas” which has been wrongly placed in the subject position. This can be rather easily justified if the text that was offered on the front side of the handout is observed. The first sentence of the text that was used to introduce the grammatical phenomenon (inductively) is: “Thanksgiving is celebrated in the USA and Canada”. If the fact that students were asked to produce a short informative text is considered, it can be inferred that they peeked the original text and they followed its structure unconsciously. Native language interference is

also noticed in group 2 with instances of forward translation. The particular statement provides a reasonable justification for instances of structures like: “In Christmas are decorated trees”, “In Christmas is eaten dinner”. It can be supposed that they arise after translation from Greek to English, where the equivalent sentences in Greek would be conceived and produced as: “Τα Χριστούγεννα στολίζονται δέντρα”, “Τα Χριστούγεννα τρώγεται βραδινό”.

From the comparison of the results between the two groups (as they are illustrated in table 3 that follows) interesting information about students’ grammatical performance and progress can arise. Again, Grammar - Translation method is considered to be seemingly more effective than Communicative Method as their statistical difference in the range of 20% indicates. From the 13 participants who were present in the class of group 1 on the day of the experiment, the majority of students scored higher marks than the mean, while, only the scores of a minority were distinctively lower than the mean. It is also noticeable that almost one third of the sampling population has succeeded high scores ranging from 81-90%. These results can be used as evidence to support the effectiveness of the Grammar- Translation method in students’ development and consolidation of grammatical knowledge. Regarding the Communicative Method group and the scores in relation to the mean, from the 15 participants, six participants scored grades lower than the mean which was 48.2% while the scores of the rest nine are noticeably higher. It is not certain whether the results of this group can be used in favor of the method regarding its effectiveness because of the little difference of percentages between week 1 and week 2.

Scores (week 2)	Number of students (group 1)	Number of students (group 2)
0-10%	0	3
11-20%	2	1
21-30%	0	0
31-40%	1	2
41-50%	0	0
51-60%	2	3
61-70%	1	1
71-80%	1	2
81-90%	5	3
9-100%	1	0

Table 3

One of the most common mistakes in sentence transformation task of group 1 is the verb formation of irregular verbs. In particular, the active sentence included the verb “write” which was transformed in passive with the adding of the regular ending “-ed” by the striking majority of students. This is probably the result of students’ urgent responses due to limited maintenance of the rule in short-term memory. One mistake which is noticed repetitively is subject-verb agreement but obviously to a lesser extent than in week 1. Another interesting point to be mentioned relates to syntax and specifically to the confusion of the object with prepositional phrases followed the verbs in active voice. One example is the sentence: “She baked the cakes for the children” and some instances of its transformation are the following: “The children was baked cakes”, “Children were baked the cakes”, “the children was baked a cake

by she”. In more complex sentences which do not consist of subject-verb-object but other constitutional parts as well, solid knowledge of syntax is needed to avoid mistakes like those notices in students’ post-tests. The low level of students in combination with the fact that the phenomenon is unknown to them, justifies mistakes that reveal syntactic failure.

The collected answers from group 2 on the post-test of week 2 seem to follow a relatively common pattern. Despite the instruction given to students according to which they were expected to write an e-mail, no one has followed the typical format of it. All of the answers were focused on producing meaningful sentences with the input which was provided to them. For this reason, any deviation from the typical framework of the genre has not been negatively marked. Students were asked to write a very short, informative text about Hercules’ life and accomplishments. Among the five sets of words that were offered as input, there were three cases where the words were set in order to cross-refer to passive structure. One of them was formed in active structure by the vast majority of the participants. The group of words that was offered is: “A lion- kill- when 18 years old” and the dominant structure is: “He killed a lion when he was 18 years old”. Probably the choice of active voice in this example is not coincidental, but rather aims at highlighting the importance of the accomplishment of the agent.

