FRONTIERS OF LANGUAGE AND TEACHING, VOL. 2

FRONTIERS OF LANGUAGE AND TEACHING, VOL. 2

Proceedings of the 2011 International Online Language Conference (IOLC 2011)

Edited by
Azadeh Shafaei

Frontiers of Language and Teaching, Vol. 2
Proceedings of the 2011 International Online Language Conference (IOLC 2011)

Table of Contents

Introduction

This collection covers papers submitted to the 4th International Online Language Conference (IOLC) held in September 2011. IOLC 2011 was a two-day conference which aimed to provide a forum for academics, practitioners, experts and students to debate current international issues and challenges in the broad area of language learning and teaching. This annual world renowned conference is online, which merely takes place over the internet allowing participants to save accommodation and flight expenses and at the same time help save our planet by reducing CO_2 emissions.

To ensure high quality of the submissions, all submitted papers went through a double blind review process before a decision was made.

Azadeh Shafaei

Editor

Training EFL Students in Cultural Event Planning and Implementation

Dr. Liliana Landolfi
Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale", Italy
lilando2@tin.it

Abstract
The academic year 2009/2010 has seen the birth of a new post-bachelor degree in "Languages and Intercultural Communication in the Euro-Mediterranean Area" at the University of Naples "L'Orientale", Italy. The nature of this degree is unusual since it represents a joint venture between the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures and the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy. Graduates are meant to leave the program with a keen awareness of the importance of the multilingual and intercultural approach required to mediate, re-mediate and inter-mediate the ties that keep members of the multi-faceted Mediterranean reality connected.

In order to satisfy some of the degree goals and cultivate "mediation skills" via verbal, non-verbal, and persuasive communication, first-year students attended a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) course on communication, with a special focus on Peace Education. Theory and practice combined and culminated in the implementation of the first academic convention entirely organized and run by EFL students.

Peace Open Day 1 (POD 1) was held on May 26, 2010. Organizers, participants, academicians, and radio interviewees attested its full success and hoped for a POD 2 to see the light in a near future. Recent developments demonstrate that the obtained success was not ephemeral.

This paper supports CLIL methodology; traces the main steps in the implementation of a cultural event as the outcome of a laboratory for foreign language learning, presents original data taken from the convention, and advocates the inclusion of peace education in foreign language curricula.

Keywords: CLIL-based Methodology, Mediation skills, Peace Education

Opening Scenario
Recent developments of the Barcelona Process (1995) are oriented toward the creation of a "Mediterranean Union" (MU) that may represent and characterize, within the larger European (EU) frame, the specific peculiarities, diversities, and congruities of the Mediterranean coastal countries. These developments pushed the language committee members of the faculties of Foreign Languages and Literatures and Arts and Philosophy at the University of Naples "L'Orientale" Italy, to create a new co-directed post-bachelor degree, entitled "*Languages and Intercultural Communication in the Euro-Mediterranean Area*" (*LM*), that could offer interested students a learning environment where they could investigate and face the MU multifaceted reality, as well as be trained for the new mediating professions that the interwoven contemporary realities of the Mediterranean area would need. Enrolling students could choose between two parallel curricula, LM-38 or LM-92, both made up of 120 credits and to be completed over a two-year path (for details see http://www.unior.it).

The degree started in the academic year 2009/2010 and has just successfully concluded its first complete cycle. It promotes understanding and respect of world languages and cultures but gives particular attention to the ones that are in use within the Mediterranean area. To be more precise, students are offered the possibility of studying, understanding,

and experimenting with these languages: Albanese, Arabic, Bulgarian, English, French, German, Greek, Italian, Russian, Slavic languages, and Spanish. Yet the general focus of the degree is not confined to the study of languages—it goes beyond. It touches upon other aspects of the above-mentioned languages and cultures, such as their philological roots and relevant literatures. It also analyzes their cultural, political, religious, and socio-economic transformations, and focuses on their historical, geographical, and artistic specificities. Further, in consideration of the fact that in our fast-changing world and international socio-cultural and politic interconnections, knowing how to communicate in English is of help for world-wide contacts, mediations, and interactions, the degree is also designed so as to allow students to develop and potentiate their knowledge of English as a *lingua franca* (Mauranen and Rant, 2009; Ostler, 2010) and as an international vehicle of communication.

During the degree, students become more and more aware of how much today's world needs a multilingual and intercultural attitude to mediate, re-mediate, and inter-mediate among state members of the Mediterranean reality. This attitude is the most powerful ingredient for peaceful relationships creating and maintaining a sound and long-lasting net of harmonic relations, effective connections, and healthy social rapport.

In general, students have less innate understanding of multicultural issues than lay adults. But that situation can be changed if students become open to a multilingual and intercultural way of thinking, are offered the possibility of stepping above the barriers and limitations of a single language and culture, and stay tuned in to others' languages, cultures, and needs. The LM degree is organized so that this type of awareness is gradually built through the various teaching/learning settings that students are offered, in the diverse subject matter, and via the different teaching styles professors adopt. Frontal teaching, interactive seminars, self-access paths (guided, semi-guided, and autonomous), practical laboratories, external/internal stages, and independent self-directed research projects on topics specific to the degree are just some of the most frequently adopted learning environments in use. They weave a harmonic, multifaceted, and strategic pedagogical network that favors and supports the various kinds of intelligence (Gardner, 2006) and learning styles (Reid, 2005).