The results from the first two weeks have put the Grammar – Translation Method at an advantage in contrast with the Communicative Method as far as students’ controlled progress is concerned. These results are upturned when compared to the findings that arise from the post- tests of week 3. As illustrated in table 4 that follows, the scores of the first group indicate a low deviation from those of the previous week while in the case of group 2 the percentages are noticeably increased almost reaching

the scores of group 1. At this point, it should be reminded that students' presence was not persistent throughout the experimental procedure. On the day of the third post-test the majority of students were present in both groups, which has probably affected in part the formation of scores.

Scores (week 3)	Number of students (group 1)	Number of students (group 2)
0-10%	0	3
11-20%	1	2
21-30%	4	0
31-40%	0	1
41-50%	2	2
51-60%	0	0
61-70%	1	0
71-80%	3	1
81-90%	2	3
91-100%	4	5

Table 4.

From a thorough examination of the tests and the results it can be inferred that the performance of students in group 1 is admittedly improved if compared to the previous weeks. The mistake which appears repetitively in their answers is subject-verb agreement, although the number of instances is reduced. Another mistake which has been previously noticed is confusion of voices which derives from failure to transform the verbs in the correct tense. The active sentences, which were given in

present perfect tense, have been transformed into active sentences with a reversal of subject and object (eg. “The man has watered the plants” has turned into “The plants has watered the man”, “The plants have watered by the man”). This can be explained by the fact that students learn that the verb transformation in passive voice leads in a verb phrase (one auxiliary and one main verb), so they are familiar with a two-verb phrase. The form of present perfect simple in active voice is probably confusing or tricky for the students and thus, applying it in an attempt to succeed sentence transformation. Of course, the particular type of mistakes cannot be left unmentioned since the sentences that are produced in this way cannot be considered ungrammatical. They are grammatically wrong in relation to the framework of instructions that preceded the task, according to which they were expected to be changed in voice. The fact that the tense has been maintained and the subject has been reversed with the object creates semantic failure in many cases, leading to the realization of the importance of correct use of grammar even when the aim is restricted to proper structure and form of language and not communication or interaction.

Communicative Method group has reached the highest results throughout the experiment in week 3. Most of students’ answers were grammatically correct and the mistakes found were not able to create communicative failure or breakdown. There are a few instances of wrong verb transformation in which the “-ed” rule of regular verbs was applied in the irregular verb “feed”; yet, the message is successfully transmitted. The rest of the mistakes made by half of the participants do not reveal anything remarkable about the method but are rather resulting from the use of active voice and the creation of short, simple sentences. The success of the method may lie in the precision of the task. In this post-test students (who were supposedly “Santa

Claus' elves) were asked to produce sentences in bullet points and write down a number of tasks that have been or were to be completed before Christmas. The task sounds fun, simple and time-saving and probably motivated students to work more focused and avoid mistakes possibly met in more complex or demanding activities.

From the results of the experiment conducted during the last week on reported speech, it can be argued that the effectiveness of the two methods can be comparable if numerical results are noticed. The Communicative Method almost counterbalances the percentages of Grammar – Translation Method even though the participants on that day were fewer in group 2 than in group 1. Table 5 that follows below offers a numerical representation of students' performance from which the balance between the two methods can be inferred relatively easily.

Scores (week 4)	Number of students (group 1)	Number of students (group 2)
0-10%	4	5
11-20%	0	0
21-30%	1	1
31-40%	1	1
41-50%	2	1
51-60%	2	0
61-70%	0	0
71-80%	1	1

81-90%	0	0
91-100%	0	1

Table 5.

One of the mistakes most commonly found in the post-test of group 1 is absence of backshift or forward transformation of tenses. Students tend to keep the tense of direct speech which may derive from L1 interference. There are cases where transformation is successful regarding verbs but quotation marks as well as subject pronouns are maintained, thus rendering the sentences ungrammatical. Another deficit pinpointed is lack of transformation of adverbs of time which can be justified by limitation of time in teaching and consolidation. Probably it was considered a detail in the rules on the side of students, or they did not pay enough attention because of restricted time. The particular phenomenon appears to be quite demanding for L2 students although it bears more similarities with the equivalent in Greek if compared to passive voice in the two languages.

The results from post-test 4 reveal some positive points regarding student's performance, irrespectively of the numerical representations. The majority of the answers include the reporting subject and verb, as well as the information to be transferred in indirect speech. However, the tenses used to deliver reported sentences do not always follow the convention of the rule. On the contrary, it is deduced that in many cases the tense or the whole reported sentence is decided upon direct translation from L1. There are also cases in which the task has been completed in very short answers or elliptical sentences. Of course they cannot be considered correct, because, even though the message is still transmitted, the communicative framework and the purpose of it which is information through interview, are disappeared.

5. Discussion

The particular research reveals interesting findings regarding the application of the Grammar-Translation method and the Communicative Method applied in the Greek EFL educational context. From an overview of the numerical results it is obvious that Grammar-Translation can be described as a more effective teaching strategy than Communicative Approach and this could be justified from the level and the age of the learners. Students' performance confirms the argument that the use of L1 creates the sense of safety and comfort in the communicative teaching environment (Jingxia, 2010) as their participation and comprehension were noticeable and depicted in the results. Of course, the value of the Communicative Approach cannot be underestimated, but it should be stressed that during the experimental procedure of teaching with this approach, there were many cases where the contribution of the native language was necessary- if not unavoidable. The findings of the study regarding contribution of L1 can also be supported with evidence from a research conducted in an Iranian university in order to investigate students' attitudes towards L1 use in the foreign language learning environment regarding the different levels of students that comprised the population (Nazary, 2008). University level students generally appear to disapprove the use of L1 both on the side of the teacher and the learners. However, in the questionnaire distributed to them to investigate their attitudes towards the use of L1, the striking majority supported the view that the teacher should know the L1, revealing thus, a subconscious fear of failure in comprehension. The findings from the elementary group of students of the same study indicate their preference for L1 as a medium for translation as well as for explanation between the two languages. Direct translation from one language to the other is

considered one of the most effective and time-saving methods for language comprehension (Nazary, 2008).

6. Conclusion

The aim of the particular study was to examine two different teaching approaches and their effectiveness on grammatical level. The methods compared were the Grammar-Translation Method and the Communicative Approach in two groups of elementary level students. The results drawn from the research place the Grammar-Translation Method in an advantageous position compared to those of the Communicative Approach but there are a few parameters to be taken into consideration to claim this argument. First of all, the two grammatical phenomena investigated (passive voice and reported speech) bear differences in structure; at the same time in reported speech more similarities can be traced between L1 and L2, which is not the case with passive voice. Students appeared to correspond more effectively in passive voice tasks within the Grammar-Translation teaching framework, while reported speech was successfully delivered both after the traditional and the communicative teaching. Secondly, other factors should be taken into account regarding the results of the study, such as the language level of students along with the fact that they are only exposed to the foreign language for a limited number of hours per week. The combination of the factors does not allow for communicative activities in the target language since their comprehension level is not sufficient enough for them to respond efficiently in a foreign language environment. The input students have is mostly taught and less

gained naturally, and for this reason their responsiveness depends more on instruction. The third parameter to be taken into consideration is the nature of the post-tests as the Grammar -Translation group was asked to perform a specific kind of exercise, that of transformation. Again appear the factor of instruction and the control in which the responses are constructed, while the other group was asked to respond in a more improvised manner although grammatical structures had been taught and the necessary vocabulary was offered.

As far as the Communicative Approach is concerned, it has been greatly supported by a plethora of foreign language teaching experts and it is considered a contemporary method of language learning if compared to the Grammar – Translation Method. The contribution of it cannot be overlooked and the results of it cannot be left unnoticed. In the experiment conducted it was illustrated that the results from the Communicative Approach group followed an ascending route but it should be noted here that the particular approach was not implemented in the classroom following the rules that govern it. What is meant is that although according to the approach, the use of L2 in the classroom is imperative and should be exclusive, it was not feasible to implement this principle. The level and the age of students, along with the possibility of lack of comprehension and (consequently) deficit in performance were important reasons to avoid exclusive use of the target language.