Methodological Framework
Multilingual and intercultural issues (Neuliep, 2009), with their multifaceted and ever-changing aspects, are better touched upon and understood if interactants work within practical boundaries and self-experience some of the overt issues and/or covert implications connected with multiculturalism and plurilingual education (Council of Europe, 2007; Commission of the European Communities, 2008). Thus, the two-year course of English (16 credits for a total of 100 frontal teaching hours) of the LM degree was designed so as to develop/potentiate communication skills (first year) and instill/encourage leadership and guidance skills (second year) within a peace-oriented framework common to both years.

The Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) methodological framework (Eurydice, 2006; Socrates-Comenius, 2006) was chosen for both years so as to allow for traditional language-related aspects (e.g., grammar, linguistics, textuality, pragmatics) to be taken care of, and diverse content focuses to be developed across years. The Eurydice study (2006) suggests that CLIL is a generic term to describe a variety of classroom environments where a second language (L2), a minority language, or any equally

official/national language is used to teach other than the L2 language itself. This definition expands the one proposed by Marsh (2002) but still leaves out teaching/learning situations where the content to be learned is taught via the language to be acquired. Landolfi (2009) has further expanded the definition and proposed to consider CLIL environments all those language settings where contents other than the L2 (e.g., communication skills, mediation techniques, public speech delivery, peace education, leadership, and so on), are taught via the target language (English in the present case).

Though the most appropriate definition of CLIL is still being debated, the validity of a CLIL approach for second-language learning (SLL) has been accepted all over the world. Initially, CLIL settings have found significant applications in elementary and secondary schools in Europe (Dillon, 2008; Mehisto, Marsh & Frigols, 2008). To date, however, CLIL instruction has been fully accepted and welcomed also at university level, and its advantages are visible in a number of studies (Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010; Sisti, 2009). Indeed, the latest university-level reforms in Italy (http://www.istruzione.it/) encourage that a number of subjects in different disciplines be taught in a foreign language (http://www.miur.it/UserFiles/2897.pdf),.

Pedagogical Structure of the Course
Within this post-bachelor degree, I conducted the two courses of *English Language and Linguistics* (first and second year). The first-year course, which is the only one the present paper reports about, took place in the first semester of the academic year 2009-2010 and was organized so that the majority of the above mentioned pedagogical settings could be experimented with.

The course (8 credits) lasted fifty class hours and was totally conducted in English. Besides the support of the traditional book-based tools, the syllabus was enriched with the facilities offered by a variety of more contemporary media, including educational videos, YouTube™ videos, movies, short TV segments, TV ads, Internet-available interviews, and audio-files on communication modes and peace matters. Students, however, were also required to attend a fifty-hour grammar-based course of English run by a native speaker, and to work autonomously, outside the classroom context, for a minimum of one-hundred extra hours. Further, the students who contributed to the convention, that followed and derived from the course (soon to be described), also attended a 20-hour laboratory (2 credits) on *Cultural event planning and implementation* (see Tab. 1).
As Tab.1 shows, within a CLIL frame, the first year of the course dealt with verbal (Knapp & Hall, 2009; Perkins, 2007), non-verbal (Warthon, 2009), and persuasive (Brock & Green 2005; Hogan, 2007) *communication* investigating *peace education* and *peace maintenance* (Bajaj, 2008) as content areas. The second year, instead, focussed on *leadership* and *guidance*. (Once again, the results of the second-year, though highly positive, are not reported in this paper.) These choices derived from and responded to a number of decisions. Major among them was the consideration that, in a degree oriented toward language mediation and intermediation, the acquisition of communication skills becomes fundamental as well as the instillation and the development of peacemaking and peace-nurturing skills.

Table 1: Pedagogical structure of the course of *English Language and Linguistics I and II*

FIRST YEAR				
Credits	Course hours	Language course hours (*native speaker*)	Hours for independent study and team-work	CLIL focus
8	50	50	100	- Verbal, non-verbal and persuasive communication - peace education and peace maintenance

LABORATORY on *Cultural event planning and implementation*		
Credits	Lab. Hours	Focus
2	20	Planning and implementing POD 1: - integrated strategies: brainstorming sessions, decision-making meetings, task assignments and task accomplishments - contacts inside/outside university - management of time, money, formalities, tasks, responsibilities, etc.

SECOND YEAR				
Credits	Course hours	Language course hours (*native speaker*)	Hours for independent study and teamwork	CLIL focus
8	50	50	100	Leadership and guidance for peace education and peace maintenance

During the first year, a variety of techniques and daily praxes were used to train students in communication skills. These included brain-storming, problem solving, creating and compiling questionnaires, analyzing texts, interviews, debates, class speeches, presentations, demonstrations, argumentations, mind maps, sequential thinking, lecturettes, and role-playing. Students were involved in the integration and factual use of all the skills linked to SLL, ranging from oral/written comprehension and production to guided, semi-guided, and autonomous activities. An array of learning settings and formats (e.g., self-study, pair work, group work, teamwork, e-learning, and chats) was adopted to make students capable of dealing with their personal/interpersonal conflicts (Weeks, 1994) in their private and social lives, as well as becoming peace promoters via focusing on topics connected, but not limited to, non-violent communication (Marshall, 2003). Students were also trained in cross-cultural understanding (Samovar, Porter & McDaniel, 2011) and conflict resolution (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse & Miall, 2011) via practical role-playing and cross-class encounters.

Roots of POD 1
The innovative content areas selected for the LM first course of English, the integrated framework offered by CLIL methodology, the freedom students experienced throughout the course, together with the possibility they were granted of speaking out about (Landolfi 2011) aspects related to their learning path in the process of developing their performance, the attention paid to the different learning styles, as well as the variety of daily praxes and

learning strategies adopted in class, galvanized the students and made the class a real success in a number of ways, to the point of triggering, in the students, the desire to go beyond the class requirements and experiment with the creation of a public event (see next section).