Regarding the mistakes of the students as noticed in the post tests, one of the most frequent met in Group 1 was the lack of subject-verb agreement which can be considered frequent at those levels and relatively minor. It probably derives from L1 interference, if it is considered that in Greek the verbs are inflected and thus there is no need to use a different form in sentence formation. Mistakes on grammatical structures and formations were also noticed in the post-tests of the second group,

which probably derives from the limited teaching time while, other omissions of the students in the communicative context where they were asked to produce written speech can be justified by limited time along with a general sense of impatience on students' side.

Other factors that should be considered are the limited number of participants as well as the duration of the experiment. The weekly experimental sessions at school did not offer a sufficient time for the researcher to conduct the lessons and to test and assess students' performance with much precision. However, this limitation can lay the ground for further investigation. A possible extension of the particular study could be a repetition of the post-test phase after a period of one month in order to test the results and thus, the effectiveness of each method in long-term.

References:

- Alseweed, M. (2012) "The effectiveness of using L1 in teaching L2 grammar". *International Journal of English and Education* 2(1): 109-119.
- Artemeva, N. (1995) "The adult learner as incipient bilingual: The role of L1 in the adult ESL classrooms" *Carleton Papers in Applied Language Studies*, 12: 113–137.
- Benati, A. (2018). Grammar-Translation Method. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-5.
- Broughton, G., Brumfit, C., Pincas, A., & Wilde, R. D. (2002). *Teaching English as a foreign language*. Routledge.
- Campa, J., Nassaji, H. (2009, winter) " The amount, purpose and reasons for using L1 in L2 classrooms". *Foreign Language Annals* 42: 742-759.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, 25(3), 459-480.
- Cummins, J. (2007) "Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms". *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 10: 221-240.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- Eskey, D. E. (1983). Meanwhile, back in the real world...: Accuracy and fluency in second language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, 17(2), 315-323.
- Fazal, S., Majoka, M. I., & Ahmad, M. (2016). Integration of grammar translation method with communicative approach: A research synthesis. *International Research Journal of Arts & Humanities (IRJAH)*, 44(44).
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Longman,.
- Hu, R. (2012). Should Grammar be Taught?. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(3), 596.
- Macaro, E. (2005) " Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication strategy". In E. Llurda (ed.) *Non-native language teachers: perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession*. Springer publishers. 63-70.
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2004). 6. Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 126-145.

Nation, P. (2001) "The role of the first language in foreign language teaching" Asian EFL Journal. 1-8.

Nazary, M. (2008). The role of L1 in L2 acquisition: Attitudes of Iranian university students. *Novitas-Royal*, 2(2), 138-153.

Sharma, B. K. (December, 2006) "Mother tongue use in the English classroom" Journal of Nelta. 11(1-2): 80-88.

White, L. (2003). *Second language acquisition and universal grammar*. Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

Grammar translation approach handout week 1

Παθητική φωνή - Passive voice

Policemen protect the citizens.

The citizens are protected by policemen.

Σχηματισμός

Για να μετατρέψουμε μία πρόταση από ενεργητική σε παθητική φωνή:

α) βάζουμε το αντικείμενο σε θέση υποκειμένου (the citizens)

β) βάζουμε το βοηθητικό ρήμα "to be" στον αντίστοιχο χρόνο της ενεργητικής φωνής (eg. present simple -> is-are) και το βασικό ρήμα στην παθητική μετοχή (κατάληξη -ed ή ανώμαλο τύπο -> protected)

γ) βάζουμε το υποκείμενο της ενεργητικής φωνής σε θέση ποιητικού αιτίου (by+ agent-> by the policemen)

δ) προσθέτουμε τους υπόλοιπους προσδιορισμούς αν υπάρχουν (e.g. every day, every Saturday etc.)