For example, just to mention some of the positive results, it is worth considering that a huge majority of the students (90%):

- attended more than 85% of the course lessons, though there was no attendance requirement, as for other university courses
- enjoyed and happily co-constructed an active, re-active, and pro-active classroom atmosphere
- appreciated the full-immersion setting that was created during class hours, group work, pair work, teamwork, and role-playing during class hours and beyond, as expressed in the anonymous final class comments and reactions
- maintained constantly active an e-mail channel among class members and professors
- worked on creative and independent peace-connected research projects
- developed a new sense of awareness toward language learning, language matters, and learning responsibilities
- got excellent grades
- applied for and got Erasmus scholarships (80% of the students)
- completed all the courses that were required during the first year, in spite of the fact that in other degree, the percentage of "*fuoricorso*" (students who do not complete all the yearly academic requirements in time) is high

Indeed, the list could be longer, as the dots suggest and the students' anonymous comments at the end of the course indicate. However, and most of all, remarkable resulted the students' enthusiasm and full cooperation in the successful accomplishment of the course requirements, as well as the friendly sense of cooperation among class members, which was gradually built during language-oriented activities on peace matters inside and outside the classroom. These factors worked as a propellant trigger toward activating other learning settings (e.g.: the peace cafe, the rainbow circle) where the students integrated peace-matters and language learning.

Thus, given the quality of the students' research projects, in a full democratic modality, it was decided that the students who wanted to transform their research projects into formal presentations for a public event on peace matters, could take part in a language laboratory on *Cultural event planning and implementation* (2 credits), thus be trained and become active organizers of such an event. To my surprise, the consensus was almost total: 85% of the students agreed on experimenting practically what they had learned during course hours and share their project findings with fellow students and academicians.

This idea—which initially seemed to all the students and to me -, quite shocking for the embedding tradition-geared academic context and almost impossible to be reached by fourth-year students of English (as students who attend the first year of a post-bachelor degree are called)—turned out to be an interesting challenge. It was a perfect way to transform CLIL methodology into CLIL practice. Further, given that LM graduates are expected, among other things, to become event planners, the organization of a convention (as students decided to call the event) resulted in perfect alignment with the degree requirements. For the university, it was going to be the first time to host a convention totally organized and run by fourth-year students. For the students themselves, the event was going to be the first time to experiment with what they just learned in class, practice communication modes, and use English for a public speech.

Indeed, the planning and the implementation of the event turned out to be a great social and linguistic growth experience for the students (as their anonymous comments attest) who volunteered to play an active role. In spite of all the possible difficulties (students' innate shyness for public performances, technical support, time boundaries, etc.) and constraints (university permission, location, sponsoring support, etc.), the conjoined efforts of students, language instructors, students' families, and university exponents concretized and gave birth to the cultural event *Peace Open Day 1* (POD 1).

Planning and Implementing POD 1
POD 1 took place on May 26, 2010, at the University of Naples "L'Orientale" under the auspices of both faculties' chairs and language exponents, in the presence of students, professors, family members, friends, and media technicians. It turned out to be a felicitous experience for all the participants, regardless of their roles, as well as for people in the audience (check a radio interview on the event
http://www.radiorientale.unior.it/index.php?start=30).
However, as all the academicians who have organized conventions or other socio-cultural public events would agree, a lot of work was necessary for the convention to become a reality. Indeed, any convention, even if only one day long, requires many days of advance planning and a significant amount of patience among the organizers. POD 1 was not an exception, and students had to work really hard to organize and run the entire event in English. My role, as supervisor and coordinator, was intentionally indirect and unobtrusive, though present and constant. I was supported by Robin Lindsay, the active native-tutor who had worked with the students during course hours. Robin took care of polishing up the students' public performance, monitoring the linguistic, phonological, and syntactic aspects of their presentations.
The students who enrolled in the laboratory met two hours, twice a week, for ten weeks in a row. All the planning aspects were taken care of during the laboratory hours. The laboratory was in English (with some Italian interference), structured informally, articulated in brainstorming sessions, decision-making meetings, task assignments and task accomplishments (Vella 2000), oral and written reports, minute taking, training on PowerPoint™ and video-making, try-outs, and more. These activities were fundamental to touch upon, put into practice, and solve the various aspects necessary for the implementation of POD 1. In turn, all the students worked as in-progress reporters, taking formal minutes on what was achieved in the laboratory hours and touching upon the weekly task assignments, the contacts to develop, the remaining steps to be accomplished, etc.
Students self-decided to be speakers (see Appendix A for the program) or helpers both behind the scenes and during the event (hostess, moderator, videographer, reporter, video-DJ, interviewer, food and beverage provider, and so on). Regardless of this division, but respectful of their personal attitudes and wishes, the students self-selected to work within one of five teams: CONTACT KEEPERS, FUND RAISERS AND MONEY HOLDERS, SETTING ORGANIZERS, REFRESHMENT SUPPLIERS, and GADGET PROPONENTS. Though, all of the students were responsible for making decisions and managing the entire process, each team had its own specific tasks to accomplish and to report about during the weekly meetings. In particular:

- CONTACT KEEPERS had to create and maintain contacts within and beyond the academic environment, write e-mails, create an invitation and a welcoming refrain, work on the brochure and the event program, contact and get a consensus from

moderators, keep team members informed on *who* was doing what, *what* and *how* something had to be done, and in *what time.*

- FUND RAISERS AND MONEY HOLDERS had tasks related to finding sponsors, writing letters to promote the event, and virtually administering the little monetary fund that was granted by both faculties. They had to check about the cost of all refreshments and beverages, be responsible for buying what was agreed upon, and delivering everything to the refreshments supplier-team.
- SETTING ORGANIZERS had to identify the location (see photo 11), ask for permission, organize diverse settings for the presentations and the breaks (coffee and lunch). They were responsible for providing electronic support, video-taping the event, creating (see Appendix B) a photo-album (before, during, and after the social event), as well as for embellishing the convention area (flowers, speaker names, trays with water, etc.) and cleaning it after the event.
- REFRESHMENT SUPPLIERS were to search on the Internet and identify recipes for typical dishes of the various Mediterranean coastal countries and prepare some of them (see photos 13 and 14) for the Lunch (Arab hummus, French rolls, Greek salad and eggplant salad, Italian fluid chocolate for fruit skewers, Lebanese couscous, Spanish gazpacho, Turkish sesame crackers, etc.). They also had to draw a food map (see photo 13), prepare a list of the ingredients, and copies of the recipes, gather utensils to serve during the event, and arrange taste samplings during laboratory hours for team members.
- GADGET PROPONENTS had to take care of all the aspects linked to what speakers would wear during the convention (badge, names, lucky clover, etc.) and the convention visitors would take with them after the convention (e.g.: "A peace thought for the day", a little sticker to wear, etc.) and contribute to during the event (e.g.: "Give-us-a-comment card", "Give-us-a-hand card", etc.). They had to search for peace definitions, aphorisms on peace, acronyms for "PEACE" (see photo 4), take care of the actualization of the POD Tapestry (see photos 5, 7, and 8), and prepare the opening video "Welcome to POD 1" (http://www.sendspace.com/file/6n8860) and closing video "Backstage alive" (http://www.sendspace.com/file/wrg6vi).

Students were constantly involved with taking decisions and solving problems in relation to all of the facets that the realization of POD 1 was bringing to light. Though on the surface they were organizing a public convention, at a deeper level they were learning how to activate a variety of personal skills, working together and helping each other toward the achievement of a common goal. They were living through the concepts about effective communication skills they had been learning. Dynamics of mediation and inter-personal mediation, as well as social re-mediation were constantly active during the academic meetings as well as in the students' social lives. Positive and negative emotions (Landolfi, 2009), stress reactions, fears and conflicts did occur but they were all faced and dealt with in an *action mode* ("I face a problem and I act on it searching for a solution.)" rather than in a *re-action mode* ("I encounter the problem but I run away or dismiss/minimize it."). Operational and functional seeds were implanted for the peace holders of tomorrow. Indeed, the sound and long-lasting net of harmonic relations, effective connections, and healthy rapport that the students were capable of creating during the laboratory hours were a significant added value to the entire implementation. The acquired communication skills practiced within a CLIL-based peace education framework contributed positively to the human growth of the students.

Conclusive Remarks

When learning a foreign language, students are generally asked to perform in class in guided or semi-guided contexts of communication which are meant to simulate real situations and are subject to the teacher's control and, most unfortunate, evaluation. The possibility for them to perform in the target language and for real purposes are very limited indeed. This situation, which is particularly true in academic settings with overcrowded classes and time limits for program accomplishment, does not favor linguistic independence, expressive spontaneity, and personal creativity. As a result, students' linguistic performance generally suffers, and they remain at scholastic level that is not acceptable in the international world we all live in.

On the contrary, letting the students organize and put on a cultural event gave them the opportunity of acting on their proficiency level and foreign language awareness. Students gained a flavor of what they could reach becoming communicatively skilled and fluent in English. That represents a significant accomplishment for citizens of the Mediterranean area, where dozens of languages coexist and intermingle and where an appropriate and functional knowledge of English, as a lingua franca, is a valid tool for activating contacts and maintaining them.

Indeed, as it appeared clear from the students' final comments and the personal communications during office hours throughout the school year, a number of co-occurring factors made the difference between a traditional Language and Linguistics course of English and a CLIL version of the same. Students mentioned zoomed out valuable considerations (see listed below) which, far from being exhaustive, support the qualities that CLIL methodology offers. For these students, among the things so far mentioned, both pedagogically relevant and socially valid factors made the difference. For example, they all stated appreciation and enjoyment for the

- pleasant and relaxed classroom atmosphere;
- class-members' support;
- possibility of openly manifesting difficulties and learning blocks so to be helped
- immersion in a language learning environment where the L2 was spoken all the time;
- building of social and collaborative relationships across class participants
- multimedia support and the use of electronic and visual devices;
- acquisition of presentation and video-making skills
- various forms of interaction: in class, outside the class, during the collaborative study groups and/or the teamwork;
- practical and concrete implementation of a cultural event;
- public recognition of the implemented efforts, besides
- professor's availability and unobtrusiveness.

All of these favorable aspects became manifest particularly thanks to the CLIL environment and the selected content areas. Indeed, the findings of this study seem to highlight that the more the students become co-actors in the learning experience, the better their results. In the context so far described, the organization and implementation of a social event turned out to be a highly productive environment for a CLIL approach. Self-consciousness about their role as language learners and self-awareness about the required proficiency level, as well as their learning modalities and their novel capacity as self-evaluators of contents and personal achievements, nurtured via a number of tools offered

at different stages of the course, made students more and more aware of their overt/covert intended goals as well as about the ways to achieve them.