Σημ.: Αν το υποκείμενο της ενεργητικής είναι προσωπική αντωνυμία, στην παθητική μπαίνει σε αιτιατική πτώση

A.V. : **He** washes the dishes.

P.V. : The dishes are washed by **him**.

Θυμίσου:

I ->me we ->us

You->you they-> them

He ->him

She ->her

It ->it

Χρήση

Χρησιμοποιούμε την παθητική φωνή όταν:

- Θέλουμε να δώσουμε έμφαση στην **πράξη** και όχι στο ποιος την κάνει.

Eg. The traffic light is fixed.

Γι' αυτό όταν δεν γνωρίζουμε ή δε μας ενδιαφέρει ή εννοείται το ποιος κάνει την πράξη, μπορούμε να παραλείψουμε το ποιητικό αίτιο.

Eg. The students are taught maths (by the teacher).

Μετατρέψτε τις παρακάτω προτάσεις στην παθητική φωνή:

Millions of people speak English ->

They paint the school. ->

Someone locks the gates. ->

She calls her mum every day. ->

They don't eat sushi. ->

We clean the house on Saturdays. ->

Communicative Approach handout week 1

Thanksgiving

- Thanksgiving is celebrated in the USA and Canada. In The USA, it is celebrated on the fourth Thursday in November every year. It is associated with giving thanks to God. In the beginning people expressed gratitude for the harvest they reaped. It used to be a religious holiday but now it has become a secular celebration.
- The most important part of the celebration is the dinner which includes the customary turkey served with cranberry sauce, and pumpkin. A lot of business goes on during this holiday. For example, restaurants take advantage of the holiday to sell turkey dinners.
- Families and friends usually get together for a large meal or dinner during Thanksgiving and have a lot of fun. That's why, the Thanksgiving holiday weekend is considered one of the busiest travel periods of the year. Students are given a four-day or five-day weekend vacation. Thanksgiving is also a paid holiday for most workers.

What is celebrated on the fourth Thursday in November? By whom?

What do we learn about the Thanksgiving holiday weekend ?

Who is given a four or five day vacation?

What are workers given?

Complete the gaps with the verbs in the correct form:

How Christmas is celebrated around the world

- **Belgium**

St. Nicholas visits on December 4th to find out which children have been good and bad.

When he visits again on December 6th good children (give) presents and bad children (leave) twigs in their shoes.

French-speaking children (visit) by Pere Noel. He and his friend Pere Fouettard give sweets to good children and a handful of sticks to bad children.

A sweet bread called cougnou or cougnolle (sometimes/eat) on Christmas morning.

Hungary

Fresh fish with rice or potatoes (usually/ eat) on Christmas Eve.

Children(visit) by Santa Claus on December 6th. Their shoes
(leave) outside the door or window before they go to bed. In the morning they find red bags
in them filled with sweets and toys.

After this, the Christmas tree (see) for the first time by the children. Christmas
songs (sing) and gifts from under the tree (share).

Produce 4 sentences to describe how Christmas is celebrated in Greece using the word pairs
given below:

Celebrated/ 25th of December

Trees/ decorated

Christmas dinner /eat

Presents/ given

Grammar-Translation method handout week 4

Ευθύς λόγος

Χρησιμοποιούμε τον ευθύ λόγο όταν επαναλαμβάνουμε τα λόγια κάποιου ακριβώς όπως ειπώθηκαν ή γράφτηκαν.

Πχ. “ Το τρένο φεύγει σε μια ώρα”, είπε η Ελένη.

“The train leaves in an hour”, Helen said.

→ Γ’ αυτό χρησιμοποιούμε πάντα εισαγωγικά ή “..”

Πλάγιος λόγος

Χρησιμοποιούμε τον πλάγιο λόγο για να αποδώσουμε το ακριβές νόημα αυτών που ειπώθηκαν ή γράφτηκαν από κάποιον (επειδή σχεδόν ποτέ δε μεταφέρουμε την πρόταση ακριβώς όπως ειπώθηκε ή γράφτηκε).