All of these considerations support the design of the recent academic reform in Italy. They suggest that university students are ready for CLIL experiences, and call for a new generation of language professors, open to the methodological changes CLIL requires. In the contemporary globalized world where everything is fast, the possibility of achieving two goals at once (content and foreign language learning) seems very appealing, and CLIL settings are an efficient and functional answer to modern demands of expertise in foreign languages and in a variety of contents.

I would like to conclude this paper thanking all the members of the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures and the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy who contributed with their warm support to the positive accomplishment of POD 1. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the group of students I had the opportunity to lead. It was definitely one of the most enriching group with whom I have had the joy and the privilege of working.

References

Bajaj, M. (2008). (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Peace Education.* Charlotte, NC. Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Barcelona Declaration adopted at the Euro-Mediterranean Conference 27/28-11-1995. [Online] Available at: http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2005/july/tradoc_124236.pdf [Accessed 3 July 2011].

Brock, T.C. & Green. M.C. (2005). (Eds.) *Persuasion: Psychological Insights and Perspectives*. London. SAGE Publications Inc.

Commission of the European Communities. (2008). *Multilingualism: An Asset for Europe and a Shared Commitment. Brussels*. [Online] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/pdf/com/2008_0566_en.pdf [Re-accessed 7 July 2011].

Council of Europe. (2007). *From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Guide_niveau2_EN.asp [Accessed 29 June 2009].

Coyle, D., Hood, P. & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Dillon, A.M. (2008). 'The CLIL approach in Irish primary schools. A multilingual perspective. *CLIL practice: Perspectives from the Field*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.atriumlinguarum.org/contenido/print%20Article.pdf [Re-accessed 20 June 2011].

Eurydice. (2006). *Content and Language Integrated Learning(CLIL) at School in Europe.* Brussels. Eurydice.

Garner, H. (2006). *Multiple Intelligences: New Horizons*. New York. Basic Books.

Hogan, K. (2007). *The psychology of Persuasion*. Gretna, LU. Pelican Publishing Company.

MUIR (2011). CLIL Methodology at University Level. [Online]. Available at http://www.miur.it/UserFiles/2897.pdf [Accessed July 5 2011].

MUIR (2011). Italian University Reform 2010. [Online]. Available at http://www.istruzione.it/ [Accessed July 5 2011].

Knapp, M. & Hall, J. (2009). *Non-Verbal Communication in Human Interaction*. 7th Edition. Boston, MA. Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Landolfi, L. (2009). "CLIL in the class of English" in Flora Sisti (Ed.). *CLIL Methodology in University instruction: Online and in classroom. An emerging framework.* Urbino. Guerra Edizioni. pp.175-189.

Landolfi, L. (2009). "Emotions and visualizations: where heart and mind intermingle" In Azadeh Shafaei- Mehran Nejati (Ed.) *Annals of language and Learning: Proceedings of the 2009 International Online Language Conference (IOLC 2009)*. Boca Raton. Universal-Publishers.

Landolfi, L. (2011). "Voice to Students" *7th International Conference on Education. Samos Conference proceedings*. Athenes. Stadiou, TK. Volume B. pp. 164-169.

Marsh, D. (2002). *CLIL/EMILE – The European dimension.* Jyväskylä. University of Jyväskylä UniCOM- Continuing Education Centre.

Marshall, B.R. (2003). *Non Violent Communication: A Language of Life*. 2nd Edition. Encintas, CA. PuddleDancer Press.

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D. & Frigols, M.J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL*. Printed in China. Macmillan Books for Teachers.

Mauranen, A. & Ranta, E. (Eds.). (2009). *English as a Lingua Franca*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Neuliep, J.W. (2009). 4th Edition. *Intercultural Communication: A contextual Approach*. London. SAGE Publications Inc.

Osteler, N. (2010). *The Last Lingua Franca*. New York. Walker & Company.

Perkins, P.S., (2007). *The Art and Science of Communication: tools for effective Communication in the Workplace*. Hoboken, N.J. John Wiley & Sons Inc.

POD 1 videos. (2010). "*Welcome to POD 1*" [Online]. Available at http://www.sendspace.com/file/6n8860 [Accessed July 26 2011] and "*Backstage alive*" [Online]. Available at http://www.sendspace.com/file/wrg6vi. [Accessed July 26 2011].

Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T. & Miall, H. (2011). *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*. 3rd Edition. Cambridge. Polity Press.

Reid, G. (2005). *Learning Styles and Inclusion*. London. Paul Chapman Publishing.

Samovar, L.A., Porter, R.E. & McDaniel, E.R. (2011). *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*. Boston, MA. Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Sisti, F. (2009). (Ed.). *CLIL Methodology in University instruction: Online and in classroom. An emerging framework.* Urbino. Guerra Edizioni.

Socrates-Comenius 2.1. (2006). CLIL across Contexts. A Scaffolding Framework for CLIL Teacher Education. [Online]. Available at: http://clil.uni.lu/ [Re-accessed 4 July 2011].

Vella, J. (2000). *Taking Learning to Tasks*: *Creative Strategies for Teaching Adults*. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.

Warthon, T. (2009). *Pragmatics and Non-verbal Communication*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Weeks, D. (1994). *The eight essential steps to conflict resolution*. New York, NY. Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.

Comparison of Time Adverbials in English and Macedonian in a Corpus of Written Works Translated from Macedonian into English by English Native Speakers

Jovanka Jovanchevska-Milenkoska
University American College Skopje, Macedonia
jovankaj@uacs.edu.mk

Abstract
This paper deals with time adverbials as lexical temporal sentence elements, and presents the results of a time adverbials research in English and Macedonian. The research treats differences and similarities of time adverbials from morphological, syntactical, and positional point of view. Corpus in this research is mainly literary and fewer academic works translated (fully or partly) from Macedonian into English by English native speakers. Main accent was put on the positional features of time adverbials in both languages.
The problems encountered in the course of the research are discussed in this paper as well, such as: the translator, the type of chosen corpus, the theoretical grammatical background present in both languages, the existence of national corpora, etc.
The paper emphasizes the importance of time adverbials in a linguistic system and aims to help: language teachers and learners to use time adverbials correctly without the influence of the mother tongue; Macedonian translators to be able to formally identify and place semantically different English time adverbials in their most preferred positions; and linguists to deepen the knowledge of Macedonian as well as English time adverbials, and further develop the field of lexical temporal markers in the study of linguistics.

Keywords: Time Adverbial, Linguistics, Position

Introduction
This research aims at elaborate and concise presentation of Macedonian time adverbials in comparison to English time adverbials. Having the background theory of English linguistics in perspective (as well as the research methodology) (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002; Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad & Finega, 1999) and using it as a comparison milestone, this research attempts to offer a detailed and versatile description of Macedonian time adverbials from morphosyntactic and positional point of view. The semantics of Macedonian time adverbials is a rather complex field of study and it will be substantially analyzed in a further research.
The research objectives are to provide the gap in Macedonian linguistics of clear identification and description of Macedonian time adverbials and supply broader and more comprehensive comparative view of English and Macedonian time adverbials.
These research objectives should help build Macedonian theoretical linguistics, improve the translation process from Macedonian into English and vice versa regarding time adverbials, their form and position, as well as aid the learning process of Macedonian ESL/EFL learners through identification of the usage of English time adverbials, as well as their interaction with other temporal markers in the sentence (structural, lexical and prosodic).

Literature Review
English linguists have contributed sufficiently in the field of temporal language phenomena, though not as much in the area of lexical temporal markers. Some linguists

(Klein, 2008; Jaszczolt, 2009) maintain that this field is generally neglected by the majority of the linguists, especially in comparison with the structural temporal markers (grammatical tense and aspect). However, time adverbials have been closely examined by major linguists (Quirk *et al.*,1985; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002; Biber *et. al*, 1999) and others (Hasselgard, 2010; Ernst, 2004; Cinque, 2004).

Macedonian linguistics currently lacks any theoretical foundations concerning adverbials in general (including time adverbials), their morphological forms, sentence position, semantic descriptions, rate of occurrence, etc., i.e. there is a shortcoming of adverbial research beyond the general and most basic definition (Минова-Ѓуркова, 1994; Саздов, 2008; Школарова-Љоровска, 1990). Most of Macedonian linguistics/grammar research deals with the rather intricate tense system and verbal-lexical categories (verboids), almost completely disregarding the "taxonomical" linguistic area of time adverbials.

Theoretical findings of the three most influential English comprehensive and extensive grammars of the last three decades were used (Quirk *et al.*,1985; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002; Biber *et. al*, 1999), while in Macedonian the comprehensive grammar of Blazhe Koneski (Блаже Конески, 1996; first published in 1952/1954) and several other contemporary Macedonian grammar books (Саздов, 2008; Минова-Ѓуркова, 1994; Панзова, 1996; Школарова-Љоровска, 1990; Корубин, 1990; Круме Конески, 2003).

Methodology
In the first two parts of the research the existent theoretical grounds in English and Macedonian are thoroughly presented.

The third part is the comparative study. Considering the fact that currently no national Macedonian corpus is available (only portioned small-scale corpora devised for special purposes), this research was based on a specially compiled corpus[1] comprised of translations from Macedonian into English done by native English speakers. Time adverbials were extracted together with their host sentence-like constructions (single predicate sentences or clauses), and were systematically and statistically analyzed in both translational equivalents. 3160 temporal adverbials were analyzed out of which 2649 were extracted from the literary part and 527 of the academic part of the corpus.[2]

Regarding the fact that most of the implications (if not all) are in Macedonian linguistics (the Macedonian existent theoretical foundations for time adverbials are practically negligent), both parts of the corpus (i.e. English translational equivalents and Macedonian translational equivalents) were compared and conclusions were made solely on the basis of the corpus findings.[3] English theoretical already existent findings were used as a milestone for establishing relevance.

Findings and Discussion
The findings can be grouped in three categories: morphological, semantic and syntactic/positional (sentence position).

---

[1] Of about 700 pages

[2] The ratio of 3:1 of literary corpus vs. academic corpus is due to reasons stated in the Problems section of this paper. (Because of the non-overlapping (and statistically non-influential) nature of the typical time adverbial phrasal forms for both the corpora (literary and academic), the rest of the paper statistically deals with the corpus as a whole.)

[3] It was illogical to compare English theoretical findings with findings of a Macedonian portioned corpus.

1. Morphological findings

English temporal adverbials are mostly phrases; adverb phrases (*sometimes, soon, tonight*) and prepositional phrases (*at the beginning of this century, on Monday, for three days*) are the most often used phrases. There also are the noun phrases which are not as common comparing to the others *(three years, Mondays, this week)*, and temporal clauses[4] (Quirk *et al.*, 1985).

The Macedonian forms of temporal adverbials include the same phrasal types as English, but with different qualitative and quantitative distribution. Following the Macedonian tradition (Саздов, 2008, p. 22), the form recognized as a basic sentence element is the noun phrase. Prepositional phrases are simply noun phrases preceded by a preposition, which actually functions as a syntactic means for connecting the sentence elements.

The statistical participation of the three phrasal categories in the overall corpus is presented in table 1. It can be concluded that the adverb phrases form the majority of the corpus, and that it is the influence (and characteristics) of the literary corpus (table 2).