Π.χ. “Μου αρέσει το ποδήλατο”, είπε η αδερφή μου.

Η αδερφή μου είπε ότι της άρεσε το ποδήλατο.

“I like the bicycle”, my sister said.

My sister said that she liked the bicycle.

Σχηματισμός

Για να μετατρέψουμε μια πρόταση από ευθύ σε πλάγιο λόγο:

Χρησιμοποιούμε τα ρήματα **say, tell** ως εισαγωγικά (στον αόριστο)

- He said (that) . . .
- He told **me** (that) . . . (το ρήμα told συντάσσεται με έμμεσο αντικείμενο)

Αφαιρούμε τα εισαγωγικά και το κόμμα και προσθέτουμε το that (το οποίο μπορεί να παραλειφθεί)

Προσθέτουμε την υπόλοιπη πρόταση κάνοντας κάποιες μετατροπές στο χρόνο του ρήματος, τις αντωνυμίες και τις χρονικές εκφράσεις ώστε να διατηρηθεί το νόημα.

Συγκεκριμένα:

Ενεστώτας → Αόριστος

work → worked

Buy → bought

Be → was/were

Is going → was going

Αόριστος → Παρακείμενος

worked → had worked

bought → had bought

was/were → had been

χρονικές εκφράσεις

now → then

today → that day

yesterday → the previous day

- “ **Δεν ξέρω** τίποτα γι’ αυτόν” είπε η μαμά.

“I **don’t know** anything about him”, mum said.

Η μαμά είπε ότι **δεν ήξερε** τίποτα γι’ αυτόν.

Mum said she **didn’t know** anything about him.

- “ **Βρήκα** το κλειδί στο σαλόνι” είπε ο Κώστας.

“I **found** the key in the living room”, Kostas said.

Ο Κώστας είπε ότι **είχε βρει** το κλειδί στο σαλόνι.

Kostas said that **he had found** the key in the living room.

Να μεταφέρετε τις παρακάτω προτάσεις σε πλάγιο λόγο ακολουθώντας τον κανόνα της μετατροπής των χρόνων:

1. He said, “ My son is in bed with flu.”

.....

2. She said, “I spoke to the teacher yesterday.”

.....

3. Mrs Mary said, “ I paid the bills yesterday.”

.....

4. Mr Green said, “I am talking on the phone now.”

.....

5. He said, “ My daughter is playing the piano.”

.....

Communicative Approach handout week 4

Mandy is sitting in the café where James works. He tells her, "I work in this café almost every day. But yesterday I saw a famous TV presenter here for the first time. She was eating an ice-cream at the table where you are sitting now."

A week later, Mandy is speaking to a friend on the phone, "I saw James at the café last week. He said that he worked in that café almost every day, but that the day before he had seen a famous TV presenter there for the first time. She had been eating an ice-cream at the table where I was sitting at that moment."

- Complete the gaps to form the rule:

(indirect speech, tense, pronouns, reporting, say)

We use reported speech to say what another person has said.

In, we change the and to show that some time has passed. Indirect speech is often introduced by a verb eg.

We also change time expressions eg. yesterday →

Now →

Transform the sentences into reported speech:

1. Mr West said, "I am very tired."
2. He said, "I am flying to Rome tomorrow."
3. He said to me, "I saw your friend at the cinema yesterday."
4. She said, "I have been to Paris many times"

Ask your partner the following questions making sure to take good notes. After you have finished the questions, find a new partner and report what you have learnt about your first partner using reported speech.

1. What is your favorite sport and how long have you been playing/doing it?
2. What are your plans for your next vacation?
3. How long have you known your best friend? Can you give me a description of him/her?
4. What kind of music do you like? Have you always listened to that kind of music?
5. What did you use to do when you were younger that you don't do anymore?