In the literary corpus the temporal adverbs and adverb phrases in Macedonian are greater in number and more common than in English (table 1), and the situation is reverse with prepositional phrases in English.

The academic corpus is mostly comprised of prepositional phrases, and the situation is rather static there – the style seeks prepositional phrases as the most convenient means for expressing calendrical information, as well as descriptive temporal information (table 3).[5]

Table 1

Corpus (overall)		
Phrasal forms of time adverbials	**Macedonian corpus**	**English corpus**
Adverb phrases	2122	1854
Prepositional phrases	675	953
Noun phrases	328	318

Table 2

Literary corpus		
Phrasal forms of time adverbials	**Macedonian corpus**	**English corpus**
Adverb phrases	1957	1708
Prepositional phrases	357	583
Noun phrases	320	309

Table 3

Academic corpus		
Phrasal forms of time adverbials	**Macedonian corpus**	**English corpus**
Adverb phrases	159	147

---

[4] Finite, non-finite and verbless clauses

[5] The subtle statistical incongruity of the numbers is caused by a small percentage of time adverbials which have other translational equivalents (clauses, conjunctions, adjectives, etc.)

Prepositional phrases	352	370
Noun phrases	16	9

More than 82% of Macedonian time adverbials are translated with the same type of phrasal form (2595 of a total of 3160, table 2); 13% are translated with a different phrasal form, (table 5), and the remaining 5% are translated either with a non-phrasal time adverbial form (or other sentence functions) or are lacking the translational equivalent of the Macedonian (or English) time adverbial. .

Table 4

AdvP mac = AdvP eng[6]	1789
PP mac = PP eng	601
NP mac = NP eng	205
Total	**2595**

Table 5

AdvP mac = PP eng	237
AdvP mac = NP eng	79
PP eng = AdvP mac	48
PP eng = NP mac	34
NP eng = PP mac	110
Total	**508**

- Adverb phrases

The predominance of the adverb phrases in the overall corpus (table 1), with more than 67% (2122 out of 3160) in the Macedonian corpus, is generally attributed to the nature of the corpus. Table 2 shows us that the majority of the adverb phrases are extracted from the literary part of the corpus, which is abundant with time-setting initial temporal adverbials which serve as story-line connectives. These connectives are mostly anaphoric or deictic, and can many times have different translational equivalents, depending on their meaning.[7] The deictic temporal adverbial *тогаш* in (1) assumes the position after the subject, unlike in English. It is also the case that such Macedonian deictic temporal adverbials can be interpreted differently and translated with different English equivalents, so *тогаш* can be translated as: *at that instant, back then, in those days*, etc., and thus obtain different sentential positions, mostly on the length basis, example (1)[8]. Other such deictic expressions designating literary time act in the same way: *now, later, afterwards*, etc.

(1) Татко **тогаш** ги удри воловите со прачка,... (Андреевски, р. 24)
Then father goaded the bullocks with a stick… (Andreevski, p. 19)

The bigger percentage of Macedonian adverb phrases (67% in the Macedonian corpus vs. 58% in the English corpus, table 1) is a direct consequence of the process of adverbialization of word groups of prepositions and nouns in the course of the past in Macedonian (Блаже Конески, 1996; Корубин, 1990). The degree of adverbialization can be different, and many of those word groups have even come to be written and considered as one single word. For example, *навреме (on time), навечер (in the evening), допладне (till noon), напладне (at noon), одвреме-навреме (from time to time), наутро (in the*

---

[6] Abbreviations explained in the annex section.

[7] Some Macedonian adverbs have a complex semantic structure, as well as multi-class membership (e.g. *тогаш, веќе, уште*, etc.).

[8] The different sentential position can be caused by other reasons as well, discussed in the Sentence position findings in this paper.

morning), прекуноќ (during the night), завчера (the day before yesterday), задутре (the day after tomorrow), etc. The common prepositions in this kind of adverbs are *на (on), од (from), до (till), преку (through),* etc. Their translations are PPs most often. We can evidence this in the following corpus examples:

(2) ***Утредента*** немаше толку многу војска колку што им се пристори ***вчераноќта***. (Јовановски, р. 259)

The next morning, the cousins realized there weren't as many soldiers as they had believed ***the night before***. (Jovanovski, p. 19)

The influence of the process of adverbialization on the number of adverb phrases in Macedopnian and prepositional phrases in English can be seen from the fact that the biggest number of Macedonian adverb phrases which are translated with prepositional phrases in English, table 5.

Macedonian and English are similar in the production of adverbs from adjectives by using productive derivational suffixes, such as *–ly* in English, and *–o* in Macedonian. The difference is that Macedonian temporal adverbs which end in *–o* have the same form with the corresponding adjectives for neutrum gender, and sometimes the morphological status can be determined only by the sentence function. For example, in (3) *долго* is an adverb and in (4) it is an adjective.[9]

(3) Братучедите се погледнаа и ***долго*** се гледаа. (Јовановски, р. 269)

The cousins exchanged glances and stood looking at one another *for a long time*. (Jovanovski, p. 29)

(4) ***Долго*** време помина така. (Јовановски, р. 286)

A *long* time passed. (Jovanovski, p. 48)

- Prepositional phrases and noun phrases

The situation with the prepositional phrases is rather fixed (especially in the academic corpus, table 3). The prepositional phrases in the Macedonian corpus examples mainly remain prepositional phrases in the English corpus examples.

The difference can be noted in the translation of Macedonian noun phrases with English prepositional phrases for durative time adverbials, which are basically translated with the preposition *for* in English.

(5) …а синот еве ***четири години*** служеше нечија војска. (Јовановски, р. 243)

...and her son had been serving in somebody's army ***for the past four years***. (Jovanovski, p. 1)

Other typical adverbial temporal forms in Macedonian are the verboids (Школарова-Љоровска, 1990, р. 67), which are actually lexical forms (nouns, adjectives and adverbs) stemming from verbs, thus carrying out a verbal function. These forms are usually translated with temporal clauses in English.

(6) Едно *излегување*, и ќе го почудат. (Андреевски, р. 52)

As soon as we he went out of the house he'd catch a spell from an unclean woman and… (Andreevski, p. 41)

(7) Ами, знаеш дека *прво намачкување* и се крена тоа пострупеното од главчето на Здравко. (Андреевски, р. 52)

No sooner had I rubbed it onto his head than the crust vanished.
(Andreevski, p. 40)

---

[9] These are also mostly expressed by prepositional phrases or *long*- or *time*-phrases.

2. Semantic findings

English temporal adverbials have been thoroughly semantically analyzed by more English major linguists (Quirk *et al.*, Biber *et al.*, Huddleston & Pullum). Yet it is a field which is still being worked in, especially by linguists intrigued by the interaction of time adverbials and other lexical temporal markers (Klein, Jaszczolt). Generally three basic semantic types are recognized: *time position, time duration* and *frequency*. Some of these, such as *frequency*, do not refer solely to time (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002). Other subtypes are mentioned as well, such as *time relationship* (Quirk *et al.,* 1985) or *serial order* (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002), which quite often overlap in their definitions.

Blazhe Koneski in his extensive grammar of the Macedonian language (Блаже Конески, 1996) tried to incorporate semantic meaning of certain forms which belong to the field of temporal adverbials, but by no means can this be considered to be an elaborate structural analysis of the semantics of temporal adverbials. Blazhe Koneski basically tried to address certain word groups and the difference of form which causes the semantic distinction (such as the difference of *во средата* and *во среда*)[10] and prepositions with secondary temporal meanings (no Macedonian prepositions are purely temporal, like the English *since*). However, their semantic presentations depict individual patterns and show no systematicity.

The temporal adverbs in either language can sometimes encode meanings which are not present in the other language. For example, the Macedonian adverbs *прекутре* and *преквчера* encode the meanings *the day after the day after tomorrow* and *the day before the day before yesterday* respectively.

The finite temporal clauses in Macedonian and English employ temporal conjunctions which basically convey similar meanings. The temporal clauses are the only grammatical feature linguistically and systematically explained in semantic terms in Macedonian (Школарова-Љоровска, 1990). The basic distinction is made on the two states: simultaneity and non-simultaneity (anteriority/posteriority) (Школарова-Љоровска, 1990, p. 12).

In this research there were not enough theoretical foundations in Macedonian to base the semantics comparison of time adverbials.[11]

3. Sentence position findings

As it is already well known from the research of English linguists (Quirk *et al.*, Biber *et al.*, Huddleston & Pullum), temporal adverbials are the most mobile semantic type of adverbials, they can virtually appear in every single sentence position available for adverbials (Quirk *et al.*, 1985, p. 490). The position of temporal adverbials in sentence or sentence-like formations (clauses) can vary according to their meaning. They can be found in the following positions: initial, medial and final (end). Quirk *et al.* (1985) offer several varieties of the three basic positions: initial-medial, medial-medial, end-medial, initial-end, medial-end, end-end, etc. Biber *et al.* (1999) offer a simpler positional view, which excludes the many confusing subtypes and only keeps the general types of initial, medial and final position. We have decided to use Biber's positional classification as a starting point and have devised the following positional comparative criteria:

---

[10] *Во средата* refers to the last Wednesday, while *во среда* refers to the next Wednesday (Блаже Конески, 1996:562)

[11] We are hoping to proceed researching in that area in the future.

Table 6

Specifications of the possible positions of time adverbials in the English and Macedonian corpus translational equivalents					
Corpus	**Position**				
	Initial	**Medial-initial**	**Medial-medial**	**Medial-final**	**Final**
Macedonian	At the beginning of the sentence, before any other sentence elements	Before the VP, but after another obligatory sentence element	Between the verb сум/имам and an infinite verboid	After the VP, before any other sentence element	At the end of the sentence, after all the remaining sentence elements
English	At the beginning of the sentence, before the subject	after the subject, before the VP	помеѓу помошниот и главниот глагол	After the VP, before any other sentence element	At the end of the sentence, after all the remaining sentence elements

The distribution of time adverbials in the three basic positions is given in table 7.

Table 7

Sentence position of time adverbials	Macedonian corpus	English corpus
initial position	1802	1222
final position	1374	1954
medial position	727	649
Total:	**2960**[12]	**2960**

It is evident from table 7 that the initial position is typical for Macedonian time adverbials, and this is the case especially for adverb phrases (process of adverbialization), and in the literary part of the corpus (initial time-setting adverbials and story-line connectives), as shown in table 8. Expressed in percentages, more than 57% of Macedonian time adverbials of the corpus are located in initial position, while this is the case with about 38% of English time adverbials. Biber et al. (1999) claim that although the final position is most typical of all adverbials (50%), the initial position is typical mostly for time adverbials (almost 25%). Still, from table 7 we can conclude that Macedonian has greater tendency to put time adverbials in initial position.

---

[12] The number of relevant corpus examples is 2960 out of 3160. The remaining 200 examples lack a translational equivalent and thus cannot be analyzed.